## Jewish Population in the United States, 2007

## "C

ONSIDERABLE CONTROVERSY EXISTS about the size and character of the Jewish population of the United States. Available sources of data about American Jewry are based on complex surveys that have become increasingly difficult to conduct."' So begins an assessment, entitled Reconsidering the Size and Characteristics of the American Jewish Population, based on a meta-analysis of 34 national surveys with a combined total of nearly 84,000 interviews. Its conclusion, that the American Jewish population totals between 6.0 and 6.4 million individuals - a range close to the sum reported in Table 1 of this article -is substantially higher than the estimate provided by the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) of 2000-01. The contentious nature of U.S. Jewish demographic data was also illustrated by the debate aroused by our article in AJYB 2006 (pp. 133-93), which was widely reported in the press, from the Forward, to Ha'aretz, to the Times of India, and on numerous Web sites. Why are there differences in the estimates?
First, American Jews are a "rare population," demographically speaking. As hard as it is to grasp for Jews living in New York, Los Angeles, or South Florida, the Jewish share of the total American population has declined by almost half, from 3.7 percent in the 1930s to about 2 percent in the first decade of the twenty-first century. A rare population is difficult to locate and interview. Second, response rates in surveys vary widely, and evidence suggests that lower response rates lead to lower estimates of the Jewish population. Third, the wording of national and local survey questions seeking to identify Jews also varies; a prime example is the difference in criteria for inclusion used in the three recent National Jewish Population Surveys, those for 1971, 1990, and 2000-01. ${ }^{2}$ In addition to these issues, there are variations in sampling techniques, the order of questions, and the culture of the institution sponsoring the research.
Since there is no consensus on the most effective and efficient strategy
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to study the Jewish population of the U.S., estimates of the number of Jews vary between about 5.2 million (NJPS 2000-01) and about 6.4 million, the figure reported below in Table $1 .^{3}$

## Methodology

Based upon a summation of local Jewish community studies (Table 3), the estimated size of the American Jewish community in 2007 is $6,443,805$ (Table 1), as compared to an estimated $6,452,750$ in 2006 . As mentioned above, the 6.4 million is about 1.2 million more than the Jewish population identified in NJPS 2000-01. ${ }^{4}$

The methodology used to develop our estimate is similar to that used for 2006. Local communities were contacted via the Internet. For those communities that did not reply, estimates from previous years have been maintained.

The estimates derive from two sources:
Scientific Estimates: These are based upon the results of some type of scientific study of a community, which, in almost all cases, involved the use of random-digit-dialing (RDD) telephone surveys, the currently accepted best practice for making Jewish population estimates.

Informant Estimates: For communities where no scientific study has been completed, local informants were contacted. They generally have access to information on the number of households on the local Jewish federation's mailing list and the number of people who belong to local Jewish organizations and synagogues.

More than 80 percent of the total of more than 6.4 million Jews estimated by this article was located through scientific studies, and only 20 percent based upon the less reliable informant procedure-although the analysis presented below strongly suggests that informant estimates are more reliable than previously thought. Also, less than 0.1 percent of the
${ }^{3}$ The authors thank Dr. Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz and Dr. Jonathon Ament, current staff members of the Research Department of United Jewish Communities (UJC), for their advice in the development of this article, and former staff members Dr. Jim Schwartz, Jeffrey Scheckner, and Dr. Barry Kosmin, who authored the article on U.S. Jewish population in previous years. Many of the estimates in this article are based upon their efforts. We also thank Dinur Blum, graduate assistant, and Lorri Lafontaine, program assistant, both at the Mandell $\mathbf{L}$. Berman Institute-North American Jewish Data Bank at the University of Connecticut, for their assistance.
${ }^{4}$ See Ira M. Sheskin and Arnold Dashefsky, "Jewish Population in the United States, 2006," AJYB 2006, pp. 134-38; and Sheskin, "Four Questions about American Jewish Demography," Jewish Political Studies Review, forthcoming, 2008.
total derives from communities where the informant estimate is more than ten years old.
All estimates are for Jews, living both in households and institutions, and do not include non-Jews living in households with Jews. The estimates of Jewish population include both Jews who are affiliated with the Jew, ish community and Jews who are not affiliated.

Population estimation is not an exact science, and therefore readers should not assume that because a number changed from last year's AJYB figure that the change occurred in the past year. Rather, it most likely occurred over a longer period of time, but has only recently been substantiated.

We have endeavored to provide the most reliable estimates available, utilizing statistics derived, whenever possible, from scientifically based studies in the archive of the Mandell L. Berman Institute-North American Jewish Data Bank at the University of Connecticut. Readers are invited to offer suggestions for improving the accuracy of the estimates and the portrayal of the data. Please send all correspondence to Ira M. Sheskin at isheskin@miami.edu.

## Features in the Local Population Estimates

Table 3 provides estimates for almost 1,000 Jewish communities and parts of communities. In some cases, the geographic areas in Table 3 coincide with Jewish federation service areas. In other cases, where data are available, we have disaggregated those service areas into smaller geographic units. Thus separate estimates are provided for such places as Boulder, Colorado, and Boynton Beach, Florida.

Included as well is information for each community as to whether the estimate is based on a scientific study or an informant estimate. Estimates for communities in boldface type are based on a scientific study. The boldface date is the year the field work for the study was conducted.
Estimates for communities that are not boldfaced are based on the informant methodology. Because detailed records are not available for many communities as to the date of the last such contact, only a range of years (pre-1997 or 1997-2001) is available for many of them. And where the date in the "Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study" column of Table 3 is more recent than the date of the latest study shown in boldface, the study estimate has been either confirmed or changed by a local informant some time after the scientific study.

Finally, the number of Jews who live in part-year households (living
there for from three to seven months of the year) is presented for communities for which such information is available as part of Table 3. Jews in these households constitute an essential part of some Florida Jewish communities, joining local synagogues and making donations to Jewish charities. Thus our methodology allows the reader to gain a better perspective on the size of certain Jewish communities without doublecounting the persons in these households in the totals produced in Tables $1-2$. Note that Jews in part-year households are reported with respect to the community that constitutes their "second home."

Three improvements are introduced this year in Table 3. First, Jewish population estimates for more than 230 sub-areas of Jewish federation service areas are shown for the first time. While in previous years sub-area information was presented only for the largest Jewish communities such as New York and Boston, it is now provided for all communities that have completed scientific studies since 1988. Thus readers can now discern the Jewish population of, for example, Squirrel Hill (in Pittsburgh) and Brighton (in Rochester). In some cases, such as the sub-area "Northwest" in Las Vegas, interested readers will need to consult the reports for the Las Vegas Jewish community, available at www.jewishdatabank.org, for a detailed definition of that geographic area.

To be sure, the shelf life of population estimates of sub-areas may be shorter than those for estimates of "whole" Jewish communities. For example, while the Jewish population of Rochester as a whole has probably not changed significantly since the 2000 Jewish community study, it is rather more likely that the Jewish population of the sub-area Brighton, already decreasing in 2000, continued to decrease as Jews moved from this traditional core area of Jewish settlement to other neighborhoods.

A second change is that the column showing the number of counties covered by some of the population estimates has been removed from Table 3. Instead, the counties covered in a given estimate are named in parentheses within the "Geographic Area" column. And third, the information that had been included in the "Notes" section of Table 3 has now been incorporated into the table itself.

## Informant Estimates and Scientific Study Estimates

As mentioned above, the estimates in Table 3 derive from two sources: informant estimates and scientific study estimates. While the latter are clearly superior, to what extent do informant estimates reflect "reality" as found by scientific studies? Table 4 shows the results of 78 scientific community studies that have been completed since 1981, as well as the

AJYB estimate for each of those communities in the year just prior to the completion of a scientific study. (Note that some Jewish communities have completed two or more scientific studies within this time frame; in such cases the informant estimates just prior to the second or third studies were themselves informed by an earlier scientific study, albeit one that was six or more years old.)
Two examples will illustrate the importance of Table 4. The first scientific study for Jacksonville, Florida, was completed in 2002. Until that time the AJYB estimate for Jacksonville was 7,300, a number provided by a local Jewish federation informant. The study found 12,900 Jews in the city, a difference of 5,600 , or 43 percent. In this case, the local federation executive had long suspected that the 7,300 was too low an estimate, but had simply never updated the estimate with the AJYB authors. In Chicago, with some guidance from a 1981 scientific study, the AJYB estimate for 1989 was 248,000 . A scientific study the next year put the number of Chicago Jews at 261,000 , a figure that remained in the AJYB until a 2000 scientific study revised it to 270,500 .

Some of the greatest absolute overestimates by the AJYB occurred in older and more established communities such as New York, Philadelphia, and Detroit. The AJYB published estimates from old scientific studies even though local informants no doubt suspected decreasing Jewish populations in these communities, since there was no methodology to document such losses. ${ }^{5}$ When the decrease, for example, in the New York Jewish population was offset by immigration, and the Jewish population of New York leveled off, the 2002 New York study showed only 38,000 fewer Jews than reported in the AJYB, out of a total of 1.4 million.

Conversely, some of the greatest absolute underestimates by the AJYB occurred in newer and especially Sunbelt communities, such as San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Atlanta, and West Palm Beach. These were also caused by publishing estimates from old scientific studies. While local informants no doubt suspected an increasing Jewish population, there was no methodology to document such gains, and the results of the last local Jewish community study continued to be published.
It must also be noted that in many cases there was a rather close correspondence between the number of Jews found by the scientific study and the number estimated by informants. Thus the 1999 Baltimore study found 91,400 Jews compared to the informant estimate of 94,500 . The

[^1]corresponding numbers for Minneapolis were 29,300 and 31,500; for San Antonio, 10,200 and 11,000; for Pittsburgh, 42,200 and 40,000; and for Tucson, 22,400 and 20,000.

Most important, the 78 studies totaled $9,047,175$ Jews. The informant estimates totaled $8,756,500$ Jews, a difference of only 290,675 , about 3 percent. Thus, while informant estimates may sometimes be far off the mark when looked at community by community, on average, they pretty much correlate with reality as the underestimates and overestimates seem largely to offset one another for the country as a whole. This is one more reason to have confidence that the current AJYB estimate of 6.4 million is closer to the truth than is the NJPS estimate of 5.2 million.

Yet another finding of interest in this table is that 51 communities had estimates that were "off" by 10 percent or more. Of these, 44 were underestimates and seven were overestimates. This wide disparity casts grave doubt on the conventional wisdom that informants tend to exaggerate population numbers in order to make their communities look "better," and should, like the point made in the previous paragraph, give pause to those who assume that informant estimates are generally inflated.

## Local Population Changes

## New Scientific Studies

In the past year, nine new local Jewish community studies or "small update studies" were completed in the U.S. Population estimates for three of them (Atlanta, Detroit, and Las Vegas) were reported in AJYB 2006. Based on a new study in San Antonio, the estimate for that community listed in Table 3 decreased by 800 , from 11,000 to 10,200 . This same study produced a first-ever estimate for seven counties surrounding San Antonio-Atascosa, Bandera, Comal, Guadalupe, Kendall, Medina, and Wilson-of 1,000 .

A new study in Boston apparently lowered the estimate of Jewish population by 16,800 , from 227,300 to 210,500 . As its authors revealed that the previous estimate had included non-Jews in Jewish households, and the new estimate, like all others in Table 3, excludes such non-Jews, the figures do not really imply a decrease in Jewish population, just a correction of a previous "error." In reality, the number of Jews in Boston increased from about 179,000 in 1995 to the current $210,500$.

Based on a new study in Denver, the estimate for that community in Table 3 increased by 9,100 , from 72,400 (a 2006 informant estimate based
on assuming a certain rate of increase in the 63,300 estimate from a 1997 scientific study) to 81,500 .

