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## Abstract

Subsidized housing units are rationed among eligible households, so coverage varies substantially by type of household. This paper shows that coverage is best for households from 10 to 30 percent of median income. Coverage is particularly good for large one parent households, and almost as good for small one parent households. Coverage of blacks
.. is particularly good; coverage of whites and hispanics is less so. However, the most serious finding is that at lower incomes, under 10 percent of median income, coverage is very poor. There appear to be households at this income level who cannot deal with our society, and thus provide a classic economic justification for in-kind transfer programs, but who have not been successfully served by HUD's in-kind programs.

## Background

This paper reviews how thoroughly housing subsidy programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) cover the eligible population. By contrast with cash welfare programs or food stamps, which are available to all eligible applicants, housing subsidies are rationed to a fixed number of households. The number is set nationally by Congress and is set in each area by decisions of HUD, local governments, and housing developers. Within the fixed number of subsidized units, it is not always clear who ought to be served first. There has been a fairly clear consensus that the poorest families deserve first priority (HUD [9]), but Congress has sought wider support for the programs by making a broad range of incomes eligible, and serving a subset of eligibles at each income level.

Besides rationing by income, it is possible to ration on any other criterion. There has been a consensus that young people without children should have the lowest priority, but there has been little consensus beyond that, and there has been some indication that all other households should be served equally. In 1974, HUD believed that too many applications were being received for housing for the elderly, and required cities to plan separately for the elderly, large families, and other families, meeting each need more or less equally. At the same time, to prevent racial discrimination, cities were also required to plan separately for each major minotity group.

In this paper we explore how equally housing subsidies have in fact been rationed. Administrative statistics for 1979 show how many households of every type we subsidize, and the Annual Housing Survey for 1979 shows how many are eligible. Therefore we can calculate what fraction of each household type is served. The program coverage measured in this way, households served as a fraction of households eliaible, varies strikingly for different household types. Some groups that turn out to have higher coverage than average can be justified as being particularly needy; for others such justification is more difficult.

We use the term "coverage," of the subsidy programs, because this term draws attention to the fact that the main constraint on the fraction of eligibles served is the size of the subsidy programs, not necessarily the desire of eligibles to participate. The related term "participation rate" has been used appropriately for the fraction served in entitlement programs, like the Experimental Housing Allowance Program (EHAP) or Food Stamps, where the main constraint on the fraction served is the desire in each type of household to participate (Mayo et al. [17).

This distinction should remind us that coverage will never, or rarely, reach $100 \%$. There is a ceiling depending on the desire of households to participate. The participation rates found by the Experimental Housing Allowance Program were $85-90 \%$ for households who would receive at
least $\$ 30$ a month in subsidy, which corresponds to the main income levels studied in this paper (Kennedy and MacMillan, [3]). This may not be a long term maximum, since household decisions in that experiment were affected by the particular options offered to them, by sterentypes of regular subsidized housing, and by the knowledge that this was an experiment. In any case regular program coverage is far short of the maximum imposed by the desire of households to participate.

## Types of Households and Suhsidy Programs

This paper shows results separately for several types of households. First we distinquish households with one adult from households with two or more adults, because we are concerned about how well the programs serve sinale parent households. Second, we distinguish among households with no children, l-3 children, and 4 or more children, in order to judge how well the programs serve small and large families. Finally, households without any children are divided between elderly and non-elderly. The households with children could also have been divided between elderly and non-elderly, but very few are elderly so this has not been done. The resulting eiaht basic types of households are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 - Types of Lower Income Households in the U.S., 1979

| Type | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| One adult with 4 children or more | 371,000 | $1 \%$ |
| one adult with l-3 children | $3,271,000$ | 9 |
| one elderly adult with no children | $7,080,000$ | 20 |
| one non-elderly adult with no children | $5,010,000$ | 14 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | $1,257,000$ |
| two adults (or more) with 4 children or more | $8,051,000$ | 24 |
| two adults (or more) with 1-3 children | $5,833,000$ | 16 |
| two adults (or more) with elderly hear and no children | $4,978,000$ | 14 |
| two adults (or more) with non-elderly head and no children |  |  |
|  |  | $35,850,000$ |
|  |  | $100 \%$ |

"Elderly" is defined as age 62 or older; "children" are defined as age 17 or younger.

Source: Micro-Simulation System, Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD.

Each of these household types can be analyzed at several income levels. This paper concentrates on incomes below the income limit for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program. That income limit, for a household of four, is $80 \%$ of the local median family income. The percentage is adjusted for smaller and larger households, ${ }^{2}$ but the income limit is still commonly called " $80 \%$ of median income." Throughout this paper, " $80 \%$ of median income" means $80 \%$ of local median family income, adjusted for household size."

Most subsidized households have incomes much lower than this income limit. In order to show program coverage at several different levels, income groups are subdivided as shown in Table 2.

This study analyzes four major subsidy programs: Public Housing, Section 236 Rental Assistance, Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments, and Rent Supplements (for descriptions see HUD [10]). The Section 8 program is subdivided into "Existing Housing," "New Construction," "Substantial Rehabilitation" and "Loan Management." Other than Loan Management, these terms are self-explanatory. The "Loan Management" subsidies are for units which previously had a HUD-insured loan. They almost all receive Section 236 subsidy as well as Loan Manaqement subsidy, so we are careful

Table 2 - Incomes of Lower Income Households in the U.S., 1979

| Income Group | Number |
| :--- | ---: |
| $0-10 \%$ of median income | $1,598,000$ |
| $10-30 \%$ of median income | $8,573,000$ |
| $30-50 \%$ of median income | $10,021,000$ |
| $50-80 \%$ of median income | $15,558,000$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | $35,850,000$ |

Note: All of these percentages apply to a four person household, and are adjusted up and down for larger and smaller households.

Source: Micro-Simulation System, Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD.
to avoid double-counting. Rent Supplement units are sub-divided into units that receive Section 236 subsidy as well as their Rent Supplement subsidy, and units that just receive Rent Supplement subsidy. Again, we are careful to avoid double-counting. Table 3 shows the size of each program.

Other housing subsidy programs are excluded because of a lack of comparable data. The Section 235 program subsidizes abut 100,000 households; Section 221(d)(3)BMIR and Section 202 another 50,000 each. Section 312 and Community Develooment Block Grants subsidize many more, through rehabilitation loans. The Farmers Home Administration subsidizes many families in rural areas. All of these excluded programs except Farmers Home, however, offer somewhat smaller subsidies per household than the programs included here, so the findings in this paper do cover the main housing subsidy programs available nationally.

The eligible populations for these proarams vary slightly, but are largely defined by income. The income limits for public housing and rent supplements are usually slightly lower than the $80 \%$ of local median income used in Section 8. The Section 236 limit is slightly higher. These differences are not critical, since most of the analysis in this paper focuses below $30 \%$ of median income, where most subsidized households are, and which is within all the income limits.

All of the programs considered are rental programs, but we compare them to all eligible households, owners and renters, not just to renter households. We make this comparison for two reasons. First, poor owners

Table 3 - Ma.jor Housing Subsidy Programs in the U.S., 1979

| Program | Number of Occupied Units |
| :---: | :---: |
| Public Housina | 1,166,000 |
| Section 236 | 514,000 |
| Section 8 Loan Management and Section 236 Rental Assistance Program | 197,000 |
| Rent Supplements with Section 236 | 86,000 |
| Other Section 236 | 231,000 |
| Section 8 Existing Housing | 405,000 |
| Section 8 New Construction | 162,000 |
| Section 8 Substantial Rehabilitation | 22,000 |
| Rent Supplement without Section 236 | 84,000 |
|  | 2,354,000 |

Source: Micro-Simulation System, Office of Policy Development and Research, HUD.
are in general just as needy as poor renters. Poor owners are usually elderly, with high housing costs relative to their incomes, and with poor housing quality, indicating they do not generally have high assets to ease their low incomes (Burke, Casey and Doepner [11). Second, poor owners have always been eligible for these subsidized housing programs. True, they are required to move and become renters, but until very recently renters equally had to move before they could be subsidized, and that is still true in all programs but Section 8 Existing. If we were studying the administrative quality of housing subsidy programs, it would be fair to compare subsidized households just to renters or just to recent movers, since that is all that administrators can reasonably be expected to serve, given the design of the programs. However, there is no reason to take the design of the programs as fixed, forever, and if that desian means that some households in need are ignored, we would prefer to show this result in the analysis, rather than ignoring owners or nonmovers ourselves. A homeownership subsidy for various reasons is inherently hard to administer. HUD and the Farmers Home Administration have tried giving subsidies to poor homeowners while they stayed in their homes, and have had some sucess. More efforts will undoubtedly be made and a solution may be found. In this paper in any case, we compare subsidized households to all eligible households, arguing that income, rather than tenure or mobility is the direct measure of need.

An additional or alternative measure of need is the housing quality of eligible households. In fact preference has sometimes been given to households with substandard housing, thus using the measure as a rationing criterion. If there were consensus that this should be the main rationing criterion, we could compare subsidized households to eligible households with substandard housing. There are serious problems of overlap between these groups, however. Some subsidized households never were in substandard housing. Others have substandard housing still, or moved into it when they moved into a subsidized project, because some subsidized units are themselves inadequate. Would one compare subsidized households in standard housing to unsubsidized households in substandard housing? Or would one compare subsidized households who used to have substandard housing but now have standard housing to the total of themselves plus others still in substandard housing? Furthermore, housing quality is a very qualitative judgement, and by different definitions one can describe most low income housing or very little of it as substandard. Besides these definitional problems, we are not willing to say in principle that households in standard housing are less worthy of help for some reason than equally low income households in substandard housing. 3 Therefore, we compare subsidized hnuseholds to eligible households regardless of housing quality, because we do not think housing quality can be or should be a major rationing
criterion. It would certainly be instructive to see what effect subsidized housing has on housing quality but the methodological problems are severe, and the issue is tangential to our concern with the rationing of subsidized housing.

