



Mitchell H. Katz, MD  
Director of Health

TO: Edward A. Chow, MD  
President, Health Commission

THROUGH: Mitchell H. Katz, MD  
Director of Health

FROM: Colleen Johnson  
Assistant Director of Policy and Planning

DATE: October 10, 2002

RE: Census 2000 Highlights

---

On August 27, 2002, the Census released new information from the 2000 Census for California and the jurisdictions within the State. This memo will provide an overview of some of the demographic, economic and housing data from Census 2000 as well as provide some comparisons to Census 1990 data. All information provided in this report was obtained from the Census 2000 website and substantial additional information can be found there, as well.

### THE 2000 CENSUS

The decennial census is the only data gathering operation in the United States that is mandated by the Constitution. The first census was taken in 1790 and it occurs every 10 years. Its primary purpose is to provide the population counts that determine how seats in the U.S. House of Representatives are apportioned. Census figures also are required to draw congressional and state legislative district boundaries, to allocate federal and state funds, to formulate public policy, and to assist with planning and decision making in the private sector.

Census 2000 was the largest peacetime effort in the history of the United States. According to Census 2000, 281.4 million people and 115.9 million housing units were counted across the United States. Through the short form, a limited number of questions were asked of every person and housing unit in the United States. Approximately one in six persons and housing units answered additional questions on the long form to provide data on population and housing.

The national 67 percent final response rate for Census 2000 exceeds the 65 percent response rate from the 1990 census. Both San Francisco and California exceeded the national response rate with their rates being 68 percent and 70 percent, respectively.

Additional county-level data that provides detailed social, economic and housing information for more detailed population groups will be released during 2003.

## **TOTAL POPULATION**

The nation's population grew by 32.7 million people between 1990 and 2000, representing the largest census-to-census population increase in American history. The previous record increase was 28.0 million people between 1950 and 1960, most likely due to the post-World War II baby boom. Total census-recorded population growth declined steadily in the three decades following the 1950s' peak before rising again in the 1990s.

The San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose metropolitan area grew 12.6 percent between 1990 and 2000 and is the 5<sup>th</sup> largest metropolitan area in the country. San Francisco's population has not grown as rapidly as metropolitan area, the State, or the rest of the nation. In fact, between the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census, the populations of both California and the U.S. grew at nearly twice the rate of San Francisco. Despite this relatively slow growth rate, out of the 3,141 counties in the U.S., San Francisco is the 62<sup>nd</sup> largest county in the country. Table 1 shows the changes in the total populations San Francisco, California and the United States.

**Table 1.**  
**Populations of San Francisco, California and United States in 1990 and 2000**

	<b>1990 Census Population</b>	<b>2000 Census Population</b>	<b>% Change</b>
San Francisco	723,959	776,733	7.3%
California	29,760,021	33,871,648	13.8%
United States	248,709,873	281,421,906	13.2%

## **GENDER**

Though there is a relative balance between males and females throughout the country, San Francisco has slightly more men than women in its population. The reverse is true for the populations of both California and the United States. Table 2 shows the gender of San Francisco residents compared to California and the United States.

**Table 2.**  
**Gender of San Francisco, California and United States Residents in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
Male	50.9%	49.7%	49.0%
Female	49.1%	50.3%	51.0%

## **AGE**

The age of San Francisco's residents is significantly different from that of the State and the nation. San Francisco has far fewer residents age 21 or younger. San Francisco's 21 and under population represents only 18 percent of the whole City population, compared to 32.9 percent and 31.4 percent in California and the U.S., respectively. Conversely, the percentage of San Francisco's population that is over 80 years old is nearly double that of California and the U.S.

In keeping with this trend, the largest percentage of the State and national populations is between the ages of six and 17, whereas the largest percentage of San Francisco’s population is between the ages of 25 and 34. Table 3 shows the ages of San Francisco residents compared to California and the United States.

**Table 3.**  
**Age of San Francisco, California and the United States Residents in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
0-5	4.8%	8.8%	8.2%
6-17	9.6%	18.4%	17.5%
18-21	3.9%	5.7%	5.7%
22 to 24 years	5.0%	4.2%	4.0%
25 to 29 years	11.8%	7.4%	6.8%
30 to 34 years	11.5%	7.9%	7.2%
35 to 39 years	9.6%	8.5%	8.2%
40 to 44 years	8.2%	8.1%	8.1%
45 to 49 years	7.3%	6.9%	7.2%
50 to 54 years	6.3%	5.8%	6.2%
55 to 59 years	4.4%	4.3%	4.8%
60 to 64 years	3.9%	3.4%	3.8%
65 to 69 years	3.5%	2.9%	3.4%
70 to 74 years	3.5%	2.7%	3.2%
75 to 79 years	3.0%	2.3%	2.6%
80 years and over	3.8%	2.7%	3.2%

Consistent with national data, the female population exceeds the male population at older ages. At the national level, the median age range for men is 30 to 34 whereas the median age range for women is 35 to 39. Though the median age range in San Francisco is 35 to 39 for both men and women, the proportion of women who are over age 65 is significantly higher than the proportion of men over age 65. Table 4 shows the gender of San Francisco residents by age.