A scientific study of Southern Maine and neighboring New Hampshire has led us to change the previous informant estimate of 6,000 for Cumberland and York counties (Maine) by an estimate of 8,350 . This study also produced a new estimate for Androscoggin County, Maine, where an informant estimate of 500 was replaced by a scientific estimate of 600 , a first-ever estimate for Oxford County, Maine, of 750, a first-ever estimate for Sagadahoc County, Maine, of 400, and the replacement of an informant estimate of 600 for Strafford County (Dover and Rochester, New Hampshire) by a scientific estimate of 700.

A small update study in Tucson confirmed the population estimates in AJYB 2006. A small update study in Delaware confirmed the 2006 estimate for Newark and Wilmington, but increased the estimate for Kent and Sussex counties from 1,600 to 3,200 .

## New Informant Estimates

Based on new informant estimates, significant increases are reported for Volusia and Flagler counties (Daytona Beach), Florida ( $+1,500$ ); Durham-Chapel Hill, North Carolina $(+1,400)$; Greenwich, Connecticut $(+1,000)$; and Poughkeepsie-Dutchess County, New York (+600). Significant decreases were reported for North Louisiana, that is, Shreveport and Monroe ( -215 ), and Springfield, Illinois ( -290 ).

Due mostly to Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the estimate for New Orleans was decreased from 13,000 to 7,000, although the New Orleans informant suggests that the number of Jews there had already decreased to 10,000 before Katrina, and thus the estimated loss to that Jewish community from the hurricane is 3,000 . The devastation caused by Katrina affected not only New Orleans but also many other Gulf Coast communities in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, scattering much of their Jewish populations to other locales. Thus the estimates for Alexandria, Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, and Lafayette, Louisiana; for Biloxi/Gulfport, Diamondhead, Hattiesburg, and Jackson, Mississippi; and for Mobile, Alabama, shown in Table 3 should be treated with caution because, unlike the New Orleans estimate, they do not yet reflect changes that may have occurred following Katrina.

## State and Regional Totals.

Tables 1 and 2 show the total Jewish populations of each state, census region, and census division. Overall, about 2.2 percent of Americans are
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Jewish, but the percentage is 4 percent or higher in New York ( 8.4 percent), New Jersey ( 5.5 percent), Washington, D.C. ( 4.8 percent), Maryland ( 4.2 percent), and Massachusetts ( 4.0 percent). Eight states have a Jewish population of 200,000 or more: New York $(1,618,000)$; California ( $1,194,000$ ); Florida ( 655,000 ); New Jersey $(479,000)$; Pennsylvania $(285,000)$; Illinois $(279,000)$; Massachusetts $(258,000)$; and Maryland $(235,000)$. The four states with the largest Jewish populations account for more than 60 percent of the more than 6.4 million American Jews.

Note that, in addition to the state totals shown in Table 1, Florida has 81,000 Jews who reside in the state for three to seven months of the year.

Table 2 shows that, on a regional basis, the Jewish population is distributed very differently from the American population as a whole. While only 18 percent of Americans live in the Northeast, 43 percent of Jews live there. While 22 percent of Americans live in the Midwest, 11 percent of Jews do. While 36 percent of Americans live in the South, 22 percent of Jews do. Approximately equal percentages of all Americans (23 percent) and Jews ( 24 percent) live in the West. ${ }^{6}$

## Vignettes of Recently Completed Local Studies

Five local demographic studies have been completed for Jewish federations since the last article on Jewish population that appeared in AJYB 2006: Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, Las Vegas, and San Antonio. In addition, small update studies were completed for Delaware and Tucson. Since local studies produce much information about a Jewish community beyond its size, this section presents a few of the major findings of each study.

In reading them it is important to bear in mind the difference between the number of Jews in a community and the number of persons in Jewish households, which also include non-Jewish spouses and children not being raised Jewish. Also, in these vignettes, when a community is compared to other Jewish communities, the comparison is to communities that have completed scientific studies during the past 13 years. Full reports of the results of these studies are available from the North American Jewish Data Bank at www.jewishdatabank.org. Finally, while
${ }^{6}$ See Ira M. Sheskin Geographic Differences among American Jews, United Jewish Communities Series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01, Report Number 8 (2005), for an analysis of changes in the geographic distribution of Jews over time, also available at http://www.ujc.org/local_includes/downloads/6760.pdf.
random digit dialing (RDD) produces the most truly random sample, most studies, for economic and other reasons, combine it with the use of Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sampling or sampling from mailing lists, known as List sampling. In all surveys that employ either DJN or List sampling, weighting factors are used in combining the samples so as to remove much of the bias introduced by their use.
The authors are aware of several new studies that will soon be completed: Cincinnati; Denver; Lehigh Valley, Pa.; and Southern Maine (Portland). Vignettes on these communities will appear in AJYB 2008. The new population estimates for Denver and Southern Maine are included in Table 3.

## Atlanta

This 2006 study covers Greater Atlanta. Jack Ukeles and Ron Miller of Ukeles Associates were the principal investigators for this study that was based upon 1,007 telephone interviews, of which 322 were completed using RDD sampling and 685 using List sampling. The survey was conducted by International Communications Research (ICR, the firm that conducted NJPS 1990). This is the first survey of Atlanta's Jewish population since 1996.

A total of 156,900 persons live in 61,300 Jewish households. Of those persons, 119,800 ( 76 percent) are Jewish. Jewish households comprise about 4.3 percent of households in the study area, compared to 4.4 percent in 1996, implying that Atlanta's Jewish population has been increasing at a rate comparable to that of the general population of the area. Atlanta is now the llth largest Jewish community in the U.S., up from 17th in 1996.

The study shows the Jewish population of Atlanta to have increased by almost 60 percent since 1996. The current number of Jewish households, 61,300, has risen significantly from the 38,000 estimated in 1996; so has the number of Jews, from 77,000 in 1996 to 119,800 in 2006. Thirty-one percent of Jewish households moved to Atlanta in that decade while 46 percent have lived there for at least 20 years, meaning that Atlanta, while growing, now has a significant proportion of its community that should feel "rooted" in the area. That 46 percent is about average among some 40 comparison Jewish communities. Nineteen percent of Jewish survey respondents were born in Georgia, and 30 percent in New York.

Atlanta is a relatively young Jewish community, with children age 0-17
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comprising 25 percent of Jewish persons and the elderly comprising only 12 percent. While the 25 percent is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities, the 12 percent is the sixth lowest among the comparison communities.

In regard to income, 14 percent of Jewish households earn less than $\$ 35,000$ and 20 percent earn $\$ 150,000$ or more. About 30 percent of households say they are, at best, "just managing." About 4 percent of Jewish households live below 150 percent of the federal poverty guidelines. About 10 percent of respondents report that someone in their household had sought assistance in finding a job or choosing an occupation, and of those, about 11 percent used a Jewish agency.

Since 1996, the percentage of respondents who identify as Orthodox increased from 3 to 9 percent, seventh highest of about 45 comparison Jewish communities. The percentage who identify as Conservative decreased from 30 to 26 percent, a figure about average among comparison Jewish communities. The percentage who identify as Reform increased from 34 to 46 percent, sixth highest of the comparison Jewish communities. The percentage identifying as "Just Jewish" decreased from 33 percent to 18 percent, seventh lowest of the comparison Jewish communities.

In findings that did not change since 1996, 56 percent of Jewish respondents indicated that being Jewish is very important to them, with only 9 percent saying that being Jewish is not at all important. Also remaining the same since 1996 was the percentage of people who always or usually light Hanukkah candles, 74 percent, about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities. Always or usually attending a Passover Seder decreased from 76 percent in 1996 to 62 percent, fourth lowest of comparison Jewish communities. The percentage of households keeping a kosher home increased from 9 percent in 1996 to 13 percent in 2006, about average among comparison Jewish communities.

The percentage of households belonging to synagogues decreased slightly from 37 percent in 1996 to 33 percent in 2006 . Ten percent of households report membership in the Marcus Jewish Community Center, and 46 percent contain a member who attended a Jewish cultural event or museum in the past year, with synagogue members being twice as likely to report such attendance.

The 50 percent of married couples that are intermarried in Atlanta (not the rate of individual Jews who are intermarried) is the third highest of about 50 comparison Jewish communities, and has increased from 37 percent since 1996. Sixty-seven percent of couples that married since 1990 are intermarried, compared to just over one-third of couples who mar-
ried in the 1970s and 1980s, and 25 percent of couples who married prior to 1970 . In intermarried households, 39 percent of children are being raised Jewish, 15 percent in two faiths, 28 percent in a different religion, 14 percent are "undecided," and 4 percent are being raised in no religion.

In other findings, 48 percent of households contributed to a Jewish charity in the past year and 25 percent to the Jewish Federation of Greater Atlanta. Forty percent of Jewish respondents have visited Israel, and the same percentage report that they are very emotionally attached to Israel: About 91 percent of Jewish respondents agree that Jews have a special responsibility to take care of other Jews in need around the world, as compared to 71 percent of respondents in the NJPS 2000-01.

## Boston

This 2005 study covered Greater Boston, including Brighton, Brook, line, Newton, Central Boston, Cambridge, Greater Framingham, the Northwestern Suburbs, Greater Sharon, and other towns in the Boston area. Leonard Saxe, Benjamin Phillips, and Charles Kadushin, all of the Steinhardt Social Research Institute at Brandeis University, were the investigators for this study, which was based upon 1,766 telephone interviews, of which 401 were completed using RDD sampling and 1,365 using List sampling. The survey field work was conducted by Schulman, Ronca \& Bucuvalas, Inc. This is the first survey of Boston's Jewish population since 1995.

A total of 265,500 persons live in 105,500 Jewish households. Of these persons, 208,500 (79 percent) are Jewish. An additional 2,000 Jews live in institutions, for a grand total of 210,500 Jews. Jews comprise about 7.2 percent of the population of the Boston area.

The study shows the Jewish population of Boston to be increasing. Over the 1995-2005 period, the number of Jewish households increased from 86,000 to 105,500 and the number of Jews in Jewish households from 177,000 to 208,500 . The study authors attribute at least part of this increase to the fact that 60 percent of children in intermarried households are being raised Jewish.
The Jewish population of Boston continues to be geographically dis* persed. However, the geographic distribution did not change significantly since 1995, after years of a consistent movement of the Jewish population westward. Newton and Brookline continue as the core areas of the Jewish community.

The age distribution of Jews suggests that there may be a need to in-
crease social and health services for older adults in the future. Nineteen percent of Jews are age $50-59,10$ percent age $60-69,8$ percent age $70-79,5$ percent age $80-89$, and 1 percent age 90 and over. About 91 percent of Jews age 25 and over have a college degree. While 6 percent of households earn less than $\$ 15,000,43$ percent earn $\$ 100,000$ and over, including 12 percent earning $\$ 200,000$ and over. Two percent of households describe themselves as poor; 1 percent as nearly poor; 10 percent as just getting along; 53 percent as living reasonably comfortably; 28 percent as living very comfortably; and 6 percent as prosperous. Five percent of respondents report that they were unable to purchase needed medication in the past year.

The 46 percent of married couples that are intermarried is the seventh highest of about 50 comparison Jewish communities. Most important, as noted above, 60 percent of children in intermarried households are being raised Jewish, the sixth highest percentage of about 50 comparison Jewish communities. The 72 percent of households that always or usually participate in a Passover Seder is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities, the 79 percent of households that always or usually light Hanukkah candles is the sixth highest of comparison communities, and the 26 percent of households that always or usually light Sabbath candles is about average among such communities.

About 49 percent of Jewish adults are synagogue members, 19 percent belong to Jewish community centers (JCCs), and 21 percent to Jewish organizations. Sixty percent of Jewish adults belong to a synagogue and/or a JCC and/or a Jewish organization. Fifty-four percent of Jewish adults volunteered to work for some type of organization in the past year, including 5 percent who volunteered only for Jewish organizations, 21 percent who volunteered for both Jewish and non-Jewish organizations, and 28 percent who volunteered for non-Jewish organizations only. About 46 percent of Jewish adults have visited Israel, including 7 percent who visited within the past five years.

