GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION DATA SHEET

[X] ORIGINAL [ ] REVISION NO. ______

Project No. D-48-612 GTRI/GIT DATE 11 / 14 / 83

Project Director: Roger F. Rupnow CO School/Lab: Arch./City Planning

Sponsor: Georgia Manufactured Housing Association
Atlanta, GA 30339

Type Agreement: Research Project Agreement No. DRH/G502.83-8

Award Period: From ______ To ______ (Performance) ______ (Reports)

Sponsor Amount:

	This Change	Total to Date
Estimated:	$	$ 28,000*
Funded:	$	$ 28,000*

Cost Sharing Amount: $ ______ Cost Sharing No: ______

Title: "Manufactured Housing Center"

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

OCA Contact John W. Burdette ext.4820

1) Sponsor Technical Contact:

2) Sponsor Admin/Contractual Matters:
Ms. Charlotte Gattis
Georgia Manufactured Housing Association
1000 Circle 75 Parkway
Suite 060
Atlanta, GA 30339

Defense Priority Rating: ______ Military Security Classification: N/A
(or) Company/Industrial Proprietary: N/A

RESTRICTIONS

See Attached ______ Supplemental Information Sheet for Additional Requirements.

Travel: Foreign travel must have prior approval – Contact OCA in each case. Domestic travel requires sponsor approval where total will exceed greater of $500 or 125% of approved proposal budget category.

Equipment: Title vests with None proposed.

COMMENTS:

* Project Costs = $28,000
Patent Rights Fee = 5,000

NOV 1983
RECEIVED
Research Reports
Office

COPIES TO:

Project Director	Procurement/EES Supply Services	GTRI
Research Administrative Network	Research Security Services	Library
Research Property Management	✓Reports Coordinator (OCA)	Project File
Accounting	Research Communications (2)	Other I. Newton

ORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

SPONSORED PROJECT TERMINATION/CLOSEOUT SHEET

Date 6/3/85

ject No. D-48-612 School/~~Lab~~ XXX Arch.

ludes Subproject No.(s) N/A

ject Director(s) Roger F. Rupnow GTRC / ~~GIT~~ XX

nsor Georgia Manufactured Housing Association

le "Manufactured Housing Center"

ective Completion Date: 9/15/83 (Performance) (Reports)

nt/Contract Closeout Actions Remaining:

- [ ] None
- [XX] Final Invoice or Final Fiscal Report
- [ ] Closing Documents
- [ ] Final Report of Inventions
- [ ] Govt. Property Inventory & Related Certificate
- [ ] Classified Material Certificate
- [ ] Other

ntinues Project No. Continued by Project No.

PIES TO:

ject Director
earch Administrative Network
earch Property Management
ounting
curement/GTRI Supply Services
earch Security Services
orts Coordinator (OCA)
al Services

Library
GTRC
Research Communications (2)
Project File
Other

RM OCA 69.285

MANUFACTURED HOUSING CENTER

INTERIM REPORT
ON
ZONING ANALYSIS

GEORGIA MANUFACTURED HOUSING ASSOCIATION

by

Georgia Institute of Technology
Center for Manufactured Housing

Roger F. Rupnow

October 1983

MANUFACTURED HOUSING CENTER

Interim Report

on

Zoning Analysis

One of the major issues confronting the Manufactured Housing industry in Georgia is the regulation of "mobile homes" by the local unit of government (city or county). Local units of government affect the availability of mobile homes by regulating their location, size, design and construction methods.

This regulation is promulgated through building codes, zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations and specific mobile home ordinances. The initial efforts of this study during the period of June 15 to September 15, 1983 addressed the impact of the zoning ordinances in this regulation effort.

To reduce duplication of effort and time expended the study used as its basic data the information collected by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs in a survey conducted between March and May 1982. This effort, "Local Government Operation Survey," administered by the Area Planning and Development Commissions attempted to obtain substantial amounts of information relating to the financial and personnel practices, as well as data on planning, zoning, and community facilities. Specifically, each respondent was asked if the county had a zoning ordinance and the date of adoption. Of the 159 counties, 62 responded that they had zoning ordinances. At this time, the final report of that study has not been published and as a result it is not possible to establish completely the accuracy of the results.

