

BIRMINGHAM CITY CENTER MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Prepared for the City of Birmingham, Alabama

Residential Market Analysis

Submitted by Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

U R B A N D E S I G N A S S O C I A T E S

O C T O B E R 2 0 0 4

MARKET ANALYSIS

RESIDENTIAL MARKET POTENTIAL

City Center

City of Birmingham
Jefferson County, Alabama

April, 2004

Conducted by
ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.
6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809

908 735-6336 • 908 735-4751 *facsimile*
www.ZVA.cc • info@ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

STUDY CONTENTS

MARKET ANALYSIS	1
Introduction	1
Market Potential	3
Potential Housing Market	5
<i>Table 1: Potential Housing Market</i>	6
Target Residential Mix	7
Market Capture	9
Target Market Analysis	11
<i>Table 2: Target Residential Mix By Household Type</i>	12
City Center Market-Rate Rent and Price Ranges	14
<i>Table 3: Optimum Market Position</i>	15
Rental Distribution	17
<i>Table 4: Target Groups For Rental Lofts/Apartments</i>	18
For-Sale Distribution	19
<i>Table 5: Target Groups For For-Sale Apartments</i>	20
<i>Table 6: Target Groups For For-Sale Rowhouses</i>	22
Downtown Housing Strategy	23
Housing Types	26
Methodology	29
Assumptions and Limitations	37
Copyright Ownership	38



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809

908 735-6336 • 908 735-4751 *facsimile*
www.ZVA.cc • info@ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

RESIDENTIAL MARKET POTENTIAL

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

April, 2004

NOTE: Tables 1 through 5 contain summaries of the market potential for new market-rate housing units created through adaptive re-use of existing buildings and/or new construction within City Center Birmingham, City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama. The appendix tables contain migration and target market data covering the appropriate draw area(s) for the City Center study area.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to identify the market potential for newly-introduced market-rate housing units to be leased or sold in City Center Birmingham. For purposes of this study, the City Center Study Area boundaries have been designated as the Red Mountain Expressway to the east, 12th Avenue South to the south, Interstate 65 to the west, and 11th Avenue North to the north, an area that includes the core downtown and several in-town neighborhoods.

The extent and characteristics of the potential market for City Center housing units were identified using Zimmerman/Volk Associates' proprietary target market methodology. This methodology was developed in response to the challenges that are inherent in the application of conventional supply/demand analysis to urban development and redevelopment. Supply/demand analysis ignores the potential impact of newly-introduced housing supply on settlement patterns, which can be substantial when that supply is specifically targeted to match the housing preferences and economic capabilities of the draw area households.

In contrast to conventional supply/demand analysis, then—which is based on supply-side dynamics and baseline demographic projections—target market analysis determines the depth and breadth of the potential market derived from the housing preferences and socio-economic characteristics of households in the defined draw area. Because it considers not only basic demographic characteristics, such as income qualification and age, but also less-frequently analyzed attributes such as mobility rates, lifestyle patterns and household compatibility

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

issues, the target market methodology is particularly effective in defining a realistic housing potential for urban development and redevelopment.

In brief, using the target market methodology, Zimmerman/Volk Associates analyzed:

- Where the potential renters and buyers for new housing units in City Center are likely to move from (the draw areas);
- Who currently lives in the draw areas and what they are like (the target markets);
- How many are likely to move to City Center if appropriate housing units were to be made available (depth and breadth of the market);
- What their housing preferences are in aggregate (rental or ownership, multi-family or single-family);
- What their alternatives are (new construction or existing housing stock, in Birmingham and in the region);
- What they will pay to live in City Center (market-rate rents and prices); and
- How quickly they will rent or buy the new units (market capture/absorption forecasts).

The target market methodology is described in detail in the METHODOLOGY section at the end of this study.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

MARKET POTENTIAL

American households, perhaps more than any other nation's, have always demonstrated extraordinary mobility. Last year, depending on region, between 14 and 16 percent of American households moved from one dwelling unit to another. Household mobility is higher in urban areas; a higher percentage of renters move than owners; and a higher percentage of younger households move than older households.

Analysis of migration, mobility and geo-demographic characteristics of households currently living within defined draw areas is therefore integral to the determination of the depth and breadth of the potential market for market-rate housing units within City Center, including the in-town neighborhoods.

The draw areas for the City of Birmingham have been delineated as follows:

- The local (internal) draw area, covering households currently living within the Birmingham city limits and within the balance of Jefferson County. Between 10 and 15 percent of the households living in the city move to another residence elsewhere in the city each year; just under four percent of the households living in the balance of the county move to a residence within the city each year.
- The regional draw area, covering households with the potential to move to the City of Birmingham from surrounding counties (Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount, and Walker Counties). Households moving to the City of Birmingham from elsewhere in the region comprise just over 30 percent of total in-migration
- The Atlanta draw area, covering households with the potential to move to the City of Birmingham from counties in the Atlanta region (Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb, and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia). Households moving to the City of Birmingham from these counties comprise approximately four percent of total in-migration
- The national draw area, covering households with the potential to move to the City of Birmingham from all other U.S. counties.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

As derived from migration, mobility and target market analysis, then, the draw area distribution of market potential (those households with the potential to move within or to the City of Birmingham) would be as follows:

Market Potential By Draw Area
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

City of Birmingham/Jefferson County:	60.2 percent
Adjacent Counties:	7.5 percent
Atlanta Region Draw Area:	2.5 percent
National Draw Area:	29.8 percent
Total:	100.0 percent

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

The target market methodology also identifies those households with a preference for Downtown living. After discounting for those segments of the potential market with preferences for suburban and/or rural locations, the distribution of draw area market potential for new housing units in City Center Birmingham, including the in-town neighborhoods, would be as follows:

Market Potential By Draw Area
 CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

City of Birmingham/Jefferson County:	53.1 percent
Adjacent Counties:	5.2 percent
Atlanta Region Draw Area:	5.5 percent
National Draw Area:	36.2 percent
Total:	100.0 percent

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

The optimum mix of housing units for new residential development is therefore based on the housing preferences and income levels of households moving from within these draw areas.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

—POTENTIAL HOUSING MARKET—

As determined by the target market methodology, which accounts for household mobility within the City of Birmingham as well as mobility patterns for households currently living in all other cities and counties, in the year 2004, nearly 3,100 younger singles and couples, empty nesters and retirees, and family-oriented households represent the potential market for new market-rate housing units within City Center Birmingham, including the in-town neighborhoods. The housing preferences of these draw area households—according to tenure (rental or for-sale) and broad financial capacity—can be arrayed as follows (*see also* Table 1):

Potential Market For New Housing Units
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

HOUSING TYPE	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Multi-family for-rent	1,040	33.8%
Multi-family for-sale	370	12.1%
Single-family attached for-sale	340	11.1%
Low-range single-family detached	490	16.0%
Mid-range single-family detached	480	15.6%
High-range single-family detached	<u>350</u>	<u>11.4%</u>
Total	3,070	100.0%

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

The market potential numbers indicate the depth of the potential market for new housing units within City Center Birmingham, not housing need and not projections of household change. These are the households that are likely to move within or to City Center if appropriate housing options were to be made available.

Table 1

Potential Housing Market

Derived From New Unit Purchase And Rental Propensities Of Draw Area Households
With The Potential To Move To The Area In 2004

City Center

The City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

*City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties
Draw Areas*

Total Target Market Households
With Potential To Rent/Purchase In
The City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama 13,120

Total Target Market Households
With Potential To Rent/Purchase Within The
City Center 3,070

Potential Housing Market

	<i>Multi- Family</i>		<i>Single- Family</i>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>For-Rent</u>	<u>For-Sale</u>	<i>.. Attached ..</i> <u>All Ranges</u>	<u>Low-Range</u>	<u>Mid-Range</u>	<u>High-Range</u>	
Total Households:	1,040	370	340	490	480	350	3,070
<i>{Mix Distribution}:</i>	33.8%	12.1%	11.1%	16.0%	15.6%	11.4%	100.0%

**Target Residential Mix
(Excluding Single-Family Detached)**

	<i>Multi- Family</i>		<i>Single- .. Family ..</i>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>For-Rent</u>	<u>For-Sale</u>	<i>.. Attached ..</i> <u>All Ranges</u>	
Total Households:	1,040	370	340	1,750
<i>{Mix Distribution}:</i>	59.4%	21.1%	19.5%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

—TARGET RESIDENTIAL MIX—

From the perspective of draw area target market propensities and compatibility, and within the context of the new housing marketplace in the Birmingham market area, the potential market for new housing units within City Center Birmingham and the in-town neighborhoods includes the full range of housing types, from rental multi-family to for-sale single-family detached. However, new construction in the downtown core should concentrate on the higher-density housing types that support urban development and redevelopment most efficiently, including:

- Rental lofts and apartments (multi-family for-rent);
- For-sale lofts and apartments (multi-family for-sale); and
- Townhouses, rowhouses, live-work or flex units (single-family attached for-sale).

The creation of “loft” dwelling units through adaptive re-use of existing buildings has been instrumental in the establishment of successful residential neighborhoods in or near the downtowns of numerous American cities, from Louisville, Kentucky, where the first loft apartment building in that city was successfully introduced and leased in 2002, to Saint Louis, Missouri, where, over the past three years, more than 900 loft apartments in the Washington Avenue Loft District have been created and are occupied, under construction, or in development. In addition to the major cities of New York, Boston, San Francisco and Chicago, other cities where intensive loft development has occurred or is underway include Albuquerque, Baltimore, Charlotte, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Richmond, New Orleans, Norfolk, Pittsburgh, Portland, Roanoke, and Saint Paul, to name only some of the cities where Zimmerman/Volk Associates has had direct involvement.

In Downtown locations, buildings proposed for adaptive re-use can incorporate a mix of uses, including residential, retail and office. This not only provides fiscal benefits and adds to downtown vitality, but also assists with financial feasibility for larger buildings with more square footage than can be absorbed as either commercial or housing within an appropriate time frame.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

This analysis has determined, then, that in the year 2004, up to 1,750 households currently living in the defined draw areas represent the pool of potential renters/buyers of new market-rate housing units (new construction and/or adaptive re-use of formerly non-residential structures), excluding single-family detached units, within the downtown core (*see again* Table 1). As derived from the tenure and housing preferences of those draw area households, the distribution of rental and for-sale multi-family and for-sale single-family attached housing types would be as follows:

Potential Housing Market
Market-Rate Higher-Density Housing Units
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

HOUSING TYPE	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Rental Multi-Family (lofts/apartments, leaseholder)	1,040	59.4%
For-Sale Multi-Family (lofts/apartments, condo/co-op ownership)	370	21.1%
For-Sale Single-Family Attached (townhouses/rowhouses, fee-simple ownership)	<u>340</u>	<u>19.5%</u>
Total	1,750	100.0%

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

—MARKET CAPTURE—

After more than a decade's experience in dozens of cities across the country, and in the context of the target market methodology, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has determined that an annual capture of between 10 and 15 percent of the potential market, depending on housing type, is achievable. Based on a 15 percent capture of the potential market for rental multi-family units, and a 10 percent capture of for-sale multi-family and single-family attached units, City Center Birmingham should be able to support up to 227 new units per year, as follows:

Annual Capture of Market Potential
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

HOUSING TYPE	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	CAPTURE RATE	NUMBER OF NEW UNITS
Rental Multi-Family (lofts/apartments, leaseholder)	1,040	15%	156
For-Sale Multi-Family (lofts/apartments, condo/co-op ownership)	370	10%	37
For-Sale Single-Family Attached (townhouses/rowhouses, fee-simple ownership)	<u>340</u>	10%	<u>34</u>
Total	1,750		227

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

This analysis examines market potential over the next five years. Because of the dramatic changes in the composition of American households that occurred during the 1990s (see THE TARGET MARKETS below), and the likelihood that significant changes will continue, both the depth and breadth of the potential market for downtown living is likely to increase. The experience of other American cities has been that, once the downtown residential alternative has been established, the percentage of households that will consider downtown housing typically increases.

NOTE: Target market capture rates are a unique and highly-refined measure of feasibility. Target market capture rates are *not* equivalent to—and should not be confused with—penetration rates or traffic conversion rates.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

The **target market capture rate** is derived by dividing the *annual* forecast absorption—in aggregate and by housing type—by the number of households that have the potential to purchase or rent new housing within a specified area *in a given year*.

The **penetration rate** is derived by dividing the *total* number of dwelling units planned for a property by the *total* number of draw area households, sometimes qualified by income.

The **traffic conversion rate** is derived by dividing the *total* number of buyers or renters by the *total* number of prospects that have visited a site.

Because the prospective market for a location is more precisely defined, target market capture rates are higher than the more grossly-derived penetration rates. However, the resulting higher capture rates are well within the range of prudent feasibility.

City Center
 City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

TARGET MARKET ANALYSIS

As determined by this analysis, the potential market for new market-rate housing units in City Center Birmingham can be characterized by general household type as follows (*see* Table 2):

**Target Residential Mix
 By Household and Unit Types
 CITY CENTER
 City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama**

HOUSEHOLD TYPE	PERCENT OF TOTAL	RENTAL MULTI-FAM.	FOR-SALE MULTI-FAM.	FOR-SALE ROWHOUSES
Empty-Nesters & Retirees	20%	19%	19%	24%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	17%	16%	14%	24%
Younger Singles & Couples	<u>63%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>67%</u>	<u>52%</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

- The largest general market segment is composed of younger, mostly childless households (younger singles and couples). These households typically choose to live in neighborhoods that contain a diverse mix of people, housing types, and uses.

Younger singles and couples currently represent between 52 and 67 percent of the market for housing units in City Center Birmingham. However, the “Millennials”—also known as “Generation Y,” those persons born between 1977 and 1996 and the second largest generation after the “Baby Boomers”—could have a growing impact. If the preference for downtown housing demonstrated by the leading edge of this group is representative of the entire generation, the market potential from this segment is likely to increase significantly over the next decade.

- The next largest market segment is comprised of older households (empty nesters and retirees). A significant number of these households have children who have grown up and moved away; another large percentage are retirees, with incomes from pensions, savings and investments, and social security.

Table 2

Target Residential Mix By Household Type
 Derived From New Unit Purchase And Rental Propensities Of Draw Area Households
 With The Potential To Move To The Area In 2004

City Center

The City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

Number of Households:	Multi- Family Attached ..
	Total	For-Rent	For-Sale	All Ranges
	1,750	1,040	370	340
Empty Nesters & Retirees	20%	19%	19%	24%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	17%	16%	14%	24%
Younger Singles & Couples	63%	65%	67%	52%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
 Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

Empty-nest and retiree households represent between 19 percent and 24 percent of the market for housing units in City Center Birmingham, depending on housing type. However, as with the Millennial Generation, over the next several years this market segment should comprise a significantly larger proportion of the market for downtown housing because increasing numbers of the “Baby Boom” generation—the huge population cohort born between 1946 and 1964—will be entering the empty-nest life stage. Baby Boomers have become a significant market for new construction in downtown neighborhoods, particularly when those new units reflect their changing lifestyles.

- The third, and smallest, general market segment is comprised of family-oriented households (traditional and non-traditional families).

Households with school-age children have historically been among the first to leave a city when one or all of three significant neighborhood elements—good schools, safe and secure streets, and sufficient green space—are perceived to be at risk. Although this is the smallest market segment, the target family groups for City Center Birmingham have a preference for urban living. Most of the adults in these households were raised in or near an urban center and have rejected the suburban alternative; most will already have made appropriate school accommodations—public, charter, parochial or private.

Depending on housing type, family-oriented households comprise between 14 and 24 percent of the market for housing units in City Center.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

CITY CENTER MARKET-RATE RENT AND PRICE RANGES

Based on the tenure preferences of draw area households and their income and equity levels, and the relevant residential context in the Birmingham region, the general range of rents and prices for newly-created market-rate residential units that could currently be sustained by the market is as follows (*see* Table 3):

Rent, Price and Size Range
Newly-Created Housing
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

HOUSING TYPE	RENT/PRICE RANGE	SIZE RANGE	RENT/PRICE PER SQ. FT.
Rental—			
Hard Lofts*	\$525-\$1,500/month	500-1,500 sf	\$1.00-\$1.05 psf
Apartments	\$650-\$1,350/month	550-1,300 sf	\$1.04-\$1.18 psf
For-Sale—			
Soft Lofts†	\$110,000-\$200,000	1,000-2,000 sf	\$100-\$110 psf
Apartments	\$100,000-\$225,000	800-1,850 sf	\$122-\$125 psf
Townhouses	\$145,000-\$250,000	1,100-2,000 sf	\$125-\$132 psf

* Unit interiors of “hard lofts” typically have high ceilings and commercial windows and are either minimally finished, limited to architectural elements such as columns and fin walls, or unfinished, with no interior partitions except those for bathrooms.