About 3 percent of respondents give all their charitable donations to Jewish causes; 17 percent give mostly to Jewish causes; 38 percent donate about equally to Jewish and non-Jewish causes, 26 percent donate mostly to non-Jewish causes, and 10 percent donate only to non-Jewish causes.

## Delaware

This small 2006 update study involved no new telephone interviewing but did include counts of Distinctive Jewish Names by zip code through-

JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, $2007 \quad 145$ out the state and in adjoining areas of southern Pennsylvania, as well as information on membership and enrollment collected from synagogues, the JCC, and the Jewish day school. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator.

New population estimates were derived by calculating a ratio between the RDD estimate of Jews from the 1995 Delaware Jewish community study and the number of households with a DJN in the 1995 telephone directory, and applying this ratio to the D.JN count from the 2006 telephone directory.

The study showed that the Jewish population of New Castle County (Wilmington and Newark) has not changed significantly since 2000. A total of 15,100 persons live in New Castle County in 5,700 Jewish households. Of those persons, 11,900 (79 percent) are Jewish. Small increases in Jewish population were shown for Kent County and a significant increase for Sussex County, although many homes in Sussex are beach homes and the Jewish population resides there only in the summer and sometimes only on weekends. Overall, the Jewish population of Kent and Sussex counties doubled from 1995 to 2006. Thus a total of 5,000 persons live in Kent and Sussex, in 2,200 Jewish households. Of those persons, 3,200 ( 64 percent) are Jewish. Consistent with this increase in Jewish population was a doubling of the membership of the one synagogue located in Sussex County.

Because Jews in southern Pennsylvania have begun to avail themselves of the facilities of the Delaware Jewish community, this study examined the growth of the Jewish community in Pennsylvania zip codes contiguous to the Delaware/Pennsylvania border and in the Route 202 corridor. These areas are technically within the service area of the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia. The number of Jewish households in this area was shown to have increased from about 3,800 houscholds in 1995 to about 8,800 (with 25,500 persons) in 2006 .

A survey of Delaware synagogues showed a significant decrease in household membership from 2,004 in 1985, to 1,927 in 1995, and 1,559 in 2000. (These counts include only households residing in Delaware.) Consistent with the Jewish population of New Castle County remaining the same from 2000 to 2006 , the number of synagogue member households rose only slightly, from 1,559 households in 2000 to 1,580 in 2006. The number of member households in Delaware synagogues who reside in Pennsylvania increased from 123 in 2000 to 171 in 2006.
Information provided by the JCC and the Jewish day school shows significant increases in involvement from southern Pennsylvania. From 2000
to 2006, the number of such Jewish JCC member households increased from 80 ( 10 percent of total membership) to 226 ( 22 percent of total membership). Likewise, the number of Jewish children in the JCC preschool from Pennsylvania increased from 10 in 2000 to 28 in 2006, and the number of Jewish children in the JCC day camp from Pennsylvania increased from 110 to 178 over that same period. About 16 percent of children in synagogue Hebrew schools now come from Pennsylvania, as do 10 percent of teenage youth-group participants.

Finally, the average donation per household to the Jewish Federation of Delaware increased from $\$ 54$ per household in 1995 to $\$ 72$ per household in 2005, adjusted for inflation.

## Detroit

This 2005 study covered Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne counties, Michigan. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 1,274 telephone interviews, of which 403 were completed using RDD sampling and 871 using DJN sampling. The survey was conducted by International Communications Research (ICR). This is the first survey of Detroit's Jewish population since 1989.

A total of 78,000 persons live in 30,000 Jewish households. Of these persons, 71,500 ( 92 percent) are Jewish. An additional 500 Jews live in institutions, for a grand total of 72,000 Jews. Jews comprise about 1.8 percent of the population in the three-county area.

The study shows the Jewish population of Detroit to be decreasing. The current number of Jewish households, 30,000 is far less than the 42,500 estimated by the 1989 study. Based upon counts of households with Distinctive Jewish Names, the number of Jewish households decreased by 2,500 , or 8 percent, from 1999 through 2005. Data on migration of Jews into and out of Detroit suggest that the latter exceeds the former. The number of donors to the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit annual campaign decreased from 16,609 in 1995 to 10,474 ten years later. Only half of adult children remain in the locality after leaving their parents' homes and an increasing proportion of young adults are attending college outside the area. The age distribution also strongly suggests an aging population with a decreasing number of children.

The geographic distribution of Jewish households in Detroit has changed. During 1999-2005, the percentage of Detroit Jewish households in the Core Area (including Bloomfield Hills, Farmington Hills,

Oak Park, Southfield, and West Bloomfield and adjacent areas of south* ern Oakland County) decreased from 77 percent to 73 percent.

Despite the decrease in Jewish population and the small decrease in its geographic concentration, the Detroit Jewish community is, in many ways, one of the strongest Jewish communities in the country. Among about 35-50 comparison Jewish communities, Detroit has the second highest percentage of respondents who keep kosher in and out of the home ( 14 percent) and who refrain from using electricity on Shabbat ( 10 percent). It has the sixth highest percentage of households that always or usually participate in a Passover Seder ( 82 percent) and keep a kosher home ( 22 percent). It has the seventh highest percentage of households with a mezuzah on the front door ( 77 percent). It has an above average percentage of households that always or usually light Sabbath candles (29 percent) and an average percentage of households that always or usually light Hanukkah candles ( 77 percent). Also, all Orthodox Jewish children and 95 percent of non-Orthodox Jewish children receive some formal Jewish education. Households under age 35 have stronger Jewish identities than is true in most comparison Jewish communities.
The 16 percent of married couples that are intermarried is the fourth lowest of about 55 comparison Jewish communities. However, as is true in all the comparison Jewish communities, the trend in Detroit is for higher intermarriage rates among younger couples: the rate is just under 20 percent in households under age 65 and 10 percent in households age 65 and over.

The 50 percent of Jewish households reporting current synagogue membership is about average among some 55 comparison Jewish communities, a surprising result given the overall level of Jewish connectedness and the fact that 88 percent of the households have been in Detroit for at least 20 years, the highest percentage among 40 comparison Jewish communities. The 71 -percent rate of current synagogue membership for households with children is the highest of about 40 comparison Jewish communities, and the 57 -percent rate for households under age 35 and the 64 -percent rate for those $35-49$ are the highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. Clearly, the reason for an only average percentage of overall synagogue membership is the fact that only 39 percent of households age 65 and over are synagogue members. This may suggest that income is a significant factor in whether a household joins.

The organized Jewish community is relatively well known and well regarded among the Jews of Detroit. As a result, the federation had the most successful campaign, on a per-houschold basis, of 55 Jewish feder-
ations, with about $\$ 35,000,000$ being raised from approximately 30,000 households. The 37 percent of respondents saying they are very familiar with the local federation is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities, while the 35 percent who perceive the Federation as "excellent" is the fourth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. Fifty percent of Jewish respondents used the Internet for Jewish-related information in the past year, including 30 percent who used it for information about the Detroit Jewish community. Younger respondents were more likely to use the Internet for Jewish-related information than were older respondents, and, similarly, were much more likely to obtain information about the local Jewish community from the Internet than from the Detroit Jewish News- which is one of the most successful Jewish newspapers in the country.

## Las Vegas

This 2005 study covered all of Clark County, Nevada. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 1,197 telephone interviews, of which 398 were completed using RDD sampling and 799 using DJN sampling. The survey was conducted by International Communications Research (ICR). This is the first survey of the Las Vegas Jewish population since 1995.

A total of 89,000 persons live in 42,000 Jewish households. Of those persons, 67,500 ( 76 percent) are Jewish. From 1995 to 2005, the number of Jewish households increased by 44 percent, from 29, 100 to 42,000 , while the number of persons in Jewish households increased by 33 percent, from 66,900 to 89,000 , and the number of Jews in Jewish households increased by 21 percent, from 55,600 to 67,500 . Las Vegas is one of the fastest-growing Jewish communities in the U.S., but the rate of growth was found to be significantly slower than had been earlier touted by community officials.

The Jewish population of Las Vegas is geographically dispersed and has shifted location over the past decade. The percentage of Jewish households who live in the Northwest increased from 24 percent to 31 percent; that in the Southeast increased from 19 percent to 25 percent; and that in the Northeast increased from 7 percent to 11 percent. In contrast, the percentage of households in the Southwest decreased from 30 percent to 23 percent, and the percentage in the Central area decreased from 20 percent to 10 percent.

Las Vegas is not "home" for many Jewish households. Only 1 percent of adults in Jewish houscholds were born in Southern Nevada, and only

21 percent of Jewish households have lived in the area for 20 years or more. Five percent of Jewish households say they will definitely move out within the next three years, the fifth highest percentage of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. These factors lead to a high level of attachment to other Jewish communities, as shown by the 8 percent of charitable dollars donated by Jewish households in the past year to Jewish federations other than the Jewish Federation of Las Vegas. Also, 69 percent of Jewish respondents reported that they feel "not very much" or "not at all" a part of the local Jewish community.
Large percentages of children in Jewish households live in nontra ditional households. Eleven percent of children age 0-17 in Jewish households live with only one parent, the fourth highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. Forty-seven percent of children that age in Jewish households live with an adult who is or has been divorced, the second highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. The divorce rate, 164 divorced adults in Jewish households per 1,000 married adults, is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities.
The study points to a clear need for singles programs, as 39 percent $(16,000)$ of Jewish adults age $18-64$ are single and 28 percent $(3,900)$ of households with single Jewish adults age $18-64$ were interested in singles programs in the past year. Included in the 28 percent are 14 percent of households with Jewish singles who attended Jewish programs, I percent who attended non-Jewish programs, and 13 percent who did not attend singles programs in the past year. As in all Jewish communities for which this measure is available, there is a strong tendency for Jewish singles who attended singles programs to attend Jewish programs. Thus while the intermarriage rate in this community is significant ( 48 percent of married couples), single persons are attempting to find Jewish mates.
Membership levels are low in Las Vegas. The 14 percent of Jewish households reporting current synagogue membership either in the vicinity or elsewhere is the lowest of about 55 comparison Jewish communities. The 16 -percent rate of current synagogue membership of households with children is the lowest of about 40 comparison Jewish communities. Among about 35 comparison Jewish communities, Las Vegas has the third lowest percentage of synagogue membership for households under age 35 ( 14 percent) and the lowest percentages for households age 35-49 ( 10 percent), age $50-64$ ( 12 percent), and age 65 and over ( 19 percent). Perhaps the very low 1 percent of adults born in the area contributes to the low levels of membership in synagogues and other local Jewish institutions.
Only 45 percent of Jewish children age 5-12 in Las Vegas currently re-
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ceive formal Jewish education, the second lowest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. For those who are age 13-17 the figure is only 11 percent, which is also the second lowest of the comparison Jewish communities.

Almost all Jewish communities the size of Las Vegas - and many that are significantly smaller - have Jewish campuses that often house the Jewish federation, a JCC, and other Jewish institutions. Las Vegas currently has its federation, JCC, and Jewish Family Service Agency operating from office buildings.

## San Antonio

This 2007 study covered Bexar County, Texas. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 675 telephone interviews, of which 290 were completed using RDD sampling and 385 using DJN sampling. This is the first scientific survey of San Antonio's Jewish population.

About 11,200 persons live in 4,500 Jewish households in San Antonio: Of these persons, 9,100 ( 81 percent) are Jewish. An additional 70 Jewish persons live in institutions, making a total of 9,170 . Jews comprise about 0.6 percent of the population of Bexar County. An additional 1,000 are estimated to live in the seven counties surrounding Bexar.

