

# THE CHANGING NUMBERS

## Part 1

Amarillo's Population & Housing Trends

Gender Distribution	Marital Status		Housing Supply	Population/Household
Population Growth	Age Distribution	Racial & Ethnic Composition	Housing Characteristics	Occupancy Status

Planning Department  
City of Amarillo, Texas  
January 2013

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS OF CENSUS DATA .....	1
POPULATION .....	2
POPULATION CHANGE .....	5
MALE/FEMALE DISTRIBUTION.....	5
MARITAL STATUS .....	7
AGE DISTRIBUTION .....	7
DEPENDENCY RATIO .....	12
INDEX OF AGING .....	13
RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION.....	14
SINGLE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN .....	20
HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS .....	20
HOUSING SUPPLY.....	20
POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD .....	23

## MAPS

PERSONS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE.....	9
PERSONS OVER 65 YEARS OF AGE.....	11
CONCENTRATION OF WHITE POPULATION .....	14
CONCENTRATION OF HISPANIC POPULATION.....	16
CONCENTRATION OF BLACK POPULATION .....	17
CONCENTRATION OF ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER POPULATION.....	18
CONCENTRATION OF AMERICAN INDIAN, ESKIMO, OR ALEUT POPULATION .....	19
HOUSING SUPPLY CHANGE .....	21
AVERAGE POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD .....	23

## CHARTS & TABLES

POPULATION GROWTH 1890-2010 .....	4
MALE/FEMALE DISTRIBUTION.....	6
MALE/FEMALE BY AGE GROUP .....	6
AMARILLO AGE DISTRIBUTION.....	8
DEPENDENCY RATIOS 1950-2010.....	12
INDEX OF AGING 1950-2010.....	13
PERCENT CHANGE IN RACE/ETHNICITY .....	15
TRENDS IN MINORITY POPULATION.....	15
HOUSING UNITS 1950-2010.....	21

## APPENDICES

<b>APPENDIX A</b> (CHANGES IN CENSUS TRACTS BY DECENNIAL CENSUS).....	24
<b>APPENDIX B</b> .....	26
<b>APPENDIX C</b> (POPULATION OF 25 TEXAS METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS).....	27
<b>APPENDIX D</b> (TEXAS CITIES OVER 100,000 POPULATION) .....	28
<b>APPENDIX E</b> (POPULATION CHANGE BY CENSUS TRACT).....	29
<b>APPENDIX F</b> (MALE/FEMALE BY AGE) .....	32
<b>APPENDIX G</b> (MARITAL STATUS) .....	33
<b>APPENDIX H</b> (AMARILLO POPULATION BY AGE).....	34
<b>APPENDIX I</b> (AMARILLO MSA POPULATION BY AGE).....	35
<b>APPENDIX J</b> (POTTER COUNTY POPULATION BY AGE) .....	36
<b>APPENDIX K</b> (RANDALL COUNTY POPULATION BY AGE).....	37
<b>APPENDIX L</b> (CENSUS TRACT POPULATION BY AGE).....	38
<b>APPENDIX M</b> (PERSONS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE BY CENSUS TRACT).....	49
<b>APPENDIX N</b> (RACE/ETHNICITY BY CENSUS TRACT) .....	51
<b>APPENDIX O</b> (SINGLE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE) .....	63
<b>APPENDIX P</b> (HOUSING SUPPLY CHANGE BY CENSUS TRACT) .....	66
<b>APPENDIX Q</b> (HOUSING OCCUPANCY BY CENSUS TRACT).....	68
<b>APPENDIX R</b> (TENURE BY CENSUS TRACT).....	70
<b>APPENDIX S</b> (AVERAGE POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD BY CENSUS TRACT) .....	73
<b>APPENDIX T</b> (PERSONS IN HOUSING UNITS BY CENSUS TRACT).....	75

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades, Amarillo has experienced many changes in population and housing. During the 1960s Amarillo experienced a population decline of nearly 8%, but rebounded with a growth rate of nearly 18% the following decade. With the Baby Boom generation growing older, the average age within the community is gradually increasing. Changes in population characteristics result in fluctuations in Amarillo's housing market. This publication will analyze the major differences in population and housing patterns for the City of Amarillo and the Amarillo Metropolitan Statistical Area (comprised of both Potter and Randall counties). The changes that occurred between 2000 and 2010 will be emphasized.

The data used to compile this document are from the 2010 Census Summary File 1 (SF 1) – 100% data, unless otherwise noted. Summary File 1 presents counts and information (age, sex, race, Hispanic/Latino origin, whether residence is owned or rented) collected from all people and housing units. Because some users of this publication will have a greater interest in what trends have occurred in their own neighborhood, certain census data have been provided by census tract. Some census tracts are exceptions to the trends occurring throughout the City; therefore, it should not be assumed that any particular census tract fits the general citywide trend.

This publication is the first of two reports generated to analyze the data provided from the 2010 Census. The second document commonly referred to as Changing Numbers, Part 2, will address the economic changes that have occurred in Amarillo during the 2000's and more detailed housing information.

## GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS OF CENSUS DATA

The purpose of this publication is to compare 2010 Census data with 2000 information, and in some cases, census data from earlier years. Comparisons have become more complex because geographic areas have changed for some of the census tracts over the past few decades. An awareness of the geographic changes is critical when comparing the census tracts from decade to decade.

Some neighborhoods in the Amarillo area did not have a large enough population to warrant being a separate census tract (abbreviated as "CT") according to the Census Bureau's criteria.

The tract has been combined as follows:

- ◆ 2010 CT 154 was created by combining 2000 CT 111 and 2000 CT 146.

Some census tracts met the Census Bureau's criteria to be divided into new census tracts.

- ◆ 2000 CT 144 was divided into 2010 **CT 144.01** and **CT 9800**.
- ◆ 2000 CT 220 was divided into 2010 **CT 220.01** and **CT 220.02**.
- ◆ 2000 CT 211 was divided into 2010 **CT 211.01** and **CT 211.02**.
- ◆ 2000 CT 216.07 was divided into 2010 **CT 216.08** and **CT 216.09**.
- ◆ 2000 CT 217.01 was divided into 2010 **CT 217.03** and **CT 216.04**.

Some census tract designations for the 2000 Census were made to correct errors the Census Bureau made in digitizing the 1990 Census maps. At the time the errors were made, the only solution was for the Census Bureau to designate new census tracts using unique .97 and .98 suffixes to the census tract numbering. The 2000 corrections include:

- ◆ 2000 **CT 128** was 1990 CT 128.98.
- ◆ 2000 **CT 215** was corrected by combining 1990 CT 215 and CT 220.97.
- ◆ 2000 **CT 220** was 1990 CT 220.98.

These geographic revisions and new census tract designations are somewhat difficult to understand; however, the changes must be kept in mind when comparing data on census tracts from one decade to another. For clarification on these changes, see Appendices A and B, located on pages 24 thru 26.

## POPULATION

**F**or the most part, the Amarillo Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), Potter County, Randall County, and the City of Amarillo grew in population at a faster rate than that of the State of Texas between 1890 and 1970, as shown in the table, "Population Growth 1890-2010" on **page 4**. Of these areas, only Randall County's growth rate exceeded that of the State from 1970 to 1990. The 2000 Census indicates that Randall County's growth rate was below that of the State as a whole. A decline in the growth rate of the MSA, Potter County and the City of Amarillo occurred during the 1960s. This decline is largely attributed to the closing of the Amarillo Air Force Base in July of 1969. It is estimated that the closing of the base resulted in a population loss of 30,000 people, including enlisted personnel, their families, and civilian personnel.

Increased construction and subdivision platting activity during the mid-1970s allowed Amarillo to recover from this population loss. In fact, the MSA grew by approximately 8% during the 1980s, 16% during the 1990s, and over 19% during the 2000s. The growth rate for the Amarillo MSA was 9.5% greater than that of the U.S. during the past decade. Of the 25 MSA's in Texas, the

Amarillo MSA ranked 13th in population in 2010 (see Appendix C). This is the same position it has held for the last four decades.

Potter County declined in population by 21.7% during the 1960s. As previously mentioned, this was due primarily to the air base closing. During the 1980s, Potter County experienced a slight loss of population, but due to strong residential growth in Northwest Amarillo, as well as growth in the outlying areas north of Amarillo, Potter County population grew by 16% during the 1990s and remained strong with a 6% increase in the 2000s. Potter County's 2010 population was 121,073.

Randall County on the other hand, continued to grow even during the decade of the air base closing. During the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, Randall County grew by 39%, 19.5%, and 16% respectively. Although Randall County's growth rate during the 2000s was not as high as in previous decades, the county did manage to post a strong 15.7% growth rate.

The City of Amarillo, with a 1980 population of 149,230, demonstrated a remarkable recovery of nearly an 18% gain in population over the previous decade's 8% loss in population. Amarillo continues to grow whereas the 2000 and 2010 Census data indicated the City of Amarillo to have approximately a 10% increase from the previous decades' population.

While the ranking of the MSA has been stable over the last 30 years, the City has fallen from the ninth largest incorporated place in the state in 1970 to 14th in 2010 (see Appendix D). Four of the five cities that surpassed Amarillo in population (Arlington in 1980, Garland in 1990, and Plano, Irving and Laredo in 2000) are part of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Statistical Area, the largest MSA in the state of Texas.

## Population Growth 1890-2010

Year	USA	Texas	Amarillo MSA	Potter County	Randall County	City of Amarillo
<b>1890</b> % Change	62,947,714 25.5%	2,235,527 40.4%	1,036 N/A	849 N/A	187 N/A	482 N/A
<b>1900</b> % Change	75,994,575 20.7%	3,048,710 36.4%	2,738 168.6%	1,820 114.4%	963 415.0%	1,442 199.2%
<b>1910</b> % Change	91,922,266 21%	3,986,542 27.8%	15,736 465.4%	12,424 582.6%	3,312 243.9%	9,957 590.5%
<b>1920</b> % Change	105,710,620 15%	4,663,228 19.7%	20,385 29.5%	16,710 34.5%	3,675 11.0%	15,494 55.6%
<b>1930</b> % Change	122,775,046 16.1%	5,824,715 24.9%	53,151 160.7%	46,080 175.8%	7,071 92.4%	43,132 178.4%
<b>1940</b> % Change	131,669,275 7.2%	6,414,824 10.1%	61,480 15.6%	54,265 17.8%	7,185 1.6%	51,686 19.8%
<b>1950</b> % Change	150,697,361 14.5%	7,711,194 20.2%	87,140 41.8%	73,336 35.2%	13,774 91.7%	74,246 43.6%
<b>1960</b> % Change	179,323,175 19%	9,579,677 24.2%	149,493 71.6%	115,580 57.5%	33,913 146.2%	137,969 85.8%
<b>1970</b> % Change	203,302,031 13.4%	11,196,730 16.9%	144,396 -3.4%	90,511 -21.7%	53,885 58.9%	127,010 -7.9%
<b>1980</b> % Change	226,545,805 11.4%	14,229,191 27.1%	173,699 20.3%	98,637 9.0%	75,062 39.9%	149,230 17.5%
<b>1990</b> % Change	248,709,873 9.8%	16,986,510 19.4%	187,547 8.0%	97,874 -0.8%	89,673 19.5%	157,615 5.6%
<b>2000</b> % Change	281,421,906 13.2%	20,851,820 22.8%	217,858 16.2%	113,546 16.0%	104,312 16.3%	173,627 10.2%
<b>2010</b> % Change	308,745,538 9.7%	25,145,561 20.6%	241,798 19.2%	121,073 6.6%	120,725 15.7%	190,695 9.8%

---

## POPULATION CHANGE

**D**uring the decade between 1990 and 2000, the City of Amarillo had a population growth of 10%, with growth occurring throughout the City. Of course some census tracts grew more rapidly than others, but only a few census tracts lost population during that ten year period. In comparison, the decade between 2000 and 2010, the City grew at approximately the same rate, however growth was confined primarily to the northwest, west, and southeast portions of the City. Most growth patterns in other census tracts in the City remained constant or lost population.

Recently, rapid population growth occurred in the northwest, southwest, and southeast areas of the City while the central portions of Amarillo have experienced a slow decline in population. In 1980, the center of Amarillo's population was located at the intersection of Interstate Highway 40 and Georgia Street. In 1990, the center was located near S.W. 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Georgia Street.

Over the last 20 years, the center of the City's population has moved further southward. In 2000, the center of population was near southwesterly to 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Paramount Street, while in 2010, the center shifted southeasterly to Georgia Street and Interstate Highway 27/Canyon E-Way.

During the 1990s, 40 census tracts (74%) of the 54 census tracts inside the City gained in population. Only two census tracts (CT 216.07 and 220) more than doubled in population due to new residential construction. During the 2000s, only 25 census tracts (45%) of the 55 census tracts inside the City gained in population. In-migration from smaller outlying communities in the Texas Panhandle as well as families moving from one residence to another during this time period are believed to be the reasons for some of the growth in these census tracts. The remaining census tracts experienced a reduction in population through out-migration, an overall decline in birth rates, a reduction in housing stock, and the tendency for fewer people to reside in each household.

While those areas of the City with a declining population base are certain to face problems in the future, those with growing numbers are also being forced to make adjustments. Public funding may need to be increased in areas facing rapid development in order to add classrooms to existing schools or construct additional schools, and to increase the availability of other public services. The extension of City services, such as police and fire protection, sanitation collection, and utilities into growing areas of the City requires quick response by City departments so the needs of these rapidly developing areas can be met. More detailed data on census tract population changes can be found in Appendix E.

## MALE / FEMALE DISTRIBUTION

**B**etween 1970 and 1990, the trend for both counties, the MSA, and the City revealed that females outnumbered males, as shown in the table, "Male/Female Distribution" located at the top of **page 6**. However, during the 1990s and 2000s, Potter County showed a slight increase in male population. This may be attributed to an increase in male prison populations. The only other exception to this occurred during the 1960s when the air base was operational. During that time, there were more males than females in the MSA, Potter County and the City of Amarillo.

Comparable to 1990 and 2000 Census data, the 2010 Census data indicated more males than females under the age of 17 in Amarillo. However after the age of 17, females dominate all age groups. Between the ages of 18 and 64, there were an average of 95 males to every 100 females. This ratio changed dramatically in the age groups over 65, where there were an average of only 65 males to every 100 females. The table, “Males & Females by Age Groups, 2010” at the bottom of this page shows the predominant number of females in different age levels. More detailed data on the subject of male/female composition by age can be found in Appendix F.

### Male/Female Distribution

Year & Gender	Amarillo MSA	Potter County	Randall County	City of Amarillo
<b>1960</b>				
Male	51.3%	51.9%	49.5%	51.4%
Female	48.7%	48.1%	50.5%	48.6%
<b>1970</b>				
Male	48.5%	47.9%	49.5%	48.1%
Female	51.5%	52.1%	50.5%	51.9%
<b>1980</b>				
Male	48.3%	48.1%	48.7%	48.2%
Female	51.5%	51.9%	51.3%	51.8%
<b>1990</b>				
Male	48.1%	48.0%	48.2%	47.9%
Female	51.9%	52.0%	51.8%	52.1%
<b>2000</b>				
Male	49.5%	50.2%	48.6%	48.0%
Female	50.5%	49.8%	51.4%	52.0%
<b>2010</b>				
Male	49.9%	51.1%	48.7%	48.5%
Female	50.1%	48.9%	51.3%	51.5%

### Amarillo Males and Females by Age Groups, 2010

Age Group	Males	Females	Excess in Numbers	
			Males	Females
Under 5 years	8,094	7,792	302	---
5 to 17 years	18,581	17,936	645	---
18 to 19 years	2,559	2,628	---	69
20 to 34 years	20,438	21,192	---	754
35 to 44 years	11,411	11,772	---	361
45 to 54 years	12,169	12,947	---	778
55 to 64 years	9,706	10,625	---	919
65 to 74 years	5,278	6,539	---	1,261
75 to 84 years	3,264	4,676	---	1,412
85 and over	965	2,123	---	1,158
<b>TOTAL – All ages</b>	<b>92,465</b>	<b>98,230</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>6,712</b>

---

## MARITAL STATUS

**D**uring the past 30 years, there has been one very notable trend in the marital status of the City's population – the percentage of individuals never married has substantially increased from 20.1% in 1990 to 28.3% in 2010. At the same time, the percentage of married people has decreased from 58.5% in 1990 to 49.6% in 2010. People who are separated, widowed, or divorced increased slightly from 21% in 1990 to 22% in 2010. Potter and Randall counties as well as the Amarillo MSA experienced similar trends. Randall County had a higher percentage of people who were married (56.4%), while Potter County had higher percentages of people who were never married (31.7%), separated (4.2%), widowed (6.5%), as well as divorced (13.4%). Appendix G shows the marital status of people in the City of Amarillo, the Amarillo MSA and both Potter and Randall counties.


## AGE DISTRIBUTION

**T**he overall age of a community's population is an indicator of whether the community is maturing or becoming younger. The population within Amarillo appears to be maturing. The illustration on **page 8**, "Amarillo Age Distribution 1950-2010," provides a graphic representation of the fluctuations in the various age groups. As the graph indicates, there were high proportions of young people during the 1950's and 1960's. This was a direct result of the Baby Boom generation. As this generation continues to age, an increase in the 45 and Over age groups will become more noticeable.

During the four decades since 1970, Amarillo has been experiencing a population decrease in the "Under 20" age groups. In addition to this trend, the "Over 35" age groups are expected to increase in proportion to Amarillo's total population at a faster rate than any other age group. This trend is expected to continue in the future as well. Total population figures by age from 1950 to 2010 are listed for the City, the Amarillo MSA, and both counties in Appendices H through K. Census tract population by age for 1990 through 2010 can be found in Appendix L. This information may be helpful in planning for community centers, recreation activities, or other facilities that may need to target specific age groups by geographic area.



The primary changes in age composition from 1960 to 2010 for the Amarillo area reveal two essential trends. The first trend is described as having a decreasing proportion of people under 20 years of age, due to a decrease in birth rates. The second trend is described as having an increasing number of older people, which has resulted from a continued decline in death rates and the aging Baby Boom generation. In 1960, individuals under the age of 20 made up 42% of the City's population. By 2010, this number had decreased to 27%. The 20 – 44 age groups have also decreased since 1960. In 1960, this group of individuals accounted for 36%, while the 2010 Census revealed that the group accounts for only 17.7% of the total City population. Conversely, in 1960, people over the age of 45 made up 22% of the population. By 2010, this percentage had increased to nearly 55% of the City's population.

**Amarillo Age Distribution 1950-2010**



	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b>Under 5</b>	11.5%	12.6%	8.7%	8.8%	10.0%	8.0%	8.3%
<b>5-19</b>	22.4%	29.3%	29.8%	23.9%	21.0%	22.9%	21.9%
<b>20-34</b>	26.8%	23.1%	20.5%	27.2%	24.4%	21.1%	21.8%
<b>35-44</b>	15.6%	13.3%	12.3%	10.8%	14.5%	14.9%	12.2%
<b>45-64</b>	18.6%	16.3%	20.2%	19.2%	18.0%	20.5%	23.8%
<b>65 &amp; Over</b>	5.1%	5.3%	8.5%	10.1%	12.0%	12.6%	12.0%




## PERSONS 18 & UNDER



The maps located on **page 9**, “Persons Under 18 Years of Age (2000 & 2010)” illustrate how the percentage of children under 18 years of age has changed geographically (by census tract) between 2000 and 2010. Appendix M shows the actual numbers and percentages of children under the age of 18 by census tract from 1990 to 2010. In 1990 and 2000 children accounted for over 30% of the total census tract population in approximately 4/10<sup>th</sup> of all census tracts in the City of Amarillo. In 2010, this number slightly decreased to 29% of all census tracts in Amarillo. Only one quarter of the census tracts increased in their percentage of children from 2000 to 2010. The largest increases occurred in census tract 216.08 (200%) with newly developing neighborhoods such as Westover Village, Hillside Terrace Estates, and Westover Park; census tract 220.01 (470%), that includes South Georgia Place and City View Estates; census tract 220.02 (450%) which encompasses Tradewinds Air Park and Windmill Acres; and census tract 133 (190%) that includes Quail Creek, Westcliff Park, La Paloma Estates, Tascosa Estates, and The Woodlands additions. The largest declines occurred in census tracts 216.03 (-51%) which includes the Puckett West subdivision and census tract 216.06 (-35%) that encompasses South Park, Windsor Square, Estacado West, Windridge Place, and Meadow subdivisions.

The maps on **page 11** illustrating “Persons 65 Years of Age and Over” indicate changes that occurred geographically (by census tract) between 2000 and 2010. Appendix L displays the actual numbers and percentages of Amarillo’s population by age in census tracts from 1990 to 2010. The increased number of people 65 years and older, along with their increased proportion of population has raise awareness to issues facing this segment of society. Issues include different types of pension and retirement plans, special housing facilities, institutional facilities for the aged, and the expansion of senior citizen recreational services. Due to the increasing numbers, considerable political strength has been gained by the aged through such groups as the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP). Amarillo’s “65 years and older” population accounted for 12% of the total population in 1990, 12.6% in 2000, and 12% in 2010. While the 65 and over population group has not significantly increased in proportion in regards to Amarillo’s total population, the number of senior citizens have increased 20% since 1990.

# PERSONS 65 & OVER




## DEPENDENCY RATIO

A population may be divided into two groups based upon the stage of life people have attained. These two broad groups are the economically dependent and the economically productive. The relative size of the economically dependent and the economically productive groups at any given point in time can have important implications in terms of economic production, tax structure, institutional and governmental needs, along with other social services.

The economically dependent are defined as children under 15 years of age and individuals 65 years of age and over. This group of individuals are not expected to be economically productive, and therefore, are dependent upon the productive people of the community. Consequently, the economically productive group encompasses all the remaining people in the community, or those between the ages of 16 and 64.


A ratio has been devised which indicates the burden of support borne by the productive members of the community. This ratio is generated by dividing the number of people under 15 years of age and over 65 years of age (the dependent population) by the number of people 16 through 64 years of age (the productive population). The resulting figure, multiplied by 1,000, is referred to as the dependency ratio of a population. This ratio indicates the number of dependent people for every 1,000 people of wage-earning age. The Amarillo MSA dependency ratio in 1960 was 713. This ratio has steadily decreased over the past 50 years, and in 2010 the ratio was 545. The City of Amarillo also has a declining dependency ratio. The ratio was 716 in 1960, but had declined to 707 by 2010. The graph below illustrating “Dependency Ratios 1950 – 2010” indicates changes in the City’s and MSA’s dependency ratio over the last seventy years.



## INDEX OF AGING

**A**lthough people in the two extreme age groups (Under 16 and 65 and Over) are classified as the economically-dependent population, each of the two groups play a different role in the community through the different types of goods and services they require. Further insight regarding the importance of the two age groups may be gained by comparing their growth rates. This type of comparison is accomplished through the development of an index. This index is created by dividing the number of people 65 years and older by the number of people under the age of 16. The resulting figure is then multiplied by 100 to produce an index of aging. The number of people age 65 years and older, in relation to those less than 16 years of age, has generally increased since 1950. In 1950, there were only 19 senior citizens per 100 young people in the City and 20 senior citizens per 100 young people in Amarillo’s MSA. The graph on below, “Index of Aging 1950 – 2010,” shows the fluctuation in the index between 1950 and 2010. In 2010, the City and MSA had an index of 68 and 49, respectively. It is clear that older people make up a significantly larger portion of the population than they did during the middle of the century. This trend is expected to continue as the Baby Boom generation enters the more dependent stage of their lives.


**Index of Aging 1950 - 2010**



## RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Five major race classifications and one ethnic characteristic classification are distinguished by the Bureau of Census: White; Black; American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut; Asian and Pacific Islander; Other Races; and Hispanic (ethnic characteristic). For the 2010 Census, another category was added entitled “Two or More Races” for individuals who are of more than one race. In 1990, Whites made up 77% of Amarillo's total population and decreased to 68% in 2000. The 2010 Census indicates that this percentage dropped to 60% of Amarillo's population. This reduction in percentage can be attributed the large increase in the Hispanic population.

In 1980, there were 45 City census tracts (out of 59 total census tracts) that contained 75% or more White population. By 1990, this had changed to 41 census tracts (out of 63 total census tracts) and in 2000, there were 31 census tracts (out of 53 total census tracts). In 2010, only 23 census tracts (out of 58 total census tracts) had 75% or more White population. The map titled “Concentration of White Population” below shows concentration to be located in the western and southwestern areas of Amarillo in 2010. Where the White population has been decreasing as a percentage of the total population, minority populations have been increasing, as shown in the table, “Percent Change in Race/Ethnicity,” on page 15. The Hispanic population had the largest increase in numbers, from 37,947 in 2000 to 54,881 in 2010 which equates to a 45% increase. Asian and Pacific Islanders also had a large percentage (69%) increase in population during the past decade. American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut population slightly decreased (-2%). Changes in actual population for each minority group are shown in the graph "Trends in Minority Populations 1990-2010" on page 15. Appendix N shows 1990 thru 2010 Race/Ethnicity by Census Tract for the City of Amarillo.




