Advancing Health Equity and Inclusive Growth in the Sacramento Region
Summary
List of indicators

DEMOGRAPHICS

1) How racially/ethnically diverse is the city?
   - Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, 2014
   - Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black and White Populations by Ancestry, 2014
   - Percent People of Color by Census Block Group, 2014

2) How is the area's population changing over time?
   - Growth Rates of Major Racial/Ethnic Groups by Nativity, 2000 to 2014
   - Net Change in Population by Geography, 2000 to 2010
   - Race/Ethnic Composition, 1980 to 2014
   - Race/Ethnicity Dot Map, 1990 and 2014
   - Racial Generation Gap: Percent People of Color (POC) by Age Group, 1980 to 2014
   - Median Age by Race/Ethnicity, 2014
   - English-Speaking Ability Among Immigrants by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014
   - Linguistic Isolation by Census Tract, 2014

ECONOMIC VITALITY

1) Is the city producing good jobs?
   - Average Annual Growth in Jobs and GDP, 1990 to 2007 and 2009 to 2014
   - Growth in Jobs and Earnings by Industry Wage Level, 1990 to 2012

2) Can all residents access good jobs?
   - How close is the region/city to reaching full employment?
     - Unemployment Rate, August 2016
     - Unemployment Rate by Census Tract, 2014
     - Unemployment Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2014
     - Unemployment Rate by Educational Attainment and Race/Ethnicity, 2014
   - Can all workers earn a living wage?
     - Median Hourly Wage by Educational Attainment and Race/Ethnicity, 2014

3) Is growth widely shared?
   - Are incomes increasing for all workers?
     - Real Earned Income Growth for Full-Time Wage and Salary Workers, 1979 to 2014
     - Median Hourly Wage by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014
   - Is the middle class expanding?
     - Households by Income Level, 1979 and 2014
   - Is the middle class becoming more inclusive?
     - Racial Composition of Middle Class Households and All Households, 1979 and 2014
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Is inequality low and decreasing?
  Income Inequality, 1979 to 2014

4) Do all residents have enough income to sustain their families?
   Is poverty low and decreasing?
     Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014
     Child Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, 2014
     Percent Population Below the Poverty Level by Census Tract, 2014

5) Is the share of working poor low and decreasing?
   Working Poor Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014

6) What are the strongest industries and occupations?
   Strong Industries Analysis, 2014
   Strong Occupations Analysis, 2011
   Industry Employment Projections, 2014-2022
   Occupational Employment Projections, 2014-2022

7) Is race/ethnicity/nativity a barrier to economic success and occupational health and safety?
   Occupational Opportunity Index: Occupations by Opportunity Level for Workers with a High School Diploma or Less
   Occupational Opportunity Index: Occupations by Opportunity Level for Workers with More Than a High School Diploma But Less Than a BA Degree
   Occupational Opportunity Index: Occupations by Opportunity Level for Workers with a BA Degree or Higher
   Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, All Workers
   Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, Workers with Low Educational Attainment
   Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, Workers with Middle Educational Attainment
   Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, Workers with High Educational Attainment

READINESS

1) Does the workforce have the skills for the jobs of the future?
   Share of Working-Age Population with an Associate's Degree or Higher by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, 2014, and Projected Share of Jobs that Require an Associate's Degree or Higher, 2020

2) Are all children receiving access to opportunity?
   Composite Child Opportunity Index by Census Tract

3) Are youth ready to enter the workforce?
   Share of 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not Enrolled in School and without a High School Diploma by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, 1990 to 2014
   Share of 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not Enrolled in School and without a High School Diploma by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 1990 to 2014
   Disconnected Youth: 16 to 24-Year-Olds Not in School or Work by Race/Ethnicity, 1990 to 2014
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Disconnected Youth: 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not in School or Work by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 1990 to 2014

4) Are residents healthy?
   Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?
   Life expectancy by Geography, 2014
   Life expectancy by Race/Ethnicity, 2014
   Adult Overweight and Obesity Rates by Geography, 2012
   Adult Overweight and Obesity Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012
   Adult Diabetes Rates by Geography, 2012
   Adult Diabetes Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012
   Do all residents live in areas with clean air?
   Air Pollution: Exposure Index by Race/Ethnicity
   Air Pollution: Exposure Index by Poverty Status
   Adult Asthma Rates by Geography, 2012
   Adult Asthma Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012
   Adult Angina or Coronary Heart Disease Rates by Geography, 2012
   Adult Angina or Coronary Heart Disease Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012

5) Do residents have access to health insurance and health care services?
   Health Insurance Rates by Geography, 2014
   Health Insurance Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

CONNECTEDNESS

1) Can all residents access affordable, quality housing?
   Percent Rent-Burdened Households by Census Tract, 2014
   Share of Affordable Rental Housing Units, 2014

   Low-Wage Jobs, Affordable Rental Housing, and Jobs-Housing Ratio, 2014
   Renter Housing Burden by Race/Ethnicity, 2010-2014
   Homeowner Housing Burden by Race/Ethnicity, 2010-2014

2) Do residents have transportation choices?
   Percent Households without a Vehicle by Census Tract, 2014
   Means of Transportation to Work by Annual Earnings, 2014
   Percent Using Public Transit by Annual Earnings and Race/Ethnicity, 2014
   Average Travel Time to Work in Minutes by Census Tract, 2014

3) Do neighborhoods reflect the region's diversity?
   Residential Segregation, 1980 to 2012
   Residential Segregation, 1990 and 2010, Measured by the Dissimilarity Index

4) Can all residents access healthy food?
   Percent People of Color by Census Block Group and Low Food Access Block Groups, 2014
   Racial/Ethnic Composition of Food Environments, 2014
   Poverty Composition of Food Environments, 2014

BENEFITS OF EQUITY

1) What are the economic benefits of inclusion?
   Actual GDP and Estimated GDP without Racial Gaps in Income, 2014
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What is an equitable county?

Regions are equitable when all residents – regardless of race/ethnicity, family income, neighborhood of residence or other characteristics – can fully participate in the region’s economic vitality, contribute to its readiness for the future, and connect to its assets and resources.

Strong, equitable regions:

- Are **ready for the future**, with a skilled, ready workforce, and a healthy population.
- Are **places of connection**, where residents can access the essential ingredients to live healthy and productive lives in their own neighborhoods, reach opportunities located throughout the region (and beyond) via transportation or technology, participate in political processes, and interact with other diverse residents.
- Possess **economic vitality**, providing high-quality jobs to their residents and producing new ideas, products, businesses, and economic activity so the region remains sustainable and competitive.
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Why equity matters now

The face of America is changing. Our country’s population is rapidly diversifying. Already, more than half of all babies born in the United States are people of color. By 2030, the majority of young workers will be people of color. And by 2044, the United States will be a majority people-of-color nation.

Yet racial and income inequality is high and persistent.

Over the past several decades, long-standing inequities in income, wealth, health, and opportunity have reached unprecedented levels. And while most have been affected by growing inequality, communities of color have felt the greatest pains as the economy has shifted and stagnated.

Racial and economic equity is necessary for the nation’s economic growth and prosperity.

Equity is an economic and health imperative as well as a moral one. Research shows that equity and diversity are win-win propositions for nations, regions, communities, and firms.

For example:

- More equitable regions experience stronger, more sustained growth.¹
- Regions with less segregation (by race and income) and lower income inequality have more upward mobility.²
- Researchers predict that health equity would lead to significant economic benefits from reductions in health care spending and lost productivity.³
- Companies with a diverse workforce achieve a better bottom line.⁴
- A diverse population more easily connects to global markets.⁵
- Greater economic equity results in better health outcomes for everyone.⁶

Counts play a critical role in building this new growth model.

Local communities are where strategies are being incubated that foster equitable growth; growing good jobs and new businesses while ensuring that all – including low-income people and people of color – can fully participate and prosper.

The way forward is with an equity-driven growth model.

To secure America’s health and prosperity, the nation must implement a new economic model based on equity, fairness, and opportunity. Public and private policies and investments must support equitable economic growth strategies, healthy and opportunity-rich neighborhoods, and “cradle-to-career” educational pathways.
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Health equity is critical to inclusive growth

Equity is just and fair inclusion into a society in which all can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential – unlocking the promise of the nation by unlocking the promise in us all. Health equity, the opportunity for everyone to attain their highest level of health,\(^1\) is a key part of inclusive economic growth and prosperity.

Many of the conditions that support inclusive growth are the same conditions that support health equity. A healthy population is better able to secure jobs and participate at their full capacity, creating a vibrant regional economy. In a highly complementary way, equitable economic growth – where all residents have opportunities to secure good jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities – supports the health of residents throughout the region. This happens through greater financial security, which reduces stress and increases people’s ability to secure health care and preventive services.\(^2\)

A long history of structural racism created the nation’s current landscape of concentrated advantage and disadvantage, leaving too many communities of color without the supportive infrastructure that helps everyone be healthy. Equitable regions must work to improve these conditions. Policymakers and advocates can promote policies and practices that foster full racial inclusion.

There are several ways that regions can support the health and economic security of all residents and foster equitable growth for the region overall.

---

\(^1\) The American Public Health Association, see https://www.apha.org/topics-and-issues/health-equity.

\(^2\) Steven Woolf et al, How Are Income and Wealth Linked to Economic Longevity. The Urban Institute and the Center on Society and Health, April 2015.
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Building a Culture of Health through inclusive growth

**Economic Vitality**
In a region that cultivates inclusive growth and health equity, good jobs will be available for all residents to access, and residents will have enough income to sustain their families and save for the future. The region will have growing industries, and race/ethnicity/nativity will not be a barrier to economic success. Economic growth will be widely shared, and incomes among lower paid workers will be increasing. These factors are beneficial to the region, since income is a documented health determinant, and reduced economic inequality has been linked to better health outcomes for everyone.

**Readiness**
In a region that cultivates inclusive growth and health equity, all residents will have the skills needed for jobs of the future and youth will be ready to enter the workforce. There will be high levels of good health throughout the population, and any racial gaps in health will be decreasing. Residents will have health insurance and will be able to readily access health care services. Local environments in areas like education, housing, air and water quality, and public transportation will support good health for all residents – allowing everyone to participate fully in the local economy.

