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# Methodology 

An Analysis of<br>Residential Market Potential<br>Vigo County, Indiana<br>August, 2023

The technical analysis to determine the market potential for new housing units that could be constructed within Vigo County included:

- The determination of the draw areas for new and existing housing units within Vigo County, based on historical settlement patterns, the most recently available county-to-county migration data from the Internal Revenue Service, and incorporating additional data from the most recent American Community Survey for Vigo County, as well as other market dynamics;
- The depth and breadth of the potential housing market by tenure (rental and ownership) and by type (multi-family, single-family attached and detached units);
- The composition of the potential housing market by lifestage (empty nesters/retirees, traditional and non-traditional families, younger singles/couples); and
- The incomes and financial capabilities of the potential housing market (income distribution based on HUD's 2022 income limits for less than 30 percent AMI, between 30 and 60 percent AMI, between 60 and 80 percent AMI, between 80 and 100 percent AMI, and above 100 percent AMI).


## Delineation of the Draw Areas (Migration Analysis)-

Analysis of migration, mobility, demographic and lifestyle characteristics of households currently living within defined draw areas is integral to the determination of the depth and breadth of the potential market for new housing within Vigo County.

Taxpayer migration data obtained from the Internal Revenue Service provide the framework for the delineation of those draw areas-the principal counties of origin for households that are likely to move to Vigo County. These data are maintained at the county and "country equivalent" level by the Internal Revenue Service and provide a clear representation of mobility patterns. The IRS household migration data have been supplemented by population migration and mobility data for the county from the most recent American Community Survey.

Historically, American households, more than any other nation's, have been extraordinarily mobile. In general, household mobility is higher in urban areas; a greater percentage of renters move than owners; and a greater percentage of younger households move than older households. Nationally, one lingering consequence of the Great Recession (officially December, 2007 through June, 2009) has been a considerable reduction in national mobility.

According to the American Community Survey, which measures population mobility, just over 10.7 percent of Vigo County's population either moved within or to the county between 2020 and 2021-a mobility rate lower than the national average of 13 percent.

Appendix One, Table 1.
Migration Trends
Analysis of Vigo County migration and mobility patterns from 2016 through 2020-the most recent data available from the Internal Revenue Service-shows that the largest number of households moving to the county over the five-year study period occurred in 2016, when 2,435 households moved in. The lowest total over the study period was 1,950 households in 2018, however that number increased to 2,215 households in 2020.

Clay County, directly adjacent to the east, represented 10 percent to 11.2 percent of Vigo County household migration; Marion County, further to the east and consolidated with Indianapolis, represented 6.2 percent to 7.2 percent of Vigo' in-migration; Sullivan County, directly to the south, made up 5.7 percent to 6.6 percent of households moving into Vigo County; and Vermillion County, directly to the north, accounted for 5.4 percent to 6.2 percent of in-migration. No other
county averaged more than four percent of household migration into Vigo County. (Reference Appendix One, Table 1.)

The number of households moving out of Vigo County over the study period reached a five-year high in 2016, with 3,100 out-migrating households, with the lowest total of 2,205 households in 2018. In 2020, 2,440 households moved out of Vigo County.

Following the same pattern as Vigo County's in-migration, Clay County represented between 8.2 and 9.4 percent of households moving out of the county; Marion County accounted for 9.4 to 10.7 percent; Sullivan County represented 4.5 to 5.8 percent; and Vermillion County represented 4.1 to 4.6 percent of households moving out of Vigo County.

Vigo County's net migration-the difference between households moving into the county and those moving out-showed net losses throughout the study period. The highest net loss of 665 households occurred in 2016 and, in 2020, the lowest net loss of 225 households ensued.

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

Based on county migration data, then, and supplemented by American Community Survey migration and mobility data, the draw areas for Vigo County have been delineated as follows:

- The local draw area, covering households with the potential to move within Vigo County.
- The regional draw area, covering households with the potential to move to Vigo County from Clay, Sullivan, and Vermillion counties.
- The metropolitan draw area, covering households with the potential to move to Vigo County from Marion County.
- The national draw area, covering households with the potential to move to Vigo County from all other U.S. cities and counties, particularly those elsewhere in Indiana and the Midwest.


## 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, or county equivalent, 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. American Community Survey data are also used to clarify migration and mobility patterns for geographic units smaller than the county level.

## 2023 Target Market Classification of Vigo County Households-

Demographic and geo-demographic data obtained from Claritas, Inc. provide the framework for the categorization of households into groups with common characteristics, not only by lifestage and demographic characteristics, but also by lifestyle preferences and socio-economic factors. An appendix containing detailed descriptions of each of these target market groups is provided along with the study.

The three main lifestages are:

- Younger singles and couples, largely one- and two-person households with the head of household typically aged between 20 and 40 , comprised now mainly of the very large Millennial generation, who were born between 1977 and 1996. The housing and lifestyle choices of the Millennials have had and will continue to have a profound effect on the nation as a whole and cities in particular. Those in the leading edge of the Zoomers, also known as Generation Z, are now 26 years old and having a noticeable impact on this lifestage's housing preferences.
- Families, comprising both "traditional" families (married couples with one or more children) and "non-traditional" families (a wide range of family households, from a single parent with one or more children, an adult caring for younger siblings, to a grandparent with custody of grandchildren), primarily Generation X, born between 1965 and 1976. However, the leading-edge Millennials are now in their early- to mid40 s , are marrying and having children, and are moving into the family lifestage.
- Empty nesters and retirees, largely one- and two-person households with the head of household typically aged over 50, primarily encompassing the Baby Boom generation, born between 1946 and 1964, as well as earlier generations. It is now the third largest generation in America, but as the Boomer generation ages, it will continue its significant impact on the nation's housing, particularly how Baby Boomers manage the consequences of aging. The oldest Generation Xers are now in the mid-fifties, joining the Baby Boomers as empty nesters when their children leave home.

Appendix One, Table 2.
Target Market Classification-
According to Claritas, Inc., an estimated 41,885 households live in Vigo County in 2023 (reference Appendix One, Table 2). Median income in the county is estimated at $\$ 50,800$, almost 31 percent lower than the national median of $\$ 73,300$. The median reported value of owner-occupied dwelling units in the county is estimated at $\$ 137,100$, just over 55 percent below the national median of $\$ 305,400$. (The median is the midpoint at which half of the households have higher incomes or home values, and half have lower incomes or lower home values.)

As characterized by lifestage, in 2023, 38.3 percent of the county's households were empty nesters and retirees (represented in 19 of Zimmerman/Volk Associates' older target market groups); 32.9 percent of the county's households were characterized as younger singles and couples (in 12 younger market groups), and the remaining 28.8 percent were traditional and non-traditional families (in 18 family groups).

## Residential Target Market Methodology:

The proprietary residential target market methodology, invented by Zimmerman/Volk Associates in 1988 and continually refined, is an analytical technique, using the PRIZM household clustering system, that establishes the optimum market position for residential development of any propertyfrom a specific site to an entire political jurisdiction-through cluster analysis of households living within designated draw areas. In contrast to conventional supply/demand analysis-which is based on supply-side dynamics and baseline demographic projections-the residential 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. Because it is based on detailed and location-specific household data, the residential target market methodology can establish the optimum market position even in locations where no closelycomparable properties exist.

In residential target market methodology, clusters of households (usually between 10 and 15) are grouped according to a variety of significant "predictable variables," ranging from basic demographic characteristics, such as income qualification and age, to less-frequently considered attributes known as "behaviors," such as mobility rates, lifestage, and lifestyle patterns.

Mobility rates detail how frequently a household moves from one dwelling unit to another.
Lifestage denotes what stage of life the household is in, from initial household formation (typically when a young person moves out of his or her parents' household into his or her own dwelling unit), through family formation (typically, marriage and children), empty-nesting (after the last adult child has left the household), to retirement (typically, no longer employed full time).

Lifestyle patterns reflect the ways households choose to live, e.g., an urban lifestyle includes residing in a dwelling unit in a city or compact neighborhood, most likely high-density, and implies the ability to walk to more activities and locations than a suburban lifestyle, which is most likely lower-density and typically requires a vehicle to access non-residential locations.

Over the past 35 years, 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.

As a result of this process, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has categorized the housing and neighborhood propensities of 68 target market groups, the most affluent of which can afford the most expensive new ownership units and the least affluent are candidates for the least expensive existing rental apartments; a sizable percentage of the latter group require some form of housing assistance.

Once the draw areas for a study area have been defined, then-through field investigation, analysis of historical migration and development trends, and employment and commutation patterns-the households within those areas are quantified using the residential target market methodology. The potential market for new dwelling units is then determined by the correlation of a number of factors-including, but not limited to: household mobility rates; incomes; lifestyle characteristics and housing preferences; the location of the study area; and the current housing market context.

## Determination of the Average Annual Potential Market for Vigo County (Mobility Analysis)-

The mobility tables, individually and in summaries, indicate the annual average number and type of households that have the potential to move within or to Vigo County each year over the next five years. The total number of households with the potential to move from each county is derived from historical migration trends; the number of households from each group is calculated from each group's mobility rate.

Appendix One, Table 3.
Internal Mobility (Households Moving within Vigo County)-
Zimmerman/Volk Associates integrates U.S. Bureau of the Census data from the American Community Survey with data from Claritas Inc. to determine the number of households in each
target market group that will move from one residence to another within a specific area or jurisdiction in a given year (internal mobility).

Based on this analysis, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has determined that an annual average of 5,355 households of all incomes living in the county have the potential to move from one residence to another-rental or ownership, new or resale-within Vigo County each year over the next five years.

Just under half of these households are likely to be younger singles and couples (in 12 target market groups); traditional and non-traditional families are likely to account for 29 percent (in 18 market groups); and empty nesters and retirees are likely to account for 21.2 percent (in 18 groups).

Appendix One, Tables 4 and 5.
External Mobility (Households Moving to Vigo County from Outside the County)-
The same sources of data are used to determine the number of households in each target market group that will move from one county to another. An annual average of 485 households of all incomes living in Clay, Sullivan, and Vermillion counties have the potential to move to Vigo County each year over the next five years. (Reference Appendix One, Table 4.)

