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## Executive Summary

A demographic profile of the Salem-Keizer area provides an essential tool to help understand the relationship between key socio-economic indicators and the local transportation system. This report is an effort to provide a larger background to enable planning for functional and equitable access to goods, services and employment. In the transportation planning process, projects and their impacts are evaluated in an environmental justice analysis. Environmental justice analysis evaluates the geographic location of minority and low-income population groups with the location of major transportation investments. This report includes additional information about traditionally underserved populations in order to provide a broader view of the Salem-Keizer Area, and to help inform the transportation community.

In addition to minority and low-income populations, this summary looks to identify populations that may potentially experience some level of limitation to convenient, accessible transportation. This affects their ability to travel, to access goods, services and recreation. Predominately, this limitation is in the use of a personal vehicle; however, it may also include difficulty accessing public transportation, or walking and biking options due to any number of socio-economic factors.

This profile helps identify who, where, and how large populations may be in the Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS) area, a region that includes the City of Turner and portions of unincorporated Polk and Marion County. Map 1 shows the SKATS area boundary in reference to the cities of Salem, Keizer and Turner.

Map 1: SKATS Boundary and City Limits


## Area Estimates

The information in this report is derived from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) 2011-2015 data. The ACS is an ongoing national survey that produces period estimates rather than point in time estimates of the decennial census. Five-year summary data is available at the smaller geographies of census tracts (reference map in Appendix), included here are tracts that are wholly or partially included within the SKATS boundary and include the following:

- Poverty (persons with incomes below Census defined poverty level)
- Minority Population (Hispanic, Black, Native American, Islander, Asian, or other race)
- Limited English households (all members have at least some difficulty with English)
- Elderly Population (aged 65 and older)
- Youth (age 15 to 17)
- Households with no access to vehicles
- Disabled, by age (Visual or Ambulatory Disability, within Age classifications)

Figure 1 shows the comparisons of each population's characteristics by area. The percentage of populations are compared for the SKATS area, Marion County, Polk County, and the State of Oregon to help provide an overall picture of the region.

Figure 1: Population Estimates During the 2011-2015 Time Period


To better understand how many people or households the above percentages represent, Figure 2 translates those values for the SKATS area into the population or household estimate of each demographic, compared to the total (population or households).

Figure 2: SKATS Area Population or Household Estimates by Characteristics
Estimated Number of People or Households


## General Long Term Trends

In reviewing current population and demographic information the question often asked is how does this compare to previous years? The changes the Census Bureau made in the methods for compiling information from the 2000 Decennial Census to the 2006-2010 and 2011-2015 American Community Surveys makes a direct comparison of numbers at small geographic areas incompatible. However, for a long-term view, some general trends can be observed. In all three periods, 2000, 2006-2010, and 20112015, the highest concentration of minority populations was in east and northeast Salem. Similarly, the highest concentrations of those living in poverty in the same three periods were in the downtown and central area of Salem. Specifically, some area-wide estimates are comparable over time, Figure 3 shows SKATS area only estimates from these three reporting periods.

Figure 3: Area-wide Estimates in Percentages by Time Period


Minorities and those living in poverty proportionally increased the greatest amount since 2000 growing from $21 \%$ to over $32 \%$ in the 15 -year time span. Those in poverty increased from $13 \%$ to over $17 \%$ in the same period. The elderly population increased slightly, largely due to the aging of the baby boomer generation, while limited English households and households without vehicles have remained relatively constant.

## Growth Over Time

The total population of the SKATS area increased from 223,988 in 2000 to an estimate of 258,107 in the 2011-2015 survey (for the census tracts covering the same geographic area) as shown in Figure 4. This represents a $15.2 \%$ increase from the year 2000 .

Figure 4: SKATS Population Growth over Time


# Demographic Profile of Populations in the SKATS Region 

## Introduction

A primary goal of transportation is to provide access to places people need to go to help them live vital, productive, and rewarding lives.

A demographic profile of the Salem-Keizer area provides an essential tool to help understand the relationship between key socio-economic indicators and the local transportation system. This report is an effort to provide a background to enable planning for functional and equitable access to goods, services and employment. In the transportation planning process, projects and their impacts are evaluated in an environmental justice analysis. Environmental justice analysis evaluates the demographic makeup of the region to compare the geographic location of minority and low-income population groups with the location of major transportation investments. This report includes additional information about traditionally underserved populations in order to provide a broader view of the Salem-Keizer Area, and to help inform the transportation community.

In addition to minority and low-income populations, this summary looks to identify populations that may potentially experience some level of limitation to convenient, accessible transportation. This affects their ability to travel, to access goods, services and recreation. Predominately, this limitation is in the use of a personal vehicle; however, it may also include difficulty accessing public transportation, or walking and biking options due to any number of socio-economic factors.

This profile identifies who, where, and how large populations are in the Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS) area, a region that includes the City of Turner and portions of unincorporated Polk and Marion County. Map 1 shows the SKATS area boundary in reference to the cities of Salem, Keizer and Turner.

Map 1: SKATS Boundary and City Limits


The data in this report is derived from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) 20112015 data. The ACS is an ongoing national survey that produces period estimates rather than point in time estimates of the decennial census. Households across the nation are randomly sampled every month. In this report, consider the values shown, both as totals and percentages, as estimates. This report includes the following:

- Poverty (persons with incomes below Census defined poverty level)
- Minority Population (Hispanic, Black, Native American, Islander, Asian, or other race)
- Limited English households (all members have at least some difficulty with English)
- Elderly Population (aged 65 and older)
- Youth (age 15 to 17 )
- Households with no access to vehicles
- Disabled, by age (Visual or Ambulatory Disability, within Age classifications)

Five-year summary data is available at the level of census tracts, which have unique tract numbers, vary in size, and generally encompass between 2,500 to 8,000 people. For the SKATS area, 45 census tracts are wholly or partially included within the official boundary, Map 2 illustrates census tract boundaries in relation to the SKATS boundary. Data is reported and mapped for the whole tract and as a result includes a slightly larger population than the official SKATS area estimate. The population estimate is 258,107 made up of 92,832 households. Throughout this report, references to the SKATS area will refer to the data from all these census tracts. Detailed tables of all data discussed here, and an additional map with individual numbered census tracts are in the Appendix.