**Connectedness**
In a region that cultivates inclusive growth and health equity, residents will have good transportation choices linking residents to a wide range of services that support good health. Many residents will choose to walk, bike, and take public transit – increasing exercise for these residents and reducing air pollution, which are both health determinants. Neighborhoods will reflect the region's diversity, and all residents will wield political power to make their voices heard.
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Building a Culture of Health through inclusive growth

**Healthy, Economically Secure People**

- Good jobs, available for all
- Adequate income for all residents
- Growing regional industries
- Economic growth widely shared
- Increasing incomes among lower paid workers
- Reduced economic inequality

**Strong Regional Economic Growth**

- Skills for the jobs of the future
- Youth ready to enter the workforce
- Good population health and reduced racial health gaps
- Health insurance coverage and access to health services
- Health-supporting local environments in education and air quality

**Connectedness**

- Transportation choices, including walking, biking, and public transit
- Connections to health-supporting services throughout the region
- Diversity and inclusion across neighborhoods
- Shared political power and voice

**Policies and Practice that Address Structural Racism and Foster Full Inclusion**
Introduction

Geography

This profile describes demographic, economic, and health conditions in the Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville metropolitan area portrayed in black on the map to the right. This region is made up of the following four counties: El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo.

Unless otherwise noted, all data follow this regional geography, which is simply referred to as “Sacramento.”
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Equity indicators framework

The indicators in this profile are presented in four sections. The first section describes the region's demographics. The next three sections present indicators of the region's economic vitality, readiness, and connectedness. Below are the questions answered within each of the four sections.

**Demographics:**
Who lives in the region and how is this changing?
- Is the population growing?
- Which groups are driving growth?
- How diverse is the population?
- How does the racial composition vary by age?

**Economic vitality:**
How is the region doing on measures of economic growth and well-being?
- Is the region producing good jobs?
- Can all residents access good jobs?
- Is growth widely shared?
- Do all residents have enough income to sustain their families?
- Are race/ethnicity and nativity barriers to economic success?
- What are the strongest industries and occupations?

**Readiness:**
How prepared are the region’s residents for the 21st century economy?
- Does the workforce have the skills for the jobs of the future?
- Are all youth ready to enter the workforce?
- Are residents healthy?
- Are racial gaps in education and health decreasing?

**Connectedness:**
Are the region’s residents and neighborhoods connected to one another and to the region’s assets and opportunities?
- Do residents have transportation choices?
- Can residents access jobs and opportunities located throughout the region?
- Can all residents access affordable, quality, convenient housing?
- Do neighborhoods reflect the region’s diversity? Is segregation decreasing?
- Can all residents access healthy food?
Demographics

**Highlights**

Who lives in the region and how is it changing?

- Growth in the Sacramento region’s communities of color outpaced overall population growth.

- The region’s fastest-growing demographic groups are also younger than Whites on average.

- The U.S.-born Latino population grew by over 134,000 people while the U.S.-born White population grew by less than 38,000 people.

- The region’s racial generation gap has doubled since 1980. A large racial generation gap (the difference in the share of seniors of color and youth of color) often corresponds with lower investments in educational systems and infrastructure to support youth.

Growth in Black immigrant population since 2000:

**122%**

The median age of Latinos in the region:

**27**

Racial generation gap in 2014:

**32** percentage points
Demographics

How racially/ethnically diverse is the region?

The region is whiter than the state as a whole. Whites (including White immigrants) account for 55% of the population, compared to 39% statewide. Latinos make up nearly 21 percent of the region’s population and Asian/Pacific Islanders account for another 13 percent.

Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, 2014

- White, U.S.-born: 51%
- White, Immigrant: 4%
- Black, U.S.-born: 0.5%
- Black, Immigrant: 7%
- Latino, U.S.-born: 5.8%
- Latino, Immigrant: 5.8%
- API, U.S.-born: 15%
- API, Immigrant: 4%
- Native American and Alaska Native: 7%
- Mixed/other: 0.3%

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
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How racially/ethnically diverse is the region?

Communities of color in the region are diverse. People of Mexican ancestry make up the largest Latino subgroup, but those of Central American ancestry are most likely to be immigrants. Southeast Asians make up the largest API ancestry group while South Asians are most likely to be immigrants.

Asian or Pacific Islander, Latino, White and Black Populations by Ancestry, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asian (all)</td>
<td>39,359</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian (all)</td>
<td>120,714</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian (all)</td>
<td>81,491</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander (all)</td>
<td>12,650</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>31,375</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>285,588</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>294,865</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>9,612</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>8,997</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Latinos</td>
<td>129,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>452,847</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western European (all)</td>
<td>698,221</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European (all)</td>
<td>101,394</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American (all)</td>
<td>179,186</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African</td>
<td>21,208</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>201,114</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,201,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European (all)</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American (all)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean/West Indian (all)</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African/Southwest Asian (all)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan African (all)</td>
<td>10,419</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Other Black</td>
<td>135,762</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,915</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Demographics

How racially/ethnically diverse is the region?

Communities of color are spread throughout Sacramento, but are more concentrated on the west side of the region. People of color make up the majority of Sacramento and Yolo Counties, while El Dorado and Placer Counties are much less diverse.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
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How is the area’s population changing over time?

Communities of color and immigrants are driving the region’s growth. The Black immigrant population is relatively small but was the fastest growing over the last decade adding over 4,000 people. U.S.-born Asians and Pacific Islanders and Latinos added over 55,000 and 134,000 residents respectively.

Growth Rates of Major Racial/Ethnic Groups by Nativity, 2000 to 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Demographics

How is the area’s population changing over time?

Growth in communities of color has outpaced population growth across the region. While the overall population increased by nearly 22 percent from 2000 to 2014, the people of color population grew by nearly 53 percent. The people of color population grew fastest in Placer County.

Net Change in Population by Geography, 2000 to 2014

- People of Color Growth
- Population Growth

Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA
- Yolo: People of Color Growth 21%, Population Growth 48%
- Placer: People of Color Growth 46%, Population Growth 120%
- El Dorado: People of Color Growth 16%, Population Growth 59%
- Sacramento: People of Color Growth 19%, Population Growth 48%
- Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA: People of Color Growth 22%, Population Growth 53%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
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How is the area’s population changing over time?

Though Whites still make up a majority, demographic change is happening quickly in the region. The Latino population share has more than doubled since 1980 and the Asian and Pacific Islander population share more than tripled. The White population share has declined from 79 percent in 1980 to 55 percent in 2014.

Racial/Ethnic Composition, 1980 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mixed/other</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.
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How is the area’s population changing over time?

The White population, represented by grey dots, still make up a majority of the region, with notable increases in the Latino and Asian or Pacific Islander population. There's been considerable population growth across the region, notably in the city of Roseville and south of the El Dorado Freeway.

Race/Ethnicity Dot Map, 1990 and 2014

Race/ethnicity
1 Dot = 35
- White
- Black
- Latino
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Native American
- Mixed/other

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, GeoLytics, Inc.; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.

Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
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How is the area’s population changing over time?

The racial generation gap has doubled since 1980. By 2014, 58 percent of youth were of color compared with just 26 percent of seniors. A large racial generation gap often corresponds with lower investments in educational systems and infrastructure to support youth.

Racial Generation Gap:
Percent People of Color (POC) by Age Group, 1980 to 2014

- Percent of seniors who are POC
- Percent of youth who are POC

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Note: Youth include persons under age 18 and seniors include those age 65 or older. Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
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How is the area’s population changing over time?

The region’s fastest-growing demographic groups are younger than Whites. People of other or mixed races have the youngest median age at 21 years old. The median ages of Latinos (27), Asians or Pacific Islanders (34), and African Americans (34) are lower than that of Whites (44).

Median Age by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
As a whole, 29 percent Sacramento’s immigrants do not speak English well or at all, including just over one in four API immigrants and one in five White immigrants. Language barriers are known to impact access to health and other vital services.

English-Speaking Ability Among Immigrants by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014

Percent speaking English...

- Only
- Very Well
- Well
- Not Well
- None

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes all persons ages 5 or older.
Note: Data for some groups by race/ethnicity/nativity in some years are excluded due to small sample size. Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
There are pockets of linguistic isolation throughout the region, with higher concentrations in Yolo and Sacramento Counties. Linguistically isolated households are defined as those in which no member age 14 or older speaks only English or speaks English at least “very well.”

Linguistic Isolation by Census Tract, 2014

- Less than 3%
- 3% to 7%
- 7% to 12%
- 12% to 18%
- 18% or more

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Economic Vitality

Highlights

How is the region doing on measures of growth and well-being?

• Job growth has grown in step with the nation since 1990, but GDP growth lags behind the national average.

• Low-wage jobs have grown the fastest since 1990, but earnings per worker have declined.

• Although education is a leveler, racial gaps persist in the labor market. Even at the highest levels of education, Black workers earn $6/hour less than their White counterparts.

• Poverty and working poverty have grown over the last decade. Latinos are four times as likely as Whites to be working full-time with a family income less than 150 percent of poverty.

Real wage growth for the bottom 50 percent of workers since 1979:

-1%

Share of Black children living in poverty:

30%

Wage gap between Whites and Latinos:

$8/hour
Economic Vitality

Is the region producing good jobs?

**Sacramento is still recovering from the Great Recession.** Pre-downturn, the region’s economy outperformed the nation in terms of job and GDP growth. Since 2009, jobs have grown at the same rate as the U.S. overall while GDP growth has lagged the national average.

Average Annual Growth in Jobs and GDP, 1990 to 2007 and 2009 to 2014

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.
Economic Vitality
Is the region producing good jobs?

Low-wage jobs have grown considerably faster than high-wage jobs from 1990 to 2012—and this growth is modest when compared to the state overall. Importantly, only middle-wage jobs saw an increase in earnings per worker in Sacramento. Earnings per worker have decreased among low-wage jobs in the region.