**Table 4.**  
**Gender of San Francisco Residents by Age in 2000**

	<b>% of Males</b>	<b>% of Females</b>
0-24	23.5%	23.1%
25-44	43.3%	38.6%
45-64	22.0%	21.9%
65 and over	11.2%	16.4%

## RACE/ETHNICITY

The Census Bureau tracks Hispanic/Latino ethnicity separately from race. In the census reports, race (which comprises White alone, Black or African American alone, Asian alone, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, American Indian and Alaska Native alone, some other race alone, or two or more races) is divided into two categories: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. Thus, for example, Black or African American persons of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity are reported separately from Black or African American persons not of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity. For purposes of this report, persons of any race that identified as Hispanic or Latino were counted as Hispanic or Latino, regardless of the race that was chosen. Races reported are for those races alone and are not Hispanic or Latino. Table 5 shows the race/ethnicity of San Francisco residents compared to the State and the nation.

**Table 5.**  
**Race/Ethnicity of San Francisco, California and the United States Residents in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
White alone	43.6%	46.6%	69.1%
Black or African American	7.4%	6.3%	12.0%
Hispanic or Latino	14.1%	32.4%	12.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	31.2%	11.1%	3.7%
Two or More Races	3.1%	2.9%	1.8%
Other	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%

Table 5 displays San Francisco's tremendous diversity. Like all of California, the percentage of White residents in San Francisco is significantly below that of the nation. The percentage of San Francisco's Asian/Pacific Islander population, however, is triple that of the State and 10 times that of the nation. San Francisco has the 9<sup>th</sup> highest number of Asian residents of all U.S. counties. Looking at Asians as a percentage of the population, San Francisco ranks 4<sup>th</sup>, behind three Hawaii counties.

Table 6 provides a comparison of San Francisco's race/ethnicity in 1990 and in 2000. The table shows that there has been a significant decrease in the number of Black or African American residents. Conversely, the Hispanic/Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander populations have grown significantly. Since Census 2000 for the first time counted persons of two or more races, it is impossible to provide a true comparison of the demographic makeup of the City between 1990 and 2000.

**Table 6.  
Race/Ethnicity of San Francisco Residents in 1990 and 2000**

	<b>SF 1990</b>		<b>SF 2000</b>		<b>% Change</b>
White	338,917	46.8%	338,886	43.6%	0.0%
Black/African American	76,944	10.6%	57,819	7.4%	-24.9%
Hispanic/Latino	96,640	13.3%	109,565	14.1%	13.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	207,457	28.7%	241,976	31.2%	16.6%
Two or More Races	-	-	24,222	3.1%	-
Other	4,001	0.6%	4,265	0.5%	6.6%

**PLACE OF BIRTH**

Consistent with San Francisco’s racial and ethnic diversity, Census 2000 shows that one out of every three San Francisco residents is foreign born. This figure is more than three times the US ratio of foreign born residents to the entire population and 40 percent greater than the California ratio. Table 7 shows the proportion of native residents compared to foreign-born residents for San Francisco, California and the United States.

**Table 7.  
Place of Birth of Residents of San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
Native	63.2%	73.8%	88.9%
Foreign born	36.8%	26.2%	11.1%

**HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND COMPOSITION**

For purposes of the census, a household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence, whether or not they are related by birth, marriage or adoption. Persons related by birth, marriage or adoption and living in the same housing unit are defined as “families” by the Census Bureau.

San Francisco has a significantly higher proportion of one-person households compared to California and the U.S. Also significant are the differences in households with children under 18 years old. San Franciscans are more likely to be living in single person households and, when there are two or more persons in the household, they are less likely to have children and more likely to be in nonfamily households. Nonfamily households would include domestic partnerships and families with foster children. Table 8 shows the size and composition of households in San Francisco compared to California and the United States.

**Table 8.**  
**Size and Composition of Households in**  
**San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

<b>Household Size/Type</b>	<b>% of Category</b>	<b>Comparable % in CA</b>	<b>Comparable % in US</b>
<b>1-person household</b>	<b>38.6%</b>	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>25.8%</b>
<b>2-or-more-person household</b>	<b>61.4%</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>74.2%</b>
<i>Family households:</i>	72.7%	90.7%	92.2%
Married-couple family:	73.2%	75.1%	76.7%
With own children under 18 years	39.9%	51.7%	46.3%
No own children under 18 years	60.1%	48.3%	53.7%
<i>Other family:</i>	26.8%	24.9%	23.3%
Male householder, no wife present:	28.0%	29.6%	25.6%
With own children under 18 years	27.4%	50.9%	50.9%
No own children under 18 years	72.6%	49.1%	49.1%
Female householder, no husband present:	72.0%	70.4%	74.4%
With own children under 18 years	38.1%	57.8%	58.9%
No own children under 18 years	61.9%	42.2%	41.1%
<i>Nonfamily households</i>	37.6%	10.3%	8.4%

## **HOUSEHOLD LANGUAGE**

In further evidence of San Francisco's rich racial and ethnic makeup are the data on household language and linguistic isolation within San Francisco households. Of the 329,850 households in San Francisco, 42 percent speak a language other than English in the home – a percentage that is significantly higher than that of both California and the U.S. Twenty-one percent of San Francisco residents speak Asian or Pacific Island languages at home, more than twice the same measure in California and nearly 10 times that of the United States. Table 9 shows the household languages spoken in San Francisco, California and the United States.

