

APPENDIX 4.

ANALYSIS OF THE DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE TOWN OF  
ROCHESTER by Michael Baden, Committee Member

## Who are we?

### The Demographics of Rochester:

### (An analysis based on the 1990 and 2000 US Census reports<sup>1</sup>)

*This report is split into two sections; a presentation of detailed data and a summary of conclusions. These conclusions, included at the end of this document, are based on the data and information at hand and reflect the trends indicated by a comparison of the 1990 and 2000 Census reports, but are strictly my own interpretations of the data.*

*Please draw your own conclusions.*

*What impact events such as 9/11 had on the community or any other post 2000 changes cannot be determined from these results. Use caution when stating current trends as we are now halfway into the next Census cycle. Census data cannot be the only data analyzed to determine trends, but is a wonderful one-stop source of vast amounts of information for comparison.*

*As new data becomes more available further study is necessary. Or perhaps comparison to earlier Census reports (not as readily available) is needed for a more long running analysis.*

### **Population**

The population of the Town of Rochester experienced significant growth for the period of 1990 to 2000. The population in 2000 was 7018 people. The population increased 23.6% for this time period or 1339 people. This is significant, because not only was the town's population increasing the highest percentage in Ulster County, it was also over 3 times the growth of the county as a whole (7.6%).

The density in 2000 was approximately 79 persons per square mile up from 64. While still enjoying a relatively low population density, Rochester has dropped from 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> when ranked within the county density schedule.

The population of Rochester is roughly evenly divided with slightly more males than females. The median age is around 38 years of age. Both of these are similar to the Ulster County reports.

In 2000, 26.4% of the population is under 18 years of age. 11.5% is over 65 years of age. This compares to 26.3% and 12.8% respectively in the 1990 Census.

In 2000, it was reported that 19.6% of our residents suffer from some type of disability with that number increasing to 42% of all over 65 years of age.

In 2000, 24.3% of males and 1.1% of females were veterans or in the armed forces.

In 1990, 29.8% of males and 1.3% of females were either veterans or in the armed forces.

The racial makeup of the town remained predominately white (93.5% down from 95.8%), while blacks remained approximately the same (2.5% for both). The Hispanic population saw about a 1 ½ % increase to 4.8%.

It is interesting to note that in 1990 our top five ancestries were listed as German, Irish, Dutch, English, and Italian. This has shifted in 2000 to Irish, German, Italian, Dutch, and English suggesting our growth is of persons of Irish and Italian descent.

---

<sup>1</sup> The percentages and numbers quoted here are taken from the 1990 and 2000 US Census reports.

Population and housing unit numbers represent a 100% reporting of all respondents. The rest of the statistics are taken from a sample unit of the subset. This sample represents the reporting of approximately 15%-16% of all the Census returns. Because of this there is an approximate percentage variation of + or - 2% of each statistic reported.

The average household<sup>2</sup> size decreased very slightly to 2.58 (previously 2.63). About 2/3 of all households are family households while 1/3 are non-family households with 25% of these being single resident households (an over 2% increase from 1990). 22% of all households have a member over 65 years of age (a 3.2% decrease from 1990). 37% of all households have a member less than 18 years of age (a 1.3% decrease from 1990).

The average family household<sup>3</sup> size remained stable at 3.1 (was 3.09), however the percentage of families decreased by 3.8% (to 68%) while the percentage of married couple families dropped 5.7% (to 52% of total).

A further study of the age groups of the town reveals that the growth of Rochester can be attributed primarily to three specific age groups. It is interesting to note that four other age groups saw a decrease in population numbers

<b>Age group</b>	<b>actual change 1990-2000</b>	<b>% of total change 1990-2000</b>	<b>% numerical difference 1990-2000</b>
45 to 49 years	271	2.7%	79.5%
10 to 14 years	242	2.2%	66.7%
50 to 54 years	232	2.4%	86.9%
65 to 69 years	-17	-1.1%	-6.8%
Under 5 years	-37	-2.1%	-8.2%
30 to 34 years	-56	-2.5%	-10.8%
25 to 29 years	-65	-2.4%	-14.8%

Comparing the 1990 Census to 2000, the significant change in population by age group is that the total percentage of 40 year olds increased by 4%, 50 year olds increased by 3%, and 20 year olds decreased by 3%, causing a jump of over 5% in the demographic group “ 40 years old and over”. All other age groups percentages remained relatively the same. Ulster County exhibits similar trends but in even greater ratios.