The study shows the Jewish population of San Antonio to be relatively stable. Based upon counts of households with Distinctive Jewish Names, the number of Jewish households decreased by 300, or 6 percent, from 2000 through 2007. Survey results suggest that migration into San Antonio is about cqual to migration out. The number of donors to the federation annual campaign decreased from 1,501 to 1,437 in that period. Only about one-third of adult children remain in San Antonio after leaving their parents' homes. The age distribution also suggests an aging population with a decreasing number of children. Thus, while evidence suggests current stability, the future will have to be carefully monitored.

The geographic distribution of Jewish households has changed in recent years. During 2000-2007, the percentage of area Jewish households inside Loop 410 decreased from 31 percent of all Jewish households to 25 percent; the percentage of Jewish households between Loop 410 and Loop 1604 remained about the same; and the percentage outside Loop 1604 increased from 10 percent to 17 percent. Thus while the Jewish population has moved significantly further from the downtown area, the core area (between Loop 410 and Loop 1604) has remained strong.

The study finds that San Antonio is a relatively strong Jewish community in several ways. Measures of Jewish religiosity are average among about 35-50 comparison Jewish communities. This is true for households having a mezuzah on the front door ( 68 percent), always or usually lighting Hanukkah candles ( 70 percent), always or usually lighting Shabbat candles ( 20 percent), keeping a kosher home ( 10 percent), keeping kosher in and out of the home ( 5 percent), and refraining from using electricity on Shabbat ( 2 percent). It has a below average percentage of households who always or usually participate in a Passover Seder ( 69 percent). The 25 percent of respondents who say they never attend services is about average among about 40 comparison Jewish communities, and the 25 percent of respondents who say they attend services at least once a month is also about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities.

The 37 percent of married couples that are intermarried in San Antonio is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities. But unlike many of the comparison Jewish communities, the trend in San Antonio is for high intermarriage rates among all age groups: 35 percent of married couples in households age 35-49, 43 percent in households age $50-64,36$ percent in households age $65-74$, and 26 percent in households age 75 and over.

San Antonio shows particular strength in Jewish community participation. Current synagogue membership ( 52 percent) is above average among about 40 comparison Jewish communities, the percentage of households who were members of a syñagogue at some time during their adult lives ( 83 percent) is the fourth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. JCC membership ( 29 percent) is the fourth highest of about 45 comparison JCCs, the 52 percent of households who participated in a JCC program over the past year is the third highest of about 45 comparison JCCs, and the JCC's 52-percent market share of the fitness facility and health club market among Jewish households is the fifth highest of about 25 comparison JCCs. The percentage of households who are associated with the Jewish community (anyone in the household is a member of a synagogue, the JCC, or a Jewish organization) is above average among about 40 comparison Jewish communities. The percentage of Jewish children age $0-5$ in a preschool/childcare program who attend a Jewish program in 92 percent, the highest Jewish market share among about 30 comparison communities. The Jewish day camp market share for Jewish children age 3-17 attending a day camp the summer prior to the survey was 78 percent, fourth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities.

The Jewish Journal of San Antonio is always or usually read by 49 percent of respondents, the second highest of about 20 comparison Jewish communities. The 53 percent of households that reported donating to the Jewish federation in the past year is the fifth highest of about 50 comparison Jewish communities, and the average donation per household of $\$ 476$ is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities. The 68 percent of households that donated to some Jewish charity in the past year is the fourth highest of about 40 comparison Jewish communities,

## Tucson

This small 2006 update study involved no new telephone interviewing, but did include counts of DJN households by zip code. New population estimates were derived from calculating a ratio between the RDD estimate of Jews from the 2002 Jewish community study of Southern Arizona and the number of households with a DJN in the 2002 telephone directory, and applying this ratio to the DJN count from the 2006 directory. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator.

The study suggests that a small decrease in the Jewish population occurred over the past four years, much of it due to a decline in the number of DJN households in zip code 85719, which contains the University of Arizona. The cause was a shift in American campus culture: the percentage of students with land lines in 2002 was considerably higher than is the case in 2006, as many now use cell phones only. Thus the Jewish population probably did not change significantly.

The study also showed no significant change in the size of the Jewish population in the West/Northwest from 2002 to 2006, an area that had seen a significant increase in Jewish population from 1994 through 2002.

## Comparisons among Local Jewish Communities

Since 1993, more than 50 American Jewish communities have completed one or more scientific demographic studies. Starting with this AJYB volume, we are introducing a new feature in the article on U.S. Jewish population consisting of comparison tables. This year, the tables illustrate length of residence in the local community (Table 5); Jewish identification (Table 6); intermarriage (Table 7); and the percentage of children being raised Jewish in intermarried households (Table 8). In cases of communities where more than one study was completed since

1993, only the latest is used. The Jewish communities shown in Tables 6-8 have a combined Jewish population that comprises about 75 percent of the total U.S. Jewish population estimated in Table 1. Comparison tables with the results of 18 Jewish community studies completed between 1982 and 1995 that are not included in the tables in this section are available elsewhere. ${ }^{7}$

These comparisons of Jewish communities should be treated with caution for three major reasons. First, the studies used were completed over a 14-year period, and thus differences between communities may be due, at least in part, to temporal factors. Second, even though only studies that used some RDD sampling are included, the individual studies used varying amounts of DJN and List sampling as well, and so differences in sampling techniques may lead to different results. And third, the questionnaires used were not uniform, and the literature on survey research indicates that even small changes in question wording or in the sequence of questions asked in a telephone survey can have a significant impact upon the results. ${ }^{8}$

To compensate somewhat for these factors, at least a five-percentagepoint difference is required in these tables for the difference to be considered significant.

## Length of Residence

Table 5 compares length of residence of respondents in 41 Jewish communities. The two most important columns show the percentages of respondents in residence for $0-4$ years (new residents) and those in residence for 20 or more years (long-term residents). Length of residence is important for understanding levels of attachment to the local Jewish community and its Jewish institutions, as many studies show that it tends to correlate with membership and participation in Jewish institutions and activities. Communities with many long-term resident households thus have an advantage over those with fewer such households. As noted in the table, the percentage of long-term households varies from 11 per-

[^2]cent in Martin-St. Lucie, Florida, to 88 percent in Detroit, with the median value at 52 percent. It should be noted that in-migration is only one demographic component of population change, the others being outmigration, births, and deaths.

Low percentages of new residents are found in mostly older, northern communities such as Hartford, Pittsburgh, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Baltimore, Rochester, and Detroit. In contrast, high percentages of new residents are found in growing, mostly Sunbelt communities as Martin-St. Lucie, Orlando, Charlotte, Las Vegas, Denver, West Palm Beach, Seattle, and Harrisburg. ${ }^{9}$ Even so, two of the largest Sunbelt communities, Los Angeles and Miami, have very low percentages of new residents. The percentage of new residents varies from 3 percent in Detroit to 32 percent in Orlando and Martin-St. Lucie. The median value is 14 percent.

It is also useful to examine the absolute numbers, which can be derived by multiplying the percentage of new residents by the number of households in the community. For example, although only 7 percent of Los Angeles Jewish households are new to the city, as compared with 31 percent in Charlotte, the absolute number in Los Angeles is about 17,000 houser holds, compared to 1,200 in Charlotte.

Since there are now eight large Jewish communities that completed scientific community studies both before and since 2000 , it is possible to gauge the rate of growth of communities. Atlanta is the fastest growing Jewish community in the country ( 4,800 Jews per year), followed by West Palm Beach $(4,700)$, San Francisco $(4,500)$, Washington, D.C. $(3,100)$, South Palm Beach ( 2,400 ), Phoenix $(2,000)$, Las Vegas $(1,200)$, and New York (800). While there may be other Jewish communities that are growing rapidly, that growth cannot be documented،

## Jewish Identification

Table 6 shows Jewish identification for 48 Jewish communities. Respondents were generally asked whether they consider themselves Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, or Just Jewish. Thus Jewish identification is based on self-definition and not necessarily on synagogue membership, ideology, or religious practice. In fact, discrep-

[^3]ancies between identification and practice are evident. For example, respondents may identify as Orthodox or Conservative, but report that they do not keep kosher. Respondents may identify as Reform, but report that they never attend synagogue services. Conversely, some respondents identifying as Just Jewish are synagogue members. ${ }^{10}$ Note that by calling a household, say, Orthodox because the respondent is Orthodox, we can project the number of Orthodox households in a community.
The comparisons here are somewhat affected by the wording of the question. While the most common wording is the one provided in the previous paragraph, alternative have sometimes been used, such as "Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, or something else?" The extent to which alternative wordings produce different responses to this question is unknown.
The percentage of respondents who consider themselves Orthodox varies from 1 percent in Allantic County, N.J, Martin-St. Lucie, Fla., and York, Pa., to more than 10 percent in Detroit ( 11 percent); Bergen. County, N.J. (12 percent); Baltimore (17 percent); and New York (19 percent). The median Orthodox value is 4 percent. But since size of Orthodox households is almost always higher than Jewish household size of non-Orthodox households, the percentage of Jews who are Orthodox is higher than the percentage of Orthodox households. In addition, because Orthodox Jews tend to join synagogues at higher rates than others, Orthodox Jews comprise a much higher percentage of synagogue members. In Miami, for example, 9 percent of households are Orthodox. 12 percent of Jews are Orthodox, and 26 percent of synagogue-member households are Orthodox. Thus the overall influence of Orthodox Jews in a community often exceeds the influence implied by the percentages shown in Table 6.
The percentage of respondents who identify as Conservative varies from 15 percent in Denver to 39 percent in Tidewater (Norfolk-Virginia Beach). The median value is 28 percent. Four of the six communities with the lowest percentages are in the West: Denver ( 15 percent), San Francisco ( 17 percent), Seattle ( 19 percent), and Tucson ( 21 percent). Note that ten of the 13 communities with the highest percentages are in the South, including four Florida retirement communities. Such Florida communities tend to have high percentages of second-generation American Jews

[^4](born in the U.S. of foreign-born parents), and these tend to identify as Conservative.

The percentage of respondents who identify as Reform varies from 22 percent in Harrisburg to 60 percent in St. Louis. The median value is 37 percent. In this case, it is hard to identify any geographic patterns.

The percentage of respondents who identify as Just Jewish varies from 11 percent in Cleveland to 47 percent in Las Vegas. The median value is 30 percent. The percentage identifying with this category is roughly indicative of the size of the Jewish population that does not feel connected to the Jewish community or their Jewish heritage. Nevertheless, the Just Jewish are not a monolithic group, and large numbers are involved in some type of Jewish activity - 86 percent of such households in South Palm Bcach, for example. And there are wide differences among them by community. In Detroit, for example, 59 percent always or usually participate in a Passover Seder, compared to 32 percent in Las Vegas, and 29 percent contributed to the Jewish federation in the past year in Detroit, compared to 12 percent in Las Vegas.

## Intermarriage

Table 7 shows intermarriage rates for 50 Jewish communities. Intermarriage, which has reached significant proportions, has become one of the most important issues for the Jcwish community. Although some intermarricd couples are contributing significantly to the Jewish community, it is clear from comparisons of in-married and intermarried couples that the phenomenon of intermarriage has a negative affect on measures of Jewishness, and therefore on Jewish continuity. In Detroit, for example, 70 percent of in-married couples are synagogue members as compared to 17 percent of intermarried couples. ${ }^{11}$

The local Jewish community studies usually distinguish between three types of marriage. An in-marriage is between spouses who were born or raised Jewish and currently consider themselves Jewish. A conversionary in-marriage is between one spouse who was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish, and the other who, while not born or raised Jewish, currently considers himself/hcrself Jewish, whether or not there was a formal conversion. An intermarriage is between one

[^5] spouse who was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other who was not born or raised Jewish and does not currently consider himself/herself Jewish.

While Halakhah (Jewish law) does not differentiate between in marriages and conversionary in-marriages, social scientists make this distinction in order to study several aspects of marital choice and their influence on Jewish behaviors.