Approximately 41.2 percent of these households are likely to be traditional and non-traditional families (in six family groups); empty nesters and retirees are likely to account for 32 percent (in six older groups), and empty nesters and retirees are likely to account for 26.8 percent of households (in four younger groups).

An annual average of 150 households of all incomes have the potential to move from a residence in Marion County to a residence in Vigo County each year over the next five years. (Reference Appendix One, Table 5.)

An estimated 63.4 percent of these households are likely to be younger singles and couples (in eight market groups); 23.3 percent are likely to be traditional and non-traditional families
(in six groups); and the remaining 13.3 are likely to be empty nesters and retirees (in four market groups).

Appendix One, Table 6.
National Mobility (Households Moving to Vigo County from the Balance of the United States)—
An annual average of 1,525 households of all incomes living elsewhere in the United States have the potential to move to a residence in Vigo County each year over the next five years.

An estimated 41.6 percent of these households are likely to be younger singles and couples (in all 17 younger market groups); another 34.1 are likely to be traditional and non-traditional families (in all 25 family groups); and the remaining 24.3 percent are likely to be empty nesters and retirees (in all 26 groups).

Appendix One, Tables 7 through 14.
Annual Average Market Potential for Vigo County-
Appendix One, Table 7 summarizes Appendix One, Tables 2 through 6. The numbers in the total column on page one of this table indicate the depth and breadth of the potential market for new and existing dwelling units in Vigo County each year over the next five years originating from households living in the designated draw areas. An annual average of 7,515 households of all incomes have the potential to move within or to the county each year over the next five years.

Younger singles and couples (in all 17 younger target market groups) are likely to account for just under 47 percent of the annual potential market; 30.7 percent are likely to be traditional and nontraditional families (in all 25 market groups); and the remaining 22.4 percent are likely to be empty nesters and retirees (in all 26 groups).

As derived from the migration and mobility analyses, then, the distribution of the draw areas as a percentage of the annual potential market for new and existing housing units in Vigo County is shown on the table on the following page.

Annual Average Market Potential by Draw Area
Vigo County, Indiana

| Vigo County: | $71.3 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Regional Draw Area: | $6.5 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Draw Area: | $2.0 \%$ |
| Balance of the U.S.: | $\underline{20.3 \%}$ |
| Total: | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.
The annual average 7,515 draw area households of all incomes that have the potential to move within or to the county each year over the next five years have been categorized by tenure propensities to determine renter/owner ratios. Of these households, 45.8 percent (or 3,440 households) comprise the average annual potential market for new and existing rental units in the county. The remaining 54.2 percent (or 4,075 households) comprise the average annual potential market for new and existing for-sale (ownership) housing units. (Reference Appendix One, Table 8.)

Of the 4,075 buyer households, 8.9 percent (or 363 households) comprise the average annual market for new and existing multi-family for-sale units (condominium apartments); 20.3 percent (829 households) comprise the annual market for new and existing attached single-family (rowhouse/townhouse/duplex) units; and 70.7 percent ( 2,883 households) comprise the annual market for new and existing single-family detached houses. (Reference Appendix One, Table 9.)

The income limits in Vigo County by household size and percent of median family income-based on the county's median family income (AMI), which, as determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in 2022, was $\$ 69,500$ for a family of four-are shown on the table on the following page.

Vigo County, Indiana
August, 2023

Fiscal Year 2022 Income Limits
Vigo County, Indiana

| Number of Persons | EXtremely Low | Very Low | Low |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In Household | $30 \%$ OF MediAn | $50 \%$ OF MediAn | $80 \%$ OF MEDIAN |
| One | $\$ 15,650$ | $\$ 26,100$ | $\$ 41,750$ |
| Two | $\$ 18,310$ | $\$ 29,800$ | $\$ 47,700$ |
| Three | $\$ 23,030$ | $\$ 33,550$ | $\$ 53,650$ |
| Four | $\$ 27,750$ | $\$ 37,250$ | $\$ 59,600$ |
| Five | $\$ 32,470$ | $\$ 40,250$ | $\$ 64,400$ |
| Six | $\$ 37,190$ | $\$ 43,250$ | $\$ 69,150$ |
| Seven | $\$ 41,910$ | $\$ 46,200$ | $\$ 73,950$ |
| Eight | $\$ 46,630^{*}$ | $\$ 49,200$ | $\$ 78,700$ |

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This study is examining the incomes and financial capabilities of the potential housing market based on income distributions at less than 30 percent AMI, between 30 and 60 percent AmI, between 60 and 80 percent AMI, between 80 and 100 percent AMI, and above 100 percent AMI. The incomes of households at 60 and 100 percent of median are shown on the following table:

Additional Income Limits
Vigo County, Indiana

| Number of Persons |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In Household | $60 \%$ OF MEDIAN | $100 \%$ OF MEDIAN |
| One | $\$ 31,300$ | $\$ 48,650$ |
| Two | $\$ 35,800$ | $\$ 55,600$ |
| Three | $\$ 40,250$ | $\$ 62,550$ |
| Four | $\$ 44,700$ | $\$ 69,500$ |
| Five | $\$ 48,300$ | $\$ 75,100$ |
| Six | $\$ 51,900$ | $\$ 80,650$ |
| Seven | $\$ 55,450$ | $\$ 86,200$ |
| Eight | $\$ 59,050$ | $\$ 91,750$ |

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.
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The 3,440 renter households have been grouped by income, using income limits derived from the preceding tables, as follows (reference Appendix One, Table 10):

Renter Households by Income
Vigo County, Indiana

| Number of |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Households | Percentage |
| 787 | $22.9 \%$ |
| 679 | $19.7 \%$ |
| 394 | $11.5 \%$ |
| 236 | $6.9 \%$ |
| 1,344 | $39.1 \%$ |
| 3,440 | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.
As noted above, the remaining 54.2 percent of the average annual potential market (or 4,075 households) comprise the market for new and existing for-sale (ownership) housing units in the county. These households have also been grouped by income, as detailed on the following table (see Appendix One, Table 11):
$\left.\begin{array}{rcc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Owner Households by Income } \\ \text { Vigo County, Indiana }\end{array} \\ \text { Number of }\end{array}\right]$

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.

Of the 4,075 potential owner households, 363 households ( 4.9 percent) comprise the market for multi-family for-sale units (condominium/cooperative lofts/apartments) and have also been grouped by income as shown on the table following this page (see also Appendix One, Table 12).

\left.| Multi-Family Owner Households by Income |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vigo County, Indiana |  |$\right]$

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.

Of the 4,075 potential owner households, 829 households ( 13.2 percent) comprise the market for single-family attached for-sale units (rowhouses/townhouses/duplexes/triplexes) and have also been grouped by income as shown on the following table (see Appendix One, Table 13):

Single-Family Attached Owner Households by Income Vigo County, Indiana

| InCOME BAND | NuMBER OF <br> Households | PERCENTAGE |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Below 30\% AMI | 169 | $20.4 \%$ |
| Between $30 \%$ and $60 \%$ AMI | 152 | $18.3 \%$ |
| Between $60 \%$ and $80 \%$ AMI | 92 | $11.1 \%$ |
| Between $80 \%$ and $100 \%$ AMI | 52 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Over $100 \%$ AMI | $\underline{364}$ | $\underline{43.9 \%}$ |
| Total: | 829 | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.
Of the 4,075 potential owner households, 2,883 households ( 81.9 percent) comprise the market for single-family detached for-sale units (detached houses) and have also been grouped by income, as detailed on the table following this page (reference Appendix One, Table 14).
$\left.\begin{array}{rcc}\text { Single-Family Detached Owner Households by Income } \\ \text { Vigo County, Indiana }\end{array}\right]$

Source: Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023.

## ——Target Market Data—

Target market data are based on the PRIZM household clustering system developed by Claritas, Inc., and modified and augmented by Zimmerman/Volk Associates as the basis for its proprietary residential target market methodology. Target market data provides the 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.

Zimmerman/Volk Associates' target market classifications are updated annually to reflect the slow, but relentless change in the composition of American households. Because of the nature of geodemographic 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 or more of three additional basic characteristics:

- Age;
- Household composition; and/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: 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 correlation between Full-Nest Suburbanites and Full-Nest Exurbanites; if a Full-Nest Suburbanite household moves to the exurbs, they become a Full-Nest Exurbanite household, if the move is not accompanied by a significant change in socio-economic status. In contrast, if a Full-Nest Suburbanite household moves within the metropolitan suburbs, and also improves their socio-economic standing, that household would likely be characterized as Nouveau Money or Corporate Establishment.

## Household Classification Methodology:

Household classifications were originally based on the PRIZM geo-demographic segmentation system that was established by Claritas in 1974 and then replaced by PRIZM NE clustering system in 2005. The PriZM Premier system now in place was updated in 2016 to include 68 household groups, each ranging between one and two and a half million households. The revised household classifications are based on PRIZM which was developed through unique classification and regression trees delineating 68 specific clusters of American households. The system is now accurate to the individual household level, adding self-reported and list-based household data to geo-demographic information. The process applies hundreds of demographic variables to nearly 10,000 "behaviors."