Exploring deeper, though, and comparing the age group of 20-29 year olds for 1990 with the age group of 30-39 year olds for 2000 reveals a net increase of 389 people. A similar check of the 30-39 year olds in 1990 and the 40-49 year olds in 2000 yields an increase of 241 people (630 people total for ages 30-49). And going one step further and comparing 10-19 year olds in 1990 with 20-29 year olds in 2000 reveals a decrease of 83 people.

<sup>2</sup> A household includes all the persons who occupy a housing unit. A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in the building and which have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated persons who share living arrangements

<sup>3</sup> A family consists of a householder and one or more other persons living in the same household who are related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. All persons in a household who are related to the householder are regarded as members of his or her family. A household can contain only one family for purposes of census tabulations. Not all households contain families since a household may comprise a group of unrelated persons or one person living alone.

## Housing

The number of housing units increased significantly in the period between 1990 and 2000 from 3227 to 3750. This represents a 16.2% increase which is almost 8% over the county percent of increase. In fact, Rochester ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> in the County in new housing units behind only New Paltz and Gardiner for 1990-2000. The housing density is now 42 per square mile as compared to 37 in 1990.

But also in comparison, Rochester ranked 1<sup>st</sup> in the County in the percentage difference between population change and housing stock change with the population change outpacing the housing change by 6.3%, followed by Shawangunk, Gardiner, and Shandaken.

55% of the units are owner occupied, 17% are renter occupied, with the remainder considered vacant. Even more revealing, is that while there was a 16.2% increase of housing units, there was a 25.8% jump in full time occupied housing units (the county was at 11%). This seems to indicate that there was a shift of units considered vacant in 1990 to occupied in 2000, possibly meaning a conversion from part time to full time for these residents.

Over 50% of the units were built prior to 1970 with 20% built prior to 1940. These numbers are approximately 10% younger for each category than the County statistics (64% and 28% respectively). The median year of construction is 1969 with the County being 1959. This is an increase from the 1990 Census of 3 years (1966) for Rochester and 2 years for the County (1957). Owner occupied structures median year of construction is considerably later than renter occupied (1975 compared to 1964). In fact, only 1% of all housing units constructed after 1990 are rentals.

50 percent of homeowners and 85% of renters have lived in their home for less than 10 years. The median year of occupation is 1990 for owners and 1999 for renters (again later than the county dates of 1986 and 1997).

So it is surprising then to see that looking at where people lived 5 years prior has changed very little.

In the 1990 Census, 62% of the residents lived in the same house in 1985. Breaking down the remainder results in 22% living in the same county, 9% in New York State, 4% in a different state, and 3% in a foreign country in the 1990 Census.

The same question on the 2000 Census (using 1995 as a basis) resulted in a 64% response to living in the same house. The 2000 Census results are almost identical with 22% living in the same county, 9% in New York State, 4% in a different state, and 1% in a foreign country.

The 2.58 residents per unit was a slight decrease from the previous 2.63. This is very similar to the county change. Approximately 25% of housing units are single occupant, approximately 33% are two occupants, approximately 16% are 3 occupants, and approximately 24% are four or more occupants.

The median number of rooms per unit is 5.1 rooms. The number of bedrooms is fairly even with 37% each for either 2 or 3 bedrooms per home. 74.2% are single unit structures. 17.8% are manufactured homes. This is a 1.5% decrease in the percentage of manufactured homes, but this housing type remains over 10% higher than the Ulster County average.

Rochester is ranked 4<sup>th</sup> out of 19 in the County for vacant housing units. The total vacancy rate is quite a bit higher than the county average (15% higher), but when seasonal units are deducted the percentage is only 1.2% higher than the county average. Even still, when the seasonal homes were deleted from the equation, Rochester had the 5<sup>th</sup> highest vacancy rate for the county, with only Shandaken, Woodstock, Wawarsing, and Hardenburgh having higher vacancy rates. The vacancy rate for seasonal units dropped 2.8% and decreased for all units by 5.5%. Vacancy rate in 2000 is 28.3% (half are manufactured homes) and is lowered to 7.5% if seasonal units are excluded.