Map 2: SKATS Bounday and Census Tracts


For each of the following demographic sections there is a summary table of estimates, a chart showing percentages by area, and a map. Maps highlight census tracts that are near or above the average in their population characteristic. For example, the estimated minority population of the entire SKATS area is $32 \%$. The map will highlight in a light color, the census tracts that are near that value ( $32 \%$ ), and then in a darker color, highlight the areas with a minority population that is greater than the area-wide estimate (greater than $32 \%$ ). Areas with a substantially higher concentration are additionally marked with a crosshatch pattern when their estimate is twice the area-wide value, in this example $64 \%$ or higher. This helps complete the picture of the population characteristics by geographically highlighting the locations of the populations of interest. Finally, if available, the estimate of the last census reporting period (2006-2010) for the same demographic characteristic is included to provide some context about any change over the last ten years.

## Poverty

The population in poverty is defined as those with income in the last 12 months that falls below the federally established poverty level, in the 2011-2015 period. Persons living in poverty generally have less access to a reliable private vehicle. The costs associated with automobile ownership and maintenance often require a disproportionate share of their total income, limiting to some extent their accessibility and usage. Generally, less income is a likely factor in access to all available transportation options. The Census Bureau uses a set of dollar value thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. Poverty thresholds for people living alone or with nonrelatives also vary by age for under and over 65 years. In addition, for those who live in group quarters, poverty status is not determined. For more information regarding poverty determinations, please see the Appendix.

During the 2011-2015 period, an estimated 43,828 people (Table 1), or $17.6 \%$ of total persons living in the SKATS area had income in the past 12 months that placed them below the poverty level. This is an increase from $16.2 \%$ during the 2006-2010 period. This rate is lower than Marion County at $18.4 \%$, but is greater than both Polk County at $16.3 \%$ and the State level at $16.5 \%$ (Figure 1).

Table 1: Estimate of People in Poverty

|  | Estimate of <br> People in <br> Poverty |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 43,828 |
| Marion County | 57,846 |
| Polk County | 12,270 |
| State of Oregon | 636,947 |

Figure 1: Percentages of People in Poverty


The largest percentages of persons with income below poverty level were located in census tracts in and around the central area including downtown Salem, and east Salem. The lowest rates were found in the south, west, and in Keizer.

Map 3 highlights all areas with near or above average poverty rates from the area-wide SKATS estimate of $17.6 \%$. Tracts 4, 5.02 and 10 had the highest poverty rates ( $44 \%, 55 \%$ and $36 \%$ respectively) and are indicated with cross hatching and are labeled on the map.

Map 3: Percentage of Population in Poverty by Census Tracts, Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity are reported as separate demographic characteristics. When responding to the ACS survey, respondents answer whether they are of Hispanic origin or not, then additionally identify their race. Persons of Hispanic origins may identify themselves as any of the race choices including White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, some other race, or two or more races. Many Hispanics indicate their race as white. Looking at just the race profile alone does not give a full picture of the area's demographics. Minorities are defined here as of Hispanic origin and/or by a race that is non-white. Table 2 shows the SKATS area population broken out by White and Minority populations, with detailed subcategories by race or ethnicity characteristics.

Table 2: Minority Populations in SKATS

|  | Total | White alone | Minority | Hispanic | Black <br> (not <br> Hispanic) | American Indian and Alaska Native (not Hispanic) | Asian (not Hispanic) | Pacific <br> Islander (not <br> Hispanic) | All other races, or 2 or more races (not Hispanic) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimate | 258,107 | 174,888 | 83,219 | 59,631 | 3,200 | 1,884 | 6,021 | 2,524 | 9,959 |
| SKATS average |  | 68\% | 32\% | 23\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 4\% |

The minority/non-minority split of the SKATS area is $32 \% / 68 \%$, an estimate of 83,219 out of SKATS' total population of 258,107 . This is a higher minority percentage than in the 2006-2010 period when the split was $29 \% / 71 \%$. Of minorities, the Hispanic population is the largest, at $23 \%$ of the population overall, see Figure 2 for the distribution.

Figure 2: Population Distribution


This proportion is very close to that of Marion County as a whole ( $33.0 \%$ ), due in part that the SalemKeizer area makes up approximately $65 \%$ of the county's population. It is higher than Polk County at $20.3 \%$ and the State of Oregon proportion at $22.8 \%$ (Figure 3). Estimates are in Table 3 for each area.

Table 3: Estimate of Minority Populations

|  | Minority <br> Population <br> Estimate |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 83,219 |
| Marion County | 106,659 |
| Polk County | 15,706 |
| State of Oregon | 896,223 |

Figure 3: Percentages of Minority Populations
MINORITY POPULATION


Most of the minority population live in the east/northeast areas of the region, with the highest percentage of $65 \%$ in tract 16.02 . There were no tracts with a population at or near the average, only tracts with above (or below) average values. Map 4 highlights all areas with above average concentrations of minority populations from the area-wide SKATS estimate of $32.2 \%$, with tract 16.02 at over twice the regional average (65\%) highlighted with cross hatching and labeled on the map.

Map 4: Percentage Minority Populations by Census Tracts, Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Limited English Speaking Household

A limited English speaking household is one in which no member 14 years old and over speaks only English, or speaks a non-English language and speaks English "very well." In other words, all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English. Previously, these households have been referred to as linguistically isolated. Limited English may result in difficulty accessing public transportation, as well as the inability to be informed of transportation issues that may impact residents' neighborhoods and access to transportation facilities.

An estimate of 3,830 households (Table 4) out of 92,832 were considered linguistically isolated for a percentage of $4.1 \%$. This is a lower percentage from the last report period 2006-2010 of $5.2 \%$. This is slightly lower than Marion County at $4.5 \%$, but higher than Polk County at $1.4 \%$ and the State at $2.8 \%$ (Figure 4).

