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The national decennial census provides policy-makers and researchers with important basic information about the populace of their region. Census data spans a broad range of subject matter, including population, education, employment, and housing information. It should be noted that the 2010 U.S. Census collected less data than in prior years, particularly in the areas of education and income.

Nevertheless, census data provides planners and local officials with essential tools for understanding where a region has been, where it is now, and where it is going. Census data also offers local officials a valuable means for benchmarking, analyzing a region in comparison to peers across a number of key indicators. The intra- and inter-region comparisons within this report can assist local officials in beginning to ensure that the Sangamon County region remains competitive in comparison to peers. This analysis can prove particularly useful when coupled with other tools, such as the SSCRPC's SangStat dashboard for demographic and quality-of-life measures for the region.

While no analysis can provide every data point that policymakers will require for decision-making across an entire decade, this report gathers key metrics and indicators from the 2010 U.S. Census to provide a preliminary basis for comparison. Throughout this report, SSCRPC staff highlights key trends in the "Noteworthy Trends" Box and provide brief discussions of their implications for leaders in the region.

Since census data is often a foundation for statistical research, the SpringfieldSangamon Countr Regional Planning Commission has assembled the area's basic census information for easy access by consumers of this information. Census information has been compiled from the U.S. Census Bureau and can also be located at www.census.gov, particularly through the American FactFinder database.

Unless otherwise noted, data are from US Census Bureau SF1 100\% data files. All graphs, tables, and maps are prepared by the Springfield-Sangamon County Regional Planning Commission. Finally, as noted above, the 2010 U.S. Census did not collect complete education and income data comparable to that collected in prior years' censuses. Accordingly, SSCRPC staff has completed the Census Analysis for these sections using American Community Survey (ACS) data where available. As estimates, ACS data must be considered in light of their varying reliability. Margins of error or reliability estimates are included where applicable and available.
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## Historical Perspective

Springfield, Sangamon County, and Illinois have each experienced a wide range of population growth rates since 1850. Springfield, for example, had a growth rate of $106 \%$ from 1850 to 1860 , but of only $2 \%$ from 1950 to 1960, an unusually low growth rate for a decade which saw significant growth in many regions due to high birth rates following World War II. As population bases increase over time in these geographical areas, the associated growth rates, indicated by a percentage figure, reflect ever larger numbers of actual population increase. For example, the increase of $106 \%$ from Springfield's 1850 population base thus represents an increase of 4,787 residents, whereas the increase of only $2 \%$ from the 1950 Springfield population base of 81,628 inhabitants represents an increase of 1,643 inhabitants. Therefore, an accurate picture of historical population changes must examine both relative and absolute growth figures. Table 1 and Figure 1 depict these figures relative to the city, county, and state over the past sixty years.

Table 1: POPULATION IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE Springfield and Sangamon County, Illinois

|  | Springfield |  | Sangamon County |  | State of Illinois |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Population | Increase <br> from Prior <br> Decade | Population | Increase <br> from Prior <br> Decade | Population | Increase <br> from Prior <br> Decade |
| 1850 | 4,533 |  | 19,228 |  | 851,470 |  |
| 1860 | 9,320 | $106 \%$ | 32,274 | $68 \%$ | $1,711,951$ | $101 \%$ |
| 1870 | 17,364 | $86 \%$ | 46,352 | $44 \%$ | $2,539,891$ | $48 \%$ |
| 1880 | 19,743 | $14 \%$ | 52,894 | $14 \%$ | $3,077,871$ | $21 \%$ |
| 1890 | 24,963 | $26 \%$ | 61,195 | $16 \%$ | $3,826,352$ | $24 \%$ |
| 1900 | 34,159 | $37 \%$ | 71,593 | $17 \%$ | $4,821,550$ | $26 \%$ |
| 1910 | 51,678 | $51 \%$ | 91,024 | $27 \%$ | $5,638,591$ | $17 \%$ |
| 1920 | 59,183 | $15 \%$ | 100,262 | $10 \%$ | $6,485,280$ | $15 \%$ |
| 1930 | 71,864 | $21 \%$ | 111,733 | $11 \%$ | $7,630,654$ | $18 \%$ |
| 1940 | 75,503 | $5 \%$ | 117,912 | $6 \%$ | $7,897,241$ | $3 \%$ |
| 1950 | 81,628 | $8 \%$ | 131,484 | $12 \%$ | $8,712,176$ | $10 \%$ |
| 1960 | 83,271 | $2 \%$ | 146,539 | $11 \%$ | $10,081,158$ | $16 \%$ |
| 1970 | 91,753 | $10 \%$ | 161,335 | $10 \%$ | $11,113,976$ | $10 \%$ |
| 1980 | 100,054 | $9 \%$ | 176,070 | $9 \%$ | $11,426,518$ | $3 \%$ |
| 1990 | 105,227 | $5 \%$ | 178,386 | $1 \%$ | $11,430,602$ | $*$ |
| 2000 | 111,454 | $6 \%$ | 188,951 | $6 \%$ | $12,419,293$ | $9 \%$ |
| 2010 | 116,250 | $4 \%$ | 197,465 | $5 \%$ | $12,830,632$ | $3 \%$ |

*Less than one-half of $1 \%$.

Sangamon County and the State of Illinois display similar fluctuations in growth rates since 1850. Sangamon County was formed in 1821 and assumed its present boundaries in 1839, the date after which population data for the county are comparable. As in Springfield, Sangamon County population growth rates have fallen into a wide range since the mid-nineteenth century. Much like the pattern observed in the State of Illinois, Sangamon County's largest rate of increase was from 1850 to 1860 , when it experienced a growth rate of $68 \%$, in contrast to
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its smallest growth rate of $1 \%$ between 1980 and 1990. The State of Illinois demonstrates an even wider range of growth rate fluctuation, with growth rates from $101 \%$ between 1850 and 1860 to one-half of a $1 \%$ increase for the 1980-1990 decade. For each of these three bodies, growth rates have slowed in recent decades. These declining rates of growth are significant, and maysuggest a move toward potential future population declines.


## Population Growth

In recent decades, mid-size Illinois counties such as Sangamon, Champaign, McLean, Macon, Peoria, Rock Island and Winnebago show considerable variation in growth rates. Sangamon County's population increased moderately at $4.5 \%$ from 2000 to 2010.

Table 2: POPULATION GROWTH
Sangamon and Selected Illinois Counties, 1990-2010

|  | Population |  |  | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| Sangamon | 178,386 | 188,951 | 197,465 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Champaign | 173,025 | 179,668 | 201,081 | $11.9 \%$ |
| McLean | 129,180 | 150,433 | 169,572 | $12.7 \%$ |
| Macon | 117,206 | 114,706 | 110,768 | $-3.4 \%$ |
| Peoria | 182,827 | 183,433 | 186,494 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Rock Island | 148,723 | 149,374 | 147,546 | $-1.2 \%$ |
| Winnebago | 252,913 | 278,418 | 295,266 | $6.1 \%$ |
| Illinois | $\mathbf{1 1 , 4 3 0 , 6 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 4 1 9 , 2 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 8 3 0 , 6 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 3} \%$ |

In comparison, most counties fluctuated at a similarly moderate rate. McLean County proved the exception again with a growth rate of $12.7 \%$ between 2000 and 2010, although this represents a decline from its previous growth rate of 16\% from 1990-2000. Macon and Rock Island Counties both showed a population decrease in the last decade, whereas Peoria and Champaign Counties showed only slight increases.

Within Sangamon County, a comparison of population growth of the twenty-six townships reveals distinct trends from those that occurred in the last decade. Between 1990 and 2000, most townships experienced population increases, with the exception of the east side of the county. In contrast, eleven of the twenty-six townships in Sangamon County experienced decreases in population from 2000 to 2010 . The bulk of these townships were on the west side of the county.

The greatest population growth in the last decades occurred in Ball, Fancy Creek, New Berlin, and Rochester Townships, which all had population growth of over $20 \%$ (Table 3, Figure 2). With the exception of New Berlin and Island Grove Townships, these townships are all located on outside edges of Capital Township and the City of Springfield. These trends represent the increased prevalence of "bedroom communities," or those yetdevelopable communities near enough to the City of Springfield to attract commuters, but which can expand and attract residents without facing some of the growth constraints associated with annexation to the City of Springfield.

Table 3: POPULATION BY TOWNSHIP, Sangamon County 1990-2010

|  | Population |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | \# Change | \% Change |
| Auburn Township | 5,208 | 6,020 | 6,333 | 313 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Ball Township | 3,475 | $\mathbf{4 , 5 7 3}$ | 6,701 | 2,128 | $46.5 \%$ |
| Buffalo Hart Township | 226 | 195 | 173 | -22 | $-11.3 \%$ |
| Capital Township | 104,126 | 111,471 | 115,756 | 4,285 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Cartwright Township | 1,381 | 1,507 | 1,482 | -25 | $-1.7 \%$ |
| Chatham Township | 4,961 | 6,019 | 6,978 | 959 | $15.9 \%$ |
| Clear Lake Township | 7,780 | 8,155 | 8,527 | 372 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Cooper Township | 771 | 820 | 893 | 73 | $8.9 \%$ |
| Cotton Hill Township | 954 | 1,065 | 902 | -163 | $-15.3 \%$ |
| Curran Township | 1,505 | 1,678 | 1,586 | -92 | $-5.5 \%$ |
| Divernon Township | 1,484 | 1,548 | 1,510 | -38 | $-2.5 \%$ |
| Fancy Creek Township | 3,293 | 4,145 | 5,410 | 1,265 | $30.5 \%$ |
| Gardner Township | 3,870 | 4,250 | 4,245 | -5 | $-0.1 \%$ |
| Illiopolis Township | 1,366 | 1,302 | 1,314 | 12 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Island Grove Township | 494 | 532 | 621 | 89 | $16.7 \%$ |
| Lanesville Township | 225 | 199 | 208 | 9 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Loami Township | 1,071 | 1,118 | 1,070 | -48 | $-4.3 \%$ |
| Maxwell Township | 215 | 194 | 193 | -1 | $-0.5 \%$ |
| Mechanicsburg Township | 2,261 | 2,116 | 2,293 | 177 | $8.4 \%$ |
| New Berlin Township | 990 | 1,262 | 1,524 | 262 | $20.8 \%$ |
| Pawnee township | 2,775 | 2,948 | 3,058 | 110 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Rochester Township | 4,432 | 4,486 | 5,361 | 1,145 | $25.5 \%$ |
| Springfield Township | 7,857 | 7,046 | 6,245 | -801 | $-11.4 \%$ |
| Talkington Township | 257 | 263 | 189 | -74 | $-28.1 \%$ |
| Williams Township | 2,797 | 3,310 | 3,446 | 136 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Woodside Township | 14,612 | 12,729 | 11,447 | $-1,282$ | $-10.1 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 7 8 , 3 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 8 , 9 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 5 1 4}$ |
|  | $4.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
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The largest decreases in population in the 2000-2010 decade occurred in the rural areas of Sangamon County. Nine of the eleven townships that experienced decreases in population in the last decade were in rural areas, many in the western portion of the county. The more distant the township area from a larger urban area, the greater the decrease, including Talkington, Buffalo Hart, and Cotton Hill Townships, each with a decrease of more than $10 \%$. It is important to note, however, that these large percentages of decrease may slightly exaggerate the trends in these areas, since their population bases are smaller than those in the rural areas. For example, with a decrease of only 74 people in the last decade, Talkington Township experienced a population growth rate of $-28.1 \%$. Even taking these numerical factors into account, however, there is a pattern of decrease in the rural areas more prevalent in those townships that do not have a strong incorporated area attracting residents. This is likely also related to the mechanization of farming and the decline of smaller family farms, requiring less population in rural areas.

Exceptions to this pattern of decline in rural areas are the large decreases in Woodside and Springfield Townships, which are not as rural in nature. These areas are generally already developed, are covered by Springfield School District 186, and do not represent areas with as many opportunities for growth as some of their neighboring townships that house growing bedroom communities. Residential growth in the Villages of Chatham, Rochester, and Sherman (Chatham, Rochester, and Fancy Creek Townships) may reflect positive resident attitudes toward community attributes, such as village amenities, services, or school districts.

## Noteworthy Trends-

Two significant trends are demonstrated in the population characteristics data that have potential to impact the region significantly:

Sangamon County's growth increased at a slighter rate in the last decade than the prior decade, suggesting that the population's rate of growth is trending downward. This is in contrast to some peer counties that continue to see more robust growth.

Most rural townships in Sangamon County that do not immediately border the urbanized area experienced population decreases. As agricultural communities require fewer people to sustain their industries, birthrates decline, aging populations experience natural declines, gas prices increase, and residents move to urban areas; rural areas in Illinois have begun to see noteworthy decreases in population.

Policymakers in Sangamon County should be aware of these trends and consider them in planning for population retention and expansion, as well as programs targeted to meet rural needs through increased amenities and quality-of-life programming.


Figure 2: POPULATION CHANGE BY TOWNSHIP


Table 4: POPULATION OF INCORPORATED AREAS Sangamon County 1990-2010

|  | Population |  |  | 2000-2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | \# Change | \% Change |
| Auburn | 3,724 | 4,317 | 4,771 | 454 | 11\% |
| Berlin | 180 | 140 | 180 | 40 | 29\% |
| Buffalo | 503 | 491 | 503 | 12 | 2\% |
| Cantrall | 123 | 139 | 139 | 0 | 0\% |
| Chatham | 6,074 | 8,583 | 11,500 | 2,917 | 34\% |
| Clear Lake | 193 | 267 | 229 | -38 | -14\% |
| Curran | n/a** | n/a | 212 |  |  |
| Dawson | 536 | 466 | 509 | 43 | 9\% |
| Divernon | 1,178 | 1,201 | 1,172 | -29 | -2\% |
| Grandview | 1,647 | 1,537 | 1,441 | -96 | -6\% |
| Illiopolis | 934 | 916 | 891 | -25 | -3\% |
| Jerome | 1,206 | 1,414 | 1,656 | 242 | 17\% |
| Leland Grove | 1,679 | 1,592 | 1,503 | -89 | -6\% |
| Loami | 802 | 804 | 745 | -59 | -7\% |
| Mechanicsburg | 538 | 456 | 590 | 134 | 29\% |
| New Berlin | 797 | 1,030 | 1,346 | 316 | 31\% |
| Pawnee | 2,384 | 2,647 | 2,739 | 92 | 3\% |
| Pleasant Plains | 701 | 777 | 802 | 25 | 3\% |
| Riverton | 2,638 | 3,048 | 3,455 | 407 | 13\% |
| Rochester | 2,676 | 2,893 | 3,689 | 796 | 28\% |
| Sherman | 2,080 | 2,871 | 4,148 | 1,277 | 44\% |
| Southern View | 1,906 | 1,695 | 1,642 | -53 | -3\% |
| Spaulding | 440 | 559 | 873 | 314 | 56\% |
| Springfield | 105,227 | 111,454 | 116,250 | 4,796 | 4\% |
| Thayer | 730 | 750 | 693 | -57 | -8\% |
| Virden (part) | 21 | 110 | 108* | 2 | -1\% |
| Williamsville | 1,140 | 1,439 | 1,476 | 37 | 3\% |
| TOTAL | 140,057 | 154,596 | 163,154 | 8,558 | 5\% |

*Estimate of partial population based on previous years' Sangamon County proportion of Virden's population.
** Curran was incorporated in 2005.
Population of incorporated areas in Sangamon County increased by $5.2 \%$ overall. The average growth rate for the various incorporated areas was $10 \%$. The Village of Clear Lake experienced the most population decline. In contrast, Spaulding ( $56 \%$ ), Sherman ( $44 \%$ ), and Chatham (34\%) had the greatest rates of population growth (Table 4). These patterns reflect similar trends to those discussed above related to growth in "bedroom communities," as opposed to rural areas.

## Population Distribution

In 2000, the Springfield Urbanized area, which includes the City of Springfield and Springfield and Woodside Townships, substantially increased in population for the first time since 1970. This trend of increased population in the urbanized area continued from 2000-2010, though with a less dramatic growth rate. The growth rate of the City of Springfield has displayed more modest rates of increase each decade since 1970.

Table 5: POPULATION OF URBANIZED AREA Sangamon County 1970-2010

|  | Urbanized Area |  | City of Springfield |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\#$ | \% Increase | $\#$ | \% Increase |
| 1970 | 125,340 |  | 91,753 |  |
| 1980 | 126,150 | $0.6 \%$ | 99,637 | $8.6 \%$ |
| 1990 | 126,595 | $0.4 \%$ | 105,227 | $5.6 \%$ |
| 2000 | 131,229 | $3.7 \%$ | 111,454 | $5.9 \%$ |
| 2010 | 133,942 | $2.1 \%$ | 116,250 | $4.3 \%$ |

These trends suggest that fewer instances of development and annexation occurred within the City of Springfield in the past decade than in the prior ten years. Since the city is already well-developed, growth in city population occurs primarily through incorporation of new areas. Earlier trends of population growth in the city (1970-1990) were mainly due to population shifts from unincorporated to incorporated areas. The city's annexation policies and a high household formation rate for Baby Boomers, those born between 1946 and 1965, contributed to this situation (see pages 11 and 19 for additional analysis related to the Baby Boomer generation).

In a more detailed examination of where growth occurred within the urbanized area, nearly all of the highest rates of population increase occurred in Census Tracts in rural areas surrounding the City of Springfield, particularly toward the city's west side. The largest numerical increase in population from 2000 to 2010 occurred in Tract 32.01, which experienced an increase of 1,901 people. The highest percentage growth rates for the period from 2000 to 2010 occurred in Tracts 32.01 and 36.03 . Similarly, in 2000, tracts that had experienced the highest rates of growth included 36.03 and 36.04 . All of these tracts are located toward the south and west of the City of Springfield in areas where new development has occurred over the past two decades.