Of occupied units, 76% are owner occupied and 24% renter occupied. About 8% more residents in Rochester own their own home than in Ulster County. These numbers are not significantly different than the 1990 reporting. But what are significant are the ages of these residents. For owned units there was a 5.4% jump in 45-54 year olds while the 25-34 year olds dropped 5% and the 65-74 year olds dropped 2.1%. Rented units saw the same pattern with 45-54 year olds raising 1.6% while 25-34 year olds dropped 2.3%. These changes can be mostly attributed to the general population age trends these age groups.

With regards to utilities, 63% heat with fuel oil or kerosene, 20% use gas, 8% wood, and 7% are electric. These numbers are similar to the 1990 Census except for about a 4% drop in wood and a 6% increase in gas. 3.5% of the units lack complete plumbing and 4.2% lack complete kitchen facilities. Most likely these are vacant (seasonal) units.

The median rental fee increased from \$493 in 1990 to \$626 (27%) in 2000. The county numbers are \$529 and \$614 (16%). Approximately 25% of rentals include utilities as a part of rent. In 1990 this was only 10%. Approximately 67% of all owned homes have a mortgage in 2000 and 20% of those have either a second mortgage or home equity loan. This is a 10% increase over the 1990 mortgage results. The median monthly costs of homes with a mortgage are \$1126 and \$362 for homes without a mortgage (very similar to the county numbers).

### **Education**

The residents of Rochester are achieving significantly higher education levels. The study is of residents 25 years of age and over.

Highest level of education	1990		2000	
	Rochester	Ulster Co.	Rochester	Ulster Co.
Less than 9th grade	9.6%	8.3%	4.9%	5.5%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	20.2%	15.0%	12.5%	12.9%
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	37.9%	29.1%	32.0%	30.0%
Some college, no degree	15.4%	17.7%	20.2%	18.4%
Associate degree	8.6%	8.2%	7.3%	8.3%
Bachelor's degree	8.3%	12.5%	11.7%	13.8%
Graduate or professional degree	8.6%	9.1%	11.5%	11.2%
<b>% high school graduate or higher</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>76.3%</b>	<b>82.6%</b>	<b>81.6%</b>
<b>% bachelors degree or higher</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>23.2%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>

### **Employment**

Rochester experienced a large drop in unemployment between 1990 and 2000. A greater percentage of females have entered the labor pool, although this has led to an increase in unemployed females. Also, the instance of both parents working has risen over 13%.

	1990		2000	
	Rochester	Ulster Co.	Rochester	Ulster Co.
<b>Male:</b>				
In labor force:	74.4%	72.5%	72.8%	67.9%
In Armed Forces	0.8%	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%
Civilian:	73.6%	72.3%	72.2%	67.7%
Employed	65.8%	68.5%	69.1%	63.0%
Unemployed	7.8%	3.8%	3.1%	4.7%
Not in labor force	25.7%	27.5%	27.2%	32.1%
<b>Female:</b>				
In labor force:	57.9%	57.0%	62.5%	59.2%
In Armed Forces	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Civilian:	57.9%	57.0%	62.5%	59.2%
Employed	54.2%	54.3%	57.7%	55.8%
Unemployed	3.7%	2.7%	4.8%	3.3%
Not in labor force	42.1%	43.0%	37.6%	40.8%
<b>% of parents with children under 6 where both work</b>				
	40.7%	50.3%	54.1%	62.3%

The types of employment by industry are varied in Rochester. Due to the fact that the categories were reported differently between 1990 and 2000 no specific comparison can be made, but both Census reports are listed below for general comparison purposes.

