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## Dear Community Leader,

To serve the needs of Oregon, we need to understand the reality of what is happening across all of our communities. In addition, communities themselves need to be able to analyze their own circumstances. To aid that process, they need good data. Numbers expose needs. Numbers reveal trends. Numbers track progress. Numbers identify successes. Through data collection and analysis, we can all make better decisions to promote the vitality and livability of Oregon.

This inaugural version of Oregon by the Numbers is an outgrowth of The Ford Family Foundation's long-term investment in the Rural Communities Explorer, an online tool (oregonexplorer.info/rural) that helps leaders explore data and statistics about their own communities.

Oregon by the Numbers is a collaborative effort between The Ford Family Foundation and Oregon State University. Together, we designed this printed report for local decision makers. We chose the key indicators for their value to all Oregonians-rural and urban. We gave priority to measures reflecting community wellbeing. Rankings help provide a snapshot of the state at this moment. This report points to successes to celebrate as well as common challenges, and reveals where there are opportunities to collaborate and learn.

We anticipate that Oregon by the Numbers will be produced annually to support communities across the state as we all work to build our collective future. Additional copies of this edition are available through the Foundation's Select Books program (www.tfff.org/select-books). A PDF version is also available.

Numbers never tell the whole story, but numbers do speak loudly. They help us understand where we need to look, listen and act to make positive differences in our communities.

Sincerely,
Anne C. Kubisch
President
The Ford Family Foundation
Roseburg, Oregon

## About this report

Good data contribute to good decisions. The Rural Communities Explorer, housed at Oregon State University, aims to make community data readily available to citizens across the state. In Oregon, we have a long history of using community measures to track our policies, programs and progress. However, ensuring all decision makers have adequate and accessible data tools remains a challenge. This indicator report assembles a suite of community measures accompanied by county-level profiles designed for use across sectors, making it possible for decision makers in a variety of arenas to have shared indicators of success.

Comprised of compact county portraits for all 36 counties as well as corresponding measure profiles, with rankings whenever possible, Oregon by the Numbers targets a broad audience.

The original concept for the report arose out of a question: What are the essential measures that all Oregon decision makers should be able to immediately access for their community? Several experts in a variety of fields were consulted and the resulting list of indicators fell into six areas or strands.

## Demographic: Measures describing the population <br> Social: Measures pertaining to safety, inequality and more <br> Education: Measures of school-based achievement available at the county level <br> Economic: Measures pertaining to enterprise, income, and the exchange of goods and services <br> Health: Measures of wellness for children and adults <br> Infrastructure: Measures of physical structures and resources

For each of these dimensions, the report relies almost exclusively on secondary data from a variety of sources stored on the Communities Reporter Tool database from the Rural Communities Explorer (http://oe.oregonexplorer. info/rural/CommunitiesReporter/), spanning a broad spectrum of topics.

County profiles are designed to display data at a glance, readily accessible to youth and adults alike. Indicator portraits provide greater specificity for those with a social science background and summarize each measure for the state as a whole. Whenever possible, county-level values are compared with Oregon, rural Oregon and urban Oregon.

## Measure Selection

The process of selecting measures for Oregon by the Numbers began with a comprehensive analysis of existing indicator reports followed by a juried ranking for the final selection. This two-stage process helped guarantee inclusion of the most broadly desired measures, while relying simultaneously on the knowledge of experts to ensure relevance.

## How to use this report

Oregon by the Numbers targets decision makers - those in executive positions, educational leaders, legislators, local government officials, nonprofit professionals and engaged residents. However, the authors hope any interested citizen will find it useful.

County profiles are designed for visual engagement and ease of interpretation, enabling all readers to learn something new about where they live. The indicator summary pages provide
definitions and discussions for each measure, along with other details such as rankings.

Taken in total, Oregon by the Numbers serves as a useful tool for developing situational awareness, initiating community conversations and promoting policy advocacy. This report is intended as a snapshot of the state and its counties. It is not a diagnostic tool. However, each measure in Oregon by the Numbers was selected with maximum utility in mind.

The indicators included, individual and collectively, have broad implications as to the overall status of the geographies described. While providing some answers, the report should raise additional questions and encourage all readers to seek a deeper understanding of the issues and opportunities facing our state and its counties.

- Vince Adams

Oregon State University
Extension Service

## The role of rural

What do we mean by "rural"? The definitions vary. Some are quantitative - focusing on size, population density, distance from a population center and so on. Others are more qualitative - detailing attributes that contribute to a rural "feel" or "culture," such as community connection or interdependence.

The Ford Family Foundation has its own definition, grounded in its explicit commitment to serving rural Oregon. We combine multiple factors: size, proximity to a metro area and the nature of the community to determine whether or not it is "rural." For grantmaking purposes, we consider 26 of Oregon's 36 counties exclusively "rural."

Because there is no standard or agreed-upon "rural" definition, making comparisons across communities for research and policy purposes can prove difficult. For this reason, Oregon by the Numbers makes use of the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of rural: any area not included in an urban area - urban areas are defined as densely settled areas of at least 500 people per square mile that total a population of 2,500 or more. According to the U.S. Census Bureau's definition, a county like The Ford Family Foundation's home county (Douglas County) is only $41 \%$ rural, as opposed to $100 \%$.
(Note: For measures only available at the county level, this report uses the designations of metropolitan and non-metro counties from the Office of Management and Budget.)

Playing a critical role in Oregon's rural landscape are the nine federally recognized Indian tribes. Highly heterogeneous (no two are exactly alike), each operates as an independent government within the state. Many offer services across multiple counties, contributing significantly to rural economies and providing local leadership in ways that benefit all rural residents. Native Americans live in every Oregon county and have a wide range of indigenous affiliations that extend beyond the state and federally recognized tribes. The interactions between Oregon's Indian tribes and our state government are complex, grounded in more than 200 years of painful and difficult history. These relationships will continue to evolve over time, impacting all of Oregon, but especially rural counties.

We recognize that no matter what definition we use, Oregon's rural communities are also heterogeneous. Despite differences, rural residents often report similar strengths (resourcefulness, connection to the land, sense of community) as well as common challenges (geographic isolation, availability of services, employment opportunities). These rural differences serve as a critical source of strength and wisdom for shaping the future of our state. We can be different together.

-Kasi Allen<br>The Ford Family Foundation

## Ten things to do with Oregon by the Numbers

Oregon by the Numbers is designed to be valuable to all - from legislators to the public, from community leaders to students. Here are a few suggestions for exploring this report.

1. Look at the map of Oregon's counties on the right. How many of Oregon's 36 counties have you visited?
2. Turn to the page for your "home" county and find something that makes you proud to be from there. What is something your county could improve on?
3. Find a county in another part of the state that has some similar characteristics to your home county. What is something the two counties do not have in common?
4. Turn to the Total Population Indicator on page 93. What do you notice about how Oregon's population is distributed across its 36 counties?
5. Find the Population Pyramid Indicator on page 104. What patterns do you see related to the age of Oregon's rural and urban populations?
6. Oregon's demographics are always changing. Which county has the highest percentage of Latino residents? Thumb through all the county profiles and look at the Population by Race/Ethnicity bar charts to find the answer.
7. Oregon has nine federally recognized tribes. How many of them can you name? See a list of the tribes and learn more about their history on page 96.
8. What industries employ the most Oregonians in each county? Take a guess and then review the data on pages 106-108.
9. Not all Oregon counties have broadband access. Explore the data related to this challenge on page 129.
10. Turn to Notable Features on pages 102-103. Have you been to all the notable features in your county? Find a place you hope to visit on a future road trip.
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## Data by County

## BAKER

Total population

## 16,030

Rural population
41\%
Net migration, 2010-2016 (per 1,000 population)
38
Federally Recognized Tribes

| BP | CLUS | COQ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| GR | KLA | SLZ |  |

Median income

| Baker |
| :--- |
| Oregon |

## Total land area <br> 3,088 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
52\%


BAKER COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | BAKER | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 21\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 21 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 28 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 23\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 73\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 48\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 52\％ | $\pm$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 10 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，099 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 25\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 32\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 6\％ | － | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 24\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 23\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 71\％ | － | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 8\％ | $\nearrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 7\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 23\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 296 | 入 | 21，369 | 15，013 | 6，355 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 8\％ | 入 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## BENTON

Total population

## 87,455

Rural population
19\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 53

Federally Recognized Tribes


Median income

| Benton | $\$ 52,015$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |



## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 81.8\%
Latino: 7.0\%
African American: 1.0\%
Asian: 6.3\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.3\%
Multiracial: 3.0\%
Other Race: 0.1\%

## Top employment industries



Educational Services


Food Services and Professional and Drinking Places Technical Services

## BENTON COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | BENTON | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | 入 | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 14\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 11 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 25 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 86\％ | 入 | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 54\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 82\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 347 | 入 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 52\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 59\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －20 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，358 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 37\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 30\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 11\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 20\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 71\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 98\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 64\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 253 | 入 | 21，369 | 15，013 | 6，355 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 33\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 6\％ | $\pi$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## CLACKAMAS

Total population
394,967
Rural population
18\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 61

## Federally Recognized Tribes

```
BP
```

GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

Median income
Clackamas \$68,915

## Oregon \$53,270

Total land area
1,883 $\mathbf{~ m i}^{2}$
Public land
55\%


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

```
                                    White: 83.2%
        Latino: 8.2%
    African American: 0.8%
        Asian: 4.0%
        Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.5%
    Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2%
    Multiracial: 2.9%
    Other Race: 0.0%
```


## Top employment industries



CLACKAMAS COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | CLACKAMAS | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 11\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 22 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 82\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 34\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 79\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 17 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 48\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 65\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 10 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，718 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 34\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 23\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 22\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 71\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 91\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 45\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，892 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 20\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 7\％ | － | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## CLATSOP

Total population

## 37,660

Rural population

## 39\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 26

## Federally Recognized Tribes <br> ```BP CLUS COQ COW \\ GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP```

## Median income

Clatsop $\$ 47,492$
Oregon \$53,270

Total land area
1,084 $\mathbf{~ m i}^{2}$
Public land
24\%


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 86.2\%
Latino: 8.2\%
African American: 0.7\%
Asian: 1.1\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.4\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Multiracial: 3.3\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



Food Services and Drinking Places


Educational Services

## CLATSOP COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | CLATSOP | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 15\％ | $\checkmark$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 18\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 18 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 43 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 24\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 73\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 24 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 41\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 58\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，784 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 37\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 40\％ | $\nearrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 21\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 65\％ | $\searrow$ | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 84\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 39\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 375 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 7\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 5\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## COLUMBIA

Total population

## 49,645

Rural population
44\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
19

Federally Recognized Tribes


Median income
Columbia $\$ 55,146$

Oregon \$53,270

Total land area
$688 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$
Public land
8\%


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 89.4\%
Latino: 4.6\%
African American: 0.6\%
Asian: 1.1\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.2\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Multiracial: 2.9\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



Food Services and Drinking Places


Educational Services


General Merchandise Stores

## COLUMBIA COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | COLUMBIA | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 17\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 26 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 15 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 80\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 19\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 79\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 46\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | － | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 57\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 1 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，222 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 32\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 24\％ | $\nearrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 20\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 63\％ | $\searrow$ | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 69\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 28\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 250 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 13\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 15\％ | $\pi$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## coos

Total population
62,944
Rural population
38\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 26

## Federally Recognized Tribes

BP CLUS COQ COW
GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

Median income

| Coos | $\$ 39,110$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area
1,806 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
29\%


## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 85.6\%
Latino: 6.2\%
African American: 0.6\%
Asian: 1.1\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 2.1\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Multiracial: 4.0\%
Other Race: 0.1\%