Over the past 35 years, Zimmerman/Volk Associates has augmented the PRIZM cluster systems for use within the company's proprietary residential target market methodology specific to housing and neighborhood preferences, with additional algorithms, correlation with geo-coded consumer data, aggregation of clusters by broad household definition, and unique cluster names.
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Vigo County, Indiana
August, 2023

## Appendix One Tables

## Gross Annual Household In-Migration <br> Vigo County, Indiana <br> 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020

| County of Origin | 2016. |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Share | Number | Share | Number | Share | Number | Share | Number | Share |
| Clay | 255 | 10.5\% | 220 | 11.2\% | 215 | 11.0\% | 210 | 10.0\% | 225 | 10.2\% |
| Marion | 150 | 6.2\% | 125 | 6.3\% | 140 | 7.2\% | 145 | 6.9\% | 155 | 7.0\% |
| Sullivan | 140 | 5.7\% | 130 | 6.6\% | 115 | 5.9\% | 135 | 6.5\% | 140 | 6.3\% |
| Vermillion | 135 | 5.5\% | 110 | 5.6\% | 120 | 6.2\% | 130 | 6.2\% | 120 | 5.4\% |
| Parke | 85 | 3.5\% | 75 | 3.8\% | 95 | 4.9\% | 80 | 3.8\% | 65 | 2.9\% |
| Putnam | 45 | 1.8\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 40 | 2.1\% | 45 | 2.2\% | 45 | 2.0\% |
| Greene | 45 | 1.8\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 40 | 1.9\% | 45 | 2.0\% |
| Clark, IL | 65 | 2.7\% | 45 | 2.3\% | 50 | 2.6\% | 55 | 2.6\% | 40 | 1.8\% |
| Monroe | 55 | 2.3\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 20 | 1.0\% | 40 | 1.9\% | 40 | 1.8\% |
| Edgar, IL | 50 | 2.1\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 50 | 2.6\% | 50 | 2.4\% | 40 | 1.8\% |
| Hendricks | 40 | 1.6\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 35 | 1.8\% | 45 | 2.2\% | 35 | 1.6\% |
| Cook, IL | 25 | 1.0\% | 40 | 2.0\% | 20 | 1.0\% | 25 | 1.2\% | 35 | 1.6\% |
| Hamilton | 20 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 25 | 1.3\% | 35 | 1.7\% | 25 | 1.1\% |
| Owen | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 25 | 1.2\% | 25 | 1.1\% |
| Vermilion, IL | 25 | 1.0\% | 20 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 20 | 1.0\% | 20 | 0.9\% |
| All Other Counties | 1,300 | 53.4\% | 1,030 | 52.3\% | 990 | 50.8\% | 1,010 | 48.3\% | 1,160 | 52.4\% |
| Total In-Migration: | 2,435 | 100.0\% | 1,970 | 100.0\% | 1,950 | 100.0\% | 2,090 | 100.0\% | 2,215 | 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

Vigo County, Indiana
2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020

| Destination County | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  | 2020 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Share | Number | Share | Number | Share | Number | Share | Number | Share |
| Clay | 270 | 8.7\% | 225 | 9.4\% | 180 | 8.2\% | 200 | 8.3\% | 200 | 8.2\% |
| Marion | 300 | 9.7\% | 250 | 10.4\% | 235 | 10.7\% | 230 | 9.5\% | 230 | 9.4\% |
| Sullivan | 160 | 5.2\% | 120 | 5.0\% | 100 | 4.5\% | 140 | 5.8\% | 125 | 5.1\% |
| Vermillion | 140 | 4.5\% | 110 | 4.6\% | 95 | 4.3\% | 110 | 4.5\% | 100 | 4.1\% |
| Parke | 85 | 2.7\% | 70 | 2.9\% | 65 | 2.9\% | 75 | 3.1\% | 70 | 2.9\% |
| Putnam | 50 | 1.6\% | 35 | 1.5\% | 45 | 2.0\% | 30 | 1.2\% | 55 | 2.3\% |
| Greene | 50 | 1.6\% | 30 | 1.3\% | 30 | 1.4\% | 30 | 1.2\% | 30 | 1.2\% |
| Clark, IL | 65 | 2.1\% | 20 | 0.8\% | 25 | 1.1\% | 30 | 1.2\% | 40 | 1.6\% |
| Monroe | 65 | 2.1\% | 50 | 2.1\% | 45 | 2.0\% | 40 | 1.7\% | 40 | 1.6\% |
| Edgar, IL | 45 | 1.5\% | 25 | 1.0\% | 30 | 1.4\% | 30 | 1.2\% | 35 | 1.4\% |
| Hendricks | 105 | 3.4\% | 85 | 3.5\% | 85 | 3.9\% | 80 | 3.3\% | 70 | 2.9\% |
| Cook, IL | 40 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 35 | 1.6\% | 30 | 1.2\% | 30 | 1.2\% |
| Hamilton | 85 | 2.7\% | 65 | 2.7\% | 55 | 2.5\% | 55 | 2.3\% | 55 | 2.3\% |
| Owen | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Vermilion, IL | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Other Counties | 1,640 | 52.9\% | 1,315 | 54.8\% | 1,180 | 53.5\% | 1,340 | 55.4\% | 1,360 | 55.7\% |
| Total Out-Migration: | 3,100 | 100.0\% | 2,400 | 100.0\% | 2,205 | 100.0\% | 2,420 | 100.0\% | 2,440 | 100.0\% |

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

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

## Net Annual Household Migration

Vigo County, Indiana
2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020

| County | $\text { . . } 2016 \text {. . }$ <br> Number | $\text { . . } 2017 \text {. . }$ <br> Number | $\text { . } 2018$ <br> Number | $\text { . } 2019$ <br> Number | $\text { . . } 2020 \text {. . }$ <br> Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clay | -15 | -5 | 35 | 10 | 25 |
| Marion | -150 | -125 | -95 | -85 | -75 |
| Sullivan | -20 | 10 | 15 | -5 | 15 |
| Vermillion | -5 | 0 | 25 | 20 | 20 |
| Parke | 0 | 5 | 30 | 5 | -5 |
| Putnam | -5 | 0 | -5 | 15 | -10 |
| Greene | -5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Clark, IL | 0 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 0 |
| Monroe | -10 | -15 | -25 | 0 | 0 |
| Edgar, IL | 5 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 5 |
| Hendricks | -65 | -50 | -50 | -35 | -35 |
| Cook, IL | -15 | 40 | -15 | -5 | 5 |
| Hamilton | -65 | -65 | -30 | -20 | -30 |
| Owen | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 |
| Vermilion, IL | 25 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| All Other Counties | -340 | -285 | -190 | -330 | -200 |
| Total Net Migration: | -665 | -430 | -255 | -330 | -225 |

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

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

## 2023 Household Classification by Market Groups

Vigo County, Indiana

| Household Type / Geographic Designation | Estimated Number | Estimated Share |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 16,045 | 38.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 5,115 \\ 1,525 \\ 9,405 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \\ 12.2 \% \\ 3.6 \% \\ 22.5 \% \end{array}$ |
|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | 12,045 | 28.8\% |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 1,575 \\ 835 \\ 9,635 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \\ 3.8 \% \\ 2.0 \% \\ 23.0 \% \end{array}$ |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 13,795 | 32.9\% |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 6,655 \\ 2,865 \\ 4,275 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \\ 15.9 \% \\ 6.8 \% \\ 10.2 \% \end{array}$ |
| Total: | 41,885 | 100.0\% |

## 2023 Estimated Median Income: <br> \$50,800

2023 Estimated National Median Income:
\$73,300

2023 Estimated Median Home Value: $\$ 137,100$
2023 Estimated National Median Home Value: $\$ 305,400$

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

## 2023 Household Classification by Market Groups

Vigo County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \text { Share } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 16,045 | 38.3\% | Estimated Median Income | Estimated Median Home Value |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 285 | 0.7\% | \$82,100 | \$202,100 |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 1,410 | 3.4\% | \$48,700 | \$109,600 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 525 | 1.3\% | \$46,900 | \$146,700 |
| Hometown Seniors | 2,080 | 5.0\% | \$33,100 | \$82,100 |
| Second City Seniors | 815 | 1.9\% | \$29,000 | \$96,500 |
| Subtotal: | 5,115 | 12.2\% |  |  |


| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| The One Percenters | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Old Money | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Suburban Establishment | 160 | $0.4 \%$ | $\$ 97,300$ | $\$ 270,900$ |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 475 | $1.1 \%$ | $\$ 66,200$ | $\$ 158,200$ |
| Middle-American Retireses | 890 | $2.1 \%$ | $\$ 65,200$ | $\$ 166,800$ |
| Subtotal: | 1,525 | $3.6 \%$ |  |  |
| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 580 | $1.4 \%$ | $\$ 113,500$ | $\$ 382,000$ |
| Pillars of the Community | 1,025 | $2.4 \%$ | $\$ 91,400$ | $\$ 194,200$ |
| New Empty Nesters | 390 | $0.9 \%$ | $\$ 94,600$ | $\$ 330,600$ |
| Traditional Couples | 350 | $0.8 \%$ | $\$ 91,300$ | $\$ 257,400$ |
| RV Retirees | 1,240 | $3.0 \%$ | $\$ 74,000$ | $\$ 163,400$ |
| Country Couples | 655 | $1.6 \%$ | $\$ 55,800$ | $\$ 160,400$ |
| Hometown Retirees | 875 | $2.1 \%$ | $\$ 58,100$ | $\$ 122,300$ |
| Heartland Retirees | 550 | $1.3 \%$ | $\$ 56,700$ | $\$ 153,100$ |
| Village Elders | 590 | $1.4 \%$ | $\$ 44,000$ | $\$ 120,500$ |
| Small-Town Seniors | 1,695 | $4.0 \%$ | $\$ 43,000$ | $\$ 95,600$ |
| Back Country Seniors | 1,455 | $3.5 \%$ | $\$ 40,000$ | $\$ 91,200$ |

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

## 2023 Household Classification by Market Groups

Vigo County, Indiana


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

## 2023 Household Classification by Market Groups

Vigo County, Indiana


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

## Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Indiana

| Household Type/ Geographic Designation | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 16,045 | 1,135 | 21.2\% |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 5,115 \\ 1,525 \\ 9,405 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 320 \\ 115 \\ 700 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \\ 6.0 \% \\ 2.1 \% \\ 13.1 \% \end{array}$ |
| Traditional \& Non-Traditional Families | 12,045 | 1,555 | 29.0\% |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 1,575 \\ 835 \\ 9,635 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 250 \\ 50 \\ 1,255 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \\ 4.7 \% \\ 0.9 \% \\ 23.4 \% \end{array}$ |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 13,795 | 2,665 | 49.8\% |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 6,655 \\ 2,865 \\ 4,275 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 1,500 \\ 485 \\ 680 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \% \\ 28.0 \% \\ 9.1 \% \\ 12.7 \% \end{array}$ |
| Total: | 41,885 | 5,355 | 100.0\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Indiana 