We accepted the results of the 1982 survey and this analysis is based on that. Using these 62 counties we set out to obtain copies of and analyze each of their zoning ordinances. We attempted to contact by phone the respondent to the Department of Community Affairs survey. To date we have succeeded in 61 of the 62 counties; we have been unable to contact an appropriate representative in Crawford County. Based on those contacts we were informed that 5 of the counties, Early, Jenkins, Stewart, Upson, and White, do not have zoning ordinances. It seems that there was some confusion between whether the survey question was directed toward the county or the city which was the county seat. This, then, reduced to 57 the number of county ordinances to be collected and analyzed.

The Center already had obtained copies of the ordinances of 33 of these counties. However, in most governments, the ordinance is amended and/or updated from time to time and it was our goal to acquire the most current document possible. To that end we have obtained 24 current ordinances. In addition, we have ordered either by phone or purchase order 25 additional ordinances.

There are 2 counties, Liberty and Walton, whose ordinances are not available; two, Effingham and Jackson, who are in the process of rewriting their ordinances; and the availability of the ordinance of one county, Clayton, is not a certainty. Their phone response was ambiguous.

Upon receipt of the ordinances, the Center staff began reviewing these ordinances to determine the impact the published controls could have on the manufactured housing industry and the existence of any differences between the regulations for conventional housing construction and manufactured housing. These differences might include siting requirements and locational design and standard differences. This data was recorded on a pre-existing form and the analyses for each of the counties, along with supporting material, is included in Appendix A. At this time, 15 ordinances have been analyzed, 7 of which were completed as a part of this contract. The other 8 had been completed earlier under an alternative arrangement. These 8 should be reviewed again to reflect the most up-to-date status. Because of the limited time available and the limited number of individual ordinances on which analysis was completed, a summation including a comparison was not undertaken. This would be undertaken in the next phase.

The attached table, "Summary - Zoning Survey Results," provides an excellent but very limited data base. To increase its value, additional ordinances need to be analyzed and the development and implementation of a computer data base needs to be undertaken.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Several preliminary conclusions have been reached as a result of the efforts to date.

- There is a wide variation in the regulation of manufactured housing in Georgia.
- Public documents such as zoning ordinances are not readily available and easily obtainable.
- Accurate up-to-date information on the status of county zoning is not readily available.
- A study of this type requires more time than has been allotted to date.

This study also recommends the following:

- A means be developed to computerize the data collected to not only permit rapid retrieval but easy analysis and updating.
- A second phase needs to be undertaken to determine the status of zoning in the remaining 96 counties. As the State continues to grow and develop, more and more counties will be required to adopt land use regulations and the content of those ordinances will have substantial impact on the manufactured housing industry.
- Results of this and any additional analyses be made available to a variety of organizations, corporations, and individuals to better acquaint them with the impediments that the manufactured housing industry is struggling against in Georgia.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1
SUMMARY
ZONING SURVEY RESULTS

	ZONING ORDINANCE							
	NO	YES						
County		Dated Copy In File	Current Copy In File	Ordered By Phone/P.O.		Rewriting Ordinance	Not Available	Analysis
Barrow		x	x					x
Ben Hill		x	x					
Bibb		x		x				
Bryan		x	x					
Butts		x	x					x
Camden		x	x					x
Chatham		x	x					
Cherokee				x				
Clarke		x						
Clayton		x			x		x	x
Cobb		x			x			
Coffee					x			
Colquit				x				
Columbia		x	x					
Coweta		x	x					x
Crawford					x			
Crisp		x	x					
DeKalb		x			x			
Dougherty		x						x
Douglas		x			x			x
Early	x							
Effingham						x		
Fayette		x	x					x
Floyd		x	x					
Forsyth		x	x					
Fulton		x						
Glynn					x			
Greene					x			
Gwinnett		x	x					x
Habersham				x				
Hall		x	x					x
Heard		x	x					
Henry		x	x					x
Houston		x						
Jackson						x		
Jasper		x	x					
Jenkins	x							
Jones					x			
Lamar			x					
Lee			x					
Liberty							x	
Lowndes				x				
McIntosh					x			
Morgan					x			
Muscogee				x				
Newton		x						x
Oconee		x	x					
Paulding		x	x					x
Peach					x			
Pike		x	x					x

Analyses of the Characteristics of the Supply, Demand and Utilization of Manufactured Housing in Georgia

Prepared for the
Georgia Manufactured Housing Association

Prepared by the
Center for Manufactured Housing,
Georgia Institute of Technology

September 27, 1983

Introduction and Summary

The Center for Manufactured Housing has undertaken an analysis of the characteristics of manufactured housing and the families who buy and rent manufactured housing in a level of detail not previously possible.