Growth in Jobs and Earnings by Industry Wage Level, 1990 to 2012

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. Universe includes all jobs covered by the federal Unemployment Insurance (UI) program.
Access to Good Jobs
How close is the region to reaching full employment?

Unemployment has declined in the region and is nearly identical to the national rate. The unemployment rate in the country was 4.8 percent in November of 2016, and it was 5 percent in California. In Sacramento, it was 4.9 percent.

Unemployment Rate, November 2016

- United States: 4.8%
- California: 5.0%
- Sacramento-Roseville-Arden Arcade, CA Metro Area: 4.9%

Access to Good Jobs

How close is the region to reaching full employment?

**Unemployment is lower in Sacramento than the state overall, but it varies geographically.** Unemployment rates were less than 7 percent in neighborhoods like Land Park in Sacramento, but 16 percent or higher in communities located in the southern most part of Sacramento County.

---

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.

Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Access to Good Jobs
How close is the region to reaching full employment?

In 2014, unemployment was relatively high in the region and racial inequities persist. Rates of unemployment in the region are highest for African Americans (17.8 percent), those of Mixed/Other races (12.8 percent), and Latinos (11 percent). Whites and APIs have the lowest unemployment rates (9.4 and 8.4 percent respectively).

Unemployment Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes the civilian noninstitutional labor force ages 25 through 64.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Access to Good Jobs
How close is the region to reaching full employment?

Unemployment declines as education levels increase, but racial gaps remain. The Black unemployment rate among those without a HS diploma is 42 percent compared with 15 percent among Latinos. At the other end of the education spectrum, the Black and Latino unemployment rates are the same among those with a BA or higher.

Unemployment Rate by Educational Attainment and Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes the civilian noninstitutional labor force ages 25 through 64.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Access to Good Jobs
Can all workers earn a living wage?

Racial wage gaps persist regardless of education. In fact, the gaps are largest among the most educated part of the population: White workers with a BA or higher make $6/hour more, on average, than Black workers with the same level of education. The smallest gaps are among the population with some college education.

Median Hourly Wage by Educational Attainment and Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes civilian noninstitutional full-time wage and salary workers ages 25 through 64. Note: Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size. Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Dollar values are in 2010 dollars.
Inclusive growth
Are incomes increasing for all workers?

Only workers in the top 20 percent have seen their wages grow over the past three decades. Workers in the bottom 20th percentile have experienced the most significant wage declines. Wage declines have been steeper in Sacramento than in the U.S. overall among those in the bottom 10 percent, while wage increases have been stronger for those in the top 20 percent.

Real Earned Income Growth for Full-Time Wage and Salary Workers, 1979 to 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes civilian noninstitutional full-time wage and salary workers ages 25 through 64.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Inclusive growth
Are incomes increasing for all workers?

Wages have increased for Whites and decreased for people of color from 2000 to 2014. The White median wage increased by just over a dollar an hour. The Black median wage also grew nearly a dollar an hour while the Latino median wage declined a dollar an hour.

Median Hourly Wage by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$23.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>$19.60</td>
<td>$20.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>$17.70</td>
<td>$16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>$18.90</td>
<td>$18.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes civilian noninstitutional full-time wage and salary workers ages 25 through 64. Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Dollar values are in 2010 dollars.
Inclusive growth

Is the middle class expanding?

The city’s middle class has declined. Since 1979, the share of middle-income and upper-income households has declined three percentage points. Meanwhile, the share of lower-income households has increased by six percentage points.

Households by Income Level, 1979 and 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes all households (no group quarters).
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Dollar values are in 2010 dollars.
Inclusive growth
Is the middle class becoming more inclusive?

Though the middle class has declined, it’s also become more diverse. Latinos make up 15 percent of all households in Sacramento and 16 percent of middle class households. Whites make up 63 percent of all households and 64 percent of middle class households.

Racial Composition of Middle Class Households and All Households, 1979 and 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes all households (no group quarters).
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Inclusive growth

Is inequality low and decreasing?

Income inequality, as measure by the Gini coefficient, has increased each decade since 1979 in Sacramento. A growing body of research suggests that living in a community with high levels of income inequality is associated with lower life expectancy.

Income Inequality, 1979 to 2014

Inequality is measured here by the Gini coefficient for household income, which ranges from 0 (perfect equality) to 1 (perfect inequality: one household has all of the income).

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes all households (no group quarters). Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Economic security
Is poverty low and decreasing?

Poverty is on the rise in the region though Black and Latino poverty is highest. The overall poverty rate in 2014 was 16 percent but it goes as high as 29 percent among the Black population down to 11 percent for Whites.

Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes all persons not in group quarters.

Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups in some years are excluded due to small sample size.
Children of color also have the highest poverty rates. In 2014, more than one in five children in the region were in poverty. But Black children are more than twice as likely as White children to grow up in poverty. A wealth of research finds that children who grow up in poverty are more likely to have serious health problems.

Child Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

- All: 21%
- Black: 30%
- Latino: 21%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 21%
- Other: 20%
- White: 13%

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes the population under age 18 not in group quarters.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Economic security
Is poverty low and decreasing?

Poverty is growing in Sacramento and differences by neighborhood remain.

Percent Population Below the Poverty Level by Census Tract, 2014

- **Less than 7%**
- **7% to 10%**
- **10% to 16%**
- **16% to 25%**
- **25% or more**

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community. Universe includes all persons not in group quarters. Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Economic security
Is the share of working poor low and decreasing?

Rates of working poverty have increased for Black and Latino workers but remained stable among White workers. The working poor rate – defined as working full time with incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty – is highest among Latinos (8 percent) and Asians or Pacific Islanders (5 percent).

Working Poor Rate by Race/Ethnicity, 2000 and 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes the civilian noninstitutional population ages 25 through 64 not in group quarters.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups in some years are excluded due to small sample size.
Advancing Health Equity and Inclusive Growth in the Sacramento Region

Strong industries and occupations

What are the region’s strongest industries?

The health care and social assistance industry is one of strongest in the region—adding nearly 24,000 jobs from 2002 to 2012 with an average annual wage of $60k.

Strong Industries Analysis, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Job Quality</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Industry Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total employment</td>
<td>Location Quotient</td>
<td>Average annual wage</td>
<td>Change in employment</td>
<td>% Change in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>91,843</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$60,433</td>
<td>23,831</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>52,143</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$79,594</td>
<td>11,239</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>35,558</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$73,626</td>
<td>-5,666</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>43,304</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$26,994</td>
<td>10,774</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$95,021</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services</td>
<td>49,333</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$34,328</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>10,456</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$75,646</td>
<td>-1,110</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>91,547</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$29,933</td>
<td>-1,343</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>26,799</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$58,862</td>
<td>-22,963</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>38,480</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$54,685</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>69,369</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$16,759</td>
<td>6,353</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>13,774</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$34,911</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>14,399</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$66,119</td>
<td>-8,011</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>33,821</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$75,961</td>
<td>-14,648</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>12,315</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$41,040</td>
<td>-1,458</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>8,664</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$28,085</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>14,615</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>$22,693</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>18,137</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$43,203</td>
<td>-1,732</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$66,331</td>
<td>-302</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. Universe includes all jobs covered by the federal Unemployment Insurance (UI) program.
Note: Analysis reflects the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
# Strong industries and occupations

## What are the region’s strongest occupations?

Health Diagnosing and Treating Practitioners are one of the highest opportunity occupations with an average annual wage above $100k. Supervisors of protective service workers have seen considerable wage growth though overall employment numbers are fairly low.

## Strong Occupations Analysis, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Diagnosing and Treating Practitioners</td>
<td>25,360</td>
<td>$111,108</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers, Judges, and Related Workers</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>$114,531</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Protective Service Workers</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>$79,826</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>247%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Executives</td>
<td>14,770</td>
<td>$106,472</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Management Occupations</td>
<td>14,020</td>
<td>$95,213</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-540</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td>$98,132</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-310</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Specialties Managers</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>$95,417</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and System Operators</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$73,339</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>161%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising, Marketing, Promotions, Public Relations, and Sales Managers</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>$192,056</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Occupations</td>
<td>27,130</td>
<td>$79,961</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Scientists</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>$80,774</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Healthcare Practitioners and Technical Occupations</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>$78,026</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>$79,026</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairers</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>$82,126</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>162%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Workers</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>$74,170</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-3,310</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Scientists</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>$78,367</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Scientists and Related Workers</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>$75,071</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-780</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Science Occupations</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>$71,716</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-130</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Construction and Extraction Workers</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>$74,920</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1,960</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Workers</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>$66,260</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-570</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Teachers</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>$75,481</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-1,980</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations Specialists</td>
<td>35,420</td>
<td>$64,549</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-460</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Representatives, Wholesale and Manufacturing</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>$63,088</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-2,850</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafters, Engineering Technicians, and Mapping Technicians</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>$60,783</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Technologists and Technicians</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>$58,437</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool, Primary, Secondary, and Special Education School Teachers</td>
<td>26,680</td>
<td>$59,301</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians, Curators, and Archivists</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>$55,928</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Office and Administrative Support Workers</td>
<td>14,470</td>
<td>$60,640</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-820</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Analysis reflects the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
Strong industries and occupations

Which industries are projected to grow?

Industry Employment Projections, 2012-2022
Strong industries and occupations

Which occupations are projected to grow?

Occupational Employment Projections, 2012-2022
Strong industries and occupations

**Identifying high opportunity occupations**

Understanding which occupations are strong and competitive in the region can help leaders develop strategies to connect and prepare workers for good jobs. To identify “high-opportunity” occupations in the region, we developed an **occupation opportunity index** based on measures of job quality and growth, including median annual wage, real wage growth, job growth (in number and share), and median age of workers. A high median age of workers indicates that there will be replacement job openings as older workers retire.

**Occupation opportunity index =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job quality</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median annual wage</td>
<td>Real wage growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the number of jobs</td>
<td>Percent change in the number of jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age of workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strong industries and occupations

Identifying high opportunity occupations

Once the occupation opportunity index score was calculated for each occupation, occupations were sorted into three categories (high-, middle-, and low-opportunity). The average index score is zero, so an occupation with a positive value has an above average score while a negative value represents a below average score.