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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years <br> Vigo County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated <br> Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traditional \& Non-Traditional Families | 12,045 | 1,555 | 29.0\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Single-Parent Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 85 | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 30 | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Uptown Families | 695 | 100 | 1.9\% |
| In-Town Families | 310 | 50 | 0.9\% |
| New American Strivers | 455 | 90 | 1.7\% |
| Subtotal: | 1,575 | 250 | 4.7\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Button-Down Families | 320 | 10 | 0.2\% |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 160 | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 25 | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 45 | 5 | 0.1\% |
| Kids 'r' Us | 285 | 25 | 0.5\% |
| Subtotal: | 835 | 50 | 0.9\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Town Families | 865 | 60 | 1.1\% |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 820 | 70 | 1.3\% |
| Rural Families | 2,180 | 160 | 3.0\% |
| Traditional Families | 140 | 10 | 0.2\% |
| Small-Town Families | 1,065 | 185 | 3.5\% |
| Four-by-Four Families | 600 | 95 | 1.8\% |
| Rustic Families | 2,480 | 305 | 5.7\% |
| Hometown Families | 1,485 | 370 | 6.9\% |
| Subtotal: | 9,635 | 1,255 | 23.4\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years <br> Vigo County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 13,795 | 2,665 | 49.8\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 440 | 60 | 1.1\% |
| Small-City Singles | 2,815 | 535 | 10.0\% |
| Twentysomethings | 690 | 210 | 3.9\% |
| Second-City Strivers | 460 | 105 | 2.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 2,250 | 590 | 11.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 6,655 | 1,500 | 28.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 125 | 35 | 0.7\% |
| Suburban Achievers | 1,505 | 110 | 2.1\% |
| Suburban Strivers | 1,235 | 340 | 6.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 2,865 | 485 | 9.1\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 1,365 | 100 | 1.9\% |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 835 | 95 | 1.8\% |
| Rural Couples | 1,375 | 295 | 5.5\% |
| Rural Strivers | 700 | 190 | 3.5\% |
| Subtotal: | 4,275 | 680 | 12.7\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix Two, Tables 1 Through 3
Clay County, Indiana, Sullivan County, Indiana, Vermillion County, Indiana

| Household Type / Geographic Designation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Clay } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ | Sullivan <br> County | Vermillion County | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters |  |  |  |  |
| \& Retirees | 65 | 45 | 45 | 155 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 65 | 45 | 45 | 155 |


| Traditional \& |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 100 | 55 | 45 | 200 |


| Younger |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 60 | 35 | 35 | 130 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{2 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 5}$ |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{4 6 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 8} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 8} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix Two, Tables 1 Through 3
Clay County, Indiana, Sullivan County, Indiana, Vermillion County, Indiana

|  | Clay County | Sullivan <br> County | Vermillion County | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 65 | 45 | 45 | 155 |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hometown Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Second City Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Suburban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middle-American Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pillars of the Community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traditional Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RV Retirees | 10 | 5 | 10 | 25 |
| Country Couples | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 |
| Hometown Retirees | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| Heartland Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Village Elders | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 25 | 15 | 15 | 55 |
| Back Country Seniors | 10 | 15 | 5 | 30 |
| Subtotal: | 65 | 45 | 45 | 155 |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix Two, Tables 1 Through 3
Clay County, Indiana, Sullivan County, Indiana, Vermillion County, Indiana

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Clay } \\ & \text { County } \end{aligned}$ | Sullivan County | Vermillion County | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | 100 | 55 | 45 | 200 |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |
| e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Single-Parent Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Uptown Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| In-Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New American Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Button-Down Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Rural Families | 25 | 10 | 10 | 45 |
| Traditional Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small-Town Families | 20 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 |
| Rustic Families | 25 | 35 | 20 | 80 |
| Hometown Families | 15 | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Subtotal: | 100 | 55 | 45 | 200 |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix Two, Tables 1 Through 3
Clay County, Indiana, Sullivan County, Indiana, Vermillion County, Indiana

|  | Clay County | Sullivan County | Vermillion County | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 60 | 35 | 35 | 130 |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small-City Singles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Twentysomethings | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Second-City Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Suburban Achievers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Suburban Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 15 | 5 | 10 | 30 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 10 | 5 | 5 | 20 |
| Rural Couples | 10 | 15 | 10 | 35 |
| Rural Strivers | 25 | 10 | 10 | 45 |
| Subtotal: | 60 | 35 | 35 | 130 |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years <br> Marion County, Indiana 



| Younger |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{1 4 5 , 0 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 3 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 97,795 | 65 | $43.3 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 46,170 | 30 | $20.0 \%$ |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 1,100 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{3 9 9 , 1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years <br> Marion County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 114,375 | 20 | 13.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 5,990 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 12,500 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 4,010 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Hometown Seniors | 19,600 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second City Seniors | 13,355 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 55,455 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 3,100 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Old Money | 1,465 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 1,475 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Establishment | 9,545 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 20,430 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Middle-American Retirees | 18,535 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 54,550 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 1,130 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Pillars of the Community | 750 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Empty Nesters | 25 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Traditional Couples | 555 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| RV Retirees | 55 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Country Couples | 1,130 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Hometown Retirees | 35 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Heartland Retirees | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Village Elders | 210 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-Town Seniors | 445 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Back Country Seniors | 30 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 4,370 | 0 | 0.0\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years <br> Marion County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traditional \& Non-Traditional Families | 139,685 | 35 | 23.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Single-Parent Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 8,455 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 7,435 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Uptown Families | 14,950 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| In-Town Families | 9,760 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| New American Strivers | 18,530 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Subtotal: | 59,130 | 25 | 16.7\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 2,235 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Nouveau Money | 3,215 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Button-Down Families | 11,970 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 11,540 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 9,270 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 9,395 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Kids 'r' Us | 21,100 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 68,725 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 1,455 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Town Families | 1,335 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 300 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Rural Families | 45 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Traditional Families | 2,875 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-Town Families | 2,875 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Four-by-Four Families | 1,785 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Rustic Families | 220 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Hometown Families | 940 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 11,830 | 0 | 0.0\% |

## Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years

Marion County, Indiana

|  | Estimated <br> Number | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 145,065 | 95 | 63.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 13,085 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Small-City Singles | 18,555 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Twentysomethings | 26,015 | 25 | 16.7\% |
| Second-City Strivers | 17,685 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 22,455 | 15 | 10.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 97,795 | 65 | 43.3\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 9,825 | 10 | 6.7\% |
| Suburban Achievers | 20,135 | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Suburban Strivers | 16,210 | 15 | 10.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 46,170 | 30 | 20.0\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 745 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 10 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Rural Couples | 45 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Rural Strivers | 300 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 1,100 | 0 | 0.0\% |

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

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years
Balance of the United States

| Household Type/ <br> Geographic Designation | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters |  |  |
| \& Retirees | $\mathbf{3 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 3 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 60 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 60 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 75 | $4.9 \%$ |
|  | 175 | $11.5 \%$ |


| Traditional \& |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{5 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 1} \%$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 50 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 125 | $8.2 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 95 | $6.2 \%$ |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 250 | $16.4 \%$ |


| Younger |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{6 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 6 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 165 | $10.8 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 200 | $13.1 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 120 | $7.9 \%$ |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 150 | $9.8 \%$ |

Total: $1,525 \quad 100.0 \%$

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential <br> To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years 

Balance of the United States

|  | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 370 | 24.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |
| The Social Register | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Urban Establishment | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Subtotal: | 60 | 3.9\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Hometown Seniors | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Second City Seniors | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 60 | 3.9\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Old Money | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Suburban Establishment | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Middle-American Retirees | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Subtotal: | 75 | 4.9\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Pillars of the Community | 10 | 0.7\% |
| New Empty Nesters | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Traditional Couples | 10 | 0.7\% |
| RV Retirees | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Country Couples | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Hometown Retirees | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Heartland Retirees | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Village Elders | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Small-Town Seniors | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Back Country Seniors | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 175 | 11.5\% |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential <br> To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years 

Balance of the United States

|  | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | 520 | 34.1\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |
| e-Type Families | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Inner-City Families | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Single-Parent Families | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Subtotal: | 50 | 3.3\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Uptown Families | 30 | 2.0\% |
| In-Town Families | 25 | 1.6\% |
| New American Strivers | 40 | 2.6\% |
| Subtotal: | 125 | 8.2\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Nouveau Money | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Button-Down Families | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 5 | 0.3\% |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Kids 'r' Us | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 95 | 6.2\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 20 | 1.3\% |
| New Town Families | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Rural Families | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Traditional Families | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Small-Town Families | 40 | 2.6\% |
| Four-by-Four Families | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Rustic Families | 60 | 3.9\% |
| Hometown Families | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 250 | 16.4\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential <br> To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over the Next Five Years 