### **1990 Rochester employment by industry**

	Rochester	Differs from County
1. Manufacturing durable goods	12.4%	-3.5%
2. Personal Services	11.1%	7.5%
3. Educational Services	10.5%	0.1%
4. Retail Trade	10.4%	-4.4%
5. Construction	10.0%	3.4%
6. Public Administration	9.2%	4.5%
7. Health Services	7.7%	-0.1%
8. Professional and Related services	5.7%	-0.9%
9. Transportation	5.4%	1.4%
10. Finance, insurance, and real estate	3.9%	-2.3%
10. Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	3.9%	1.8%
11. Wholesale Trade	3.0%	0.0%
12. Manufacturing non-durable goods	2.2%	-1.2%
13. Business and repair services	2.1%	-2.2%
14. Entertainment and recreation services	1.3%	0.0%

**A comparison of the difference between the  
2000 Census for Rochester and Ulster County  
Employment by Industry**

<b>Rochester Higher than County by</b>		<b>Rochester Less than County by</b>	
Public Administration	4.1%	Health Care and social assistance	-1.9%
Accommodation and food services	2.5%	Educational services	-1.8%
Construction	2.4%	Other Services	-1.4%
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting	1.1%	Retail Trade	-1.3%
		Finance and Insurance	-1.3%

<b>2000 employment by industry</b>	<b>male</b>	<b>female</b>	<b>combined</b>
<b>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining:</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting	1.8%	3.0%	2.4%
Mining	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Construction</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
<b>Manufacturing</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>
<b>Wholesale trade</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
<b>Retail trade</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>
<b>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities:</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>
Transportation and warehousing	3.8%	1.9%	2.9%
Utilities	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%
<b>Information</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
<b>Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing:</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>
Finance and insurance	2.4%	2.8%	2.6%
Real estate and rental and leasing	1.0%	0.5%	0.8%
<b>Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services:</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
Professional, scientific, and technical services	5.7%	5.9%	5.8%
Management of companies and enterprises	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Administrative and support and waste management services	2.5%	1.4%	2.0%
<b>Educational, health and social services:</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>34.5%</b>	<b>22.0%</b>
Educational services	7.7%	14.7%	10.8%
Health care and social assistance	4.1%	19.8%	11.2%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services:</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
Arts, entertainment, and recreation	3.3%	2.0%	2.7%
Accommodation and food services	7.1%	11.3%	9.0%
<b>Other services (except public administration)</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
<b>Public administration</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>

The types of employment by occupation are also varied in Rochester. Due to the fact that the categories were reported differently between 1990 and 2000 no specific comparison can be made, but both Census reports are listed below for general comparison.

**1990 Rochester employment by occupation**

		<b>Rochester Differs from County</b>
Managerial and professional specialty occupations	24.0%	-4.4%
Technical, sales, and administrative support occupations	21.9%	-9.6%
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	18.0%	5.3%
Service occupations	17.5%	3.4%
Precision production, craft, and repair occupations	15.0%	3.2%
Farming, forestry, and fishing occupations	3.7%	2.1%

**A comparison of the difference between the  
2000 Census for Rochester and Ulster County  
Employment by Occupation**

<b>Rochester Higher than County by</b>		<b>Rochester Less than County by</b>	
Fire fighting, prevention, and law enforcement workers	2.4%	Sales and related	-2.7%
Construction trades workers	1.5%	Architects, surveyors, cartographers, and engineers	-0.8%
Office and administrative support	1.0%	Computer and mathematical	-0.7%
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance	1.0%	Business operations	-0.7%
Motor vehicle operators	0.9%	Personal care and service	-0.7%
Transportation and material moving	0.8%	Health diagnosing and treating	-0.6%
Farming, fishing, and forestry	0.4%	Community and social services	-0.6%
Health technologists and technicians	0.4%	Installation, maintenance, and repair	-0.6%
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media	0.4%	Education, training, and library	-0.5%
		Financial specialists	-0.3%
		Drafters, engineering, and mapping	-0.3%

