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## Housing Demand Index

The housing demand index was generated from county level variables that influence the demand for housing in the state of Kentucky. This index utilizes an aggregate scoring system that ranks counties from greatest to least demand for each of the 18 variables included (see Table One, below); counties with the highest demand for a variable receive a 1, while counties with the lowest demand receive a 120 . Each individual variable was ranked (e.g. percentage change in population) from 1 to 120 . Once all individual elements were ranked, each corresponding rank was aggregated to a total score (i.e. summation of all individual scores). This aggregate score was ranked using the same methodology as the individual elements, creating an "Overall Rank" by county.

Table One: Variables included in Housing Demand Index with Definitions and Sources

| Variable | Definition | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of Renters with Housing Costs Greater than 30\% making less than $\$ 35,000$ per year | Current percentage of renters by county earning less than $\$ 35,000$ per year, whose monthly housing costs are greater than $30 \%$ of their monthly income | American Community Survey 5-year Estimates. (2016). "Household Income by Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income in the past 12 Months." (Table B25074) |
| Percentage of Owners with Housing Costs Greater than 30\% making less than $\$ 35,000$ per year | Current percentage of owners by county earning less than $\$ 35,000$ per year, whose monthly housing costs are greater than $30 \%$ of their monthly income | American Community Survey 5-year Estimates. (2016). "Household Income by Selected Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income in the past 12 Months." (Table B25095) |
| Percentage of Households below VLIL ( $50 \%$ of Median Family Income) | Utilizing the HUD generated "Very Low Income Limit" (VLIL) cut point by county ( $50 \%$ of Median Family Income), the percentage of households within that county falling below that Median Family Income limit were calculated based upon PUMS data. | Income information: Department of Housing and Urban Development. "Data for Section 8 Income Limits"; crossreferenced with IPUMS data |
| Percentage of Households below LIL ( $80 \%$ of Median Family Income) | Utilizing the HUD generated "Low Income Limit" (LIL) cut point by county ( $80 \%$ of Median Family Income), the percentage of households within that county falling below that Median Family Income limit were calculated based upon PUMS household data. | Income information: Department of Housing and Urban Development. "Data for Section 8 Income Limits"; crossreferenced with IPUMS data |
| Health - ESHE Score | ESHE Score is the aggregate score generated to determine the access to food by county. | County Health Rankings. (2016). "Kentucky Rankings Data." |
| Health - Number of Major Medical Centers | Count of major medical centers by county. | Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care (2015). "Data by Hospital: Kentucky" |
| Health - Number of Primary Care Physicians | Estimate of the number of primary care physicians working in each county. | County Health Rankings. (2016). "Kentucky Rankings Data." |
| Health - Number of HIV Diagnosis per 100,000 | AIDSVu provides the Number of HIV Diagnosis per 100,000 residents, which is generated from the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention national HIV Surveillance Database. | AIDSVu (www.aidsvu.org). Emory University, Rollins School of Public Health. |
| Employment - Change in Unemployment Rate between 2009 and 2016 | Percentage change calculated between 2009 and 2016 based up on the estimated unemployment rate by county | American Community Survey 5-year Estimates. (2009, 2016). "Employment Status." (Table: S2301) |


| Variable | Definition | Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Employment - Percent Change in <br> Labor Force Participation (2009 to <br> 2016) | Percentage change calculated based <br> upon the total number of employed <br> individuals residing in a county <br> between 2009 and 2016 | American Community Survey 5-year <br> Estimates. (2009, 2016). "Selected <br> Economic Characteristics." (Table |
| Housing - Total housing units - <br> Occupied housing units (\%) | Percentage of total occupied housing <br> units within a county. | American Community Survey 5-year <br> Estimates. (2016). "Selected Housing <br> Characteristics." (Table DP04) |
| Housing - Percentage of Loans <br> Denied | Percentage of loans denied by county <br> for single family loans (primary <br> residence). | Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. <br> (2016) "HMDA Data." |
| Housing - Dwellings Built before | Aggregate value generated for the <br> number of homes built before 1979; <br> percentage of total housing units built <br> within a county build before 1979 | American Community Survey 5-year <br> Estimates. (2016). "Selected Housing |
| Characteristics." (Table DP04) |  |  |

## Methodology

Creation of any index is an exercise in balancing parsimony with inclusion; the unmet need is not observed but estimated. The index itself utilizes variables that indicate greater levels of unmet need may exist in counties across the Commonwealth. The list of variables that can be included in any index is extremely long. Our experience with indices (both construction and utilization) has been that additional variables seldom add much to the index. They also make it more difficult to then understand the factors which led to the rankings.