† Unit interiors of “soft lofts” may or may not have high ceilings and are more finished than hard lofts, with the interiors partitioned into separate rooms.

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

The above rents and prices are in year 2004 dollars and are exclusive of consumer options and upgrades, or floor or location premiums. Significant premiums are typically achievable on units that face parks or greens, or are located on high floors with view potential.

The above rents and prices are “market rates”—that is, within the economic context of both older and more recently-constructed rental units in Center City Birmingham and within the comparable price ranges and prices per square foot of new construction elsewhere in the city.

Table 3

Optimum Market Position
City Center

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

March, 2004

<u>Housing Type</u>		<u>Base Rent/Price Range*</u>	<u>Base Unit Size Range</u>	<u>Base Rent/Price Per Sq. Ft.*</u>
Multi-Family For-Rent				
Lofts <i>{Hard Lofts}</i>		\$525 to \$1,500	500 to 1,500	\$1.00 to \$1.05
Apartments	Eff.	\$650	550	\$1.18
	1br	\$850	750	\$1.13
	2br	\$1,100	1,000	\$1.10
	3br	\$1,350	1,300	\$1.04
Multi-Family For-Sale				
Lofts <i>{Soft Lofts}</i>		\$110,000 to \$200,000	1,000 to 2,000	\$100 to \$110
Apartments	1br	\$100,000	800	\$125
	2br	\$150,000	1,200	\$125
	3br	\$225,000	1,850	\$122
Single-Family Attached For-Sale				
Rowhouses <i>2 and 3 BR units</i>		\$145,000 to \$250,000	1,100 to 2,000	\$125 to \$132

NOTE: Base rents/prices in year 2004 dollars and exclude options and upgrades.

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

However, depending on how “affordability” is defined, many of the “market-rate” rents and prices would qualify as affordable, *i.e.*—at levels that enable leases or purchases by households with annual incomes of 80 percent or less than the Area Median Income (AMI) for the Birmingham MSA, which is \$55,200 in fiscal year 2004 for a four-person household.

For example, based on HUD affordability standards, a two-person household with an income of 80 percent of the AMI adjusted for household size, or \$35,350 per year, paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for housing costs—including utilities as well as rent for rental units and covering mortgage principal, interest, taxes, insurance as well as utilities for for-sale units—should be able to qualify for a rent of up to \$800 per month or for a mortgage (at current interest rates) of up to \$110,000. A four-person household with an income of 80 percent of the AMI, or \$44,150 per year, paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for housing costs—again, including utilities as well as rent for rental units and covering mortgage principal, interest, taxes, insurance as well as utilities for for-sale units—would likely to be able to qualify for a rent of up to \$1,000 per month or for a mortgage (at current interest rates) of up to \$135,000.

To maintain values in Center City, units designated for purchase by lower-income households should not be priced below market value. Recording discounted sales prices could have a significant negative impact on the appraised values of existing dwellings. Purchasers of below-market housing, rather than the units, should be subsidized through the use of special financing, such as a “soft second” mortgage.

Each new residential development approved by the city could contain a percentage of affordable housing units. The percentage of affordable units could range from 10 to 25 percent; typically, in municipalities with affordable housing requirements, developers are granted density bonuses or other incentives to include affordable units in their developments. However, from the market perspective, for mixed-income developments to be successful over the long term, the “affordable” units must reflect the exterior configurations and finish

City Center
 City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

standards associated with the “market-rate” dwelling units, to ensure that the below-market-rate units are incorporated into, rather than set apart from, the urban fabric.

—*Rental Distribution*—

The market-rate rent range covers leases by households with annual incomes generally ranging between \$25,000 and \$75,000 or more. A one-person household with an income of \$25,000 per year, paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for rent (the national standard for affordability) can typically qualify for a rent of \$500 per month. A two- or three-person household, with an income of \$75,000 or more per year, paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for rent, is qualified for a rent of \$1,875 per month.

Based on the target household mix, the distribution by rent range of the 156 market-rate rental units that could be absorbed each year over the next five years in City Center Birmingham is as follows:

Loft/Apartment Distribution By Rent Range
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

MONTHLY RENT RANGE	NUMBER OF UNITS	PERCENTAGE
\$500–\$750	36	23.1%
\$750–\$1,000	36	23.1%
\$1,000–\$1,250	34	21.8%
\$1,250–\$1,500	28	17.9%
\$1,500 and up	<u>22</u>	<u>14.1%</u>
Total:	156	100.0%

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

Table 4

Target Groups For Rental Lofts/Apartments
City Center

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

Empty Nesters & Retirees	<i>Number of Households</i>	<i>At 15 Percent Capture</i>
Urban Establishment	10	2
Nouveau Money	30	5
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	30	5
Affluent Empty Nesters	40	6
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	30	5
Middle-Class Move-Downs	50	6
Subtotal:	190	29
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families		
Full-Nest Urbanites	10	2
Multi-Cultural Families	10	2
Black Urban Families	10	2
Latino Urban Families	20	3
Cosmopolitan Families	20	3
Unibox Transferees	50	6
Mainstream Families	50	6
Subtotal:	170	24
Younger Singles & Couples		
Urban Elite	20	3
e-Types	30	5
Urban Achievers	30	5
New Bohemians	50	8
The VIPs	70	11
Fast-Track Professionals	240	34
University / College Affiliates	110	17
Twentysomethings	130	20
Subtotal:	680	103
Total Households:	1,040	156

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

—*For-Sale Distribution*—

The market-rate price range covers purchases by households with annual incomes generally ranging between \$40,000 and \$125,000. A one-person household with an income of \$40,000 per year, paying no more than 25 percent of gross income for housing costs, including mortgage principal, interest, taxes, insurance and utilities, is qualified for a mortgage of \$100,000. A two- or three-person household with an income of \$125,000 per year, paying no more than 25 percent of gross income for housing costs, including mortgage principal, interest, taxes, insurance and utilities, is qualified for a mortgage of \$300,000 or more.

Based on the target household mix (*see* Table 5), the distribution by price range of the 37 market-rate for-sale apartments that could be absorbed each year over the next five years in City Center Birmingham is as follows:

Loft/Apartment Distribution By Price Range
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

PRICE RANGE	NUMBER OF UNITS	PERCENTAGE
\$100,000–\$150,000	11	29.7%
\$150,000–\$200,000	9	24.3%
\$200,000–\$250,000	9	24.3%
\$250,000 and up	<u>8</u>	<u>21.7%</u>
Total:	37	100.0%

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

Table 5

Target Groups For For-Sale Apartments
City Center

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

Empty Nesters & Retirees	<i>Number of Households</i>	<i>At 10 Percent Capture</i>
Nouveau Money	10	1
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	10	1
Affluent Empty Nesters	20	2
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	10	1
Middle-Class Move-Downs	20	2
Subtotal:	70	7
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families		
Cosmopolitan Families	10	1
Unibox Transferees	20	2
Mainstream Families	20	2
Subtotal:	50	5
Younger Singles & Couples		
e-Types	10	1
Urban Achievers	10	1
New Bohemians	20	2
The VIPs	30	3
Fast-Track Professionals	100	10
University/College Affiliates	40	4
Twentysomethings	40	4
Subtotal:	250	25
Total Households:	370	37

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

Based on the target household mix (*see* Table 6), the distribution by price range of the 34 market-rate rowhouses units that could be absorbed each year over the next five years in City Center Birmingham is as follows:

Rowhouse Distribution By Price Range
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

PRICE RANGE	NUMBER OF UNITS	PERCENTAGE
\$125,000–\$175,000	15	44.1%
\$217,500–\$225,000	12	35.3%
\$225,000 and up	<u>7</u>	<u>20.6%</u>
Total:	34	100.0%

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

Table 6

Target Groups For For-Sale Rowhouses
City Center

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

Empty Nesters & Retirees	<i>Number of Households</i>	<i>At 10 Percent Capture</i>
Nouveau Money	10	1
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	10	1
Affluent Empty Nesters	20	2
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	20	2
Middle-Class Move-Downs	20	2
Subtotal:	80	8
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families		
Black Urban Families	10	1
Latino Urban Families	10	1
Cosmopolitan Families	10	1
Unibox Transferees	20	2
Mainstream Families	30	3
Subtotal:	80	8
Younger Singles & Couples		
e-Types	10	1
Urban Achievers	10	1
New Bohemians	10	1
The VIPs	20	2
Fast-Track Professionals	60	6
University/College Affiliates	30	3
Twentysomethings	40	4
Subtotal:	180	18
Total Households:	340	34

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

DOWNTOWN HOUSING STRATEGY

From the perspective of draw area target market propensities and compatibility, a broad range of new construction as well as adaptive re-use of existing buildings will be required to support and sustain residential diversity in City Center Birmingham.

An effective housing strategy to attract the target households should include:

- **Preservation of the Built Environment:** the restoration, repositioning and/or adaptive re-use of existing buildings.
- **New Residential Construction:** the introduction of housing types not currently available or under-represented in City Center.
- **Mixed-Use Development:** the inclusion of a residential component within mixed-use buildings, either adaptive re-use or new construction.

The residential re-use of existing non-residential structures is one of the most beneficial redevelopment types because it creates and enhances a pedestrian-oriented street environment at a familiar, and often historic, urban scale. The City of Birmingham should encourage residential redevelopment of existing buildings, particularly those of architectural merit, because of the demonstrated positive impact historic rehabilitation has had on housing and neighborhood values nationally.

In general, areas or buildings slated for new development or redevelopment should be evaluated relative to the following criteria for successful urban housing initiatives:

1. **Advantageous adjacency:** It is critical to “build on strength,” not only to provide maximum support for any proposed housing initiatives, but also, conversely, so that housing initiatives will reinforce existing or proposed adjacent developments (commercial, retail, or residential).
2. **Building and/or land availability:** At present, several buildings or parcels within the Downtown are underutilized or vacant. From the City’s perspective, poorly-located or

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

under-used surface parking lots are better utilized as sites for new infill mixed-use development.

3. Potential for expansion: Each housing initiative should be located in an area where, at the successful completion of the initial project, adjacent or nearby buildings and/or land appropriate for the continuation or extension of the neighborhood, either through new construction or adaptive re-use would potentially be available. Each housing initiative should be viewed not as a “stand-alone” project, but rather as a potential catalyst for additional residential development in surrounding areas.
4. Anchors/linkage: Each housing initiative must be seen as part of an overall urban strategy to build a critical mass of both housing and related non-residential uses. “Anchor” locations establish the potential for economic activity in an underutilized area; “linkage” locations build on the strength of two or more established, but isolated assets.

Successful residential development/redevelopment in City Center will require the establishment of a cohesive downtown residential neighborhood, instead of disconnected residential buildings. A neighborhood is established when enough “mass” is created—both in number of people and in number of residential buildings. Rental apartments in particular can be instrumental in the rapid establishment of “mass.” Rentals allow households to experiment with living in a particular location without the commitment of home ownership; and renters will form a pool of potential purchasers of ownership units that may be developed at a later date.

A neighborhood is the sum of a variety of elements: the configuration of the street and block network, the arrangement of lots on those blocks, and the manner in which buildings are disposed on their lots and address the street. A downtown neighborhood succeeds when its physical characteristics consistently emphasize urbanity and the qualities of city life; conversely, attempts to introduce suburban scale and housing types (or, indeed, suburban building forms in general) into urban areas have invariably yielded disappointing results.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

Therefore, appropriate urban design—which places as much emphasis on creating quality streets and public places as on creating or redeveloping quality buildings—will be essential to success. The important elements can be summarized in several practical inter-related guidelines:

- Preservation or restoration of the urban fabric. Emphasis should be on adaptive re-use, with new construction used as infill among rehabilitated structures.
- Respect for the urban context. Major renovation and new infill construction should maintain the building lot disposition and “build-to” line. When building heights are increased, the new floors should be set back from the historic cornice line. Pedestrian entrances should always be from the sidewalk; automobile entrances should always be minimized. Buildings should never present a blank wall to the street.
- Streets designed for pedestrian comfort. Automobiles are accommodated on great urban streets; however, they are not given precedence over ease of pedestrian movement. The emphasis on streets can have significant, long-term impact on both street safety (providing “eyes on the street”) and usable parks and squares.
- Parallel parking should be encouraged wherever possible not only to enhance pedestrian safety but also to help meet residents’ parking needs. Resident parking on designated streets should be ensured through a permit system; permits should be issued at the cost of administering the program, including the added cost of enforcement.

Throughout City Center, urban, rather than suburban, parking ratios should be utilized, with 1.3 parking spaces per rental unit and 1.5 parking spaces per for-sale unit. Although lack of parking is a recurring complaint in many cities, detailed analysis of parking capacity typically reveals under-utilization of existing parking.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

Shared parking should be encouraged in City Center. The overall number of required parking spaces could be significantly reduced if businesses and residential development shared parking facilities.

HOUSING TYPES

Building and unit types most successfully used in residential redevelopment or new residential construction in other downtowns comparable in size and scale to City Center Birmingham, include:

- Courtyard Apartment Building: In new construction, an urban, pedestrian-oriented equivalent to conventional garden apartments. An urban courtyard building is four or more stories, often combined with non-residential uses on the ground floor. The building should be built to the sidewalk edge and, to provide privacy and a sense of security, the first floor should be elevated significantly above grade. Parking is either below grade or in an integral structure.

The building's apartments can be leased, as in a conventional income property, or sold to individual buyers, under condominium or cooperative ownership, in which the owner pays a monthly maintenance fee in addition to the purchase price.

- Loft Apartment Building: Either adaptive re-use of older warehouse and manufacturing buildings or a new-construction building type inspired by those buildings. The new-construction version is usually elevator-served with double-loaded corridors.

Hard Lofts: Unit interiors typically have high ceilings and commercial windows and are minimally finished (with limited architectural elements such as columns and fin walls), or unfinished (with no interior partitions except those for bathrooms).

Soft Lofts: Unit interiors typically have high ceilings, are fully finished and partitioned into individual rooms. Units may also contain architectural elements

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

reminiscent of “hard lofts,” such as brick walls and iron railings, particularly if the building is an adaptive re-use of an existing industrial structure.

The building’s loft apartments can be leased, as in a conventional income property, or sold to individual buyers, under condominium or cooperative ownership, in which the owner pays a monthly maintenance fee in addition to the purchase price. (Loft apartments can also be incorporated into multifamily buildings along with conventionally-finished apartment units.)

- **Mansion Apartment Building**: A small-scale apartment building with a street façade resembling a large detached house (hence, “mansion”). The building can accommodate a variety of uses—from rental or for-sale apartments, professional offices, any of these uses over ground-floor retail, a bed and breakfast inn, or a large single-family detached house—and its physical structure complements other buildings within a neighborhood.

NOTE: Development flexibility of use is somewhat constrained by the handicapped accessibility regulations in both the 1988 Fair Housing Amendments Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Smaller mansion buildings can be exempt from all but the public accommodations regulations of the ADA. Buildings with three or fewer dwelling units are exempt from the Fair Housing handicapped accessibility regulations, and upper-floor commercial uses of less than 3,000 feet fall below the threshold of the imposition of handicapped accessibility under the ADA.

An attached version of the mansion, typically built to a sidewalk on the front lot line, is appropriate for town center locations. This version can accommodate the same variety of uses as the detached, lower-density mansion.

Parking behind the mansion buildings can be either alley-loaded, or front-loaded served by shared drives. The form of the parking can be in open lots, garages with units above, or integral to the building.

- **Rowhouse**: Similar in form to a conventional suburban townhouse except that the garage—either attached or detached—is located to the rear of the unit and accessed

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

from an alley or auto court. Unlike conventional townhouses, urban rowhouses conform to the pattern of streets, typically with shallow front-yard setbacks. To provide privacy and a sense of security, the first floor should be elevated significantly above grade.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

METHODOLOGY

The technical analysis of city-wide and City Center market potential included delineation of the draw area(s) and evaluation of City Center's market potential.

The delineation of the draw area(s) for housing within the City of Birmingham was based on historic settlement patterns, migration trends, and other market dynamics.

The evaluation of Birmingham's market potential was derived from target market analysis of households in the draw area(s), and yielded:

- The depth and breadth of the potential housing market by tenure (rental and ownership) and by type (apartments, attached and detached houses); and
- The composition of the potential housing market (empty-nesters/retirees, traditional and non-traditional families, younger singles/couples).

Target Market Methodology:

The proprietary target market methodology developed by Zimmerman/Volk Associates is an analytical technique, using the PRIZM geo-demographic system, that establishes the optimum market position for residential development of any property—from a specific site to an entire political jurisdiction—through cluster analysis of households living within designated draw areas. In contrast to classical supply/demand analysis—which is based on supply-side dynamics and baseline demographic projections—target market analysis establishes the optimum market position derived from the housing and lifestyle preferences of households in the draw area and within the framework of the local housing market context, even in locations where no close comparables exist.

