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## SUMMARY

In 2001 the United Way conducted a Hispanic Community Assessment: Assets and Opportunities project. As part of the project, CGR was asked to analyze selected Census trend data for Monroe County's Hispanic/Latino population. Characteristics of the Hispanic population living in Monroe County were analyzed using decennial Census data for the years 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000. However, at the time of the 2001 report, not all 2000 Census data were yet available.

In 2003 the Ibero-American Action League engaged CGR to update the remaining tables, as additional data had been released. This report builds on the initial report, and updates all the tables with 2000 data.

The total Hispanic/Latino population grew substantially in Monroe County between 1970 (5,792 individuals of Puerto Rican descent) and 2000 ( 39,065 of Hispanic descent). The highest proportion of growth was in the suburbs, with an increase of $72.5 \%$ between 1990 and 2000, but the greatest growth in number of Hispanic/Latino individuals was in the City. The majority of Hispanic/Latino individuals in Monroe County are of Puerto Rican descent.

The Hispanic/Latino population is disproportionately younger than the population as a whole (e.g., $35.0 \%$ of the Hispanic population is 14 or younger countywide, compared to $21.4 \%$ of the population as a whole). In addition, Hispanic families are
more likely to be headed by a female with children under age 18 ( $36.2 \%$ in 2000), compared to the population as a whole ( $13.4 \%$ ).

The proportion of the Hispanic/Latino adult population with a college degree rose from $3.2 \%$ in 1970 to $13.3 \%$ in 2000. Conversely, the proportion of the Hispanic/Latino adult population with less than a 9th grade education dropped from $62.0 \%$ in 1970 to $16.4 \%$ in 2000.

The Census Bureau changed its categorization of occupations between 1990 and 2000, making direct comparison impossible. Between 1970 and 1990, the Hispanic/Latino population shifted in occupational choice, with the proportion working as "machine operators, assemblers, or inspectors" dropping from 45.6\% to $15.9 \%$, for example. Occupational categories that saw increases over that 20 year period include an increase from $0.3 \%$ to $7.2 \%$ in sales, $3.4 \%$ to $7.2 \%$ in executive and managerial occupations, and from $4.7 \%$ to $11.4 \%$ in professional specialty occupations. In 2000, the most common occupations for Hispanic workers were production ( $16 \%$ ), office and administrative support ( $15 \%$ ), and sales ( $9 \%$ ). Hispanic unemployment rates in 2000 remain more than twice as high as the rates in the total population.

Hispanics lag behind the total population in income levels. In 2000, 25.8\% of Hispanics in Monroe County had household incomes of less than $\$ 10,000$, compared to $9.1 \%$ of the total population. Per capita income among Hispanics was $\$ 11,234$ in 2000 , compared to $\$ 22,821$ among the total population.

Hispanics had substantially higher poverty rates in every age category in 2000, compared to the total population. Most dramatically, while $17.6 \%$ of children under 5 years of age lived in poverty among the total population in 2000, the rate was $42.9 \%$ among the Hispanic/Latino population.

Language continued to be a barrier for the Hispanic/Latino population, with $29.7 \%$ of Hispanics indicating that they "do not speak English very well" in 2000, though this is a decrease from $34.0 \%$ in 1990.

Hispanic/Latino households were more likely in 2000 to lack access to a vehicle ( $28.9 \%$ ) compared to the total population
(11.5\%), and were less likely to own their home ( $31.9 \%$ versus 65.1\%).

The Hispanic/Latino population is a fast growing segment of the population in Monroe County, and in the City of Rochester in particular. Between 1970 and 2000 the Hispanic population gained ground in education, but it faces challenges with high poverty rates, low home-ownership rates, and high rates of singleparent households.
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## I NTRODUCTI ON

In 2001 the United Way conducted a Hispanic Community Assessment: Assets and Opportunities project. As part of the project, CGR was asked to analyze selected Census trend data for Monroe County's Hispanic/Latino population. Characteristics of the Hispanic population living in Monroe County were analyzed using decennial Census data for the years 1970, 1980, 1990, and 2000. However, at the time of the 2001 report, not all 2000 Census data were yet available.

In 2003 the Ibero-American Action League engaged CGR to update the remaining tables, as additional data had been released. This report builds on the initial report, and updates most of the tables with 2000 data.

It should be noted that for all 1970 estimates included in this report, only those individuals of Puerto Rican descent were included in the Hispanic/Latino category by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Note that while summary tables and charts are included in the body of this report, more detailed tables are included in the Appendix.

## Census Data Analysis

Total Population

The total
Hispanic/Latino population in Monroe

County grew from
5,792 in 1970 (Puerto
Ricans only) to 39,065
in 2000.

Between 1990 and 2000, the Hispanic/Latino population, including those of Puerto Rican, Mexican, and Cuban descent, increased in Monroe County from 26,450 to 39,065, an increase of $47.7 \%$ (See Appendix Table 1). The vast majority of the Hispanic/Latino population is of Puerto Rican descent ( $70.4 \%$ in 2000). Most of the population increase in the Hispanic community can be attributed to the growth of the Puerto Rican subgroup (an increase of $43 \%$ between 1990 and 2000 and of $133 \%$ between 1980 and 2000).


The Hispanic/Latino population grew substantially between 1990 and 2000 in both the City of Rochester ( $39.8 \%$ increase) and in the suburbs ( $72.5 \%$ increase). While the rate of growth was higher in the suburbs, the overall numbers of Hispanics are higher in the City than in the suburbs ( $71.8 \%$ of the County's Hispanics live in Rochester), and most of the growth numerically took place in the City.

Though the number of Hispanics living in the suburbs of Monroe County increased to 11,033 in 2000 from 6,395 in 1990, the suburban growth contributed only $36.7 \%$ of the entire growth of the County's Hispanic population growth. The number of Puerto Rican individuals, in particular, increased from 2,846 to 5,604 in the suburbs between 1990 and 2000. Nonetheless, the Puerto Rican portion of the Hispanic population appears to be concentrated in the City; while $78.1 \%$ of the City's Hispanic population is of Puerto Rican origin, only $50.8 \%$ of the suburban Hispanic population is Puerto Rican.

The proportion of the Hispanic/Latino population in Monroe County that is native born increased slightly between 1980 and 2000 , from $86.8 \%$ to $88.9 \%$.

Place of Birth: Hispanic/Latino Population, 1980-2000

|  | Monroe County |  | City of Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Count Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |  |
| Total | 38,546 | $100.0 \%$ | 27,869 | $100.0 \%$ | 10,677 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Native | 34,265 | $88.9 \%$ | 25,508 | $91.5 \%$ | 8,757 | $82.0 \%$ |
| Foreign-born | 4,281 | $11.1 \%$ | 2,361 | $8.5 \%$ | 1,920 | $18.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | Count Percentage | Count Percentage | Count | Percentage |  |  |
| Total | 24,731 | $100.0 \%$ | 18,936 | $100.0 \%$ | 5,795 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Native | 21,749 | $87.9 \%$ | 17,374 | $91.8 \%$ | 4,375 | $75.5 \%$ |
| Foreign-born | 2,982 | $12.1 \%$ | 1,562 | $8.2 \%$ | 1,420 | $24.5 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total | 16,538 | $100.0 \%$ | 12,961 | $100.0 \%$ | 3,577 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Native | 14,348 | $86.8 \%$ | 11,619 | $89.6 \%$ | 2,729 | $76.3 \%$ |
| Foreign-born | 2,190 | $13.2 \%$ | 1,342 | $10.4 \%$ | 848 | $23.7 \%$ |

Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing Table PCT-63H; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Table P-20; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Table 28.

Racial make-up of the Hispanic/Latino population changed slightly between 1990 and 2000, as seen in the table below. In 1990, $40.1 \%$ of the Hispanic population self-reported themselves as White, while $8.2 \%$ reported their race as Black. In 2000, the proportion of Hispanics self-reporting their race as White decreased slightly to $38.9 \%$, while the proportion of Blacks also decreased to $7.4 \%$. Approximately $44 \%$ of the population indicated they were of some race other than Black, White, Asian, or Native American in 2000; presumably some consider their Hispanic origin to be their racial identity. It should be noted that in 2000 individuals were able for the first time to select more than one race on the Census form, rendering race not directly comparable over time. And in fact, among the Hispanic/Latino population, $8.7 \%$ indicated that they are of two or more races.

| Hispanic Population in Monroe County by Race, 2000 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 39,065 | $100.0 \%$ |
| White alone | 15,198 | $38.9 \%$ |
| Black or African American alone | 2,904 | $7.4 \%$ |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alo1 | 305 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Asian or Pacific Islander alone | 204 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Some other race alone | 17,062 | $43.7 \%$ |
| Two or more races | 3,392 | $8.7 \%$ |

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Table P8

Hispanic Population in Monroe County by Race, 1990

| Total | 26,450 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| White | 10,605 | $40.1 \%$ |
| Black | 2,165 | $8.2 \%$ |
| American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut | 96 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 246 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Other race | 13,338 | $50.4 \%$ |

Source: 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Table 8

| Hispanic Population in Monroe County by Race, $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 16,738 | $100.0 \%$ |
| White | 7,083 | $42.3 \%$ |
| Black | 1,112 | $6.6 \%$ |
| Other race | 8,543 | $51.0 \%$ |

Source: 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Table P-7

## Gender

## Age

The Hispanic population age 55 and over increased from $3 \%$ to $8 \%$ of the population between 1970 and 2000.

The Hispanic/Latino population in 2000 has a slightly larger female concentration than male, which is consistent with all racial and ethnic categories (Appendix Table 2). In 2000, females made up slightly more than half $(51.0 \%)$ of the Hispanic population in Monroe County, while in 1980, Monroe County's Hispanic community was nearly equally split between females (49.9\%) and males (50.1\%).

The age structure of the Hispanic population has shifted since 1970. Appendix Tables 3A-3D show that $32.6 \%$ of the Monroe County Puerto Rican community in 1970 was less than 10 years of age, and $78.9 \%$ was under the age of 35 . At the other end of the age scale, the population age 55 and older comprised only $3.3 \%$ of the Puerto Rican community in 1970. In 1980, only $24.3 \%$ of the Monroe County Hispanic population was under the age of 10 and the proportion of individuals 55 and older was $7.0 \%$, or more than
double that of 1970. By 1990, the proportion of the Hispanic population under 10 was virtually unchanged at $24.1 \%$, while the proportion 55 and older increased to $8.5 \%$. In 2000, the percentage of Monroe County's Hispanic population under 10 and over 55 years of age remained relatively similar to 1990 ( $23.7 \%$ and $8.4 \%$, respectively).

> The Hispanic population is disproportionately younger than the Monroe County population as a whole.

While $13.8 \%$ of the Monroe County population was under 10 years of age in 2000, $23.7 \%$ of the Hispanic population was less than 10 in that year. This trend continues through the 25-34 age group, and then reverses, with the Hispanic population proportionately smaller than the total population in all age groups over 35. For example, among the total population, $16.1 \%$ are aged 35 to 44 , compared to $13.7 \%$ of Hispanics. At the oldest age breakdowns, $6.8 \%$ of the total population is aged 75 or older, compared to $1.4 \%$ of the Hispanic population.

## Location in City of Rochester

The Hispanic population in the City of Rochester in 2000 was concentrated in Planning Sectors 3, 8, 9, and 10 (See Appendix for Planning Sector map). Sector 9 had the highest number of Hispanics, at 9,812 (an increase of $60 \%$ from 1990 to 2000). Sector 10 had fewer Hispanics $(5,434)$, but had the highest concentration ( $31.7 \%$ of the total population in Sector 10). Sector 2 more than tripled its Hispanic
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{lcc} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\
\text { Population } \\
\mathbf{( 2 0 0 0 )}\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Hispanic } \\
\text { Population }\end{array}
$$ <br>

\mathbf{( 2 0 0 0 )}\end{array}\right]\)| City of Rochester | 219,773 | 28,032 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Sector 9 | 35,907 | 9,812 |
| Sector 10 | 17,143 | 5,434 |
| Sector 3 | 27,069 | 4,666 |
| Sector 8 | 27,674 | 2,481 |
| Sector 2 | 19,319 | 1,811 |
| Sector 6 | 20,807 | 1,104 |
| Sector 4 | 33,812 | 1,067 |
| Sector 7 | 22,505 | 850 |
| Sector 5 | 6,629 | 432 |
| Sector 1 | 8,829 | 369 |
| Source: Dept of Commerce, Bureau of the Census |  |  |
| (compilation by The Housing Council) |  |  |
| Note: Sector data exclude census stract 89 (the airport). |  |  |
| Population in this tract is 256. |  |  |
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4.2\% population from 1990 to 2000, from 538 to 1,811 (up from $3.0 \%$ to $9.4 \%$ of the sector's total population).

Sectors 8, 9, and 10 are located in the North-Northeast area of the City. While the Hispanic population is somewhat concentrated in those selected Sectors, the population is represented in all sectors of the City, with more than 350 Hispanic persons residing in each of the Sectors.

Family Structure

Hispanic families with a married couple dropped from $85 \%$ in 1970 to $47 \%$ in 2000.

Family type over the last 40 years has changed substantially in the United States. All regions have experienced a decline in the percentage of married couple families, and an increase in the percentage of single-parent households, particularly female-headed households. The Rochester region is no exception. To examine the issue of family structure by race/ethnicity is of interest because of the substantial difference in experience among the various groups.

The chart below shows the percentage of families in Monroe County that are structured around a married couple, as a percentage of all families. The chart shows the percentages over time for white, black, and Hispanic/Latino families. While the percentage of all County families with a married couple declined from $87.6 \%$ to $73.7 \%$ between 1970 and 2000 (Tables 4A-4D), the drop in proportion of married couple families for Hispanics dropped dramatically from $85.2 \%$ to $47.1 \%$. While the percentage of Hispanic families with a married couple was very similar to whites in 1970, by 2000 the two groups were very far apart. The black population started out with a lower percentage of married couple families in 1970, with $64.7 \%$. By 2000, this percentage had dropped to $36.2 \%$. Meanwhile, single-mother households with children under age 18 increased from $8.4 \%$ to $36.2 \%$ of all Hispanic families in 2000, compared with an increase from $5.1 \%$ to $13.4 \%$ of all families.


## Marital Status

## Education

## Hispanics in the suburbs are much more likely to be in college than those in the city.

Compared to the total population in Monroe County, the Hispanic population in 2000 was less likely to be married ( $37.1 \%$ versus $51.3 \%$ ), and more likely to have never married ( $43.3 \%$ versus $30.9 \%$ ), as shown in Appendix Tables 5A-5B. The proportion of the Hispanic population that was married in 2000 was lower than in 1980 by 10.3 percentage points, and the downward trend was more pronounced when compared to the total population (2.8 percentage points). In 2000, Hispanics in the suburbs were more likely to be married ( $51.2 \%$ ) than their counterparts in the City ( $31.4 \%$ ). This difference is also reflected in the total population.

Among the 35,893 persons of Hispanic origin ages 3 and older estimated from the 2000 sample data, ${ }^{1} 41.5 \%$ were in school, up from $37.0 \%$ in 1990 , and $34.7 \%$ in 1970 (Tables 6A-6D). However, the proportion of the total Hispanic population in college dropped from $8.3 \%$ in 1990 to $6.5 \%$ in 2000 , though it is still much higher than in $1970(0.3 \%)$. In 2000, the percentage of whites enrolled in college was $8.0 \%$, and for blacks was $6.1 \%$, both of which were small drops compared to 1990.

The percentage of the Hispanic population in the suburbs who attended college in 2000 was more than three times that of those in the City ( $13.0 \%$ and $4.0 \%$, respectively). This difference has become more pronounced since 1990, when the rates were $13.9 \%$ in the suburbs and $6.6 \%$ in the city.

Among all Hispanics in Monroe County aged 25 and older, 3.2\% had completed 4 or more years of college in 1970, compared to $10.0 \%$ in 1980, $12.0 \%$ in 1990, and $13.3 \%$ in 2000 (Tables 7A-7D). These figures are much lower than the overall percentage of whites who had finished four or more years of college ( $34 \%$ in 2000), but are somewhat higher than the proportion of blacks who completed 4 or more years of college ( $11.4 \%$ in 2000). The percentages for Hispanics are substantially lower in the City (8.1\%) and are substantially higher in the suburbs $(25.4 \%)$.

[^0]> The percentage of the Hispanic population with less than a 9 th grade education has declined from $62 \%$ in 1970 to $16 \%$ in 2000 , but only 4\% of the total population in 2000 had less than a 9th grade education.

## Employment

The Monroe County
Hispanic/Latino population has higher rates of unemployment than the overall population.