Table 4: Estimates of Linguistically Isolated Households

|  | Estimated <br> Households |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 3,830 |
| Marion County | 5,179 |
| Polk County | 397 |
| State of Oregon | 42,894 |

Figure 4: Percentages of Linguistically Isolated Households
LIMITED ENGLISH HOUSEHOLDS


The highest concentrations of households with limited English speakers were found in east Salem.
Map 5 highlights all areas with above average percentages of limited English households from the areawide SKATS estimate of $4.1 \%$. Many tracts have twice the regional average of households, as indicated with cross hatching and labels on the map.

Map 5: Percentage Limited English Households by Census Tracts, Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Elderly

The elderly population (persons aged 65 and over) tends to exhibit more physical impediments to driving, using public transportation, bicycling, and walking than the general public.

People age 65 years and older made up $13.9 \%$ of the population in census tracts of the SKATS area. This is an increase from $12.7 \%$ from the 2006-2010 report. This represents an estimated 35,996 persons out of the area total of 258,107 (Table 5). This proportion equals Marion County at $14 \%$ and is less than both Polk County at $16.4 \%$ and the State at $15.4 \%$ (Figure 5).

Table 5: Estimate of Population Age 65 and Over

|  | Population <br> Estimate |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 35,996 |
| Marion County | 45,211 |
| Polk County | 12,648 |
| State of Oregon | 606,877 |

Figure 5: Percentages of Population Age 65 and Over


Many census tracts have a higher than average population over the age of 65, mostly located around the edge of the Salem-Keizer area. However, no area has an exceptionally high proportion of an older population as no census tract is flagged with twice the regional average. Looking at Map 6, this pattern is evident where outlying tracts west, north, east, and southeast all have higher than average senior populations. Lower than average concentrations of seniors are reported in the central and east area of the region.

Map 6: Percentage of Population Age 65 and over by Census Tracts, Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Youth Age 15 to 17

Young people between the age of 15 and 17 may work part-time, or need transportation beyond traditional school bus support for sports and activities. This group may rely on public transportation, bicycling, and walking as they are less likely to own their own car.

People age 15 to 17 years made up $4.3 \%$ of the population in the SKATS area, or an estimated 10,972 people (Table 6). This proportion equals Marion County and Polk County, and is just slightly higher than the State as a whole at $3.7 \%$ (Figure 6).

Table 6: Estimates of Population Age 15 to 17

|  | Population <br> Estimate |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 10,972 |
| Marion County | 13,877 |
| Polk County | 3,298 |
| State of Oregon | 147,384 |

Figure 6: Percentages of Population Age 15 to 17


The population of young people is widely distributed, with a few areas with a higher than average population. However, no one area has an exceptionally high percentage of youth as no census tract is flagged with twice the regional average. Map 7 show that many tracts are just near average, and a few are higher than average.

Map 7: Percentage of Population Age 15 to 17 by Census Tracts, Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Households with no Automobile Access

The ACS inventories the number of cars, if any, that are available to the residents of the household. If "no vehicles available," the household is included here. As the majority of our transportation and land use infrastructure has been designed to accommodate vehicle use since WWII, lack of access to an automobile can readily be considered a transportation handicap in this culture.

The residents of an estimated 7,320 households, out of a total of 92,832 had no available vehicle (Table 7). In SKATS $7.9 \%$ of all households had no vehicle. This is close to the same value as in 2006-2010 with a rate of $7.6 \%$. Marion county and the state are similar at $7.5 \%$ and $8.1 \%$ respectively, and higher than Polk county at $5.9 \%$ (Figure 7).

Table 7: Estimates of Households without Vehicles

|  | Estimated <br> Households |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 7,320 |
| Marion County | 8,536 |
| Polk County | 1,677 |
| State of Oregon | 123,445 |

Figure 7: Percentages of Households without Vehicles


Census tracts in the downtown and central area of SKATS had a higher than average number of households with no automobile access. Map 8 shows that the higher than average rates all fall in the central part of the SKATS area, and many are twice the regional average, indicated with cross hatching and labels.

Map 8: Percentage of Households with No Car by Census Tracts, Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Disability

The profile for disability status includes several types of impairments. For this summary, those with a vision difficulty or an ambulatory difficulty were included, as these have a direct effect on mobility and transportation options. Disability status was also divided by age category, using ages 18 to 64 , and age 65 and over.

In the age group of 18 to 64 , it is estimated 13,489 of 152,751 people (Table $\mathbf{8}$ ) had a disability for an average percentage of $8.8 \%$. This is close to Marion County at $8.7 \%$, and slightly higher that Polk county at $8.3 \%$ and the State at $7.6 \%$ (Figure 8). For those over the age of 65, it is estimated 10,729 of 35,087 people (Table 9) are disabled, for a rate of $30.6 \%$, again similar to Marion County at $29.9 \%$, Polk county at $26.8 \%$ and the State at $29 \%$ (Figure 9). Disability reporting has changed over the last 15 years, and there is no earlier comparable data to look at for recent trends.

Table 8: Estimate of Disabled Population Ages 18-64

|  | Population <br> Estimate |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 13,489 |
| Marion County | 16,482 |
| Polk County | 3,813 |
| State of Oregon | 187,004 |

Figure 8: Percentages of Disabled Population Ages 18-64


Table 9: Estimate of Disabled Population Age 65 and over

|  | Population <br> Estimate |
| :--- | ---: |
| Salem-Keizer Area | 10,729 |
| Marion County | 13,189 |
| Polk County | 3,365 |
| State of Oregon | 173,418 |

Figure 9: Percentages of Disabled Population Age 65 and over


The following two maps show the distribution of the disabled population by age categories. Map 9 for those age 18 to 64 show areas with higher than average populations, but there is no area of high concentration (twice the regional average).

Map 10 shows the disabled aged 65 and over. The disability rate is substantially higher overall as the populations ages, with one census tract (5.02) at twice the regional average, indicated with a label and crosshatching.

