Starfish Family Services Community Needs Assessment

2013 Update

Compiled by Data Driven Detroit

November 1, 2013





Contents

Wayne County Overview	4
The Starfish Primary Service Area	11
Starfish Community Demographics	14
Neighborhood Opportunity Index	41
Background on the Index and Its Use in Detroit	43
Comprehensive Rank/Index	44
Schools	46
Appendix A	
Appendix B	54
Appendix C	60
Appendix D	61

Figures

Figure 1: Unemployment Trends in Wayne County and Detroit, 2000 - 2013	5
Figure 2: Population of Wayne County, 1980 - 2012	6
Figure 3: Net Migration (Domestic + Immigration) Trends in Wayne County, 2000 - 2012	7
Figure 4: Population Change by Age Group, Wayne County, 2000 - 2010	8
Figure 5: Wayne County Residents Receiving Food Assistance, 2001 to 2013	9
Figure 6: Population Change in Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010	14
Figure 7: Percent Population Change in Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010	15
Figure 8: Population Change for Children Less than 5 Years of Age, 2000 - 2010	17
Figure 9: Percentage Change in the Population Less than 5 Years of Age, 2000 - 2010	18
Figure 10: Characteristics of Mothers and Births, 2009-2011	19
Figure 11: Population Change by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 - 2010	22
Figure 12: Household Change by Type Across the Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010	23
Figure 13: Average Annual Unemployment Rates, 2010 - 2012	26
Figure 14: Percent of Adults, 25+, without a High School Diploma	28
Figure 15: Percent of Adults Age 25+ with Bachelor's Degree or Higher	29
Figure 16: Household Income Distribution, 2007 – 2011 5-Year Average	32
Figure 17: Percent of Residents in Poverty, 1999 and 2011	34
Figure 18: Percentage of households in Current Residence Less than One Year, 2011	35
Figure 19: Percentage of Households Living in Current Residence Prior to 2005	37
Figure 20: Percent of Households Spending 30% or More on Housing	39
Figure 21: Percentage of Households with No Vehicle Available, 2011	40

Maps

Map 1: Starfish Primary Service Area Reference Map	12
Map 2: Starfish Primary Service Area Census Tracts	13
Map 3: Population Density, Starfish Primary Service Area, 2010	16
Map 4: Population Density, Residents 0 to 4 Years Old	
Map 5: Percent Minority Population, 2010	21
Map 6: Single Parent Households as a Percent of Households with Children	24
Map 7: Subsidized Housing Units (2011) as a Percent of Total Housing Units (2010)	25
Map 8: Percent of Labor Force Unemployed, 2007-2011 5-Year Average	27
Map 9: Percent of Population Age 25+ with High School Diploma or less	
Map 10: Percent of Population Age 25+ with Bachelor's Degree or Higher	31
Map 11: Percent of Households with Income below \$20,000	
Map 12: Percent of Current Households in Residence Less than One Year	
Map 13: Percent of Current Households in Residence Prior to 2005	
Map 14: Percent Vacant Units	41
Map 15: Neighborhood Opportunity Index, Starfish Primary Service Area	45
Map 16: School District Boundaries, Starfish Primary Service Area	47
Map 17: Neighborhood Opportunity Index, City of Detroit	61

Tables

Table 1: Median Household Income in Southeast Michigan, 1999 - 2012	4
Table 2: Characteristics of Mothers and Births, 2009 – 2011	19
Table 3: Decennial Census Comparison for all Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010	48
Table 4: ACS Summary for all Starfish Communities, 2007 - 2011 5-Years Average Estimates .	54
Table 5: Employment by Level of Education, Inkster and Taylor	60

Wayne County Overview

While Wayne County has begun to show some signs of population and economic stabilization in 2013, the last twelve years, since 2000-01, marks one of the longest periods of demographic and economic challenge that the county has ever endured. While it started out at a high point - the year 2000 being one of the best for resident income (median household income was \$56,190 in 2012 dollars)¹ and employment (911,000 employed/unemployment rate of 4.3 percent) - the Michigan recession that started soon after the September 2001 terrorist attack took its toll. By 2012^{2,3}, median household income had fallen 29.7 percent to \$39,486 (Table 1). Recently released annual employment figures for 2012 show that the number of employed residents fell by 190,000, and the unemployment rate is much higher, at 11.7 percent.⁴ Nonetheless, this represents an employment increase of 4,000 and a reduction in the unemployment rate from 12.6 percent in 2011. While the unemployment rate drop is a good thing in that 8,000 fewer residents are unemployed, the fact that this rate was driven, in part, by an overall decrease in the total labor force (both employed and unemployed) of 24,000 since 2010, and 8,000 over the last year should be of concern.⁵

	1999	2012	Change, 1	999 - 2012
Wayne County	\$56,190	\$39,486	-\$16,704	-29.7%
City of Detroit	\$40,773	\$23,600	-\$17,173	-42.1%
Oakland County	\$85,308	\$63,345	-\$21,963	-25.7%
Macomb County	\$71,797	\$52,185	-\$19,612	-27.3%
Southeast MI	\$67,764	\$50,310	-\$17,454	-25.8%
Michigan	\$61,551	\$46,859	-\$14,692	-23.9%
United States	\$57,868	\$51,371	-\$6,497	-11.2%

Table 1: Median Household Income in Southeast Michigan, 1999 - 20

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

According to the Michigan Labor Market Information Division, Wayne County experienced a decrease of 24.7 percent in private sector employment between 2000 and 2010 as the county lost 184,108 jobs. The greatest losses were experienced in manufacturing - jobs that generally paid quite well, came with benefits and required relatively low levels of education. Manufacturing jobs decreased by more than half (54.5 percent) between 2000 and 2010, falling from 148,309 to 67,528. Not surprising is the fact that the majority of these losses came in automotive-related manufacturing, where a loss of almost 50,000 jobs translated to a 63 percent drop. The good news, however, as was the case with unemployment, is that manufacturing employment has added over 11,000 jobs between the 3rd quarter of 2010 and 2012, with transportation equipment manufacturing picking up 9,000 of

¹ The income data were collected in the 2000 Census and represent income for calendar year 1999.

² The date reported for each variable in the text is the most recent that is available.

³ 2012 income data are from the 2012 American Community Survey, released by the Census Bureau on September 19, 2013.

⁴ It must be pointed out that this is a discussion of Wayne County as an entire entity. It is comprised of 43 separate units of government. While each has suffered from the recession, the impact on individual municipalities has varied a great deal.

⁵ Recent monthly estimates show that both total employment and total labor force are growing.

⁶ All 1999 monetary values are adjusted to 2012 dollars using U.S. Consumer Price Research Series Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U-RS) from 1999 to 2012.

the total. While no one is projecting growth anywhere near 2000 totals, and many of these jobs are coming in conjunction with the two-tiered labor agreements between the UAW and the Big 3, manufacturing continues to be a critical component of the economic structure of Wayne County. National and local trends point to the next few years being a period of slow but steady growth. The only negative of this trend is that the pay scale of these jobs will be considerably less than what has been seen in the past.



Figure 1: Unemployment Trends in Wayne County and Detroit, 2000 - 2013

* All years represent annual averages except 2013, which is a June figure. Source: Michigan Labor Market Information Division.

The loss of buying power over the decade has coincided with increasing rates of poverty. Estimates of the poverty rate between 1999 and 2012 show increases from 14.4 to 26.2 percent for all persons, and from 21.3 to 30.0 percent for children.⁷ Both represent small, but insignificant, increases over 2011 rates. These increases, coupled with decreasing household income, reinforce the fact that job growth is not resulting in increasing levels of economic security for Wayne County households. In fact, the income gap is widening as educational attainment and skills become an increasing differentiator of employment and wages. The City of Detroit continued to have the highest poverty rates in the country among large cities in 2012 – 42.3 percent for persons and 59.4 percent for children.

⁷ The poverty rate for children less than 5 years is estimated at 44 percent in 2011.

Between 2000 and 2012, Wayne County's population fell by 286,815 persons (13 percent) amounting to a greater loss than any other county in the U.S. Several factors have contributed to this loss.⁸ Between 2000 and 2011, the number of births in the county dropped by 23.8 percent. The majority of this decrease can be attributed to the City of Detroit where births decreased by 34.9 percent (12.1 percent in out-Wayne, with a slight upturn between 2010 and 2011). The City of Detroit accounted for 75 percent of the overall reduction in county births. The decrease in Wayne County deaths (11.5 percent) can also be attributed to Detroit, where the number of deaths dropped by 25.1 percent while the out-county number actually increased by 1.7 percent. Newly released numbers for 2011⁹ indicate a continuation in the decrease in total deaths in the county, down by just over 500 since 2010. The combination of these factors resulted in a decrease in population growth due to natural increase. The annual numerical natural increase for the county dropped by 42 percent over the decade, falling from 10,864 to 6,297 persons added per year.



Figure 2: Population of Wayne County, 1980 - 2012

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses of 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010, Population Estimates Program.

However, the factor that is driving the majority of demographic trends in the county is out-migration. While Wayne County has historically seen more people leave the county than come in on an annual basis, the negative net migration this decade is almost unprecedented. While immigrants - particularly from the Middle East, Mexico and South and Central America - continue to come to Wayne County to live, the native-born population has been leaving. Wayne County residents moving

⁸ Population change is affected by the following: Births - Deaths = Natural Increase; In-Migration - Out-Migration = Net Migration.

⁹ 2011 data are provisional at the county level and have not yet been released by community.

to adjoining counties or leaving the Detroit region entirely brought about a net loss of 267,576 residents between 2000 and 2009.¹⁰ Estimates for the period between July 1, 2010 and July 1, 2012 indicate a continuing, though decreasing, rate of departure. The net decrease between 2010 and 2011 was estimated to be 19,530 persons, while continued outmigration brought an estimated loss of another 14,740 residents between 2011 and 2012.



Source: Census Bureau Population Estimates Program.

The decreasing births, coupled with the out-migration of younger residents, often with young children,¹¹ has resulted in a smaller cohort of children five years of age or less, a cohort that is facing unprecedented hardship. The population less than five years of age has decreased from 152,600 (7.4 percent of the county's population) in 2000 to 115,838 (6.5 percent) in 2012. A larger decrease has been experienced in the next age cohort, those 5 to 9 years of age. While this group totaled 175,610 in 2000, representing 8.5 percent of the county's population, it has fallen to 118,597 in 2012, a decrease of 32.5

¹⁰ The Census Bureau does not estimate migration between July 1, 2009 and April 1, 2010 (date of the decennial census). While calculations of this 9month period are possible, the final result would not add greatly to the current analysis, and thus have not been developed for this document.

¹¹ Out-migration tends to be driven by a younger demographic - the young tend to be more mobile and young families are often looking for better education opportunities for their children. An analysis of population change by age cohort between 2000 and 2010, demonstrates clearly, particularly for Detroit, that movement out was dominated by families with school-age children – particularly those 5-9 years of age. Decreasing births drove the 0-4 year cohort numbers down, while educational alternatives were likely the leading factor for older cohorts.

percent, and now represents just 6.6 percent of the total. An analysis of Detroit trends showed a 47 percent decrease in this age group between 2000 and 2010.



Figure 4: Population Change by Age Group, Wayne County, 2000 - 2010

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.

The recession resulted in a large number of children seeing their parents unemployed or underemployed, many of them seeking services for the first time. The best example of this is the county's food assistance rolls. In September 2001, 238,460 Wayne County residents were receiving food assistance. As of August 2013, in spite of decreases in the overall number of Wayne County residents receiving food assistance since late 2011, 521,299 residents received food assistance. This represents a 101.7 percent increase since 2002 and a rate of close to one of every three county residents. Figure 5 illustrates the change in the number of Wayne County residents receiving food assistance.



Figure 5: Wayne County Residents Receiving Food Assistance, 2001 to 2013

* Data represent September counts for all years except 2013, which uses August figures. Source: Michigan Department of Human Services.

While the urban core communities of Detroit and Highland Park have continued to suffer to the greatest extent, this recession affected all segments of the population and all communities across the county. In addition to job losses, the foreclosure crisis added a significant level of need and strife to families throughout the county. Beginning in 2005-06 with the subprime loan crisis in the lower income communities, foreclosures due to interest-only and balloon mortgages that made payments unaffordable moved to the higher income suburbs. Families that saw large mortgages as investments, due to increasing housing values, found themselves "underwater" as home values in Wayne County and the Detroit region fell back to 1995 levels. The result has been increasing numbers of families who are, at best, moving to apartments or living with friends or neighbors, or, at worst, finding themselves homeless. While the number of mortgage foreclosures has declined since 2011, the vast majority of those who lost their homes have seen little improvement in their fortunes. More troubling in recent years has been the increasing number of properties affected by tax foreclosures through the Wayne County Treasurer. While the foreclosure source may differ, the result is the same – families forced out of their homes. The result of these factors was a 106 percent increase in vacant housing units between 2000 and 2010 in Wayne County (57,705 to 118,944). Detroit's vacant housing stock grew from 38,688 to 79,725 (106 percent), while the remainder of Wayne County experienced an increase from 19,017 to 39,219 (106 percent).

Increasing human service needs have come at a time of decreasing government program funding. Deficits at the state and local levels, due to decreasing property tax revenues and increasing legacy costs of pensions and health care, are resulting in decreasing program allocations - allocations that cannot be supplemented to a large degree by the philanthropic community due to the decrease in assets caused by losses in the stock market.¹² Recent market gains have yet to change that scenario to any substantive degree, though the trend is definitely positive. An additional factor to recognize is that many foundations have targeted the bulk of their funding to programs and projects in the City of Detroit. As a result, access to funding for programming in other parts of the region has been limited. The national debate on health care legislation comes at a time when increasing numbers of individuals - often termed the "working poor" - are without insurance. State programs have endeavored to reach out to enroll all children, but many adults are not aware of the programs. Nevertheless, it is estimated that almost 96 percent of Wayne County children, 0-18 years of age, were insured in 2012. However, such programs for children do not provide adequate prenatal care for pregnant woman without health care, or those living in areas with few OB/GYN or pediatric practitioners. The Affordable Care Act, which takes effect on January 1, 2014, coupled with the state legislation that will increase Medicaid eligibility, should help to fill some of these gaps.

Early childhood education is critical to ensure children are ready to learn when they start kindergarten. Studies have shown¹³ that children from low-income families/neighborhoods tend to begin school with vocabularies less than half the size of children from middle class families/neighborhoods. Such deficits are seldom made up, resulting in children falling farther behind and often dropping out. Local efforts around creating a community of quality childcare and developing a kindergarten readiness assessment tool are trying to address the issue. The system of early childhood services is extremely complicated, ranging from structured large licensed centers to individuals providing care in their home. It is because of this complexity that it is extremely important to keep an eye on the quality and accessibility of all levels of care. However, the economy has resulted in fewer and fewer children attending childcare facilities, as families try to bring resources to the table by utilizing state provided subsidies for care delivered by Unlicensed Child Care Providers (formerly called Relatives and Aides). This has resulted in a reduction of child care facilities due to their inability to cover costs. There is a whole other group of providers called Family, Friend, and Neighbor (FFN) who cannot be tracked because they represent a system of informal caregivers who are not tied to the state in any financial or programmatic way. While there are 760 child care centers in Wayne County in mid-2013¹⁴, it is estimated that over 8,000 Wayne County children (over 6,000 in Detroit alone) are being cared for by Unlicensed Child Care Providers. There are no estimates of the number of children in FFN situations. In addition, full-day Head Start slots

¹² Detroit has experienced significant financial difficulties, resulting in the appointment of an Emergency Financial Manager and a recent declaration of bankruptcy. Programs have been cut, human services have been outsourced to Wayne County's Community Action Agency, and nonprofits have been created in the areas of employment and health. Other communities in Wayne County, such as Allen Park, Ecorse, Inkster and River Rouge, have suffered for a variety of financial reasons.

¹³ The work of the Harlem Children's Zone is a perfect example that has been lifted up by President Obama and supported for replication in his recent Promise Neighborhoods legislation, now rebranded as promise zones.

¹⁴ There were also 323 Family Homes and 170 Group Homes. Data were collected in 2nd Quarter of 2013. Relative and aide counts were developed in 2012 with no recent update available.

have been decreasing and the City of Detroit has relinquished its role as a Head Start grantee. The proposal application process for the federal government's total regranting of Head Start (and Early Head Start) providers and slots in the city was closed earlier this year. It is anticipated that the final announcement of Head Start grantees will be made in late 2013/early 2014.

The national economic news appears to be improving and, while Michigan is always first to enter and last to leave a recession, it appears that Michigan's economy may have finally reached the bottom. While some communities are beginning to see property values rise, the majority of older Wayne County communities are not. Residential and commercial property values are likely to rise in the coming years resulting in more funding to local government. Even with a turnaround, however, increases are slowed by state legislation. Proposal A and the Headlee Amendment limit the amount communities can raise annual property changes ownership. While the state is experiencing an improvement in its bottom line, the improvement has not resulted in increased human service program funding. The philanthropic community, while increasing the share of assets that they are putting into the community, is just coming out of several bad years that reduced their bottom lines.

The case for early childhood investment has been made over and over again. In order to assess the landscape and prioritize our needs, we must have accurate and timely information. A broad segment of the local philanthropic community is turning its attention to early childhood and the elements that help children develop towards kindergarten readiness. This report updates the landscape analysis completed by Data Driven Detroit in 2010. With the completion of the 2010 Census and recent iterations of the American Community Survey, coupled with several updated datasets from the state, we are able to "paint a picture" of the conditions faced by children in the 14 Wayne County communities covered by Starfish Family Services. This picture can then be placed alongside the geographic program mix that Starfish is providing. When these components are combined, it is our hope that the next steps become clear.

The Starfish Primary Service Area

Map 1 outlines the western Wayne County communities in Starfish's primary service area where it operates facilities and provides direct services. These communities range from Dearborn on the east, with its large Arab-American population, to Taylor on the south with a mixed population of African Americans and whites, to the increasingly diverse (a variety of Asian subgroups and increasing numbers of African Americans, Latinos and Arab Americans) community of Canton township and the substantially white populations of Northville, Plymouth, and Livonia on the west and north. While the large white majorities are still present, they have been decreasing in recent years due to a significant increase of African Americans in Livonia, and growing Asian population in the Northville and Plymouth area. This report will examine a number of demographic, socioeconomic and housing trends across all 14 communities, while focusing on Inkster for some of the more detailed analyses. To provide additional context, data for the State of Michigan, Wayne County as a whole, and the City of Detroit, are included periodically.





It is often the case that data presented at the community level fail to show the degree of variation that occurs at the neighborhood level. For instance, a community may show overall population loss, which can mask the fact that some neighborhoods are growing. Demographic homogeneity, whether age structure, income distribution or housing value, seldom exists across a community. The ability to understand neighborhood-level variations through census tract¹⁵ data presentation will allow Starfish Family Services to more readily demonstrate service gaps (areas of need where services are few or nonexistent) and help plan for programs. The large numbers of families who need assistance of various types, coupled with the limited transportation options in the community, make the importance of locating services where the need is greatest more critical. Map 2, a reference map of census tracts across the 14 communities, shows the level of neighborhood detail that can be analyzed.

¹⁵ According to the Census Bureau, census tracts are small, relatively permanent statistical subdivisions of a county and are updated by local participants prior to each decennial census. The primary purpose of census tracts is to provide a stable set of geographic units for the presentation of statistical data. Census tracts generally have a population size between 1,200 and 8,000 people with an optimum size of 4,000 people. The spatial size of census tracts varies widely depending on the density of settlement. Census tract boundaries are delineated with the intention of being maintained over a long time so that statistical comparisons can be made from census to census.

Map 2: Starfish Primary Service Area Census Tracts



Starfish Community Demographics

The 2010 decennial census enumerated a total population of 677,175 in the Starfish communities. This represented a reduction of only 43 residents since 2000 (a loss of less than 0.01 percent). This is quite surprising when one reflects on the introduction to this report that pronounced Wayne County as suffering the greatest loss of any county in the country. It is clear that Detroit, Highland Park and several downriver communities contributed significantly to the overall population decrease. Similarly, there was a great deal of variation across the Starfish communities, as can be seen in Figure 6.



Figure 6: Population Change in Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.

The older communities that form the core of the service area showed the greatest losses. Inkster suffered the largest population loss (-4,746) over the decade, or 15.8 percent of their total. Garden City, Wayne and Redford Township also suffered smaller, but significant, losses. Dearborn, however, reversed the trend with a small population increase, likely due to continued immigration and higher birth rates. The growth communities were those on the outer fringes - Canton Township and Northville Township¹⁶ - which, up until 2006-07, experienced a great deal of new residential construction. While the economy slowed construction throughout the region, these areas were able to sustain their population growth. Figure 7 provides a view of population change by percent, and adds the state, county and Detroit to the analysis.

¹⁶ While Northville Township experienced a 35 percent increase in population, the City of Northville experienced a decrease of 11.8 percent.





While population totals can vary widely at the census tract level, due to both housing density and mere size of the tract, the computation of population density (population per square mile) allows one to standardize across geographic variations and make "apples to apples" comparisons. An analysis of population density by census tract (Map 3) shows that the highest density areas trend toward the older portions of the Starfish primary service area. This includes Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, Garden City, Redford Township and Westland. Inkster has experienced a significant decrease in density and has no tract showing up in the two highest density ranges. Dearborn's density pattern is notable for its tripartite division, with the highest density areas in the eastern section of town (where the Arab American population is concentrated), followed by a reduced density to the west, and little density in the central downtown business district.