Intermarriage rates may be reported based on married couples or individuals. As an illustration, imagine two weddings. In the first, Moshe (a Jew) marries Rachel (also a Jew). In the second, Abraham (a Jew) marries Christine (a non-Jew). Thus there are two married couples, one of which is intermarried, and so the couples intermarriage rate is 50 percent. However another method of calculating the rate is to note that there are three Jews (Moshe, Rachel, and Abraham), one of whom (Abraham) is married to a non-Jew (Christine), and the individual intermarriage rate is 33 percent. Each rate can be useful for different purposes: The local community studies generally cite the couples rate.

Two more points should be noted. The intermarriage rates reported in local Jewish community studies are for persons who currently consider themselves Jewish, and do not normally include those who have converted to another religion or attend services of another faith on a regular basis. Also, the rates reported in Table 7 are for all existing married couples, not just for marriages that have occurred recently (in the past five years, for example), as are often reported for both the 1990 and 2000-01 NJPS.

Table 7 shows that the couples intermarriage rate varies from 9 percent in South Palm Beach to 55 percent in Seattle and San Francisco. The median value is 33 percent. Note that six of the ten communities with the lowest rates ( 20 percent or lower) are retirement communities, mostly in Florida. Four of the nine Jewish communities with rates in excess of 45 percent are western, including the top two, Seattle and San Francisco.
Many American Jewish institutions today are developing policies, even if only informally, concerning intermarriage. They address such questions as: To what extent should intermarried couples be encouraged to affiliate? In religious institutions, will non-Jews be allowed to participate in religious services? How does the community welcome the children of intermarried couples while at the same time encouraging Jews to marry other Jews? While the answers entail a number of ideological and practical considerations, communities with relatively low intermarriage rates might well select different strategies than communities with high rates.
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## Children Being Raised Jewish in Intermarried Households

Table 8 shows the percentage of children being raised Jewish in 49 Jewish communities, a figure that varies from a low of 18 percent in MartinSt. Lucie to 75 percent in South Palm Beach. The median value is 42 percent.

Three factors complicate these comparisons, and therefore only relatively large differences between two percentages ( $15-20$ points) are given credence. First, the sample sizes are often small, and so the standard errors of these percentages are relatively high. Second, the question has often been asked in varying ways, making the basis for comparison somewhat suspect. Third, respondents often do not give clear answers, and non-Jewish interviewers sometimes interpret responses differently than Jewish interviewers might.

Four of the five communities with the smallest percentages are in the West: Palm Springs ( 19 percent), San Diego ( 21 percent), Seattle ( 23 percent), and Phoenix ( 26 percent). Detroit, which is otherwise one of the more Jewishly-connected communities, has a relatively low percentage of children in intermarried households, 31 percent, being raised Jewish. One possible explanation is that Detroit has a very low overall intermarriage rate, 16 percent, and only 4 percent of married couples who are members of Detroit synagogues are intermarried, compared to 35 percent of married couples who are non-members. Perhaps intermarried couples investigating a synagogue in Detroit do not find too many other intermarried couples there, and may feel uncomfortable joining for that reason alone.

The data indicate that some communities have been more successful than others in convincing intermarried Jews to raise their children Jewish, and/or in attracting such couples into the community.

TABLE 1: Jewish Population in the United States, 2007

| State | Estimated Jewish Population | Total Population* | Estimated Jewish Percent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 9,000 | 4,559,030 | 0.2 |
| Alaska | 3,425 | 670,053 | 0.5 |
| Arizona | 106,100 | 6,166,318 | 1.7 |
| Arkansas | 1,675 | 2,810,872 | 0.1 |
| California | 1,194,190 | 36,457,549 | 3.3 |
| Colorado | 87,720 | 4,753,377 | 1.8 |
| Connecticut | 112,830 | 3,504,809 | 1.8 3.2 |
| Delaware | 15,100 | 853,476 | 1.8 |
| Washington, D.C. | 28,000 | 581,530 | 4.8 |
| Florida | 654,935 | 18,089,888 | 3.6 |
| Georgia | 127,245 | 9,363,941 | 1.4 |
| Hawaii | 6,990 | 1,285,498 | 0.5 |
| Idaho | 1,100 | 1,466,465 | 0.1 |
| Illinois | 278,520 | 12,831,970 | 2.2 |
| Indiana | 17,420 | 6,313,520 | 0.3 |
| lowa | 6,140 | 2,982,085 | 0.2 |
| Kansas | 18,225 | 2,764,075 | 0.7 |
| Kentucky | 11,450 | 4,206,074 | 0.3 |
| Louisiana | 9,975 | 4,287,768 | 0.2 |
| Maine | 13,915 | 1,321,574 | 1.1 |
| Maryland | 234,550 | 5,615,727 | 4.2 |
| Massachusetts | 258,230 | 6,437,193 | 4.0 |
| Michigan Minnesota | 87,270 | 10,095,643 | 0.9 |
| Minnesota | 46,685 | 5,167,101 | 0.9 |
| Mississippi Missouri | 1,500 | 2,910,540 | 0.1 |
| Missouri Montana | 59,165 | 5,842,713 | 1.0 |
| Montana | 850 | 944,632 | 0.1 |
| Nebraska Nevada | 6,850 | 1,768,331 | 0.4 |
| Nevada New Hampshire | 69,600 | 2,495,529 | 2.8 |
| New Hampshire | 10,070 479 | 1,314,895 | 0.8 |
| New Jersey New Mexico | 479,200 | 8,724,560 | 5.5 |
| New Mexico | 11,250 $1,617,720$ | $1,954,599$ $19,306,183$ | 0.6 8.4 |
| North Carolina | $1,617,720$ 27,745 | $19,306,183$ $8,856,505$ | 8.4 0.3 |
| North Dakota | 430 | 6,635,867 | 0.1 |
| Ohio | 144,955 | 11,478,006 | 1.3 |
| Oklahoma | 5,050 | 3,579,212 | 0.1 |
| Oregon | 31,850 | 3,700,758 | 0.9 |
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TABLE 1: Jewish Population in the United States, 2007 (Continued)

|  | Estimated Jewish | Total | Estimated Jewish <br> Popalation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Population | Total |  |


| Pennsylvania | 284,850 | $12,440,621$ | 2.3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Rhode Island | 18,750 | $1,067,610$ | 1.8 |
| South Carolina | 11,335 | $4,321,249$ | 0.3 |
| South Dakota | 295 | 781,919 | 0.0 |
| Tennessee | 19,300 | $6,038,803$ | 0.3 |
| Texas | 130,170 | $23,507,783$ | 0.6 |
| Utah | 4,400 | $2,550,063$ | 0.2 |
| Vermont | 5,510 | 623,908 | 0.9 |
| Virginia | 98,040 | $7,642,884$ | 1.3 |
| Washington | 43,135 | $6,395,798$ | 0.7 |
| West Virginia | 2,335 | $1,818,470$ | 0.1 |
| Wisconsin | 28,330 | $5,556,506$ | 0.5 |
| Wyoming | 430 | 515,004 | 0.1 |
| TOTAL | $6,443,805$ | $299,398,484$ | 2.2 |

*July 1, 2006 http://factfinder.census.gov

TABLE 2: Distribution of U.S. Jewish Population by Regions, 2007

|  | Total <br> Population | Percent <br> Distribution | Jewish <br> Population | Percent <br> Distribution |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast | $54,741,353$ | $18.3 \%$ | $2,801,075$ | 43.5 |
| Middle Atlantic | $40,471,364$ | $13.5 \%$ | $2,381,770$ | 37.0 |
| New England | $14,269,989$ | $4.8 \%$ | 419,305 | 6.5 |
| Midwest | $66,217,736$ | $22.1 \%$ | 694,285 | 10.8 |
| East North Central | $46,275,645$ | $15.5 \%$ | 556,495 | 8.6 |
| West North Central | $19,942,091$ | $6.7 \%$ | 137,790 | 2.1 |
| South | $109,083,752$ | $36.4 \%$ | $1,387,405$ | 21.5 |
| East South Central | $17,754,447$ | $5.9 \%$ | 41,250 | 0.6 |
| South Atlantic | $57,143,670$ | $19.1 \%$ | $1,199,285$ | 18.6 |
| West South Central | $34,185,635$ | $11.4 \%$ | 146,870 | 2.2 |
| West | $69,355,643$ | $23.2 \%$ | $1,561,040$ | 24.2 |
| Mountain | $20,845,987$ | $7.0 \%$ | 281,450 | 4.4 |
| Pacific | $48,509,656$ | $16.2 \%$ | $1,279,590$ | 19.9 |
| TOTAL | $299,398,484$ | $100.0 \%$ | $6,443,805$ | 100.0 |

TABLE 3: Communities with Jewish Population of 100 or More, 2007

|  | Date of <br> Informant <br> Confirmation <br> or Latest Study |  | Geographic Area* |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

*Estimates for communities with boldface type are from a scientific study in the year shown. ${ }^{* *}$ Part-year population shown only for where such information is available.

Malibu-Palisades (1997)Santa Monica-Venice (1997)Airport Marina (1997)Fairfax (1997)Beverly Hills (1997)27,190
23,140
22,140
54,850
Cheviot-Beverlywood (1997)20,500
29,310Westwood (1997)
20,670Central City (1997)
4,710Hollywood (1997)
10,390Culver City (1997)
9,110Central Valley (1997)
27,740Burbank-Glendale (1997)
Encino-Tarzana (1997) ..... 19,840
Southeast Valley (1997) ..... 50,290
28,150Simi-Conejo (1997)
38,470High Desert (1997)
10,920
North Valley (1997)
Nort Valley (1997) ..... 36,760
West Valley (1997) ..... 40,160
Beach Cities (1997) ..... 17,270
Central (1997) ..... 11,600
Palos Verdes Peninsula (1997) ..... 6,780
San Pedro (1997) ..... 5,310
Eastern Belt (1997) ..... 3,900
Los Angeles-Pasadena-Santa Monica (1997) ..... 519,200
Mendocino County (Redwood Valley-Ukiah) ..... 600
Merced County ..... 190
Modesto ..... 500
Monterey Peninsula ..... 2,300
Murrieta Hot Springs ..... 550
Napa County ..... 1,000
Orange County (most of Orange County-excluding parts
included in Long Beach) ..... 60,000

| State' | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | Geographic Area* | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998-2002 | Palm Springs (1998) | 4,400 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1998-2002 \\ & 1998-2002 \end{aligned}$ | Cathedral City-Rancho Mirage (1998) | 3,100 |  |  |
|  | 1998-2002 | Palm Desert-Sun City (1998) | 2,500 |  |  |
|  | 1998-2002 | East Valley (Bermuda-Dunes-Indian Wells-Indio- | 1,300 |  |  |
|  |  | La Quinta) (1998) . | 1,300 |  |  |
|  | 1998-2002 | North Valley (Desert Hot Springs-North Palm SpringsThousand Palms) (1998) | 700 |  |  |
|  | 1998-2002 | Palm Springs Total (1998) |  | 12,000 | 5,000 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Redding (Shasta County) | 150 2000 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Riverside-Corona-Moreno Valley | 2,000 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Sacramento (El Dorado, Placer, Sacremento and Yolo Counties) | 21,300 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Salinas | 1,000 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | San Bernardino-Fontana area | 3,000 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | North County Coastal (2003) | 24,000 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | North County Inland (2003) | 18,100 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | Greater East San Diego (2003) | 18,900 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | La Jolla-Mid-Coastal (2003) | 14,400 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | Central San Diego (2003) | 12,200 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | South County (2003) | 1,400 |  |  |
|  | 2003 | San Diego (San Diego County) Total (2003) |  | 89,000 |  |
|  | 2006 | Alameda County (Oakland) (1986) | 40,000 |  |  |
|  | 2006 | Contra Costa County (1986) | 60,000 | 100,000 |  |
|  | 2006 | East Bay Total (1986) |  | 100,000 |  |
|  | 2007 | Marin County (2004) | $\begin{aligned} & 26,100 \\ & 40,300 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | 2007 | North Peninsula (2004) San Francisco County (2004) | 65,800 |  |  |