In geo-demographic segmentation, clusters of households (usually between 10 and 15) are grouped according to a variety of significant factors, ranging from basic demographic characteristics, such as income qualification and age, to less-frequently considered attributes such as mobility rates, lifestyle patterns and compatibility issues. Zimmerman/Volk Associates has refined the analysis of these household clusters through the correlation of more than 500 data points related to housing preferences and consumer and lifestyle characteristics.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

As a result of this process, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has identified 41 target market groups with median incomes that enable most of the households within each group to qualify for market-rate housing. The most affluent of the 41 groups can afford the most expensive new ownership units; the least prosperous are candidates for the least expensive existing rental apartments.

Once the draw area(s) for specific city, location or site have been defined, then—through field investigation, analysis of historic migration and development trends, and employment and commutation patterns—the households within those areas are quantified using the target market methodology. The potential market for market-rate units is then determined by the correlation of a number of factors—including, but not limited to household mobility rates; median incomes; lifestyle characteristics and housing preferences; and the competitive environment.

Delineation of the Draw Areas (Migration Analysis)—

Taxpayer migration data provide the framework for the delineation of the draw areas—the principal counties of origin for households that are likely to move to the City of Birmingham. These data are maintained at the county and “county equivalent” level by the Internal Revenue Service and provide a clear representation of mobility patterns.

—Migration Trends—

Analysis of Jefferson County migration and mobility patterns from 1997 through 2001—the latest data available from the Internal Revenue Service—shows that the number of households moving into the county has fallen from 12,055 households in 1997 to just over 11,620 households in 2001. (*Reference* Appendix Table 1.) Over the same period, the number of households moving out of the county rose from more than 12,560 households in 1997 to just over 12,900 households in 2001. The county continues to lose households to out-migration, exceeding a net loss of more than 1,000 households since 1998.

More than 30 percent of Jefferson County’s in-migration is from counties in the Birmingham region. Other significant sources of in-migration are from counties in the Atlanta region.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

NOTE: Although net migration provides insights into the county's historic ability to attract or retain households compared to other locations, it is those households likely to move into the county (gross in-migration) that represent the county's external market potential.

Based on the migration data, the draw areas for the City of Birmingham have been delineated as follows:

- The local (or internal) draw area, covering households currently living within the Birmingham city limits and the balance of Jefferson County.
- The regional draw area, covering households with the potential to move to the City of Birmingham from five counties in the Birmingham region.
- The Atlanta draw area, covering households with the potential to move to the City of Birmingham from four counties in the Atlanta region.
- The national draw area, covering households with the potential to move to the City of Birmingham from all other U.S. counties.

The regional draw area consists of Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount, and Walker Counties). The Atlanta draw area consists of Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb, and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia. The national draw area includes the balance of the country taken in aggregate.

Determination of the Potential Market for the City of Birmingham (Mobility Analysis)—

The mobility tables, individually and in summaries, indicate the number and type of households that have the potential to move to the City of Birmingham in the year 2004. The total number from each city or county is derived from historic migration trends; the number of households from each group is based on each group's mobility rate.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

Internal Mobility (Households Moving Within The City Of Birmingham)

Zimmerman/Volk Associates uses U.S. Bureau of the Census data, combined with Claritas data, to determine the number of households in each target market group that will move from one residence to another within a specific jurisdiction in a given year (internal mobility).

Using these data, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has determined that up to 3,800 households currently living in the City of Birmingham have the potential to move from one residence to another in the city this year. (*Reference Appendix Table 4.*) More than 45 percent of these households are likely to be empty nesters and retirees (as characterized within eight Zimmerman/Volk Associates target market groups); just over 30 percent are likely to be younger singles and couples (in six groups); and the remaining 30.3 percent are likely to be traditional and non-traditional families (in six groups).

External Mobility (Households Moving To The City Of Birmingham)

The tables that follow determine the number of households in each target market group living in each draw area county that are likely to move to the City of Birmingham this year (through a correlation of Claritas data, U.S. Bureau of the Census data, and the Internal Revenue Service migration data). (*Reference Appendix Tables 5 through 9.*)

The total potential market for the City of Birmingham includes the local, regional, Atlanta, and national draw areas. (*Reference Appendix Table 10.*) More than 13,100 households have the potential to move within or to the City of Birmingham this year. Traditional and non-traditional families are likely to account for just over 41 percent of these households (in 18 market groups); another 30 percent are younger singles and couples (in 11 groups); and the remaining 28.9 percent are empty nester and retiree households (in 12 groups).

The distribution of the draw areas as a percentage of the potential market for the City of Birmingham is as follows:

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
 April, 2004

Market Potential By Draw Area
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

City of Birmingham/Jefferson County:	60.2 percent
Adjacent Counties:	7.5 percent
Atlanta Region Draw Area:	2.5 percent
National Draw Area:	29.8 percent
Total:	100.0 percent

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

Determination of the Potential Market for City Center Birmingham—

The total potential market for City Center includes the same draw areas. Zimmerman/Volk Associates uses U.S. Bureau of the Census data, combined with Claritas data, to determine which target market groups, as well as how many households within each group, are likely to move to a downtown location in a given year.

Using these data, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has determined that up to 3,650 households have the potential to move to City Center Birmingham, including the in-town neighborhoods, this year. (*Reference* Appendix Table 11.) Approximately 55 percent of these households are likely to be younger singles and couples (in eight market groups); another 27 percent are likely to be empty nesters and retirees (in six groups); and the remaining 18.4 percent are likely to be traditional and non-traditional family households (in seven groups).

The distribution of the draw areas as a percentage of the potential market for City Center Birmingham, including the in-town neighborhoods, is as follows:

Market Potential By Draw Area
CITY CENTER
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

City of Birmingham/Jefferson County:	53.1 percent
Adjacent Counties:	5.2 percent
Atlanta Region Draw Area:	5.5 percent
National Draw Area:	36.2 percent
Total:	100.0 percent

SOURCE: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2004.

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

The 3,650 draw area households that have the potential to move to City Center this year have also been categorized by tenure propensities to determine the appropriate renter/owner ratio. More than 44 percent of these households (or 1,610 households) comprise the potential market for rental units, of which 1,040 households comprise the potential market for rental units at the rent levels required to support newly-constructed market-rate housing. The remaining 56 percent (or 2,040 households) comprise the market for market-rate for-sale housing units. (*Reference Appendix Table 12.*)

Of these 2,040 households, 18.1 percent (or 370 households) comprise the market for multi-family for-sale units (condominium/cooperative lofts/apartments); another 16.7 percent (340 households) comprise the market for attached single-family (townhouse/rowhouse/live-work) units; and the remaining 65 percent (1,330 households) comprise a market for all ranges of single-family detached houses. (*Reference Appendix Table 13.*)

—Target Markets—

Zimmerman/Volk Associates' target market classifications are updated periodically to reflect the relentless change in the composition of American households. Because of the nature of geo-demographic segmentation, a change in household classification is directly correlated with a change in geography, *i.e.*—a move from one neighborhood condition to another. However, these changes of classification can also reflect an alteration in one of three additional basic characteristics:

- Age;
- Household composition; or
- Economic status.

Age, of course, is the most predictable, and easily-defined of these changes. Household composition has also been relatively easy to define; recently, with the growth of non-traditional households, however, definitions of a family have had to be expanded and parsed into more highly-refined segments. Economic status remains clearly defined through measures of annual income and household wealth.

A change in classification is rarely induced by a change in just one of the four basic characteristics. This is one reason that the target household categories are so highly refined:

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

they take in multiple characteristics. Even so, there are some rough equivalents in household types as they move from one neighborhood condition to another. There is, for example, a strong correlation between the *Suburban Achievers* and the *Urban Achievers*; a move by the *Suburban Achievers* to the urban core can make them *Urban Achievers*, if the move is accompanied by an upward move in socio-economic status. In contrast, *Suburban Achievers* who move up socio-economically, but remain within the metropolitan suburbs may become *Fast-Track Professionals* or *The VIPs*.

Migration Methodology:

County-to-county migration is based on the year-to-year changes in the addresses shown on the population of returns from the Internal Revenue Service Individual Master File system. Data on migration patterns by county for the entire United States, include inflows and outflows. The data include the number of returns (which can be used to approximate the number of households), and the median and average incomes reported on the returns.

Target Market Data—

Target market data are based on the Claritas PRIZM geo-demographic system, modified and augmented by Zimmerman/Volk Associates as the basis for its proprietary target market methodology. Target market data provides number of households by cluster aggregated into the three main demographic categories—empty nesters and retirees; traditional and non-traditional families; and younger singles and couples.

Household Classification Methodology:

Household classifications are based on the Claritas PRIZM geo-demographic segmentation system, which was established in 1974 and is the most widely-used neighborhood target marketing system in the United States. Claritas uses 15 unique clustering algorithms to define various domains of affluence and settlement density. These algorithms isolate the key factors in each density-affluence domain that accounted for the most statistical difference among neighborhoods within that group.

Over the past 15 years, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has augmented the PRIZM cluster system for use within the company's proprietary target market methodology specific to

City Center
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama
April, 2004

housing and neighborhood preferences, with additional algorithms, correlation with geo-coded consumer data, aggregation of clusters by broad household definition, and unique cluster names. (*See TARGET MARKET METHODOLOGY above.*) For purposes of this study, only those household groups with median incomes that enable most of the households within each group to qualify for market-rate housing are included in the tables.



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809
908-735-6336 • 908-735-4751 *facsimile*
info@ZVA.cc • www.ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS—

Every effort has been made to insure the accuracy of the data contained within this analysis. Demographic and economic estimates and projections have been obtained from government agencies at the national, state, and county levels. Market information has been obtained from sources presumed to be reliable, including developers, owners, and/or sales agents. However, this information cannot be warranted by Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. While the methodology employed in this analysis allows for a margin of error in base data, it is assumed that the market data and government estimates and projections are substantially accurate.

Absorption scenarios are based upon the assumption that a normal economic environment will prevail in a relatively steady state during development of the subject property. Absorption paces are likely to be slower during recessionary periods and faster during periods of recovery and high growth. Absorption scenarios are also predicated on the assumption that the product recommendations will be implemented generally as outlined in this report and that the developer will apply high-caliber design, construction, marketing, and management techniques to the development of the property.

Recommendations are subject to compliance with all applicable regulations. Relevant accounting, tax, and legal matters should be substantiated by appropriate counsel.



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809
908 735-6336 • 908 735-4751 *facsimile*
www.ZVA.cc • info@ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP—

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. retains all rights, title and interest to all aspects of this report. This report cannot be copied or distributed by any person or entity other than the client without the express written permission of Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.



Appendix One

TARGET MARKET TABLES

MARKET ANALYSIS

RESIDENTIAL MARKET POTENTIAL

City Center

City of Birmingham
Jefferson County, Alabama

April, 2004

Conducted by
ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.
6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809



Gross Annual Household In-Migration*Jefferson County, Alabama***1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001**

County of Origin 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001	
	Number	Share								
Shelby	1,575	13.1%	1,670	14.0%	1,785	14.8%	1,710	14.6%	1,795	15.4%
St. Clair	480	4.0%	485	4.1%	495	4.1%	505	4.3%	550	4.7%
Tuscaloosa	505	4.2%	505	4.2%	575	4.8%	515	4.4%	520	4.5%
APO/FPO/Foreign	295	2.4%	355	3.0%	330	2.7%	365	3.1%	365	3.1%
Blount	300	2.5%	355	3.0%	345	2.9%	355	3.0%	350	3.0%
Montgomery	320	2.7%	315	2.6%	320	2.7%	310	2.7%	295	2.5%
Walker	300	2.5%	315	2.6%	305	2.5%	315	2.7%	285	2.5%
Mobile	225	1.9%	250	2.1%	255	2.1%	240	2.1%	220	1.9%
Madison	250	2.1%	270	2.3%	295	2.5%	275	2.4%	210	1.8%
Calhoun	175	1.5%	150	1.3%	155	1.3%	170	1.5%	160	1.4%
Etowah	140	1.2%	150	1.3%	155	1.3%	165	1.4%	160	1.4%
Talladega	130	1.1%	160	1.3%	160	1.3%	175	1.5%	135	1.2%
Cullman	140	1.2%	120	1.0%	130	1.1%	160	1.4%	125	1.1%
Fulton, GA	135	1.1%	110	0.9%	115	1.0%	115	1.0%	125	1.1%
Lee	125	1.0%	135	1.1%	125	1.0%	145	1.2%	125	1.1%
Bibb	95	0.8%	95	0.8%	115	1.0%	100	0.9%	115	1.0%
Cobb, GA	110	0.9%	105	0.9%	105	0.9%	115	1.0%	115	1.0%
De Kalb, GA	115	1.0%	110	0.9%	95	0.8%	95	0.8%	110	0.9%
Baldwin	90	0.7%	115	1.0%	100	0.8%	105	0.9%	105	0.9%
Morgan	85	0.7%	80	0.7%	95	0.8%	90	0.8%	95	0.8%
Davidson, TN	95	0.8%	100	0.8%	105	0.9%	105	0.9%	90	0.8%
Gwinnett, GA	65	0.5%	60	0.5%	55	0.5%	70	0.6%	80	0.7%
Shelby, TN	65	0.5%	90	0.8%	75	0.6%	70	0.6%	70	0.6%
Chilton	75	0.6%	55	0.5%	75	0.6%	90	0.8%	70	0.6%
Harris, TX	65	0.5%	65	0.5%	75	0.6%	60	0.5%	65	0.6%
Cook, IL	90	0.7%	70	0.6%	80	0.7%	75	0.6%	65	0.6%
Dallas, TX	55	0.5%	35	0.3%	55	0.5%	45	0.4%	65	0.6%
Houston	55	0.5%	55	0.5%	75	0.6%	60	0.5%	60	0.5%
Dallas	100	0.8%	70	0.6%	80	0.7%	75	0.6%	55	0.5%
Elmore	45	0.4%	40	0.3%	55	0.5%	40	0.3%	55	0.5%
Marshall	55	0.5%	65	0.5%	75	0.6%	60	0.5%	55	0.5%
Escambia, FL	60	0.5%	70	0.6%	65	0.5%	65	0.6%	55	0.5%
Lauderdale	50	0.4%	60	0.5%	60	0.5%	65	0.6%	55	0.5%
Broward, FL	45	0.4%	40	0.3%	35	0.3%	40	0.3%	55	0.5%
Los Angeles, CA	65	0.5%	60	0.5%	60	0.5%	35	0.3%	50	0.4%
All Other Counties	5,480	45.5%	5,170	43.2%	4,950	41.1%	4,700	40.2%	4,715	40.6%
Total In-Migration:	12,055	100.0%	11,955	100.0%	12,030	100.0%	11,680	100.0%	11,620	100.0%

NOTE: All numbers have been rounded to the nearest five.