Because education level plays such a large role in determining access to jobs, we present the occupational analysis for each of three educational attainment levels: workers with a high school degree or less, workers with more than a high-school degree but less than a BA, and workers with a BA or higher.
Advancing Health Equity and Inclusive Growth in the Sacramento Region

Strong industries and occupations
Identifying high opportunity occupations

Supervisors of construction and extraction workers are the only high-opportunity jobs for workers with a high school diploma or less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Opportunity</td>
<td>Supervisor of Construction and Extraction Workers</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>$74,920</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>-1,960</td>
<td>-39.4%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Opportunity</td>
<td>Supervisor of Production Workers</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>$56,020</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-540</td>
<td>-25.1%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor of Transportation and Material Moving Workers</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$43,946</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-2,440</td>
<td>-24.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor of Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Workers</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>$42,088</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Opportunity</td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>$49,868</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Construction and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>$44,344</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-430</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and Mobile Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairs</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing Workers</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Workers and Plastic Workers</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Operators</td>
<td>17,170</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>-880</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Analysis reflects the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
Advancing Health Equity and Inclusive Growth in the Sacramento Region

Strong industries and occupations
Identifying high opportunity occupations

Supervisors of protective service workers, plant and system operators, and electric and electrical equipment mechanics, installers, and repairers are high-opportunity jobs for workers with more than a high school degree but less than a BA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment (2011)</th>
<th>Job Quality</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Protective Service Workers</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>$79,826</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and System Operators</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$71,339</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Equipment Mechanics, Installers, and Repairers</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>$52,126</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Workers</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>$74,170</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Workers</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>$66,260</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafters, Engineering Technicians, and Mapping Technicians</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>$60,783</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Technologists and Technicians</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>$58,437</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Office and Administrative Support Workers</td>
<td>14,470</td>
<td>$60,640</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Sales Workers</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>$57,652</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Support Workers</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>$36,201</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education, Training, and Library Occupations</td>
<td>12,730</td>
<td>$40,773</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries and Administrative Assistants</td>
<td>23,630</td>
<td>$41,155</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors of Sales Workers</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>$39,432</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, Physical, and Social Science Technicians</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>$37,116</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Clerks</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td>$33,480</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Healthcare Support Occupations</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td>$34,668</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Record Clerks</td>
<td>33,070</td>
<td>$33,124</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office and Administrative Support Workers</td>
<td>38,890</td>
<td>$19,048</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Office and Administrative Support Workers</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>$19,048</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation Opportunity Index: Occupations by Opportunity Level for Workers with More Than a High School Degree but Less Than a BA


Note: Analysis reflects the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
# Strong industries and occupations

## Identifying high opportunity occupations

Health diagnosing and treating practitioners, lawyers and judges, top executives, and other management occupations are high-opportunity occupations for workers with a bachelor's degree or higher.

## Occupation Opportunity Index: Occupations by Opportunity Level for Workers with a BA or Higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment (2011)</th>
<th>Job Quality</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Occupation Opportunity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Specialists</td>
<td>20,650</td>
<td>$62,437</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communication Workers</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>$58,350</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Design Workers</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>$45,768</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media and Communication Equipment Workers</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>$37,403</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Representatives, Services</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>$53,831</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors, Social Workers, and Other Community and Social Service Workers</td>
<td>11,420</td>
<td>$46,844</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainers and Performers, Sports and Related Workers</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>$32,690</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sales and Related Workers</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>$40,038</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers and Instructors</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>$40,429</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Diagnosing and Treating Practitioners</td>
<td>25,360</td>
<td>$111,108</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers, Judges, and Related Workers</td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td>$114,531</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Executives</td>
<td>14,770</td>
<td>$95,417</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Management Occupations</td>
<td>14,020</td>
<td>$95,417</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td>$80,274</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Specialties Managers</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>$79,961</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising, Marketing, Promotions, Public Relations, and Sales Managers</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>$75,873</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Occupations</td>
<td>27,130</td>
<td>$74,061</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Scientists</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>$80,274</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Healthcare Practitioners and Technical Occupations</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>$75,481</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects, Surveyors, and Cartographers</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>$75,071</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Scientists</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>$75,071</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Scientists and Related Workers</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>$71,716</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Science Occupations</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>$75,481</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Teachers</td>
<td>35,420</td>
<td>$64,459</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operations Specialists</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>$63,088</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Representatives, Wholesale and Manufacturing</td>
<td>26,680</td>
<td>$59,301</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool, Primary, Secondary, and Special Education School Teachers</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>$55,928</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians, Curators, and Archivists</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>$55,928</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Analysis reflects the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
Strong industries and occupations  
*Is race/ethnicity a barrier to economic success?*

Examining access to high-opportunity jobs by race/ethnicity, we find that White workers and Asian or Pacific Islander workers are most likely to be employed in high-opportunity occupations. Latino workers, on the other hand, are most likely to be in low-opportunity occupations.

**Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity, All Workers**

- **High Opportunity**
- **Middle Opportunity**
- **Low Opportunity**

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes the employed civilian non-institutional population ages 25 through 64. Note: Data on workers and the opportunity ranking for each worker’s occupation is based on analysis of the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.
Strong industries and occupations

Is race/ethnicity a barrier to economic success?

Among workers with a high school degree or less, White workers are most likely to be in high-opportunity occupations. Black workers are the most likely to be in middle opportunity jobs while Latino workers are the most likely to be in low-opportunity jobs.

Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity, Workers with Low Educational Attainment

- High Opportunity
- Middle Opportunity
- Low Opportunity


Note: Data on workers and the opportunity ranking for each worker’s occupation is based on analysis of the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Strong industries and occupations

Is race/ethnicity a barrier to economic success?

Differences in job opportunity are generally smaller for workers with middle education levels. White workers are still most likely to be found in high-opportunity jobs and Black workers in middle-opportunity jobs. Yet nearly three in ten Latino workers are in low-opportunity jobs.


Note: Data on workers and the opportunity ranking for each worker’s occupation is based on analysis of the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Strong industries and occupations
Is race/ethnicity a barrier to economic success?

Differences in access to high-opportunity jobs tend to decrease even more for workers with college degrees, though gaps across groups remain. Among the most educated workers, Black workers are the least likely to be in high opportunity jobs while Latino workers are most likely to be in low opportunity jobs.

Opportunity Ranking of Occupations by Race/Ethnicity, Workers with High Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>API</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Data on workers and the opportunity ranking for each worker's occupation is based on analysis of the Sacramento Core Based Statistical Area as defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Readiness

Highlights
How prepared are the region’s residents for the 21st century economy?

To build a Culture of Health—where every person, no matter where they live, has an equal opportunity to live the healthiest life possible—we must improve people’s opportunities to be healthier in the places where they live, learn, work and play.

• There is a looming skills and education gap for Latinos and African Americans, whose rates of postsecondary education (having at least an associate's degree) are lower than the share of future jobs that will require that level of education.

• Despite some progress since 2000, Latino young people were twice as likely as White youth to be without a high school degree and not in pursuit of one in 2014.

• The average Black resident of Sacramento has more exposure to air pollution than 90 percent of tracts in the United States

Percent of people of color with an AA degree or higher:

33%

Number of youth who are disconnected:

41,785

Share of Black adults with asthma:

15%
Skilled workforce

Does the workforce have the skills for the jobs of the future?

The education levels of the region’s population aren’t keeping up with employers’ educational demands. By 2020, an estimated 44 percent of California jobs will require at least an associate’s degree. Only 23 percent of Latinos and 31 percent of African Americans have that level of education now.

Share of Working-Age Population with an Associate’s Degree or Higher by Race/Ethnicity, 2014, and Projected Share of Jobs that Require an Associate’s Degree or Higher, 2020
Youth preparedness
Do all children have access to opportunity?

The highest levels of opportunities for children are concentrated near downtown Sacramento, north Roseville and the city of Rocklin. The areas ranked lowest on the child opportunity index include unincorporated communities and areas in all four counties.

Composite Child Opportunity Index by Census Tract

- Very High
- High
- Moderate
- Low
- Very Low

Source: The diversitydatakids.org project and the Kirwin Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity; U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.

Note: The Child Opportunity Index is a composite of indicators across three domains: educational opportunity, health and environmental opportunity, and social and economic opportunity. The vintage of the underlying indicator data varies, ranging from years 2007 through 2013. The map was created by applying Jenks natural breaks to census tract level Overall Child Opportunity Index Score values for the region.
Youth preparedness
Are youth ready to enter the workforce?

More of Sacramento’s youth are getting high school diplomas, but racial gaps remain. Despite improvements since 2000, Latino young people were more than twice as likely as White youth to be without a high school diploma and not in pursuit of one in 2014.

Share of 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not Enrolled in School and without a High School Diploma by Race/Ethnicity and Nativity, 1990 to 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups in some years are excluded due to small sample size.
Youth preparedness

Are youth ready to enter the workforce?

Young women are less likely than men to drop out of high school across all races/ethnicities. Young Latina women are the most likely among the female population to have been pushed out of school and young Latino men are the most likely among the male population.

Share of 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not Enrolled in School and without a High School Diploma by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Youth preparedness
Are youth ready to enter the workforce?

The number of disconnected youth has increased in each decade since 1990, and youth of color are disproportionately disconnected. Of the nearly 41,800 disconnected youth in 2014, 30 percent were Latino. Youth of color make up 59 percent of disconnected youth but 55 percent of all youth.

Disconnected Youth: 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not in School or Work by Race/Ethnicity, 1990 to 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Youth preparedness
Are youth ready to enter the workforce?

Young Latina women are slightly more likely than their male counterparts to be disconnected while the opposite is true for young Black and White women. Young White men make up 42 percent of disconnected young men in Sacramento while young White women make up 33 percent of disconnected young women.