**Percent Change in Race/Ethnicity  
Between 1990 and 2000**

Race/Ethnicity	% Change 2000 – 2010	% Change 1990 – 2000	OVERALL CHANGE 1990 – 2010
Hispanic *	45 %	63 %	136 %
White	- 4 %	- 2 %	-6 %
Black	19 %	9 %	30 %
American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut	- 2 %	-1 %	-3 %
Asian or Pacific Islander	69 %	-1 %	111 %
Other Race	78 %	- 35 %	16 %
<b>Total Population Change</b>	<b>10 %</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>21 %</b>

\* Ethnic characteristic

**Trends in Minority Population 1990 – 2010**




## Hispanic Persons

Although the Census Bureau considered Hispanic as an ethnic characteristic in 1990, 2000, and 2010 Censuses, Hispanic figures are reported by the Census Bureau so they may be compared numerically with other races. In the 2010 Census, Hispanics are the principal non-White minority group in Amarillo making up 28.8% of the City's population and 71.5% of the total non-White population. In comparison, people of Spanish language and Spanish surname comprised of 14.7% of the City's population in 1990, and by 2000 accounted for 21.9% of the City's population.

The Hispanic population is not only the largest non-White population in Amarillo, it is also the fastest growing segment of the population. Between 1990 and 2010, the Hispanic population grew by nearly 140%, outpacing all other racial group's growth rate (see "Percent Change in Race/Ethnicity" table on **page 15**). This high rate of growth for Hispanics is expected to continue due to provisions of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1986. According to the Act, any person who has been granted legalization through a permanent residential visa is eligible to move their immediate families into the country to live with them.

The Hispanic population in Amarillo is young in that 39% were under 18 years of age in 2010, compared to 27% being under age 18 for the total City population. There is an extremely low percentage (4%) of elderly Hispanics in Amarillo, compared to 12% of the entire City population.

Only 14 census tracts within the City were over 20% Hispanic in 1990; that increased to 20 census tracts by 2000. In 2010, there were 29 census tracts with more than 20% of their population being Hispanic as shown on the map of "Concentration of Hispanic Population" below.




## Black Persons

The City of Amarillo's Black population accounted for 5.8% of the total population in 1990 as well as 2000, and grew to 6.3% in 2010. This represents a 30 % increase of total growth in the Black community between 1990 and 2010 (see “Percent Change in Race/Ethnicity” table and “Trends in Minority Population” graph on **page 15**).

The Black population is young, as 38% of the Blacks in Amarillo were under 18 years of age in 2010, compared to 27% for the total City population. The proportion of the Black population 65 and over was nearly 7%, in contrast to 12% of the entire City population.


The Black population is concentrated in the northern and north central portions of the City, as shown on the map “Concentration of Black Population” below. The 2010 Census indicated that 67.3% of the residents in Census Tract 130 were Black, while 42.4% were Black in Census Tract 139 and 41.9% in Census Tract 148. These areas of the City also had concentrations of Black people in previous censuses.



### Asian or Pacific Islanders

In Amarillo, the Asian or Pacific Islander population consists predominantly of Laotian and Vietnamese people. There were 5,945 Asian or Pacific Islanders in the City in 2010, which represents 3% of Amarillo’s total population. This was a 69% increase in this racial population during the past decade (see “Percent Change in Race/Ethnicity” table and “Trends in Minority Population” graph on **page 15**). People of this race reside in all quadrants of the City, as shown on the map below.


However, census tract 149 has the largest number with 2,449 (42% of the census tract) being Asian or Pacific Islanders. A cultural characteristic of this population segment is that many often live in large extended families.



**American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut**

In 2010, there were 928 American Indians, Eskimos, or Aleutians in the City of Amarillo. This was approximately the same number as resided in Amarillo in 2000. This population group accounted for only 0.5% of Amarillo's total population in 2010.

There were ten census tracts in 2010 that had 30 or more people of the American Indian, Eskimo or Aleutian race. Census Tract 216.08 had the largest proportion of this population with a total of 39 people. The map below shows areas of concentrations of American Indians, Eskimos or Aleutian.



## **SINGLE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN**

**S**ingle parent households are a growing segment of Amarillo’s population. Between 1990 and 2010, the number of single head of households with children under 18 increased by 41%. The 1990 Census was the first time in which the number of male-headed households with dependent children was reported and was again reported in the 2000 and 2010 Censuses. In 2010, there were 6,299 female householders (no husband present) with dependent children and 2,087 male householders (no wife present) with dependent children. In 1990, there were 4,807 female householders (no husband present) with dependent children and 1,121 male householders (no wife present) with dependent children. Appendix O lists female-headed households (no husband present) and male-headed households (no wife present) with children under 18 years of age by census tract.

While no gender bias is intended, households headed by females with dependent children generally have lower family incomes. For instance in April 2012, of the single-family households with dependent children (1,225) that were on the waiting list for assisted housing in Amarillo, 96% were female-headed households with dependent children. Conversely, the remaining 4% were male-headed households with dependent children. This socio-economic trend is of great concern to many public and private agencies, and has resulted in the development of many programs that are targeted to help single head of household families with dependent children.

## **HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS**

**H**ousing is a major determinant of a city's quality of life. Housing stock, affordability, and location are all major factors that relate to this. In order to plan for and project future housing needs, it is necessary to observe past and present population characteristics. In addition, past and present housing characteristics, such as occupancy status, population per household, and quality features must also be observed. When this is accomplished, the ability to forecast housing supply and demand is improved, and the gap between the two can be narrowed.

## **HOUSING SUPPLY**

**D**uring the past decade, the City of Amarillo's housing supply grew 10.9%. As of April 1, 2010, there were 80,298 year-round housing units within the City, or 7,890 more than in 2000. As the “Housing Units 1950 – 2010” table on **page 21** shows, this increase in housing units was not as great as that which occurred during the previous decades, but nevertheless affirms the trend that Amarillo's housing supply is growing at a steady rate.


Furthermore, when the 10.9% growth in housing supply is compared to the 9.8% growth in population for the City of Amarillo, it becomes apparent that the availability of housing per person is nearly equal. The same follows for the Amarillo MSA, where the 11 % population growth is about equal to the 12.5% growth in housing supply.

### Housing Units 1950-2010 City of Amarillo

Year	Housing Units	Changes in Housing Units		
		Years	Number	% Change
1950	24,399	----	----	----
1960	43,099	1950 - 1960	18,700	76.6%
1970	48,381	1960 - 1970	5,281	12.3%
1980	60,242	1970 - 1980	11,861	24.5%
1990	68,592	1980 - 1990	8,350	13.9%
2000	72,408	1990 - 2000	3,816	5.6%
2010	80,298	2000 - 2010	7,890	10.9%



### HOUSING SUPPLY CHANGE 2000-2010



The map on **page 21** illustrating “Housing Supply Change 2000-2010” depicts the Amarillo census tracts that showed a marked increase or decrease in the number of housing units. As was noted earlier, during the past decade, Amarillo gained 7,890 housing units. The majority of this growth occurred on the City's periphery. Specifically, growth in housing supply was concentrated in the south, southwest, and northwest areas of the City.

As was the case during the 1990s, the central area of Amarillo saw a reduction in housing supply during the 2000s. The 2000 Census Tracts 146 and 111 that contain the Central Business District were combined into one larger census tract (Census Tract 154) for the 2010 Census and due to the increase in size, showed a 7.8% increase in housing supply.

The central area housing supply rallied slightly as per the 2010 figures, with census tracts located north and south of the Central Business District (census tracts 148 and 147 respectively) growing by 2.3%. Appendix P shows numerical and percentage changes in housing supplies by census tract between 1990 and 2010.

## OCCUPANCY STATUS

**I**n 2010, the City of Amarillo had 73,918 occupied residences, which equated to an occupancy rate of 92.1%. This percentage was lower than the 93.5% occupancy rate reported during the 2000 Census, but higher than the reported 1990 Census occupancy rate of 89.1%.


In 2010, Census Tract 103 had the lowest occupancy rate at 77.7% and Census Tract 210 had the highest at 98.5%.

Housing supply and occupancy figures by census tract for 1990 through 2000 are included in Appendix Q. Of the 73,918 occupied residential units in Amarillo, 46,254 (62.6%) units were owner-occupied. The remaining 27,664 units (37.4%) were renter-occupied. For the past three decades, both the northern and southwestern census tracts had a high majority of housing units that were owner-occupied. Appendix R details Tenure (owners/renters) by Census Tract for 1990, 2000, and 2010.

## POPULATION PER HOUSEHOLD

**A**marillo’s average household size decreased during the 1990s and 2000s, but have since rebounded. In 1990, the average household size was 2.54 which decreased to 2.53 people per household in 2000. However, in 2010 the number increased slightly to 2.55 people per household. This increase may be attributed to an increase of extended families living in a residential environment. Two additional factors that negatively impact the calculation include divorce rates and the number of individuals living alone. However, both of these factors have increased in the past decade.

The “Average Population per Household by Census Tract,” for the years 1990 through 2010 are detailed in Appendix S. The 2010 average population per household is shown by census tract on the map below. As can be seen, the census tracts with the greatest population per household are located in the northeastern section of the City. For more detailed information, Appendix T includes persons in housing units per census tract.




## APPENDIX A

The diagram below is to aid in clarifying geographic changes in census tracts between 1990 and 2010. This may be helpful when comparing data from decade to decade.

The Appendix tables denote changes with footnotes as follows:



- \* Census Tract did not exist during this Census.
- \*\* The geographic area of this census tract has changed over the decades. The diagram below details these changes.
- \*\*\* Due to the changes in the geographic area of this census tract, simple comparisons from decade to decade are not possible. Comparisons can be made, however, by combining data as indicated in the diagram below.

### Changes in Census Tracts by Decennial Census



<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>2010</u>
123	→	149	→	149
125				
140	→	150	→	150
127				
128.97				
135	→	151	→	151
136				
137	→	152	→	152
138				
131	→	153	→	153
133				
(portion east of Western St.)				
211	→	211	→	211.01
			→	211.02
215	→	215	→	215
220.97				
216.07	→	216.07	→	216.08
			→	216.09
217	→	217.01	→	217.03
			→	217.04
220.98	→	220	→	220.01
			→	220.02

## APPENDIX B



## APPENDIX C

### Population for 25 Texas Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs)

MSA Name	2010	2000	1990	% Change	
				2000-2010	1990-2000
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington	6,371,773	5,221,801	3,885,415	22.0%	34.4%
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown	5,946,800	4,669,571	3,711,043	27.4%	25.8%
San Antonio-New Braunfels	2,142,508	1,592,383	1,302,099	34.5%	22.3%
Austin-Round Rock-San Marcos	1,716,289	1,249,763	781,572	37.3%	59.9%
El Paso	800,647	679,622	591,610	17.8%	14.9%
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission	774,769	569,463	383,545	36.1%	48.5%
Corpus Christi	428,185	380,783	349,894	12.4%	8.8%
Brownsville-Harlingen	406,220	335,227	260,120	21.2%	28.9%
Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood	405,300	312,952	255,301	29.5%	22.6%
Beaumont-Port Arthur	388,745	385,090	361,226	0.9%	6.6%
Lubbock	284,890	242,628	222,636	17.4%	9.0%
Laredo	250,304	193,117	133,239	29.6%	44.9%
<b>AMARILLO</b>	<b>249,881</b>	<b>217,858</b>	<b>187,547</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>
Waco	234,906	213,517	189,123	10.0%	12.9%
College Station-Bryan	228,660	152,415	121,862	50.0%	25.1%
Longview	214,369	208,780	162,431	2.7%	28.5%
Tyler	209,714	174,706	151,309	20.0%	15.5%
Abilene	135,252	126,555	119,655	6.9%	5.8%
Wichita Falls	151,306	140,518	122,378	7.7%	14.8%
Odessa	137,130	Combined with Midland			
Midland	136,872	Combined with Odessa			
Texarkana	136,027	129,749	81,665	4.8%	58.9%
Sherman-Denison	120,877	110,595	95,021	9.3%	16.4%
Victoria	115,384	84,088	74,361	37.2%	13.1%
San Angelo	111,823	104,010	98,458	7.5%	5.6%
<b>Texas (total population)</b>	<b>25,145,561</b>	<b>20,851,820</b>	<b>16,986,510</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>22.8%</b>
<b>25 MSAs (total population)</b>	<b>22,098,631</b>	<b>17,732,323</b>	<b>13,867,055</b>	<b>24.6%</b>	<b>27.9%</b>
<b>% of Texas population living in MSAs</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>81.6%</b>		

## APPENDIX D

### Texas Cities over 100,000 Population

City Name	2010	2000	% Change 2000-2010
Houston	2,099,451	1,953,631	7.5%
San Antonio	1,327,407	1,144,646	16.0%
Dallas	1,197,816	1,188,580	0.8%
Austin	790,390	656,562	20.4%
Fort Worth	741,206	534,694	38.6%
El Paso	649,121	563,662	15.2%
Arlington	365,438	332,969	9.8%
Corpus Christi	305,215	277,454	10.0%
Plano	259,841	222,030	17.0%
Laredo	236,091	176,576	33.7%
Lubbock	229,573	199,564	15.0%
Garland	226,876	215,768	5.1%
Irving	216,290	191,615	12.9%
<b>AMARILLO</b>	<b>190,695</b>	<b>173,627</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
Grand Prairie	175,396	127,427	37.6%
Brownsville	175,023	139,722	25.3%
Pasadena	149,043	141,674	5.2%
Mesquite	139,824	124,943	11.9%
McKinney	131,117	54,369	141.2%
McAllen	129,877	106,414	22.0%
Killeen	127,921	86,911	47.2%
Waco	124,805	113,866	9.6%
Carrollton	119,097	106,576	11.7%
Beaumont	118,296	114,024	3.7%
Abilene	117,063	115,930	1.0%
Frisco	116,989	33,714	247.0%
Denton	113,383	80,537	40.8%
Midland	111,147	94,996	17.0%
Wichita Falls	104,553	104,197	0.3%
<b>Texas (Total Population)</b>	<b>25,145,561</b>	<b>20,851,820</b>	<b>20.6%</b>
<b>Population of Cities over 100,000</b>	<b>10,788,944</b>	<b>9,026,151</b>	<b>19.5%</b>
<b>% of Texas Population living in Cities over 100,000</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	

**APPENDIX E**  
**Population Change by Census Tract**  
**City of Amarillo**

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990	2000-2010 Change		1990-2000 Change	
				Difference	%	Difference	%
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>							
101	1,949	2,085	1,882	-136	-6.5%	203	10.8%
102	1,961	1,939	1,886	22	1.1%	53	2.8%
103	1,251	1,491	1,587	-240	-16.1%	-96	-6.0%
104	3,365	3,445	3,109	-80	-2.3%	336	10.8%
105*	**	**	2,095	***	***	***	***
106	2,168	1,926	1,600	242	12.6%	326	20.4%
107	3,262	3,171	3,247	91	2.9%	-76	-2.3%
108*	**	**	812	***	***	***	***
109*	**	**	4,491	***	***	***	***
110	2,304	2,317	2,064	-13	-0.6%	253	12.3%
111*	**	2,218	2,334	***	***	-116	-5.0%
112*	**	**	717	***	***	***	***
113*	**	**	363	***	***	***	***
114*	**	**	1,790	***	***	***	***
115	4,155	4,289	3,867	-134	-3.1%	422	10.9%
116	4,211	3,826	3,597	385	10.1%	229	6.4%
117	4,538	3,884	3,792	654	16.8%	92	2.4%
118	3,739	3,647	3,696	92	2.5%	-49	-1.3%
119	3,205	3,226	2,971	-21	-0.7%	255	8.6%
120	1,745	1,700	1,654	45	2.6%	46	2.8%
121*	**	**	563	***	***	***	***
122	3,946	3,714	2,959	232	6.2%	755	25.5%
123*	**	**	597	***	***	***	***
125*	**	**	4,670	***	***	***	***
126	3,255	2,564	2,301	691	27.0%	263	11.4%
127*	**	**	4,907	***	***	***	***
128*	5,053	4,558	**	495	10.9%	***	***
128.97*	**	**	100	***	***	***	***
128.98*	**	**	3,756	***	***	***	***
129*	**	**	1,853	***	***	***	***
130	1,695	1,707	1,756	-12	-0.7%	-49	-2.8%
131*	**	**	4,036	***	***	***	***
132	1,636	1,862	1,308	-226	-12.1%	554	42.4%
133	4,608	2,889	1,846	1,719	59.5%	1,043	56.5%
134	58	13	58	45	346.2%	-45	-77.6%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990	2000-2010 Change		1990-2000 Change	
				Difference	%	Difference	%
135*	**	**	992	***	***	***	***
136*	**	**	1,044	***	***	***	***
137*	**	**	1,938	***	***	***	***
138*	**	**	888	***	***	***	***
139	3,390	3,336	3,218	54	1.6%	118	3.7%
140*	**	**	794	***	***	***	***
141	2,271	2,425	2,256	-154	-6.4%	169	7.5%
144*	**	2,072	2,108	***	***	-36	-1.7%
144.01*	2,179	**	**	***	***	***	***
145	6,184	5,649	**	535	9.5%	***	***
146*	**	635	**	***	***	***	***
147*	4,934	4,990	**	-56	-1.1%	***	***
148*	2,502	2,533	**	-31	-1.2%	***	***
149*	5,901	5,709	**	192	3.4%	***	***
150*	6,964	6,110	**	854	14.0%	***	***
151*	2,266	2,198	**	68	3.1%	***	***
152*	2,825	2,841	**	-16	-0.6%	***	***
153*	5,002	4,864	**	138	2.8%	***	***
154*	2,964	**	**	***	***	***	***
9800*	**	**	**	***	***	***	***
<b>Total in Potter County</b>	<b>105,486</b>	<b>99,833</b>	<b>91,502</b>	<b>5,193</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>4,650</b>	<b>9.1%</b>

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990	2000-2010 Change		1990-2000 Change	
				Difference	%	Difference	%
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>							
201	2,101	2,194	2,176	-93	-4.2%	18	0.8%
202	2,059	2,284	2,145	-225	-9.9%	139	6.5%
203	1,987	2,011	1,812	-24	-1.2%	199	11.0%
204	1,864	2,041	2,008	-177	-8.7%	33	1.6%
205	3,982	3,885	3,536	97	2.5%	349	9.9%
206	3,867	3,839	4,118	28	0.7%	-279	-6.8%
208	6,623	5,738	5,519	885	15.4%	219	4.0%
209	2,892	2,866	2,793	26	0.9%	73	2.6%
210	2,420	2,384	2,450	36	1.5%	-66	-2.7%
211*	**	6,580	6,228	***	***	352	5.7%
211.01*	3,962	**	**	***	***	***	***
211.02*	2,369	**	**	***	***	***	***
212	5,208	5,191	5,395	17	0.3%	-204	-3.8%
213	5,288	5,577	5,649	-289	-5.2%	-72	-1.3%
215	4,843	4,979	4,480	-136	-2.7%	499	11.1%
216.02	5,096	5,676	5,604	-580	-10.2%	72	1.3%
216.03	1,932	2,204	2,315	-272	-12.3%	-111	-4.8%
216.04	4,468	4,815	3,441	-347	-7.2%	1374	39.9%
216.05	1,955	1,760	1,093	195	11.1%	667	61.0%
216.06	5,121	5,527	4,006	-406	-7.3%	1521	38.0%
216.07*	**	2,518	348	***	***	2170	623.6%
216.08*	5,745	**	**	***	***	***	***
216.09*	3,241	**	**	***	***	***	***
217.01*	**	-	**	***	***	***	***
220*	**	1,725	**	***	***	***	***
220.01*	4,193	**	**	***	***	***	***
220.02*	3,993	**	**	***	***	***	***
220.97*	**	**	214	***	***	***	***
220.98*	**	**	783	***	***	***	***
<b>Total in Randall County</b>	<b>85,209</b>	<b>73,794</b>	<b>66,113</b>	<b>-1,265</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>6,953</b>	<b>11.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>190,695</b>	<b>173,627</b>	<b>157,615</b>	<b>3,928</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>11,603</b>	<b>10.2%</b>

**APPENDIX F**  
**Male / Female by Age 1990 – 2010**

Age	2010			2000			1990		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Under 5	8,094	7,792	15,886	7,124	6,787	13,911	6,660	6,578	13,238
5 to 9	7,592	7,264	14,856	6,893	6,679	13,572	6,684	6,358	13,042
10 to 14	6,983	6,731	13,714	6,673	6,447	13,120	5,898	5,906	11,804
15 to 17	4,006	3,941	7,947	3,910	3,910	7,820	3,226	3,062	6,288
18 to 19	2,559	2,628	5,187	2,548	2,683	5,231	2,242	2,287	4,529
20	1,226	1,335	2,561	1,222	1,394	2,616	1,043	1,192	2,235
21	1,252	1,359	2,611	1,199	1,239	2,438	1,019	1,075	2,094
22 to 24	4,066	4,315	8,381	3,557	3,942	7,499	3,169	3,415	6,584
25 to 29	7,358	7,677	15,035	6,037	6,326	12,363	6,697	6,716	13,413
30 to 34	6,536	6,506	13,042	5,778	5,962	11,740	6,961	7,159	14,120
35 to 44	11,411	11,772	23,183	12,698	13,166	25,864	11,242	11,613	22,855
45 to 54	12,169	12,947	25,116	10,545	11,135	21,680	6,992	7,755	14,747
55 to 59	5,375	5,863	11,238	3,571	3,881	7,452	3,238	3,620	6,858
60 to 61	1,871	2,028	3,899	1,190	1,501	2,691	1,246	1,439	2,685
62 to 64	2,460	2,734	5,194	1,658	2,077	3,735	1,872	2,277	4,149
65 to 74	5,278	6,539	11,817	5,152	6,473	11,625	4,675	6,241	10,916
75 to 84	3,264	4,676	7,940	2,878	4,678	7,556	2,175	4,007	6,182
85 and over	965	2,123	3,088	737	1,977	2,714	484	1,392	1,876
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92,465</b>	<b>98,230</b>	<b>190,695</b>	<b>83,370</b>	<b>90,257</b>	<b>173,627</b>	<b>75,523</b>	<b>82,092</b>	<b>157,615</b>
<b>Median age (yrs.)</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>34.7</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Age	2010 Percentage			2000 Percentage			1990 Percentage		
	Male	Female		Male	Female		Male	Female	
Under 5	51.0%	49.0%		51.2%	48.8%		50.3%	49.7%	
5 to 9	51.1%	48.9%		50.8%	49.2%		51.2%	48.8%	
10 to 14	50.9%	49.1%		50.9%	49.1%		50.0%	50.0%	
15 to 17	50.4%	49.6%		50.0%	50.0%		51.3%	48.7%	
18 to 19	49.3%	50.7%		48.7%	51.3%		49.5%	50.5%	
20	47.9%	52.1%		46.7%	53.3%		46.7%	53.3%	
21	48.0%	52.0%		49.2%	50.8%		48.7%	51.3%	
22 to 24	48.5%	51.5%		47.4%	52.6%		48.1%	51.9%	
25 to 29	48.9%	51.1%		48.8%	51.2%		49.9%	50.1%	
30 to 34	50.1%	49.9%		49.2%	50.8%		49.3%	50.7%	
35 to 44	49.2%	50.8%		49.1%	50.9%		49.2%	50.8%	
45 to 54	48.5%	51.5%		48.6%	51.4%		47.4%	52.6%	
55 to 59	47.8%	52.2%		47.9%	52.1%		47.2%	52.8%	
60 to 61	48.0%	52.0%		44.2%	55.8%		46.4%	53.6%	
62 to 64	47.4%	52.6%		44.4%	55.6%		45.1%	54.9%	
65 to 74	44.7%	55.3%		44.3%	55.7%		42.8%	57.2%	
75 to 84	41.1%	58.9%		38.1%	61.9%		35.2%	64.8%	
85 and over	31.3%	68.8%		27.2%	72.8%		25.8%	74.2%	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>51.5%</b>		<b>48.0%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>		<b>47.9%</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	

N/A = Not available

**APPENDIX G**  
**Marital Status 1990 – 2010**  
**(Population 15 years of age and over)**

**City of Amarillo**

Marital Status	2010*		2000		1990	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Never Married	40,999	28.3%	29,876	22.5%	24,031	20.1%
Married	71,904	49.6%	74,826	56.3%	69,949	58.5%
Separated	4,455	3.1%	3,339	2.5%	3,009	2.5%
Widowed	9,154	6.3%	9,292	7.0%	9,256	7.7%
Divorced	18,459	12.7%	15,660	11.8%	13,286	11.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>144,971</b>		<b>132,993</b>		<b>119,531</b>	

**Amarillo MSA (Potter and Randall Counties Only)**

Marital Status	2010*		2000		1990	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Never Married	52,389	28.4%	37,154	22.0%	29,512	20.7%
Married	92,943	50.3%	97,748	57.9%	84,285	59.1%
Separated	5,371	2.9%	4,355	2.6%	3,341	2.3%
Widowed	11,264	6.1%	10,917	6.5%	10,334	7.2%
Divorced	22,748	12.3%	18,552	11.0%	15,073	10.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>184,715</b>		<b>168,726</b>		<b>142,545</b>	

**Potter County**

Marital Status	2010*		2000		1990	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Never Married	29,116	31.7%	19,490	22.5%	15,692	21.3%
Married	40,585	44.2%	47,371	54.6%	40,347	54.7%
Separated	3,864	4.2%	3,066	3.5%	2,319	3.1%
Widowed	6,015	6.5%	6,423	7.4%	6,576	8.9%
Divorced	12,344	13.4%	10,335	11.9%	8,786	11.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>91,924</b>		<b>86,685</b>		<b>73,720</b>	

**Randall County**

Marital Status	2010*		2000		1990	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Never Married	23,273	25.1%	17,664	21.5%	13,820	20.1%
Married	52,358	56.4%	50,377	61.4%	43,938	63.8%
Separated	1,507	1.6%	1,289	1.6%	1,022	1.5%
Widowed	5,249	5.7%	4,494	5.5%	3,758	5.5%
Divorced	10,404	11.2%	8,217	10.0%	6,287	9.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>92,791</b>		<b>82,041</b>		<b>68,825</b>	