SOURCE: Internal Revenue Service;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Gross Annual Household Out-Migration*Jefferson County, Alabama***1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001**

Destination County 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001	
	Number	Share								
Shelby	2,630	20.9%	2,870	21.8%	2,765	21.1%	2,555	19.7%	2,770	21.5%
St. Clair	780	6.2%	885	6.7%	830	6.3%	750	5.8%	870	6.7%
Tuscaloosa	430	3.4%	440	3.3%	435	3.3%	470	3.6%	430	3.3%
APO/FPO/Foreign	135	1.1%	130	1.0%	115	0.9%	155	1.2%	160	1.2%
Blount	555	4.4%	585	4.5%	530	4.1%	610	4.7%	560	4.3%
Montgomery	180	1.4%	210	1.6%	190	1.5%	170	1.3%	185	1.4%
Walker	360	2.9%	350	2.7%	320	2.4%	310	2.4%	310	2.4%
Mobile	180	1.4%	135	1.0%	180	1.4%	155	1.2%	145	1.1%
Madison	200	1.6%	205	1.6%	200	1.5%	255	2.0%	250	1.9%
Calhoun	115	0.9%	85	0.6%	105	0.8%	120	0.9%	125	1.0%
Etowah	95	0.8%	115	0.9%	100	0.8%	95	0.7%	105	0.8%
Talladega	150	1.2%	150	1.1%	175	1.3%	145	1.1%	140	1.1%
Cullman	180	1.4%	185	1.4%	180	1.4%	160	1.2%	225	1.7%
Fulton, GA	230	1.8%	230	1.7%	245	1.9%	225	1.7%	185	1.4%
Lee	70	0.6%	75	0.6%	95	0.7%	120	0.9%	125	1.0%
Bibb	145	1.2%	115	0.9%	120	0.9%	140	1.1%	115	0.9%
Cobb, GA	170	1.4%	175	1.3%	185	1.4%	185	1.4%	160	1.2%
De Kalb, GA	185	1.5%	205	1.6%	200	1.5%	205	1.6%	170	1.3%
Baldwin	155	1.2%	125	1.0%	135	1.0%	130	1.0%	125	1.0%
Morgan	70	0.6%	75	0.6%	70	0.5%	50	0.4%	55	0.4%
Davidson, TN	135	1.1%	115	0.9%	155	1.2%	125	1.0%	115	0.9%
Gwinnett, GA	90	0.7%	120	0.9%	110	0.8%	130	1.0%	95	0.7%
Shelby, TN	85	0.7%	70	0.5%	85	0.6%	55	0.4%	65	0.5%
Chilton	85	0.7%	110	0.8%	100	0.8%	95	0.7%	95	0.7%
Harris, TX	75	0.6%	80	0.6%	95	0.7%	65	0.5%	95	0.7%
Cook, IL	75	0.6%	80	0.6%	80	0.6%	90	0.7%	60	0.5%
Dallas, TX	50	0.4%	75	0.6%	55	0.4%	60	0.5%	50	0.4%
Houston	35	0.3%	35	0.3%	50	0.4%	60	0.5%	50	0.4%
Dallas	35	0.3%	40	0.3%	35	0.3%	35	0.3%	45	0.3%
Elmore	35	0.3%	65	0.5%	50	0.4%	50	0.4%	40	0.3%
Marshall	55	0.4%	50	0.4%	40	0.3%	55	0.4%	60	0.5%
Escambia, FL	60	0.5%	65	0.5%	60	0.5%	60	0.5%	65	0.5%
Lauderdale	30	0.2%	45	0.3%	45	0.3%	40	0.3%	30	0.2%
Broward, FL	30	0.2%	50	0.4%	55	0.4%	40	0.3%	35	0.3%
Los Angeles, CA	50	0.4%	45	0.3%	65	0.5%	60	0.5%	55	0.4%
All Other Counties	4,620	36.8%	4,755	36.2%	4,825	36.9%	4,940	38.1%	4,740	36.7%
Total Out-Migration:	12,560	100.0%	13,145	100.0%	13,080	100.0%	12,965	100.0%	12,905	100.0%

NOTE: All numbers have been rounded to the nearest five.

SOURCE: Internal Revenue Service;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Net Annual Household Migration*Jefferson County, Alabama***1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001**

County 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Number</i>
Shelby	-1,055	-1,200	-980	-845	-975
St. Clair	-300	-400	-335	-245	-320
Tuscaloosa	75	65	140	45	90
APO/FPO/Foreign	160	225	215	210	205
Blount	-255	-230	-185	-255	-210
Montgomery	140	105	130	140	110
Walker	-60	-35	-15	5	-25
Mobile	45	115	75	85	75
Madison	50	65	95	20	-40
Calhoun	60	65	50	50	35
Etowah	45	35	55	70	55
Talladega	-20	10	-15	30	-5
Cullman	-40	-65	-50	0	-100
Fulton, GA	-95	-120	-130	-110	-60
Lee	55	60	30	25	0
Bibb	-50	-20	-5	-40	0
Cobb, GA	-60	-70	-80	-70	-45
De Kalb, GA	-70	-95	-105	-110	-60
Baldwin	-65	-10	-35	-25	-20
Morgan	15	5	25	40	40
Davidson, TN	-40	-15	-50	-20	-25
Gwinnett, GA	-25	-60	-55	-60	-15
Shelby, TN	-20	20	-10	15	5
Chilton	-10	-55	-25	-5	-25
Harris, TX	-10	-15	-20	-5	-30
Cook, IL	15	-10	0	-15	5
Dallas, TX	5	-40	0	-15	15
Houston	20	20	25	0	10
Dallas	65	30	45	40	10
Elmore	10	-25	5	-10	15
Marshall	0	15	35	5	-5
Escambia, FL	0	5	5	5	-10
Lauderdale	20	15	15	25	25
Broward, FL	15	-10	-20	0	20
Los Angeles, CA	15	15	-5	-25	-5
All Other Counties	860	415	125	-240	-25
Total Net Migration:	-505	-1,190	-1,050	-1,285	-1,285

NOTE: All numbers have been rounded to the nearest five.

SOURCE: Internal Revenue Service;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification By Market Groups

Jefferson County, Alabama

Household Type/ Geographic Designation	<i>Estimated Number</i>	<i>Estimated Share</i>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	48,915	32.5%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	39,420	26.2%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	8,635	5.7%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	860	0.6%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	65,765	43.7%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	4,595	3.1%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	5,765	3.8%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	39,370	26.2%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	16,035	10.7%
Younger Singles & Couples	35,805	23.8%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	27,565	18.3%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	8,240	5.5%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0.0%
Total:	150,485	100.0%
Total County Households:	263,850	
Classified Households As A Share Of Total County Households:	57.0%	
Estimated Median Income:	\$41,900	
Estimated National Median Income:	\$46,900	
Estimated Median Home Value:	\$103,500	
Estimated National Median Home Value:	\$128,300	

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification By Market Groups

Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Estimated Share</u>	<u>Estimated Median Income</u>	<u>Estimated Median Home Value</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	48,915	32.5%		
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>				
Urban Establishment	0	0.0%		
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0.0%		
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>				
The Social Register	4,665	3.1%	\$186,100	\$384,300
Nouveau Money	4,200	2.8%	\$124,200	\$269,200
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	10,750	7.1%	\$91,900	\$190,700
Affluent Empty Nesters	4,585	3.0%	\$70,400	\$125,800
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	6,925	4.6%	\$65,100	\$89,700
Middle-American Retirees	8,295	5.5%	\$48,800	\$89,300
<i>Subtotal:</i>	39,420	26.2%		
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>				
Middle-Class Move-Downs	3,105	2.1%	\$57,500	\$94,000
Active Retirees	445	0.3%	\$57,200	\$143,100
Blue-Collar Retirees	5,085	3.4%	\$47,900	\$63,700
<i>Subtotal:</i>	8,635	5.7%		
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>				
Mainstream Retirees	860	0.6%	\$38,800	\$60,700
<i>Subtotal:</i>	860	0.6%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification By Market Groups

Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Estimated Share</u>	<u>Estimated Median Income</u>	<u>Estimated Median Home Value</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	65,765	43.7%		
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>				
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0.0%		
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0.0%		
Black Urban Families	0	0.0%		
Latino Urban Families	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0.0%		
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>				
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0.0%		
Kids 'r' Us	4,595	3.1%	\$70,100	\$94,500
<i>Subtotal:</i>	4,595	3.1%		
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>				
Cosmopolitan Families	785	0.5%	\$92,900	\$171,000
Unibox Transferees	2,780	1.8%	\$85,000	\$143,500
Mainstream Families	2,200	1.5%	\$48,300	\$78,700
<i>Subtotal:</i>	5,765	3.8%		
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>				
Exurban Elite	3,550	2.4%	\$121,900	\$229,700
Full-Nest Exurbanites	5,005	3.3%	\$89,400	\$140,300
New-Town Families	11,530	7.7%	\$72,400	\$103,400
Pillars of the Community	0	0.0%		
Middle-American Families	19,285	12.8%	\$56,800	\$70,100
Young Homesteaders	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	39,370	26.2%		
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>				
Heartland Families	4,475	3.0%	\$70,700	\$103,100
Small-Town Families	7,350	4.9%	\$54,600	\$64,700
Rustic Families	4,210	2.8%	\$52,700	\$54,600
<i>Subtotal:</i>	16,035	10.7%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification By Market Groups

Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Estimated Share</u>	<u>Estimated Median Income</u>	<u>Estimated Median Home Value</u>
Younger Single & Couples	35,805	23.8%		
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>				
Urban Elite	0	0.0%		
e-Types	0	0.0%		
Urban Achievers	0	0.0%		
New Bohemians	0	0.0%		
Subtotal:	0	0.0%		
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>				
The VIPs	2,635	1.8%	\$93,800	\$190,400
Fast-Track Professionals	16,550	11.0%	\$70,800	\$159,100
Suburban Achievers	3,160	2.1%	\$63,500	\$113,700
Generation X	5,220	3.5%	\$48,800	\$95,600
Subtotal:	27,565	18.3%		
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>				
Twentysomethings	5,795	3.9%	\$50,100	\$90,800
University / College Affiliates	2,445	1.6%	\$37,000	\$88,200
Subtotal:	8,240	5.5%		
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>				
PC Pioneers	0	0.0%		
Subtotal:	0	0.0%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification by Market Groups

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

Household Type/ Geographic Designation	<i>Estimated Number</i>	<i>Estimated Share</i>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	17,310	53.3%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	9,670	29.7%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	7,640	23.5%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0.0%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	7,620	23.4%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	3,335	10.3%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	3,495	10.8%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	790	2.4%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0.0%
Younger Singles & Couples	7,575	23.3%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	2,725	8.4%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	4,850	14.9%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0.0%
Total:	32,505	100.0%
Total City Households:	96,180	
Classified Households As A Share Of Total City Households:	33.8%	
Estimated Median Income:	\$30,000	
Estimated National Median Income:	\$46,900	
Estimated Median Home Value:	\$70,500	
Estimated National Median Home Value:	\$128,300	

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification by Market Groups

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Estimated Share</u>	<u>Estimated Median Income</u>	<u>Estimated Median Home Value</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	17,310	53.3%		
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>				
Urban Establishment	0	0.0%		
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>		
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>				
The Social Register	90	0.3%	\$255,800	\$382,400
Nouveau Money	100	0.3%	\$224,000	\$267,900
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	755	2.3%	\$91,700	\$189,800
Affluent Empty Nesters	2,730	8.4%	\$70,300	\$125,200
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	1,110	3.4%	\$64,900	\$89,300
Middle-American Retirees	4,885	15.0%	\$48,700	\$88,900
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>9,670</u>	<u>29.7%</u>		
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>				
Middle-Class Move-Downs	2,845	8.8%	\$57,400	\$93,500
Active Retirees	0	0.0%		
Blue-Collar Retirees	4,795	14.8%	\$47,800	\$63,400
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>7,640</u>	<u>23.5%</u>		
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>				
Mainstream Retirees	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification by Market Groups

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Estimated Share</u>	<u>Estimated Median Income</u>	<u>Estimated Median Home Value</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	7,620	23.4%		
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>				
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0.0%		
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0.0%		
Black Urban Families	0	0.0%		
Latino Urban Families	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0.0%		
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>				
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0.0%		
Kids 'r' Us	3,335	10.3%	\$70,000	\$94,000
<i>Subtotal:</i>	3,335	10.3%		
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>				
Cosmopolitan Families	785	2.4%	\$92,900	\$171,000
Unibox Transferees	510	1.6%	\$53,500	\$104,400
Mainstream Families	2,200	6.8%	\$48,300	\$78,700
<i>Subtotal:</i>	3,495	10.8%		
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>				
Exurban Elite	40	0.1%	\$121,700	\$228,600
Full-Nest Exurbanites	0	0.0%		
New-Town Families	350	1.1%	\$72,300	\$102,900
Pillars of the Community	0	0.0%		
Middle-American Families	400	1.2%	\$56,700	\$69,800
Young Homesteaders	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	790	2.4%		
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>				
Heartland Families	0	0.0%		
Small-Town Families	0	0.0%		
Rustic Families	0	0.0%		
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0.0%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

2004 Household Classification by Market Groups

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Estimated Share</u>	<u>Estimated Median Income</u>	<u>Estimated Median Home Value</u>
Younger Single & Couples	7,575	23.3%		
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>				
Urban Elite	0	0.0%		
e-Types	0	0.0%		
Urban Achievers	0	0.0%		
New Bohemians	0	0.0%		
Subtotal:	0	0.0%		
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>				
The VIPs	575	1.8%	\$93,600	\$189,500
Fast-Track Professionals	325	1.0%	\$70,700	\$158,400
Suburban Achievers	205	0.6%	\$63,400	\$113,200
Generation X	1,620	5.0%	\$48,700	\$95,100
Subtotal:	2,725	8.4%		
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>				
Twentysomethings	2,405	7.4%	\$50,000	\$90,300
University / College Affiliates	2,445	7.5%	\$37,000	\$88,200
Subtotal:	4,850	14.9%		
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>				
PC Pioneers	0	0.0%		
Subtotal:	0	0.0%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Household Classification By Market Groups

City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

Household Type/ Geographic Designation	<i>Estimated Number</i>	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Share of Potential</i>
Empty Nesters & Retirees			
	17,310	1,730	45.5%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	9,670	980	25.8%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	7,640	750	19.7%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0.0%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families			
	7,620	920	24.2%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	3,335	430	11.3%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	3,495	410	10.8%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	790	80	2.1%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0.0%
Younger Singles & Couples			
	7,575	1,150	30.3%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	2,725	420	11.1%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	4,850	730	19.2%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0.0%
Total:	32,505	3,800	100.0%
Total City Households:	96,180		
Classified Households As A Share Of Total City Households:	33.8%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Household Classification By Market Groups
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	17,310	1,730	45.5%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Urban Establishment	0	0	0.0%
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
The Social Register	90	10	0.3%
Nouveau Money	100	10	0.3%
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	755	60	1.6%
Affluent Empty Nesters	2,730	250	6.6%
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	1,110	90	2.4%
Middle-American Retirees	4,885	560	14.7%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	9,670	980	25.8%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Middle-Class Move-Downs	2,845	310	8.2%
Active Retirees	0	0	0.0%
Blue-Collar Retirees	4,795	440	11.6%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	7,640	750	19.7%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>			
Mainstream Retirees	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0	0.0%

Households With The Potential To Move Within The City Of Birmingham In 2004

Household Classification By Market Groups
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	7,620	920	24.2%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0.0%
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0.0%
Black Urban Families	0	0	0.0%
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0	0.0%
Kids 'r' Us	3,335	430	11.3%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>3,335</u>	<u>430</u>	<u>11.3%</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Cosmopolitan Families	785	70	1.8%
Unibox Transferees	510	70	1.8%
Mainstream Families	2,200	270	7.1%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>3,495</u>	<u>410</u>	<u>10.8%</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>			
Exurban Elite	40	0	0.0%
Full-Nest Exurbanites	0	0	0.0%
New-Town Families	350	40	1.1%
Pillars of the Community	0	0	0.0%
Middle-American Families	400	40	1.1%
Young Homesteaders	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>790</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>			
Heartland Families	0	0	0.0%
Small-Town Families	0	0	0.0%
Rustic Families	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Household Classification By Market Groups
City of Birmingham, Jefferson County, Alabama

	<i>Estimated Number</i>	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Share of Potential</i>
Younger Singles & Couples	7,575	1,150	30.3%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Urban Elite	0	0	0.0%
e-Types	0	0	0.0%
Urban Achievers	0	0	0.0%
New Bohemians	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
The VIPs	575	80	2.1%
Fast-Track Professionals	325	50	1.3%
Suburban Achievers	205	30	0.8%
Generation X	1,620	260	6.8%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>2,725</u>	<u>420</u>	<u>11.1%</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Twentysomethings	2,405	340	8.9%
University/College Affiliates	2,445	390	10.3%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>4,850</u>	<u>730</u>	<u>19.2%</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>			
PC Pioneers	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Household Classification By Market Groups

Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

<u>Household Type/ Geographic Designation</u>	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	31,605	850	20.7%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	29,750	800	19.5%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	995	20	0.5%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	860	30	0.7%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	58,145	1,810	44.1%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	1,260	0	0.0%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	2,270	110	2.7%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	38,580	1,310	32.0%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	16,035	390	9.5%
Younger Singles & Couples	28,230	1,440	35.1%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	24,840	1,270	31.0%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	3,390	170	4.1%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0.0%
Total:	117,980	4,100	100.0%
Total Households: (Balance Of County)	167,670		
Classified Households As A Share Of Total Households: (Balance Of County)	70.4%		

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Household Classification By Market Groups

Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

	<i>Estimated Number</i>	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Share of Potential</i>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	31,605	850	20.7%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Urban Establishment	0	0	0.0%
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
The Social Register	4,575	80	2.0%
Nouveau Money	4,100	130	3.2%
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	9,995	280	6.8%
Affluent Empty Nesters	1,855	0	0.0%
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	5,815	170	4.1%
Middle-American Retirees	3,410	140	3.4%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	29,750	800	19.5%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Middle-Class Move-Downs	260	10	0.2%
Active Retirees	445	0	0.0%
Blue-Collar Retirees	290	10	0.2%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	995	20	0.5%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>			
Mainstream Retirees	860	30	0.7%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	860	30	0.7%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Households With The Potential To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004