| 2000. | Hartford County Total (including northern Middlesex Coun western Tolland County, eastern Litchfield County, northern New Haven County) (2000) <br> Other Places in Litchfield County <br> Litchfield County Total (excluding towns in adjacent Hartford County) | 50. | 32,800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1997-200I | Lower Middlesex County (Branford-Clinton-Durham-Guilford-Killingworth-Madison Old Saybrook-Old Lyme-Westbrook) Middlesex County Total (excluding towns in adjacent, Hartford County) | I.,600 | 630 |
| 1987 | New Haven (Ansonia-Bethany-Branford-Derby-East Haven- <br> Guilford-Hamden <br> Madison-Meriden-Milford-North Haven-Orange- <br> Quinnipiac-Seymour-Wallingford <br> West Haven-Woodbridge) (1987) | 24,300 | 1,600 |
| 1997-2001 | Waterbury-Cheshire (Bethlehem-Litchfield-Middlebury-Morris-Naugatuck-Oakville-Oxford-Plymouth-Prospect-Roxbury-Southbury-Southbury-Southington-Thomaston-Torrington-Washington-Waterbury-Watertown-Wolcott-Woodbury-and other parts of Litchfield County and northern New Haven County New Haven County Total (excluding towns in adjacent Hartford County) | 4500 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { pre-1997 } \\ & \text { 1997-2001 } \end{aligned}$ | Colchester-Lebanon; Hebron (adjacent Tolland County) New London-Norwich (central and southern New London County and parts of Middlesex and Windham Counties) New London County Total (including adjacent Tolland County) | 300 3,850 | 28,800 |
| 2006 | Storrs-Columbia <br> Other Places in Tolland County <br> Tolland County Total (excluding towns in adjacent Hartford and New London Counties) | $\begin{aligned} & 400 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | 4,150 500 |

Lower Middlesex County (Branford-Clinton-Durham-
Litchfield County Total (excluding towns in adjacent ..... $630^{\circ}$Guilford-Killingworth-MadisonL., 600Middlesex County Total (excluding towns in adjacentHartford County)
Guilford-Hamden ..... 24,300Quinnipiac-Seymour-WallingfordWest Haven-Woodbridge) (1987)
northern New Haven County) (2000)1,600Morris-Naugatuck-Oakville-Oxford-Plymouth-Prospect-Roxbury-Southbury-Southbury-Southington-Thomaston-Woodbury-and other parts of Litchfield County and45003003,850
Tolland County)4,150

Jacksonville Core Area (2002)


|  | Date of <br> Informant <br> Confirmation <br> or Latest Study | Geographic Area* |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | Geographic Area* | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish <br> Population** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hawall | 1997-2001 | Augusta (Burke, Columbia, and Richmond Counties) | 1,300 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Brunswick | 120 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Columbus | 750 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Dalton | 125 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Macon | 1,000 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Savannah (Chatham County) | 3,000 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Valdosta | 100 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other Placess | 250 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Georgia | 127,245 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Hilo | 280 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Oahu (Honolulu) | 6,400 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Kauai | 100 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Maui | 210 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Hawaii | 6,990 |  |  |
| IDAHO |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Boise (Ada and Boise Counties) Ketchum | 100 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Moscow-Lewistón | 100 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other Places | 100 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Idaho | 1,100 |  |  |
| tulinois |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Aurora area | 750 |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Bloomington-Normal | 500 |  |  |
|  | 2007 | Champaign-Urbana (Champaign County) | 1,400 |  |  |
|  | 2000 | Chicago (Cook and DuPage Counties and parts of Lake County) (2000) | 270,500 |  |  |


|  | 1997-2001 | Decatur (Macon County) | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-2001 | DeKalb | 180 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Elgin (northern Kane County and southern |  |
|  |  | McHenry County) | 500 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Joliet (Will County) | 210 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Kankakee | 100 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Peoria | 800 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Quad Cities-Illinois portion (Moline-Rock Island) | 400 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Quad Cities-Iowa portion (Davenport) (Scott County) | 500 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Quad Cities Total |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Quincy | 100 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Rockford-Freeport (Boone, Winnebago, and |  |
|  |  | Stephenson Counties) | 1,100 |
|  | 1997-200I | Southern Illinois (Carbondale-East St. Louis) |  |
|  |  | (all of Illinois south of Carlinville) | 500 |
|  | 2007 | Springfield (Morgan and Sangamon Counties) | 800 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Waukegan | 300 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other Places | 250 |
|  |  | Total Illinois | 278,520 |
| INDIANA |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Bloomington | 1,000 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Evansville | 400 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Fort Wayne | 900 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Gary-Northwest Indiana (Lake and Porter Counties) | 2,000 |
|  | 2006 | Indianapolis | 10,000 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Lafayette | 550 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Michigan City (La Porte County) | 300 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Muncie | 120 |
|  | 1997-2001 | South Bend-Elkhart (St. Joseph and Elkhart Counties) | 1,850 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Terre Haute (Vigo County) | 100 |
|  | 1997-2001. | Other Places | 200 |
|  |  | Total Indiana | 177,420 |


| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | Geographic Area* | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population** | - - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10WA |  |  |  |  |  | $>$ |
|  |  |  | 420 |  |  | 3 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Cedar Rapids | $150$ |  |  | (1) |
|  | 1997-2001 | Council Bluffs | 2,800 |  |  | * |
|  | 1997-2001 | Des Moines-Ames | 2,800 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Iowa City (Johnson County) | 1,300 150 |  |  | 2 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Postville | 400 |  |  | - |
|  | 1997-2001 | Quad Cities-Illinois portion (Moline-Rock Island) | 500 |  |  | H |
|  | 1997-2001 | Quad Cities-Iowa portion (Davenport) (Scott County) | 400 |  |  | $\underline{\square}$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Sioux City (Plymouth and Woodbury Counties) | 170 |  |  | $\cdots$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Waterloo (Black Hawk County) | 250 |  |  | د |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other Places | 6,140 |  |  | < |
|  |  | al lowa |  |  |  | > |
| KANSAS |  | Kansas City area-Kansas portion (1985) (Johnson and |  | 16,000 |  | 2 |
|  | 2006 | Wyandotte Counties) | 16,000 |  |  | - |
|  | 2006 | Kansas City area-Missouri portion (1985) | 4,000 |  |  | 0 |
|  |  | Kansas City Total |  |  |  | $\pi$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Lawrence |  |  |  | 1000 |
|  | pre-1997 | Manhattan |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Topeka (Shawnee County) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Wichita (Sedgwick County and Salina-Dodge City- | 1,100 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Great Bend-Liberal-Russell-Hays) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other Places |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Kansas | 18,225 |  |  |  |
| KENTUCKY |  |  | 500 |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Covington-Newport area |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Lexington (Bourbon, Clark, Fayette, Jessamine, Madison, | 2,000 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pulaski, Scott, and Woodford Counties) | 8,700 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1997-2001 \\ & 1997-2001 \end{aligned}$ | Louisville (Jefferson County) | 150 |  |  |  |




| 2002 | Attleboro area (2002) | 800 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2005 | Brighton-Brookline-Newton and Contiguous Areas (2005) | 61,500 |
| 2005 | Central Boston-Cambridge and Contiguous Areas (2005) | 43,400 |
| 2005 | Greater Framingham (2005) | 18,700 |
| 2005 | Northwestern Suburbs (2005) | 24,600 |
| 2005 | Greater Sharon (2005) | 21.000 |
| 2005 | Other Towns (2005) | 41,300 |
| 2005 | Boston Region Total (2005) |  |
| $1997-2001$ | Cape Cod-Barnstable County | 3,250 |
| $1997-2001$ | Fall River area | 1,100 |
| $1997-2001$ | Greenfield (Franklin County) | 1,100 |
| $1997-2001$ | Haverhill | 800 |
| $1997-2001$ | Holyoke | 600 |
| $1997-2001$ | Lowell area | 2,000 |
| $1997-2001$ | Martha's Vineyard (Dukes County) | 300 |
| $1997-2001$ | New Bedford (Dartmouth-Fairhaven-Maftapoisett) | 2,600 |
| $1997-2001$ | Newburyport | 280 |
| $1997-2001$ | North Adams (northern Berkshire County) | 400 |
| $1997-2001$ | North Worcester County (Fitchburg-Gardener-Leominster) | 1,500 |
| $1997-2001$ | Northampton | 1,200 |
| $1997-2001$ | Pittsfield (Central and Southern Berkshire County) | 4,000 |
| $1997-2001$ | Plymouth area | 1,000 |
| $1997-2001$ | South Worcester County (Southbridge-Webster) | 500 |
| $1997-2001$ | Springfield (Agawam-East Longmeadow-Hampden- |  |
|  | Longmeadow-West Springfiled Wilbraham) | 10,000 |
| $1997-2001$ | Taunton area | 1,000 |
| $1997-2001$ | Worcester (central Worcester County) (1986) | 11,000 |
| $1997-2001$ | Other places | 150 |
|  | Total Massachusetts | 258,230 |
|  |  | 7,000 |
|  |  | 150 |
|  |  |  |
| $1997-2001$ | Ann Arbor (Washtenaw County) |  |
| 2006 | Bay City |  |









Brooklyn Subtotal (2002)
456,000
Gramercy Park-Murray Hill (2002)
32,500



|  | Date of <br> Informant <br> Confirmation <br> or Latest Study |  | Geographic Area* | Part-Year <br> Jewish |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| State |  |  |  |  |


Wooster
Youngstown-Warren (Mahoning, and Trumbull Counties) (2002)
Zanesville (Muskingum County) Other Places
Total Ohio

 Corvallis Eugene
Medford-Ashland-Grants Pass (Jackson and Josephine Counties)
Portland
Salem (Marion and Polk Counties) Other places Total Oregon Altoona (Blair County) Harrisburg Total (1994)
Beaver Falls (northern Beaver County)
$1997-2001$
$1997-2001$