## Top employment industries



COOS COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | COOS | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 24 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 22 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 79\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 18\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 58\％ | $\geq$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 34 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 45\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 50\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 2 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄938 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 37\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 15\％ | $\nearrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 30\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 15\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 70\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 88\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 32\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 298 | $\pm$ | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 8\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## CROOK

Total population

## 21,334

Rural population
48\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
42

## Federally Recognized Tribes <br> 

Median income

| Crook | $\$ 39,583$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area
2,987 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
50\%


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 88.6\%

Latino: 7.4\%
African American: 0.2\%
Asian: 0.2\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.0\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Multiracial: 2.5\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



CROOK COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | CROOK | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 31 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 27 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 82\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 16\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 68\％ |  | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 47\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 53\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，156 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 37\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 26\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 8\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 74\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 9\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 97\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 6\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 112 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 4\％ | 入 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 15\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## CURRY

Total population

## 22,364

Rural population

## 39\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 63 <br> Federally Recognized Tribes



Total land area
$1,988 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$
Public land
55\%

Median income

| Curry | $\$ 38,661$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

```
                                    White: 87.3%
                                    Latino: 6.5%
African American: 0.4%
Asian: 0.6%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.8\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Multiracial: 3.3\%
Other Race: 0.1\%
```


## Top employment industries



## CURRY COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | CURRY | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 15\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 9 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 6 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | － | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 24\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 72\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 28\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 44\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 9 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，076 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 40\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 26\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 6\％ | $\geq$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 51\％ | $y$ | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 94\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 9\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 130 | $y$ | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 3\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 19\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## DESCHUTES

Total population

## 170,183

Rural population

## 28\%

Net migration, 2010-2016 (per 1,000 population)
99


Median income

| Deschutes | $\$ 54,211$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

## Total land area <br> 3,055 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
78\%


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 87.9\%

Latino: 7.6\%
African American: 0.5\%
Asian: 1.0\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.5\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Multiracial: 2.5\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



Food Services Ambulatory Health Administrative and and Drinking Places Care Services Support Services

DESCHUTES COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | DESCHUTES | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 18\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 11 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 24 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 83\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 33\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 79\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 40 | 入 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 45\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 61\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 36 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，764 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 38\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 25\％ | $\checkmark$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 17\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 69\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 97\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 25\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 721 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 6\％ | 7 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 7\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## DOUGLAS

Total population

## 107,375

Rural population
41\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)


Median income
Douglas \$42,052
Oregon \$53,270

Total land area
5,134 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
52\%


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 88.8\%
Latino: 5.3\%
African American: 0.4\%
Asian: 0.9\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.0\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Multiracial: 3.7\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



DOUGLAS COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | DOUGLAS | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 29\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 32 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 29 | $\downarrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 77\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 16\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 66\％ | 7 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 21 | 7 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 33\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $y$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 50\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄842 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 34\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 22\％ | 入 | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 24\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 73\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 入 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 90\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 31\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，127 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 8\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 19\％ | － | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## GILLIAM

Total population

## 1,913

Rural population
100\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
60

## Federally Recognized Tribes <br> 

Median income
Gilliam \$40,556
Oregon \$53,270

Total land area
1,223 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
8\%


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity



## Top employment industries



Waste Manage- Executive, Legislament and Remedia- tive, and General tion Services Government


Educational Services

GILLIAM COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | GILLIAM | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14\％ | 入 | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 4\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 60 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 2 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 84\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 50\％ | $\geq$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 16\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 53\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 18 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄4，546 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 29\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking |  |  | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet |  |  | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old |  |  | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | $y$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 57\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 0\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 173 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 26\％ | $\pi$ | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## GRANT

Total population
7,227
Rural population
100\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)


Median income
Grant \$40,193
Oregon \$53,270

Total land area

## 4,529 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
62\%


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity

```
                                    White: 92%
            Latino: 3.5%
African American: 0.4%
Asian: 0.2%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Multiracial: 3.2\%
Other Race: 0.0\%
```


## Top employment industries



Forestry and Logging


Educational Services


Hospitals

GRANT COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | GRANT | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 21\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 35 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 19 | 7 | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 86\％ | 入 | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 22\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 91\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 24\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 8\％ | $y$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 53\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄987 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 29\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 51\％ |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 15\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 31\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 61\％ | $\searrow$ | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 71\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 20\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 59 | $y$ | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 1\％ | 入 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 20\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## HARNEY

Total population

## 7,214

Rural population

## 44\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
-9


Median income

| Harney | $\$ 38,431$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 87.2\%
Latino: 4.9\%
African American: 0.6\%
Asian: 0.4\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 3.3\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Multiracial: 2.7\%
Other Race: 0.6\%

## Top employment industries



Educational Services


Hospitals


Administration of Environmental Programs

## HARNEY COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | HARNEY | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 27\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 23 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 21 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 86\％ | － | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 17\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 74\％ | $\geq$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 49\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 58\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 4 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄970 | 7 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 27\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 11\％ | － | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet |  |  | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 71\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 2\％ | $\searrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 0\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 12\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 85 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 5\％ | $\nearrow$ | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 27\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## HOOD RIVER

Total population
22,842
Rural population

## 52\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 72



Median income
Hood River $\quad \$ 56,581$

## Oregon

 \$53,270| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Total land area
$533 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$
Public land
73\%


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity

| White: 64.5\% |
| :--- |
| African American: 0.5\% |
| Asian: 1.7\% |
| Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.9\% |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\% |
| Multiracial: 1.5\% |
| Other Race: 0.0\% |

## Top employment industries



HOOD RIVER COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | HOOD RIVER | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 9\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 20\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 15 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 11 | $\checkmark$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 83\％ | $\downarrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 30\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 6\％ | 7 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 81\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 32\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 65\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 13 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，187 | 7 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 31\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 18\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 9\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 15\％ | $\downarrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 78\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 74\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 10\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 324 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 10\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 11\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## JACKSON

Total population

## 210,916

Rural population
20\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
49
Federally Recognized Tribes


Median income


Total land area
2,802 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
52\%


## Population by race/ethnicity



## Top employment industries



## JACKSON COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | JACKSON | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 15\％ | $y$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 20 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 47 | 入 | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 80\％ | $y$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 26\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 75\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 30 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 35\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $\pm$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 58\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，226 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 40\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 30\％ | 入 | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 20\％ | $y$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 69\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | $\pi$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 89\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 2\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，005 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 10\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 14\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

Total population

## 22,305

Rural population

## 63\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)


Total land area
1,791 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
51\%


## Median income

| Jefferson | $\$ 47,063$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


Educational Services


Food Services and Social Assistance Drinking Places

## JEFFERSON COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | JEFFERSON | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 30\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 31 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 21 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 77\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 16\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 63\％ | $\searrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 35\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 53\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －4 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，097 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 28\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 10\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 13\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 23\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 73\％ | － | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 88\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 24\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 211 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 8\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 24\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## JOSEPHINE

Total population

## 84,063

Rural population
45\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
50


Median income


Total land area
1,642 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
68\%


Population by race/ethnicity
White: 87.7\%
Latino: 7.0\%
African American: 0.4\%
Asian: 0.8\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.2\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Multiracial: 2.9\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



Food Services and Drinking Places


Educational Services


Ambulatory Health Care Services

JOSEPHINE COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | JOSEPHINE | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 27\％ | － | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 19 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 32 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 76\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 17\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 8\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 70\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 58 | 入 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 39\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 47\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄738 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 41\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 32\％ | － | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 25\％ | $y$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 25\％ | $y$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 65\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 77\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 30\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 507 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 7\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## KLAMATH

## Total population

## 65,946

Rural population

## 38\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
8

## Federally Recognized Tribes <br> BP CLUS COQ COW GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP



Total land area

6,136 $\mathrm{mi}^{2}$
Public land
60\%

## Median income

| Klamath |
| :--- |
| Oregon |

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


Educational Services


Food Services and Drinking Places


Wood Product Manufacturing

KLAMATH COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | KLAMATH | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\checkmark$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 24\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 29 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 14 | $v$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 79\％ | v | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 19\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 71\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 101 | $\pi$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 37\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | $v$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 54\％ | $v$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 3 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄945 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 33\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 25\％ | $v$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 23\％ | － | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 12\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 72\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 8\％ | л | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 83\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 54\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 477 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 9\％ | $v$ | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 17\％ | $v$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

Total population
7,799
Rural population
63\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 26

## Federally Recognized Tribes



Median income


## Total land area

## $8,358 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$

Public land
75\%



Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 85.6\%
Latino: 7.6\%
African American: 0.6\%
Asian: 0.9\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.2\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Multiracial: 4.0\%
Other Race: 0.1\%

## Top employment industries



Hospitals


Educational Services


Wood Product Manufacturing

LAKE COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | LAKE | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 19\％ | － | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 25 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 7 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 85\％ | 入 | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 17\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 87\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 34\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 49\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 0 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，593 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 30\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 19\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 28\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 73\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 9\％ | $\searrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 62\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 0\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 69 | $v$ | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 3\％ | $入$ | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 26\％ | － | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## LANE

Total population
360,273
Rural population

## 18\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
36


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


## LANE COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | LANE | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 22\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 16 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 36 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 29\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 71\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 90 | 入 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 42\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\pm$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 59\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 0 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，283 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 40\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 24\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 19\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 17\％ | $\pm$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 70\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 86\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 57\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，613 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 10\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 9\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## LINCOLN

Total population

## 46,685

Rural population

## 38\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
54

Federally Recognized Tribes
BP CLUS COQ COW
GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

Median income

| Lincoln |
| :--- |
| Oregon |




Total land area

## 1,194 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
29\%

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



## Top employment industries



Food Services and Accommodation Drinking Places


Educational Services

## LINCOLN COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | LINCOLN | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 15\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 29\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 22 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 12 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 80\％ | $y$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 23\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 74\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 9 | $\checkmark$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 31\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $y$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 52\％ | $y$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 0 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄2，035 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 38\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 24\％ | 入 | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 32\％ | $y$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 28\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 69\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 入 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 87\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 42\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 363 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 7\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 14\％ | $y$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## LINN

Total population

## 119,862

Rural population
32\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
34
Federally Recognized Tribes


Median income

| Linn | $\$ 46,782$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area
2,309 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
40\%


## Albany

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



## Top employment industries



## LINN COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | LINN | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $y$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 11 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 30 | $\pm$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 79\％ | $y$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 18\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 76\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 48 | $\pi$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 35\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $\pm$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 58\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，136 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 37\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 22\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 20\％ | － | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 18\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 68\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 97\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 32\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，160 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 26\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## MALHEUR

Total population
30,474
Rural population
48\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
-14

Federally Recognized Tribes
BP CLUS COQ COW
GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP



Total land area

## 9,930 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land

## 78\%

Median income


## Population by race/ethnicity



## Top employment industries



Educational Services


Justice, Public Order, and Safety Activities

MALHEUR COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | MALHEUR | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 13\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 35\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 21 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 28 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 76\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 13\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 8\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 83\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 66 | $\pi$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 43\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 50\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 15 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄754 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 36\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 22\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 76\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 8\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 67\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 26\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 309 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 4\％ | 入 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 17\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## MARION

Total population
326,527
Rural population

## 13\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
24

## Federally Recognized Tribes



Median income

| Marion | $\$ 50,775$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

## Total land area <br> 1,193 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
35\%


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


## MARION COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | MARION | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 15 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 36 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 78\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 22\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 8\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 74\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 33 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 34\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\pm$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 62\％ | － | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 6 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，065 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 37\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 22\％ | 入 | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 21\％ | － | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 73\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 98\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 56\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，807 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 46\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 9\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## MORROW

Total population

## 11,207

Rural population

## 46\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
4

Federally Recognized Tribes


Median income

## Morrow

\$54,441

## Oregon

 \$53,270

Total land area

## 2,049 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
17\%

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

| White: 61.2\% |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| African American: $0.1 \%$ | Latino: 34.7\% |
| Asian: $0.4 \%$ |  |
| Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.4\% |  |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\% |  |
| Multiracial: 3.1\% |  |
| Other Race: $0.0 \%$ |  |

