

Self-Storage Demand Shortlist

Texas · top 20 markets of 747 scored

Prepared for [Your Company] · sample report

20 MARKETS	100.0 TOP SCORE	98.5 MEDIAN	14 COUNTIES	19/20 SUPPLY MEASURED
----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---

Markets are ranked by a self-storage-specific demand model built on Census ACS demographics, then compared against County Business Patterns establishment counts to find where operators have not kept pace with demand. Scores are percentile ranks within the industry nationally — a 98 outranks 98% of the 10,051 scored self-storage markets in the United States.

Where the Census withholds a county's establishment count under its disclosure rules, the supply gap is shown as *not measured* rather than assumed to be zero. One market in this shortlist falls into that category.

Ranked shortlist

Supply gap is a standardized residual: how far actual operator counts sit from what the county's demographics predict. More negative means more underserved.

#	MARKET	SCORE	SUPPLY GAP	POPULATION	5-MI CATCHMENT	TOP DEMAND DRIVERS
1	Forney, TX 75126	100.0	-0.84	67,852	67,852	Population growth %: +0.36; Household growth %: +0.18
2	Brownsville, TX 78526	99.7	-1.06	59,547	59,547	Population growth %: +0.23; Households: +0.14
3	Buda, TX 78610	99.6	-0.59	44,410	49,609	Population growth %: +0.32; Household growth %: +0.17
4	Copperas Cove, TX 76522	99.1	-1.44	41,087	41,087	Market saturation vs state: +0.15; Households: +0.14
5	Austin, TX 78737	99.0	-0.59	24,951	54,210	Population growth %: +0.36; Household growth %: +0.18
6	Mission, TX 78573	99.0	-1.74	43,555	167,719	Local self-storage supply per 1k residents (5mi): +0.19; Supply gap vs comparable counties (z-score, lower = more underserved): +0.17
7	Odessa, TX 79765	99.0	+0.62	21,210	23,750	Population growth %: +0.36; Household growth %: +0.18
8	New Braunfels, TX 78132	98.8	-0.65	37,386	37,386	Population growth %: +0.35; Households with 3+ vehicles %: +0.21
9	Edinburg, TX 78539	98.8	-1.74	37,182	98,181	Local self-storage supply per 1k residents (5mi): +0.19; Supply gap vs comparable counties (z-score, lower = more underserved): +0.17
10	Midlothian, TX 76065	98.5	-0.07	42,415	42,415	Population growth %: +0.20; Households with 3+ vehicles %: +0.17
11	Baytown, TX 77523	98.4	not measured	27,489	27,489	Population growth %: +0.24; Households with 3+ vehicles %: +0.15
12	Edinburg, TX 78542	98.4	-1.74	83,925	84,763	Local self-storage supply per 1k residents (5mi): +0.19; Supply gap vs comparable counties (z-score, lower = more underserved): +0.17
13	Fulshear, TX 77441	98.3	+0.74	27,067	27,337	Population growth %: +0.36; Median income (z-score): +0.22
14	New Braunfels, TX 78130	98.2	-0.65	91,275	91,275	Population growth %: +0.27; Household growth %: +0.16
15	Amarillo, TX 79119	98.1	+0.20	22,371	22,371	Population growth %: +0.36; Household growth %: +0.18
16	Kyle, TX 78640	98.1	-0.59	68,265	68,265	Population growth %: +0.25; Household growth %: +0.17
17	Richmond, TX 77406	98.1	+0.74	63,187	63,187	Population growth %: +0.36; Household growth %: +0.18
18	Argyle, TX 76226	97.9	+0.90	37,413	37,413	Population growth %: +0.36; Median income (z-score): +0.20
19	Waco, TX 76706	97.8	-0.90	40,770	50,244	Renter households %: +0.23; Households: +0.14
20	Cleveland, TX 77327	97.4	-1.00	33,673	33,673	Population growth %: +0.36; Market saturation vs state: +0.15

■ ≤ -1.0 σ materially underserved ■ below prediction ■ at or above prediction

■ not measured (Census disclosure)

Market detail — Forney, TX

ZCTA	75126
Demand score	100.0 / 100
National rank	4 of 10,051
Supply gap	-0.84
Population	67,852
Households	21,282
5-mile catchment	67,852
Operators in county	9

What moved this score

- Population growth %: +0.36
- Household growth %: +0.18
- Households with 3+ vehicles %: +0.16

Operators on the ground

BUSINESS	ADDRESS	PHONE	RATING
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	([REDACTED]) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	([REDACTED]) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	([REDACTED]) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Operator names, addresses, phone numbers, websites and ratings are included in full in a purchased report. They are withheld here because this document is public — we don't publish other businesses' contact details.

How these numbers were produced

1. **Demand.** Census ACS demographics for every ZIP code tabulation area, weighted for self-storage specifically. Rates are shrunk toward the national mean in proportion to how little population backs them, so a small market's extreme percentage is not taken at face value. Output is a percentile rank, 0–100.
2. **Supply.** An ordinary-least-squares fit across US counties of log(establishments) on demographics, per NAICS industry code, trained only on counties where the Census publishes a real count.
3. **Gap.** Actual minus predicted, standardized. Negative means fewer operators than the demographics justify.

What this cannot tell you

- **Supply is county-resolution.** The Census publishes establishment counts by county, not by address. This will not tell you that two competitors sit on the same road as your site. Drive the market before you sign.
- **Demographics, not real estate.** Nothing here knows about zoning, parcel availability, traffic counts or land cost. A market can rank first and have nowhere to build.
- **As current as the Census.** ACS and County Business Patterns run on a release cycle; CBP 2022 is the current vintage. A market that moved sharply in the last eighteen months may not show it yet.
- **Some industries share a code.** Self-storage and RV/boat storage are both NAICS 531130; the Census counts them together and so do we, rather than inventing a split.

Want this for your market?

Pick an industry and a region — ranked shortlist, score drivers, supply gap and the operators already there, with contact details. From \$750, within 24 hours.

purposeblt.com