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.



Map 3: Population Density, Starfish Primary Service Area, 2010

While population trends are important for gaining an understanding of general demographic shifts, Starfish Family Services needs to know what changes are occurring in their target populations. A critical client component is the population less than five years of age. The reduction in births, a pattern that has played out throughout Southeast Michigan, has resulted in a decrease of 4,599 0 to 4 year olds in the service area. This 9.7 percent decrease contrasts sharply with the minimal change in the total population.

Figure 8 illustrates that only three communities experienced an increase in this cohort. These three included one community with a significant overall population increase - Northville Township – and two that actually lost overall population – Dearborn Heights and Plymouth. It seems clear that the latter two are experiencing an influx of young families that are replacing older households.



Figure 8: Population Change for Children Less than 5 Years of Age in Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.

Figure 9 portrays the percentage change in this cohort and adds our three comparison areas. The variation across communities is quite large, but the majority trend of loss is also reflected at the state and county level.



Figure 9: Percentage Change in the Population Less than 5 Years of Age, 2000 - 2010

Table 2 lists characteristics of mothers and births for women in the Starfish communities who gave birth between 2009 and 2011, with the overall average for the 14 communities shown at the bottom of the table. Figure 10 displays these figures graphically. It is clear that there is wide variation among the communities, with Northville Township and City, Plymouth Township and City, Canton Township, and Livonia generally having the lowest percentages of low birth weight babies; teen mothers; mothers who received less than adequate prenatal care; mothers with a high school education or less; and mothers who were unmarried at the time of the birth. At the other end of the spectrum, Inkster had the highest percentages on all five of these measures. Inkster particularly stood out in its percentage of mothers who were unmarried (73 percent).

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.

Table 2: Characteristics of Mothers and Births, 2009 – 2011 for Births Occurring in the Starfish Communities¹⁷

		Percent of Mothers that	Percent of Mothers	Percent of Mothers who	Percent of Mothers	Percent of
		Gave Birth that had	who Gave Birth	Gave Birth that had	who Gave Birth that	Mothers who
	Total Births,	Children with Low or	that were Teen	Intermediate or	had a High School	Gave Birth that
	2009 - 2011	Very Low Birth Weight	Mothers	Inadequate Prenatal Care	Education or Less	were Unmarried
Inkster	1,168	7%	15%	40%	57%	73%
Wayne	616	5%	11%	31%	52%	56%
Taylor	2,415	6%	10%	27%	51%	58%
Redford Township	1,738	5%	9%	31%	37%	46%
Westland	3,104	5%	8%	29%	42%	48%
Garden City	874	5%	6%	26%	38%	40%
Dearborn Heights	2,167	4%	6%	27%	37%	29%
Dearborn	4,758	4%	5%	32%	48%	12%
Livonia	2,409	3%	4%	19%	19%	21%
Canton Township	3,196	3%	3%	21%	18%	20%
Plymouth	632	2%	2%	19%	12%	18%
Northville	455	3%	2%	18%	10%	13%
Plymouth Township	384	3%	1%	15%	7%	9%
Northville Township	355	4%	0%	15%	2%	4%
All Starfish Communities	24,271	4%	6%	27%	21%	32%
Detroit	32,483	11%	20%	46%	72%	80%

Figure 10: Characteristics of Mothers and Births, 2009-2011



¹⁷ Birth percentages are calculated by dividing the 3-year total of births in each category by the 3-year total number of births

Map 4 illustrates the population density of 0 to 4 year olds by census tract. While the pattern is relatively similar to that of the total population (though the values are quite a bit smaller), the areas of highest concentration become fewer. A more concentrated area of east Dearborn rises to the top, and is followed by one on the south end of Taylor. The middle tier features two areas in Inkster, two in Westland, two in Canton Township and one in Dearborn Heights.



Map 4: Population Density, Residents 0 to 4 Years Old

While Starfish Family Services does not develop services based on client race or ethnicity, cultural competency is an important component when dealing with diverse groups such as those found in the Middle Eastern, Southeast Asian and Latino populations. The understanding of racial/ethnic patterns is important because race continues to play such a large role in southeast Michigan's population patterns. A basic view of its distribution across the service area can help Starfish structure its outreach and programmatic offerings appropriately. Map 5 presents a rather simplistic view in that it

divides the population into two groups: (1) non-Hispanic Whites and (2) all other classifications, which we have labeled "minority."¹⁸



Map 5: Percent Minority Population, 2010

The most obvious take away from this map is the wide variation in the concentration of persons of color across census tracts. The heaviest, and largest, concentration occurs in Inkster, primarily south of Michigan Avenue (M-12). African Americans represent 73 percent of Inkster's population (up from 67 percent in 2000), while small shares of Asians (two percent), Latinos (three percent) and multiracial (three percent) also call Inkster home. African Americans are also the dominant group in one high minority census tract in Redford Township, and a slightly less heavily minority tract in Taylor. While not classified as a race, or listed separately as an ethnic group for which the Census Bureau collects information, the Middle Eastern community of Dearborn shows itself to some degree by answering "other race" on the census questionnaire and thus falling into our minority

¹⁸ While the map illustrates the percentages of minorities, it does not differentiate racial/ethnic composition within the "minority" classification. The community profiles provide detail on the racial and ethnic composition of each community.

classification. Canton Township's rapid growth over the last twenty years has resulted in an influx of a wide range of non-white population groups – Asian (14 percent of total population, 2010), African American (10 percent of total population, 2010) and Latino (three percent of total population, 2010)

Figure 11 presents a picture of racial/ethnic changes that occurred across the Starfish primary service area between 2000 and 2010. Due in large part to the exodus from Detroit to the suburbs,¹⁹ the African American population in the Starfish primary service area increased by over 35,000 (75.5 percent) over the decade. The Asian population experienced a 47.9 percent increase (adding fewer than 9,000) and was followed by the Latino population at 40.8 percent (adding just over 6,000). The white, non-Hispanic, Native American and multiracial populations all decreased over the decade.



Figure 11: Population Change by Race/Ethnicity Across the Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.

Family structure is often a strong determinant of socioeconomic status and service needs. The birth section of this report addresses the issue of increasing out-of-wedlock births. This trend has resulted in a continually increasing share of children living in one-parent families. Figure 12 presents an analysis of the changing households in the Starfish primary service area as a whole. It is immediately

¹⁹ The African American population decreased by 24 percent in Detroit during the last decade as more than 185,000 left the city. There was a decrease of less than 3,000 over the previous decade.

apparent that, while households increased by less than one percent, single parent households, both male and female-headed, with and without children, experienced gains of more than 20 percent. The greatest decrease was experienced by husband-wife families with children. This is a trend playing out across the country as 2010 marked the first time that husband-wife families, whether with or without children at home, represented less than half of all households.





The share of families with children that are headed by single parents varies a great deal across the service area, though every community experienced an increase between 2000 and 2010. The lowest rates are seen in the higher socioeconomic communities of Northville Township (13.6 percent), the City of Northville (14.1 percent), Plymouth Township (16.2 percent), and Canton Township (20.1 percent). It is interesting to note that Dearborn (21.3 percent), perhaps as a result of strong cultural norms, had a lower rate than the City of Plymouth (24.3 percent).

On the other end of the spectrum was Inkster at 66.7 percent single parent households, followed by Taylor, Wayne and Westland, which all fell in the range between 40 and 50 percent. Each of the four communities experienced an increase of more than ten percentage points in their rate between 2000 and 2010. The rate for Michigan is 34 percent), while Detroit more than doubles that with 69.2 percent of all families with children headed by one parent.

Source: Census Bureau, Decennial Censuses, 2000 and 2010.

Map 6 provides a detailed look at the distribution of single parent households as a share of households with children. It is no surprise, based on the community discussion above, that all census tracts in the city of Inkster have rates above 50 percent. They are joined by several contiguous tracts in Wayne and Westland. Only two census tracts in Canton Township and three in Taylor reach the majority mark.









The Wayne County overview addressed the issue of job loss and increasing unemployment. Figure 13 shows the 2010-2012 annual average unemployment rates for those communities covered by the Michigan Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth. The unemployment rate provides only an estimate of true unemployment in an area. One must be actively searching for work to be counted. The recession, which hit those without education and skills the hardest, resulted in a large number of discouraged workers – a group that, while not working or searching for work, does not get counted. Add to this those who can only get part time work and those who, while employed, have had to find jobs paying less than what they made previously. It is clear that each of the communities (Detroit has been added for context) has experienced a gradual decline in its unemployment rate over this period. Initially, improvements came not because more people were finding jobs but because they were getting discouraged and dropping out of the labor force. Recently, the improved economic climate has resulted in more people coming back to the labor force and employment levels have risen. Across the 11 Starfish communities tracked by the State of Michigan's

Labor Market Division²⁰, the total labor force began growing in 2012 when it added just 188 persons. The employment ranks over this time grew by 1,640 persons. The pace of growth has picked up in both areas during 2013. The latest report (August 2013) shows labor force growth of 7,143 and employment growth of 7,626. Nevertheless, the job market for residents of Inkster and Detroit, and to a lesser extent Taylor, is still leaving a large proportion of the population unemployed. Add to that the significant segment that has left the labor force because they do not have the education or skills to compete, and one can understand that the "official" numbers must be viewed as underestimates. While Inkster and Taylor have similar shares of adults with a high school diploma or less education, Inkster has a higher proportion of working-age adults without a HS degree (20.1 vs. 14.7 percent) who also have higher rates of unemployment (49.3 vs. 30.3 percent) and lower labor force participation rates (42.3 vs. 57.0 percent). Appendix C provides data on employment by level of education for Inkster and Taylor.



Figure 13: Average Annual Unemployment Rates for Selected Starfish Communities, 2010 - 2012

Map 8 provides a look at unemployment at the neighborhood level. It is necessary for us to utilize the American Community Survey because the state unemployment data are not available below the community level. While the sources (and years of coverage) differ, the map supports the table above and provides another variable that points to the concentration of need throughout Inkster, adjoining

²⁰ Northville Township, Plymouth Township and the City of Wayne are not tracked.

neighborhoods, and portions of Taylor. While not as acute, there is also a pocket of unemployment in the east Dearborn area.



Map 8: Percent of Labor Force Unemployed, 2007- 2011 5-Year Average

A critical component of labor force participation and the capacity to provide economic resources to one's family is educational attainment. Education is critically important, more so now than ever before, to setting the stage of providing access to employment and the associated skills that allow one to better identify and access basic resources. Parental education also influences the importance placed on education for children in the home, and the personal resources families bring to raising their children.

Figure 14 shows, at the community level, the percentage of persons 25 years and over without a high school diploma.²¹ Once again, we see the extremely wide variation that exists across communities in the Starfish primary service area. The percent of adults who did not earn a high school diploma (or equivalent) as their highest level of education ranged from lows of less than 5 percent (Northville Township, Plymouth Township and Plymouth City), to highs above 17 percent (Wayne, Taylor, Dearborn and Inkster).

The high rate of non-high school graduates in Inkster correlates quite highly with the unemployment rate documented earlier and the poverty rates that will be discussed later. Dearborn's high rate is a function of the immigrant population from the Middle East and lower levels of education for females. Their general lack of participation in the labor force, coupled with higher marital rates, have kept both the unemployment level and poverty levels considerably lower in Dearborn than Inkster. The higher rates in Wayne and Taylor track with the pockets of unemployment that were observed in both.



Figure 14: Percent of Adults, 25+, without a High School Diploma

Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

²¹ While this variable describes the size of the least educated segment of the population, one that has little opportunity to participate in today's economy, it is the next tier, those who graduated from high school, but went no further (which is mapped out later in this section), that have suffered extensively with the manufacturing job loss and the mid-decade recession.

The educational gap across communities is much greater when comparing rates of college completion. Figure 15 clearly shows how educational attainment is unevenly distributed across the Starfish primary service area. The 14 communities are clearly differentiated into two sets of seven – or perhaps 3 sets if one separates out the mid-level communities of Livonia and Dearborn. On the high end, with rates of 45 percent or more, there is the western tier of communities – Plymouth City and Township, Northville City and Township and Canton Township. To the east, Dearborn and Livonia with somewhat lower rates, though higher than the county average. The bottom tier of seven have college degree rates of less than 20 percent, with Taylor and Inkster holding the bottom ranks with 9 and 10 percent, respectively. Today's economy is requiring post-secondary education for entry into living wage jobs. Without such education, individuals are left to compete for minimum wage jobs – many of which have located outside of distressed communities such as Inkster and Taylor.



Figure 15: Percent of Adults Age 25+ with Bachelor's Degree or Higher

Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

The two maps that follow take these ends of the education spectrum and illustrate them at the census tract level. Rather than detail out the relatively small numbers of persons without a high school diploma, Map 9 portrays the share of persons with a high school diploma or less.



Map 9: Percent of Population Age 25+ with High School Diploma or less

The high school degree map reveals a degree of concentration that was not evident in the map of unemployment. The City of Taylor, which had the lowest level of attainment overall, contains a majority of census tracts with values of 60 percent or higher. This is also true in the City of Wayne. The other two low education communities – Garden City and Inkster – show less concentration and more of a generalized community wide education deficit. Dearborn Heights, while not as low overall as the others, shows pockets of concentrated low attainment in the southern tracts, tying into those in Inkster and Wayne, and relatively high attainment in the core. East Dearborn, with its high level of Middle Eastern immigrants, also contains such concentrations, while the remainder of Dearborn scores quite high.

Map 10 illustrates the percent of college graduates by neighborhood. Areas with high rates of residents with a bachelor's degree or higher are hyper-concentrated in the highly educated communities mentioned earlier. While not showing up at the overall community level, two census tracts in Dearborn come in with rates over 50 percent. In addition, the northwestern section of Livonia demonstrates a relatively high rate of college graduates. The cities of Garden City, Inkster, Taylor and Wayne combined have only two census tracts with college graduation rates above 20 percent.





While the previous discussion demonstrated some of the variations across the communities (as well as across neighborhoods within communities) in the Starfish primary service area, nowhere are those variations as stark as when one looks at economic vitality and resource access. The first measure we review is household income. Figure 16 illustrates income differences by showing the distribution of households in four income categories for 2011: less than \$20,000 (a figure that approximates, but is below, the federal poverty threshold for a family of four – \$22,350); between \$20,000 and \$49,999; \$50,000 to \$74,999; and \$75,000 and over.

The differences among communities are quite large. At the low end are the communities of Inkster, Dearborn, Taylor and Wayne where 28 percent or more of households make less than \$20,000. Inkster is far and away the highest in this category with almost half of all households (44.6 percent) living on less than \$20,000. On the other end of the spectrum are Livonia, Canton, and the townships of Plymouth and Northville – all with less than 15 percent of the households earning below \$20,000.

It must be understood that, as is the case for any demographic, socioeconomic or housing variable one studies, there are variations within communities. In this case, one can say that the lower income communities do have pockets of prosperity, while the high-income communities have pockets of need. Canton Township is a good example in that, while generally middle class and above, there are neighborhoods with high numbers of multi-unit rentals (both high end and low) and others populated primarily by mobile home parks.



Figure 16: Household Income Distribution, 2007 – 2011 5-Year Average

Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

Map 11, which maps out the percentage of households with income less than \$20,000 at the census tract level, illustrates the point that low-income communities do have pockets of prosperity, while the high-income communities have pockets of need. The discussion of race/ethnicity needs to be remembered as one looks at areas of low-income household concentration. Inkster, with one primary exception, tends toward a broad distribution of low-income households. Areas of African American concentration in Taylor and Wayne also show this pattern. Racial gaps and issues of race equity need

to be explored as programs and services are created.²² To the east there are low-income areas of Dearborn. Obviously concentrated in the Middle Eastern population section on the east side, ethnic family ties, a strong social service network provided by ACCESS, and a resource rich community can help to alleviate some of the issues generally associated with low income areas.



Map 11: Percent of Households with Income below \$20,000

The corollary to income is that of poverty. The past decade has brought decreasing median household incomes (refer to Table 1 at beginning of report) and increasing levels of poverty. Figure 17 shows the poverty rate for each of the 14 Starfish communities and the City of Detroit for 1999 and 2011. It is clear that every community, with the exception of Northville, experienced an increase in the share of residents in poverty. The degree of increase was closely related to the poverty rate in

²² The concept of Neighborhoods of Opportunity was developed by John Powell at Ohio State University. Utilizing a number of factors, he coded census tracts in Southeast Michigan from Very Low Opportunity to Very High Opportunity. By introducing race/ethnicity into the equation, he was able to demonstrate that over 65 percent of whites lived in areas of High or Very High Opportunity, while only 3.9 percent of African Americans did so. Such a pattern means that the vast majority of African American families are located in neighborhoods with limited resources and points of access. This report utilizes new Neighborhood Opportunity Index (NOI) data that are being developed as an update to the previous work, with Data Driven Detroit serving as the local data partner. The NOI data will be used as a more comprehensive measure to replace our previous "stress index."

1999. The higher the poverty rate was in 1999, the larger the increase in poverty rate was by 2011. While Detroit had the highest overall rate in 2001, it experienced an increase of about ten percentage points, from 26 to 36 percent. Inkster, which had the second highest rate in 2011 at 33.2 percent, experienced the largest percentage point increase over the period – 13.7 percentage points. Significant increases were also seen in Dearborn and Taylor.



Figure 17: Percent of Residents in Poverty, 1999 and 2011

Source: Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF3; American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Estimates

Residential instability (the regularity of movement or "churn")²³ can be an indicator of a stressed community if families have to move because, for example, they cannot afford rent or mortgage payments or the family is breaking up. Housing affordability is definitely an issue in Inkster and other lower income communities. An analysis of 2007-11 data from the American Community Survey shows that 39 percent of Inkster homeowners and 56 percent of renters were paying 30 percent or more of their income for housing (tabular details appear later in this report). High rates are also evident in a number of other communities.

The percentage of households living in their current residence less than one year is one measure of instability. Figure 18 gives this percentage for the Starfish communities. Note, however, that

²³ High rates of mobility are also evident where the number of rental units is high. The past decade increased the share of rentals (due to job losses, coupled with underwater mortgages) in all corners of the region, with the largest increases occurring in poorer communities.

residential instability is not necessarily a measure of economic distress. The reasons for, and consequences of, residential instability must be analyzed in the context of other factors. While poverty is a major factor in Inkster and Taylor, the high percentages of residential instability in the more affluent communities in western Wayne County are the result of new construction drawing new residents.



Figure 18: Percentage of households in Current Residence Less than One Year, 2011

Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

Map 12 identifies the least stable neighborhoods, as measured by the population in their current residence less than one year. The pattern is quite clear in the poorest census tracts where high shares of residents exhibit a great deal of mobility. On the other end of the income spectrum, we see some of the growth areas in the western edge communities, coupled with neighborhoods containing apartment complexes.





A variation on the previous measure is the percentage of householders who have lived in their current residence for five or more years, which can be construed as a measure of stability.²⁴ Figure 19 shows a reversal of the previous chart, though the spread is not as great. Almost three out of four residents in Livonia, Dearborn Heights, Garden City, Plymouth Township and Redford Township have moved in to their current home prior to 2005, qualifying these cities as the most stable, while Plymouth, Northville, Westland, Inkster and Northville Township are on the lower end.





Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

²⁴ Due to the fact that the American Community Survey file for census tracts aggregates data collected over a five year period, a variable of "Residence Prior to 2005" must be used in lieu of the "5 or more years" variable from the 2000 Census. In spite of this difference, it still serves as an adequate measure of stability.

Once again, a neighborhood analysis (Map 13) points to variations within communities. Livonia clearly has the largest concentration of stable neighborhoods of any community in the service area, while Inkster has only has two census tracts in the top two tiers of stability



Map 13: Percent of Current Households in Residence Prior to 2005

Housing affordability was mentioned previously as an important factor in determining neighborhood stability. Figure 20 measures housing affordability across the Starfish service area. The accepted standard of affordability is that a homeowner or renter should not be paying more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. It is clear from the chart that a large proportion of renters across all communities have an affordability issue. In five of the communities, the proportion of renters spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs exceeds 50 percent. There is much less variation on the homeowner side of the equation where Plymouth Township is on the low end with 24 percent, while Inkster reaches 39 percent.

The more one must pay for housing costs, the less one has for other essentials such as food and clothing. The benefit of disposable income necessary to provide enrichment activities for children is often unattainable in communities such as Inkster, Wayne, and Taylor.



Figure 20: Percent of Households Spending 30% or More of their Monthly Income on Housing

Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

Southeast Michigan is notorious for its poor public transportation system. In fact, we are the only one of the largest 20 metropolitan areas in the country without a regional system. There are currently two operating bus systems in the tri-county area – DDOT and SMART – that operate independently and do not coordinate their schedules. Add to that the fact that transit legislation to date has allowed communities to opt out of paying a transit millage, thus eliminating public transportation within their boundaries.

This past year the state legislature approved the creation of a Regional Transit Authority. While it will necessitate a millage vote for public transit next year (with a no opt-out provision), the first order of business will be to try to foster scheduling coordination between the Detroit and regional systems.

