

## VI. APPENDIX

---

### Part I: Methodology and Notes on Data

#### **California Department of Finance Population Data**

The population projections utilize California, Department of Finance, State and County Population Projections by Race/Ethnicity, Sex, and Age 2010-2060 data. These data are broken out by county, year, race/ethnicity, gender and age. We aggregated the county level demographics of interest at the regional level, in terms of total population numbers. We were then able to calculate percentages based on age, race and gender for 2015 and 2035. The CA Department of Finance Data includes population projections, which can be found at <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/projections/>.<sup>53</sup>

#### **Public Use Microdata Sample**

All of the data in this report on current senior demographics, income, earnings and poverty in this report are based on an analysis of microdata from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). The 1% Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) was gathered for each of the years 2009-2013, and aggregated to form a five-year appended sample, one large enough for robust subpopulation analysis. We used the user-friendly ACS PUMS dataset made available by the University of Minnesota's IPUMS program ([www.ipums.umn.edu](http://www.ipums.umn.edu)).<sup>54</sup> The total number of observations in our sample for each region is as follows:

##### PUMS Sample Sizes

Northern CA	65,043
Sacramento	101,426
Central Valley	192,674
Bay Area	345,773
Central Coast	69,030
Los Angeles	818,263
San Diego	152,263

---

<sup>53</sup> For the CA Department of Finance's methodology, please see [http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/projections/documents/Projections\\_Methodology\\_2014.pdf](http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/projections/documents/Projections_Methodology_2014.pdf).

<sup>54</sup> Steven Ruggles, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ronnander. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0 (Machine-readable database). Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center, 2004. URL: <http://www.ipums.org>.

We have rejected as statistically unsound any calculation with an unweighted cell count of less than 40. Also, following convention, we have disregarded the institutionalized population in all of our analysis, as does the Census Bureau in most of their Summary Files

## Geography in PUMS

The regional breakdown for our report is below:

Region	County List
Northern California	Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba
Sacramento Region	El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Yolo
Central Valley	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tulare, Tuolumne
Bay Area	Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma
Central Coast	Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz
Los Angeles Region	Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura
San Diego Region	Imperial, San Diego

In this report, the data is presented at the regional level, and represents aggregated statistics from county and PUMA level data in order to draw regional-level conclusions from common patterns in the county data. Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data are made available at the Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA) and county level. The minimum population for a PUMA is 100,000. Although the Census Bureau tries to make PUMA boundaries coterminous with county boundaries, counties that are too small to be given their own PUMA designation are grouped with other counties (see table below)

The PUMA codes were updated by the Census in 2010. We were working with data from 2009-2013. As a result, our sample included PUMA codes from both the old coding scheme (for data from 2009) and the new coding scheme (2010-2013).

In order to capture smaller counties, not represented at the county level, we grouped them by PUMA designation and incorporated the PUMA groups at the regional level:

PUMA Group 1	Alpine Amador Calaveras Inyo Mariposa Mono Tuolumne
PUMA Group 2	Colusa Glenn Tehama Trinity
PUMA Group 3	Del Norte Lassen Modoc Plumas Siskiyou
PUMA Group 4	Lake Mendocino
PUMA Group 5	Monterrey San Benito
PUMA Group 6	Nevada Sierra
PUMA Group 7	Sutter Yuba

## Race/Ethnicity

The 2013 census allowed respondents to designate multiple racial categories. In Table 1.3 and 1.4, which show population by race over time, we relied on tables from the CA Department of Finance, which used a technique developed by the Census Bureau to assign respondents with more than one racial category to a single racial category. In other places where we have looked at race/ethnicity using census summary files or PUMS, we excluded respondents with multiple racial categories from the race/ethnicity analysis, but not elsewhere. The percentages of excluded respondents are small.

## Income, Earnings and Wages

The following are definitions for ACS income data used in this report.

- Total personal income means money received from all sources. It includes the sources identified below, as well as income from property (rents, interest and dividends), and some forms of government assistance.
- Social Security includes any pre-tax income from Social Security pensions, survivors benefits or permanent disability insurance.
- Supplemental Security Income (SSI) includes any pre-tax income the respondent received from SSI.
- Retirement income includes any pre-tax retirement, survivor, and disability pension income, other than Social Security.

- Earnings is an aggregated measure of wages/salary from employers (wage and salary PUMS variable) and farm/business income (farm and business PUMS variable).

We adjusted ACS income data to 2013 values using the CPI-U:

<b>Data year</b>	<b>Inflator</b>
<b>2009</b>	1.1059
<b>2010</b>	1.0683
<b>2011</b>	1.0356
<b>2012</b>	1.0146

### **Economic Self-Sufficiency and the Elder Index**

We used PUMS data to determine the percentage of seniors 65+ in every region whose total incomes fell below the annual economic sufficiency benchmark supplied by the Elder Index.<sup>55</sup> The benchmark uses six indicators of economic security (housing, food, transportation, healthcare and miscellaneous costs) across six categories based on marital and homeowner status: single homeowners (with and without a mortgage) and renters; and married homeowners (with and without a mortgage) and renters. In order to make a comparison of current senior income and the Elder Index, our analysis used a universe conditional on marital status. The universe for single seniors counted all heads of household age 65 and older that either own their own homes or are renters. The universe for married seniors included all heads of household age 65 and older that either own their own home or are renters, and their spouses. For each member of a married couple, we counted the couple's total income (excluding income from other family members) for comparison to the benchmark. Dependent seniors that are not heads of household or their spouses were not counted in this analysis due to the parameters of the Elder Index. Results were weighted with the ACS PUMS person weight.

---

<sup>55</sup> The current Elder Index benchmarks for California are equivalent to 2013 dollars. For more on their methodology, please see: <http://www.wowonline.org/ourprograms/eesi/documents/FinalWOWGINationalMethodology.pdf>.