Disconnected Youth: 16-to-24-Year-Olds Not in School or Work by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 1990 to 2012

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Health of residents

Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

Health equity means that everyone has a just and fair opportunity to lead a long and healthy life, but life expectancy at birth varies from place to place.

Life Expectancy by Geography, 2014

Source: ???
Health of residents

Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

Life expectancy not only varies by place but also by race.

Source: ???
Healthy food access
Can all residents access healthy food?

Asians or Pacific Islanders are the most likely to live in areas without adequate access to supermarkets in Sacramento. White and Latino residents are the least likely to live in these areas. Healthy food is a critical component of a healthy, thriving community.

Percent Living in Limited Supermarket Access areas (LSAs) by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSAs are defined as areas where residents must travel significantly farther to reach a supermarket than the “comparatively acceptable” distance traveled by residents in well-served areas with similar population densities and car ownership rates.

Source: The Reinvestment Fund, 2014 LSA analysis; U.S. Census Bureau.
Note: Data on population by race/ethnicity reflects a 2010 through 2014 average.
Healthy food access
Can all residents access healthy food?

Interestingly, the population at 200 percent of poverty or above is disproportionately located in LSAs. They make up 66 percent of the region but 71 percent of LSAs.

Limited food access areas (LSAs) are defined as areas where residents must travel significantly farther to reach a supermarket than the “comparatively acceptable” distance traveled by residents in well-served areas with similar population densities and car ownership rates.

Poverty Composition of Food Environments, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Limited Food Access</th>
<th>Food Accessible</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200% poverty or above</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-199% poverty</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-149% poverty</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited food access areas (LSAs) are defined as areas where residents must travel significantly farther to reach a supermarket than the “comparatively acceptable” distance traveled by residents in well-served areas with similar population densities and car ownership rates.

Source: The Reinvestment Fund, 2014 LSA analysis; U.S. Census Bureau. Universe includes all persons not in groups quarters.
Note: Data on population by poverty status reflects a 2010 through 2014 average.
Healthy food access
Can all residents access healthy food?

Low Supermarket Access (LSA) areas are located across the region but tend to be in communities of color. Block groups are drawn based on population size not land area. Seemingly large block groups in the eastern part of the region have a comparable number of people as small block groups in the more urbanized part of the region.

Percent People of Color by Census Block Group and Low Supermarket Access Block Groups, 2014

Source: The Reinvestment Fund, 2014 LSA analysis; U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia. © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community.
Note: Data on population by race/ethnicity represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

Obesity rates are lower in Sacramento than in both California and the U.S. overall. Just under one in four adults are obese.

Adult Overweight and Obesity by Geography, 2012

- **United States**: 36% Overweight, 27% Obese
- **California**: 36% Overweight, 25% Obese
- **Sacramento-Arden Arcade-Roseville, CA Metro Area**: 36% Overweight, 24% Obese

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

Black adults in Sacramento face the highest obesity rates followed by Latinos. While genetics matter, research shows there are other important social and environmental factors that influence obesity, including toxic stress, income, and education.

Adult Overweight and Obesity Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012

- **All**: 36% overweight, 24% obese
- **White**: 37% overweight, 23% obese
- **Black**: 36% overweight, 36% obese
- **Latino**: 35% overweight, 29% obese
- **Asian or Pacific Islander**: 35% overweight, 16% obese
- **Mixed/other**: 35% overweight, 41% obese

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average for the Sacramento region. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

When compared to the state and nation overall, Sacramento also has a slightly lower rate of adult diabetes. Just under 9 percent of adults have diabetes.

**Adult Diabetes Rates by Geography, 2012**

- **United States**: 9%
- **California**: 9%
- **Sacramento-Arden Arcade-Roseville, CA Metro Area**: 8.6%

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

While the adult diabetes rate is slightly lower in Sacramento than in the state and nation overall, racial disparities are stark. Black adults are more than twice as likely as Whites to have diabetes. The social determinants of health, where people live, work, and age, are increasingly recognized as influencing growing rates of chronic diseases, such as diabetes.

Adult Diabetes Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average for the Sacramento region. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Environmental health factors

Do all residents live in areas with clean air?

The average Sacramento resident has more exposure to air pollution than nearly 83 percent of tracts in the United States. Black and Asian or Pacific Islander residents have the highest exposure overall.

**Air Pollution: Exposure Index by Race/Ethnicity, 2014**

Values range from 1 (lowest risk) to 100 (highest risk) on a national scale. The index value is based on percentile ranking each risk measure across all census tracts in the U.S. and taking the averaging ranking for each Atlas geography and demographic group.

Note: Data on population by race/ethnicity represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Environmental health factors
Do all residents live in areas with clean air?

Both race and class impact exposure to pollutants. In Sacramento, White residents below poverty have lower exposure on average than people of color residents above poverty.

Air Pollution: Exposure Index by Poverty Status, 2014

Values range from 1 (lowest risk) to 100 (highest risk) on a national scale. The index value is based on percentile ranking each risk measure across all census tracts in the U.S. and taking the averaging ranking for each Atlas geography and demographic group.


Note: Data on population by poverty status represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Health of residents

Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

Given high exposure to air pollution, it’s unsurprising that the share of adults living with asthma is higher in Sacramento than in the state and U.S. as a whole. One in ten adults in the region have asthma.

Adult Asthma Rates by Geography, 2012

- United States: 8.9%
- California: 8.2%
- Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area: 10%

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

While the adult asthma rate is 10 percent overall, this ranges from 7 percent among Asian or Pacific Islander adults to 15 percent among Black adults. The Black population also has the highest exposure to air pollution in the region.

Adult Asthma Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2012

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average for the Sacramento region. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

Heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States. The share of adults who have had a heart attack is lower in Sacramento than the nation, though it’s slightly higher than the state average.

Share of Adults who have had a Heart Attack by Geography, 2012

- United States: 4.3%
- California: 3.3%
- Sacramento-Arden Arcade-Roseville, CA Metro Area: 3.5%

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

White adults in Sacramento are the most likely to have had a heart attack: 3.7 percent of White adults have had a heart attack compared with 2.4 percent of adults of mixed/other races.

Share of Adults who have had a Heart Attack by Race/Ethnicity, 2012

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average for the Sacramento region. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Health of residents
Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

The share of adults with Angina or coronary heart disease is lower in Sacramento than in the U.S., though the rate is higher than the state average. Four percent of adults in the region have angina or heart disease.

Share of Adults with Angina or Coronary Heart Disease by Geography, 2012

- United States: 4.3%
- California: 3.4%
- Sacramento-Arden Arcade-Roseville, CA Metro Area: 4%

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average.
Health of residents

Do all residents have the opportunity to live long and healthy lives?

White adults are the most likely in Sacramento to be living with Angina or coronary heart disease, followed by Latino and API adults.

**Share of Adults with Angina or Coronary Heart Disease by Race/Ethnicity, 2012**

- **All**: 4%
- **White**: 4.3%
- **Black**: 1.5%
- **Latino**: 4%
- **Asian or Pacific Islander**: 4%
- **Mixed/other**: 2%

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2008 through 2012 average for the Sacramento region. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Health of residents

Do residents have access to health insurance and health care services?

The share of children and adults with health insurance is higher in Sacramento than in the state and U.S. overall. Still, 18 percent of adults lack coverage. People without health insurance have worse access to care than those who do. Without health insurance, many people go without needed medical treatment and are less likely to access preventative care.

Health Insurance Rates by Geography, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>18-64 years</th>
<th>0-18 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Metro Area</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.

Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Health of residents
Do residents have access to health insurance and health care services?

Latino children and adults are the least likely to have health insurance in the region: 31 percent of Latino adults and 7 percent of Latino children are uninsured. Native American and Black adults also face high uninsured rates.

Health Insurance Rates by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: BRFSS. Universe includes all persons age 18 or older.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Connectedness Highlights
Are the region’s residents and neighborhoods connected to one another and to the region’s assets and opportunities?

To build a **Culture of Health**—where every person, no matter where they live, has an equal opportunity to live the healthiest life possible—we must improve people’s opportunities to be healthier in the places where they live, learn, work and play.

- Low-income Black workers are the most likely to rely on public transit to get to work.

- Black and Latino renters and homeowners are the most likely to be paying more than 30 percent of their incomes on housing costs.

Share of renter households that pay too much for housing:

56%

Share of low-income Black workers who rely on public transit:

11%

Share of White residents who would need to move to achieve Latino-White integration:

46%
Connectedness
Can all residents access affordable, quality housing?

Across the region, 24 percent of jobs are low wage (paying $1,250 per month or less) but just 18 percent of rental units are affordable when combining two low-wage workers’ incomes. The mismatch is most extreme in Placer County where 27 percent of jobs are low-wage yet just 10 percent of rental housing units are affordable.

Share of Affordable Rental Housing Units, 2014

Source: Housing data from the U.S. Census Bureau and jobs data from the 2012 Longitudinal-Employer Household Dynamics.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Connectedness

Can all residents access affordable, quality housing?

A low-wage jobs to affordable rental housing ratio in a county that is higher than the regional average indicates a lower availability of affordable rental housing for low-wage workers in that county relative to the region overall. Placer County has the highest ratio followed by El Dorado.

### Low-Wage Jobs, Affordable Rental Housing, and Jobs-Housing Ratio by County, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countycler County, CA</th>
<th>Jobs (2010-14)</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Low-wage</th>
<th>Housing (2010-14)</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Rental*</th>
<th>Affordable Rental*</th>
<th>Jobs-Housing Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td>593,241</td>
<td>134,358</td>
<td>519,460</td>
<td>222,292</td>
<td>43,124</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td></td>
<td>129,620</td>
<td>35,503</td>
<td>134,111</td>
<td>38,198</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,842</td>
<td>18,053</td>
<td>70,953</td>
<td>32,709</td>
<td>6,429</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,015</td>
<td>13,519</td>
<td>67,220</td>
<td>15,938</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>849,718</td>
<td>201,433</td>
<td>791,744</td>
<td>309,137</td>
<td>56,381</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only those units paid for in cash rent.