More importantly, the percentage with less than a ninth grade education has declined dramatically over time from $62.0 \%$ of the Monroe County Hispanic population in 1970 to $23.1 \%$ of the population in 1990 , and to $16.4 \%$ in 2000 . While dramatic improvements in educational attainment have been made, the Hispanic population still lags behind the overall population. While $16.4 \%$ of the Hispanic population had less than a ninth grade education in 2000, $4.3 \%$ of the overall population had educational attainment at this level. Similarly, while $13.3 \%$ of Hispanics had a bachelor's degree or higher, $31.2 \%$ of the overall population had the same high level of education.

The Hispanic labor force in Monroe County grew from 2,054 in 1970 to 9,380 in 1990, and to 15,117 in 2000 . The proportion of the County's Hispanic labor force that resides in the suburbs grew slightly from approximately $32.0 \%$ of the total Hispanic labor force in 1990 to $33.6 \%$ in 2000 (Tables 8A-8D).

Rates of unemployment among the Monroe County Hispanic population have consistently been about twice the rate of the overall population. In 1970, $6.3 \%$ of the Hispanic population was unemployed, compared to $3.1 \%$ of the overall population. In 2000, $12.8 \%$ of the Hispanic population was unemployed, compared to $12.5 \%$ in 1990. The 2000 rate for Hispanics is more than double the total population's 2000 unemployment rate of $6.0 \%$. Unemployment rates are consistently higher in the City of Rochester when compared to the suburbs for all racial and ethnic groups. In 2000, the Hispanic unemployment rate in the City was $13.3 \%$, compared to $11.6 \%$ in the suburbs.

Occupations among the working Hispanic population aged 16 and older in Monroe County changed substantially between 1970 and 1990. In 1970, $45.6 \%$ of workers worked in the occupational category "machine operators, assemblers, or inspectors" (Table 9). By 1990, only $15.9 \%$ of the working Hispanic population was in this occupational category. On the other hand, the proportion of the working Hispanic population increased from $0.3 \%$ to $7.2 \%$ in sales, from $4.7 \%$ to $11.4 \%$ in Professional specialty occupations, and from $3.4 \%$ to $7.2 \%$ in executive and managerial occupations between 1970 and 1990. In 2000, the most common occupations
for Hispanic workers were production (16\%), office and administrative support ( $15 \%$ ), and sales ( $9 \%$ ).

## Income

Household income in the Hispanic population is strikingly lower than household income in the white population, and is somewhat
 lower than household income among black households (Tables 10A-10D). To look at trend information for income is difficult because the dollars are not adjusted for inflation. However, in 1970, 65.1\% of Hispanic households made less than $\$ 10,000$ in annual income, compared to $33.5 \%$ of the total population. In 2000, 25.8\% of the Hispanic population had a household income of less than $\$ 10,000$, compared to $9.1 \%$ of the total population, and $23.1 \%$ of the black population. At the high end of the income scale, $22.0 \%$ of the Hispanic population had a household income of $\$ 50,000$ or higher in 2000, compared to $45.0 \%$ of the total population.

Overall per capita income in Monroe County was $\$ 22,821$ in 2000 (Table 11). Among Hispanics the average was $\$ 11,234$, among blacks it was $\$ 13,231$, and among whites, the per capita income was $\$ 25,291$. Among Hispanics in the City of Rochester, per capita income was much lower, at $\$ 8,797$.

> Hispanics in Monroe County are more likely than whites or blacks to live in poverty.

2000 Census data indicate that $34.5 \%$ of the Hispanic population in Monroe County was below the poverty level, compared to $37.4 \%$ in 1990 (Tables 12A-12D). This percentage was higher in the City of Rochester ( $41.8 \%$ ) than in the suburbs ( $14.9 \%$ ). While the rates of poverty among Hispanics are down in the City of Rochester compared to 1990 , rates in the suburbs are up by 4 percentage points. The poverty level among the total population in 2000 was $11.2 \%(25.9 \%$ in the City and $4.9 \%$ in the suburbs).


Hispanics had poverty rates two to four times higher at every age category, compared to the total population. For example, while $17.6 \%$ of children under 5 years of age lived in poverty among the total population in 2000, the rate was $42.9 \%$ among the Hispanic/Latino population.


Among all Hispanics in Monroe County ages 5 and older, nearly three-quarters indicated that they speak a language other than English (73.9\%) (they may or may not speak English also) (Table 13). This compares to $12.1 \%$ of the total population.

The proportion of Hispanics that indicated that they "do not speak English very well" dropped from $34.0 \%$ in 1990 to $29.7 \%$ in 2000 . This compares to $4.7 \%$ of the total population. The decrease among Hispanics was concentrated in the City, with a drop from $38.5 \%$ to $33.4 \%$. In the suburbs, the proportion of Hispanics who "do not speak English very well" remained constant at 20\% in 1990 and 2000.

## Housing Characteristics

Hispanic heads of household were less likely to own their homes in 2000 (32\% of housing units) compared to the total population (65\%).

Hispanic housing units were more than twice as likely to lack access to a vehicle (29\%) compared to the total population (12\%).

In 2000, $31.9 \%$ of housing units occupied by persons with an Hispanic head of household were owner-occupied, while the remainder were rented (Tables 14A-B). This is very similar to the rate in 1990 ( $31.2 \%$ owner-occupied), but is low compared to the total population ( $65.1 \%$ owner-occupied). In the suburbs, $52.0 \%$ of Hispanic households were owner-occupied, down from $60.0 \%$ in 1990. In the City, $25.0 \%$ of Hispanic households were owneroccupied, compared to $22.9 \%$ in 1990. Among the total population, $76.3 \%$ of housing units in the suburbs are owneroccupied, compared to $40.2 \%$ in the City.

Among all Hispanic occupied housing units, 28.9\% had no car available in 2000 , down from $37.9 \%$ in 1990. The percentage of households in the total population with no car was much lower, at $11.5 \%$ in 2000 . The percentage of Hispanic homes in the City with no car were much higher than those in the suburbs ( $35.4 \%$ versus $10.2 \%)$. The percentage of Hispanic suburban homes with no car doubled between 1990 and 2000 ( $5.0 \%$ to $10.2 \%$ ).

The percentage of homes with an Hispanic origin head of household that did not have a telephone decreased from $16.9 \%$ in 1990 to $6.7 \%$ in 2000 . Yet this is still high compared to the total
population in $2000(1.8 \%)$. The percentage of Hispanic homes with no telephone were somewhat higher in the City, and only $0.7 \%$ in the suburbs in 2000.


# Table 1: Hispanic/ Latino Population by Origin 

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total 2000 | 39,065 | $100.0 \%$ | 28,032 | $100.0 \%$ | 11,033 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mexican | 2,285 | $5.8 \%$ | 851 | $3.0 \%$ | 1,434 | $13.0 \%$ |
| Puerto Rican | 27,501 | $70.4 \%$ | 21,897 | $78.1 \%$ | 5,604 | $50.8 \%$ |
| Cuban | 1,893 | $4.8 \%$ | 1,177 | $4.2 \%$ | 716 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Other | 7,386 | $18.9 \%$ | 4,107 | $14.7 \%$ | 3,279 | $29.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1990 | 26,450 | $100.0 \%$ | 20,055 | $100.0 \%$ | 6,395 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mexican | 1,367 | $5.2 \%$ | 574 | $2.9 \%$ | 793 | $12.4 \%$ |
| Puerto Rican | 19,229 | $72.7 \%$ | 16,383 | $81.7 \%$ | 2,846 | $44.5 \%$ |
| Cuban | 1,051 | $4.0 \%$ | 519 | $2.6 \%$ | 532 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Other | 4,803 | $18.2 \%$ | 2,579 | $12.9 \%$ | 2,224 | $34.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1980 | 16,738 | $100.0 \%$ | 13,153 | $100.0 \%$ | 3,585 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Mexican | 1,186 | $7.1 \%$ | 660 | $5.0 \%$ | 526 | $14.7 \%$ |
| Puerto Rican | 11,797 | $70.5 \%$ | 10,545 | $80.2 \%$ | 1,252 | $34.9 \%$ |
| Cuban | 869 | $5.2 \%$ | 452 | $3.4 \%$ | 417 | $11.6 \%$ |
| Other | 2,886 | $17.2 \%$ | 1,496 | $11.4 \%$ | 1,390 | $38.8 \%$ |

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Table PCT11; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Table 8; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Table P-7.
Note: Data are from 100\% Tabulations.

## Table 2: Population by Gender

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Hispanic Persons | 39,065 | $100.0 \%$ | 28,032 | $100.0 \%$ | 11,033 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 19,154 | $49.0 \%$ | 13,621 | $48.6 \%$ | 5,533 | $50.1 \%$ |
| Female | 19,911 | $51.0 \%$ | 14,411 | $51.4 \%$ | 5,500 | $49.9 \%$ |
| White Persons* | 581,961 | $100.0 \%$ | 106,161 | $100.0 \%$ | 475,800 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 281,323 | $48.3 \%$ | 51,785 | $48.8 \%$ | 229,538 | $48.2 \%$ |
| Female | 300,638 | $51.7 \%$ | 54,376 | $51.2 \%$ | 246,262 | $51.8 \%$ |
| Black Persons* | 101,078 | $100.0 \%$ | 84,717 | $100.0 \%$ | 16,361 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 47,124 | $46.6 \%$ | 39,144 | $46.2 \%$ | 7,980 | $48.8 \%$ |
| Female | 53,954 | $53.4 \%$ | 45,573 | $53.8 \%$ | 8,381 | $51.2 \%$ |
| Total Persons | 735,343 | $100.0 \%$ | 219,773 | $100.0 \%$ | 515,570 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 354,327 | $48.2 \%$ | 105,083 | $47.8 \%$ | 249,244 | $48.3 \%$ |
| Female | 381,016 | $51.8 \%$ | 114,690 | $52.2 \%$ | 266,326 | $51.7 \%$ |

## 1990

| Hispanic Persons | 26,450 | $100.0 \%$ | 20,055 | $100.0 \%$ | 6,395 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 12,935 | $48.9 \%$ | 9,775 | $48.7 \%$ | 3,160 | $49.4 \%$ |
| Female | 13,515 | $51.1 \%$ | 10,280 | $51.3 \%$ | 3,235 | $50.6 \%$ |
| White Persons | 600,328 | $100.0 \%$ | 141,503 | $100.0 \%$ | 458,825 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 289,062 | $48.2 \%$ | 67,153 | $47.5 \%$ | 221,909 | $48.4 \%$ |
| Female | 311,266 | $51.8 \%$ | 74,350 | $52.5 \%$ | 236,916 | $51.6 \%$ |
| Black Persons | 85,041 | $100.0 \%$ | 73,024 | $100.0 \%$ | 12,017 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 39,590 | $46.6 \%$ | 33,725 | $46.2 \%$ | 5,865 | $48.8 \%$ |
| Female | 45,451 | $53.4 \%$ | 39,299 | $53.8 \%$ | 6,152 | $51.2 \%$ |
| Total Persons | 713,968 | $100.0 \%$ | 231,636 | $100.0 \%$ | 482,332 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 342,764 | $48.0 \%$ | 109,286 | $47.2 \%$ | 233,478 | $48.4 \%$ |
| Female | 371,204 | $52.0 \%$ | 122,350 | $52.8 \%$ | 248,854 | $51.6 \%$ |

1980

| Hispanic Persons | 16,738 | $100.0 \%$ | 13,153 | $100.0 \%$ | 3,585 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 8,389 | $50.1 \%$ | 6,549 | $49.8 \%$ | 1,840 | $51.3 \%$ |
| Female | 8,349 | $49.9 \%$ | 6,604 | $50.2 \%$ | 1,745 | $48.7 \%$ |
| White Persons | 613,525 | $100.0 \%$ | 168,102 | $100.0 \%$ | 445,423 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 295,226 | $48.1 \%$ | 79,088 | $47.0 \%$ | 216,138 | $48.5 \%$ |
| Female | 318,299 | $51.9 \%$ | 89,014 | $53.0 \%$ | 229,285 | $51.5 \%$ |
| Black Persons | 71,041 | $100.0 \%$ | 62,332 | $100.0 \%$ | 8,709 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 33,620 | $47.3 \%$ | 29,258 | $46.9 \%$ | 4,362 | $50.1 \%$ |
| Female | 37,421 | $52.7 \%$ | 33,074 | $53.1 \%$ | 4,347 | $49.9 \%$ |
| Total Persons | 702,238 | $100.0 \%$ | 241,741 | $100.0 \%$ | 460,497 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 337,664 | $48.1 \%$ | 113,947 | $47.1 \%$ | 223,717 | $48.6 \%$ |
| Female | 364,574 | $51.9 \%$ | 127,794 | $52.9 \%$ | 236,780 | $51.4 \%$ |


| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic Persons** | 5,792 | $100.0 \%$ | 5,456 | $100.0 \%$ | 336 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 3,098 | $53.5 \%$ | 2,917 | $53.5 \%$ | 181 | $53.9 \%$ |
| Female | 2,694 | $46.5 \%$ | 2,539 | $46.5 \%$ | 155 | $46.1 \%$ |
| White Persons | 655,821 | $100.0 \%$ | 244,118 | $100.0 \%$ | 411,703 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 316,061 | $48.2 \%$ | 114,091 | $46.7 \%$ | 201,970 | $49.1 \%$ |
| Female | 339,760 | $51.8 \%$ | 130,027 | $53.3 \%$ | 209,733 | $50.9 \%$ |
| Black Persons | 52,218 | $100.0 \%$ | 49,647 | $100.0 \%$ | 2,571 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 25,040 | $48.0 \%$ | 23,681 | $47.7 \%$ | 1,359 | $52.9 \%$ |
| Female | 27,178 | $52.0 \%$ | 25,966 | $52.3 \%$ | 1,212 | $47.1 \%$ |
| Total Persons | 711,917 | $100.0 \%$ | 296,233 | $100.0 \%$ | 415,684 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 343,006 | $48.2 \%$ | 139,012 | $46.9 \%$ | 203,994 | $49.1 \%$ |
| Female | 368,911 | $51.8 \%$ | 157,221 | $53.1 \%$ | 211,690 | $50.9 \%$ |

* Respondents were allowed to choose more than one race for the first time in 2000.

This figure includes those who checked only this race.
**1970 only reports persons of Puerto Rican descent.
Note: D ata are from 100\% Tabulations.

Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P12, P12A, P12B, P12H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing,
Tables 1,2,3,6; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 1,2,3,6; 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 1,5,7.

# Table 3: Population by Age 

3A: Hispanic Population by Age
Monnoe County Rochester

## Suburbs

| 2000 | Count | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 39,065 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 4,668 | $11.9 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 4,610 | $11.8 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 4,411 | $11.3 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 3,728 | $9.5 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 3,469 | $8.9 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 6,319 | $16.2 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 5,338 | $13.7 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 3,304 | $8.5 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 1,740 | $4.5 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 960 | $2.5 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 416 | $1.1 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 102 | $0.3 \%$ |


| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 26,450 | $100.0 \%$ | 20,055 | $100.0 \%$ | 6,395 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 3,424 | $12.9 \%$ | 2,842 | $14.2 \%$ | 582 | $9.1 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 2,970 | $11.2 \%$ | 2,396 | $11.9 \%$ | 574 | $9.0 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 2,710 | $10.2 \%$ | 2,094 | $10.4 \%$ | 616 | $9.6 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 2,501 | $9.5 \%$ | 1,865 | $9.3 \%$ | 636 | $9.9 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 2,695 | $10.2 \%$ | 2,044 | $10.2 \%$ | 651 | $10.2 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 4,785 | $18.1 \%$ | 3,590 | $17.9 \%$ | 1,195 | $18.7 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 3,196 | $12.1 \%$ | 2,249 | $11.2 \%$ | 947 | $14.8 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 1,939 | $7.3 \%$ | 1,390 | $6.9 \%$ | 549 | $8.6 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 1,158 | $4.4 \%$ | 815 | $4.1 \%$ | 343 | $5.4 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 647 | $2.4 \%$ | 469 | $2.3 \%$ | 178 | $2.8 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 358 | $1.4 \%$ | 252 | $1.3 \%$ | 106 | $1.7 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 67 | $0.3 \%$ | 49 | $0.2 \%$ | 18 | $0.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 16,738 | $100.0 \%$ | 13,153 | $100.0 \%$ | 3,585 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 2,177 | $13.0 \%$ | 1,837 | $14.0 \%$ | 340 | $9.5 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 1,884 | $11.3 \%$ | 1,539 | $11.7 \%$ | 345 | $9.6 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 1,894 | $11.3 \%$ | 1,515 | $11.5 \%$ | 379 | $10.6 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 1,995 | $11.9 \%$ | 1,573 | $12.0 \%$ | 422 | $11.8 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 1,876 | $11.2 \%$ | 1,467 | $11.2 \%$ | 409 | $11.4 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 2,792 | $167 \%$ | 2,138 | $16.3 \%$ | 654 | $18.2 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 1,768 | $10.6 \%$ | 1,311 | $10.0 \%$ | 457 | $12.7 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 1,180 | $7.0 \%$ | 896 | $6.8 \%$ | 284 | $7.9 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 671 | $4.0 \%$ | 520 | $4.0 \%$ | 151 | $4.2 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 306 | $1.8 \%$ | 225 | $1.7 \%$ | 81 | $2.3 \%$ |
| $75+$ | 195 | $1.2 \%$ | 132 | $1.0 \%$ | 63 | $1.8 \%$ |


| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 5,792 | $100.0 \%$ | 5,486 | $100.0 \%$ | 306 | $100.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-4$ | 921 | $15.9 \%$ | 861 | $15.7 \%$ | 60 | $19.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5-9$ | 965 | $16.7 \%$ | 915 | $16.7 \%$ | 50 | $16.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10-14$ | 833 | $14.4 \%$ | 775 | $14.1 \%$ | 58 | $19.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $15-19$ | 608 | $10.5 \%$ | 572 | $10.4 \%$ | 36 | $11.8 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $20-24$ | 461 | $8.0 \%$ | 431 | $7.9 \%$ | 30 | $9.8 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $25-34$ | 775 | $13.4 \%$ | 727 | $13.3 \%$ | 48 | $15.7 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $35-44$ | 701 | $12.1 \%$ | 651 | $11.9 \%$ | 50 | $16.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $45-54$ | 337 | $5.8 \%$ | 337 | $6.1 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $55-64$ | 97 | $1.7 \%$ | 93 | $1.7 \%$ | 4 | $1.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $65-74$ | 72 | $1.2 \%$ | 72 | $1.3 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $75+$ | 22 | $0.4 \%$ | 22 | $0.4 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 3B: White Population by Age