\*Data was obtained through the 2006-2010 American Community Survey provided by the Census Bureau

**APPENDIX H**  
**Population by Age 1950 – 2010**  
City of Amarillo

Age Group	2010	2000	1990	1980	1970	1960	1950
<b>Under 5</b>	15,886	13,911	13,238	13,059	11,046	17,430	8,533
<b>5 to 9</b>	14,856	13,572	13,042	11,800	12,649	15,276	6,356
<b>10 to 14</b>	13,714	13,120	11,804	11,184	13,228	12,037	5,105
<b>15 to 19</b>	7,947	7,820	6,288	12,674	11,991	13,067	5,201
<b>20 to 24</b>	5,187	5,231	4,529	14,800	9,840	10,729	6,410
<b>25 to 29</b>	2,561	2,616	2,235	14,155	} 16,190	10,725	7,082
<b>30 to 34</b>	2,611	2,438	2,094	11,631		10,461	6,403
<b>35 to 39</b>	8,381	7,499	6,584	} 16,130	} 15,584	9,898	6,056
<b>40 to 44</b>	15,035	12,363	13,413			8,456	5,495
<b>45 to 49</b>	13,042	11,740	14,120	} 15,205	} 14,504	7,334	4,765
<b>50 to 54</b>	23,183	25,864	22,855			6,120	3,853
<b>55 to 59</b>	25,116	21,680	14,747	7,313	6,092	5,213	2,921
<b>60 to 64</b>	11,238	7,452	6,858	6,151	5,116	3,866	2,249
<b>65 to 69</b>	3,899	2,691	2,685	} 9,446	} 7,074	2,938	1,624
<b>70 to 74</b>	5,194	3,735	4,149			2,090	1,059
<b>75 to 79</b>	11,817	11,625	10,916	} 4,542	} 3,696	1,276	975
<b>80 to 84</b>	7,940	7,556	6,182			646	} 159
<b>85 and over</b>	3,088	2,714	1,876	1,140	407		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190,695</b>	<b>173,627</b>	<b>157,615</b>	<b>149,230</b>	<b>127,010</b>	<b>137,969</b>	<b>74,246</b>
<b>Median Age</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

N/A = Data not available

**APPENDIX I**  
**Population by Age 1950 – 2010**  
**Amarillo Metropolitan Statistical Area (Potter & Randall Counties Only)**

Age Group	2010	2000	1990	1980	1970	1960	1950
<b>Under 5</b>	18,545	16,535	15,308	14,720	12,439	18,670	9,948
<b>5 to 9</b>	18,010	16,330	15,403	13,433	14,254	16,469	7,524
<b>10 to 14</b>	17,155	16,367	14,291	13,088	15,070	13,010	6,083
<b>15 to 19</b>	17,362	17,260	13,471	15,911	14,701	14,400	6,524
<b>20 to 24</b>	17,890	16,800	13,675	18,118	12,032	12,069	7,811
<b>25 to 29</b>	18,223	15,635	15,645	16,028	} 18,519	11,456	8,122
<b>30 to 34</b>	16,492	14,492	16,576	13,184		11,170	7,264
<b>35 to 39</b>	15,221	16,493	15,013	} 19,182	} 17,611	10,559	6,856
<b>40 to 44</b>	14,987	17,207	12,230			9,038	6,377
<b>45 to 49</b>	16,553	15,183	9,492	} 17,772	} 16,121	7,927	5,523
<b>50 to 54</b>	16,870	12,323	8,390			6,677	4,478
<b>55 to 59</b>	14,674	9,490	8,259	8,353	6,617	5,710	3,422
<b>60 to 64</b>	11,595	8,027	8,085	7,000	5,512	4,246	2,608
<b>65 to 69</b>	8,491	7,327	7,099	} 10,613	} 7,573	3,210	1,943
<b>70 to 74</b>	6,604	6,636	5,463			2,285	1,268
<b>75 to 79</b>	5,492	5,182	4,158	} 5,039	} 3,947	1,413	1,198
<b>80 to 84</b>	4,087	3,505	2,869			727	} 191
<b>85 and over</b>	3,547	3,066	2,120	1,258	457		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>241,798</b>	<b>217,858</b>	<b>187,547</b>	<b>173,699</b>	<b>144,396</b>	<b>149,493</b>	<b>87,140</b>
<b>Median Age</b>	<b>34.2</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>31.8</b>	<b>29.9</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

N/A = Data not available

**APPENDIX J**  
**Population by Age 1950 – 2010**  
Potter County

Age Group	2010	2000	1990	1980	1970	1960	1950
<b>Under 5</b>	10,326	9,393	8,742	8,757	7,789	14,191	8,263
<b>5 to 9</b>	9,598	8,978	8,154	7,575	8,532	12,351	6,327
<b>10 to 14</b>	8,663	8,526	7,258	7,180	9,071	9,878	5,125
<b>15 to 19</b>	8,413	8,735	6,987	8,644	8,602	11,863	5,310
<b>20 to 24</b>	8,786	8,738	7,145	10,326	7,342	9,561	6,329
<b>25 to 29</b>	9,594	8,920	8,399	9,023	} 10,585	8,736	6,749
<b>30 to 34</b>	8,437	7,894	8,442	6,795		8,205	6,128
<b>35 to 39</b>	7,744	8,692	7,181	} 9,672	} 10,223	7,811	5,876
<b>40 to 44</b>	7,707	8,677	5,697			6,857	5,476
<b>45 to 49</b>	8,271	7,277	4,480	} 9,668	} 10,410	6,203	4,797
<b>50 to 54</b>	8,245	5,915	4,160			5,263	3,871
<b>55 to 59</b>	6,850	4,622	4,120	4,932	4,797	4,551	2,944
<b>60 to 64</b>	5,297	3,877	4,303	4,384	4,143	3,410	2,256
<b>65 to 69</b>	3,851	3,463	3,853	} 7,243	} 5,853	2,644	1,660
<b>70 to 74</b>	2,944	3,283	3,146			1,904	1,083
<b>75 to 79</b>	2,444	2,632	2,527	} 3,523	} 3,164	1,177	1,007
<b>80 to 84</b>	1,943	1,972	1,854			596	} 165
<b>85 and over</b>	1,960	1,952	1,426	915	379		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>121,073</b>	<b>113,546</b>	<b>97,874</b>	<b>98,637</b>	<b>90,511</b>	<b>115,580</b>	<b>73,366</b>
<b>Median Age</b>	<b>33.0</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.7</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

N/A = Data not available

**APPENDIX K**  
**Population by Age 1950 – 2010**  
**Randall County**

Age Group	2010	2000	1990	1980	1970	1960	1950
<b>Under 5</b>	8,219	7,142	6,566	5,963	4,650	4,479	1,685
<b>5 to 9</b>	8,412	7,352	7,249	5,858	5,722	4,118	1,197
<b>10 to 14</b>	8,492	7,841	7,033	5,908	5,999	3,132	958
<b>15 to 19</b>	8,949	8,525	6,484	7,267	6,099	2,537	1,214
<b>20 to 24</b>	9,104	8,062	6,530	7,792	4,690	2,508	1,482
<b>25 to 29</b>	8,629	6,715	7,246	7,005	} 7,934	2,720	1,373
<b>30 to 34</b>	8,055	6,598	8,134	6,389		2,965	1,136
<b>35 to 39</b>	7,477	7,801	7,832	} 9,510	} 7,388	2,748	980
<b>40 to 44</b>	7,280	8,560	6,533			2,181	901
<b>45 to 49</b>	8,282	7,906	5,012	} 8,104	} 5,711	1,724	726
<b>50 to 54</b>	8,625	6,408	4,230			1,414	607
<b>55 to 59</b>	7,824	4,868	4,139	3,421	1,820	1,159	478
<b>60 to 64</b>	6,298	4,150	3,782	2,616	1,369	836	352
<b>65 to 69</b>	4,640	3,864	3,246	} 3,370	} 1,720	566	283
<b>70 to 74</b>	3,660	3,353	2,317			381	185
<b>75 to 79</b>	3,048	2,550	1,631	} 1,516	} 783	236	191
<b>80 to 84</b>	2,144	1,533	1,015			131	} 26
<b>85 and over</b>	1,587	1,114	694	343	78		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>120,725</b>	<b>104,342</b>	<b>89,673</b>	<b>75,062</b>	<b>53,885</b>	<b>33,913</b>	<b>13,774</b>
<b>Median Age</b>	<b>35.3</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

N/A = Data not available

## APPENDIX L

### Census Tract Population by Age 1990 – 2010

#### City of Amarillo

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 101</b>													
2010	1,949	134	119	111	107	184	288	200	230	113	81	163	219
% of CT		6.9%	6.1%	5.7%	5.5%	9.4%	14.8%	10.3%	11.8%	5.8%	4.2%	8.4%	11.2%
2000	2,085	90	80	92	110	253	280	247	235	113	102	239	244
% of CT		4.3%	3.8%	4.4%	5.3%	12.1%	13.4%	11.8%	11.3%	5.4%	4.9%	11.5%	11.7%
1990	1,882	87	110	68	110	153	281	234	215	111	128	191	194
% of CT		4.6%	5.8%	3.6%	5.8%	8.1%	14.9%	12.4%	11.4%	5.9%	6.8%	10.1%	10.3%
<b>CT 102</b>													
2010	1,961	115	152	134	105	64	194	239	305	120	114	190	229
% of CT		5.9%	7.8%	6.8%	5.4%	3.3%	9.9%	12.2%	15.6%	6.1%	5.8%	9.7%	11.7%
2000	1,939	79	123	151	153	44	145	293	266	101	100	274	210
% of CT		4.1%	6.3%	7.8%	7.9%	2.3%	7.5%	15.1%	13.7%	5.2%	5.2%	14.1%	10.8%
1990	1,886	92	128	109	94	52	211	224	233	125	192	281	145
% of CT		4.9%	6.8%	5.8%	5.0%	2.8%	11.2%	11.9%	12.4%	6.6%	10.2%	14.9%	7.7%
<b>CT 103</b>													
2010	1,251	126	97	61	98	204	265	147	140	30	42	28	13
% of CT		10.1%	7.8%	4.9%	7.8%	16.3%	21.2%	11.8%	11.2%	2.4%	3.4%	2.2%	1.0%
2000	1,491	161	100	64	139	297	247	188	117	32	23	41	82
% of CT		10.8%	6.7%	4.3%	9.3%	19.9%	16.6%	12.6%	7.8%	2.1%	1.5%	2.7%	5.5%
1990	1,587	147	72	59	136	304	309	153	139	41	34	73	120
% of CT		9.3%	4.5%	3.7%	8.6%	19.2%	19.5%	9.6%	8.8%	2.6%	2.1%	4.6%	7.6%
<b>CT 104</b>													
2010	3,365	229	188	224	198	161	536	421	516	251	196	230	215
% of CT		6.8%	5.6%	6.7%	5.9%	4.8%	15.9%	12.5%	15.3%	7.5%	5.8%	6.8%	6.4%
2000	3,445	227	229	223	229	209	528	519	482	167	134	222	276
% of CT		6.6%	6.6%	6.5%	6.6%	6.1%	15.3%	15.1%	14.0%	4.8%	3.9%	6.4%	8.0%
1990	3,109	206	182	194	151	142	515	455	279	139	146	342	358
% of CT		6.6%	5.9%	6.2%	4.9%	4.6%	16.6%	14.6%	9.0%	4.5%	4.7%	11.0%	11.5%
<b>CT 105*</b>													
2010	CT 105 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 105 did not exist in 2000												
1990	2,095	191	161	105	136	185	427	297	174	67	65	129	158
% of CT		9.1%	7.7%	5.0%	6.5%	8.8%	20.4%	14.2%	8.3%	3.2%	3.1%	6.2%	7.5%
<b>CT 106</b>													
2010	2,168	274	218	187	179	211	294	251	266	74	61	88	65
% of CT		12.6%	10.1%	8.6%	8.3%	9.7%	13.6%	11.6%	12.3%	3.4%	2.8%	4.1%	3.0%
2000	1,926	210	225	198	162	155	301	278	157	58	45	86	51
% of CT		10.9%	11.7%	10.3%	8.4%	8.0%	15.6%	14.4%	8.2%	3.0%	2.3%	4.5%	2.6%
1990	1,531	84	157	136	145	159	268	189	133	50	51	97	62
% of CT		5.5%	10.3%	8.9%	9.5%	10.4%	17.5%	12.3%	8.7%	3.3%	3.3%	6.3%	4.0%
<b>CT 107</b>													
2010	3,262	308	278	259	252	226	516	385	386	151	130	166	205
% of CT		9.4%	8.5%	7.9%	7.7%	6.9%	15.8%	11.8%	11.8%	4.6%	4.0%	5.1%	6.3%
2000	3,171	255	295	272	241	194	454	460	339	108	117	283	153
% of CT		8.0%	9.3%	8.6%	7.6%	6.1%	14.3%	14.5%	10.7%	3.4%	3.7%	8.9%	4.8%
1990	3,247	275	288	263	244	216	547	447	286	169	185	242	85
% of CT		8.5%	8.9%	8.1%	7.5%	6.7%	16.8%	13.8%	8.8%	5.2%	5.7%	7.5%	2.6%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 108*</b>													
2010	CT 108 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 108 did not exist in 2000												
1990	812	76	81	57	77	51	128	99	98	49	36	44	16
% of CT		9.4%	10.0%	7.0%	9.5%	6.3%	15.8%	12.2%	12.1%	6.0%	4.4%	5.4%	2.0%
<b>CT 109</b>													
2010	CT 109 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 109 did not exist in 2000												
1990	4,491	496	468	391	333	347	786	526	384	187	176	219	178
% of CT		11.0%	10.4%	8.7%	7.4%	7.7%	17.5%	11.7%	8.6%	4.2%	3.9%	4.9%	4.0%
<b>CT 110</b>													
2010	2,304	214	196	168	191	161	314	266	260	106	100	173	155
% of CT		9.3%	8.5%	7.3%	8.3%	7.0%	13.6%	11.5%	11.3%	4.6%	4.3%	7.5%	6.7%
2000	2,317	235	210	199	218	167	348	291	238	79	72	130	130
% of CT		10.1%	9.1%	8.6%	9.4%	7.2%	15.0%	12.6%	10.3%	3.4%	3.1%	5.6%	5.6%
1990	2,064	201	213	163	169	129	346	236	155	71	101	149	131
% of CT		9.7%	10.3%	7.9%	8.2%	6.3%	16.8%	11.4%	7.5%	3.4%	4.9%	7.2%	6.3%
<b>CT 111*</b>													
2010	CT 111 did not exist in 2010												
2000	2,218	236	192	185	204	171	311	301	215	73	63	142	125
% of CT		10.6%	8.7%	8.3%	9.2%	7.7%	14.0%	13.6%	9.7%	3.3%	2.8%	6.4%	5.6%
1990	2,334	240	253	247	188	185	342	277	161	97	84	147	113
% of CT		10.3%	10.8%	10.6%	8.1%	7.9%	14.7%	11.9%	6.9%	4.2%	3.6%	6.3%	4.8%
<b>CT 112*</b>													
2010	CT 112 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 112 did not exist in 2000												
1990	717	89	57	61	59	64	134	106	44	20	21	33	29
% of CT		12.4%	7.9%	8.5%	8.2%	8.9%	18.7%	14.8%	6.1%	2.8%	2.9%	4.6%	4.0%
<b>CT 113*</b>													
2010	CT 113 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 113 did not exist in 2000												
1990	386	16	3	1	25	36	94	57	72	22	19	26	15
% of CT		4.1%	0.8%	0.3%	6.5%	9.3%	24.4%	14.8%	18.7%	5.7%	4.9%	6.7%	3.9%
<b>CT 114*</b>													
2010	CT 114 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 114 did not exist in 2000												
1990	1,790	135	84	78	91	168	298	231	142	58	67	133	305
% of CT		7.5%	4.7%	4.4%	5.1%	9.4%	16.6%	12.9%	7.9%	3.2%	3.7%	7.4%	17.0%
<b>CT 115</b>													
2010	4,155	345	272	266	233	300	681	511	619	244	218	260	206
% of CT		8.3%	6.5%	6.4%	5.6%	7.2%	16.4%	12.3%	14.9%	5.9%	5.2%	6.3%	5.0%
2000	4,289	347	279	278	280	306	638	731	589	181	140	248	272
% of CT		8.1%	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%	7.1%	14.9%	17.0%	13.7%	4.2%	3.3%	5.8%	6.3%
1990	3,867	311	262	201	220	250	687	570	314	145	161	355	391
% of CT		8.0%	6.8%	5.2%	5.7%	6.5%	17.8%	14.7%	8.1%	3.7%	4.2%	9.2%	10.1%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 116</b>													
2010	4,211	352	322	258	253	378	745	489	508	245	181	250	230
% of CT		8.4%	7.6%	6.1%	6.0%	9.0%	17.7%	11.6%	12.1%	5.8%	4.3%	5.9%	5.5%
2000	3,826	291	249	214	247	322	555	521	512	164	143	287	321
% of CT		7.6%	6.5%	5.6%	6.5%	8.4%	14.5%	13.6%	13.4%	4.3%	3.7%	7.5%	8.4%
1990	3,597	269	223	185	198	244	616	462	331	143	194	465	267
% of CT		7.5%	6.2%	5.1%	5.5%	6.8%	17.1%	12.8%	9.2%	4.0%	5.4%	12.9%	7.4%
<b>CT 117</b>													
2010	4,538	376	224	180	273	661	945	406	514	202	157	186	414
% of CT		8.3%	4.9%	4.0%	6.0%	14.6%	20.8%	8.9%	11.3%	4.5%	3.5%	4.1%	9.1%
2000	3,884	329	198	150	244	615	782	430	367	122	86	202	359
% of CT		8.5%	5.1%	3.9%	6.3%	15.8%	20.1%	11.1%	9.4%	3.1%	2.2%	5.2%	9.2%
1990	3,792	316	244	147	237	483	927	451	263	119	119	159	327
% of CT		8.3%	6.4%	3.9%	6.3%	12.7%	24.4%	11.9%	6.9%	3.1%	3.1%	4.2%	8.6%
<b>CT 118</b>													
2010	3,739	307	232	187	173	265	732	403	450	256	174	247	313
% of CT		8.2%	6.2%	5.0%	4.6%	7.1%	19.6%	10.8%	12.0%	6.8%	4.7%	6.6%	8.4%
2000	3,647	259	247	212	215	214	517	543	442	162	151	327	358
% of CT		7.1%	6.8%	5.8%	5.9%	5.9%	14.2%	14.9%	12.1%	4.4%	4.1%	9.0%	9.8%
1990	3,696	311	278	236	191	169	637	508	292	185	187	357	345
% of CT		8.4%	7.5%	6.4%	5.2%	4.6%	17.2%	13.7%	7.9%	5.0%	5.1%	9.7%	9.3%
<b>CT 119</b>													
2010	3,205	307	257	207	203	232	536	375	487	187	144	154	116
% of CT		9.6%	8.0%	6.5%	6.3%	7.2%	16.7%	11.7%	15.2%	5.8%	4.5%	4.8%	3.6%
2000	3,226	280	254	251	229	258	523	503	390	112	113	148	165
% of CT		8.7%	7.9%	7.8%	7.1%	8.0%	16.2%	15.6%	12.1%	3.5%	3.5%	4.6%	5.1%
1990	2,971	262	252	192	196	188	611	399	202	99	105	209	256
% of CT		8.8%	8.5%	6.5%	6.6%	6.3%	20.6%	13.4%	6.8%	3.3%	3.5%	7.0%	8.6%
<b>CT 120</b>													
2010	1,745	186	148	107	98	130	259	207	222	90	102	77	119
% of CT		10.7%	8.5%	6.1%	5.6%	7.4%	14.8%	11.9%	12.7%	5.2%	5.8%	4.4%	6.8%
2000	1,700	155	151	117	117	132	238	247	205	66	46	95	131
% of CT		9.1%	8.9%	6.9%	6.9%	7.8%	14.0%	14.5%	12.1%	3.9%	2.7%	5.6%	7.7%
1990	1,654	190	115	103	119	144	258	180	130	67	49	95	204
% of CT		11.5%	7.0%	6.2%	7.2%	8.7%	15.6%	10.9%	7.9%	4.1%	3.0%	5.7%	12.3%
<b>CT 121*</b>													
2010	CT 121 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 121 did not exist in 2000												
1990	563	29	28	32	37	22	63	60	46	25	38	77	106
% of CT		5.2%	5.0%	5.7%	6.6%	3.9%	11.2%	10.7%	8.2%	4.4%	6.7%	13.7%	18.8%
<b>CT 122</b>													
2010	3,946	447	398	340	356	312	576	516	463	171	146	129	92
% of CT		11.3%	10.1%	8.6%	9.0%	7.9%	14.6%	13.1%	11.7%	4.3%	3.7%	3.3%	2.3%
2000	3,714	448	368	336	332	284	586	488	403	97	96	129	147
% of CT		12.1%	9.9%	9.0%	8.9%	7.6%	15.8%	13.1%	10.9%	2.6%	2.6%	3.5%	4.0%
1990	2,959	345	297	218	185	238	520	353	203	103	115	209	173
% of CT		11.7%	10.0%	7.4%	6.3%	8.0%	17.6%	11.9%	6.9%	3.5%	3.9%	7.1%	5.8%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 123*</b>													
2010	CT 123 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 123 did not exist in 2000												
1990	597	57	48	46	42	51	108	77	59	24	27	36	22
% of CT		9.5%	8.0%	7.7%	7.0%	8.5%	18.1%	12.9%	9.9%	4.0%	4.5%	6.0%	3.7%
<b>CT 125*</b>													
2010	CT 125 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 125 did not exist in 2000												
1990	4,670	454	540	506	428	356	797	674	380	161	125	164	85
% of CT		9.7%	11.6%	10.8%	9.2%	7.6%	17.1%	14.4%	8.1%	3.4%	2.7%	3.5%	1.8%
<b>CT 126</b>													
2010	3,255	432	329	293	256	271	485	388	351	127	91	123	109
% of CT		13.3%	10.1%	9.0%	7.9%	8.3%	14.9%	11.9%	10.8%	3.9%	2.8%	3.8%	3.3%
2000	2,564	291	252	221	181	202	396	373	224	77	72	127	148
% of CT		11.3%	9.8%	8.6%	7.1%	7.9%	15.4%	14.5%	8.7%	3.0%	2.8%	5.0%	5.8%
1990	2,301	258	203	190	148	156	429	246	144	75	113	209	130
% of CT		11.2%	8.8%	8.3%	6.4%	6.8%	18.6%	10.7%	6.3%	3.3%	4.9%	9.1%	5.6%
<b>CT 127*</b>													
2010	CT 127 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 127 did not exist in 2000												
1990	4,907	494	460	458	396	343	889	575	364	214	235	330	149
% of CT		10.1%	9.4%	9.3%	8.1%	7.0%	18.1%	11.7%	7.4%	4.4%	4.8%	6.7%	3.0%
<b>CT 128*</b>													
2010	5,053	541	455	451	476	447	719	650	587	215	167	200	145
% of CT		10.7%	9.0%	8.9%	9.4%	8.8%	14.2%	12.9%	11.6%	4.3%	3.3%	4.0%	2.9%
2000	4,558	479	454	439	352	338	671	655	440	165	123	259	183
% of CT		10.5%	10.0%	9.6%	7.7%	7.4%	14.7%	14.4%	9.7%	3.6%	2.7%	5.7%	4.0%
1990	CT 128 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 128.97*</b>													
2010	CT 128.97 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 128.97 did not exist in 2000												
1990	100	10	7	6	12	11	12	16	10	6	2	5	3
% of CT		10.0%	7.0%	6.0%	12.0%	11.0%	12.0%	16.0%	10.0%	6.0%	2.0%	5.0%	3.0%
<b>CT 128.98*</b>													
2010	CT 128.98 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 128.98 did not exist in 2000												
1990	3,380	435	350	258	273	683	439	257	137	166	241	141	0
% of CT		12.9%	10.4%	7.6%	8.1%	20.2%	13.0%	7.6%	4.1%	4.9%	7.1%	4.2%	0.0%
<b>CT 129*</b>													
2010	CT 129 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 129 did not exist in 2000												
1990	1,853	205	170	145	153	160	259	210	139	79	82	146	105
% of CT		11.1%	9.2%	7.8%	8.3%	8.6%	14.0%	11.3%	7.5%	4.3%	4.4%	7.9%	5.7%
<b>CT 130</b>													
2010	1,695	157	144	133	150	106	183	165	241	107	82	103	124
% of CT		9.3%	8.5%	7.8%	8.8%	6.3%	10.8%	9.7%	14.2%	6.3%	4.8%	6.1%	7.3%
2000	1,707	134	180	147	129	106	199	208	179	67	57	175	126
% of CT		7.9%	10.5%	8.6%	7.6%	6.2%	11.7%	12.2%	10.5%	3.9%	3.3%	10.3%	7.4%
1990	1,756	175	158	118	142	102	240	182	144	90	105	202	98
% of CT		10.0%	9.0%	6.7%	8.1%	5.8%	13.7%	10.4%	8.2%	5.1%	6.0%	11.5%	5.6%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 131*</b>													
2010	CT 131 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 131 did not exist in 2000												
1990	4,036	389	344	291	266	291	736	505	334	143	164	285	288
% of CT		9.6%	8.5%	7.2%	6.6%	7.2%	18.2%	12.5%	8.3%	3.5%	4.1%	7.1%	7.1%
<b>CT 132</b>													
2010	1,636	82	75	63	50	56	177	127	208	114	90	161	433
% of CT		5.0%	4.6%	3.9%	3.1%	3.4%	10.8%	7.8%	12.7%	7.0%	5.5%	9.8%	26.5%
2000	1,862	72	56	62	72	70	130	194	189	100	66	207	644
% of CT		3.9%	3.0%	3.3%	3.9%	3.8%	7.0%	10.4%	10.2%	5.4%	3.5%	11.1%	34.6%
1990	1,308	77	83	58	51	49	165	172	157	69	78	180	169
% of CT		5.9%	6.3%	4.4%	3.9%	3.7%	12.6%	13.1%	12.0%	5.3%	6.0%	13.8%	12.9%
<b>CT 133</b>													
2010	4,608	269	361	387	248	121	415	702	742	383	313	374	293
% of CT		5.8%	7.8%	8.4%	5.4%	2.6%	9.0%	15.2%	16.1%	8.3%	6.8%	8.1%	6.4%
2000	2,889	216	187	145	146	103	387	472	467	188	152	233	193
% of CT		7.5%	6.5%	5.0%	5.1%	3.6%	13.4%	16.3%	16.2%	6.5%	5.3%	8.1%	6.7%
1990	1,846	156	137	101	79	104	398	307	182	65	67	115	135
% of CT		8.5%	7.4%	5.5%	4.3%	5.6%	21.6%	16.6%	9.9%	3.5%	3.6%	6.2%	7.3%
<b>CT 134</b>													
2010	58	3	4	6	5	3	7	14	3	4	5	3	1
% of CT		5.2%	6.9%	10.3%	8.6%	5.2%	12.1%	24.1%	5.2%	6.9%	8.6%	5.2%	1.7%
2000	13	0	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	0	2	0	0
% of CT		0.0%	15.4%	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%	23.1%	7.7%	15.4%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%
1990	58	3	5	4	5	5	13	8	11	1	1	0	2
% of CT		5.2%	8.6%	6.9%	8.6%	8.6%	22.4%	13.8%	19.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	3.4%
<b>CT 135*</b>													
2010	CT 135 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 135 did not exist in 2000												
1990	992	60	67	97	96	36	124	181	124	60	46	72	29
% of CT		6.0%	6.8%	9.8%	9.7%	3.6%	12.5%	18.2%	12.5%	6.0%	4.6%	7.3%	2.9%
<b>CT 136*</b>													
2010	CT 136 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 136 did not exist in 2000												
1990	1,044	69	82	88	99	71	137	163	127	58	54	65	31
% of CT		6.6%	7.9%	8.4%	9.5%	6.8%	13.1%	15.6%	12.2%	5.6%	5.2%	6.2%	3.0%
<b>CT 137*</b>													
2010	CT 137 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 137 did not exist in 2000												
1990	1,938	155	157	150	140	124	307	248	197	94	114	144	108
% of CT		8.0%	8.1%	7.7%	7.2%	6.4%	15.8%	12.8%	10.2%	4.9%	5.9%	7.4%	5.6%
<b>CT 138*</b>													
2010	CT 138 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 138 did not exist in 2000												
1990	888	79	58	65	51	65	133	101	109	43	55	80	49
% of CT		8.9%	6.5%	7.3%	5.7%	7.3%	15.0%	11.4%	12.3%	4.8%	6.2%	9.0%	5.5%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 139</b>													
2010	3,390	303	350	317	337	190	470	378	391	164	144	213	133
% of CT		8.9%	10.3%	9.4%	9.9%	5.6%	13.9%	11.2%	11.5%	4.8%	4.2%	6.3%	3.9%
2000	3,336	280	387	359	306	178	417	473	342	150	140	207	97
% of CT		8.4%	11.6%	10.8%	9.2%	5.3%	12.5%	14.2%	10.3%	4.5%	4.2%	6.2%	2.9%
1990	3,218	297	299	310	336	213	449	466	339	167	130	158	54
% of CT		9.2%	9.3%	9.6%	10.4%	6.6%	14.0%	14.5%	10.5%	5.2%	4.0%	4.9%	1.7%
<b>CT 140*</b>													
2010	CT 140 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 140 did not exist in 2000												
1990	794	103	78	93	71	64	129	104	66	24	14	40	8
% of CT		13.0%	9.8%	11.7%	8.9%	8.1%	16.2%	13.1%	8.3%	3.0%	1.8%	5.0%	1.0%
<b>CT 141</b>													
2010	2,271	232	240	191	182	139	327	275	263	117	101	125	79
% of CT		10.2%	10.6%	8.4%	8.0%	6.1%	14.4%	12.1%	11.6%	5.2%	4.4%	5.5%	3.5%
2000	2,425	257	264	236	170	171	403	319	240	91	82	138	54
% of CT		10.6%	10.9%	9.7%	7.0%	7.1%	16.6%	13.2%	9.9%	3.8%	3.4%	5.7%	2.2%
1990	2,256	229	258	226	173	166	423	298	186	94	84	90	29
% of CT		10.2%	11.4%	10.0%	7.7%	7.4%	18.8%	13.2%	8.2%	4.2%	3.7%	4.0%	1.3%
<b>CT 144*</b>													
2010	CT 144 did not exist in 2010												
2000	2,072	227	225	237	181	175	359	344	177	51	50	34	12
% of CT		11.0%	10.9%	11.4%	8.7%	8.4%	17.3%	16.6%	8.5%	2.5%	2.4%	1.6%	0.6%
1990	2,108	205	194	210	178	190	524	344	141	44	36	24	18
% of CT		9.7%	9.2%	10.0%	8.4%	9.0%	24.9%	16.3%	6.7%	2.1%	1.7%	1.1%	0.9%
<b>CT 144.01*</b>													
2010	2,179	196	219	199	157	160	477	303	229	89	57	63	30
% of CT		9.0%	10.1%	9.1%	7.2%	7.3%	21.9%	13.9%	10.5%	4.1%	2.6%	2.9%	1.4%
2000	CT 144.01 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 144.01 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 145*</b>													
2010	6,184	672	624	558	537	487	888	760	695	243	221	316	183
% of CT		10.9%	10.1%	9.0%	8.7%	7.9%	14.4%	12.3%	11.2%	3.9%	3.6%	5.1%	3.0%
2000	5,649	617	506	540	488	472	812	768	564	233	204	277	168
% of CT		10.9%	9.0%	9.6%	8.6%	8.4%	14.4%	13.6%	10.0%	4.1%	3.6%	4.9%	3.0%
1990	CT 145 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 146*</b>													
2010	CT 146 did not exist in 2010												
2000	635	54	27	23	48	55	94	133	107	35	21	26	12
% of CT		8.5%	4.3%	3.6%	7.6%	8.7%	14.8%	20.9%	16.9%	5.5%	3.3%	4.1%	1.9%
1990	CT 146 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 147*</b>													
2010	4,934	363	349	285	268	426	714	533	594	267	168	266	701
% of CT		7.4%	7.1%	5.8%	5.4%	8.6%	14.5%	10.8%	12.0%	5.4%	3.4%	5.4%	14.2%
2000	4,990	362	337	315	309	440	757	742	538	159	156	210	665
% of CT		7.3%	6.8%	6.3%	6.2%	8.8%	15.2%	14.9%	10.8%	3.2%	3.1%	4.2%	13.3%
1990	CT 147 did not exist in 1990												

