Corporation for Supportive Housing
Brooke Page
BCC Special 7/14/21

CSH

Prioritizing Households with Extremely Low Incomes in Nevada's American Rescue Plan

The Need

The COVID-19 pandemic has shed light on critical gaps in housing and community-based services for vulnerable families and individuals in communities throughout the State. CSH's National Supportive Housing Needs Assessment estimates that roughly 8,000 Nevadans need deeply affordable permanent housing paired with wrap around services, also known as "supportive housing." These households include families and individuals experiencing homelessness and/or unnecessary institutionalization, including 2,000 transition age youth, 1,000 aging seniors on fixed or no income, and 2,500 people with justice involved backgrounds. Today's housing crisis is further compounded by an 11 percent increase in rental home prices in 2021 over those of 2020. With a rising demand for market rate units and low vacancy rates, households who are severely rent burdened or lack sufficient services are at the greatest risk of experiencing homelessness. These needs are further compounded by years of racial inequality in our public systems. In Nevada, According to CSH's Racial Disparities and Disproportionality Index (RDDI) Black People are five times more likely, compared to other racial groups, to interact with the homeless response, justice, child welfare, and other crisis response systems. American Indian/ Alaska Native and Hispanic/Latinx populations are also over represented in these systems.

The Solution

The $3.7 billion allocation of State and Local Fiscal Recovery (SLFR) funds and $37 million allocation from HOME-ARP from the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) offers Nevada a once-in-a-generation opportunity to seed supportive housing development in Nevada, demonstrate the evidence-based effectiveness, and make the case to scale this intervention to meet the need.

Although SLFR funds and HOME-ARP fund sources can provide the necessary funding to seed supportive housing, the process to ensure that a sustainable pipeline continues long after ARPA funds expires requires a collective impact approach. This undertaking will require all systems of care to prioritize allocating resources to address the need. The Governor's commitment, vision, leadership and budget, Legislative Action to codify sound policies, State Departments like the Housing Division, Health and Human Services, and State Corrections will need to align resources to provide quality services and prioritize funding for housing. The local Public Housing Authorities play an important role to help provide needed Project Based Vouchers to keep developed units affordable and align with community partners to prioritize certain populations like those with justice involvement as stated in HUD Secretary Fudge's June 23, 2021 letter.

Prioritizing a substantial portion of ARPA funds for development for households with extremely low incomes and significant service needs aligns with the Every Nevadan Recovery Framework Mission Statement by prioritizing basic needs, community, economy, and quality of life and helps the State deliver on some of its key priorities:

- **Supporting Disadvantaged Communities**: increasing access to healthcare and community-based services by addressing the immediate and long-term housing insecurity;
- **Investing in Infrastructure**: accelerating capital projects throughout Nevada that will result in the creation of high-paying construction and development jobs now;
- **Modernizing and Enhancing State Government Services**: increase efficiency across state government and align resources across major systems to improve services for Nevada's residents.

To Learn More Visit csh.org or
Contact: Brooke.Page@csh.org

Updated:7/9/21

Addressing communities and households disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 will also address U.S. Department of Treasury's May 10, 2021 guidance suggesting that states make "investments in housing and neighborhoods, such as services to address individuals experiencing homelessness, affordable housing development, housing vouchers, and residential counseling and housing navigation assistance to facilitate moves to neighborhoods with high economic opportunity." Putting opportunity into action will require significant collaboration among multiple state and local agencies, intricate layering and leveraging of multiple fund sources, and development and evaluation of key performance indicators to ensure the most vulnerable Nevadans are housed and remain housed permanently.

About Supportive Housing

Supportive housing is an innovative and proven solution to some of communities' toughest problems. It combines deeply affordable housing with services that help people who face the most complex challenges to live with stability, autonomy and dignity. Supportive housing improves housing stability, employment, mental and physical health, and school attendance; and reduces active substance use. People in supportive housing live more stable and productive lives. Supportive housing costs essentially the same as keeping people homeless and stuck in the revolving door of high-cost crisis care and emergency housing.

The COVID-19 pandemic has illuminated the importance that Housing is HealthCare! Non-congregate housing was critical to reduce the spread of COVID-19 and we see the health benefits when a person has a roof, can stabilize in a safe environment and then focus on their personal needs like physical health, behavioral health or increasing income.