Balance of the United States

|  | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 635 | 41.6\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 5 | 0.3\% |
| New Bohemians | 65 | 4.3\% |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 10 | 0.7\% |
| Downtown Couples | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Downtown Proud | 50 | 3.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 165 | 10.8\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |
| The VIPs | 30 | 2.0\% |
| Small-City Singles | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Twentysomethings | 65 | 4.3\% |
| Second-City Strivers | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Subtotal: | 200 | 13.1\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 35 | 2.3\% |
| Suburban Achievers | 15 | 1.0\% |
| Suburban Strivers | 70 | 4.6\% |
| Subtotal: | 120 | 7.9\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 20 | 1.3\% |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 25 | 1.6\% |
| Rural Couples | 65 | 4.3\% |
| Rural Strivers | 40 | 2.6\% |
| Subtotal: | 150 | 9.8\% |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix One, Tables 3 Through 6
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type/ Geographic Designation | Vigo County | Regional Draw Area | Marion County | Balance of U.S. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 1,135 | 155 | 20 | 370 | 1,680 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 320 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 390 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 115 | 0 | 10 | 75 | 200 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 700 | 155 | 0 | 175 | 1,030 |
|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | 1,555 | 200 | 35 | 520 | 2,310 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 250 | 0 | 25 | 125 | 400 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 50 | 0 | 10 | 95 | 155 |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 1,255 | 200 | 0 | 250 | 1,705 |


| Younger |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{2 , 6 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 5 2 5}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 165 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 1,500 | 0 | 65 | 200 | 1,765 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 485 | 0 | 30 | 120 | 635 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 680 | 130 | 0 | 150 | 960 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{5 , 3 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 5 1 5}$ |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{7 1 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{6 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix One, Tables 3 Through 6
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

|  | Vigo <br> County | Regional <br> Draw Area | Marion <br> County | Balance of U.S. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 1,135 | 155 | 20 | 370 | 1,680 |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 60 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 110 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 135 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 25 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 |
| Hometown Seniors | 50 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 55 |
| Second City Seniors | 125 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 150 |
| Subtotal: | 320 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 390 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Suburban Establishment | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 20 |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 45 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 70 |
| Middle-American Retirees | 65 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 95 |
| Subtotal: | 115 | 0 | 10 | 75 | 200 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 30 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 45 |
| Pillars of the Community | 65 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 75 |
| New Empty Nesters | 15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 25 |
| Traditional Couples | 15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 25 |
| RV Retirees | 65 | 25 | 0 | 15 | 105 |
| Country Couples | 45 | 20 | 0 | 15 | 80 |
| Hometown Retirees | 55 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 75 |
| Heartland Retirees | 25 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 35 |
| Village Elders | 40 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 65 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 215 | 55 | 0 | 35 | 305 |
| Back Country Seniors | 130 | 30 | 0 | 35 | 195 |
| Subtotal: | 700 | 155 | 0 | 175 | 1,030 |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix One, Tables 3 Through 6
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

|  | Vigo <br> County | Regional <br> Draw Area | Marion <br> County |  | Balance <br> of U.S. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Metropolitan Cities

e-Type Families
Multi-Cultural Families
Single-Parent Families
Subtotal:

Small Cities/Satellite Cities
Unibox Transferees
Multi-Ethnic Families
Uptown Families
In-Town Families
New American Strivers
Subtotal:

## Metropolitan Suburbs

| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Button-Down Families | 10 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 25 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 5 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 30 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 20 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 25 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 50 |
|  | 50 | 0 | 10 | 95 | 155 |

Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs

| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Town Families | 60 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 70 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 70 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 100 |
| Rural Families | 160 | 45 | 0 | 25 | 230 |
| Traditional Families | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 |
| Small-Town Families | 185 | 25 | 0 | 40 | 250 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 95 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 140 |
| Rustic Families | 305 | 80 | 0 | 60 | 445 |
| Hometown Families | 370 | 25 | 0 | 35 | 430 |
|  | 1,255 | 200 | 0 | 250 | 1,705 |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Summary: Appendix One, Tables 3 Through 6
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

|  | Vigo County | Regional Draw Area | Marion <br> County | Balance of U.S. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger |  |  |  |  |  |
| Singles \& Couples | 2,665 | 130 | 95 | 635 | 3,525 |

Metropolitan Cities

| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 65 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 35 |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 |
|  | Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |

Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| The VIPs | 60 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 95 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small-City Singles | 535 | 0 | 10 | 35 | 580 |
| Twentysomethings | 210 | 0 | 25 | 65 | 300 |
| Second-City Strivers | 105 | 0 | 10 | 35 | 150 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 590 | 0 | 15 | 35 | 640 |
| $:$ | 1,500 | 0 | 65 | 200 | 1,765 |


| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 35 | 0 | 10 | 35 | 80 |
| Suburban Achievers | 110 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 130 |
| Suburban Strivers | 340 | 0 | 15 | 70 | 425 |
|  | 485 | 0 | 30 | 120 | 635 |


| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 100 | 30 | 0 | 20 | 150 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 95 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 140 |
| Rural Couples | 295 | 35 | 0 | 65 | 395 |
| Rural Strivers | 190 | 45 | 0 | 40 | 275 |
|  | 680 | 130 | 0 | 150 | 960 |

## Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Annual Average Number of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type/ Geographic Designation | Potential <br> Renters | Potential Owners | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 542 | 1,138 | 1,680 |
| Metropolitan Cities Small Cities/Satellite Cities Metropolitan Suburbs Town \& Country/Exurbs | $\begin{array}{r} 39 \\ 192 \\ 61 \\ 250 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 198 \\ 139 \\ 780 \end{array}$ | 60 390 200 1,030 |
| Traditional \& Non-Traditional Families | 872 | 1,438 | 2,310 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 29 | 21 | 50 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 213 | 187 | 400 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 45 | 110 | 155 |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 585 | 1,120 | 1,705 |


| Younger |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{2 , 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 5 2 5}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 120 | 45 | 165 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 1,186 | 579 | 1,765 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 356 | 279 | 635 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 364 | 596 | 960 |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{7 , 5 1 5}$ |
| Total: | $\mathbf{3 , 4 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 0 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ |

## Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Annual Average Number of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States


Metropolitan Cities The Social Register Urban Establishment Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters Cosmopolitan Couples Subtotal:

## Small Cities/Satellite Cities

Second City Establishment
Blue-Collar Retirees

| Potential |
| :---: |
| Renters |

$\begin{array}{r}1 \\ 14 \\ 4 \\ 20 \\ \hline 39\end{array}$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4 \\
46 \\
8 \\
24 \\
110 \\
\hline 192
\end{array}
$$

## Metropolitan Suburbs

The One Percenters
Old Money
Affluent Empty Nester Suburban Establishment
Mainstream Empty Nesters 25
Middle-American Retirees
Subtotal:

## Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs

Small-Town Patriarchs

| New Empty Nesters | 3 | 22 | 25 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Traditional Couples | 3 | 22 | 25 |
| RV Retirees | 17 | 88 | 105 |
| Country Couples | 17 | 63 | 80 |
| Hometown Retirees | 13 | 62 | 75 |
| Heartland Retirees | 6 | 29 | 35 |
| Village Elders | 18 | 47 | 65 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 107 | 198 | 305 |
| Back Country Seniors | 50 | 145 | 195 |
| Subtotal: | $\mathbf{2 5 0}$ | 780 | 1,030 |
| Total: |  |  | $\mathbf{1 , 1 3 8}$ |

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

## Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Annual Average Number of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | Potential Renters | Potential Owners | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| e-Type Families | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Inner-City Families | 9 | 6 | 15 |
| Single-Parent Families | 16 | 9 | 25 |
| Subtotal: | 29 | 21 | 50 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| Uptown Families | 58 | 77 | 135 |
| In-Town Families | 34 | 46 | 80 |
| New American Strivers | 104 | 36 | 140 |
| Subtotal: | 213 | 187 | 400 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 1 | 9 | 10 |
| Nouveau Money | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| Button-Down Families | 5 | 20 | 25 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 7 | 13 | 20 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 16 | 34 | 50 |
| Subtotal: | 45 | 110 | 155 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 2 | 18 | 20 |
| New Town Families | 10 | 60 | 70 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 14 | 86 | 100 |
| Rural Families | 41 | 189 | 230 |
| Traditional Families | 4 | 16 | 20 |
| Small-Town Families | 111 | 139 | 250 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 40 | 100 | 140 |
| Rustic Families | 102 | 343 | 445 |
| Hometown Families | 261 | 169 | 430 |
| Subtotal: | 585 | 1,120 | 1,705 |
| Total: | 872 | 1,438 | 2,310 |
| Percent: | 37.7\% | 62.3\% | 100.0\% |

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

## Tenure (Renter/Buyer) Profile

Annual Average Number of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Younger Singles \& Couples | Potential <br> Renters | Potential Owners | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| New Bohemians | 52 | 13 | 65 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| Downtown Couples | 19 | 16 | 35 |
| Downtown Proud | 43 | 7 | 50 |
| Subtotal: | 120 | 45 | 165 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 60 | 35 | 95 |
| Small-City Singles | 263 | 317 | 580 |
| Twentysomethings | 248 | 52 | 300 |
| Second-City Strivers | 119 | 31 | 150 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 496 | 144 | 640 |
| Subtotal: | 1,186 | 579 | 1,765 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 66 | 14 | 80 |
| Suburban Achievers | 46 | 84 | 130 |
| Suburban Strivers | 244 | 181 | 425 |
| Subtotal: | 356 | 279 | 635 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 48 | 102 | 150 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 31 | 109 | 140 |
| Rural Couples | 135 | 260 | 395 |
| Rural Strivers | 150 | 125 | 275 |
| Subtotal: | 364 | 596 | 960 |
| Total: | 2,026 | 1,499 | 3,525 |
| Percent: | 57.5\% | 42.5\% | 100.0\% |

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

## Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States


| Younger |  | $\mathbf{9 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 9 9}$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 18 | 14 | 317 | 45 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 78 | 184 | 161 | 579 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 35 | 83 | 433 | 279 |
| Town ECountry/Exurbs | 47 | 116 |  | 596 |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 , 8 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 7 5}$ |
| Total: | $\mathbf{3 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

## Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States


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

## Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States


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

## Purchase Propensity By Housing Type

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Younger Singles \& Couples | . Multi-Family . . | Single-Family |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | .... Attached.... | .... Detached.... | Total |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| New Bohemians | 9 | 3 | 1 | 13 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Downtown Couples | 3 | 6 | 7 | 16 |
| Downtown Proud | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Subtotal: | 18 | 14 | 13 | 45 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 10 | 14 | 11 | 35 |
| Small-City Singles | 17 | 69 | 231 | 317 |
| Twentysomethings | 18 | 24 | 10 | 52 |
| Second-City Strivers | 9 | 15 | 7 | 31 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 24 | 62 | 58 | 144 |
| Subtotal: | 78 | 184 | 317 | 579 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 8 | 6 | 0 | 14 |
| Suburban Achievers | 4 | 16 | 64 | 84 |
| Suburban Strivers | 23 | 61 | 97 | 181 |
| Subtotal: | 35 | 83 | 161 | 279 |
| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 6 | 16 | 80 | 102 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 8 | 15 | 86 | 109 |
| Rural Couples | 22 | 52 | 186 | 260 |
| Rural Strivers | 11 | 33 | 81 | 125 |
| Subtotal: | 47 | 116 | 433 | 596 |
| Total: | 178 | 397 | 924 | 1,499 |
| Percent: | 11.9\% | 26.5\% | 61.6\% | 100.0\% |