Top employment industries


MORROW COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | MORROW | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 9\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 23\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 6 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 27 | $\pm$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 77\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 10\％ | $\searrow$ | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 8\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 84\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 35\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\pm$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 61\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －3 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄2，708 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 23\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 16\％ | － | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 49\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 74\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5\％ | $y$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 55\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 5\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 199 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 29\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 29\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## MULTNOMAH

Total population

## 778,193

Rural population

## 1\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 41



## Median income

## Multnomah <br> \$57,449 <br> Oregon \$53,270

Total land area
$466 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$
Public land
36\%

OPortland
OPortland


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


MULTNOMAH COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | MULTNOMAH | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | У | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 22\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 14 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 55 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 43\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 74\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 86 | 入 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 53\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 69\％ | 入 | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，744 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 41\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 26\％ | $\pm$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 18\％ | $v$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 24\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 69\％ | － | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | $\nearrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 98\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 85\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 3，096 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 42\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 2\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## POLK

Total population

## 78,470

Rural population
20\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 38 <br> Federally Recognized Tribes <br> ```BP CLUS COQ COW \\ GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP```

Median income

## Polk

\$54,010

## Oregon

 \$53,270Total land area
744 mi $^{2}$
Public land
12\%


## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


Educational Services


Food Services and Drinking Places


Nursing and Residential Care Facilities

POLK COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | POLK | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 13\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 17\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 13 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 15 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 80\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 30\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 81\％ | $\nearrow$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 69 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 37\％ | － | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 60\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －4 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，020 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 35\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 30\％ | $\nearrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 22\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 69\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 95\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 21\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 441 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 41\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 7\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## SHERMAN

Total population
1,705
Rural population

## 100\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 17

## Federally Recognized Tribes <br> BP <br> GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

## Median income

## Sherman \$41,389

## Oregon \$53,270



Total land area

Public land
12\%

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 88.3\%
Latino: 5.1\%
African American: 0.5\%
Asian: 0.1\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 2.5\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Multiracial: 3.5\%
Other Race: 0.0\%

## Top employment industries



Professional and Food Services and Gasoline Stations Technical Services Drinking Places

SHERMAN COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | SHERMAN | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 17\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 0 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 6 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 85\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 17\％ | $\checkmark$ | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 80\％ | $\geq$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 53\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 57\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄3，892 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 31\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking |  |  | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet |  |  | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old |  |  | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 12\％ | $\nearrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 1\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 0\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 128 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 40\％ | 7 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 24\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## TILLAMOOK

Total population

## 25,552

Rural population

## 70\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)


Median income

## Tillamook

\$43,777

## Oregon



- Tillamook State Forest



Total land area
$1333 \mathrm{mi}^{2}$
Public land
77\%

## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


Food Services and Drinking Places


Food Manufacturing


Educational Services

TILLAMOOK COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | TILLAMOOK | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14\％ | $y$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 19\％ | $v$ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 19 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 19 | $v$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | v | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 21\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 80\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 10 | $v$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 42\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $v$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 50\％ | $v$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －1 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，914 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 36\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 17\％ | $\checkmark$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 31\％ | л | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 18\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 70\％ | $v$ | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6\％ | л | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 94\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 31\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 243 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 8\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 11\％ | $v$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## UMATILLA

Total population

## 76,582

Rural population
29\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 15

Federally Recognized Tribes


Median income

| Umatilla | $\$ 49,287$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area

## 3,231 mi ${ }^{2}$

Public land
27\%



## Population by age



## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


UMATILLA COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | UMATILLA | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 9 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 25 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 73\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 16\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 11\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 75\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 22 | $\searrow$ | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 32\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $y$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 60\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 10 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，030 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 28\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 18\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 68\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 85\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 36\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 685 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 35\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 15\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## UNION

Total population

## 25,578

Rural population
42\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 28

## Federally Recognized Tribes <br> BP CLUS COQ COW GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

Median income
Union
\$45,564

## Oregon \$53,270




## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 89.7\%
Latino: 4.4\%
African American: 0.7\%
Asian: 1.1\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.8\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1.1\%
Multiracial: 2.2\%
Other Race: 0.1\%

## Top employment industries



Educational Services

Wood Product Manufacturing

UNION COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | UNION | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 25\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 21 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 24 | 7 | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 80\％ | $\searrow$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4－year degree or greater | 23\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 8\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 85\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 123 | 入 | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 45\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6\％ | $y$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 58\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －6 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄873 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 31\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 39\％ | 入 | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 14\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 24\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 67\％ | 7 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 69\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 40\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 262 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 15\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 15\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## WALLOWA

Total population

## 6,836

Rural population
100\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 41



## Median income

## Wallowa $\$ 42,349$

## Oregon \$53,270

## Population by age



Total land area
3,152 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
59\%


## Population by race/ethnicity

White: 93.7\%
Latino: 2.5\%
African American: 0.4\%
Asian: 0.2\%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 0.4\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Multiracial: 2.6\%
Other Race: 0.1\%

## Top employment industries



WALLOWA COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | WALLOWA | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 23\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 32 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 1 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 85\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 25\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 10\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 93\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 43\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 7\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 54\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，173 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 34\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 26\％ | － | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking |  |  | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 20\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 68\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 95\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 35\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 43 | $v$ | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 4\％ | $入$ | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 17\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

Total population

## 25,657

Rural population

## 33\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 59 <br> Federally Recognized Tribes <br> 

Median income

| Wasco | $\$ 46,814$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area
2,395 mi ${ }^{2}$
Public land
44\%


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


## WASCO COUNTY

Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | WASCO | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 13\％ | $\checkmark$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 24 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 24 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 79\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 19\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 11\％ | 7 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 76\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 35 | － | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 32\％ | $\searrow$ | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 58\％ | $\pm$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 6 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，259 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 33\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking |  |  | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet |  |  | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old |  |  | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 入 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 78\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 2\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 370 | 7 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 10\％ | 7 | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 15\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## WASHINGTON

Total population
564,088
Rural population
6\%
Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)
52

## Federally Recognized Tribes



Median income

| Washington | $\$ 69,743$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area
726 mi $^{2}$
Public land
15\%


## Population by race/ethnicity



## Top employment industries



Computer and Administrative and Food Services and Electronic Product Support Services Drinking Places Manufacturing

WASHINGTON COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | WASHINGTON | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 15\％ | 7 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 17 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | $y$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 41\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 9\％ | 7 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 82\％ | $\pi$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 48\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4\％ | 入 | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 69\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，633 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 35\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 28\％ | $\nearrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 12\％ | $\searrow$ | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 20\％ | $\searrow$ | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 73\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7\％ | 入 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 96\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 56\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 1，821 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 44\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 3\％ | $\searrow$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

## WHEELER

Total population

## 1,369

Rural population

## 100\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)

## 55 <br> Federally Recognized Tribes <br> 

Median income
Wheeler \$33,400

## Oregon \$53,270



## Population by race/ethnicity

```
White: 94.3%
Latino: 1.9%
African American: 0.0%
Asian: 0.7%
Am Indian/Alaska Native: 1.1%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0%
Multiracial: 2.0\%
Other Race: 0.0\%
```


## Top employment industries



Educational Services


Executive, Legisla- Administration tive, and General of Environmental
 Government

WHEELER COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | WHEELER | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 45\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 0 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 4 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 85\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 17\％ | 7 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 7\％ | 7 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 18\％ | $\geq$ | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） | 35 | － | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 45\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 47\％ | $\pm$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | 9 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，492 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 33\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults |  |  | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 12\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet |  |  | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old |  |  | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 18\％ | 入 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 0\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 7\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 21 | － | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 2\％ | $入$ | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 20\％ | 入 | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．

Total population

## 102,217

Rural population

## 23\%

Net migration, 2010-2016
(per 1,000 population)


Median income

| Yamhill | $\$ 54,951$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oregon | $\$ 53,270$ |

Total land area 718 mi $^{2}$

Public land
17\%
 Scenic Viewpoint


Population by age


## Population by race/ethnicity



Top employment industries


YAMHILL COUNTY
Definitions of indicators can be found on page 87.

Arrows：Trend is up，down or unchanged．Blanks：Data are missing or inconclusive．

Color：Measure is above or below the county． Black：Comparisons cannot be made． Blank：Rural－Urban data not available．

| SOCIAL | YAMHILL | TREND | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 13\％ | $\searrow$ | 14\％ |  |  |
| Child poverty＊ | 23\％ | 入 | 20\％ | 19\％ | 21\％ |
| Child abuse（per 1，000 population） | 8 |  | 14 | 22 | 12 |
| Index crime（per 1，000 population） | 18 | $\searrow$ | 32 | 22 | 34 |
| Voter participation | 81\％ | $\checkmark$ | 80\％ |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 －year degree or greater | 25\％ | 入 | 31\％ | 23\％ | 36\％ |
| 2－year degree | 8\％ | 入 | 9\％ | 9\％ | 8\％ |
| Graduation rate | 81\％ | 入 | 75\％ | 71\％ | 77\％ |
| Higher education enrollment（per 1，000 pop） |  |  | 50 | 16 | 64 |
| Early education＊ | 36\％ | 入 | 43\％ | 38\％ | 46\％ |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5\％ | $\searrow$ | 5\％ |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 60\％ | $\searrow$ | 62\％ | 55\％ | 65\％ |
| Job growth（per 1，000 population） | －10 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| Property tax（per person） | \＄1，150 | 入 | \＄1，427 | \＄1，191 | \＄1，474 |
| Housing cost burden | 36\％ | 入 | 37\％ | 32\％ | 39\％ |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physically active adults | 17\％ | $\nearrow$ | 24\％ |  |  |
| Adult smoking | 18\％ | 入 | 18\％ |  |  |
| Healthy diet | 22\％ | 入 | 20\％ |  |  |
| Vaccination rate， 2 year old | 76\％ | 入 | 70\％ |  |  |
| Low weight births | 8\％ | 7 | 7\％ | 7\％ | 7\％ |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 81\％ |  | 91\％ | 85\％ | 97\％ |
| Transit service | 48\％ |  | 50\％ |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled（in millions） | 446 | 入 | 21，369 | 6，355 | 15，013 |
| Developed or cultivated land | 41\％ | － | 11\％ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 11\％ | $\pm$ | 8\％ | 15\％ | 7\％ |

＊Interpret with caution for small counties（population under 10，000）．
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## Data by Measure
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## Measure Selection

The process of selecting measures for Oregon by the Numbers began with a comprehensive analysis of existing indicator reports followed by a juried ranking for the final selection. This two-stage process helped guarantee inclusion of the most broadly desired measures, while relying simultaneously on the knowledge of experts to ensure relevance. A crossover matrix of measures and reports helped generate a short list, based on data already available in the Communities Reporter Tool. Experts at OSU considered the short list generated by the crossover matrix and determined causal or covariant relationships of the measures, prioritizing those with central influence and/or those that best function as overall indicators of societal progress.

The team of experts also took care to populate each topic domain with a sufficient number and type of measures to ensure relevance to all Oregon counties. Some new measures were added to the Rural Community Explorer as part of this process, such as Mobile Homes and Broadband Access.

Nearly a third of the selected indicators in Oregon by the Numbers come from the American Community Survey (ACS). The federal government has collected information about the American population since 1790 with the decennial census and began asking questions about housing and other topics in the midtwentieth century.

Collected on a continuous basis starting in 2005, the ACS is intended to give the American public a sense of how people in the country are doing, where they are working, whether they have access to the services they need and so on. In 2009, the U.S. Census Bureau released the first annual installment of data from the ACS about the economic, demographic, housing, and social characteristics of America's people and households.