The result of this lack of public transportation for residents in the tri-county area is that personal transportation is a necessity to get to work, access services, and provide resources for children. Figure 21 identifies the percentage of households in the 14 Starfish communities that do not have access to a vehicle.



Figure 21: Percentage of Households with No Vehicle Available, 2011

Once again, we see the disparities between the older, poorer communities of Inkster and Wayne, where one of every 7 households lacks personal transportation, and the higher income communities on the western edge of the county. As disinvestment grows in the older communities, due to businesses closing or relocating, residents in these communities become more dependent on vehicle ownership to access jobs.

The opening discussion of Wayne County trends spoke to the issue of increasing vacancies over the last decade. While the actual vacancy rate differed widely by community, there was no doubt that every community in the tri-county area experienced an increase. While vacancies in more affluent communities usually arose as a result of job loss and an inability to sell homes due to their "underwater" mortgage status, poor communities experienced walkaways and abandonment of houses where residents had ownership, but the structure had little or no value. Once vacant, these structures became targets of "strippers" and arson. Vacant housing is one of the most destabilizing issues that neighborhoods have to deal with. The "broken windows theory" states that as the quality of housing begins to deteriorate, vandalism escalates, resulting in increasing crime and further neighborhood destabilization.

Source: American Community Survey, 2007-2011 5-Year Average Estimates.

Map 14 shows the latest available data from the U.S. Postal Service on the percent of vacant units by neighborhood.

Map 14: Percent Vacant Units



Neighborhood Opportunity Index

Data Driven Detroit designed a single measure that summarized the degree of stress on a community for the previous Starfish Community Assessment (2011). We called this a "stress index" and calculated the value of the index for each census tract. The index incorporated scores on six indicators:

- The percentage of households with an annual income of less than \$20,000;
- The percentage of all family households with children that are single-parent households;
- The percentage of population age 25+ with a high school diploma or less;

- The percentage of occupied housing units that have been occupied by the same resident(s) for five or more years (scale is reversed for this variable);
- The percentage of households with no vehicle;
- The percentage of housing units that are vacant.

While this index proved to be a very effective way to help Starfish Family Services identify the highest pockets of need across their service area, we still felt that it could be expanded and improved.

Such an expansion possibility arose when The Kresge Foundation, in partnership with the Neighborhood Investment Forum and Data Driven Detroit, funded the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, at Ohio State University, to embark on a collaborative venture to engage community members and facilitate a *Neighborhood Opportunity Mapping Initiative* in the greater Detroit region. The purpose of the work is to identify and understand the geography of opportunity and assets in the various neighborhoods and communities in the region, paying particular attention to marginalized communities of color and strategies that affirmatively support access to opportunity for the region's vulnerable or marginalized communities. The intent is to arrive at a common understanding of the conditions necessary for supporting access to opportunity and healthy communities, in order to build local capacity and inform strategic investments that promote better outcomes for all.

The stress index and opportunity index are both predicated on an **extensive body of research that has established that neighborhood conditions and proximity to opportunities such as high performing schools or sustainable employment have a critical impact on quality of life and self-advancement**. The central premise of opportunity mapping is that residents of a metropolitan area are situated within an interconnected web of opportunities that shape their quality of life. Opportunity mapping provides an analytical framework to measure opportunity comprehensively in metropolitan regions and determine who has access to opportunity rich areas. Opportunity mapping also provides a framework to assess what factors are limiting opportunity in a community and can assist in identifying what actions are needed to remedy these impediments to opportunity.

Utilizing opportunity as the base for comparing neighborhoods provides us with a more comprehensive view of place and its effect on residents. The Opportunity Index product serves as a more comprehensive, but comparable, measure of our stress index. A measure of Very High Stress would be comparable to an area of Very Low Opportunity. Because there is wide agreement among funders, planning agencies such as SEMCOG, and other civic/nonprofit organizations to incorporate the Opportunity Index in regional initiatives, it is important that Starfish Family Services includes it in their community assessment and strategic planning efforts.

Background on the Index and Its Use in Detroit

The Kirwan Institute is a national leader in utilizing community-based mapping to both diagnose conditions that result in inequity and identify strategic intervention points for community advocacy and equitable policy. The Institute has regularly worked as a consultant to social justice organizations and community groups across the nation. The organization's signature work is its opportunity mapping initiatives. Opportunity mapping engages community members to create maps based on numerous neighborhood indicators of community opportunity, assets and vitality. Opportunity maps have been utilized in policy advocacy, litigation, applied research, community organizing, coalition building and to inform service delivery.

Opportunity mapping is a research tool used to understand the dynamics of "opportunity" within metropolitan areas. The purpose of opportunity mapping is to illustrate where opportunity rich communities exist (and assess who has access to these communities) and to understand what needs to be remedied in opportunity poor communities. Opportunity mapping builds upon the rich history of using neighborhood based information and mapping to understand the challenges impacting our neighborhoods.

This mapping, research and community engagement and advocacy model has several broad goals and advocacy outcomes. These goals could include:

- To raise significant attention and awareness to the structural and community barriers impacting marginalized communities, to identify policy solutions to remedy barriers to opportunity for marginalized communities.
- To provide an entry point to begin consensus building or collaborative discussions among stakeholders.
- To provide a local resource to identify areas of greatest need in communities and assess "gaps" where need is not being met by on-going advocacy efforts, local initiatives, investments or policy initiatives.
- To utilize opportunity mapping to inform and guide advocacy and community planning.
- To provide data, analysis and strategies that help build local organizational capacity in understanding challenges, needs and strategies for marginalized neighborhoods.
- To provide a collaborative framework to collectively organize the strategic planning of multiple stakeholders in communities.

(Jason Reece, Director of Research, The Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity)

Data Driven Detroit has worked with the Kirwan Institute to develop an opportunity index for the Detroit region. Utilizing the following list of indicators, in three groupings – Education, Economy and Employment, and Neighborhood – each census tract's indicator values are ranked and assigned scores. The scores are aggregated within group and three "high level scores" are computed. Once that step is complete, a final "comprehensive score" is computed. The indicators are as follows:

Education

Childhood Poverty High School Dropout Rate Persons 16-19 No HS Diploma, Unemployed High school Completion Reading Score Math Score Student Poverty (FRL)

Economy & Employment

Public Assistance Rate Median Household Income Unemployment Rate Job Change

Neighborhood

Vacant Property Property Values Homeownership rates Poverty Rates Percentage Population change Crime Risk

Comprehensive Rank/Index

Map 15 provides a map of the census tracts in the Starfish service area. Each census tract is assigned an Opportunity Index value. The index is set up to be a 5-point scale.

- 1 = Very Low Opportunity
- 2 = Low Opportunity
- 3 = Moderate Opportunity
- 4 = High Opportunity
- 5 = Very High Opportunity



Map 15: Neighborhood Opportunity Index, Starfish Primary Service Area

The patterns of opportunity are shown in Map 15. A total of seven census tracts out of the total of 190 are classified as "Very Low Opportunity" neighborhoods. Three of those census tracts are located in Inkster, while two are in Taylor. Westland and Canton Township account for the other two. The concentration of need in Inkster is further established by the fact that all five of the remaining tracts are classified as "Low Opportunity" neighborhoods.

A total of 53 tracts in the service area are classified "Low Opportunity," with Taylor, east Dearborn, Redford Township and the southern tier of Westland having the primary clusters.

A total of 58 census tracts are classified as "Moderate Opportunity" neighborhoods. They tend to cluster across the middle of the service area from Westland east through Garden City, Dearborn Heights and the western two thirds of Dearborn.

While Dearborn has several areas of "High Opportunity," as does Westland, the majority of the 31 neighborhoods in this category are in Livonia and Canton Township.

A total of 48 census tracts are classified as "Very High Opportunity." With only one outlier in west Dearborn, "Very High Opportunity" is concentrated in six communities – Canton Township, Livonia, Northville City, Northville Township, Plymouth City and Plymouth Township.

A comparison with the previous results of the "stress index" confirms that the measures are consistent. The Neighborhood Opportunity Index clearly delineates the areas of greatest need and reinforces the continued need for targeted, comprehensive programing by Starfish Family Services. For comparison, Map 17 in Appendix D illustrates the Opportunity Index for the City of Detroit

Schools

Our previous report described the concept of school district student "churn" and its tie to community stability. The discussion derived from the fact that a significant percentage of students attending Inkster schools lived outside the district, and a significant number of Inkster district resident students went to charters or other districts. Research shows that the school environment provides ready access to children for service providers to deliver health, recreation and a host of other services. When children are attending schools outside their district, and districts are serving large numbers of children from outside their district, it is difficult, if not impossible, to efficiently reach the children within the community one is trying to serve. After-school programming is difficult to undertake due to the number of children who must leave at the end of a school day. Finally, the community cohesion that can be fostered through common school attendance is no longer possible.

The issue of "churn" has taken a different direction during this last year. As a result of large deficits in the district, the Wayne Regional Educational Service Agency (the oversight body for Wayne county school districts) voted to formally dissolve Inkster's school district after the state passed legislation targeted at Inkster Public Schools and Buena Vista Schools. In so doing, they divided the Inkster Public Schools District into quadrants that connected to (and were thus absorbed by) the four surrounding districts of Romulus, Westwood, Wayne-Westland and Taylor. Map 16 shows the current school district boundaries for districts in the Starfish primary service area.

Map 16: School District Boundaries, Starfish Primary Service Area



Appendix A

Table 3: Decennial Census Comparison for all Starfish Communities, 2000 - 2010

			Michigan				W	ayne County					Detroit		
	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change
POPULATION, GENDER AND AGE															
Total	9,938,444	1007	9,883,640	1077	-0.6%	2,061,162	107	1,820,584	1007	-11.7%	951,270	1707	713,777	1707	-25.0%
Male	4,8/1,161	49%	4,848,114	49%	-0.5%	988,227	48%	8/4,161	48%	-11.5%	448,215	4/%	337,679	4/%	-24.7%
Female	5,067,283	51%	5,035,526	51%	-0.6%	1,072,935	52%	946,423	52%	-11.8%	503,055	53%	3/6,098	53%	-25.2%
Under Evern	//0///0	707	50/ 00/	/07	11.007	151 011	707	110 450	707	22.097	75 00/	007	50.14/	707	22.007
Eta Quagra	667,66Z	/%	J76,∠86	6% /7	-11.0%	131,711	/%	118,450	7%	-22.0%	/ 3,886	1.007	30,146	/ %	-33.9%
	746,022	8%	637,784	6% 707	-14.3%	1/0,//3	9%	124,104	7%	-29.4%	93,272	10%	49,550	/%	-40.9%
10 10 14 years	747,137	0%	0/J,Z10	7 %	-9.0%	102,332	0%	131,120	7 %	-19.2%	03,037	7 %	32,703	/ %	-37.2%
20 to 24 years	/11,934	7%	440 070	7 %	3.9%	100,2/0	1 %	144,713	0%	4.0%	45 705	7%	54.047	7 %	-4.3%
2010 24 years	647,720	7%	500 502	1 %	0.5%	149.940	0%	109,700	1 %	-0.0%	72 420	7 %	12 917	0% 297	-17.7%
20 to 24 years	702 044	7%	574 544	0% 207	-9.0%	147,740	7%	109,100	0% 207	-27.2%	40.004	0%	43,017	0% 297	-40.3%
30 10 34 years	703,944	7 %	3/4,300	0%	-10.4%	132,767	7 %	107,073	0%	-20.2%	67,204	7 %	42,373	0%	-30.3%
	912 200	076	245 491	707	-23.470	142 000	0/0	120,000	7 /0	-24.7 /0	70,210	7/0	40,7 30	1 /0	-32.07
40 10 44 years	738 388	7%	744 581	9%	-10.2%	146 042	7%	124,004	7 /0	-23.7/0	63 474	7 /0	46,133	7%	-34.3%
43 TO 47 years	427 429	1 /0	744,301	8%	22.0%	122 /29	1 /0	137 378	9%	-7.7/0	51 747	5%	40,707	7%	-20.1%
55 to 59 years	494 477	507	202 102	707	41.0%	00.544	1070	100,070	707	22.0%	37.540	107	45 434	1 /0	-1.470
	277.052	J/6	549 911	1 /0	41.0%	70,364	4/0	00 200	7 /0 507	40.197	00 70 A	4/0	27 111	507	21.070
60 10 64 years	377,032	4%	419 425	0%	30.9%	70,114	3%	70,200	3% 107	40.1%	27,/74	3%	25 270	3% 197	24.0% 4.7%
	215 759	3%	410,023	4/0	20.0%	4,700	3/0	40 499	4/0	4.J/0	27,000	3%	19 000	4/0	-0.7 /0
75 to 79 years	250 149	3%	244.095	370 207	-3.1%	54 959	3/0	47,000		-24.7 /0	20,121	- 376 - 207	15,002	370 207	-31.1/0
	170 405	- 376 - 207	244,000	2/0	-5.0%	35,737	370 207	42,220	2/0	-23.970	12,000	2/0	12,170	2/0 207	-32.7 /0
85 years and over	1/2,823	2/0	191 881	2/0	36.2%	26 697	2/0	3/ 319	2/0	28.6%	10.884	1 /0	11 398	2/0	-7.2/0
Median age (vears)	35.5	(X)	38.0	/X1	9.6%	20,077	1 /o X	34,317	(X)	20.0%	30.9	1/0 X	34.8	(X)	4.7 %
Less than 18 years	2.592.595	26%	2.344.068	24%	-9.6%	577.032	28%	461.795	25%	-20.0%	295.549	31%	190.347	27%	-35.6%
18 years and over	7.345.849	74%	7.539.572	76%	2.6%	1.484.130	72%	1.358.789	75%	-8.4%	655,721	69%	523,430	73%	-20.2%
RACE / ETHNICITY	.,	,.	.,	,.		.,	,.	.,,	,.					,.	
Not Hispanic or Latino	9,614,567	97%	9,447,282	96%	-1.7%	1,983,955	96%	1.725.324	95%	-13.0%	904,103	95%	665.098	93%	-26.4%
White	7.806.691	79%	7.569.939	77%	-3.0%	1.028.984	50%	902.180	50%	-12.3%	99.921	11%	55.604	8%	-44.4%
Black /African American	1.402.047	14%	1.383.756	14%	-1.3%	864.627	42%	732.801	40%	-15.2%	771.966	81%	586.573	82%	-24.0%
Native American	53,421	1%	54,665	1%	2.3%	6.582	0%	5.635	0%	-14.4%	2.572	0%	1.927	0%	-25.1%
Asian	175.311	2%	236,490	2%	34.9%	34,837	2%	45,590	3%	30.9%	9,135	1%	7,436	1%	-18.6%
Native Hawaijan / Pl	2,145	0%	2,170	0%	1.2%	398	0%	304	0%	-23.6%	169	0%	82	0%	-51.5%
Other Race	11,465	0%	9,866	0%	-13.9%	3,191	0%	2.387	0%	-25.2%	1,676	0%	994	0%	-40.7%
Multi-Race	163,487	2%	190.396	2%	16.5%	45.336	2%	36,427	2%	-19.7%	18,664	2%	12,482	2%	-33.1%
Latino	323,877	3%	436,358	4%	34.7%	77,207	4%	95,260	5%	23.4%	47,167	5%	48,679	7%	3.2%
HOUSEHOLDS , FAMILIES AND GROUP QUARTERS															
Total households	3,785,661	38%	3,872,508	39%	2.3%	768,440	37%	702,749	39%	-8.5%	336,428	35%	269,445	38%	-19.9%
Family households	2,575,699	26%	2,554,073	26%	-0.8%	511,717	25%	450,651	25%	-11.9%	218,483	23%	162,924	23%	-25.4%
With own children under 18 years	1,236,713	12%	1,106,735	11%	-10.5%	251,929	12%	204,090	11%	-19.0%	113,961	12%	74,251	10%	-34.8%
Husband-wife family	1,947,710	20%	1,857,127	19%	-4.7%	313,028	15%	262,559	14%	-16.1%	89,660	9%	57,982	8%	-35.3%
with own children under 18 years	873,227	9%	730,892	7%	-16.3%	144,699	7%	110,871	6%	-23.4%	42,085	4%	22,871	3%	-45.7%
Male householder, no wife present	154,187	2%	185,363	2%	20.2%	40,510	2%	42,462	2%	4.8%	22,437	2%	20,469	3%	-8.8%
with own children under 18 years	79,728	1%	91,281	1%	14.5%	17,366	1%	17,310	1%	-0.3%	9,343	1%	7,569	1%	-19.0%
Female householder, no husband present	473,802	5%	511,583	5%	8.0%	158,179	8%	145,630	8%	-7.9%	106,386	11%	84,473	12%	-20.6%
with own children under 18 years	283,758	3%	284,562	3%	0.3%	89,864	4%	75,909	4%	-15.5%	62,533	7%	43,811	6%	-29.9%
Nonfamily households	1,209,962	12%	1,318,435	13%	9.0%	256,723	12%	252,098	14%	-1.8%	117,945	12%	106,521	15%	-9.7%
Householder living alone	993,607	10%	1,079,678	11%	8.7%	217,664	11%	215,710	12%	-0.9%	99,861	10%	91,740	13%	-8.1%
Male	437,371	4%	483,093	5%	10.5%	97,847	5%	98,486	5%	0.7%	46,946	5%	44,623	6%	-4.9%
Female	556,236	6%	596,585	6%	7.3%	119,817	6%	117,224	6%	-2.2%	52,915	6%	47,117	7%	-11.0%
Two or More persons	216,355	2%	238,757	2%	10.4%	39,059	2%	36,388	2%	-6.8%	18,084	2%	14,781	2%	-18.3%
Average household size	2.56	(X)	2.49	(X)	-2.7%	2.64		2.56	(X)	-3.0%	2.77		2.59	(X)	-6.5%
Average family size	3.10	(X)	3.05	(X)	-1.6%	3.26		3.22	(X)	-1.2%	3.45		3.36	(X)	-2.6%
Persons living in households	9,688,555	97%	9,654,572	98%	-0.4%	2,028,544	98%	1,796,735	99%	-11.4%	931,569	98%	699,018	98%	-25.0%
Persons living in group quarters	249,889	3%	229,068	2%	-8.3%	32,618	2%	23,849	1%	-26.9%	19,701	2%	14,759	2%	-25.1%
HOUSING UNITS AND TENURE															
Total housing units	4,234,279	43%	4,532,233	46%	7.0%	826,145	40%	821,693	45%	-0.5%	375,096	39%	349,170	49%	-6.9%
Occupied housing units	3,785,661	38%	3,872,508	39%	2.3%	768,440	37%	702,749	39%	-8.5%	336,428	35%	269,445	38%	-19.9%
Vacant housing units	448,618	5%	659,725	7%	47.1%	57,705	3%	118,944	7%	106.1%	38,668	4%	79,725	11%	106.2%
Owner-occupied housing units	2,793,124	28%	2,793,342	28%	0.0%	511,837	25%	454,706	25%	-11.2%	184,647	19%	137,730	19%	-25.4%
Renter-occupied housing units	992,537	10%	1,079,166	11%	8.7%	256,603	12%	248,043	14%	-3.3%	151,781	16%	131,715	18%	-13.2%
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	1.6	(X)	2.7	(X)	68.8%	1.4		2.9	(X)	107.1%	1.6		3.8	(X)	137.5%
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	6.8	(X)	11.5	(X)	69.1%	7.2		14.4	(X)	100.0%	8.3		18.0	(X)	116.9%