By analyzing the extensive data contained in the 1980 U.S. Census Public Use Micro Sample, it has been possible to learn more about both manufactured housing and its occupants than previous data would allow. For example, we now know that 138,846 Georgia households live in manufactured housing, that over three-quarters of these households own their housing (a proportion higher than the non-manufactured sector), that the ownership market for manufactured housing has significantly lower vacancy rates than does the ownership sector generally, that one-quarter of the second home market is composed of manufactured housing, that manufactured housing has become increasingly more popular as a housing choice in Georgia over the past two decades, and that rents for the one-quarter of the manufactured housing stock which is rental are nearly identical to rents in the conventional stock.

It is now known that American's and Georgian's preferences for smaller households is a demographic trend which includes residents of manufactured housing. These trends portend both reduced public service costs and new marketing opportunities.

The incomes of households residing in manufactured housing have been enumerated for the first time. The data presented in this report show that owners of manufactured housing have incomes which are 87 percent of typical Georgian households, that those income are higher than Georgians who live in rental housing and lower than conventional housing owner. Again, the implications for marketing are significant.

For the first time it is known that a higher proportion of households in manufactured housing are married couple families. At the same time, the number of single people living in manufactured housing has increased, a trend which has elicited new forms of housing in the conventional sector but which has yet to significantly impact the design of manufactured homes.

The complete report contains detailed analyses of these characteristics as well as comparisons of the population living in manufactured housing with the population as a whole according to the industries they work in, the occupations they hold, the extent of their unemployment, their race, mobility, nativity and previous service to the country.

Characteristics of the Housing Stock

The number of households choosing manufactured housing increased proportionately more than any other type of housing choice during the decade of the 1970's. In 1970, 76,435 Georgia households lived in manufactured housing. By 1980 this number had increased 82 percent to 138,846. In comparison, occupied multifamily housing two or more units) increased 52 percent and occupied single family increased only 29 percent. By 1980, one household in 13 lived in manufactured housing.

The explanations for these shifts are complex and not at all certain. Part of the explanation has to do with consumer preferences and with the changing nature of demand for housing, both subjects which require more detailed analysis than is possible here.

But other parts of the explanation for the increasing preference of consumers for manufactured housing are accessible. The foremost cause is price. The median monthly housing cost for single and multifamily homeowners was $340 per month. The Census did not collect data for owned manufactured housing but industry estimates place the average cost of owning a mobile home in 1980 at $??. Clearly, the cost of manufactured housing makes it more accessible to more Georgians. On the rental side median rents for both manufactured housing and the rental stock generally were $211 or some 38 percent less than the cost of homeownership.

As the prices of single family homes and their monthly carrying charges continue to increase, more and more Georgians are finding manufactured housing a preferable economic alternative.

.Table 1.

Table 1 indirectly reflects the financial advantages associated with manufactured housing. Fully three-quarters of occupied manufactured housing units are owned by their occupants. The comparable figure for non-manufactured housing is less than two-third (64.2 percent). The fact that manufactured housing costs substantially less than owned conventional housing means that a higher proportion of its occupants are able to own their own homes and reap the significant benefits of homeownership.

.Table 2.

The newly available Census data present the first opportunity to compare the different housing markets within the state. Table 2 shows that the ownership market for manufactured housing was nearly three times as was the non-manufactured ownership market. The vacancy rate in the manufactured housing ownership market was an extremely low 0.6 percent, while in the non-manufacturing ownership sector, the rate was a still tight but higher 1.7 percent.