Map 9: Percentage of Disabled Age 18 to 64 by Census Tracts, Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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Map 10: Percentage of Disabled Age 65 and over by Census Tract Near or Above Regional Estimate, American Community Survey 2011-2015
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## Multiple High Percentage Populations

There are some census tracts that have multiple higher than average populations that may have limitations to transportation. These are of interest from a planning standpoint to identify neighborhoods that may benefit from greater targeted outreach and involvement. To identify those areas, the top $10 \%$ of values were highlighted across all the populations data sets and summarized resulting in four census tracts with multiple occurrences of higher than average statistics. They are:

Tract 4, High in: poverty, no access to vehicle, disabled age 18 to 64 , and disabled over 65 Tract 5.02, High in: poverty, minority populations, disabled age 18 to 64 , and disabled over 65 Tract 16.02, High in: minority populations, limited English households, and disabled over 65 Tract 17.01, High in: youth populations, no vehicle access, and limited English households

Map 11 highlights these four census tracts, mostly in northeast Salem. For detailed tables of all census tracts and the percentages of populations, see the Appendix where the top $10 \%$ of values in each category are highlighted.

## Map 11: Census Tracts with Multiple High Percentage Values of Population

 Characteristics, ACS Data 2011-2014
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## Summary

Summarizing all the data together is Figure 10 with population estimates by category. For changes over time of some populations, please see the Executive Summary of this report.

Figure 10: Salem-Keizer Area Estimates


This profile is one piece in better understanding the diversity of the community. The SKATS Metropolitan Planning Organization will continue to work with its members and community partners to improve outreach to and involvement of all its community, and to measure and respond to regional disparities.

## A Note about the Data Source

For the purposes of this report, the margins of errors are not mapped or detailed in the tables. A margin of error is the difference between an estimate and its upper or lower confidence bounds. Confidence bounds can be created by adding the margin of error to the estimate (for the upper bound) and subtracting the margin of error from the estimate (for the lower bound). All published ACS margins of error are based on a 90-percent confidence level. In this report, consider the values shown, both as totals and percentages, as estimates. Complete error reporting statistics for the data tables summarized here are available through the U.S. Census website at www.census.gov.

## Appendix: Reference Maps and Tables

## Population Density

American Community Survey 2011-2015


SKATS Area Boundary and Census Tracts


Census Tracts, top $10 \%$ of values highlighted (four tracts with multiple high values)

| Census Tract | Youth 15 to 17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } 65 \\ \text { and over } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Persons } \\ \text { in } \\ \text { poverty } \end{gathered}$ | Households with no vehicle | Minority Population | Limited English households | Age 18 to 64 with a disability | Age 65+ with a disability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.3\% | 14\% | 25\% | 20\% | 19\% | 2\% | 4\% | 43\% |
| 3 | 4\% | 9\% | 31\% | 14\% | 37\% | 3\% | 8\% | 40\% |
| 4 | 4\% | 7\% | 44\% | 26\% | 47\% | 9\% | 12\% | 49\% |
| 5.01 | 6\% | 11\% | 21\% | 2\% | 57\% | 12\% | 5\% | 37\% |
| 5.02 | 6\% | 5\% | 55\% | 15\% | 59\% | 11\% | 12\% | 86\% |
| 6 | 5\% | 12\% | 14\% | 6\% | 19\% | 1\% | 7\% | 37\% |
| 7.01 | 3\% | 10\% | 35\% | 9\% | 45\% | 8\% | 9\% | 38\% |
| 9 | 4\% | 7\% | 25\% | 15\% | 40\% | 0\% | 5\% | 31\% |
| 10 | 6\% | 10\% | 36\% | 17\% | 42\% | 3\% | 6\% | 38\% |
| 11 | 4\% | 18\% | 17\% | 13\% | 23\% | 2\% | 5\% | 11\% |
| 12 | 1\% | 15\% | 22\% | 9\% | 13\% | 2\% | 7\% | 17\% |
| 13 | 3\% | 13\% | 11\% | 8\% | 16\% | 0\% | 3\% | 15\% |
| 14.01 | 3\% | 24\% | 20\% | 2\% | 19\% | 1\% | 4\% | 24\% |
| 14.02 | 3\% | 15\% | 9\% | 3\% | 34\% | 4\% | 4\% | 30\% |
| 15.01 | 5\% | 19\% | 12\% | 6\% | 24\% | 1\% | 5\% | 21\% |
| 15.02 | 5\% | 11\% | 19\% | 3\% | 39\% | 2\% | 7\% | 21\% |
| 15.03 | 4\% | 13\% | 24\% | 18\% | 36\% | 6\% | 5\% | 46\% |
| 16.01 | 5\% | 15\% | 16\% | 5\% | 46\% | 11\% | 4\% | 29\% |
| 16.02 | 4\% | 7\% | 30\% | 12\% | 65\% | 16\% | 7\% | 52\% |
| 16.03 | 4\% | 11\% | 8\% | 2\% | 43\% | 8\% | 5\% | 36\% |
| 16.04 | 4\% | 10\% | 19\% | 17\% | 56\% | 9\% | 6\% | 42\% |
| 17.01 | 8\% | 11\% | 32\% | 24\% | 55\% | 16\% | 3\% | 44\% |
| 17.02 | 4\% | 13\% | 21\% | 12\% | 56\% | 8\% | 3\% | 46\% |
| 17.03 | 5\% | 19\% | 10\% | 2\% | 31\% | 1\% | 7\% | 30\% |
| 18.01 | 4\% | 13\% | 23\% | 12\% | 52\% | 15\% | 6\% | 57\% |
| 18.02 | 3\% | 7\% | 22\% | 6\% | 56\% | 5\% | 3\% | 20\% |
| 18.03 | 1\% | 12\% | 17\% | 2\% | 30\% | 4\% | 10\% | 33\% |
| 20 | 4\% | 13\% | 11\% | 7\% | 21\% | 0\% | 3\% | 20\% |
| 21.01 | 4\% | 17\% | 12\% | 15\% | 14\% | 0\% | 8\% | 37\% |
| 21.02 | 4\% | 16\% | 6\% | 5\% | 26\% | 1\% | 6\% | 28\% |
| 22.01 | 5\% | 19\% | 15\% | 2\% | 11\% | 2\% | 1\% | 27\% |
| 22.02 | 3\% | 13\% | 9\% | 3\% | 15\% | 0\% | 4\% | 15\% |
| 23.01 | 6\% | 13\% | 8\% | 3\% | 14\% | 0\% | 4\% | 33\% |
| 23.03 | 3\% | 13\% | 16\% | 4\% | 14\% | 2\% | 6\% | 41\% |
| 23.04 | 4\% | 19\% | 5\% | 3\% | 12\% | 0\% | 2\% | 35\% |
| 24 | 5\% | 20\% | 11\% | 0\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 16\% |
| 25.01 | 5\% | 14\% | 9\% | 4\% | 16\% | 1\% | 4\% | 35\% |
| 25.02 | 4\% | 21\% | 12\% | 5\% | 28\% | 3\% | 7\% | 43\% |
| 27 | 4\% | 23\% | 7\% | 4\% | 11\% | 0\% | 5\% | 26\% |
| 28 | 3\% | 21\% | 11\% | 1\% | 18\% | 2\% | 3\% | 18\% |
| 51 | 4\% | 7\% | 31\% | 10\% | 38\% | 4\% | 8\% | 39\% |
| 52.01 | 5\% | 15\% | 8\% | 5\% | 23\% | 0\% | 4\% | 30\% |
| 52.02 | 7\% | 16\% | 7\% | 8\% | 23\% | 1\% | 5\% | 25\% |
| 53 | 5\% | 24\% | 11\% | 2\% | 17\% | 3\% | 4\% | 19\% |
| Average | 4\% | 14\% | 18\% | 8\% | 32\% | 4\% | 9\% | 31\% |