ACS data provide decision makers unprecedented access to timely information about key issues. The results help determine how billions of dollars of government funds are distributed each year. The data also can illuminate opportunities for state-level research.

## Margin of error

Because the American Community Survey is a sample survey, involving 3.5 million households every year, its estimates are subject to statistical error. The Census Bureau publishes the margin of error associated with each ACS estimate.

The margin of error associated with estimates for small communities and/or for sub-groups within the population (e.g. age categories, racial/ethnic groups, people with disabilities, etc.) can be large relative to the estimate. In these cases, users should interpret results with caution.

In this report, any necessary cautions about margin of error are noted on the measure page in question and the appropriate county profiles. The margins of error for the measures in this report are available on the American Factfinder website from the U.S. Census Bureau or the Communities Reporter Tool from the Rural Communities Explorer.

Oregon by the Numbers

## TOTAL POPULATION

Definition: The total number of individuals living within a county's designated boundaries.

Population size provides insight into the nature of a county's residential communities. This measure is also important for tracking growth or declines within a specific county and making comparisons across counties. Changes in population occur through births, deaths and migration. Such shifts can indicate whether a county is attracting new residents, or when an economy is struggling or prosperous. Total population as a measure also helps in planning for current and future community needs.


| Rank | County | Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Oregon | 3,982,267 |
|  | Urban | 2,743,636 |
|  | Rural | 1,238,631 |
| 1 | Multnomah | 778,193 |
| 2 | Washington | 564,088 |
| 3 | Clackamas | 394,967 |
| 4 | Lane | 360,273 |
| 5 | Marion | 326,527 |
| 6 | Jackson | 210,916 |
| 7 | Deschutes | 170,813 |
| 8 | Linn | 119,862 |
| 9 | Douglas | 107,375 |
| 10 | Yamhill | 102,217 |
| 11 | Benton | 87,455 |
| 12 | Josephine | 84,063 |
| 13 | Polk | 78,470 |
| 14 | Umatilla | 76,582 |
| 15 | Klamath | 65,946 |
| 16 | Coos | 62,944 |
| 17 | Columbia | 49,645 |
| 18 | Lincoln | 46,685 |
| 19 | Clatsop | 37,660 |
| 20 | Malheur | 30,474 |
| 21 | Union | 25,758 |
| 22 | Wasco | 25,657 |
| 23 | Tillamook | 25,552 |
| 24 | Hood River | 22,842 |
| 25 | Curry | 22,364 |
| 26 | Jefferson | 22,305 |
| 27 | Crook | 21,334 |
| 28 | Baker | 16,030 |
| 29 | Morrow | 11,207 |
| 30 | Lake | 7,799 |
| 31 | Grant | 7,227 |
| 32 | Harney | 7,214 |
| 33 | Wallowa | 6,836 |
| 34 | Gilliam | 1,913 |
| 35 | Sherman | 1,705 |
| 36 | Wheeler | 1,369 |

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B01003. Total population: 2012-2016, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2017.

## RURAL POPULATION

## Definition: The percentage of people who reside outside of Census-designated urban areas or clusters in a given county.

Rural communities, especially those defined as rural according to the U.S. Census guidelines, present significantly different contexts from their urban and suburban counterparts. The strengths, needs and capacities of rural communities differ accordingly. In Oregon, where there are only 12 cities with population greater than 50,000, knowing the proportion of the rural population in a county allows decision makers to develop more balanced strategies to support different types of communities. (See "The Role of Rural," page 9.) Because this measure makes use of data released every decade, researchers are exploring alternatives for future reports.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gilliam | 100.0\% |
| 1 | Grant | 100.0\% |
| 1 | Sherman | 100.0\% |
| 1 | Wallowa | 100.0\% |
| 1 | Wheeler | 100.0\% |
| 6 | Tillamook | 69.6\% |
| 7 | Lake | 63.3\% |
| 8 | Jefferson | 63.1\% |
| 9 | Hood River | 52.2\% |
| 10 | Malheur | 48.4\% |
| 11 | Crook | 48.0\% |
| 12 | Morrow | 45.9\% |
| 13 | Josephine | 45.0\% |
| 14 | Harney | 44.3\% |
| 15 | Columbia | 43.6\% |
| 16 | Union | 42.1\% |
| 17 | Douglas | 41.2\% |
| 18 | Baker | 41.0\% |
| 19 | Clatsop | 39.0\% |
| 20 | Curry | 38.7\% |
| 21 | Coos | 38.4\% |
| 22 | Lincoln | 37.6\% |
| 22 | Klamath | 37.6\% |
| 24 | Wasco | 33.1\% |
| 25 | Linn | 31.6\% |
| 26 | Umatilla | 29.1\% |
| 27 | Deschutes | 27.6\% |
| 28 | Yamhill | 22.6\% |
| 29 | Jackson | 20.1\% |
| 30 | Polk | 19.9\% |
|  | Oregon | 19.0\% |
| 31 | Benton | 18.8\% |
| 32 | Clackamas | 18.1\% |
| 33 | Lane | 17.5\% |
| 34 | Marion | 13.1\% |
| 35 | Washington | 5.6\% |
| 36 | Multnomah | 1.3\% |

Source: US Census Bureau, Decennial Census (2010) Rural population: 2010, updated decennially. Released 2012.

## NET MIGRATION

Definition: Net migration is the change in population due to people moving in or out of a given area over a specified time period per 1,000 residents.

A positive net migration means more people are moving into a county than are leaving, while a negative value means more people are moving out of a county than moving in. Overall, urban areas in Oregon tend to have higher rates of net migration than in rural, but there are exceptions for individual counties. It is important for businesses and local leaders to understand net migration in order to anticipate the county's future demands. Population growth resulting from migration requires different resources than growth caused by natural increase. Understanding the various contributors to population change is important for long-range planning.


| Rank | County | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Deschutes | 98.8 |
| 2 | Hood River | 72.1 |
| 3 | Curry | 63.2 |
| 4 | Clackamas | 60.8 |
| 5 | Gilliam | 59.8 |
| 6 | Wasco | 59.2 |
| 7 | Wheeler | 54.6 |
| 8 | Lincoln | 53.8 |
| 9 | Benton | 52.5 |
| 10 | Washington | 51.8 |
| 11 | Josephine | 49.6 |
| 12 | Jackson | 48.5 |
|  | Urban | 46.1 |
|  | Oregon | 43.5 |
| 13 | Douglas | 43.1 |
| 14 | Crook | 42.2 |
| 15 | Wallowa | 40.9 |
| 16 | Multnomah | 40.5 |
| 16 | Yamhill | 40.5 |
| 18 | Polk | 38.2 |
| 18 | Baker | 38.2 |
| 20 | Lane | 36.1 |
| 21 | Tillamook | 34.6 |
| 22 | Linn | 33.7 |
|  | Rural | 30.6 |
| 23 | Union | 28.0 |
| 24 | Coos | 26.4 |
| 25 | Lake | 26.2 |
| 26 | Clatsop | 26.0 |
| 27 | Jefferson | 24.1 |
| 28 | Marion | 23.6 |
| 29 | Columbia | 18.7 |
| 30 | Sherman | 17.2 |
| 31 | Umatilla | 15.1 |
| 32 | Grant | 13.0 |
| 33 | Klamath | 8.4 |
| 34 | Morrow | 4.1 |
| 35 | Harney | -9.4 |
| 36 | Malheur | -14.0 |

Source: Portland State University,
Population Research Center, Annual Population Report, 2010-2016, migration since 2010 updated annually. Released 2017.

## FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

Definition: The presence of designated services and/or reservation lands associated with one of the nine federally recognized tribes of Oregon.

BP Burns Paiute Tribe
cow
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe

Confederated Tribes of Siletz

## CLUS

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians

GR Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde

Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation

## COQ Coquille Indian Tribe

KLA Klamath Tribes

## WSP

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs

Oregon is Indian country. Dozens of indigenous tribes and bands once inhabited the territory now known as Oregon - and did so successfully for thousands of years until the arrival of Europeans in the 18th century. In 1797, the U.S. Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance, establishing the goal of westward expansion. Despite language indicating that lands and property would never be taken from native people without their consent, history would prove otherwise. Ultimately, European settlers acquired nearly 3 million acres of Indian land in Oregon.

The term "federally recognized" refers to the government-to-government relationships between the United States and Indian tribes, managed in large part by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In 1954, during the Termination Era, the U.S. Congress terminated every tribe and band in Western Oregon. The 1970s and 1980s served as an era of rebuilding tribal communities and land bases. The majority of Oregon's nine federally recognized tribes were restored through legal action at the federal level during that time.

This report highlights the federally recognized Indian tribes as an indication of potential government-to-government or other official relationships in Oregon's counties and across the state. Each federally recognized tribe is a distinct
sovereign nation, with its own political and legal status described in the U.S. Constitution. Tribal members are U.S. citizens as well as citizens of their tribal nations.

The data here do not represent the diverse Native American presence within a given county or throughout Oregon. Estimates suggest between 45,000 and 50,000 Native Americans presently reside in Oregon; there are Indians in every county. A significant portion of Native Americans in Oregon are affiliated with tribes other than those that are federally recognized as being located in Oregon. In addition, federally recognized tribes in neighboring states may be involved with co-management or other official relationships within Oregon that are not represented here. Numerous Indian-affiliated organizations operate in Oregon that are not associated with the nine federally recognized tribes.

Ultimately, Indian history is Oregon history. Passage of Senate Bill 13, which directs the Department of Education to develop new curriculum about the Native American experience in Oregon and to provide professional development for teachers in support of that curriculum, has the potential to usher in a new era of awareness among all Oregonians.

## FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

Definition: The presence of designated services and/or reservation lands associated with one of the nine federally recognized tribes of Oregon.

BP
Burns Paiute Tribe

## 

COW Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe


## CLUS <br> Confederated Tribes of Coos, <br> Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians



## GR Confederated Tribes of <br> Grande Ronde



Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation

COQ
Coquille Indian Tribe

KLA
Klamath Tribes
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## MEDIAN INCOME

Definition: The household income value at which $50 \%$ of households in the county earn less and 50\% earn more.

Median household income in this report provides a measure of the typical or "middle" income level in a county as well as the overall economic wellbeing for residents. One key drawback is that this measure treats all households equally regardless of the number of people in the household. The size of the household has a big impact on how the income is distributed to individuals. Nonetheless, median household income remains a broadly used measure. It is useful in tracking income growth, which is associated with the ability of residents to meet their needs, and comparing economic conditions across counties.


| Rank | County | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Washington | \$69,743 |
| 2 | Clackamas | \$68,915 |
| 3 | Multnomah | \$57,449 |
| 4 | Hood River | \$56,581 |
| 5 | Columbia | \$55,146 |
| 6 | Yamhill | \$54,951 |
| 7 | Morrow | \$54,441 |
| 8 | Deschutes | \$54,211 |
| 9 | Polk | \$54,010 |
|  | Oregon | \$53,270 |
| 10 | Benton | \$52,015 |
| 11 | Marion | \$50,775 |
| 12 | Umatilla | \$49,287 |
| 13 | Clatsop | \$47,492 |
| 14 | Jefferson | \$47,063 |
| 15 | Wasco | \$46,814 |
| 16 | Linn | \$46,782 |
| 17 | Jackson | \$46,343 |
| 18 | Union | \$45,564 |
| 19 | Lane | \$45,222 |
| 20 | Tillamook | \$43,777 |
| 21 | Wallowa | \$42,349 |
| 22 | Douglas | \$42,052 |
| 23 | Klamath | \$41,951 |
| 24 | Baker | \$41,722 |
| 25 | Sherman | \$41,389 |
| 26 | Lincoln | \$41,303 |
| 27 | Gilliam | \$40,556 |
| 28 | Grant | \$40,193 |
| 29 | Crook | \$39,583 |
| 30 | Coos | \$39,110 |
| 31 | Curry | \$38,661 |
| 32 | Harney | \$38,431 |
| 33 | Josephine | \$37,867 |
| 34 | Malheur | \$34,720 |
| 35 | Lake | \$33,453 |
| 36 | Wheeler | \$33,400 |

Source: US Census Bureau,
American Community Survey, Table B19013, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2017.