As expected, in 2010, as well as 2000, population increases coincided with housing unit increases. All tracts with substantial increases in population experienced some increase in total number of housing units, and for most of these tracts, the increase in housing units was over $10 \%$.
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Table 6: POPULATION CHANGE- Sangamon County

| Census Tract | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# Change } \\ \text { 1990-2000 } \end{gathered}$ | \% Change 1990-2000 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# Change } \\ \text { 2000-2010 } \end{gathered}$ | \% Change 2000-2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4,251 | 4,270 | 3,967 | 19 | 0.45\% | -303 | -7.10\% |
| 2.01 | 2,555 | 2,474 | 2,401 | -81 | -3.17\% | -73 | -2.95\% |
| 2.02 | 4,125 | 4,176 | 3,902 | 24 | 0.58\% | -274 | -6.56\% |
| 3 | 4,017 | 3,374 | 2,932 | -643 | -16.01\% | -442 | -13.10\% |
| 4 | 3,583 | 3,065 | 2,969 | -518 | -14.46\% | -96 | -3.13\% |
| 5.01 | 2,050 | 2,420 | 2,358 | 370 | 18.05\% | -62 | -2.56\% |
| 5.03 | 3,863 | 4,061 | 4,006 | 198 | 5.13\% | -55 | -1.35\% |
| 5.04 | 3,981 | 3,258 | 3,059 | -723 | -18.16\% | -199 | -6.11\% |
| 6 | 5,943 | 6,001 | 5,233 | 58 | 0.98\% | -768 | -12.80\% |
| 7 | 2,422 | 2,290 | 2,104 | -132 | -5.45\% | -186 | -8.12\% |
| 8 | 2,741 | 1,715 | 2,075 | -1,026 | -37.43\% | 360 | 20.99\% |
| 9 | 3,089 | 2,388 | 2,484 | -701 | -22.69\% | 96 | 4.02\% |
| 10.01 | 1,994 | 2,467 | 2,104 | 473 | 23.72\% | -363 | -14.71\% |
| 10.02 | 6,827 | 6,380 |  | -447 | -6.55\% |  |  |
| 10.03 |  |  | 1,327 |  |  |  |  |
| 10.04 |  |  | 4,631 |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 2,710 | 2,486 | 2,342 | -224 | -8.27\% | -144 | -5.79\% |
| 12 | 3,905 | 3,630 | 3,526 | -275 | -7.04\% | -104 | -2.87\% |
| 13 | 2,246 | 1,929 | 1,742 | -317 | -14.11\% | -187 | -9.69\% |
| 14 | 911 | 928 | 1,027 | 17 | 1.87\% | 99 | 10.67\% |
| 15 | 1,169 | 1,071 | 1,005 | -98 | -8.38\% | -66 | -6.16\% |
| 16 | 4,203 | 3,314 | 3,477 | -889 | -21.15\% | 163 | 4.92\% |
| 17 | 2,003 | 1,818 | 1,241 | -185 | -9.24\% | -577 | -31.74\% |
| 18 | 2,773 | 2,286 | 2,261 | -487 | -17.56\% | -25 | -1.09\% |
| 19 | 3,939 | 3,596 | 3,279 | -343 | -8.71\% | -317 | -8.82\% |
| 20 | 5,103 | 5,925 | 5,955 | 822 | 16.11\% | 30 | 0.51\% |
| 21 | 3,882 | 3,679 | 3,688 | -203 | -5.23\% | 9 | 0.24\% |
| 22 | 3,742 | 3,451 | 3,375 | -291 | -7.78\% | -76 | -2.20\% |
| 23 | 3,061 | 2,681 | 2,460 | -380 | -12.41\% | -221 | -8.24\% |
| 24 | 4,238 | 3,892 | 3,582 | -346 | -8.16\% | -310 | -7.97\% |
| 25 | 4,628 | 4,982 | 5,081 | 354 | 7.65\% | 99 | 1.99\% |
| 26 | 3,102 | 2,804 | 2,580 | -298 | -9.61\% | -224 | -7.99\% |
| 27 | 4,173 | 3,718 | 3,406 | -455 | -10.90\% | -312 | -8.39\% |
| 28.01 | 3,500 | 3,480 | 3,041 | -20 | -0.57\% | -439 | -12.61\% |
| 28.02 | 2,487 | 3,213 | 3,394 | 726 | 29.19\% | 181 | 5.63\% |
| 29 | 4,812 | 5,058 | 4,953 | 246 | 5.11\% | -105 | -2.08\% |
| 30 | 3,281 | 5,331 | 5,912 | 2,050 | 62.48\% | 581 | 10.90\% |
| 31 | 4,588 | 5,733 | 7,296 | 1,145 | 24.96\% | 1,563 | 27.26\% |
| 32.01 | 1,873 | 2,529 | 4,430 | 656 | 35.02\% | 1,901 | 75.17\% |
| 32.02 | 2,641 | 3,251 | 3,972 | 610 | 23.10\% | 721 | 22.18\% |
| 32.03 | 3,133 | 4,764 | 5,811 | 1,631 | 52.06\% | 1,047 | 21.98\% |
| 33 | 4,634 | 4,944 | 5,004 | 310 | 6.69\% | 60 | 1.21\% |
| 34 | 5,171 | 5,975 | 6,290 | 804 | 15.55\% | 315 | 5.27\% |
| 35 | 4,400 | 4,881 | 5,085 | 481 | 10.93\% | 204 | 4.18\% |
| 36.01 | 2,264 | 2,580 | 2,702 | 316 | 13.96\% | 122 | 4.73\% |
| 36.02 | 2,569 | 3,443 | 4,200 | 874 | 34.02\% | 757 | 21.99\% |
| 36.03 | 1,208 | 3,206 | 4,899 | 1,998 | 165.40\% | 1,693 | 52.81\% |
| 36.04 | 580 | 3,293 | 4,637 | 2,713 | 467.76\% | 1,344 | 40.81\% |
| 37 | 5,688 | 7,009 | 8,372 | 1,321 | 23.22\% | 1,363 | 19.45\% |
| 38.01 | 2,750 | 2,899 | 2,759 | 149 | 5.42\% | -140 | -4.83\% |
| 38.02 | 4,765 | 5,232 | 5,846 | 467 | 9.80\% | 614 | 11.74\% |
| 39.01 | 2,796 | 3,611 | 5,102 | 815 | 29.15\% | 1,491 | 41.29\% |
| 39.02 | 3,595 | 3,853 | 3,829 | 258 | 7.18\% | -24 | -0.62\% |
| 40 | 4,395 | 4,137 | 4,352 | -258 | -5.87\% | 215 | 5.20\% |
| Total: | 178,386 | 188,951 | 197,465 | 10,565 | 5.92\% | 8,514 | 4.51\% |

Figure 3: POPULATION CHANGE BY TRACT
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## Noteworthy Trends-

Another important trend evident in the population distribution data is the continued dispersion of the City of Springfield's population. North and central portions of the city have experienced population decline, whereas the southwest portion of the city's census tracts all exhibit increases in population.

While this statistically supported trend parallels intuitive assumptions based on the west side's growth, it is important to note because of its significant potential to impact policy decisions.

New development on the outer reaches of the city, rather than infill development, has potential to increase infrastructure costs to the city and lead to decline and blight in the central city areas.

While some favorable increases in population appear to have occurred in some of the near northeast census tracts in the city, perhaps incentivized by redevelopment projects, the decreases in population in the majority of the central city are a noteworthy and concerning trend.

## Age Characteristics

Continuing the trend from 2000, Census data indicate that the population of Sangamon County as a whole is growing older. Since 1970, median age has been increasing in the State of Illinois, Sangamon County, and the City of Springfield. Years with the largest increases for Sangamon County include from 1980-1990 and 1990-2000. Between 2000 and 2010, median age in Sangamon County increased by just under two years. Median age in Springfield, which is generally slightly lower than Sangamon County's median age, increased by 1.3 years. Significantly, both have higher median ages than the State of Illinois as a whole, pointing toward an aging population in the region.

Increases in median age over the last several decades have been heavily influenced by the aging of the Baby Boom cohort beyond the median age (Table 8). Baby Boomers in 2010 are considered those who are in the age cohort of 45-64 years. In 1970, Baby Boomers were in the under 18 age cohort. Table 8 demonstrates the shifts in population distribution based on the growth of the Baby Boomers. From 1970 to 2000, this age group shifted from under 18 to middle age, and the distribution bulge of above $30 \%$ in these selected age groups represents this trend. In 2010, Baby Boomers were aging beyond the middle range of 35-54 years, seen by the reduction of this figure to $28 \%$.

Table 7: MEDIAN AGE

|  | Illinois | Sangamon County | Springfield |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1970 | 28.6 | 30.3 | 31.4 |
| 1980 | 29.9 | 30.8 | 31 |
| 1990 | 32.8 | 34.2 | 34 |
| 2000 | 34.7 | 37.3 | 36.9 |
| 2010 | 36.6 | 39.2 | 38.2 |

Table 8: DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED AGE GROUPS, \% of Total Population

|  | Under 18 | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 +}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1970 | 34 | 23 | 12 |
| 1980 | 27 | 21 | 13 |
| 1990 | 25 | 26 | 14 |
| 2000 | 25 | 31 | 13 |
| 2010 | 24 | 28 | 14 |

Accordingly, in Table 9, below, the age group of 45-64, which has previously not been a cohort of focus, has been added. The $26 \%$ increase in this group from 2000-2010 indicates that Baby Boomers have now reached this stage of life. The population pyramid (Figure 4) also demonstrates this trend. Sangamon County's pyramid represents a typical 2010 structure, with the Baby Boom generation creating the "bulge" from ages 45-64.

As time continues to pass, this age distribution will have significant impact on the region, as well as the amenities and services its residents may require. Sangamon County's largest population cohort will soon reach retirement age, leading to a higher dependency ratio of non-working population to working population (see page 21 for further discussion). Increases in the relative size of the retirement-age population cohort could have other effects as well. For example, it may lead to population decline as residents relocate. Alternatively, it could lead to ongoing increases in the number of aging residents. In 2020, for instance, nearly $8 \%$ of residents are likely to be reaching age 70, perhaps requiring additional social services and/or medical care. This group would reach
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approximately age 80 by 2030. While life cycle effects will likely lead to a slight reduction in the number of people in this age cohort over time, as natural deaths occur, improved medical care will likely reduce this decline and increase the life expectancy of this age cohort.

Table 9: COMPARISON OF SELECT AGE GROUPS OF INTEREST Sangamon County

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\#$ | $\#$ | $\#$ | $\#$ | $\%$ Change | $\%$ Change | $\%$ Change | $\%$ Change |
| Under 18 Years | 48,356 | 45,551 | 47,147 | 46,816 | $-6 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $-3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 4}$ Years | 36,967 | 46,893 | 59,066 | 55,268 | $27 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $-6 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| $45-64$ Years | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 44,841 | 56,522 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $26 \%$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| $\mathbf{6 5 +}$ Years | 22,037 | 24,450 | 25,524 | 27,362 | $11 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 6 , 0 8 9}$ | 178,386 | 188,951 | 197,465 | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ |

Figure 4: POPULATION PYRAMID


## Geographical Distribution

Median age in Sangamon County varies by geographical area. For instance, the lowest median age county-wide is 27.1 years, in Census Tract 28.07. In contrast, the median age in Census Tract 20 is 55.5 years.

This variation in age is likely linked to other demographic factors as well, such as race and gender.

Table 10 displays the geographic distribution of age groups by township, and Figure 5 gives a visual representation of median age by census tract.

## Noteworthy Trends-

Sangamon County's median age has increased in the last decade, particularly in the western portion of the City of Springfield and in rural areas. Areas that have lower concentrations of white population and lower incomes, in contrast, retain lower median ages.

It will be important for policymakers to consider the needs of this aging population in future years. Some avenues for doing this that may be considered include expansion of medical services, public transit, and community or accessible housing.


Table 10: MEDIAN AGE
Sangamon County 2010

| Census <br> Tract | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 45.5 | 43.8 | 46.8 |
| 2.01 | 42.9 | 40.1 | 44.9 |
| 2.02 | 33.3 | 31.2 | 35.3 |
| 3 | 38.3 | 34.8 | 42.9 |
| 4 | 36.0 | 34.5 | 37.6 |
| 5.01 | 46.1 | 43.8 | 47.8 |
| 5.03 | 35.7 | 34.6 | 36.8 |
| 5.04 | 38.4 | 36.9 | 40.1 |
| 6 | 40.1 | 38.1 | 42.3 |
| 7 | 37.4 | 35.5 | 40.1 |
| 8 | 26.5 | 23.7 | 27.6 |
| 9 | 36.8 | 36.1 | 37.4 |
| 10.01 | 50.8 | 47.6 | 53.1 |
| 10.03 | 46.8 | 44.6 | 48.9 |
| 10.04 | 40.7 | 37.8 | 44.0 |
| 11 | 44.0 | 36.9 | 50.2 |
| 12 | 34.3 | 33.4 | 35.1 |
| 13 | 33.8 | 35.8 | 32.6 |
| 14 | 41.4 | 36.6 | 51.8 |
| 15 | 43.4 | 39.6 | 48.2 |
| 16 | 27.1 | 24.7 | 28.7 |
| 17 | 27.4 | 25.1 | 28.7 |
| 18 | 31.2 | 31.9 | 30.4 |
| 19 | 33.5 | 32.8 | 34.3 |
| 20 | 53.3 | 50.4 | 55.5 |
| 21 | 42.9 | 41.1 | 44.7 |
| 22 | 35.6 | 33.7 | 37.5 |
| 23 | 30.0 | 29.6 | 30.5 |
| 24 | 31.5 | 28.2 | 34.1 |
| 25 | 37.0 | 34.8 | 39.1 |
| 26 | 34.5 | 33.7 | 35.3 |
| 27 | 41.5 | 38.6 | 45.0 |
| 28.01 | 37.1 | 34.6 | 39.5 |
| 28.02 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 27.1 |
| 29 | 44.7 | 42.4 | 46.3 |
| 30 | 30.5 | 29.5 | 32.1 |
| 31 | 43.8 | 43.2 | 44.3 |
| 32.01 | 36.1 | 35.6 | 36.9 |
| 32.02 | 36.3 | 36.0 | 36.6 |
| 32.03 | 38.4 | 37.6 | 39.2 |
| 33 | 38.9 | 38.1 | 39.8 |
| 34 | 35.6 | 33.6 | 37.3 |
| 35 | 40.1 | 39.8 | 40.5 |
| 36.01 | 46.2 | 45.5 | 46.7 |
| 36.02 | 47.0 | 44.5 | 48.9 |
| 36.03 | 44.4 | 43.7 | 45.0 |
| 36.04 | 44.4 | 43.5 | 45.3 |
| 37 | 42.3 | 41.0 | 43.5 |
| 38.01 | 41.0 | 41.4 | 40.7 |
| 38.02 | 38.8 | 38.0 | 39.5 |
| 39.01 | 41.4 | 41.3 | 41.7 |
| 39.02 | 43.2 | 43.1 | 43.2 |
| 40 | 40.5 | 40.3 | 40.9 |
| Total: | 39.2 | 37.7 | 40.6 |
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Figure 5: MEDIAN AGE BY TRACT
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## Age by Township

An examination of townships suggests that the highest percentages of children (those under 18) are in Ball Township and Maxwell Township, both of which have $30 \%$ of the population in this age cohort. By way of comparison, in 2000 Ball and Cartwright Townships each had a high distribution of $30 \%$. Sangamon County has a county-wide distribution of $27 \%$ under the age of 18 in 2010, whereas in 2000 there were $25 \%$ under the age of 18 .

In 2010, Buffalo Hart Township had the lowest percentage of children, $12 \%$. This continues a striking trend of decreasing numbers of children in this township, down from 16\% in 2000 and 31\% in 1990. Buffalo Hart Township's rural character, including no municipalities, provides a likely explanation for these aging trends.

As Table 11 indicates, the lowest median age, 35.7, occurred in Auburn and Chatham Townships. Buffalo Hart had the highest median age, 51.9. The median age for Sangamon County in 2010 was 39.2.

Table 11: SELECTED AGE CHARACTERISTICS
Sangamon County Townships, 2010

|  | \% Under <br> 18 Years | \% 65 <br> Years + | Median <br> Age |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auburn Twp | $28 \%$ | $11 \%$ | 35.7 |
| Ball Twp | $30 \%$ | $9 \%$ | 37.9 |
| Buffalo Hart Twp | $12 \%$ | $21 \%$ | 51.9 |
| Capital Twp | $23 \%$ | $14 \%$ | 38.1 |
| Cartwright Twp | $27 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 41.2 |
| Chatham Twp | $26 \%$ | $10 \%$ | 35.7 |
| Clear Lake Twp | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 40.6 |
| Cooper Twp | $24 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 42.3 |
| Cotton Hill Twp | $22 \%$ | $12 \%$ | 44.7 |
| Curran Twp | $20 \%$ | $17 \%$ | 47.9 |
| Divernon Twp | $24 \%$ | $14 \%$ | 42.4 |
| Fancy Creek Twp | $25 \%$ | $16 \%$ | 42.8 |
| Gardner Twp | $23 \%$ | $15 \%$ | 45.8 |
| Illiopolis Twp | $26 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 38.7 |
| Island Grove Twp | $23 \%$ | $18 \%$ | 44.9 |
| Lanesville Twp | $25 \%$ | $12 \%$ | 38.5 |
| Loami Twp | $25 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 40.4 |
| Maxwell Twp | $30 \%$ | $9 \%$ | 37.8 |
| Mechanicsburg Twp | $24 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 40.3 |
| New Berlin Twp | $27 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 37.0 |
| Pawnee Twp | $27 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 37.1 |
| Rochester Twp | $28 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 42.3 |
| Springfield Twp | $22 \%$ | $14 \%$ | 40.0 |
| Talkington Twp | $23 \%$ | $15 \%$ | 43.6 |
| Williams Twp | $26 \%$ | $11 \%$ | 41.6 |
| Woodside Twp | $20 \%$ | $17 \%$ | 43.0 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{2 7 . 3 \%}$ | $13.9 \%$ | 39.2 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 12：
COMPARATIVE AGE DISTRIBUTION，
2000－2010
Selected Geographies

Table 12 provides a preliminary look at the growth trends for specific age cohorts in Sangamon County as compared to both the State of Illinois and the City of Springfield．

As the county＇s age distribution data discussed above suggest， fewer children and higher proportions of older adults now reside in the county．However， Sangamon County＇s decrease in residents age 18 and under is smaller than the decrease experienced by Illinois in the last decade．Sangamon County showed a decline of only $0.7 \%$ ， compared to a $3.5 \%$ decline for the state at large．The City of Springfield has experienced even less of a decline and also had a smaller increase than the county or state in its population age 60 and over．
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { ㅇㅡㅡㅡㄹ } \end{aligned}$ |  | 20 | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \underset{r}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \underset{m}{2} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & m \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \mathrm{~N} \\ & \mathrm{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{1}{2} \\ & \underset{1}{2} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & n \\ & n \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{寸}{9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{m}{N}$ | $\stackrel{m}{n}$ | $\stackrel{n}{m}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\text { ®T}}$ | $\stackrel{\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | กั่ |
|  | O-8 | 29 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ | $\stackrel{m}{n}$ | $\underset{N}{N}$ | $\stackrel{9}{6}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \underset{7}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 6 \\ -1 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{m}$ | $\xrightarrow{4}$ |  | H C N | n | 6 $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
|  |  | ＊ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 9 \\ \underset{4}{4} \\ 0^{2} \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \alpha_{1} \\ & \text { Ni } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ \infty \\ 0 \\ \infty \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{gathered}\right.$ | $$ | N O O－ O－ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{N}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathbf{N} \\ & \mathrm{n}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \\ & \text { ò } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { Nָ } \\ & \text { त्न } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{-i}{\underset{\sim}{n}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ \％ － －i |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline-\lambda \\ & \hline N \end{aligned}$ | 20 | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} n \\ 6 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} N \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 9 \\ 6 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} n \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \underset{y}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 7 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7 \\ \forall \end{array}$ | $\infty$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{*}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ | $\xrightarrow{N}$ | $\xrightarrow[\sim]{n}$ |
|  |  | 潥 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} N \\ N \\ N \\ \omega \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \text { on } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & 寸 \\ & \sigma^{\prime} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{q}_{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{n} \\ & \stackrel{1}{n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{N} \\ & \underset{i}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n^{n} \\ & N \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $o$ $\infty$ 0 0 $\cdots$ $\cdots$ $\cdots$ | $\hat{N}$ N N N $\underset{\sim}{*}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O- } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N్ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \stackrel{n}{6} \\ & 6 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | m － － O－ － |
|  |  | 告 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 7 \\ & 9 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 7 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 9 \\ 7 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \cdots \\ \cdots \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { } \\ 0 \\ 9 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} q^{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ n \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 寸 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ m \\ m \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & N \\ & 9 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} \pm \\ \infty \\ o \\ \vdots \\ N \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{1}{\circ}}$ |  |  |  |  |

## Under 18 Age Group

Throughout the county, the historical trend has been a gradual decline in the number of children (defined as those under 18 years of age) from decade to decade. From 2000 to 2010, only ten census tracts showed an increase in the number of children. This increase was negligible in all but Tracts 8 (near east Springfield) and 13 (downtown). With $39 \%$ of its population under 18 years of age, Census Tract 8 has the greatest distribution of children in the County. Tract 8's relatively low median age reflects this fact.

For Tract 8 (which includes the area between $11^{\text {th }}$ and $19^{\text {th }}$ Streets that is north of Jefferson Street and south of North Grand Street), the new development of residential homes in Madison Park place likely led to this increase. Tract 13 runs from $5^{\text {th }}$ Street to Walnut Street, between Jefferson Street and Lawrence Street. Here, the substantial increase in the under-18 population is likely due to additional residential housing downtown, on top of an initially small residential base, allowing for smaller numerical increases to reflect greater percentage change.

In contrast, Tract 14 has only 4\% children, followed by Tract 27 with $19 \%$ children. These low percentage distributions of children are in keeping with the historical trends for these tracts. Figure 6 depicts the percent distribution of those under 18 years of age by tract in 2010. Census tracts with over $30 \%$ of their population under 18 years of age are concentrated on the east side of the City of Springfield. The large proportions of children in these areas are noteworthy, particularly given some other demographic challenges facing the area.