Jewish
Population
-

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Part-Year } \\
\text { Jewish } \\
\text { Population** }
\end{gathered}
$$





| 2006 | East and Northeast Dallas-West Garland (1988) | 5,700 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | Plano-Carrollton (1988) | 6,900 |  |
| 2006 | Other areas of Dallas (1988) | 10,200 |  |
| 2006 | Dallas (1988) |  | 45,000 |
| 1997-2001 | El Paso | 5,000 |  |
| 1997-2001 | Fort Worth (Tarrant County) | 5,000 |  |
| 1997-2001 | Galveston | 400 |  |
| 2007 | Braeswood (1986) | 16,000 |  |
| 2007 | Bellaire-Southwest (1986) | 5,100 |  |
| 2007 | West Memorial (1986) | 5,000 |  |
| 2007 | Memorial Villages (1986) | 2,500 |  |
| 2007 | Rice-West University (1986) | 3,300 |  |
| 2007 | University Park-South Main (1986) | 450 |  |
| 2007 | Near Northwest (1986) | 2,700 |  |
| 2007 | Northwest-Cypress Creek (1986) | 3,000 |  |
| 2007 | Addicks-West Houston (1986) | 2,100 |  |
| 2007 | Clear Lake (1986) | 1,350 |  |
| 2007 | Other areas of Harris County (1986) | 3,500 |  |
| 2007 | Houston (Harris, Montgomery, Fort Bend Counties and parts of Brazoria and Galveston Counties) Total (1986) |  | 45,000 |
| 1997-2001 | Laredo | 130 |  |
| 1997-2001 | Longview | 100 |  |
| 1997-2001 | Lubbock (Lubbock County) | 230 |  |
| 1997-2001 | McAllen (Hidalgo and Starr Counties) | 500 |  |
| 1997-2001 | Midland-Odessa | 200 |  |
| 1997-2001 | Port Arthur | 100 |  |
| 2007 | Inside Loop 410 (2007) | 2,000 |  |
| 2007 | Between the Loops (2007) | 5,600 |  |
| 2007 | Outside Loop 1604 (2007) | 1,600 |  |
| 2007 | San Antonio Sorrounding Counties (Atascosa, Bandera, Comal, Guadalupe, Kendall, Medina, and Wilson |  |  |
|  | Counties) (2007) | 1,000 |  |
| 2007 | San Antonio Total (2007) |  | 10,200 |


| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | Geographic Area* | Jewish <br> Population | Regional Totals | $\begin{gathered} \text { Part-Year } \\ \text { Jewish } \\ \text { Population** } \end{gathered}$ | 8 8 - 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-2001 | Tyler | 400 |  |  | \% |
|  | 1997-2001 | Waco (Bell, Coryell, Falls, Hamilton, Hill, and McLennan Counties) | 300 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Wichita Falls | 260 |  |  | z |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other places | 600 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | Total Texas | 130,170 |  |  | m |
| UTAH |  |  |  |  |  | - |
|  | 1997-2001 | Ogden | 150 |  |  | $\cdots$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Salt Lake City (Salt Lake County), | 4,200 |  |  | 山 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other places | 50 |  |  | $\cdots$ |
|  |  | Total Utah | 4,400 |  |  | $\geq$ |
| Vermont |  |  |  |  |  | $\pi$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Bennington area | 500 |  |  | 0 |
|  | pre-1997 | Brattleboro | 350 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Burlington | 2,500 |  |  | $\pi$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Manchester area | 325 |  |  | " |
|  | 1997-2001 | Montpelier-Barre | 550 |  |  | N |
|  | 1997-2001 | Rutland | 625 |  |  | - |
|  | 1997-2001 | St. Johnsbury-Newport (Caledonia and Orleans County) | 140 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Stowe | 150 |  |  |  |
|  | pre-1997 | Woodstočk | 270 |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other places | 100 5.510 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Vermont | 5,510 |  |  |  |
| Virginia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Blacksburg-Radford | $175$ |  |  |  |
|  | 1997-2001 | Charlottesville | 1,500 |  |  |  |


|  | 1997-2001 | Danville area | 100 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-2001 | Fredericksburg (parts of Spotsylvania, Stafford, King Geo and Orange Counties) | 500 |  | ¢ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Lynchburg area | 275 |  | $\Sigma$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Martinsville | 100 |  | $\cdots$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Newport News-Hampton-Williamsburg-James City- |  |  | $=$ |
|  |  | York County, and Poquoson City | 2,400 |  | 5 |
|  | '2007 | Norfolk (2001) | 3,550 |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | 2007 | Virginia Beach (2001) | 6,000 |  | E |
|  | 2007 | Chesepeake-Portsmouth-Suffolk (2001) | 1,400 |  | 3 |
|  | 2007 | Norfolk-Virginia Beach Total (2001) |  | $10,950^{*}$ | $\xrightarrow{7}$ |
|  | 2003 | Arlington-Alexandria-Falls Church (2003) | 28,000 |  | z |
|  | 2003 | South Fairfax-Prince William County (2003) | 25,000 |  | 2 |
|  | 2003 | West Fairfax-Loudoun County (2003) | 14,500 |  | z |
|  | 2003 | Greater Washington Total in Northern Virginia (2003), |  | 67,500 | -1 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Petersburg-Colonial Heights | 350 |  | Z |
|  | 2006 | Central (1994) | 2,200 |  | T |
|  | 2006 | West End (1994) | 2,400 |  | $\stackrel{C}{2}$ |
|  | 2006 | Far West End (1994) | 4,800 |  | $\xrightarrow{-1}$ |
|  | 2006 | Northeast (1994) | 1,200 |  | 年 |
|  | 2006 | Southside (1994) | 1,900 |  | 0 |
|  | 2006 | Richmond (Henrico and Chesterfield Counties) Total (1994) |  | 12,500 | $\stackrel{\sim}{4}$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Roanoke | 900 |  | $>$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Staunton-Lexington (Augusta, Bath, Highland, Page, |  |  | -1 |
|  |  | Rockingham, and Shenandoah Counties) | 370 |  | $\sim$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Winchester (Clarke, Frederick, Warren, and Winchester Counties) | 270 |  | N |
|  | 1997-2001 | Other places | 150 |  | C |
|  |  | Total Virginia | 98,040 |  | - |
| WASHINGTTON |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |
|  | 1997-2001 | Bellingham | 525 |  | 5 |
|  | 1997-2001 | Kennewick-Pasco-Richland | 300 |  | us |


|  | Date of <br> Informant <br> Confirmation <br> or Latest Study |  | Part-Year <br> Jewish |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| State |  |  |  |



TABLE 4: Comparison of Informant Estimates to Scientific Study
Estimates

| Community | Year of Study | Informant <br> Estimate of Number of Jews in AJYB Prior to Study | Number of Jews <br> Found by Scientific Study | Over or <br> (Under) <br> Estimate by <br> Informant | Percentage Over or (Under) Estimate by Informant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlanta | 1996 | 70,000 | 76,800 | $(6,800)$ | -8.9 |
| Atlanta | 2006 | 85,900 | 119,800 | $(33,900)$ | -28.3 |
| Atlantic County | 1984 | 12,000 | 14,700 | $(2,700)$ | -18.4 |
| Atlantic County | 2004 | 15,800 | 20,226 | $(4,426)$ | -21.9 |
| Baltimore | 1985 | 92,000 | 87,000 | 5,000 | 5.7 |
| Baltimore | 1999 | 94,500 | 91,400 | 3,100 | 3.4 |
| Bergen | 2001 | 83,700 | 83,700 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Boston | 1995 | 228,000 | 233,000 | $(5,000)$ | -2.1 |
| Boston | 2005 | 227,300 | 210,500 | 16,800 | 8.0 |
| Broward | 1997 | 237,000 | 219,600 | 17,400 | $\begin{array}{r}7.9 \\ \hline 8.6\end{array}$ |
| Buffalo | 1995 | 17,000 | 26,400 | $(9,400)$ | -35.6 |
| Charlotte | 1997 | 6,000 | 7,800 | $(1,800)$ | -23.1 |
| Chicago | 1990 | 248,000 | 261,000 | $(13,000)$ | -5.0 |
| Chicago | 2000 | 261,000 | 270,500 | $(9,500)$ | 3.5 |
| Cleveland | 1987 | 70,000 | 80,500 | $(10,500)$ | -13.0 |
| Cleveland | 1996 | 65,000 | 81,500 | $(16,500)$ | -20.2 |
| Columbus | 1990 | 15,000 | 15,600 | (600) | -3.8 |
| Columbus | 2001 | 15,600 | 22,000 | $(6,400)$ | -29.1 |
| Delaware | 1995 | 10,150 | 15,100 | $(4,950)$ | -32.8 |
| Denver | 1981 | 30,000 | 38,600 | $(8,600)$ | -22.3 |
| Denver | 1997 | 46,000 | 63,300 | $(17,300)$ | -27.3 |
| Denver | 2007 | 72,400 | 81,500 | $(9,100)$ | -11.2 |
| Detroit | 1989 | 70,000 | 96,000 | $(26,000)$ | -27.1 |
| Detroit | 2005 | 94,000 | 72,000 | 22,000 | . 6 |
| Harrisburg | 1994 | 6,500 | 7,100 | (600) | 8.5 |
| Hartford | 1981 | 23,500 | 25,111 | $(1,611)$ | -6.4 |
| Hartford | 2000 | 25,200 | 32,800 | $(7,600)$ | -23.2 |
| Howard County | 1999 | 10,000 | 16,000 | $(6,000)$ | -37.5 |
| Jacksonville | 2002 | 7,300 | 12,900 | $(5,600)$ | -43.4 |
| Las Vegas | 1995 | 20,000 | 55,600 | $(35,600)$ | -64.0 |
| Las Vegas | 2005 | 75,000 | 67,500 | 7,500 | 11.1 |
| Los Angeles | 1979 | 455,000 | 503,000 | $(48,000)$ | -9.5 |
| Los Angeles | 1997 | 490,000 | 519,200 | $(29,200)$ | -5.6 |
| Martin-St. Lucit | 1999 | 3,000 | 6,650 | $(3,650)$ | -54.9 |
| Miami | 1994 | 145,000 | 153,600 | $(8,600)$ | . 6 |
| Miami | 2004 | 118,000 | 113,300 | 4,700 | 4.1 |
| Milwaukee | 1983 | 23,900 | 30,000 | $(6,100)$ | -20.3 |
| Milwaukee | 1996 | 28,000 | 21,100 | 6,900 | 32.7 |
| Minneapolis | 2004 | 31,500 | 29,300 | 2,200 | 7.5 |


| Community | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Study } \end{aligned}$ | Informant <br> Estimate of <br> Number of Jews in AJYB Prior to Study | Number of Jews Found by Scientific Study | Over or <br> (Under) <br> Estimate by Informant | Percentage Over or (Under) Estimate by Informant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monmouth | 1997 | 33,600 | 65,700 | $(32,100)$ | -48.9 |
| New York | 1991 | 1,671,000 | 1,420,000 | 251,000 | 17.7 |
| New York | 2002 | 1,450,000 | 1,412,000 | 38,000 | 2.7 |
| Orlando | 1993 | 18,000 | 19,200 | $(1,200)$ | -6.3 |
| Palm Springs | 1998 | 9,850 | 13,850 | $(4,000)$ | -28.9 |
| Philadelphia | 1984 | 295,000 | 252,364 | 42,636 | 16.9 |
| Philadelphia | 1997 | 250,000 | 206,100 | 43,900 | 21.3 |
| Phoenix | 1983 | 30,000 | 45,000 | $(15,000)$ | -33.3 |
| Phoenix | 2002 | 60,000 | 82,900 | $(22,900)$ | -27.6 |
| Pittsburgh | 2002 | 40,000 | 42,200 | $(2,200)$ | -5.2 |
| Rhode Island | 1987 | 17,500 | 16,000 | 1,500 | 9.4 |
| Rhode Island | 2002 | 16,000 | 18,750 | $(2,750)$ | -14.7 |
| Richmond | 1994 | 8,000 | 12,150 | $(4,150)$ | -34.2 |
| Rochester | 1986 | 19,600 | 25,800 | $(6,200)$ | -24.0 |
| Rochester | 1999 | 22,500 | 21,000 | 1,500 | 7.1 |
| San Antonio | 2007 | 11,000 | 10,200 | 800 | 7.8 |
| San Diego | 2003 | 70,000 | 89,000 | $(19,000)$ | -21.3 |
| San Francisco | 1986 | 80,000 | 119,000 | $(39,000)$ | -32.8 |
| San Francisco | 2004 | 122,500 | 208,600 | $(86,100)$ | -41.3 |
| Sarasota | 1992 | 10,000 | 12,200 | $(2,200)$ | -18.0 |
| Sarasota | 2001 | 17,500 | 15,500 | 2,000 | 12.9 |
| Seattle | 1990 | 19,500 | 29,300 | $(9,800)$ | -33.4 |
| Seatte | 2000 | 29,300 | 37,200 | $(7,900)$ | -21.2 |
| South Palm Beach | 1995 | 83,500 | 110,800 | $(27,300)$ | -24.6 |
| South Palm Beach | 2005 | 93,000 | 107,600 | $(14,600)$ | -13.6 |
| Southern Maine | 2007 | 6,000 | 8,350 | $(2,350)$ | -28.1 |
| St. Louis | 1995 | 53,500 | 54,000 | (500) | -0.9 |
| St. Paul | 2004 | 9,200 | 10,940 | $(1,740)$ | -15.9 |
| St. Petersburg | 1994 | 9,500 | 25,700 | $(16,200)$ | -63.0 |
| Tidewater | 1988 | 15,000 | 18,850 | $(3,850)$ | -20.4 |
| Tidewater | 2001 | 11,000 | 10,950 | 50 | 0.5 |
| Tucson | 2002 | 20,000 | 22,400 | $(2,400)$ | -10.7 |
| Washington (D.C.) | 1983 | 160,000 | 157,334 | 2,666 | 1.7 |
| Washington (D.C.) | 2003 | 165,100 | 215,600 | $(50,500)$ | -23.4 |
| West Palm Beach | 1987 | 50,000 | 60,400 | $(10,400)$ | -17.2 |
| West Palm Beach | 1999 | 67,000 | 73,900 | $(6,900)$ | -9.3 |
| West Palm Beach | 2005 | 74,000 | 101,400 | $(27,400)$ | -27.0 |
| Westport | 2000 | 9,100 | 11,450 | $(2,350)$ | -20.5 |
| York | 1999 | 1,500 | 1,800 | (300) | -16.7 |
| Total |  | 8,756,500 | 9,047,175 | $(290,675)$ | -3.2 |
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TABLE 5: Length of Residence in the Local Metropolitan Arefa
Community Comparisons, Percentages