<b>2000 employment by occupation</b>	<b>male</b>	<b>female</b>	<b>combined</b>
<b>Management, business, and financial operations occupations:</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>10.5%</b>
Management occupations, except farmers and farm managers	9.0%	5.6%	7.5%
Farmers and farm managers	1.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Business operations specialists	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%
Financial specialists	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%
<b>Professional and related occupations:</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>28.4%</b>	<b>21.3%</b>
Computer and mathematical occupations	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%
Architects, surveyors, cartographers, and engineers	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%
Drafters, engineering, and mapping technicians	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Life, physical, and social science occupations	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%
Community and social services occupations	0.7%	3.0%	1.8%
Legal occupations	1.1%	0.3%	0.7%
Education, training, and library occupations	4.0%	12.6%	7.9%
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations	4.3%	2.4%	3.4%
Health diagnosing and treating practitioners and technical occupations	2.3%	4.0%	3.1%
Health technologists and technicians	0.5%	3.5%	1.9%
<b>Service occupations:</b>	<b>17.7%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>
Healthcare support occupations	0.6%	5.0%	2.6%
Fire fighting, prevention, and law enforcement workers, including supervisors	7.4%	1.2%	4.6%
Other protective service workers, including supervisors	1.2%	0.0%	0.7%
Food preparation and serving related occupations	3.7%	6.6%	5.0%
Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations	4.6%	3.4%	4.1%
Personal care and service occupations	0.0%	5.2%	2.3%
<b>Sales and office occupations:</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>23.8%</b>
Sales and related occupations	7.7%	8.3%	8.0%
Office and administrative support occupations	7.7%	25.7%	15.8%
<b>Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
<b>Construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations:</b>	<b>18.9%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>
Supervisors, construction and extraction workers	0.9%	0.0%	0.5%
Construction trades workers	12.1%	0.0%	6.6%
Extraction workers	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	5.6%	0.8%	3.4%

Continued on next page

<b>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations:</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>13.4%</b>
Production occupations	9.1%	4.8%	7.1%
Supervisors, transportation and material moving workers	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Aircraft and traffic control occupations	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Motor vehicle operators	6.2%	1.8%	4.2%
Rail, water and other transportation occupations	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Material moving workers	2.5%	0.5%	1.6%

Where people work has changed dramatically.

Rochester residents reported 99.6% worked in NYS and 84.6% worked in Ulster County in 1990.

In 2000 this changed to 97.5% in NYS and only 74.3% reported they work in Ulster County.

How we get to work has only changed slightly (except we carpool less).

In 1990, 91% drove (split 70% alone and 21% carpool), 3% used public transportation, 2% walked, and 3% worked at home.

In 2000, 85% drove (split 75% alone and 10% carpool), 5% used public transportation, 4% walked, and 6% worked at home.

In reviewing the time it takes to travel to work, it is taking significantly longer in 2000.

The median travel time to work in 2000 was 35 minutes for the Rochester resident versus 27 for the Ulster County resident. This fact was not calculated in 1990, but would appear to be between 20-24 minutes based on the chart below.

<b>Travel time to work</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>
Less than 5 minutes	2.6%	3.5%
5 to 9 minutes	9.9%	7.5%
10 to 14 minutes	10.2%	10.6%
15 to 19 minutes	14.4%	10.0%
20 to 24 minutes	14.2%	10.4%
25 to 29 minutes	6.7%	6.6%
30 to 34 minutes	14.8%	14.6%
35 to 39 minutes	1.7%	2.9%
40 to 44 minutes	4.1%	2.8%
45 to 59 minutes	8.5%	12.4%
60 to 89 minutes	8.5%	5.2%
90 or more minutes	1.4%	7.3%
Worked at home	3.1%	6.3%

## **Income**<sup>4</sup>

Wages have risen in Rochester with the town outpacing the county in the percentage increase of median household and family income.

<b>Median household income</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>% increase</b>
Rochester	\$27,196	\$43,071	58.4%
Ulster County	\$34,033	\$42,551	25.0%
<b>Median family income</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>% increase</b>
Rochester	\$30,478	\$47,257	55.1%
Ulster County	\$40,072	\$51,708	29.3%
<b>Per Capita Income</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>% increase</b>
Rochester	\$13,216	\$21,065	59.4%
Ulster County	\$14,921	\$20,846	39.7%

The under 25 year olds and over 65 year olds make more than the county averages, the 25-34 and 55-64 age groups make less than the county average, and 35-54 year olds make about the same as the rest of the county

<b>1999 median</b>		<b>Ulster Co.</b>	<b>Rochester</b>
<b>Household income</b>			
Householder under 25 years		20,151	29,063
Householder 25 to 34 years		40,997	35,294
Householder 35 to 44 years		50,359	49,773
Householder 45 to 54 years		55,713	56,953
Householder 55 to 64 years		48,970	36,284
Householder 65 to 74 years		33,519	36,797
Householder 75 years and over		21,107	24,783
Male full time worker		36,808	36,250
Female full time worker		27,086	24,733

<sup>4</sup> The definitions of household and family income are as follows: Income of Households--Includes the income of the householder and all other persons 15 years old and over in the household, whether related to the householder or not. Because many households consist of only one person, average household income is usually less than average family income.