Table I

Occupied Housing Units by Tenure

Occupancy Characteristics	Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Housing	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Owner Occupied	104,575	75.3	1,111,857	64.2
Renter Occupied	34,271	24.7	620,949	35.8
Total Occupied	**138,846**	100.0	1,732,806	100.0

Table 2

Housing Market Characteristics

Market	Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Housing	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Ownership Market				
Occupied	104,575	99.4	1,111,857	98.3
For Sale	579	0.6	18,989	1.7
Total	105,154	100.0	1,130,846	100.0
Rental Market				
Occupied	34,271	87.4	620,949	92.4
For Rent	4,950	12.6	51,154	7.6
Total	39,221	100.0	672,103	100.0
Second Home Market				
Seasonal	3,815	54.9	6,881	32.4
Held for Occasional Use	3,128	45.1	14,359	67.6
Total	6,953	100.0	21,240	100.0

Without longitudinal data, it is impossible to determine whether this is consistent phenomena or whether the relationships between these two markets fluctuates. But it is clear that the balance between supply and demand in 1980 was significantly tighter for owned manufactured housing than it was in the non-manufactured ownership sector.

The situation in the rental market was the reverse. Both the non-manufactured rental sector and the manufactured rental sector exhibited high vacancy rates. Both markets were in a state which is usually associated with being temporarily overbuilt.

As with the ownership market, the absence of longitudinal data prevents a more complete explanation of the relationships between the two markets.

Two characteristics of the second home market are notable. Table 2 shows that manufactured housing comprises fully one-quarter of the second home market, 6,953 units out of a total of 28,193. Thus, manufactured housing's share of the second home market was three times as great as its share of the primary residence market.

Secondly, the proportions of second homes which are seasonal and which are year round (held for occassional use) differ for manufactured and conventional housing. Subsequent analyses will investigate the extent to which these differences are responses to different climatic regions within the state.

.Table 3.

Table 3 presents a more detailed analysis of the characteristics of vacant units. From the previous analysis, the finding that only 3.6 percent of all vacant manufactured housing is for sale is expected because the sales market was so tight in 1960. The other

Table 3

Vacant Housing Units by Vacancy Status

Vacancy Status	Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Housing	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
For Sale	579	3.6	18,989	13.9
For Rent	4,950	30.7	51,154	37.4
Held for Occasional Use	3,128	19.4	14,359	10.5
Seasonal	3,815	23.7	6,881	5.0
Other Vacant	3,658	22.7	45,370	33.2
Total	16,130	100.0	136,753	100.0

significant finding in this data is that over two-fifths of vacant manufactured housing are in the second home market. This compares with the one-sixth of the conventional stock.

.Table 4.

Table 4 presents the Census tabulations on the age of the housing stock. Clearly the manufactured housing stock is substantially younger than the conventional stock. However, comparisons between the longevity of the two types of housing cannot be conclusively made. The data reflect two trends which complicate the analysis. First, the presence of manufactured housing in any significant numbers is a relatively recent phenomena. It was not until the 1960's that manufactured housing gained broad acceptance as an alternative to conventional housing.

Secondly, the extent of the acceptance of manufactured housing, particularly by local governments, was not immediate but has been slowly evolving since the mid-1960's. One consequence of this pattern has been a continual increase in the manufactured housing proportion of the total stock since the 1960's. By the last time period for which data is available (1979 and the first four months of 1980), manufactured housing accounted for 13.7 percent of additions to stock. This is nearly twice the proportion (7.4 percent) of the total stock which is manufactured housing.

.Table 5.

Two facts stand out in the comparison of gross rents for manufactured housing with non-manufactured housing. First, the distribution of rents for manufactured housing is highly concentrated around the median. Over two-third of the occupied rental units rent for $170-299. In contrast to the conventional stock, very few units rent for low prices. There are only 1,267 manufactured units (4.6 percent of the occupied rental

Table 4

Age of Stock

Year Built	Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Housing	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
1979-March, 1980	10,503	6.8	66,336	3.6
1975-1978	33,038	21.3	181,943	9.8
1970-1974	65,977	42.6	312,307	16.8
1960-1969	36,186	23.3	468,972	25.2
1950-1959	5,519	3.6	330,877	17.8
1940-1949	1,650	1.1	203,869	11.0
1939 or earlier	2,103	1.3	294,559	15.8
Total	154,976	100.0	1,858,863	100.0