Table 13: HISTORICAL \% UNDER 18 YEARS; Sangamon County

| Census Tract | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 32 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 18 |
| 2 | 38 | 25 | 23 |  |  |
| 2.01 |  |  |  | 20 | 20 |
| 2.02 |  |  |  | 24 | 25 |
| 3 | 26 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 23 |
| 4 | 29 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 |
| 5 | 40 | 33 |  |  |  |
| 5.01 |  |  | 27 | 24 | 20 |
| 5.02 |  |  | 27 |  |  |
| 5.03 |  |  |  | 24 | 24 |
| 5.04 |  |  |  | 27 | 24 |
| 6 | 36 | 27 | 24 | 23 | 22 |
| 7 | 41 | 28 | 24 | 24 | 22 |
| 8 | 41 | 38 | 40 | 34 | 39 |
| 9 | 22 | 18 | 24 | 25 | 23 |
| 10 | 35 | 21 | 19 |  |  |
| 10.01 |  |  |  | 24 | 17 |
| 10.02 |  |  |  | 16 |  |
| 10.03 |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 10.04 |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| 11 | 27 | 20 | 20 | 18 | 17 |
| 12 | 27 | 21 | 23 | 22 | 23 |
| 13 | 16 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 21 |
| 14 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| 15 | 33 | 33 | 23 | 22 | 22 |
| 16 | 36 | 35 | 37 | 38 | 37 |
| 17 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 38 | 34 |
| 18 | 17 | 15 | 19 | 22 | 25 |
| 19 | 25 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 22 |
| 20 | 44 | 33 | 28 | 21 | 18 |
| 21 | 31 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 21 |
| 22 | 29 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 |
| 23 | 31 | 26 | 30 | 32 | 32 |
| 24 | 40 | 34 | 32 | 35 | 33 |
| 25 | 42 | 26 | 21 | 25 | 25 |
| 26 | 29 | 21 | 23 | 21 | 22 |
| 27 | 35 | 23 | 20 | 21 | 19 |
| 28 | 33 | 22 | 20 |  |  |
| 28.01 |  |  |  | 23 | 22 |
| 28.02 |  |  |  | 21 | 22 |
| 29 | 42 | 30 | 24 | 22 | 20 |
| 30 | 39 | 30 | 23 | 20 | 17 |
| 31 | 35 | 29 | 26 | 26 | 23 |
| 32 | 41 | 37 | 32 |  |  |
| 32.01 |  |  |  | 30 | 28 |
| 32.02 |  |  |  | 30 | 26 |
| 32.03 |  |  |  | 31 | 29 |
| 33 | 36 | 31 | 28 | 27 | 26 |
| 34 | 35 | 32 | 30 | 30 | 28 |
| 35 | 35 | 30 | 28 | 27 | 26 |
| 36 | 39 | 32 | 28 |  |  |
| 36.01 |  |  |  | 27 | 24 |
| 36.02 |  |  |  | 27 | 23 |
| 36.03 |  |  |  | 29 | 24 |
| 36.04 |  |  |  | 26 | 22 |
| 37 | 40 | 33 | 29 | 27 | 25 |
| 38 | 34 | 31 | 28 |  |  |
| 38.01 |  |  |  | 25 | 22 |
| 38.02 |  |  |  | 27 | 26 |
| 39 | 39 | 33 | 31 |  |  |
| 39.01 |  |  |  | 28 | 29 |
| 39.02 |  |  |  | 27 | 25 |
| 40 | 38 | 32 | 29 | 26 | 24 |
| Total: | 34 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 24 |

## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

Figure 6: UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE BY TRACT


## Baby Boom Generation (45-64 Years)

As discussed above, the Baby Boom generation, age 45 to 64 in 2010, are an age group of historical importance. The Baby Boom generation was born between 1946 and 1965, in a time of high fertility rates and rising levels of births. In 2010, Baby Boomers made up approximately $29 \%$ of the population of Sangamon County, as compared to $31 \%$ in 2000.

Geographically, Census 2010 indicates that larger concentrations of Baby Boomers reside in the area surrounding the City of Springfield than within the city. These areas represent more affluent and rural areas.

In Sangamon County, the Baby Boom population ranges from a low of $18 \%$ in Tract 28.02 to a high of $38 \%$ in Tract 36.01 (Figure 7).

As a whole, Sangamon County's population has aged since 2000. As the Baby Boom generation ages, there are not as many members of the 25 to 44 year-old age cohort to replace their demographic in Sangamon County's workforce. In 2000, the Baby Boom generation was part of the 35 to 54 age cohort, and therefore was still a presence in the County's labor force. However, as the Baby Boom generation nears retirement age, the aging population will be a concern for Sangamon County.

As discussed above, some of the implications of these changes include increasing retirements or increased need for social services and healthcare. Particularly because this age cohort generally lives in the outlying areas surrounding the city, transportation to and from these amenities for aging residents may also be a policy matter of concern.

Table 14: BABY BOOM GENERATION
Sangamon County 2010

| Census Tract | Total | 45 to 64 years | \% 45 to 64 years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3,967 | 1,378 | 34.7 |
| 2.01 | 2,401 | 736 | 30.7 |
| 2.02 | 3,902 | 963 | 24.7 |
| 3 | 2,932 | 705 | 24.0 |
| 4 | 2,969 | 790 | 26.6 |
| 5.01 | 2,358 | 774 | 32.8 |
| 5.03 | 4,006 | 997 | 24.9 |
| 5.04 | 3,059 | 870 | 28.4 |
| 6 | 5,233 | 1,497 | 28.6 |
| 7 | 2,104 | 541 | 25.7 |
| 8 | 2,075 | 399 | 19.2 |
| 9 | 2,484 | 691 | 27.8 |
| 10.01 | 2,104 | 729 | 34.6 |
| 10.03 | 1,327 | 425 | 32.0 |
| 10.04 | 4,631 | 1,240 | 26.8 |
| 11 | 2,342 | 594 | 25.4 |
| 12 | 3,526 | 949 | 26.9 |
| 13 | 1,742 | 468 | 26.9 |
| 14 | 1,027 | 310 | 30.2 |
| 15 | 1,005 | 270 | 26.9 |
| 16 | 3,477 | 685 | 19.7 |
| 17 | 1,241 | 259 | 20.9 |
| 18 | 2,261 | 578 | 25.6 |
| 19 | 3,279 | 872 | 26.6 |
| 20 | 5,955 | 1,984 | 33.3 |
| 21 | 3,688 | 1,135 | 30.8 |
| 22 | 3,375 | 871 | 25.8 |
| 23 | 2,460 | 542 | 22.0 |
| 24 | 3,582 | 847 | 23.6 |
| 25 | 5,081 | 1,337 | 26.3 |
| 26 | 2,580 | 665 | 25.8 |
| 27 | 3,406 | 985 | 28.9 |
| 28.01 | 3,041 | 784 | 25.8 |
| 28.02 | 3,394 | 612 | 18.0 |
| 29 | 4,953 | 1,475 | 29.8 |
| 30 | 5,912 | 1,387 | 23.5 |
| 31 | 7,296 | 2,494 | 34.2 |
| 32.01 | 4,430 | 1,189 | 26.8 |
| 32.02 | 3,972 | 1,119 | 28.2 |
| 32.03 | 5,811 | 1,761 | 30.3 |
| 33 | 5,004 | 1,436 | 28.7 |
| 34 | 6,290 | 1,603 | 25.5 |
| 35 | 5,085 | 1,512 | 29.7 |
| 36.01 | 2,702 | 1,013 | 37.5 |
| 36.02 | 4,200 | 1,388 | 33 |
| 36.03 | 4,899 | 1,713 | 35.0 |
| 36.04 | 4,637 | 1,481 | 31.9 |
| 37 | 8,372 | 2,605 | 31.1 |
| 38.01 | 2,759 | 886 | 32.1 |
| 38.02 | 5,846 | 1,700 | 29.1 |
| 39.01 | 5,102 | 1,631 | 32.0 |
| 39.02 | 3,829 | 1,298 | 33.9 |
| 40 | 4,352 | 1,349 | 31.0 |
| Total: | 197,465 | 56,522 | 28.6 |

Figure 7: BABY BOOM GENERATION BY TRACT


## Age 65 and Above

In keeping with the aging population trends of the nation, the number of persons age 65 and older has increased by approximately $7 \%$ since 2000 in both Sangamon County and the State of Illinois. Although the proportion of the population in this age cohort decreased from 1990-2000, this proportion increased to $13.9 \%$ in 2010. In 2010, this age cohort made up 13.9\% of Sangamon County's total population, compared to $13.5 \%$ in 2000. The geographical distribution of this cohort is represented in Table 14 and Figure 8.

The highest concentrations of those aged 65 and older expanded in geographical distribution toward the outlying areas around the city of Springfield, particularly on its west side. This represents a slight change from 2000, when tracts within Springfield's downtown and near west side, such as $3,14,15,10.02$, and 11 had the highest percentages. In contrast, Tract 20, with $28.2 \%$ over the age of 65 , had the highest concentration in 2010. Tracts 10.01, 11, and 15 had the next highest concentrations, all with over $20 \%$. This suggests that, while tracts that previously had high percentages of elderly residents maintained relatively similar distributions of those aged 65 and older, aging patterns in other, surrounding tracts have caused more tracts to fall into the category with highest percentages of respondents in this age cohort.

## Noteworthy Trends -

Another useful way to consider age data is to develop dependency ratios for a region. Age dependency ratios represent the percentage of residents that are either children ( $0-18$ years), elderly ( 65 years + ), or both (considered the dependent populations), as compared to the population of working age (19-64 years). Dependency ratios for Sangamon County and Illinois are provided to the left.

|  | Sangamon County | Illinois |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age dependency ratio | 66.4 | 58.6 |
| Old-age dependency ratio | 24.4 | 19.9 |
| Child dependency ratio | 41.8 | 38.7 |

> These ratios suggest that the population that is of working age has an unusually high portion of dependent population to support in this region. While these ratios are not
> a perfect metric because some

residents work prior to age 18 and after age 65, they nevertheless provide a simple and useful representation of the potential impact that age distribution may have on the economic well-being of the region. Increases in the proportions of older and younger populations can place demands on healthcare, social services, and education services, which can create strain on governmental entities, particularly in a scenario where the economic base of those in the labor force is not robust enough to support these service levels.


## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

TABLE 15: AGE 65 YEARS AND OVER, SANGAMON COUNTY

| Census Tract | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | \% Change 2000-2010 | \% of Tract 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 471 | 596 | 639 | 7.2\% | 16.1\% |
| 2 | 805 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.01 |  | 438 | 404 | -7.8\% | 16.8\% |
| 2.02 |  | 489 | 443 | -9.4\% | 11.4\% |
| 3 | 962 | 741 | 558 | -24.7\% | 19.0\% |
| 4 | 716 | 494 | 344 | -30.4\% | 11.6\% |
| 5.01 | 230 | 346 | 439 | 26.9\% | 18.6\% |
| 5.02 | 895 |  |  |  |  |
| 5.03 |  | 708 | 555 | -21.6\% | 13.9\% |
| 5.04 |  | 266 | 388 | 45.9\% | 12.7\% |
| 6 | 872 | 941 | 794 | -15.6\% | 15.2\% |
| 7 | 384 | 371 | 315 | -15.1\% | 15.0\% |
| 8 | 289 | 183 | 122 | -33.3\% | 5.9\% |
| 9 | 619 | 403 | 282 | -30.0\% | 11.4\% |
| 10 | 1675 |  |  |  |  |
| 10.01 |  | 401 | 481 | 20.0\% | 22.9\% |
| 10.02 |  | 1450 |  |  |  |
| 10.03 |  |  | 261 |  | 19.7\% |
| 10.04 |  |  | 867 |  | 18.7\% |
| 11 | 707 | 585 | 553 | -5.5\% | 23.6\% |
| 12 | 467 | 348 | 260 | -25.3\% | 7.4\% |
| 13 | 399 | 252 | 163 | -35.3\% | 9.4\% |
| 14 | 246 | 186 | 145 | -22.0\% | 14.1\% |
| 15 | 344 | 285 | 219 | -23.2\% | 21.8\% |
| 16 | 418 | 294 | 332 | 12.9\% | 9.5\% |
| 17 | 270 | 181 | 112 | -38.1\% | 9.0\% |
| 18 | 484 | 247 | 156 | -36.8\% | 6.9\% |
| 19 | 698 | 405 | 277 | -31.6\% | 8.4\% |
| 20 | 589 | 1438 | 1682 | 17.0\% | 28.2\% |
| 21 | 710 | 648 | 618 | -4.6\% | 16.8\% |
| 22 | 690 | 520 | 381 | -26.7\% | 11.3\% |
| 23 | 468 | 300 | 210 | -30.0\% | 8.5\% |
| 24 | 486 | 424 | 416 | -1.9\% | 11.6\% |
| 25 | 655 | 774 | 748 | -3.4\% | 14.7\% |
| 26 | 572 | 394 | 261 | -33.8\% | 10.1\% |
| 27 | 812 | 678 | 576 | -15.0\% | 16.9\% |
| 28 | 855 |  |  |  |  |
| 28.01 |  | 587 | 443 | -24.5\% | 14.6\% |
| 28.02 |  | 206 | 177 | -14.1\% | 5.2\% |
| 29 | 575 | 834 | 987 | 18.3\% | 19.9\% |
| 30 | 179 | 568 | 705 | 24.1\% | 11.9\% |
| 31 | 493 | 687 | 1017 | 48.0\% | 13.9\% |
| 32 | 467 |  |  |  |  |
| 32.01 |  | 211 | 478 | 126.5\% | 10.8\% |
| 32.02 |  | 279 | 374 | 34.1\% | 9.4\% |
| 32.03 |  | 296 | 511 | 72.6\% | 8.8\% |
| 33 | 559 | 554 | 646 | 16.6\% | 12.9\% |
| 34 | 689 | 690 | 718 | 4.1\% | 11.4\% |
| 35 | 574 | 589 | 675 | 14.6\% | 13.3\% |
| 36 | 698 |  |  |  |  |
| 36.01 |  | 244 | 386 | 58.2\% | 14.3\% |
| 36.02 |  | 564 | 853 | 51.2\% | 20.3\% |
| 36.03 |  | 247 | 698 | 182.6\% | 14.2\% |
| 36.04 |  | 274 | 788 | 187.6\% | 17.0\% |
| 37 | 610 | 902 | 1214 | 34.6\% | 14.5\% |
| 38 | 869 |  |  |  |  |
| 38.01 |  | 335 | 370 | 10.4\% | 13.4\% |
| 38.02 |  | 528 | 670 | 26.9\% | 11.5\% |
| 39 | 464 |  |  |  |  |
| 39.01 |  | 323 | 574 | 77.7\% | 11.3\% |
| 39.02 |  | 373 | 505 | 35.4\% | 13.2\% |
| 40 | 483 | 447 | 572 | 28.0\% | 13.1\% |
| Total: | 24,448 | 25,524 | 27,362 | 7.2\% | 13.9\% |

Figure 8: AGE 65 AND OLDER, BY TRACT
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## Cross-Group Age Comparisons

Table 16: AGE BY SEX Sangamon County, 2010

|  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ |
| Under 5 years | 6,280 | 6.6 | 6,135 | 6.0 |
| 5 to 9 years | 6,723 | 7.1 | 6,502 | 6.3 |
| 10 to 14 years | 6,593 | 7.0 | 6,343 | 6.2 |
| 15 to 19 years | 6,678 | 7.0 | 6,387 | 6.2 |
| 20 to 24 years | 5,802 | 6.1 | 5,890 | 5.7 |
| 25 to 29 years | 6,295 | 6.6 | 6,857 | 6.7 |
| 30 to 34 years | 6,032 | 6.4 | 6,306 | 6.1 |
| 35 to 39 years | 5,817 | 6.1 | 6,189 | 6.0 |
| 40 to 44 years | 6,335 | 6.7 | 6,417 | 6.2 |
| 45 to 49 years | 7,393 | 7.8 | 7,793 | 7.6 |
| 50 to 54 years | 7,352 | 7.8 | 7,972 | 7.8 |
| 55 to 59 years | 6,740 | 7.1 | 7,430 | 7.2 |
| 60 to 64 years | 5,527 | 5.8 | 6,315 | 6.1 |
| 65 to 69 years | 3,708 | 3.9 | 4,405 | 4.3 |
| 70 to 74 years | 2,767 | 2.9 | 3,427 | 3.3 |
| 75 to 79 years | 2,030 | 2.1 | 2,881 | 2.8 |
| 80 to 84 | 1,517 | 1.6 | 2,572 | 2.5 |
| 85 to 89 years | 888 | 0.9 | 1,787 | 1.7 |
| 90 years and over | 303 | 0.3 | 1,077 | 1.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 23,841 | 25.2 | 22,975 | 22.4 |
| Under 21 years | 27,469 | 29.0 | 26,519 | 25.8 |
| 60 years and over | 16,704 | 17.6 | 22,464 | 21.9 |
| 65 years and over | 11,213 | 11.8 | 16,149 | 15.7 |

The age distribution by sex and race also represent important demographic information for a region. In Sangamon County, trends for age and sex comparisons mirror those generally found nation-wide, although the differences in age groups by sex are sharper. For example, both in Sangamon County and the United States, higher percentages of females than males can be found in the oldest population cohorts. This is not unusual, as life expectancy on average is lower for men than for women. Males typically have higher mortality rates during infant, child, and young adult years, contributing to this trend. Nationwide, $14.6 \%$ of females are age 65 and older as compared to $13.0 \%$ of males. Sangamon County has a more dramatic distinction of $15.7 \%$ of females in this cohort, compared to $11.8 \%$ of males. In contrast, a higher percentage of males fall into the cohort under 18 years of age than females by $2.8 \%$. This difference in distribution is greater than the difference in the United States, which is only 0.9\%.

The trend of a slightly more elderly distribution of the female population occurs in all racial groups except that of American Indians, suggested by the median ages presented in Table 17, below.

Table 17 also indicates that the median age for black residents of Sangamon County is substantially lower than that of white or American Indian residents. Blacks have a median age of 26.8 years of age, compared to the total median age of 40.6 for Sangamon County. Asians have a median age of 33.1 years.

Table 17: MEDIAN AGE BY RACE
Sangamon County 2010

| Race | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 42.0 | 40.4 | 43.6 |
| American Indian | 40.6 | 41.0 | 40.5 |
| Asian | 33.1 | 31.9 | 34.4 |
| Black | 26.8 | 25.4 | 28.0 |
| TOTAL | 40.6 | 41.0 | 40.5 |

## Race Characteristics

## Composition

As in 2000, the white population was the largest racial group in both Sangamon County and the City of Springfield in 2010. However, the white population made up a smaller percentage of the population in 2010 in both areas, with $83.6 \%$ in Sangamon County (compared to $87 \%$ in 2000) and $75.8 \%$ in Springfield (compared to $81 \%$ ). This trend stems from increases in the black population, especially in Springfield, and slight increases in the population of two or more races.

In 2010, the black population was the largest minority with $11.8 \%$ in Sangamon County and $18.5 \%$ in Springfield. About $2.2 \%$ of the population indicated that they were of two or more racial groups. Small percentages of the population fell into the Asian (1.6\% total) or Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (0.1\%) categories.

Table 18: RACIAL COMPOSITION OF POPULATION, 2010

|  | Sangamon County |  | Springfield |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ |
| One Race | 193,146 | 97.8 | 113,187 | 97.4 |
| White | 165,103 | 83.6 | 88,092 | 75.8 |
| Black or African American | 23,335 | 11.8 | 21,510 | 18.5 |
| American Indian and Alaskan Native | 394 | 0.2 | 239 | 0.2 |
| Asian | 3,220 | 1.6 | 2,555 | 2.2 |
| Asian Indian | 1160 | 0.6 | 1,160 | 1.0 |
| Chinese | 611 | 0.3 | 611 | 0.5 |
| Filipino | 347 | 0.2 | 347 | 0.3 |
| Japanese | 87 | 0.0 | 87 | 0.1 |
| Korean | 249 | 0.1 | 249 | 0.2 |
| Vietnamese | 271 | 0.1 | 271 | 0.2 |
| Pakistani | 146 | 0.1 | 146 | 0.1 |
| Taiwanese | 74 | 0.1 | 74 | 0.1 |
| Thai | 52 | 0.0 | 52 | 0.0 |
| Other | 117 | 0.0 | 117 | 0.1 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 47 | 0.1 | 25 | 0.0 |
| Native Hawaiian | 9 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.0 |
| Guamanian or Chamorro | 13 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 |
| Samoan | 12 | 0.0 | 6 | 0.0 |
| Other Pacific Islander | 4 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 |
| Some other race | 1,047 | 0.5 | 766 | 0.7 |
| Two or more races | 4,319 | 2.2 | 3,063 | 2.6 |
| TOTAL | 197,465 |  | 116,250 |  |

## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

Although not a racial category, "persons of Hispanic origin" is a population subgroup of great interest, especially since it is one of the fastest growing subgroups in the country. In Sangamon County, there was a $74.0 \%$ increase in the number of persons of Hispanic origin between 2000 and 2010 and, in Springfield, a $73.9 \%$ increase. This represents an acceleration in the trends of population increase for persons of Hispanic origin since the last decade, when the subgroup grew by $57 \%$ in Sangamon County and $54 \%$ in Springfield. However, in both geographic locations, "persons of Hispanic origin" constituted 2\% of the population or less (Table 19). This percentage is significantly lower than the $15.8 \%$ population of persons of Hispanic origin in the State of Illinois.