## Coverage of Housing Subsidy Programs

Figure 1 shows the total combined coverage of Public Housing, Section 236, Section 8, and Rent Supplements. The households served by these programs are shown on the graph as a percentage of all eligible households. Spread out on the same page, there is a separate chart for each of four different income levels, and in each chart the eight household types are shown across the bottom.

Most activity is at the income level from $10-30 \%$ of median income, so we will discuss that chart in detail. The peak of the chart is among households with four or more children and only on? adult: $29 \%$ of those households are covered by HUD subsidy programs. Households with l-3 children and one adult are served almost as well: $25 \%$ of those households are covered. The elderly and two-or-more-adult households are covered somewhat less well: $15 \%$ or less are subsidized by HUD.

Most of this coverage comes from Public Housing, the largest program, which serves many one-adult households. Out of $1,166,000$ public housing tenants, 205,000 are one-adult households with l-3 children; another 59,00n are one-adult households with 4 or more children. The high degree

Figure 1 - Programs and Eligibles at Four Income Levels
$10-30 \%$ of Median Income


0-107 of Median Income


30-50\% of Median Income

$50-807 \%$ of Median Income

of occupancy by single parent households helps explain why public housing proiects are popularly perceived as having a lot of children: they do have a lot of children and relatively few adults.

Section 8 Existing is slightly different, with more occupancy by households with 1-3 children and one adult, but it serves very much the same population. It is important, however, to note that Secton 8 Existing is a scattered site program, whose tenants are generally dispersed among many privately owned rental buildings, rather than concentrated in one project. Thus the high ratio of children to adults does not overwhelm any single project, but is diluted by being scattered among other, unsubsidized, households.

The remaining programs, not charted separately, are small, and do not contribute much to the total program coverage.

Overall, HUD has given good coverage to one adult households with children, but at the cost of not serving many two adult nor elderly households at equally low incomes. This emphasis may result from discrimination against one adult. households in the private market, forcing them to apply more to subsidized housing. Alternatively, even without private discrimination, local housing authorities may have thought that one adult households were more needy than two adult households with similar incomes, and may have given them priority for admission.

The relatively low coverage of elderly households is more surprising, since many communities are eager to serve the elderly poor, and many projects are built specifically for the elderly. The direct answer is
that there are so many elderly poor these projects have not yet covered the population well. 4 A possible explanation for low elderly coverage is that many elderly poor are homeowners, and program managers may have aimed primarily at renters, rather than all the poor, as discussed earlier. Figure 2 shows total program coverage as a percentage of renter households. Elderly individuals are served fairly well on this measure: $35 \%$ are subsidized. However two or more person elderly households are still not served to a great extent.

Up to now the discussion has covered households at $10-30 \%$ of median income. The pattern of coverage at higher income levels is quite similar and is not discussed in detail. The overall level of coverage declines with increasing income, for every household type. This decline in coverage is reasonable, since the higher income groups are less in need, and HUD has focused its programs on the very poor.

The chart for households at 0-10\% of median income, however, deserves separate discussion. These are in truth the "poorest of the poor." At a national level, $10 \%$ of median income was $\$ 2,000$ per year in 1979. There are few households in the U.S. with such low incomes, but HUD does not serve very well even the few there are. There are two relatively distinct subgroups within this category, whose characteristics are so different they must be
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separated for analysis. First, there are some households counted as eligible, who are simply having a bad year and are really fairly well off. For example some self-employed people, farmers, fishermen, etc., have wide income swings from year to year and may have a bad year with cash income under $\$ 2,000$. But they live on savings or credit, until they recover in a good year. These temporarily poor households are found at other incomes too, but they become especially noticeable at $0-10 \%$ of median income, because there are so few other households this poor. These temporarily poor households usually do not need and are not interested in subsidized housing.

The second important subgroup at this low income level is made up of people who are indeed this poor, are not subsidized, and are in need of housing assistance. Some live in very ramshackle housing. Others live in institutions and group quarters, such as religious missions, residential hotels, and boarding houses. 5 People who remain in this income group for long probably are people who cannot or do not deal with society's institutions. Welfare and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments are usually just above this level, and certainly any job is. "Street people," "baq ladies," "skid row bums" are popular terms applied to this income level, and some people in remote rural areas may also subsist at this level. The main housing subsidy programs have
a basically bureaucratic bias, forms to be filled in, a waiting period of weeks or years before one moves in, a lease to sign, a reg̣ular rent payment to make even if it is low. Many poor people can and do deal with these requirements. Those who cannot are not served. This does not mean they are impossible to serve, just difficult. Salvation Army hostels, emerqency shelters, and sometimes single room occupancy hotels (Gonder and Gordon [2]) do serve them. In rural areas they may have their own dilapidated houses or rent shelter.

The people who are thus at this income level because they cannot deal with society provide a classic iustification for in-kind transfers. That is in fact the way that emergency shelters serve them, offerina a bed and sometimes a meal. On the other hand in-kind national housing subsidy programs have bureaucratic rules that ration help to people who can best deal with society, and therefore need least to have their assistance delivered in-kind. The difference, shown on figure 1, between coverages of the $0-10 \%$ group and the $10-30 \%$ aroup highlights that the current rationing process excludes the very lowest income group. HUD programs have focused on a slightly higher income level, and changes would be needed to serve these extremely poor households.

This extremely low income group from 0-10\% of median income is numerically small, but it includes the most needy people. The time constraints of the study have prevented a full examination of them, but they are an important consideration for future research and program design. The hostel approach is probably appropriate, and all that is needed may be a small subsidy per occupied bed per night, to provide the organizations
running these hostels extra resources to expand and perhaps improve conditions slightly. One significant side benefit of any assistance to emergency shelters like these is that it would also help people with a more temporary need for emergency shelter, such as battered wives or the temporarily homeless.

## Race and Ethnic Grouns

We have been considering the total coveraqe of HUD programs at each income level. We analyze this now by race. HUD subsidy programs differ substantially in their coverage of different races. Fiqure 3 shows the total coverage of whites, blacks, and hispanics. Households of other races were included in the total but are not shown on this figure because the sample is too small to be reliable.

At $10-30 \%$ of median income, blacks are covered more than whites in every type of household. $33 \%$ of black one adult households with four or more children are served, compared to $22 \%$ of whites. $36 \%$ of black one adult households with one to three children are served, compared to $20 \%$ of whites. In every other type of household, the differences are just as striking. Furthermore the differences are also present at other income levels. HUD programs consistently provide much more coverage to black households than to similar white households.

The position of hispanics is similar to that of whites. ${ }^{6}$ Among one adult households with children, hispanics are served less than whites. But in some categories, especially two adult households without children, hispanics are served a little more than whites. In other categories coverage is virtually the same.

Figure 3 - Races at Four Income Levels


These differing rates of coverage of whites, hispanics, and blacks are partly a reflection of the neighhorhoods in which HUD projects are located. The differences arise largely from the traditional Public Housing Program. The scattered site Section 8 Existing Program, which is not limited to any particular neighborhoods, follows a much more even pattern. Under the Public Housing Program, projects were more likely to be built in central cities (where black populations are relatively larger) and also in black neiahborhoods of these cities. The result is that many blacks moved in to occupy the projects. Under Section 236, and Section 8, housing subsidies are more likely to go to neighborhoods which are not heavily black, and to be more balanced between central city and surburb. Hence, coverage of racial groups has been more balanced under these latter programs.

## Coverage by Gengraphic Area

For geographic analysis, we have chosen to compare metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas and also the four Census Regions. It should be noted that U.S. dependencies, such as Puerto Rico, are not included in this study, because of lack of recent data on the eligible population, and very sparse HUD program data for the areas. Figure 4 compares HUD program coverage in metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. For most income levels and family types the coverage is a little higher in metropolitan areas than non-metropolitan. Part of this difference may be explained by Farmers Home Administration programs which are largely non-metropolitan and are not included in this study.

Figure 4 - Metropolitan and Non-Metropolitan Areas




Figure 5 shows HUD program coverage for the four Census Regions, Northeast, North Central, South and West. A map is included to show the boundaries of each region (Figure 6). Program coverage is reasonably similar across the country, with some variation at different income levels and in different family types.

Figure 5 - Regions


Figure 6 - Boundaries of the Census Regions


## Conclusions

This paper has shown who is served by subsidized housing. Some parts of the population are served to a much greater degree than others: those with incomes $10-30 \%$ of median income, one parent households with children, and blacks. Housing subsidies have thus been rationed more to certain types of households than to others. Whether this is "right" or "wrong" is harder to say. The principle of horizontal equity is that households in equal need should be treated equally. Clearly the major inequity is between those who are served and those who are not, whether black or white, family or elderly. In every group there are families who are not served, and these families are not helped much by the fact that their group overall may have a high rate of coverage.