Household Classification By Market Groups

Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

	<u>Estimated Number</u>	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	58,145	1,810	44.1%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0.0%
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0.0%
Black Urban Families	0	0	0.0%
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0	0.0%
Kids 'r' Us	1,260	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>1,260</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Cosmopolitan Families	0	0	0.0%
Unibox Transferees	2,270	110	2.7%
Mainstream Families	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>2,270</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>2.7%</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>			
Exurban Elite	3,510	0	0.0%
Full-Nest Exurbanites	5,005	190	4.6%
New-Town Families	11,180	440	10.7%
Pillars of the Community	0	0	0.0%
Middle-American Families	18,885	680	16.6%
Young Homesteaders	0	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>38,580</u>	<u>1,310</u>	<u>32.0%</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>			
Heartland Families	4,475	150	3.7%
Small-Town Families	7,350	240	5.9%
Rustic Families	4,210	0	0.0%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>16,035</u>	<u>390</u>	<u>9.5%</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**
Household Classification By Market Groups
Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

	<i>Estimated Number</i>	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Share of Potential</i>
Younger Singles & Couples	28,230	1,440	35.1%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Urban Elite	0	0	0.0%
e-Types	0	0	0.0%
Urban Achievers	0	0	0.0%
New Bohemians	0	0	0.0%
Subtotal:	0	0	0.0%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
The VIPs	2,060	100	2.4%
Fast-Track Professionals	16,225	820	20.0%
Suburban Achievers	2,955	140	3.4%
Generation X	3,600	210	5.1%
Subtotal:	24,840	1,270	31.0%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Twentysomethings	3,390	170	4.1%
University / College Affiliates	0	0	0.0%
Subtotal:	3,390	170	4.1%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>			
PC Pioneers	0	0	0.0%
Subtotal:	0	0	0.0%

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

Household Type/ Geographic Area	<i>City of Birmingham</i>	<i>Balance of Jefferson</i>	Total
Empty Nesters & Retirees	1,730	850	2,580
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	980	800	1,780
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	750	20	770
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	30	30
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	920	1,810	2,730
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	430	0	430
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	410	110	520
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	80	1,310	1,390
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	390	390
Younger Singles & Couples	1,150	1,440	2,590
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	420	1,270	1,690
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	730	170	900
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0
Total:	3,800	4,100	7,900
Percent:	48.1%	51.9%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

	<i>City of Birmingham</i>	<i>Balance of Jefferson</i>	Total
Empty Nesters & Retirees	1,730	850	2,580
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Urban Establishment	0	0	0
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
The Social Register	10	80	90
Nouveau Money	10	130	140
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	60	280	340
Affluent Empty Nesters	250	0	250
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	90	170	260
Middle-American Retirees	560	140	700
<i>Subtotal:</i>	980	800	1,780
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Active Retirees	310	10	320
Middle-Class Move-Downs	0	0	0
Blue-Collar Retirees	440	10	450
<i>Subtotal:</i>	750	20	770
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>			
Mainstream Retirees	0	30	30
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	30	30

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

	<i>City of Birmingham</i>	<i>Balance of Jefferson</i>	Total
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	920	1,810	2,730
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0
Black Urban Families	0	0	0
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0	0
Kids 'r' Us	430	0	430
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>430</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>430</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Cosmopolitan Families	70	0	70
Unibox Transferees	70	110	180
Mainstream Families	270	0	270
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>410</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>520</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>			
Exurban Elite	0	0	0
Full-Nest Exurbanites	0	190	190
New-Town Families	40	440	480
Pillars of the Community	0	0	0
Middle-American Families	40	680	720
Young Homesteaders	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>80</u>	<u>1,310</u>	<u>1,390</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>			
Heartland Families	0	150	150
Small-Town Families	0	240	240
Rustic Families	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>390</u>	<u>390</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County, Alabama

	<i>City of Birmingham</i>	<i>Balance of Jefferson</i>	Total
Younger Singles & Couples	1,150	1,440	2,590
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>			
Urban Elite	0	0	0
e-Types	0	0	0
Urban Achievers	0	0	0
New Bohemians	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>			
The VIPs	80	100	180
Fast-Track Professionals	50	820	870
Suburban Achievers	30	140	170
Generation X	260	210	470
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>420</u>	<u>1,270</u>	<u>1,690</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>			
Twentysomethings	340	170	510
University/College Affiliates	390	0	390
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>730</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>900</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>			
PC Pioneers	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Draw Area Households
With The Potential To Move To The City of Birmingham In 2004
Adjacent Counties Draw Area**

Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama

<u>Household Type/ Geographic Designation</u>	<u>Shelby County</u>	<u>Tuscaloosa County</u>	<u>St. Clair County</u>	<u>Blount County</u>	<u>Walker County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	30	30	10	0	20	90
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	30	0	0	0	0	30
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	0	30	0	0	0	30
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	10	0	20	30
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	420	110	80	60	30	700
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	0	30	0	0	0	30
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	350	40	30	0	20	440
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	70	40	50	60	10	230
Younger Singles & Couples	70	70	40	10	0	190
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	50	0	0	0	0	50
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	0	70	0	0	0	70
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	20	0	40	10	0	70
Total:	520	210	130	70	50	980
Percent:	53.1%	21.4%	13.3%	7.1%	5.1%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.
Appendix Table 7

Draw Area Households
With The Potential To Move To The City of Birmingham In 2004
Adjacent Counties Draw Area
Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama

	<u>Shelby County</u>	<u>Tuscaloosa County</u>	<u>St. Clair County</u>	<u>Blount County</u>	<u>Walker County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	30	30	10	0	20	90
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>						
Urban Establishment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>						
The Social Register	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nouveau Money	30	0	0	0	0	30
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Affluent Empty Nesters	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle-American Retirees	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>						
Middle-Class Move-Downs	0	10	0	0	0	10
Active Retirees	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blue-Collar Retirees	0	20	0	0	0	20
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>						
Mainstream Retirees	0	0	10	0	20	30
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>30</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Draw Area Households
With The Potential To Move To The City of Birmingham In 2004
Adjacent Counties Draw Area**

Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama

	<u>Shelby County</u>	<u>Tuscaloosa County</u>	<u>St. Clair County</u>	<u>Blount County</u>	<u>Walker County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	420	110	80	60	30	700
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>						
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black Urban Families	0	0	0	0	0	0
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>						
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kids 'r' Us	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>						
Cosmopolitan Families	0	10	0	0	0	10
Unibox Transferees	0	10	0	0	0	10
Mainstream Families	0	10	0	0	0	10
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>						
Exurban Elite	90	0	0	0	0	90
Full-Nest Exurbanites	40	10	0	0	0	50
New-Town Families	200	0	0	0	0	200
Pillars of the Community	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middle-American Families	20	20	30	0	0	70
Young Homesteaders	0	10	0	0	20	30
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>350</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>440</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>						
Heartland Families	20	10	10	0	0	40
Small-Town Families	40	10	10	40	0	100
Rustic Families	10	20	30	20	10	90
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>70</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>230</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Draw Area Households
With The Potential To Move To The City of Birmingham In 2004
Adjacent Counties Draw Area**

Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama

	<u>Shelby County</u>	<u>Tuscaloosa County</u>	<u>St. Clair County</u>	<u>Blount County</u>	<u>Walker County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Younger Singles & Couples	70	70	40	10	0	190
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>						
Urban Elite	0	0	0	0	0	0
e-Types	0	0	0	0	0	0
Urban Achievers	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Bohemians	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal:	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>						
The VIPs	20	0	0	0	0	20
Fast-Track Professionals	30	0	0	0	0	30
Suburban Achievers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Generation X	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal:	<u>50</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>50</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>						
Twentysomethings	0	20	0	0	0	20
University / College Affiliates	0	50	0	0	0	50
Subtotal:	<u>0</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>						
PC Pioneers	20	0	40	10	0	70
Subtotal:	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Atlanta Metro Draw Area

Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia

<u>Household Type/ Geographic Designation</u>	<u>Fulton County</u>	<u>Cobb County</u>	<u>DeKalb County</u>	<u>Gwinnett County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	20	10	10	0	40
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	20	10	10	0	40
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	10	40	10	30	90
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	0	10	10	10	30
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	0	30	0	10	40
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	10	0	0	10	20
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Younger Singles & Couples	80	40	60	20	200
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	20	0	0	0	20
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	60	20	60	20	160
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	0	20	0	0	20
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	110	90	80	50	330
Percent:	33.3%	27.3%	24.2%	15.2%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004
Atlanta Metro Draw Area
Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia**

	<u>Fulton County</u>	<u>Cobb County</u>	<u>DeKalb County</u>	<u>Gwinnett County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	20	10	10	0	40
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Urban Establishment	0	0	0	0	0
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
The Social Register	10	0	0	0	10
Nouveau Money	10	10	10	0	30
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	0	0	0	0	0
Affluent Empty Nesters	0	0	0	0	0
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	0	0	0	0	0
Middle-American Retirees	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Middle-Class Move-Downs	0	0	0	0	0
Active Retirees	0	0	0	0	0
Blue-Collar Retirees	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>					
Mainstream Retirees	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Atlanta Metro Draw Area

Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia

	<u>Fulton County</u>	<u>Cobb County</u>	<u>DeKalb County</u>	<u>Gwinnett County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	10	40	10	30	90
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0	0	0
Black Urban Families	0	0	0	0	0
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	10	10	10	30
Kids 'r' Us	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>30</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Cosmopolitan Families	0	0	0	0	0
Unibox Transferees	0	20	0	10	30
Mainstream Families	0	10	0	0	10
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>40</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>					
Exurban Elite	10	0	0	0	10
Full-Nest Exurbanites	0	0	0	10	10
New-Town Families	0	0	0	0	0
Pillars of the Community	0	0	0	0	0
Middle-American Families	0	0	0	0	0
Young Homesteaders	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>					
Heartland Families	0	0	0	0	0
Small-Town Families	0	0	0	0	0
Rustic Families	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Atlanta Metro Draw Area

Fulton, Cobb, DeKalb and Gwinnett Counties, Georgia

	<u>Fulton County</u>	<u>Cobb County</u>	<u>DeKalb County</u>	<u>Gwinnett County</u>	<u>Total</u>
Younger Singles & Couples	80	40	60	20	200
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Urban Elite	0	0	0	0	0
e-Types	10	0	0	0	10
Urban Achievers	0	0	0	0	0
New Bohemians	10	0	0	0	10
Subtotal:	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
The VIPs	20	10	0	0	30
Fast-Track Professionals	30	0	20	10	60
Suburban Achievers	10	10	20	10	50
Generation X	0	0	20	0	20
Subtotal:	<u>60</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>160</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Twentysomethings	0	20	0	0	20
University/College Affiliates	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal:	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>					
PC Pioneers	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal:	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Households With The Potential To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004

Household Classification By Market Groups

All Other U.S. Counties

Household Type/ Geographic Designation	<i>Potential</i>	<i>Share of Potential</i>
Empty Nesters & Retirees		
	1,080	27.6%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	110	2.8%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	550	14.1%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	330	8.4%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	90	2.3%
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families		
	1,880	48.1%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	290	7.4%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	260	6.6%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	340	8.7%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	710	18.2%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	280	7.2%
Younger Singles & Couples		
	950	24.3%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	290	7.4%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	420	10.7%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	180	4.6%
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	60	1.5%
Total:	3,910	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Households With The Potential To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004

Household Classification By Market Groups
All Other U.S. Counties

	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	1,080	27.6%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>		
Urban Establishment	40	1.0%
Rowhouse Retirees	70	1.8%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	110	2.8%
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>		
The Social Register	50	1.3%
Nouveau Money	110	2.8%
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	80	2.0%
Affluent Empty Nesters	120	3.1%
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	90	2.3%
Comfortable Retirees	100	2.6%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	550	14.1%
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>		
Middle-Class Move-Downs	110	2.8%
Active Retirees	130	3.3%
Blue-Collar Retirees	90	2.3%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	330	8.4%
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>		
Mainstream Retirees	90	2.3%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	90	2.3%

Households With The Potential To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004

Household Classification By Market Groups
All Other U.S. Counties

	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	1,880	48.1%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>		
Full-Nest Urbanites	80	2.0%
Multi-Cultural Families	60	1.5%
Black Urban Families	60	1.5%
Latino Urban Families	90	2.3%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>290</u>	<u>7.4%</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>		
Full-Nest Suburbanites	190	4.9%
Kids 'r' Us	70	1.8%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>260</u>	<u>6.6%</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>		
Cosmopolitan Families	90	2.3%
Unibox Transferees	140	3.6%
Mainstream Families	110	2.8%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>340</u>	<u>8.7%</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>		
Exurban Elite	90	2.3%
Full-Nest Exurbanites	180	4.6%
New-Town Families	110	2.8%
Pillars of the Community	90	2.3%
Middle-American Families	130	3.3%
Young Homesteaders	110	2.8%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>710</u>	<u>18.2%</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>		
Heartland Families	90	2.3%
Small-Town Families	100	2.6%
Rustic Families	90	2.3%
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>280</u>	<u>7.2%</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

Household Classification By Market Groups

All Other U.S. Counties

	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Share of Potential</u>
Younger Singles & Couples	950	24.3%
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>		
Urban Elite	30	0.8%
e-Types	60	1.5%
Urban Achievers	90	2.3%
New Bohemians	110	2.8%
Subtotal:	<u>290</u>	<u>7.4%</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>		
The VIPs	110	2.8%
Fast-Track Professionals	100	2.6%
Suburban Achievers	110	2.8%
Generation X	100	2.6%
Subtotal:	<u>420</u>	<u>10.7%</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>		
Twentysomethings	70	1.8%
University/College Affiliates	110	2.8%
Subtotal:	<u>180</u>	<u>4.6%</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>		
PC Pioneers	60	1.5%
Subtotal:	<u>60</u>	<u>1.5%</u>

Households With The Potential To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

<u>Household Type/ Geographic Designation</u>	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<u>Total</u>	
Empty Nesters & Retirees	2,580	90	40	1,080	3,790	0.2889
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	110	110	
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	1,780	30	40	550	2,400	
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	770	30	0	330	1,130	
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	30	30	0	90	150	
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	2,730	700	90	1,880	5,400	0.4116
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	290	290	
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	430	0	30	260	720	
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	520	30	40	340	930	
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	1,390	440	20	710	2,560	
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	390	230	0	280	900	
Younger Singles & Couples	2,590	190	200	950	3,930	0.2995
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	20	290	310	
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	1,690	50	160	420	2,320	
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	900	70	20	180	1,170	
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	70	0	60	130	
Total:	7,900	980	330	3,910	13,120	
Percent:	60.2%	7.5%	2.5%	29.8%	100.0%	

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

*City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and
Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties*

	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<u>Total</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	2,580	90	40	1,080	3,790
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Urban Establishment	0	0	0	40	40
Rowhouse Retirees	0	0	0	70	70
Subtotal:	0	0	0	110	110
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
The Social Register	90	0	10	50	150
Nouveau Money	140	30	30	110	310
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	340	0	0	80	420
Affluent Empty Nesters	250	0	0	120	370
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	260	0	0	90	350
Middle-American Retirees	700	0	0	100	800
Subtotal:	1,780	30	40	550	2,400
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Middle-Class Move-Downs	320	10	0	110	440
Active Retirees	0	0	0	130	130
Blue-Collar Retirees	450	20	0	90	560
Subtotal:	770	30	0	330	1,130
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>					
Mainstream Retirees	30	30	0	90	150
Subtotal:	30	30	0	90	150

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Households With The Potential To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<i>Total</i>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	2,730	700	90	1,880	5,400
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0	80	80
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0	60	60
Black Urban Families	0	0	0	60	60
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0	90	90
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>290</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
Full-Nest Suburbanites	0	0	30	190	220
Kids 'r' Us	430	0	0	70	500
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>430</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>260</u>	<u>720</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Cosmopolitan Families	70	10	0	90	170
Unibox Transferees	180	10	30	140	360
Mainstream Families	270	10	10	110	400
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>520</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>340</u>	<u>930</u>
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>					
Exurban Elite	0	90	10	90	190
Full-Nest Exurbanites	190	50	10	180	430
New-Town Families	480	200	0	110	790
Pillars of the Community	0	0	0	90	90
Middle-American Families	720	70	0	130	920
Young Homesteaders	0	30	0	110	140
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>1,390</u>	<u>440</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>710</u>	<u>2,560</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>					
Heartland Families	150	40	0	90	280
Small-Town Families	240	100	0	100	440
Rustic Families	0	90	0	90	180
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>390</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>280</u>	<u>900</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To The City Of Birmingham In 2004**

*City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and
Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties*