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

## Renter Households By Income Bands

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type / Geographic Designation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text {. . . . Rent } \\ 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { er Income B } \\ 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ands . . . . } \\ 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 102 | 99 | 56 | 32 | 253 | 542 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 39 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 49 | 43 | 21 | 12 | 67 | 192 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 6 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 39 | 61 |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 43 | 45 | 27 | 14 | 121 | 250 |


| Traditional \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{1 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 2}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 6 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 56 | 40 | 28 | 16 | 73 | 29 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 29 | 213 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 129 | 94 | 72 | 45 | 245 | 45 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 585 |  |


| Younger |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{4 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 2 6}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 19 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 69 | 120 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 320 | 277 | 137 | 81 | 371 | 1,186 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 61 | 59 | 41 | 26 | 169 | 356 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 88 | 85 | 43 | 26 | 122 | 364 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{7 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 4 4 0}$ |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{2 2 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Renter Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \ldots . \text {. Ren } \\ 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { er Income B } \\ 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ands . . . . } \\ 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Above $100 \%$ AMI | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Urban Establishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 20 |
| Subtotal: | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 26 | 39 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 7 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 22 | 46 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| Hometown Seniors | 6 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 24 |
| Second City Seniors | 35 | 27 | 11 | 6 | 31 | 110 |
| Subtotal: | 49 | 43 | 21 | 12 | 67 | 192 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Suburban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 25 |
| Middle-American Retirees | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 30 |
| Subtotal: | 6 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 39 | 61 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Pillars of the Community | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 |
| New Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Traditional Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| RV Retirees | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 17 |
| Country Couples | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 17 |
| Hometown Retirees | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 13 |
| Heartland Retirees | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Village Elders | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 18 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 21 | 22 | 13 | 7 | 44 | 107 |
| Back Country Seniors | 11 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 19 | 50 |
| Subtotal: | 43 | 45 | 27 | 14 | 121 | 250 |
| Total: | 102 | 99 | 56 | 32 | 253 | 542 |
| Percent: | 18.8\% | 18.3\% | 10.3\% | 5.9\% | 46.7\% | 100.0\% |

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

## Renter Households By Income Bands

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States
Traditional \&
Non-Traditional Families
. . . . . . . . . . . . .Renter Income Bands
Below $30 \%$ to $60 \%$ to $80 \%$ to Above 30\% AMI 60\% AMI 80\% AMI 100\% AMI 100\% AMI $\qquad$

Metropolitan Cities

| e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Inner-City Families | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Single-Parent Families | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Subtotal: | 6 | 5 | $\frac{3}{2}$ | $\frac{2}{2}$ |  |  |

Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 12 |
| Uptown Families | 10 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 28 | 58 |
| In-Town Families | 11 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 34 |
| New American Strivers | 33 | 23 | 15 | 8 | 25 | 104 |
|  | 56 | 40 | 28 | 16 | 73 | 213 |

Metropolitan Suburbs

| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Button-Down Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 16 |
|  | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 29 | 45 |

Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs

| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Town Families | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 |
| Rural Families | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 23 | 41 |
| Traditional Families | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Small-Town Families | 19 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 58 | 111 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 20 | 40 |
| Rustic Families | 21 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 43 | 102 |
| Hometown Families | 73 | 51 | 36 | 20 | 81 | 261 |
|  | Subtotal: | 129 | 94 | 72 | 45 | 245 |
| Total: | $\mathbf{1 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 5}$ |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{2 2 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 4} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

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

## Renter Households By Income Bands

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/ To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Regional Draw Area,
Marion County, and Balance of the United States
$\qquad$

| Younger |
| :---: |
| Singles \& Couples |

Below $30 \%$ to $60 \%$ to $80 \%$ to Above
30\% AMI 60\% AMI 80\% AMI 100\% AMI 100\% AMI $\qquad$
Metropolitan Cities

| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Bohemians | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 38 | 52 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Downtown Couples | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 19 |
| Downtown Proud | 10 | 8 | $\frac{5}{2}$ | $\frac{3}{10}$ | $\frac{17}{4}$ | 69 |

Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| The VIPs | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 40 | 60 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small-City Singles | 50 | 57 | 34 | 21 | 101 | 263 |
| Twentysomethings | 63 | 48 | 30 | 19 | 88 | 248 |
| Second-City Strivers | 26 | 25 | 15 | 9 | 44 | 119 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 175 | 141 | 53 | 29 | 98 | 496 |
|  | 320 | 277 | 137 | 81 | 371 | 1,186 |

## Metropolitan Suburbs

Fast-Track Professionals
Suburban Achievers
Suburban Strivers
Subtotal:

## Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs

Hometown Sweethearts Blue-Collar Traditionalists

Rural Couples
Rural Strivers
Subtotal:
Total
Percent:
. . . . . . . . . . . . .Renter Income Bands

# Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type / | Below | 30\% to | 60\% to | 80\% to | Above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geographic Designation | 30\% AMI | 60\% AMI | 80\% AMI | 100\% AMI | 100\% AMI | Total |


| Empty Nesters |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| \& Retires | $\mathbf{1 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 3 8}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 40 | 38 | 23 | 0 | 21 | 21 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 12 | 17 | 11 | 8 | 85 | 198 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 113 | 126 | 79 | 45 | 417 | 139 |


| Traditional \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 3 8}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 44 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 187 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 13 | 9 | 23 | 13 | 75 | 110 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 207 | 156 | 128 | 6 | 74 | 10 |


| Younger |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Singles \& Couples | 320 | 316 | 180 | 107 | 576 | 1,499 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 45 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 134 | 129 | 70 | 44 | 202 | 579 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 51 | 50 | 35 | 20 | 123 | 279 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 130 | 132 | 72 | 43 | 219 | 596 |
| Total: | 753 | 697 | 452 | 271 | 1,902 | 4,075 |
| Percent: | 18.5\% | 17.1\% | 11.1\% | 6.7\% | 46.7\% | 100.0\% |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 21 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 16 |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 14 | 16 | 11 | 6 | 42 | 89 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 22 |
| Hometown Seniors | 9 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 31 |
| Second City Seniors | 13 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 40 |
| Subtotal: | 40 | 38 | 23 | 12 | 85 | 198 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Suburban Establishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 17 |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 28 | 45 |
| Middle-American Retirees | 7 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 38 | 65 |
| Subtotal: | 12 | 17 | 11 | 8 | 91 | 139 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 39 |
| Pillars of the Community | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 49 | 65 |
| New Empty Nesters | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 22 |
| Traditional Couples | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 22 |
| RV Retirees | 8 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 59 | 88 |
| Country Couples | 7 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 38 | 63 |
| Hometown Retirees | 7 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 35 | 62 |
| Heartland Retirees | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 29 |
| Village Elders | 9 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 20 | 47 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 40 | 41 | 25 | 13 | 79 | 198 |
| Back Country Seniors | 31 | 32 | 18 | 10 | 54 | 145 |
| Subtotal: | 113 | 126 | 79 | 45 | 417 | 780 |
| Total: | 165 | 181 | 113 | 65 | 614 | 1,138 |
| Percent: | 14.5\% | 15.9\% | 9.9\% | 5.7\% | 54.0\% | 100.0\% |

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

# Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States
Traditional \&
Non-Traditional Families
. . . . . . . . . . . . .Ownership Income Bands

Non-Traditional Families
Below $30 \%$ to $60 \%$ to $80 \%$ to Above 30\% AMI 60\% AMI 80\% AMI 100\% AMI 100\% AMI $\qquad$

Metropolitan Cities

| e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Inner-City Families | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Single-Parent Families | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Subtotal: | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 | $\frac{1}{21}$ |

## Small Cities/Satellite Cities

Unibox Transferees
Multi-Ethnic Families
Uptown Families
In-Town Families
New American Strivers
Subtotal:

| 1 | 1 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 3 |
| 13 | 11 |
| 15 | 9 |
| 12 | 8 |
| 44 | 32 |


| 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 1 | 9 | 18 |
| 9 | 6 | 38 | 77 |
| 6 | 3 | 13 | 46 |
| 5 | 3 | 8 | 36 |
|  | 13 | 75 | 187 |

Metropolitan Suburbs

| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Button-Down Families | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 20 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 18 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 18 | 34 |
| Subtotal: | 13 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 74 | 110 |


| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 18 |
| New Town Families | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 43 | 60 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 9 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 59 | 86 |
| Rural Families | 30 | 23 | 20 | 12 | 104 | 189 |
| Traditional Families | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 16 |
| Small-Town Families | 24 | 17 | 15 | 9 | 74 | 139 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 16 | 14 | 12 | 7 | 51 | 100 |
| Rustic Families | 72 | 54 | 44 | 30 | 143 | 343 |
| Hometown Families | 48 | 33 | 24 | 13 | 51 | 169 |
| Subtotal: | 207 | 156 | 128 | 80 | 549 | 1,120 |
| Total: | 268 | 200 | 159 | 99 | 712 | 1,438 |
| Percent: | 18.6\% | 13.9\% | 11.1\% | 6.9\% | 49.5\% | 100.0\% |

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

# Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

## Younger Singles \& Couples

 . . . . . . . . . . . . .Ownership Income Bands> | Below | $30 \%$ to | $60 \%$ to | $80 \%$ to | Above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30 \%$ AMI | $60 \%$ AMI | $80 \%$ AMI | $100 \%$ AMI | $100 \%$ AMI |

| Total |
| ---: |
|  |
| 3 |
| 13 |
| 6 |
| 16 |
| 7 |
| 45 |

## Small Cities/Satellite Cities



| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 16 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
|  | 5 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 35 |
| 60 | 69 | 41 | 26 | 121 | 317 |
| 14 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 52 |
| 7 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 31 |
| 50 | 41 | 16 | 8 | 29 | 144 |
| 134 | 129 | 70 | 44 | 202 | 579 |