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 148*</b>													
2010	2,502	227	219	188	217	186	283	302	281	173	134	146	146
% of CT		9.1%	8.8%	7.5%	8.7%	7.4%	11.3%	12.1%	11.2%	6.9%	5.4%	5.8%	5.8%
2000	2,533	208	252	228	205	205	329	330	253	87	76	197	163
% of CT		8.2%	9.9%	9.0%	8.1%	8.1%	13.0%	13.0%	10.0%	3.4%	3.0%	7.8%	6.4%
1990	CT 148 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 149*</b>													
2010	5,901	591	609	522	467	441	799	801	727	298	221	287	138
% of CT		10.0%	10.3%	8.8%	7.9%	7.5%	13.5%	13.6%	12.3%	5.0%	3.7%	4.9%	2.3%
2000	5,709	563	585	577	543	392	871	838	625	220	162	239	94
% of CT		9.9%	10.2%	10.1%	9.5%	6.9%	15.3%	14.7%	10.9%	3.9%	2.8%	4.2%	1.6%
1990	CT 149 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 150*</b>													
2010	6,964	824	744	625	597	507	972	872	780	308	237	283	215
% of CT		11.8%	10.7%	9.0%	8.6%	7.3%	14.0%	12.5%	11.2%	4.4%	3.4%	4.1%	3.1%
2000	6,110	642	634	546	551	456	884	801	665	201	188	324	218
% of CT		10.5%	10.4%	8.9%	9.0%	7.5%	14.5%	13.1%	10.9%	3.3%	3.1%	5.3%	3.6%
1990	CT 150 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 151*</b>													
2010	2,266	170	145	180	183	113	270	270	358	166	125	173	113
% of CT		7.5%	6.4%	7.9%	8.1%	5.0%	11.9%	11.9%	15.8%	7.3%	5.5%	7.6%	5.0%
2000	2,198	133	165	171	215	116	234	351	320	127	89	180	97
% of CT		6.1%	7.5%	7.8%	9.8%	5.3%	10.6%	16.0%	14.6%	5.8%	4.0%	8.2%	4.4%
1990	CT 151 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 152*</b>													
2010	2,825	171	185	181	183	160	329	312	460	225	181	263	175
% of CT		6.1%	6.5%	6.4%	6.5%	5.7%	11.6%	11.0%	16.3%	8.0%	6.4%	9.3%	6.2%
2000	2,841	198	177	204	201	192	326	419	400	172	136	229	187
% of CT		7.0%	6.2%	7.2%	7.1%	6.8%	11.5%	14.7%	14.1%	6.1%	4.8%	8.1%	6.6%
1990	CT 152 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 153*</b>													
2010	5,002	519	469	389	377	440	751	585	642	284	186	215	145
% of CT		10.4%	9.4%	7.8%	7.5%	8.8%	15.0%	11.7%	12.8%	5.7%	3.7%	4.3%	2.9%
2000	4,864	508	475	345	365	426	770	709	511	181	152	223	199
% of CT		10.4%	9.8%	7.1%	7.5%	8.8%	15.8%	14.6%	10.5%	3.7%	3.1%	4.6%	4.1%
1990	CT 153 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 154*</b>													
2010	2,964	263	253	231	222	233	408	360	419	191	118	139	127
% of CT		8.9%	8.5%	7.8%	7.5%	7.9%	13.8%	12.1%	14.1%	6.4%	4.0%	4.7%	4.3%
2000	CT 154 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 154 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 9800*</b>													
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 9800 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 9800 did not exist in 1990												

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 201</b>													
2010	2,101	105	125	128	147	112	193	207	311	146	137	209	281
% of CT		5.0%	5.9%	6.1%	7.0%	5.3%	9.2%	9.9%	14.8%	6.9%	6.5%	9.9%	13.4%
2000	2,194	101	129	148	153	109	143	309	302	106	146	333	215
% of CT		4.6%	5.9%	6.7%	7.0%	5.0%	6.5%	14.1%	13.8%	4.8%	6.7%	15.2%	9.8%
1990	2,176	97	119	152	126	106	195	301	288	221	187	276	108
% of CT		4.5%	5.5%	7.0%	5.8%	4.9%	9.0%	13.8%	13.2%	10.2%	8.6%	12.7%	5.0%
<b>CT 202</b>													
2010	2,059	136	152	144	149	126	301	242	258	116	81	170	184
% of CT		6.6%	7.4%	7.0%	7.2%	6.1%	14.6%	11.8%	12.5%	5.6%	3.9%	8.3%	8.9%
2000	2,284	127	139	140	173	144	284	340	271	94	121	232	219
% of CT		5.6%	6.1%	6.1%	7.6%	6.3%	12.4%	14.9%	11.9%	4.1%	5.3%	10.2%	9.6%
1990	2,143	99	134	123	96	126	310	278	236	143	166	252	180
% of CT		4.6%	6.3%	5.7%	4.5%	5.9%	14.5%	13.0%	11.0%	6.7%	7.7%	11.8%	8.4%
<b>CT 203</b>													
2010	1,987	168	147	130	102	156	333	231	218	99	112	134	157
% of CT		8.5%	7.4%	6.5%	5.1%	7.9%	16.8%	11.6%	11.0%	5.0%	5.6%	6.7%	7.9%
2000	2,011	147	108	89	125	171	302	265	248	85	101	171	199
% of CT		7.3%	5.4%	4.4%	6.2%	8.5%	15.0%	13.2%	12.3%	4.2%	5.0%	8.5%	9.9%
1990	1,812	146	110	106	105	139	347	242	161	78	82	184	112
% of CT		8.1%	6.1%	5.8%	5.8%	7.7%	19.2%	13.4%	8.9%	4.3%	4.5%	10.2%	6.2%
<b>CT 204</b>													
2010	1,864	84	115	132	137	83	186	203	313	158	120	176	157
% of CT		4.5%	6.2%	7.1%	7.3%	4.5%	10.0%	10.9%	16.8%	8.5%	6.4%	9.4%	8.4%
2000	2,041	123	126	160	157	67	183	311	310	120	92	191	201
% of CT		6.0%	6.2%	7.8%	7.7%	3.3%	9.0%	15.2%	15.2%	5.9%	4.5%	9.4%	9.8%
1990	2,008	105	150	172	115	79	234	279	204	115	120	260	175
% of CT		5.2%	7.5%	8.6%	5.7%	3.9%	11.7%	13.9%	10.2%	5.7%	6.0%	12.9%	8.7%
<b>CT 205</b>													
2010	3,982	400	346	256	251	360	776	477	506	183	142	159	126
% of CT		10.0%	8.7%	6.4%	6.3%	9.0%	19.5%	12.0%	12.7%	4.6%	3.6%	4.0%	3.2%
2000	3,885	361	349	255	274	381	694	588	399	107	86	188	203
% of CT		9.3%	9.0%	6.6%	7.1%	9.8%	17.9%	15.1%	10.3%	2.8%	2.2%	4.8%	5.2%
1990	3,536	365	269	234	172	367	763	431	227	106	126	262	214
% of CT		10.3%	7.6%	6.6%	4.9%	10.4%	21.6%	12.2%	6.4%	3.0%	3.6%	7.4%	6.1%
<b>CT 206</b>													
2010	3,867	272	319	335	306	203	520	503	495	255	211	282	166
% of CT		7.0%	8.2%	8.7%	7.9%	5.2%	13.4%	13.0%	12.8%	6.6%	5.5%	7.3%	4.3%
2000	3,839	300	320	274	334	200	513	577	567	210	170	229	145
% of CT		7.8%	8.3%	7.1%	8.7%	5.2%	13.4%	15.0%	14.8%	5.5%	4.4%	6.0%	3.8%
1990	4,118	321	417	417	351	177	710	689	467	177	146	198	48
% of CT		7.8%	10.1%	10.1%	8.5%	4.3%	17.2%	16.7%	11.3%	4.3%	3.5%	4.8%	1.2%
<b>CT 208</b>													
2010	6,623	623	552	469	412	507	1,227	800	794	341	262	320	316
% of CT		9.4%	8.3%	7.1%	6.2%	7.7%	18.5%	12.1%	12.0%	5.1%	4.0%	4.8%	4.8%
2000	5,738	557	523	459	343	428	994	855	607	205	167	359	241
% of CT		9.7%	9.1%	8.0%	6.0%	7.5%	17.3%	14.9%	10.6%	3.6%	2.9%	6.3%	4.2%
1990	5,519	537	556	462	271	350	1,278	793	441	204	219	260	148
% of CT		9.7%	10.1%	8.4%	4.9%	6.3%	23.2%	14.4%	8.0%	3.7%	4.0%	4.7%	2.7%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 209</b>													
2010	2,892	320	231	213	182	272	562	343	339	121	107	109	93
% of CT		11.1%	8.0%	7.4%	6.3%	9.4%	19.4%	11.9%	11.7%	4.2%	3.7%	3.8%	3.2%
2000	2,866	295	268	201	172	254	561	403	310	86	59	133	124
% of CT		10.3%	9.4%	7.0%	6.0%	8.9%	19.6%	14.1%	10.8%	3.0%	2.1%	4.6%	4.3%
1990	2,793	271	296	204	139	211	642	353	163	98	101	187	128
% of CT		9.7%	10.6%	7.3%	5.0%	7.6%	23.0%	12.6%	5.8%	3.5%	3.6%	6.7%	4.6%
<b>CT 210</b>													
2010	2,420	158	192	159	159	125	393	308	311	158	129	179	149
% of CT		6.5%	7.9%	6.6%	6.6%	5.2%	16.2%	12.7%	12.9%	6.5%	5.3%	7.4%	6.2%
2000	2,384	143	187	179	153	125	338	418	336	129	116	176	84
% of CT		6.0%	7.8%	7.5%	6.4%	5.2%	14.2%	17.5%	14.1%	5.4%	4.9%	7.4%	3.5%
1990	2,450	188	226	214	158	126	464	442	287	109	100	103	33
% of CT		7.7%	9.2%	8.7%	6.4%	5.1%	18.9%	18.0%	11.7%	4.4%	4.1%	4.2%	1.3%
<b>CT 211*</b>													
2010	CT 211 did not exist in 2010												
2000	6,580	449	331	299	408	770	1,038	866	793	275	228	522	601
% of CT		6.8%	5.0%	4.5%	6.2%	11.7%	15.8%	13.2%	12.1%	4.2%	3.5%	7.9%	9.1%
1990	6,228	383	325	294	382	643	1,197	854	574	245	292	579	460
% of CT		6.1%	5.2%	4.7%	6.1%	10.3%	19.2%	13.7%	9.2%	3.9%	4.7%	9.3%	7.4%
<b>CT 211.01*</b>													
2010	3,962	232	233	239	208	192	533	460	569	321	264	345	366
% of CT		5.9%	5.9%	6.0%	5.2%	4.8%	13.5%	11.6%	14.4%	8.1%	6.7%	8.7%	9.2%
2000	CT 211.01 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 211.01 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 211.02*</b>													
2010	2,369	186	94	58	190	501	506	220	192	89	84	93	156
% of CT		7.9%	4.0%	2.4%	8.0%	21.1%	21.4%	9.3%	8.1%	3.8%	3.5%	3.9%	6.6%
2000	CT 211.02 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 211.02 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 212</b>													
2010	5,208	366	321	351	313	266	661	612	679	338	318	500	483
% of CT		7.0%	6.2%	6.7%	6.0%	5.1%	12.7%	11.8%	13.0%	6.5%	6.1%	9.6%	9.3%
2000	5,191	297	321	338	378	285	567	714	760	335	308	525	363
% of CT		5.7%	6.2%	6.5%	7.3%	5.5%	10.9%	13.8%	14.6%	6.5%	5.9%	10.1%	7.0%
1990	5,395	284	370	436	406	237	722	914	729	339	290	446	222
% of CT		5.3%	6.9%	8.1%	7.5%	4.4%	13.4%	16.9%	13.5%	6.3%	5.4%	8.3%	4.1%
<b>CT 213</b>													
2010	5,288	332	312	398	373	338	702	648	700	333	298	454	400
% of CT		6.3%	5.9%	7.5%	7.1%	6.4%	13.3%	12.3%	13.2%	6.3%	5.6%	8.6%	7.6%
2000	5,577	376	378	380	397	374	689	874	759	325	265	456	304
% of CT		6.7%	6.8%	6.8%	7.1%	6.7%	12.4%	15.7%	13.6%	5.8%	4.8%	8.2%	5.5%
1990	6,329	388	428	462	569	929	869	934	715	279	253	305	198
% of CT		6.1%	6.8%	7.3%	9.0%	14.7%	13.7%	14.8%	11.3%	4.4%	4.0%	4.8%	3.1%
<b>CT 215</b>													
2010	4,843	295	329	345	313	212	617	576	807	407	333	347	262
% of CT		6.1%	6.8%	7.1%	6.5%	4.4%	12.7%	11.9%	16.7%	8.4%	6.9%	7.2%	5.4%
2000	4,979	294	322	463	447	182	543	933	903	253	187	305	147
% of CT		5.9%	6.5%	9.3%	9.0%	3.7%	10.9%	18.7%	18.1%	5.1%	3.8%	6.1%	3.0%
1990	4,480	347	440	468	345	169	754	949	460	202	118	159	69
% of CT		7.7%	9.8%	10.4%	7.7%	3.8%	16.8%	21.2%	10.3%	4.5%	2.6%	3.5%	1.5%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 216.02</b>													
2010	5,096	264	281	332	358	330	548	562	750	373	314	500	484
% of CT		5.2%	5.5%	6.5%	7.0%	6.5%	10.8%	11.0%	14.7%	7.3%	6.2%	9.8%	9.5%
2000	5,676	282	309	380	535	469	536	832	897	312	300	524	300
% of CT		5.0%	5.4%	6.7%	9.4%	8.3%	9.4%	14.7%	15.8%	5.5%	5.3%	9.2%	5.3%
1990	5,604	262	342	412	436	385	715	960	855	380	291	373	193
% of CT		4.7%	6.1%	7.4%	7.8%	6.9%	12.8%	17.1%	15.3%	6.8%	5.2%	6.7%	3.4%
<b>CT 216.03</b>													
2010	1,932	105	110	108	104	84	225	205	340	152	150	198	151
% of CT		5.4%	5.7%	5.6%	5.4%	4.3%	11.6%	10.6%	17.6%	7.9%	7.8%	10.2%	7.8%
2000	2,204	115	160	193	180	53	212	424	385	112	95	170	105
% of CT		5.2%	7.3%	8.8%	8.2%	2.4%	9.6%	19.2%	17.5%	5.1%	4.3%	7.7%	4.8%
1990	2,315	215	269	208	142	65	381	542	222	91	63	91	26
% of CT		9.3%	11.6%	9.0%	6.1%	2.8%	16.5%	23.4%	9.6%	3.9%	2.7%	3.9%	1.1%
<b>CT 216.04</b>													
2010	4,468	219	225	230	280	317	458	446	699	393	346	473	382
% of CT		4.9%	5.0%	5.1%	6.3%	7.1%	10.3%	10.0%	15.6%	8.8%	7.7%	10.6%	8.5%
2000	4,815	202	312	352	365	283	450	754	884	301	247	406	259
% of CT		4.2%	6.5%	7.3%	7.6%	5.9%	9.3%	15.7%	18.4%	6.3%	5.1%	8.4%	5.4%
1990	3,441	238	296	246	220	239	603	757	347	144	144	164	43
% of CT		6.9%	8.6%	7.1%	6.4%	6.9%	17.5%	22.0%	10.1%	4.2%	4.2%	4.8%	1.2%
<b>CT 216.05</b>													
2010	1,955	129	141	116	100	91	232	289	320	138	107	176	116
% of CT		6.6%	7.2%	5.9%	5.1%	4.7%	11.9%	14.8%	16.4%	7.1%	5.5%	9.0%	5.9%
2000	1,760	147	136	138	97	72	314	343	232	63	66	93	59
% of CT		8.4%	7.7%	7.8%	5.5%	4.1%	17.8%	19.5%	13.2%	3.6%	3.8%	5.3%	3.4%
1990	1,093	149	79	57	60	71	357	169	66	26	20	27	12
% of CT		13.6%	7.2%	5.2%	5.5%	6.5%	32.7%	15.5%	6.0%	2.4%	1.8%	2.5%	1.1%
<b>CT 216.06</b>													
2010	5,121	259	340	387	368	215	527	660	879	467	367	378	274
% of CT		5.1%	6.6%	7.6%	7.2%	4.2%	10.3%	12.9%	17.2%	9.1%	7.2%	7.4%	5.4%
2000	5,527	336	435	538	480	198	556	1111	1019	237	200	283	134
% of CT		6.1%	7.9%	9.7%	8.7%	3.6%	10.1%	20.1%	18.4%	4.3%	3.6%	5.1%	2.4%
1990	4,006	364	428	390	271	103	701	952	426	119	107	114	31
% of CT		9.1%	10.7%	9.7%	6.8%	2.6%	17.5%	23.8%	10.6%	3.0%	2.7%	2.8%	0.8%
<b>CT 216.07*</b>													
2010	CT 216.07 did not exist in 2010												
2000	2,518	232	210	250	174	153	377	488	302	99	68	111	54
% of CT		9.2%	8.3%	9.9%	6.9%	6.1%	15.0%	19.4%	12.0%	3.9%	2.7%	4.4%	2.1%
1990	348	45	30	12	20	39	95	38	22	9	12	14	12
% of CT		12.9%	8.6%	3.4%	5.7%	11.2%	27.3%	10.9%	6.3%	2.6%	3.4%	4.0%	3.4%
<b>CT 216.08*</b>													
2010	5,745	470	466	437	364	379	931	932	769	309	241	262	185
% of CT		8.2%	8.1%	7.6%	6.3%	6.6%	16.2%	16.2%	13.4%	5.4%	4.2%	4.6%	3.2%
2000	CT 216.08 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 216.08 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 216.09*</b>													
2010	3,241	194	203	196	193	193	405	438	566	258	220	246	129
% of CT		6.0%	6.3%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	12.5%	13.5%	17.5%	8.0%	6.8%	7.6%	4.0%
2000	CT 216.09 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 216.09 did not exist in 1990												