	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<u>Total</u>
Younger Singles & Couples	2,590	190	200	950	3,930
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Urban Elite	0	0	0	30	30
e-Types	0	0	10	60	70
Urban Achievers	0	0	0	90	90
New Bohemians	0	0	10	110	120
Subtotal:	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>290</u>	<u>310</u>
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
The VIPs	180	20	30	110	340
Fast-Track Professionals	870	30	60	100	1,060
Suburban Achievers	170	0	50	110	330
Generation X	470	0	20	100	590
Subtotal:	<u>1,690</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>420</u>	<u>2,320</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Twentysomethings	510	20	20	70	620
University/College Affiliates	390	50	0	110	550
Subtotal:	<u>900</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>1,170</u>
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>					
PC Pioneers	0	70	0	60	130
Subtotal:	<u>0</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>130</u>

Households With The Potential To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Household Type/ Geographic Designation	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	Total
Empty Nesters & Retirees	610	40	30	310	990
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	40	40
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	450	30	30	210	720
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	160	10	0	60	230
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	270	30	40	330	670
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	150	150
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	270	30	40	180	520
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Younger Singles & Couples	1,060	120	130	680	1,990
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	20	290	310
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	530	50	90	210	880
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	530	70	20	180	800
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	1,940	190	200	1,320	3,650
Percent:	53.1%	5.2%	5.5%	36.2%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential To Move
To The City Center In 2004**

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<u>Total</u>
Empty Nesters & Retirees	610	40	30	310	990
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Urban Establishment	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>40</u>
Subtotal:	0	0	0	40	40
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
Nouveau Money	70	30	30	60	190
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	120	0	0	40	160
Affluent Empty Nesters	130	0	0	60	190
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	<u>130</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>180</u>
Subtotal:	450	30	30	210	720
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Middle-Class Move-Downs	<u>160</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>230</u>
Subtotal:	160	10	0	60	230

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential To Move
To The City Center In 2004**

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<u>Total</u>
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	270	30	40	330	670
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	0	40	40
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	0	30	30
Black Urban Families	0	0	0	30	30
Latino Urban Families	0	0	0	50	50
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>150</u>
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Cosmopolitan Families	40	10	0	50	100
Unibox Transferees	90	10	30	70	200
Mainstream Families	140	10	10	60	220
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>270</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>520</u>

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

**Households With The Potential To Move
To The City Center In 2004**

*City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and
Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties*

	<i>Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson</i>	<i>Adjacent Counties</i>	<i>Atlanta Metro</i>	<i>Other US Counties</i>	<i>Total</i>
Younger Singles & Couples	1,060	120	130	680	1,990
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>					
Urban Elite	0	0	0	30	30
e-Types	0	0	10	60	70
Urban Achievers	0	0	0	90	90
New Bohemians	0	0	10	110	120
Subtotal:	0	0	20	290	310
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>					
The VIPs	90	20	30	110	250
Fast-Track Professionals	440	30	60	100	630
Subtotal:	530	50	90	210	880
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>					
Twentysomethings	260	20	20	70	370
University/College Affiliates	270	50	0	110	430
Subtotal:	530	70	20	180	800

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Household Type/ Geographic Designation Rental Ownership				Total
	<i>Below Median</i>	<i>Above Median</i>	<i>Entry- Level</i>	<i>First-Time Move-Up</i>	<i>Move-Up/ Lateral</i>	<i>Move- Down</i>	
Empty Nesters & Retirees	50	190	0	110	360	280	990
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	10	0	0	20	10	40
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	20	130	0	70	290	210	720
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	30	50	0	40	50	60	230
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	60	170	50	130	160	100	670
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	10	50	0	20	40	30	150
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	50	120	50	110	120	70	520
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Younger Singles & Couples	460	680	280	290	150	130	1,990
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	70	130	30	40	10	30	310
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	90	310	130	170	110	70	880
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	300	240	120	80	30	30	800
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	570	1,040	330	530	670	510	3,650
Percent:	15.6%	28.5%	9.0%	14.5%	18.4%	14.0%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Empty Nesters & Retirees Rental Ownership				Total
	<i>Below Median</i>	<i>Above Median</i>	<i>Entry- Level</i>	<i>First-Time Move-Up</i>	<i>Move-Up/ Lateral</i>	<i>Move- Down</i>	
Metropolitan Cities							
Urban Establishment	0	10	0	0	20	10	40
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	10	0	0	20	10	40
Metropolitan Suburbs							
Nouveau Money	0	30	0	0	100	60	190
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	0	30	0	0	90	40	160
Affluent Empty Nesters	10	40	0	30	50	60	190
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	10	30	0	40	50	50	180
<i>Subtotal:</i>	20	130	0	70	290	210	720
Small Cities/Edge Cities							
Middle-Class Move-Downs	30	50	0	40	50	60	230
<i>Subtotal:</i>	30	50	0	40	50	60	230
Total:	50	190	0	110	360	280	990
Percent:	5.1%	19.2%	0.0%	11.1%	36.4%	28.3%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Traditional & Non-Traditional Families Rental Ownership				Total
	<i>Below Median</i>	<i>Above Median</i>	<i>Entry- Level</i>	<i>First-Time Move-Up</i>	<i>Move-Up/ Lateral</i>	<i>Move- Down</i>	
Metropolitan Cities							
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	10	0	10	10	10	40
Multi-Cultural Families	0	10	0	0	10	10	30
Black Urban Families	0	10	0	0	10	10	30
Latino Urban Families	10	20	0	10	10	0	50
<i>Subtotal:</i>	10	50	0	20	40	30	150
Small Cities/Edge Cities							
Cosmopolitan Families	0	20	10	20	30	20	100
Unibox Transferees	10	50	20	50	50	20	200
Mainstream Families	40	50	20	40	40	30	220
<i>Subtotal:</i>	50	120	50	110	120	70	520
Total:	60	170	50	130	160	100	670
Percent:	9.0%	25.4%	7.5%	19.4%	23.9%	14.9%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Younger Singles & Couples Rental Ownership				Total
	<i>Below Median</i>	<i>Above Median</i>	<i>Entry- Level</i>	<i>First-Time Move-Up</i>	<i>Move-Up/ Lateral</i>	<i>Move- Down</i>	
Metropolitan Cities							
Urban Elite	0	20	0	10	0	0	30
e-Types	10	30	10	10	0	10	70
Urban Achievers	20	30	10	10	10	10	90
New Bohemians	40	50	10	10	0	10	120
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>70</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>310</u>
Metropolitan Suburbs							
The VIPs	10	70	30	60	60	20	250
Fast-Track Professionals	80	240	100	110	50	50	630
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>90</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>170</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>880</u>
Small Cities/Edge Cities							
Twentysomethings	90	130	60	50	20	20	370
University / College Affiliates	210	110	60	30	10	10	430
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>300</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>800</u>
Total:	460	680	280	290	150	130	1,990
Percent:	23.1%	34.2%	14.1%	14.6%	7.5%	6.5%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

New Unit Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Household Type/ Geographic Designation	Multi- .. Family ..	Single- Family			Total	
	<i>All Ranges</i>	.. Attached .. <i>All Ranges</i> Detached			
		<i>All Ranges</i>	<i>Low-Range</i>	<i>Mid-Range</i>	<i>High-Range</i>	
Empty Nesters & Retirees	70	80	210	200	190	750
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	0	0	10	20	30
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	50	60	140	160	160	570
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	20	20	70	30	10	150
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	50	80	140	120	50	440
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	0	20	40	20	10	90
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	50	60	100	100	40	350
<i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Younger Singles & Couples	250	180	150	160	110	850
<i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	40	30	10	10	20	110
<i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	130	80	60	120	90	480
<i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	80	70	80	30	0	260
<i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	370	340	500	480	350	2,040
Percent:	18.1%	16.7%	24.5%	23.5%	17.2%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

New Unit Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Empty Nesters & Retirees	Multi- .. Family ..	Single- Family			Total	
	<i>All Ranges</i>	.. Attached Detached			
	<i>All Ranges</i>	<i>All Ranges</i>	<i>Low-Range</i>	<i>Mid-Range</i>	<i>High-Range</i>	
Metropolitan Cities						
Urban Establishment	0	0	0	10	20	30
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	0	0	10	20	30
Metropolitan Suburbs						
Nouveau Money	10	10	0	40	100	160
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	10	10	20	50	40	130
Affluent Empty Nesters	20	20	40	40	20	140
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	10	20	80	30	0	140
<i>Subtotal:</i>	50	60	140	160	160	570
Small Cities/Edge Cities						
Middle-Class Move-Downs	20	20	70	30	10	150
<i>Subtotal:</i>	20	20	70	30	10	150
Total:	70	80	210	200	190	750
Percent:	9.3%	10.7%	28.0%	26.7%	25.3%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

New Unit Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Traditional & Non-Traditional Families	Multi- .. Family ..	Single- Family			Total	
	<i>All Ranges</i>	.. Attached .. <i>All Ranges</i> Detached			
		<i>Low-Range</i>	<i>Mid-Range</i>	<i>High-Range</i>		
Metropolitan Cities						
Full-Nest Urbanites	0	0	10	10	10	30
Multi-Cultural Families	0	0	10	10	0	20
Black Urban Families	0	10	10	0	0	20
Latino Urban Families	0	10	10	0	0	20
<i>Subtotal:</i>	0	20	40	20	10	90
Small Cities/Edge Cities						
Cosmopolitan Families	10	10	10	30	20	80
Unibox Transferees	20	20	30	50	20	140
Mainstream Families	20	30	60	20	0	130
<i>Subtotal:</i>	50	60	100	100	40	350
Total:	50	80	140	120	50	440
Percent:	11.4%	18.2%	31.8%	27.3%	11.4%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

New Unit Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Draw Area Households With The Potential

To Move To The City Center In 2004

City of Birmingham; Balance of Jefferson County; Shelby, Tuscaloosa, St. Clair, Blount and Walker Counties, Alabama; Atlanta Metro Draw Area; All Other U.S. Counties

Younger Singles & Couples	Multi- .. Family ..	Single- Family				Total
	<i>All Ranges</i>	.. Attached Detached			
		<i>All Ranges</i>	<i>Low-Range</i>	<i>Mid-Range</i>	<i>High-Range</i>	
Metropolitan Cities						
Urban Elite	0	0	10	0	0	10
e-Types	10	10	0	0	10	30
Urban Achievers	10	10	0	10	10	40
New Bohemians	20	10	0	0	0	30
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>40</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>110</u>
Metropolitan Suburbs						
The VIPs	30	20	10	60	50	170
Fast-Track Professionals	100	60	50	60	40	310
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>130</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>120</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>480</u>
Small Cities/Edge Cities						
Twentysomethings	40	40	50	20	0	150
University / College Affiliates	40	30	30	10	0	110
<i>Subtotal:</i>	<u>80</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>260</u>
Total:	250	180	150	160	110	850
Percent:	29.4%	21.2%	17.6%	18.8%	12.9%	100.0%

SOURCE: Claritas, Inc.;
Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809
908-735-6336 • 908-735-4751 *facsimile*
info@ZVA.cc • www.ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS—

Every effort has been made to insure the accuracy of the data contained within this analysis. Demographic and economic estimates and projections have been obtained from government agencies at the national, state, and county levels. Market information has been obtained from sources presumed to be reliable, including developers, owners, and/or sales agents. However, this information cannot be warranted by Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. While the methodology employed in this analysis allows for a margin of error in base data, it is assumed that the market data and government estimates and projections are substantially accurate.

Absorption scenarios are based upon the assumption that a normal economic environment will prevail in a relatively steady state during development of the subject property. Absorption paces are likely to be slower during recessionary periods and faster during periods of recovery and high growth. Absorption scenarios are also predicated on the assumption that the product recommendations will be implemented generally as outlined in this report and that the developer will apply high-caliber design, construction, marketing, and management techniques to the development of the property.

Recommendations are subject to compliance with all applicable regulations. Relevant accounting, tax, and legal matters should be substantiated by appropriate counsel.



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809
908 735-6336 • 908 735-4751 *facsimile*
www.ZVA.cc • info@ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP—

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. retains all rights, title and interest to all aspects of this report. This report cannot be copied or distributed by any person or entity other than the client without the express written permission of Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.



Appendix Two

TARGET MARKET DESCRIPTIONS

MARKET ANALYSIS

RESIDENTIAL MARKET POTENTIAL

City Center

City of Birmingham
Jefferson County, Alabama

April, 2004

Conducted by
ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.
6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809
908-735-6336 • 908-735-4751 *facsimile*
info@ZVA.cc • www.ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TARGET MARKET DESCRIPTIONS	1
EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES— <i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	
The Urban Establishment	3
Rowhouse Retirees	4
EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES— <i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	
The Social Register	6
Nouveau Money	7
Post-War Suburban Pioneers	8
Affluent Empty Nesters	9
Blue-Collar Button-Downs	10
Middle-American Retirees	11
EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES— <i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	
Middle-Class Move-Downs	13
Active Retirees	14
Blue-Collar Retirees	15
EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES— <i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	
Mainstream Retirees	17
TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES— <i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	
Full-Nest Urbanites	19
Multi-Cultural Families	20
Black Urban Families	21
Latino Urban Families	22
TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES— <i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	
Full-Nest Suburbanites	24
Kids ‘r’ Us	25

TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES— <i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	
Cosmopolitan Families	27
Unibox Transferees	28
Mainstream Families	29
TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES— <i>Town & Country/Exurbs</i>	
Exurban Elite	31
Full-Nest Exurbanites	32
New-Town Families	33
Pillars of the Community	34
Middle-American Families	35
Young Homesteaders	36
TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES— <i>Agrarian/Rural</i>	
Heartland Families	38
Small-Town Families	39
Rustic Families	40
YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES— <i>Metropolitan Cities</i>	
Urban Elite	42
e-Types	43
Urban Achievers	44
New Bohemians	45
YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES— <i>Metropolitan Suburbs</i>	
The VIPs	47
Fast-Track Professionals	48
Suburban Achievers	49
Generation X	50
YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES— <i>Small Cities/Edge Cities</i>	
Twentysomethings	52
University/College Affiliates	53

YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES—*Agrarian/Rural*

PC Pioneers

55

COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP



TARGET MARKET DESCRIPTIONS _____

The following target market lifestyle and values profiles have been developed by Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. based on United States Bureau of Census data, Claritas' geo-demographic segmentation, and Zimmerman/Volk Associates' lifestyle and housing correlation methodology. The target market lifestyle and values profiles have been devised for use by design, marketing, and merchandising professionals in perfecting the position of new housing within the marketplace.





EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES

– Metropolitan Cities –



THE URBAN ESTABLISHMENT

Configuration: Empty-nest couples; older singles (divorced and widowed).
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—45 to 64.

Characteristics: Affluent older couples, secure in their power and position.
Success achieved through intelligence, connections and contacts.
Two-thirds attended or graduated from college, remarkable for their older age cohort.
High-ranking professionals in business and finance; arts and entertainment.

Housing preferences: Exclusive urban neighborhoods.
Elegant townhouses (the city version) and condominiums (the high-rise version).
Nearly one-quarter lease large, luxurious apartments.

Consumption patterns: Chauffeured car.
Investment property.
Espresso maker.
World travel.
Watch *Washington Week In Review*.
Read *The Wall Street Journal*.

Icons: Mark Cross appointment book; the blue Tiffany box and the red Cartier box.



“Wealth is the parent of luxury and indolence.”

– Plato



ROWHOUSE RETIREES

Configuration: Empty-nest couples; widows and widowers; children live at home until they get married.

Average household size—2 to 3 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—65 and older.

Characteristics: Middle-income households, often immigrant, Latino or Asian.

First-generation Americans.

High-school educated.

A mix of blue- and white-collar workers.

Housing preferences: Dense, urban neighborhoods built before World War II.

Rowhouses; duplexes; three-story apartment buildings.

Homes are frequently sold or leased to family members. Low property values.

Consumption patterns: Rarely own cars; older Jeep Grand Wagoneer, Buick Century.

Membership in religious organizations; Christmas clubs; unions.

Fans of boxing and bowling.

Caribbean cruises.

Watch *Court TV*.

Read *Entertainment Weekly*.

Icons: Lace curtains; lottery tickets.



“Join the United States and join the family—
But not much in between unless a college.”

– Robert Frost





EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES

– Metropolitan Suburbs –



THE SOCIAL REGISTER

Configuration: Empty-nest couples; families with high school- and college-aged children.
Average household size—2 to 3 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—45 to 64.

Characteristics: Upper crust, wealthy American families—one in 10 is a multi-millionaire.
Heirs to “old money;” accustomed to privilege and luxury.
Highly educated, with college and graduate degrees.
Judges; medical specialists; chief executive officers.

Housing preferences: Older metropolitan suburban fringe areas.
Estate homes in high-prestige neighborhoods; secluded older estates.
Attached units for resort homes or urban *pieds-à-terre*.

Consumption patterns: A collection of thoroughbred automobiles.
Theater; classical music.
Tennis; golf.
Extended visits to Europe.
Watch *Wall Street Week*.
Read *Architectural Digest*..

