

County of Santa Clara
Department of Planning and Development
Planning Office



PLN02 092705

Prepared by: Steven Golden
Planner III

Reviewed by: Jody Hall Esser
Interim Director of
Planning and
Development

DATE: September 27, 2005

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Jody Hall Esser", written over a horizontal line.

Jody Hall Esser
Interim Director of Planning and Development

SUBJECT: Report back on referral regarding U.S. Census information for people in poverty
by Supervisorial District

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Under advisement from June 21, 2005 (Item No. 26): Accept report relating to people in poverty data estimated from the U.S. Census with a particular focus on children, seniors, and families in poverty.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

No impact to the General Fund as a result of this action.

CONTRACT HISTORY

Not applicable.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

On June 21, 2005 the Board of Supervisors directed administration to develop poverty data by supervisorial district using Census 2000 data. The data was to focus on those individuals in poverty that may be eligible for certain need-based services including services provided by the Senior Nutrition Program, First Five Commission, and other need-based family services. The original request was for Districts Four and Five, however, the request was expanded to develop the data for all supervisorial districts. On July 28, 2005 an off-agenda memorandum was sent to the Board of Supervisors (Board) requesting a time extension to the normal 45 day response period to report back to the Board because of the significant amount of time required to fulfill the request and other extraneous circumstances. This transmittal is in response to the Board of Supervisor's request.

BACKGROUND

Subsequent to receipt of the June 21, 2005 directive, District 4 staff offered some clarification of the Census 2000 data which would best reflect the eligibility criteria for the identified social service programs. Previously, the Planning Office developed a data report for the Children Seniors, and Families Committee (CSFC) (Attachment 4: February 16, 2005, Item No. 9) and a similar methodology was used in this report. The main issue in developing poverty data for supervisorial districts is that the supervisor districts were created by assembling Census Blocks and the U.S. Census Bureau does not make poverty data available at this geographic level. The data is available at larger levels of geography and therefore, supervisor district boundaries are not entirely coincident with these larger geographic areas. It was determined that some of the Census poverty data is available at the Block Group geographic level, however, in some cases the supervisor district boundaries split these geographic areas.

"Estimating Methodology"

The Planning Office used a similar methodology that was developed for the CSFC, however, Census Block Groups were used in this analysis (Census Tracts were used in the previous

analysis). The attached September 27, 2005 memorandum (Attachment 1) from Steven Golden, Associate Planner, describes the "estimating methodology" in more detail.

Summary of Data

The values reported are only an estimation based on the methodology used. It is possible that the technique used to assign data amongst split Block Groups does not accurately represent the actual distribution of individuals for each demographic criterion analyzed because there is immeasurable uncertainty in the level of correlation between total population and each demographic criterion analyzed. Local characteristics of neighborhoods and communities play a key role and could have a significant effect on how concentrated or dispersed these populations are. For these reasons, ranges are also being reported, which reflect the actual range of the number of individuals in each supervisorial district based on the data analyzed.

In addition, some of the demographics reported are based on the number of families. Since the Block Groups were split using population data, it is possible that the splitting might result in different values if the splitting methodology used the proportional number of families rather than population totals. Because of the time restraints, this analysis was not completed. However, it is believed the difference would not likely be significant.

The number of individuals with income to poverty ratio of less than 1.99 and families with family income of less than \$45,000 are reported to estimate the number of individuals or families that might be eligible for need-based services. One of the criteria for some need-based services is having a family income of less than 300% of the federal poverty limit. This measure is not directly reported in Census 2000, therefore, the two estimates reported were used to assist in estimating this measure. The income limit of \$45,000 was derived by calculating the average of the 300% federal poverty limit for a three- and four-person family and rounded to the nearest income level as reported in Census 2000.

For a summary of the estimated data, see the attached memorandum from Steven Golden, Associate Planner.

Mapping

In addition to the data summary, the Board requested maps be developed comparing areas of poverty using Census geographies to where senior nutrition sites are located and locations

where services to children are provided through the First Five Commission. These maps have been developed and are included as an attachment to this transmittal (Attachments 2 & 3).

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

This report will not be used for the purposed of evaluating services.

STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL

The Clerk of the Board will file and maintain a copy of this report.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Memorandum from Planning Office
- Attachment 2: Map of Adults 65 Years and Older in Poverty by Block Group with Senior Nutrition Sites (original map on file with the Clerk of the Board)
- Attachment 3: Map of Children Less Than 5 Years Old in Poverty by Block Group with First Five Commission Service Locations (original map on file with the Clerk of the Board)
- Attachment 4: CSFC Transmittal, February 16, 2005, Item 9

DATE: September 27, 2005

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Steven Golden,
Planner III, Planning Office

RE: Response to Board Request for Census Data from June 21, 2005

On June 21, 2005, the Board of Supervisors requested that poverty related data based on Census 2000 information be developed for Supervisor Districts Four and Five. Subsequently, the referral was expanded to include all supervisorial districts. This data was to focus on individuals that may be eligible for need based services with a focus on seniors, children, and families that may receive assistance through the Senior Nutrition Program or the First Five Commission. The following memo describes the methodology of estimating the data by supervisorial district.

"Estimating Methodology"

(This is similar to the memo submitted to the Children Seniors and Families Committee on February 16, 2005)

Supervisorial Districts were previously created through the Redistricting Program that occurred in 2001. These districts were created by assembling Census Blocks and establishing boundaries coincident with Census Block boundaries. However, the U.S. Census Bureau does not release poverty based data at the Census Block geographical level. The Board of Supervisors has requested to use the smallest level of geography possible to report the data by supervisorial district. Some poverty based data is available at the Census Block Group level. The available Census data at the Block Group level was used, but not all of the 1010 total Block Group boundaries are coincident with supervisorial district boundaries (i.e. supervisorial districts split a number of Block Group areas). Consequently, the data had to be estimated using the most practical and appropriate method available. The derived method follows:

- For those Block Groups that were entirely located in a particular supervisorial district, 100% of the data went to that particular district.
- There were a total of 69 split Block Groups between two supervisorial districts. There were 3 categories for estimating data for these Block Groups as follows:
 - 100% of total population – For 24 of these Block Groups, one section of the split Block Group had 100% of the total population, therefore 100% of the data was assigned to the supervisorial district containing the population.
 - >90% of total population – 20 Block Groups were split where >90% of the total population were located in one section of the split Block Group. In these cases, all of the data was assigned to the Supervisorial District containing the portion of the Block Group that had >90% of the population.
 - <90% of total population – 25 Block Groups were split where <90% of the total population were located in either section of the split Block Group. In these cases the data was assigned to each supervisorial district according to the percentage of total population for that section of the Block Group.

Data was obtained from Summary File 3 (sample population), 2000 Census, U.S. Census Bureau using the Bureau's online database, American FactFinder.

Poverty Definition

The Census Bureau uses the federal government's official poverty definition. The Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) Directive 14 prescribes this definition as the official poverty measure for federal agencies to use in their statistical work. The following is from the U.S. Census Bureau's website:

How Poverty Status is Determined

The poverty status of families and unrelated individuals in 1999 was determined using 48 thresholds (income cutoffs) arranged in a two dimensional matrix. The matrix consists of family size (from 1 person to 9 or more people) cross-classified by presence and number of family members under 18 years old (from no children present to 8 or more children present). Unrelated individuals and 2-person families were further differentiated by the age of the reference person (RP) (under 65 years old and 65 years old and over).

To determine a person's poverty status, one compares the person's total family income with the poverty threshold appropriate for that person's family size and composition (see table below). If the total income of that person's family is less than the threshold appropriate for that family, then the person is considered poor, together with every member of his or her family. If a person is not living with anyone related by birth, marriage, or adoption, then the person's own income is compared with his or her poverty threshold.

Weighted average thresholds. Even though the official poverty data are based on the 48 thresholds arranged by family size and number of children within the family, data users often want to get an idea of the "average" threshold for a given family size. The weighted average thresholds provide that summary. They are weighted averages because for any given family size, families with a certain number of children may be more or less common than families with a different number of children. In other words, among 3-person families, there are more families with two adults and one child than families with three adults. To get the weighted average threshold for families of a particular size, multiply each threshold by the number of families for whom that threshold applies; then add up those products, and divide by the total number of families who are of that family size.

For example, for 3-person families, 1999 weighted thresholds were calculated in the following way using information from the 2000 Current Population Survey:

<u>Family type</u>	<u>Number of families</u>		<u>Threshold</u>
No children (three adults)	5,213	*	\$13,032 = \$67,935,816
One child (two adults)	8,208	*	\$13,410 = \$110,069,280
Two children (one adult)	2,656	*	\$13,423 = \$35,651,488
Totals	16,077		\$213,656,584

Source: Current Population Survey, March 2000.