## Metropolitan Suburbs

Fast-Track Professionals
Suburban Achievers
Suburban Strivers
Subtotal:

| 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 14 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 14 | 15 | 11 | 6 | 38 | 84 |
| 35 | 33 | 23 | 14 | 76 | 181 |
|  | 50 | 35 | 20 | 123 | 279 |


| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 15 | 18 | 13 | 7 | 49 | 102 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 17 | 21 | 14 | 9 | 48 | 109 |
| Rural Couples | 61 | 60 | 31 | 19 | 89 | 260 |
| Rural Strivers | 37 | 33 | 14 | 8 | 33 | 125 |
| Subtotal: | 130 | 132 | 72 | 43 | 219 | 596 |
| Total: | $\mathbf{3 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 9 9}$ |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{2 1 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

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

# Multi-Family Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type / Geographic Designation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Above $100 \% \text { AMI }$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 11 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 49 | 80 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 22 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 6 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 24 | 41 |


|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Metropolitan Cities | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 19 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 15 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 33 | 73 |


| Younger <br> Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 8}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Metropolitan Cities | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 19 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 6 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 28 | 78 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 10 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 16 | 35 |


| Total: | 71 | 63 | 37 | 21 | 171 | 363 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Percent: | $19.6 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Multi-Family Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |

## Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Hometown Seniors | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Second City Seniors | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| Subtotal: | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 22 |


| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Suburban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Middle-American Retirees | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Pillars of the Community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| RV Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Country Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Hometown Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Heartland Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Village Elders | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 13 |
| Back Country Seniors | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 |
| Subtotal: | 6 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 24 | 41 |
| Total: | 11 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 49 | 80 |
| Percent: | 13.8\% | 15.0\% | 6.3\% | 3.8\% | 61.3\% | 100.0\% |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Multi-Family Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area,
Marion County, and Balance of the United States

> . . . . . . . . . . . . .Multi-Family Ownership Income Bands

|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Single-Parent Families | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Subtotal: | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |

Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Uptown Families | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| In-Town Families | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| New American Strivers | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Subtotal: | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 19 |

Metropolitan Suburbs

| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Subtotal: | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 |


| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| New Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Rural Families | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Traditional Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Small-Town Families | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 17 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Rustic Families | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 19 |
| Hometown Families | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 20 |
| Subtotal: | 15 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 33 | 73 |
| Total: | 22 | 14 | 11 | 7 | 51 | 105 |
| Percent: | 21.0\% | 13.3\% | 10.5\% | 6.7\% | 48.6\% | 100.0\% |

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

# Multi-Family Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Younger Singles \& Couples | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Below } \\ & 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \% \text { to } \\ & 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| New Bohemians | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Downtown Couples | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Downtown Proud | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Subtotal: | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 18 |

## Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| The VIPs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small-City Singles | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 17 |
| Twentysomethings | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 18 |
| Second-City Strivers | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 8 | 7 | 3 | 1 | $\frac{5}{2}$ | 24 |
| Subtotal: | 19 | 17 | 9 | 5 | 28 | 78 |

## Metropolitan Suburbs

Fast-Track Professionals
Suburban Achievers
Suburban Strivers
Subtotal:

| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
|  |  |  | 2 | 16 | 23 |

Town \& Country/Exurbs
Hometown Sweethearts
Blue-Collar Traditionalists
Rural Couples
Rural Strivers
Subtotal:

| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 22 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| 10 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 16 | 47 |
| 38 | 37 | 21 | 11 | 71 | 178 |
| 21.3\% | 20.8\% | 11.8\% | 6.2\% | 39.9\% | 100.0\% |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Single-Family Attached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type/ Geographic Designation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Above $100 \% \text { AMI }$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Retirees | 28 | 28 | 17 | 8 | 92 | 173 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 10 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 17 | 42 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 24 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 16 | 17 | 10 | 4 | 53 | 100 |


|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Metropolitan Cities | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 22 | 51 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 20 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 37 | 27 | 22 | 12 | 83 | 181 |


| Younger <br> Singles \& Couples | 88 | 85 | 47 | 28 | 149 | 397 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 14 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 45 | 42 | 22 | 14 | 61 | 184 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 16 | 15 | 10 | 6 | 36 | 83 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 26 | 27 | 14 | 8 | 41 | 116 |
| Total: | 169 | 152 | 92 | 52 | 364 | 829 |
| Percent: | 20.4\% | 18.3\% | 11.1\% | 6.3\% | 43.9\% | 100.0\% |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Single-Family Attached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

## Empty Nesters \& Retirees

Metropolitan Cities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 |

## Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 17 |  |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Hometown Seniors | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 |  |
| Second City Seniors | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 |  |
|  | 10 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 | 17 | 42 |
| Subtotal: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Suburban Establishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 |  |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 |  |
| Middle-American Retirees | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 24 |  |


| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Pillars of the Community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| New Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Traditional Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| RV Retirees | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| Country Couples | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Hometown Retirees | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Heartland Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Village Elders | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 7 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 34 |
| Back Country Seniors | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 21 |
|  | Subtotal: | 16 | 17 | 10 | 4 | 53 |
| Total: |  | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |

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

# Single-Family Attached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States

Single-Family Attached Ownership Income Bands

| Traditional \& | Below | $30 \%$ to | $60 \%$ to | $80 \%$ to | Above |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\underline{30 \% A M I}$ | $\underline{60 \% A M I}$ | $\underline{80 \% A M I}$ | $100 \%$ AMI | $100 \% A M I$ | Total |


| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Inner-City Families | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Single-Parent Families | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 |


| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Uptown Families | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 18 |
| In-Town Families | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| New American Strivers | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 16 |
|  | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 22 | 51 |

Metropolitan Suburbs

| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Button-Down Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| Subtotal: | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 20 |

Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs

| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| New Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Rural Families | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 18 |
| Traditional Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Small-Town Families | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 34 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| Rustic Families | 9 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 44 |
| Hometown Families | 16 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 17 | 56 |
|  |  | 27 | 22 | 12 | 83 | 181 |
| Subtotal: | 37 |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 6}$ |
| Total: | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ |  |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{2 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

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

# Single-Family Attached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area, Marion County, and Balance of the United States
. . . . . . . . . . . Single-Family Attached Ownership Income Bands

| Younger Singles \& Couples | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \% \text { to } \\ & 60 \% \text { AMI } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Above $100 \%$ AMI | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Downtown Couples | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Subtotal: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 14 |

Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| The VIPs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Small-City Singles | 13 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 26 | 69 |
| Twentysomethings | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 24 |
| Second-City Strivers | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 15 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 22 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 62 |
|  | 45 | 42 | 22 | 14 | 61 | 184 |

Metropolitan Suburbs
Fast-Track Professionals
Suburban Achievers
Suburban Strivers
Subtotal:

| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 16 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | 11 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 8 | 5 | 25 | 61 |
|  |  | 6 | 36 | 83 |  |


| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 16 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 15 |
| Rural Couples | 12 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 52 |
| Rural Strivers | 10 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 33 |
| Subtotal: | 26 | 27 | 14 | 8 | 41 | 116 |
| Total: | 88 | 85 | 47 | 28 | 149 | 397 |
| Percent: | 22.2\% | 21.4\% | 11.8\% | 7.1\% | 37.5\% | 100.0\% |

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

# Single-Family Detached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area,
Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Household Type / Geographic Designation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 126 | 141 | 91 | 54 | 473 | 885 |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 25 | 26 | 16 | 9 | 58 | 134 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 10 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 69 | 106 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 91 | 103 | 66 | 39 | 340 | 639 |


| Traditional \& |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{1 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 7 4}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 27 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 9 | 7 | 76 | 8 | 46 | 117 |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 155 | 118 | 97 | 5 | 53 | 81 |
|  |  |  |  | 63 | 433 | 866 |


| Younger |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{1 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 4}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 70 | 70 | 39 | 25 | 113 | 13 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 29 | 29 | 20 | 12 | 71 | 161 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 94 | 94 | 52 | 31 | 162 | 433 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{5 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 8 3}$ |
| Percent: | $\mathbf{1 7 . 8} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 7} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

# Single-Family Detached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area,
Marion County, and Balance of the United States

| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \% \text { to } \\ & 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 13 |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 10 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 31 | 66 |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 14 |
| Hometown Seniors | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 23 |
| Second City Seniors | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 18 |
| Subtotal: | 25 | 26 | 16 | 9 | 58 | 134 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Suburban Establishment | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 30 |
| Middle-American Retirees | 6 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 29 | 50 |
| Subtotal: | 10 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 69 | 106 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 25 | 32 |
| Pillars of the Community | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 42 | 58 |
| New Empty Nesters | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 20 |
| Traditional Couples | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 20 |
| RV Retirees | 8 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 52 | 80 |
| Country Couples | 6 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 32 | 54 |
| Hometown Retirees | 6 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 29 | 53 |
| Heartland Retirees | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 24 |
| Village Elders | 6 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 34 |
| Small-Town Seniors | 30 | 31 | 19 | 10 | 61 | 151 |
| Back Country Seniors | 24 | 25 | 14 | 8 | 42 | 113 |
| Subtotal: | 91 | 103 | 66 | 39 | 340 | 639 |
| Total: | 126 | 141 | 91 | 54 | 473 | 885 |
| Percent: | 14.2\% | 15.9\% | 10.3\% | 6.1\% | 53.4\% | 100.0\% |

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

# Single-Family Detached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area,
Marion County, and Balance of the United States
. . . . . . . . . . . . . Single-Family Detached Ownership Income Bands

| Traditional \& | Below | $30 \%$ to | $60 \%$ to | $80 \%$ to | Above |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\underline{30 \% A M I}$ | $60 \% A M I$ |  | $80 \% A M I$ | $100 \% A M I$ | $100 \%$ AMI | Total |

Metropolitan Cities

| e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Inner-City Families | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Single-Parent Families | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Subtotal: | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 4 |  |  |