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000** | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count |  |
| Total | 581,961 | $100.0 \%$ | 106,161 | $100.0 \%$ | 475,800 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 31,757 | $5.5 \%$ | 5,368 | $5.1 \%$ | 26,389 | $5.5 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 37,457 | $6.4 \%$ | 5,104 | $4.8 \%$ | 32,353 | $6.8 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 39,420 | $6.8 \%$ | 4,685 | $4.4 \%$ | 34,735 | $7.3 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 38,988 | $6.7 \%$ | 5,643 | $5.3 \%$ | 33,345 | $7.0 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 35,446 | $6.1 \%$ | 9,759 | $9.2 \%$ | 25,687 | $5.4 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 73,676 | $12.7 \%$ | 20,087 | $18.9 \%$ | 53,589 | $11.3 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 96,300 | $16.5 \%$ | 16,964 | $16.0 \%$ | 79,336 | $16.7 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 86,948 | $14.9 \%$ | 13,995 | $13.2 \%$ | 72,953 | $15.3 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 53,805 | $9.2 \%$ | 8,211 | $7.7 \%$ | 45,594 | $9.6 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 41,616 | $7.2 \%$ | 6,388 | $6.0 \%$ | 35,228 | $7.4 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 33,552 | $5.8 \%$ | 6,611 | $6.2 \%$ | 26,941 | $5.7 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 12,996 | $2.2 \%$ | 3,346 | $3.2 \%$ | 9,650 | $2.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 600,328 | $100.0 \%$ | 141,503 | $100.0 \%$ | 458,825 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 41,004 | $6.8 \%$ | 10,248 | $7.2 \%$ | 30,756 | $6.7 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 38,283 | $6.4 \%$ | 7,141 | $5.0 \%$ | 31,142 | $6.8 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 34,046 | $5.7 \%$ | 5,339 | $3.8 \%$ | 28,707 | $6.3 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 38,131 | $6.4 \%$ | 7,035 | $5.0 \%$ | 31,096 | $6.8 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 47,912 | $8.0 \%$ | 14,210 | $10.0 \%$ | 33,702 | $7.3 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 105,750 | $17.6 \%$ | 33,380 | $23.6 \%$ | 72,370 | $15.8 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 94,640 | $15.8 \%$ | 19,539 | $13.8 \%$ | 75,101 | $16.4 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 63,564 | $10.6 \%$ | 10,605 | $7.5 \%$ | 52,959 | $11.5 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 52,674 | $8.8 \%$ | 9,882 | $7.0 \%$ | 42,792 | $9.3 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 47,357 | $7.9 \%$ | 11,700 | $8.3 \%$ | 35,657 | $7.8 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 27,193 | $4.5 \%$ | 8,676 | $6.1 \%$ | 18,517 | $4.0 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 9,774 | $1.6 \%$ | 3,748 | $2.6 \%$ | 6,026 | $1.3 \%$ |


| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 613,525 | $100.0 \%$ | 168,102 | $100.0 \%$ | 445,423 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 35,779 | $5.8 \%$ | 10,062 | $6.0 \%$ | 25,717 | $5.8 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 38,662 | $6.3 \%$ | 8,574 | $5.1 \%$ | 30,088 | $6.8 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 48,157 | $7.8 \%$ | 8,813 | $5.2 \%$ | 39,344 | $8.8 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 55,935 | $9.1 \%$ | 11,854 | $7.1 \%$ | 44,081 | $9.9 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 60,362 | $9.8 \%$ | 19,607 | $11.7 \%$ | 40,755 | $9.1 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 102,909 | $16.8 \%$ | 32,394 | $19.3 \%$ | 70,515 | $15.8 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 69,776 | $11.4 \%$ | 13,777 | $8.2 \%$ | 55,999 | $12.6 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 63,819 | $10.4 \%$ | 13,539 | $8.1 \%$ | 50,280 | $11.3 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 64,048 | $10.4 \%$ | 18,278 | $10.9 \%$ | 45,770 | $10.3 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 41,908 | $6.8 \%$ | 16,021 | $9.5 \%$ | 25,887 | $5.8 \%$ |
| $75+$ | 32,170 | $5.2 \%$ | 15,183 | $9.0 \%$ | 16,987 | $3.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 655,821 | $100.0 \%$ | 244,118 | $100.0 \%$ | 411,703 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 56,484 | $8.6 \%$ | 20,085 | $8.2 \%$ | 36,399 | $8.8 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 62,843 | $9.6 \%$ | 18,058 | $7.4 \%$ | 44,785 | $10.9 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 63,386 | $9.7 \%$ | 17,532 | $7.2 \%$ | 45,854 | $11.1 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 57,383 | $8.7 \%$ | 19,435 | $8.0 \%$ | 37,948 | $9.2 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 53,494 | $8.2 \%$ | 25,241 | $10.3 \%$ | 28,253 | $6.9 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 83,039 | $12.7 \%$ | 29,365 | $12.0 \%$ | 53,674 | $13.0 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 73,742 | $11.2 \%$ | 21,140 | $8.7 \%$ | 52,602 | $12.8 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 78,334 | $11.9 \%$ | 27,382 | $11.2 \%$ | 50,952 | $12.4 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 59,881 | $9.1 \%$ | 27,023 | $11.1 \%$ | 32,858 | $8.0 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 39,643 | $6.0 \%$ | 21,917 | $9.0 \%$ | 17,726 | $4.3 \%$ |
| $75+$ | 27,592 | $4.2 \%$ | 16,940 | $6.9 \%$ | 10,652 | $2.6 \%$ |

* Respondents were allowed to choose more than one race for the first time in 2000. This figure includes those who checked only this race.


## 3C: Black Population by Age

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000** | Count <br> Cercentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |  |
| Total | 101,078 | $100.0 \%$ | 84,717 | $100.0 \%$ | 16,361 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 9,445 | $9.3 \%$ | 8,408 | $9.9 \%$ | 1,037 | $6.3 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 11,624 | $11.5 \%$ | 10,255 | $12.1 \%$ | 1,369 | $8.4 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 11,083 | $11.0 \%$ | 9,530 | $11.2 \%$ | 1,553 | $9.5 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 8,876 | $8.8 \%$ | 7,161 | $8.5 \%$ | 1,715 | $10.5 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 7,036 | $7.0 \%$ | 5,752 | $6.8 \%$ | 1,284 | $7.8 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 14,507 | $14.4 \%$ | 12,357 | $14.6 \%$ | 2,150 | $13.1 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 14,978 | $14.8 \%$ | 12,480 | $14.7 \%$ | 2,498 | $15.3 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 11,074 | $11.0 \%$ | 8,751 | $10.3 \%$ | 2,323 | $14.2 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 6,805 | $6.7 \%$ | 5,360 | $6.3 \%$ | 1,445 | $8.8 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 3,632 | $3.6 \%$ | 3,004 | $3.5 \%$ | 628 | $3.8 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 1,552 | $1.5 \%$ | 1,290 | $1.5 \%$ | 262 | $1.6 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 466 | $0.5 \%$ | 369 | $0.4 \%$ | 97 | $0.6 \%$ |


| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 85,041 | 100.0\% | 73,024 | 100.0\% | 12,017 | 100.0\% |
| 0-4 | 10,188 | 12.0\% | 9,285 | 12.7\% | 903 | 7.5\% |
| 5-9 | 8,635 | 10.2\% | 7,641 | 10.5\% | 994 | 8.3\% |
| 10-14 | 7,928 | 9.3\% | 6,816 | 9.3\% | 1,112 | 9.3\% |
| 15-19 | 7,901 | 9.3\% | 6,598 | 9.0\% | 1,303 | 10.8\% |
| 20-24 | 7,583 | 8.9\% | 6,389 | 8.7\% | 1,194 | 9.9\% |
| 25-34 | 14,944 | 17.6\% | 13,080 | 17.9\% | 1,864 | 15.5\% |
| 35-44 | 11,657 | 13.7\% | 9,559 | 13.1\% | 2,098 | 17.5\% |
| 45-54 | 7,531 | 8.9\% | 6,096 | 8.3\% | 1,435 | 11.9\% |
| 55-64 | 4,693 | 5.5\% | 4,018 | 5.5\% | 675 | 5.6\% |
| 65-74 | 2,617 | 3.1\% | 2,320 | 3.2\% | 297 | 2.5\% |
| 75-84 | 1,061 | 1.2\% | 957 | 1.3\% | 104 | 0.9\% |
| 85+ | 303 | 0.4\% | 265 | 0.4\% | 38 | 0.3\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 71,041 | 100.0\% | 62,332 | 100.0\% | 8,709 | 100.0\% |
| 0-4 | 7,586 | 10.7\% | 6,855 | 11.0\% | 731 | 8.4\% |
| 5-9 | 7,871 | 11.1\% | 7,000 | 11.2\% | 871 | 10.0\% |
| 10-14 | 8,629 | 12.1\% | 7,686 | 12.3\% | 943 | 10.8\% |
| 15-19 | 8,466 | 11.9\% | 7,372 | 11.8\% | 1,094 | 12.6\% |
| 20-24 | 7,119 | 10.0\% | 6,134 | 9.8\% | 985 | 11.3\% |
| 25-34 | 11,775 | 16.6\% | 10,069 | 16.2\% | 1,706 | 19.6\% |
| 35-44 | 8,153 | 11.5\% | 6,870 | 11.0\% | 1,283 | 14.7\% |
| 45-54 | 5,481 | 7.7\% | 4,827 | 7.7\% | 654 | 7.5\% |
| 55-64 | 3,509 | 4.9\% | 3,211 | 5.2\% | 298 | 3.4\% |
| 65-74 | 1,697 | 2.4\% | 1,599 | 2.6\% | 98 | 1.1\% |
| 75+ | 755 | 1.1\% | 709 | 1.1\% | 46 | 0.5\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 52,218 | 100.0\% | 49,647 | 100.0\% | 2,571 | 100.0\% |
| 0-4 | 7,642 | 14.6\% | 7,359 | 14.8\% | 283 | 11.0\% |
| 5-9 | 7,450 | 14.3\% | 7,143 | 14.4\% | 307 | 11.9\% |
| 10-14 | 6,672 | 12.8\% | 6,306 | 12.7\% | 366 | 14.2\% |
| 15-19 | 4,902 | 9.4\% | 4,637 | 9.3\% | 265 | 10.3\% |
| 20-24 | 4,649 | 8.9\% | 4,399 | 8.9\% | 250 | 9.7\% |
| 25-34 | 8,102 | 15.5\% | 7,685 | 15.5\% | 417 | 16.2\% |
| 35-44 | 5,697 | 10.9\% | 5,358 | 10.8\% | 339 | 13.2\% |
| 45-54 | 3,629 | 6.9\% | 3,421 | 6.9\% | 208 | 8.1\% |
| 55-64 | 2,007 | 3.8\% | 1,928 | 3.9\% | 79 | 3.1\% |
| 65-74 | 1,057 | 2.0\% | 1,020 | 2.1\% | 37 | 1.4\% |
| 75+ | 411 | 0.8\% | 391 | 0.8\% | 20 | 0.8\% |

[^1]
## 3D: Total Population by Age

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total | 735,343 | $100.0 \%$ | 219,773 | $100.0 \%$ | 515,570 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 46,977 | $6.4 \%$ | 17,227 | $7.8 \%$ | 29,750 | $5.8 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 54,661 | $7.4 \%$ | 18,733 | $8.5 \%$ | 35,928 | $7.0 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 55,725 | $7.6 \%$ | 17,233 | $7.8 \%$ | 38,492 | $7.5 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 52,980 | $7.2 \%$ | 15,699 | $7.1 \%$ | 37,281 | $7.2 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 47,587 | $6.5 \%$ | 18,432 | $8.4 \%$ | 29,155 | $5.7 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 97,480 | $13.3 \%$ | 37,652 | $17.1 \%$ | 59,828 | $11.6 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 118,293 | $16.1 \%$ | 33,057 | $15.0 \%$ | 85,236 | $16.5 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 102,728 | $14.0 \%$ | 25,014 | $11.4 \%$ | 77,714 | $15.1 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 63,133 | $8.6 \%$ | 14,749 | $6.7 \%$ | 48,384 | $9.4 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 46,468 | $6.3 \%$ | 9,992 | $4.5 \%$ | 36,476 | $7.1 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 35,676 | $4.9 \%$ | 8,179 | $3.7 \%$ | 27,497 | $5.3 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 13,635 | $1.9 \%$ | 3,806 | $1.7 \%$ | 9,829 | $1.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 713,968 | $100.0 \%$ | 231,636 | $100.0 \%$ | 482,332 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 54,587 | $7.6 \%$ | 21,808 | $9.4 \%$ | 32,779 | $6.8 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 50,047 | $7.0 \%$ | 16,722 | $7.2 \%$ | 33,325 | $6.9 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 44,703 | $6.3 \%$ | 13,847 | $6.0 \%$ | 30,856 | $6.4 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 48,887 | $6.8 \%$ | 15,377 | $6.6 \%$ | 33,510 | $6.9 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 58,553 | $8.2 \%$ | 22,613 | $9.8 \%$ | 35,940 | $7.5 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 126,091 | $17.7 \%$ | 49,753 | $21.5 \%$ | 76,338 | $15.8 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 110,109 | $15.4 \%$ | 31,036 | $13.4 \%$ | 79,073 | $16.4 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 73,428 | $10.3 \%$ | 17,852 | $7.7 \%$ | 55,576 | $11.5 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 58,434 | $8.2 \%$ | 14,493 | $6.3 \%$ | 43,941 | $9.1 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 50,514 | $7.1 \%$ | 14,326 | $6.2 \%$ | 36,188 | $7.5 \%$ |
| $75-84$ | 28,494 | $4.0 \%$ | 9,773 | $4.2 \%$ | 18,721 | $3.9 \%$ |
| $85+$ | 10,121 | $1.4 \%$ | 4,036 | $1.7 \%$ | 6,085 | $1.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 702,198 | $100.0 \%$ | 241,741 | $100.0 \%$ | 460,457 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 45,579 | $6.5 \%$ | 18,391 | $7.6 \%$ | 27,188 | $5.9 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 48,556 | $6.9 \%$ | 16,813 | $7.0 \%$ | 31,743 | $6.9 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 58,629 | $8.3 \%$ | 17,751 | $7.3 \%$ | 40,878 | $8.9 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 66,273 | $9.4 \%$ | 20,585 | $8.5 \%$ | 45,688 | $9.9 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 69,287 | $9.9 \%$ | 27,052 | $11.2 \%$ | 42,235 | $9.2 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 118,115 | $16.8 \%$ | 44,554 | $18.4 \%$ | 73,561 | $16.0 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 80,142 | $11.4 \%$ | 21,789 | $9.0 \%$ | 58,353 | $12.7 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 70,447 | $10.0 \%$ | 19,089 | $7.9 \%$ | 51,358 | $11.2 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 68,194 | $9.7 \%$ | 21,906 | $9.1 \%$ | 46,288 | $10.1 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 43,916 | $6.3 \%$ | 17,821 | $7.4 \%$ | 26,095 | $5.7 \%$ |
| $75+$ | 33,060 | $4.7 \%$ | 15,990 | $6.6 \%$ | 17,070 | $3.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 711,917 | $100.0 \%$ | 296,233 | $100.0 \%$ | 415,684 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $0-4$ | 64,614 | $9.1 \%$ | 27,765 | $9.4 \%$ | 36,849 | $8.9 \%$ |
| $5-9$ | 70,696 | $9.9 \%$ | 25,451 | $8.6 \%$ | 45,245 | $10.9 \%$ |
| $10-14$ | 70,325 | $9.9 \%$ | 24,000 | $8.1 \%$ | 46,325 | $11.1 \%$ |
| $15-19$ | 62,568 | $8.8 \%$ | 24,267 | $8.2 \%$ | 38,301 | $9.2 \%$ |
| $20-24$ | 58,643 | $8.2 \%$ | 30,009 | $10.1 \%$ | 28,634 | $6.9 \%$ |
| $25-34$ | 91,975 | $12.9 \%$ | 37,579 | $12.7 \%$ | 54,396 | $13.1 \%$ |
| $35-44$ | 79,889 | $11.2 \%$ | 26,727 | $9.0 \%$ | 53,162 | $12.8 \%$ |
| $45-54$ | 82,272 | $11.6 \%$ | 30,983 | $10.5 \%$ | 51,289 | $12.3 \%$ |
| $55-64$ | 62,048 | $8.7 \%$ | 29,060 | $9.8 \%$ | 32,988 | $7.9 \%$ |
| $65-74$ | 40,809 | $5.7 \%$ | 23,004 | $7.8 \%$ | 17,805 | $4.3 \%$ |
| $75+$ | 28,078 | $3.9 \%$ | 17,388 | $5.9 \%$ | 10,690 | $2.6 \%$ |

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P12, P12A, P12B, P12H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 6, 2, 3, 1; 1980
Census of Population and Hosuing, Tables 6, 2 3, 1;
1970 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 1, 7, 5.
Note: D ata are from 100\% tabulations.