		Co	anton Township	c				Dearborn		Dearborn Heights					
	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change
POPULATION, GENDER AND AGE															
Total	76,310	10.00	90,173	10.07	18.2%	97,775		98,153		0.4%	58,264	10.00	57,774		-0.8%
Male	37,552	49%	44,052	49%	17.3%	48,901	50%	48,519	49%	-0.8%	28,033	48%	27,938	48%	-0.3%
Female	38,/58	51%	46,121	51%	19.0%	48,8/4	50%	49,634	51%	1.6%	30,231	52%	29,836	52%	-1.3%
Linder Europa	((00	007	(004	707	0 707	9.0/1	007	7 020	007	0.007	2 745	/07	2 000	707	2.007
Charles and the second se	6,600	9%	6,024	/%	-8.7%	8,061	8%	7,839	8%	-2.8%	3,/45	6%	3,820	7%	2.0%
	6,638	9%	7,100	8%	7.0%	7,994	8%	8,444	9%	3.0%	3,634	6%	3,925	7%	8.0%
10 to 14 years	5,700	7 %	/,100	0%	20.1%	/,033	770	7,732	0%	12.4%	3,003	0%	3,732	7 %	7.0%
	3,024	/ 70	6,406	/ %	27.3%	6,303	/ 70	/,032	0%	22.770	3,207	0% E07	4,200	/ 70	29.4%
2010 24 years	4,2/0	0%	4,/01	3%	11.3%	3,334	0%	6,000	7 %	Z3.4%	3,140	3%	3,431	0%	9.9%
20 to 24 years	3,242	7 %	5,330	0%	1.7 %	0,//3	007	6,370	/ %	-3.0%	3,077	7 %	3,300	0%	-0.2%
30 10 34 years	0,700	7/0	3,761	0%	-17.2%	7,300	0%	0,102	0%	-10.3%	4,2/9	7 %	3,304	0%	-10.2%
	7,001	10%	7,030	0%	-10.4%	7,130	007	0,243	0%	-12.7%	4,550	0%	3,711	0%	-10.1%
40 10 44 years	5,900	7 /0	7,627	076	27.497	4 252	2070	6,236	207	-13.2%	4,000	707	4 097	707	-17.0%
43 10 47 years	5 433	707	7,500	707	27.4/0	5 353	507	6,270	207	16 797	4,020	1 /0	4,007	7/0	21.207
50 to 54 years	3,433	/ /0 E07	6,655 5,770	/ /0	ZZ.J/0	3,332	J/0	0,24J	0/0	21.0%	0,200	0/0 E07	4,207	/ /0	31.3%
	3,010	3%	5,007	0%	30.0%	4,142	4%	3,464	0%	31.9% AE 107	2,007	J%	0,4/0	0% E07	Z3.0%
	1,740	3%	3,004	0%	101.3%	3,041	3%	4,411	4%	43.1%	2,003	4% E07	2,755	J%	3.0%
	1,372	2% 007	3,170	4%	131.0%	2,713	3%	3,036	3% 007	4.0%	2,000	3% E07	2,200	4%	-22.270
75 to 79 years	014	2/0	1,703	2/0	20.6%	3,311	4/0	1 029	2/0 207	-32.0%	2,000	J /0	1,707	3%	-31.0%
	214	1 %	1,103	1 %	29.0%	3,763	4%	1,730	2% 207	-40.3%	2,470	207	1,000	3%	-24.3%
85 years and over	341	007	743	1 /0	150.0%	2,000	- J/6 - 207	2 417	2/0 207	-20.0%	1,000	370 007	1,074	3%	4.2/0
Median age (vegs)	33 4	V/0	36.0	/Y1	10.5%	2,300	2/0 Y	2,417	(Y)		38.0	2/0 Y	38.3	(Y)	40.7%
Less than 18 years	22 138	29%	24.571	27%	11.0%	27 122	28%	29 117	30%	7.4%	13 106	22%	14 430	25%	10.1%
18 years and over	54 172	71%	65.602	73%	21.1%	70,653	72%	69.036	70%	-2.3%	45 158	78%	43,344	7.5%	-4.0%
RACE / ETHNICITY	.,	,.					/.		,.		,	,.			1
Not Hispanic or Latino	74.578	98%	87.351	97%	17.1%	94.844	97%	94.767	97%	-0.1%	56,290	97%	55.062	95%	-2.2%
White	62 846	82%	63 165	70%	0.5%	82 893	85%	85 116	87%	2.7%	52 032	89%	47 943	83%	-7.9%
Black /African American	3 434	.5%	9 070	10%	164.1%	1 225	1%	3 895	4%	218.0%	1 224	2%	4 490	8%	266.8%
Native American	205	0%	206	0%	0.5%	214	0%	166	0%	-22.4%	196	0%	196	0%	0.0%
Asian	6.634	9%	12,720	14%	91.7%	1.431	1%	1.696	2%	18.5%	1.289	2%	995	2%	-22.8%
Native Hawaijan / Pl	14	0%	21	0%	.50.0%	13	0%	31	0%	138.5%	4	0%	9	0%	125.0%
Other Race	145	0%	136	0%	-6.2%	124	0%	171	0%	37.9%	54	0%	75	0%	38.9%
Multi-Race	1.300	2%	2.033	2%	.56.4%	8.944	9%	3.692	4%	-58.7%	1.491	3%	1.354	2%	-9.2%
Latino	1,788	2%	2,822	3%	57.8%	2,931	3%	3,386	3%	15.5%	1,974	3%	2,712	5%	37.4%
HOUSEHOLDS , FAMILIES AND GROUP QUARTERS															
Total households	27,490	36%	32,771	36%	19.2%	36,770	38%	34,342	35%	-6.6%	23,276	40%	22,266	39%	-4.3%
Family households	20,561	27%	24,231	27%	17.8%	23,851	24%	22,888	23%	-4.0%	15,771	27%	14,591	25%	-7.5%
With own children under 18 years	11,536	15%	12,475	14%	8.1%	11,520	12%	11,885	12%	3.2%	6,403	11%	6,475	11%	1.1%
Husband-wife family	17,421	23%	19,755	22%	13.4%	18,740	19%	17,119	17%	-8.6%	12,265	21%	10,241	18%	-16.5%
with own children under 18 years	9,672	13%	9,968	11%	3.1%	9,450	10%	9,359	10%	-1.0%	5,063	9%	4,534	8%	-10.4%
Male householder, no wife present	779	1%	1,209	1%	55.2%	1,642	2%	1,685	2%	2.6%	999	2%	1,259	2%	26.0%
with own children under 18 years	397	1%	595	1%	49.9%	500	1%	569	1%	13.8%	373	1%	489	1%	31.1%
Female householder, no husband present	2,361	3%	3,267	4%	38.4%	3,469	4%	4,084	4%	17.7%	2,507	4%	3,091	5%	23.3%
with own children under 18 years	1,467	2%	1,912	2%	30.3%	1,570	2%	1,957	2%	24.6%	967	2%	1,452	3%	50.2%
															1
Nonfamily households	6,929	9%	8,540	9%	23.3%	12,919	13%	11,454	12%	-11.3%	7,505	13%	7,675	13%	2.3%
Householder living alone	5,622	7%	7,088	8%	26.1%	11,376	12%	10,177	10%	-10.5%	6,510	11%	6,693	12%	2.8%
Male	2,709	4%	3,060	3%	13.0%	4,832	5%	4,605	5%	-4.7%	2,675	5%	2,895	5%	8.2%
Female	2,913	4%	4,028	4%	38.3%	6,544	7%	5,572	6%	-14.9%	3,835	7%	3,798	7%	-1.0%
Two or More persons	1,307	2%	1,452	2%	11.1%	1,543	2%	1,277	1%	-17.2%	995	2%	982	2%	-1.3%
															1
Average household size	2.77		2.75	(X)	-0.7%	2.65		2.85	(X)	7.5%	2.47		2.57	(X)	4.0%
Average family size	3.26		3.25	(X)	-0.3%	3.42		3.67	(X)	7.3%	3.04		3.23	(X)	6.3%
															1
Persons living in households	76,224	100%	90,018	100%	18.1%	97,374	100%	97,927	100%	0.6%	57,577	99%	57,172	99%	-0.7%
Persons living in group quarters	86	0%	155	0%	80.2%	401	0%	226	0%	-43.6%	687	1%	602	1%	-12.4%
HOUSING UNITS AND TENURE															
Total housing units	28,430	37%	34,829	39%	22.5%	38,981	40%	37,871	39%	-2.8%	23,913	41%	24,068	42%	0.6%
Occupied housing units	27,490	36%	32,771	36%	19.2%	36,770	38%	34,342	35%	-6.6%	23,276	40%	22,266	39%	-4.3%
Vacant housing units	940	1%	2,058	2%	118.9%	2,211	2%	3,529	4%	59.6%	637	1%	1,802	3%	182.9%
Owner-occupied housing units	21,737	28%	24,982	28%	14.9%	26,996	28%	23,687	24%	-12.3%	19,883	34%	17,366	30%	-12.7%
Renter-occupied housing units	5,753	8%	7,789	9%	35.4%	9,774	10%	10,655	11%	9.0%	3,393	6%	4,900	8%	44.4%
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	1.2		2.6	(X)	116.7%	1.5		2.3	(X)	53.3%	0.9		2.4	(X)	166.7%
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	5.3		9.6	(X)	81.1%	6.1		8.2	(X)	34.4%	3.8		7.2	(X)	89.5%

			Garden City				Inkster	Livonia							
	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change
POPULATION, GENDER AND AGE															
Total	30,047		27,692		-7.8%	30,115		25,369		-15.8%	100,545		96,942		-3.6%
Male	14,800	49%	13,592	49%	-8.2%	14,325	48%	11,885	47%	-17.0%	48,861	49%	46,859	48%	-4.1%
Female	15,247	51%	14,100	51%	-7.5%	15,790	52%	13,484	53%	-14.6%	51,684	51%	50,083	52%	-3.1%
Under 5 years	1,820	6%	1,478	5%	-18.8%	2,414	8%	1,858	7%	-23.0%	5,611	6%	4,397	5%	-21.6%
5 to 9 years	2,183	7%	1,665	6%	-23.7%	2,909	10%	1,901	7%	-34.7%	6,768	7%	5,257	5%	-22.3%
10 to 14 years	2,271	8%	1,856	7%	-18.3%	2,415	8%	2,000	8%	-17.2%	7,234	7%	6,141	6%	-15.1%
15 to 19 years	1,989	7%	1,977	7%	-0.6%	2,114	7%	2,186	9%	3.4%	6,484	6%	6,737	7%	3.9%
20 to 24 years	1,474	5%	1,600	6%	8.5%	1,889	6%	1,830	7%	-3.1%	4,116	4%	5,181	5%	25.9%
25 to 29 years	2,103	7%	1,642	6%	-21.9%	2,427	8%	1,550	6%	-36.1%	5,064	5%	4,878	5%	-3.7%
30 to 34 years	2,483	8%	1,791	6%	-27.9%	2,248	7%	1,619	6%	-28.0%	6,413	6%	4,811	5%	-25.0%
35 to 39 years	2,711	9%	1,881	7%	-30.6%	2,529	8%	1,664	7%	-34.2%	7,893	8%	5,310	5%	-32.7%
40 to 44 years	2,649	9%	2,031	7%	-23.3%	2,022	7%	1,603	6%	-20.7%	9,679	10%	6,519	7%	-32.6%
45 to 49 years	2,273	8%	2,373	9%	4.4%	1,884	6%	1,744	7%	-7.4%	8,300	8%	8,086	8%	-2.6%
50 to 54 years	1,619	5%	2,263	8%	39.8%	1,657	6%	1,693	7%	2.2%	6,600	7%	8,982	9%	36.1%
55 to 59 years	1,334	4%	1,882	7%	41.1%	1,443	5%	1,554	6%	7.7%	5,198	5%	7,663	8%	47.4%
60 to 64 years	1,070	4%	1,384	5%	29.3%	957	3%	1,292	5%	35.0%	4,220	4%	5,814	6%	37.8%
65 to 69 years	1,345	4%	1,140	4%	-15.2%	927	3%	978	4%	5.5%	4,470	4%	4,133	4%	-7.5%
70 to 74 years	1,321	4%	749	3%	-43.3%	843	3%	645	3%	-23.5%	4,482	4%	3,474	4%	-22.5%
75 to 79 years	751	2%	821	3%	9.3%	739	2%	509	2%	-31.1%	3,674	4%	3,351	3%	-8.8%
80 to 84 years	420	1%	694	3%	65.2%	441	1%	417	2%	-5.4%	2,445	2%	3,203	3%	31.0%
85 years and over	231	1%	465	2%	101.3%	257	1%	326	1%	26.8%	1,894	2%	3,005	3%	58.7%
Median age (years)	36.5	Х	39.9	(X)	9.3%	31.8	Х	34.2	(X)	7.5%	40.2	Х	44.5	(X)	10.7%
Less than 18 years	7,521	25%	6,191	22%	-17.7%	9,002	30%	7,087	28%	-21.3%	24,010	24%	20,165	21%	-16.0%
18 years and over	22,526	75%	21,501	78%	-4.6%	21,113	70%	18,282	72%	-13.4%	76,535	76%	76,777	79%	0.3%
RACE / ETHNICITY															
Not Hispanic or Latino	29,436	98%	26,789	97%	-9.0%	29,633	98%	24,716	97%	-16.6%	98,814	98%	94,543	98%	-4.3%
White	28,438	95%	24,977	90%	-12.2%	7,379	25%	4,959	20%	-32.8%	94,651	94%	87,332	90%	-7.7%
Black /African American	330	1%	928	3%	181.2%	20,267	67%	18,413	73%	-9.1%	945	1%	3,264	3%	245.4%
Native American	112	0%	113	0%	0.9%	111	0%	70	0%	-36.9%	207	0%	204	0%	-1.4%
Asian	211	1%	232	1%	10.0%	1,023	3%	409	2%	-60.0%	1,944	2%	2,441	3%	25.6%
Native Hawaiian / Pl	1	0%	4	0%	300.0%	3	0%	4	0%	33.3%	13	0%	11	0%	-15.4%
Other Race	10	0%	30	0%	200.0%	83	0%	46	0%	-44.6%	72	0%	86	0%	19.4%
Multi-Race	334	1%	505	2%	51.2%	767	3%	815	3%	6.3%	982	1%	1,205	1%	22.7%
Latino	611	2%	903	3%	47.8%	482	2%	653	3%	35.5%	1,731	2%	2,399	2%	38.6%
HOUSEHOLDS , FAMILIES AND GROUP QUARTERS															
Total households	11,479	38%	10,894	39%	-5.1%	11,169	37%	9,821	39%	-12.1%	38,089	38%	38,714	40%	1.6%
Family nouseholds	8,234	2/%	/,383	2/%	-10.3%	7,465	25%	6,1/5	24%	-17.3%	28,081	28%	26,856	28%	-4.4%
With own children under 18 years	3,/26	12%	3,065	11%	-17.7%	3,695	12%	2,915	11%	-21.1%	12,360	12%	10,523	11%	-14.9%
Husbana-wite family	6,426	21%	5,246	19%	-18.4%	3,799	13%	2,52/	10%	-33.5%	23,938	24%	21,625	22%	-9.7%
with own children under 18 years	2,902	10%	2,096	8%	-27.8%	1,648	5%	971	4%	-41.1%	10,662	11%	8,307	9%	-22.1%
Male nousenoider, no wite present	519	2%	652	2%	25.6%	6/5	2%	698	3%	3.4%	1,106	1%	1,4/0	2%	32.9%
with own children under 18 years	239	1%	28/	1%	20.1%	295	1%	286	1%	-3.1%	395	0%	609	1%	54.2%
Female householder, no husband present	1,289	4%	1,485	5%	15.2%	2,991	10%	2,950	12%	-1.4%	3,03/	3%	3,/61	4%	23.8%
with own children under 18 years	585	2%	682	2%	16.6%	1,/52	6%	1,658	/%	-5.4%	1,303	1%	1,607	2%	23.3%
	0.045	1107	0.511	1007	0.007	0.70.4	107	0.444	1.107	1.107	10.000	100	11.050	1007	10.507
Nontamily households	3,245	11%	3,511	13%	8.2%	3,704	12%	3,646	14%	-1.6%	10,008	10%	11,858	12%	18.5%
Householder living alone	2,750	9%	2,922	11%	6.3%	3,115	10%	3,104	12%	-0.4%	8,/28	9%	10,346	11%	18.5%
Male	1,18/	4%	1,310	5%	10.4%	1,459	5%	1,429	6%	-2.1%	3,421	3%	4,086	4%	19.4%
Female	1,563	5%	1,612	6%	3.1%	1,656	5%	1,6/5	/%	1.1%	5,307	5%	6,260	6%	18.0%
Iwo or More persons	495	2%	589	2%	19.0%	589	2%	542	2%	-8.0%	1,280	1%	1,512	2%	18.1%
	0.10			0.0	0.107			0.54	0.0				0.17	0.0	
Average nousenoia size	2.62		2.54	(X)	-3.1%	2.6/		2.56	(X)	-4.1%	2.59		2.4/	(X)	-4.6%
Average family size	3.11		3.07	(X)	-1.3%	3.26		3.24	(X)	-0.6%	3.07		3.01	(X)	-2.0%
Persons living in households	30,029	100%	27,638	100%	-8.0%	29,863	99%	25,139	99%	-15.8%	98,654	98%	95,576	99%	-3.1%
Persons living in group quarters	18	0%	54	0%	200.0%	252	1%	230	1%	-8.7%	1,891	2%	1,366	1%	-27.8%
HOUSING UNITS AND TENURE				105			105						10.17	100-	
lotal housing units	11,719	39%	11,616	42%	-0.9%	12,013	40%	11,647	46%	-3.0%	38,658	38%	40,401	42%	4.5%
Occupied housing units	11,479	38%	10,894	39%	-5.1%	11,169	37%	9,821	39%	-12.1%	38,089	38%	38,714	40%	1.6%
Vacant housing units	240	1%	722	3%	200.8%	844	3%	1,826	7%	116.4%	569	1%	1,687	2%	196.5%
Owner-occupied housing units	9,898	33%	8,994	32%	-9.1%	6,475	22%	5,144	20%	-20.6%	33,808	34%	33,394	34%	-1.2%
Renter-occupied housing units	1,581	5%	1,900	7%	20.2%	4,694	16%	4,677	18%	-0.4%	4,281	4%	5,320	5%	24.3%
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	0.5		2.0	(X)	300.0%	1.7		4.0	(X)	135.3%	0.4		1.1	(X)	175.0%
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	3.6		6.8	(X)	88.9%	7.7		11.8	(X)	53.2%	2.7		7.5	(X)	177.8%