Median Age = 7.82 years Median Age 18.11

Table 5

Gross Rent for Renter Occupied Housing

Gross Rent	Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Housing	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Less Than #79	605	2.2	46,391	8.4
80 to 99	662	2.4	24,236	4.4
100 to 119	916	3.3	28,708	5.2
120 to 149	2,279	8.2	52,328	9.5
150 to 169	2,512	9.0	39,293	7.1
170 to 179	4,987	17.9	57,116	10.4
200 to 249	9,486	34.0	98,007	17.8
250 to 299	4,245	15.2	83,627	15.2
300 to 349	1,461	5.2	65,855	12.0
350 to 399	468	1.7	28,893	5.2
400 to 499	214	0.7	19,115	3.5
500 or more	77	0.2	7,133	1.3
Total	27,912	100.0	550,702	100.0
Median	$ 211		$ 211	
Mean	$ 212		$ 217	
No Cash Rent	4,046		37,200	

rent for less than $100. In contrast, one in eight occupied conventional rental units (12.8 percent, or 70,627 units).

While the Census has substantially increased both the amount of data it collects and reports on manufactured housing, parity with conventional housing has not been achieved. The most notable ommission from the Census data set is information on the value and monthly costs of owned manufactured units. These ommissions could serve as prime targets of industry efforts for expanded Census coverage.

The 1980 Census does provide data on rental costs, and this information is displayed in rent for less than $100.

The second fact to emerge from this analysis, is that, on average, rents for manufactured housing and conventional housing are similar. Median rents for the two types of rental housing are exactly the same, $211 per month. Mean, or average rents are only $5 apart: $212 for manufactured housing and $217 for conventional units.

.Table 6.

Table 6 compares the average number of rooms in manufactured and non-manufactured housing. The striking fact here is that conventional housing is only one sixth larger, in terms of rooms, than manufactured housing. This is particularly surprising in view of the fact that the basis for the calculation for conventional housing includes some extremely large units. A more detailed comparison, holding price and value constant, for example, would therefore, show an even higher degree of comparability.

Table 6

Unit Sizes

	Manufactured Housing	Non-Manufactured Housing
Mean Number of Rooms	4.5	5.4

Characteristics of Demand and Utilization

The focus of the report now shifts from characteristics of the housing stock, the supply analysis, to the characteristics of the people living in Georgia housing, is the demand and utilization analysis.

Table 7 presents the distributions of households by number of persons in households for manufactured housing and for all Georgians. The two distributions are quite similar. Average (mean) household size is almost identical: 2.89 persons per household for manufactured housing and 2.84 persons per household for all Georgians.

The other measure of central tendancy, median persons per household, shows only slightly divergance between the two types. 2.00 for conventional housing and 2.17 for manufactured housing.

It is clear that the national trend for American households to be smaller than they were in the past has arrived in Georgia. It is also clear that an integral part of this trend, households with no children and households with fewer children is a feature of all Georgians in general and Georgians who live in manufactured housing in particular.

The impacts of these demographic changes are profound. Not only will local school boards be faced with housing to build fewer new schools, some will be in the unusual position of having surplus capacity. Conventional condominium and apartment developers have recognized entire new markets of smaller households in need of housing. Portions of these markets may be accessible to manufactured housing developments.

.Table 7.

.Table 8.

A more detailed understanding of these changes is presented in Table 8. By far the largest single type of household in either manufactured housing or in Georgia are married couple families. Two-thirds of all households in manufactured housing and three-fifths of all Georgia households are married couple families. In fact, households in manufactured housing are eight percent more likely to be married couple families than are Georgia households.

When this knowledge is combined with the information on household sizes presented in Table 7, it becomes clear that the primary reason for smaller household is that traditional, married couple families are having fewer children.

The second major reason for smaller households is the increasing proportion of single person households. One in five residents of manufactured housing is a single person (1 Person households in Table 7 and most of the non-family households in Table 8). The proportion is even higher in the population at large: one in every four and one-quarter households is a non-family (primarily single person) household.

It is also important to note that manufactured housing contains 19 percent fewer female headed households than does the population at large.

.Table 9.

Table 9 describes the racial composition of persons in Georgia and persons in manufactured housing. Both populations are predominately white, but the proportion of whites is greater in manufactured housing.