Icons: Threadbare Oriental carpets; chipped heirloom Waterford crystal.



“They [the very rich] are different from you and me.”

– F. Scott Fitzgerald



NOUVEAU MONEY

Configuration: Empty-nest couples; families with teen-aged children.
Average household size—2 to 3 persons.
Predominant age range of adults— 45 to 64.

Characteristics: Affluent, family-oriented households.
Conspicuous displays of wealth.
Highly educated, with college and graduate degrees.
Executives, entrepreneurs in technology, consumer services, and
pharmaceuticals; doctors; lawyers, stockbrokers.

Housing preferences: Newer metropolitan suburban fringe areas.
Expensive new mansions with “power façades” and very high property values.
Attached units for second homes.

Consumption patterns: Expensive automobiles—Mercedes-Benzes and Porsches—and SUVs—Land
Rovers or Lincoln Navigators.
Prolific spenders and global travelers.
Country club membership: golf; tennis.
Skiing in Aspen.
Watch *NYPD Blue*.
Read *Kiplinger’s Personal Finance*.

Icons: Housekeeper; Titanium Visa Card.



“That’s it, baby, if you’ve got it, flaunt it.”

– Mel Brooks



POST-WAR SUBURBAN PIONEERS

Configuration: Empty-nest couples; some singles—widows/widowers, divorcés/divorcées.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—55 to 64; 65 and older.

Characteristics: Upper-middle-income couples whose last children have just left home.
Parents of the Baby Boom Generation.
Some college education; high-school graduates.
Mostly white-collar workers, with jobs they've held for years.

Housing preferences: Post World-War II suburban subdivisions.
Originally, relatively modest detached houses; however, most have been fitted with various additions and improvements.
Many still live in the houses they bought new, 30 or 40 years ago; when they move, they downsize to an apartment downtown and a resort condominium.

Consumption patterns: Foreign cars, *e.g.*—Saabs, Volvos.
Trips to gambling resorts.
Low-fat food and diet drinks.
Theater and museum attendees.
Watch *Ebert & Roeper and the Movies*.
Read *Money*.

Icons: Suits at work, sweats at home; pasta machines.



“If youth but knew; if old age but could.”

– Henri Estienne



AFFLUENT EMPTY NESTERS

Configuration: Married empty-nest couples.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—55 to 64; 65 and older.

Characteristics: Older established couples with two incomes.
Significant financial resources—untapped equity in their homes.
Two-thirds are college educated.
Small-business owners; corporate officers; sales directors.

Housing preferences: Older suburban neighborhoods.
Detached houses with high property values.
Likely to move to rentals, townhouses, or small-lot singles when last child has left home.

Consumption patterns: Saturns and Suburus.
An active life of travel, leisure, and entertainment.
Adult education courses.
Cruises; travel abroad.
Watch *Charlie Rose*.
Read *Golf Digest*.

Icons: Callaway golf clubs; AAA membership card.



“We made our money the old-fashioned way; we earned it.”

– Variation on Advertisement



BLUE-COLLAR BUTTON-DOWNS

Configuration: Married couples with older children, many of whom have left the nest.
Average household size—2 to 3 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—45 to 54; 55 to 64.

Characteristics: Middle-class households with working-class values.
The “white flight” of the post-war years.
Most are high-school grads; many also attended two-year colleges or technical schools.
Small contractors, small business owners, technical or sales workers.

Housing preferences: Post-war subdivisions of “carpenter capes” and ranches.
Most live in older single-family detached houses, although some empty-nest couples have “moved down” to new townhouses or condominiums.
Over 75 percent own their homes.

Consumption patterns: American cars, *e.g.*—Ford Tempos, Buick Skylarks.
Community-oriented activities.
Do-it-yourself home and auto maintenance.
Sports fanatics.
Watch *Providence*.
Read *Reader’s Digest*.

Icons: Above-ground swimming pool; backyard gas grill.



“Nice work if you can get it,
And you can get it if you try.”

– Ira Gershwin



MIDDLE-AMERICAN RETIREES

Configuration: Retired couples and singles.
Average household size—1 to 2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—55 and older.

Characteristics: Middle-income households with middle-class sensibilities.
Family-, not community-oriented.
Educated at public universities.
Former teachers; social workers; small business owners.

Housing preferences: Older inner-ring suburbs.
Well-kept garden apartments, rowhouses, bungalows.
More than half own their residence and the mortgage is paid off.

Consumption patterns: Suzukis and Nissans.
Clothing from local stores.
Frequent fast-food restaurants, dollar stores.
Gossip with friends.
Watch *NBC Nightly News*.
Read *Ladies Home Journal*.

Icons: Ten-year-old toaster oven; family dinners.



“If I’d known I was going to live this long,
I’d have taken better care of myself.”

– Eubie Blake





EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES

– *Small Cities/Edge Cities* –



MIDDLE-CLASS MOVE-DOWNS

Configuration: Older married couples, widows/widowers, divorcés/divorcées.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—65 and older; 55 to 64.

Characteristics: Older couples in the middle of the socio-economic scale.
Some members of this group have already retired.
Most are high school graduates; some attended college.
Middle managers; professionals; retired military officers.

Housing preferences: Mid-scale satellite cities.
Moderate-value ramblers and ranches; new townhouses as move-down alternatives.
Two-thirds of these households own their homes.

Consumption patterns: Buick Park Avenues, Cadillac DeVilles, Buick LeSabres.
Resort time-shares.
College sports fanatics.
Adult education courses.
Watch *The Today Show*.
Read *Newsweek*.

Icons: Bloody Marys; local university booster apparel.



“So always look for the silver lining
And try to find the sunny side of life.”

– P.G. Wodehouse



ACTIVE RETIREES

Configuration: Empty-nest couples; most are retired.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—55 and older.

Characteristics: Well-to-do couples with pensions and portfolios.
Lead a busy, leisure-filled retirement.
Some college educations.
Before retirement, held white-collar jobs.

Housing preferences: Retirement communities, preferably in resort locations.
Attached or small-lot detached houses.
Many live in lifestyle-oriented, age-restricted communities.

Consumption patterns: Long-lasting, luxury sedans, such as Lincolns, Cadillacs or Mercedes-Benz, which they bought with cash.
Convenience foods; items for easy entertaining: cocktail snacks and frozen desserts.
Golf or tennis fanatics.
Overseas tour packages.
Watch *60 Minutes*.
Read *House Beautiful*.

Icons: Passports; matching golf outfits.



“Just enjoy your ice cream while it’s on your plate.”

– Thornton Wilder



BLUE-COLLAR RETIREES

Configuration: Older singles and couples.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—65 and older.

Characteristics: Empty-nest, lower-middle-income households.
Former policemen, firemen, repairmen, technicians.
High-school grads.
Most are retired or nearing retirement.

Housing preferences: Bedroom suburbs of industrial cities.
Most stay in their homes, but a few choose to retire in resort locations.
More than a quarter are still living in the same house they bought when they got married.

Consumption patterns: Buick Century.
Easy-listening tapes.
Recreational vehicles; camping equipment.
Library card.
Watch *Tonight Show With Jay Leno*.
Read *Family Handyman*.

Icons: Large-screen TV; “collectible” dolls and plates.



“We’re tenting tonight on the old campground,
Give us a song to cheer
Our weary hearts, a song of home
And friends we love so dear.”

– Walter Kittredge





EMPTY NESTERS & RETIREES

– Town & Country/Exurbs –



MAINSTREAM RETIREES

Configuration: Retired couples.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—65 and older.

Characteristics: Lower-middle-income households.
Prefer to spend their “golden years” around people of all ages.
High-school educated.
Earned their living in blue- and white-collar employment.

Housing preferences: Rustic towns and villages.
Small detached houses and cottages; mobile homes.
Near water, mountain, desert or other vacation regions.

Consumption patterns: Older American-made sedans, *e.g.*—Chrysler New Yorkers, Dodge Diplomats.
Knitting; sewing; gardening; bingo; cable TV; reading.
Senior citizen volunteer programs.
Bowling; golf.
Watch *Price is Right*.
Read *Family Circle*.

Icons: Cable TV guide; aluminum folding chair.



“And love can come to everyone,
The best things in life are free.”

– Buddy De Sylva





TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

– Metropolitan Cities –



FULL-NEST URBANITES

Configuration: Multi-generational households—the “extended family.”
Average household size—4-plus persons.
Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Ethnically diverse. Upper-middle-class immigrants.
Well-educated; many pursue adult education.
Multi-racial, multi-lingual.
White-collar professionals; government and health workers.

Housing preferences: Urban neighborhoods.
Relatively settled—more than half have lived in the same house for more than six years.
Nearly three-quarters own their houses.

Consumption patterns: Toyotas, Mazdas, Hondas, Nissans.
Belong to local ethnic organizations.
Foreign movies.
Boats and RVs.
Watch *Showtime*.
Read *People*.

Icons: Neighborhood watch programs; beepers.



“America, the land of unlimited possibilities.”

– Ludwig Max Goldberger



MULTI-CULTURAL FAMILIES

Configuration: Families with lots of children; single-parent families.

Average household size—4-plus persons.

Predominant age range of adults—25 to 54.

Characteristics: Middle-income immigrant families.

High-school graduates.

Lower-level white-collar and upper-level blue-collar workers.

Jobs range from day laborers to management professionals.

Housing preferences: Older urban rowhouse and bungalow neighborhoods.

Two-thirds own their houses.

Dream of moving to larger houses in more affluent neighborhoods.

Consumption patterns: Public transportation.

Bodegas; Czech bakeries; Mexican restaurants; German breweries; Pizzerias.

Home maintenance.

Foreign-language newspapers.

Watch *Cops*.

Read *Us*.

Icons: Gitano jeans; U.S. Savings Bonds.



“America is God’s crucible, the great melting pot where all
the races are melting and reforming.”

– Israel Zangwill



BLACK URBAN FAMILIES

Configuration: Working couples with children; single-parent families.

Average household size—4 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—25 to 44.

Characteristics: Middle-class African-American households.

40 percent are college-educated.

White-collar, blue-collar, and service employment.

Teachers; craftspeople; health care employees; service workers.

Housing preferences: Rowhouses; low-rise apartments in transitional urban neighborhoods.

Mix of long-time residents and newcomers.

More than half own their houses, which they have owned for several years.

Consumption patterns: Pontiac LeMans, Plymouth Acclaim, Chevrolet Corsica, Toyota Corolla.

Saving to give their kids a better chance.

Singing in the church choir.

Volunteer and community involvement.

Watch *The Montel Williams Show*.

Read *Essence*.

Icons: Photograph of Martin Luther King; Mighty Clouds of Joy gospel tapes.



“Before a group can enter the open society,
it must first close ranks.”

– Stokely Carmichael and
Charles Vernon Hamilton



LATINO URBAN FAMILIES

Configuration: Families with children; single-parent families; extended families.
Average household size—4-plus persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 34.

Characteristics: Primarily Spanish-speaking households; many recent immigrants from Latin America and South America.
More than 43 percent did not finish high school.
Blue-collar and service employment.
Manual laborers; maintenance workers; government clerks.

Housing preferences: High-rise and low-rise apartments in older neighborhoods; rowhouses.
Nearly two-thirds are renters.
Highly mobile: more than half have moved within the last six years.

Consumption patterns: Ten-year-old Toyota Tercels, Honda Civics, Nissan Sentras.
Vibrant street life; sitting on the stoop chatting with the neighbors.
Church activities.
Social clubs.
Watch *All My Children*.
Read *Soap Opera Weekly*.

Icons: Our Lady of Guadalupe; Salsa.



“Con pan y vino se anda el camino.
[With bread and wine you can walk your road.]”

– Proverb





TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

– Metropolitan Suburbs –



FULL-NEST SUBURBANITES

Configuration: Families with two or more children.
Average household size—4-plus persons.
Predominant age range of adults—35 to 44; 45 to 54.

Characteristics: Upper-middle-income suburban families.
Significant numbers of stay-at-home Moms.
Well educated—more than two-thirds went to college.
Officers of small corporations; sales managers; communications.

Housing preferences: Upscale suburban subdivisions.
More than half have moved within the past six years.
Relatively high property values.

Consumption patterns: Practical family automobiles—mini-vans for carpooling (*e.g.*—Toyota Sienna) and SUVs for show (*e.g.*—Dodge Grand Caravan).
Family-oriented activities.
Spectator and Little League sports.
Frequent visits to Disney World.
Watch *The Disney Channel*.
Read *USA Today*.

Icons: Weber barbecue grill; “My child is an honor student at ...” bumper stickers.



“Hail wedded love, mysterious law, true source of human offspring.”

– John Milton



KIDS 'R' US

Configuration: Large families with children of all ages.
Average household size—4-plus persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 34; 35 to 44.

Characteristics: Early child-rearing families concerned with cost and convenience.
Nearly all have high-school diplomas; significant number of college degrees.
White-collar employment.
Technicians, executive trainees, public service employees; accountants.

Housing preferences: New subdivisions outside fast-growing metro areas.
Detached houses—two-stories and split-levels.
More than 75 percent own their homes, and have just started payments on a mortgage.

Consumption patterns: Station wagons, minivans, and pick-up trucks.
Maternity clothes.
Kids' toys.
Bargain shopping at Kmart, Sears and JC Penney.
Watch *Mad About You* reruns.
Read *Popular Science*.

Icons: Disposable diapers; garage sales.



“There's always room for one more.”

– Saying





TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

– *Small Cities/Edge Cities* –



COSMOPOLITAN FAMILIES

Configuration: Older families with teen-aged children.
Average household size—3-to 4 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Upper-middle- to high-income families—oldest of the Baby Boomers.
Pre-empty nesters; professional parents who had their children in their 30s.
Well educated—more than two-thirds attended college.
Prominent professionals and executives in local business, finance, law, and communications industries.

Housing preferences: Single-family neighborhoods within smaller cities.
Detached houses in wealthy enclaves, often near the country club.
More than 40 percent have moved within the past six years.

Consumption patterns: Several automobiles—one for Mom (Chevrolet Suburban), Dad (Mercedes-Benz), and the two teenagers (Volkswagon Jetta and Jeep).
Family membership at the country club.
Involvement in civic activities—historic preservation, beautification programs.
Frequent visits to Europe.
Watch *Frasier*.
Read *Bon Appetit*.

Icons: Full-screen TV in the multi-media room; family membership in English Heritage.



“Wealth is not without its advantages.”

– John Kenneth Galbraith



UNIBOX TRANSFEREES

Configuration: Families with pre-school and school-aged children.
Average household size—4 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 34; 35 to 44.

Characteristics: Upper-middle-income younger families; both spouses work.
One-third graduated from college.
On the move; frequent transfers for better jobs, better pay.
Career-oriented middle managers; many are computer literate with home offices.

Housing preferences: Single-family detached houses in brand-new subdivisions just outside suburban satellite cities.
Two-story uniboxes, easy to resell when the next transfer comes.
More than 25 percent move every year.

Consumption patterns: New Isuzu Trooper, Mercury Villager.
Heavy business travel, both spouses.
Cleaning service; laundry service; 18-hour babysitters.
Soccer Moms and Dads.
Watch *Frontline*.
Read *Fortune*.

Icons: Car phones; platinum frequent flyer cards.



“They change their clime, not their disposition.”

– Horace



MAINSTREAM FAMILIES

Configuration: Young families with several young children.

Average household size—4-plus persons.

Predominant age range of adults—25 to 34.

Characteristics: Middle-income households; early marriage and parenthood.

High-school educated.

Stable, traditional-style families; mothers rarely work.

Skilled craftsmen and union laborers.

Housing preferences: Outskirts of smaller cities.

Starter-home neighborhoods of ramblers and ranches.

Nearly 60 percent own their homes.

Consumption patterns: Mitsubishi Mirages, Geo Storms.

Pop Tarts, Kool-Aid, and other kid foods, bought in bulk; fast food restaurants.

Clothing from Kmart or Wal-Mart.

Resort campgrounds.

Watch *The Cartoon Network*.

Read *Bride's Magazine*.

Icons: Pop-up camper; Beanie Babies.



“It [tradition] cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labor.”

– T.S. Eliot





TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

– Town & Country/Exurbs –



EXURBAN ELITE

Configuration: Married couples with children.
Average household size—3 to 4 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Wealthy families living in private luxury.
Highly-educated; three-quarters have college degrees.
Former residents of cities or metropolitan suburbs who have “escaped” urban stress.
Executives; professionals; entrepreneurs; freelance consulting businesses.

Housing preferences: “Retreat” locations—the Maine coast; horse farms in Virginia; Taos, New Mexico.
“Estate” homes—custom if new; restored if old.
Among the highest home values in the nation.

Consumption patterns: Saabs, Audis, Volvos.
Extensive travel—England in spring, Nantucket in summer, Paris in fall, the Caribbean in winter.
The children attend boarding school.
Club sports.
Watch *The Late Show With David Letterman*.
Read *Martha Stewart Living*.