			Northville				Nor	thville Townshi	ip		Plymouth					
	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	
POPULATION, GENDER AND AGE																
Total	3,107	1000	2,739		-11.8%	21,036		28,497	10.00	35.5%	9,170		9,132		-0.4%	
Male	1,4/5	4/%	1,326	48%	-10.1%	9,811	4/%	13,63/	48%	39.0%	4,326	4/%	4,380	48%	1.2%	
Female	1,632	53%	1,413	52%	-13.4%	11,225	53%	14,860	52%	32.4%	4,844	53%	4,/52	52%	-1.9%	
Under Event	104	107	107	E 07	24 507	005	E 07	1 522	E 07	E 4 107	E/2	107	/14	707	0.107	
Under 5 years	194	6%	12/	5%	-34.5%	995	3%	1,033	5% 707	54.1%	563	6%	614	/%	9.1%	
5 10 4 years	161	5%	139	6%	-1.2%	1,395	/%	2,031	/%	43.0%	517	6% rm	565	6%	9.3%	
10 to 14 years	212	/%	1/3	6% 507	-18.4%	1,286	6%	2,202	8%	/1.2%	433	5%	203	6%	10.2%	
	136	4%	140	5% 407	2.9%	1,203	6%	1,/12	6%	42.3%	352	4%	398	4%	13.1%	
20 to 24 years	122	4%	100	4%	-11.3%	1 02/	4%	1,124	4% E07	JZ.4%	000	4%	402	4%	19.3%	
20 to 24 years	170	3% 707	140	3%	-12.9%	1,230	0%	1,342	3% E07	0.0%	720	10%	/ 22	0%	-ZZ.Z%	
30 to 34 years	221	/ %	121	4%	-43.2%	1,330	0%	1,30/	3% 707	2.1%	937	10%	07/	0%	-23.0%	
	203	0%	214	0%	-32.7%	2,009	0%	1,003	007	0.207	730	9 %	477	7%	-4.4%	
40 10 44 years	270	10%	214	0/6	-27.770	1 700	007	2,173	0/0	7.3/0	/ 30	707	677	7 /0	-7.3/0	
40 to 47 years	257	007	234	1.097	-23.0%	1,777	7 /0	2,472	7 /0	22 607	210	7 /0	457	7 /0	J.0%	
50 10 34 years	2.37	0/0 E07	2/1	007	22.207	1,707	707	2,304	707	40.107	421	/ /0 E07	500	7 /0	20.007	
	100	5% E07	107	0%	10.0%	1,4/4	/ /o E07	2,065	/ 70	40.1%	431	J%	524	/ 70	39.0%	
60 10 64 years	130	0% 007	107	/ %	17.7%	1,034	3%	1,002	0% E07	71.0%	332	4%	241	0%	00.0%	
70 to 74 vegra	33	2% 007	142	3%	150.2%	707	4%	1,370	3% 207	20.7%	333	4%	100	4%	Z.4%	
70 10 74 years	120	Z/0	07	3%	13.0%	/ 30	4%	771	3%	30.7%	301	4%	172	2%	-43.3%	
	130	4%	60	2%	-47.7%	634	3%	/ 00	3% 007	10.2%	270	3%	230	3%	-19.0%	
80 10 84 years	70	3%	6/	2%	-30.2%	436	2/0	020 500	2% 007	44.0%	017	3%	241	3%	-22.0%	
Modian and Warr	00	3% V	90 45 1	3% /VI	4.7%	271	1%	J00	Z/0	102.1%	21/	Z%	207	3% (VI	24.0%	
Less than 18 years	40.8	21%	43.1	21%	-13.9%	41.1	21%	42.4	24%	55.9%	1 742	19%	1 962	21%	12.6%	
18 years and over	2 445	79%	2 169	79%	-11.3%	16 568	79%	21 530	7.6%	29.9%	7 428	81%	7 170	79%	-3.5%	
RACE / ETHNICITY	2,110	1170	2,107	7770	1110/0	10,000	1170	21,000	/ 0/0	271770	7,7120	0170	7,170	7770	0.070	
Not Hispanic or Latino	3 055	98%	2 690	98%	-11.9%	20.664	98%	27 826	98%	34.7%	8 904	97%	8 969	98%	0.7%	
White	2 978	96%	2,516	92%	-15.5%	18 538	88%	23 049	81%	24.3%	8,616	94%	8 469	93%	-1.7%	
Black /African American	10	0%	2,010	2%	440.0%	914	4%	1 021	4%	11.7%	51	1%	144	2%	182.4%	
Native American	3	0%	2	0%	_33.3%	47	-1/0	32	0%	-31.9%	31	0%	22	0%	-29.0%	
Asian	37	1%	62	2%	67.6%	891	4%	3 205	11%	259.7%	95	1%	199	2%	109.5%	
Native Hawaiian / Pl	1	0%	02	0%	-100.0%	6	- 1/0	9	0%	50.0%	.5	0%	2	0%	-60.0%	
Other Race	2	0%	6	0%	200.0%	18	0%	40	0%	122.2%	6	0%	12	0%	100.0%	
Multi-Race	24	1%	50	2%	108.3%	250	1%	470	2%	88.0%	100	1%	121	1%	21.0%	
Latino	52	2%	49	2%	-5.8%	372	2%	671	2%	80.4%	118	1%	163	2%	38.1%	
HOUSEHOLDS , FAMILIES AND GROUP QUARTERS	01	2/0		2/0	0.070	0,12	2/0	0,1	2/0	00.170		170	100	2/0	00.170	
Total households	1,417	46%	1,275	47%	-10.0%	8,119	39%	11,520	40%	41.9%	4,322	47%	4,314	47%	-0.2%	
Family households	822	26%	704	26%	-14.4%	5,573	26%	7,927	28%	42.2%	2,276	25%	2,218	24%	-2.5%	
With own children under 18 years	353	11%	305	11%	-13.6%	2,323	11%	3,627	13%	56.1%	959	10%	1,068	12%	11.4%	
Husband-wife family	723	23%	610	22%	-15.6%	4,911	23%	6,919	24%	40.9%	1,835	20%	1,753	19%	-4.5%	
with own children under 18 years	304	10%	262	10%	-13.8%	2,007	10%	3,132	11%	56.1%	756	8%	808	9%	6.9%	
Male householder, no wife present	26	1%	28	1%	7.7%	152	1%	270	1%	77.6%	118	1%	123	1%	4.2%	
with own children under 18 years	11	0%	12	0%	9.1%	54	0%	131	0%	142.6%	39	0%	62	1%	59.0%	
Female householder, no husband present	73	2%	66	2%	-9.6%	510	2%	738	3%	44.7%	323	4%	342	4%	5.9%	
with own children under 18 years	38	1%	31	1%	-18.4%	262	1%	364	1%	38.9%	164	2%	198	2%	20.7%	
Nonfamily households	595	19%	571	21%	-4.0%	2,546	12%	3,593	13%	41.1%	2,046	22%	2,096	23%	2.4%	
Householder living alone	523	17%	498	18%	-4.8%	2,146	10%	3,082	11%	43.6%	1,792	20%	1,831	20%	2.2%	
Male	223	7%	217	8%	-2.7%	837	4%	1,122	4%	34.1%	707	8%	783	9%	10.7%	
Female	300	10%	281	10%	-6.3%	1,309	6%	1,960	7%	49.7%	1,085	12%	1,048	11%	-3.4%	
Two or More persons	72	2%	73	3%	1.4%	400	2%	511	2%	27.8%	254	3%	265	3%	4.3%	
Average household size	2.17		2.12	(X)	-2.3%	2.39		2.47	(X)	3.3%	2.04		2.08	(X)	2.0%	
Average family size	2.88		2.90	(X)	0.7%	2.93		3.05	(X)	4.1%	2.81		2.93	(X)	4.3%	
Persons living in households	3,069	99%	2,705	99%	-11.9%	19,411	92%	28,478	100%	46.7%	8,968	98%	8,993	98%	0.3%	
Persons living in group quarters	38	1%	34	1%	-10.5%	1,625	8%	19	0%	-98.8%	202	2%	139	2%	-31.2%	
HOUSING UNITS AND TENURE																
Total housing units	1,477	48%	1,391	51%	-5.8%	8,480	40%	12,236	43%	44.3%	4,498	49%	4,652	51%	3.4%	
Occupied housing units	1,417	46%	1,275	47%	-10.0%	8,119	39%	11,520	40%	41.9%	4,322	47%	4,314	47%	-0.2%	
Vacant housing units	60	2%	116	4%	93.3%	361	2%	716	3%	98.3%	176	2%	338	4%	92.0%	
Owner-occupied housing units	870	28%	801	29%	-7.9%	5,975	28%	8,818	31%	47.6%	2,831	31%	2,748	30%	-2.9%	
Renter-occupied housing units	547	18%	474	17%	-13.3%	2,144	10%	2,702	9%	26.0%	1,491	16%	1,566	17%	5.0%	
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	0.8		2.5	(X)	212.5%	0.7		1.9	(X)	171.4%	0.8		2.4	(X)	200.0%	
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	5.4		9.5	(X)	75.9%	5.9		9.5	(X)	61.0%	4.7		9.9	(X)	110.6%	

		Plyi	nouth Townshi	р			Re	dford Township	<u> </u>		Taylor					
	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change	
POPULATION, GENDER AND AGE																
Total	27,650	5000	27,524	10.07	-0.5%	51,622	10.00	48,362	10.00	-6.3%	65,868	10.00	63,131	10.00	-4.2%	
Male	13,94/	50%	13,3/5	49%	-4.1%	25,232	49%	23,536	49%	-6./%	31,/38	48%	30,215	48%	-4.8%	
Female	13,703	50%	14,149	51%	3.3%	26,390	51%	24,826	51%	-5.9%	34,130	52%	32,916	52%	-3.6%	
Under Comm	1 (50	107	1.072	F 07	00.007	2.405	707	2.07/	107	10.007	4.07/	707	4.470	707	0.007	
E ta Quagra	1,637	6%	1,2/3	5% /07	-23.3%	3,473	7%	3,076	6% /7	-12.0%	4,8/6	/%	4,469	/%	-8.3%	
10 to 1 4 vo gra	1,730	0%	1,755	0%	-0.2%	3,007	7 %	3,066	0%	-20.0%	5,007	0%	4,001	0%	-19.0%	
10 10 14 years	1,022	7 % 507	1,702	1 %	1.7%	3,000	/ %	3,293	7 %	-9.9%	3,300	0% 297	4,303	7 %	-10.0%	
20 to 24 years	1,477	1%	1,071	1%	0.1%	2 416	5%	2 759	170	14.2%	4,277	7%	4,042	7%	-0.6%	
25 to 29 years	1,227	470	1,230	4%	-23.8%	3 768	7%	2,707	6%	-23.2%	5.066	8%	4 181	7%	-17.5%	
30 to 34 years	2 091	8%	1,200	4%	-42.4%	4 445	9%	3 449	7%	-22.4%	4 930	7%	4,035	6%	-18.2%	
35 to 39 years	2,671	10%	1.565	6%	-41.4%	4.538	9%	3.840	8%	-15.4%	5.346	8%	4,154	7%	-22.3%	
40 to 44 years	2,222	.070	2.057	7%	-7.4%	4,764	9%	3.621	7%	-24.0%	5,162	8%	4,335	7%	-16.0%	
45 to 49 years	2.381	9%	2,329	8%	-2.2%	3,669	7%	3,895	8%	6.2%	4,343	7%	4,651	7%	7.1%	
50 to 54 years	2,430	9%	2,393	9%	-1.5%	2,711	5%	3,840	8%	41.6%	4,046	6%	4,682	7%	15.7%	
55 to 59 years	1.895	7%	2.197	8%	15.9%	1.740	3%	3.153	7%	81.2%	3.356	5%	3.820	6%	13.8%	
60 to 64 years	1.029	4%	2.102	8%	104.3%	1.508	3%	2,255	5%	49.5%	2,360	4%	3.300	5%	39.8%	
65 to 69 years	880	3%	1.533	6%	74.2%	1,583	3%	1,425	3%	-10.0%	2,454	4%	2,481	4%	1.1%	
70 to 74 years	1,006	4%	974	4%	-3.2%	1,952	4%	1,098	2%	-43.8%	2,073	3%	1,871	3%	-9.7%	
75 to 79 years	672	2%	807	3%	20.1%	2,189	4%	965	2%	-55.9%	1,346	2%	1,707	3%	26.8%	
80 to 84 years	507	2%	672	2%	32.5%	1,276	2%	1,126	2%	-11.8%	788	1%	1,156	2%	46.7%	
85 years and over	284	1%	550	2%	93.7%	831	2%	1,185	2%	42.6%	606	1%	839	1%	38.4%	
Median age (years)	39.6	Х	44.5	(X)	12.4%	35.9	Х	38	(X)	5.8%	33.9	Х	36.9	(X)	8.8%	
Less than 18 years	6,243	23%	6,134	22%	-1.7%	13,120	25%	11,575	24%	-11.8%	17,906	27%	15,616	25%	-12.8%	
18 years and over	21,407	77%	21,390	78%	-0.1%	38,502	75%	36,787	76%	-4.5%	47,962	73%	47,515	75%	-0.9%	
RACE / ETHNICITY																
Not Hispanic or Latino	27,343	99%	26,866	98%	-1.7%	50,578	98%	46,942	97%	-7.2%	63,737	97%	59,922	95%	-6.0%	
White	25,365	92%	24,872	90%	-1.9%	44,731	87%	31,292	65%	-30.0%	55,338	84%	47,177	75%	-14.7%	
Black /African American	809	3%	589	2%	-27.2%	4,383	8%	13,891	29%	216.9%	5,721	9%	9,896	16%	73.0%	
Native American	72	0%	68	0%	-5.6%	211	0%	206	0%	-2.4%	403	1%	285	0%	-29.3%	
Asian	755	3%	957	3%	26.8%	385	1%	399	1%	3.6%	1,064	2%	1,111	2%	4.4%	
Native Hawaiian / Pl	4	0%	4	0%	0.0%	9	0%	5	0%	-44.4%	19	0%	16	0%	-15.8%	
Other Race	30	0%	22	0%	-26.7%	66	0%	56	0%	-15.2%	77	0%	84	0%	9.1%	
Multi-Race	308	1%	354	1%	14.9%	793	2%	1,093	2%	37.8%	1,115	2%	1,353	2%	21.3%	
	455	2%	658	2%	44.6%	1,044	2%	1,420	3%	36.0%	2,131	3%	3,209	5%	50.6%	
HOUSEHOLDS , FAMILIES AND GROUP QUARTERS	10 757	2097	11 202	4107	4 107	20 192	2097	10 149	4097	E 107	24 77/	2097	24 270	2097	1 4 07	
	7 684	28%	7 850	29%	2.2%	13.589	26%	12,387	26%	-8.8%	17 751	27%	16 700	26%	-5.9%	
With own children under 18 years	3 298	12%	3 138	11%	-4.9%	6 417	12%	5 572	12%	-13.2%	8 643	13%	7 534	12%	-12.8%	
Husband-wife family	6 791	25%	6,100	24%	-1.9%	10 172	20%	8 026	17%	-21.1%	12 064	18%	10.078	16%	-16.5%	
with own children under 18 years	2.884	10%	2.630	10%	-8.8%	4.819	2070	3.461	7%	-28.2%	5.301	8%	3.821	6%	-27.9%	
Male householder, no wife present	238	1%	347	1%	45.8%	982	2%	1.142	2%	16.3%	1.374	2%	1.653	3%	20.3%	
with own children under 18 years	99	0%	133	0%	34.3%	430	1%	486	1%	13.0%	698	1%	766	1%	9.7%	
Female householder, no husband present	655	2%	841	3%	28.4%	2,435	5%	3,219	7%	32.2%	4,313	7%	4,969	8%	15.2%	
with own children under 18 years	315	1%	375	1%	19.0%	1,168	2%	1,625	3%	39.1%	2,644	4%	2,947	5%	11.5%	
,																
Nonfamily households	3,073	11%	3,353	12%	9.1%	6,593	13%	6,761	14%	2.5%	7,025	11%	7,670	12%	9.2%	
Householder living alone	2,659	10%	2,883	10%	8.4%	5,514	11%	5,609	12%	1.7%	5,717	9%	6,213	10%	8.7%	
Male	1,073	4%	1,176	4%	9.6%	2,392	5%	2,546	5%	6.4%	2,562	4%	2,740	4%	6.9%	
Female	1,586	6%	1,707	6%	7.6%	3,122	6%	3,063	6%	-1.9%	3,155	5%	3,473	6%	10.1%	
Two or More persons	414	1%	470	2%	13.5%	1,079	2%	1,152	2%	6.8%	1,308	2%	1,457	2%	11.4%	
Average household size	2.49		2.45	(X)	-1.6%	2.54		2.51	(X)	-1.2%	2.63		2.56	(X)	-2.7%	
Average family size	3.01		2.98	(X)	-1.0%	3.12		3.11	(X)	-0.3%	3.09		3.05	(X)	-1.3%	
Persons living in households	26,685	97%	27,495	100%	3.0%	51,280	99%	48,024	99%	-6.3%	65,173	99%	62,458	99%	-4.2%	
Persons living in group quarters	965	3%	29	0%	-97.0%	342	1%	338	1%	-1.2%	695	1%	673	1%	-3.2%	
HOUSING UNITS AND TENURE																
Total housing units	11,043	40%	11,708	43%	6.0%	20,605	40%	20,739	43%	0.7%	25,905	39%	26,422	42%	2.0%	
Occupied housing units	10,757	39%	11,203	41%	4.1%	20,182	39%	19,148	40%	-5.1%	24,776	38%	24,370	39%	-1.6%	
Vacant housing units	286	1%	505	2%	76.6%	423	1%	1,591	3%	276.1%	1,129	2%	2,052	3%	81.8%	
Owner-occupied housing units	8,973	32%	9,323	34%	3.9%	18,183	35%	15,753	33%	-13.4%	17,538	27%	16,429	26%	-6.3%	
kenter-occupied housing units	1,784	6%	1,880	7%	5.4%	1,999	4%	3,395	7%	69.8%	7,238	11%	7,941	13%	9.7%	
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	0.8		1.2	(X)	50.0%	0.6		2.5	(X)	316.7%	1.5		2.8	(X)	86.7%	
kental vacancy rate (percent)	3.3		9.2	(X)	178.8%	4.2		8.1	(X)	92.9%	5.8		7.8	(X)	34.5%	

			Wavne					Westland		
	2000		2010		Change	2000		2010		Change
POPULATION, GENDER AND AGE										
īotal	19,049		17,593		-7.6%	86,660		84,094		-3.0%
Male	9,134	48%	8,482	48%	-7.1%	41,707	48%	39,938	47%	-4.2%
Female	9,915	52%	9,111	52%	-8.1%	44,953	52%	44,156	53%	-1.8%
Under 5 years	1,409	7%	1,048	6%	-25.6%	6,052	7%	5,339	6%	-11.8%
5 to 9 years	1,512	8%	1,165	7%	-22.9%	5,852	7%	4,833	6%	-17.4%
10 to 14 years	1,392	7%	1,183	7%	-15.0%	5,245	6%	5,120	6%	-2.4%
15 to 19 years	1,279	7%	1,234	7%	-3.5%	4,909	6%	5,455	6%	11.1%
20 to 24 years	1,170	6%	1,088	6%	-7.0%	5,915	7%	5,856	7%	-1.0%
25 to 29 years	1,346	7%	1,089	6%	-19.1%	7,440	9%	6,036	7%	-18.9%
30 to 34 years	1,384	7%	1,138	6%	-17.8%	7,535	9%	5,645	7%	-25.1%
35 to 39 years	1,451	8%	1,231	7%	-15.2%	7,331	8%	5,886	7%	-19.7%
40 to 44 years	1,710	9%	1,251	7%	-26.8%	7,044	8%	5,741	7%	-18.5%
45 to 49 years	1,350	7%	1,356	8%	0.4%	6,007	7%	6,410	8%	6.7%
50 to 54 years	1,233	6%	1,400	8%	13.5%	4,774	6%	6,418	8%	34.4%
55 to 59 years	876	5%	1,196	7%	36.5%	3,671	4%	5,359	6%	46.0%
60 to 64 years	711	4%	1,011	6%	42.2%	3,411	4%	4,232	5%	24.1%
65 to 69 years	564	3%	634	4%	12.4%	3,159	4%	3,034	4%	-4.0%
/U to /4 years	586	3%	546	3%	-6.8%	2,832	3%	2,632	3%	-7.1%
/5 TO /Y years	518	3%	377	2%	-27.2%	2,340	3%	2,345	3%	0.2%
8U TO 84 years	289	2%	323	2%	11.8%	1,729	2%	1,909	2%	10.4%
85 years and over	269	1%	323	2%	20.1%	1,414	2%	1,844	2%	30.4%
Median age (years)	34./	X	38.0	(X)	11.2%	35.2	X 0007	38.3	(X)	8.8%
essinan to years	12 005	Z/ %	4,137	Z4%	-10.3%	20,070	Z3%	45 503	ZZ%	-7.4%
	13,703	73%	13,434	/0%	-3.0%	00,370	1170	63,303	/0%	-1.0%
	19 492	0.0077	14 001	0797	0.197	94.444	0797	90.020	0497	1.207
White	15,002	0207	13,090	77/0	-7.1/0	74 114	91/0	41 924	70/0	-4.2/0
Rigek (African American	2 1 4 5	1197	13,000	1 797	-17.3%	74,110	00%	14 347	1 797	-10.0%
Native American	2,143	11/0	2,704	07	20.2%	3,023	07	14,34/	07	140.4 /0
Asian	275	1 /0	340	2%	30.0%	2 427	3%	2 526	3%	-1.770
Native Hawaijan / Pl	2/0	0%	6	0%	-25.0%	2,427	0%	13	0%	-48.0%
Other Race	20	0%	51	0%	155.0%	127	0%	134	0%	5.5%
Multi-Race	309	2%	455	3%	47.2%	1.586	2%	1 730	2%	9.1%
atino	369	2%	602	3%	63.1%	2 138	2%	3 165	4%	48.0%
OUSEHOLDS , FAMILIES AND GROUP QUARTERS		-/-					_/*		.,.	
otal households	7,373	39%	7,055	40%	-4.3%	36,533	42%	35,886	43%	-1.8%
Family households	4,847	25%	4,450	25%	-8.2%	22,244	26%	21,289	25%	-4.3%
With own children under 18 years	2,435	13%	1,986	11%	-18.4%	10,462	12%	9,488	11%	-9.3%
Husband-wife family	3,332	17%	2,741	16%	-17.7%	16,222	19%	13,465	16%	-17.0%
with own children under 18 years	1,573	8%	1,063	6%	-32.4%	7,275	8%	5,428	6%	-25.4%
Male householder, no wife present	359	2%	415	2%	15.6%	1,590	2%	1,951	2%	22.7%
with own children under 18 years	180	1%	215	1%	19.4%	792	1%	909	1%	14.8%
Female householder, no husband present	1,156	6%	1,294	7%	11.9%	4,432	5%	5,873	7%	32.5%
with own children under 18 years	682	4%	708	4%	3.8%	2,395	3%	3,151	4%	31.6%
Nonfamily households	2,526	13%	2,605	15%	3.1%	14,289	16%	14,597	17%	2.2%
Householder living alone	2,100	11%	2,177	12%	3.7%	11,892	14%	12,311	15%	3.5%
Male	970	5%	999	6%	3.0%	5,040	6%	5,127	6%	1.7%
Female	1,130	6%	1,178	7%	4.2%	6,852	8%	7,184	9%	4.8%
Two or More persons	426	2%	428	2%	0.5%	2,397	3%	2,286	3%	-4.6%
Average household size	2.53		2.45	(X)	-3.2%	2.34		2.31	(X)	-1.3%
Average family size	3.13		3.06	(X)	-2.2%	3.00		2.98	(X)	-0.7%
ersons living in households	18,646	98%	17,316	98%	-7.1%	85,718	99%	83,060	99%	-3.1%
Persons living in group quarters	403	2%	277	2%	-31.3%	942	1%	1,034	1%	9.8%
OUSING UNITS AND TENURE										
iotal housing units	7,651	40%	7,824	44%	2.3%	38,077	44%	39,201	47%	3.0%
Occupied housing units	7,373	39%	7,055	40%	-4.3%	36,533	42%	35,886	43%	-1.8%
Vacant housing units	278	1%	769	4%	176.6%	1,544	2%	3,315	4%	114.7%
Owner-occupied housing units	4,802	25%	4,359	25%	-9.2%	22,901	26%	22,079	26%	-3.6%
Renter-occupied housing units	2,571	13%	2,696	15%	4.9%	13,632	16%	13,807	16%	1.3%
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	1.1		2.4	(X)	118.2%	1.5		2.3	(X)	53.3%
	1.0		10.2	(V)	110.007	5.2		10.4	(V)	100.007

Appendix B

Table 4: ACS Summary for all Starfish Communities, 2007 - 2011 5-Years Average Estimates