Small Cities/Satellite Cities

| Unibox Transferees | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 13 |
| Uptown Families | 9 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 26 | 52 |
| In-Town Families | 11 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 34 |
| New American Strivers | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 12 |
| Subtotal: | 27 | 20 | 16 | 8 | 46 | 117 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Button-Down Families | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 18 |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Kids 'r' Us | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 25 |
| Subtotal: | 9 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 53 | 81 |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 15 |
| New Town Families | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 37 | 54 |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 8 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 53 | 78 |
| Rural Families | 26 | 20 | 17 | 11 | 90 | 164 |
| Traditional Families | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 13 |
| Small-Town Families | 15 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 47 | 88 |
| Four-by-Four Families | 13 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 42 | 81 |
| Rustic Families | 59 | 44 | 36 | 24 | 117 | 280 |
| Hometown Families | 26 | 18 | 13 | 7 | 29 | 93 |
| Subtotal: | 155 | 118 | 97 | 63 | 433 | 866 |
| Total: | 193 | 147 | 120 | 76 | 538 | 1,074 |
| Percent: | 18.0\% | 13.7\% | 11.2\% | 7.1\% | 50.1\% | 100.0\% |

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

# Single-Family Detached Owner Households By Income Bands 

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move Within/To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Vigo County, Regional Draw Area,
Marion County, and Balance of the United States
. . . . . . . . . . . . Single-Family Detached Ownership Income Bands

| Younger Singles \& Couples | $\begin{gathered} \text { Below } \\ 30 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \text { to } \\ 60 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \% \text { to } \\ 80 \% \text { AMI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80 \% \text { to } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Above } \\ 100 \% \text { AMI } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Downtown Couples | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Subtotal: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 |
| Small-City Singles | 44 | 50 | 30 | 19 | 88 | 231 |
| Twentysomethings | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| Second-City Strivers | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 20 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 58 |
| Subtotal: | 70 | 70 | 39 | 25 | 113 | 317 |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Achievers | 10 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 30 | 64 |
| Suburban Strivers | 19 | 18 | 12 | 7 | 41 | 97 |
| Subtotal: | 29 | 29 | 20 | 12 | 71 | 161 |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 12 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 38 | 80 |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 14 | 16 | 11 | 7 | 38 | 86 |
| Rural Couples | 44 | 43 | 22 | 13 | 64 | 186 |
| Rural Strivers | 24 | 21 | 9 | 5 | 22 | 81 |
| Subtotal: | 94 | 94 | 52 | 31 | 162 | 433 |
| Total: | 194 | 194 | 112 | 68 | 356 | 924 |
| Percent: | 21.0\% | 21.0\% | 12.1\% | 7.4\% | 38.5\% | 100.0\% |

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc.

Methodology: An Analysis of Residential Market Potential
Vigo County, Indiana
August, 2023

## Appendix Two Tables

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential <br> To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years <br> Clay County, Indiana 

| Household Type / Geographic Designation | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 4,720 | 65 | 28.9\% |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 4,720 | 65 | 28.9\% |


| Traditional \& |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{3 , 8 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 4 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs | 3,885 | 100 | $44.4 \%$ |


| Younger |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 7 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 2,000 | 60 | $26.7 \%$ |
| Total: | $\mathbf{1 0 , 6 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years <br> Clay County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 4,720 | 65 | 28.9\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Hometown Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second City Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Middle-American Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 65 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Pillars of the Community | 70 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Empty Nesters | 215 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Traditional Couples | 170 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| RV Retirees | 925 | 10 | 4.4\% |
| Country Couples | 815 | 10 | 4.4\% |
| Hometown Retirees | 395 | 5 | 2.2\% |
| Heartland Retirees | 240 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Village Elders | 395 | 5 | 2.2\% |
| Small-Town Seniors | 815 | 25 | 11.1\% |
| Back Country Seniors | 615 | 10 | 4.4\% |
| Subtotal: | 4,720 | 65 | 28.9\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years <br> Clay County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | 3,885 | 100 | 44.4\% |
| Metropolitan Cities e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Single-Parent Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Uptown Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| In-Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New American Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Button-Down Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Kids 'r' Us | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Town Families | 35 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 155 | 5 | 2.2\% |
| Rural Families | 1,525 | 25 | 11.1\% |
| Traditional Families | 145 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-Town Families | 500 | 20 | 8.9\% |
| Four-by-Four Families | 340 | 10 | 4.4\% |
| Rustic Families | 945 | 25 | 11.1\% |
| Hometown Families | 240 | 15 | 6.7\% |
| Subtotal: | 3,885 | 100 | 44.4\% |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential <br> To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years <br> Clay County, Indiana 

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 2,000 | 60 | 26.7\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-City Singles | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Twentysomethings | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second-City Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Achievers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 990 | 15 | 6.7\% |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 410 | 10 | 4.4\% |
| Rural Couples | 215 | 10 | 4.4\% |
| Rural Strivers | 385 | 25 | 11.1\% |
| Subtotal: | 2,000 | 60 | 26.7\% |

Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential
To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years
Sullivan County, Indiana

| Household Type/ Geographic Designation | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 3,425 | 45 | 33.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 3,425 | 45 | 33.3\% |


|  <br> Non-Traditional Families | 2,835 | 55 | $40.7 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Metropolitan Cities } & 0 & 0 & 0.0 \%\end{array}$

| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |

Town \& Country/Exurbs
2,835 $55 \quad 40.7 \%$

| Younger |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{1 , 4 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 9 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 1,425 | 35 | $25.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{7 , 6 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential <br> To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Sullivan County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 3,425 | 45 | 33.3\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Hometown Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second City Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Middle-American Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 65 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Pillars of the Community | 70 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Traditional Couples | 80 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| RV Retirees | 630 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Country Couples | 250 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Hometown Retirees | 225 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Heartland Retirees | 230 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Village Elders | 320 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Small-Town Seniors | 675 | 15 | 11.1\% |
| Back Country Seniors | 880 | 15 | 11.1\% |
| Subtotal: | 3,425 | 45 | 33.3\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Sullivan County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traditional \& Non-Traditional Families | 2,835 | 55 | 40.7\% |
| Metropolitan Cities e-Type Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Single-Parent Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Uptown Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| In-Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New American Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Button-Down Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Kids 'r' Us | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Town Families | 45 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Rural Families | 755 | 10 | 7.4\% |
| Traditional Families | 110 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-Town Families | 80 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Four-by-Four Families | 180 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Rustic Families | 1,555 | 35 | 25.9\% |
| Hometown Families | 110 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Subtotal: | 2,835 | 55 | 40.7\% |

## Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Sullivan County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 1,425 | 35 | 25.9\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-City Singles | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Twentysomethings | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second-City Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Achievers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 440 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 330 | 5 | 3.7\% |
| Rural Couples | 435 | 15 | 11.1\% |
| Rural Strivers | 220 | 10 | 7.4\% |
| Subtotal: | 1,425 | 35 | 25.9\% |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Vermillion County, Indiana

| Household Type/ Geographic Designation | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 2,955 | 45 | 36.0\% |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 2,955 | 45 | 36.0\% |


| Traditional \& |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Non-Traditional Families | $\mathbf{2 , 1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 0 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 2,135 | 45 | $36.0 \%$ |


| Younger |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Singles \& Couples | $\mathbf{1 , 3 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 0 \%}$ |
| Metropolitan Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Metropolitan Suburbs | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Town E Country/Exurbs | 1,355 | 35 | $28.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total: | $\mathbf{6 , 4 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0} \%$ |

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Vermillion County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty Nesters \& Retirees | 2,955 | 45 | 36.0\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| The Social Register | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Urban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Second City Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Blue-Collar Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Middle-Class Move-Downs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Hometown Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second City Seniors | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| The One Percenters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Old Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Affluent Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mainstream Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Middle-American Retirees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town $\mathcal{E}$ Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Small-Town Patriarchs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Pillars of the Community | 20 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Empty Nesters | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Traditional Couples | 35 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| RV Retirees | 910 | 10 | 8.0\% |
| Country Couples | 235 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Hometown Retirees | 315 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Heartland Retirees | 195 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Village Elders | 240 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Small-Town Seniors | 600 | 15 | 12.0\% |
| Back Country Seniors | 405 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 2,955 | 45 | 36.0\% |

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

# Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years 

Vermillion County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traditional \& Non-Traditional Families | 2,135 | 45 | 36.0\% |
| Metropolitan Cities e-Type Families |  |  |  |
| e-Type Families <br> Multi-Cultural Families | 0 | 0 0 | $0.0 \%$ $0.0 \%$ |
| Inner-City Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Single-Parent Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| Unibox Transferees | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Uptown Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| In-Town Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New American Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Corporate Establishment | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Nouveau Money | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Button-Down Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Fiber-Optic Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Late-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Suburbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Kids 'r' Us | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town E Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Ex-Urban Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Town Families | 20 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Full-Nest Exurbanites | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Rural Families | 760 | 10 | 8.0\% |
| Traditional Families | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-Town Families | 225 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Four-by-Four Families | 180 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Rustic Families | 895 | 20 | 16.0\% |
| Hometown Families | 55 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 2,135 | 45 | 36.0\% |

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

## Annual Average Number Of Households With The Potential To Move To Vigo County Each Year Over The Next Five Years

Vermillion County, Indiana

|  | Estimated Number | Potential | Share of <br> Potential |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Younger Singles \& Couples | 1,355 | 35 | 28.0\% |
| Metropolitan Cities |  |  |  |
| New Power Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| New Bohemians | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Cosmopolitan Elite | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Couples | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Downtown Proud | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small Cities/Satellite Cities |  |  |  |
| The VIPs | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Small-City Singles | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Twentysomethings | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Second-City Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Multi-Ethnic Singles | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Metropolitan Suburbs |  |  |  |
| Fast-Track Professionals | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Achievers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Suburban Strivers | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Town \& Country/Exurbs |  |  |  |
| Hometown Sweethearts | 705 | 10 | 8.0\% |
| Blue-Collar Traditionalists | 195 | 5 | 4.0\% |
| Rural Couples | 240 | 10 | 8.0\% |
| Rural Strivers | 215 | 10 | 8.0\% |
| Subtotal: | 1,355 | 35 | 28.0\% |
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## 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 proprietary residential target market methodology ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ 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.

## Rights and Study Ownership-

Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc. retains all rights, title and interest in the ZVA residential target market methodology ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ and target market descriptions contained within this study. The specific findings of the analysis are the property of the client and can be distributed at the client's discretion.
© Zimmerman/Volk Associates, Inc., 2023