**Table 9.**  
**Household Language of**  
**Residents of San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
English	58.2%	62.2%	81.1%
Spanish	10.3%	22.4%	10.2%
Other Indo-European language	8.8%	5.8%	5.2%
Asian and Pacific Island language	21.6%	8.6%	2.6%
Other language	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%

Thirteen percent of all San Francisco households are linguistically isolated. According to the Census Bureau definition, a linguistically isolated household is one in which no member 14 years old and over (1) speaks only English or (2) speaks a non-English language and speaks

English very well. In other words, all members of a linguistically isolated household who are 14 years old or older have at least some difficulty with English. In San Francisco, more than half of the linguistically isolated households speak an Asian or Pacific Island language. Table 10 shows the percentage of linguistically isolated households in San Francisco by language spoken.

**Table 10.**  
**Linguistically Isolated Households in San Francisco in 2000**

	<b>% of All SF Households</b>
Spanish	2.3%
Other Indo-European language	2.0%
Asian and Pacific Island language	8.7%
Other language	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.3%</b>

### **DISABILITY STATUS**

The data on disability status were derived from answers to long-form questionnaire items. The first question pertained to physical and sensory disabilities. Respondents were asked about the existence of the following long-lasting conditions: (a) blindness, deafness, or a severe vision or hearing impairment, (sensory disability) and (b) a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying (physical disability).

The second disability question pertained to mental, self-care, going-outside-the-home, and employment disabilities. This was a four-part question that asked if the individual had a physical, mental, or emotional condition lasting six months or more that made it difficult to perform certain activities. The four activity categories were: (a) learning, remembering, or concentrating (mental disability); (b) dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home (self-care disability); (c) going outside the home alone to shop or visit a doctor's office (going outside the home disability); and (d) working at a job or business (employment disability).

It is important to note, that disability status in Census 2000 was self-reported and is not necessarily an indicator of a person who has been deemed disabled by a physician.

When looking at the proportion of residents with disabilities by age and type of disability, San Francisco's reported disability data is similar to that at both the State and national levels. Tables 11 and 12 show San Francisco residents with reported disabilities by age and by type of disability.

**Table 11.  
San Francisco Residents with Disabilities by Age in 2000**

	<b>Persons with Disabilities</b>	<b>% of all Persons with Disabilities</b>	<b>% of SF Population</b>
Ages 5 to 15 years	3,936	1.4%	0.5%
Ages 16 to 64 years	176,974	63.1%	22.8%
Ages 65 years and over	99,440	35.5%	12.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280,350</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>36.1%</b>

**Table 12.  
San Francisco Residents with Disabilities by Type of Disability in 2000**

	<b>Persons with Disabilities</b>	<b>% of all Persons with Disabilities</b>	<b>% of Total SF Population</b>
Sensory disability	25,732	9.2%	3.3%
Physical disability	56,774	20.3%	7.3%
Mental disability	39,117	14.0%	5.0%
Self-care disability	22,410	8.0%	2.9%
Go-outside-home disability	67,712	24.2%	8.7%
Employment disability	68,605	24.5%	8.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>280,350</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>36.1%</b>

**EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT**

San Francisco residents are more likely to have completed a higher level of education than other residents of the State or of the United States. Forty-five percent of San Francisco residents possess a bachelor's, graduate or professional degree, nearly twice the percentage of U.S. residents possessing the same degrees. At the same time, however, 10.5 percent of all San Francisco residents have less than a 9<sup>th</sup> grade education. This figure is lower than the national proportion by three percentage points. Table 13 provides a comparison of educational attainment between San Francisco, California and the United States.

**Table 13.**  
**Highest Educational Level Achieved by Residents Aged 25 Years and Older in**  
**San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
Less than 9th grade	10.5%	11.5%	7.5%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	8.3%	11.7%	12.1%
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	13.9%	20.1%	28.6%
Some college, no degree	16.8%	22.9%	21.0%
Associate degree	5.6%	7.1%	6.3%
Bachelor's degree	28.6%	17.1%	15.5%
Graduate or professional degree	16.4%	9.5%	8.9%

Educational attainment is a socio-economic characteristic of a population that can be linked to health disparities and outcomes. Looking at educational attainment by race and ethnicity a significant difference between racial and ethnic groups becomes apparent. Asian/Pacific Islanders have the highest proportion of residents with a less than 9<sup>th</sup> grade education. Approximately 50 percent of Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino residents have a high school education or less, compared to just 15 percent of Whites. Table 14 shows the educational disparities among racial and ethnic groups in San Francisco.