## LAND AREA

## Definition: The total land area within the boundary of each county, measured in square miles.

Using GIS to delineate jurisdictional and census boundaries, these data are collected by the U.S. Census Bureau every 10 years. As a measure, land area communicates the amount of physical space a county has as a resource. It also suggests the scope of demand for infrastructure on local governments and provides insight about the distances residents may need to travel in order to access employment, education, resources and services.


| Rank | County | $\mathrm{mi}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Oregon | 98,379 |
|  | Rural | 76,753 |
|  | Urban | 21,625 |
| 1 | Harney | 10,226 |
| 2 | Malheur | 9,930 |
| 3 | Lake | 8,358 |
| 4 | Klamath | 6,136 |
| 5 | Douglas | 5,134 |
| 6 | Lane | 4,722 |
| 7 | Grant | 4,529 |
| 8 | Umatilla | 3,231 |
| 9 | Wallowa | 3,152 |
| 10 | Baker | 3,088 |
| 11 | Deschutes | 3,055 |
| 12 | Crook | 2,987 |
| 13 | Jackson | 2,802 |
| 14 | Wasco | 2,395 |
| 15 | Linn | 2,309 |
| 16 | Morrow | 2,049 |
| 17 | Union | 2,039 |
| 18 | Curry | 1,988 |
| 19 | Clackamas | 1,883 |
| 20 | Coos | 1,806 |
| 21 | Jefferson | 1,791 |
| 22 | Wheeler | 1,715 |
| 23 | Josephine | 1,642 |
| 24 | Tillamook | 1,333 |
| 25 | Gilliam | 1,223 |
| 26 | Lincoln | 1,194 |
| 27 | Marion | 1,193 |
| 28 | Clatsop | 1,084 |
| 29 | Sherman | 831 |
| 30 | Polk | 744 |
| 31 | Washington | 726 |
| 32 | Yamhill | 718 |
| 33 | Columbia | 688 |
| 34 | Benton | 679 |
| 35 | Hood River | 533 |
| 36 | Multnomah | 466 |

Source: US Census Bureau, TigerLine Shapefiles, Decennial Census, 2010, updated decennially. Released 2012.

## PUBLICLY OWNED LANDS

## Definition: The percentage of total land area in a county publicly held rather than privately owned.

Publicly owned land area is calculated by aggregating lands managed by federal, state and local governments. Much of the western United States is held publicly - protected for natural resources, open spaces and recreational areas. The economic history of Oregon is closely tied to the state's large proportion of public lands, especially federal lands that comprise more than $50 \%$ of the state. These publicly held lands have significant economic impacts on the Oregon counties that contain them.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Malheur | 78.4\% |
| 2 | Deschutes | 77.9\% |
| 3 | Lake | 77.4\% |
| 4 | Harney | 75.3\% |
| 5 | Hood River | 74.9\% |
| 6 | Tillamook | 73.0\% |
| 7 | Josephine | 68.0\% |
| 8 | Curry | 61.7\% |
| 9 | Grant | 60.2\% |
| 10 | Klamath | 58.8\% |
| 11 | Lane | 58.5\% |
| 12 | Wallowa | 57.8\% |
|  | Rural | 57.8\% |
|  | Oregon | 54.9\% |
| 13 | Clackamas | 54.5\% |
| 14 | Douglas | 52.2\% |
| 15 | Jackson | 52.1\% |
| 16 | Baker | 51.7\% |
| 17 | Jefferson | 50.8\% |
| 18 | Crook | 50.5\% |
|  | Urban | 49.9\% |
| 19 | Union | 48.7\% |
| 20 | Wasco | 43.9\% |
| 21 | Linn | 39.6\% |
| 22 | Multnomah | 36.0\% |
| 23 | Lincoln | 34.6\% |
| 24 | Marion | 29.2\% |
| 25 | Clatsop | 29.0\% |
| 26 | Coos | 28.8\% |
| 27 | Wheeler | 26.7\% |
| 28 | Umatilla | 26.4\% |
| 29 | Benton | 24.4\% |
| 30 | Morrow | 16.7\% |
| 31 | Yamhill | 16.5\% |
| 32 | Washington | 14.8\% |
| 33 | Sherman | 12.3\% |
| 34 | Polk | 11.9\% |
| 35 | Gilliam | 8.4\% |
| 36 | Columbia | 8.0\% |

Source: Oregon Department of Forestry: Land Management Layer, 2017, collected annually. Released 2017.

## LARGEST COMMUNITIES

Definition: The name, location, and population of the largest community within a county's boundaries.

The largest community is identified by comparing Census-designated population clusters within the county. Highlighting the size and location of the largest community within a county provides insight into how population is distributed within a particular county and across the state. Two metro areas are the largest communities for multiple counties: Portland for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington; Salem for Marion and Polk.


| \# | Community | County | Pop | \# | Community | County | Pop | \# | Community | County | Pop |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Portland | Clackamas | 620,589 | 13 | Roseburg | Douglas | 22,201 | 25 | Hood River | Hood River | 7,476 |
| 2 | Portland | Multnomah | 620,589 | 14 | Klamath Falls | Klamath | 21,322 | 26 | Madras | Jefferson | 6,504 |
| 3 | Portland | Washington | 620,589 | 15 | Hermiston | Umatilla | 17,150 | 27 | Brookings | Curry | 6,390 |
| 4 | Salem | Marion | 161,975 | 16 | Coos Bay | Coos | 16,129 | 28 | Tillamook | Tillamook | 5,063 |
| 5 | Salem | Polk | 161,975 | 17 | The Dalles | Wasco | 15,276 | 29 | Boardman | Morrow | 3,347 |
| 6 | Eugene | Lane | 161,649 | 18 | St. Helens | Columbia | 13,169 | 30 | Lakeview | Lake | 2,867 |
| 7 | Bend | Deschutes | 84,416 | 19 | La Grande | Union | 13,079 | 31 | Burns | Harney | 2,760 |
| 8 | Medford | Jackson | 78,856 | 20 | Ontario | Malheur | 11,045 | 32 | Enterprise | Wallowa | 1,872 |
| 9 | Corvallis | Benton | 55,766 | 21 | Newport | Lincoln | 10,139 | 33 | John Day | Grant | 1,721 |
| 10 | Albany | Linn | 51,919 | 22 | Baker City | Baker | 9,757 | 34 | Arlington | Gilliam | 571 |
| 11 | Grants Pass | Josephine | 36,776 | 23 | Astoria | Clatsop | 9,595 | 35 | Fossil | Wheeler | 403 |
| 12 | McMinnville | Yamhill | 33,724 | 24 | Prineville | Crook | 9,419 | 36 | Wasco | Sherman | 381 |

## NOTABLE FEATURES

## Definition: Prominent natural and community features that serve as points of interest for residents and visitors.

Researchers at OSU Extension generated the data for this indicator by examining the online presence of named attractions within a particular county. Features tend to be popular recreational destinations for local populations and tourists. These destinations can help stimulate local economies through tourism dollars and civic engagement. In Oregon, parks figure prominently as county features.

## Baker

Wallowa Whitman National Forest
Hells Canyon National Recreation Area
Anthony Lakes Ski Area

## Benton

Corvallis Watershed Wild Animal Refuge
Marys Peak
Alsea Falls Recreational Site

## Clackamas

Mount Hood National Forest
Timberline Lodge
Trillium Lake

## Clatsop

Lewis and Clark National and State Historical Parks
Haystack Rock
Fort Stevens State Park

## Columbia

Forest Grove District State Forest
Collins Beach
Multnomah Channel

## Coos

Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area
Sunset Bay State Park
Shore Acres State Park

## Crook

Ochoco National Forest
Prineville Reservoir Wildlife Area
Ochoco Wayside State Park

## Curry

Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest
Cape Blanco State Park
Floras Lake State Natural Area

## Deschutes

Mount Bachelor Ski Area
Tumalo Falls
Lava River Cave

## Douglas

Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area
Wildlife Safari
Umpqua National Forest

Gilliam
Cottonwood Canyon Recreation Area
J S Burres State Park
Earl Snell Memorial Park
Grant
John Day Fossil Beds National Monument
Umatilla National Forest
Malheur National Forest

## Harney

Steen Mountains
Malheur National Wildlife Refuge
Alvord Hot Springs
Hood River
Mount Hood National Forest
Mount Hood Meadows Ski Area
Eagle Creek

## Jackson

Bear Creek Greenway
Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument
Oregon Vortex
Jefferson
The Cove Palisades State Park
Black Butte
Lake Billy Chinook

| Josephine | Polk |
| :---: | :---: |
| Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserves | Basket Slough National Wildlife Refuge |
| Indian Mary Park | Valley of the Giants |
| Rogue River-Siskiyou National Park | Sarah Helmick State Recreation Site |
| Klamath | Sherman |
| Crater Lake National Park | Deschutes River State Recreation Area |
| Winema National Forest | Cottonwood Canyon State Park |
| Klamath Marsh National Wildlife Refuge | John Day Dam |
| Lake | Tillamook |
| Fremont National Forest | Tillamook State Forest |
| Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge | Nehalem Bay State Park |
| Derrick Cave | Cape Meares National Wildlife Refuge |
| Lane | Umatilla |
| Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area | Umatilla National Forest |
| Sea Lion Caves | Bridge Creek Wildlife Area |
| Three Sisters | Hat Rock State Park |
| Lincoln | Union |
| Oregon Coast Aquarium | Umatilla National Forest |
| Yaquina Bay State Recreation Site | Eagle Cap Mountain Peak |
| South Beach State Park | Hilgard Junction State Park |
| Linn | Wallowa |
| Mount Washington | Wallowa Lake State Park |
| Middle Santiam Wilderness | Zumwalt Prairie |
| Willamette National Forest | Wallowa Whitman National Forest |
| Malheur | Wasco |
| Lake Owyhee State Park | Mount Hood National Forest |
| Succor Creek Natural Area | Deschutes River Recreation Site |
| Ontario State Recreation Site | Memaloose State Park |
| Marion | Washington |
| Silver Falls State Park | L L Stub Stewart State Park |
| Enchanted Forest | Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge |
| Oregon State Capitol | Tualatin Hills Nature Park |
| Morrow | Wheeler |
| Umatilla National Forest | Ochoco National Forest |
| Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge | Painted Hills |
| Willow Creek Dam | Umatilla National Forest |
| Multnomah | Yamhill |
| Multnomah Falls | Mount Hebo |
| Mount Hood National Forest | Pheasant Creek Falls |
| Mark O Hatfield Wilderness | Bald Creek State Scenic Viewpoint |

Source: Rural Communities Explorer, 2018.
Released 2018.

## POPULATION PYRAMID

Definition: Population pyramids show the distribution of a population by age and by sex.

The population pyramid graphically represents the population. It can provide insights into the distribution of age groups, differences between men and women, population growth patterns, and the demand for specific types of goods and services. While named for their typically pyramidal shape, the graphs demonstrate that many counties in Oregon have larger populations in higher age categories and will not follow this shape. The graphs on this page show population distributions for the entire state (right) and broken down into rural and urban populations (below).


Oregon



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B01001. Total population: 2012-2016, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2017.

## RACE/ETHNICITY

## Definition: The percentage of a county's total population in each racial and ethnic group.

Understanding the distribution of racial and ethnic groups within communities is essential for promoting equal opportunity and addressing policies and practices that may create barriers for underserved populations. Tracking race/ethnicity is important for community situational awareness, implementing programs and accessing funding. Reporting race/ ethnicity data may be required under state and federal statute. Breakouts by urban and rural provide additional insights about the distribution of racial and ethnic groups across the state.