# Table 4: Family Type by Presence of 0 wn Children 

Families
With own children under 18 years
Married Couple Families
With own children under 18 years
Female householder, no husband present
With own children under 18 years

## 4A: Hispanic Families

## 1990

1990
Families
With own children under 18 years
Married Couple Families
With own children under 18 years
Female householder, no husband present
With own children under 18 years

## 1980

Families
With own children under 18 years
Married couple family
With own children under 18 years
Female householder, no husband present
With own children under 18 years

| Monroe County |  | $\underline{\text { Rochester }}$ |  | $\underline{\text { Suburbs }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| 8,495 | $100.0 \%$ | 6,210 | $100.0 \%$ | 2,285 | $100.0 \%$ |
| 5,922 | $69.7 \%$ | 4,441 | $71.5 \%$ | 1,481 | $64.8 \%$ |
| 4,000 | $47.1 \%$ | 2,402 | $38.7 \%$ | 1,598 | $69.9 \%$ |
| 2,410 | $28.4 \%$ | 1,445 | $23.3 \%$ | 965 | $42.2 \%$ |
| 3,793 | $44.6 \%$ | 3,250 | $52.3 \%$ | 543 | $23.8 \%$ |
| 3,077 | $36.2 \%$ | 2,660 | $42.8 \%$ | 417 | $18.2 \%$ |


| 5,902 | $100.0 \%$ | 4,503 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,399 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4,109 | $69.6 \%$ | 3,257 | $72.3 \%$ | 852 | $60.9 \%$ |
| 2,977 | $50.4 \%$ | 1,857 | $41.2 \%$ | 1,120 | $80.1 \%$ |
| 1,810 | $30.7 \%$ | 1,141 | $25.3 \%$ | 669 | $47.8 \%$ |
| 2,500 | $42.4 \%$ | 2,268 | $50.4 \%$ | 232 | $16.6 \%$ |
| 2,051 | $34.8 \%$ | 1,892 | $42.0 \%$ | 159 | $11.4 \%$ |


| 3,725 | $100.0 \%$ | 2,910 | $100.0 \%$ | 815 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,762 | $74.1 \%$ | 2,213 | $76.0 \%$ | 549 | $67.4 \%$ |
| 2,417 | $64.9 \%$ | 1,721 | $59.1 \%$ | 696 | $85.4 \%$ |
| 1,718 | $46.1 \%$ | 1,258 | $43.2 \%$ | 460 | $56.4 \%$ |
| 1,100 | $29.5 \%$ | 1,000 | $34.4 \%$ | 100 | $12.3 \%$ |
| 924 | $24.8 \%$ | 847 | $29.1 \%$ | 77 | $9.4 \%$ |

## 1970

Families
With own children under 18 years
Married couple family
With own children under 18 years
Female householder, no husband present
With own children under 18 years

| 1,172 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,106 | $100.0 \%$ | 66 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 950 | $81.1 \%$ | 897 | $81.1 \%$ | 53 | $80.3 \%$ |
| 998 | $85.2 \%$ | 944 | $85.4 \%$ | 54 | $81.8 \%$ |
| 825 | $70.4 \%$ | 784 | $70.9 \%$ | 41 | $62.1 \%$ |
| 110 | $9.4 \%$ | 104 | $9.4 \%$ | 6 | $9.1 \%$ |
| 98 | $8.4 \%$ | 92 | $8.3 \%$ | 6 | $9.1 \%$ |

## 4B: White Families

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Families | 150,163 | 100.0\% | 21,658 | 100.0\% | 128,505 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 68,928 | 45.9\% | 9,623 | 44.4\% | 59,305 | 46.1\% |
| Married Couple Families | 121,074 | 80.6\% | 13,827 | 63.8\% | 107,247 | 83.5\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 52,976 | 35.3\% | 5,308 | 24.5\% | 47,668 | 37.1\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 21,747 | 14.5\% | 5,985 | 27.6\% | 15,762 | 12.3\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 12,332 | 8.2\% | 3,504 | 16.2\% | 8,828 | 6.9\% |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Households | 156,865 | 100.0\% | 31,274 | 100.0\% | 125,591 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 70,501 | 44.9\% | 13,666 | 43.7\% | 56,835 | 45.3\% |
| Married couple family | 129,149 | 82.3\% | 21,657 | 69.2\% | 107,492 | 85.6\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 56,975 | 36.3\% | 8,722 | 27.9\% | 48,253 | 38.4\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 21,327 | 13.6\% | 7,545 | 24.1\% | 13,782 | 11.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 11,101 | 7.1\% | 4,214 | 13.5\% | 6,887 | 5.5\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Households | 157,885 | 100.0\% | 39,225 | 100.0\% | 118,660 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 78,209 | 49.5\% | 16,747 | 42.7\% | 61,462 | 51.8\% |
| Married couple family | 133,768 | 84.7\% | 29,448 | 75.1\% | 104,320 | 87.9\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 65,856 | 41.7\% | 11,999 | 30.6\% | 53,857 | 45.4\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 19,106 | 12.1\% | 7,733 | 19.7\% | 11,373 | 9.6\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 10,563 | 6.7\% | 4,114 | 10.5\% | 6,449 | 5.4\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Households | 164,276 | 100.0\% | 59,915 | 100.0\% | 104,361 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 90,922 | 55.3\% | 28,056 | 46.8\% | 62,866 | 60.2\% |
| Married couple family | 146,334 | 89.1\% | 46,430 | 77.5\% | 99,904 | 95.7\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 83,685 | 50.9\% | 24,046 | 40.1\% | 59,639 | 57.1\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 13,967 | 8.5\% | 8,275 | 13.8\% | 5,692 | 5.5\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 6,186 | 3.8\% | 3,534 | 5.9\% | 2,652 | 2.5\% |


| 4C: Black Families |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Families | 23,664 | 100.0\% | 19,649 | 100.0\% | 4,015 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 15,299 | 64.7\% | 13,027 | 66.3\% | 2,272 | 56.6\% |
| Married Couple Families | 8,569 | 36.2\% | 6,044 | 30.8\% | 2,525 | 62.9\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 4,514 | 19.1\% | 3,264 | 16.6\% | 1,250 | 31.1\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 13,133 | 55.5\% | 11,894 | 60.5\% | 1,239 | 30.9\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 9,671 | 40.9\% | 8,803 | 44.8\% | 868 | 21.6\% |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Households | 19,823 | 100.0\% | 16,935 | 100.0\% | 2,888 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 12,971 | 65.4\% | 11,221 | 66.3\% | 1,750 | 60.6\% |
| Married couple family | 7,780 | 39.2\% | 5,742 | 33.9\% | 2,038 | 70.6\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 4,428 | 22.3\% | 3,239 | 19.1\% | 1,189 | 41.2\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 10,671 | 53.8\% | 9,969 | 58.9\% | 702 | 24.3\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 7,888 | 39.8\% | 7,417 | 43.8\% | 471 | 16.3\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Households | 15,965 | 100.0\% | 13,965 | 100.0\% | 2,000 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 11,800 | 73.9\% | 10,334 | 74.0\% | 1,466 | 73.3\% |
| Married couple family | 7,570 | 47.4\% | 6,061 | 43.4\% | 1,509 | 75.5\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 5,205 | 32.6\% | 4,128 | 29.6\% | 1,077 | 53.9\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 7,476 | 46.8\% | 7,055 | 50.5\% | 421 | 21.1\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 6,093 | 38.2\% | 5,747 | 41.2\% | 346 | 17.3\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Family Households | 10,856 | 100.0\% | 10,319 | 100.0\% | 537 | 100.0\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 7,824 | 72.1\% | 7,451 | 72.2\% | 373 | 69.5\% |
| Married couple family | 7,023 | 64.7\% | 6,540 | 63.4\% | 483 | 89.9\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 4,870 | 44.9\% | 4,528 | 43.9\% | 342 | 63.7\% |
| Female householder, no husband present | 3,340 | 30.8\% | 3,296 | 31.9\% | 44 | 8.2\% |
| With own children under 18 years | 2,721 | 25.1\% | 2,694 | 26.1\% | 27 | 5.0\% |

## 4D: Total Families

2000
Families
$\quad$ With own children under 18 years
Married Couple Families
With own children under 18 years
Female householder, no husband present
With own children under 18 years

1990

| Families | 182,813 | $100.0 \%$ | 51,933 | $100.0 \%$ | 130,880 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| With own children under 18 years | 87,826 | $48.0 \%$ | 27,626 | $53.2 \%$ | 60,200 | $46.0 \%$ |
| Married couple family | 140,622 | $76.9 \%$ | 29,053 | $55.9 \%$ | 111,569 | $85.2 \%$ |
| With own children under 18 years | 63,913 | $35.0 \%$ | 13,058 | $25.1 \%$ | 50,855 | $38.9 \%$ |
| Female householder, no husband present | 34,008 | $18.6 \%$ | 19,276 | $37.1 \%$ | 14,732 | $11.3 \%$ |
| With own children under 18 years | 20,619 | $11.3 \%$ | 13,102 | $25.2 \%$ | 7,517 | $5.7 \%$ |

## 1980

| Families | 177,728 | $100.0 \%$ | 55,637 | $100.0 \%$ | 122,091 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\quad$ With own children under 18 years | 92,895 | $52.3 \%$ | 28,902 | $51.9 \%$ | 63,993 | $52.4 \%$ |
| Married couple family | 144,135 | $81.1 \%$ | 37,021 | $66.5 \%$ | 107,114 | $87.7 \%$ |
| With own children under 18 years | 73,124 | $41.1 \%$ | 17,220 | $31.0 \%$ | 55,904 | $45.8 \%$ |
| Female householder, no husband present | 27,436 | $15.4 \%$ | 15,546 | $27.9 \%$ | 11,890 | $9.7 \%$ |
| With own children under 18 years | 17,363 | $9.8 \%$ | 10,497 | $18.9 \%$ | 6,866 | $5.6 \%$ |

## 1970

| Families | 175,934 | $100.0 \%$ | 70,724 | $100.0 \%$ | 105,210 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\quad$ With own children under 18 years | 99,258 | $56.4 \%$ | 35,814 | $50.6 \%$ | 63,444 | $60.3 \%$ |
| Married couple family | 154,071 | $87.6 \%$ | 56,383 | $79.7 \%$ | 97,688 | $92.9 \%$ |
| $\quad$ With own children under 18 years | 89,023 | $50.6 \%$ | 28,841 | $40.8 \%$ | 60,182 | $57.2 \%$ |
| Female householder, no husband present | 17,375 | $9.9 \%$ | 11,634 | $16.4 \%$ | 5,741 | $5.5 \%$ |
| With own children under 18 years | 8,945 | $5.1 \%$ | 6,264 | $8.9 \%$ | 2,681 | $2.5 \%$ |

Source:2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P27, 27H, 27B, 27H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 6, 2, 3, 1; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 6, 2, 3, 1; 1970
Census of Population Part 34, New York, Section 1, Tables 96,129,25,36,1.

# Table 5: Marital Status (Ages 15 and older) 

| 5A: Hispanic Population |
| :---: |
|  |
| Monroe County     <br> Count Rochester Percentage Count Percentage Count <br> Suburbs     |


| Total 2000 | 24,857 | $100.0 \%$ | 17,701 | $100.0 \%$ | 7,156 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never Married | 10,766 | $43.3 \%$ | 8,315 | $47.0 \%$ | 2,451 | $34.3 \%$ |
| Married | 9,219 | $37.1 \%$ | 5,554 | $31.4 \%$ | 3,665 | $51.2 \%$ |
| Separated | 1,679 | $6.8 \%$ | 1,341 | $7.6 \%$ | 338 | $4.7 \%$ |
| Widowed | 935 | $3.8 \%$ | 718 | $4.1 \%$ | 217 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Divorced | 2,258 | $9.1 \%$ | 1,773 | $10.0 \%$ | 485 | $6.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1990 | 17,346 | $100.0 \%$ | 12,723 | $100.0 \%$ | 4,623 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Never Married | 7,424 | $42.8 \%$ | 5,809 | $45.7 \%$ | 1,615 | $34.9 \%$ |
| Married | 6,675 | $38.5 \%$ | 4,235 | $33.3 \%$ | 2,440 | $52.8 \%$ |
| Separated | 1,237 | $7.1 \%$ | 1,118 | $8.8 \%$ | 119 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Widowed | 598 | $3.4 \%$ | 444 | $3.5 \%$ | 154 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Divorced | 1,412 | $8.1 \%$ | 1,117 | $8.8 \%$ | 295 | $6.4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1980 | 10,783 | $100.0 \%$ | 8,262 | $100.0 \%$ | 2,521 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Never Married | 3,954 | $36.7 \%$ | 3,116 | $37.7 \%$ | 838 | $33.2 \%$ |
| Married | 5,113 | $47.4 \%$ | 3,674 | $44.5 \%$ | 1,439 | $57.1 \%$ |
| Separated | 658 | $6.1 \%$ | 606 | $7.3 \%$ | 52 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Widowed | 340 | $3.2 \%$ | 266 | $3.2 \%$ | 74 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Divorced | 718 | $6.7 \%$ | 600 | $7.3 \%$ | 118 | $4.7 \%$ |

# 5B: Total Population 

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | $\underline{\text { Suburbs }}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total 2000 | 578,062 | $100.0 \%$ | 166,218 | $100.0 \%$ | 411,844 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Never Married | 174,072 | $30.1 \%$ | 72,619 | $43.7 \%$ | 101,453 | $24.6 \%$ |
| Married | 296,518 | $51.3 \%$ | 54,129 | $32.6 \%$ | 242,389 | $58.9 \%$ |
| Separated | 16,320 | $2.8 \%$ | 9,252 | $5.6 \%$ | 7,068 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Widowed | 40,305 | $7.0 \%$ | 11,708 | $7.0 \%$ | 28,597 | $6.9 \%$ |
| Divorced | 50,847 | $8.8 \%$ | 18,510 | $11.1 \%$ | 32,337 | $7.9 \%$ |


|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total 1990 | 564,631 | $100.0 \%$ | 179,259 | $100.0 \%$ | 385,372 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Never Married | 174,354 | $30.9 \%$ | 74,413 | $41.5 \%$ | 99,941 | $25.9 \%$ |
| Married | 292,334 | $51.8 \%$ | 62,846 | $35.1 \%$ | 229,488 | $59.5 \%$ |
| Separated | 17,309 | $3.1 \%$ | 9,947 | $5.5 \%$ | 7,362 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Widowed | 40,103 | $7.1 \%$ | 14,889 | $8.3 \%$ | 25,214 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Divorced | 40,531 | $7.2 \%$ | 17,164 | $9.6 \%$ | 23,367 | $6.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1980 | 549,474 | $100.0 \%$ | 188,786 | $100.0 \%$ | 360,688 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Never Married | 166,609 | $30.3 \%$ | 67,380 | $35.7 \%$ | 99,229 | $27.5 \%$ |
| Married | 297,116 | $54.1 \%$ | 78,290 | $41.5 \%$ | 218,826 | $60.7 \%$ |
| Separated | 15,686 | $2.9 \%$ | 9,886 | $5.2 \%$ | 5,800 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Widowed | 40,514 | $7.4 \%$ | 18,978 | $10.1 \%$ | 21,536 | $6.0 \%$ |
| Divorced | 29,549 | $5.4 \%$ | 14,252 | $7.5 \%$ | 15,297 | $4.2 \%$ |