Table 7

Households by Persons in Household

Persons	Households in Manufactured Housing		Georgia Households	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
1 Person	25,337	18.2	382,572	20.4
2 Persons	38,848	28.0	556,448	29.7
3 Persons	31,124	22.4	357,667	19.1
4 Persons	24,447	17.6	313,146	16.7
5 Persons	11,691	8.4	153,201	8.2
6 or More Persons	7,375	5.3	109,530	5.8
Total Households	138,846	100.0	1,872,564	100.0
Total Persons	400,731			
Mean Persons/Household	2.89		2.84	
Median Persons/Household	2.17		2.00	

Table 8

Family Households by Family Type

Household Type	Households in Manufactured Housing		Georgia Households	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Married Couple Family	91,917	66.2	1,151,782	61.5
Male Householders No Wife Present	3,835	2.8	45,156	2.4
Female Householders No Husband Present	14,662	10.6	235,393	12.6
Non-family Household	28,432	20.5	440,233	23.5
Total Householders	138,846	100.0	1,872,564	100.0

Table 9

Persons by Race

Race	Persons in Manufactured Housing		Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
White	325,017	81.1	3,949,583	72.3
Black	71,800	17.9	1,464,435	26.8
Other	3,914	1.0	49,087	0.9
Total	400,731	100.0	5,463,105	100.0

.Table 10.

Table 10 compares household incomes for residents of manufactured housing and all Georgia households. Not surprisingly, incomes of households in manufactured housing have lower incomes than the population as a whole. But the difference is not as great as one might expect. Comparing median income (which, due to the presence of high income households (over $50,000) in both distributions, is the best measure of typical situations), manufactured housing households earn 81 percent of the statewide median.

.Table 11.

Table 11 provides the basis for a more detailed analysis of household income. When the incomes of all Georgians are disaggregated by tenure, the explanation for the difference between Georgia incomes and manufactured housing incomes becomes clear. Owner households, (which comprise 64 percent of all households in the State) earn substantially more than either manufactured housing households or renter households. Households in manufactured housing earn 9 percent more than their counter parts in rental housing.

.Table 12.

Table 12 carries this analysis one step further. When households living in manufactured housing are dissaggregated by tenure, a similar distinction between the incomes of owners and renters appears. Owners of manufactured housing earn 36 percent more than renters, and they earn 87 percent of typical incomes for all Georgia households.

The fact that manufactured housing provides a financially feasible way for households who earn more than most rental households but less than most owners of conventional housing is clearly demonstrated by this data.

Table 10

Household Income

Household Income	Households in Manufactured Housing		Georgia Households	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Less than $2,500	9,738	7.0	124,555	6.7
2,500 to 4,999	13,803	9.9	179,770	9.6
5,000 to 7,499	15,294	11.0	160,732	8.6
7,500 to 9,999	16,398	11.8	159,968	8.5
10,000 to 14,999	31,884	23.0	304,919	16.2
15,000 to 19,999	25,380	18.3	265,463	14.2
20,000 to 24,999	14,055	10.1	215,722	11.5
25,000 to 34,999	9,197	6.6	256,788	13.7
35,000 to 49,999	2,110	1.5	128,355	6.9
50,000 or more	987	0.1	76,292	4.1
Total	138,846	100.0	1,872,564	100.0

Mean Income $13,695
Median Income $12,225
Per Capita Income $4,745

Mean Income $18,728
Median Income $15,110
Per Capita Income $6,542

Table 11

Income and Tenure Characteristics of Georgians

Mean Household Income	
All Georgians	$ 18,728
Owner Households	22,074
Manufactured Housing Households	13,695
Renter Households	12,517

Table 12

Household Income

Household Income	Manufactured Housing Owners		Manufactured Housing Renters	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Less than $2,500	6,642	6.2	2,400	8.7
2,500 to 4,999	9,485	8.9	3,620	13.0
5,000 to 7,499	10,549	9.9	4,046	14.6
7,500 to 9,999	11,382	10.6	4,452	16.0
10,000 to 14,999	24,272	22.7	6,891	24.8
15,000 to 19,999	21,601	20.2	3,446	12.4
20,000 to 24,999	12,311	11.5	1,607	5.8
25,000 to 34,999	8,111	7.6	987	3.6
35,000 to 49,999	1,897	1.8	194	0.6
50,000 or more	832	0.8	97	0.3
Total	107,082	100.0	27,740	100.0

Mean Income $14,514
Median Income $13,189

Mean Income $11,123
Median Income $9,636

.Table 13.