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	UNDER 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-59	60-64	65-74	75 & OVER
<b>CT 217*</b>													
2010	CT 217 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 217 did not exist in 2000												
1990	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>CT 217.01*</b>													
2010	CT 217.01 did not exist in 2010												
2000	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	CT 217.01 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 217.03*</b>													
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 217.03 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 217.03 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 217.04*</b>													
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 217.04 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 217.04 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 220*</b>													
2010	CT 220 did not exist in 2010												
2000	1,725	184	144	146	123	116	314	289	196	59	45	80	29
% of CT		10.7%	8.3%	8.5%	7.1%	6.7%	18.2%	16.8%	11.4%	3.4%	2.6%	4.6%	1.7%
1990	CT 220 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 220.01*</b>													
2010	4,193	402	387	357	251	215	825	677	544	202	124	160	49
% of CT		9.6%	9.2%	8.5%	6.0%	5.1%	19.7%	16.1%	13.0%	4.8%	3.0%	3.8%	1.2%
2000	CT 220.01 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 220.01 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 220.02*</b>													
2010	3,993	432	360	306	243	301	861	531	420	166	139	153	81
% of CT		10.8%	9.0%	7.7%	6.1%	7.5%	21.6%	13.3%	10.5%	4.2%	3.5%	3.8%	2.0%
2000	CT 220.02 did not exist in 2000												
1990	CT 220.02 did not exist in 1990												
<b>CT 220.97*</b>													
2010	CT 220.97 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 220.97 did not exist in 2000												
1990	214	16	20	16	13	11	50	26	24	11	9	15	3
% of CT		7.5%	9.3%	7.5%	6.1%	5.1%	23.4%	12.1%	11.2%	5.1%	4.2%	7.0%	1.4%
<b>CT 220.98*</b>													
2010	CT 220.98 did not exist in 2010												
2000	CT 220.98 did not exist in 2000												
1990	783	71	84	53	49	48	186	122	90	22	17	29	12
% of CT		9.1%	10.7%	6.8%	6.3%	6.1%	23.8%	15.6%	11.5%	2.8%	2.2%	3.7%	1.5%
<b>CITY TOTAL</b>													
2010	190,695	15,886	14,856	13,714	13,134	13,553	28,077	23,183	25,116	11,238	9,093	11,817	11,028
% of CT		8.3%	7.8%	7.2%	6.9%	7.1%	14.7%	12.2%	13.2%	5.9%	4.8%	6.2%	5.8%
2000	173,627	13,911	13,572	13,120	13,051	12,553	24,103	25,864	21,680	7,452	6,426	11,625	10,270
% of CT		8.0%	7.8%	7.6%	7.5%	7.2%	13.9%	14.9%	12.5%	4.3%	3.7%	6.7%	5.9%
1990	157,615	15,834	10,446	11,804	10,817	10,913	27,533	22,855	14,747	6,858	6,834	10,916	8,058
% of CT		10.0%	6.6%	7.5%	6.9%	6.9%	17.5%	14.5%	9.4%	4.4%	4.3%	6.9%	5.1%

**APPENDIX M**  
**Persons Under 18 Years of Age by Census Tract (1990 – 2010)**  
**City of Amarillo**

Census Tract	2010		2000		1990	
	Number	Percent of CT	Number	Percent of CT	Number	Percent of CT
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>						
101	412	21.1%	303	14.5%	322	17.1%
102	474	24.2%	458	23.6%	390	20.7%
103	321	25.7%	358	24.0%	309	19.5%
104	779	23.2%	817	23.7%	667	21.5%
105*	**	**	**	**	522	24.9%
106	794	36.6%	723	37.5%	536	33.5%
107	999	30.6%	977	30.8%	970	29.9%
108*	**	**	**	**	257	31.7%
109*	**	**	**	**	1,546	34.4%
110	686	29.8%	780	33.7%	671	32.5%
111*	**	**	744	33.5%	853	36.5%
112*	**	**	**	**	236	32.9%
113*	**	**	**	**	25	6.9%
114*	**	**	**	**	348	19.4%
115	1,033	24.9%	1,069	24.9%	895	23.1%
116	1,080	25.6%	900	23.5%	798	22.2%
117	890	19.6%	763	19.6%	801	21.1%
118	825	22.1%	850	23.3%	947	25.6%
119	893	27.9%	934	29.0%	831	28.0%
120	490	28.1%	481	28.3%	478	28.9%
121*	**	**	**	**	108	19.2%
122	1,391	35.3%	1,357	36.5%	955	32.3%
123*	**	**	**	**	175	29.3%
125*	**	**	**	**	1,747	37.4%
126	1,196	36.7%	874	34.1%	725	31.5%
127*	**	**	**	**	1,644	33.5%
128*	1,733	34.3%	1,576	34.6%	**	**
128.97*	**	**	**	**	29	29.0%
128.98*	**	**	**	**	1,187	31.6%
129*	**	**	**	**	613	33.1%
130	524	30.9%	541	31.7%	533	30.4%
131*	**	**	**	**	1,163	28.8%
132	249	15.2%	234	12.6%	242	18.5%
133	1,200	26.0%	636	22.0%	440	23.8%
134	14	24.1%	4	30.8%	14	24.1%
135*	**	**	**	**	287	28.9%
136*	**	**	**	**	294	28.2%
137*	**	**	**	**	544	28.1%
138*	**	**	**	**	234	26.4%
139	1,204	35.5%	1,229	36.8%	1,114	34.6%
140*	**	**	**	**	315	39.7%
141	764	33.6%	870	35.9%	821	36.4%
144*	**	**	797	38.5%	714	33.9%
144.01*	715	32.8%	**	**	**	**
145*	2,148	34.7%	1,950	34.5%	**	**
146*	**	**	123	19.5%	**	**
147*	1,150	23.3%	1,177	23.6%	**	**
148*	760	30.4%	813	32.1%	**	**
149*	2,018	34.2%	2,048	35.9%	**	**
150*	2,555	36.7%	2,145	35.1%	**	**
151*	619	27.3%	608	27.7%	**	**
152*	657	23.3%	696	24.5%	**	**
153*	1,615	32.3%	1,545	31.8%	**	**
154*	876	29.6%	**	**	**	**
9800*	0	0.0%	**	**	**	**
<b>TOTAL IN POTTER COUNTY</b>	<b>31,064</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>29,380</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>26,300</b>	<b>28.7%</b>

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010		2000		1990	
	Number	Percent of CT	Number	Percent of CT	Number	Percent of CT
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>						
201	452	21.5%	479	21.8%	443	20.4%
202	522	25.4%	506	22.2%	415	19.3%
203	501	25.2%	415	20.6%	412	22.7%
204	429	23.0%	517	25.3%	511	25.4%
205	1,141	28.7%	1,112	28.6%	957	37.7%
206	1,121	29.0%	1,116	29.1%	1,382	33.6%
208	1,904	28.7%	1,757	30.6%	1,721	31.2%
209	875	30.3%	876	30.6%	856	30.6%
210	614	25.4%	617	25.9%	733	29.9%
211*	**	**	1,255	19.1%	1,172	18.8%
211.01*	844	21.3%	**	**	**	**
211.02*	379	16.0%	**	**	**	**
212	1,226	23.5%	1,202	23.2%	1,327	24.6%
213	1,260	23.8%	1,375	24.7%	1,571	27.8%
215	1,170	24.2%	1,353	27.2%	1,468	32.8%
216.02	1,100	21.6%	1,287	22.7%	1,297	23.1%
216.03	389	20.1%	588	26.7%	792	34.2%
216.04	838	18.8%	1,102	22.9%	920	26.7%
216.05	443	22.7%	481	27.3%	318	29.1%
216.06	1,221	23.8%	1,648	29.8%	1,373	34.3%
216.07*	**	**	803	31.9%	100	28.7%
216.08*	1,624	28.3%	**	**	**	**
216.09*	725	22.4%	**	**	**	**
217*	**	**	**	**	0	0.0%
217.01*	**	**	0	0.0%	**	**
217.03*	0	0.0%	**	**	**	**
217.04*	0	0.0%	**	**	**	**
220*	**	**	554	32.1%	**	**
220.01*	1,313	31.3%	**	**	**	**
220.02*	1,248	31.3%	**	**	**	**
220.97*	**	**	**	**	62	29.0%
220.98*	**	**	**	**	242	30.9%
<b>TOTAL IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>	<b>21,339</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>19,043</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>18,072</b>	<b>27.3%</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>52,403</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>48,423</b>	<b>27.9%</b>	<b>44,372</b>	<b>28.2%</b>

**APPENDIX N**  
**Race/Ethnicity by Census Tract (1990 – 2010)**  
City of Amarillo

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 101</b>								
<b>2010</b>	<b>1,949</b>	274	1,496	70	13	39	8	49
<b>% of CT</b>		14.1%	76.8%	3.6%	0.7%	2.0%	0.4%	2.5%
<b>2000</b>	<b>2,085</b>	185	1,737	53	9	73	0	28
<b>% of CT</b>		8.9%	83.3%	2.5%	0.4%	3.5%	0.0%	1.3%
<b>1990</b>	<b>1,882</b>	105	1,729	31	3	14	0	N/A
<b>% of CT</b>		5.6%	91.9%	1.6%	0.2%	0.7%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 102</b>								
<b>2010</b>	<b>1,961</b>	178	1,722	14	8	10	0	29
<b>% of CT</b>		9.1%	87.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	1.5%
<b>2000</b>	<b>1,939</b>	78	1,819	20	1	3	0	18
<b>% of CT</b>		4.0%	93.8%	1.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.9%
<b>1990</b>	<b>1,886</b>	51	1,826	4	2	3	0	N/A
<b>% of CT</b>		2.7%	96.8%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 103</b>								
<b>2010</b>	<b>1,251</b>	356	624	206	5	14	1	45
<b>% of CT</b>		28.5%	49.9%	16.5%	0.4%	1.1%	0.1%	3.6%
<b>2000</b>	<b>1,491</b>	356	914	177	13	4	1	26
<b>% of CT</b>		23.9%	61.3%	11.9%	0.9%	0.3%	0.1%	N/A
<b>1990</b>	<b>1,587</b>	225	1,247	101	5	8	1	N/A
<b>% of CT</b>		14.2%	78.6%	6.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 104</b>								
<b>2010</b>	<b>3,365</b>	426	2,757	69	12	45	4	52
<b>% of CT</b>		12.7%	81.9%	2.1%	0.4%	1.3%	0.1%	1.5%
<b>2000</b>	<b>3,445</b>	326	3,005	31	23	20	0	40
<b>% of CT</b>		9.5%	87.2%	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	1.2%
<b>1990</b>	<b>3,109</b>	116	2,946	15	17	14	1	N/A
<b>% of CT</b>		3.7%	94.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 105*</b>								
<b>2010</b>	CT 105 did not exist in 2010							
<b>2000</b>	CT 105 did not exist in 2000							
<b>1990</b>	<b>2,095</b>	311	1,711	43	22	8	0	N/A
<b>% of CT</b>		14.8%	81.7%	2.1%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 106</b>								
<b>2010</b>	<b>2,168</b>	1,740	329	67	9	4	4	15
<b>% of CT</b>		80.3%	15.2%	3.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.7%
<b>2000</b>	<b>1,926</b>	1,507	376	19	10	2	0	12
<b>% of CT</b>		78.2%	19.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%
<b>1990</b>	<b>1,600</b>	1,087	487	7	6	0	13	N/A
<b>% of CT</b>		67.9%	30.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.8%	N/A

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 107</b>								
2010	3,262	1,665	1,449	72	12	20	3	41
% of CT		51.0%	44.4%	2.2%	0.4%	0.6%	0.1%	1.3%
2000	3,171	1,270	1,809	56	16	2	0	18
% of CT		40.1%	57.0%	1.8%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%
1990	3,247	811	2,375	16	23	11	11	N/A
% of CT		25.0%	73.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	N/A
<b>CT 108*</b>								
2010	CT 108 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 108 did not exist in 2000							
1990	812	181	613	11	4	2	1	N/A
% of CT		22.3%	75.5%	1.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 109*</b>								
2010	CT 109 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 109 did not exist in 2000							
1990	4,491	1,886	2,413	95	43	43	11	N/A
% of CT		42.0%	53.7%	2.1%	1.0%	1.0%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 110</b>								
2010	2,304	1,650	563	34	12	23	9	13
% of CT		71.6%	24.4%	1.5%	0.5%	1.0%	0.4%	0.6%
2000	2,317	1,524	698	31	5	40	1	18
% of CT		65.8%	30.1%	1.3%	0.2%	1.7%	0.0%	0.8%
1990	2,064	1,083	941	20	13	7	0	N/A
% of CT		52.5%	45.6%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 111*</b>								
2010	CT 111 did not exist in 2010							
2000	2,218	1,823	291	64	24	3	0	13
% of CT		82.2%	13.1%	2.9%	1.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%
1990	2,334	1,802	444	67	5	11	5	N/A
% of CT		77.2%	19.0%	2.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 112*</b>								
2010	CT 112 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 112 did not exist in 2000							
1990	717	338	336	18	12	5	8	N/A
% of CT		47.1%	46.9%	2.5%	1.7%	0.7%	1.1%	N/A
<b>CT 113*</b>								
2010	CT 113 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 113 did not exist in 2000							
1990	363	42	203	105	4	9	0	N/A
% of CT		11.6%	55.9%	28.9%	1.1%	2.5%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 114*</b>								
2010	CT 114 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 114 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,790	242	1,399	117	22	9	1	N/A
% of CT		13.5%	78.2%	6.5%	1.2%	0.5%	0.1%	N/A

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 115</b>								
2010	4,155	820	3,048	156	38	33	1	59
% of CT		19.7%	73.4%	3.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.0%	1.4%
2000	4,289	660	3,399	132	36	6	6	50
% of CT		15.4%	79.2%	3.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	1.2%
1990	3,867	393	3,331	96	38	9	0	N/A
% of CT		10.2%	86.1%	2.5%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 116</b>								
2010	4,211	733	2,557	317	20	494	23	67
% of CT		17.4%	60.7%	7.5%	0.5%	11.7%	0.5%	1.6%
2000	3,826	479	3,070	170	19	39	0	49
% of CT		12.5%	80.2%	4.4%	0.5%	1.0%	0.0%	1.3%
1990	3,597	244	3,240	73	26	8	6	N/A
% of CT		6.8%	90.1%	2.0%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 117</b>								
2010	4,538	917	2,946	368	18	190	11	88
% of CT		20.2%	64.9%	8.1%	0.4%	4.2%	0.2%	1.9%
2000	3,884	605	2,900	235	8	67	10	59
% of CT		15.6%	74.7%	6.1%	0.2%	1.7%	0.3%	1.5%
1990	3,792	315	3,135	271	19	46	6	N/A
% of CT		8.3%	82.7%	7.1%	0.5%	1.2%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 118</b>								
2010	3,739	676	2,825	95	29	62	8	44
% of CT		18.1%	75.6%	2.5%	0.8%	1.7%	0.2%	1.2%
2000	3,647	407	3,115	65	11	15	3	31
% of CT		11.2%	85.4%	1.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.9%
1990	3,696	225	3,377	56	26	6	6	N/A
% of CT		6.1%	91.4%	1.5%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 119</b>								
2010	3,205	885	1,954	257	20	25	10	54
% of CT		27.6%	61.0%	8.0%	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	1.7%
2000	3,226	664	2,305	151	17	8	1	80
% of CT		20.6%	71.5%	4.7%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	2.5%
1990	2,971	334	2,451	139	30	17	0	N/A
% of CT		11.2%	82.5%	4.7%	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 120</b>								
2010	1,745	648	799	231	15	7	1	44
% of CT		37.1%	45.8%	13.2%	0.9%	0.4%	0.1%	2.5%
2000	1,700	517	998	138	11	0	0	36
% of CT		30.4%	58.7%	8.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
1990	1,654	352	1,113	169	11	5	4	N/A
% of CT		21.3%	67.3%	10.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 121*</b>								
2010	CT 121 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 121 did not exist in 2000							
1990	563	64	153	335	6	4	1	N/A
% of CT		11.4%	27.2%	59.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.2%	N/A

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 122</b>								
2010	3,946	2,847	727	269	19	44	4	36
% of CT		72.1%	18.4%	6.8%	0.5%	1.1%	0.1%	0.9%
2000	3,714	2,186	1,208	222	11	48	4	35
% of CT		58.9%	32.5%	6.0%	0.3%	1.3%	0.1%	0.9%
1990	2,959	1,090	1,636	162	18	46	7	N/A
% of CT		36.8%	55.3%	5.5%	0.6%	1.6%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 123*</b>								
2010	CT 123 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 123 did not exist in 2000							
1990	597	201	351	2	10	32	1	N/A
% of CT		33.7%	58.8%	0.3%	1.7%	5.4%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 125*</b>								
2010	CT 125 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 125 did not exist in 2000							
1990	4,670	974	1,795	364	18	1,501	18	N/A
% of CT		20.9%	38.4%	7.8%	0.4%	32.1%	0.4%	N/A
<b>CT 126</b>								
2010	3,255	2,139	664	338	11	57	6	40
% of CT		65.7%	20.4%	10.4%	0.3%	1.8%	0.2%	1.2%
2000	2,564	1,314	1,022	144	20	26	0	38
% of CT		51.2%	39.9%	5.6%	0.8%	1.0%	0.0%	1.5%
1990	2,301	801	1,348	81	14	55	2	N/A
% of CT		34.8%	58.6%	3.5%	0.6%	2.4%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 127*</b>								
2010	CT 127 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 127 did not exist in 2000							
1990	4,907	1,562	2,811	316	39	164	15	N/A
% of CT		31.8%	57.3%	6.4%	0.8%	3.3%	0.3%	N/A
<b>CT 128*</b>								
2010	5,053	2,865	1,028	723	21	333	9	74
% of CT		56.7%	20.3%	14.3%	0.4%	6.6%	0.2%	1.5%
2000	4,558	2,317	1,427	635	45	56	7	71
% of CT		50.8%	31.3%	13.9%	1.0%	1.2%	0.2%	1.6%
1990	CT 128 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 128.97*</b>								
2010	CT 128.97 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 128.97 did not exist in 2000							
1990	100	19	68	12	1	0	0	N/A
% of CT		19.0%	68.0%	12.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 128.98*</b>								
2010	CT 128.98 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 128.98 did not exist in 2000							
1990	3,756	1,213	1,857	593	13	77	3	N/A
% of CT		32.3%	49.4%	15.8%	0.3%	2.1%	0.1%	N/A

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 129*</b>								
2010	CT 129 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 129 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,853	208	324	1,161	9	146	5	N/A
% of CT		11.2%	17.5%	62.7%	0.5%	7.9%	0.3%	N/A
<b>CT 130</b>								
2010	1,695	359	147	1,140	5	2	0	42
% of CT		21.2%	8.7%	67.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	2.5%
2000	1,707	169	92	1,407	6	4	5	24
% of CT		9.9%	5.4%	82.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	1.4%
1990	1,756	15	46	1,693	2	0	0	N/A
% of CT		0.9%	2.6%	96.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 131*</b>								
2010	CT 131 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 131 did not exist in 2000							
1990	4,036	613	2,998	364	30	26	5	N/A
% of CT		15.2%	74.3%	9.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 132</b>								
2010	1,636	132	1,425	44	10	5	0	20
% of CT		8.1%	87.1%	2.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	1.2%
2000	1,862	84	1,697	31	20	13	2	15
% of CT		4.5%	91.1%	1.7%	1.1%	0.7%	0.1%	0.8%
1990	1,308	71	1,205	18	8	6	0	N/A
% of CT		5.4%	92.1%	1.4%	0.6%	0.5%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 133</b>								
2010	4,608	340	3,804	142	18	247	0	57
% of CT		7.4%	82.6%	3.1%	0.4%	5.4%	0.0%	1.2%
2000	2,889	166	2,535	70	14	59	0	45
% of CT		5.7%	87.7%	2.4%	0.5%	2.0%	0.0%	1.6%
1990	1,846	120	1,582	120	7	14	3	N/A
% of CT		6.5%	85.7%	6.5%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 134</b>								
2010	58	17	40	0	0	0	0	1
% of CT		29.3%	69.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
2000	13	2	10	0	0	0	0	1
% of CT		15.4%	76.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%
1990	58	5	49	0	2	2	0	N/A
% of CT		8.6%	84.5%	0.0%	3.4%	3.4%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 135*</b>								
2010	CT 135 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 135 did not exist in 2000							
1990	992	42	944	3	1	2	0	N/A
% of CT		4.2%	95.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 136*</b>								
2010	CT 136 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 136 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,044	86	952	0	1	3	2	N/A
% of CT		8.2%	91.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	N/A

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 137*</b>								
2010	CT 137 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 137 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,938	140	1,774	6	18	0	0	N/A
% of CT		7.2%	91.5%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 138*</b>								
2010	CT 138 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 138 did not exist in 2000							
1990	888	80	802	2	4	0	0	N/A
% of CT		9.0%	90.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 139</b>								
2010	3,390	921	902	1,439	9	44	1	74
% of CT		27.2%	26.6%	42.4%	0.3%	1.3%	0.0%	2.2%
2000	3,336	640	1,046	1,528	17	47	5	53
% of CT		19.2%	31.4%	45.8%	0.5%	1.4%	0.1%	1.6%
1990	3,218	513	1,308	1,292	62	38	5	N/A
% of CT		15.9%	40.6%	40.1%	1.9%	1.2%	0.2%	N/A
<b>CT 140*</b>								
2010	CT 140 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 140 did not exist in 2000							
1990	794	181	401	169	24	17	2	N/A
% of CT		22.8%	50.5%	21.3%	3.0%	2.1%	0.3%	N/A
<b>CT 141</b>								
2010	2,271	1,082	893	171	8	53	5	59
% of CT		47.6%	39.3%	7.5%	0.4%	2.3%	0.2%	2.6%
2000	2,425	834	1,282	155	20	96	2	36
% of CT		34.4%	52.9%	6.4%	0.8%	4.0%	0.1%	1.5%
1990	2,256	455	1,596	145	20	38	2	N/A
% of CT		20.2%	70.7%	6.4%	0.9%	1.7%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 144*</b>								
2010	CT 144 did not exist in 2010							
2000	2,072	354	1,550	74	12	26	2	54
% of CT		17.1%	74.8%	3.6%	0.6%	1.3%	0.1%	2.6%
1990	2,108	258	1,678	137	20	12	3	N/A
% of CT		12.2%	79.6%	6.5%	0.9%	0.6%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 144.01*</b>								
2010	2,179	488	1,508	105	13	26	0	39
% of CT		22.4%	69.2%	4.8%	0.6%	1.2%	0.0%	1.8%
2000	CT 144.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 144.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 144*</b>								
2010	CT 144 did not exist in 2010							
2000	2,072	354	1,550	74	12	26	2	54
% of CT		17.1%	74.8%	3.6%	0.6%	1.3%	0.1%	2.6%
1990	2,108	258	1,678	137	20	12	3	N/A
% of CT		12.2%	79.6%	6.5%	0.9%	0.6%	0.1%	N/A

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 144.01*</b>								
2010	2,179	488	1,508	105	13	26	0	39
% of CT		22.4%	69.2%	4.8%	0.6%	1.2%	0.0%	1.8%
2000	CT 144.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 144.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 145*</b>								
2010	6,184	4,168	1,686	193	30	55	2	50
% of CT		67.4%	27.3%	3.1%	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%
2000	5,649	3,189	2,191	131	42	33	1	62
% of CT		56.5%	38.8%	2.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%
1990	CT 145 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 146*</b>								
2010	CT 146 did not exist in 2010							
2000	635	131	344	127	9	6	2	16
% of CT		20.6%	54.2%	20.0%	1.4%	0.9%	0.3%	2.5%
1990	CT 146 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 147*</b>								
2010	4,934	1,322	3,283	157	32	30	0	110
% of CT		26.8%	66.5%	3.2%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	2.2%
2000	4,990	1,144	3,603	98	43	24	16	62
% of CT		22.9%	72.2%	2.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	1.2%
1990	CT 147 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 148*</b>								
2010	2,502	961	397	1,048	11	40	3	42
% of CT		38.4%	15.9%	41.9%	0.4%	1.6%	0.1%	1.7%
2000	2,533	691	466	1,300	9	43	2	22
% of CT		27.3%	18.4%	51.3%	0.4%	1.7%	0.1%	0.9%
1990	CT 148 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 149*</b>								
2010	5,901	2,023	888	413	8	2,449	3	117
% of CT		34.3%	15.0%	7.0%	0.1%	41.5%	0.1%	2.0%
2000	5,709	1,943	1,494	375	15	1,709	2	171
% of CT		34.0%	26.2%	6.6%	0.3%	29.9%	0.0%	3.0%
1990	CT 149 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 150*</b>								
2010	6,964	4,167	1,610	800	24	252	9	102
% of CT		59.8%	23.1%	11.5%	0.3%	3.6%	0.1%	1.5%
2000	6,110	2,655	2,402	663	28	246	5	111
% of CT		43.5%	39.3%	10.9%	0.5%	4.0%	0.1%	1.8%
1990	CT 150 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 151*</b>								
2010	2,266	257	1,933	14	22	5	0	35
% of CT		11.3%	85.3%	0.6%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.5%
2000	2,198	178	1,959	24	8	10	1	18
% of CT		8.1%	89.1%	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.8%
1990	CT 151 did not exist in 1990							