**Table 14.**  
**Highest Educational Level Achieved by San Francisco Residents**  
**Aged 25 Years and Older by Selected Races/Ethnicity in 2000**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black/African American</b>	<b>Hispanic/Latino</b>	<b>Asian/Pacific Islander</b>
Less than 9th grade	1.8%	6.0%	21.4%	21.7%
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	3.5%	17.9%	16.1%	11.1%
High school graduate (incl. equivalency)	10.0%	24.1%	20.0%	15.1%
Some college, no degree	16.5%	27.1%	17.6%	14.0%
Associate degree	5.0%	6.7%	4.6%	6.5%
Bachelor's degree	38.5%	11.5%	13.1%	22.6%
Graduate or professional degree	24.7%	6.6%	7.2%	9.0%

**EMPLOYMENT STATUS**

Census 2000 data show that civilian unemployment in San Francisco decreased by 1.2 percentage points between the 1990 census and the 2000 census. With this reduction, the City was well below the national average of 3.7 percent as well as the State average of 4.3 percent. It is likely, however, that more recent data would show an increase in unemployment in San

Francisco within the last year. Table 15 shows the employment status of San Francisco, California and U.S. residents over age 16.

**Table 15.  
Employment Status of Residents Aged 16 Years and Older in  
San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

	SF		CA 2000	US 2000
	1990	2000		
Armed Forces	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%	0.5%
Civilian Employed	62.3%	63.3%	57.5%	59.7%
Civilian Unemployed	4.2%	3.0%	4.3%	3.7%
Not in the labor force	32.8%	33.7%	37.6%	36.1%

## INCOME

The median income represents the income of the household precisely in the middle of all households listed in ascending or descending order by income. In other words, the median divides the list of all households into two equal parts: one-half of all households fall below the median income and one-half of all households exceed the median income.

San Francisco is the nation's most expensive city for housing. Not surprisingly, the median income is significantly higher than the median incomes of California and the U.S. However, as with other socio-economic determinants of health, racial and ethnic disparities can be seen by looking at San Francisco's median household income by race and ethnicity. Though San Francisco's overall median income is higher than that of California and the United States, the median incomes for Black/African American San Franciscans is lower than the statewide median for the same population. Further, the median income for Asian San Franciscans falls below both the State and national median incomes for this population. Table 16 shows the median incomes for San Francisco, California and the United States by selected race/ethnicities.

**Table 16.  
Median Household Income of Residents of  
San Francisco, California and the United States by Selected Race/Ethnicities in 2000**

	SF	CA	US
White	\$ 65,431	\$ 53,734	\$ 45,367
Black/African American	\$ 29,640	\$ 34,956	\$ 29,423
Hispanic/Latino	\$ 46,553	\$ 36,532	\$ 33,676
Asian*	\$ 49,596	\$ 55,366	\$ 51,908
All ethnicities	\$ 55,221	\$ 47,493	\$ 41,994

\*Note: Median incomes for Asians and Pacific Islanders are reported separately by the Census Bureau. Because medians cannot be accurately combined without additional data, Asians are reported here alone.

The relatively high income of White San Franciscans raises the median income for all incomes and ethnicities. Per capita income is another way to look at income levels and gives a different perspective on how the income is spread among the population. Per capita income is an average and is obtained by dividing the sum of all incomes of a population by the total number of persons in that population.

Table 17 shows the per capita income of San Francisco, California and U.S. residents by selected race/ethnicities. The per capita income of White San Franciscans is more than twice as high as that of Hispanic/Latino or African American San Franciscans.

**Table 17.**  
**Per Capita Income of Residents of**  
**San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
White	\$ 51,986	\$ 31,700	\$ 24,819
Black/African American	\$ 19,275	\$ 17,447	\$ 14,437
Hispanic/Latino	\$ 18,584	\$ 11,674	\$ 12,111
Asian	\$ 22,357	\$ 22,050	\$ 21,823
All ethnicities	\$ 34,556	\$ 22,711	\$ 21,587

\*Note: Per capita incomes for Asians and Pacific Islanders are reported separately by the Census Bureau. Because per capita incomes cannot be accurately combined without additional data, Asians are reported here alone.

People receive income from a variety of sources. The sources tracked by the Census Bureau that may provide some insight into health status are Social Security, Supplemental Security, Public Assistance and Retirement income. Given the age of San Francisco's population, as discussed earlier, it is not surprising that the proportion of Social Security and retirement income in the City is lower than in California or in the nation. San Francisco does have a higher proportion of residents receiving Supplemental Security income, which indicates that San Francisco has higher proportions of low-income aged, blind and disabled residents. This has been corroborated to an extent by the age and income data provided in this report.