	Michigan		Wayne County		Detroit		Canton Township		Dearborn		Dearborn Heights		Garde	n City
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (25 YEARS AND OVER)														
Total Persons 25 Years and over	6,566,864		1,194,623		455,297		60,332		38,730		57,336		18,828	
Less than High school graduate	763,310	11.6%	197,187	16.5%	104,302	22.9%	11,224	18.6%	6,192	16.0%	3,659	6.4%	1,896	10.1%
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	2,041,868	31.1%	377,097	31.6%	151,945	33.4%	13,938	23.1%	13,370	34.5%	11,701	20.4%	7,933	42.1%
Some College, no degree	1,561,637	23.8%	289,638	24.2%	115,268	25.3%	12,710	21.1%	9,467	24.4%	11,007	19.2%	5,232	27.8%
Associate's degree	540,517	8.2%	84,364	7.1%	28,221	6.2%	4,181	6.9%	2,711	7.0%	5,098	8.9%	1,387	7.4%
Bachelor's degree	1,021,486	15.6%	150,838	12.6%	33,097	7.3%	10,657	17.7%	4,374	11.3%	15,268	26.6%	1,675	8.9%
Post Bachelor's degree	638,046	9.7%	95,499	8.0%	22,464	4.9%	7,622	12.6%	2,616	6.8%	10,603	18.5%	705	3.7%
Bachelor's degree or more	1,659,532	25.3%	246,337	20.6%	55,561	12.2%	18,279	30.3%	6,990	18.0%	25,871	45.1%	2,380	12.6%
FOREIGN BORN POPULATION														
Total Foreign Born	595,730	6.0%	142,213	7.7%	37,536	5.1%	24,984	25.5%	8,689	15.0%	14,164	16.0%	750	2.7%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 2011														
Total Households	3,825,182		681,674		264,209		33,574		21,658		30,848		10,384	
Less than \$15,000	521,590	13.6%	127,257	18.7%	77,991	29.5%	5,113	15.2%	2,460	11.4%	1,481	4.8%	868	8.4%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	443,591	11.6%	87,300	12.8%	42,351	16.0%	4,609	13.7%	2,830	13.1%	1,645	5.3%	841	8.1%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	425,215	11.1%	77,896	11.4%	34,744	13.2%	3,399	10.1%	2,892	13.4%	2,073	6.7%	1,136	10.9%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	565,405	14.8%	96,666	14.2%	38,079	14.4%	4,468	13.3%	3,154	14.6%	3,269	10.6%	1,844	17.8%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	715,754	18.7%	114,212	16.8%	35,497	13.4%	5,563	16.6%	4,499	20.8%	5,454	17.7%	2,498	24.1%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	463,228	12.1%	71,829	10.5%	17,376	6.6%	4,024	12.0%	2,813	13.0%	5,281	17.1%	1,544	14.9%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	438,559	11.5%	69,464	10.2%	13,241	5.0%	3,944	11.7%	2,146	9.9%	6,784	22.0%	1,217	11.7%
\$150,000 or more	251,840	6.6%	37,050	5.4%	4,930	1.9%	2,454	7.3%	864	4.0%	4,861	15.8%	436	4.2%
Median Household Income	48,669		41,886		27,862		46,685		47,241		82,780		54,094	
Average Household Income	64,478		57,673		39,327		64,450		57,356		94,647		63,270	
FAMILY INCOME, 2011														
Total Families	2,534,769		432,589		156,679		21,738		14,319		22,647		7,061	
Less than \$15,000	213,929	8.4%	58,172	13.4%	36,877	23.5%	2,740	12.6%	972	6.8%	723	3.2%	323	4.6%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	206,933	8.2%	43,800	10.1%	23,805	15.2%	2,611	12.0%	1,232	8.6%	735	3.2%	355	5.0%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	234,634	9.3%	42,837	9.9%	20,580	13.1%	1,783	8.2%	1,602	11.2%	883	3.9%	596	8.4%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	365,386	14.4%	60,348	14.0%	24,223	15.5%	2,742	12.6%	2,211	15.4%	1,894	8.4%	1,187	16.8%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	523,409	20.6%	78,611	18.2%	23,374	14.9%	3,679	16.9%	3,392	23.7%	3,637	16.1%	1,809	25.6%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	378,635	14.9%	56,085	13.0%	12,921	8.2%	2,856	13.1%	2,333	16.3%	4,082	18.0%	1,292	18.3%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	384,255	15.2%	59,429	13.7%	10,824	6.9%	3,272	15.1%	1,791	12.5%	6,142	27.1%	1,112	15.7%
\$150,000 or more	227,588	9.0%	33,307	7.7%	4,075	2.6%	2,055	9.5%	786	5.5%	4,551	20.1%	387	5.5%
Median Household Income	60,895		53,004		33,445		56,589		56,063		96,559		65,106	
Average Household Income	76,467		68,654		45,229		72,919		67,048		107,748		72,292	
	05 400		00.051		15 0/1		00.01/		00.000		22 / 50		04.250	
Ciri Inden	25,402	AE 207	22,351	47 597	15,201	40.097	22,010	AL E07	22,273	40 597	33,850	27 497	24,330	24 407
		45.2/0		47.5/0		47.0/0		40.3/0		40.3%		37.4/0		30.0/0
roverit bi AGE	1 510 450	15 797	412 427	22 797	242.002	24.997	24 422	25.097	7 400	12 197	5 242	E 097	2 000	7 597
	1,310,430	13.7 /o	413,437	24.770	202,003	30.∠/o 0.007	24,423	23.0%	1,400	02 /07	3,243	J.7 /0	2,077	0.007
(to 1) years	103,077	23.3/0	52,201	20.3/0	622	7 407	3,2/3	32.3/o 20.107	1,102	1/ 007	32,742	54.0%	104	0.7/0 E 707
10 to 17 years	160,423	21.7/0	51,730	20.0%	630	0.007	3,731	37.1/0	627	14.707	32,022	J1.Z/0	240	0.0%
12 to 17 years	254 174	10.0%	50 593	20.2/6	701	11.3%	2 881	31.9%	824	14.0/0	30,507	47.0%	240	7.0%
25 to 34 years	202,817	17.4%	52 215	27.370	454	5.5%	2,001	23.2%	1 090	1/.0%	32,074	42.370	2/3	0.0%
25 to 44 years	202,017	10.00	40 150	10.70	630	3.3/0	2,004	23.2/0	1,000	14.7/0	32,247	20.0%	027	7.Z/0 E 007
45 to 54 years	140 545	12.0%	47,130	17.0%	476	J.4%	3,303	19/07	701	0.107	21,60/	32.7% 20.007	23/	J.7%
45 10 54 yours	102,343	0 207	40,320	15 507	200	4.3%	2,303	14.0%	721	7.1%	27,309	20.7%	301	0.3% 7.0%
45 to 74 years	51 010	7.0%	13,032	10.0%	10/	J.7%	1,634	10.0%	73/	7 007	20,330	23.4%	207	/.U%
75 years and ever	51,910	0.077	13,602	12.0%	196	4.3%	564	10./%	354	/.6%	0,315	19./%	133	6.3% E F
73 years and over	53,643	0.7%	12,269	11.3%	16/	0.1%	552	0.4%	242	4.7%	7,046	10.4%	94	3.3%

	Inkste	ar	Livoni	ia	North	مالان	Northville	lownship	Plymouth Plymouth Township		Redford Township			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (25 YEARS AND OVER)														
Total Persons 25 Years and over	15.533		69.029		2.007		19.304		6.758		19.340		32.694	
Less than Hiah school graduate	3,361	21.6%	5,286	7.7%	142	7.1%	746	3.9%	323	4.8%	814	4.2%	3,825	11.7%
Hiah school araduate, GED, or alternative	4,997	32.2%	18,018	26.1%	270	13.5%	2,768	14.3%	1,235	18.3%	3,539	18.3%	11,177	34.2%
Some College, no degree	4,723	30.4%	16,115	23.3%	312	15.5%	3,166	16.4%	1,174	17.4%	3,782	19.6%	9,122	27.9%
Associate's degree	834	5.4%	6,104	8.8%	73	3.6%	1,423	7.4%	435	6.4%	1,317	6.8%	2,599	7.9%
Bachelor's dearee	1,301	8.4%	15,764	22.8%	696	34.7%	5,840	30.3%	2,108	31.2%	5,438	28.1%	4,363	13.3%
Post Bachelor's degree	317	2.0%	7,742	11.2%	514	25.6%	5,361	27.8%	1,483	21.9%	4,450	23.0%	1,608	4.9%
Bachelor's dearee or more	1,618	10.4%	23,506	34.1%	1,210	60.3%	11,201	58.0%	3,591	53.1%	9,888	51.1%	5,971	18.3%
FOREIGN BORN POPULATION														
Total Foreign Born	927	3.6%	7,452	7.7%	143	5.2%	4.315	15.6%	403	4.4%	2.019	7.3%	1.297	2.7%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 2011			.,				.,						.,=	
Total Households	9.789		37.309		1.264		10.165		4,100		10.583		18.473	
Less than \$15,000	2.598	26.5%	2.268	6.1%	88	7.0%	400	3.9%	324	7.9%	497	4.7%	1.677	9.1%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	1,763	18.0%	2,944	7.9%	123	9.7%	610	6.0%	422	10.3%	762	7.2%	1.950	10.6%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	1.299	13.3%	3.113	8.3%	97	7.7%	608	6.0%	333	8.1%	718	6.8%	2.215	12.0%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	1.560	15.9%	4.843	13.0%	113	8.9%	780	7.7%	524	12.8%	1.049	9.9%	2,735	14.8%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	1.498	15.3%	7,189	19.3%	165	13.1%	1.364	13.4%	618	15.1%	1.613	15.2%	4.435	24.0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	585	6.0%	5.934	15.9%	128	10.1%	1.332	13.1%	444	10.8%	1.332	12.6%	2.875	15.6%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	390	4.0%	7.393	19.8%	322	25.5%	2.008	19.8%	751	18.3%	2.336	22.1%	2,106	11.4%
\$150,000 or more	96	1.0%	3.625	9.7%	228	18.0%	3.063	30.1%	684	16.7%	2.276	21.5%	480	2.6%
Median Household Income	29.076		69.887		85.647		99,458		69.038		87.846	,.	52.476	
Average Household Income	37.223		80.518		101.992		136.117		86.442		110.147		59.475	
FAMILY INCOME. 2011														
Total Families	5,938		26,048		654		7,105		2,234		7,634		12,084	
Less than \$15,000	1,304	22.0%	665	2.6%	0	0.0%	93	1.3%	64	2.9%	144	1.9%	660	5.5%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	987	16.6%	920	3.5%	11	1.7%	145	2.0%	128	5.7%	249	3.3%	778	6.4%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	779	13.1%	1.506	5.8%	17	2.6%	250	3.5%	112	5.0%	365	4.8%	1,169	9.7%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	963	16.2%	2,887	11.1%	15	2.3%	332	4.7%	219	9.8%	479	6.3%	1,734	14.3%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	1,130	19.0%	5,309	20.4%	92	14.1%	797	11.2%	261	11.7%	1.079	14.1%	3.073	25.4%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	448	7.5%	4,944	19.0%	85	13.0%	975	13.7%	317	14.2%	1.062	13.9%	2,400	19.9%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	265	4.5%	6.393	24.5%	255	39.0%	1.654	23.3%	555	24.8%	2,105	27.6%	1.840	15.2%
\$150,000 or more	62	1.0%	3,424	13.1%	179	27.4%	2.859	40.2%	578	25.9%	2,151	28.2%	430	3.6%
Median Household Income	33,209		83,514		124,600		129,083		100,889		107,440		61,578	
Average Household Income	41,004		94,237		143,302		163,354		110,767		132,160		68,730	J
Per capita Income	15,157		31,959		47,636		51,413		40,004		43,082		23,654	
Gini Index		43.7%		37.9%		43.5%		46.3%		42.4%		43.8%		36.5%
POVERTY BY AGE														
Total Population	8,527	33.2%	5,510	5.7%	51	1.9%	857	3.2%	414	4.6%	951	3.5%	4,945	10.3%
Less than 6 years	1,239	51.7%	653	11.5%	0	0.0%	20	1.1%	22	3.1%	102	5.4%	625	17.9%
6 to 11 years	1,287	56.9%	578	8.6%	0	0.0%	29	1.2%	37	6.1%	46	2.0%	515	14.3%
12 to 17 years	1,245	43.9%	377	4.8%	0	0.0%	31	1.4%	37	7.8%	109	5.0%	586	13.3%
18 to 24 years	1,063	38.5%	616	8.1%	27	11.6%	185	10.9%	27	5.1%	96	5.2%	571	13.6%
25 to 34 years	968	28.1%	593	5.9%	0	0.0%	140	5.1%	64	3.9%	195	7.8%	559	8.9%
35 to 44 years	889	27.9%	601	4.8%	14	3.4%	141	3.4%	25	1.8%	69	2.0%	729	8.9%
45 to 54 years	851	27.1%	724	4.4%	0	0.0%	28	0.6%	48	3.9%	150	3.1%	494	6.5%
55 to 64 years	560	19.2%	639	4.8%	0	0.0%	89	3.1%	66	4.9%	92	2.2%	448	9.7%
65 to 74 years	214	14.0%	301	4.0%	0	0.0%	72	3.4%	58	10.0%	39	1.6%	94	3.9%
75 years and over	211	16.7%	428	5.1%	10	5.6%	122	6.9%	30	6.6%	53	2.8%	324	9.8%