We chose the variable list to be broad. Demand for housing is a multi-faceted, complex topic that is influenced by a broad spectrum of elements. We include a broad variety of factors which are correlated with both the individual and the community. The variables included can be grouped into four broad topical groups: Income, employment, health, and housing. They can also be grouped into three broad measurement types: level, percent of size, and growth. Many variables serve dual roles in the topical type. All serve dual roles by being in both a group and measurement type. We have worked to balance each type, since all factors contribute to demand.

Demand for housing is the latent amount of housing desired in the community. Measuring demand for any good is a challenge as the observed equilibrium amount of the good in the economy reflects a combination of both the demand for the good and the supply of the good. There are always individuals in an economy would like some amount of the good who obtain less than that amount. The problem is even more difficult when we consider the demand for affordable housing. This market has a public goods aspect in that there is no free market mechanism to allocate that
housing efficiently. We have chosen variables which have often been used in the analysis of the provision of other similar types of government support for low income individuals.

Income is a crucial component for understanding the demand for any good and in the present index we focus on the low income population. Six variables are used: percentage of renters and percentage of owners with housing costs greater than $30 \%$ making less than $\$ 35,000$ per year, percentage of households below VLIL, percentage of households below LIL, population growth, and total number of homeless. It may seem odd to include population growth in income, but total income in a county is highly correlated with total population. Homelessness is only weakly correlated with overall population growth, but this group clearly has severe unmet need.

Employment is included in housing demand because it measure of the overall economic status of the economy. We include the change in the unemployment rate, the change in the labor force participation rate, and the change in industries. We focus on change here as positive changes will drive the index up (similar to other measures of low income for examples). While change in unemployment is a measure of unmet need (higher unemployment indicates more need), change in total industries represents overall economic growth in the county, thus measuring total demand.

Our measures of housing focus on unmet housing need: the percentage of occupied units, percentage of loans denied, percentage of dwellings built before 1979, and percentage change in housing units. The first two clearly measure unmet need, while the last two are more subtle, measuring demand for more modern or updated units. We also note that particularly with this type of capital product, supply lags demand, hence growth in units indicates higher demand at this time (and past growth is indicative of population growth as well).

Health is included because poor health is typically associated with need for many support programs. These measures help capture both the overall growth of the economy but also the overall health of the population.

Choosing weights for any index is challenging. This is the first such index constructed and methodology for choosing weights is highly dependent on the subject matter. However, many well respected indices use the simple approach we adopted: equal weighting. Any weighting is highly controversial. A careful look at many indices will reveal that even after considerable research, weights are quite often close to equal across categories (see for example the Appalachian Regional Commissions' County Economic Status or the University of Wisconsin’s County Health Rankings). Even these well-established indices are often criticized for their weights. Our approach here, given the limited scope of the project, was parsimony. The complex analysis required to achieve more subtle weighting is a large project, requiring substantial time and resources. We note too, the complexity of the myriad low income housing programs implies that some variables will be important for certain programs, while other variables will be important for other programs. To see this more clearly, consider the varied slope coefficients on these variables in the Needs Assessment (KHC Outputs and Outcomes).

## How to Use the Demand Index

The Demand Index was created to provide an overall view of low income housing demand within a county. Housing is a multi-product industry and extremely complex. Demand for the type of products supplied by the Kentucky Housing Corporation is a particularly complicated industry. The purpose of any index like this is to summarize complex data and provide a starting point for deeper, detailed analysis, rather than an ending point that provides a single answer. Many times, individuals familiar with one aspect of a program find the overall ranking at odds with their perceptions. Individuals can then examine in detail factors of which they were previously unaware and place the factors they typically rely upon in a broader context. An individual seeking to dig deeper can then use the Kentucky Demographics Section of the Housing Needs Assessment (which provides detail for all variables in the index).

The index is not the only variable or value that decision makers should consider. Given the breadth of the programs offered by KHC, it would be impossible to summarize these outcomes in a single measure. The index is designed to
be used only as a starting place. The advantage is that it provides an organization with a single starting place, which then focuses the discussion surrounding topics.