Developing Supportive Housing

Developing new supportive housing requires "three legs of a stool"- capital, operating, and services funding. To mobilize and leverage ARPA funds to create enough supportive housing to meet the need, the State will need to carefully braid these new resources with its existing sources noted in Table 2.

- Capital financing is the funding for both the hard and soft costs of new construction and rehabilitation (e.g. land acquisition, construction costs, and architectural design) needed to plan, re-habilitate and build or acquire new housing.
- Operating sources cover the gap between the costs of operating an apartment building (e.g., utilities, property management, maintenance, etc.) and what the tenants can afford to pay in rent and utilities which traditionally is 30 percent of the household income. As an example, the average Social Security Income (SSI) for Nevada is $775 per month. If this household only had SSI income, they would not pay more than $232 per month on rent and utilities.
- Services funding pays for the services that help families and individuals get housed and stay housed (e.g. navigation, tenancy supports, substance use disorder treatment, and mental health services).

When leasing apartments in the private market, no capital sources are needed, and rental assistance takes the place of operating subsidies. Rental assistance pays the difference between a tenant's affordable rent and the market rate rent for their apartment. A mix of new construction, acquisition/re-habilitation, and leased housing make for the best array of tenant choices.

The Funding Request

The State's initial needs analysis calls for the creation of 4,458 units of supportive housing statewide to address the supportive housing deficit. These numbers provide a baseline for development goals and targets for the State to strive towards. Having specific goals for the State helps to align advocacy and planning efforts, maximizes resources and generates a shared commitment that can support targeted efforts.

In order to determine jurisdictional need of how much supportive housing will address housing deficits and in-flows into the homeless response system, CSH uses a formula that encompasses local need data, point in time counts for those experiencing homelessness, existing housing inventory and a variety of sector level data to assess inflows into the homeless response system and gaps. Considering the importance of this process by jurisdiction, CSH is recommending that resources be made available to conduct a comprehensive supportive housing needs assessment for each jurisdiction in the state to truly identify, account, and develop targeted goals for unit production.

For the purposes of this document, CSH is utilizing a hybrid approach utilizing publicly-available data for Northern Nevada and Balance of State and system modeling results conducted by Southern Nevada to estimate need to develop 4,458 units of supportive housing.

1. National Supportive Housing Needs Assessment assesses data across a spectrum of public systems that provides a compilation of point in time, or census counts for people involved in multiple public systems that have needs consistent with supportive housing.
2. In 2020, Southern Nevada conducted a robust System Modeling process that utilized numerous sources to determine the permanent supportive housing need across multiple subpopulations. Using data provided from the August 24, 2020 Southern Nevada System Modeling Report CSH has modified State supportive housing needs projections to account for this robust process.

Refinements to the exact number of units needed can and should be made on a regular basis to ensure that supply meets demand over time and to account for inflation and prevailing wage by considering fluctuations in the rental housing market; new policies that help or hinder unit creation; federal, state, and local resource alignment; and public support.

Financial Model Assumptions

In order to establish the costs of creating/rehabbing and operating 4,458 units over Three-Phases totaling a ten-year period, a number of essential costs drivers have to be evaluated. The total costs may differ depending on whether the supportive housing is created through development of new affordable housing units or buildings purchased and rehabbed for supportive housing. The cost of newly constructed units includes the one-time capital cost of acquiring land and building the units as well as the ongoing cost of maintenance and operation of the building. Acquisition will require building acquisition, rehabilitation to ensure habitability and ongoing cost of maintenance and operation of the building. Both acquisition/rehabilitation and new constructions of supportive housing requires the ongoing cost of providing support services to the tenants in the units. The plan outlined in this document used working assumptions for these costs, summarized below:

1. The average 2021 per-unit cost for new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation in Nevada using the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit project estimates.
2. The fair market rents and estimated affordable tenant rents for one-bedroom apartments for single adults and three-bedroom apartments for families based on the Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV metropolitan statistical area.
3. The national average for supportive service costs based on a 1:10 caseload ratio for service providers at a living salary wage

Table 1.1 Supportive Housing Stock Needed: Type of Units

Total Supportive Housing Need	Total Need by Region/Statewide	Percentage of State Need
Southern Nevada	2,372	53%
Northern Nevada	1,206	27%
Balance of State	880	20%
Statewide	4,458	100%