The inequity between groups however, does have importance, because it indicates the likelihood that a member of the group may be served in the future. The present differences in coverage show the effect of past implicit and explicit rationing schemes. Unless the rationing plan is drastically changed, the same differences can be expected to persist. For example, the income group below ten percent of median income, including street people and transients who move from hostel to hostel, is not well served now, because our programs require some permanence and socialization in the ways of bureaucracy, and these are not, steady, bureaucracy-oriented people. They will remain unserved until more flexible programs are designed to meet their needs. As a
further example, blacks are covered relatively well now, so other poor blacks will hear of vacancies, and may be more willing than whites to move into projects that are heavily black, so they will continue to have a better chance to be served than poor whites or poor hispanics.

The differences shown in this paper highlight the fact that a rationing process, partly explicit, but largely implicit, exists. As long as most eligible households remain unserved, it is important to review the results of this rationing, and discuss whether it has the results we want.
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## Footnotes

1 The housing standard has in fact constantly been under question, and has been reduced very aradually since the late 1960s. Coupled with constantly increasing appropriations, this has meant an increasing fraction of eliqibles can be served, though still a minority.

2 The actual percentage of local median income is $56 \%$ for one person, 64\% for two, $72 \%$ for three, $80 \%$ for four, $85 \%$ for five, $90 \%$ for six, $95 \%$ for seven, and $100 \%$ for eight people or more. For "Local median income" we use the higher of median family income of the metropolitan area or median family income of the Census Region. In non-metropolitan areas, we use median family income of the Census Region.

3
Similarly the Food Stamps program is not restricted to households with nutritional problems, but depends only on income. There are some special supplemental food programs for high risk groups, such as pregnant mothers, just as there are special housing programs for the handicapped, but income is the major criterion in the basic programs.

4
Dther studies (for example [71 and [8]) have compared coverage of elderly households to the average coverage of all non-elderly households, and have found the elderly coverage better. That is true overall, but when number of children is considered, as shown in Figure 1, it is clear that elderly coverage is midway between coverage of non-elderly households without children and those with children.

5 The figures in this paper, low as they are, may overcount coverage of the extremely low income population, because the Annual Housing Survey excludes people in institutions and group quarters, so it undercounts the eliqible extremely low income population.

6
In this analysis a household is counted as hispanic regardless of race. Most hispanics are white, but black as well as white hispanics are counted as hispanic. Anyone who is counted as hispanic is not counted in the categories of white or black, so we are not double counting any family. Other minorities, such as American Indians and Asians, are included in all totals in this paper, but are not analyzed separately, because the sample sizes are ton small.

```
TABLE 4 - TOTAL OF HUD PROGRAMS
TABLE 5 - PUBLIC HOUSING
TABLE 6 - SECTION 8 EXISTING HOUSING, EXCEPT LOAN MANAGEMENT
TABLE 7 - SECTION 8 NEW CONSTRUCTION
TABLE 8 - SECTION 8 SUBSTANTIAL REHABILITATION
TABLE 9 - SECTION 8 LOAN MANAGEMENT AND SECTION 236 RAP
TABLE 10 - SECTION 236, INCLUDING ALL SUBPROGRAMS
TABLE 11 - RENT SUPPLEMENTS WITH SECTION }23
TABLE 12 - RENT SUPPLEMENTS WITHOUT SECTION 236
TABLE 13 - WHITES
TABLE 14 - BLACKS
TABLE 15 - HISPANICS
TABLE 16 - OTHER RACES
TABLE 17 - METROPOLITAN AREAS
TABLE 18 - NON-METROPOLITAN AREAS
TABLE 19 - NORTHEAST
TABLE 20 - NORTH CENTRAL
TABLE 21 - SOUTH
TABLE 22 - WEST
```



HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT

| SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| NONELDERLY | ELDERLY | ADULT | ADULT |
| ADULT \& | ADULT \& | WITH 1-3 | WITH 4+ |
| 0 CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN |

HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN 0 CHILDRE

TOTAL
$\begin{array}{rrrrr}3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 4 \\ 7 & 4,000 & 4 & 2 & 6 \\ 1,000 & 7,000 & 4,000 & 57,000 \\ 43,000 & 348,000 & 120,000 & 287,000 & 1,598,000 \\ 16,000 & 150,000 & 27,000 & 165,000 & 901,000\end{array}$

| 14 |  | 11 | 7 | 6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 22 | 18 | 23 | 9 | 15 |
| 32,000 | 106,000 | 72,000 | 54,000 | $1,311,000$ |
| 230,000 | 944,000 | 993,000 | 839,000 | $8,673,000$ |
| 149,000 | 580,000 | 315,000 | 596,000 | $5,260,000$ |

30-50 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

50-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

0-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
4 & 11 & 16 \\
6 & 26 & 22 \\
203,000 & 798,000 & 509,000 \\
5,010,000 & 7,080,000 & 3,271,000 \\
3,684,000 & 3,043,000 & 2,337,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 \\
3,000 & 2,000 \\
4,520,000 & 1,185,000 \\
2,669,000 & 355,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
1 \\
3,000 \\
808,000 \\
302,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
2 \\
0 \\
32,000 \\
7,000
\end{array}
$$




$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
2 & 10 & 13 \\
3 & 24 & 19 \\
206,000 & 800,000 & 513,000 \\
9,530,000 & 8,265,000 & 4,079,000 \\
6,352,000 & 3,397,000 & 2,638,000
\end{array}
$$

22
32
90,000
403,000
483,000

| 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12 | 5 | 12 | 9 |  |
| 84,000 | 322,000 | 201,000 | 138,000 | $2,354,000$ |
| $2,440,000$ | $25,549,000$ | $10,421,000$ | $18,182,000$ | $78,867,000$ |
| 685,000 | $6,073,000$ | $1,733,000$ | $6,056,000$ | $27,219,000$ |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA
 TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS RENTER HOUSEHOLDS
households with one adult

| SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NELDERLY | ELDERLY | ADU |  |
| ADULT 8 | ADULT \& | TH 1-3 | WITH $4+$ |
| ILDREN | Hild | ildiren | CHILDREN |



TOTAL

| 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 1,000 | 3,000 | 1,000 | 2,000 | 29,000 |
| 43,000 | 348,000 | 120,000 | 287,000 | $1,598,000$ |
| 16,000 | 150,000 | 27,000 | 165,000 | 901,000 |

10-30 PCT OF MEDIAN INCOME

30-50 PCT of median income

50-80 PCT OF MEDIAN INCOME
$0-80$ PCT OF MEDIAN INCOME
$80+\mathrm{PCT}$
0 F
MEDIAN INCOME

TOTAL

| 1 | 5 | 5 | 15 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{8 2 , 0 0 0}$ | 414,12 | 205,08 | 20 |
| $9,530,000$ | $8,265,000$ | $4,079,000$ | 493,000 |
| $6,352,000$ | $3,397,000$ | $2,638,000$ | 283,000 |
|  |  |  |  |


| 11 | 7 | 5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 24,000 | 66,000 | 50,16 |
| 230,000 | 944,000 | 993,000 |
| 149,000 | 580,000 | 315,000 |


| , | 3 |  | 2 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26,000 | 58,000 ${ }^{6}$ | 46,000 | 19,000 | 275,000 ${ }^{6}$ |
| 352,000 | 1,782,000 | 2,089,000 | 1,212,000 | 10,021,000 |
| 189,000 | 976,000 | 467,000 | 764,000 | 4,932,000 |


| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 63,000 | 30,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 82,000 |
| 188,000 | $4,977,000$ | $2,631,000$ | $2,640,000$ | $15,558,000$ |
|  | $1,859,000$ | 378,000 | $1,385,000$ | $6,450,000$ |


| 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11 | 4 | 9 | 7 |  |
| $1,257,000$ | 157,000 | 108,000 | 64,000 | $1,146,000$ |
| 543,000 | $8,051,000$ | $5,533,000$ | $4,978,000$ | $35,850,000$ |

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
1,000 & 0 & 1,000 \\
4,520,000 & 1,185,000 & 800,000 \\
2,669,000 & 355,000 & 302,000
\end{array}
$$


 $\begin{array}{llll}4,588,000 & 13,224,000 & 43,017,000 \\ 547,000 & 3,146,000 & 9,676,000\end{array}$

$$
3,397,000 \quad 2,638,000
$$

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

TABLE 6 - SECTION 8 EXISTING HOUSING, EXCEPT LOAN MANAGEMENT
! HUD AS PCT OF TOTAL
! HUD AS PC OF RENTERS
! HUD-SUBS IDIZ ED
ITOTAL HOUSEHOLDS
! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS

| SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| NONELDERLY | ELDERLY | ADULT | ADULT |
| ADULT \& | ADULT \& | WITH 1-3 | WITH 4+ |
| 0 CHILDREN 0 | CHTLDREN | CHTLDREN | CHILDREN |


| HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE 2 OR MORE |  |
| ADULTS | ADULTS | ELDERLY NONELDERLY |  |
| WITH 4+ | WITH 1-3 | ADULTS \& |  |
| CHILDREN | CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN |  |  |

TOTAL
----ー-ー-
$0-10$ PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
10-30 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rrrr}
3 & 3 & 8 & 5 \\
4 & 5 & 9 & 6 \\
34,000 & 83,000 & 87,000 & 10,000 \\
1,138,000 & 3,191,000 & 1,130,000 & 208,000 \\
841,000 & 1,625,000 & 975,000 & 179,000
\end{array}
$$

2
3
4,000
230,000
149,000
2
3
18,000
944,000
580,000

| 1 | 1 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 9,000 | 8,000 | 253,000 |
| 993,000 | 839,000 | $8,673,000$ |
| 315,000 | 596,000 | $5,260,000$ |