## Results

Based upon the ranking methodology and discussion in the previous section, Figure One displays the results of the index in a map (below). (Table Two provides the correlating rank to the colors in the map). Taking into account variables that influence demand for housing within a county, the counties shaded in red are those counties with the highest demand for housing in the state; counties shaded in dark blue have the lowest demand for housing in the state. In terms of regional trends, we see that a large portion of Eastern Kentucky is shaded in Orange (Moderate to High Demand) and Red (High Demand). Calloway County has the highest demand rank in the state, followed by Robertson, Clay, Knox, and Letcher Counties (respectively). Hancock County has the lowest demand rank in the state, followed by Spencer, Carter, Nicholas, and Webster Counties (respectively). Table Three (next page) displays all counties with their corresponding rank by category from Low Demand to High Demand.

Figure One: Demand Index Rank by County


Table Two: Demand Index Categories

| Category | Rank | Color |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Low | 97 to 120 | Dark Blue |
| Low to Moderate | 73 to 96 | Light Blue |
| Moderate | 49 to 72 | Yellow |
| Moderate to High | 25 to 48 | Orange |
| High | 1 to 24 | Red |

Table Three: Ranks by County and Category

| Low Demand |  | Low to Moderate Demand |  | Moderate Demand |  | Moderate to High Demand |  | High Demand |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County Name | Rank | County Name | Rank | County Name | Rank | County Name | Rank | County Name | Rank |
| Butler County | 98 | Breckinridge County | 74 | Marshall County | 49 | Bell County | 25 | Calloway County | 1 |
| Larue County | 98 | Washington County | 75 | Kenton County | 50 | Breathitt County | 26 | Robertson County | 2 |
| Jackson County | 100 | Johnson County | 76 | Mercer County | 51 | Lee County | 27 | Clay County | 3 |
| Garrard County | 101 | Taylor County | 77 | Lincoln County | 52 | Henderson County | 28 | Knox County | 4 |
| Trimble County | 102 | Caldwell County | 78 | Campbell County | 53 | Elliott County | 29 | Letcher County | 5 |
| Nelson County | 103 | Lyon County | 78 | Powell County | 54 | Hardin County | 30 | Madison County | 6 |
| Leslie County | 104 | Muhlenberg County | 78 | Allen County | 55 | Perry County | 30 | Jefferson County | 7 |
| Todd County | 105 | Shelby County | 81 | Morgan County | 56 | Wayne County | 32 | Wolfe County | 8 |
| Woodford County | 106 | Mason County | 82 | Boyd County | 57 | Graves County | 33 | Hart County | 9 |
| Bullitt County | 107 | Monroe County | 83 | Owsley County | 58 | Pike County | 34 | Harlan County | 10 |
| Henry County | 108 | Russell County | 84 | Gallatin County | 59 | Estill County | 35 | Christian County | 11 |
| Anderson County | 109 | Carroll County | 85 | Martin County | 59 | Knott County | 36 | Floyd County | 12 |
| Green County | 110 | Greenup County | 86 | Boyle County | 61 | Bath County | 37 | Fayette County | 13 |
| Marion County | 111 | Casey County | 87 | Trigg County | 61 | Daviess County | 38 | Fulton County | 13 |
| Fleming County | 112 | Meade County | 87 | Bourbon County | 63 | Magoffin County | 39 | McCracken County | 15 |
| Franklin County | 113 | Lawrence County | 89 | Clark County | 64 | Laurel County | 40 | Rockcastle County | 16 |
| Carlisle County | 114 | McLean County | 89 | Bracken County | 65 | McCreary County | 41 | Grayson County | 17 |
| Metcalfe County | 115 | Boone County | 91 | Hopkins County | 66 | Owen County | 42 | Crittenden County | 18 |
| Webster County | 116 | Harrison County | 92 | Logan County | 67 | Union County | 42 | Adair County | 19 |
| Nicholas County | 117 | Ballard County | 93 | Edmonson County | 68 | Warren County | 42 | Whitley County | 20 |
| Carter County | 118 | Montgomery County | 93 | Cumberland County | 69 | Hickman County | 45 | Barren County | 21 |
| Spencer County | 119 | Scott County | 93 | Menifee County | 69 | Ohio County | 45 | Clinton County | 21 |
| Hancock County | 120 | Jessamine County | 96 | Pendleton County | 71 | Oldham County | 47 | Grant County | 23 |
|  |  | Livingston County | 96 | Lewis County | 72 | Rowan County | 48 | Pulaski County | 24 |
|  |  |  |  | Simpson County | 72 |  |  |  |  |