Number Percent Number Percent Number Percent Number Percent Torol Person 25 Years and over 11,05 12,08 57,384 12,55 7,206 12,55 12,65 High school graduate 17,35 2,125 17,55 2,305 12,55 30,05 22,52 31,05 Some College, no degree 2,384 5,75 8,33 6,57 4,281 7,55 Bochelor's degree 2,910 7,05 1,042 8,65 7,331 12,85 Bochelor's degree or more 3,840 9,225 1,464 12,455 10,027 17,85 Fold Foreign Born 2,953 4,77 931 5,256 6,333 7,576 Fold Household's 2,3544 4,830 4,458 12,357 4,468 12,357 Fold Foreign Born 2,915 1,047 15,655 4,916 14,113 S15,000 53,4797 2,812 12,357 4,248 12,257 Fold Fouschoid 2,3		Taylo	r	Wayne		Westlo	and	
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (22 YEARS AND OVER) 12.000 12.008 57.384 Total Persons 25 Years and over 41,600 17.55 2.123 17.55 7.206 12.67 High school graduate, GED, or alternative 16.724 40.25 4.576 83.05 21.292 37.05 Associate's degree 2.384 5.75 8.33 6.75 4.285 7.55 Bochelor's degree 2.910 7.075 1.042 8.65 7.53 12.68 Post Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.25 1.446 12.45 10.217 17.85 Post Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.25 1.446 12.45 10.217 17.85 Post Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.25 1.456 4.916 14.13 Stoto Io SUCOME, 2011 2.955 2.105 9.255 1.375 2.107 12.55 4.916 14.14.12 Stoto Io SUCOME, 2011 2.000 1.375 1.075 1.975 5.572 1.595 5.572 1.595 5.572 <th></th> <th>Number</th> <th>Percent</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Percent</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Percent</th>		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Total Persons 25 Years and over 41.600 12.098 57.384 Less han Hijs school graduate, GED, or alternative 16.724 40.25 1.135 21.25 37.05 Some College, no degree 11.315 22.25 3.000 22.27 14.428 25.17 Sonciel's degree 2.346 5.75 8.33 6.457 4.281 7.35 Bacchelor's degree 2.910 7.05 1.042 8.65 7.351 12.85 Bacchelor's degree or more 3.840 9.25 1.466 12.45 6.335 2.586 5.000 Fold Foreign Born 2.943 4.78 911 5.28 6.433 7.58 Fold Neushold 2.3544 6.850 1.2.45 4.850 1.2.46 12.85 S5.000 to 54.4979 2.415 1.5.85 1.0.67 15.85 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35 1.2.35	EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (25 YEARS AND OVER)							
Less mon High school groduate 7.337 17.45 2.128 7.206 12.85 High school groduate, GED, or ditenative 11.315 27.25 3.050 25.25 14.428 25.15 Associate's degree 2.344 5.75 8.38 2.645 3.88 2.666 5.05 Bochelor's degree 2.910 7.05 1.496 12.82 3.840 7.53 12.88 Post Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.255 1.496 10.217 17.88 Post Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.255 4.464 10.217 17.88 Post Bochelor's degree or more 2.953 4.755 3.87 4.383 2.664 500 Post Bochelor's degree or more 2.953 4.755 4.535 4.510 14.411 14.119 Stoto Is Stato St	Total Persons 25 Years and over	41,600		12,098		57,384		
High school graduate. GED, or alternative 16,724 44.255 44.976 32.05 32.252 37.05 Associate's degree 11.315 27.25 3.050 32.52 14.428 25.19 Associate's degree 2.364 5.75 833 6.95 4.281 7.53 Bachelor's degree 2.910 7.05 1.042 8.68 7.53 12.85 Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.255 4.454 3.88 2.864 5.05 Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.275 1.476 10.217 17.89 Fold Foreign Born 2.854 4.75 3.81 2.66 3.476 Fold Households 2.3544 6.830 3.4960 3.476 Less thm 515.000 3.3716 15.56 1.067 15.65 4.141 14.15 S5.0000 to \$3.4999 2.915 12.45 13.20 19.35 4.265 12.25 S5.0000 to \$4.9999 2.060 1.735 1.321 19.35 4.265 12.25 10.25 15.95 10.73 3.250 10.175 4.265	Less than High school graduate	7,337	17.6%	2,123	17.5%	7,206	12.6%	
Some College, no degree 11.315 22.25 14.428 25.15 Associate's degree 2.384 5.75 8.33 6.97 4.281 7.55 Bochelor's degree 2.910 7.05 1.142 8.68 7.351 12.88 Post Bacchelor's degree or more 3.840 9.225 1.446 12.48 10.217 17.88 Foble for degree or more 3.840 9.225 1.446 10.217 17.88 Foble for degree or more 3.840 9.25 1.476 12.48 6.333 7.55 Foble foot foot foot foot foot foot foot foo	High school graduate, GED, or alternative	16,724	40.2%	4,596	38.0%	21,252	37.0%	
Associate's degree 2.384 5.75 8.33 6.97 4.281 7.55 Post Bachelor's degree 2.910 7.05 1.042 8.65 7.351 12.88 Post Bachelor's degree or more 3.840 9.225 1.476 10.217 17.378 Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.225 1.476 10.217 17.378 Dottlor foreign Born 2.963 4.75 931 2.285 4.53 7.55 Total foreign Born 2.963 4.75 931 5.278 6.33 7.55 Total foreign Born 2.2544 6.339 1.245 4.946 12.85 15.000 to 24,4799 2.915 1.245 6.39 12.37 4.266 12.25 25.000 to 34,979 2.802 1.005 5.57 1.37 3.529 10.15 55.000 to 57,4999 2.600 11.05 4.245 12.25 10.35 3.529 10.15 55.000 to 57,4999 2.600 11.05 4.244 44.666 5.55 4.244 44.666 Average Household Income 52.159 <t< td=""><td>Some College, no degree</td><td>11,315</td><td>27.2%</td><td>3,050</td><td>25.2%</td><td>14,428</td><td>25.1%</td></t<>	Some College, no degree	11,315	27.2%	3,050	25.2%	14,428	25.1%	
Bachelor's degree 2,910 7,0% 10.42 8.4% 7,351 12.8% Bochelor's degree or more 3.840 9.2% 14.66 12.4% 10.217 17.88 Foot Bich BORN FOPULATION -	Associate's degree	2,384	5.7%	833	6.9%	4,281	7.5%	
Past Bachelor's degree 930 22% 44% 3.8% 2.866 5.00 FOREIGN BORN POPULATION 2963 4.7% 931 5.2% 6.333 7.5% Foreign Born 2.963 4.7% 931 5.2% 6.333 7.5% Foreign Born 2.963 4.7% 931 5.2% 6.333 7.5% Foreign Born 2.915 1.2.5% 1.0.67 15.6% 4.916 14.1% 15.000 to 24.4999 2.915 1.2.4% 6.830 12.3% 4.466 12.2% 25.000 to 34.999 2.040 17.3% 1.321 19.3% 5.57.5 15.5% 1.0.67 12.2% 4.466 12.2% 13.5% 1.0.2% 12.2% 13.5% 1.0.2% 12.2% 13.5% 1.0.2% 12.2% 12.5% 1.0.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.5% 10.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2% 12.2%	Bachelor's degree	2,910	7.0%	1,042	8.6%	7,351	12.8%	
Bacheloris degree or more 3.840 9.2% 1.4%6 12.4% 10.217 77.87 Total Foreign Born 2.963 4.7% 931 5.2% 6.333 7.5% ROUSENDLD INCOME, 2011 2.963 4.7% 931 5.2% 6.333 7.5% ROUSENDLD INCOME, 2011 2.963 4.7% 931 5.2% 4.964 12.4% 10.217 7.18% 5.491 6.830 4.964 12.4% 10.217 7.13% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 15.9% 5.572 1.573 3.526 10.215 7.5% 5.572 1.573 3.526 10.275 3.595 10.13 5.572 1.573 3.526 10.275 3.595 10.135 5.672 10.33 5.757 10.73 3.526 10.275 3.595 10.135 5.672 10.33 5.757 10.75 3.595 10.135 5.655 10.55	Post Bachelor's degree	930	2.2%	454	3.8%	2,866	5.0%	
COREIGN BORN POPULATION Constraint Constraint <thconstraint< th=""> Constraint</thconstraint<>	Bachelor's degree or more	3,840	9.2%	1,496	12.4%	10,217	17.8%	
Total Foreign Born 2,933 4,7% 931 5.2% 6,333 7.5% Total HouseHolds 2 4,7% 931 5.2% 6,333 7.5% Total HouseHolds 23,544 6,830 3,4900 11,6% 11,07 11,5,6% 4,916 14,18 \$15,000 to \$24,999 2,842 12,0% 45,25 12,3% 44,66 12,28 \$25,000 to \$34,999 2,802 12,0% 952 13,3% 5,572 15,9% \$30,000 to \$1,49,999 2,600 11,0% 64,2 9,4% 42,56 12,275 \$10,000 to \$1,49,999 2,600 11,0% 64,2 9,4% 42,56 12,275 \$10,000 to \$1,49,999 2,600 9,7% 3,165 9,0% 3,3529 10,173 \$10,000 to \$1,49,999 2,600 9,241 3,37 8,35 2,575 \$20,000 to \$1,49,999 2,100 9,241 3,39 9,135 1,98 9,500 \$20,000 to \$24,999 2,101 3,39 9	FOREIGN BORN POPULATION							
HOUSENDLD INCOME, 2011 Z3.544 6.830 34.960 Lord Households 23.544 6.830 34.960 Less than \$15.000 3.716 15.8% 1.0.67 15.6% 4.916 14.13 \$15.000 to \$24.999 2.215 12.4% 839 12.3% 4.468 12.8% \$25.000 to \$24.999 2.040 17.3% 1.321 19.3% 5.572 15.9% \$25.000 to \$149.999 4.064 17.3% 1.321 19.3% 5.572 15.9% \$50.000 to \$149.999 2.600 11.06 642 9.4% 44.265 12.22% \$10.000 to \$149.999 1.869 7.9% 50.01 7.3% 3.529 10.19 \$15.000 to \$149.999 1.869 7.9% 50.01 5.3 7.7% \$15.000 to \$24.999 1.6189 42.143 44.466 44.366 Less than \$15.000 2.281 14.18 4.275 20.635 1.583 7.75 \$15.000 to \$24.999 1.618 92.23 3.44.66 <	Total Foreign Born	2,963	4.7%	931	5.2%	6,333	7.5%	
Total Households 23.544 6.830 44.90 Less than \$15.000 3.71 15.87 15.87 15.86 4.918 14.19 \$15.000 1 \$24.999 2.915 12.28 8.39 12.38 4.268 12.38 \$25.000 1 \$34.999 2.822 13.97 5.572 15.99 \$50.000 1 \$74.999 2.600 11.05 6.42 9.48 4.268 12.23 \$10.000 1 \$14.999 2.600 11.05 6.42 9.48 4.266 12.23 \$10.000 1 \$14.999 1.869 7.93 5.01 7.38 3.529 10.19 \$10.000 0 red 149.999 1.869 7.94 42.66 12.23 42.13 44.46 Average Household Income 42.373 44.44 44.46 44.464 44.46 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464 44.464	HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 2011							
Less than \$15.000 3.716 15.8% 1.047 15.6% 4.916 14.19 \$15.000 to \$24.999 2.015 1.2.4% 8.89 1.2.3% 4.468 12.28 \$25.000 to \$34.999 2.016 7.2.3% 1.3.21 19.3% 5.5.22 15.99 \$50.000 to \$74.999 2.000 1.037 20.1% 7.069 20.25 \$50.000 to \$149.999 2.600 1.05 6.42 9.4% 4.266 12.28 \$10.000 to \$149.999 2.600 1.05 6.42 9.4% 4.266 12.28 \$10.000 to \$149.999 1.869 7.9% 501 7.3% 3.529 10.19 \$15.000 to \$149.999 1.869 7.9% 501 7.3% 3.529 10.19 \$15.000 to \$149.999 1.869 7.9% 51.659 42.13 44.466 Average Household Income 42.373 42.143 44.466 44.466 Average Household Income 42.81 1.41% 389 9.1% 1.987 9.6% \$15.000 to \$24.999 1.618 10.2% 58.8% 1.583 7.79<	Total Households	23,544		6,830		34,960		
\$15.000 to \$24.999 2.915 12.4% 8.39 12.3% 4.4.48 12.8% \$25.000 to \$34.999 2.822 13.7% 4.2.45 12.2% \$50.000 to \$49.999 4.0464 17.3% 1.321 19.3% 5.572 15.9% \$50.000 to \$49.999 5.037 21.4% 1.337 20.1% 7.069 20.22% \$50.000 to \$49.999 1.869 7.7% 501 7.3% 3.529 10.1% \$10.000 to \$149.999 1.869 7.9% 501 7.3% 3.529 10.1% \$15.000 to rare 521 2.2% 135 2.0% 885 2.5% Median Household Income 51.659 49.241 44.466 42.760 44.466 42.760 44.464 44.466 44.466 44.99 44.466 44.99 44.466 44.99 44.466 44.99 44.94 44.46 44.466 44.94 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46 44.46	Less than \$15,000	3,716	15.8%	1,067	15.6%	4,916	14.1%	
\$25.000 to \$34.999 2.822 12.0% 952 13.9% 4.245 12.2% \$35.000 to \$44.999 4.064 17.3% 1.321 19.3% 5.572 15.9% \$50.000 to \$44.999 2.000 11.0% 6.42 9.4% 4.256 12.2% \$150.000 to \$44.999 2.000 11.0% 6.42 9.4% 4.256 12.2% \$150.000 to more 521 2.2% 135 2.0% 885 2.5% Median Household Income 42.373 42.143 44.466 44.666 Average Household Income 42.373 42.143 44.466 54.760 Total Families 16.189 4.275 20.635 1.583 7.73 \$15.000 \$24.999 1.618 10.0% 375 8.8% 1.583 7.73 \$25.000 to \$44.999 2.41% 54.760 3.88 1.633 7.73 \$25.000 to \$47.999 2.60% 2.23% 3.445 16.73 \$25.000 to \$47.999 2.60% 2.41% 9.49% 9.40% \$25.000 to \$47.999 2.60% 2.41%	\$15,000 to \$24,999	2,915	12.4%	839	12.3%	4,468	12.8%	
\$35.000 to \$49,999 4.064 17.3% 1.321 19.3% 5.572 15.99 \$50.000 to \$97.999 2.000 11.0% 6.42 9.4% 4.265 12.2% \$100.000 to \$149.999 11.869 7.9% 501 7.3% 3.529 10.19 \$150.000 or more 521 2.2% 135 2.0% 885 2.5% Average Household Income 51,659 49,241 54,760 53,85 1,833 7,73 342,113 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760	\$25,000 to \$34,999	2,822	12.0%	952	13.9%	4,265	12.2%	
\$50,000 to \$74,999 5,037 21.4% 1.373 20.1% 7,069 20.23 \$75,000 to \$97,979 2,000 11.0% 642 9,4% 4,256 12.23 \$100,000 to \$149,999 13.669 7,7% 501 7,3% 3,529 10.11 \$150,000 or more 42.373 42.143 44.466 Average Household Income 42.373 42.143 44.466 Total Families 16,189 4,275 20,635 Less thon \$15,000 \$24,999 1,411% 389 9.1% 1,987 9.457 \$25,000 to \$24,999 1,659 10.2% 538 12.6% 1,948 9.43 \$25,000 to \$34,999 2,607 16.1% 952 2.3% 46.00 2.27% \$25,000 to \$49,999 1,961 12.1% 497 2.3% 4.60 2.27% \$25,000 to \$49,999 1,961	\$35,000 to \$49,999	4,064	17.3%	1,321	19.3%	5,572	15.9%	
\$75,000 to \$99.999 2,600 11.0% 642 9,4% 4,256 12,23 \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,869 7,7% 501 7,3% 3,529 10.18 \$150,000 ro more 521 2,2% 135 2,0% 885 2,5% Median Household Income 42,373 42,143 44,466 44,466 Average Household Income 51,659 49,241 54,760 FMILV INCOME, 2011 1 42,075 20,635 Total Families 16,189 4,275 20,635 Less than \$15,000 2,281 14,1% 389 9,1% 1,987 9,4% \$15,000 to \$24,999 1,618 10.0% 375 8.8% 1,583 7,7% \$50,000 to \$34,999 2,607 16,1% 952 22,3% 3,445 16,7% \$50,000 to \$34,999 1,306 12,1% 446 14,2% 32,22 15,8% \$50,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 439 10,3% 2,939 14,2% \$10,000 or more 49,5% 48,322 56,0371 65,037	\$50,000 to \$74,999	5,037	21.4%	1,373	20.1%	7,069	20.2%	
\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,869 7,9% 501 7,3% 3,529 10,19 \$150,000 or more 521 2,2% 135 2,0% 885 2,5% Average Household Income 42,373 42,143 44,466 44,466 Average Household Income 51,659 49,241 54,760 54,760 FAMILY INCOME, 2011 10 54,760 54,760 54,760 54,760 Total Families 16,189 4,2275 20,635 1,887 1,987 9,65 Less than \$15,000 2,281 14,1% 389 9,1% 1,987 9,65 \$25,000 to \$3,4999 2,607 16,1% 952 2,2% 3,445 16,77 \$25,000 to \$49,999 2,607 16,1% 952 2,2% 3,445 16,77 \$50,000 to \$49,999 2,607 16,1% 952 2,2% 3,445 16,77 \$10,000 to \$1,49,999 1,901 1,05% 449 11,6% 3,262 15,89 \$10,000 to \$1,49,999 1,901 1,05% 48,382 56,038 Average Household Income	\$75,000 to \$99,999	2,600	11.0%	642	9.4%	4,256	12.2%	
\$150.000 or more 521 2.2% 135 2.0% 885 2.5% Median Household Income 51,659 42,143 44,466 44,466 Average Household Income 51,659 49,241 54,760 54,760 FAMILY INCOME, 2011 10 20,835 42,275 20,835 54,760 Total Familles 16,189 4,275 20,835 7.7% 58,8% 1,583 7.7% \$15,000 \$24,999 1,616 10.0% 375 8,8% 1,583 7.7% \$25,000 to \$24,999 1,659 10.2% 538 12.6% 1,948 9,445 \$35,000 to \$49,999 2,607 16,1% 952 22.3% 3,445 16.7% \$35,000 to \$49,999 1,961 12.1% 496 11.6% 3,262 15.8% \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,961 12.1% 496 11.6% 3,262 15.8% \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,970 10.5% 489 2.1% 797 13.8% Median Household Income 49,586 48,382 56,038 40.1% <td< td=""><td>\$100,000 to \$149,999</td><td>1,869</td><td>7.9%</td><td>501</td><td>7.3%</td><td>3,529</td><td>10.1%</td></td<>	\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,869	7.9%	501	7.3%	3,529	10.1%	
Median Household Income 42,373 42,143 44,466 Average Household Income 51,659 49,241 54,760 FMILU INCOME, 2011 1 20,635 20,635 Total Families 16,189 4,275 20,635 Less than \$15,000 2,281 14,1% 389 9,1% 1,987 9,458 \$15,000 to \$24,999 1,6165 10.0% 3.75 8.8% 1,583 7.77 \$25,000 to \$34,999 2,607 16,1% 952 22.3% 3,445 16.77 \$50,000 to \$49,999 2,607 16,1% 952 22.3% 3,445 16.77 \$50,000 to \$74,999 3,908 2,1% 977 23,3% 4,680 22.79 \$50,000 to \$74,999 1,700 10.5% 439 10.3% 2,939 14.28 \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10.5% 48,382 56,038 56,557 Per capita Income 47,976 40,7% 40,7% 41,0% 41,0% PovEnty BY AGE	\$150,000 or more	521	2.2%	135	2.0%	885	2.5%	
Average Household Income 51,659 49,241 54,760 FAMILY INCOME, 2011 1	Median Household Income	42,373		42,143		44,466		
FAMILY INCOME, 2011 Info and Parallelis Info and Parallelis <thinfo and="" parallelis<="" th=""> Info and Parallelis</thinfo>	Average Household Income	51,659		49,241		54,760		
Total Families 16,189 4,275 20,635 Less than \$15,000 2,281 14,1% 389 9,1% 1,987 9,635 \$15,000 15,24,999 1,618 10,0% 3375 8.8% 1,583 7,77 \$25,000 15,34,999 1,659 10,2% 538 12,6% 1,948 9,473 \$35,000 15,\$47,999 2,407 16,1% 952 2,2.3% 3,445 16,77 \$50,000 15,\$47,999 3,906 2,1% 997 23,3% 4,680 22,78 \$10,000 15,\$49,999 1,700 10,5% 439 10,3% 2,939 14,22 \$10,000 10,\$149,999 1,700 10,5% 48,322 56,038 56,038 Average Household Income 47,986 48,322 56,038 56,055 5 Fer capita Income 20,227 20,006 40,1% 41,0% 24,059 Fold Population 12,166 19,5% 2,792 16,0% 14,0% Fold Population 2,150 38,9%	FAMILY INCOME, 2011							
Less than \$15,000 2,281 14,1% 389 9,1% 1,987 9,6% \$15,000 to \$24,999 1,618 10,0% 375 8,8% 1,583 7,7% \$25,000 to \$34,999 1,619 10,2% 538 12,2% 1,948 9,4% \$35,000 to \$49,999 2,607 16,1% 952 22,3% 3,445 16,7% \$50,000 to \$49,999 3,908 24,1% 997 23,3% 4,680 22,7% \$50,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 439 10,3% 2,939 14,2% \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 4882 56,038 8 Average Household Income 49,586 48,822 56,038 8 Average Household Income 20,227 20,006 40,1% 41,0% PovERTN BY AGE 40,7% 40,7% 41,0% 12,25% 14,5% 27,29 16,0% 12,059 14,5% 27,29 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 14,0% 12,059 <td< td=""><td>Total Families</td><td>16,189</td><td></td><td>4,275</td><td></td><td>20,635</td><td></td></td<>	Total Families	16,189		4,275		20,635		
\$15.000 to \$24,999 1.618 10.0% 375 8.8% 1.583 7.7% \$25.000 to \$34,999 1.659 10.2% 538 12.6% 1,948 9.49 \$35.000 to \$74.999 3.908 24.1% 997 23.3% 4.680 22.7% \$75.000 to \$74.999 3.908 24.1% 997 23.3% 4.680 22.7% \$75.000 to \$74.999 1.961 12.1% 446 11.6% 3.262 15.88 \$100.000 to \$149.999 1.700 10.5% 439 10.3% 2.939 14.27 \$100.000 to \$149.999 1.700 10.5% 488 21% 791 3.88 Median Household Income 49.586 48.382 56.038 46.055 56.055	Less than \$15,000	2,281	14.1%	389	9.1%	1,987	9.6%	
\$25,000 to \$34,999 1,659 10.2% 538 12.6% 1,948 9,49 \$35,000 to \$49,999 2,007 16.1% 952 2.3% 4,460 16.7% \$50,000 to \$49,999 3,008 2.4.1% 997 2.3% 4,460 22.7% \$75,000 to \$99,999 1,961 12.1% 496 11.6% 3,262 15.8% \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10.5% 439 10.3% 2,239 14.28 \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10.5% 489 2.1% 791 3.8% Median Household Income 455 2.8% 89 2.1% 791 3.8% Average Household Income 50,038 56,031 65,055 65,055 610 140,7% 40.1% 41.0% 41.0% PovErty BY AGE 20,006 23,652 14,0% 12,059 14.5% 22,72 16,0% 12,059 14.5% Fold Population 12,166 19.5% 2.722 16,0% 12,059 14.9% 20,9% 1,529 27.2% 16,0% 14,29% 16,5% 27	\$15,000 to \$24,999	1,618	10.0%	375	8.8%	1,583	7.7%	
\$\$35,000 to \$49,999 2,607 16,1% 952 22.3% 3,445 16,7% \$\$50,000 to \$74,999 3,908 24,1% 997 23.3% 4,680 22.7% \$\$50,000 to \$74,999 1,161 12,1% 446 11.4% 3,222 15,88 \$\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 439 10,3% 2,939 14,23 \$\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 439 10,3% 2,939 14,23 \$\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 483 2 56,038 Average Household Income 57,197 56,371 65,055 65,055 Fer capita Income 20,227 20,006 40,1% 41,0% POVERT BY AGE 40,7% 40,7% 41,0% 14,0% Fordal Population 12,166 19,5% 2,729 16,0% 12,059 14,5% Los Sthan 6 years 1,368 31,9% 2,49 19,9% 1,529 27,2% 12 to 17 years 1,032 2,4% 2,5% 14,9% 16,8% 2,5% 12 to 17 years	\$25,000 to \$34,999	1,659	10.2%	538	12.6%	1,948	9.4%	
\$\$0,000 to \$74,999 3,906 24,1% 997 23,3% 4,680 22,7% \$\$0,000 to \$74,999 1,961 12,1% 446 11.6% 3,262 15.8% \$\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,3% 439 10,3% 2,939 14,2% \$\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,3% 489 2,1% 791 3,8% Median Household Income 49,586 48,382 56,038 56,038 56,038 Average Household Income 57,197 56,371 65,055 56,038 56,055 56,038 56,038 56,055 <	\$35,000 to \$49,999	2,607	16.1%	952	22.3%	3,445	16.7%	
\$75,000 to \$99,999 1,961 12,1% 496 11,6% 3,262 15,8% \$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10,5% 439 10,3% 2,399 14,28 \$100,000 to \$149,999 2,1% 791 3,8% 48,382 56,038 48,382 56,038 Median Household Income 49,586 48,382 56,031 65,055 56,055 Per capita Income 20,227 20,006 23,652 64,01% 41,0% PovErty BY AGE 40,7% 40,1% 41,0% 11,4% 10,259 14,5% Colal Population 12,166 19,5% 2,722 16,0% 12,059 14,5% Less than 6 years 2,150 38,7% 427 35,6% 1,208 20,99 10 to years 1,368 31,7% 269 19,9% 1,529 27,22 12 to 17 years 1,364 31,7% 245 14,4% 10,28% 10,29 14,5% 25 to 34 years 1,641 19,7% 366 17,2% 11,88 15,6% 25 to 44 years 1,372 1,55% <td>\$50,000 to \$74,999</td> <td>3,908</td> <td>24.1%</td> <td>997</td> <td>23.3%</td> <td>4,680</td> <td>22.7%</td>	\$50,000 to \$74,999	3,908	24.1%	997	23.3%	4,680	22.7%	
\$100,000 to \$149,999 1,700 10.5% 439 10.3% 2,939 14,23 \$150,000 or more 455 2.6% 89 2,1% 791 3.87 Median Household Income 49,586 48,322 56,038 56,371 65,055 56,371 65,055 Per capita Income 20,227 20,006 40,1% 41,0% 41,0% PovERVB VACE 40,7% 40,1% 41,0% 12,059 12,059 12,059 12,059 12,059 12,059 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059 14,0% 12,059	\$75,000 to \$99,999	1,961	12.1%	496	11.6%	3,262	15.8%	
\$150.000 or more 455 2.8% 89 2.1% 791 3.8% Median Household Income 49,586 48,382 56,038 48,382 56,038 48,382 56,038 48,382 56,038 56,03	\$100,000 to \$149,999	1,700	10.5%	439	10.3%	2,939	14.2%	
Median Household Income 49,586 48,382 56,038 Average Household Income 57,197 56,371 65,035 Per capila Income 20,227 20,006 23,652 Gini Index 40.7% 40.1% 40.1% 41.0% POVERTY BY AGE 0 40.1% 11,059 14.5% Ical Population 12,166 19,5% 22,722 16,0% 12,059 14.5% Less than 6 years 2,150 38,9% 427 35,6% 1,208 20,272 12 to 17 years 1,036 31,9% 249 19,9% 1,689 20,6% 25 to 34 years 1,844 27.8% 255 14,9% 1,689 20,6% 35 to 44 years 1,844 19,7% 366 1,2% 1,838 1,649 20,6% 35 to 44 years 1,372 1,844 19,7% 366 1,2% 1,138 15,6% 1,138 15,6% 1,138 15,6% 1,138 15,6% 1,15% 1,253 1,11,15	\$150,000 or more	455	2.8%	89	2.1%	791	3.8%	
Average Household Income 57,197 56,371 65,055 Per capita Income 20,227 20,006 23,652 Gini Index 40,7% 40,1% 41,0% POVERT 8Y AGE 7 56,371 12,065 Isolar Income 12,066 40,7% 40,1% 41,0% POVERT 8Y AGE 7 56,072 16,0% 12,059 14,5% Less than 6 years 2,150 38,9% 427 35,6% 1,209 27,2% 12 to 17 years 1,368 31,9% 22,95 14,9% 1,689 20,9% 25 to 34 years 1,641 19,7% 366 17,2% 1,838 15,6% 25 to 34 years 1,641 19,7% 366 17,2% 1,838 15,6% 25 to 34 years 1,641 19,7% 366 17,2% 1,838 15,6% 25 to 44 years 1,372 1,5% 370 16,4% 1,253 11,1% 55 to 64 years 754 11,1% 195 8,	Median Household Income	49,586		48, 382		56,038		
Per capita income 20,227 20,006 40,1% 23,652 Gini Index 40,7% 40,7% 40,1% 41,0% POVERTy BY AGE 12,661 19,5% 2,792 16,0% 12,059 Loss than 6 years 2,150 38,7% 427 35,6% 1,208 20,2% 4 to 17% 11 years 1,368 31,9% 2,29 19,9% 1,529 27,2% 12 to 17 years 1,368 31,9% 2,255 14,3% 1,699 20,6% 1,208 20,7% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,641 19,7% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 27,2% 1,529 21,53 1,649 20,6% 1,649 20,6% 1,649 20,6% 1,649 20,6% 1,649 20,6% 1,559 27,2%	Average Household Income	57,197		56,371		65,055		
Light income Light income<	Por ognite Incomo	20 227		20.004		22 452		
Interview Image: Construction Image: Cons Image:	Gini Index	20,227	40.7%	20,000	40 1%	20,032	41.0%	
Interview Interview <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>40.770</td><td></td><td>40.176</td><td></td><td>41.0/0</td></t<>			40.770		40.176		41.0/0	
Less than 6 years 2,150 38.7% 427 35.6% 1,208 20.79 6 to 11 years 1,368 31.9% 249 19.9% 1,529 27.2% 12 to 17 years 1,368 31.9% 249 19.9% 1,529 27.2% 12 to 17 years 1,032 20.4% 245 18.5% 1,323 19.0% 18 to 24 years 1,844 27.8% 255 51.4% 1,838 15.6% 25 to 34 years 1,641 19.7% 366 17.2% 1,838 15.6% 35 to 44 years 1,372 15.5% 370 16.4% 1,253 11.1% 45 to 54 years 1,372 14.9% 14.3% 14.5% 11.2% 15.5% 55 to 64 years 754 11.1% 195 8.2% 908 10.5% 55 to 74 years 367 8.9% 137 11.7% 407 7.2% 55 to 74 years 367 8.9% 137 11.7% 407 7.2%	Total Population	12 166	19 5%	2 792	16.0%	12 059	14 5%	
Loss interference Loss Loss <thlos< th=""> Loss Loss</thlos<>	Less than 6 years	2 150	38.9%	127	35.6%	1 208	20.9%	
1,360 1,360 1,370 1,320 1,321 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,332 1,333 1,333 1,333 1,333 1,333 1,335 1,332 1,332 1,333 1,333 1,335 1,335 1,433 1,455 1,233 1,113 456 413 1,60% 1,1475 1,235 1,133 456 413 1,405 1,235 1,235<	6 to 11 years	1 368	31.9%	269	19.9%	1,200	20.770	
1.60 2.75% 2.60 1.60 <t< td=""><td>12 to 17 years</td><td>1,000</td><td>20.4%</td><td>245</td><td>18.5%</td><td>1,323</td><td>19.0%</td></t<>	12 to 17 years	1,000	20.4%	245	18.5%	1,323	19.0%	
1.04 2.104 2.104 2.104 2.007 25 to 34 years 1.641 19.7% 366 17.2% 1.838 15.6% 35 to 44 years 1.392 15.5% 390 16.4% 1.253 11.19 45 to 54 years 1.372 14.9% 413 16.0% 1.495 11.23 55 to 64 years 754 11.1% 195 8.2% 908 10.5% 65 to 74 years 367 8.9% 137 11.7% 407 7.2%	18 to 24 years	1,032	20.4%	243	14.9%	1,525	20.4%	
1.041 1.7.7 3.00 17.2.6 1.3.0 35 to 44 years 1.392 15.5% 390 16.4% 1.2.23 11.11 45 to 54 years 1.372 14.9% 413 16.0% 1.495 11.2% 55 to 64 years 7.54 11.1% 195 8.2% 908 10.5% 55 to 74 years 367 8.9% 137 11.7% 407 7.2% 55 to 64 years 246 6.7% 95 8.0% 407 7.2%	25 to 34 years	1,641	10.7%	344	17.0%	1,007	15.4%	
1.372 1.372 1.372 1.372 1.372 1.372 1.372 1.174 32 to 54 years 1.372 14.% 4.13 16.0% 1.125 11.17 35 to 64 years 1.372 14.% 4.13 16.0% 1.125 11.23 55 to 64 years 754 11.1% 195 8.2% 908 10.5% 56 to 74 years 367 8.% 137 11.7% 407 7.28 57 years and over 246 6.7% 95 8.c% 409 7.0%	35 to 44 years	1,041	15.5%	200	16 197	1,050	11.0%	
1,07 z 14.7 z 14.7 z 14.7 z 11.2 z 55 to 64 years 754 11.1 % 195 8.2 % 908 10.5 % 65 to 74 years 367 8.9 % 137 11.7 % 407 7.2 % 75 years and over 246 6.7 % 95 8.0 % 409 7 0 %	45 to 54 years	1,372	1/ 0%	370	16.4%	1,233	11.1/0	
7.54 11.17 17.36 62.76 700 10.07 65 to 74 years 367 8.9% 137 11.7% 407 7.2% 75 years and over 246 6.7% 95 8.6% 409 7.1%	55 to 64 years	754	14.7/0	413	8.0%	0/12	10.5%	
246 67% 95 8 ng 409 7 ng	65 to 74 years	247	8.9%	173	11.7%	700 ⊿∩7	7.0%	
	75 years and over	246	6.7%	95	8.0%	407	7.0%	