Interestingly, the percentage of persons on public assistance decreased significantly for San Francisco, California and the U.S. between 1990 and 2000, though the largest decreases were in San Francisco. This timetable is a too early to attribute the decline to the ticking of the welfare clock. The clock started ticking at the beginning of 1997, when welfare reform measures took effect in California. CalWORKs recipients were given five years to learn new skills, find work and move off of welfare. Though this is clearly not related to the welfare clock, it may be in part attributable to the success of welfare to work programs offered through CalWORKs. However, the greater decline of public assistance or other public income between 1990 and 2000 may also indicate that lower income San Franciscans are moving out of San Francisco as a result in the increased cost of living. This theory is corroborated by the significant decline in the proportion of African Americans in the City between 1990 and 2000 and the fact that African Americans have the lowest incomes in the City. San Francisco's larger decline Table 18 shows selected types of income received by households in San Francisco, California and the U.S. in 1990 and 2000.

**Table 18.**  
**Types of Household Income of Residents of**  
**San Francisco, California and the United States in 1990 and 2000**

	SF		CA		US	
	% of all Households, 1990	% of all Households, 2000	% of all Households, 1990	% of all Households, 2000	% of all Households, 1990	% of all Households, 2000
Social Security	23.8%	21.0%	21.9%	22.3%	26.3%	25.7%
Supplemental Security	-	6.7%	-	5.3%	-	4.4%
Public Assistance	10.4%	3.9%	9.4%	4.9%	7.5%	3.4%
Retirement	14.4%	13.0%	14.9%	15.4%	15.6%	16.7%

**POVERTY**

In health care we use federal poverty guidelines. However, poverty thresholds are the original version of the federal poverty measure. All official poverty population figures, including those used in the Census, are calculated using the poverty thresholds, not the poverty guidelines. Like poverty guidelines, the poverty thresholds vary by family size and composition. Table 19 is an abbreviated version of the 2000 poverty threshold. The incomes listed are annual and, despite the differences in calculation, are very close to the poverty guidelines, just slightly higher.

**Table 19.**  
**Federal Poverty Threshold for 2000**

Size of Family Unit	Related Children Under 18					
	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five
One Person						
Under age 65	\$ 8,959					
Age 65 and over	\$ 8,259					
Two People						
Householder under age 65	\$ 11,531	\$ 11,869				
Householder age 65 or older	\$ 10,409	\$ 11,824				
Three People	\$ 13,470	\$ 13,861	\$ 13,874			
Four People	\$ 17,761	\$ 18,052	\$ 17,463	\$ 17,524		
Five People	\$ 21,419	\$ 21,731	\$ 21,065	\$ 20,550	\$ 20,236	
Six People	\$ 24,636	\$ 24,734	\$ 24,224	\$ 23,736	\$ 23,009	\$ 22,579

Unlike the poverty threshold, the poverty guidelines consider the size of the family unit only, and do not change with the number of children or the age of the householder. Like the poverty guidelines, however, the poverty threshold does not take into account regional differences in the cost of living. Thus, the poverty threshold is the same for a family in San Francisco as it is for a family in Boise, for example.

Between the 1990 Census and Census 2000, the rate of poverty in San Francisco decreased by nearly one and one-half percentage points. This could be attributable to San Francisco's high cost of living. San Francisco residents have among the highest incomes in the State. However, the income gap between the most and least affluent is also wider in the region. Table 20 compares the poverty status of San Francisco residents in 1990 and 2000 with California and U.S. residents in 2000.

**Table 20.  
Poverty Status of Residents of  
San Francisco, California and the United States in 1990 and 2000**

	SF		CA 2000	US 2000
	1990	2000		
<b>Income in 1999 below poverty level:</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>12.4%</b>
Under 5 years	8.0%	4.5%	10.4%	10.1%
5 to 11 years	8.0%	7.1%	15.8%	14.3%
12 to 17 years	7.6%	6.2%	11.1%	10.3%
18 to 64 years	65.1%	69.4%	56.7%	55.6%
65 to 74 years	6.1%	6.2%	3.0%	4.6%
75 years and over	5.2%	6.6%	3.0%	5.1%
<b>Income in 1999 at or above poverty level:</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>88.7%</b>	<b>85.8%</b>	<b>87.6%</b>
Under 5 years	4.6%	3.8%	6.7%	6.4%
5 to 11 years	5.5%	5.4%	10.6%	9.9%
12 to 17 years	4.9%	4.5%	8.3%	8.4%
18 to 64 years	70.2%	72.4%	63.1%	62.8%
65 to 74 years	8.3%	7.2%	6.1%	7.0%
75 years and over	6.5%	6.6%	5.1%	5.6%

Consistent with the racial and ethnic disparities displayed above, a look at poverty by race and ethnicity reveal further significant disparities. Twenty-five percent of the City's African American population is living in poverty compared to seven percent of Whites and 11 percent of the citywide population. Table 21 shows the proportion of San Francisco's population living poverty by race and ethnicity.