Dividing \$213,656,584 by 16,077 (the total number of 3-person families) yields \$13,290, the weighted average threshold for 3-person families. Please note that the thresholds are weighted not just by the number of poor families, but by all families for which the thresholds apply: the thresholds are used to determine which families are *at or above* poverty, as well as below poverty.

Individuals for whom poverty status is determined. Poverty status was determined for all people except institutionalized people, people in military group quarters, people in college dormitories, and unrelated individuals under 15 years old. These groups also were excluded from the numerator and denominator when calculating poverty rates. They are considered neither "poor" nor "nonpoor."

Specified poverty levels. For various reasons, the official poverty definition does not satisfy all the needs of data users. Therefore, some of the data reflect the number of people below different percentages of the poverty level. These specified poverty levels are obtained by multiplying the official thresholds by the appropriate factor. For example, the average income cutoff at 125 percent of the poverty level was \$21,286 (\$17,029 x 1.25) in 1999 for family of four people.

Poverty Thresholds in 1999 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years Old
(Dollars)

Size of Family Unit	Weighted Average Threshold	Related children under 18 years								
		None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight or more
One person (unrelated individual)	8501									
Under 65 years old	8667	8667								
65 years old and over	7990	7990								
Two People	10869									
Householder under 65 years old	11214	11158	11483							
Householder 65 years old and over	10075	10070	11440							
Three people	13290	13032	13410	13423						
Four people	17029	17184	17465	16895	16954					
Five people	20127	20723	21024	20380	19882	19578				
Six people	22727	23835	23930	23436	22964	22261	21845			
Seven people	25912	27425	27596	27006	26595	25828	24934	23953		
Eight people	28967	30673	30944	30387	29899	29206	28327	27412	27180	
Nine people or more	34417	36897	37076	36583	36169	35489	34554	33708	33499	32208

Summary of Data

The values reported are only an estimation based on the methodology used. It is possible that the technique used to assign data amongst split Block Groups does not accurately represent the actual distribution of individuals for each demographic criterion analyzed because there is immeasurable uncertainty in the level of correlation between total population and each demographic criterion analyzed. Local characteristics of neighborhoods and communities play a key role and could have a significant effect on how concentrated or dispersed these populations are. For these reasons, ranges are also being reported, which reflect the actual range of the number of individuals in each supervisorial district based on the data analyzed.

In addition, some of the demographics reported are based on the number of families. Since the Block Groups were split using population data, it is possible that the splitting might result in

different values if the splitting methodology used the proportional number of families rather than population totals. Because of the time restraints, this analysis was not completed. However, it is believed the difference would not likely be significant.

The number of individuals with income to poverty ratio of $<1.99^1$ and families with family income $< \$45,000$ are reported to estimate the number of individuals or families that might be eligible for need based services. One of the criteria for some need based services is having a family income $< 300\%$ of the federal poverty limit. This measure is not directly reported in Census 2000, therefore, the two estimates reported were used to assist in estimating this measure. The income limit of \$45,000 was derived by calculating the average of the 300% federal poverty limit for a 3- and 4-person family² and rounded to the nearest income level as reported in Census 2000.

Notes (For all tables):

1. As calculated using the "Estimating Methodology"
2. Population for whom poverty status is determined

Table 1A. Individuals with Income to Poverty Ratio of <1.99

	Total Population ^{1,2}	Individuals with Income to Poverty Ratio of $<1.99^1$	Percent of Individuals with Income to Poverty Ratio of <1.99
District 1	329,595	47,604	16.0%
District 2	324,122	106,192	35.8%
District 3	331,028	48,200	16.2%
District 4	337,499	58,028	19.6%
District 5	331,288	36,784	12.4%
Total	1,653,532	296,808	100%

Table 1B.

	Range: Total Population ^{1,2}	Range: Individuals with Income to Poverty Ratio of $<1.99^1$
District 1	86,322 – 89,032	26,028 – 27,127
District 2	88,680 – 89,854	24,018 – 24,624
District 3	77,425 – 79,616	24,563 – 24,959
District 4	70,543 – 74,573	32,841 – 34,889
District 5	72,660 – 74,404	42,011 – 42,731

¹ This is the highest income to poverty ratio reported in Census 2000 data.

² The average family size in Santa Clara County is 3.41.