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 152*</b>								
2010	2,825	552	2,153	53	24	6	1	36
% of CT		19.5%	76.2%	1.9%	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%	1.3%
2000	2,841	360	2,388	19	18	5	2	49
% of CT		12.7%	84.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	1.7%
1990	CT 152 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 153*</b>								
2010	5,002	2,062	2,218	575	26	23	8	90
% of CT		41.2%	44.3%	11.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	1.8%
2000	4,864	1,407	2,732	539	59	28	6	93
% of CT		28.9%	56.2%	11.1%	1.2%	0.6%	0.1%	1.9%
1990	CT 153 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 154*</b>								
2010	2,964	2,167	556	183	17	23	1	17
% of CT		73.1%	18.8%	6.2%	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.6%
2000	CT 154 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 154 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 9800*</b>								
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 9800 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 9800 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 201</b>								
2010	2,101	195	1,829	35	6	13	1	22
% of CT		9.3%	87.1%	1.7%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	1.0%
2000	2,194	100	2,050	20	6	6	2	10
% of CT		4.6%	93.4%	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%
1990	2,176	56	2,103	8	2	7	0	N/A
% of CT		2.6%	96.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 202</b>								
2010	2,059	279	1,661	53	19	18	3	26
% of CT		13.6%	80.7%	2.6%	0.9%	0.9%	0.1%	1.3%
2000	2,284	223	1,993	30	5	15	2	16
% of CT		9.8%	87.3%	1.3%	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.7%
1990	2,145	96	2,027	7	13	2	0	N/A
% of CT		4.5%	94.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 203</b>								
2010	1,987	413	1,395	107	10	15	3	44
% of CT		20.8%	70.2%	5.4%	0.5%	0.8%	0.2%	2.2%
2000	2,011	201	1,726	49	5	8	1	21
% of CT		10.0%	85.8%	2.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	1.0%
1990	1,812	139	1,632	28	11	2	0	N/A
% of CT		7.7%	90.1%	1.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 204</b>								
2010	1,864	212	1,584	14	5	18	0	31
% of CT		11.4%	85.0%	0.8%	0.3%	1.0%	0.0%	1.7%
2000	2,041	111	1,878	10	9	18	0	15
% of CT		5.4%	92.0%	0.5%	0.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%
1990	2,008	60	1,925	18	3	2	0	N/A
% of CT		3.0%	95.9%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	N/A

Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 205</b>								
2010	3,982	1,320	2,393	146	17	21	7	78
% of CT		33.1%	60.1%	3.7%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	2.0%
2000	3,885	829	2,834	105	42	30	0	45
% of CT		21.3%	72.9%	2.7%	1.1%	0.8%	0.0%	1.2%
1990	3,536	526	2,918	47	30	10	5	N/A
% of CT		14.9%	82.5%	1.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 206</b>								
2010	3,867	1,795	1,902	87	15	22	0	46
% of CT		46.4%	49.2%	2.2%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	1.2%
2000	3,839	1,094	2,604	71	14	13	0	43
% of CT		28.5%	67.8%	1.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	1.1%
1990	4,118	767	3,291	42	9	8	1	N/A
% of CT		18.6%	79.9%	1.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 208</b>								
2010	6,623	1,516	4,643	254	31	56	1	122
% of CT		22.9%	70.1%	3.8%	0.5%	0.8%	0.0%	1.8%
2000	5,738	859	4,629	107	44	16	0	83
% of CT		15.0%	80.7%	1.9%	0.8%	0.3%	0.0%	1.4%
1990	5,519	489	4,923	38	53	14	2	N/A
% of CT		8.9%	89.2%	0.7%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 209</b>								
2010	2,892	686	1,911	179	8	27	12	69
% of CT		23.7%	66.1%	6.2%	0.3%	0.9%	0.4%	2.4%
2000	2,866	488	2,261	46	26	8	1	36
% of CT		17.0%	78.9%	1.6%	0.9%	0.3%	0.0%	1.3%
1990	2,793	247	2,481	40	18	6	1	N/A
% of CT		8.8%	88.8%	1.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 210</b>								
2010	2,420	440	1,903	30	13	9	3	22
% of CT		18.2%	78.6%	1.2%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	0.9%
2000	2,384	295	1,987	30	10	21	2	39
% of CT		12.4%	83.3%	1.3%	0.4%	0.9%	0.1%	1.6%
1990	2,450	131	2,242	39	13	18	7	N/A
% of CT		5.3%	91.5%	1.6%	0.5%	0.7%	0.3%	N/A
<b>CT 211*</b>								
2010	CT 211 did not exist in 2010							
2000	6,580	662	5,574	145	49	61	4	85
% of CT		10.1%	84.7%	2.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.1%	1.3%
1990	6,228	414	5,629	126	16	37	6	N/A
% of CT		6.6%	90.4%	2.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 211.01*</b>								
2010	3,962	465	3,311	92	14	20	2	58
% of CT		11.7%	83.6%	2.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%	1.5%
2000	CT 211.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 211.01 did not exist in 1990							

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 211.02*</b>								
2010	2,369	604	1,545	149	12	20	9	30
% of CT		25.5%	65.2%	6.3%	0.5%	0.8%	0.4%	1.3%
2000	CT 211.02 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 211.02 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 212</b>								
2010	5,208	693	4,250	111	33	30	0	91
% of CT		13.3%	81.6%	2.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	1.7%
2000	5,191	436	4,578	94	16	24	1	42
% of CT		8.4%	88.2%	1.8%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.8%
1990	5,395	217	5,053	59	31	35	0	N/A
% of CT		4.0%	93.7%	1.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 213</b>								
2010	5,288	704	4,279	155	31	27	3	89
% of CT		13.3%	80.9%	2.9%	0.6%	0.5%	0.1%	1.7%
2000	5,577	479	4,835	103	32	59	7	62
% of CT		8.6%	86.7%	1.8%	0.6%	1.1%	0.1%	1.1%
1990	5,649	326	5,196	70	25	31	1	N/A
% of CT		5.8%	92.0%	1.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 215</b>								
2010	4,843	506	4,154	51	30	48	3	51
% of CT		10.4%	85.8%	1.1%	0.6%	1.0%	0.1%	1.1%
2000	4,979	295	4,541	35	11	39	3	55
% of CT		5.9%	91.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.8%	0.1%	1.1%
1990	4,480	133	4,276	27	16	28	0	N/A
% of CT		3.0%	95.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 216.02</b>								
2010	5,096	508	4,351	90	12	67	0	68
% of CT		10.0%	85.4%	1.8%	0.2%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%
2000	5,676	302	5,145	81	14	99	0	35
% of CT		5.3%	90.6%	1.4%	0.2%	1.7%	0.0%	0.6%
1990	5,604	180	5,259	84	15	63	3	N/A
% of CT		3.2%	93.8%	1.5%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 216.03</b>								
2010	1,932	232	1,599	45	2	46	0	8
% of CT		12.0%	82.8%	2.3%	0.1%	2.4%	0.0%	0.4%
2000	2,204	133	1,969	39	10	38	0	15
% of CT		6.0%	89.3%	1.8%	0.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.7%
1990	2,315	92	2,171	37	4	11	0	N/A
% of CT		4.0%	93.8%	1.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 216.04</b>								
2010	4,468	428	3,709	63	31	184	3	50
% of CT		9.6%	83.0%	1.4%	0.7%	4.1%	0.1%	1.1%
2000	4,815	290	4,253	42	13	172	4	41
% of CT		6.0%	88.3%	0.9%	0.3%	3.6%	0.1%	0.9%
1990	3,441	128	3,202	33	10	68	0	N/A
% of CT		3.7%	93.1%	1.0%	0.3%	2.0%	0.0%	N/A

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 216.05</b>								
2010	1,955	212	1,633	22	13	51	2	22
% of CT		10.8%	83.5%	1.1%	0.7%	2.6%	0.1%	1.1%
2000	1,760	122	1,558	21	4	34	1	20
% of CT		6.9%	88.5%	1.2%	0.2%	1.9%	0.1%	1.1%
1990	1,093	84	991	12	1	4	1	N/A
% of CT		7.7%	90.7%	1.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	N/A
<b>CT 216.06</b>								
2010	5,121	409	4,546	45	30	41	3	47
% of CT		8.0%	88.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%	0.1%	0.9%
2000	5,527	324	5,052	58	18	49	0	26
% of CT		5.9%	91.4%	1.0%	0.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.5%
1990	4,006	119	3,768	49	22	46	2	N/A
% of CT		3.0%	94.1%	1.2%	0.5%	1.1%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 216.07*</b>								
2010	CT 216.07 did not exist in 2010							
2000	2,518	214	2,180	45	8	42	3	26
% of CT		8.5%	86.6%	1.8%	0.3%	1.7%	0.1%	1.0%
1990	348	41	298	4	5	0	0	N/A
% of CT		11.8%	85.6%	1.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 216.08*</b>								
2010	5,745	837	4,555	108	39	131	7	68
% of CT		14.6%	79.3%	1.9%	0.7%	2.3%	0.1%	1.2%
2000	CT 216.08 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 216.08 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 216.09*</b>								
2010	3,241	301	2,691	66	10	140	4	29
% of CT		9.3%	83.0%	2.0%	0.3%	4.3%	0.1%	0.9%
2000	CT 216.09 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 216.09 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 217*</b>								
2010	CT 217 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 217 did not exist in 2000							
1990	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>CT 217.01*</b>								
2010	CT 217.01 did not exist in 2010							
2000	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	CT 217.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 217.03*</b>								
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 217.03 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 217.03 did not exist in 1990							

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

CENSUS TRACT CENSUS YEAR	TOTAL CT POP.	Hispanic**	White	Black	American Indian	Asian & Pac. Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
<b>CT 217.04*</b>								
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 217.04 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 217.04 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220*</b>								
2010	CT 220 did not exist in 2010							
2000	1,725	325	1,290	52	13	13	0	32
% of CT		18.8%	74.8%	3.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	1.9%
1990	CT 220 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220.01*</b>								
2010	4,193	840	3,064	131	9	84	7	58
% of CT		20.0%	73.1%	3.1%	0.2%	2.0%	0.2%	1.4%
2000	CT 220.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 220.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220.02*</b>								
2010	3,993	1,449	2,090	181	19	197	0	57
% of CT		36.3%	52.3%	4.5%	0.5%	4.9%	0.0%	1.4%
2000	CT 220.02 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 220.02 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220.97*</b>								
2010	CT 220.97 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 220.97 did not exist in 2000							
1990	214	8	205	0	1	0	0	N/A
% of CT		3.7%	95.8%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<b>CT 220.98*</b>								
2010	CT 220.98 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 220.98 did not exist in 2000							
1990	783	124	644	6	5	1	3	N/A
% of CT		15.8%	82.2%	0.8%	0.6%	0.1%	0.4%	N/A
<b>CITY TOTAL</b>								
2010	190,695	54,881	113,929	11,977	928	5,945	208	2,827
% of CT		28.8%	59.7%	6.3%	0.5%	3.1%	0.1%	1.5%
2000	173,627	37,947	118,821	10,067	948	3,526	117	2,201
% of CT		21.9%	68.4%	5.8%	0.5%	2.0%	0.1%	1.3%
1990	157,615	23,231	121,229	9,203	961	2,811	180	N/A
% of CT		14.7%	76.9%	5.8%	0.6%	1.8%	0.1%	N/A

N/A = Data not available

**APPENDIX O**  
**Single Head of Household with Children Under 18 Years of Age**  
City of Amarillo

Census Tract	2010					2000					1990				
	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT
<b>PORTRION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>															
101	486	61	12.6%	13	2.7%	500	50	10.0%	10	2.0%	489	36	7.4%	8	1.6%
102	575	29	5.0%	12	2.1%	593	32	5.4%	10	1.7%	618	24	3.9%	5	0.8%
103	257	89	34.6%	26	10.1%	329	126	38.3%	33	10.0%	345	92	26.7%	17	4.9%
104	918	88	9.6%	30	3.3%	962	120	12.5%	29	3.0%	873	78	8.9%	14	1.6%
105*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	526	71	13.5%	18	3.4%
106	526	120	22.8%	22	4.2%	452	72	15.9%	28	6.2%	383	42	11.0%	16	4.2%
107	850	110	12.9%	45	5.3%	863	115	13.3%	37	4.3%	933	91	9.8%	18	1.9%
108*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	235	59	25.1%	11	4.7%
109*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1141	143	12.5%	56	4.9%
110	550	75	13.6%	32	5.8%	564	103	18.3%	34	6.0%	532	61	11.5%	15	2.8%
111*	*	*	*	*	*	529	122	23.1%	29	5.5%	547	104	19.0%	21	3.8%
112*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	154	24	15.6%	4	2.6%
113*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	31	6	19.4%	2	6.5%
114*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	335	62	18.5%	4	1.2%
115	1027	128	12.5%	54	5.3%	1,060	141	13.3%	48	4.5%	1026	116	11.3%	35	3.4%
116	1050	177	16.9%	41	3.9%	1,073	234	21.8%	32	3.0%	1044	153	14.7%	20	1.9%
117	934	254	27.2%	55	5.9%	832	175	21.0%	45	5.4%	838	159	19.0%	24	2.9%
118	946	107	11.3%	46	4.9%	956	108	11.3%	26	2.7%	1038	96	9.2%	15	1.4%
119	780	135	17.3%	37	4.7%	811	167	20.6%	48	5.9%	1231	186	15.1%	44	3.6%
120	364	87	23.9%	23	6.3%	361	94	26.0%	27	7.5%	351	58	16.5%	34	9.7%
121*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	112	29	25.9%	5	4.5%
122	893	143	16.0%	66	7.4%	875	153	17.5%	71	8.1%	720	107	14.9%	41	5.7%
123*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	132	14	10.6%	11	8.3%
125*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1121	118	10.5%	41	3.7%
126	739	137	18.5%	62	8.4%	644	108	16.8%	46	7.1%	573	82	14.3%	16	2.8%
127*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1264	195	15.4%	40	3.2%
128*	1158	202	17.4%	82	7.1%	1,097	240	21.9%	73	6.7%	*	*	*	*	*
128.97*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	26	1	3.8%	2	7.7%

Changing Numbers, Part I

Census Tract	2010				2000				1990						
	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT
128.98*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	955	180	18.8%	47	4.9%
129*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	446	132	29.6%	18	4.0%
130	421	98	23.3%	20	4.8%	427	147	34.4%	26	6.1%	436	153	35.1%	10	2.3%
131*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1044	197	18.9%	49	4.7%
132	409	31	7.6%	15	3.7%	418	27	6.5%	11	2.6%	367	23	6.3%	9	2.5%
133	1338	38	2.8%	18	1.3%	889	25	2.8%	6	0.7%	498	24	4.8%	10	2.0%
134	14	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	3	25.0%	1	8.3%
135*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	296	11	3.7%	4	1.4%
136*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	300	27	9.0%	3	1.0%
137*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	544	51	9.4%	10	1.8%
138*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	264	20	7.6%	10	3.8%
139	843	186	22.1%	24	2.8%	835	204	24.4%	42	5.0%	847	152	17.9%	40	4.7%
140*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	210	86	41.0%	8	3.8%
141	572	79	13.8%	32	5.6%	625	100	16.0%	33	5.3%	594	64	10.8%	30	5.1%
144*	*	*	*	*	*	534	101	18.9%	27	5.1%	*	*	*	*	*
144.01*	489	73	14.9%	30	6.1%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
145*	1498	271	18.1%	81	5.4%	1,404	272	19.4%	81	5.8%	*	*	*	*	*
146*	*	*	*	*	*	75	27	36.0%	6	8.0%	*	*	*	*	*
147*	1,035	178	17.2%	60	5.8%	1,089	174	16.0%	55	5.1%	*	*	*	*	*
148*	567	129	22.8%	30	5.3%	589	159	27.0%	34	5.8%	*	*	*	*	*
149*	1,370	141	10.3%	60	4.4%	1,358	217	16.0%	80	5.9%	*	*	*	*	*
150*	1,688	377	22.3%	80	4.7%	1,537	330	21.5%	82	5.3%	*	*	*	*	*
151*	643	61	9.5%	27	4.2%	646	69	10.7%	18	2.8%	*	*	*	*	*
152*	790	64	8.1%	43	5.4%	784	65	8.3%	64	8.2%	*	*	*	*	*
153*	1,177	264	22.4%	89	7.6%	1,202	305	25.4%	84	7.0%	*	*	*	*	*
154*	605	156	25.8%	27	4.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
9800*	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>TOTAL IN POTTER COUNTY</b>	<b>25,512</b>	<b>4,088</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>24,917</b>	<b>4,382</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	<b>1,275</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>23,431</b>	<b>3,330</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>786</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010					2000					1990				
	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT	Family Households	Female Head	Percent of CT	Male Head	Percent of CT
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>															
201	615	35	5.7%	14	2.3%	678	28	4.1%	13	1.9%	706	30	4.2%	3	0.4%
202	566	83	14.7%	28	4.9%	625	83	13.3%	25	4.0%	621	40	6.4%	10	1.6%
203	509	114	22.4%	32	6.3%	540	82	15.2%	19	3.5%	498	68	13.7%	15	3.0%
204	533	34	6.4%	7	1.3%	598	29	4.8%	14	2.3%	593	31	5.2%	10	1.7%
205	954	162	17.0%	65	6.8%	997	197	19.8%	54	5.4%	939	121	12.9%	39	4.2%
206	1,062	114	10.7%	37	3.5%	1,104	99	9.0%	37	3.4%	1,145	88	7.7%	19	1.7%
208	1,755	209	11.9%	88	5.0%	1,564	208	13.3%	74	4.7%	1,569	141	9.0%	43	2.7%
209	733	106	14.5%	44	6.0%	771	138	17.9%	35	4.5%	776	89	11.5%	22	2.8%
210	691	61	8.8%	27	3.9%	703	51	7.3%	14	2.0%	706	54	7.6%	7	1.0%
211*	*	*	*	*	*	1,607	197	12.3%	60	3.7%	1,605	152	9.5%	36	2.2%
211.01*	1,078	89	8.3%	34	3.2%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
211.02*	421	121	28.7%	40	9.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
212	1,439	135	9.4%	50	3.5%	1,531	130	8.5%	35	2.3%	1,567	115	7.3%	24	1.5%
213	1,453	177	12.2%	36	2.5%	1,581	182	11.5%	41	2.6%	1,632	170	10.4%	24	1.5%
215	1,469	80	5.4%	30	2.0%	1,495	95	6.4%	24	1.6%	1,294	68	5.3%	19	1.5%
216.02	1,444	89	6.2%	38	2.6%	1,585	119	7.5%	38	2.4%	1,613	113	7.0%	22	1.4%
216.03	611	26	4.3%	14	2.3%	676	30	4.4%	10	1.5%	680	27	4.0%	7	1.0%
216.04	1,332	68	5.1%	29	2.2%	1,394	71	5.1%	16	1.1%	973	62	6.4%	14	1.4%
216.05	587	33	5.6%	13	2.2%	519	40	7.7%	13	2.5%	328	22	6.7%	5	1.5%
216.06	1,598	90	5.6%	32	2.0%	1,679	91	5.4%	29	1.7%	1,187	45	3.8%	10	0.8%
216.07*	*	*	*	*	*	719	58	8.1%	10	1.4%	91	15	16.5%	2	2.2%
216.08*	1,596	140	8.8%	39	2.4%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
216.09*	967	48	5.0%	14	1.4%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
217.03*	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
217.04*	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
220*	*	*	*	*	*	485	53	10.9%	18	3.7%	*	*	*	*	*
220.01*	1,203	76	6.3%	33	2.7%	*	**	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
220.02*	1,042	121	11.6%	59	5.7%	*	**	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
220.97*	*	*	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	64	3	4.7%	0	0.0%
220.98*	*	*	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	221	23	10.4%	4	1.8%
<b>TOTAL IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>	<b>23,658</b>	<b>2,211</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>20,851</b>	<b>1,981</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>18,808</b>	<b>1,477</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>1.8%</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>49,170</b>	<b>6,299</b>	<b>12.8%</b>	<b>2,087</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>45,768</b>	<b>6,363</b>	<b>13.9%</b>	<b>1,854</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>42,239</b>	<b>4,807</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>1,121</b>	<b>2.7%</b>

**APPENDIX P**  
**Housing Supply Change by Census Tract**  
**City of Amarillo**

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990	2000-2010 Change		1990-2000 Change	
				Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>							
101	1,093	1,223	1,129	-130	-10.6%	94	8.3%
102	826	816	815	10	1.2%	1	0.1%
103	790	829	949	-39	-4.7%	-120	0.1%
104	1,646	1,653	1,642	-7	-0.4%	11	0.7%
105*	**	**	1,153	***	***	***	***
106	777	638	579	139	21.8%	59	10.2%
107	1,190	1,182	1,180	8	0.7%	2	10.2%
108*	**	**	346	***	***	***	***
109*	**	**	1,701	***	***	***	***
110	920	797	774	123	15.4%	23	3.0%
111*	**	848	868	***	***	-20	3.0%
112*	**	**	361	***	***	***	***
113*	**	**	205	***	***	***	***
114*	**	**	1,295	***	***	***	***
115	2,026	2,053	2,094	-27	-1.3%	-41	***
116	1,937	1,914	1,948	23	1.2%	-34	-1.7%
117	2,295	1,842	1,902	453	24.6%	-60	-3.2%
118	1,823	1,600	1,598	223	13.9%	2	0.1%
119	1,430	1,489	1,520	-59	-4.0%	-31	0.1%
120	835	853	854	-18	-2.1%	-1	-0.1%
121*	**	**	308	***	***	***	***
122	1,343	1,350	1,346	-7	-0.5%	4	0.3%
123*	**	**	277	***	***	***	0.3%
125*	**	**	1,458	***	***	***	***
126	1,082	913	917	169	18.5%	-4	-0.4%
127*	**	**	1,844	***	***	***	***
128*	1,789	1,756	**	33	1.9%	***	***
128.97*	**	**	40	***	***	***	***
128.98*	**	**	1,690	***	***	***	***
129*	**	**	852	***	***	***	***
130	805	776	854	29	3.7%	-78	***
131*	**	**	1,933	***	***	***	***
132	807	765	600	42	5.5%	165	27.5%
133	1,811	1,149	756	662	57.6%	393	52.0%
134	24	5	25	19	380.0%	-20	52.0%
135*	**	**	363	***	***	***	***
136*	**	**	385	***	***	***	***
137*	**	**	781	***	***	***	***
138*	**	**	366	***	***	***	***
139	1,140	1,076	1,072	64	5.9%	4	0.4%
140*	**	**	285	***	***	***	***
141	765	849	774	-84	-9.9%	75	9.7%
144*	**	682	634	***	***	48	9.7%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990	2000-2010 Change		1990-2000 Change	
				Number	Percent	Number	Percent
144.01*	641	**	**	***	***	***	***
145*	2,100	2,052	**	48	2.3%	***	***
146*	**	208	**	***	***	***	***
147*	2,575	2,513	**	62	2.5%	***	***
148*	1,115	1,090	**	25	2.3%	***	***
149*	1,820	1,803	**	17	0.9%	***	***
150*	2,416	2,198	**	218	9.9%	***	***
151*	944	912	**	32	3.5%	***	***
152*	1,217	1,197	**	20	1.7%	***	***
153*	2,027	2,057	**	-30	-1.5%	***	***
154*	1,138	**	**	***	***	***	***
9800*	0	**	**	***	***	***	***
<b>TOTAL IN POTTER COUNTY</b>	<b>43,147</b>	<b>41,088</b>	<b>40,473</b>	<b>2,018</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>1.5%</b>
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>							
201	946	951	948	-5	-0.5%	3	0.3%
202	1,092	1,115	1,118	-23	-2.1%	(3)	-0.3%
203	984	1,040	923	-56	-5.4%	117	12.7%
204	831	871	843	-40	-4.6%	28	3.3%
205	1,703	1,702	1,686	1	0.1%	16	0.9%
206	1,385	1,378	1,374	7	0.5%	4	0.3%
208	2,526	2,175	2,088	351	16.1%	87	4.2%
209	1,183	1,172	1,171	11	0.9%	1	0.1%
210	983	958	936	25	2.6%	22	2.4%
211*	**	3,478	3,459	***	***	19	0.5%
211.01*	1,979	**	**	***	***	***	***
211.02*	1,516	**	**	***	***	***	***
212	2,271	2,266	2,272	5	0.2%	(6)	-0.3%
213	2,430	2,431	2,434	-1	0.0%	(3)	-0.1%
215	1,919	1,828	1,510	91	5.0%	318	21.1%
216.02	2,531	2,575	2,562	-44	-1.7%	13	0.5%
216.03	788	808	789	-20	-2.5%	19	2.4%
216.04	2,210	2,171	1,602	39	1.8%	569	35.5%
216.05	917	796	481	121	15.2%	315	65.5%
216.06	2,067	2,017	1,382	50	2.5%	635	45.9%
216.07*	**	951	154	***	***	797	517.5%
216.08*	2,412	**	**	***	***	***	***
216.09*	1,493	**	**	***	***	***	***
217.03*	0	**	**	***	***	***	***
217.04*	0	**	**	***	***	***	***
220*	**	637	**	***	***	***	***
220.01*	1,456	**	**	***	***	***	***
220.02*	1,529	**	**	***	***	***	***
220.97*	**	**	80	***	***	***	***
220.98*	**	**	307	***	***	***	***
<b>TOTAL IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>	<b>37,151</b>	<b>31,320</b>	<b>28,119</b>	<b>5,831</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>3,201</b>	<b>11.4%</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>80,298</b>	<b>72,408</b>	<b>68,592</b>	<b>7,890</b>	<b>10.9%</b>	<b>3,816</b>	<b>5.6%</b>