Income of Families and Persons--In compiling statistics on family income, the incomes of all members 15 years old and over in each family are summed and treated as a single amount. However, for persons 15 years old and over, the total amounts of their own incomes are used.

Amount	Household Income			
	1990		2000	
	Rochester	Ulster Co.	Rochester	Ulster Co.
\$0>9,999	12.4%	11.8%	6.8%	8.7%
\$10,000>\$14,999	9.2%	7.4%	5.7%	6.4%
\$15,000>\$24,999	20.7%	15.8%	13.5%	13.1%
\$25,000>\$34,999	20.9%	16.4%	12.5%	12.7%
\$35,000>\$49,999	17.3%	20.5%	19.8%	16.9%
\$50,000>\$74,999	12.9%	18.4%	23.2%	20.8%
\$75,000>\$99,999	2.4%	6.1%	8.5%	10.7%
\$100,000>\$149,999	3.2%	2.7%	5.1%	7.5%
\$150,000>\$199,999	1.1%	1.0%	2.4%	1.8%
Over \$200,000	N/A	N/A	2.6%	1.5%

Amount	Family Income			
	1990		2000	
	Rochester	Ulster Co.	Rochester	Ulster Co.
\$0>9,999	7.2%	5.8%	4.4%	4.4%
\$10,000>\$14,999	7.8%	5.4%	5.0%	4.1%
\$15,000>\$24,999	21.2%	14.5%	11.4%	9.8%
\$25,000>\$34,999	21.1%	16.5%	12.0%	11.5%
\$35,000>\$49,999	19.6%	22.8%	20.6%	17.8%
\$50,000>\$74,999	15.8%	23.1%	24.2%	25.0%
\$75,000>\$99,999	2.1%	7.7%	11.5%	13.7%
\$100,000>\$149,999	3.8%	3.2%	6.3%	9.8%
\$150,000>\$199,999	1.5%	1.1%	2.5%	2.3%
Over \$200,000	N/A	N/A	2.0%	1.7%

Household Income Sources				
(Expressed as what percentage of residents receive that type of income)				
Type	1990		2000	
	Rochester	Ulster Co.	Rochester	Ulster Co.
	Earnings	82.7%	81.4%	82.4%
Wage/salary	74.5%	77.5%	79.6%	75.5%
Self Employment	20.2%	15.8%	16.8%	15.2%
Social Security	28.0%	27.7%	26.2%	28.7%
Public Assistance	7.0%	5.8%	1.9%	2.5%
Retirement Income	19.3%	17.2%	17.4%	20.0%
Other Income	13.7%	9.5%	11.5%	13.4%

Total of All	Below Poverty Level			
	1990		2000	
	Rochester	Ulster Co.	Rochester	Ulster Co.
<b>Total of All</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>8.56%</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
Over 18 yrs.	9.7%	8.0%	8.5%	10.7%
Over 65 yrs.	11.0%	9.8%	7.2%	8.7%
Families	7.7%	5.6%	8.2%	7.2%
Family/Female householder/ No husband present	32.0%	20.9%	29.1%	22.5%

## Conclusions

### Population

Rochester is growing rapidly in size and growing older. While the population age group percentages have remained relatively stable there is a noticeable increase in the 40's and 50's age groups and a noticeable decrease in the under 5 and 25-34 year old groups. In a breakdown of population by age group, 45-54 year olds increased 5% while 25-34 year olds fell by 5%.

The average age was not recorded in 1990, but examination of the age group percentages indicates it was most likely 33 years old, while the county average appears to be 34. In 2000 the average age jumps to 38 years old. Rochester now matches the county average and this leads to the conclusion that Rochester is growing older at a quicker rate than the county.

It would appear that a large portion of the new population is 35-54 year old families with young teenage children (10-14). The decrease in the 25-34 year age group as well as the increase in never married is partially responsible for the under 5 year old population decrease. It would also appear that our younger residents are moving elsewhere after college. These trends mirror county trends, but the large jumps in both the 10-14 and the 45-49 year old groups are considerably higher than the county increases.