Table 19: PERSONS OF HISPANIC ORIGIN (of Any Race)

|  | Sangamon County | Springfield |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 2,000 | 1,337 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 3,480 | 2,325 |
| \# Change | 1,480 | 988 |
| \% Change | $74.0 \%$ | $73.9 \%$ |

Table 20: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS OF HISPANIC ORIGIN, 2010

|  | Sangamon County |  | Springfield |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\#$ | \% of Total <br> Population | $\#$ | \% of Total <br> Population |
| Mexican | $\mathbf{1 , 9 5 6}$ | $0.99 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 7}$ | $1.11 \%$ |
| Puerto Rican | $\mathbf{4 9 5}$ | $0.25 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 7 4}$ | $0.32 \%$ |
| Cuban | $\mathbf{8 2}$ | $0.04 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $0.04 \%$ |
| Other Hispanic | $\mathbf{9 4 7}$ | $0.48 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 1 7}$ | $0.53 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{3 , 4 8 0}$ | $1.76 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 , 3 2 5}$ | $2.00 \%$ |

Racial diversity in Sangamon County has continued to increase over the past decade. From 2000-2010, the total population grew at a rate of $4.5 \%$. The black, Asian, other, and two or more races population groups grew at rates far higher than this over the last decade. Those of two or more races experienced the greatest proportional increase as a percentage of population, with approximately $88 \%$ growth. Numerically, the group that grew the most was blacks, with an increase of 5,098. In contrast, whites, Native Hawaiians, and American Indians experienced population decreases. As a proportion of the total population of the county, blacks experienced the greatest increase in their population distribution. These trends are similar to those that occurred from 1990-2000, with accelerated rates of increase in racial diversity.

In contrast to the 2000 Census, 2010 data indicate that whites experienced both numerical and proportional decreases in the last decade, with a decline of 616 people, from 87.4 to $83.6 \%$. Although the total population's growth rate in the City of Springfield was roughly the same as that for Sangamon County, racial trends were even more pronounced in Springfield. Whites experienced a $5.2 \%$ decrease in the proportion of the City's population they made up, and the black population proportion grew by $3.2 \%$. In Springfield, the black population increased at a slightly lower rate than it did county-wide over the ten-year period, potentially a numerical effect of the larger population base in this decade than in the last. However, the Asian population increased at a higher rate within the City than it did elsewhere in the county (Table 21).

## Table 21: RACIAL COMPOSITION AND DISTRIBUTION

|  | 2000 |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ Sangamon County (total) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Racial Designation | Pop. | \% Dist. | Pop. | \% Dist. | \# Change <br> $2000-2010$ | \% Change <br> $2000-2010$ | \% Change in <br> Distribution |
| White | 165,719 | $87.4 \%$ | 165,103 | $83.6 \%$ | -616 | $-0.37 \%$ | $-3.80 \%$ |
| Black | 18,237 | $9.7 \%$ | 23,335 | $11.8 \%$ | 5,098 | $27.95 \%$ | $2.10 \%$ |
| American Indian | 397 | $0.2 \%$ | 394 | $0.2 \%$ | -3 | $-0.76 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Asian | 2,082 | $1.1 \%$ | 3,220 | $1.6 \%$ | 1,138 | $54.66 \%$ | $0.50 \%$ |
| Hawaiian | 53 | $0.0 \%$ | 47 | $0.1 \%$ | -6 | $-11.32 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ |
| Other | 709 | $0.4 \%$ | 1,047 | $0.5 \%$ | 338 | $47.67 \%$ | $0.10 \%$ |
| Two or More | 2,294 | $1.2 \%$ | 4,319 | $2.2 \%$ | 2,025 | $88.27 \%$ | $1.00 \%$ |
| Total | 188,951 |  | 197,465 |  | $\mathbf{8 , 5 1 4}$ | $4.51 \%$ |  |
| Hispanic | 2,000 | $1.1 \%$ | 3,480 | $1.8 \%$ | 1,480 | $74.00 \%$ | $0.70 \%$ |

City of Springfield

|  | 2000 |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Racial Designation | Pop. | \% Dist. | Pop. | \% Dist. | \# Change <br> $2000-2010$ | \% Change <br> $2000-2010$ | \% Change in <br> Distribution |
| White | 90,287 | $81.0 \%$ | 88,092 | $75.8 \%$ | $-2,195$ | $-2.4 \%$ | $-5.2 \%$ |
| Black | 17,096 | $15.3 \%$ | 21,510 | $18.5 \%$ | 4,414 | $25.8 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| American Indian | 231 | $0.2 \%$ | 239 | $0.2 \%$ | 8 | $3.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Asian | 1,620 | $1.5 \%$ | 2,555 | $2.2 \%$ | 935 | $57.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Hawaiian | 34 | - | 25 | $0.0 \%$ | -9 | $-26.5 \%$ |  |
| Other | 525 | $0.5 \%$ | 766 | $0.7 \%$ | 241 | $45.9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Two or More | 1,661 | $1.5 \%$ | 3,063 | $2.6 \%$ | 1,402 | $84.4 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 1 1 , 4 5 4}$ |  | 116,250 |  | $\mathbf{4 , 7 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3 \%}$ |  |
| Hispanic | 1,337 | $1.2 \%$ | 2,325 | $2.0 \%$ | 988 | $73.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |

## Distribution

As indicated above, minority racial groups in Sangamon County are concentrated in the City of Springfield. Approximately $59 \%$ of the Sangamon County's total population lives in Springfield. However, $92 \%$ of the black population and $79 \%$ of the Asian population, the two largest minority groups, reside within the City (Figure 9). The population outside of Springfield is predominately white. Only $5.2 \%$ of the population outside of Springfield is not white. However, this represents an increase from $3.2 \%$ in 2010 , indicating that racial diversity in the county is becoming slightly more dispersed.

Figure 9: RACIAL POPULATION DISTRIBUTION- WITHIN CITY OF SPRINGFIELD Sangamon County 2010


The 2010 Census suggests that the patterns of increased dispersion of the black population from the 2000 Census have continued in the last decade. Fifty percent of the total black population lived in only the nine tracts with the highest concentration of blacks in 2010, which included Tracts 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 28.02, and 30 (Table 22, Figure 10), all in east Springfield. In contrast, fifty percent of the black population could be found in only six tracts in 2000. This effect comes from the increases in the dispersion of the black population living in Tracts 19, 25, 28.02, and 30, accompanied by proportional decreases in the other most heavily concentrated tracts. The tract with the highest concentration of black population was Tract 17 with $78 \%$. Rural tracts in Sangamon County maintained concentrations under or around 1\% black.

In a comparison of Census 2000 and 2010, with very few exceptions, census tracts generally experienced moderate to large increases in the percentage of their population that was black. The tracts that experienced decreases were those that previously had the highest proportions of black population, such as Tracts 15,16 , and 17. However, these tracts still represent the highest concentrations of the black population, which cluster on the east side of Springfield (Figure 10). The continued increases in the black population (28\%) over the last decade account for these trends of dispersion and increased areas of concentration. Regardless of this variation among specific census tracts, however, it is important to note that overall patterns related to the geographical distribution of various racial groups in the City of Springfield remained similar to prior years' patterns and perhaps became even more entrenched as more white residents moved to areas outside the City of Springfield. For example, Springfield experienced a decline of $2.4 \%$ for white residents while experiencing a $25.8 \%$ increase in its black population.

Figure 10: PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF BLACK POPULATION, BY TRACT


Table 22: POPULATION BY TRACT- Black Only, Sangamon County

| Census Tract | Total | Black or African American | \% of Tract Black | \% Distribution of Black Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3,967 | 144 | 3.6\% | 0.6\% |
| 2.01 | 2,401 | 213 | 8.9\% | 0.9\% |
| 2.02 | 3,902 | 572 | 14.7\% | 2.5\% |
| 3 | 2,932 | 505 | 17.2\% | 2.2\% |
| 4 | 2,969 | 370 | 12.5\% | 1.6\% |
| 5.01 | 2,358 | 167 | 7.1\% | 0.7\% |
| 5.03 | 4,006 | 444 | 11.1\% | 1.9\% |
| 5.04 | 3,059 | 318 | 10.4\% | 1.4\% |
| 6 | 5,233 | 501 | 9.6\% | 2.1\% |
| 7 | 2,104 | 197 | 9.4\% | 0.8\% |
| 8 | 2,075 | 1,221 | 58.8\% | 5.2\% |
| 9 | 2,484 | 908 | 36.6\% | 3.9\% |
| 10.01 | 2,104 | 199 | 9.5\% | 0.9\% |
| 10.02 |  |  |  |  |
| 10.03 | 1,327 | 89 | 6.7\% | 0.4\% |
| 10.04 | 4,631 | 684 | 14.8\% | 2.9\% |
| 11 | 2,342 | 101 | 4.3\% | 0.4\% |
| 12 | 3,526 | 387 | 11.0\% | 1.7\% |
| 13 | 1,742 | 395 | 22.7\% | 1.7\% |
| 14 | 1,027 | 311 | 30.3\% | 1.3\% |
| 15 | 1,005 | 692 | 68.9\% | 3.0\% |
| 16 | 3,477 | 2631 | 75.7\% | 11.3\% |
| 17 | 1,241 | 969 | 78.1\% | 4.2\% |
| 18 | 2,261 | 635 | 28.1\% | 2.7\% |
| 19 | 3,279 | 746 | 22.8\% | 3.2\% |
| 20 | 5,955 | 227 | 3.8\% | 1.0\% |
| 21 | 3,688 | 188 | 5.1\% | 0.8\% |
| 22 | 3,375 | 249 | 7.4\% | 1.1\% |
| 23 | 2,460 | 1129 | 45.9\% | 4.8\% |
| 24 | 3,582 | 2278 | 63.6\% | 9.8\% |
| 25 | 5,081 | 1580 | 31.1\% | 6.8\% |
| 26 | 2,580 | 294 | 11.4\% | 1.3\% |
| 27 | 3,406 | 204 | 6.0\% | 0.9\% |
| 28.01 | 3,041 | 402 | 13.2\% | 1.7\% |
| 28.02 | 3,394 | 875 | 25.8\% | 3.7\% |
| 29 | 4,953 | 422 | 8.5\% | 1.8\% |
| 30 | 5,912 | 768 | 13.0\% | 3.3\% |
| 31 | 7,296 | 233 | 3.2\% | 1.0\% |
| 32.01 | 4,430 | 171 | 3.9\% | 0.7\% |
| 32.02 | 3,972 | 86 | 2.2\% | 0.4\% |
| 32.03 | 5,811 | 61 | 1.0\% | 0.3\% |
| 33 | 5,004 | 14 | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |
| 34 | 6,290 | 28 | 0.4\% | 0.1\% |
| 35 | 5,085 | 29 | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 36.01 | 2,702 | 15 | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |
| 36.02 | 4,200 | 76 | 1.8\% | 0.3\% |
| 36.03 | 4,899 | 82 | 1.7\% | 0.4\% |
| 36.04 | 4,637 | 268 | 5.8\% | 1.1\% |
| 37 | 8,372 | 44 | 0.5\% | 0.2\% |
| 38.01 | 2,759 | 67 | 2.4\% | 0.3\% |
| 38.02 | 5,846 | 29 | 0.5\% | 0.1\% |
| 39.01 | 5,102 | 66 | 1.3\% | 0.3\% |
| 39.02 | 3,829 | 36 | 0.9\% | 0.2\% |
| 40 | 4,352 | 15 | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |
| Total: | 197,465 | 23,335 | 11.8\% | 100.0\% |

Table 23: BLACK POPULATION: \% CHANGE FROM 1990-2010

| Census Tract | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | \# Change 2000-2010 | \% Change 2000-2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 28 | 108 | 161 | 129 | 144 | 15 | 12\% |
| 2 | 86 | 208 | 246 | 499 | 785 | 286 | 57\% |
| 2.01 |  |  |  | 109 | 213 |  |  |
| 2.02 |  |  |  | 390 | 572 |  |  |
| 3 | 216 | 263 | 259 | 357 | 505 | 148 | 41\% |
| 4 | 15 | 32 | 128 | 194 | 370 | 176 | 91\% |
| 5 | 8 | 178 | 277 | 646 | 929 | 283 | 44\% |
| 5.01 |  |  | 38 | 120 | 167 |  |  |
| 5.02 |  |  | 239 |  |  |  |  |
| 5.03 |  |  |  | 277 | 444 |  |  |
| 5.04 |  |  |  | 249 | 318 |  |  |
| 6 | 57 | 155 | 248 | 362 | 501 | 139 | 38\% |
| 7 | 3 | 31 | 51 | 115 | 197 | 82 | 71\% |
| 8 | 1482 | 1660 | 1380 | 722 | 1221 | 499 | 69\% |
| 9 | 16 | 178 | 510 | 644 | 908 | 264 | 41\% |
| 10 | 2 | 282 | 395 | 640 | 972 | 332 | 52\% |
| 10.01 |  |  |  | 146 | 199 |  |  |
| 10.02 |  |  |  | 494 |  |  |  |
| 10.03 |  |  |  |  | 89 |  |  |
| 10.04 |  |  |  |  | 684 |  |  |
| 11 | 1 | 18 | 25 | 76 | 101 | 25 | 33\% |
| 12 | 15 | 44 | 150 | 183 | 387 | 204 | 111\% |
| 13 | 12 | 165 | 256 | 291 | 395 | 104 | 36\% |
| 14 | 77 | 19 | 124 | 221 | 311 | 90 | 41\% |
| 15 | 1566 | 960 | 808 | 764 | 692 | -72 | -9\% |
| 16 | 946 | 1989 | 2713 | 2369 | 2631 | 262 | 11\% |
| 17 | 1512 | 1585 | 1549 | 1434 | 969 | -465 | -32\% |
| 18 | 46 | 156 | 258 | 407 | 635 | 228 | 56\% |
| 19 | 88 | 180 | 321 | 492 | 746 | 254 | 52\% |
| 20 | 3 | 56 | 67 | 146 | 227 | 81 | 55\% |
| 21 | 7 | 40 | 55 | 146 | 188 | 42 | 29\% |
| 22 | 11 | 21 | 44 | 106 | 249 | 143 | 135\% |
| 23 | 298 | 491 | 763 | 1106 | 1129 | 23 | 2\% |
| 24 | 1201 | 1775 | 2252 | 2350 | 2278 | -72 | -3\% |
| 25 | 16 | 123 | 291 | 1100 | 1580 | 480 | 44\% |
| 26 | 29 | 63 | 127 | 261 | 294 | 33 | 13\% |
| 27 | 4 | 38 | 49 | 98 | 204 | 106 | 108\% |
| 28 | 0 | 224 | 305 | 995 | 1277 | 282 | 28\% |
| 28.01 |  |  |  | 405 | 402 |  |  |
| 28.02 |  |  |  | 590 | 875 |  |  |
| 29 | 0 | 108 | 155 | 270 | 422 | 152 | 56\% |
| 30 | 6 | 88 | 166 | 411 | 768 | 357 | 87\% |
| 31 | 5 | 39 | 68 | 145 | 233 | 88 | 61\% |
| 32 | 0 | 19 | 14 | 91 | 318 | 227 | 249\% |
| 32.01 |  |  |  | 25 | 171 |  |  |
| 32.02 |  |  |  | 39 | 86 |  |  |
| 32.03 |  |  |  | 27 | 61 |  |  |
| 33 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 13 | 14 | 1 | 8\% |
| 34 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 28 | 14 | 100\% |
| 35 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 30 | 29 | -1 | -3\% |
| 36 | 4 | 38 | 52 | 251 | 441 | 190 | 76\% |
| 36.01 |  |  |  | 8 | 15 |  |  |
| 36.02 |  |  |  | 41 | 76 |  |  |
| 36.03 |  |  |  | 38 | 82 |  |  |
| 36.04 |  |  |  | 164 | 268 |  |  |
| 37 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 27 | 44 | 17 | 63\% |
| 38 | 41 | 10 | 21 | 61 | 96 | 35 | 57\% |
| 38.01 |  |  |  | 46 | 67 |  |  |
| 38.02 |  |  |  | 15 | 29 |  |  |
| 39 | 2 | 16 | 20 | 54 | 102 | 48 | 89\% |
| 39.01 |  |  |  | 18 | 66 |  |  |
| 39.02 |  |  |  | 36 | 36 |  |  |
| 40 | 35 | 18 | 21 | 17 | 15 | -2 | -12\% |

## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

Table 24: RACE OF POPULATION, Sangamon County 2010

|  | Total | Pop. Of one race | White alone | Black or African American alone | Am. Ind. \& Alaska Native alone | Asian alone | Nat. Haw. \& Other Pac.. Island alone | Some other race alone | Pop. Of two or more races |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3,967 | 3,893 | 3,689 | 144 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 23 | 74 |
| 2.01 | 2,401 | 2,359 | 2,096 | 213 | 3 | 34 | 1 | 12 | 42 |
| 2.02 | 3,902 | 3,719 | 3,068 | 572 | 9 | 33 | 7 | 30 | 183 |
| 3 | 2,932 | 2,820 | 2,210 | 505 | 13 | 81 | 2 | 9 | 112 |
| 4 | 2,969 | 2,889 | 2,456 | 370 | 12 | 30 | 1 | 20 | 80 |
| 5.01 | 2,358 | 2,314 | 2,117 | 167 | 2 | 17 | 1 | 10 | 44 |
| 5.03 | 4,006 | 3,875 | 3,378 | 444 | 10 | 21 | 0 | 22 | 131 |
| 5.04 | 3,059 | 2,988 | 2,635 | 318 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 17 | 71 |
| 6 | 5,233 | 5,072 | 4,497 | 501 | 27 | 28 | 0 | 19 | 161 |
| 7 | 2,104 | 2,044 | 1,824 | 197 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 60 |
| 8 | 2,075 | 1,983 | 724 | 1,221 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 92 |
| 9 | 2,484 | 2,374 | 1,429 | 908 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 19 | 110 |
| 10.01 | 2,104 | 2,054 | 1,761 | 199 | 1 | 75 | 0 | 18 | 50 |
| 10.03 | 1,327 | 1,306 | 1,151 | 89 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 15 | 21 |
| 10.04 | 4,631 | 4,523 | 3,673 | 684 | 11 | 139 | 1 | 15 | 108 |
| 11 | 2,342 | 2,307 | 2,159 | 101 | 3 | 28 | 0 | 16 | 35 |
| 12 | 3,526 | 3,425 | 2,971 | 387 | 5 | 38 | 0 | 24 | 101 |
| 13 | 1,742 | 1,675 | 1,182 | 395 | 5 | 53 | 0 | 40 | 67 |
| 14 | 1,027 | 1,006 | 662 | 311 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 21 |
| 15 | 1,005 | 988 | 291 | 692 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 16 | 3,477 | 3,358 | 679 | 2,631 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 119 |
| 17 | 1,241 | 1,166 | 177 | 969 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 75 |
| 18 | 2,261 | 2,154 | 1,480 | 635 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 21 | 107 |
| 19 | 3,279 | 3,146 | 2,334 | 746 | 9 | 44 | 0 | 13 | 133 |
| 20 | 5,955 | 5,880 | 5,400 | 227 | 11 | 220 | 0 | 22 | 75 |
| 21 | 3,688 | 3,610 | 3,346 | 188 | 8 | 44 | 1 | 23 | 78 |
| 22 | 3,375 | 3,291 | 2,987 | 249 | 8 | 23 | 1 | 23 | 84 |
| 23 | 2,460 | 2,342 | 1,175 | 1,129 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 26 | 118 |
| 24 | 3,582 | 3,432 | 1,123 | 2,278 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 150 |
| 25 | 5,081 | 4,937 | 3,267 | 1,580 | 12 | 53 | 1 | 24 | 144 |
| 26 | 2,580 | 2,482 | 2,133 | 294 | 6 | 30 | 1 | 18 | 98 |
| 27 | 3,406 | 3,328 | 3,081 | 204 | 11 | 21 | 0 | 11 | 78 |
| 28.01 | 3,041 | 2,927 | 2,424 | 402 | 9 | 71 | 0 | 21 | 114 |
| 28.02 | 3,394 | 3,279 | 2,130 | 875 | 7 | 160 | 3 | 104 | 115 |
| 29 | 4,953 | 4,871 | 4,216 | 422 | 7 | 175 | 4 | 47 | 82 |
| 30 | 5,912 | 5,762 | 4,643 | 768 | 7 | 302 | 0 | 42 | 150 |
| 31 | 7,296 | 7,220 | 6,790 | 233 | 4 | 165 | 0 | 28 | 76 |
| 32.01 | 4,430 | 4,356 | 4,041 | 171 | 5 | 110 | 5 | 24 | 74 |
| 32.02 | 3,972 | 3,907 | 3,715 | 86 | 2 | 82 | 4 | 18 | 65 |
| 32.03 | 5,811 | 5,738 | 5,543 | 61 | 5 | 110 | 0 | 19 | 73 |
| 33 | 5,004 | 4,893 | 4,854 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 111 |
| 34 | 6,290 | 6,229 | 6,133 | 28 | 12 | 15 | 5 | 36 | 61 |
| 35 | 5,085 | 5,026 | 4,963 | 29 | 7 | 21 | 0 | 6 | 59 |
| 36.01 | 2,702 | 2,671 | 2,631 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 7 | 31 |
| 36.02 | 4,200 | 4,177 | 4,017 | 76 | 3 | 79 | 0 | 2 | 23 |
| 36.03 | 4,899 | 4,847 | 4,492 | 82 | 5 | 244 | 1 | 23 | 52 |
| 36.04 | 4,637 | 4,570 | 3,973 | 268 | 3 | 307 | 0 | 19 | 67 |
| 37 | 8,372 | 8,282 | 8,152 | 44 | 14 | 60 | 1 | 11 | 90 |
| 38.01 | 2,759 | 2,722 | 2,620 | 67 | 9 | 20 | 1 | 5 | 37 |
| 38.02 | 5,846 | 5,784 | 5,710 | 29 | 17 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 62 |
| 39.01 | 5,102 | 5,049 | 4,913 | 66 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 17 | 53 |
| 39.02 | 3,829 | 3,774 | 3,695 | 36 | 4 | 18 | 1 | 20 | 55 |
| 40 | 4,352 | 4,322 | 4,293 | 15 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 30 |
| TOTAL | 197,465 | 193,146 | 165,103 | 23,335 | 394 | 3,220 | 47 | 1,047 | 4,319 |

As Table 24 suggests, there are no overwhelming areas of population concentration for other racial minorities in Sangamon County. Since so few members of these populations live in Sangamon County, the reliability of trends for populations is limited. One exception may be the Asian population, which appears more likely to live in the southern and western parts of the City of Springfield. Nearly $50 \%$ of the Asian population in Sangamon County lives in Tracts 10.04, 28.02, 29, 30, 31, 36.03, 36.04 (Table 24).

## Noteworthy Trends-

In a trend similar - though perhaps of less
magnitude - to the one occurring
throughout the nation, Sangamon
County's population became more diverse
in the past decade. Black and Asian
populations grew and became slightly more disperse throughout the City of Springfield and Sangamon County. However, the highest concentration of black residents remains in East Springfield, as has been the historical pattern. The population of Hispanic origin also increased.

Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

## Households

## Household Growth

By Census definition, a household is all the people who occupy a housing unit. Throughout the past two decades, the number of households has increased in Springfield, Sangamon County, and Illinois (Table 25). The growth rate of households exceeded the rate of population growth from 2000 to 2010. Particularly in the City of Springfield, household growth far surpassed population growth. The continued trend of smaller household size contributed to the higher household formation rate. Several smaller household types that have experienced increases may have contributed to this trend, including increased numbers of single-person elderly households and single-parent families (see dependency ratio discussion on page 21). The tendency of young adults to marry and form shared households somewhat later than in prior decades may also be contributing to higher individual household formation rates, as well as lower average numbers of persons per household.

Table 25: GROWTH IN HOUSEHOLDS, 2000-2010

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Increase | \% Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Springfield | 48,621 | 55,729 | 7,108 | 14.6 |
| Sangamon County | 78,722 | 82,986 | 4,264 | 5.4 |
| Illinois | $4,591,779$ | $4,836,972$ | 245,193 | 5.3 |

Table 26: GROWTH RATES (\%) FOR HOUSEHOLDS

|  | Growth in Households <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0} \mathbf{- 2 0 1 0}$ | Growth in Population <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0} \mathbf{- 2 0 1 0}$ | Growth <br> Households : Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Springfield | 14.6 | 4.3 | $3.4: 1$ |
| Sangamon County | 5.4 | 4.5 | $1.2: 1$ |
| Illinois | 5.3 | 3.3 | $1.6: 1$ |

Growth in the number of households from 2000-2010 varied in different portions of the county. The sharpest declines in households occurred in the north and east parts of the City of Springfield. The single greatest change in households occurred in Tract 17, with a 33\% decrease, and Tract 32.01, with an 84\% increase. The largest increases in households were on the west and south sides of Springfield.

Throughout the region, growth trends for number of households paralleled those for population. Households tended to have sharper changes in percentage increases and decreases, which would be expected due to the lower total number of households (Table 26). The only tract where this pattern of parallel trends did not hold true was Tract 9 on the northeast side of Springfield.

Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010
Table 27: NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS, 2000-2010; Sangamon County

| Census Tract | 2000 Total Households | 2010 Total Households | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# Change } \\ \text { 2000-2010 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { \% Change } \\ & \text { 2000-2010 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1,866 | 1,810 | -56 | -3\% |
| 2.01 | 1,150 | 1,149 | -1 | 0\% |
| 2.02 | 1,987 | 1,821 | -166 | -8\% |
| 3 | 1,388 | 1,160 | -228 | -16\% |
| 4 | 1,393 | 1,329 | -64 | -5\% |
| 5.01 | 958 | 1,011 | 53 | 6\% |
| 5.03 | 1,776 | 1,717 | -59 | -3\% |
| 5.04 | 1,243 | 1,236 | -7 | -1\% |
| 6 | 2,713 | 2,372 | -341 | -13\% |
| 7 | 957 | 936 | -21 | -2\% |
| 8 | 584 | 723 | 139 | 24\% |
| 9 | 1,104 | 1,035 | -69 | -6\% |
| 10.01 | 1,049 | 1,004 | -45 | -4\% |
| 10.02 | 3,227 |  |  |  |
| 10.03 |  | 706 |  |  |
| 10.04 |  | 2,415 |  |  |
| 11 | 1,195 | 1,150 | -45 | -4\% |
| 12 | 1,709 | 1,635 | -74 | -4\% |
| 13 | 1,114 | 969 | -145 | -13\% |
| 14 | 532 | 568 | 36 | 7\% |
| 15 | 474 | 388 | -86 | -18\% |
| 16 | 1,174 | 1,253 | 79 | 7\% |
| 17 | 609 | 406 | -203 | -33\% |
| 18 | 1,210 | 1,052 | -158 | -13\% |
| 19 | 1,868 | 1,659 | -209 | -11\% |
| 20 | 2,542 | 2,713 | 171 | 7\% |
| 21 | 1,683 | 1,704 | 21 | 1\% |
| 22 | 1,611 | 1,591 | -20 | -1\% |
| 23 | 1,027 | 904 | -123 | -12\% |
| 24 | 1,414 | 1,344 | -70 | -5\% |
| 25 | 2,061 | 2,130 | 69 | 3\% |
| 26 | 1,272 | 1,190 | -82 | -6\% |
| 27 | 1,679 | 1,576 | -103 | -6\% |
| 28.01 | 1,597 | 1,456 | -141 | -9\% |
| 28.02 | 1,628 | 1,643 | 15 | 1\% |
| 29 | 2,202 | 2,242 | 40 | 2\% |
| 30 | 2,244 | 2,312 | 68 | 3\% |
| 31 | 2,129 | 2,938 | 809 | 38\% |
| 32.01 | 924 | 1,699 | 775 | 84\% |
| 32.02 | 1,192 | 1,591 | 399 | 33\% |
| 32.03 | 1,679 | 2,084 | 405 | 24\% |
| 33 | 1,920 | 1,994 | 74 | 4\% |
| 34 | 2,228 | 2,361 | 133 | 6\% |
| 35 | 1,880 | 1,999 | 119 | 6\% |
| 36.01 | 944 | 1,031 | 87 | 9\% |
| 36.02 | 1,261 | 1,657 | 396 | 31\% |
| 36.03 | 1,140 | 1,925 | 785 | 69\% |
| 36.04 | 1,360 | 2,015 | 655 | 48\% |
| 37 | 2,473 | 3,097 | 624 | 25\% |
| 38.01 | 1,023 | 1,001 | -22 | -2\% |
| 38.02 | 2,025 | 2,273 | 248 | 12\% |
| 39.01 | 1,285 | 1,841 | 556 | 43\% |
| 39.02 | 1,417 | 1,464 | 47 | 3\% |
| 40 | 1,602 | 1,707 | 105 | 7\% |
| TOTAL | 78,722 | 82,986 | 4,264 | 5\% |

Figure 11: PERCENT CHANGE IN HOUSEHOLDS, 2000-2010 BY TRACT


> | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Housenords } \\ \% \text { Change } \\ \text { 200 }\end{array}$ | Households \% Change |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2000-2010 |  |



## Type of Household

The Census distinguishes between two basic types of households. A family household consists of two or more persons, including the householder, who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption, and who live together as one household. A family may be husband/wife, female/no spouse with children or other relatives, or male/no spouse with children or other relatives. It may also include non-relatives living with the family. A non-family household consists of a person living alone or of a householder living with unrelated individuals which includes partners of the opposite sex or same sex. Due to difference in state policy, the Census Bureau does not distinguish for those with registered civil unions, which are included in "non-family" households of two or more. The Census Bureau indicates that "Same-sex couple households are included in the family households category if there is at least one additional person related to the householder by birth or adoption. Same-sex couple households with no relatives of the householder present are tabulated in nonfamily households."

Table 28 suggests that the majority of households in Sangamon County are family households (62\%), although a variety of households exists. Among non-family households, most (83\%) are one-person households, and approximately a third of these one-person households are comprised of elderly persons. Among these one-person households in which the householder is over 65 years of age, 2,291 were male householders, and 6,512 were female. Slightly less than half of all households are married couples, among which slightly over $40 \%$ have children ( $18 \%$ of total households). Generally speaking, the last several decades have seen a decline in traditional married couple households.

Table 28: HOUSEHOLD TYPE, Sangamon County; 2010

| Total Households | $\mathbf{8 2 , 9 8 6}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family | $51,376(62 \%)$ |  |  |
| Married Couple |  | $36,835(44 \%)$ |  |
| With Children |  |  | $14,969(18 \%)$ |
| Without Children |  | $14,541(18 \%)$ | $21,866(26 \%)$ |
| Other Family |  |  | $7,627(9 \%)$ |
| Female Head with Children |  |  | $6,914(8 \%)$ |
| Other | $31,610(38 \%)$ |  |  |
| Non-Family |  | $26,389(32 \%)$ | $8,803(11 \%)$ |
| 1-Person Household |  |  | $17,586(21 \%)$ |
| Over 65 Years |  |  |  |
| Under 65 Years |  | $5,221(6 \%)$ |  |
| 2+ Persons |  |  |  |

*All percentages are based upon total households $(82,986)$.
Household type varies by race. Compared to the rest of the population, Asians have a slightly higher percentage of family households at $71 \%$. Black households have the lowest proportion of married couple households at $15 \%$. As Table 29 suggests, Asian couples have the highest proportion of married households at an estimated 71\%. Among white families, married couples were $46 \%$ of total households in 2010 as compared to $50 \%$ in 2000.

Table 29: HOUSEHOLD TYPE BY RACE
Sangamon County; 2010

|  | White | Black | Asian |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family | $43,680(61 \%)$ | $5,238(59 \%)$ | $895(71 \%)$ |
| Married Couple | $32,865(46 \%)$ | $1,369(15 \%)$ | $895(71 \%)$ |
| Other Family | $10,815(15 \%)$ | $3,869(44 \%)$ | 0 |
| Non-Family | $27,712(39 \%)$ | $3,607(41 \%)$ | $371(29 \%)$ |
| Total Households: | $71,392(100 \%)$ | $8,845(100 \%)$ | $1,266(100 \%)$ |

Due to shortened Census 2010 form, Household Type by Race data are not available in the Census SF1 File form. Table 29 data are estimates taken from the American Community Survey, 2010 One-Year Estimates.
(See C11001B in American Factfinder 2).

Household composition has changed greatly since 1980. The number of married couple households has declined, in contrast to a growth in the number of total households. Total households increased by $22 \%$ from 1980 to 2010, whereas the percentage change in married households was $-5.6 \%$. The numbers of female-headed families with children, non-traditional families, and non-family households have increased steadily since 1980 (Table 30).

Table 30: HOUSEHOLDS

## Sangamon County

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | \% Change <br> $\mathbf{2 0 0 0} \mathbf{- 2 0 1 0}$ | \% Change <br> $\mathbf{1 9 8 0 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Households | $\mathbf{6 8 , 0 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 , 1 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 , 7 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 , 9 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 0}$ |
| Family | 47,313 | 47,543 | 49,898 | 51,376 | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 6}$ |
| Married Couple | 39,016 | 37,408 | 37,974 | 36,835 | $\mathbf{- 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 . 6}$ |
| With Children | 19,462 | 17,212 | 16,560 | 14,969 | $\mathbf{- 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 3 . 1}$ |
| Without Children | 19,554 | 20,196 | 21,414 | 21,866 | $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 8}$ |
| Other Family | 8,297 | 10,135 | 11,924 | 14,541 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3}$ |
| Female Head with <br> any related children | 4,143 | 4,883 | 5,881 | 7,627 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 . 1}$ |
| Other | 4,154 | 5,252 | 6,043 | 6,914 | $\mathbf{1 4 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 4}$ |
| Non-Family | 20,709 | 24,603 | 28,824 | 31,610 | $\mathbf{9 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 6}$ |
| 1-Person Household | 18,239 | 21,218 | 24,374 | 26,389 | $\mathbf{8 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 7}$ |
| Over 65 Years | 7,006 | 8,159 | 8,324 | 8,803 | $\mathbf{5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 6}$ |
| Under 65 Years | 11,233 | 13,059 | 16,050 | 17,586 | $\mathbf{9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 6}$ |
| 2+ Persons | 2,470 | 3,385 | 4,450 | 5,221 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 4}$ |

## One-Person Households

One-person households are a growing component of the fabric of Sangamon County household types as well. In the last three decades, the number of one-person households has increased by $44.7 \%$. This is likely due to the increased aging population, as well as the tendency for young adults to postpone marriage for longer periods of time, which are nationwide trends. The distribution of one-person households, however, has not changed relative to the total population in the last decade. Although the number of one-person households increased by $8.3 \%$ from 2000-2010, this is in keeping with the rate of total household growth, as approximately $31 \%$ of households were one-person households in both 2000 and 2010.

## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

## Table 31: ONE-PERSON HOUSEHOLDS, Sangamon County, 2010

## Noteworthy Trends-

One-person households have increased by $8.3 \%$ in the past decade and are concentrated in the central east part of the City of Springfield. Policymakers should consider the implications of this trend, which could point to aging residents, increased likelihood for younger generations to postpone forming families until later in life, or some other pattern with potential to impact service needs and preferences.

Generally speaking, there has been a dramatic change in the distribution of certain family types that make up households in Sangamon County. Between 1980 and 2010, there was a $23 \%$ decrease in married couples with children, but an $84 \%$ increase in femaleheaded households with related children and a 66\% increase in other family types, including grandparents caring for children. These family types can often be correlated with lower incomes, increased difficulty in providing childcare when children are not in school, and other challenges.

It is therefore also important for policymakers to consider this trend, which represents not just a change in the nature of households, but a transformational change in how our region thinks about family as part of its social fabric.


|  |  | One-person Households |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Census Tract | Total Households | \# | \% |
| 1 | 1,810 | 594 | 33 |
| 2.01 | 1,149 | 460 | 40 |
| 2.02 | 1,821 | 757 | 42 |
| 3 | 1,160 | 482 | 42 |
| 4 | 1,329 | 53 | 40 |
| 5.01 | 1,011 | 276 | 27 |
| 5.03 | 1,717 | 552 | 32 |
| 5.04 | 1,236 | 328 | 27 |
| 6 | 2,372 | 888 | 37 |
| 7 | 936 | 314 | 34 |
| 8 | 723 | 193 | 27 |
| 9 | 1,035 | 586 | 57 |
| 10.01 | 1,004 | 364 | 36 |
| 10.03 | 706 | 316 | 45 |
| 10.04 | 2,415 | 1,178 | 49 |
| 11 | 1,150 | 561 | 49 |
| 12 | 1,635 | 642 | 39 |
| 13 | 969 | 535 | 55 |
| 14 | 568 | 459 | 81 |
| 15 | 388 | 209 | 54 |
| 16 | 1,253 | 367 | 29 |
| 17 | 406 | 103 | 25 |
| 18 | 1,052 | 477 | 45 |
| 19 | 1,659 | 833 | 50 |
| 20 | 2,713 | 885 | 33 |
| 21 | 1,704 | 591 | 35 |
| 22 | 1,591 | 639 | 40 |
| 23 | 904 | 240 | 27 |
| 24 | 1,344 | 395 | 29 |
| 25 | 2,130 | 687 | 32 |
| 26 | 1,190 | 449 | 38 |
| 27 | 1,576 | 609 | 39 |
| 28.01 | 1,456 | 602 | 41 |
| 28.02 | 1,643 | 661 | 40 |
| 29 | 2,242 | 744 | 33 |
| 30 | 2,312 | 904 | 39 |
| 31 | 2,938 | 654 | 22 |
| 32.01 | 1,699 | 322 | 19 |
| 32.02 | 1,591 | 365 | 23 |
| 32.03 | 2,084 | 318 | 15 |
| 33 | 1,994 | 469 | 24 |
| 34 | 2,361 | 523 | 22 |
| 35 | 1,999 | 451 | 23 |
| 36.01 | 1,031 | 173 | 17 |
| 36.02 | 1,657 | 436 | 26 |
| 36.03 | 1,925 | 369 | 19 |
| 36.04 | 2,015 | 672 | 33 |
| 37 | 3,097 | 562 | 18 |
| 38.01 | 1,001 | 231 | 23 |
| 38.02 | 2,273 | 489 | 22 |
| 39.01 | 1,841 | 298 | 16 |
| 39.02 | 1,464 | 278 | 19 |
| 40 | 1,707 | 366 | 21 |
| TOTAL | 82,986 | 25,909 | 31 |

Figure 12: PERCENTAGE ONE-PERSON HOUSEHOLDS BY TRACT, 2010


## Elderly Households

Households in which the householder is 65 years of age or older increased by $7.8 \%$ in Sangamon County from 2000 to 2010. This is a notably higher rate of increase than that of the last decade ( $4 \%$ from 1990 to 2000). Interestingly, the proportion of elderly residents in the county overall (approximately $22 \%$ ) is similar to that of the last two decades (Table 32).

This disparity can be explained by examining the trends within versus outside of the City of Springfield. The City has seen a slight growth in the number of elderly households ( $3.7 \%$ ), whereas the portion of Sangamon County that is outside the City of Springfield has seen an increase of $15.3 \%$ in elderly households. However, the City has experienced $14.6 \%$ growth in its total households of all age groups, whereas the growth in Sangamon County has been far more moderate ( $5.4 \%$ ). While the County as a whole has an increased number of elderly households, as a percentage of the total population this trend is even more prevalent in the non-Springfield areas.