Source: 2011-2015 American Community Survey

Population in Poverty

| Census <br> Tract | Population Base to evaluate Poverty status | Persons with income (12 months) below poverty level: | Percent in Poverty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2,103 | 535 | 25\% |
| 3 | 4,872 | 1,492 | 31\% |
| 4 | 5,013 | 2,187 | 44\% |
| 5.01 | 4,151 | 857 | 21\% |
| 5.02 | 4,919 | 2,696 | 55\% |
| 6 | 4,633 | 665 | 14\% |
| 7.01 | 5,511 | 1,948 | 35\% |
| 9 | 6,269 | 1,552 | 25\% |
| 10 | 4,061 | 1,478 | 36\% |
| 11 | 4,370 | 735 | 17\% |
| 12 | 3,452 | 765 | 22\% |
| 13 | 4,009 | 451 | 11\% |
| 14.01 | 5,918 | 1,208 | 20\% |
| 14.02 | 5,942 | 516 | 9\% |
| 15.01 | 4,633 | 535 | 12\% |
| 15.02 | 5,238 | 1,020 | 19\% |
| 15.03 | 4,322 | 1,032 | 24\% |
| 16.01 | 7,471 | 1,230 | 16\% |
| 16.02 | 9,124 | 2,715 | 30\% |
| 16.03 | 7,169 | 595 | 8\% |
| 16.04 | 7,885 | 1,502 | 19\% |
| 17.01 | 6,979 | 2,223 | 32\% |
| 17.02 | 5,398 | 1,151 | 21\% |
| 17.03 | 4,521 | 467 | 10\% |
| 18.01 | 6,487 | 1,509 | 23\% |
| 18.02 | 8,185 | 1,837 | 22\% |
| 18.03 | 3,131 | 526 | 17\% |
| 20 | 10,193 | 1,121 | 11\% |
| 21.01 | 2,151 | 253 | 12\% |
| 21.02 | 6,140 | 397 | 6\% |
| 22.01 | 2,048 | 305 | 15\% |
| 22.02 | 6,390 | 557 | 9\% |
| 23.01 | 3,182 | 265 | 8\% |
| 23.03 | 7,465 | 1,227 | 16\% |
| 23.04 | 5,493 | 261 | 5\% |
| 24 | 3,530 | 373 | 11\% |
| 25.01 | 9,154 | 847 | 9\% |
| 25.02 | 5,323 | 654 | 12\% |
| 27 | 8,662 | 588 | 7\% |
| 28 | 3,986 | 458 | 11\% |
| 51 | 2,437 | 766 | 31\% |
| 52.01 | 8,981 | 690 | 8\% |
| 52.02 | 9,724 | 644 | 7\% |
| 53 | 8,915 | 995 | 11\% |
| Average | 249,540 | 43,828 | 17.6\% |

## Minority Population

| Census <br> Tract | Non-Minority Population | Minority Population | Percent Minority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2,566 | 586 | 19\% |
| 3 | 3,049 | 1,823 | 37\% |
| 4 | 2,668 | 2,374 | 47\% |
| 5.01 | 1,822 | 2,407 | 57\% |
| 5.02 | 2,066 | 2,940 | 59\% |
| 6 | 3,745 | 901 | 19\% |
| 7.01 | 4,611 | 3,748 | 45\% |
| 9 | 3,976 | 2,647 | 40\% |
| 10 | 2,535 | 1,842 | 42\% |
| 11 | 3,363 | 1,007 | 23\% |
| 12 | 3,006 | 446 | 13\% |
| 13 | 3,374 | 635 | 16\% |
| 14.01 | 4,814 | 1,104 | 19\% |
| 14.02 | 3,989 | 2,018 | 34\% |
| 15.01 | 3,568 | 1,155 | 24\% |
| 15.02 | 3,246 | 2,097 | 39\% |
| 15.03 | 2,856 | 1,605 | 36\% |
| 16.01 | 4,081 | 3,439 | 46\% |
| 16.02 | 3,205 | 5,919 | 65\% |
| 16.03 | 4,089 | 3,136 | 43\% |
| 16.04 | 3,515 | 4,412 | 56\% |
| 17.01 | 3,158 | 3,829 | 55\% |
| 17.02 | 2,490 | 3,109 | 56\% |
| 17.03 | 3,178 | 1,403 | 31\% |
| 18.01 | 3,115 | 3,394 | 52\% |
| 18.02 | 3,728 | 4,665 | 56\% |
| 18.03 | 3,493 | 1,522 | 30\% |
| 20 | 8,059 | 2,185 | 21\% |
| 21.01 | 1,879 | 309 | 14\% |
| 21.02 | 4,605 | 1,624 | 26\% |
| 22.01 | 1,822 | 226 | 11\% |
| 22.02 | 5,437 | 993 | 15\% |
| 23.01 | 2,781 | 439 | 14\% |
| 23.03 | 6,412 | 1,053 | 14\% |
| 23.04 | 4,895 | 653 | 12\% |
| 24 | 3,373 | 157 | 4\% |
| 25.01 | 7,754 | 1,461 | 16\% |
| 25.02 | 3,843 | 1,503 | 28\% |
| 27 | 7,921 | 975 | 11\% |
| 28 | 3,292 | 702 | 18\% |
| 51 | 1,507 | 930 | 38\% |
| 52.01 | 6,972 | 2,046 | 23\% |
| 52.02 | 7,525 | 2,292 | 23\% |
| 53 | 7,505 | 1,508 | 17\% |
| Average | 174,888 | 83,219 | 32\% |