Table 1.2 Per Unit Cost Estimates for Supportive Housing

Developed/ Unit	Per Unit Cost
Capital One Time Costs	$231,580
Operating Subsidy Per Year-Ongoing Costs	$9,324
Services Per Year-Ongoing Costs	$7,200

1.3 Total Supportive Housing Pipeline Need Cost by Region

County	Supportive Housing Need	Capital Total	Operating Total/Yr.	Services Total/Yr.
Southern Nevada[1]	2,372	$549,307,706	$22,116,528	$14,028,008
Northern Nevada	1,206	$279,285,480	$11,244,744	$8,683,200
Balance of State	880	$203,790,400	$8,205,120	$6,336,000
Statewide	4,458	$1,032,383,640	41,566,392	$29,047,208

Phase I) (Years 1 – 2) ARPA Seeding Demonstration Allocation

Development of deeply affordable supportive housing units are extremely limited throughout the State. To demonstrate the evidence-based effectiveness of supportive housing for some of the States most vulnerable populations, Phase I will cover a two-year period and utilize ARPA resources to help seed pipeline development and jumpstart unit creation or rehabilitation processes.

To seed pipeline development of supportive housing, CSH recommends a phased approach using the following budget allocations based on eligible uses of various ARPA, state, and local sources. By leveraging HOME-ARP and State Local Fiscal Recovery Funds to compliment the average LIHTC estimated allocation, Nevada can incentivize developers to embed deeply affordable units for households who make zero to 30 percent below area median income (AMI) in planned affordable housing projects.

Based on 2021 estimated LIHTC estimates of 636 units, CSH proposes that 20 percent or 130 units of the total allocation be set-aside each year for a total of 260 units in Phase I, (roughly 6 percent of the total State need), for development/rehabilitation of units for households who make zero to 30 percent below AMI. The costs for Phase I

[1] Southern Nevada need estimate based on the August 24, 2020 System Modeling Report conducted by Written by HUD Technical Assistance Providers from CSH and The Cloudburst Group

can be leveraged with ARPA funds with a combination of nine percent LIHTC tax credits, existing HOME funds, Community Development Block Grants, Health and Human Services resources and the State Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The estimates provided can be distributed across geographies based on the regional state need percentages outlined in Table 1.1.

Table 1.4 Phase 1 Funding Request Year 1

Funding Request for 130 Units of Supportive Housing				
Sources	Capital	Operating/yr.	Services/yr.	Initial Investment
SLFR[2]	$3,224,004			$3,224,004
HOME-ARP[3]	$9,672,012			$9,672,012
LIHTC[4] 9%	$17,209,384			$17,209,384
State Housing Trust Fund		$1,212,120		$1,212,120
HHS[5]			$936,000	$936,000
Total	$30,105,400	$1,212,120	$936,000	$32,253,520

Table 1.5 Phase 1 Funding Request Year 2

Funding Request for 130 New Units and Operating/ Servicing 260 Units in Year 1 & 2					
Sources	Capital	Operating/yr.	Services/yr.	Year 2 Total	15-yr. Total Yr. 1 & 2
SLFR[6]	$3,224,004			$3,224,004	$6,448,008
HOME-ARP[7]	$9,672,012			$9,672,012	$19,344,024
LIHTC[8] 9%	$17,209,384			$17,209,384	$34,418,767
State Housing Trust Fund[9]		$2,448,482		$2,448,482	$4,471,586
HHS[10]			$1,900,080	$1,900,080	$2,874,041
Total	$30,105,400	$2,448,482	$1,900,080	$34,453,962	$67,556,425

[2] SLFR: State Local Fiscal Recovery Funds – American Rescue Plan Act. Amount is 25% of the total set aside capital cost

[3] HOME-ARP - American Rescue Plan Act is 75% of the total set aside capital cost

[4] LIHTC: Low Income Housing Tax Credits – Based on 20% of state annual projected allocation. Figures are based on the average 2020 equity investment over the 10-year IRS period.

[5] HHS: Health and Human Services Sources: Medicaid, Substance Abuse Mental Health Block Grants, Mental Health Block Grants etc.

[6] SLFR: State Local Fiscal Recovery Funds – American Rescue Plan Act. Amount is 25% of the total set aside capital cost

[7] HOME-ARP - American Rescue Plan Act is 75% of the total set aside capital cost

[8] LIHTC: Low Income Housing Tax Credits – Based on 20% of state annual projected allocation. Figures are based on the average 2020 equity investment over the 10-year IRS period.