Table2A. Families with Family Income <\$45,000

	Total Families ¹	Families w/Family Income <\$45,000 ¹	Percent of Families w/Family Income <\$45,000
District 1	84,984	16,335	17.5%
District 2	64,469	25,064	26.9%
District 3	78,221	16,226	17.4%
District 4	84,697	21,954	23.6%
District 5	87,394	13,537	14.5%
Total	399,765	93,116	100%

Table 2B.

	Range: Total Families ¹		Range: Families w/Family Income <\$45,000 ¹	
District 1	318,739	– 340,074	46,878	– 48,735
District 2	319,512	– 329,827	105,474	– 107,421
District 3	322,642	– 342,454	46,781	– 49,853
District 4	318,913	– 348,588	55,280	– 59,305
District 5	324,254	– 342,059	36,045	– 37,842

Table 3A. Families in Poverty with children <5 years old (can include families with older children) and Families with children <18 years old

	Total Families ¹	Families with Children <5yrs ¹ in Poverty	Percent of Families with Children <5yrs in Poverty	Families with Children <18yrs ¹ in Poverty	Percent of Families with Children <18yrs in Poverty
District 1	84,984	1,110	15.6%	2,547	17.2%
District 2	64,469	2,876	40.5%	5,395	36.4%
District 3	78,221	1,101	15.5%	2,356	15.9%
District 4	84,697	1,348	19.0%	2,702	18.2%
District 5	87,394	661	9.3%	1,841	12.4%
Total	399,765	7,096	100%	14,841	100%

Table 3B.

	Range: Total Families ¹		Range: Families w/Children <5yrs ¹ in Poverty		Range: Families w/Children <18yrs ¹ in Poverty	
District 1	82,071	– 87,781	1,095	– 1,127	2,508	– 2,595
District 2	63,366	– 65,915	2,854	– 2,913	5,368	– 5,462
District 3	76,161	– 80,997	1,055	– 1,157	2,256	– 2,476
District 4	79,673	– 87,717	1,261	– 1,380	2,512	– 2,792
District 5	85,545	– 90,304	643	– 707	1,782	– 1,931

Table 4A. Children <5 years old in poverty

	Total Children <5 years ¹	Children <5 years in Poverty ¹	Percent of Children <5 years in Poverty
District 1	23,821	1,556	16.4%
District 2	25,990	4,029	42.5%
District 3	23,865	1,385	14.6%
District 4	22,837	1,695	17.9%
District 5	19,417	812	8.6%
Total	115,930	9,477	100%

Table 4B.

	Range: Total Children <5 years ¹		Range: Children <5 in Poverty ¹	
District 1	82,071	– 87,781	16,100	– 16,722
District 2	63,366	– 65,915	24,806	– 25,463
District 3	76,161	– 80,997	15,817	– 16,783
District 4	79,673	– 87,717	20,826	– 22,520
District 5	85,545	– 90,304	13,232	– 13,963

Table 5A. Children <18 years old in poverty

	Total Children <18 years ¹	Children <18 years in Poverty ¹	Percent of Children <18 years in Poverty
District 1	89,032	6,237	17.1%
District 2	89,854	15,321	41.9%
District 3	79,616	5,474	15.0%
District 4	74,573	5,848	16.0%
District 5	74,404	3,669	10.0%
Total	407,479	36,549	100%

Table 5B.

	Range: Total Children <18 years ¹		Range: Children <18 years in Poverty ¹	
District 1	2,508	– 2,595	1,095	– 1,110
District 2	5,368	– 5,462	2,854	– 2,876
District 3	2,256	– 2,476	1,055	– 1,101
District 4	2,512	– 2,792	1,261	– 1,348
District 5	1,782	– 1,931	643	– 661

Table 6A. Seniors 65 years and older in Poverty

	Total Seniors 65yrs+ ¹	Seniors 65yrs+ in Poverty ¹	Percent of Seniors 65yrs+ in Poverty
District 1	27,127	1,373	14.0%
District 2	24,624	2,726	27.7%
District 3	24,959	1,552	15.8%
District 4	34,889	2,418	24.6%
District 5	42,731	1,773	18.0%
Total	154,330	9,842	100%

Table 6B.

	Range: Total Seniors 65yrs+ ¹			Range: Seniors 65yrs+ in Poverty ¹		
District 1	82,071	–	84,984	2,508	–	2,547
District 2	63,366	–	64,469	5,368	–	5,395
District 3	76,161	–	78,221	2,256	–	2,356
District 4	79,673	–	84,697	2,512	–	2,702
District 5	85,545	–	87,394	1,782	–	1,841