	Michic	ian	Wavne C	ountv	Detr	oit	Canton T	ownship	Dearborn Dearborn Heights		Heights	Garde	n Citv	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
UNITS IN STRUCTURE														
Total Housing Units	4,532,215		823,853		363,281		37,328		23,422		32,684		10,873	
1 unit, detached	3,255,189	71.8%	569,284	69.1%	238,007	65.5%	27,615	74.0%	20,613	88.0%	20,575	63.0%	10,080	92.7%
1 unit, attached	205,859	4.5%	50,126	6.1%	24,757	6.8%	1,631	4.4%	351	1.5%	3,274	10.0%	28	0.3%
2 units	124,969	2.8%	42,691	5.2%	31,414	8.6%	2,328	6.2%	102	0.4%	158	0.5%	35	0.3%
3 or 4 units	116,979	2.6%	22,022	2.7%	9,483	2.6%	848	2.3%	607	2.6%	1,154	3.5%	97	0.9%
5 to 9 units	191,190	4.2%	34,505	4.2%	8,123	2.2%	756	2.0%	586	2.5%	3.278	10.0%	173	1.6%
10 or more units	386,108	8.5%	91.052	11.1%	50,126	13.8%	4.036	10.8%	559	2.4%	2,605	8.0%	454	4.2%
Estimate: Total: - 10 to 19	163,977	3.6%	27.361	3.3%	10.871	3.0%	742	2.0%	59	0.3%	1.389	4.2%	298	2.7%
Estimate: Total: - 20 to 49	92,434	2.0%	22.050	2.7%	13.513	3.7%	1,186	3.2%	159	0.7%	492	1.5%	5	0.0%
Estimate: Total: - 50 or more	129.697	2.9%	41.641	5.1%	25.742	7.1%	2.108	5.6%	341	1.5%	724	2.2%	151	1.4%
Mobile home	250.991	5.5%	14.051	1.7%	1.278	0.4%	114	0.3%	604	2.6%	1.630	5.0%	6	0.1%
Other	930	0.0%	122	0.0%	93	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	0.0%	0	0.0%
	,	0.070		0.070		0.070	Ŭ	0.070	Ŭ	0.070		0.070	Ĭ	0.070
Moved Wihin the Last Year	1,427,657	14.6%	265.353	14.6%	119.751	16.4%	12,696	13.2%	7,177	12.6%	11,475	13.2%	2.991	10.9%
	.,												-/.	
Owner occupied units	2,812,607		453,730		142, 125		23,676		17,174		24,112		8,637	
Between 2005 and 2011		20.1%	1	18.1%		16.1%		19.6%		16.9%		25.0%		11.6%
Between 2000 and 2004		21.8%	l .	19.1%		14.0%	l l	20.3%		18.0%	4	28.8%		17.9%
Between 1990 and 1999		26.8%	1	24.4%		22.0%		25.4%		23.7%		28.1%		26.7%
Prior to 1990		31.4%	1	38.4%		48.0%		34.8%		41.4%		18.1%		43.7%
Renter occupied units	1,012,575		227,944		122,084		9,898		4,484		6,736		1,747	
Between 2005 and 2011		73.7%	1	68.4%		65.4%	1	70.1%		69.8%	1	82.4%		69.6%
Between 2000 and 2004		14.1%	l	15.5%		15.7%		15.4%		15.7%		10.6%		14.2%
Between 1990 and 1999		7.8%	l .	9.8%		10.9%	d I	10.6%		8.8%	d I	4.2%		8.0%
Prior to 1990		4.4%	1	6.4%		8.0%		4.0%		5.7%		2.7%		8.2%
VEHICLE AVAILABILITY														
No Vehicle Available	282,285	7.4%	88,747	13.0%	59,289	22.4%	2,865	8.5%	1,423	6.6%	1,005	3.3%	544	5.2%
One Vehicle Available	1,326,375	34.7%	277,653	40.7%	122,589	46.4%	14,000	41.7%	8,625	39.8%	8,665	28.1%	3,471	33.4%
2 or More Vehicles Available	2,216,522	57.9%	315,274	46.2%	82,331	31.2%	16,709	49.8%	11,610	53.6%	21,178	68.7%	6,369	61.3%
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME - OWNERS														
PAYING MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF INCOME														
Less than \$20,000	247,607	79.8%	53,307	85.8%	26,641	86.8%	2,904	89.7%	1,966	86.1%	969	91.6%	656	85.2%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	204,245	49.4%	39,005	55.2%	16,686	58.0%	2,341	62.2%	1,339	42.3%	1,005	59.9%	494	42.1%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	155,446	37.2%	27,828	42.4%	10,081	42.0%	1,558	48.9%	986	37.9%	1,091	56.2%	646	44.8%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	137,363	23.3%	22,967	25.8%	5,384	20.6%	1,062	25.2%	856	23.4%	1,614	41.8%	665	29.9%
\$75,000 or more	84,107	7.9%	12,656	7.8%	1,663	5.7%	627	6.9%	219	4.1%	1,828	11.8%	153	5.1%
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME - RENTERS														
PAYING MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF INCOME														
Less than \$10,000	144,548	92.1%	40,117	93.0%	27,316	94.1%	1,257	93.7%	425	97.7%	297	97.1%	101	92.7%
\$10,000 to \$19,999	179,371	86.4%	41,533	87.4%	24,203	88.5%	1,931	92.2%	682	91.3%	551	84.8%	170	65.1%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	142,012	63.7%	32,638	69.1%	17,128	69.7%	1,486	79.8%	867	83.3%	914	71.5%	318	87.1%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	33,035	23.6%	7,996	27.4%	3,707	28.5%	715	56.3%	270	55.0%	453	35.1%	186	49.5%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	9,596	8.0%	1,932	8.1%	496	5.6%	250	20.1%	144	19.0%	246	15.6%	13	4.8%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	1,412	3.0%	141	1.6%	23	0.7%	8	1.1%	16	5.6%	13	1.7%	0	0.0%
\$100,000 or more	404	1.1%	63	0.9%	0	0.0%	9	1.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

	Inkste	≥r	Livon	ia	Northville		Northville Township		Plymouth		Plymouth Township		Redford T	(ownship
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
UNITS IN STRUCTURE			,		1						,			
Total Housing Units	12,178		39,086		1,374		10,940		4,435		11,129		20,342	
1 unit, detached	8,649	71.0%	33,810	86.5%	809	58.9%	6,092	55.7%	2,464	55.6%	7,734	69.5%	18,763	92.2%
1 unit, attached	394	3.2%	1,169	3.0%	126	9.2%	2,004	18.3%	293	6.6%	799	7.2%	187	0.9%
2 units	196	1.6%	74	0.2%	102	7.4%	90	0.8%	245	5.5%	55	0.5%	82	0.4%
3 or 4 units	453	3.7%	419	1.1%	44	3.2%	432	3.9%	462	10.4%	422	3.8%	162	0.8%
5 to 9 units	579	4.8%	1.675	4.3%	7	0.5%	1,449	13.2%	411	9.3%	786	7.1%	307	1.5%
10 or more units	1.893	15.5%	1.858	4.8%	279	20.3%	861	7.9%	560	12.6%	722	6.5%	588	2.9%
Estimate: Total: - 10 to 19	865	7.1%	594	1.5%	11	0.8%	362	3.3%	148	3.3%	408	3.7%	166	0.8%
Estimate: Total: - 20 to 49	265	2.2%	315	0.8%	57	4.1%	148	1.4%	157	3.5%	90	0.8%	141	0.7%
Estimate: Total: - 50 or more	763	6.3%	949	2.4%	211	15.4%	351	3.2%	255	5.7%	224	2.0%	281	1.4%
Mobile home	14	0.1%	81	0.2%	. 7	0.5%	12	0.1%	0	0.0%	611	5.5%	253	1.2%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
RESIDENCY AND MIGRATION							-							
Moved Wihin the Last Year	4,617	18.2%	7,770	8.1%	407	14.7%	4,191	15.3%	1,465	16.4%	2,441	9.0%	6,319	13.2%
Owner occupied units	5,132		32,656		821		7,661		2,588		8,780		15,824	
Between 2005 and 2011		13.4%		15.7%		21.2%		29.0%		26.0%		16.2%		19.9%
Between 2000 and 2004		13.8%		20.3%		23.5%		32.2%		22.7%	l I	27.1%		23.1%
Between 1990 and 1999		20.1%		26.8%		25.6%		22.4%		24.9%	1	31.0%		24.6%
Prior to 1990		52.7%		37.3%		29.7%		16.4%		26.4%	1	25.7%		32.4%
Renter occupied units	4,657		4,653		443		2,504		1,512		1,803		2,649	
Between 2005 and 2011		66.1%		67.2%		83.1%		78.8%		76.7%		72.4%		68.3%
Between 2000 and 2004		16.5%		15.7%		9.3%		11.6%		12.6%	1	15.8%		18.2%
Between 1990 and 1999		10.1%		11.6%		3.8%		7.8%		6.4%	1	9.8%		8.6%
Prior to 1990		7.2%		5.5%		3.8%		1.8%		4.3%	1	2.0%		4.9%
VEHICLE AVAILABILITY														
No Vehicle Available	1,489	15.2%	1,497	4.0%	91	7.2%	389	3.8%	188	4.6%	452	4.3%	836	4.5%
One Vehicle Available	5,080	51.9%	11,718	31.4%	504	39.9%	2,794	27.5%	1,588	38.7%	2,738	25.9%	7,161	38.8%
2 or More Vehicles Available	3,220	32.9%	24,094	64.6%	669	52.9%	6,982	68.7%	2,324	56.7%	7,393	69.9%	10,476	56.7%
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME - OWNERS														
PAYING MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF INCOME														
Less than \$20,000	718	85.1%	1,928	88.5%	36	100.0%	344	100.0%	88	55.0%	376	83.6%	1,316	80.8%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	663	58.3%	1,867	53.4%	35	81.4%	334	68.7%	141	61.0%	381	59.3%	1,544	57.1%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	468	42.2%	1,829	44.5%	21	42.9%	267	58.8%	133	59.4%	270	44.9%	1,113	47.9%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	148	13.4%	1,734	27.3%	46	46.5%	328	41.1%	190	48.6%	480	36.9%	986	25.4%
\$75,000 or more	16	1.9%	894	5.5%	96	16.2%	955	17.3%	166	10.5%	602	10.5%	190	3.7%
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME - RENTERS														
PAYING MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF INCOME														
Less than \$10,000	926	85.6%	323	90.2%	13	100.0%	38	100.0%	77	100.0%	34	100.0%	209	91.3%
\$10,000 to \$19,999	970	83.7%	771	82.9%	65	85.5%	138	100.0%	229	79.8%	294	88.0%	475	98.1%
\$20,000 to \$34,999	611	60.3%	656	67.6%	71	54.6%	442	89.5%	215	66.4%	275	69.1%	462	90.2%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	86	21.8%	176	26.7%	24	37.5%	105	32.2%	117	40.6%	46	10.5%	110	33.1%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	0	0.0%	83	10.8%	8	12.1%	164	31.3%	42	18.5%	57	18.3%	105	20.5%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	0	0.0%	8	2.7%	27	67.5%	12	4.0%	0	0.0%	9	10.3%	0	0.0%
\$100,000 or more	0	0.0%	20	7.9%	0	0.0%	24	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

	Taylo	r	Wayn	e	Westlo	and	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
UNITS IN STRUCTURE							
Total Housing Units	25,427		7,822		39,258		
1 unit, detached	18,319	72.0%	4,870	62.3%	22,217	56.6%	
1 unit, attached	1,486	5.8%	559	7.1%	2,970	7.6%	
2 units	119	0.5%	119	1.5%	888	2.3%	
3 or 4 units	317	1.2%	271	3.5%	1,087	2.8%	
5 to 9 units	1,639	6.4%	566	7.2%	3,911	10.0%	
10 or more units	2,763	10.9%	1,437	18.4%	7,134	18.2%	
Estimate; Total: - 10 to 19	1,498	5.9%	613	7.8%	3,719	9.5%	
Estimate: Total: - 20 to 49	493	1.9%	197	2.5%	1,079	2.7%	
Estimate: Total: - 50 or more	772	3.0%	627	8.0%	2.336	6.0%	
Mobile home	784	3.1%	0	0.0%	1,051	2.7%	
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
RESIDENCY AND MIGRATION							
Moved Wihin the Last Year	10,928	17.5%	2,445	13.9%	13,844	16.7%	
Owner occupied units	15,785		4,225		22,202		
Between 2005 and 2011		17.5%		14.5%		19.7%	
Between 2000 and 2004		18.1%		21.0%		20.8%	
Between 1990 and 1999		24.6%		25.4%		27.5%	
Prior to 1990		39.8%		39.1%		32.0%	
Renter occupied units	7,759		2,605		12,758		
Between 2005 and 2011		73.1%		60.8%		76.3%	
Between 2000 and 2004		13.2%		19.4%		14.4%	
Between 1990 and 1999		8.5%		8.3%		6.5%	
Prior to 1990		5.2%		11.5%		2.8%	
VEHICLE AVAILABILITY							
No Vehicle Available	1,670	7.1%	919	13.5%	3,093	8.8%	
One Vehicle Available	9,659	41.0%	2.361	34.6%	15,186	43.4%	
2 or More Vehicles Available	12,215	51.9%	3,550	52.0%	16,681	47.7%	
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME - OWNERS							
PAYING MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF INCOME							
Less than \$20,000	1,685	83.2%	298	82.5%	2.022	80.0%	
\$20,000 to \$34,999	1,216	48.4%	400	55.6%	1,566	49.0%	
\$35,000 to \$49,999	944	34.1%	349	39.7%	1,295	40.6%	
\$50,000 to \$74,999	659	16.9%	292	26.9%	1,572	28.6%	
\$75,000 or more	151	3.3%	28	2.4%	549	7.1%	
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY BY INCOME - RENTERS							
PAYING MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF INCOME							
Less than \$10,000	1,131	96.1%	446	87.1%	1.558	92.8%	
\$10,000 to \$19,999	1,396	87.7%	503	84.8%	2,269	87.7%	
\$20.000 to \$34.999	1,107	67.0%	299	53.8%	2,133	67.2%	
\$35.000 to \$49.999	213	16.9%	85	19.2%	394	17.2%	
\$50,000 to \$74,999	23	2,1%	0	0.0%	94	6.1%	
\$75.000 to \$99.999	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
\$100.000 or more	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	

Appendix C

Table 5: Employment by Level of Education, Inkster and Taylor

	lnks	iter	Tay	lor
Total Persons 25 - 64 Years	12,543		32,922	
In labor force:	7,922	63.2%	23,954	72.8%
Employed	5,898	74.5%	19,749	82.4%
Unemployed	2,024	25.5%	4,205	17.6%
Not in labor force	4,621	36.8%	8,968	27.2%
BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
Less than high school graduate	2,518	20 .1%	4,832	14.7%
In labor force:	1,064	42.3%	2,755	57.0%
Employed	539	50.7%	1,920	69.7%
Unemployed	525	49.3%	835	30.3%
Not in labor force	1,454	57.7%	2,077	43.0%
High school graduate	3,963	31.6 %	12,568	38.2%
In labor force:	2,338	59.0%	8,547	68.0%
Employed	1,862	79.6%	6,639	77.7%
Unemployed	476	20.4%	1,908	22.3%
Not in labor force	1,625	41.0%	4,021	32.0%
Some college or associate's degree	4,838	38.6%	12,536	38 .1%
In labor force:	3,500	72.3%	10,168	81.1%
Employed	2,538	72.5%	8,895	87.5%
Unemployed	962	27.5%	1,273	12.5%
Not in labor force	1,338	27.7%	2,368	18.9%
Bachelor's degree or higher	1,224	9.8 %	2,986	9 .1%
In labor force:	1,020	83.3%	2,484	83.2%
Employed	959	94.0%	2,295	92.4%
Unemployed	61	6.0%	189	7.6%
Not in labor force	204	16.7%	502	16.8%

Source: American Community Survey, 2009-2011 3-year estimate

Major Findings

Taylor has a higher proportion of working-age residents in the labor force (72.8 v s. 63.2%) Taylor's ov erall unemployment rate is lower than that of Inkster (17.6 v s. 25.5%) Inkster has a higher proportion of working-age without a HS degree (20.1 v s. 14.7%) The non-HS grads in inkster hav e higher unemployemnt rate (49.3 v s. 30.3%)

Appendix D



Map 17: Neighborhood Opportunity Index, City of Detroit