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Table P-18, Sample Data File; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 1 and 6; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 1 and 6.

| Table 6: School Ennollment <br> 6A: Hispanic School Enrollment <br> City of Rochester <br> Suburbs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total (age 3+) | 35,893 | 100.0\% | 25,872 | 100.0\% | 10,021 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 14,879 | 41.5\% | 10,448 | 40.4\% | 4,431 | 44.2\% |
| Preprimary school* | 1,980 | 5.5\% | 1,322 | 5.1\% | 658 | 6.6\% |
| Elementary or High scho | 10,563 | 29.4\% | 8,094 | 31.3\% | 2,469 | 24.6\% |
| College | 2,336 | 6.5\% | 1,032 | 4.0\% | 1,304 | 13.0\% |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3+) | 24,731 | 100.0\% | 18,936 | 100.0\% | 5,795 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 9,145 | 37.0\% | 6,896 | 36.4\% | 2,249 | 38.8\% |
| Preprimary school* | 595 | 2.4\% | 469 | 2.5\% | 126 | 2.2\% |
| Elementary or High schor | 6,494 | 26.3\% | 5,175 | 27.3\% | 1,319 | 22.8\% |
| College | 2,056 | 8.3\% | 1,252 | 6.6\% | 804 | 13.9\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3+) | 16,538 | 100.0\% | 12,961 | 100.0\% | 3,577 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 6,276 | 37.9\% | 4,584 | 35.4\% | 1,692 | 47.3\% |
| Preprimary school* | 509 | 3.1\% | 438 | 3.4\% | 71 | 2.0\% |
| Elementary or High schor | 4,819 | 29.1\% | 3,719 | 28.7\% | 1,100 | 30.8\% |
| College | 948 | 5.7\% | 427 | 3.3\% | 521 | 14.6\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3 to 34) | 5,792 | 100.0\% | 5,456 | 100.0\% | 336 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 2,010 | 34.7\% | 1,863 | 34.1\% | 147 | 43.8\% |
| Preprimary school* | 190 | 3.3\% | 170 | 3.1\% | 20 | 6.0\% |
| Elementary or High scho, | 1,801 | 31.1\% | 1,681 | 30.8\% | 120 | 35.7\% |
| College | 19 | 0.3\% | 12 | 0.2\% | 7 | 2.1\% |


| 2000 | 6B: White School Enrollment |  |  |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Monroe County |  | City of Rochester |  |  |  |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total (age 3+) | 562,372 | 100.0\% | 102,346 | 100.0\% | 460,026 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 155,062 | 27.6\% | 24,354 | 23.8\% | 130,708 | 28.4\% |
| Preprimary school* | 15,612 | 2.8\% | 2,102 | 2.1\% | 13,510 | 2.9\% |
| Elementary or High schor | 94,695 | 16.8\% | 11,965 | 11.7\% | 82,730 | 18.0\% |
| College | 44,755 | 8.0\% | 10,287 | 10.1\% | 34,468 | 7.5\% |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3+) | 602,177 | 100.0\% | 141,952 | 100.0\% | 460,225 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 150,066 | 24.9\% | 30,244 | 21.3\% | 119,822 | 26.0\% |
| Preprimary school* | 13,086 | 2.2\% | 2,625 | 1.8\% | 10,461 | 2.3\% |
| Elementary or High schoı | 85,288 | 14.2\% | 14,141 | 10.0\% | 71,147 | 15.5\% |
| College | 51,692 | 8.6\% | 13,478 | 9.5\% | 38,214 | 8.3\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3+) | 615,317 | 100.0\% | 169,510 | 100.0\% | 445,807 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 172,326 | 28.0\% | 36,351 | 21.4\% | 135,975 | 30.5\% |
| Preprimary school* | 14,034 | 2.3\% | 3,273 | 1.9\% | 10,761 | 2.4\% |
| Elementary or High schoı | 113,986 | 18.5\% | 21,276 | 12.6\% | 92,710 | 20.8\% |
| College | 44,306 | 7.2\% | 11,802 | 7.0\% | 32,504 | 7.3\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3 to 34) | 655,821 | 100.0\% | 244,118 | 100.0\% | 411,703 | 100.0\% |
| Total In School | 192,644 | 29.4\% | 55,346 | 22.7\% | 137,298 | 33.3\% |
| Preprimary school* | 16,866 | 2.6\% | 4,670 | 1.9\% | 12,196 | 3.0\% |
| Elementary or High scho, | 146,205 | 22.3\% | 39,955 | 16.4\% | 106,250 | 25.8\% |
| College | 29,573 | 4.5\% | 10,721 | 4.4\% | 18,852 | 4.6\% |


| 6C: Black School Enrollment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{\text { Monroe County }}$ | $\underline{\text { Rochester }}$ |  | $\underline{\text { Suburbs }}$ |  |  |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total (age 3+) | 93,678 | $100.0 \%$ | 78,004 | $100.0 \%$ | 15,674 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total In School | 36,884 | $39.4 \%$ | 30,658 | $39.3 \%$ | 6,226 | $39.7 \%$ |
| Preprimary school* | 4,328 | $4.6 \%$ | 3,790 | $4.9 \%$ | 538 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Elementary or High schoı | 26,854 | $28.7 \%$ | 23,059 | $29.6 \%$ | 3,795 | $24.2 \%$ |
| College | 5,702 | $6.1 \%$ | 3,809 | $4.9 \%$ | 1,893 | $12.1 \%$ |

1990

| Total (age 3+) | 84,530 | $100.0 \%$ | 73,102 | $100.0 \%$ | 11,428 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total In School | 27,882 | $33.0 \%$ | 23,362 | $32.0 \%$ | 4,520 | $39.6 \%$ |
| Preprimary school* | 1,927 | $2.3 \%$ | 1,679 | $2.3 \%$ | 248 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Elementary or High schoı | 20,664 | $24.4 \%$ | 17,889 | $24.5 \%$ | 2,775 | $24.3 \%$ |
| College | 5,291 | $6.3 \%$ | 3,784 | $5.2 \%$ | 1,507 | $13.2 \%$ |
| $\quad \mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3+) | 71,460 | $100.0 \%$ | 62,256 | $100.0 \%$ | 9,204 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total In School | 26,825 | $37.5 \%$ | 22,858 | $36.7 \%$ | 3,967 | $43.1 \%$ |
| Preprimary school* | 2,511 | $3.5 \%$ | 2,185 | $3.5 \%$ | 326 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Elementary or High schoı | 20,600 | $28.8 \%$ | 18,361 | $29.5 \%$ | 2,239 | $24.3 \%$ |
| College | 3,714 | $5.2 \%$ | 2,312 | $3.7 \%$ | 1,402 | $15.2 \%$ |
| $\quad \mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total (age 3 to 34) | 51,926 | $100.0 \%$ | 49,591 | $100.0 \%$ | 2,335 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total In School | 17,494 | $33.7 \%$ | 16,558 | $33.4 \%$ | 936 | $40.1 \%$ |
| Preprimary school* | 1,935 | $3.7 \%$ | 1,835 | $3.7 \%$ | 100 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Elementary or High schoı | 14,794 | $28.5 \%$ | 14,116 | $28.5 \%$ | 678 | $29.0 \%$ |
| College | 765 | $1.5 \%$ | 607 | $1.2 \%$ | 158 | $6.8 \%$ |



Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P-36, P-147,P-147A, P-147B, P-147H, and DP-2; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 28, 20, 22, 17; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 20, 12, 14, 9; 1970 Census of Population Part 34 New York, Section 1, Tables 97, 130, 125, 91, 120, 83.

Note: Data from Census Summary File 3-Sample D ata. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent D ata.
*Includes Nursery School and Kindergarten

Table 7: Educational Attainment 7A: Hispanic Educational Attainment Monroe County Rochester

Suburbs
ZUUU
Persons 25 years and over
Less than 9th grade
9th to 12th grade, no diploma
High school graduate*
Some college, no degree
Associate degree
Bachelor's degree
G raduate or professional degree

1990
Persons 25 years and over
Less than 9th grade
9th to 12th grade, no diploma
High school graduate*
Some college, no degree
Associate degree
Bachelor's degree
G raduate or professional degree

| Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18,262 | $100.0 \%$ | 12,869 | $100.0 \%$ | 5,393 | $100.0 \%$ |
| 2,986 | $16.4 \%$ | 2,553 | $19.8 \%$ | 433 | $8.0 \%$ |
| 4,227 | $23.1 \%$ | 3,440 | $26.7 \%$ | 787 | $14.6 \%$ |
| 4,830 | $26.4 \%$ | 3,729 | $29.0 \%$ | 1,101 | $20.4 \%$ |
| 2,508 | $13.7 \%$ | 1405 | $10.9 \%$ | 1,103 | $20.5 \%$ |
| 1,288 | $7.1 \%$ | 693 | $5.4 \%$ | 595 | $11.0 \%$ |
| 1,328 | $7.3 \%$ | 619 | $4.8 \%$ | 709 | $13.1 \%$ |
| 1,095 | $6.0 \%$ | 430 | $3.3 \%$ | 665 | $12.3 \%$ |

## 1980

| Persons 25 years and over | 6,735 | $100.0 \%$ | 5,174 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,561 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 9th grade | 2,428 | $36.1 \%$ | 2,239 | $43.3 \%$ | 189 | $12.1 \%$ |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 1,354 | $20.1 \%$ | 1,153 | $22.3 \%$ | 201 | $12.9 \%$ |
| High school graduate* | 1,399 | $20.8 \%$ | 1,032 | $19.9 \%$ | 367 | $23.5 \%$ |
| 1-3 years of college | 898 | $13.0 \%$ | 527 | $10.2 \%$ | 351 | $22.5 \%$ |
| 4 or more years of college | 676 | $10.0 \%$ | 223 | $4.3 \%$ | 453 | $29.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 25 years and over | 2,004 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,902 | $100.0 \%$ | 102 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Less than 9th grade | 1,242 | $62.0 \%$ | 1,233 | $64.8 \%$ | 9 | $8.8 \%$ |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 391 | $19.5 \%$ | 377 | $19.8 \%$ | 14 | $13.7 \%$ |
| High school graduate* | 259 | $12.9 \%$ | 237 | $12.5 \%$ | 22 | $21.6 \%$ |
| 1-3 years of college | 48 | $2.4 \%$ | 22 | $1.2 \%$ | 26 | $25.5 \%$ |
| 4or more years of college | 64 | $3.2 \%$ | 33 | $1.7 \%$ | 31 | $30.4 \%$ |
| *Includes equivalency |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 7B: White Educational Attainment Monroe County Rochester |  |  |  |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Persons 25 years and over | 398,258 | 100.0\% | 75,188 | 100.0\% | 323,070 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 12,946 | 3.3\% | 4,148 | 5.5\% | 8,798 | 2.7\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 34,398 | 8.6\% | 10,587 | 14.1\% | 23,811 | 7.4\% |
| High school graduate* | 102,772 | 25.8\% | 20,294 | 27.0\% | 82,478 | 25.5\% |
| Some college, no degree | 72,327 | 18.2\% | 12,321 | 16.4\% | 60,006 | 18.6\% |
| Associate degree | 40,656 | 10.2\% | 6,421 | 8.5\% | 34,235 | 10.6\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 81,052 | 20.4\% | 12,851 | 17.1\% | 68,201 | 21.1\% |
| G raduate or professional degree | 54,107 | 13.6\% | 8,566 | 11.4\% | 45,541 | 14.1\% |
| 1990 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Persons 25 years and over | 402,208 | 100.0\% | 97,680 | 100.0\% | 304,528 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 23,066 | 5.7\% | 8,950 | 9.2\% | 14,116 | 4.6\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 46,963 | 11.7\% | 16,066 | 16.4\% | 30,897 | 10.1\% |
| High school graduate* | 113,717 | 28.3\% | 27,011 | 27.7\% | 86,706 | 28.5\% |
| Some college, no degree | 67,591 | 16.8\% | 14,509 | 14.9\% | 53,082 | 17.4\% |
| Associate degree | 39,012 | 9.7\% | 8,056 | 8.2\% | 30,956 | 10.2\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 69,883 | 17.4\% | 14,353 | 14.7\% | 55,530 | 18.2\% |
| G raduate or professional degree | 41,976 | 10.4\% | 8,735 | 8.9\% | 33,241 | 10.9\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 25 years and over | 375,375 | 100.0\% | 109,790 | 100.0\% | 265,585 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 46,895 | 12.5\% | 22,133 | 20.2\% | 24,762 | 9.3\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 51,879 | 13.8\% | 20,463 | 18.6\% | 31,416 | 11.8\% |
| High school graduate* | 128,160 | 34.1\% | 34,147 | 31.1\% | 94,013 | 35.4\% |
| $1-3$ years of college | 64,816 | 17.3\% | 15,358 | 14.0\% | 49,458 | 18.6\% |
| 4 or more years of college | 83,625 | 22.3\% | 17,689 | 16.1\% | 65,936 | 24.8\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 25 years and over | 362,160 | 100.0\% | 143,016 | 100.0\% | 219,144 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 77,285 | 21.3\% | 45,897 | 32.1\% | 31,388 | 14.3\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 69,584 | 19.2\% | 32,681 | 22.9\% | 36,903 | 16.8\% |
| High school graduate* | 115,526 | 31.9\% | 39,613 | 27.7\% | 75,913 | 34.6\% |
| $1-3$ years of college | 44,809 | 12.4\% | 244 | 0.2\% | 44,565 | 20.3\% |
| 4 or more years of college | 54,956 | 15.2\% | 12,284 | 8.6\% | 42,672 | 19.5\% |
| * Includes equivalency |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 7C: Black Educational Attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Persons 25 years and over | 52,369 | 100.0\% | 43,000 | 100.0\% | 9,369 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 3,968 | 7.6\% | 3,537 | 8.2\% | 431 | 4.6\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 12,862 | 24.6\% | 11,583 | 26.9\% | 1,279 | 13.7\% |
| High school graduate* | 16,292 | 31.1\% | 13,913 | 32.4\% | 2,379 | 25.4\% |
| Some college, no degree | 9,338 | 17.8\% | 7,579 | 17.6\% | 1,759 | 18.8\% |
| Associate degree | 3,938 | 7.5\% | 2,847 | 6.6\% | 1,091 | 11.6\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3,630 | 6.9\% | 2,404 | 5.6\% | 1,226 | 13.1\% |
| G raduate or professional degree | 2,341 | 4.5\% | 1,137 | 2.6\% | 1,204 | 12.9\% |
| 1990 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Persons 25 years and over | 42,677 | 100.0\% | 36,271 | 100.0\% | 6,406 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 5,017 | 11.8\% | 4,784 | 13.2\% | 233 | 3.6\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 11,326 | 26.5\% | 10,553 | 29.1\% | 773 | 12.1\% |
| High school graduate* | 11,951 | 28.0\% | 10,447 | 28.8\% | 1,504 | 23.5\% |
| Some college, no degree | 7,227 | 16.9\% | 5,917 | 16.3\% | 1,310 | 20.4\% |
| Associate degree | 2,539 | 5.9\% | 1,856 | 5.1\% | 683 | 10.7\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 3,002 | 7.0\% | 1,874 | 5.2\% | 1,128 | 17.6\% |
| G raduate or professional degree | 1,615 | 3.8\% | 840 | 2.3\% | 775 | 12.1\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 25 years and over | 31,688 | 100.0\% | 27,307 | 100.0\% | 4,381 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 7,193 | 22.7\% | 6,780 | 24.8\% | 413 | 9.4\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 8,004 | 25.3\% | 7,436 | 27.2\% | 568 | 13.0\% |
| High school graduate* | 9,833 | 31.0\% | 8,721 | 31.9\% | 1,112 | 25.4\% |
| $1-3$ years of college | 3,789 | 12.0\% | 2,862 | 10.5\% | 927 | 21.2\% |
| 4 or more years of college | 2,869 | 9.1\% | 1,508 | 5.5\% | 1,361 | 31.1\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 25 years and over | 20,803 | 100.0\% | 19,800 | 100.0\% | 1,003 | 100.0\% |
| Less than 9th grade | 7,474 | 35.9\% | 7,247 | 36.6\% | 227 | 22.6\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 6,339 | 30.5\% | 6,173 | 31.2\% | 166 | 16.6\% |
| High school graduate* | 4,982 | 23.9\% | 4,750 | 24.0\% | 232 | 23.1\% |
| $1-3$ years of college | 1,199 | 5.8\% | 1,100 | 5.6\% | 99 | 9.9\% |
| 4 or more years of college | 809 | 3.9\% | 530 | 2.7\% | 279 | 27.8\% |
| * Includes equivalency |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 7D: Total Educational Attainment



Rochester
Suburbs
2000
Persons 25 years and over
Less than 9th grade
9th to 12th grade, no diploma
High school graduate*
Some college, no degree
Associate degree
Bachelor's degree
Graduate or professional degree

1990
Persons 25 years and over
Less than 9th grade
9th to 12th grade, no diploma
High school graduate*
Some college, no degree
Associate degree
Bachelor's degree
Graduate or professional degree
$\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$

| Persons 25 years and over | 414,129 | $100.0 \%$ | 141,270 | $100.0 \%$ | 272,859 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 9th grade | 56,013 | $13.5 \%$ | 30,568 | $21.6 \%$ | 25,445 | $9.3 \%$ |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 60,981 | $14.7 \%$ | 28,783 | $20.4 \%$ | 32,198 | $11.8 \%$ |
| High school graduate* | 139,390 | $33.7 \%$ | 43,697 | $30.9 \%$ | 95,693 | $35.1 \%$ |
| 1-3 years of college | 69,407 | $16.8 \%$ | 18,578 | $13.2 \%$ | 50,829 | $18.6 \%$ |
| 4 or more years of college | 88,338 | $21.3 \%$ | 19,644 | $13.9 \%$ | 68,694 | $25.2 \%$ |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 25 years and over | 384,967 | $100.0 \%$ | 164,718 | $100.0 \%$ | 220,249 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Less than 9th grade | 86,001 | $22.3 \%$ | 54,377 | $33.0 \%$ | 31,624 | $14.4 \%$ |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 76,314 | $19.8 \%$ | 39,231 | $23.8 \%$ | 37,083 | $16.8 \%$ |
| High school graduate* | 120,767 | $31.4 \%$ | 44,600 | $27.1 \%$ | 76,167 | $34.6 \%$ |
| 1-3 years of college | 46,056 | $12.0 \%$ | 1,366 | $0.8 \%$ | 44,690 | $20.3 \%$ |
| 4 or more years of college | 55,829 | $14.5 \%$ | 12,847 | $7.8 \%$ | 42,982 | $19.5 \%$ |

[^2]Note: Data from Census Summary File 3-Sample Data. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent Data.