Table 32: ELDERLY HOUSEHOLDS

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | \% Change, (2000-2010) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sangamon County (all) | 16,345 <br> $(22.6 \%)$ | 17,058 <br> $(21.6 \%)$ | 18,393 <br> $(22.1 \%)$ | $7.8 \%$ |
|  | 10,551 <br> $(23.4 \%)$ | 10,967 <br> $(22.5 \%)$ | 11,368 <br> $(20.3 \%)$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| Sangamon County <br> (not including City of <br> Springfield) | 5,794 <br> $(27.4 \%)$ | 6,091 <br> $(20.2 \%)$ | 7,025 <br> $(25.7 \%)$ | $15.3 \%$ |

## Families with Children

To reiterate, the Census Bureau defines a family as two or more persons, including the householder, who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption, and who live together as one household. Overall, the number of families with children decreased in the last decade in Springfield, Sangamon County, and the State of Illinois. For Sangamon County, there was a $5 \%$ decline in families with children, in contrast to the period from 1990 to 2000, when Sangamon County experienced a $4 \%$ increase in the number of families with children (Table 33).

Since these numbers are counts of families, rather than percentage distributions relative to the total number of families, it is important to consider them in the broader framework of increases and declines relative to the overall number of families. For instance, the number of families with children in Sangamon County has declined by $5 \%$ in the last decade. However, families with children are almost the same percentage of all families in 2010 $(62 \%)$ as they were in $2000(63 \%)$. On the other hand, the total number of married couples with children has declined by $14 \%$ in Sangamon County, representing a drop from $21 \%$ to $18 \%$ of the total population.

In general, the number of non-traditional families is increasing, with both female-headed families with children and other varieties of families with children increasing in Sangamon County (by $14 \%$ and $24 \%$, respectively). Some of these other varieties, for example, could include children living with grandparents. These trends generally represent a continuation of trends from the previous decade. For example, married couples with children decreased 3\% in Springfield from 1990 to 2000 and continued to decline an additional $18 \%$ from 2000 to 2010. Therefore, the trend from 1990 to 2010 represents a $21 \%$ decline. On the other hand, the increases in "other"
families with children in Springfield, Sangamon County, and Illinois, respectively, represent $74 \%, 93 \%$, and $82 \%$ increases from 1990 to 2010.

Table 33: FAMILIES WITH OWN CHILDREN

|  | Total Families with Children |  |  | Married Couples |  |  | Female-Headed |  |  | Other |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Change } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Change } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Change } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2000 | 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Change } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Springfield | 13,351 | 12,598 | -6 | 8,395 | 6,884 | -18 | 3,985 | 4,593 | 15 | 971 | 1,121 | 15 |
| Sangamon County | 24,040 | 22,874 | -5 | 16,560 | 14,168 | -14 | 5,881 | 6,716 | 14 | 1,599 | 1,990 | 24 |
| Illinois | 1,514,561 | 1,455,656 | -4 | 1,113,582 | 1,016,456 | -9 | 315,957 | 334,269 | 6 | 85,022 | 104,931 | 23 |

## Female-Headed Households with Children

The number of female-headed households with their own children (as distinct from female-headed households with any related children, discussed above) increased in Sangamon County by 835 households between 2000 and 2010. Although this is a $14 \%$ increase, the proportion of total households that were female-headed with children households increased only from $7.4 \%$ in 2000 to $8.0 \%$ in 2010, due to a decline in the total number of households with Children (Table 33). The increase in female-headed households with children is a concern because of the high poverty rate often associated with households of this type. More female-headed households with children are located in the east part of Springfield than in other areas of the city (Table 34, Figure 13). The highest percentage of female-headed households with children occurs in Tract 8, where 30\% of total households are female-headed with children. In 2000, this tract had $18.5 \%$ female-headed households with children as a proportion of total households.

## Household Size

The size of households has been decreasing steadily for several decades. As Table 34 suggests, this trend toward smaller households is occurring nationwide. Demographic trends in the Springfield area that substantiate the trend of smaller household size include the increase in 1-person households, the increase in female-headed families with children, and a decreasing number of married couple households with children.

Table 34: PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD (1960-2010)

|  | United States | Illinois | Sangamon County | Springfield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1960 | 3.33 | 3.18 | 3.03 | 2.83 |
| 1970 | 3.14 | 3.09 | 2.90 | 2.76 |
| 1980 | 2.76 | 2.76 | 2.55 | 2.38 |
| 1990 | 2.63 | 2.65 | 2.43 | 2.29 |
| 2000 | 2.59 | 2.63 | 2.36 | 2.24 |
| 2010 | 2.58 | 2.59 | 2.33 | 2.23 |
| \% Decrease (1960-2010) | $-23 \%$ | $-19 \%$ | $-23 \%$ | $-21 \%$ |
| \% Decrease (2000-2010) | $-<1 \%$ | $-2 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $-<1 \%$ |

As in the previous decade, household size declined in the majority of census tracts from 2000 to 2010 (Table 36, Figure 14). Household sizes range in Sangamon County's census tracts from 1.23 persons to 3.0 persons. Smallest household sizes are generally in the west and central portions of the City of Springfield, whereas the east side of Springfield and the rural areas surrounding the city tend to have slightly larger household sizes. From 2000 to 2010, slightly more tracts experienced an increase in average household size as compared to 1990-2000. As in previous years, these tracts were located primarily in the center-ease part of the city, although several of the northern tracts in the City also experienced increases in average household size from 2000-2010.

## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

Table 35: Female-Headed Households with own Children, Sangamon County, 2010

|  |  | Female-Headed Households |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Census Tract | Total Households | \# | \% |
| 1 | 1,810 | 106 | 6 |
| 2.01 | 1,149 | 69 | 6 |
| 2.02 | 1,821 | 231 | 13 |
| 3 | 1,160 | 121 | 10 |
| 4 | 1,329 | 135 | 10 |
| 5.01 | 1,011 | 45 | 4 |
| 5.03 | 1,717 | 171 | 10 |
| 5.04 | 1,236 | 85 | 7 |
| 6 | 2,372 | 219 | 9 |
| 7 | 936 | 97 | 10 |
| 8 | 723 | 216 | 30 |
| 9 | 1,035 | 125 | 12 |
| 10.01 | 1,004 | 39 | 4 |
| 10.03 | 706 | 27 | 4 |
| 10.04 | 2,415 | 162 | 7 |
| 11 | 1,150 | 71 | 6 |
| 12 | 1,635 | 140 | 9 |
| 13 | 969 | 87 | 9 |
| 14 | 568 | 16 | 3 |
| 15 | 388 | 43 | 11 |
| 16 | 1,253 | 343 | 27 |
| 17 | 406 | 89 | 22 |
| 18 | 1,052 | 127 | 12 |
| 19 | 1,659 | 176 | 11 |
| 20 | 2,713 | 51 | 2 |
| 21 | 1,704 | 94 | 6 |
| 22 | 1,591 | 135 | 8 |
| 23 | 904 | 190 | 21 |
| 24 | 1,344 | 283 | 21 |
| 25 | 2,130 | 276 | 13 |
| 26 | 1,190 | 126 | 11 |
| 27 | 1,576 | 130 | 8 |
| 28.01 | 1,456 | 131 | 9 |
| 28.02 | 1,643 | 230 | 14 |
| 29 | 2,242 | 110 | 5 |
| 30 | 2,312 | 184 | 8 |
| 31 | 2,938 | 98 | 3 |
| 32.01 | 1,699 | 136 | 8 |
| 32.02 | 1,591 | 103 | 6 |
| 32.03 | 2,084 | 130 | 6 |
| 33 | 1,994 | 140 | 7 |
| 34 | 2,361 | 190 | 8 |
| 35 | 1,999 | 107 | 5 |
| 36.01 | 1,031 | 30 | 3 |
| 36.02 | 1,657 | 56 | 3 |
| 36.03 | 1,925 | 57 | 3 |
| 36.04 | 2,015 | 71 | 4 |
| 37 | 3,097 | 159 | 5 |
| 38.01 | 1,001 | 100 | 10 |
| 38.02 | 2,273 | 227 | 10 |
| 39.01 | 1,841 | 66 | 4 |
| 39.02 | 1,464 | 77 | 5 |
| 40 | 1,707 | 89 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 82,986 | 6,716 | 8 |

## Noteworthy Trends-

The percentage of households with children in which a married couple is the head of the household has decreased over the last decade. Increases have occurred in the region and within the City of Springfield for female-headed households and other household types
with children. Female-headed households with their own children increased by 14\%, whereas femaleheaded households with any related children increased by 30\% over the last decade. Though these percentage increases are smaller as a proportion of the total families with children, this is due to an overall decline in the number of families with children. In contrast to
female-headed households with children, married families with their own children experienced an $18 \%$ decline in the last decade.

This represents a fairly dramatic increase
in female-headed households, concentrated on the east side of Springfield. Changes in family structure
can be correlated with changes in income, educational opportunity, and other matters of key concern for both
residents and policymakers. These trends are significant for policymakers to monitor in the coming decade.

Figure 13: PERCENTAGE FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS WITH OWN CHILDREN BY TRACT, 2010


| $\square 0-5 \%$ <br> $\square 6-10 \%$ $\square 11.15 \%$ <br> - over 15 | Female-Headed Households with Children 2010 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 36: PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD, by Tract
Sangamon County, 1970-2010

| Census Tract | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2.95 | 2.62 | 2.48 | 2.29 | 2.19 |
| 2 | 3.22 | 2.44 | 2.23 | * | * |
| 2.01 | * | * | * | 2.15 | 2.09 |
| 2.02 | * | * | * | 2.10 | 2.14 |
| 3 | 2.70 | 2.21 | 2.18 | 2.18 | 2.24 |
| 4 | 2.72 | 2.30 | 2.31 | 2.15 | 2.18 |
| 5 | 3.51 | 2.99 | * | * | * |
| 5.01 | * | * | 2.74 | 2.52 | 2.33 |
| 5.02 | 8 | * | 2.67 | * | * |
| 5.03 | * | * | * | . 2.29 | 2.33 |
| 5.04 | * | * | * | 2.62 | 2.47 |
| 6 | 3.11 | 2.78 | 2.33 | 2.21 | 2.21 |
| 7 | 3.37 | 2.62 | 2.42 | 2.39 | 2.25 |
| 8 | 2.98 | 2.72 | 2.67 | 2.82 | 2.87 |
| 9 | 2.24 | 1.87 | 1.95 | 1.99 | 2.09 |
| 10 | 3.31 | 2.22 | 2.06 | * | * |
| 10.01 | * | * | * | 2.35 | 2.10 |
| 10.02 | * | * | * | 1.86 |  |
| 10.03 | * | * | * | * | 1.88 |
| 10.04 | * | * | * | * | 1.86 |
| 11 | 2.72 | 2.28 | 2.08 | 1.94 | 1.88 |
| 12 | 2.50 | 2.13 | 2.12 | 2.12 | 2.16 |
| 13 | 1.88 | 1.62 | 1.69 | 1.73 | 1.80 |
| 14 | 1.28 | 1.21 | 1.27 | 1.23 | 1.23 |
| 15 | 2.58 | 2.55 | 1.98 | 1.97 | 2.03 |
| 16 | 3.04 | 2.80 | 2.88 | 2.82 | 2.77 |
| 17 | 2.80 | 2.71 | 2.71 | 2.98 | 3.00 |
| 18 | 1.98 | 1.75 | 1.83 | 1.89 | 2.13 |
| 19 | 2.15 | 1.77 | 1.83 | 1.90 | 1.96 |
| 20 | 3.84 | 3.19 | 2.84 | 2.33 | 2.18 |
| 21 | 2.83 | 2.42 | 2.26 | 2.19 | 2.16 |
| 22 | 2.76 | 2.35 | 2.26 | 2.14 | 2.12 |


| Census Tract | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 2.84 | 2.46 | 2.56 | 2.61 | 2.72 |
| 24 | 3.34 | 2.91 | 2.80 | 2.75 | 2.65 |
| 25 | 3.67 | 2.76 | 2.32 | 2.33 | 2.29 |
| 26 | 2.82 | 2.32 | 2.23 | 2.16 | 2.17 |
| 27 | 3.09 | 2.46 | 2.24 | 2.15 | 2.10 |
| 28 | 2.92 | 2.22 | 2.08 | * | * |
| 28.01 | * | * | * | 2.17 | 2.09 |
| 28.02 | * | * | * | 1.96 | 2.05 |
| 29 | 3.53 | 2.49 | 2.49 | 2.29 | 2.21 |
| 30 | 3.37 | 2.56 | 2.56 | 2.16 | 2.06 |
| 31 | 3.27 | 2.81 | 2.81 | 2.66 | 2.46 |
| 32 | 3.48 | 2.97 | 2.97 | * | * |
| 32.01 | * | * | * | 2.73 | 2.61 |
| 32.02 | * | * | * | 2.73 | 2.50 |
| 32.03 | * | * | * | 2.84 | 2.79 |
| 33 | 3.13 | 2.85 | 2.67 | 2.58 | 2.51 |
| 34 | 3.00 | 2.86 | 2.75 | 2.65 | 2.64 |
| 35 | 3.22 | 2.85 | 2.66 | 2.60 | 2.54 |
| 36 | 3.47 | 3.06 | 2.83 | * | * |
| 36.01 | * | * | * | 2.73 | 2.62 |
| 36.02 | * | * | * | 2.61 | 2.45 |
| 36.03 | * | * | * | 2.80 | 2.53 |
| 36.04 | * | * | * | 2.42 | 2.27 |
| 37 | 3.34 | 3.04 | 2.83 | 2.76 | 2.64 |
| 38 | 3.15 | 2.90 | 2.77 | * | * |
| 38.01 | * | * | * | 2.60 | 2.55 |
| 38.02 | * | * | * | 2.58 | 2.57 |
| 39 | 3.33 | 3.09 | 2.95 | * | * |
| 39.01 | * | * | * | 2.81 | 2.77 |
| 39.02 | * | * | * | 2.71 | 2.62 |
| 40 | 3.21 | 2.91 | 2.75 | 2.58 | 2.55 |
| Total: | 2.92 | 2.55 | 2.43 | 2.36 | 2.33 |

Figure 14: PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD BY TRACT, 2010

Person Per Household 2010


Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

## Housing

## Number of Housing Units

Living quarters are defined by the Census Bureau as either housing units or group quarters. A housing unit is a house, apartment, a mobile home or trailer, a group of rooms, or a single room intended as separate living quarters, where residents live and eat separately from other persons in the building. Group quarters are group living situations such as a nursing home, jail, or boarding house. It important to note that the Great Recession occurred during the decade covered by this census analysis and likely inhibited growth rates for new housing units. Even at the writing of this analysis (2014), the housing market had not fully rebounded from the Recession's effects.

Table 37: TOTAL HOUSING UNITS, 2000-2010

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | \# Increase | \% Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | $4,885,615$ | $5,296,715$ | 411,100 | 8 |
| Sangamon County | 85,459 | 89,901 | 4,442 | 5 |
| Springfield | 53,887 | 55,729 | 1,842 | 3 |

The number of housing units in the city, the county, and the state increased over the last decade. The rate of increase was the lowest for the City of Springfield with only a 3\% increase. In contrast, the rate of population increase from 2000 to 2010 was $4 \%$ for Springfield and 5\% for Sangamon County. These trends represent a decline from the rates of increase in housing units between 1990 and 2000. For both the city and county, the rate of increase in the last decade was $11 \%$. For the State of Illinois, the rate of increase was $8 \%$ both in between 19902000 and in 2000-2010.

Figure 15: GROWTH RATES, 2000-2010


As suggested in Figure 15, the increase in Sangamon County's housing units show parity with the rate of population increase, whereas Springfield's rate of housing unit increase is lower than its population increase. One reason that population may increase more than the number of housing units is that family sizes are becoming larger, though this is unlikely for Springfield given the information discussed above. Another reason is that vacant houses may exist that can be filled by increased populations. This is more likely the case for Springfield than Sangamon County as a whole, given the comparable growth rates for population and housing units in the county as a whole. Significantly, both Springfield and Sangamon County experienced contrasting patterns to that experienced by the State of Illinois as a whole in which housing units increased at a much higher rate than population, echoing the state's declining household size.

The percent change in the number of housing units from 2000 to 2010 varies considerably by census tract within the Sangamon County region. For instance, in Tract 32.01, there was an $83 \%$ increase in housing units due to multi-family and residential development in the Village of Chatham, whereas Tract 17 experienced $32 \%$ decline due primarily to removal of dilapidated housing stock. The largest loss in housing units from 2000-2010 occurred in east and central parts of the City of Springfield, and the largest increases in housing units generally occurring south and west of the city near the Village of Chatham (Table 39, Figure 16).

## Housing Type

The primary types of housing units that the Census identified in prior years were single-family, multiple-family, and mobile homes. The "other" category included boats, RVs, and vans used as living quarters. However, in 2000, the proportion of the total housing units considered "other" in the state, Sangamon County and Springfield was 0\%. The 2010 Census Analysis therefore combines "other" with "mobile homes" in information presented below.

In 2010, the Census form did not inquire as to types of housing units. The estimates on housing units presented below are American Community Survey estimates with wide margins of error. They indicate the percentage distribution of the various types of housing structures. "Single-family" housing units are considered those with one housing unit (attached or detached). "Multi-family" units are those not defined as 1 unit, mobile home, or "other."

Table 38: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY HOUSING TYPE 2010 ACS Estimates (Physical Housing Unit Characteristics S2504)

|  | Single- <br> Family | Multiple- <br> Family | Mobile <br> Home |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\%$ | $\%$ | $\%$ |
| Illinois | $66.5 \%$ | $31.0 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Sangamon County | $75.2 \%$ | $20.5 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| Springfield | $68.1 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |

Housing unit census data by type have historically been problematic in terms of accuracy. ACS estimates provide even less clarity or specific information related to housing units by tract of numbers as opposed to percentages of housing units by types of structure. However, trends in past and current estimates confirm that single-family housing is predominate in Sangamon County and the City of Springfield with somewhat higher percentages of multi-family housing within the city.

Table 39: HOUSING UNITS, Sangamon County, 2000-2010

| Census Tract | 2000 | 2010 | \# Change 2000-2010 | \% Change 2000-2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2,027 | 1,999 | -28 | -1\% |
| 2.01 | 1,198 | 1,221 | 23 | 2\% |
| 2.02 | 2,139 | 2,003 | -136 | -6\% |
| 3 | 1,570 | 1,324 | -246 | -16\% |
| 4 | 1,576 | 1,500 | -76 | -5\% |
| 5.01 | 985 | 1,052 | 67 | 7\% |
| 5.03 | 1,866 | 1,856 | -10 | -1\% |
| 5.04 | 1,272 | 1,264 | -8 | -1\% |
| 6 | 2,914 | 2,619 | -295 | -10\% |
| 7 | 1,016 | 996 | -20 | -2\% |
| 8 | 684 | 839 | 155 | 23\% |
| 9 | 1,466 | 1,217 | -249 | -17\% |
| 10.01 | 1,088 | 1,080 | -8 | -1\% |
| 10.02 | 3,400 |  |  |  |
| 10.03 |  | 743 |  |  |
| 10.04 |  | 2,647 |  |  |
| 11 | 1,262 | 1,253 | -9 | -1\% |
| 12 | 1,895 | 1,820 | -75 | -4\% |
| 13 | 1,340 | 1,178 | -162 | -12\% |
| 14 | 667 | 647 | -20 | -3\% |
| 15 | 577 | 430 | -147 | -25\% |
| 16 | 1,583 | 1,593 | 10 | 1\% |
| 17 | 809 | 549 | -260 | -32\% |
| 18 | 1,519 | 1,352 | -167 | -11\% |
| 19 | 2,244 | 1,984 | -260 | -12\% |
| 20 | 2,691 | 2,868 | 177 | 7\% |
| 21 | 1,779 | 1,809 | 30 | 2\% |
| 22 | 1,698 | 1,694 | -4 | 0\% |
| 23 | 1,219 | 1,096 | -123 | -10\% |
| 24 | 1,579 | 1,514 | -65 | -4\% |
| 25 | 2,251 | 2,256 | 5 | 0\% |
| 26 | 1,383 | 1,321 | -62 | -4\% |
| 27 | 1,801 | 1,717 | -84 | -5\% |
| 28.01 | 1,682 | 1,619 | -63 | -4\% |
| 28.02 | 1,842 | 1,804 | -38 | -2\% |
| 29 | 2,288 | 2,338 | 50 | 2\% |
| 30 | 2,334 | 2,397 | 63 | 3\% |
| 31 | 2,239 | 3,068 | 829 | 37\% |
| 32.01 | 954 | 1,747 | 793 | 83\% |
| 32.02 | 1,222 | 1,641 | 419 | 34\% |
| 32.03 | 1,729 | 2,168 | 439 | 25\% |
| 33 | 2,032 | 2,133 | 101 | 5\% |
| 34 | 2,384 | 2,497 | 113 | 5\% |
| 35 | 1,990 | 2,131 | 141 | 7\% |
| 36.01 | 980 | 1,071 | 91 | 9\% |
| 36.02 | 1,301 | 1,791 | 490 | 38\% |
| 36.03 | 1,213 | 1,985 | 772 | 64\% |
| 36.04 | 1,444 | 2,121 | 677 | 47\% |
| 37 | 2,550 | 3,217 | 667 | 26\% |
| 38.01 | 1,134 | 1,102 | -32 | -3\% |
| 38.02 | 2,116 | 2,364 | 248 | 12\% |
| 39.01 | 1,333 | 1,912 | 579 | 43\% |
| 39.02 | 1,468 | 1,527 | 59 | 4\% |
| 40 | 1,726 | 1,827 | 101 | 6\% |
| Total: | 85,459 | 89,901 | 4,442 | 5\% |

## Sangamon County Census Analysis- 2010

Figure 16: PERCENT CHANGE IN HOUSING UNITS, 2000-2010
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*Census Tracts 10.03 and 10.04 are excluded because they were newly created for 2010 Census.