Source: Housing data from the U.S. Census Bureau and jobs data from the 2012 Longitudinal-Employer Household Dynamics.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Connectedness
Can all residents access affordable, quality housing?

More than half of renter households and a third of homeowner households are cost burdened (paying more than 30 percent of income on housing costs). Black and Mixed/Other Race households are the most likely to be cost burdened regardless of whether they rent or own.

Renter Housing Burden and Homeowner Housing Burden by Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Universe includes all renter-occupied households with cash rent.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups are excluded due to small sample size.
Connectedness
Can all residents access affordable, quality housing?

**There are rent-burdened households throughout the region.** The darkest orange census tracts represent areas where *at least* 73 percent of households pay more than 30 percent of their income on rent.

---

**Percent Rent-Burdened Households by Census Tract, 2014**

- Less than 27%
- 27% to 46%
- 46% to 60%
- 60% to 73%
- 73% or more

---

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community. Universe includes all renter-occupied households with cash rent. Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Connectedness

Do residents have transportation choices?

Car access also varies across the region but is lowest in the city of Sacramento and pockets in Placer County.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community. Universe includes all households (excludes group quarters).

Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Connectedness
Do residents have transportation choices?

Lower-income residents are less likely to drive alone to work.
While 75 percent of all residents drive alone to work, single-driver commuting varies by income with 66 percent of workers earning under $10,000 a year driving alone compared to 80 percent of workers earning more than $75,000 a year.

Means of Transportation to Work by Annual Earnings, 2014

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Universe includes workers ages 16 and older with earnings.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Connectedness
Do residents have transportation choices?

Low-income Black workers are the most likely to rely on the regional transit system to get to work. Very low-income Black workers are nearly four times as likely as very low-income White workers to use public transit.

Percent Using Public Transit by Annual Earnings and Race/Ethnicity, 2014

Source: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. Universe includes workers ages 16 and older with earnings.
Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Data for some racial/ethnic groups in some earnings categories are excluded due to small sample size.
Connectedness

Do residents have transportation choices?

Neighborhoods with the highest commute times are scattered throughout the region. Residents of more rural areas in El Dorado and Placer County have the highest commute times on average.

Average Travel Time to Work in Minutes by Census Tract, 2014

- Less than 21 minutes
- 21 to 24 minutes
- 24 to 26 minutes
- 26 to 29 minutes
- 29 minutes or more

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; TomTom, ESRI, HERE, DeLorme, MaymyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community. Universe includes all persons ages 16 or older who work outside of home.

Note: Data represent a 2010 through 2014 average. Areas in white are missing data.
Connectedness

Do neighborhoods reflect the region’s diversity?

Segregation, as measured by the entropy index, is lower in Sacramento than the nation overall, though it hasn’t decreased since 2000. The entropy index ranges from 0, if all census tracts had the same racial/ethnic composition as the entire metro area (fully integrated), to 1, if all census tracts contained one group only (fully segregated).

Residential Segregation, 1980-2012

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Segregation, as measured by the dissimilarity index, however, has increased for many groups since 1990. In order to achieve Black-White integration, 58 percent of White residents would need to move. Similarly, 51 percent of White residents would have to move to achieve White-API integration.

Residential Segregation, 1990 to 2014, Measured by the Dissimilarity Index

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Note: Data for 2014 represent a 2010 through 2014 average.
Economic benefits of equity

What are the economic benefits of inclusion?

Sacramento’s GDP would have been $19.4 billion higher in 2014 if racial gaps in income were closed: a 17 percent increase.

Actual GDP and Estimated GDP without Racial Gaps in Income, 2014

$112.2
$131.7
$19.4 billion

Equity Dividend:

Economic benefits of equity

What are the economic benefits of inclusion?

Latinos would experience the largest gain in average income with racial equity in the region (a 70 percent increase) followed by Black residents (a 58 percent increase). Gains in average income would be higher for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and those of mixed/other races in the region compared to California overall.

Percentage Gain in Income with Racial Equity, 2014

Economic benefits of equity
What are the economic benefits of inclusion?

For Latinos, the vast majority of these income gains would come from closing the racial wage gap with Whites. For Black residents, most of the gains would come from closing employment differences between Black and White workers (as measured by number of hours worked).

Source of Income Gains, 2014
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Data and methods

Data source summary and geography

Unless otherwise noted, all of the data and analyses presented in this equity profile are the product of PolicyLink and the USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity (PERE).

The specific data sources are listed in the table on the right. While much of the data and analysis presented in this equitable growth profile are fairly intuitive, in the following pages we describe some of the estimation techniques and adjustments made in creating the underlying database, and provide more detail on terms and methodology used. Finally, the reader should bear in mind that while only a single county is profiled here, many of the analytical choices in generating the underlying data and analyses were made with an eye toward replicating the analyses in other regions and the ability to update them over time. That said, we do draw upon more local data sources for some indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dataset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau</td>
<td>1980 Summary Tape File 1 (STF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 Summary Tape File 2 (STF2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1980 Summary Tape File 3 (STF3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990 Summary Tape File 2 (STF2A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modified Age/Race, Sex and Hispanic Origin File (MARS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990 Summary Tape File 4 (STF4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 Summary File 1 (SF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Summary File 1 (SF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 American Community Survey Summary File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 5-Year American Community Survey Summary File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 National Population Projections, Middle Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 TIGER/Line Shapefiles, 2010 Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 Local Employment Dynamics, LODES 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods &amp; Poole Economics, Inc.</td>
<td>2014 Complete Economic and Demographic Data Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product by State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product by Metropolitan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Area Personal Income Accounts, CA30: regional economic profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics</td>
<td>Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Area Unemployment Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Employment Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce</td>
<td>Recovery: Job Growth And Education Requirements Through 2020; State Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The diversitydatakids.org project and the Kirwin Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>Child Opportunity Index Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Health Foundation</td>
<td>How Healthy is Northern Virginia? A Look at the Latest Community Health Indicators (May 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data and methods

Selected terms and general notes

Broad racial/ethnic origin
In the analyses presented, two different racial/ethnic categorizations are used depending on whether or not the Middle Eastern population is broken out. All categorization of people by race/ethnicity and nativity is based on individual responses to various census surveys.

For all analyses that do not break out the Middle Eastern population, all people were first assigned to one of six mutually exclusive racial/ethnic categories, depending on their responses to two separate questions on race and Hispanic origin as follows:

• “White” and “non-Hispanic White” are used to refer to all people who identify as White alone and do not identify as being of Hispanic origin.
• “Black” and “African American” are used to refer to all people who identify as Black or African American alone and do not identify as being of Hispanic origin.
• “Latino” refers to all people who identify as being of Hispanic origin, regardless of racial identification.
• “Asian,” “Asian/Pacific Islander,” and “API” are used to refer to all people who identify as Asian or Pacific Islander alone and do not identify as being of Hispanic origin.
• “Native American” and “Native American and Alaska Native” are used to refer to all people who identify as Native American or Alaskan Native alone and do not identify as being of Hispanic origin.
• “Other” and “Other or mixed race” are used to refer to all people who identify with a single racial category not included above, or identify with multiple racial categories, and do not identify as being of Hispanic origin.
• “People of color” or “POC” is used to refer to all people who do not identify as non-Hispanic White.

For all analyses that do break out the Middle Eastern population, we began with the categorization described above and re-categorized all people into a new “Middle Eastern” category who identified as being of Middle Eastern descent, as determined their response(s) to the census question on ancestry (virtually all of those we ultimately categorized as Middle Easterners identify racially as non-Hispanic White and were thus removed from the White category). The census reports up to two responses to the question, and if any response indicated a Middle Eastern country or region. More specifically, individuals in the IPUMS data with values for the variables “ANCESTR1” and “ANCESTR2” ranging from 400 to 496 were all defined as Middle Easterner.

Nativity
The term “U.S.-born” refers to all people who identify as being born in the United States (including U.S. territories and outlying areas), or born abroad of American parents. The term “immigrant” refers to all people who identify as being born abroad, outside of the United States, of non-American parents.

Detailed racial/ethnic ancestry
Given the diversity of ethnic origin and substantial presence of immigrants among the Latino, Asian, Black, and Middle Eastern populations, we present population totals and the percentage immigrant for more detailed
Data and methods

Selected terms and general notes

(continued)

racial/ethnic categories within these groups. In order to maintain consistency with the broader racial/ethnic categories and to calculate the immigrant shares, these more detailed categories are drawn from the same two questions on race and Hispanic origin. For example, while country-of-origin information could have been used to identify Filipinos among the Asian population or Salvadorans among the Latino population, it could only do so for immigrants and not the U.S.-born population. For the Black and Middle Eastern populations, however, responses to the question on race do not provide sufficient detail to identify subgroups so we utilize the responses to the question on ancestry.

Other selected terms

Below we provide some definitions and clarification around some of the terms used in the equity profile:

• The terms “region,” “metropolitan area,” “metro area,” and “metro,” are used interchangeably to refer to the geographic areas defined as metropolitan statistical areas by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, as well as to the region that is the subject of this profile as defined previously.

• The term “communities of color” generally refers to distinct groups defined by race/ethnicity among people of color.

• The term “full-time” workers refers to all persons in the IPUMS microdata who reported working at least 45 or 50 weeks (depending on the year of the data) and usually worked at least 35 hours per week during the year prior to the survey. A change in the “weeks worked” question in the 2008 American Community Survey (ACS), as compared with prior years of the ACS and the long form of the decennial census, caused a dramatic rise in the share of respondents indicating that they worked at least 50 weeks during the year prior to the survey. To make our data on full-time workers more comparable over time, we applied a slightly different definition in 2008 and later than in earlier years: in 2008 and later, the “weeks worked” cutoff is at least 50 weeks while in 2007 and earlier it is 45 weeks. The 45-week cutoff was found to produce a national trend in the incidence of full-time work over the 2005-2010 period that was most consistent with that found using data from the March Supplement of the Current Population Survey, which did not experience a change to the relevant survey questions. For more information, see http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/methodology/content_test/P6b_Weeks_Worked_Final_Report.pdf.