## Table 8: Employment Status

8A: Hispanic Employment Status
2000
Total in
In Ar
Civilia
Civili
1990

| Total in labor force | 9,380 | $100.0 \%$ | 6,378 | $100.0 \%$ | 3,002 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In Armed Forces | 10 | $0.1 \%$ | 10 | $0.2 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 8,196 | $87.4 \%$ | 5,399 | $84.7 \%$ | 2,797 | $93.2 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 1,174 | $12.5 \%$ | 969 | $15.2 \%$ | 205 | $6.8 \%$ |

## 1980

| Total in labor force | 6,056 | $100.0 \%$ | 4,579 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,477 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In Armed Forces | 6 | $0.1 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 6 | $0.4 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 5,304 | $87.6 \%$ | 3,907 | $85.3 \%$ | 1,397 | $94.6 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 746 | $12.3 \%$ | 672 | $14.7 \%$ | 74 | $5.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 7 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 2,054 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,828 | $100.0 \%$ | 226 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 1,925 | $93.7 \%$ | 1,718 | $94.0 \%$ | 207 | $91.6 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 129 | $6.3 \%$ | 110 | $6.0 \%$ | 19 | $8.4 \%$ |

## 8B: White Employment Status

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total in labor force | 310,133 | $100.0 \%$ | 57,924 | $100.0 \%$ | 252,209 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 217 | $0.1 \%$ | 35 | $0.1 \%$ | 182 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 295,461 | $95.3 \%$ | 53,771 | $92.8 \%$ | 241,690 | $95.8 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 14,455 | $4.7 \%$ | 4,118 | $7.1 \%$ | 10,337 | $4.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 324,798 | $100.0 \%$ | 75,418 | $100.0 \%$ | 249,380 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 402 | $0.1 \%$ | 57 | $0.1 \%$ | 345 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 312,234 | $96.1 \%$ | 71,333 | $94.6 \%$ | 240,901 | $96.6 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 12,162 | $3.7 \%$ | 4,028 | $5.3 \%$ | 8,134 | $3.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 307,201 | $100.0 \%$ | 81,759 | $100.0 \%$ | 225,442 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 178 | $0.1 \%$ | 55 | $0.1 \%$ | 123 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 292,344 | $95.2 \%$ | 76,245 | $93.3 \%$ | 216,099 | $95.9 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 14,679 | $4.8 \%$ | 5,459 | $6.7 \%$ | 9,220 | $4.1 \%$ |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 280,508 | $100.0 \%$ | 107,250 | $100.0 \%$ | 173,258 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 267 | $0.1 \%$ | 83 | $0.1 \%$ | 184 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 272,509 | $97.1 \%$ | 103,346 | $96.4 \%$ | 169,163 | $97.6 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 7,732 | $2.8 \%$ | 3,821 | $3.6 \%$ | 3,911 | $2.3 \%$ |



| 8D : Total Employment Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Monroe County | Rochester |  |  | Suburbs |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total in labor force | 374,449 | $100.0 \%$ | 102,424 | $100.0 \%$ | 272,025 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 301 | $0.1 \%$ | 66 | $0.1 \%$ | 235 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 351,605 | $93.9 \%$ | 91,927 | $89.8 \%$ | 259,678 | $95.5 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 22,543 | $6.0 \%$ | 10,431 | $10.2 \%$ | 12,112 | $4.5 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 373,022 | $100.0 \%$ | 111,946 | $100.0 \%$ | 261,076 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 563 | $0.2 \%$ | 156 | $0.1 \%$ | 407 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 353,883 | $94.9 \%$ | 101,942 | $91.1 \%$ | 251,941 | $96.5 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 18,576 | $5.0 \%$ | 9,848 | $8.8 \%$ | 8,728 | $3.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 343,643 | $100.0 \%$ | 111,199 | $100.0 \%$ | 232,444 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 222 | $0.1 \%$ | 84 | $0.1 \%$ | 138 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 323,746 | $94.2 \%$ | 101,003 | $90.8 \%$ | 222,743 | $95.8 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 19,675 | $5.7 \%$ | 10,112 | $9.1 \%$ | 9,563 | $4.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total in labor force | 301,568 | $100.0 \%$ | 127,084 | $100.0 \%$ | 174,484 | $100.0 \%$ |
| In Armed Forces | 280 | $0.1 \%$ | 96 | $0.1 \%$ | 184 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Civilian- Employed | 291,906 | $96.8 \%$ | 121,576 | $95.7 \%$ | 170,330 | $97.6 \%$ |
| Civilian -Not employed | 9,382 | $3.1 \%$ | 5,412 | $4.3 \%$ | 3,970 | $2.3 \%$ |

Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P-143, P-150A, P-150B, P-150H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 18, 20, 22, 28; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 20, 12, 14, 10; 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 8, 6, 3.

Note: D ata from Census Summary File 3-Sample D ata. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent D ata.

## Table 9: Occupation Among Employed Hispanic Civilian Workers

|  | Monroe County |  |  | Rochester City |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |  |
| Total Employed Persons 16+ | 13,165 | $100.0 \%$ | 8,691 | $100.0 \%$ | 4,474 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Management | 487 | $3.7 \%$ | 319 | $3.7 \%$ | 168 | $3.8 \%$ |  |
| Business and financial operations | 214 | $1.6 \%$ | 63 | $0.7 \%$ | 151 | $3.4 \%$ |  |
| Computer and mathematical | 254 | $1.9 \%$ | 116 | $1.3 \%$ | 138 | $3.1 \%$ |  |
| Architecture and engineering | 258 | $2.0 \%$ | 48 | $0.6 \%$ | 210 | $4.7 \%$ |  |
| Life, physical, and social science | 96 | $0.7 \%$ | 30 | $0.3 \%$ | 66 | $1.5 \%$ |  |
| Community and social services | 412 | $3.1 \%$ | 282 | $3.2 \%$ | 130 | $2.9 \%$ |  |
| Legal | 39 | $0.3 \%$ | 4 | $0.0 \%$ | 35 | $0.8 \%$ |  |
| Education, training, and library | 661 | $5.0 \%$ | 320 | $3.7 \%$ | 341 | $7.6 \%$ |  |
| Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media | 171 | $1.3 \%$ | 77 | $0.9 \%$ | 94 | $2.1 \%$ |  |
| Healthcare practitioners and technical | 502 | $3.8 \%$ | 251 | $2.9 \%$ | 251 | $5.6 \%$ |  |
| Healthcare support occupations | 528 | $4.0 \%$ | 441 | $5.1 \%$ | 87 | $1.9 \%$ |  |
| Service occupations: protective service | 208 | $1.6 \%$ | 128 | $1.5 \%$ | 80 | $1.8 \%$ |  |
| Food preparation and serving-related | 1,051 | $8.0 \%$ | 806 | $9.3 \%$ | 245 | $5.5 \%$ |  |
| Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance | 844 | $6.4 \%$ | 672 | $7.7 \%$ | 172 | $3.8 \%$ |  |
| Personal care and service | 459 | $3.5 \%$ | 325 | $3.7 \%$ | 134 | $3.0 \%$ |  |
| Sales and related | 1,227 | $9.3 \%$ | 811 | $9.3 \%$ | 416 | $9.3 \%$ |  |
| Office and administrative support | 1,980 | $15.0 \%$ | 1,249 | $14.4 \%$ | 731 | $16.3 \%$ |  |
| Farming, fishing, and forestry | 73 | $0.6 \%$ | 29 | $0.3 \%$ | 44 | $1.0 \%$ |  |
| Construction and extraction | 350 | $2.7 \%$ | 258 | $3.0 \%$ | 92 | $2.1 \%$ |  |
| Installation, maintenance, and repair | 421 | $3.2 \%$ | 307 | $3.5 \%$ | 114 | $2.5 \%$ |  |
| Production | 2,111 | $16.0 \%$ | 1,516 | $17.4 \%$ | 595 | $13.3 \%$ |  |
| Transportation and material moving | 819 | $6.2 \%$ | 639 | $7.4 \%$ | 180 | $4.0 \%$ |  |


|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester City |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| 1990 | 8,196 | 100.0\% | 5,399 | 100.0\% | 2,797 | 100.0\% |
| Total Employed Persons 16+ | 594 | 7.2\% | 298 | 5.5\% | 296 | 10.6\% |
| Executive, Administrative, Managerial | 933 | 11.4\% | 448 | 8.3\% | 485 | 17.3\% |
| Professional specialty occupations | 172 | 2.1\% | 87 | 1.6\% | 85 | 3.0\% |
| Technicians and related support | 589 | 7.2\% | 291 | 5.4\% | 298 | 10.7\% |
| Sales | 1,231 | 15.0\% | 789 | 14.6\% | 442 | 15.8\% |
| Administrative support, clerical | 39 | 0.5\% | 24 | 0.4\% | 15 | 0.5\% |
| Private household | 199 | 2.4\% | 114 | 2.1\% | 85 | 3.0\% |
| Protective service | 1,719 | 21.0\% | 1,380 | 25.6\% | 339 | 12.1\% |
| Service, except protective and household | 82 | 1.0\% | 47 | 0.9\% | 35 | 1.3\% |
| Farming, forestry, fishing | 814 | 9.9\% | 507 | 9.4\% | 307 | 11.0\% |
| Precision production, craft, repair | 1,305 | 15.9\% | 1,004 | 18.6\% | 301 | 10.8\% |
| Machine operators, assemblers, inspectors | 213 | 2.6\% | 154 | 2.9\% | 59 | 2.1\% |
| Transportation and material moving | 306 | 3.7\% | 256 | 4.7\% | 50 | 1.8\% |
| Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, laborers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester City |  | Suburbs |  |
| 1980 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total Employed Persons 16+ | 5,304 | 100.0\% | 3,907 | 100.0\% | 1,397 | 100.0\% |
| Executive, Administrative, Managerial | 204 | 3.8\% | 89 | 2.3\% | 115 | 8.2\% |
| Professional specialty occupations | 496 | 9.4\% | 189 | 4.8\% | 307 | 22.0\% |
| Technicians and related support | 150 | 2.8\% | 68 | 1.7\% | 82 | 5.9\% |
| Sales | 247 | 4.7\% | 133 | 3.4\% | 114 | 8.2\% |
| Administrative support, clerical | 795 | 15.0\% | 571 | 14.6\% | 224 | 16.0\% |
| Private household | 13 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.4\% |
| Protective service | 108 | 2.0\% | 90 | 2.3\% | 18 | 1.3\% |
| Service, except protective and household | 1,077 | 20.3\% | 905 | 23.2\% | 172 | 12.3\% |
| Farming, forestry, fishing | 35 | 0.7\% | 31 | 0.8\% | 4 | 0.3\% |
| Precision production, craft, repair | 502 | 9.5\% | 372 | 9.5\% | 130 | 9.3\% |
| Machine operators, assemblers, inspectors | 1,237 | 23.3\% | 1,089 | 27.9\% | 148 | 10.6\% |
| Transportation and material moving | 141 | 2.7\% | 104 | 2.7\% | 37 | 2.6\% |
| Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, laborers | 299 | 5.6\% | 259 | 6.6\% | 40 | 2.9\% |

1970
Total Employed Persons 16+
Executive, Administrative, Managerial
Professional specialty occupations [includes technicians]
Technicians and related support
Sales
Administrative support, clerical
Private household
Protective service
Service, except household [includes protective]
Farming, forestry, fishing
Precision production, craft, repair
Machine operators, assemblers, inspectors
Transportation and material moving
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, laborers

Monroe County Rochester City
Count Percentage Count Percentage Count Percentage

| Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentag |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,815 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,718 | $100.0 \%$ | 97 | $100.0 \%$ |
| 62 | $3.4 \%$ | 56 | $3.3 \%$ | 6 | $6.2 \%$ |
| 85 | $4.7 \%$ | 50 | $2.9 \%$ | 35 | $36.1 \%$ |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 5 | $0.3 \%$ | 5 | $0.3 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 173 | $9.5 \%$ | 142 | $8.3 \%$ | 31 | $32.0 \%$ |
| 13 | $0.7 \%$ | 13 | $0.8 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 323 | $17.8 \%$ | 313 | $18.2 \%$ | 10 | $10.3 \%$ |
| 6 | $0.3 \%$ | 6 | $0.3 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 83 | $4.6 \%$ | 76 | $4.4 \%$ | 7 | $7.2 \%$ |
| 828 | $45.6 \%$ | 820 | $47.7 \%$ | 8 | $8.2 \%$ |
| 99 | $5.5 \%$ | 99 | $5.8 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 138 | $7.6 \%$ | 138 | $8.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |

Note: Estimates from Sample Population
Sources: Census Bureau 2000 Sample File (Advanced Query System); 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Table 29; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Table 21; 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Table 8.

| 2000 | Table 10: H ousehold Income 10A: Hispanic H ousehold Income |  |  |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total Households | 12,047 | 100.0\% | 8,729 | 100.0\% | 3,318 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$10,000 | 3,109 | 25.8\% | 2,680 | 30.7\% | 429 | 12.9\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1,074 | 8.9\% | 921 | 10.6\% | 153 | 4.6\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1,998 | 16.6\% | 1,655 | 19.0\% | 343 | 10.3\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 1,471 | 12.2\% | 1,156 | 13.2\% | 315 | 9.5\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 1,755 | 14.6\% | 1,104 | 12.6\% | 651 | 19.6\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 1,336 | 11.1\% | 744 | 8.5\% | 592 | 17.8\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 646 | 5.4\% | 255 | 2.9\% | 391 | 11.8\% |
| \$100,000+ | 658 | 5.5\% | 214 | 2.5\% | 444 | 13.4\% |
| 1990 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total Households | 7,323 | 100.0\% | 5,744 | 100.0\% | 1,579 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 1,237 | 16.9\% | 1,230 | 21.4\% | 7 | 0.4\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 1,317 | 18.0\% | 1,227 | 21.4\% | 90 | 5.7\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 733 | 10.0\% | 626 | 10.9\% | 107 | 6.8\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1,163 | 15.9\% | 936 | 16.3\% | 227 | 14.4\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 1,024 | 14.0\% | 762 | 13.3\% | 262 | 16.6\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 815 | 11.1\% | 536 | 9.3\% | 279 | 17.7\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 726 | 9.9\% | 355 | 6.2\% | 371 | 23.5\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 189 | 2.6\% | 39 | 0.7\% | 150 | 9.5\% |
| \$100,000+ | 119 | 1.6\% | 33 | 0.6\% | 86 | 5.4\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Households | 4,698 | 100.0\% | 3,723 | 100.0\% | 975 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 1,130 | 24.1\% | 1,040 | 27.9\% | 90 | 9.2\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 740 | 15.8\% | 657 | 17.6\% | 83 | 8.5\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 777 | 16.5\% | 646 | 17.4\% | 131 | 13.4\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1,082 | 23.0\% | 827 | 22.2\% | 255 | 26.2\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 564 | 12.0\% | 396 | 10.6\% | 168 | 17.2\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 285 | 6.1\% | 134 | 3.6\% | 151 | 15.5\% |
| \$50,000 and up | 120 | 2.6\% | 23 | 0.6\% | 97 | 9.9\% |

1970

| Total Households | 1,172 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,106 | $100.0 \%$ | 66 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $\$ 5,000$ | 281 | $24.0 \%$ | 281 | $25.4 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999$ | 482 | $41.1 \%$ | 456 | $41.2 \%$ | 26 | $39.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 289 | $24.7 \%$ | 269 | $24.3 \%$ | 20 | $30.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 105 | $9.0 \%$ | 85 | $7.7 \%$ | 20 | $30.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 15 | $1.3 \%$ | 15 | $1.4 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |

$\$ 50,000$ and up
Note: Decennial Census data based on prior full calandar year, i.e., 2000 is based on 1999 calendar year income.