[9] State Housing Trust Fund can be replaced with other funding sources that can be used for operating expenses. 15-year affordability period accounts for a 2% inflation rate per year.

[10] HHS: Health and Human Services Sources: Medicaid, Substance Abuse Mental Health Block Grants, Mental Health Block Grants etc. Sources can be replaced with other funding that can be used. 15-year affordability period accounts for a 3% inflation rate per year.

Phase II) (Years 3 -7) 5-Years Funding Alignment

To support an ongoing pipeline of supportive housing post ARPA funding investments, coordination of resources from various funding sources will be needed and coordinated during Phase I. Phase II will utilize coordinated efforts to jointly fund and scale an ongoing pipeline of supportive housing to continue to address the supportive housing need by increasing the annual development goal. Coordinated tracking, data integration and evaluation during Phase II will help make the business case for dedicated resources to fund supportive housing in perpetuity through a dedicated funding source. Phase II will account for an annual goal of 260 units year three, 520 units in year four, 780 units in year five, 1,060 units in year six, and 1,340 units in year seven. The costs for Phase II are shared using various eligible funding sources as well as leveraging a combination of 9% tax credits, Community Development Block Grants, and State Affordable Housing Trust Fund dollars. Five-year totals for Phase II can create 3,960 units of supportive housing (combined with Phase I, can meet 95% the total unit need).

Phase III) (Years 8 – 10) Dedicated Funding for a Supportive Housing Pipeline

Utilizing the research and business case from Phase II, a budget request will be needed in Phase III to ensure the state has:

- a dedicated funding source to meet and exceed the current supportive housing need of 238 units,
- resources to sustain the existing supportive housing operating and supportive services costs as well as,
- resources to fully address and account for ongoing capacity building and workforce development needs of supportive housing.

Coordinated tracking, data integration and evaluation will continue in Phase III and will help refine appropriate requests. Phase III will account for an annual development goal of 120 units each year along with sustaining the existing 4,220 units from Phases I and II. The costs for Phase III will be proposed for legislative action and development continue to leverage a combination of 9% tax credits, Community Development Block Grants, and State Affordable Housing Trust Fund dollars to pencil the remaining supportive housing project need.
Three-year totals in Phase III can create 360 new units (combined with Phase I and II will meet and exceed the total State need creating a total of 4,580 units) of supportive housing.

CSH

The Policy Request

Develop a Capacity Building Strategy

The workforce related to supportive housing will need training and capacity building to operate quality supportive housing as defined by CSH's Dimensions of Quality Supportive Housing standards. To aid in the process of developing the field to meet quality standards, CSH recommends the State host an annual Supportive Housing Institute aimed to build the capacity of developers, direct service providers, property managers, and health care partners to develop, operate, and/or form strong partnerships to deliver new, high-quality supportive housing developments. To ensure that housing developments created through the Institute are successful in their applications the State should work to prioritize projects who complete the Institute by setting aside capital, operating and supportive service funding to help fund projects that complete the Institute training program.

Table 2: available funding sources

Funding	Capital	Operating	Service
SAMSHA			X
Medicaid			X
Ryan White			X
LIHTC	X		Limited
HOME	X		
CoC	X	X	X
CDBG	X		X
HOPWA		X	X
Hospitals/Philanthropy	X	X	X
CDFI Loans	X		
National Housing Trust Fund	X	X	
Public Housing Authority	X	X	
Social Impact Bonds		X	X
Tax Reserves	X		X
Housing Bonds	X		X
OZ Funds	X		
State LIHTC	X		
Housing Vouchers		X	
State Agencies		X	X

Layer Housing and Services Funding Sources

In response to COVID-19, the CARES Act and American Rescue Plan Act appropriates significant new resources that, if aligned strategically, can have a substantial impact in supporting systemic change from emergency response and institutional settings to long-term, permanent housing. Coronavirus funds such as Community Development Block Grants (CDBG-CV), State and Local Fiscal Recovery funds and HOME-ARP can be used for longer-term options such as capital, rental assistance, housing navigation, and tenancy support services. Waivers may also be requested for CDBG appropriations from FY19 and FY20 to align these monies for broader, long-term COVID-19 responses. In addition to the CARES Act funding, it is critical to consider additional sources of funds that can be aligned. The adjacent table outlines additional resources that may be available that can be used to maximize LIHTCs. Table 2 provides examples of possible available funding sources for consideration. Based on a review of other resources to expand supportive housing development, almost two-thirds of HFAs incentivize braiding of funds such as project-based rental assistance or state housing tax credits. HFAs should extend this model and look to partner with other state agencies such housing, child welfare agency, and/or department of corrections to pair housing vouchers and services dollars with development capital. State Medicaid Waivers and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant dollars are ideal sources to consider braiding to address the supportive service needs for supportive housing.