General notes on analyses

Below we provide some general notes about the analyses conducted.

• In the summary document that accompanies this profile, we may discuss rankings comparing the profiled region to the largest 150 metros. In all such instances, we are referring to the largest 150 metropolitan statistical areas in terms of 2010 population.

• In regard to monetary measures (income, earnings, wages, etc.), the term “real” indicates the data have been adjusted for
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Selected terms and general notes (continued)

inflation, and, unless otherwise noted, all dollar values are in 2010 dollars. All inflation adjustments are based on the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers (CPI-U) from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, available at http://www.bls.gov/cpi/tables.htm.

• Note that income information in the decennial censuses for 1980, 1990, and 2000 is reported for the year prior to the survey.
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Summary measures from IPUMS microdata

Although a variety of data sources were used, much of our analysis is based on a unique dataset created using microdata samples (i.e., “individual-level” data) from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS), for four points in time: 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2008 through 2012 pooled together. While the 1980 through 2000 files are based on the decennial census and cover about 5 percent of the U.S. population each, the 2008 through 2012 files are from the ACS and cover only about 1 percent of the U.S. population each. Five years of ACS data were pooled together to improve the statistical reliability and to achieve a sample size that is comparable to that available in previous years. Survey weights were adjusted as necessary to produce estimates that represent an average over the 2008 through 2012 period.

Compared with the more commonly used census “summary files,” which include a limited set of summary tabulations of population and housing characteristics, use of the microdata samples allows for the flexibility to create more illuminating metrics of equity and inclusion, and provides a more nuanced view of groups defined by age, race/ethnicity, and nativity in each region of the United States.

The IPUMS microdata allows for the tabulation of detailed population characteristics, but because such tabulations are based on samples, they are subject to a margin of error and should be regarded as estimates – particularly in smaller regions and for smaller demographic subgroups. In an effort to avoid reporting highly unreliable estimates, we do not report any estimates that are based on a universe of fewer than 100 individual survey respondents.

A key limitation of the IPUMS microdata is geographic detail: each year of the data has a particular “lowest-level” of geography associated with the individuals included, known as the Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA) or “county groups.” PUMAs are drawn to contain a population of about 100,000, and vary greatly in size from being fairly small in densely populated urban areas, to very large in rural areas, often with one or more counties contained in a single PUMA.

Because PUMAs do not neatly align with the boundaries of metropolitan areas, we created a geographic crosswalk between PUMAs and the region for the 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2008-2012 microdata. This involved estimating the share of each PUMA’s population that falls inside the region using population information from Geolytics for 2000 census block groups (2010 population information was used for the 2008-2012 geographic crosswalk). If the share was at least 50 percent, the PUMAs were assigned to the region and included in generating regional summary measures. For the remaining PUMAs, the share was somewhere between 50 and 100 percent, and this share was used as the “PUMA adjustment factor” to adjust downward the survey weights for individuals included in such PUMAs in the microdata when estimating regional summary measures.
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Adjustments made to census summary data on race/ethnicity by age

For the racial generation gap indicator, we generated consistent estimates of populations by race/ethnicity and age group (under 18, 18-64, and over 64 years of age) for the years 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010, at the county level, which was then aggregated to the regional level and higher. The racial/ethnic groups include non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic/Latino, non-Hispanic Asian and Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic Native American/Alaska Native, and non-Hispanic Other (including other single-race alone and those identifying as multiracial). While for 2000 and 2010, this information is readily available in SF1 of each year, for 1980 and 1990, estimates had to be made to ensure consistency over time, drawing on two different summary files for each year.

For 1980, while information on total population by race/ethnicity for all ages combined was available at the county level for all the requisite groups in STF1, for race/ethnicity by age group we had to look to STF2, where it was only available for non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and the remainder of the population. To estimate the number of non-Hispanic Asian and Pacific Islanders, non-Hispanic Native Americans/Alaskan Natives, and non-Hispanic Others among the remainder for each age group, we applied the distribution of these three groups from the overall county population (of all ages) from STF1.

For 1990, population by race/ethnicity at the county level was taken from STF2A, while population by race/ethnicity was taken from the 1990 Modified Age Race Sex (MARS) file – special tabulation of people by age, race, sex, and Hispanic origin. However, to be consistent with the way race is categorized by the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Directive 15, the MARS file allocates all persons identifying as “Other race” or multiracial to a specific race. After confirming that population totals by county were consistent between the MARS file and STF2A, we calculated the number of “Other race” or multiracial that had been added to each racial/ethnic group in each county (for all ages combined) by subtracting the number that is reported in STF2A for the corresponding group. We then derived the share of each racial/ethnic group in the MARS file that was made up of “Other race” or multiracial people and applied this share to estimate the number of people by race/ethnicity and age group exclusive of the “Other race” and multiracial, and finally the number of the “Other race” and multiracial by age group.
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Adjustments made to demographic projections

National projections
National projections of the non-Hispanic White share of the population are based on the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2012 National Population Projections, Middle Series. However, because these projections follow the OMB 1997 guidelines on racial classification and essentially distribute the Other single-race alone group across the other defined racial/ethnic categories, adjustments were made to be consistent with the six broad racial/ethnic groups used in our analysis.

Specifically, we compared the percentage of the total population composed of each racial/ethnic group in the projected data for 2010 to the actual percentage reported in SF1 of the 2010 Census. We subtracted the projected percentage from the actual percentage for each group to derive an adjustment factor, and carried this adjustment factor forward by adding it to the projected percentage for each group in each projection year. Finally, we applied the adjusted population distribution by race/ethnicity to the total projected population from 2012 National Population Projections to get the projected number of people by race/ethnicity.

County and regional projections
Similar adjustments were made in generating county and regional projections of the population by race/ethnicity. Initial county-level projections were taken from Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. Like the 1990 MARS file described above, the Woods & Poole projections follow the OMB Directive 15-race categorization, assigning all persons identifying as Other or multiracial to one of five mutually exclusive race categories: White, Black, Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, or Native American. Thus, we first generated an adjusted version of the county-level Woods & Poole projections that removed the Other or multiracial group from each of these five categories. This was done by comparing the Woods & Poole projections for 2010 to the actual results from SF1 of the 2010 Census, figuring out the share of each racial/ethnic group in the Woods & Poole data that was composed of Other or multiracial persons in 2010, and applying it forward to later projection years. From these projections, we calculated the county-level distribution by race/ethnicity in each projection year for five groups (White, Black, Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Native American), exclusive of Others or multiracials.

To estimate the county-level share of population for those classified as Other or multiracial in each projection year, we then generated a simple straight-line projection of this share using information from SF1 of the 2000 and 2010 Census. Keeping the projected Other or multiracial share fixed, we allocated the remaining population share to each of the other five racial/ethnic groups by applying the racial/ethnic distribution implied by our adjusted Woods & Poole projections for each county and projection year.

The result was a set of adjusted projections at the county level for the six broad racial/ethnic groups included in the Atlas, which were then applied to projections of the total population by county from Woods & Poole to get
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projections of the number of people for each of the six racial/ethnic groups.

Finally, an Iterative Proportional Fitting (IPF) procedure was applied to bring the county-level results into alignment with our adjusted national projections by race/ethnicity described above. The final adjusted county results were then aggregated to produce a final set of projections at the metro-area and state levels.
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Estimates and adjustments made to BEA data on GDP

The data on national gross domestic product (GDP) and its analogous regional measure, gross regional product (GRP) – both referred to as GDP in the text – are based on data from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). However, due to changes in the estimation procedure used for the national (and state-level) data in 1997, and a lack of metropolitan area estimates prior to 2001, a variety of adjustments and estimates were made to produce a consistent series at the national, state, metropolitan-area, and county levels from 1969 to 2012.

Adjustments at the state and national levels

While data on gross state product (GSP) are not reported directly in the equity profile, they were used in making estimates of gross product at the county level for all years and at the regional level prior to 2001, so we applied the same adjustments to the data that were applied to the national GDP data. Given a change in BEA’s estimation of gross product at the state and national levels from a standard industrial classification (SIC) basis to a North American industry classification system (NAICS) basis in 1997, data prior to 1997 were adjusted to avoid any erratic shifts in gross product in that year. While the change to a NAICS basis occurred in 1997, BEA also provides estimates under an SIC basis in that year. Our adjustment involved figuring the 1997 ratio of NAICS-based gross product to SIC-based gross product for each state and the nation, and multiplying it by the SIC-based gross product in all years prior to 1997 to get our final estimate of gross product at the state and national levels.

County and metropolitan area estimates

To generate county-level estimates for all years, and metropolitan-area estimates prior to 2001, a more complicated estimation procedure was followed. First, an initial set of county estimates for each year was generated by taking our final state-level estimates and allocating gross product to the counties in each state in proportion to total earnings of employees working in each county – a BEA variable that is available for all counties and years. Next, the initial county estimates were aggregated to metropolitan-area level, and were compared with BEA’s official metropolitan-area estimates for 2001 and later. They were found to be very close, with a correlation coefficient very close to one (0.9997). Despite the near-perfect correlation, we still used the official BEA estimates in our final data series for 2001 and later. However, to avoid any erratic shifts in gross product during the years up until 2001, we made the same sort of adjustment to our estimates of gross product at the metropolitan-area level that was made to the state and national data – we figured the 2001 ratio of the official BEA estimate to our initial estimate, and multiplied it by our initial estimates for 2000 and earlier to get our final estimate of gross product at the metropolitan-area level.

We then generated a second iteration of county-level estimates – just for counties included in metropolitan areas – by taking the final metropolitan-area-level estimates and allocating gross product to the counties in each metropolitan area in proportion to total earnings of employees working in each
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(continued)

county. Next, we calculated the difference between our final estimate of gross product for each state and the sum of our second-iteration county-level gross product estimates for metropolitan counties contained in the state (that is, counties contained in metropolitan areas). This difference, total nonmetropolitan gross product by state, was then allocated to the nonmetropolitan counties in each state, once again using total earnings of employees working in each county as the basis for allocation. Finally, one last set of adjustments was made to the county-level estimates to ensure that the sum of gross product across the counties contained in each metropolitan area agreed with our final estimate of gross product by metropolitan area, and that the sum of gross product across the counties contained in state agreed with our final estimate of gross product by state. This was done using a simple IPF procedure.