## 10B: White Household Income

|  | Monroe County |  | $\underline{2}$Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |  |  |
| Count | Percentage |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Households | 235,447 | $100.0 \%$ | 49,968 | $100.0 \%$ | 185,479 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Less than $\$ 10,000$ | 15,045 | $6.4 \%$ | 7,207 | $14.4 \%$ | 7,838 | $4.2 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 11,931 | $5.1 \%$ | 4,518 | $9.0 \%$ | 7,413 | $4.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 26,727 | $11.4 \%$ | 8,450 | $16.9 \%$ | 18,277 | $9.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 27,783 | $11.8 \%$ | 7,300 | $14.6 \%$ | 20,483 | $11.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 38,258 | $16.2 \%$ | 8,162 | $16.3 \%$ | 30,096 | $16.2 \%$ |
| $\$ 50,000-\$ 74,999$ | 50,881 | $21.6 \%$ | 7,939 | $15.9 \%$ | 42,942 | $23.2 \%$ |
| $\$ 75,000-\$ 99,999$ | 30,925 | $13.1 \%$ | 3,483 | $7.0 \%$ | 27,442 | $14.8 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000+$ | 33,897 | $14.4 \%$ | 2,909 | $5.8 \%$ | 30,988 | $16.7 \%$ |


| 1990 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Households | 236,108 | $100.0 \%$ | 64,077 | $100.0 \%$ | 172,031 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Less than $\$ 5,000$ | 6,694 | $2.8 \%$ | 3,803 | $5.9 \%$ | 2,891 | $1.7 \%$ |
| $\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999$ | 17,002 | $7.2 \%$ | 8,905 | $13.9 \%$ | 8,097 | $4.7 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 15,822 | $6.7 \%$ | 6,448 | $10.1 \%$ | 9,374 | $5.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 34,423 | $14.6 \%$ | 12,039 | $18.8 \%$ | 22,384 | $13.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 35,669 | $15.1 \%$ | 10,896 | $17.0 \%$ | 24,773 | $14.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 48,033 | $20.3 \%$ | 11,221 | $17.5 \%$ | 36,812 | $21.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 50,000-\$ 74,999$ | 48,415 | $20.5 \%$ | 7,665 | $12.0 \%$ | 40,750 | $23.7 \%$ |
| $\$ 75,000-\$ 99,999$ | 17,593 | $7.5 \%$ | 2,006 | $3.1 \%$ | 15,587 | $9.1 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000+$ | 12,457 | $5.3 \%$ | 1,094 | $1.7 \%$ | 11,363 | $6.6 \%$ |

1980

| Total Households | 225,763 | $100.0 \%$ | 72,309 | $100.0 \%$ | 153,454 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $\$ 5,000$ | 20,564 | $9.1 \%$ | 12,473 | $17.2 \%$ | 8,091 | $5.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999$ | 27,068 | $12.0 \%$ | 13,327 | $18.4 \%$ | 13,741 | $9.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 29,053 | $12.9 \%$ | 11,851 | $16.4 \%$ | 17,202 | $11.2 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 59,896 | $26.5 \%$ | 18,918 | $26.2 \%$ | 40,978 | $26.7 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 45,572 | $20.2 \%$ | 9,835 | $13.6 \%$ | 35,737 | $23.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 30,111 | $13.3 \%$ | 4,247 | $5.9 \%$ | 25,864 | $16.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 50,000$ and up | 13,499 | $6.0 \%$ | 1,658 | $2.3 \%$ | 11,841 | $7.7 \%$ |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Households | 164,610 | $100.0 \%$ | 59,815 | $100.0 \%$ | 104,795 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Less than $\$ 5,000$ | 15,835 | $9.6 \%$ | 9,603 | $16.1 \%$ | 6,232 | $5.9 \%$ |
| $\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999$ | 35,487 | $21.6 \%$ | 18,291 | $30.6 \%$ | 17,196 | $16.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 54,562 | $33.1 \%$ | 18,502 | $30.9 \%$ | 36,060 | $34.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 46,559 | $28.3 \%$ | 11,332 | $18.9 \%$ | 35,227 | $33.6 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 10,594 | $6.4 \%$ | 1,875 | $3.1 \%$ | 8,719 | $8.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 1,573 | $1.0 \%$ | 212 | $0.4 \%$ | 1,361 | $1.3 \%$ |

$\$ 50,000$ and up
Note: Decennial Census data based on prior full calandar year, i.e., 2000 is based on 1999 calendar year income.

## 10C: Black Household Income

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | $\underline{\text { Suburbs }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total Households | 34,824 | $100.0 \%$ | 29,447 | $100.0 \%$ | 5,377 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Less than $\$ 10,000$ | 8,037 | $23.1 \%$ | 7,501 | $25.5 \%$ | 536 | $10.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 3,202 | $9.2 \%$ | 2,986 | $10.1 \%$ | 216 | $4.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 5,988 | $17.2 \%$ | 5,419 | $18.4 \%$ | 569 | $10.6 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 4,674 | $13.4 \%$ | 4,121 | $14.0 \%$ | 553 | $10.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 4,865 | $14.0 \%$ | 3,943 | $13.4 \%$ | 922 | $17.1 \%$ |
| $\$ 50,000-\$ 74,999$ | 4,121 | $11.8 \%$ | 3,247 | $11.0 \%$ | 874 | $16.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 75,000-\$ 99,999$ | 2,062 | $5.9 \%$ | 1,362 | $4.6 \%$ | 700 | $13.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000+$ | 1,875 | $5.4 \%$ | 868 | $2.9 \%$ | 1,007 | $18.7 \%$ |


| 1990 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Households | 28,306 | 100.0\% | 24,523 | 100.0\% | 3,783 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 4,108 | 14.5\% | 3,976 | 16.2\% | 132 | 3.5\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 4,367 | 15.4\% | 4,222 | 17.2\% | 145 | 3.8\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 3,033 | 10.7\% | 2,863 | 11.7\% | 170 | 4.5\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 4,713 | 16.7\% | 4,189 | 17.1\% | 524 | 13.9\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 3,760 | 13.3\% | 3,315 | 13.5\% | 445 | 11.8\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 3,961 | 14.0\% | 3,211 | 13.1\% | 750 | 19.8\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 3,101 | 11.0\% | 2,132 | 8.7\% | 969 | 25.6\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 872 | 3.1\% | 466 | 1.9\% | 406 | 10.7\% |
| \$100,000+ | 391 | 1.4\% | 149 | 0.6\% | 242 | 6.4\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Households | 22,446 | 100.0\% | 19,607 | 100.0\% | 2,839 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 4,897 | 21.8\% | 4,715 | 24.0\% | 182 | 6.4\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 4,182 | 18.6\% | 3,950 | 20.1\% | 232 | 8.2\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 3,323 | 14.8\% | 2,991 | 15.3\% | 332 | 11.7\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 5,164 | 23.0\% | 4,500 | 23.0\% | 664 | 23.4\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 2,870 | 12.8\% | 2,229 | 11.4\% | 641 | 22.6\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 1,537 | 6.8\% | 974 | 5.0\% | 563 | 19.8\% |
| \$50,000 and up | 473 | 2.1\% | 248 | 1.3\% | 225 | 7.9\% |
| 1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Households | 10,845 | 100.0\% | 10,378 | 100.0\% | 467 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 3,160 | 29.1\% | 3,097 | 29.8\% | 63 | 13.5\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 4,012 | 37.0\% | 3,913 | 37.7\% | 99 | 21.2\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 2,419 | 22.3\% | 2,277 | 21.9\% | 142 | 30.4\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1,122 | 10.3\% | 984 | 9.5\% | 138 | 29.6\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 121 | 1.1\% | 96 | 0.9\% | 25 | 5.4\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 11 | 0.1\% | 11 | 0.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| \$50,000 and up |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 10D: Total Household Income

|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Total Households | 286,820 | 100.0\% | 89,093 | 100.0\% | 197,727 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$10,000 | 26,223 | 9.1\% | 17,228 | 19.3\% | 8,995 | 4.5\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 16,528 | 5.8\% | 8,611 | 9.7\% | 7,917 | 4.0\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 35,200 | 12.3\% | 15,717 | 17.6\% | 19,483 | 9.9\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 34,313 | 12.0\% | 12,650 | 14.2\% | 21,663 | 11.0\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 45,513 | 15.9\% | 13,372 | 15.0\% | 32,141 | 16.3\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 57,480 | 20.0\% | 12,170 | 13.7\% | 45,310 | 22.9\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 34,109 | 11.9\% | 5,202 | 5.8\% | 28,907 | 14.6\% |
| \$100,000+ | 37,454 | 13.1\% | 4,143 | 4.7\% | 33,311 | 16.8\% |
| 1990 | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Pencentage |
| Total Households | 272,193 | 100.0\% | 93,521 | 100.0\% | 178,672 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 11,990 | 4.4\% | 8,828 | 9.4\% | 3,162 | 1.8\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 22,374 | 8.2\% | 14,022 | 15.0\% | 8,352 | 4.7\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 19,520 | 7.2\% | 9,847 | 10.5\% | 9,673 | 5.4\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 40,267 | 14.8\% | 17,047 | 18.2\% | 23,220 | 13.0\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 40,495 | 14.9\% | 14,865 | 15.9\% | 25,630 | 14.3\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 53,070 | 19.5\% | 14,996 | 16.0\% | 38,074 | 21.3\% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 52,583 | 19.3\% | 10,138 | 10.8\% | 42,445 | 23.8\% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 18,779 | 6.9\% | 2,505 | 2.7\% | 16,274 | 9.1\% |
| \$100,000+ | 13,115 | 4.8\% | 1,273 | 1.4\% | 11,842 | 6.6\% |
| 1980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Households | 252,741 | 100.0\% | 94,876 | 100.0\% | 157,865 | 100.0\% |
| Less than \$5,000 | 26,277 | 10.4\% | 17,887 | 18.9\% | 8,390 | 5.3\% |
| \$5,000-\$9,999 | 31,965 | 12.6\% | 17,895 | 18.9\% | 14,070 | 8.9\% |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 33,141 | 13.1\% | 15,432 | 16.3\% | 17,709 | 11.2\% |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 66,135 | 26.2\% | 24,064 | 25.4\% | 42,071 | 26.6\% |
| \$25,000-\$34,999 | 49,002 | 19.4\% | 12,338 | 13.0\% | 36,664 | 23.2\% |
| \$35,000-\$49,999 | 32,033 | 12.7\% | 5,337 | 5.6\% | 26,696 | 16.9\% |
| \$50,000 and up | 14,188 | 5.6\% | 1,923 | 2.0\% | 12,265 | 7.8\% |

## 1970

| Total Households | 176,627 | $100.0 \%$ | 71,299 | $100.0 \%$ | 105,328 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $\$ 5,000$ | 19,276 | $10.9 \%$ | 12,981 | $18.2 \%$ | 6,295 | $6.0 \%$ |
| $\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999$ | 39,981 | $22.6 \%$ | 22,660 | $31.8 \%$ | 17,321 | $16.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 10,000-\$ 14,999$ | 57,270 | $32.4 \%$ | 21,048 | $29.5 \%$ | 36,222 | $34.4 \%$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 24,999$ | 47,786 | $27.1 \%$ | 12,401 | $17.4 \%$ | 35,385 | $33.6 \%$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 34,999$ | 10,730 | $6.1 \%$ | 1,986 | $2.8 \%$ | 8,744 | $8.3 \%$ |
| $\$ 35,000-\$ 49,999$ | 1,584 | $0.9 \%$ | 223 | $0.3 \%$ | 1,361 | $1.3 \%$ | \$50,000 and up

Note: Decennial Census data based on prior full calandar year, i.e., 2000 is based on 1999 calendar year income.
Note: Data from Census Summary File 3-Sample Data. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent D ata.

Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P-52, P-151A, P-151B, P-151H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 29, 21, 23, 19; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 21, 13, 15, 11; 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 8, 6, 4.

## Table 11: Per Capita Income by Race

2000

| Per Capita Income | Monroe <br> County | City of <br> Rochester |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total | $\$ 22,821$ | $\$ 15,588$ |
| Hispanic | $\$ 11,234$ | $\$ 8,797$ |
| White | $\$ 25,291$ | $\$ 20,320$ |
| Black | $\$ 13,231$ | $\$ 11,744$ |

1990

## Per Capita Income

Total
Hispanic
White
Black
\$16,162
\$7,696
\$17,433
\$11,704
\$5,967
\$14,210
\$9,177 \$8,073
1980

## Per Capita Income

Total
Hispanic
White
Black
\$8,294
\$4,595
\$8,742
\$6,492
\$3,903
\$5,033
\$7,350

1970
Per Capita Income
Total
\$3,834
Hispanic
White
\$1,906
Black
\$7,451
\$3,250
\$1,873
\$5,782
Black
\$2,145
\$2,095
Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P82, P157A, P157B, P157H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 19, 21, 23, 29; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 11, 13, 15, 21; 1970 Census of Population and Housing.
Note: Data from Census Summary File 3-Sample Data. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent D ata.

Table 12: Poverty Status by Age, 2000, 1990

|  |  | 2: Hisp | Per |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Monr | County |  | ester |  | urbs |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 2000 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 37,595 | 34.5\% | 27,417 | 41.8\% | 10,178 | 14.9\% |
| Under 5 years | 4,407 | 42.9\% | 3,230 | 50.9\% | 1,177 | 21.0\% |
| 5 years | 842 | 40.6\% | 568 | 52.6\% | 274 | 15.7\% |
| 6 -11 years | 5,599 | 43.7\% | 4,305 | 51.7\% | 1,294 | 17.2\% |
| 12-17 years | 4,375 | 35.9\% | 3,312 | 42.7\% | 1,063 | 14.7\% |
| 18-64 years | 20,811 | 30.3\% | 15,010 | 36.8\% | 5,801 | 13.3\% |
| 65-74 years | 1,123 | 26.6\% | 714 | 35.3\% | 409 | 11.5\% |
| 75 years and over | 438 | 26.0\% | 278 | 31.7\% | 160 | 16.3\% |
| Hispanic persons above and below poverty level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total persons | 37,595 | 100.0\% | 27,417 | 100.0\% | 10,178 | 100.0\% |
| Above poverty level | 24,629 | 65.5\% | 15,966 | 58.2\% | 8,663 | 85.1\% |
| Below poverty level | 12,966 | 34.5\% | 11,451 | 41.8\% | 1,515 | 14.9\% |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 1990 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 24,064 | 37.4\% | 18,517 | 45.2\% | 5,547 | 11.3\% |
| Under 5 years | 3,331 | 57.6\% | 2,797 | 65.3\% | 534 | 17.4\% |
| 5 years | 632 | 51.7\% | 507 | 57.2\% | 125 | 29.6\% |
| 6 -11 years | 3,254 | 49.1\% | 2,597 | 57.1\% | 657 | 17.8\% |
| 12-17 years | 2,752 | 40.5\% | 2,126 | 49.8\% | 626 | 8.9\% |
| 18-64 years | 13,354 | 29.1\% | 9,918 | 35.9\% | 3,436 | 9.4\% |
| 65-74 years | 480 | 15.0\% | 404 | 17.3\% | 76 | 2.6\% |
| 75 years and over | 261 | 29.1\% | 168 | 45.2\% | 93 | 0.0\% |
| Hispanic persons above and below poverty level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total persons | 26,064 | 100.0\% | 18,517 | 100.0\% | 5,547 | 100.0\% |
| Above poverty level | 15,071 | 62.6\% | 10,153 | 54.8\% | 4,918 | 88.7\% |
| Below poverty level | 8,993 | 37.4\% | 8,364 | 45.2\% | 629 | 11.3\% |