## APPENDIX Q

### Housing Occupancy by Census Tract

#### City of Amarillo

Census Tract	2010			2000			1990		
	Total Units	Occupied Units	Occupancy Rate	Total Units	Occupied Units	Occupancy Rate	Total Units	Occupied Units	Occupancy Rate
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>									
101	1,093	975	89.2%	1,223	1,153	94.3%	1,129	987	87.4%
102	826	800	96.9%	816	796	97.5%	815	788	96.7%
103	790	614	77.7%	829	726	87.6%	949	802	84.5%
104	1,646	1,501	91.2%	1,653	1,543	93.3%	1,642	1,461	89.0%
105*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,153	958	83.1%
106	777	689	88.7%	638	576	90.3%	579	511	88.3%
107	1,190	1,129	94.9%	1,182	1,143	96.7%	1,180	1,133	96.0%
108*	**	**	**	**	**	**	346	318	91.9%
109*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,701	1,493	87.8%
110	920	822	89.3%	797	750	94.1%	774	686	88.6%
111*	**	**	**	848	752	88.7%	868	733	84.4%
112*	**	**	**	**	**	**	361	242	67.0%
113*	**	**	**	**	**	**	205	130	63.4%
114*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,295	947	73.1%
115	2,026	1,824	90.0%	2,053	1,885	91.8%	2,094	1,772	84.6%
116	1,937	1,822	94.1%	1,914	1,774	92.7%	1,948	1,714	88.0%
117	2,295	2,125	92.6%	1,842	1,671	90.7%	1,902	1,609	84.6%
118	1,823	1,685	92.4%	1,600	1,526	95.4%	1,598	1,497	93.7%
119	1,430	1,292	90.3%	1,489	1,338	89.9%	1,520	1,288	84.7%
120	835	743	89.0%	853	724	84.9%	854	625	73.2%
121*	**	**	**	**	**	**	308	223	72.4%
122	1,343	1,216	90.5%	1,350	1,209	89.6%	1,346	1,105	82.1%
123*	**	**	**	**	**	**	277	234	84.5%
125*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,458	1,322	90.7%
126	1,082	1,001	92.5%	913	838	91.8%	917	814	88.8%
127*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,844	1,676	90.9%
128*	1,789	1,611	90.1%	1,756	1,580	90.0%	**	**	**
128.97*	**	**	**	**	**	**	40	36	90.0%
128.98*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,690	1,397	82.7%
129*	**	**	**	**	**	**	852	663	77.8%
130	805	658	81.7%	776	673	86.7%	854	688	80.6%
131*	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,933	1,632	84.4%
132	807	733	90.8%	765	723	94.5%	600	560	93.3%
133	1,811	1,727	95.4%	1,149	1,117	97.2%	756	698	92.3%
134	24	22	91.7%	5	5	100.0%	25	24	96.0%
135*	**	**	**	**	**	**	363	347	95.6%
136*	**	**	**	**	**	**	385	375	97.4%
137*	**	**	**	**	**	**	781	721	92.3%
138*	**	**	**	**	**	**	366	331	90.4%
139	1,140	1,068	93.7%	1,076	1,044	97.0%	1,072	1,011	94.3%
140*	**	**	**	**	**	**	285	279	97.9%
141	765	724	94.6%	849	795	93.6%	774	715	92.4%
144*	**	**	**	682	648	95.0%	634	551	86.9%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010			2000			1990		
	Total Units	Occupied Units	Occupancy Rate	Total Units	Occupied Units	Occupancy Rate	Total Units	Occupied Units	Occupancy Rate
144.01*	641	615	95.9%	**	**	**	**	**	**
145*	2,100	1,950	92.9%	2,052	1,861	90.7%	**	**	**
146*	**	**	**	208	170	81.7%	**	**	**
147*	2,575	2,243	87.1%	2,513	2,198	87.5%	**	**	**
148*	1,115	912	81.8%	1,090	902	82.8%	**	**	**
149*	1,820	1,698	93.3%	1,803	1,659	92.0%	**	**	**
150*	2,416	2,205	91.3%	2,198	2,040	92.8%	**	**	**
151*	944	853	90.4%	912	802	87.9%	**	**	**
152*	1,217	1,111	91.3%	1,197	1,114	93.1%	**	**	**
153*	2,027	1,809	89.2%	2,057	1,858	90.3%	**	**	**
154*	1,138	910	80.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**
9800*	0	0	0.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**
<b>TOTAL IN POTTER COUNTY</b>	<b>43,147</b>	<b>39,087</b>	<b>90.6%</b>	<b>41,088</b>	<b>37,593</b>	<b>91.5%</b>	<b>40,473</b>	<b>35,096</b>	<b>86.7%</b>
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>									
201	946	905	95.7%	951	926	97.4%	948	900	94.9%
202	1,092	894	81.9%	1,115	1,059	95.0%	1,118	1,000	89.4%
203	984	924	93.9%	1,040	990	95.2%	923	849	92.0%
204	831	786	94.6%	871	831	95.4%	843	796	94.4%
205	1,703	1,553	91.2%	1,702	1,570	92.2%	1,686	1,480	87.8%
206	1,385	1,338	96.6%	1,378	1,350	98.0%	1,374	1,319	96.0%
208	2,526	2,425	96.0%	2,175	2,108	96.9%	2,088	1,954	93.6%
209	1,183	1,104	93.3%	1,172	1,132	96.6%	1,171	1,072	91.5%
210	983	968	98.5%	958	940	98.1%	936	880	94.0%
211*	**	**	**	3,478	3,308	95.1%	3,459	3,116	90.1%
211.01*	1,979	1,845	93.2%	**	**	**	**	**	**
211.02*	1,516	1,356	89.4%	**	**	**	**	**	**
212	2,271	2,199	96.8%	2,266	2,217	97.8%	2,272	2,182	96.0%
213	2,430	2,266	93.3%	2,431	2,365	97.3%	2,434	2,218	91.1%
215	1,919	1,870	97.4%	1,828	1,795	98.2%	1,510	1,470	97.4%
216.02	2,531	2,210	87.3%	2,575	2,468	95.8%	2,562	2,371	92.5%
216.03	788	775	98.4%	808	803	99.4%	789	768	97.3%
216.04	2,210	2,075	93.9%	2,171	2,070	95.3%	1,602	1,440	89.9%
216.05	917	838	91.4%	796	723	90.8%	481	425	88.4%
216.06	2,067	1,999	96.7%	2,017	1,969	97.6%	1,382	1,299	94.0%
216.07*	**	**	**	951	875	92.0%	154	144	93.5%
216.08*	2,412	2,262	93.8%	**	**	**	**	**	**
216.09*	1,493	1,375	92.1%	**	**	**	**	**	**
217.03*	0	0	0.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**
217.04*	0	0	0.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**
220*	**	**	**	637	607	95.3%	**	**	**
220.01*	1,456	1,414	97.1%	**	**	**	**	**	**
220.02*	1,529	1,450	94.8%	**	**	**	**	**	**
220.97*	**	**	**	**	**	**	80	77	96.3%
220.98*	**	**	**	**	**	**	307	281	91.5%
<b>TOTAL IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>	<b>37,151</b>	<b>34,831</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>31,320</b>	<b>30,106</b>	<b>96.1%</b>	<b>28,119</b>	<b>26,041</b>	<b>92.6%</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>80,298</b>	<b>73,918</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>72,408</b>	<b>67,699</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>68,592</b>	<b>61,137</b>	<b>89.1%</b>

**APPENDIX R**  
**Tenure by Census Tract**  
**City of Amarillo**

Census Tract	2010					2000					1990				
	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>															
101	975	399	576	40.9%	59.1%	1,153	378	775	32.8%	67.2%	987	352	635	35.7%	64.3%
102	800	725	75	90.6%	9.4%	796	729	67	91.6%	8.4%	788	715	73	90.7%	9.3%
103	614	4	610	0.7%	99.3%	726	24	702	3.3%	96.7%	802	69	733	8.6%	91.4%
104	1,501	1,071	430	71.4%	28.6%	1,543	1,110	433	71.9%	28.1%	1,461	1,028	433	70.4%	29.6%
105*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	958	538	420	56.2%	43.8%
106	689	371	318	53.8%	46.2%	576	364	212	63.2%	36.8%	511	328	183	64.2%	35.8%
107	1,129	874	255	77.4%	22.6%	1,143	924	219	80.8%	19.2%	1,133	916	217	80.8%	19.2%
108*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	318	191	127	60.1%	39.9%
109*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,493	975	518	65.3%	34.7%
110	822	464	358	56.4%	43.6%	750	474	276	63.2%	36.8%	686	446	240	65.0%	35.0%
111*	**	**	**	**	**	752	451	301	60.0%	40.0%	733	430	303	58.7%	41.3%
112*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	242	100	142	41.3%	58.7%
113*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	130	11	119	8.5%	91.5%
114*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	947	292	655	30.8%	69.2%
115	1,824	1,049	775	57.5%	42.5%	1,885	1,134	751	60.2%	39.8%	1,772	1,098	674	62.0%	38.0%
116	1,822	911	911	50.0%	50.0%	1,774	942	832	53.1%	46.9%	1,714	899	815	52.5%	47.5%
117	2,125	369	1,756	17.4%	82.6%	1,671	347	1,324	20.8%	79.2%	1,609	317	1,292	19.7%	80.3%
118	1,685	1,102	583	65.4%	34.6%	1,526	1,151	375	75.4%	24.6%	1,497	1,135	362	75.8%	24.2%
119	1,292	695	597	53.8%	46.2%	1,338	717	621	53.6%	46.4%	1,288	719	569	55.8%	44.2%
120	743	219	524	29.5%	70.5%	724	240	484	33.1%	66.9%	625	247	378	39.5%	60.5%
121*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	223	126	97	56.5%	43.5%
122	1,216	645	571	53.0%	47.0%	1,209	676	533	55.9%	44.1%	1,105	614	491	55.6%	44.4%
123*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	234	129	105	55.1%	44.9%
125*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,322	917	405	69.4%	30.6%
126	1,001	530	471	52.9%	47.1%	838	550	288	65.6%	34.4%	814	522	292	64.1%	35.9%
127*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,676	1,131	545	67.5%	32.5%
128*	1,611	853	758	52.9%	47.1%	1,580	899	681	56.9%	43.1%	**	**	**	**	**
128.97*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	36	28	8	77.8%	22.2%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010					2000					1990				
	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied
128.98*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,397	787	610	56.3%	43.7%
129*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	663	378	285	57.0%	43.0%
130	658	361	297	54.9%	45.1%	673	420	253	62.4%	37.6%	688	450	238	65.4%	34.6%
131*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	1,632	858	774	52.6%	47.4%
132	733	447	286	61.0%	39.0%	723	443	280	61.3%	38.7%	560	415	145	74.1%	25.9%
133	1,727	1,490	237	86.3%	13.7%	1,117	916	201	82.0%	18.0%	698	424	274	60.7%	39.3%
134	22	19	3	86.4%	13.6%	5	5	0	100.0%	0.0%	24	19	5	79.2%	20.8%
135*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	347	293	54	84.4%	15.6%
136*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	375	335	40	89.3%	10.7%
137*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	721	548	173	76.0%	24.0%
138*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	331	259	72	78.2%	21.8%
139	1,068	737	331	69.0%	31.0%	1,044	750	294	71.8%	28.2%	1,011	759	252	75.1%	24.9%
140*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	279	123	156	44.1%	55.9%
141	724	540	184	74.6%	25.4%	795	614	181	77.2%	22.8%	715	588	127	82.2%	17.8%
144*	**	**	**	**	**	648	77	571	11.9%	88.1%	551	66	485	12.0%	88.0%
144.01*	615	87	528	14.1%	85.9%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
145*	1,950	1,248	702	64.0%	36.0%	1,861	1,216	645	65.3%	34.7%	**	**	**	**	**
146*	**	**	**	**	**	170	33	137	19.4%	80.6%	**	**	**	**	**
147*	2,243	818	1,425	36.5%	63.5%	2,198	870	1,328	39.6%	60.4%	**	**	**	**	**
148*	912	488	424	53.5%	46.5%	902	528	674	58.5%	41.5%	**	**	**	**	**
149*	1,698	1,082	616	63.7%	36.3%	1,659	1,064	595	64.1%	35.9%	**	**	**	**	**
150*	2,205	1,282	923	58.1%	41.9%	2,040	1,314	726	64.4%	35.6%	**	**	**	**	**
151*	853	613	240	71.9%	28.1%	802	644	158	80.3%	19.7%	**	**	**	**	**
152*	1,111	840	271	75.6%	24.4%	1,114	839	275	75.3%	24.7%	**	**	**	**	**
153*	1,809	840	969	46.4%	53.6%	1,858	915	943	49.2%	50.8%	**	**	**	**	**
154*	910	477	433	52.4%	47.6%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
9800*	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
<b>TOTAL IN POTTER COUNTY</b>	<b>39,087</b>	<b>21,650</b>	<b>17,437</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>44.6%</b>	<b>37,593</b>	<b>21,758</b>	<b>16,135</b>	<b>57.9%</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>35,096</b>	<b>20,575</b>	<b>14,521</b>	<b>58.6%</b>	<b>41.4%</b>

Changing Numbers, Part I

Census Tract	2010						2000						1990							
	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied	Occupied Units	Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	% Owner Occupied	% Renter Occupied
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>																				
201	905	728	177	80.4%	19.6%	926	756	170	81.6%	18.4%	900	752	148	83.6%	16.4%	900	752	148	83.6%	16.4%
202	894	588	306	65.8%	34.2%	1,059	646	413	61.0%	39.0%	1,000	619	381	61.9%	38.1%	1,000	619	381	61.9%	38.1%
203	924	443	481	47.9%	52.1%	990	496	494	50.1%	49.9%	849	394	455	46.4%	53.6%	849	394	455	46.4%	53.6%
204	786	685	101	87.2%	12.8%	831	754	77	90.7%	9.3%	796	693	103	87.1%	12.9%	796	693	103	87.1%	12.9%
205	1,553	914	639	58.9%	41.1%	1,570	952	618	60.6%	39.4%	1,480	892	588	60.3%	39.7%	1,480	892	588	60.3%	39.7%
206	1,338	1,168	170	87.3%	12.7%	1,350	1,184	166	87.7%	12.3%	1,319	1,111	208	84.2%	15.8%	1,319	1,111	208	84.2%	15.8%
208	2,425	1,879	546	77.5%	22.5%	2,108	1,606	502	76.2%	23.8%	1,954	1,447	507	74.1%	25.9%	1,954	1,447	507	74.1%	25.9%
209	1,104	707	397	64.0%	36.0%	1,132	733	399	64.8%	35.2%	1,072	707	365	66.0%	34.0%	1,072	707	365	66.0%	34.0%
210	968	772	196	79.8%	20.2%	940	762	178	81.1%	18.9%	880	702	178	79.8%	20.2%	880	702	178	79.8%	20.2%
211*	**	**	**	**	**	3,308	1,366	1,942	41.3%	58.7%	3,116	1,346	1,770	43.2%	56.8%	3,116	1,346	1,770	43.2%	56.8%
211.01*	1,845	1,283	562	69.5%	30.5%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
211.02*	1,356	1	1,355	0.1%	99.9%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
212	2,199	1,502	697	68.3%	31.7%	2,217	1,569	648	70.8%	29.2%	2,182	1,561	621	71.5%	28.5%	2,182	1,561	621	71.5%	28.5%
213	2,266	1,459	807	64.4%	35.6%	2,365	1,480	885	62.6%	37.4%	2,218	1,430	788	64.5%	35.5%	2,218	1,430	788	64.5%	35.5%
215	1,870	1,688	182	90.3%	9.7%	1,795	1,663	132	92.6%	7.4%	1,470	1,303	167	88.6%	11.4%	1,470	1,303	167	88.6%	11.4%
216.02	2,210	1,372	838	62.1%	37.9%	2,468	1,382	1,086	56.0%	44.0%	2,371	1,316	1,055	55.5%	44.5%	2,371	1,316	1,055	55.5%	44.5%
216.03	775	717	58	92.5%	7.5%	803	750	53	93.4%	6.6%	768	690	78	89.8%	10.2%	768	690	78	89.8%	10.2%
216.04	2,075	1,377	698	66.4%	33.6%	2,070	1,368	702	66.1%	33.9%	1,440	832	608	57.8%	42.2%	1,440	832	608	57.8%	42.2%
216.05	838	706	132	84.2%	15.8%	723	601	122	83.1%	16.9%	425	300	125	70.6%	29.4%	425	300	125	70.6%	29.4%
216.06	1,999	1,716	283	85.8%	14.2%	1,969	1,716	253	87.2%	12.8%	1,299	1,147	152	88.3%	11.7%	1,299	1,147	152	88.3%	11.7%
216.07*	**	**	**	**	**	875	818	57	93.5%	6.5%	144	131	13	91.0%	9.0%	144	131	13	91.0%	9.0%
216.08*	2,262	1,613	649	71.3%	28.7%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
216.09*	1,375	951	424	69.2%	30.8%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
217.03*	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
217.04*	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
220*	**	**	**	**	**	607	506	101	83.4%	16.6%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
220.01*	1,414	1,268	146	89.7%	10.3%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
220.02*	1,450	1,067	383	73.6%	26.4%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
220.97*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
220.98*	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
<b>TOTAL IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>	<b>34,831</b>	<b>24,604</b>	<b>10,227</b>	<b>70.6%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>30,106</b>	<b>21,108</b>	<b>8,998</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>29.9%</b>	<b>26,041</b>	<b>17,699</b>	<b>8,342</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>26,041</b>	<b>17,699</b>	<b>8,342</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>73,918</b>	<b>46,254</b>	<b>27,664</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>67,699</b>	<b>42,866</b>	<b>25,133</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>37.1%</b>	<b>61,137</b>	<b>38,274</b>	<b>22,863</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>61,137</b>	<b>38,274</b>	<b>22,863</b>	<b>62.6%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>

**APPENDIX S**  
**Average Population per Household by Census Tract**  
**City of Amarillo**

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN POTTER COUNTY</b>			
101	2.00	1.81	1.91
102	2.45	2.44	2.39
103	2.04	1.95	1.87
104	2.24	2.23	2.13
105*	**	**	2.19
106	3.15	3.34	3.13
107	2.89	2.77	2.87
108*	**	**	2.55
109*	**	**	3.01
110	2.80	3.04	2.95
111*	**	2.93	3.18
112*	**	**	2.82
113*	**	**	1.55
114*	**	**	1.78
115	2.27	2.26	2.17
116	2.31	2.16	2.10
117	1.97	2.05	2.07
118	2.19	2.32	2.40
119	2.48	2.41	2.31
120	2.35	2.32	2.44
121*	**	**	2.20
122	3.23	3.07	2.68
123*	**	**	2.46
125*	**	**	3.53
126	3.24	3.00	2.75
127*	**	**	2.91
128*	3.14	2.88	**
128.97*	**	**	2.78
128.98*	**	**	2.69
129*	**	**	2.79
130	2.58	2.54	2.54
131*	**	**	2.47
132	1.99	2.01	2.20
133	2.62	2.48	2.47
134	2.64	2.60	2.42
135*	**	**	2.84
136*	**	**	2.78
137*	**	**	2.69
138*	**	**	2.68
139	3.17	3.20	3.18
140*	**	**	2.85
141	3.14	3.05	3.16
144*	**	**	3.19
144.01*	3.08	3.12	**
145*	3.17	3.04	**

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract	2010	2000	1990
146*	**	2.11	**
147*	2.11	2.14	**
148*	2.69	2.70	**
149*	3.48	3.44	**
150*	3.16	2.99	**
151*	2.66	2.74	**
152*	2.54	2.55	**
153*	2.77	2.62	**
154*	2.84	**	**
9800*	0.00	**	**
<b>TOTAL IN POTTER COUNTY</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.55</b>
<b>PORTION OF AMARILLO IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>			
201	2.32	2.37	2.42
202	2.30	2.16	2.14
203	2.15	2.03	2.13
204	2.33	2.40	2.45
205	2.56	2.47	2.39
206	2.89	2.84	3.12
208	2.70	2.69	2.80
209	2.62	2.53	2.61
210	2.50	2.54	2.78
211*	**	1.96	1.95
211.01*	2.15	**	**
211.02*	1.67	**	**
212	2.37	2.34	2.47
213	2.33	2.36	2.55
215	2.59	2.77	3.05
216.02	2.31	2.30	2.36
216.03	2.48	2.74	3.01
216.04	2.15	2.32	2.39
216.05	2.33	2.42	2.57
216.06	2.56	2.81	3.08
216.07*	**	2.82	2.42
216.08**	2.54	**	**
216.09**	2.36	**	**
217.03**	0.00	**	**
217.04**	0.00	**	**
220*	**	2.84	**
220.01**	2.96	**	**
220.02**	2.75	**	**
220.97*	**	**	2.78
220.98*	**	**	2.79
<b>TOTAL IN RANDALL COUNTY</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.53</b>
<b>TOTAL CITY</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.54</b>