## Housing Tenure

All occupied housing units are classified by the Census Bureau as either owner-occupied or renter-occupied. A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit, even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid for. A renter-occupied unit can be rented for cash rent or occupied without payment of cash rent (i.e., caretaker or military housing). On a percentage basis, owner-occupied is the inverse of renter-occupied. For example, if a tract is $58 \%$ owner-occupied, $42 \%$ is renter-occupied.

After a slight increase from previous years to $63 \%$ in 2000, the proportion of owner-occupied housing units in Springfield remained fairly steady in 2010. Percentages of owner-occupied houses in Sangamon County, which remained fairly constant from 1970-1990, experienced a slight increase in 2000, and maintained that percentage through 2010 (Table 40).

Table 40: OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS, 1970-2010

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | $59 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Sangamon County | $67 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
| Springfield | $59 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $64 \%$ |

The county's rate of owner occupancy has been consistently higher than the state or city rate of owner-occupied units. Proportions of owner-occupied housing in Sangamon County outside of the Springfield area range from a low of $76 \%$ in Buffalo and Woodside Townships (excluding Capital Township, which is essentially coterminous with the City of Springfield) to a high of $93 \%$ in Ball Township (Table 41).

The percentage of owner-occupied housing units by census tract ranges from under 3\% in tract 14 to over $93 \%$ in tract 36.01 (Table 42, Figure 18). Tracts with higher proportions (over 50\%) of renter-occupied housing units, and thus lower rates of owner-occupied housing, are primarily found in the central city area. The highest concentrations of owner-occupied housing are located in census tracts around the outer boundaries of Springfield and the smaller "bedroom" communities.

Table 41: HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE

## Sangamon County Townships

| Township | Occupied Units |  |  | \% Owner-Occupied |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Owner | Renter | Total | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| Auburn | 1,878 | 499 | 2,377 | 79 | 79 |
| Ball | 2,170 | 169 | 2,339 | 93 | 93 |
| Buffalo Hart | 59 | 19 | 78 | 73 | 76 |
| Capital | 32,014 | 18,445 | 50,459 | 63 | 63 |
| Cartwright | 478 | 98 | 576 | 82 | 83 |
| Chatham | 2,175 | 684 | 2,839 | 80 | 77 |
| Clear Lake | 2,526 | 697 | 3,223 | 83 | 78 |
| Cooper | 302 | 29 | 331 | 93 | 91 |
| Cotton Hill | 328 | 28 | 356 | 80 | 92 |
| Curran | 569 | 66 | 635 | 89 | 90 |
| Divernon | 507 | 127 | 634 | 78 | 80 |
| Fancy Creek | 1,758 | 234 | 1,992 | 86 | 88 |
| Gardner | 1,462 | 198 | 1,660 | 86 | 88 |
| Illiopolis | 406 | 102 | 508 | 77 | 80 |
| Island Grove | 211 | 46 | 257 | 81 | 82 |
| Lanesville | 63 | 16 | 79 | 76 | 80 |
| Loami | 343 | 68 | 411 | 88 | 84 |
| Maxwell | 55 | 13 | 68 | 80 | 81 |
| Mechanicsburg | 748 | 161 | 909 | 81 | 82 |
| New Berlin | 508 | 101 | 609 | 82 | 83 |
| Pawnee | 955 | 240 | 1,195 | 84 | 80 |
| Rochester | 1,791 | 214 | 2,005 | 90 | 89 |
| Springfield | 1,830 | 966 | 2,796 | 72 | 66 |
| Talkington | 59 | 17 | 76 | 79 | 78 |
| Williams | 1,121 | 165 | 1,286 | 85 | 87 |
| Woodside | 4,035 | 1,253 | 5,288 | 78 | 76 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{5 8 , 3 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 6 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 , 9 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |

Table 42: TENURE OF HOUSEHOLDER BY CENSUS TRACT, Sangamon County , 2010

|  |  | Owner Occupied |  | Renter Occupied |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Census Tract | Total Households | \# | \% | \# | \% |
| 1 | 1,810 | 1,459 | 80.61\% | 351 | 19.39\% |
| 2.01 | 1,149 | 849 | 73.89\% | 300 | 26.11\% |
| 2.02 | 1,821 | 974 | 53.49\% | 847 | 46.51\% |
| 3 | 1,160 | 588 | 50.69\% | 572 | 49.31\% |
| 4 | 1,329 | 858 | 64.56\% | 471 | 35.44\% |
| 5.01 | 1,011 | 858 | 84.87\% | 153 | 15.13\% |
| 5.03 | 1,717 | 1,299 | 75.66\% | 418 | 24.34\% |
| 5.04 | 1,236 | 1,096 | 88.67\% | 140 | 11.33\% |
| 6 | 2,372 | 1,757 | 74.07\% | 615 | 25.93\% |
| 7 | 936 | 643 | 68.70\% | 293 | 31.30\% |
| 8 | 723 | 238 | 32.92\% | 485 | 67.08\% |
| 9 | 1,035 | 208 | 20.10\% | 827 | 79.90\% |
| 10.01 | 1,004 | 694 | 69.12\% | 310 | 30.88\% |
| 10.03 | 706 | 477 | 67.56\% | 229 | 32.44\% |
| 10.04 | 2,415 | 1,209 | 50.06\% | 1,206 | 49.94\% |
| 11 | 1,150 | 791 | 68.78\% | 359 | 31.22\% |
| 12 | 1,635 | 964 | 58.96\% | 671 | 41.04\% |
| 13 | 969 | 289 | 29.82\% | 680 | 70.18\% |
| 14 | 568 | 14 | 2.46\% | 554 | 97.54\% |
| 15 | 388 | 132 | 34.02\% | 256 | 65.98\% |
| 16 | 1,253 | 463 | 36.95\% | 790 | 63.05\% |
| 17 | 406 | 163 | 40.15\% | 243 | 59.85\% |
| 18 | 1,052 | 468 | 44.49\% | 584 | 55.51\% |
| 19 | 1,659 | 582 | 35.08\% | 1,077 | 64.92\% |
| 20 | 2,713 | 2,286 | 84.26\% | 427 | 15.74\% |
| 21 | 1,704 | 1,280 | 75.12\% | 424 | 24.88\% |
| 22 | 1,591 | 1,265 | 79.51\% | 326 | 20.49\% |
| 23 | 904 | 465 | 51.44\% | 439 | 48.56\% |
| 24 | 1,344 | 665 | 49.48\% | 679 | 50.52\% |
| 25 | 2,130 | 1,556 | 73.05\% | 574 | 26.95\% |
| 26 | 1,190 | 850 | 71.43\% | 340 | 28.57\% |
| 27 | 1,576 | 1,024 | 64.97\% | 552 | 35.03\% |
| 28.01 | 1,456 | 936 | 64.29\% | 520 | 35.71\% |
| 28.02 | 1,643 | 261 | 15.89\% | 1,382 | 84.11\% |
| 29 | 2,242 | 1,705 | 76.05\% | 537 | 23.95\% |
| 30 | 2,312 | 1,407 | 60.86\% | 905 | 39.14\% |
| 31 | 2,938 | 2,560 | 87.13\% | 378 | 12.87\% |
| 32.01 | 1,699 | 1,440 | 84.76\% | 259 | 15.24\% |
| 32.02 | 1,591 | 1,295 | 81.40\% | 296 | 18.60\% |
| 32.03 | 2,084 | 1,785 | 85.65\% | 299 | 14.35\% |
| 33 | 1,994 | 1,614 | 80.94\% | 380 | 19.06\% |
| 34 | 2,361 | 1,864 | 78.95\% | 497 | 21.05\% |
| 35 | 1,999 | 1,655 | 82.79\% | 344 | 17.21\% |
| 36.01 | 1,031 | 963 | 93.40\% | 68 | 6.60\% |
| 36.02 | 1,657 | 1,395 | 84.19\% | 262 | 15.81\% |
| 36.03 | 1,925 | 1,782 | 92.57\% | 143 | 7.43\% |
| 36.04 | 2,015 | 1,540 | 76.43\% | 475 | 23.57\% |
| 37 | 3,097 | 2,712 | 87.57\% | 385 | 12.43\% |
| 38.01 | 1,001 | 830 | 82.92\% | 171 | 17.08\% |
| 38.02 | 2,273 | 1,732 | 76.20\% | 541 | 23.80\% |
| 39.01 | 1,841 | 1,709 | 92.83\% | 132 | 7.17\% |
| 39.02 | 1,464 | 1,306 | 89.21\% | 158 | 10.79\% |
| 40 | 1,707 | 1,396 | 81.78\% | 311 | 18.22\% |
| Total: | 82,986 | 58,351 | 70.31\% | 24,635 | 29.69\% |

Figure 17: HOUSEHOLDS BY TENURE, 2010


## \% Owner Occupied <br> $\square 3.49 \%$ <br> $\square 50$ - 69 \% <br> $=70.84$ \% <br> - $85.93 \%$ <br> Tenure of Housing Units- 2010

An examination of tenure by black and white households, the two major racial categories in Springfield and Sangamon County, shows an increase in home ownership for the white population from 2000-2010, but a decrease in home ownership among the black population. Home ownership among blacks is still lower than the historic high over the last several decades of $41 \%$ in 1980 (Table 43).

## Table 43: TENURE BY RACE OF HOUSEHOLDER Sangamon County Historical Comparison

|  | \% Owner-Occupied |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ |
| Total | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| Black | $41 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| White | $69 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $75 \%$ |

Table 44 elaborates on the relationships demonstrated in Table 43. As evident, home ownership rates among all racial minorities are lower than the rate among white householders. The least substantial disparity occurs between white and Asian householders with a gap of $15 \%$. In contrast, the proportion of black families living in owner-occupied housing is over $40 \%$ less than the proportion of white families owning their own homes. While the proportion of white families in owner occupied housing is increasing over time, black or African American households are experiencing the opposite trend, so that the gap in tenure by race is growing with time. This again reflects the increasing distinction between different racial groups along various demographic lines.

Table 44: TENURE BY RACE
Sangamon County, 2010

|  |  | Owner-Occupied |  | Renter-Occupied |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Race of Householder | Total | $\#$ |  | \% | \# |
| Total | 82,986 | 58,351 | $70.3 \%$ | 24,635 | \% |
| White | 71,535 | 53,896 | $75.3 \%$ | 17,639 | $29.7 \%$ |
| Black or African American | 8,353 | 2,810 | $33.6 \%$ | 5,543 | $24.7 \%$ |
| Asian | 1,079 | 648 | $60.1 \%$ | $66.4 \%$ |  |
| Native Hawaiian | 18 | 8 | $44.4 \%$ | 431 | $39.9 \%$ |
| Other | 47 | 28 | $59.6 \%$ | 10 | $55.6 \%$ |
| Two or more races | 77 | 33 | $42.9 \%$ | 19 | $40.4 \%$ |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,028 | 517 | $50.3 \%$ | 44 | $57.1 \%$ |

Housing tenure in Sangamon County increases as age of householder increases, through age 74. The proportion of homes that are owner occupied then decreases slightly in the age cohorts above age 74. However, householders age $75-84$ or age 85 and older are still more likely to own their own homes than the population under 55 years of age, with rates of $80.5 \%$ and $68.8 \%$, respectively. Older age cohorts were more likely to experience increases in owner occupancy rate from 2000 to 2010 than younger age cohorts, many of which exhibited a decline in their rate of owner-occupied housing relative to renter-occupied housing (Table 45, Figure 19).

Table 45: TENURE BY AGE, Sangamon County, 2010

|  |  | Owner-Occupied |  | Renter-Occupied |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\#$ |  | \% | \# | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 2 , 9 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 , 3 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 , 6 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 . 7 \%}$ |
| Householder 15 to 24 years | 3,757 | 778 | $20.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 7 9}$ | $79.3 \%$ |
| Householder 25 to 34 years | 13,115 | 6,737 | $51.4 \%$ | 6,378 | $48.6 \%$ |
| Householder 35 to 44 years | 13,824 | 9,596 | $69.4 \%$ | 4,228 | $30.6 \%$ |
| Householder 45 to 54 years | 17,801 | 13,460 | $75.6 \%$ | 4,341 | $24.4 \%$ |
| Householder 55 to 64 years | 16,096 | 13,088 | $81.3 \%$ | 3,008 | $18.7 \%$ |
| Householder 65 to 74 years | 9,434 | 7,800 | $82.7 \%$ | 1,634 | $17.3 \%$ |
| Householder 75 to 84 years | 6,224 | 5,011 | $80.5 \%$ | 1,213 | $19.5 \%$ |
| Householder 85 years and over | 2,735 | 1,881 | $68.8 \%$ | 854 | $31.2 \%$ |

Figure 18: TENURE BY AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER, Sangamon County, 2010


## Vacancy

A housing unit is vacant if no one is living in it at the time of Census enumeration, unless its occupants are only temporarily absent. Units temporarily occupied at the time of enumeration by persons who have a usual residence elsewhere are also classified as vacant.

The vacancy rate serves as an indication of the availability of housing. Generally, some vacancies are desirable in a community, and the acceptable vacancy rate for multiple-family housing is deemed higher than for single-family
housing. Overall, a $4-5 \%$ vacancy rate is considered necessary to provide reasonable mobility in the housing market. Unusually high vacancy rates could be an indication of market saturation or poor housing quality.

Table 46: VACANT HOUSING, 2010

|  |  |  | \% Vacant* |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Housing <br> Units | \# Vacant <br> Units | Owner <br> Vacancy <br> Rate | Rental <br> Vacancy <br> Rate | Total <br> Vacancy <br> Rate |
| Illinois | $5,296,715$ | 459,743 | 3.0 | 10.6 | 8.7 |
| Sangamon County | 89,901 | 6,915 | 2.5 | 10.9 | 7.7 |
| Springfield | 55,729 | 5,015 | 3.0 | 11.8 | 9.0 |

*Renter vacancy rate and owner vacancy rate based on units "For Rent" plus "Rented, not yet occupied" or "For sale" plus "Sold, not yet occupied," respectively.

On average, total vacancy rates for Illinois have increased since 2000, from 6.0\% up to $8.7 \%$. In contrast to 2000, the total vacancy rate for Sangamon County in 2010 was less than that of the State of Illinois. Total vacancy rates in Sangamon County and in the City of Springfield declined slightly from 2000 to 2010. This was the first decade for a decline in vacancy rates in the City of Springfield since 1970, and one of only two decades in which a decline occurred in Sangamon County during the same time period (Table 47).

Table 47: VACANY RATES, 1970-2010

|  | Sangamon County |  |  |  |  |  | Springfield |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |  |
| Owner | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 2.4 |  |
| Renter | 6.4 | 10.1 | 8.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 7.5 | 10.2 | 8.7 | 11.0 | 11.3 |  |
| Total <br> Vacancy | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 0}$ |  |

Table 48: STATUS OF VACANT STRUCTURES, Sangamon County, 2010

| Vacancy Status | Number of Housing Units |
| :--- | :---: |
| Total: | 6,915 |
| For rent | 2,547 |
| Rented, not occupied | 126 |
| For sale only | 1,137 |
| Sold, not occupied | 314 |
| For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use | 426 |
| For migrant workers | 6 |
| Other vacant | 2,359 |

It is significant to note that Sangamon County and Springfield each had slightly lower vacancy rates in the decade from 2000 to 2010 than in the prior decade. However, vacancy rates remain higher than the suggested standard for beneficial mobility levels discussed above.
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Table 49: VACANT HOUSING UNITS, Sangamon County, 2010

## Noteworthy Trends- <br> Vacancy rates in the region remain elevated as compared to the ideal standard for community mobility. This is particularly true for the City of Springfield, where vacancy is higher than in the Sangamon County region as a whole, and higher than that of the state. Tracts with the most vacant properties are on the near east side of the City of Springfield. <br> 

| Census Tract | Total HU | Occupied HU | Vacant HU | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ \text { \% Vacant HU } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000 \% \\ \text { Vacant HU } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1,999 | 1,810 | 189 | 9\% | 8\% |
| 2.01 | 1,221 | 1,149 | 72 | 6\% | 5\% |
| 2.02 | 2,003 | 1,821 | 182 | 9\% | 7\% |
| 3 | 1,324 | 1,160 | 164 | 12\% | 12\% |
| 4 | 1,500 | 1,329 | 171 | 11\% | 12\% |
| 5.01 | 1,052 | 1,011 | 41 | 4\% | 3\% |
| 5.03 | 1,856 | 1,717 | 139 | 7\% | 4\% |
| 5.04 | 1,264 | 1,236 | 28 | 2\% | 2\% |
| 6 | 2,619 | 2,372 | 247 | 9\% | 7\% |
| 7 | 996 | 936 | 60 | 6\% | 6\% |
| 8 | 839 | 723 | 116 | 14\% | 17\% |
| 9 | 1,217 | 1,035 | 182 | 15\% | 26\% |
| 10.01 | 1,080 | 1,004 | 76 | 7\% | 4\% |
| 10.02 | * | * | * | * | 5\% |
| 10.03 | 743 | 706 | 37 | 5\% |  |
| 10.04 | 2,647 | 2,415 | 232 | 9\% |  |
| 11 | 1,253 | 1,150 | 103 | 8\% | 4\% |
| 12 | 1,820 | 1,635 | 185 | 10\% | 9\% |
| 13 | 1,178 | 969 | 209 | 18\% | 18\% |
| 14 | 647 | 568 | 79 | 12\% | 21\% |
| 15 | 430 | 388 | 42 | 10\% | 19\% |
| 16 | 1,593 | 1,253 | 340 | 21\% | 25\% |
| 17 | 549 | 406 | 143 | 26\% | 25\% |
| 18 | 1,352 | 1,052 | 300 | 22\% | 20\% |
| 19 | 1,984 | 1,659 | 325 | 16\% | 17\% |
| 20 | 2,868 | 2,713 | 155 | 5\% | 6\% |
| 21 | 1,809 | 1,704 | 105 | 6\% | 5\% |
| 22 | 1,694 | 1,591 | 103 | 6\% | 5\% |
| 23 | 1,096 | 904 | 192 | 18\% | 16\% |
| 24 | 1,514 | 1,344 | 170 | 11\% | 10\% |
| 25 | 2,256 | 2,130 | 126 | 6\% | 8\% |
| 26 | 1,321 | 1,190 | 131 | 10\% | 8\% |
| 27 | 1,717 | 1,576 | 141 | 8\% | 6\% |
| 28.01 | 1,619 | 1,456 | 163 | 10\% | 5\% |
| 28.02 | 1,804 | 1,643 | 161 | 9\% | 12\% |
| 29 | 2,338 | 2,242 | 96 | 4\% | 4\% |
| 30 | 2,397 | 2,312 | 85 | 4\% | 4\% |
| 31 | 3,068 | 2,938 | 130 | 4\% | 5\% |
| 32.01 | 1,747 | 1,699 | 48 | 3\% | 3\% |
| 32.02 | 1,641 | 1,591 | 50 | 3\% | 2\% |
| 32.03 | 2,168 | 2,084 | 84 | 4\% | 3\% |
| 33 | 2,133 | 1,994 | 139 | 7\% | 6\% |
| 34 | 2,497 | 2,361 | 136 | 5\% | 7\% |
| 35 | 2,131 | 1,999 | 132 | 6\% | 6\% |
| 36.01 | 1,071 | 1,031 | 40 | 4\% | 4\% |
| 36.02 | 1,791 | 1,657 | 134 | 7\% | 3\% |
| 36.03 | 1,985 | 1,925 | 60 | 3\% | 7\% |
| 36.04 | 2,121 | 2,015 | 106 | 5\% | 6\% |
| 37 | 3,217 | 3,097 | 120 | 4\% | 3\% |
| 38.01 | 1,102 | 1,001 | 101 | 9\% | 10\% |
| 38.02 | 2,364 | 2,273 | 91 | 4\% | 4\% |
| 39.01 | 1,999 | 1,810 | 189 | 9\% | 4\% |
| 39.02 | 1,527 | 1,464 | 63 | 4\% | 3\% |
| 40 | 1,827 | 1,707 | 120 | 7\% | 7\% |
| Total: | 89,901 | 82,986 | 6,915 | 8\% | 8\% |

Figure 19: VACANT UNITS BY TRACT, 2010
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## Housing Structures

Although the SSCRPC's 2000 Census Analysis included data related to the age of housing stock, housing value, and median gross rent paid for rental housing, these items were not a part of the 2010 Census and would have to be derived from American Community Survey estimates. The SSCRPC finds that in many instances ACS estimates have excessively large margins of error and should be treated with caution. While certain ACS information is presented in tables below, the reader should take into account margins of error in drawing conclusions related to the information. Moreover, based on these concerns, the SSCRPC did not find it appropriate to compare housing estimates or percentage distributions to previous years' information. Where inconsistencies occur between ACS Estimates and Census SF1 Data provided above, Census data should be considered more accurate.