# 12B: White Persons 

| 2000 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
|  | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 561,687 | 6.5\% | 99,749 | 16.4\% | 461,938 | 4.4\% |
| Under 5 years | 30,983 | 6.6\% | 5,020 | 22.4\% | 25,963 | 3.5\% |
| 5 years | 6,439 | 8.8\% | 848 | 29.2\% | 5,591 | 5.7\% |
| 6 -11 years | 46,475 | 7.7\% | 6,336 | 27.2\% | 40,139 | 4.6\% |
| $12-17$ years | 45,183 | 6.2\% | 5,011 | 23.3\% | 40,172 | 4.1\% |
| 18-64 years | 350,138 | 6.4\% | 68,519 | 15.3\% | 281,619 | 4.2\% |
| 65-74 years | 41,339 | 4.7\% | 6,245 | 11.8\% | 35,094 | 3.4\% |
| 75 years and over | 41,130 | 8.0\% | 7,770 | 12.0\% | 33,360 | 7.0\% |
| White persons above and below poverty level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total persons | 561,687 | 100.0\% | 99,749 | 100.0\% | 461,938 | 100.0\% |
| Above poverty level | 525,150 | 93.5\% | 83,351 | 83.6\% | 441,799 | 95.6\% |
| Below poverty level | 36,537 | 6.5\% | 16,398 | 16.4\% | 20,139 | 4.4\% |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 1990 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 583,893 | 6.5\% | 134,844 | 14.8\% | 449,049 | 3.9\% |
| Under 5 years | 41,135 | 9.2\% | 10,314 | 23.7\% | 30,821 | 4.3\% |
| 5 years | 7,839 | 8.8\% | 1,638 | 21.9\% | 6,201 | 5.3\% |
| $6-11$ years | 44,676 | 8.5\% | 7,783 | 28.1\% | 36,893 | 4.4\% |
| $12-17$ years | 38,917 | 7.3\% | 5,849 | 19.6\% | 33,068 | 4.2\% |
| 18-64 years | 372,625 | 5.8\% | 87,590 | 12.7\% | 285,035 | 3.7\% |
| 65-74 years | 47,253 | 4.8\% | 11,309 | 10.1\% | 35,944 | 3.1\% |
| 75 years and over | 31,448 | 8.6\% | 10,361 | 12.4\% | 21,087 | 6.8\% |
| White persons above and below poverty level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total persons | 583,893 | 100.0\% | 134,844 | 100.0\% | 449,049 | 100.0\% |
| Above poverty level | 546,219 | 93.5\% | 114,872 | 85.2\% | 431,347 | 96.1\% |
| Below poverty level | 37,674 | 6.5\% | 19,972 | 14.8\% | 17,702 | 3.9\% |


|  |  | 12C: Bla | ers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mon | County |  | ester |  | nbs |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 2000 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 96,077 | 30.1\% | 81,207 | 33.6\% | 14,870 | 11.2\% |
| Under 5 years | 8,773 | 45.1\% | 7,926 | 47.8\% | 847 | 19.8\% |
| 5 years | 2,163 | 40.5\% | 1,886 | 45.3\% | 277 | 7.9\% |
| 6 -11 years | 13,575 | 41.1\% | 12,215 | 43.7\% | 1,360 | 17.7\% |
| 12-17 years | 11,074 | 32.3\% | 9,180 | 36.5\% | 1,894 | 12.0\% |
| 18-64 years | 55,354 | 25.0\% | 45,793 | 28.2\% | 9,561 | 9.5\% |
| 65-74 years | 3,380 | 22.2\% | 2,771 | 25.3\% | 609 | 8.2\% |
| 75 years and over | 1,758 | 21.7\% | 1,436 | 23.3\% | 322 | 14.3\% |
| Black persons above and below poverty leve |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total persons | 96,077 | 100.0\% | 81,207 | 100.0\% | 14,870 | 100.0\% |
| Above poverty level | 67,119 | 69.9\% | 53,914 | 66.4\% | 13,205 | 88.8\% |
| Below poverty level | 28,958 | 30.1\% | 27,293 | 33.6\% | 1,665 | 11.2\% |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 1990 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 82,120 | 32.4\% | 71,486 | 35.9\% | 10,634 | 8.9\% |
| Under 5 years | 9,676 | 53.0\% | 9,003 | 56.0\% | 673 | 12.9\% |
| 5 years | 1,841 | 44.6\% | 1,653 | 48.0\% | 188 | 14.4\% |
| 6 -11 years | 9,987 | 41.0\% | 8,683 | 45.8\% | 1,304 | 8.8\% |
| 12-17 years | 8,840 | 36.7\% | 7,735 | 40.6\% | 1,105 | 9.5\% |
| 18-64 years | 48,334 | 25.8\% | 41,264 | 28.8\% | 7,070 | 8.1\% |
| 65-74 years | 2,288 | 24.4\% | 2,085 | 25.6\% | 203 | 12.3\% |
| 75 years and over | 1,154 | 23.4\% | 1,063 | 24.6\% | 91 | 9.9\% |
| Black persons above and below poverty leve |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total persons | 82,120 | 100.0\% | 71,486 | 100.0\% | 10,634 | 100.0\% |
| Above poverty level | 55,538 | 67.6\% | 45,847 | 64.1\% | 9,691 | 91.1\% |
| Below poverty level | 26,582 | 32.4\% | 25,639 | 35.9\% | 943 | 8.9\% |


|  | 12D: Total Persons |  |  |  | Suburbs | \% Below |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  |  |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 2000 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 711,296 | 11.2\% | 211,273 | 25.9\% | 500,023 | 4.9\% |
| Under 5 years | 45,977 | 17.6\% | 16,720 | 39.7\% | 29,257 | 5.0\% |
| 5 years | 9,630 | 18.4\% | 3,302 | 41.3\% | 6,328 | 6.4\% |
| $6-11$ years | 67,052 | 17.1\% | 22,830 | 39.6\% | 44,222 | 5.4\% |
| 12-17 years | 62,406 | 12.9\% | 17,636 | 33.4\% | 44,770 | 4.9\% |
| 18-64 years | 436,448 | 9.9\% | 131,377 | 21.9\% | 305,071 | 4.7\% |
| $65-74$ years | 46,025 | 6.4\% | 9,745 | 16.8\% | 36,280 | 3.6\% |
| 75 years and over | 43,758 | 8.6\% | 9,663 | 13.9\% | 34,095 | 7.1\% |

Total persons above and below poverty level

| Total persons | 711,296 | 100.0\% | 211,273 | 100.0\% | 500,023 | 100.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Above poverty level | 631,985 | 88.8\% | 156,560 | 74.1\% | 475,425 | 95.1\% |
| Below poverty level | 79,311 | 11.2\% | 54,713 | 25.9\% | 24,598 | 4.9\% |
|  |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |  | \% Below |
|  |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |  | Poverty |
| 1990 | Total | Level | Total | Level | Total | Level |
| Total | 692,286 | 10.4\% | 222,065 | 23.4\% | 470,221 | 4.2\% |
| Under 5 years | 53,891 | 19.1\% | 21,500 | 41.2\% | 32,391 | 4.5\% |
| 5 years | 10,281 | 16.7\% | 3,448 | 33.0\% | 6,833 | 8.5\% |
| $6-11$ years | 58,022 | 15.5\% | 18,623 | 38.7\% | 39,399 | 4.5\% |
| $12-17$ years | 50,839 | 13.6\% | 15,412 | 34.7\% | 35,427 | 4.4\% |
| 18-64 years | 436,406 | 8.7\% | 137,859 | 19.0\% | 298,547 | 3.9\% |
| 65-74 years | 49,980 | 5.7\% | 13,624 | 12.5\% | 36,356 | 3.2\% |
| 75 years and over | 32,867 | 9.4\% | 11,599 | 14.2\% | 21,268 | 6.8\% |

## Total persons above

and below poverty level
$\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { Total persons } & 692,286 & 100.0 \% & 222,065 & 100.0 \% & 470,221 & 100.0 \% \\ \text { Above poverty level } & 620,552 & 89.6 \% & 170,028 & 76.6 \% & 450,524 & 95.8 \% \\ \text { Below poverty level } & 71,734 & 10.4 \% & 52,037 & 23.4 \% & 19,697 & 4.2 \%\end{array}$
Note: Data from Census Summary File 3-Sample D ata. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent D ata.
Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing Tables P87, P159A, P159B, P159H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 29, 21,23, 19.

## Table 13: Language Spoken

## 2ONO

Persons 5+ years old
Speak a language other than English
Do not speak English "very well"
$\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$
Persons 5+ years old
Speak a language other than English
Do not speak English "very well"
$\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$
Persons 5+ years old
Speak a language other than English
Do not speak English "very well"

## 2000

| Persons 5+ years old | 688,804 | $100.0 \%$ | 202,726 | $100.0 \%$ | 486,078 | $100.0 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\quad$ Speak a language other than English | 83,632 | $12.1 \%$ | 36,083 | $17.8 \%$ | 47,549 | $9.8 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Do not speak English "very well" | 32,063 | $4.7 \%$ | 15,172 | $7.5 \%$ | 16,891 | $3.5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 5+ years old | 659,505 | $100.0 \%$ | 209,742 | $100.0 \%$ | 449,763 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Speak a language other than English | 67,419 | $10.2 \%$ | 29,748 | $14.2 \%$ | 37,671 | $8.4 \%$ |
| Do not speak English "very well" | 24,542 | $3.7 \%$ | 12,296 | $5.9 \%$ | 12,246 | $2.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons 5+ years old | 656,721 | $100.0 \%$ | 223,402 | $100.0 \%$ | 433,319 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Speak a language other than English | 63,666 | $9.7 \%$ | 29,847 | $13.4 \%$ | 33,819 | $7.8 \%$ |
| Do not speak English "very well" | 8,852 | $1.3 \%$ | 5,553 | $2.5 \%$ | 3,299 | $0.8 \%$ |

Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables PCT 62H, P19; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 17, 20, 22, 28; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 9, 12, 14, 20.

Note: D ata from Census Summary File 3-Sample D ata. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent Data.

| Table 14: Housing Characteristics 14A: Hispanic Population |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| O ccupied Housing Units | 11,890 | 100.0\% | 8,839 | 100.0\% | 3,051 | 100.0\% |
| O wned | 3,796 | 31.9\% | 2,210 | 25.0\% | 1,586 | 52.0\% |
| Rented | 8,094 | 68.1\% | 6,629 | 75.0\% | 1,465 | 48.0\% |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 3,438 | 28.9\% | 3,126 | 35.4\% | 312 | 10.2\% |
| One or more | 8,452 | 71.1\% | 5,713 | 64.6\% | 2,739 | 89.8\% |
| No telephone | 801 | 6.7\% | 779 | 8.8\% | 22 | 0.7\% |
| 1990 | Mon | County |  | hester |  | burbs |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Occupied Housing Units | 7,078 | 100.0\% | 5,504 | 100.0\% | 1,574 | 100.0\% |
| O wned | 2,208 | 31.2\% | 1,263 | 22.9\% | 945 | 60.0\% |
| Rented | 4,870 | 68.8\% | 4,241 | 77.1\% | 629 | 40.0\% |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 2,685 | 37.9\% | 2,606 | 47.3\% | 79 | 5.0\% |
| One | 2,393 | 33.8\% | 1,852 | 33.6\% | 541 | 34.4\% |
| Two or more | 2,000 | 28.3\% | 1,046 | 19.0\% | 954 | 60.6\% |
| No telephone | 1,195 | 16.9\% | 1,175 | 21.3\% | 20 | 1.3\% |


| 1980 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Occupied Housing Units | 4,639 | 100.0\% | 3,663 | 100.0\% | 976 | 100.0\% |
| O wned | 1,689 | 36.4\% | 1,096 | 29.9\% | 593 | 60.8\% |
| Rented | 2,950 | 63.6\% | 2,567 | 70.1\% | 383 | 39.2\% |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 1,559 | 33.6\% | 1,480 | 40.4\% | 79 | 8.1\% |
| One | 1,897 | 40.9\% | 1,493 | 40.8\% | 404 | 41.4\% |
| Two or more | 1,183 | 25.5\% | 690 | 18.8\% | 493 | 50.5\% |
| No telephone | 874 | 18.8\% | 820 | 22.4\% | 54 | 5.5\% |
| 1970 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| Occupied Housing Units | 1,235 | 100.0\% | 1,166 | 100.0\% | 69 | 100.0\% |
| O wned | 328 | 26.6\% | 280 | 24.0\% | 48 | 69.6\% |
| Rented | 907 | 73.4\% | 886 | 76.0\% | 21 | 30.4\% |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 587 | 47.5\% | 587 | 50.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| One | 538 | 43.6\% | 497 | 42.6\% | 41 | 59.4\% |
| Two or more | 110 | 8.9\% | 82 | 7.0\% | 28 | 40.6\% |
| No telephone | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

## 14B: Total Population

| 2000 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| O ccupied Housing Units | 286,512 | $100.0 \%$ | 89,003 | $100.0 \%$ | 197,509 | $100.0 \%$ |
| O wned | 186,458 | $65.1 \%$ | 35,777 | $40.2 \%$ | 150,681 | $76.3 \%$ |
| Rented | 100,054 | $34.9 \%$ | 53,226 | $59.8 \%$ | 46,828 | $23.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 32,879 | $11.5 \%$ | 22,533 | $25.3 \%$ | 10,346 | $5.2 \%$ |
| One | 103,833 | $36.2 \%$ | 39,332 | $44.2 \%$ | 64,501 | $32.7 \%$ |
| Two or more | 149,800 | $52.3 \%$ | 27,138 | $30.5 \%$ | 122,662 | $62.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No telephone | 5,210 | $1.8 \%$ | 4,562 | $5.1 \%$ | 648 | $0.3 \%$ |


| 1990 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| O ccupied Housing Units | 271,944 | $100.0 \%$ | 93,607 | $100.0 \%$ | 178,337 | $100.0 \%$ |
| O wned | 176,945 | $65.1 \%$ | 41,188 | $44.0 \%$ | 135,757 | $76.1 \%$ |
| Rented | 94,999 | $34.9 \%$ | 52,419 | $56.0 \%$ | 42,580 | $23.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 34,596 | $12.7 \%$ | 26,334 | $28.1 \%$ | 8,262 | $4.6 \%$ |
| One | 94,139 | $34.6 \%$ | 38,323 | $40.9 \%$ | 55,816 | $31.3 \%$ |
| Two or more | 143,209 | $52.7 \%$ | 28,950 | $30.9 \%$ | 114,259 | $64.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No telephone | 8,185 | $3.0 \%$ | 7,288 | $7.8 \%$ | 897 | $0.5 \%$ |


| 1980 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| O ccupied Housing Units | 252,217 | 100.0\% | 94,597 | 100.0\% | 157,620 | 100.0\% |
| O wned | 159,558 | 63.3\% | 43,566 | 46.1\% | 115,992 | 73.6\% |
| Rented | 92,659 | 36.7\% | 51,031 | 53.9\% | 41,628 | 26.4\% |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 34,065 | 13.5\% | 27,220 | 28.8\% | 6,845 | 4.3\% |
| One | 102,049 | 40.5\% | 43,732 | 46.2\% | 58,317 | 37.0\% |
| Two or more | 116,103 | 46.0\% | 23,645 | 25.0\% | 92,458 | 58.7\% |
| No telephone | 1,221 | 0.5\% | 901 | 1.0\% | 320 | 0.2\% |
| 1970 | Monroe County |  | Rochester |  | Suburbs |  |
|  | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage | Count | Percentage |
| O ccupied Housing Units | 220,554 | 100.0\% | 101,238 | 100.0\% | 119,316 | 100.0\% |
| O wned | 144,122 | 65.3\% | 48,240 | 47.7\% | 95,882 | 80.4\% |
| Rented | 76,432 | 34.7\% | 52,998 | 52.3\% | 23,434 | 19.6\% |
| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | 33,724 | 15.3\% | 29,117 | 28.8\% | 4,607 | 3.9\% |
| One | 114,146 | 51.8\% | 54,230 | 53.6\% | 59,916 | 50.2\% |
| Two or more | 72,684 | 33.0\% | 17,891 | 17.7\% | 54,793 | 45.9\% |
| No telephone | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Data from Census Summary File 3-Sample D ata. Totals may not precisely match tables with data from Summary File 1-100 Percent Data. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: 2000 Census of Population and Housing Tables H-4, H-7, H-12, H-43, HCT-32, HCT-33; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 32, 42; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables H-7, H-17; 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Tables H-2, H-5. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ While data on total population, race, sex, and age is tabulated from the full $100 \%$ Census survey, other information such as education, income, marital status, and other characteristics are estimated using the sample of the population who received and completed the "long form" Census survey. Therefore, while these sample numbers are weighted to reflect the full population, the figures do not exactly match the true $100 \%$ Census data.

[^1]:    * Respondents were allowed to choose more than one race for the first time in 2000. This figure includes those who checked only one race.

[^2]:    * Includes equivalency

    Sources: 2000 Census of Population and Housing, Tables P-37, P-148A, P-148B, P-148H; 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 28,20, 22, 17; 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 20, 12, 14, 9; 1970 Census of Population and Housing, Tables 7, 5, 2.