30-50 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
50-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 \\
1,000 & 2,000 \\
2,271,000 & 1,353,000 \\
1,659,000 & 415,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
12,000 \\
1,009,000 \\
548,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1 \\
3 \\
1,000 \\
45,000 \\
18,000
\end{array}
$$


0
1
2,000
$2,631,000$
378,000

| 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 |
| 2,000 | 27,000 |
| $2,640,000$ | $15,558,000$ |
| $1,385,000$ | $6,450,000$ |

0-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
1 & 2 & 4 \\
42,000 & 112,000 & 144,000 \\
5,010,000 & 7,080,000 & 3,271,000 \\
3,684,000 & 3,043,000 & 2,337,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4 \\
6 \\
16,000 \\
371,000 \\
277,000
\end{array}
$$

1
2
10,000
$1,257,000$
543,000
1
44,000
$8,051,000$
$3,564,000$

| 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 22,000 | 16,000 | 405,000 |
| $5,833,000$ | $4,978,000$ | $35,850,000$ |
| $1,186,000$ | $2,911,000$ | $17,543,000$ |

$80+$ PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $4,520,000$ | $1,185,000$ | 808,000 | 32,000 |
| $2,669,000$ | 355,000 | 302,000 | 7,000 |


| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 |
| $1,182,000$ | $17,498,000$ | $4,588,000$ | $13,204,000$ | $43,017,000$ |
| 142,000 | $2,509,000$ | 547,000 | $3,146,000$ | $9,676,000$ |

SOURCE: MICRO-STMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA
 ! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS

| SINGLE | SINGLE |
| ---: | ---: |
| NONELDFRLY | ELDERLY |
| ADULT \& |  |
| CHILDEN |  |

SINGLE
ADULT
WITH 1-3
CHILDREN
SINGLE
ADULT
WITH 4+
CHILDREN

| 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE 2 OR MORE |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ADULTS | ADULTS | ELDERLY NONELDERLY |
| WITH 4+ | WITH 1-3 |  |
| CHILDREN | CHILDREN 0 | CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN | 0-10 PCT

OF MEDIAN INCOME
10-30 PCT OF MEDIAN INCOME
30-50 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
50-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
0-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
80+ PCT
80+ PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
OF MEDIAN INCOME

| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $4,520,000$ | $1,185,000$ | 808,000 | 32,000 |
| $2,669,000$ | 355,000 | 302,000 | 7,000 |

TOTAL

| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 13,000 | 95,000 | 23,000 | 2,000 |
| $9,530,000$ | $8,265,000$ | $4,079,000$ | 403,000 |
| $6,352,000$ | $3,397,000$ | $2,638,000$ | 283,000 |



SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVEI,OPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA
! HUD AS PCT OF TOTAL!
! HUD AS PC OF RENTERS
! HUD-SUBSIDIZ ED
!TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS

| SINGLE | S INGLE | S INGLE | S INGLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NONELDERLY | ELDERLY | ADULT | ADULT |
| ADULT \& | ADJLT \& | WITH 1-3 | WITH 4+ |
| 0 CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN |


| HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE 2 OR MORE |
| ADULTS | ADULTS | ELDERLY NONELDERLY |
| WITH 4+ | WITH 1-3 |  |
| CHILDREN | CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN |  |



SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA


| SINGLE | SINGLE |
| :--- | ---: |
| NONELDERLY | ELDERLY |
| 0 ADULT $\&$ | ADULT $\&$ |
| 0 CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN |


| SINGLE | SINGLE |
| ---: | ---: |
| ADULT | ADULT |
| WITH 1-3 | WITH 4+ |
| CHILDREN | CHILDREN |


| 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1,000 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 |
| 361,000 | 190,000 | 225,000 | 24,000 |
| 272,000 | 88,000 | 167,000 | 17,000 |

$$
\begin{array}{rrrr}
1 & 1 & 3 & 1 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 2 \\
11,000 & 39,000 & 31,000 & 3,000 \\
1,138,000 & 3,191,000 & 1,130,000 & 208,000 \\
841,000 & 1,625,000 & 975,000 & 179,000
\end{array}
$$



$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
0 & 1 & 2 \\
0 & 2 & 2 \\
17,000 & 72,000 & 57,000 \\
5,010,000 & 7,080,000 & 3,271,000 \\
3,684,000 & 3,043,000 & 2,337,000
\end{array}
$$

10-30 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

30-50 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rrrr}
0 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
4,000 & 29,000 & 17,000 & 2,000 \\
1,239,000 & 2,346,000 & 907,000 & 94,0000 \\
911,000 & 915,000 & 647,000 & 62,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 \\
1,000 & 3,000 & 6,000 \\
2,271,000 & 1,353,000 & 1,009,000 \\
1,659,000 & 415,000 & 548,000
\end{array}
$$

0-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
$80+$ PCT OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
4,520,000 & 1,185,000 & 808,000 \\
2,669,000 & 355,000 & 302,000
\end{array}
$$

HOUSEHOLDS NITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS

| 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ADULTS | ADULTS | ELDERLY | NONELDERLY |
| WITH 4+ | WITH 1-3 | ADULTS $\&$ | ADULTS $\&$ |
| CHILDREN | CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN |

TOTAL

$$
\begin{array}{rrrrrrrr}
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
17,000 & 72,000 & 57,000 & 5,000 & 3,000 & 22,000 & 13,000 & 8,000 \\
9,530,000 & 8,265,000 & 4,079,000 & 403,000 & 2,440,000 & 25,549,000 & 10,421,000 & 18,182,000 \\
6,35,867,000 \\
6,352,000 & 3,397,000 & 2,638,000 & 233,000 & 685,000 & 6,073,000 & 1,733,000 & 6,056,000 \\
27,219,000
\end{array}
$$

$\begin{array}{rr}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 348,000 & 120,000 \\ 150,000 & 27,000\end{array}$

| 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 6,000 |
| 287,000 | $1,598,000$ |
| 165,000 | 901,000 |


$\begin{array}{rrr}1 & 0 & C \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 8,000 & 4,000 & 4,000 \\ 944,000 & 993,000 & 839,000 \\ 580,000 & 315,000 & 596,000\end{array}$





0
3,000
2,000
4,000 74
10,021
4,932

1
1
000
000

0
0
3,000
$4,977,000$
$1,859,000$
0
0
2,000
$2,631,000$
378,000 $\begin{array}{rr}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1,000 & 17,000 \\ 2,640,000 & 15,558,000 \\ 1,385,000 & 6,450,000\end{array}$

8,000
$8,978,000$
$2,911,000$
$35,850,000$
$17,543,000$

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA
! HUD AS PCT OF TOTAL
! HUD AS PC OF RENTERS
! HUD-SUBSIDIZ ED
! TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS
! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS


| HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE 2 OR MORE |  |
| ADULTS | ADULTS | ELDERLY NONELDERLY |  |
| WITH 4+ | WITH 1-3 | ADUUTS \& |  |
| CHILDREN | CHILDREN | 0 CHIILDREN | 0 CHILDREN |


| 0-10 PCT OF MEDIAN | INCOME | 0 0 1,000 361,000 272,000 | 1 1 1,000 190,000 88,000 | 1 2,000 22,000 167,000 | 1 1 0 24,000 17,000 | 0 0 0 43,000 16,000 | 0 1 1,000 348,000 150,000 | 0 1 0 120,000 27,000 | 0 0 1,000 287,000 165,000 | r 1 6,000 $1,598,000$ 901,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-30 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN } \end{aligned}$ | INCOME |  |  | [ $\begin{array}{r}3 \\ 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 2\end{array}$ | - ${ }_{1}^{1}$ | $\quad 1 \begin{array}{r}1 \\ 2\end{array}$ | - ${ }^{1}$ | ( $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 1\end{array}$ | 2 3 |
|  |  | , 16,000 | 70,000 | 33,000 | 3,000 | 1,000 | 12,000 | 8,000 | 7,000 | 149,000 |
|  |  | 1,138,000 | 3,191,000 | 1,130,000 | 208,000 | 230,000 | 944,000 | 993,000 | 839,000 | 8,673,000 |
|  |  | 841,000 | 1,625,000 | 1975,000 | 179,000 | 149,000 | 580,000 | 315,000 | 596,000 | 5,260,000 |
| 30-50 PCT |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| OF MEDIAN | INCOME | 16,002 | 69,88 | , 06 | , $0^{4}$ | , $0^{2}$ | $36.0{ }^{4}$ | 2.005 | 15,002 |  |
|  |  | 16,000 | 69,000 | 38,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 36,000 | 24,000 | 15,000 | 203,000 |
|  |  | 1,239,000 | 2,346,000 | 907,000 | 94,000 | 352,000 | 1,782,000 | 2,089,000 | 1,212,000 | 10,021,000 |
|  |  | -911,000 | 2,915,000 | 647,000 | 62,000 | 189,000 | 1,976,000 | 2,067,000 | -764,000 | 4,932,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50-80 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN } \end{aligned}$ | INCOME |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{4}$ | 1 |  |
|  | INCOME | 19,000 | 22,000 | 33,000 | 1,000 | 2,000 | 36,000 | 16,000 | 17,000 | 146,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 45,000 | 633,000 | 4,977,000 | 2,631,000 | 2,640,000 | 15,558,000 |
|  |  | 1,659,000 | 1,415,000 | 1, 548,000 | 18,000 | 188,000 | 1,859,000 | 2,631,000 | 1,385,000 | 6,450,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN } \end{aligned}$ | INCOME | [ $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 51,000\end{array}$ | 2 5 162,000 | 3 5 106,000 | 2 2 7,000 | 1 1 7,000 |  | 48, $\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 4 \\ 4\end{array}$ |  | 504,000 ${ }^{\frac{1}{3}}$ |
|  |  | 5,010,000 | 7,162,000 | 3,271,000 | 371,000 | 1,257,000 | 8,051,000 | 5,833,000 | 4,978,000 | 35, 504,000 |
|  |  | 3,010,000 | 3,043,000 | 2,337,000 | 277,000 | 1,257,000 | 3,564,000 | 1,186,000 | 2,911,000 | 17,543,000 |
| $80+$ PCT <br> OF MEDIAN | INCOME | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 0 0 1,000 | 0 1 2 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 3 | 0 0 1,000 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 10 |
|  |  | 4, $\begin{array}{r}2,000 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 1,185,000 | 808,000 | 32,000 |  | 17,498,000 | 4,588,000 | 13,204,000 | 43,017,000 |
|  |  | 4,520,000 $2,669,000$ | $1,185,000$ 355,000 | 808,000 | 32,000 7,000 | $1,182,000$ 142,000 | $17,498,000$ $2,509,000$ | $4,588,000$ 547,000 | $13,204,000$ $3,146,000$ | $43,017,000$ $9,676,000$ |
| TOTAL |  | , | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  | 5 | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
|  |  | 53,000 | 163,000 | 107,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 86,000 | 49,000 | 42,000 | 514,000 |
|  |  | 9,530,000 | 8,265,000 | 4,079,000 | 403,000 | 2,440,000 | 25,549,000 | 10,421,000 | 18,182,000 | 78,867,000 |
|  |  | 6,352,000 | 3,397,000 | 2,638,000 | 283,000 | 685,000 | 6,073,000 | 1,733,000 | 6,056,000 | 27,219,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA
! HUD AS PCT OF TOTAL
! HUD AS PC OF RENTERS
! HUD-SUBSIDIZ ED
! TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS
! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS

0-10 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME
10-30 PCT
0 F MEDIAN
INCOME
30-50 PCT
0 F MEDIAN INCOME

0-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME



$80+$ PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

TOTAL

0
1
27,000
371,000
277,000



| HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE |
| ADULTS | ADULTS | ELDERLY | NONELDERLY |
| WITH 4+ | WITH 1-3 | ADULTS \& |  |
| HILDREN | CHII |  |  |

CHILDREN CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN 0 CHILDREN
$\begin{array}{rr}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 9,000 & 7,000 \\ 8,051,000 & 5,833,000\end{array}$
3,564,000

8,000
85,000
85,000
$4,978,00035,850,000$
$2,911,00017,543,000$


| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1,000 | 5,000 | 4,000 | 5,000 | 63,000 |
| 230,000 | 944,000 | 993,000 | 839,000 | $8,673,000$ |
| 149,000 | 580,000 | 315,000 | 596,000 | $5,260,000$ |





| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $1,182,000$ | $17,498,000$ | $4,588,000$ | $13,204,000$ | $43,017,000$ |
| 142,000 | $2,509,000$ | 547,000 | $3,146,000$ | $9,676,000$ |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE |
| NONELDERLY | ELDERLY | SINGLE |  |
| ADULT $\&$ | ADULT $\&$ | WITH 1-3 | WITH 4+ |
| 0 CHILDREN | 0 | CHILDREN | CHILDREN |

$$
\begin{array}{rrrr}
0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 2 & 3 \\
1,000 & 0 & 3,000 & 0 \\
361,000 & 190,000 & 225,000 & 24,000 \\
272,000 & 88,000 & 167,000 & 17,000
\end{array}
$$

$\begin{array}{rrrr}2 \text { OR MORE } & 2 \text { OR MORE } & 2 \text { OR MORE } 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ADULTS } & \text { ADULTS } & \text { ELDERLY NONELDERLY } \\ \text { WITH 4+ } & \text { WITH 1-3 } & \text { ADULTS \& } & \text { ADULTS } \& \\ \text { CHILDREN } & \text { CHILDREN } & 0 \text { CHILDREN } 0 \text { CHILDREN }\end{array}$

0-10 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

10-30 PCT
0F MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rrrr}
1 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\
1 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
10,000 & 6,000 & 17,000 & 4,000 \\
1,138,000 & 3,191,000 & 1,130,000 & 208,000 \\
841,000 & 1,625,000 & 975,000 & 179,000
\end{array}
$$

30-50 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 \\
2,000 & 1,000 \\
1,239,000 & 2,346,000 \\
911,000 & 915,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
1 & 2 \\
1 & 2 \\
7,000 & 1,000 \\
907,000 & 94,000 \\
647,000 & 62,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 \\
2,000 & 6,000 \\
352,000 & 1,782,000 \\
189,000 & 976,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
0 \\
1,000 \\
2,089,000 \\
467,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
0 \\
2,000 \\
1,212,000 \\
764,000
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
0 \\
21,000 \\
10,021,000 \\
4,932,000
\end{array}
$$

50-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME

0-80 PCT
OF MEDIAN INCOME




 0
0
7,000
$4,978,000$ 8 $4,978,00035,850,000$
$2,911,00017,543,000$
$80+$ PCT OF MEDIAN INCOME



$\begin{array}{rr}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 4,588,000 & 13,204,000 \\ 547,000 & 3,146,000\end{array}$ $43,017,000$
$9,676,000$ TOTAL

| 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 13,000 | 8,000 | 28,000 | 6,000 |
| $9,530,000$ | $8,265,000$ | $4,079,000$ | 403,000 |
| $6,352,000$ | $3,397,000$ | $2,638,000$ | 283,000 |

$\begin{array}{rr}2,440,000 & 25,549,000 \\ 685,000 & 6,073,000\end{array}$
0
0
3,000
7,00

6,000
000
SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

| ! HUD AS PCTI OF TOTAD ! | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! HUD-SUBSIDIZ ED | SINGLE | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SINGIE } \\ \text { ELDERLY } \\ \text { ADULT } \& 6 \end{array}$ | SINGLEADULTWITH 1-3CHILDREN |  | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH 4+ CHILDREN | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH 1-3 CHILDREN |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { NONELDERLY } \\ \text { ADUITS \& } \\ 0 \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ |  |  |
| ! TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS | NONELDERLY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS | A ADULT \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 CHILDREN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0-10 \text { PCT } \\ & 0 \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 16 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
|  | 2,000 | 3,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 16,000 |  |
|  | 261,000 | 147,000 | 127,000 | 7,000 | 30,000 | 233,000 | 102,000 | 225,000 | 1,132,000 |  |
|  | 183,000 | 67,000 | 85,000 | 2,000 | 9,000 | 67,000 | 21,000 | 107,000 | -540,000 |  |
| 10-30 PCT <br> OF MEDIAN INCOME | 9 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 12 |  |
|  | 13 | 34 | 25 | 30 |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 74,000 | 417,000 | 101,000 | 10,000 | 6,000 | 33,000 | 41,000 | 23,000 | 705,000 |  |
|  | 811,000 | 2,589,000 | 515,000 | 44,000 | 68,000 | 515,000 | 744,000 | 625,000 | 5,912,000 |  |
|  | 555,000 | 1,240,000 | 409,000 | 33,000 | 37,000 | 264,000 | 193,000 | 431,000 | 3,162,000 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30-50 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 |  |
|  |  |  | 18 | 23 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 24,000 | 169,000 | 59,000 | 5,000 | 8,000 | 50,000 | 69,000 | 23,000 | 406,000 |  |
|  | 964,000 | 2,124,000 | 503,000 | 35,000 | 150,000 | 1,036,000 | 1,789,000 | 894,000 | 7,495,000 |  |
|  | 692,000 | 791,000 | 323,000 | 22,000 | 69,000 | 496,000 | 346,000 | 524,000 | 3,263,000 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
|  | 1 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 3 |  |
|  | 15,000 | 31,000 | 33,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 33,000 | 26,000 | 17,000 | 159,000 |  |
|  |  | 1,265,000 | 743,000 | 24,000 |  | 3,848,000 | 2,404,000 | 2,171,000 | 12,666,000 |  |
|  | 1,284,000 | 1,291,000 | 379,000 | 24,000 | 79,000 | 1,284,000 | 2, 306,000 | 1,068,000 | 4,799,000 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0-80 \text { PCT } \\ & 0 \text { MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 15 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 |  |
|  | 1154 | - 25 | 199 | . 25 | -9 ${ }^{9}$ | 118,000 | 136,16 | 3 | $11$ |  |
|  | 115,000 | 620,000 | 199,000 | 16,000 | 18,000 | 118,000 | 136,000 | 64,000 | 1,287,000 |  |
|  | 3,854,000 | 6,126,000 | 1,887,000 | 111,000 | 641,000 | 5,632,000 | 5,038,000 | 3,916,000 | 27,204,000 |  |
|  | 2,714,000 | 2,489,000 | 1,195,000 | 64,000 | 194,000 | 2,110,000 | 867,000 | 2,131,000 | 11,763,000 |  |
| $80+\mathrm{PCT}$ <br> OF MEDIAN INCOME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | , 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 1, 1,000 | 1, 1,000 | 1,000 | ${ }^{0}$ | -15,00 | -3,000 | 2,2,000 | 113,000 | 12,000 |  |
|  | 3,943,000 | 1,154,000 | 676,000 | 32,000 | 915,000 | 15,226,000 | 4,319,000 | 11,893,000 | 38,158,000 |  |
|  | 2,269,000 | 1,343,000 | 235,000 | 7,000 | 82,000 | 1,876,000 | 497,000 | 2,606,000 | 7,915,000 |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
|  | 17.2 | 622 | 200, 14 | 16, 23 | 18, $0^{7}$ | 121, $0^{3}$ | 138.10 | 67.10 |  |  |
|  | 7117,000 | -622,000 | 200,000 | 16,000 | 1,58,000 | 121,000 | 138,000 | 15,67,000 | 1, 299,000 |  |
|  | 7,797,000 | 7,280,000 | 2,562,000 | 143,000 | 1,557,000 | 20,858,000 | 9, 357,000 | 15,809,000 | 65,362,000 |  |
|  | 4,983,000 | 2,832,000 | 1,430,000 | 71,000 | 276,000 | 3,986,000 | 1,364,000 | 4,736,000 | 19,678,000 |  |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA


SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

| ! HOD AS PCT OF TOTAL ! | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADIJLT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! ${ }^{\text {! HUD-SUBS IDIZ ED }}$ ! ${ }^{\text {TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS }}$ ! ${ }^{\text {RENTER HOUSEHOLDS }}$ ! | NONELDERLY | FLIDERLY | S INGLE | S ADGLE |  |  |  |  | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | 2 OR MORE | NONELDERLY |  |
|  | ADULT \& | ADULT \& | WITH 1-3 | WITH $4+$ | WITH $4+$ | WITH 1-3 | ADULTS \& | ADULTS \& |  |
|  | 0 CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN | 0 CHILDREN |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0-10 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 1 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
|  |  |  | 3,000 | 0 |  | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 |
|  | 14,000 | 17,000 | 22,000 | 0 | 4,000 | 27,000 | 2,000 | 14,000 | 100,000 |
|  | 12,000 | 9,000 | 17,000 | 0 | 4,000 | 21,000 | 2,00 | 14,000 | 78,000 |
| 10-30 PCT <br> OF MEDIAN INCOME | 9 | 19 | 13 | 19 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 13 |
|  | 11 | 17.27 | 23, 14 | 19 | 13 | 14 14 | - 23 | 12 | -16 |
|  | 6,000 | 17,000 | 23,000 | 6,000 | 5,000 | 14,000 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 81,000 |
|  | 67,000 | 90,000 | 176,000 | 34,000 | 54,000 | 131,000 | 47,000 | 45,000 | 643,000 |
|  | 57,000 | 63,000 | 172,000 | 33,000 | 37,000 | 97,000 | 25,000 | 33,000 | 516,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-50 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 |
|  |  | 10 | 12 |  | 12 |  | 10 |  | 9 |
|  | 1,000 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 3,000 | 7,000 | 18,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 46,000 |
|  | 66,000 | 38,000 | 80,000 | 17,000 | 84,000 | 284,000 | 74,000 | 85,000 | 726,000 |
|  | 62,000 | 24,000 | 67,000 | 14,000 | 57,000 | 209,000 | 36,000 | 69,000 | 538,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 1 | 1 6 | $\begin{array}{r}5 \\ 8 \\ \hline 8.00{ }^{8}\end{array}$ | 5 7 0 | 3 7 2 | $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 4 \\ 10\end{array}$ | 2 5 1 | 2 2 | - ${ }^{2}$ |
|  | 1,000 |  | 3,000 |  | 2,000 | 10,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 20,000 |
|  | 108,000 | 18,000 | 53,000 | 5,000 | 84,000 | 472,000 | 55,000 | 169,000 | 964,000 |
|  | 93,000 | 3,000 | 32,000 | 3,000 | 28,000 | 275,000 | 23,000 | 136,000 | 593,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 12 | 11 | 17 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 6 |
|  | 4 | 20 | 13 | 19 | 11 |  | 12 | 4 | 9 |
|  | 8,000 | 20,000 | 37,000 | 9,000 | 14,000 | 42,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 152,000 |
|  | 254,000 | 163,000 | 332,000 | 56,000 | 226,000 | 913,000 | 178,000 | 313,000 | 2,433,000 |
|  | 223,000 | 99,000 | 289,000 | 50,000 | 127,000 | 602,000 | 83,000 | 252,000 | 1,725,000 |
| $80+$ PCT <br> OF MEDIAN INCOME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | , 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 3,000 |
|  |  | 7,000 |  | 0 | 110,000 | 786,000 | 73,000 | 398,000 | 1,530,000 |
|  | 81,000 | 5,000 | 18,000 | 0 | 31,000 | 231,000 | 13,000 | 159,000 | -538,000 |
| TOTAL |  | 12 | 10 | 17 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
|  | ${ }^{3}$ | 19 | 12 | 19 | 9 | 4 | 11.11 | $11.00{ }^{3}$ | 7 |
|  | 87,000 | 20,000 | 37,000 | 59,000 | 14,000 | 144,000 | 11,000 | 11,000 | 155,000 |
|  | 370,000 | 170,000 | 371,000 | 56,000 | 336,000 | 1,699,000 | 251,000 | 711,000 | 3,964,000 |
|  | 304,000 | 104,000 | 307,000 | 50,000 | 158,000 | 832,000 | 96,000 | 411,000 | 2,262,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMEINT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

| ! HUD AS PCT OF TUTAL! | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! HUD AS PC OF RENTERS! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! HUD-SUBSIDIZED ! | SINGLE <br> NONELDERLY <br>  <br> 0 CHILDREN | SINGLE ELDERLY ADULT $\&$ CHILDREN | SINGLE ADULT WITH 1-3 CHILDREN | SINGLE <br> ADULT <br> WITH 4+ CHILDREN | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH 4+ CHILDREN | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ADULTS } \\ \text { WITH 1-3 } \\ \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ELDERLY } \\ \text { ADULTS \& } \end{array}$ |  <br> 0 CHILDREN |  |
| !TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0-10 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
|  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1,000 |
|  | 10,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 3,000 | 1,000 | 23,000 | 0 | 10,000 | 49,000 |
|  | 10,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 3,000 | , 0 | 21,000 | 0 | 10,000 | 46,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-30 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 25 | 64 | 76 | 60 | 21 | 27 | 10 | 25 |
|  | 20 | 30 | 68 | 76 | 90 | 28 | 38 | 11 | 30 |
|  | 4,000 | 12,000 | 7,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 35,000 |
|  | 22,000 | 47,000 | 11,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 23,000 | 9,000 | 24,000 | 140,000 |
|  | 20,000 | 39,000 | 10,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 17,000 | 6,000 | 22,000 | 117,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30-50 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 13 | 22 | 28 | 55 | 26 | 16 | 17 | 10 | 18 |
|  | 14 | - 34 | +38 | . 0 | - 36 | 022 | 26 | 111 | - 24 |
|  | 2,000 | 6,000 | 4,000 | 1,000 | 2,000 | 8,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 30,000 |
|  | 17,000 | 27,000 | 16,000 | 2,000 | 9,000 | 52,000 | 21,000 | 27,000 | 170,000 |
|  | 16,000 | 17,000 | 12,000 | , 0 | 6,000 | 37,000 | 13,000 | 24,000 | 126,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 29 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 6 |
|  | $10^{4}$ | - 44 | 22 | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 6,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 16,000 |
|  | 47,000 | 5,000 | 17,000 | 0 | 23,000 | 117,000 | 17,000 | 50,000 | 276,000 |
|  | 40,000 | 3,000 | 13,000 | 0 | 16,000 | 70,000 | 2,000 | 36,000 | 180,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0-80 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 24 | 33 | 41 58 | 14 | 9 | 16 | 7 8 | 13 |
|  | 9 | 31 | 42 | 58 | . 20 | 13 | 35 | 8 | 18 |
|  | 8,000 | 19,000 | 15,000 | 2,000 | 5,000 | 19,000 | 8,000 | 7,000 | 82,000 |
|  | 96,000 86,000 | 80,000 | 44,000 | 6,000 | 35,000 24,000 | 214,000 145,000 | 47,000 21,000 | 111,000 | 634,000 |
|  | 86,000 | 61,000 | 35,000 | 4,000 | 24,000 | 145,000 | 21,000 | 92,000 | 469,000 |
| $80+$ PCT <br> OF MEDIAN INCOME | 0 | 2 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 0 | 0 0 | 3 0 | 0 | 4 0 | 1,000 | 2 0 | 0 0 | 2,000 |
|  | - 00 | - 0 | - 0 | 0 | 32.00 | 1,000 | 27000 | $19500{ }^{0}$ | 67,000 |
|  | 89,000 61,000 | 3,000 | 16,000 6,000 | 0 | 32,000 4,000 | 312,000 | 27,000 8,000 | 195,000 83,000 | 674,000 |
|  | 61,000 | 3,00000 | 6,000 | 0 | 4,000 | 76,000 | 8,000 | 83,000 | 238,000 |
| TOTAL |  | 23 | 25 | - 41 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 6 |
|  | - 5 | - 31 | - 36 | - 58 | 518 | 19.98 | - 27 | - ${ }^{4}$ | 84,12 |
|  | 8,000 | 19,000 | 15,000 | 2,000 | 5,000 | 19,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 84,000 |
|  | 185,000 | 84,000 | 61,000 | 6,000 | 67,000 | 526,000 | 73,000 | 306,000 | 1,308,000 |
|  | 148,000 | 61,000 | 41,000 | 4,000 | 28,000 | 222,000 | 29,000 | 175,000 | 707,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 dATA