Icons: Home offices; private stables.



“Far from the madding crowd’s ignoble strife,
Their sober wishes never learn’d to stray;
Along the cool sequester’d vale of life
They kept the noiseless tenor of their way.”

– Thomas Gray



FULL-NEST EXURBANITES

Configuration: Families with children.

Average household size—3 to 4 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—35 to 44; 45 to 54.

Characteristics: Upper-middle-income families who relocate frequently.

Family- and outdoor-oriented.

Well educated, with college degrees.

Professional and managerial workers, following high-tech companies.

Housing preferences: Rural, upscale boomtowns.

Detached houses in new subdivisions, often on recently-developed farmland.

Close to corporations located along major highway corridors.

Consumption patterns: Minivans (*e.g.*—Plymouth Grand Voyager) and SUVs (*e.g.*—GMC Safari.)

Camping in state forests; hiking; backpacking; canoeing.

Gardens and golf.

Video cameras, VCRs and stereo equipment.

Watch *Home Improvement* reruns.

Read *Golf Magazine*.

Icons: Garden tiller; Newcomers Club membership.



“A piece of land not so very large, which would contain a garden,
and near the house a spring of ever-flowing water,
and beyond these a bit of wood.”

– Horace



NEW-TOWN FAMILIES

Configuration: Families with children of all ages.
Average household size—4 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 44.

Characteristics: Young, upper-middle-class town families.
High-school graduates, two-thirds have gone to local universities.
Cost-conscious early adopters.
Local white- and blue-collar occupations.

Housing preferences: Upper-middle-class neighborhoods of satellite cities or the metropolitan fringes.
Detached houses, with multi-family in some areas.
Nearly 80 percent own their homes, which are mortgaged to the hilt.

Consumption patterns: Ford Windstar.
Fitness freaks.
Volunteers at schools and sporting clubs.
Little League baseball; children's soccer and football leagues.
Watch *Good Morning America*.
Read *PC Magazine*.

Icons: Home treadmill; maxed-out credit cards.



“The root of the state is in the family.”

– Mencius



PILLARS OF THE COMMUNITY

Configuration: Families with school-age children and teenagers.

Average household size—3 to 4 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Well-to-do families with “standing” in the community.

High-school graduates, with some college.

Conservative businesspeople.

Presidents of local banks, mortuaries, department stores; small-business owners;
local doctors and lawyers.

Housing preferences: Semi-rural small towns fast becoming middle-class suburbs.

The nicest house on the nicest street in town.

New subdivisions on the edge of town.

Consumption patterns: Buy “American”—cars, clothes, cameras.

Belong to the country club.

High volunteerism—garden club, hospital, church activities.

The sons play football; the daughters are cheerleaders.

Watch *The Today Show*.

Read *Country Living*.

Icons: Bass-fishing boat; Caribbean cruises.



“Always give your best, never get discouraged, never be petty.”

– Richard M. Nixon



MIDDLE-AMERICAN FAMILIES

Configuration: Families with many children.
 Average household size—4-plus persons.
 Predominant age range of adults—25 to 44.

Characteristics: Middle-class, middle-American families living in middle-sized towns.
 Nearly all are high school graduates; a few went to college.
 Worry about maintaining their living standards.
 Small shopkeepers; retail workers; salespersons; nurses.

Housing preferences: Mid-sized towns.
 Stable neighborhoods.
 Mostly three-bedroom ramblers, although mobile homes are an affordable alternative for the younger families.

Consumption patterns: Ford pick-ups and Pontiac Grand Prix.
 Lots of pets, including dogs, cats, rabbits, parakeets, gerbils.
 Fast food and family barbecues.
 Little League baseball and bowling leagues.
 Watch *America's Most Wanted*.
 Read *Parenting*.

Icons: Hummel figurines on the mantel; bowling league trophies in the den.



“You will be safest in the middle.”

– Ovid



YOUNG HOMESTEADERS

Configuration: Families with children.

Average household size—3 to 4 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—35 to 44.

Characteristics: Middle-class families priced out of suburbia.

Some college educations.

Paramount concern is a safe place for children.

Decent jobs in retail, health and the communications industries.

Housing preferences: In or near rapidly-growing exurban areas.

Bungalows, ranches and Cape Cods.

About 70 percent own their homes.

Consumption patterns: Jeep Grand Wagoneers and GMC Sierras.

Wilderness camping; backpacking.

Halloween.

At-home Saturday nights.

Watch *CBS Evening News*.

Read *National Geographic*.

Icons: Campers; every kind of pet.



“Ah, wilderness were Paradise enow!”

– Omar Khayyám





TRADITIONAL & NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILIES

– Agrarian/Rural –



HEARTLAND FAMILIES

Configuration: Married couples, most with kids.
Average household size—3 to 5 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Rural, family-oriented households.
More than half were born and raised in the same place, the rest just arrived from the city.
High-school graduates.
Well-paid skilled craftsmen; machinists; builders; farmers.

Housing preferences: Quiet towns in scenic settings.
New ranch-house developments surrounding old town centers.
Most own their own detached homes, be it two-story, bilevel, ranch, or mobile home.

Consumption patterns: Chevrolet Astros and Plymouth Grand Voyagers.
Hunting; fishing; boating; other outdoor activities.
Needlepoint and photography.
Vegetable gardens.
Watch *Full House* reruns.
Read *Outdoor Life*.

Icons: “His,” “hers,” and “theirs” backpacks and sleeping bags; fly fishing reel.



“His first, best country ever is, at home.”

– Oliver Goldsmith



SMALL-TOWN FAMILIES

Configuration: Married couples, most with children.
Average household size—4 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—35 to 44; 45 to 54.

Characteristics: Solid middle-class citizens.
High-school graduates.
Raising kids in an old-fashioned way of life.
Blue-collar and farming jobs.

Housing preferences: Rural middle-class towns.
Farmhouses, of the front-porch variety; ranches, ramblers, and mobile homes.
Predominantly homeowners.

Consumption patterns: Dodge, Ford and Chevy pick-up trucks; Chevy Lumina.
Friday night football at the local high school.
Boats and campers for fishing and hunting.
Church suppers.
Watch *Family Channel*.
Read *Family Circle*.

Icons: American flag; bib overalls.



“No Farmers, No Food.”

– Bumper Sticker



RUSTIC FAMILIES

Configuration: Married couples with school-age children.

Average household size—4 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Lower-middle-income households.

High-school educated.

Respectful children, well-tended gardens, a few cattle for extra money.

Farmers; blue-collar workers, many in the lumber industry; military recruits.

Housing preferences: Rural crossroads villages.

Modest detached houses or mobile homes; ranch houses on small lots.

Over 80 percent own their homes.

Consumption patterns: Chevrolet, Dodge and Ford 4x4 pickup trucks with CD players and gun racks.

Guns; woodworking; auto repair; country music; needlepoint.

Deer hunting; target shooting.

A week in the woods during deer season.

Watch *Family Feud*.

Read *Guns & Ammo*.

Icons: Camouflage hunting outfit; professional chain saw.



“When you’re running down our country, man,
You’re walking on the fightin’ side of me.”

– Merle Haggard





YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES

– Metropolitan Cities –



URBAN ELITE

Configuration: Mostly singles; some couples.

Average household size—1 person.

Predominant age range of adults—35 to 44; 45 to 54.

Characteristics: Elite career-oriented urban singles and couples.

Well educated—more than two-thirds are college graduates; many have advanced degrees.

Trend-setters.

Youthful executives and professionals in business, finance, entertainment, and education who have achieved success at an early age.

Housing preferences: In-town and downtown big cities—two-thirds live in New York.

Upscale high-rise apartments.

Two-thirds rent their apartments; the rest own coops or condominiums.

Consumption patterns: Few own cars; most travel by taxi or train. But if they do, Ferraris, Alfa Romeos, and Porsches.

Empty refrigerators.

Early adopters—the first to own Palm Pilots, cell phones.

Work hard and play hard.

Watch *Late Night with Conan O'Brien*.

Read *The New York Times*.

Icons: Conan O'Brien; PC banking.



“The only credential the city asked was the boldness to dream.
For those who did, it unlocked its gates and its treasures,
not caring who they were or where they came from.”

– Moss Hart



E-TYPES

Configuration: Mostly singles, some couples just a few years out of college.
Average household size—1 to 2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 44.

Characteristics: High-living, high-energy city-dwellers.
Half have college degrees; another quarter attended some college.
Education, exercise and ecology.
E-businesses, information technologies.

Housing preferences: Upscale urban neighborhoods, often near universities.
Half rent; half own city townhouses or apartments.
Median home value is third highest in the nation.

Consumption patterns: Audi 90s, BMWs, Volkswagens.
Everything on-line.
Frequent movers.
Travel—Club Med.
Watch *The Simpsons*.
Read *Scientific American*.

Icons: Bandwidth; Urban Outfitters.



“Are we having fun yet?”
– Bill Griffith



URBAN ACHIEVERS

Configuration: Singles, couples.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 34.

Characteristics: Well-educated upper-middle-class households.
60 percent college graduates.
Ethnically diverse; many are recent immigrants.
Students; professionals in business, finance, and public service.

Housing preferences: Diverse urban neighborhoods.
Half own, half rent townhouses, rowhouses, or apartments.
Housing stock ranges from SROs to ornate \$600,000 townhouses.

Consumption patterns: Transit cards.
Ethnic clubs and restaurants.
Imported food, newspapers, videos and CDs.
Travel extensively.
Watch *Seinfeld* reruns.
Read *Esquire*.

Icons: Running shoes with business suits; credit cards and green cards.



“¿Qué pasa, dude?”

– Greeting



NEW BOHEMIANS

Configuration: Mostly singles; very few couples.
Average household size—1 person.
Predominant age range of adults—20 to 34.

Characteristics: Unconventional, ethnically-diverse, upper-middle-income households.
“Politically correct” college graduates.
The social and political *avant-garde*; one-third are gay.
Executives; students; actors; artists; writers; boutique owners; public-interest advocates.

Housing preferences: In-town and downtown urban neighborhoods.
Three-quarters rent; the rest own flats in brownstones, older apartment houses, and converted lofts.

Consumption patterns: Transit cards.
Trendy nightspots.
Poetry readings and gallery openings.
Risk-tolerant urban appreciators.
Watch *Nightline*.
Read *Interview*.

Icons: Jean-Michèl Basquiat; state-of the-art haircuts.



“Sacred cows make the tastiest hamburger.”

– Abbie Hoffman





YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES

– *Metropolitan Suburbs* –



THE VIPS

Configuration: Couples and some singles.
Average household size—2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 44.

Characteristics: Dual-income, dual-career couples.
Nearly three-quarters have attended or graduated from college.
Yesterday: *Fast-Track Professionals*. Tomorrow: *Nouveau Money*.
White-collar professionals: executive vice presidents; department heads;
partner.

Housing preferences: Upper-middle-class neighborhoods just outside the beltways.
New single-family detached homes in brand-new subdivisions close to *Nouveau Money* neighborhoods.
Upscale condos and townhouses in more urban areas.

Consumption patterns: New Lexus.
Downtown commuters.
Financial planning services.
Racquetball; squash.
Watch *News Hour With Jim Lehrer*.
Read *INC*.

Icons: Espresso maker; digital camera.



“Power is the great aphrodisiac.”

– Henry Kissinger



FAST-TRACK PROFESSIONALS

Configuration: Singles and couples.
Average household size—1 to 2 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 44.

Characteristics: Upper-middle-income households—young suburban professionals.
Type-A college grads.
Career- and lifestyle-oriented techies.
Employed by software and IT companies, communications firms.

Housing preferences: Upscale inner suburbs of large cities.
Upscale condominiums, townhouses, and apartments.
Half own, half rent their residences.

Consumption patterns: New foreign cars; sport-utility vehicles with roof racks.
High-tech electronics.
Exercise equipment and health clubs.
Coffee bars, clubs, microbreweries.
Watch *Saturday Night Live*.
Read *Vanity Fair*.

Icons: REI; Bayliner ski boat.



“Nothing succeeds like success.”

– Alexandre Dumas, père



SUBURBAN ACHIEVERS

Configuration: Ethnically-mixed married couples, a few children.
Average household size—2 to 3 persons.
Predominant age range of adults—25 to 34.

Characteristics: Multi-lingual, multi-ethnic households in the heart of suburbia.
High-school and college graduates.
First- and second-generation immigrants.
White-collar workers looking for upward mobility.

Housing preferences: Older suburbs near the big city.
Just over half own their homes—starter single-family, townhouses, or
condominiums.
The rest are renters in suburban apartment complexes.

Consumption patterns: Used foreign cars.
Jet skis and snowmobiles.
Shopping at the malls.
Commute to downtown.
Watch *Friends*.
Read *Time*.

Icons: In-line skates; ESL classes.



“What’s up?!?”

– Greeting



GENERATION X

Configuration: Mostly singles; some couples; single parents with kids.

Average household size—1 to 2 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—22 to 35.

Characteristics: Young adults in a state of transition.

Sixty percent went to college.

Many divorcés/divorcées and single-parents.

Students, teachers, hospital workers, white-collar and clerical employment.

Housing preferences: Sunbelt Boomtowns.

Apartments, townhouses, and modest single-family houses.

Nearly three-quarters are renters.

Consumption patterns: Inexpensive import, such as Hyundai.

Any kind of social situation, including health clubs, evening classes, sports bars, single-parent groups.

Taco Bell and Burger King.

Mountain bikes; beanbag chairs; and milk-crate shelves.

Watch *Saturday Night Live*.

Read *Spin*.

Icons: McJobs; disposable lighters.



“Oh well, whatever, never mind.”

– Kurt Cobain





YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES

– *Small Cities/Edge Cities* –



TWENTYSOMETHINGS

Configuration: Mostly singles; couples.

Average household size—1 to 2 persons.

Predominant age ranges—20 to 34.

Characteristics: Middle-income singles and couples.

Recent college graduates who have moved to “edge city” areas to start their careers.

Good pay for a first job in a relatively inexpensive area.

Starter positions in info-tech start-ups, public and private service industries.

Housing preferences: Fast-growing satellite cities; small-city suburbs.

Sixty percent rent units in apartment complexes, as most of these young people have just moved into the area.

The 40 percent who are owners bought starter houses, townhouses, or condominiums.

Consumption patterns: Old Volvos and BMWs.

Take-out, fast food, and happy hour grazing.

Health clubs and night clubs.

Jeans and t-shirts.

Watch *Comedy Central*.

Read *Rolling Stone*.

Icons: Rollerblades; MTV.



“You can’t always get what you want
But if you try sometimes
You just might find
You get what you need.”

– Mick Jagger and Keith Richard



UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE AFFILIATES

Configuration: Mostly singles and some couples (cohabs), few children.

Average household size—1 to 2 persons.

Predominant age ranges—Under 24; 25 to 34.

Characteristics: Half are still in college; half out, often college employees.

Students and college graduates; the highly-educated professionals that teach them.

“Trust Fund Babies,” who get by on their parents’ largesse.

Recent grads who’ve launched start-up companies, white-collar workers.

Housing preferences: College and university towns.

Three-quarters are renters in apartment complexes or houses.

Students often live off-campus.

Consumption patterns: Compact imports such as VW, Toyota.

Wine, beer, and CDs.

College sports and skiing.

ATM card.

Watch *Friends*.

Read *Sports Illustrated*.

Icons: Birkenstocks; Grateful Dead CDs (same as it ever was).



“Youth is wholly experimental.”

– Robert Louis Stevenson





YOUNGER SINGLES & COUPLES

– Agrarian/Rural –



PC PIONEERS

Configuration: Married couples, a few with one or two children.

Average household size—2 to 3 persons.

Predominant age range of adults—35 to 54.

Characteristics: Well-educated urban-exile couples.

Citized rustics with New Age values.

Home-based businesses; or work-at-home, connected to the office via computer modem.

Housing preferences: An hour's drive from the closest metro in scenic rural areas.

Detached residences in small new housing developments, many at cluster densities.

Wood-burning stoves.

Consumption patterns: Pick-up trucks and Jeeps.

Home recycling center, composter.

Home office.

Organic food.

Watch *NBC Nightly News*.

Read *Country Living*.

Icons: Personal website; satellite dish.



“:-)”

– Cyberspace Smile



ZIMMERMAN/VOLK ASSOCIATES, INC.

6 East Main Street
Clinton, New Jersey 08809
908 735-6336 • 908 735-4751 *facsimile*
www.ZVA.cc • info@ZVA.cc

Research & Strategic Analysis

COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP—

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. retains all rights, title and interest to all aspects of this report. This report cannot be copied or distributed by any person or entity other than the client without the express written permission of Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