**Table 21.  
San Francisco Residents in Poverty by Selected Races/Ethnicities in 2000**

	Total Population For Which Poverty Was Determined	% of Population Below Poverty
White	334,131	7.7%
Black or African American	56,826	25.1%
Hispanic or Latino	107,542	15.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	241,548	10.9%
All Ethnicities	765,356	11.3%

## **HOUSING**

### **Owned and Rented Housing**

San Franciscans are far less likely to own their home than their state or national counterparts. Only 35 percent of all San Francisco residents owned their own home, compared to 57 percent in the State and 66 percent in the nation.

**Table 22.  
Occupied Housing Units in San Francisco in 2000**

	SF		CA		US	
	Units	% of all Units	Units	% of all Units	Units	% of all Units
Owner Occupied	115,315	35.0%	6,546,237	56.9%	69,816,513	66.2%
Renter Occupied	214,385	65.0%	4,956,633	43.1%	35,663,588	33.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>329,700</b>		<b>11,502,870</b>		<b>105,480,101</b>	

### **Length of Time in Current Housing**

Census 2000 recorded the length of time a person was in their current housing situation. A look at this data detailed by race and ethnicity shows that African Americans have been living in their homes far longer than residents of other races or ethnicities. Twenty-seven percent of African Americans moved into their current housing prior to 1979, compared to approximately 17 percent of Whites and Latinos. More than 50 percent of White residents moved into their current housing within the last seven years. The largest proportion across all ethnicities moved into their current housing in the years between 1995 and 1998. Table 23 shows the length of time San Francisco residents have lived in their current home by ethnicity.

**Table 23.  
Households' Length of Time in Current Housing by Selected Races/Ethnicities  
in San Francisco in 2000**

	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander
Moved in 1999 to March 2000	20.8%	13.0%	17.6%	14.8%
Moved in 1995 to 1998	33.2%	26.8%	31.8%	27.0%
Moved in 1990 to 1994	16.2%	18.0%	17.6%	19.9%
Moved in 1980 to 1989	12.7%	15.2%	15.3%	19.8%
Moved in 1970 to 1979	8.2%	13.6%	9.3%	11.0%
Moved in 1969 or earlier	9.0%	13.5%	8.2%	7.5%

## Rent

San Francisco has the fourth highest median rent in the State. Looking, again, at this socioeconomic indicator of health by race and ethnicity, African American residents of San Francisco are found to have the lowest median rent – nearly half that of White residents. This trend is not the same for the State or the U.S., where the difference between median rents for these two populations is no more than 20 percent. Table 24 displays the median rent by ethnicity for San Francisco, California and the United States.

**Table 24.**  
**Median Gross Rent in San Francisco, California and the United States by Selected Races/Ethnicities in 2000**

	<b>SF</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>US</b>
White	\$1,059	\$829	\$613
Black or African American	\$579	\$681	\$542
Hispanic or Latino	\$862	\$658	\$604
Asian	\$747	\$809	\$734
All Ethnicities	\$928	\$747	\$602

African American San Franciscans pay less in rent than other racial and ethnic groups, but they spend a larger percentage of their income on rent. Twenty-two percent of African Americans spend more than 50 percent on rent, compared to 15 percent of Whites. This is not surprising when considered with the income data reported for these populations. Table 25 shows the percentage of income San Francisco's racial and ethnic populations spend on rent.

**Table 25.**  
**Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income in San Francisco, California and the United States by Selected Races/Ethnicities in 2000**

	<b>White</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Asian</b>	<b>All Ethnicities</b>
Less than 25 percent	52.6%	42.7%	47.9%	42.8%	49.1%
25 to 49 percent	29.6%	30.4%	30.5%	32.3%	30.4%
50 percent or more	14.7%	22.5%	18.1%	17.5%	16.4%
Not computed	3.1%	4.4%	3.6%	7.4%	4.2%

## Occupants per Room

Census 2000 shows that San Francisco's Hispanic/Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander populations are most likely to have more than one occupant per room. These data are consistent with State and national data. Table 26 shows the occupancy per room by selected race and ethnicities.

**Table 26.  
Occupants per Room in Occupied Housing Units by Selected Races/Ethnicities  
in San Francisco in 2000**

	<b>More Than One Occupant Per Room</b>
White	4.7%
Black or African American	10.5%
Hispanic or Latino	30.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	27.1%

**Kitchen and Plumbing Facilities**

Census 2000 provides information on the availability of kitchen and plumbing facilities within housing units. Housing units without kitchens inside the individual unit were considered as not having kitchen facilities. Complete plumbing facilities include: (1) hot and cold piped water; (2) a flush toilet; and (3) a bathtub or shower. All three facilities must be located in the housing unit.

San Francisco had twice as many housing units that lacked complete plumbing facilities as the United States as a whole and more than three times as many housing units that lacked kitchen facilities. This can be attributed to the large number of single room occupancy hotels in the City. Table 27 shows the percentages of housing units without plumbing or kitchen facilities in San Francisco, California and the United States.