| Community | Base: Respondents |  | Years in Residence |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-19 | $20+$ |
| Martin-St. Lucię | 1999 | 32 | 28 | 29 | 11 |
| Orlando | 1993 | 32 | 20 | 30 | 18 |
| Charlotte | 1997 | 31 | 21 | 20 | 29 |
| Las Vegas | 2005 | 29 | 21 | 30 | 21 |
| Denver | 1997 | 23 | 14 | 19 | 44 |
| West Palm Beach | 2005 | 21 | 23 | 33 | 23 |
| Seattle | 2000 | 21 | 16 | 22 | 40 |
| Harrisburg | 1994 | 21 | 11 | 19 | 50 |
| Phoenix | 2002 | 19 | 23 | 19 | 39 |
| St. Petersburg | 1994 | 19 | 20 | 35 | 26 |
| South Palm Beach | 2005 | 19 | 19 | 39 | 23 |
| San Diego | 2003 | 19 | 13 | 24 | 45 |
| Sarasota | 2001 | 18 | 24 | 33 | 26 |
| Tucson | 2002 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 1 |
| Westport | 2000 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 44 |
| Washington | 2003 | 17 | 11 | 20 | 54 |
| Wilmington | 1995 | 17 | 11 | 14 | 8 |
| Broward | 1997 | 16 | 17 | 37 | 31 |
| Atlanta | 2006 | 15 | 16 | 23 | 46 51 |
| Richmond | 1994 | 15 | 13 | 21 | 51 |
| Jack sonville | 2002 | 14 | 9 | 24 | 53 |
| San Antonio | 2007 | 13 | 15 | 18 | 62 |
| Monmouth | 1997 | 13 | 15 | 26 | 46 |
| Bergen | 2001 | 13 | 12 | 20 | 56 |
| St. Paul | 2004 | 13 | 6 | 21 | 60 |
| Atlantic County | 2004 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 50 |
| Miami | 2004 | 12 | 9 | 17 | 62 |
| York | 1999 | 11 | 17 | 25 | 47 |
| Tidewater | 2001 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 59 |
| Milwaukee | 1996 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 68 |
| Rhode Island | 2002 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 69 |
| Hartford | 2000 | \% | 7 | 16 | 69 |
| Pittsburgh | 2002 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 73 |
| Minneapolis | 2004 | , | 5 | 18 | 68 |
| Philadelphia | 1997 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 75 |
| St. Louis | 1995 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 73 |
| Los Angeles | 1997 | 7 | 8 | 20 | 65 |
| Baltimore | 1999 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 74 |
| Rochester | 1999 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 70 |
| Detroit | 2005 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 88 |
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table 6: Continued

|  | Base: Jewish Respondents |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Community | Yeat | Orthodox | Conservative | Reconstruc- <br> tionist | Reform | Just <br> Jewish |
| Detroit $^{3}$ | 2005 | 11 | 28 | 3 | 36 | 18 |
| Pittsburgh | 2002 | 7 | 32 | 2 | 41 | 18 |
| St. Louis | 1995 | 3 | 21 | 1 | 60 | 15 |
| Baltimore | 1999 | 17 | 33 | NA | 36 | 14 |
| Palm Springs ${ }^{4}$ | 1998 | 6 | 31 | NA | 42 | 14 |
| Cleveland | 1996 | 10 | 29 | 1 | 49 | 1.1 |

${ }^{1} 10 \%$ of respondents reported that they identify as Traditional.
${ }^{2} 5 \%$ of respondents reported that they identify as Traditional.
${ }^{3} 3 \%$ of respondents reported that they identify as Jewish Humanist and $1 \%$, Jewish Renewal.
${ }^{4} 7 \%$ of respondents reported that they identify as Traditional.

TABLE 7: Intermarriage Community Comparisons
$\left.\begin{array}{lccccc}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { Individual } \\ \text { Rate: }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Couples Rate: } \\ \text { Percentage of } \\ \text { Married }\end{array} \\ \text { Couples Who Are: }\end{array}\right]$

TABLE 7: Continued'

| Community | Year | Individual Rate: <br> Percentage of Married Jews <br> Who Are Married to Non-Jews | Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Intermarried | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \mathrm{In}-\mathrm{m} \\ & 2 \text { Born/ } \\ & \text { Raised } \\ & \text { Jews } \end{aligned}$ | rried <br> Conversionary |
| Denver | 1997 | 26 | 39 | 48 | 14 |
| St. Paul | 2004 | 25 | 39 | 49 | 12 |
| San Antonio | 2007 | 23 | 37 | 50 | 13 |
| Pittsburgh | 2002 | 24 | 36 | 51 | 13 |
| Richmond | 1994 | 21 | 34 | 56 | 10 |
| Rhode Island | 2002 | 21 | 34 | 59 | 7 |
| Harrisburg | 1994 | 20 | 33 | 56 | 1) |
| Minneapolis | 2004 | 20 | 33 | 59 | 8 |
| Wilmington | 1995 | 19 | 33 | 60 | 7 |
| Westport | 2000 | 20 | 33 | 61 | 6 |
| Orlando | 1993 | 19 | 32 | 59 | 9 |
| Rochester | 1999 | 17 | 30 | 62 | 8 |
| Chicago | . 2000 | 18 | 30 |  |  |
| St. Petersburg | 1994 | 17 | 29 | ¢ 8 | i'4. |
| Milwaukee | 1996 | 16 | 28 | 68 | 4 |
| Martin-St. Lucie | 1999 | 15 | 27 | 62 | 12 |
| Atlantic County | 2004 | 15 | 26 | 68 | 6 |
| Buffalo | 1995 | 15 | 26 | 71 | 3 |
| St. Louis | 1995 | 15 | 25 | 64 | 11 |
| Hartford | 2000 | 13 | 23 | 69 | 8 |
| Los Angeles | 1997 | 13 | 23 | 71 | 6 |
| Cleveland | 1996 | 13 | 23 | 74 | 3 |
| New York | 2002 | 13 | 22 | 72 | 7 |
| Philadelphia | 1997 | 13 | 22 | 73 | 5 |
| Sarasota | 2001 | 11 | 20 | 76 | 4 |
| Palm Springs | 1998 | 10 | 19 |  |  |
| Broward | 1997 | 10 | 18 | 78 | 4 |
| Baltimore | 1999 | 10 | 17 | 75 | 8 |
| Bergen | 2001 | 10 | 17 | 78 | 5 |
| Monmouth | 1997 | 9 | 17 | 81 | 3 |
| Miami | 2004 | 9 | 16 | 75 | 9 |
| Detroit | 2005 | 9 | 16 | 76 | 8 |
| West Palm Beach | 2005 | 9 | 16 | 79 | 5 |
| South Palm Beach | 2005 | S | 9. | 88 | 3 |

Table 8: Children Being Raised Jewish in Intermarried Households Community Comparisons

| Community | Base: Children Age 0-17 in Intermarried Households |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Percentage |
| South Palm Beach | 2005 | 75 |
| Sarasota | 2001 | 74 |
| Cleveland | 1996 | 66 |
| St. Louis | 1995 | 65 |
| Baltimore | 1999 | 62 |
| Boston | 2005 | 60 |
| Atlantic County | 2004 | 60 |
| Hartford | 2000 | 59 |
| Bergen | 2001 | 59 |
| Harrisburg | 1994 | 57 |
| Westport | 2000 | 56 |
| Essex-Morris | 1998 | 50 |
| Jacksonville | 2002 | 49 |
| Howard County | 1999 | 48 |
| Philadelphia | 1997 | 47 |
| Tucson | 2002 | 45 |
| Washington | 2003 | 45 |
| Tidewater | 2001 | 45 |
| Broward | 1997 | 43 |
| York | 1999 | 43 |
| Los Angeles | 1997 | 43 |
| Miami | 2004 | 42 |
| Denver | 1997 | 42 |
| Las Vegas | 2005 | 42 |
| Columbus | 2001 | 40 |
| San Antonio | 2007 | 39 |
| Atlanta | 2006 | 39 |
| Orlando | 1993 | 39 |
| San Francisco | 2004 | 38 |
| Chicago | 2000 | 38 |
| St. Paul | 2004 | 37 |
| Pittsburgh | 2002 | 36 |
| Milwaukee | 1996 | 36 |
| Wilmington | 1995 | 36 |
| Richmond | 1994 | 36 |
| Rhode Island | 2002 | 35 |
| West Palm Beach | 2005 | 34 |
| Charlotte | 1997 | 34 |
| Rochester | 1999 | 32 |
| Monmouth | 1997 | 31 |
| Detroit | 2005 | 31 |
| Minneapolis | 2004 | 30 |
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Table 8: Continued

New York
St. Petersburg
Phoenix
Seattle
San Diego
Palm Springs
Martin-St. Lucie

200230
$1994 \quad 29$
$2002 \quad 26$
2000
23
2003
21
$1998 \quad 19$
1999
18


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Leonard Saxe, Elizabeth Tighe, Benjamin Phillips, and Charles Kadushin, Reconsidering the Size and Characteristics of the American Jewish Population: New Estimates of a Larger and More Diverse Community (Waltham, Mass., 2007), p. 5.
    ${ }^{2}$ Compare http://www.Jewishdatabank.orgNJPS1971.asp, http://www.Jewishdata-bank.org/Archive/NJPS1990-Study_Highlights_Part_1.pdf, and http://www.ujc.org/page. html?ArticleID=46185

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ This is one reason the current authors, starting with AJYB 2006, began publishing, in Table 3, the year ol the last scientific estimate, allowing the reader to judge the aceuracy of each estimate.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ See Ira M. Sheskin, How Jewish Communities Differ: Variations in the Findings of Local Jewish Demographic Studies (New York, 2001), published by the North American Jewish Data Bank and the City University of New York, for 124 comparison tables containing older data, also available at www.jewishdatabank.org
    ${ }^{8}$ For a more complete discussion of the difficulties in comparing study results see Ira M. Sheskin, "Comparisons between Local Jewish Community Studies and the 2000-01 National Jewish Population Survey," Contemporary Jewry 25 (2005), pp. 158-92.

[^3]:    ${ }^{9}$ The high percentage of new residents in Harrisburg can be explained by the small Jewish population as well as the city's role as a state capital, where changes in administrations lead to migration in and out of the city.

[^4]:    ${ }^{\text {li }}$ See also Bernard Lazerwitz, J. Alan Winter; Arnold Dashefsky, and Ephraim Tabory, Jewish Choices: American Jewish Denominationalism (Albany, N.Y., 1998).

[^5]:    ${ }^{11}$ See, in particular, Steven M. Cohen, A Tale of Twe Jewries: The Inconvenient Truth for American Jews (New York, 2006).