Table 50: VACANCY BY TYPE OF STRUCTURE, Sangamon County, 2010*

| Units in Structure | Total | Margin of Error |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1, Detached | 60,885 | $+/-2,156$ |
| 1, Attached | 5,375 | $+/-1,055$ |
| 2 | 3,093 | $+/-856$ |
| 3 or 4 | 4,484 | $+/-1,155$ |
| 5 to 9 | 3,858 | $+/-1,009$ |
| 10 to 19 | 3,939 | $+/-1,091$ |
| 20+ | 4,266 | $+/-884$ |
| Mobile Home | 4,041 | $+/-914$ |
| Boat, RV, Van, etc. | 0 | $+/-267$ |
| TOTAL | 89,941 | $+/-540$ |

*American Community Survey estimates- Margin of error represents a 90\% confidence interval.

The American Community Survey data related to age of housing structures (Table 51) suggest that housing stock in Sangamon County and the City of Springfield are comparable to one another, and that housing stock is slightly younger in this region than throughout the state as a whole. Again, margins of error have been reported for the data as they are American Community Survey estimates.

Table 51: AGE OF STRUCTURES, 2010

| Year Built | Illinois |  |  | Sangamon County |  |  | Springfield |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Estimate | Margin of <br> Error | Percent <br> of <br> Units | Estimate | Margin of <br> Error | Percent <br> of <br> Units | Estimate | Margin of <br> Error | Percent <br> of <br> Units |
| 2005 or later | 250,882 | $+/-938$ | $5 \%$ | 3,856 | $+/-707$ | $4 \%$ | 1,930 | $+/-491$ | $3 \%$ |
| 2000 to 2004 | 364,849 | $+/-7,959$ | $7 \%$ | 8,328 | $+/-1,239$ | $9 \%$ | 5,731 | $+/-1,202$ | $10 \%$ |
| 1990 to 1999 | 557,112 | $+/-8,745$ | $11 \%$ | 12,679 | $+/-1,487$ | $14 \%$ | 8,165 | $+/-1,248$ | $14 \%$ |
| 1980 to 1989 | 454,400 | $+/-10,142$ | $9 \%$ | 8,498 | $+/-1,267$ | $9 \%$ | 5,621 | $+/-1,090$ | $10 \%$ |
| 1970 to 1979 | 757,226 | $+/-9,107$ | $14 \%$ | 15,356 | $+/-1,885$ | $17 \%$ | 9,725 | $+/-1,514$ | $17 \%$ |
| 1960 to 1969 | 614,725 | $+/-12,266$ | $12 \%$ | 9,595 | $+/-1,324$ | $11 \%$ | 5,914 | $+/-1,121$ | $10 \%$ |
| 1950 to 1959 | 708,857 | $+/-9,946$ | $13 \%$ | 10,136 | $+/-1,120$ | $11 \%$ | 5,209 | $+/-928$ | $9 \%$ |
| 1940 to 1949 | 362,701 | $+/-12,299$ | $7 \%$ | 6,238 | $+/-1,100$ | $7 \%$ | 4,146 | $+/-968$ | $7 \%$ |
| 1939 or earlier | $1,226,325$ | $+/-8353$ | $23 \%$ | 15,255 | $+/-1,544$ | $17 \%$ | 10,907 | $+/-1,552$ | $19 \%$ |
| Total | $5,297,077$ | $+/-13,858$ | $100 \%$ | 89,941 | $+/-540$ | $100 \%$ | 57,348 | $+/-1,498$ | $100 \%$ |

*American Community Survey estimates- Margin of error represents a $90 \%$ confidence interval.

## Education

It is important to note that, although additional data were available from the Census Bureau related to Education and Income in the past, the 2010 Census did not include education and income detailed questions. Accordingly, SSCRPC staff has included only minimal and basic information in these categories as reliably available from the American Community Survey. The information provided in these sections includes estimates, and should be considered as including potential error.

## Educational Attainment

In the City of Springfield and in Sangamon County at large, the percentage of the populace with a high school diploma or higher has grown continuously over the last several decades. Educational attainment in the City is comparable to that of the entire County, with slightly over $90 \%$ of residents with high school diplomas and slightly over $30 \%$ with college diplomas.

Table 52: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, 1970-2010

|  | Sangamon County |  |  |  | Springfield |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Adults <br> 25 <br> and Over | $132,183(2010)$ |  |  |  | $77,043(2010)$ |  |  |  |
|  | High School |  | College Graduate |  | High School |  | College Graduate |  |
|  | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ | $\#$ | $\%$ |
| 1970 | 51,795 | 57 | 9,495 | 10 | 30,215 | 57 | 6,405 | 12 |
| 1980 | 77,168 | 72 | 19,908 | 19 | 44,207 | 72 | 12,814 | 21 |
| 1990 | 96,233 | 82 | 26,313 | 22 | 57,153 | 82 | 17,396 | 25 |
| 2000 | 111,520 | 88 | 36,152 | 29 | 65,906 | 87 | 23,061 | 31 |
| $2010^{*}$ | 120,222 | 91 | 41,031 | 31 | 69,947 | 91 | 25,056 | 33 |

*American Community Survey Five-Year estimates, 2006-2010. The largest margin of error for any of the individual data points included in calculating educational attainment at a $90 \%$ confidence level is $+/-1.0 \%$ for Sangamon County and $+/-1.2 \%$ for the City of Springfield.

Table 53: EDUCATION BY AGE BY SEX, Sangamon County, 2010

|  | \% HS Graduate |  | \% College Graduate |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 18-24 Years | 83 | 84 | 9 | 15 |
| $25-34$ Years | 92 | 95 | 33 | 39 |
| $35-44$ Years | 93 | 96 | 37 | 37 |
| $45-64$ Years | 90 | 93 | 33 | 30 |
| $65+$ Years | 83 | 85 | 27 | 15 |

* American Community Survey Five-Year estimates, 2006-2010, B15001. These estimates should be treated with caution due to high margins of error.

In the youngest age cohort, females have a slightly higher estimated percentage with high school diplomas or the equivalent and a much larger percentage that has a college degree or higher. For all age cohorts, men and women have similar percentages with a high school diploma or higher level of education, with females having
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slightly higher percentages. For college graduates, however, particularly in the older cohorts, males' percentages exceed females'.

To examine the geographic dispersion of educational attainment in the region, education is broken down by township in Table 54. Margins of error on the ACS estimates are also provided, as in many cases the margin of error for a particular township is fairly high. Because of these higher ranges, SSCRPC has not provided analysis of the geographic dispersion of educational attainment in this report, because the estimates that would be utilized in forming this analysis have limited reliability.

Table 54: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY TOWNSHIP*

| Township | Population <br> $\mathbf{2 5}$ or Older | High School <br> Graduate or <br> Higher | Margin <br> of Error | Bachelor's <br> Degree or <br> Higher | Margin of <br> Error |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auburn | 4,072 | $89.9 \%$ | $+/-3.7$ | $16.7 \%$ | $+/-4.1$ |
| Ball | 4,042 | $98.2 \%$ | $+/-1.2$ | $46.1 \%$ | $+/-5.5$ |
| Buffalo Hart | 143 | $100.0 \%$ | $+/-20.2$ | $35.7 \%$ | $+/-17.0$ |
| Capital | 76,670 | $90.9 \%$ | $+/-0.8$ | $32.7 \%$ | $+/-1.3$ |
| Cartwright | 965 | $93.4 \%$ | $+/-3.6$ | $31.7 \%$ | $+/-7.3$ |
| Chatham | 4,376 | $94.2 \%$ | $+/-2.3$ | $34.1 \%$ | $+/-4.1$ |
| Clear Lake | 6,150 | $78.2 \%$ | $+/-20.0$ | $21.9 \%$ | $+/-6.2$ |
| Cooper | 458 | $86.5 \%$ | $+/-8.0$ | $31.4 \%$ | $+/-12.9$ |
| Cotton Hill | 769 | $96.0 \%$ | $+/-3.2$ | $32.5 \%$ | $+/-11.0$ |
| Curran | 1,187 | $96.6 \%$ | $+/-1.9$ | $39.7 \%$ | $+/-11.6$ |
| Divernon | 1,054 | $94.3 \%$ | $+/-3.0$ | $22.5 \%$ | $+/-6.1$ |
| Fancy Creek | 3,636 | $94.9 \%$ | $+/-2.4$ | $38.2 \%$ | $+/-6.0$ |
| Gardner | 3,037 | $94.0 \%$ | $+/-2.7$ | $37.0 \%$ | $+/-6.0$ |
| Illiopolis | 902 | $95.9 \%$ | $+/-2.1$ | $24.9 \%$ | $+/-6.5$ |
| Island Grove | 494 | $92.7 \%$ | $+/-4.7$ | $16.4 \%$ | $+/-9.4$ |
| Lanesville | 150 | $94.0 \%$ | $+/-10.4$ | $22.0 \%$ | $+/-25.0$ |
| Loami | 764 | $93.2 \%$ | $+/-4.4$ | $11.9 \%$ | $+/-5.2$ |
| Maxwell | 78 | $100.0 \%$ | $+/-32.7$ | $19.2 \%$ | +-26.1 |
| Mechanicsburg | 1,441 | $89.5 \%$ | $+/-2.8$ | $14.9 \%$ | $+/-4.2$ |
| New Berlin | 1,066 | $94.6 \%$ | $+/-2.6$ | $28.0 \%$ | $+/-5.6$ |
| Pawnee | 2,083 | $89.6 \%$ | $+/-4.3$ | $24.8 \%$ | $+/-5.2$ |
| Rochester | 3,519 | $97.8 \%$ | $+/-1.5$ | $45.5 \%$ | $+/-5.3$ |
| Springfield | 4,535 | $81.2 \%$ | $+/-4.1$ | $9.9 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ |
| Talkington | 156 | $100.0 \%$ | $+/-18.7$ | $61.5 \%$ | $+/-42.0$ |
| Williams | 2,209 | $96.3 \%$ | $+/-1.7$ | $29.6 \%$ | $+/-6.9$ |
| Woodside | 8,227 | $91.7 \%$ | $+/-1.8$ | $28.7 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 3 2 , 1 8 3}$ |  |  |  |  |

* American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates, 2006-2010.

Educational attainment has not been examined by census tract, because the lower population bases per tract lead to even greater margins of error in estimated data.

## Employment and Income

## Income

Another metric for analyzing a population base that has historically been included in the SSCRPC Census Analysis is that of income. Again, income was not collected in Census short forms in the 2010 Census, so American Community Survey Estimates are provided. As compared to the State of Illinois, Springfield and Sangamon County have slightly higher per capita incomes and slightly lower median household incomes. This is the case both for total households and for family and non-family households when examined by household type. Median income is used, rather than mean income, because of the likelihood that a mean income figure can be skewed by outliers.

Table 55: COMPARATIVE INCOME, 2010

|  | Per Capita Income | Median Household Income |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | $\$ 27,325$ | $\$ 52,972$ |
| Sangamon County | $\$ 27,881$ | $\$ 50,166$ |
| Springfield | $\$ 28,385$ | $\$ 44,598$ |

*American Community Survey Five-Year estimates, 2006-2010.
Table 56: MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE, 2010

|  | Total Households | Family Households | Non-Family Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Illinois | $\$ 52,972$ | $\$ 65,417$ | $\$ 31,804$ |
| Sangamon County | $\$ 50,166$ | $\$ 63,344$ | $\$ 31,542$ |
| Springfield | $\$ 44,598$ | $\$ 60,922$ | $\$ 30,999$ |

*American Community Survey Five-Year estimates, 2006-2010, S1903.

## Employment

Income data are closely tied to employment data. The 2010 American Community Survey estimated that of a 106,000 person population in the labor force, approximately $5 \%$ were unemployed (Table 57). This estimate appears to be low in comparison to Bureau of Labor Statistics data for 2010, in which the average of monthly unemployment rates in 2010 for the Springfield Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is the closest roughly comparable geographic unit to Sangamon County examined at this level, is $8.1 \%$ (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment data). It is likely that, because American Community Survey estimates are built using five years' data, recession effects are not fully considered in terms of their full impact on the 2006-2010 dataset. The ACS three-year estimates, for example, provide an unemployment rate of $5.1 \%$, and one-year estimates place the 2010 unemployment rate at 5.6\%.

Table 57: EMPLOYMENT STATUS, Sangamon County, 2010

| EMPLOYMENT STATUS | $\#$ | Margin of <br> Error | $\mathbf{\%}$ | Margin of <br> Error |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 16 years and over | 154,060 | $+/-275$ | 154,060 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| In labor force | 105,789 | $+/-1,516$ | $68.7 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ |
| Civilian labor force | 105,441 | $+/-1,500$ | $68.4 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ |
| Employed | 97,917 | $+/-1,436$ | $63.6 \%$ | $+/-0.9$ |
| Unemployed | 7,524 | $+/-601$ | $4.9 \%$ | $+/-0.4$ |
| Armed Forces | 348 | $+/-136$ | $0.2 \%$ | $+/-0.1$ |
| Not in labor force | 48,271 | $+/-1,509$ | $31.3 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ |

*American Community Survey Five-Year estimates, 2006-2010, DP03.

Table 58: EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY, Sangamon County, 2010

| INDUSTRY | \# <br> Employed | Margin of Error | \% <br> Employed | Margin of Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population 16 years and over | 97,917 | +/-1,436 |  |  |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining | 1,204 | +/-210 | 1.2\% | +/-0.2 |
| Construction | 4,717 | +/-445 | 4.8\% | +/-0.4 |
| Manufacturing | 4,143 | +/-404 | 4.2\% | +/-0.4 |
| Wholesale trade | 2,413 | +/-334 | 2.5\% | +/-0.3 |
| Retail trade | 10,425 | +/-717 | 10.6\% | +/-0.7 |
| Transportation and warehousing, and utilities | 3,894 | +/-374 | 4.0\% | +/-0.4 |
| Information | 2,556 | +/-340 | 2.6\% | +/-0.3 |
| Finance, insurance, real estate, rental and leasing | 7,511 | +/-617 | 7.7\% | +/-0.6 |
| Professional, scientific, and management, and administrative and waste management services | 8,164 | +/-575 | 8.3\% | +/-0.6 |
| Education, and health care and social assistance | 24,439 | +/-1,082 | 25.0\% | +/-1.1 |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services | 8,982 | +/-759 | 9.2\% | +/-0.7 |
| Other services, except public administration | 5,655 | +/-428 | 5.8\% | +/-0.4 |
| Public administration | 13,814 | +/-672 | 14.1\% | +/-0.7 |

Table 59 provides an industry breakdown for employment in the Sangamon County region in 2010. Educational services, healthcare, and social assistance are the largest employment industry at $25.0 \%$, likely due to Sangamon County's robust medical community. Public administration is the next largest industry at $14.1 \%$. In 2000, Public administration represented $20 \%$ of employment in Sangamon County, and Educational services, healthcare, and social assistance made up only $22 \%$.

## Noteworthy Trends -

Public administration continues to decline as an industry in Sangamon County. With a decline of approximately 6\% over the last decade as a proportion of total employment by industry. This is a reversal of the trend of the prior several decades, when it increased from 13\% in 1970 up to 20\% in 2000, and is likely tied to cuts in state employment or transfer of some functions of state government to locations outside the capital. This shift in labor force distribution across industries may have significant impact on numerous factors in the Sangamon County region.

## Conclusions

Census data is a valuable resource for leaders in the Sangamon County region. Particularly in terms of on-going trends and their policy implications, demographic factors can and do have a significant impact on the nature of how residents live. Throughout this analysis, SSCRPC staff has summarized several significant and relevant trends revealed by the data. A thoughtful analysis of census data from the past decade leads to significant and provocative questions for the decade to come. Should present trends continue, the impact of some noteworthy demographic factors will only continue to intensify in coming years:

Sangamon County will continue to see increased proportions of its population becoming dependent on a proportionately smaller labor force. As Baby Boomers reach retirement age in the next decade, but continue to see longer life expectancy horizons because of improvements in medical care, a substantial portion of the population, up to approximately $25 \%$, will be in the 55 to 74 year age cohort in 2020 and the 65 to 84 year cohort in 2030. At the same time, most areas in the region have experienced a decline in the percentage of children that will be reaching working age during this time.

Sangamon County will continue to develop a different orientation toward the concept of "family." The traditional household of a married couple with their own children has decreased as a proportion of total households and may continue to do so. Single-person households, female-headed households, and other nontraditional family types will potentially increase proportionately in the coming decade, which may bring challenges as communities face a changing social fabric and the policy implications of those trends.

Sangamon County will continue to observe both its positive and negative trends clustering in different geographical centers in the region. It is of great significance that many observed trends in family size and type, vacancy, income, and population increases versus decreases have not occurred consistently or on an equally dispersed basis throughout the region. Instead, geographical disparities in the direction and intensity of certain trends have sharpened over the last decade. "Bedroom communities," for example, have experienced notable increases in population while the City of Springfield and some smaller and more distant rural communities have seen declines. For many areas, population growth appears to be slowing in comparison to previous decades. Several of the family type trends discussed above are also particularly prevalent in low-income areas in Springfield, and some trends facing the eastern portion Springfield also appear to be expanding slightly northward.

As suggested throughout this analysis, many of the trends observed in Sangamon County, including those highlighted above, parallel statewide and national trends. However, this does not minimize the significant potential they have to impact the Sangamon County region, nor the attention that should be paid to these demographic trends by local leaders and policymakers. The social fabric of our community, the types of jobs that our region can attract, the provision of adequate healthcare for residents, the appropriate application of social service models, the challenges facing our education system, and the potential for residential development in our region-each of these critical aspects of community wellbeing are among the overwhelming number of factors that can ultimately be traced back to census data.