| Limited English Households |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Census Tract | Households | Limited English HH | Percent <br> Limited <br> English HH |
| 2 | 1,228 | 29 | 2.4\% |
| 3 | 1,824 | 61 | 3.3\% |
| 4 | 1,751 | 158 | 9.0\% |
| 5.01 | 1,136 | 138 | 12.1\% |
| 5.02 | 1,603 | 177 | 11.0\% |
| 6 | 2,079 | 15 | 0.7\% |
| 7.01 | 1,909 | 150 | 7.9\% |
| 9 | 2,222 | - | 0.0\% |
| 10 | 1,471 | 50 | 3.4\% |
| 11 | 1,926 | 35 | 1.8\% |
| 12 | 1,670 | 30 | 1.8\% |
| 13 | 1,999 | 8 | 0.4\% |
| 14.01 | 2,395 | 18 | 0.8\% |
| 14.02 | 2,159 | 95 | 4.4\% |
| 15.01 | 1,779 | 24 | 1.3\% |
| 15.02 | 1,743 | 36 | 2.1\% |
| 15.03 | 1,739 | 107 | 6.2\% |
| 16.01 | 2,532 | 273 | 10.8\% |
| 16.02 | 3,086 | 479 | 15.5\% |
| 16.03 | 2,218 | 169 | 7.6\% |
| 16.04 | 2,737 | 257 | 9.4\% |
| 17.01 | 2,366 | 373 | 15.8\% |
| 17.02 | 1,648 | 128 | 7.8\% |
| 17.03 | 1,533 | 16 | 1.0\% |
| 18.01 | 2,358 | 358 | 15.2\% |
| 18.02 | 2,476 | 133 | 5.4\% |
| 18.03 | 1,181 | 43 | 3.6\% |
| 20 | 3,862 | 16 | 0.4\% |
| 21.01 | 1,056 | 2 | 0.2\% |
| 21.02 | 2,524 | 30 | 1.2\% |
| 22.01 | 806 | 15 | 1.9\% |
| 22.02 | 2,353 | - | 0.0\% |
| 23.01 | 1,194 | - | 0.0\% |
| 23.03 | 2,921 | 53 | 1.8\% |
| 23.04 | 2,323 | 11 | 0.5\% |
| 24 | 1,422 | 22 | 1.5\% |
| 25.01 | 3,343 | 28 | 0.8\% |
| 25.02 | 1,930 | 65 | 3.4\% |
| 27 | 3,358 | - | 0.0\% |
| 28 | 1,540 | 37 | 2.4\% |
| 51 | 892 | 35 | 3.9\% |
| 52.01 | 3,224 | - | 0.0\% |
| 52.02 | 3,821 | 45 | 1.2\% |
| 53 | 3,495 | 111 | 3.2\% |
| Average | 92,832 | 3,830 | 4.1\% |

## Age Divisions

| Census <br> Tract | Total Population | Youth 15 - $17$ | Percent Youth | Age 65+ | Percent <br> Age 65+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 3,152 | 10 | 0.3\% | 437 | 14\% |
| 3 | 4,872 | 186 | 3.8\% | 451 | 9\% |
| 4 | 5,042 | 216 | 4.3\% | 331 | 7\% |
| 5.01 | 4,229 | 246 | 5.8\% | 448 | 11\% |
| 5.02 | 5,006 | 301 | 6.0\% | 259 | 5\% |
| 6 | 4,646 | 222 | 4.8\% | 569 | 12\% |
| 7.01 | 8,359 | 287 | 3.4\% | 839 | 10\% |
| 9 | 6,623 | 233 | 3.5\% | 472 | 7\% |
| 10 | 4,377 | 279 | 6.4\% | 427 | 10\% |
| 11 | 4,370 | 192 | 4.4\% | 773 | 18\% |
| 12 | 3,452 | 23 | 0.7\% | 532 | 15\% |
| 13 | 4,009 | 137 | 3.4\% | 531 | 13\% |
| 14.01 | 5,918 | 159 | 2.7\% | 1,449 | 24\% |
| 14.02 | 6,007 | 205 | 3.4\% | 907 | 15\% |
| 15.01 | 4,723 | 246 | 5.2\% | 884 | 19\% |
| 15.02 | 5,343 | 255 | 4.8\% | 580 | 11\% |
| 15.03 | 4,461 | 196 | 4.4\% | 568 | 13\% |
| 16.01 | 7,520 | 343 | 4.6\% | 1,099 | 15\% |
| 16.02 | 9,124 | 397 | 4.4\% | 653 | 7\% |
| 16.03 | 7,225 | 306 | 4.2\% | 824 | 11\% |
| 16.04 | 7,927 | 306 | 3.9\% | 757 | 10\% |
| 17.01 | 6,987 | 590 | 8.4\% | 775 | 11\% |
| 17.02 | 5,599 | 196 | 3.5\% | 724 | 13\% |
| 17.03 | 4,581 | 208 | 4.5\% | 866 | 19\% |
| 18.01 | 6,509 | 292 | 4.5\% | 849 | 13\% |
| 18.02 | 8,393 | 277 | 3.3\% | 629 | 7\% |
| 18.03 | 5,015 | 39 | 0.8\% | 610 | 12\% |
| 20 | 10,244 | 398 | 3.9\% | 1,349 | 13\% |
| 21.01 | 2,188 | 91 | 4.2\% | 377 | 17\% |
| 21.02 | 6,229 | 223 | 3.6\% | 1,020 | 16\% |
| 22.01 | 2,048 | 94 | 4.6\% | 388 | 19\% |
| 22.02 | 6,430 | 212 | 3.3\% | 849 | 13\% |
| 23.01 | 3,220 | 206 | 6.4\% | 422 | 13\% |
| 23.03 | 7,465 | 217 | 2.9\% | 970 | 13\% |
| 23.04 | 5,548 | 232 | 4.2\% | 1,070 | 19\% |
| 24 | 3,530 | 176 | 5.0\% | 711 | 20\% |
| 25.01 | 9,215 | 439 | 4.8\% | 1,294 | 14\% |
| 25.02 | 5,346 | 212 | 4.0\% | 1,148 | 21\% |
| 27 | 8,896 | 332 | 3.7\% | 2,079 | 23\% |
| 28 | 3,994 | 139 | 3.5\% | 833 | 21\% |
| 51 | 2,437 | 94 | 3.9\% | 174 | 7\% |
| 52.01 | 9,018 | 453 | 5.0\% | 1,366 | 15\% |
| 52.02 | 9,817 | 668 | 6.8\% | 1,561 | 16\% |
| 53 | 9,013 | 439 | 4.9\% | 2,142 | 24\% |
| Average | 258,107 | 10,972 | 4.3\% | 35,996 | 13.9\% |