**Table 27.  
Housing Units by Plumbing and Kitchen Facilities in San Francisco, California and the  
United States in 2000**

	SF		CA	US
	Units	% of all Units		
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	7,940	2.3%	0.9%	1.2%
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	14,400	4.2%	1.3%	1.3%

African American San Franciscans were five times as likely to be without kitchen facilities as their California counterparts and more than seven times as likely as their national counterparts. Asian/Pacific Islanders in San Francisco had the second highest proportion of residents without kitchen or plumbing facilities, more than three times higher than California and the U.S. Table 28 shows the proportion of San Francisco, California and U.S. residents without kitchen or plumbing facilities by race/ethnicity.

**Table 28.  
Occupied Housing Units by Plumbing and Kitchen Facilities and Race/Ethnicity  
in San Francisco, California and the United States in 2000**

	SF		CA		US	
	w/out Plumbing	w/out Kitchen	w/out Plumbing	w/out Kitchen	w/out Plumbing	w/out Kitchen
White	1.3%	2.8%	0.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%
Black or African American	3.8%	6.5%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.9%
Hispanic or Latino	2.1%	3.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.2%	4.9%	1.0%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%

**Group Quarters**

According to Census 2000, approximately 20,000 San Franciscans, or 2.5 percent of the population, reside in group quarters. This is consistent with State and national percentages. The Census Bureau classifies all people not living in households as living in group quarters. There are two types of group quarters: institutional, which includes correctional facilities, nursing homes, and mental hospitals; and non-institutional, which includes college dormitories, military barracks, group homes, missions, and shelters. Table 29 lists the various types of group quarters and provides information on residents of San Francisco, California and the U.S. who live in these settings.

Because San Francisco has no State or federal prisons, it is not very surprising that the proportion of institutionalized persons, particularly institutionalized in correctional facilities, is significantly lower for San Francisco than for the State or the nation. However, of the institutionalized populations, 41 percent of those in “hospitals/wards, hospices, and schools for the handicapped” were “wards in general hospitals for patients who have no usual home.” This percentage is four times that for both the State and the country. This figure provides further data to substantiate the problem of decertified days at San Francisco General Hospital.

**Table 29.**  
**Residents of Group Quarters in San Francisco, California and United States by Type of**  
**Group Quarters in 2000**

	SF		Comparable % in CA	Comparable % in US
	Residents	% of category		
<b>Institutionalized population:</b>	4,200	<b>21.3%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>52.2%</b>
<i>Correctional institutions:</i>	1,376	32.8%	60.1%	48.7%
<i>Nursing homes</i>	1,685	40.1%	29.2%	42.4%
<i>Hospitals/wards, hospices, and schools for the handicapped:</i>	984	23.4%	6.4%	5.8%
Hospitals/wards and hospices for chronically ill:	64	6.5%	17.1%	17.1%
Hospitals or wards for drug/alcohol abuse	96	9.8%	2.9%	8.1%
Mental (Psychiatric) hospitals or wards	174	17.7%	31.0%	33.8%
Schools, hospitals, or wards for the mentally retarded	223	22.7%	9.7%	17.9%
Schools, hospitals, or wards for the physically handicapped	21	2.1%	14.1%	8.9%
Wards in general hospitals for patients who have no usual home	406	41.3%	10.4%	10.0%
Wards in military hospitals for patients who have no usual home	0	0.0%	14.8%	4.2%
<i>Juvenile institutions:</i>	155	3.7%	4.3%	3.2%
<b>Noninstitutionalized population:</b>	15,557	<b>78.7%</b>	<b>49.5%</b>	<b>47.8%</b>
<i>College dormitories</i>	3,926	25.2%	31.2%	55.5%
<i>Military quarters</i>	36	0.2%	14.5%	9.5%
<i>Group homes:</i>	3,212	20.6%	17.6%	12.2%
Homes or halfway houses for drug/alcohol abuse	943	29.4%	28.4%	20.8%
Homes for the mentally ill	389	12.1%	14.8%	14.1%
Homes for the mentally retarded	277	8.6%	22.4%	32.6%
Homes for the physically handicapped	19	0.6%	3.3%	3.6%
Other group homes	1,584	49.3%	31.0%	29.0%
<i>Religious group quarters</i>	619	4.0%	1.9%	2.1%
<i>Other dormitories</i>	295	1.9%	5.0%	2.6%
<i>Crews of maritime vessels</i>	43	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Other nonhousehold living situations</i>	2,306	14.8%	3.9%	2.6%
<i>Other noninstitutional group quarters</i>	5,120	32.9%	25.7%	15.3%
<b>Total:</b>	19,757			

Also significant in Table 29 is the proportion of persons residing in “other noninstitutional group quarters.” This accounts for 33 percent of San Francisco’s noninstitutionalized population living in group quarters. “Other noninstitutional group quarters” includes shelters for abused women (shelters against domestic violence or family crisis centers), soup kitchens, regularly scheduled mobile food vans, and targeted nonsheltered outdoor locations. It also includes shelters with

sleeping facilities, low-cost hotels and motels, and hotels/motels used by cities to house the homeless regardless of cost.