When the sources of these incomes are examined, as they are in Table 13, our understanding of the similarity between households in manufactured housing and the rest of population increases. Over three quarters of both groups work for private wages and salaries. In fact, manufactured housing households are 3 percent more likely to be employed in the private sector.

Correspondingly, a higher proportion of all Georgia households (18.2 percent) work for government than do manufactured housing households (14.4 percent).

More manufactured housing households (7.7 percent) are self-employed than are households generally (6.2 percent). But these differences are slight. The overriding conclusion is that, insofar as the source of incomes are concerned, households in manufactured housing differ very little from the population as a whole.

.Table 14.

The analysis of the source of income can be enriched by examining the industries in which the two groups work. Table 14 presents this data. The most striking feature of this data is the fact that manufacturing householders are represented in all industrial categories.

They are proportionately more frequently found working in agriculture, forestries fisheries and mining; construction; manufacturing and transportation; and less frequently in retail trade; finance, insurance and real estate, personal, entertainment and recreation services; in professional and related services; and public administration. Finally, they work in roughly the same proportions as the population as a whole in the communications and other public utilties; wholesale trade; business and repair services

Table 13

Employed Persons by Class of Worker

Class of Worker	Manufactured Housing Householders		Employed Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Private Wage & Salary Worker	94,488	77.7	1,754,308	75.1
Federal Government Worker	7,356	6.1	105,617	4.5
State Government Worker	3,833	3.2	123,602	5.3
Local Government Worker	6,214	5.1	195,953	8.4
Self Employed Worker	9,330	7.7	145,717	6.2
Unpaid Family Worker	329	0.3	10,638	0.5
Total	121,550	100.0	2,335,835	100.0

x x Could Redistribute 89

Table 14

Employed Persons by Industry

	Employed Manufactured Housing Householders		Employed Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Mining	7,549	6.4	76,713	3.3
Construction	15,446	13.1	150,041	6.4
Manufacturing				
Nondurable Goods	24,408	20.7	341,941	14.6
Durable Goods	19,201	16.3	220,082	9.4
Transportation	6,369	5.4	113,618	4.9
Communication, Other Public Utilities	3,427	2.9	75,058	3.2
Wholesale Trade	5,691	4.8	113,927	4.9
Retail Trade	12,833	10.9	358,122	15.3
Finance Insurance and Real Estate	1,800	1.5	130,329	5.6
Business and Repair Services	4,259	3.6	90,702	3.9
Personal, Entertainment and Recreation Services	3,657	3.1	104,742	4.5
Professional and Related Services:				
Health Services	3,446	2.9	152,357	6.5
Educational Services	3,504	3.0	187,938	8.0
Other Professional and Related Services	1,007	0.8	84,891	3.6
Public Administration	5,246	4.5	135,374	5.8
Total	117, 843	100.0	2,335,835	100.0

industries.

.Table 15.

Table 15 compares the occupations of employed persons. Again, the central finding is that manufactured housing householders are represented in every occupational category. They are more frequently found working as farmers, forestry workers or fishermen; as operators, fabricators and laborers, and less frequently as managers, professionals, technicians, in sales, or as service workers.

.Table 16.

Manufactured housing householders are slightly less likely to be unemployed than employed persons in Georgia, and, if they are unemployed they are more likely to not to be unemployed for an extended period of time (Table 16).

In Georgia in 1979, 18 percent of the employed population was out of work for at least a week. The comparable figure for manufactured housing householders was 17 percent. For those who were unemployed for more than 15 weeks the state figure was 6.2 percent, while the manufactured housing figure was 5.4 percent.

.Table 17.

The mobility of residents of manufactured housing falls between that of the population has a whole and that of the rental population, Table 17 shows that the median Georgia household has lived in their current residence for 5.16 years. Comparable figures for rental households and manufactured housing households are 1.92 years and 3.15 years respectively. In other words, manufactured housing households move only 61 percent as frequently as the rental population and 63 percent more frequently than the population generally.