## Households with No Vehicle

| Census Tract | Households | No vehicle HH | Percent <br> No vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1,228 | 250 | 20\% |
| 3 | 1,824 | 251 | 14\% |
| 4 | 1,751 | 460 | 26\% |
| 5.01 | 1,136 | 18 | 2\% |
| 5.02 | 1,603 | 245 | 15\% |
| 6 | 2,079 | 131 | 6\% |
| 7.01 | 1,909 | 178 | 9\% |
| 9 | 2,222 | 335 | 15\% |
| 10 | 1,471 | 245 | 17\% |
| 11 | 1,926 | 242 | 13\% |
| 12 | 1,670 | 146 | 9\% |
| 13 | 1,999 | 158 | 8\% |
| 14.01 | 2,395 | 43 | 2\% |
| 14.02 | 2,159 | 57 | 3\% |
| 15.01 | 1,779 | 100 | 6\% |
| 15.02 | 1,743 | 49 | 3\% |
| 15.03 | 1,739 | 314 | 18\% |
| 16.01 | 2,532 | 119 | 5\% |
| 16.02 | 3,086 | 377 | 12\% |
| 16.03 | 2,218 | 55 | 2\% |
| 16.04 | 2,737 | 457 | 17\% |
| 17.01 | 2,366 | 563 | 24\% |
| 17.02 | 1,648 | 199 | 12\% |
| 17.03 | 1,533 | 31 | 2\% |
| 18.01 | 2,358 | 272 | 12\% |
| 18.02 | 2,476 | 156 | 6\% |
| 18.03 | 1,181 | 28 | 2\% |
| 20 | 3,862 | 269 | 7\% |
| 21.01 | 1,056 | 156 | 15\% |
| 21.02 | 2,524 | 124 | 5\% |
| 22.01 | 806 | 17 | 2\% |
| 22.02 | 2,353 | 67 | 3\% |
| 23.01 | 1,194 | 33 | 3\% |
| 23.03 | 2,921 | 121 | 4\% |
| 23.04 | 2,323 | 62 | 3\% |
| 24 | 1,422 | 6 | 0\% |
| 25.01 | 3,343 | 121 | 4\% |
| 25.02 | 1,930 | 92 | 5\% |
| 27 | 3,358 | 148 | 4\% |
| 28 | 1,540 | 10 | 1\% |
| 51 | 892 | 85 | 10\% |
| 52.01 | 3,224 | 176 | 5\% |
| 52.02 | 3,821 | 289 | 8\% |
| 53 | 3,495 | 65 | 2\% |
| Average | 92,832 | 7,320 | 7.9\% |