Develop a Multi-Jurisdictional, Multi-Sector Team

The State should develop a non- partisan, cross-divisional team responsible for identifying solutions, aligning resources throughout the state, and promoting best practices. This can be achieved through executive order and/or legislative action. In some cases, states may have already developed an HFA workgroup to guide the QAP process or a State Interagency Council on Homelessness (SICH) that brings together secretaries and commissioners from key governmental departments, often including the HFA, with stakeholders. States may look to leverage the SICHs as a platform for solving the upstream challenges of housing instability and affordability. Alternatively, in states that have not developed SICHs or where SICHs choose to remain explicitly focused on ending homelessness, states can create a cross-divisional team by bringing together the HFA with core state agencies, such as Housing, Health and Human Services, Child Welfare, Corrections, Economic Development, Education, and Finance. The governor may appoint a chair for the taskforce or members may select a leader or co-leaders. It should be the goal of the taskforce to coordinate available development and services resources across all partner agencies to ensure impact is maximized.

Conduct a Supportive Housing Needs Assessment

As a first step, the Housing Taskforce should conduct a thorough housing needs assessment, with a specific focus on supportive housing. This should include total number of units needed in each community across the state and details on specific vulnerable populations. The taskforce should leverage the administrative data across state agencies to create a wide reach in their review. To underscore the necessity of linking data across systems, data sharing agreements should be codified in statute or through an agreed upon Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The findings from the need's assessment should be accompanied with concrete solutions including an implementation strategy and a supportive housing production plan. The production plan must include the number of units needed in each community and details on funding resources that developers can access to meet the production goals.

Develop Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Report on Progress

In addition to HFAs reporting on the number of units projected and actualized from the LIHTC supportive housing allocation, similar efforts should be made to report on the progress of the Housing Taskforce. The taskforce must set clear expected outcomes and review data annually to determine progress on both implementation and unit production plans. While the Housing Taskforce is encouraged to develop its own set of KPIs to track outcomes based on the goals set forth and agreed upon by its members, at a minimum it should track the total number of units in the production pipeline and the total number of units created. The governor or legislature may consider mandating an annual report to key offices or committees to ensure outcomes are being met. During annual reporting, the taskforce may consider budgetary requests to support the Housing Taskforce goals and develop capacity through training for service providers, developers, and property managers.

Public comment
Ed Uehling
BCC Special 7/14/21

▶ 10 ⏭ 🔇 00:00 / 05:00

Other Cities in United States

City Name	Population
New York City (/cities/23083/new-york-city/population)	18,823,000
Los Angeles (/cities/23052/los-angeles/population)	12,459,000
Chicago (/cities/22956/chicago/population)	8,877,000
Houston (/cities/23014/houston/population)	6,491,000
Dallas-Fort Worth (/cities/22966/dallas-fort-worth/population)	6,397,000
Miami (/cities/23064/miami/population)	6,167,000
Atlanta (/cities/22922/atlanta/population)	5,911,000
Philadelphia (/cities/23098/philadelphia/population)	5,734,000
Washington DC (/cities/23174/washington-dc/population)	5,378,000
Phoenix (/cities/23099/phoenix/population)	4,584,000
Boston (/cities/22939/boston/population)	4,315,000
Detroit (/cities/22974/detroit/population)	3,530,000
Seattle (/cities/23140/seattle/population)	3,461,000
San Francisco (/cities/23130/san-francisco/population)	3,313,000
San Diego (/cities/23129/san-diego/population)	3,272,000