Other Race: 0.1\%

Rural


Other Race: 0.1\%

## Urban

Latino: 13.8\%
African American: 2.3\%
Asian: 5.3\%
American Indian or Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.5\%
Multiracial: 3.7\%
Other Race: 0.1\%

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B03002, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2017.

## TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES

Definition: The three industries with the greatest number of employees in each county, using the 3-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes.

Identifying the top three employment industries in each county provides insight about the structure of the local economy. Employment industries have different average wage levels, so the top three figure prominently in determining the total wage earnings of a county. Examining this indicator across the state and between counties suggests notable employment trends and could point to policy opportunities. (Note: Each county profile shows the top three employment industries in ranked order from left to right.)



Administration of environmental programs


Administrative and support services


Source: State of Oregon Employment Department, Economic Data 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES

Definition: The three industries with the greatest number of employees in each county, using the 3-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes.

## $\because$ <br> 



Educational services


Food manufacturing


Q Gasoline stations



Executive, legislative, and general government



Food services and drinking places


Source: State of Oregon Employment Department, Economic Data 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES

Definition: The three industries with the greatest number of employees in each county, using the 3-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes.

Hospitals

## Coserses)

Primary metal manufacturing

## 4n

Truck transportation

Justice, public order and safety activities


Professional and technical services

$\square$ Waste management
and remediation service



Wood product manufacturing


Source: State of Oregon Employment Department, Economic Data
2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## FOOD INSECURITY

## Definition: The estimated percentage of individuals who have limited or uncertain access to adequate food.

Food insecurity has profound negative impacts on the well-being and success of individuals, families and communities. It is one way to represent households at social and economic risk. Because there are no direct measures of food insecurity available at the county level, researchers for Feeding America develop an estimate using a mathematical model that combines food security data from the Current Population Survey with other household demographic and economic information. Food-secure households have consistent access to safe and nutritional foods without needing to resort to emergency food sources, scavenging, stealing or other coping strategies.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Lake | 16.8\% |
| 2 | Josephine | 16.5\% |
| 2 | Sherman | 16.5\% |
| 4 | Coos | 16.4\% |
| 4 | Crook | 16.4\% |
| 4 | Douglas | 16.4\% |
| 7 | Curry | 16.2\% |
| 8 | Grant | 16.1\% |
| 8 | Lane | 16.1\% |
| 8 | Wallowa | 16.1\% |
| 11 | Benton | 16.0\% |
| 11 | Union | 16.0\% |
| 13 | Harney | 15.9\% |
| 14 | Klamath | 15.7\% |
| 15 | Linn | 15.6\% |
| 15 | Wheeler | 15.6\% |
| 17 | Baker | 15.5\% |
| 17 | Multnomah | 15.5\% |
| 19 | Jackson | 15.3\% |
| 20 | Lincoln | 15.2\% |
| 21 | Clatsop | 14.6\% |
|  | Oregon | 14.2\% |
| 22 | Columbia | 14.1\% |
| 22 | Deschutes | 14.1\% |
| 24 | Gilliam | 13.8\% |
| 25 | Jefferson | 13.7\% |
| 26 | Tillamook | 13.5\% |
| 27 | Polk | 13.4\% |
| 28 | Malheur | 12.9\% |
| 29 | Wasco | 12.8\% |
| 30 | Yamhill | 12.5\% |
| 31 | Marion | 12.2\% |
| 32 | Umatilla | 11.9\% |
| 33 | Clackamas | 11.8\% |
| 34 | Washington | 11.5\% |
| 35 | Hood River | 8.8\% |
| 36 | Morrow | 8.7\% |

Source: Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap, 2015, updated annually. Released 2017.

## CHILD POVERTY

Definition: The child poverty rate is the percentage of individuals in a county under 18 years of age and living in families whose income falls below the poverty line for their family size.

Child poverty is a key predictor of negative social outcomes and increased demand for government services. Poverty can limit a child's social, educational and personal development due to reduced access to opportunities. Children experiencing poverty are less likely to be successful in school, are more likely to have negative health outcomes, have greater difficulty accessing the job market later in life, and are more likely to commit crimes, resulting in a greater demand for services overall. High rates of child poverty can limit community progress.

* Because people younger than 18 years old are a relatively narrow group of the population, the child poverty estimates for small counties (population under 10,000) may have wide margins of error, and readers should use caution when interpreting these statistics.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Malheur | 34.7\% |
| 2 | Jefferson | 29.9\% |
| 3 | Lincoln | 29.3\% |
| 4 | Douglas | 28.6\% |
| 5 | Josephine | 27.3\% |
| 6 | Harney* | 26.7\% |
| 7 | Marion | 25.4\% |
| 8 | Umatilla | 25.3\% |
| 9 | Crook | 25.2\% |
| 9 | Coos | 25.2\% |
| 11 | Union | 25.0\% |
| 11 | Linn | 25.0\% |
| 13 | Jackson | 24.5\% |
| 14 | Klamath | 23.9\% |
| 15 | Morrow | 22.9\% |
| 16 | Wallowa* | 22.7\% |
| 17 | Yamhill | 22.5\% |
| 18 | Multnomah | 22.3\% |
| 19 | Lane | 21.8\% |
| 20 | Baker | 21.3\% |
|  | Urban | 21.2\% |
| 21 | Grant* | 21.1\% |
|  | Oregon | 20.4\% |
| 22 | Hood River | 20.1\% |
| 23 | Tillamook | 19.2\% |
|  | Rural | 18.6\% |
| 24 | Lake* | 18.6\% |
| 25 | Deschutes | 18.3\% |
| 25 | Clatsop | 18.3\% |
| 27 | Polk | 17.4\% |
| 28 | Columbia | 16.6\% |
| 29 | Wasco | 16.2\% |
| 30 | Washington | 15.0\% |
| 31 | Curry | 14.8\% |
| 32 | Benton | 14.0\% |
| 33 | Clackamas | 11.0\% |
|  | Gilliam* | ID |
|  | Sherman* | ID |
|  | Wheeler* | ID |

[^0]
## CHILD ABUSE

Definition: The number of children in a county who were victims of child abuse or neglect per 1,000 in the population under 18 years of age.

Child abuse is a serious problem in our country. Among industrialized nations, the United States has one of the highest rates of child death by abuse. Child abuse negatively affects the wellbeing of young people in our communities now and in the long run. Experiencing abuse as a child contributes to poor physical and mental health well into adulthood. The compounding costs of medical care, lost productivity, child welfare services, criminal justice and specialized education services all place an additional burden on counties - above and beyond the human suffering associated with child abuse. Community economic stress can contribute to rates of child abuse, creating a vicious cycle.


| Rank | County | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gilliam | 60.2 |
| 2 | Grant | 35.0 |
| 3 | Douglas | 31.8 |
| 4 | Wallowa | 31.7 |
| 5 | Crook | 31.3 |
| 6 | Jefferson | 30.6 |
| 7 | Klamath | 28.6 |
| 8 | Columbia | 25.8 |
| 9 | Lake | 25.0 |
| 10 | Wasco | 23.8 |
| 11 | Coos | 23.6 |
| 12 | Harney | 23.2 |
| 13 | Lincoln | 22.0 |
|  | Rural | 21.9 |
| 14 | Union | 21.5 |
| 15 | Baker | 21.1 |
| 16 | Malheur | 21.0 |
| 17 | Jackson | 19.8 |
| 18 | Tillamook | 19.1 |
| 19 | Josephine | 18.6 |
| 20 | Clatsop | 17.8 |
| 21 | Lane | 16.3 |
| 22 | Hood River | 15.4 |
| 23 | Marion | 14.8 |
|  | Oregon | 13.6 |
| 24 | Multnomah | 13.6 |
| 25 | Polk | 12.6 |
|  | Urban | 11.9 |
| 26 | Benton | 11.2 |
| 27 | Linn | 10.7 |
| 28 | Deschutes | 10.6 |
| 29 | Umatilla | 9.1 |
| 30 | Curry | 8.7 |
| 31 | Yamhill | 7.5 |
| 32 | Washington | 6.7 |
| 33 | Clackamas | 6.6 |
| 34 | Morrow | 6.3 |
| 35 | Sherman | 0.0 |
| 35 | Wheeler | 0.0 |

Source: Oregon Department of Human
Services, Population Research Center at Portland State University, 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## INDEX CRIME

Definition: The annual number of index crime offenses per 1,000 residents in a county. Index crimes include willful murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, theft and arson.

Crime rates are a measure of the relative safety of an area, but crime also has important social and economic influences on communities. High rates of crime are associated with population mobility, weaker attachment of residents to their community, less local involvement and lower home values. The index crime rate is created to provide a standard measure of particularly important crimes against people and property across the United States. Tracking crime supports law enforcement operations, public safety budgeting and local community development efforts.


| Rank | County | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Multnomah | 55.1 |
| 2 | Jackson | 47.4 |
| 3 | Clatsop | 42.6 |
| 4 | Marion | 36.0 |
| 4 | Lane | 36.0 |
|  | Urban | 33.7 |
|  | Oregon | 32.2 |
| 6 | Josephine | 32.1 |
| 7 | Linn | 30.0 |
| 8 | Douglas | 29.1 |
| 9 | Baker | 27.8 |
| 9 | Malheur | 27.8 |
| 11 | Crook | 27.2 |
| 12 | Morrow | 26.6 |
| 13 | Umatilla | 25.1 |
| 14 | Benton | 25.0 |
| 15 | Deschutes | 24.4 |
| 16 | Wasco | 24.2 |
| 17 | Union | 23.6 |
|  | Rural | 22.3 |
| 18 | Clackamas | 22.2 |
| 19 | Coos | 21.9 |
| 20 | Harney | 21.2 |
| 21 | Jefferson | 20.5 |
| 22 | Tillamook | 19.0 |
| 23 | Grant | 18.6 |
| 24 | Yamhill | 18.2 |
| 25 | Washington | 17.3 |
| 26 | Polk | 14.8 |
| 27 | Columbia | 14.6 |
| 28 | Klamath | 13.7 |
| 29 | Lincoln | 12.0 |
| 30 | Hood River | 11.3 |
| 31 | Lake | 7.0 |
| 32 | Curry | 5.6 |
| 32 | Sherman | 5.6 |
| 34 | Wheeler | 4.1 |
| 35 | Gilliam | 2.0 |
| 36 | Wallowa | 0.7 |

Source: Oregon State Police,
Population Research Center at Portland State University 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## VOTER PARTICIPATION

Definition: The percentage of registered voters who participated in biennial general elections.

Voter participation has long served as a secondary measure of social capital. The relationship between voting and social connections has been heavily researched with little consensus. In the absence of an alternative measure, voter participation continues as an important proxy for civic engagement and community social capital. This in turn reflects community capacity. The state of Oregon has implemented multiple policies over the years to increase voter participation, such as mail-in ballots and automatic voter registration. The state reports some of the highest voter participation rates in the country.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Grant | 86.2\% |
| 2 | Benton | 85.8\% |
| 3 | Harney | 85.6\% |
| 4 | Wallowa | 85.4\% |
| 5 | Wheeler | 85.2\% |
| 6 | Lake | 84.5\% |
| 6 | Sherman | 84.5\% |
| 8 | Gilliam | 83.5\% |
| 9 | Hood River | 83.4\% |
| 10 | Deschutes | 83.1\% |
| 11 | Crook | 81.8\% |
| 12 | Clackamas | 81.7\% |
| 13 | Curry | 81.2\% |
| 14 | Tillamook | 81.1\% |
| 14 | Washington | 81.1\% |
| 16 | Lane | 81.0\% |
| 16 | Yamhill | 81.0\% |
| 18 | Baker | 80.7\% |
| 19 | Clatsop | 80.6\% |
| 20 | Multnomah | 80.5\% |
|  | Oregon | 80.3\% |
| 21 | Lincoln | 80.3\% |
| 22 | Polk | 79.9\% |
| 22 | Union | 79.9\% |
| 24 | Columbia | 79.7\% |
| 24 | Jackson | 79.7\% |
| 26 | Coos | 79.3\% |
| 27 | Linn | 79.0\% |
| 28 | Klamath | 78.6\% |
| 28 | Wasco | 78.6\% |
| 30 | Marion | 77.5\% |
| 31 | Douglas | 77.1\% |
| 31 | Morrow | 77.1\% |
| 33 | Jefferson | 76.7\% |
| 34 | Malheur | 76.3\% |
| 35 | Josephine | 75.7\% |
| 36 | Umatilla | 73.3\% |

Source: Office of the Oregon Secretary of State, 2016, updated biennially. Released 2017.