Table 15

Employed Persons by Occupation

Occupation	Employed Manufactured Housing Householders		Employed Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Managerial and Professional Specialty:				
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	5,672	4.8	237,945	10.2
Professional Speciality	3,639	3.1	250,429	10.7
Technical Sales Administrative Support:				
Technical and Related Support	2,323	2.0	67,417	2.9
Sales	6,485	5.5	239,377	10.2
Administrative Support Including Clerical	7,781	6.6	382,738	16.4
Service:				
Private Household	581	0.5	23,331	1.0
Protective Service	19	0.0	34,559	1.5
Service, Except Protective and Household	10,859	9.2	225,478	9.7
Farming, Forestry, and Fishing		6,775	5.7	66,750
Precision Production Craft and Repair	29,866	25.3	297,604	12.7
Operators, Fabrication, and Laborers:				
Machine Operators, Assemblers, Inspectors	21,563	18.3	274,920	11.8
Transportation and Material Moving	13,685	11.6	112,669	4.8
Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, Laborers	8,595	7.3	122,618	5.2
Total	117,843	100.0	2,335,835	100.0

Table 16

Extent of Unemployment

Employment Status	Manufactured Housing Householders		Employed Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Fully Employed	101,981	83.0	2,282,289	82.0
Unemployed 1-4 Weeks	6,853	5.6	161,896	5.8
Unemployed 5-14 Weeks	7,454	6.1	166,589	6.0
Unemployed 15 or More Weeks	6,639	5.4	171,020	6.2
Total	122,927	100.0	2,781,794	100.0

Table 17

Household Mobility

Year Moved	Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Housing		Non-Manufactured Rental Housing	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
1979-March 1980	44,971	32.4	402,161	23.2	292,824	44.7
1975-1978	51,535	37.1	475,482	27.4	206,384	31.5
1970-1974	31,866	23.0	295,032	17.0	77,730	11.9
1960-1969	9,487	6.8	297,945	17.2	48,204	7.4
1950-1959	619	0.4	145,839	8.4	17,049	2.6
1949 or earlier	368	0.3	116,347	6.7	13,029	2.0
Total	138,846	100.0	1,732,806	100.0	655,220	100.0

Median Residency = 3.15 years Median Residency = 5.16 Median Residency = 1.92

.Table 18.

.Table 19.

People who live in manufactured housing are 5 percent more likely to be native Georgians than the State population as a whole (Table 18). Nearly three of every four people living in manufactured housing was born in Georgia.

In spite of the popular attention given to migration into the State as a part of the Frost Belt to Sun Belt shift, Table 19 shows the 87.5 percent of all current Georgians and 88.4 percent of all residents of manufactured housing were living within the State five years earlier. Approximately three-quarters of both groups were living in the same Georgia county five years earlier. Forty percent of manufactured housing residents were living in the same home, and one-half of the population as a whole had not moved in five years.

.Table 20.

Finally, manufactured housing householders are more likely to have been in the U.S. armed forces than the population at large. Table 20 shows that over 40 percent of the householders have served in one of the armed services, while fewer than 20 percent of the Georgia population over 16 years old have.

Table 18

Persons by Nativity and Place of Birth

Place of Birth	Persons in Manufactured Housing		Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Born in Georgia	298,505	74.5	3,876,310	71.0
Born in U.S. Not in Georgia	97,378	24.3	1,462,111	26.8
Foreign Born	4,808	1.2	124,684	1.5
Total	400,731	100.0	5,463,105	100.0

Table 19

Persons 5 Years and Over
By Residence in 1975

	Persons in Manufactured Housing		Persons in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Same Home	150,850	40.7	2,650,282	52.5
Different Home				
Same County	117,206	31.6	1,150,143	22.8
Different County				
Same State	59,622	16.1	615,045	12.2
Different State				
Northeast	3,233	0.9	92,928	1.8
North Central	6,506	1.8	99,201	2.0
South	28,516	7.7	339,801	6.7
West	1,832	0.5	49,623	1.0
Abroad	2,778	0.7	54,602	1.1
Total	370,543	100.0	5,051,625	100.0

Table 20

Civilians 16 Years and Over by Veteran Status

Veteran Status	Manufactured Housing Householders		Civilians Over 16 in Georgia	
	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency
Veteran	55,769	40.2	628,697	15.9
Non-Veteran	83,077	59.8	3,326,509	84.1
Total	138,846	100.0	3,955,206	100.0