**APPENDIX T**  
**Persons in Housing Units by Census Tract 1990 - 2010**  
City of Amarillo

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 101</b>								
2010	975	427	305	119	82	29	10	3
% of CT		43.8%	31.3%	12.2%	8.4%	3.0%	1.0%	0.3%
2000	1,153	578	366	116	61	17	10	5
% of CT		50.1%	31.7%	10.1%	5.3%	1.5%	0.9%	0.4%
1990	987	454	329	97	64	37	4	2
% of CT		46.0%	33.3%	9.8%	6.5%	3.7%	0.4%	0.2%
<b>CT 102</b>								
2010	800	199	328	100	92	54	23	4
% of CT		24.9%	41.0%	12.5%	11.5%	6.8%	2.9%	0.5%
2000	796	183	343	88	125	40	13	4
% of CT		23.0%	43.1%	11.1%	15.7%	5.0%	1.6%	0.5%
1990	788	155	380	104	100	37	10	2
% of CT		19.7%	48.2%	13.2%	12.7%	4.7%	1.3%	0.3%
<b>CT 103</b>								
2010	614	289	161	85	41	22	8	8
% of CT		47.1%	26.2%	13.8%	6.7%	3.6%	1.3%	1.3%
2000	726	316	238	96	51	20	3	2
% of CT		43.5%	32.8%	13.2%	7.0%	2.8%	0.4%	0.3%
1990	802	382	242	104	56	14	3	1
% of CT		47.6%	30.2%	13.0%	7.0%	1.7%	0.4%	0.1%
<b>CT 104</b>								
2010	1,501	497	528	224	167	56	19	10
% of CT		33.1%	35.2%	14.9%	11.1%	3.7%	1.3%	0.7%
2000	1,543	512	535	242	170	62	15	7
% of CT		33.2%	34.7%	15.7%	11.0%	4.0%	1.0%	0.5%
1990	1,461	527	532	186	141	60	10	5
% of CT		36.1%	36.4%	12.7%	9.7%	4.1%	0.7%	0.3%
<b>CT 105*</b>								
2010	CT 105 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 105 did not exist in 2000							
1990	958	372	298	132	84	48	16	8
% of CT		38.8%	31.1%	13.8%	8.8%	5.0%	1.7%	0.8%
<b>CT 106</b>								
2010	689	137	161	115	123	87	44	22
% of CT		19.9%	23.4%	16.7%	17.9%	12.6%	6.4%	3.2%
2000	576	104	124	96	104	76	45	27
% of CT		18.1%	21.5%	16.7%	18.1%	13.2%	7.8%	4.7%
1990	511	100	116	108	86	47	29	25
% of CT		19.6%	22.7%	21.1%	16.8%	9.2%	5.7%	4.9%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 107</b>								
2010	1,129	234	335	184	194	108	42	32
% of CT		20.7%	29.7%	16.3%	17.2%	9.6%	3.7%	2.8%
2000	1,143	247	362	200	174	96	41	23
% of CT		21.6%	31.7%	17.5%	15.2%	8.4%	3.6%	2.0%
1990	1,133	178	383	219	210	84	39	20
% of CT		15.7%	33.8%	19.3%	18.5%	7.4%	3.4%	1.8%
<b>CT 108*</b>								
2010	CT 108 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 108 did not exist in 2000							
1990	318	73	99	75	50	13	6	2
% of CT		23.0%	31.1%	23.6%	15.7%	4.1%	1.9%	0.6%
<b>CT 109*</b>								
2010	CT 109 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 109 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,493	300	427	239	237	157	74	59
% of CT		20.1%	28.6%	16.0%	15.9%	10.5%	5.0%	4.0%
<b>CT 110</b>								
2010	822	236	197	126	120	84	34	25
% of CT		28.7%	24.0%	15.3%	14.6%	10.2%	4.1%	3.0%
2000	750	154	205	142	101	69	44	35
% of CT		20.5%	27.3%	18.9%	13.5%	9.2%	5.9%	4.7%
1990	686	135	210	114	109	62	33	23
% of CT		19.7%	30.6%	16.6%	15.9%	9.0%	4.8%	3.4%
<b>CT 111*</b>								
2010	CT 111 did not exist in 2010							
2000	752	193	163	138	122	74	36	26
% of CT		25.7%	21.7%	18.4%	16.2%	9.8%	4.8%	3.5%
1990	733	165	176	111	96	89	49	47
% of CT		22.5%	24.0%	15.1%	13.1%	12.1%	6.7%	6.4%
<b>CT 112*</b>								
2010	CT 112 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 112 did not exist in 2000							
1990	242	74	59	33	33	17	15	11
% of CT		30.6%	24.4%	13.6%	13.6%	7.0%	6.2%	4.5%
<b>CT 113*</b>								
2010	CT 113 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 113 did not exist in 2000							
1990	130	83	29	12	5	1	0	0
% of CT		63.8%	22.3%	9.2%	3.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 114*</b>								
2010	CT 114 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 114 did not exist in 2000							
1990	947	552	217	81	52	27	12	6
% of CT		58.3%	22.9%	8.6%	5.5%	2.9%	1.3%	0.6%
<b>CT 115</b>								
2010	1,824	665	553	277	194	81	29	25
% of CT		36.5%	30.3%	15.2%	10.6%	4.4%	1.6%	1.4%
2000	1,885	675	600	269	196	98	34	13
% of CT		35.8%	31.8%	14.3%	10.4%	5.2%	1.8%	0.7%
1990	1,772	667	573	254	176	63	27	12
% of CT		37.6%	32.3%	14.3%	9.9%	3.6%	1.5%	0.7%
<b>CT 116</b>								
2010	1,822	630	579	274	183	96	37	23
% of CT		34.6%	31.8%	15.0%	10.0%	5.3%	2.0%	1.3%
2000	1,774	617	636	259	180	61	15	6
% of CT		34.8%	35.9%	14.6%	10.1%	3.4%	0.8%	0.3%
1990	1,714	624	604	259	163	51	10	3
% of CT		36.4%	35.2%	15.1%	9.5%	3.0%	0.6%	0.2%
<b>CT 117</b>								
2010	2,125	935	679	280	147	56	14	14
% of CT		44.0%	32.0%	13.2%	6.9%	2.6%	0.7%	0.7%
2000	1,671	671	550	239	136	58	13	4
% of CT		40.2%	32.9%	14.3%	8.1%	3.5%	0.8%	0.2%
1990	1,609	646	516	225	152	54	11	5
% of CT		40.1%	32.1%	14.0%	9.4%	3.4%	0.7%	0.3%
<b>CT 118</b>								
2010	1,685	616	555	243	158	85	18	10
% of CT		36.6%	32.9%	14.4%	9.4%	5.0%	1.1%	0.6%
2000	1,526	498	515	215	176	87	21	14
% of CT		32.6%	33.7%	14.1%	11.5%	5.7%	1.4%	0.9%
1990	1,497	419	530	233	199	91	20	5
% of CT		28.0%	35.4%	15.6%	13.3%	6.1%	1.3%	0.3%
<b>CT 119</b>								
2010	1,292	398	407	192	155	83	34	23
% of CT		30.8%	31.5%	14.9%	12.0%	6.4%	2.6%	1.8%
2000	1,338	454	376	230	156	68	32	22
% of CT		33.9%	28.1%	17.2%	11.7%	5.1%	2.4%	1.6%
1990	1,288	462	368	213	140	71	25	9
% of CT		35.9%	28.6%	16.5%	10.9%	5.5%	1.9%	0.7%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 120</b>								
2010	743	312	166	100	80	50	19	16
% of CT		42.0%	22.3%	13.5%	10.8%	6.7%	2.6%	2.2%
2000	724	295	198	86	69	39	18	19
% of CT		40.7%	27.3%	11.9%	9.5%	5.4%	2.5%	2.6%
1990	625	238	155	88	74	35	12	23
% of CT		38.1%	24.8%	14.1%	11.8%	5.6%	1.9%	3.7%
<b>CT 121*</b>								
2010	CT 121 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 121 did not exist in 2000							
1990	223	99	62	23	14	13	7	5
% of CT		44.4%	27.8%	10.3%	6.3%	5.8%	3.1%	2.2%
<b>CT 122</b>								
2010	1,216	254	276	177	231	136	77	65
% of CT		20.9%	22.7%	14.6%	19.0%	11.2%	6.3%	5.3%
2000	1,209	284	287	190	193	126	74	55
% of CT		23.5%	23.7%	15.7%	16.0%	10.4%	6.1%	4.5%
1990	1,105	336	296	168	142	85	43	35
% of CT		30.4%	26.8%	15.2%	12.9%	7.7%	3.9%	3.2%
<b>CT 123*</b>								
2010	CT 123 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 123 did not exist in 2000							
1990	234	84	61	38	25	11	9	6
% of CT		35.9%	26.1%	16.2%	10.7%	4.7%	3.8%	2.6%
<b>CT 125*</b>								
2010	CT 125 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 125 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,322	159	302	243	241	189	102	86
% of CT		12.0%	22.8%	18.4%	18.2%	14.3%	7.7%	6.5%
<b>CT 126</b>								
2010	1,001	206	210	166	175	133	64	47
% of CT		20.6%	21.0%	16.6%	17.5%	13.3%	6.4%	4.7%
2000	838	172	217	166	130	82	40	31
% of CT		20.5%	25.9%	19.8%	15.5%	9.8%	4.8%	3.7%
1990	814	209	250	126	113	55	27	34
% of CT		25.7%	30.7%	15.5%	13.9%	6.8%	3.3%	4.2%
<b>CT 127*</b>								
2010	CT 127 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 127 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,676	356	484	276	274	152	84	50
% of CT		21.2%	28.9%	16.5%	16.3%	9.1%	5.0%	3.0%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 128*</b>								
2010	1,611	360	340	272	283	202	80	74
% of CT		22.3%	21.1%	16.9%	17.6%	12.5%	5.0%	4.6%
2000	1,580	398	374	279	251	170	71	37
% of CT		25.2%	23.7%	17.7%	15.9%	10.8%	4.5%	2.3%
1990	CT 128 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 128.97*</b>								
2010	CT 128.97 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 128.97 did not exist in 2000							
1990	36	10	8	8	5	2	2	1
% of CT		27.8%	22.2%	22.2%	13.9%	5.6%	5.6%	2.8%
<b>CT 128.98*</b>								
2010	CT 128.98 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 128.98 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,397	385	391	240	191	100	53	37
% of CT		27.6%	28.0%	17.2%	13.7%	7.2%	3.8%	2.6%
<b>CT 129*</b>								
2010	CT 129 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 129 did not exist in 2000							
1990	663	190	163	109	97	50	26	28
% of CT		28.7%	24.6%	16.4%	14.6%	7.5%	3.9%	4.2%
<b>CT 130</b>								
2010	658	206	184	107	73	48	21	19
% of CT		31.3%	28.0%	16.3%	11.1%	7.3%	3.2%	2.9%
2000	673	222	175	119	80	34	21	22
% of CT		33.0%	26.0%	17.7%	11.9%	5.1%	3.1%	3.3%
1990	688	235	178	108	76	51	23	17
% of CT		34.2%	25.9%	15.7%	11.0%	7.4%	3.3%	2.5%
<b>CT 131*</b>								
2010	CT 131 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 131 did not exist in 2000							
1990	1,632	506	489	262	218	84	47	26
% of CT		31.0%	30.0%	16.1%	13.4%	5.1%	2.9%	1.6%
<b>CT 132</b>								
2010	733	288	283	94	39	18	6	5
% of CT		39.3%	38.6%	12.8%	5.3%	2.5%	0.8%	0.7%
2000	723	281	277	82	55	19	7	2
% of CT		38.9%	38.3%	11.3%	7.6%	2.6%	1.0%	0.3%
1990	560	173	223	79	61	16	4	4
% of CT		30.9%	39.8%	14.1%	10.9%	2.9%	0.7%	0.7%

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 133</b>								
2010	1,727	332	695	237	295	123	31	14
% of CT		19.2%	40.2%	13.7%	17.1%	7.1%	1.8%	0.8%
2000	1,117	201	512	183	143	58	14	6
% of CT		18.0%	45.8%	16.4%	12.8%	5.2%	1.3%	0.5%
1990	698	179	241	124	101	37	11	5
% of CT		25.6%	34.5%	17.8%	14.5%	5.3%	1.6%	0.7%
<b>CT 134</b>								
2010	22	6	6	6	1	1	1	1
% of CT		27.3%	27.3%	27.3%	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%
2000	5	1	2	0	2	0	0	0
% of CT		20.0%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1990	24	6	6	9	2	1	0	0
% of CT		25.0%	25.0%	37.5%	8.3%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>CT 135*</b>								
2010	CT 135 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 135 did not exist in 2000							
1990	347	43	124	68	78	26	7	1
% of CT		12.4%	35.7%	19.6%	22.5%	7.5%	2.0%	0.3%
<b>CT 136*</b>								
2010	CT 136 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 136 did not exist in 2000							
1990	375	68	123	74	68	27	8	7
% of CT		18.1%	32.8%	19.7%	18.1%	7.2%	2.1%	1.9%
<b>CT 137*</b>								
2010	CT 137 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 137 did not exist in 2000							
1990	721	153	249	123	119	46	16	15
% of CT		21.2%	34.5%	17.1%	16.5%	6.4%	2.2%	2.1%
<b>CT 138*</b>								
2010	CT 138 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 138 did not exist in 2000							
1990	331	60	122	57	61	21	8	2
% of CT		18.1%	36.9%	17.2%	18.4%	6.3%	2.4%	0.6%
<b>CT 139</b>								
2010	1,068	191	278	193	183	112	56	55
% of CT		17.9%	26.0%	18.1%	17.1%	10.5%	5.2%	5.1%
2000	1,044	174	273	192	170	131	59	45
% of CT		16.7%	26.1%	18.4%	16.3%	12.5%	5.7%	4.3%
1990	1,011	144	267	208	193	112	51	36
% of CT		14.2%	26.4%	20.6%	19.1%	11.1%	5.0%	3.6%

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 140*</b>								
2010	CT 140 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 140 did not exist in 2000							
1990	279	64	70	57	49	22	11	6
% of CT		22.9%	25.1%	20.4%	17.6%	7.9%	3.9%	2.2%
<b>CT 141</b>								
2010	724	122	211	121	132	64	37	37
% of CT		16.9%	29.1%	16.7%	18.2%	8.8%	5.1%	5.1%
2000	795	143	219	146	133	85	47	22
% of CT		18.0%	27.5%	18.4%	16.7%	10.7%	5.9%	2.8%
1990	715	101	196	139	143	78	35	23
% of CT		14.1%	27.4%	19.4%	20.0%	10.9%	4.9%	3.2%
<b>CT 144*</b>								
2010	CT 144 did not exist in 2010							
2000	648	82	171	152	130	75	26	12
% of CT		12.7%	26.4%	23.5%	20.1%	11.6%	4.0%	1.9%
1990	551	69	131	123	126	70	22	10
% of CT		12.5%	23.8%	22.3%	22.9%	12.7%	4.0%	1.8%
<b>CT 144.01*</b>								
2010	615	104	143	125	132	81	20	10
% of CT		16.9%	23.3%	20.3%	21.5%	13.2%	3.3%	1.6%
2000	CT 144.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 144.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 145*</b>								
2010	1,950	363	452	357	376	215	108	79
% of CT		18.6%	23.2%	18.3%	19.3%	11.0%	5.5%	4.1%
2000	1,861	381	488	337	311	171	92	81
% of CT		20.5%	26.2%	18.1%	16.7%	9.2%	4.9%	4.4%
1990	CT 145 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 146*</b>								
2010	CT 146 did not exist in 2010							
2000	170	72	48	28	8	9	5	0
% of CT		42.4%	28.2%	16.5%	4.7%	5.3%	2.9%	0.0%
1990	CT 146 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 147*</b>								
2010	2,243	1,046	605	236	170	98	49	39
% of CT		46.6%	27.0%	10.5%	7.6%	4.4%	2.2%	1.7%
2000	2,198	945	629	273	184	106	30	31
% of CT		43.0%	28.6%	12.4%	8.4%	4.8%	1.4%	1.4%
1990	CT 147 did not exist in 1990							

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 148*</b>								
2010	912	293	232	133	102	79	43	30
% of CT		32.1%	25.4%	14.6%	11.2%	8.7%	4.7%	3.3%
2000	902	272	226	151	118	79	28	28
% of CT		30.2%	25.1%	16.7%	13.1%	8.8%	3.1%	3.1%
1990	CT 148 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 149*</b>								
2010	1,698	263	351	308	304	233	134	105
% of CT		15.5%	20.7%	18.1%	17.9%	13.7%	7.9%	6.2%
2000	1,659	241	356	320	305	227	113	97
% of CT		14.5%	21.5%	19.3%	18.4%	13.7%	6.8%	5.8%
1990	CT 149 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 150*</b>								
2010	2,205	414	559	390	355	257	131	99
% of CT		18.8%	25.4%	17.7%	16.1%	11.7%	5.9%	4.5%
2000	2,040	445	504	382	340	201	95	73
% of CT		21.8%	24.7%	18.7%	16.7%	9.9%	4.7%	3.6%
1990	CT 150 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 151*</b>								
2010	853	178	307	145	130	61	21	11
% of CT		20.9%	36.0%	17.0%	15.2%	7.2%	2.5%	1.3%
2000	802	135	295	156	124	65	17	10
% of CT		16.8%	36.8%	19.5%	15.5%	8.1%	2.1%	1.2%
1990	CT 151 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 152*</b>								
2010	1,111	258	426	198	121	58	26	24
% of CT		23.2%	38.3%	17.8%	10.9%	5.2%	2.3%	2.2%
2000	1,114	274	401	190	130	74	27	18
% of CT		24.6%	36.0%	17.1%	11.7%	6.6%	2.4%	1.6%
1990	CT 152 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 153*</b>								
2010	1,809	490	476	322	247	149	70	55
% of CT		27.1%	26.3%	17.8%	13.7%	8.2%	3.9%	3.0%
2000	1,858	525	527	330	232	145	72	27
% of CT		28.3%	28.4%	17.8%	12.5%	7.8%	3.9%	1.5%
1990	CT 153 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 154*</b>								
2010	910	256	215	146	119	113	32	29
% of CT		28.1%	23.6%	16.0%	13.1%	12.4%	3.5%	3.2%
2000	CT 154 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 154 did not exist in 1990							

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 9800*</b>								
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 9800 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 9800 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 201</b>								
2010	905	253	357	125	112	46	9	3
% of CT		28.0%	39.4%	13.8%	12.4%	5.1%	1.0%	0.3%
2000	926	219	404	129	112	49	10	3
% of CT		23.7%	43.6%	13.9%	12.1%	5.3%	1.1%	0.3%
1990	900	182	414	132	112	43	13	4
% of CT		20.2%	46.0%	14.7%	12.4%	4.8%	1.4%	0.4%
<b>CT 202</b>								
2010	894	293	292	139	106	50	9	5
% of CT		32.8%	32.7%	15.5%	11.9%	5.6%	1.0%	0.6%
2000	1,059	383	374	128	119	43	7	5
% of CT		36.2%	35.3%	12.1%	11.2%	4.1%	0.7%	0.5%
1990	1,000	339	385	127	97	46	5	1
% of CT		33.9%	38.5%	12.7%	9.7%	4.6%	0.5%	0.1%
<b>CT 203</b>								
2010	924	364	285	139	78	38	12	8
% of CT		39.4%	30.8%	15.0%	8.4%	4.1%	1.3%	0.9%
2000	990	397	338	130	89	27	6	3
% of CT		40.1%	34.1%	13.1%	9.0%	2.7%	0.6%	0.3%
1990	849	309	288	136	71	35	10	0
% of CT		36.4%	33.9%	16.0%	8.4%	4.1%	1.2%	0.0%
<b>CT 204</b>								
2010	786	218	308	104	109	31	14	2
% of CT		27.7%	39.2%	13.2%	13.9%	3.9%	1.8%	0.3%
2000	831	219	307	138	113	39	10	5
% of CT		26.4%	36.9%	16.6%	13.6%	4.7%	1.2%	0.6%
1990	796	186	332	101	116	39	18	4
% of CT		23.4%	41.7%	12.7%	14.6%	4.9%	2.3%	0.5%
<b>CT 205</b>								
2010	1,553	462	462	267	207	86	40	29
% of CT		29.7%	29.7%	17.2%	13.3%	5.5%	2.6%	1.9%
2000	1,570	460	482	293	191	82	42	20
% of CT		29.3%	30.7%	18.7%	12.2%	5.2%	2.7%	1.3%
1990	1,480	451	458	285	168	85	25	8
% of CT		30.5%	30.9%	19.3%	11.4%	5.7%	1.7%	0.5%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 206</b>								
2010	1,338	231	441	263	201	123	42	37
% of CT		17.3%	33.0%	19.7%	15.0%	9.2%	3.1%	2.8%
2000	1,350	215	451	275	232	123	40	14
% of CT		15.9%	33.4%	20.4%	17.2%	9.1%	3.0%	1.0%
1990	1,319	153	356	268	346	140	34	22
% of CT		11.6%	27.0%	20.3%	26.2%	10.6%	2.6%	1.7%
<b>CT 208</b>								
2010	2,425	521	784	449	392	185	60	34
% of CT		21.5%	32.3%	18.5%	16.2%	7.6%	2.5%	1.4%
2000	2,108	450	684	396	352	143	52	31
% of CT		21.3%	32.4%	18.8%	16.7%	6.8%	2.5%	1.5%
1990	1,954	316	625	398	425	144	33	13
% of CT		16.2%	32.0%	20.4%	21.8%	7.4%	1.7%	0.7%
<b>CT 209</b>								
2010	1,104	308	303	192	185	71	26	19
% of CT		27.9%	27.4%	17.4%	16.8%	6.4%	2.4%	1.7%
2000	1,132	291	364	194	196	58	23	6
% of CT		25.7%	32.2%	17.1%	17.3%	5.1%	2.0%	0.5%
1990	1,072	244	351	206	171	67	24	9
% of CT		22.8%	32.7%	19.2%	16.0%	6.3%	2.2%	0.8%
<b>CT 210</b>								
2010	968	242	342	175	118	62	19	10
% of CT		25.0%	35.3%	18.1%	12.2%	6.4%	2.0%	1.0%
2000	940	204	340	177	152	50	10	7
% of CT		21.7%	36.2%	18.8%	16.2%	5.3%	1.1%	0.7%
1990	880	155	283	163	190	63	17	9
% of CT		17.6%	32.2%	18.5%	21.6%	7.2%	1.9%	1.0%
<b>CT 211*</b>								
2010	CT 211 did not exist in 2010							
2000	3,308	1,464	1,056	405	263	83	29	8
% of CT		44.3%	31.9%	12.2%	8.0%	2.5%	0.9%	0.2%
1990	3,116	1,383	1,001	366	263	87	12	4
% of CT		44.4%	32.1%	11.7%	8.4%	2.8%	0.4%	0.1%
<b>CT 211.01*</b>								
2010	1,845	683	648	231	176	75	21	11
% of CT		37.0%	35.1%	12.5%	9.5%	4.1%	1.1%	0.6%
2000	CT 211.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 211.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 211.02*</b>								
2010	1,356	773	367	144	47	20	4	1
% of CT		57.0%	27.1%	10.6%	3.5%	1.5%	0.3%	0.1%
2000	CT 211.02 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 211.02 did not exist in 1990							

Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 212</b>								
2010	2,199	668	765	319	268	120	41	18
% of CT		30.4%	34.8%	14.5%	12.2%	5.5%	1.9%	0.8%
2000	2,217	615	840	357	264	104	25	12
% of CT		27.7%	37.9%	16.1%	11.9%	4.7%	1.1%	0.5%
1990	2,182	557	748	378	351	100	39	9
% of CT		25.5%	34.3%	17.3%	16.1%	4.6%	1.8%	0.4%
<b>CT 213</b>								
2010	2,266	690	778	361	281	116	29	11
% of CT		30.5%	34.3%	15.9%	12.4%	5.1%	1.3%	0.5%
2000	2,365	682	822	383	328	121	22	7
% of CT		28.8%	34.8%	16.2%	13.9%	5.1%	0.9%	0.3%
1990	2,218	521	747	396	372	147	25	10
% of CT		23.5%	33.7%	17.9%	16.8%	6.6%	1.1%	0.5%
<b>CT 215</b>								
2010	1,870	348	752	337	271	109	33	20
% of CT		18.6%	40.2%	18.0%	14.5%	5.8%	1.8%	1.1%
2000	1,795	249	669	332	386	121	28	10
% of CT		13.9%	37.3%	18.5%	21.5%	6.7%	1.6%	0.6%
1990	1,470	151	417	323	427	109	35	8
% of CT		10.3%	28.4%	22.0%	29.0%	7.4%	2.4%	0.5%
<b>CT 216.02</b>								
2010	2,210	665	863	286	221	114	45	16
% of CT		30.1%	39.0%	12.9%	10.0%	5.2%	2.0%	0.7%
2000	2,468	754	937	318	282	120	40	17
% of CT		30.6%	38.0%	12.9%	11.4%	4.9%	1.6%	0.7%
1990	2,371	687	834	356	338	115	35	6
% of CT		29.0%	35.2%	15.0%	14.3%	4.9%	1.5%	0.3%
<b>CT 216.03</b>								
2010	775	137	340	146	106	37	5	4
% of CT		17.7%	43.9%	18.8%	13.7%	4.8%	0.6%	0.5%
2000	803	107	301	158	182	37	18	0
% of CT		13.3%	37.5%	19.7%	22.7%	4.6%	2.2%	0.0%
1990	768	74	239	156	221	64	9	5
% of CT		9.6%	31.1%	20.3%	28.8%	8.3%	1.2%	0.7%
<b>CT 216.04</b>								
2010	2,075	650	864	272	200	66	17	6
% of CT		31.3%	41.6%	13.1%	9.6%	3.2%	0.8%	0.3%
2000	2,070	607	797	267	257	101	30	11
% of CT		29.3%	38.5%	12.9%	12.4%	4.9%	1.4%	0.5%
1990	1,440	418	483	217	230	68	22	2
% of CT		29.0%	33.5%	15.1%	16.0%	4.7%	1.5%	0.1%

## Changing Numbers, Part 1

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 216.05</b>								
2010	838	220	327	138	110	38	4	1
% of CT		26.3%	39.0%	16.5%	13.1%	4.5%	0.5%	0.1%
2000	723	179	257	136	109	37	4	1
% of CT		24.8%	35.5%	18.8%	15.1%	5.1%	0.6%	0.1%
1990	425	84	141	102	73	22	2	1
% of CT		19.8%	33.2%	24.0%	17.2%	5.2%	0.5%	0.2%
<b>CT 216.06</b>								
2010	1,999	339	854	336	335	102	30	3
% of CT		17.0%	42.7%	16.8%	16.8%	5.1%	1.5%	0.2%
2000	1,969	249	713	421	399	141	36	10
% of CT		12.6%	36.2%	21.4%	20.3%	7.2%	1.8%	0.5%
1990	1,299	95	402	283	383	104	25	7
% of CT		7.3%	30.9%	21.8%	29.5%	8.0%	1.9%	0.5%
<b>CT 216.07*</b>								
2010	CT 216.07 did not exist in 2010							
2000	875	135	272	202	173	74	13	6
% of CT		15.4%	31.1%	23.1%	19.8%	8.5%	1.5%	0.7%
1990	144	43	39	34	20	5	1	2
% of CT		29.9%	27.1%	23.6%	13.9%	3.5%	0.7%	1.4%
<b>CT 216.08*</b>								
2010	2,262	549	779	367	382	130	43	12
% of CT		24.3%	34.4%	16.2%	16.9%	5.7%	1.9%	0.5%
2000	CT 216.08 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 216.08 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 216.09*</b>								
2010	1,375	350	566	185	191	65	14	4
% of CT		25.5%	41.2%	13.5%	13.9%	4.7%	1.0%	0.3%
2000	CT 216.09 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 216.09 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 217*</b>								
2010	CT 217 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 217 did not exist in 2000							
1990	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>CT 217.01*</b>								
2010	CT 217.01 did not exist in 2010							
2000	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	CT 217.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 217.03*</b>								
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 217.03 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 217.03 did not exist in 1990							

Census Tract & Year	Occupied Units	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons	7 + Persons
<b>CT 217.04*</b>								
2010	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	CT 217.04 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 217.04 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220*</b>								
2010	CT 220 did not exist in 2010							
2000	607	96	193	134	113	45	19	7
% of CT		15.8%	31.8%	22.1%	18.6%	7.4%	3.1%	1.2%
1990	CT 220 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220.01*</b>								
2010	1,414	149	474	313	300	135	30	13
% of CT		10.5%	33.5%	22.1%	21.2%	9.5%	2.1%	0.9%
2000	CT 220.01 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 220.01 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220.02*</b>								
2010	1,450	320	436	256	258	117	39	24
% of CT		22.1%	30.1%	17.7%	17.8%	8.1%	2.7%	1.7%
2000	CT 220.02 did not exist in 2000							
1990	CT 220.02 did not exist in 1990							
<b>CT 220.97*</b>								
2010	CT 220.97 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 220.97 did not exist in 2000							
1990	77	11	26	18	15	5	2	0
% of CT		14.3%	33.8%	23.4%	19.5%	6.5%	2.6%	0.0%
<b>CT 220.98*</b>								
2010	CT 220.98 did not exist in 2010							
2000	CT 220.98 did not exist in 2000							
1990	281	48	85	59	61	25	2	1
% of CT		17.1%	30.2%	21.0%	21.7%	8.9%	0.7%	0.4%
<b>CITY TOTAL</b>								
2010	73,918	20,638	23,590	11,596	9,858	5,008	1,924	1,304
% of CT		27.9%	31.9%	15.7%	13.3%	6.8%	2.6%	1.8%
2000	67,699	18,720	21,793	11,065	9,172	4,320	1,642	987
% of CT		27.7%	32.2%	16.3%	13.5%	6.4%	2.4%	1.5%
1990	61,137	16,642	19,333	10,053	9,074	3,819	1,389	827
% of CT		27.2%	31.6%	16.4%	14.8%	6.2%	2.3%	1.4%