Las Vegas - Historical Population Data

Year	Population	Growth Rate
2021	2,772,000	2.70%
2020	2,699,000	2.98%
2019	2,621,000	3.15%
2018	2,541,000	3.67%
2017	2,451,000	3.68%
2016	2,364,000	3.68%
2015	2,280,000	3.68%
2014	2,199,000	3.68%
2013	2,121,000	3.67%
2012	2,046,000	3.70%
2011	1,973,000	3.68%
2010	1,903,000	3.65%
2009	1,836,000	3.67%
2008	1,771,000	3.69%
2007	1,708,000	3.70%
2006	1,647,000	3.65%
2005	1,589,000	3.72%
2004	1,532,000	3.65%
2003	1,478,000	3.72%
2002	1,425,000	3.64%
2001	1,375,000	3.70%
2000	1,326,000	5.83%
1999	1,253,000	6.55%
1998	1,176,000	6.52%
1997	1,104,000	6.56%
1996	1,036,000	6.47%
1995	973,000	6.57%
1994	913,000	6.53%

41%

43%

87%

Other Cities in United States	
Minneapolis (/cities/23068/minneapolis/population)	2,946,000
Tampa (/cities/23160/tampa/population)	2,911,000
Denver (/cities/22972/denver/population)	2,862,000
Las Vegas (/cities/23043/las-vegas/population)	**2,772,000**
Riverside-San Bernardino (/cities/23116/riverside-san-bernardino/population)	2,514,000
San Antonio (/cities/23128/san-antonio/population)	2,368,000
Baltimore (/cities/22928/baltimore/population)	2,333,000
St. Louis (/cities/23152/st-louis/population)	2,216,000
Portland (/cities/23102/portland/population)	2,174,000
Sacramento (/cities/23121/sacramento/population)	2,155,000
Charlotte (/cities/22954/charlotte/population)	2,132,000
Austin (/cities/22926/austin/population)	2,117,000
Orlando (/cities/23091/orlando/population)	2,002,000
Indianapolis (/cities/23017/indianapolis/population)	1,833,000
San Jose (/cities/23131/san-jose/population)	1,799,000
Cleveland (/cities/22959/cleveland/population)	1,760,000
Cincinnati (/cities/22957/cincinnati/population)	1,754,000
Pittsburgh (/cities/23100/pittsburgh/population)	1,700,000
Kansas City (/cities/23028/kansas-city/population)	1,698,000
Columbus (/cities/22963/columbus/population)	1,666,000
Raleigh (/cities/23110/raleigh/population)	1,498,000
Virginia Beach (/cities/23084/virginia-beach/population)	1,479,000
Milwaukee (/cities/23067/milwaukee/population)	1,443,000
Jacksonville (/cities/23020/jacksonville/population)	1,297,000
Nashville (/cities/23077/nashville/population)	1,272,000
Providence (/cities/23106/providence/population)	1,200,000
Salt Lake City (/cities/23126/salt-lake-city/population)	1,180,000

Las Vegas - Historical Population Data			
1993	857,000	6.59%	
1992	804,000	6.49%	
1991	755,000	6.64%	
1990	708,000	5.20%	
1989	673,000	4.83%	
1988	642,000	4.90%	
1987	612,000	4.97%	62%
1986	583,000	4.86%	
1985	556,000	4.91%	
1984	530,000	4.95%	
1983	505,000	4.77%	
1982	482,000	5.01%	
1981	459,000	4.79%	
1980	438,000	5.80%	
1979	414,000	6.43%	
1978	389,000	5.99%	
1977	367,000	6.38%	82.5%
1976	345,000	6.15%	
1975	325,000	6.21%	
1974	306,000	6.25%	
1973	288,000	6.27%	
1972	271,000	6.27%	
1971	255,000	6.25%	
1970	240,000	9.09%	
1969	220,000	10.00%	
1968	200,000	10.50%	
1967	181,000	10.37%	161%
1966	164,000	10.07%	
1965	149,000	10.37%	
1964	135,000	9.76%	
1963	123,000	10.81%	
1962	111,000	9.90%	
1961	101,000	9.78%	
1960	92,000	10.84%	
1959	83,000	10.67%	
1958	75,000	8.70%	
1957	69,000	11.29%	162%
1956	62,000	10.71%	
1955	56,000	9.80%	
1954	51,000	8.51%	
1953	47,000	11.90%	
1952	42,000	10.53%	
1951	38,000	8.57%	
1950	35,000	0.00%	317%
1940	8,400		38%
1930	5,165		