Of San Francisco’s residents who are living in group quarters, 7.8 percent are living in emergency or transitional shelters, compared to 3.4 percent in California and 2.2 percent in the U.S. San Francisco has the highest proportion of its residents in emergency or transitional shelters and the third highest number of residents in emergency or transitional shelters of any California county. Table 31 shows the residents of San Francisco, California and the U.S. who live in emergency or transitional housing.

**Table 30.  
Residents of San Francisco, California and United States in Emergency/Transitional Shelters in 2000**

	<b>Residents</b>	<b>% of Residents of Group Quarters</b>	<b>% of all Residents</b>
SF	1,539	7.8%	0.198%
CA	27,701	3.4%	0.082%
US	170,706	2.2%	0.061%

### **NEW DATA ON THE UNINSURED**

On September 30, 2002, the Census Bureau released Health Insurance Coverage: 2001. These new data show that the number of uninsured living in the United States increased by 1.4 million in 2001, to 41.2 million, or 14.6 percent of the total population. These new estimates are based on interviews with 78,000 households and were obtained under the Census Bureau’s annual Current Population Survey. Respondents were asked if they had health insurance at any point during 2001.

The most substantial drop in insurance occurred among small business workers whose health benefits were discontinued by their employers. The proportion of people who received health coverage through their jobs fell from 63.6 percent in 2000 to 62.6 percent in 2001, a difference “almost entirely attributable” to a decline in employer-sponsored health coverage at businesses with 25 employees or fewer.

The report shows that government programs prevented a much larger increase in the number of very poor Americans without health insurance. If not for increased enrollment in Medicaid and State Children’s Health Insurance Program (Healthy Families in California), the number of uninsured reported would have been much higher

Though continued racial and ethnic disparities were evident in the data reported, the proportion of uninsured whites rose from 13.2 percent to 13.6 percent. The uninsured rate for Latinos remained the highest of any racial or ethnic group. The proportion of African Americans without health insurance rose two-tenths of a percentage point to 19 percent.

Looking at the rates of uninsurance by income, the proportion of the uninsured in households with incomes of less than \$25,000 remained the highest at 23.3 percent. However, households with incomes above \$75,000 experienced the largest increase in the rates of uninsurance, moving from 7.1 percent in 2000 to 7.7 percent in 2001.

Though county-specific data was not included in the report, the report did provide some data on states. In California, 18 percent of residents were without uninsured, the third-highest percentage in the nation behind New Mexico and Texas.

## CONCLUSION

Whether it is issues of race/ethnicity, income, age, or housing, diversity continues to be the defining characteristic of San Francisco's population. One in three San Franciscans is foreign born. San Francisco ranks fourth among more than 3,100 U.S. counties for the proportion of Asians/Pacific Islanders in the population. The City has a greater proportion of Latinos than the nation and a greater percentage of multiracial residents than either the State or the nation.

Significant disparities in socioeconomic indicators of health are present, however, among San Francisco's racial and ethnic populations. African Americans are San Francisco's most impacted population. Though the fact that many African American San Franciscans have lived in their current housing units for more than 20 years may exhibit stability among this population, the decrease in the proportion of African Americans in the City indicates otherwise. Between 1990 and 2000, there was a significant decline not only in the percentage of African Americans in San Francisco but in the actual numbers. There were 19,000 fewer African Americans in San Francisco in 2000 than in 1990, representing a 25 percent decline. African Americans have the lowest incomes and highest rates of poverty. They are more likely to live in housing without adequate plumbing or kitchen facilities, and they pay higher proportions of their incomes in rent than other San Francisco populations. The data on Asian/Pacific Islanders also exhibit significant disparities. Asian/Pacific Islanders in San Francisco are more likely to be linguistically isolated, are more likely to live more than one to a room, and are less likely to have completed a 9<sup>th</sup> grade education than other San Francisco populations.

San Francisco is also diverse in terms of its age and household composition. San Franciscans tend to be older than the populations of the State and the nation. San Francisco has far fewer residents age 21 or younger and the proportion of the population over age 75 is significantly higher than that of the rest of California and the nation. Nearly 40 percent of San Francisco households are one-person households, 13 percentage points higher than the same nationwide figures. Though there are fewer two-person households in San Francisco, these households are much more likely than their State or national counterparts to be nonfamily households (unrelated by birth, marriage or adoption) and to be households without children.

It is just San Francisco's diversity that gives the City its unique character. From a socioeconomic perspective, the data show that there continue to be several gaps to bridge to overcome the disparities that affect the health and well being of San Franciscans. It is our hope that this data will assist the Department and the Health Commission in the continued planning for health care and prevention services in San Francisco.