We should note that BEA does not provide data for all counties in the United States, but rather groups some counties that have had boundary changes since 1969 into county groups to maintain consistency with historical data. Any such county groups were treated the same as other counties in the estimate techniques described above.

Fairfax County is included in one of the BEA county groups (composed of Fairfax County, Fairfax City, and Falls Church City). Thus, to estimate GDP for the region comprising of just Fairfax County and Fairfax City, which is the regional definition used for most of the data presented in this profile, we applied a similar approach to that described above but using a different data source – the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) – which provides data for each individual county/city. Using the QCEW, we calculated Falls Church’s share of total earnings for workers in its BEA county group, and adjusted our GDP estimate for the county group downward by that share to get our final GDP estimate for the region comprising just Fairfax County and Fairfax City.
To analyze middle-class decline over the past four decades, we began with the regional household income distribution in 1979 – the year for which income is reported in the 1980 Census (and the 1980 IPUMS microdata). The middle 40 percent of households were defined as “middle class,” and the upper and lower bounds in terms of household income (adjusted for inflation to be in 2010 dollars) that contained the middle 40 percent of households were identified. We then adjusted these bounds over time to increase (or decrease) at the same rate as real average household income growth, identifying the share of households falling above, below, and in between the adjusted bounds as the upper, lower, and middle class, respectively, for each year shown. Thus, the analysis of the size of the middle class examined the share of households enjoying the same relative standard of living in each year as the middle 40 percent of households did in 1979.
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Assembling a complete dataset on employment and wages by industry

Analysis of jobs and wages by industry, reported on pages 23 and 39, is based on an industry-level dataset constructed using two-digit NAICS industries from the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW). Due to some missing (or nondisclosed) data at the county and regional levels, we supplemented our dataset using information from Woods & Poole Economics, Inc., which contains complete jobs and wages data for broad, two-digit NAICS industries at multiple geographic levels. (Proprietary issues barred us from using Woods & Poole data directly, so we instead used it to complete the QCEW dataset.) While we refer to counties in describing the process for “filling in” missing QCEW data below, the same process was used for the regional and state levels of geography.

Given differences in the methodology underlying the two data sources (in addition to the proprietary issue), it would not be appropriate to simply “plug in” corresponding Woods & Poole data directly to fill in the QCEW data for nondisclosed industries.

Therefore, our approach was to first calculate the number of jobs and total wages from nondisclosed industries in each county, and then distribute those amounts across the nondisclosed industries in proportion to their reported numbers in the Woods & Poole data.

To make for a more accurate application of the Woods & Poole data, we made some adjustments to it to better align it with the QCEW. One of the challenges of using Woods & Poole data as a “filler dataset” is that it includes all workers, while QCEW includes only wage and salary workers. To normalize the Woods & Poole data universe, we applied both a national and regional wage and salary adjustment factor; given the strong regional variation in the share of workers who are wage and salary, both adjustments were necessary. Second, while the QCEW data are available on an annual basis, the Woods & Poole data are available on a decadal basis until 1995, at which point they become available on an annual basis. For the 1990-1995 period, we estimated the Woods & Poole annual jobs and wages figures using a straight-line approach. Finally, we standardized the Woods & Poole industry codes to match the NAICS codes used in the QCEW.

It is important to note that not all counties and regions were missing data at the two-digit NAICS level in the QCEW, and the majority of larger counties and regions with missing data were only missing data for a small number of industries and only in certain years. Moreover, when data are missing it is often for smaller industries. Thus, the estimation procedure described is not likely to greatly affect our analysis of industries, particularly for larger counties and regions.
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Growth in jobs and earnings by industry wage level, 1990 to 2012

The analysis on page 23 uses our filled-in QCEW dataset (see the previous page) and seeks to track shifts in regional job composition and wage growth by industry wage level.

Using 1990 as the base year, we classified broad industries (at the two-digit NAICS level) into three wage categories: low, middle, and high wage. An industry’s wage category was based on its average annual wage, and each of the three categories contained approximately one-third of all private industries in the region.

We applied the 1990 industry wage category classification across all the years in the dataset, so that the industries within each category remained the same over time. This way, we could track the broad trajectory of jobs and wages in low-, middle-, and high-wage industries.


While we initially sought to conduct the analysis at a more detailed NAICS level, the large amount of missing data at the three- to six-digit NAICS levels (which could not be resolved with the method that was applied to generate our filled-in two-digit QCEW dataset) prevented us from doing so.
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Analysis of occupations by opportunity level

The analysis of strong occupations on page 40 and jobs by opportunity level on page 33 are related and based on an analysis that seeks to classify occupations in the region by opportunity level. Industries and occupations with high concentrations in the region, strong growth potential, and decent and growing wages are considered strong.

To identify “high-opportunity” occupations, we developed an “occupation opportunity index” based on measures of job quality and growth, including median annual wage, wage growth, job growth (in number and share), and median age of workers (which represents potential job openings due to retirements).

Once the “occupation opportunity index” score was calculated for each occupation, they were sorted into three categories (high, middle, and low opportunity). Occupations were evenly distributed into the categories based on employment. The strong occupations shown on page 40 are those found in the top, or high category.

There are some aspects of this analysis that warrant further clarification. First, the “occupation opportunity index” that is constructed is based on a measure of job quality and set of growth measures, with the job-quality measure weighted twice as much as all of the growth measures combined. This weighting scheme was applied both because we believe pay is a more direct measure of “opportunity” than the other available measures, and because it is more stable than most of the other growth measures, which are calculated over a relatively short period (2005-2011). For example, an increase from $6 per hour to $12 per hour is fantastic wage growth (100 percent), but most would not consider a $12-per-hour job as a “high-opportunity” occupation.

Second, all measures used to calculate the “occupation opportunity index” are based on data for metropolitan statistical areas from the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) program of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), with one exception: median age by occupation. This measure, included among the growth metrics because it indicates the potential for job openings due to replacements as older workers retire, is estimated for each occupation from the 2010 5-year IPUMS ACS microdata file (for the employed civilian noninstitutional population ages 16 and older). It is calculated at the metropolitan statistical area level (to be consistent with the geography of the OES data), except in cases for which there were fewer than 30 individual survey respondents in an occupation; in these cases, the median age estimate is based on national data.

Third, the level of occupational detail at which the analysis was conducted, and at which the lists of occupations are reported, is the three-digit standard occupational classification (SOC) level. While considerably more detailed data is available in the OES, it was necessary to aggregate to the three-digit SOC level in order to align closely with the occupation codes reported for workers in the ACS microdata, making the analysis reported on page 40 possible.
Estimates of the gains in GDP under a hypothetical scenario in which there is no income inequality by race/ethnicity are based on the IPUMS 2012 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) microdata. We applied a methodology similar to that used by Robert Lynch and Patrick Oakford in Chapter Two of All-in Nation: An America that Works for All with some modification to include income gains from increased employment (rather than only those from increased wages). As in the Lynch and Oakford analysis, once the percentage increase in overall average annual income was estimated, 2012 GDP was assumed to rise by the same percentage.

We first organized individuals aged 16 or older in the IPUMS ACS into six mutually exclusive racial/ethnic groups: non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Latino, non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic Native American, and non-Hispanic Other or multiracial. Following the approach of Lynch and Oakford in All-In Nation, we excluded from the non-Hispanic Asian/Pacific Islander category subgroups whose average incomes were higher than the average for non-Hispanic Whites. Also, to avoid excluding subgroups based on unreliable average income estimates due to small sample sizes, we added the restriction that a subgroup had to have at least 100 individual survey respondents in order to be included.

We then assumed that all racial/ethnic groups had the same average annual income and hours of work, by income percentile and age group, as non-Hispanic Whites, and took those values as the new “projected” income and hours of work for each individual. For example, a 54-year-old non-Hispanic Black person falling between the 85th and 86th percentiles of the non-Hispanic Black income distribution was assigned the average annual income and hours of work values found for non-Hispanic White persons in the corresponding age bracket (51 to 55 years old) and “slice” of the non-Hispanic White income distribution (between the 85th and 86th percentiles), regardless of whether that individual was working or not. The projected individual annual incomes and work hours were then averaged for each racial/ethnic group (other than non-Hispanic Whites) to get projected average incomes and work hours for each group as a whole, and for all groups combined.

One difference between our approach and that of Lynch and Oakford is that we include all individuals ages 16 years and older, rather than just those with positive income. Those with income values of zero are largely non-working, and were included so that income gains attributable to increased average annual hours of work would reflect both expanded work hours for those currently working and an increased share of workers—an important factor to consider given sizeable differences in employment rates by race/ethnicity. One result of this choice is that the average annual income values we estimate are analogous to measures of per capita income for the age 16 and older population and are notably lower than those reported in Lynch and Oakford; another is that our estimated income gains are relatively larger as they presume increased employment rates.
PolicyLink is a national research and action institute advancing economic and social equity by Lifting Up What Works®.

**Headquarters:**
1438 Webster Street
Suite 303
Oakland, CA 94612
t 510 663-2333
f 510 663-9684

**Communications:**
55 West 39th Street
11th Floor
New York, NY 10018
t 212 629-9570
f 212 763-2350

http://www.policylink.org

The USC Program for Environmental and Regional Equity (PERE) conducts research and facilitates discussions on issues of environmental justice, regional inclusion, and social movement building.

University of Southern California
950 W. Jefferson Boulevard
JEF 102
Los Angeles, CA 90089
t 213 821-1325
f 213 740-5680

http://dornsife.usc.edu/pere

Cover photos courtesy of .

Equitable Growth Profiles are products of a partnership between PolicyLink and PERE, the Program for Environmental and Regional Equity at the University of Southern California.

The views expressed in this document are those of PolicyLink and PERE, and do not necessarily represent those of .

©2017 by PolicyLink and PERE. All rights reserved.