Disability by Age Divisions

| Census Tract | Population 18 to 64 | 18 to 64, Disabled | Percent with disability | Population 65 and over | 65 and over, Disabled | Percent with disability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2,433 | 121 | 4\% | 391 | 169 | 43\% |
| 3 | 3,166 | 372 | 8\% | 451 | 182 | 40\% |
| 4 | 3,237 | 627 | 12\% | 322 | 159 | 49\% |
| 5.01 | 2,505 | 221 | 5\% | 402 | 150 | 37\% |
| 5.02 | 3,125 | 602 | 12\% | 200 | 171 | 86\% |
| 6 | 3,081 | 331 | 7\% | 569 | 212 | 37\% |
| 7.01 | 3,574 | 520 | 9\% | 539 | 206 | 38\% |
| 9 | 4,530 | 351 | 5\% | 449 | 139 | 31\% |
| 10 | 2,528 | 262 | 6\% | 427 | 163 | 38\% |
| 11 | 2,801 | 235 | 5\% | 773 | 85 | 11\% |
| 12 | 2,421 | 241 | 7\% | 532 | 91 | 17\% |
| 13 | 2,743 | 110 | 3\% | 531 | 77 | 15\% |
| 14.01 | 3,164 | 249 | 4\% | 1,449 | 345 | 24\% |
| 14.02 | 3,720 | 253 | 4\% | 907 | 275 | 30\% |
| 15.01 | 2,610 | 246 | 5\% | 817 | 171 | 21\% |
| 15.02 | 3,166 | 357 | 7\% | 580 | 120 | 21\% |
| 15.03 | 2,728 | 223 | 5\% | 535 | 244 | 46\% |
| 16.01 | 4,321 | 291 | 4\% | 1,095 | 315 | 29\% |
| 16.02 | 5,149 | 622 | 7\% | 653 | 342 | 52\% |
| 16.03 | 4,172 | 372 | 5\% | 823 | 297 | 36\% |
| 16.04 | 4,922 | 442 | 6\% | 753 | 317 | 42\% |
| 17.01 | 4,003 | 242 | 3\% | 767 | 340 | 44\% |
| 17.02 | 3,255 | 166 | 3\% | 623 | 286 | 46\% |
| 17.03 | 2,494 | 300 | 7\% | 860 | 255 | 30\% |
| 18.01 | 4,205 | 408 | 6\% | 845 | 478 | 57\% |
| 18.02 | 5,083 | 261 | 3\% | 629 | 127 | 20\% |
| 18.03 | 2,181 | 344 | 10\% | 610 | 203 | 33\% |
| 20 | 6,160 | 335 | 3\% | 1,298 | 262 | 20\% |
| 21.01 | 1,321 | 170 | 8\% | 377 | 140 | 37\% |
| 21.02 | 3,793 | 384 | 6\% | 976 | 278 | 28\% |
| 22.01 | 1,106 | 29 | 1\% | 388 | 103 | 27\% |
| 22.02 | 3,925 | 275 | 4\% | 809 | 121 | 15\% |
| 23.01 | 1,972 | 126 | 4\% | 422 | 139 | 33\% |
| 23.03 | 4,727 | 451 | 6\% | 970 | 398 | 41\% |
| 23.04 | 3,214 | 138 | 2\% | 1,050 | 370 | 35\% |
| 24 | 2,065 | 88 | 2\% | 711 | 115 | 16\% |
| 25.01 | 5,182 | 353 | 4\% | 1,269 | 438 | 35\% |
| 25.02 | 3,056 | 358 | 7\% | 1,148 | 493 | 43\% |
| 27 | 5,271 | 473 | 5\% | 2,079 | 543 | 26\% |
| 28 | 2,176 | 122 | 3\% | 833 | 148 | 18\% |
| 51 | 1,550 | 204 | 8\% | 174 | 68 | 39\% |
| 52.01 | 5,015 | 350 | 4\% | 1,366 | 406 | 30\% |
| 52.02 | 5,934 | 511 | 5\% | 1,543 | 384 | 25\% |
| 53 | 4,967 | 353 | 4\% | 2,142 | 404 | 19\% |
| Average | 152,751 | 13,489 | 9\% | 35,087 | 10,729 | 31\% |

Source: ACS 2001-2015, table S1819, MOEs not included
Ambulatory and Visual impairments only

## Poverty Definitions from the U.S. Census Website:

## How Poverty Is Measured

Poverty status is determined by comparing annual income to a set of dollar values called thresholds that vary by family size, number of children, and age of householder. If a family's before tax money income is less than the dollar value of their threshold, then that family and every individual in it are considered to be in poverty. For people not living in families, poverty status is determined by comparing the individual's income to his or her threshold. The poverty thresholds are updated annually to allow for changes in the cost of living using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). They do not vary geographically. The ACS is a continuous survey, and people respond throughout the year. Since income is reported for the previous 12 months, the appropriate poverty threshold for each family is determined by multiplying the base-year poverty threshold (1982) by the average of monthly CPI values for the 12 months preceding the survey month. For more information, see "How Poverty Is Calculated in the ACS" at www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/methods/defi nitions.html.

## How Poverty is Calculated in the ACS

Poverty statistics presented in ACS reports and tables adhere to the standards specified by the Office of Management and Budget in Statistical Policy Directive 14. The Census Bureau uses a set of dollar value thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. Further, poverty thresholds for people living alone or with nonrelatives (unrelated individuals) and two-person families vary by age (under 65 years or 65 years and older).

If a family's total income is less than the dollar value of the appropriate threshold, then that family and every individual in it are considered to be in poverty. Similarly, if an unrelated individual's total income is less than the appropriate threshold, then that individual is considered to be in poverty. The poverty thresholds do not vary geographically. They are updated annually to allow for changes in the cost of living (inflation factor) using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Poverty status was determined for all people except institutionalized people, people in military group quarters, people in college dormitories, and unrelated individuals under 15 years old. These groups were excluded from the numerator and denominator when calculating poverty rates.

Since the ACS is a continuous survey, people respond throughout the year. Because the income items specify a period covering the last 12 months, the appropriate poverty thresholds are determined by multiplying the base-year poverty thresholds (1982) by the monthly inflation factor based on the 12 monthly CPIs and the base-year CPI.

Poverty Thresholds for 2015 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

| Size of family unit | Weighted average poverty thresholds | Related children under 18 years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | None | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | Seven | Eight or more |
| One person (unrelated individual)...... | 12,082 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 65 years.......................... | 12,331 | 12,331 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 years and over........................ | 11,367 | 11,367 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two people................................. | 15,391 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Householder under 65 years.......... | 15,952 | 15,871 | 16,337 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Householder 65 years and over....... | 14,342 | 14,326 | 16,275 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Three people............................... | 18,871 | 18,540 | 19,078 | 19,096 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Four people.............................. | 24,257 | 24,447 | 24,847 | 24,036 | 24,120 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Five people... | 28,741 | 29,482 | 29,911 | 28,995 | 28,286 | 27,853 |  |  |  |  |
| Six people... | 32,542 | 33,909 | 34,044 | 33,342 | 32,670 | 31,670 | 31,078 |  |  |  |
| Seven people............................... | 36,998 | 39,017 | 39,260 | 38,421 | 37,835 | 36,745 | 35,473 | 34,077 |  |  |
| Eight people............................... | 41,029 | 43,637 | 44,023 | 43,230 | 42,536 | 41,551 | 40,300 | 38,999 | 38,668 |  |
| Nine people or more...................... | 49,177 | 52,493 | 52,747 | 52,046 | 51,457 | 50,490 | 49,159 | 47,956 | 47,658 | 45,822 |