| ! HUD AS PCTI OF TOTAL | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! HUD-SUBS IDIZ ED ! | SINGLE | SINGLE | SINGLE | S INGLE ADULT | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH $4+$ CHILDREN | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH 1-3 CHILDREN |  | 2 OR MORE NONELDERLY ADULTS \& 0 CHILDREN |  |
| $!$ TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS | NONELDERLY | ELDERLY | ADULT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS ! | A ADULT \& | ADULT \& | WITH 1-3 | WITH $4+$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 Children | 0 CHILDREN | CHILDREN | CHILDREN |  |  |  |  |  |
| INCOME | 2 | 3 | 18 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  |  | 22 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |
|  | 4,000 | 4,000 | 27,000 | 2,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 47,000 |
|  | 274,000 | 140,000 | 153,000 | 20,000 | 29,000 | 216,000 | 79,000 | 189,000 | 1,101,000 |
|  | 222,000 | 63,000 | 125,000 | 15,000 | 13,000 | 111,000 | 21,000 | 122,000 | 1,691,000 |
| INCOME | 13 | 20 | 25 | 31 | 17 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 17 |
|  | 16 | 35 | 28 | 34 | 24 | 19 | 22 | 9 | 25 |
|  | 104,000 | 405,000 | 218,000 | 48,000 | 25,000 | 78,000 | 50,000 | 41,000 | 968,000 |
|  | 811,000 | 2,018,000 | 877,000 | 157,000 | 144,000 | 602,000 | 559,000 | 606,000 | 5,774,000 |
|  | 639,000 | 1,146,000 | 786,000 | 141,000 | 101,000 | 415,000 | 223,000 | 452,000 | 3,902,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-50 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 9 | 14 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 7 |
|  | ${ }^{4}$ | 20 | 18 | 40 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 27,000 | 134,000 | 90,000 | 18,000 | 27,000 | 84,000 | 63,000 | 30,000 | 472,000 |
|  | 886,000 | 1,531,000 | 660,000 | 66,000 | 219,000 | 1,129,000 | 1,206,000 | 833,000 | 6,529,000 |
|  | 695,000 | 673,000 | 497,000 | 45,000 | 131,000 | 697,000 | 337,000 | 590,000 | 3,665,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50-80 \mathrm{PCT} \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  | 19 |  | 4 | 8 |  |  |
|  | 15,000 | 24,000 | 41,000 | 3,000 | 10,000 | 49,000 | 23,000 | 21,000 | 185,000 |
|  | 1,740,000 | 892,000 | 742,000 | 36,000 | 393,000 | 3,151,000 | 1,651,000 | 1,809,000 | 10,413,000 |
|  | 1,362,000 | 322,000 | 441,000 | 13,000 | 115,000 | 1,280,000 | 296,000 | 1,057,000 | 4,886,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ |  | 12 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
|  |  | 26 | 20 | 33 | 17 | 9 | 16 |  | 13 |
|  | 150,000 | 567,000 | 377,000 | 71,000 | 62,000 | 216,000 | 136,000 | 94,000 | 1,673,000 |
|  | 3,712,000 | 4,580,000 | 2,432,000 | 280,000 | 784,000 | 5,099,000 | 3,494,000 | 3,437,000 | $23,818,000$ |
|  | 2,917,000 | 2,204,000 | 1,849,000 | 214,000 | 359,000 | 2,503,000 | 877,000 | 2,221,000 | 13,145,000 |
| $80+\mathrm{PCT}$ OF MEDIAN INCOME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 |  |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2,000 | 1,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 9,000 | 3,000 | 5,000 | 23,000 |
|  | 3,538,000 | 780,000 | 604,000 | 25,000 | 769,000 | 11,856,000 | 3,037,000 | 9,523,000 | 30, 132,000 |
|  | 2,161,000 | 291,000 | 244,000 | 5,000 | 90,000 | 1,839,000 | 4,43,000 | 2,463,000 | 7,537,000 |
| TOTAL |  | 11 | 12 |  | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |
|  | 152003 | 568, 23 | 37918 | 71, 32 | 63.14 | $225,00^{5}$ | 139, 111 | - $0^{2}$ | 1,695 ${ }^{8}$ |
|  | 152,000 | 568,000 | 379,000 | 71,000 | 63,000 | 225,000 | 139,000 | 129,000 | 1,695,000 |
|  | 7,250,000 | 5,360,000 | 3,036,000 | 305,000 | 1,554,000 | 16,955,000 | 6,531,000 | 12,960,000 | 53, 949,000 |
|  | 5,078,000 | 2,495,000 | 2,094,000 | 219,000 | 450,000 | 4,342,000 | 1,320,000 | 4,684,000 | 20,682,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

| ! HUD AS PCT' OF TOTAL | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! HUD AS PC OF RENTERS |  <br> 0 <br> CHILDREN | SINGLEELDERLY0 CHIULT \& | SINGLEADULTWITH 1-3CHILDREN | S INGLE <br> ADULT <br> WI'TH $4+$ CHILDREN | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH $4+$ CHILDREN | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH 1-3 CHILDREN | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ELDERLY } \\ 0 \text { ADULTS \& } \\ 0 \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | 2 OR MORE NONELDERLY ADULTS \& 0 CHILDREN |  |
| !TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0-10 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  | 5 | 10 | 14 | 5 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
|  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 10,000 |
|  | 87,000 | 50,000 | 72,000 | 3,000 | 13,000 | 133,000 | 42,000 | 97,000 | 497,000 |
|  | 50,000 | 24,000 | 41,000 | 3,000 | 4,000 | 39,000 | 6,000 | 43,000 | 210,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-30 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 14 | 26 | 23 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 12 |
|  | 16 | 34 | 35 | 31 | 15 | 17 | 25 | 9 | 25 |
|  | 32,000 | 162,000 | 66,000 | 12,000 | 7,000 | 27,000 | 23,000 | 13,000 | 342,000 |
|  | 327,000 | 1,173,000 | 253,000 | 51,000 | 86,000 | 342,000 | 434,000 | 233,000 | 2,899,000 |
|  | 202,000 | 479,000 | 190,000 | 38,000 | 48,000 | 165,000 | 92,000 | 144,000 | 1,358,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-50 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 7 | 17 | 21 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
|  | 11.50 | 57.23 | 4, 27 | -35 | 16 | - 14 | $20^{21}$ | 14.88 | 20, 16 |
|  | 11,000 | 57,000 | 41,000 | 6,000 | 9,000 | 39,000 | 28,000 | 14,000 | 204,000 |
|  | 353,000 | 816,000 | 247,000 | 28,000 | 133,000 | 653,000 | 883,000 | 379,000 | 3,492,000 |
|  | 217,000 | 242,000 | 150,000 | 17,000 | 59,000 | 279,000 | 129,000 | 174,000 | 1,267,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ |  | 12 | 208 | 11 20 | 1 5 | 1 | 14 | 1 3 | 2 |
|  | 9,000 | 11,000 | 22,000 | 1,000 | 4,000 | 26,000 | 11,000 | 10,000 | 93,000 |
|  | 531,000 | 461,000 | 266,000 | 9,000 | 240,000 | 1,826,000 | 980,000 | 832,000 | 5,145,000 |
|  | 297,000 | 93,000 | 106,000 | 5,000 | 23,000 | 578,000 | 82,000 | 328,000 | 1,563,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0-80 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 4 7 | 231, $\mathbf{2 9}^{98}$ | 16 27 | $\begin{array}{r}21 \\ 31 \\ \hline 900\end{array}$ | 4 11 | 3 9 | ( $2^{3}$ | $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 5\end{array}$ | 5 15 |
|  | 53,000 | 231,000 | 133,000 | 19,000 | 20,000 | 94,000 | 61,000 | 138,000 | 650,000 |
|  | 1,298,000 | 2,500,000 | 839,000 | 91,000 | 473,000 | 2,952,000 | 2,339,000 | 1,541,000 | 12,033,000 |
|  | 1,296,000 | 838,000 | 487,000 | 63,000 | 183,000 | 1,062,000 | 2,309,000 | 1,690,000 | 4,398,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80+\text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 |  | 1, ${ }^{2}$ | 2 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 1,000 | ${ }^{0}$ | 1,000 |  |  | 5, 3,000 | , 1,000 | 2,000 | 9,000 |
|  | $982,000$ | $405,000$ | 204,000 | 7,000 | 413,000 | 5,642,000 | 1,551,000 | 3,681,000 | 12,885,000 |
|  | 508,000 | $64,000$ | 57,000 | 2,000 | 52,000 | 670,000 | 104,000 | 6883,000 | 2,139,000 |
| TOTAL | 2 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|  | 4 | 26 | 25 | 30 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 10 |
|  | 54,000 | 232,000 | 134,000 | 19,000 | 21,000 | 97,000 | 62,000 | 39,000 | 659,000 |
|  | 2,280,000 | 2,904,000 | 1,043,000 | 98,000 | 886,000 | 8,594,000 | 3,890,000 | 5,222,000 | 24,918,000 |
|  | 1,274,000 | 902,000 | 545,000 | 65,000 | 235,000 | 1,731,000 | 413,000 | 1,372,000 | 6,537,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMEIT AND RESEARCH, hUD; 1979 dATA


SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 dATA

TABLE 20 - NORTH CENTRAL


SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

| !HUD AS PCT OF TOITAL | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! HUD-SUBS IDIZ ED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SINGLE } \\ & \text { NONELDERLY } \\ & 0 \text { ADULT \& } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SINGLE } \\ \text { ELDERLY } \\ \text { ADULT \& } \\ 0 \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | SINGLEADULTWITH 1-3CHILDREN | S INGLE ADULT WITH $4+$ CHI DREN | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ADULTS } \\ \text { WITH 4+ } \\ \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | 2 OR MORE ADULTS WITH 1-3 CHILIREN | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ELDERLY } \\ \text { ADULTS \& } \\ 0 \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | 2 OR MORENONELDERLYADULTS0 CHILDREN |  |
| $!$ TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| !RENTER HOUSEHOLDS ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INCOME | 2 | 4 | 29 | 19 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
|  | 4 | 12 | 41 | 24 | 18 | 11 | 18 | 5 | 17 |
|  | 3,000 | 2,000 | 30,000 | 2,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 | 1,000 | 2,000 | 46,000 |
|  | 118,000 | 54,000 | 102,000 | 13,000 | 11,000 | 117,000 | 39,000 | 98,000 | 552,000 |
|  | 75,000 | 18,000 | 72,000 | 10,000 | 6,000 | 47,000 | 3,000 | 50,000 | 280,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-30 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 18 | 35 | 39 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 18 |
|  | - 24 | 203, 41 | - 44 | . 48 | , 25 | 26 | 34 |  | , 34 |
|  | 49,000 | 203,000 | 106,000 | 32,000 | 19,000 | 51,000 | 38,000 | 24,000 | 521,000 |
|  | 325,000 | 1,111,000 | 303,000 | 81,000 | 123,000 | 335,000 | 395,000 | 234,000 | 2,907,000 |
|  | 202,000 | 495,000 | 238,000 | 65,000 | 78,000 | 196,000 | 110,000 | 139,000 | 1,524,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-50 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
|  | 13, 000 | 45.20 | 288 | . 40 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 9,000 | 14,000 | 733,000 | 26,000 | 18,000 | 242,000 |
|  | 336,000 | 693,000 | 342,000 | 31,000 | 132,000 | 700,000 | 717,000 | 419,000 | 3,370,000 |
|  | 193,000 | 226,000 | 223,000 | 24,000 | 61,000 | 338,000 | 134,000 | 236,000 | 1,435,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50-80 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 |
|  | - $0^{2}$ | 11. 12 | 24.13 | 1.15 | 4, $0^{5}$ | 24 | - $0^{8}$ | 10, $0^{2}$ | 91, $0^{5}$ |
|  | 66,000 | 11,000 | 24,000 | 1,000 | 4,000 | 1,24,000 | 8,000 | 10,000 | 91,000 |
|  | 668,000 | 461,000 | 355,000 | 14,000 | 221,000 | 1,657,000 | 780,000 | 894,000 | 5,050,000 |
|  | 457,000 | 96,000 | 193,000 | 18,000 | 80,000 | 637,000 | 94,000 | 430,000 | 1,996,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0-80 PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 11 | 20 | 32 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
|  | 8 | 31 | 31 | 42 | 17 | 11 | 21 | 6 | 17 |
|  | 74,000 | 262,000 | 222,000 | 45,000 | 39,000 | 133,000 | 72,000 | 54,000 | 901,000 |
|  | 1,448,000 | 2,318,000 | 1,102,000 | 139,000 | 487,000 | 2,809,000 | 1,931,000 |  | 11,879,000 |
|  | 1,927,000 | 2,836,000 | 1,727,000 | 107,000 | 225,000 | 1,218,000 | 1,931,000 | 1,855,000 | 5,235,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80+ PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0. | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 7,000 |
|  | 1,372,000 |  |  |  | 341,000 |  | 1,523,000 |  | 13,947,000 |
|  | 1,779,000 | 92,000 | 105,000 | 15,000 | 49,000 | 5,962,000 | 1, 141,000 | 4,919,000 | 2,992,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | 29 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
|  | 75,4 | - 28 | $27$ | 450 | 29, 14 | - 136 | 73.15 | $56,00{ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | -75,000 | 262,000 | 223,000 | 45,000 | 39,000 | -136,000 | -73,000 | 56,000 | -908,000 |
|  | 2,820,000 | 2,681,000 | 1,376,000 | 154,000 | 828,000 | 8,774,000 | 3,454,000 | 5,739,000 | 25,826,000 |
|  | 1,706,000 | 928,000 | 832,000 | 112,000 | 273,000 | 2,119,000 | 482,000 | 1,774,000 | 8,226,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMEINT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

| ! HUD AS PCTI OF TOTAL | HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONE ADULT |  |  |  | HOUSEHOLDS WITH TWO OR MORE ADULTS |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ! HUD-SUBSIDIZ ED ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SINGLE } \\ \text { NONELDERLY } \\ 0 \text { ADULT \& } \end{array}$ | SINGLE ELDERLY ADULT \& CHILDREN | S INGLEADULTWITH 1-3CHILDREN | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SINGLE } \\ \text { ADULT } \\ \text { WITH 4+ } \\ \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | 2 OR MORE <br> ADULTS <br> WITH 4+ CHILDREN | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ADULTS } \\ \text { WITH 1-3 } \\ \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \text { OR MORE } \\ \text { ELDERLY } \\ \text { ADULTS \& } \\ 0 \text { CHILDREN } \end{array}$ | $\qquad$ |  |
| !TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! RENTER HOUSEHOLDS ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0-10 \text { PCT } \\ & \text { OF MEDIAN INCOME } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  | 14 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 3,000 |
|  | 76,000 | 18,000 | 33,000 | 6,000 | 10,000 | 66,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 284,000 |
|  | 61,000 | 4,000 | 25,000 | 4,000 | 3,000 | 33,000 | 25,000 | 27,000 | 157,000 |
| $10-30 \mathrm{PCT}$ | 10 | 16 | 33 | 24 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 14 |
| OF MEDIAN INCOME | 27.12 | 78, 30 | 53 | 527 | 20 | 16, 14 | 12 | 10,000 | 10720 |
|  | 27,000 | 78,000 | 52,000 | 5,000 | 3,000 | 16,000 | 6,000 | 10,000 | 197,000 |
|  | 262,000 | 482,000 | 160,000 | 22,000 | 25,000 | 172,000 | 141,000 | 193,000 | 1,456,000 |
|  | 216,000 | 261,000 | 133,000 | 20,000 | 17,000 | 116,000 | 49,000 | 156,000 | 1966,000 |
| 30-50 PCT | 3 | 11 | 14 | 31 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| OF MEDIAN INCOME | 4 | 24 | 19 | 38 | 11 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11,000 | 50,000 | 26,000 | 5,000 | 7,000 | 26,000 | 15,000 | 8,000 | 147,000 |
|  | 337,000 | 452,000 | 177,000 | 17,000 | 87,000 | 316,000 | 337,000 | 266,000 | 1,989,000 |
|  | 270,000 | 209,000 | 133,000 | 14,000 | 62,000 | 228,000 | 85,000 | 192,000 | 1,192,000 |
|  | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| OF MEDIAN INCOME |  | 10 | 10 | 19 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |
|  | 3,000 | 7,000 | 13,000 | 1,000 | 3,000 | 15,000 | 6,000 | 5,000 | 53,000 |
|  | 499,000 | 232,000 | 233,000 | 12,000 | 122,000 | 898,000 | 501,000 | 555,000 | 3,051,000 |
|  | 374,000 | 69,000 | 134,000 | 4,000 | 44,000 | 451,000 | 82,000 | 370,000 | 1,528,000 |
|  | 4 | 11 | 15 | - 20 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| OF MEDIAN INCOME | 4 | 25 | 22 | . 28 | 10 |  | 13 | 3 | 10 |
|  | 41,000 | 134,000 | 92,000 | 11,000 | 13,000 | 57,000 | 28,000 | 24,000 | 401,000 |
|  | 1,173,000 | 1,185,000 | 602,000 | 56,000 | 244,000 | 1,451,000 | 1,005,000 | 1,064,000 | 6,780,000 |
|  | 1,921,000 | 1,543,000 | 424,000 | 41,000 | 126,000 | 1,828,000 | 216,000 | 1,745,000 | 3,844,000 |
| $80+$ PCT0 F MEDIAN INCOME | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 | 3,000 |
|  | 1,126,000 | 235,000 | 225,000 | 7,000 | 240,000 | 3,225,000 | 814,000 | 2,750,000 | 8,622,000 |
|  | 662,000 | 75,000 | 82,000 | 0 | 43,000 | 568,000 | 82,000 | 720,000 | 2,231,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|  | - ${ }^{3}$ | 13502 | 22 18 | 1 28 | - 88 | 5, $0^{4}$ | 28.9 | , 22 | 404, ${ }^{7}$ |
|  | 42,000 | 135,000 | 92,000 | 11,000 | 13,000 | 59,000 | -28,000 | -24,000 | 404,000 |
|  | 2,299,000 | 1,420,000 | 828,000 | 63,000 | 484,000 | 4,676,000 | 1,819,000 | 3,814,000 | 15,403,000 |
|  | 1,583,000 | 618,000 | 507,000 | 41,000 | 168,000 | 1,397,000 | 297,000 | 1,465,000 | 6,076,000 |

SOURCE: MICRO-SIMULATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, HUD; 1979 DATA