This is further backed up by checking the school population by grade for the period of 2000-2004. It is important to remember the school district comprises several other towns, not just Rochester, but the decrease in younger children seems apparent.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>actual change 2000-2004</b>	<b>% change 2000-2004</b>
Pre-K	23	42.59%
Ungraded Elem.	4	100.00%
K-4	-190	-17.81%
5-8	0	0.00%
9-12	138	16.83%
<b>All</b>	<b>-25</b>	<b>-0.86%</b>

## Housing

Rochester is experienced significant growth in housing. Housing units increased at almost 8% over the county average for the same period (ranked 3<sup>rd</sup>). Approximately 1/3 of owners appear to have moved into their home after 1995. Almost 60% of new households can be attributed to single or two person residences.

But population is rising faster than housing units are being built and that combined with the larger numbers of single and two person residences could be an indication of a housing shortage in the future if population growth continues at this rate.

The greatest proportion of new housing units appears to be owner occupied single structures with almost no growth in rental units. Rental prices that were considered low (compared to county numbers) in 1990 have caught up with county averages in 2000. ¾ of occupied housing units are owned. The number of homes with a mortgage has increased by 10%.

It is significant, though, that even in this climate of rapid growth the need for affordable housing has decreased. New York State defines “affordable housing” as that costing less than 30 percent of monthly household income. In 2000, approximately 24% of owned homes and 37% of rentals do not meet these criteria when the rental or monthly costs expressed as a percentage of household income are examined. While this is sizable, this is a much better situation than in 1990 when the percentages were 32% for owners and 50% for renters (about a 25% drop in the percentages).

It also appears that almost 10% of residents previously considered part time are shifting to full time residents. But Rochester still has a sizable vacant housing stock to draw from which could result in the continued population growth. With a finite amount of land available for new construction and such a large portion of housing units considered vacant (seasonal), perhaps one approach might be to attempt to convert vacant seasonal homes to full-time homes to accommodate the population increases, but the financial and economic implications of this suggestion should be studied also.

## Education/Employment/Income

I list these topics together because in my mind they naturally are related. With the large growth in population has come an even larger growth in income for the Rochester residents (between 55-60% depending on how classified with the county growth being between 25-30%). There has also been a substantial increase in highest level of education attained by residents. Some of this is can be attributed to the increases nationwide and statewide of more young people having greater opportunities to continue their education and also as our senior population who didn't have these opportunities pass away, but not all as Rochester has significantly higher percentages than county wide statistics.

Unemployment has dropped considerably in Rochester and more women have entered the labor force since 1990. This is not very much different than county, state, and national numbers.

And it appears that residents now travel much more than they did previously for employment as is evidenced by 42% in 2000 versus 51% in 1990 traveling less than 25 minutes to work and 25% in 2000 versus 18% in 1990 traveling over 45 minutes.

Rochester has also experienced a 3.4% decrease in self employment while the county has remained relatively stable but coincidentally 3.2% more residents state they work at home.

It is very interesting to me to see to see the types of industry our residents are employed in. Education, health, and social services is by far the largest employment industry, but this field has a 3 to 1 ratio of women to men. Women also work predominately in Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services. In fact half of the women employed work in these two fields. Men are more equally distributed between the industry fields with construction being the number one industry followed by public administration, but no one industry stands out with males as with females. Taken as a whole 56% of our residents work in the four top fields.

22% Education, health, and social services

12% Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services

11% Retail trade

11% Public Administration

It further appears that resident's occupations are seeing an increase in professional, sales/office, and service occupations. There is a decrease in the percentages of population involved in manufacturing and farming. Male employment displays the same trend as being widely varied with construction holding a slight edge closely followed by managers, sales, office workers, and protective service workers. The large number of protective service workers might be explained by the close proximity of several prisons. Over 1 in 4 females work in office and administrative support and 1 in 8 works in education, training and library services. Again taken as a whole the three top occupation types are

24% Sales and office occupations

21% Professional occupations

19% Service Occupations

The closeness of the percentages of occupation indicates to me that Rochester has a very diverse type of resident. No one occupation clearly lends itself to being what our town is known for.