## FOUR-YEAR DEGREE OR GREATER

Definition: The percentage of the county population, age 25 or older, that has earned a four-year degree or greater educational attainment. Individuals included are those with a four-year (bachelor's) degree, a master's degree, a professional degree or a doctorate.

Individuals who have earned a four-year degree or higher experience increased salaries and worker benefits, more mobility and improved health. This measure is an important indicator of human capital and is frequently used to describe a community's labor force for purposes of economic development.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Benton | 53.7\% |
| 2 | Multnomah | 42.7\% |
| 3 | Washington | 41.2\% |
|  | Urban | 35.7\% |
| 4 | Clackamas | 34.1\% |
| 5 | Deschutes | 33.3\% |
|  | Oregon | 31.4\% |
| 6 | Hood River | 30.1\% |
| 7 | Polk | 29.8\% |
| 8 | Lane | 28.7\% |
| 9 | Jackson | 26.1\% |
| 10 | Wallowa | 25.2\% |
| 11 | Yamhill | 24.5\% |
| 12 | Clatsop | 24.1\% |
| 13 | Curry | 23.6\% |
| 14 | Union | 23.3\% |
| 15 | Lincoln | 23.0\% |
| 15 | Baker | 23.0\% |
|  | Rural | 22.6\% |
| 17 | Marion | 22.4\% |
| 18 | Grant | 21.7\% |
| 19 | Tillamook | 20.9\% |
| 20 | Columbia | 19.2\% |
| 21 | Klamath | 18.9\% |
| 22 | Wasco | 18.6\% |
| 23 | Coos | 18.4\% |
| 24 | Linn | 18.1\% |
| 25 | Harney | 17.3\% |
| 25 | Lake | 17.3\% |
| 25 | Josephine | 17.3\% |
| 28 | Gilliam | 17.1\% |
| 29 | Sherman | 17.0\% |
| 29 | Wheeler | 17.0\% |
| 31 | Douglas | 16.3\% |
| 32 | Crook | 16.1\% |
| 32 | Jefferson | 16.1\% |
| 34 | Umatilla | 15.6\% |
| 35 | Malheur | 13.3\% |
| 36 | Morrow | 10.0\% |

Source: US Census Bureau:
Decennial Census (for trend), American Community Survey, Table DP02,
2012-2016, 5-year estimates,
updated annually. Released 2017.

## TWO-YEAR DEGREE

Definition: The percentage of a county's population, age 25 or older, that has earned a two-year degree.

An associate degree or other two-year credential confers benefits similar to those connected with higher levels of education attainment, but to a lesser degree. In Oregon, there is broad support for having $40 \%$ of the population earn two-year degrees or equivalent trade certification. Unfortunately, the current proportion of the state population with this level of education falls far short of this goal. The discrepancy between aspiration and reality manifests in counties as shortages of skilled labor and tradespeople.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Umatilla | 10.6\% |
| 1 | Wasco | 10.6\% |
| 3 | Grant | 10.3\% |
| 3 | Klamath | 10.3\% |
| 5 | Linn | 10.1\% |
| 6 | Clatsop | 9.9\% |
| 6 | Sherman | 9.9\% |
| 8 | Wallowa | 9.7\% |
| 9 | Jefferson | 9.5\% |
| 10 | Douglas | 9.4\% |
| 10 | Harney | 9.4\% |
| 12 | Clackamas | 9.3\% |
| 13 | Deschutes | 9.1\% |
| 14 | Curry | 9.0\% |
|  | Rural | 8.9\% |
| 15 | Columbia | 8.8\% |
| 15 | Lane | 8.8\% |
| 15 | Lake | 8.8\% |
| 15 | Polk | 8.8\% |
| 19 | Washington | 8.7\% |
| 20 | Crook | 8.6\% |
| 20 | Coos | 8.6\% |
| 20 | Lincoln | 8.6\% |
|  | Oregon | 8.5\% |
| 23 | Yamhill | 8.4\% |
| 23 | Josephine | 8.4\% |
|  | Urban | 8.3\% |
| 25 | Malheur | 8.3\% |
| 26 | Union | 8.2\% |
| 27 | Marion | 8.1\% |
| 28 | Morrow | 7.9\% |
| 29 | Jackson | 7.4\% |
| 29 | Multnomah | 7.4\% |
| 29 | Benton | 7.4\% |
| 32 | Baker | 7.3\% |
| 33 | Gilliam | 7.2\% |
| 34 | Tillamook | 7.1\% |
| 35 | Wheeler | 6.6\% |
| 36 | Hood River | 6.4\% |

Source: US Census Bureau:
Decennial Census (for trend), American Community Survey, Table DP02, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates, updated annually. Released 2017.

## HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATE

Definition: The percentage of students in a high school cohort who graduate with a regular or modified diploma, or who have met all diploma requirements but remained enrolled, within four years of their high school start year.

For generations, the four-year graduation rate has served as a key measure of success for K-12 education institutions. Students who fail to graduate before leaving high school will face significant challenges as their adult life unfolds: gaining employment, continuing their education and engaging in their community. As Oregon and the nation continue to transition away from extractive and industrial economies, it becomes increasingly important for students to graduate from high school on time and ready to attend college and/or enter the workforce.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Wallowa | 92.9\% |
| 2 | Grant | 90.6\% |
| 3 | Lake | 86.7\% |
| 4 | Union | 85.3\% |
| 5 | Morrow | 84.5\% |
| 6 | Malheur | 82.9\% |
| 7 | Benton | 82.1\% |
| 8 | Washington | 81.7\% |
| 9 | Hood River | 81.3\% |
| 10 | Polk | 80.6\% |
| 11 | Yamhill | 80.5\% |
| 12 | Tillamook | 80.2\% |
| 13 | Sherman | 80.0\% |
| 14 | Clackamas | 79.1\% |
| 15 | Columbia | 78.7\% |
| 16 | Deschutes | 78.5\% |
|  | Urban | 76.6\% |
| 17 | Linn | 76.2\% |
| 18 | Wasco | 75.6\% |
| 19 | Umatilla | 75.4\% |
| 20 | Jackson | 75.3\% |
|  | Oregon | 74.8\% |
| 21 | Lincoln | 74.3\% |
| 22 | Harney | 73.9\% |
| 23 | Multnomah | 73.8\% |
| 24 | Marion | 73.6\% |
| 25 | Clatsop | 73.5\% |
| 26 | Baker | 73.1\% |
| 27 | Curry | 72.1\% |
| 28 | Lane | 71.0\% |
| 29 | Klamath | 70.8\% |
|  | Rural | 70.6\% |
| 30 | Josephine | 69.7\% |
| 31 | Crook | 67.7\% |
| 32 | Douglas | 66.0\% |
| 33 | Jefferson | 63.5\% |
| 34 | Coos | 57.7\% |
| 35 | Gilliam | 50.0\% |
| 36 | Wheeler | 18.1\% |

Source: Oregon Department of Education, 2015-2016,
updated annually. Released 2017.

## HIGHER EDUCATION ENROLLMENT

Definition: The number of students enrolled per 1,000 of population in public institutions of higher education located in the county. Students enrolled through satellite campuses are attributed to the county where the primary campus resides. OSU-Cascades is an exception, attributed to Deschutes County.

Colleges and universities are important economic drivers for the communities and regions where they are located. They offer a stabilizing influence during downturns in the business cycle. Most obviously they increase human capital by producing educated graduates, but they also contribute to attracting a skilled labor force. Many alumni remain in the communities where they graduate, adding to the local economy through higher wages and tax revenue. College enrollment normalized to community population is a proxy indicator of these positive influences. "No college" indicates that there is no primary campus for a public community college or university in the county.


| Rank | County | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Benton | 347 |
| 2 | Union | 123 |
| 3 | Klamath | 101 |
| 4 | Lane | 90 |
| 5 | Multnomah | 86 |
| 6 | Polk | 69 |
| 7 | Malheur | 66 |
|  | Urban | 64 |
| 8 | Josephine | 58 |
|  | Oregon | 50 |
| 9 | Linn | 48 |
| 10 | Deschutes | 40 |
| 11 | Wasco | 35 |
| 12 | Coos | 34 |
| 13 | Marion | 33 |
| 14 | Jackson | 30 |
| 15 | Clatsop | 24 |
| 16 | Umatilla | 22 |
| 17 | Douglas | 21 |
| 18 | Clackamas | 17 |
|  | Rural | 16 |
| 19 | Tillamook | 10 |
| 20 | Lincoln | 9 |
|  | Baker* | No college |
|  | Columbia | No college |
|  | Crook* | No college |
|  | Curry* | No college |
|  | Gilliam | No college |
|  | Grant | No college |
|  | Harney* | No college |
|  | Hood River* | No college |
|  | Jefferson | No college |
|  | Lake* | No college |
|  | Morrow* | No college |
|  | Sherman | No college |
|  | Wallowa | No college |
|  | Washington* | No college |
|  | Wheeler | No college |
|  | Yamhill* | No college |

[^1]Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, 2016, updated annually. Released 2018.

## EARLY EDUCATION

Definition: The percentage of three-and four-year-olds enrolled in early education programs (nursery school or preschool), based on parent report.

Early childhood education has lasting impacts that extend into primary education and beyond. Preschool experience positively influences child cognitive, language and social development in addition to preparation for learning in an academic environment.

* Preschool-age children are a very narrow group of the population. The estimates for the proportion of these children enrolled in early education in small counties (population under 10,000) have wide margins of error, and readers should use caution when interpreting these statistics.

| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Multnomah | 52.5\% |
| 2 | Benton | 52.0\% |
| 3 | Clackamas | 48.1\% |
| 4 | Washington | 47.5\% |
| 5 | Crook | 46.7\% |
| 6 | Columbia | 46.3\% |
|  | Urban | 45.5\% |
| 7 | Deschutes | 45.1\% |
| 7 | Coos | 45.1\% |
| 9 | Union | 44.6\% |
|  | Oregon | 43.4\% |
| 10 | Malheur | 43.4\% |
| 11 | Lane | 42.2\% |
| 12 | Tillamook | 41.7\% |
| 13 | Clatsop | 41.4\% |
| 14 | Josephine | 39.4\% |
|  | Rural | 37.8\% |
| 15 | Klamath | 37.0\% |
| 16 | Polk | 36.5\% |
| 17 | Yamhill | 36.0\% |
| 18 | Jackson | 34.9\% |
| 19 | Linn | 34.7\% |
| 20 | Jefferson | 34.5\% |
| 21 | Marion | 33.8\% |
| 22 | Douglas | 33.3\% |
| 23 | Wasco | 32.1\% |
| 24 | Umatilla | 31.6\% |
| 25 | Lincoln | 30.7\% |
|  | Baker | ID |
|  | Curry | ID |
|  | Gilliam* | ID |
|  | Grant* | ID |
|  | Harney* | ID |
|  | Hood River | ID |
|  | Lake* | ID |
|  | Morrow | ID |
|  | Sherman* | ID |
|  | Wallowa* | ID |
|  | Wheeler* | ID |

ID: Insufficient data
Source: US Census Bureau: American Community Survey, Table S1401, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates, updated annually. Released 2017.

## UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

## Definition: The percentage of the population who do not have a job, are currently available for work and are actively seeking work.

Unemployment has an impact on the individuals who are without work, their families and their communities. The purchasing power of those workers is lost, as are the goods and services they might have produced. People who are unemployed are also at a higher risk of social challenges. The unemployment rate serves as both a measure of labor availability and an overall indicator of a county's economic health. While labor availability is an important factor in economic development, high rates of unemployment are considered unfavorable.

| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Grant | 7.8\% |
| 2 | Crook | 7.0\% |
| 3 | Curry | 6.9\% |
| 3 | Klamath | 6.9\% |
| 5 | Jefferson | 6.7\% |
| 5 | Wallowa | 6.7\% |
| 7 | Josephine | 6.6\% |
| 8 | Coos | 6.5\% |
| 9 | Baker | 6.4\% |
| 9 | Douglas | 6.4\% |
| 9 | Lake | 6.4\% |
| 12 | Harney | 6.3\% |
| 13 | Columbia | 6.2\% |
| 14 | Gilliam | 5.9\% |
| 14 | Union | 5.9\% |
| 16 | Jackson | 5.8\% |
| 16 | Linn | 5.8\% |
| 18 | Lincoln | 5.7\% |
| 19 | Malheur | 5.6\% |
| 20 | Umatilla | 5.4\% |
| 21 | Lane | 5.1\% |
| 21 | Marion | 5.1\% |
| 21 | Polk | 5.1\% |
| 24 | Morrow | 5.0\% |
| 24 | Tillamook | 5.0\% |
|  | Oregon | 4.9\% |
| 26 | Deschutes | 4.9\% |
| 26 | Wasco | 4.9\% |
| 28 | Clatsop | 4.8\% |
| 29 | Yamhill | 4.7\% |
| 30 | Sherman | 4.6\% |
| 31 | Clackamas | 4.4\% |
| 32 | Multnomah | 4.3\% |
| 32 | Wheeler | 4.3\% |
| 34 | Hood River | 4.2\% |
| 34 | Washington | 4.2\% |
| 36 | Benton | 3.9\% |

ID: Insufficient data
Source: Oregon Employment Department, Economic Data, 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE

Definition: The ratio between the size of the civilian labor force and the overall population 16 years of age and older. People in the labor force are those who are employed or are actively seeking work.

The labor force participation rate measures the supply side of the labor market, including both those currently working and those seeking work. It is particularly useful in detecting discouraged unemployed workers during economic down turns and in areas that are economically depressed. Higher rates of labor force participation are generally viewed favorably. Use caution interpreting labor force participation at the local level because income types and population age structure can be confounding factors.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Multnomah | 68.7\% |
| 2 | Washington | 68.5\% |
|  | Urban | 65.1\% |
| 3 | Hood River | 65.1\% |
| 4 | Clackamas | 64.8\% |
|  | Oregon | 61.9\% |
| 5 | Marion | 61.8\% |
| 6 | Deschutes | 61.4\% |
| 7 | Morrow | 61.0\% |
| 8 | Yamhill | 59.9\% |
| 8 | Polk | 59.9\% |
| 10 | Umatilla | 59.7\% |
| 11 | Lane | 59.2\% |
| 12 | Benton | 59.1\% |
| 13 | Wasco | 58.4\% |
| 14 | Clatsop | 58.1\% |
| 15 | Harney | 57.7\% |
| 16 | Union | 57.6\% |
| 16 | Linn | 57.6\% |
| 18 | Jackson | 57.5\% |
| 19 | Columbia | 56.9\% |
| 20 | Sherman | 56.5\% |
|  | Rural | 55.0\% |
| 21 | Wallowa | 54.4\% |
| 22 | Klamath | 54.2\% |
| 23 | Jefferson | 53.5\% |
| 24 | Crook | 53.0\% |
| 25 | Gilliam | 52.8\% |
| 26 | Grant | 52.5\% |
| 27 | Baker | 52.1\% |
| 28 | Lincoln | 51.6\% |
| 29 | Douglas | 50.3\% |
| 30 | Tillamook | 50.1\% |
| 30 | Malheur | 50.1\% |
| 30 | Coos | 50.1\% |
| 33 | Lake | 48.8\% |
| 34 | Josephine | 47.2\% |
| 34 | Wheeler | 47.2\% |
| 36 | Curry | 44.2\% |

Source: US Census Bureau: American Community Survey, Table B23025, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates, updated annually. Released 2017.

## JOB GROWTH

Definition: The net change in the estimated number of full-time and part-time jobs being performed between the listed year and the year prior, per 1,000 residents in the county.

Job growth focuses on the change in the number of jobs worked. It does not provide perspective on unfilled or vacant jobs potentially available in communities. Job growth serves as an essential measure of economic vitality and tracks closely with productivity. Taken in combination with unemployment and labor force participation rate, net job growth provides valuable insights on the overall labor market in a given county and across the state.


| Rank | County | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Deschutes | 36.1 |
| 2 | Gilliam | 18.4 |
| 3 | Malheur | 15.0 |
| 4 | Hood River | 13.1 |
| 5 | Baker | 10.3 |
| 6 | Umatilla | 10.1 |
| 6 | Clackamas | 10.1 |
| 8 | Wheeler | 9.5 |
| 9 | Curry | 8.7 |
| 10 | Douglas | 7.5 |
| 11 | Clatsop | 7.0 |
| 12 | Jackson | 6.8 |
| 12 | Multnomah | 6.6 |
| 12 | Grant | 6.6 |
| 15 | Washington | 6.5 |
| 16 | Wasco | 6.2 |
| 17 | Marion | 6.0 |
|  | Urban | 5.9 |
|  | Oregon | 5.8 |
| 18 | Josephine | 5.0 |
| 19 | Wallowa | 4.7 |
|  | Rural | 4.6 |
| 20 | Linn | 4.6 |
| 21 | Harney | 3.9 |
| 22 | Klamath | 3.0 |
| 23 | Coos | 1.6 |
| 24 | Columbia | 1.0 |
| 25 | Lake | 0.0 |
| 26 | Lane | -0.2 |
| 27 | Lincoln | -0.3 |
| 28 | Tillamook | -0.7 |
| 29 | Morrow | -3.4 |
| 30 | Polk | -3.6 |
| 31 | Jefferson | -4.4 |
| 32 | Sherman | -5.2 |
| 33 | Union | -6.2 |
| 34 | Crook | -7.5 |
| 35 | Yamhill | -9.5 |
| 36 | Benton | -19.6 |

Source: US Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Accounts, CA25N, 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## PROPERTY TAX PER PERSON

Definition: The per-capita property tax imposed, calculated as the total property tax imposed divided by the number of people in the county.

Property tax serves as an important source of revenue for local governments. Per-capita property tax is an indicator of the capacity of local government to provide services such as public safety, roads and other infrastructure, parks/recreation, and public health. It is also a measure of relative tax burden. Property tax imposed excludes taxes allocated to urban renewal agencies and special assessments.


| Rank | County | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gilliam | \$4,546 |
| 2 | Sherman | \$3,892 |
| 3 | Morrow | \$2,708 |
| 4 | Lincoln | \$2,035 |
| 5 | Tillamook | \$1,914 |
| 6 | Clatsop | \$1,784 |
| 7 | Deschutes | \$1,764 |
| 8 | Multnomah | \$1,744 |
| 9 | Clackamas | \$1,718 |
| 10 | Washington | \$1,633 |
| 11 | Lake | \$1,593 |
| 12 | Wheeler | \$1,492 |
|  | Urban | \$1,474 |
|  | Oregon | \$1,427 |
| 13 | Benton | \$1,358 |
| 14 | Lane | \$1,283 |
| 15 | Wasco | \$1,259 |
| 16 | Jackson | \$1,226 |
| 17 | Columbia | \$1,222 |
|  | Rural | \$1,191 |
| 18 | Hood River | \$1,187 |
| 19 | Wallowa | \$1,173 |
| 20 | Crook | \$1,156 |
| 21 | Yamhill | \$1,150 |
| 22 | Linn | \$1,136 |
| 23 | Baker | \$1,099 |
| 24 | Jefferson | \$1,097 |
| 25 | Curry | \$1,076 |
| 26 | Marion | \$1,065 |
| 27 | Umatilla | \$1,030 |
| 28 | Polk | \$1,020 |
| 29 | Grant | \$987 |
| 30 | Harney | \$970 |
| 31 | Klamath | \$945 |
| 32 | Coos | \$938 |
| 33 | Union | \$873 |
| 34 | Douglas | \$842 |
| 35 | Malheur | \$754 |
| 36 | Josephine | \$738 |

Source: Oregon Department of Revenue, Property Tax Statistics Table 1.6, 2016, updated annually. Released 2016.

## HOUSING COST BURDEN

Definition: The percentage of households, both renters and owners, paying 30\% or greater of their income on rent or mortgage.

Housing cost burden provides a measure of a county's affordability. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has established the " 30 percent rule," meaning that households should spend no more than 30 percent of their income on housing. Some criticize the rule for being oversimplified. For example, it does not take into account income level. Still, housing cost burden provides a measure of the number of households that may be at risk of eviction, foreclosure, and/or homelessness. This measure is a key success indicator for affordable housing efforts. Those facing housing cost burden also may face challenges spending money in other domains, including food, transportation, health or education.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Josephine | 40.6\% |
| 2 | Multnomah | 40.5\% |
| 3 | Jackson | 40.4\% |
| 4 | Lane | 40.3\% |
| 5 | Curry | 39.6\% |
|  | Urban | 39.1\% |
| 6 | Deschutes | 38.1\% |
| 7 | Lincoln | 37.5\% |
| 8 | Clatsop | 37.3\% |
| 9 | Benton | 37.1\% |
|  | Oregon | 37.0\% |
| 10 | Linn | 37.0\% |
| 11 | Marion | 36.8\% |
| 11 | Coos | 36.8\% |
| 11 | Crook | 36.8\% |
| 14 | Yamhill | 36.1\% |
| 15 | Malheur | 36.0\% |
| 16 | Tillamook | 35.8\% |
| 17 | Polk | 35.4\% |
| 18 | Washington | 34.5\% |
| 19 | Clackamas | 34.4\% |
| 19 | Wallowa | 34.4\% |
| 21 | Douglas | 34.1\% |
| 22 | Wasco | 32.8\% |
| 22 | Klamath | 32.8\% |
| 24 | Wheeler | 32.6\% |
|  | Rural | 32.5\% |
| 25 | Columbia | 32.5\% |
| 26 | Hood River | 31.2\% |
| 27 | Union | 31.1\% |
| 27 | Sherman | 31.1\% |
| 29 | Lake | 29.7\% |
| 30 | Gilliam | 29.3\% |
| 31 | Grant | 29.0\% |
| 32 | Jefferson | 28.2\% |
| 33 | Umatilla | 27.6\% |
| 34 | Harney | 26.8\% |
| 35 | Baker | 25.0\% |
| 36 | Morrow | 23.0\% |

Source: US Census Bureau: American Community Survey, Table B25070, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates, updated annually. Released 2017.

## PHYSICALLY ACTIVE ADULTS

Definition: The percentage of adults who report meeting the guidelines for physical activity provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). They are: 150 minutes per week of moderate-intensity activity or 75 minutes per week of vigorousintensity activity, or a combination AND muscle-strengthening activities for all major muscle groups at least two days per week.

The data comprising this measure are from aggregated sampling across years. Low physical activity has been associated with several disease conditions such as Type 2 diabetes, cancer, stroke, hypertension, cardiovascular disease and premature mortality, independent of obesity. Being physically active has a positive impact on mental as well as physical health. Adults who are physically active tend to encourage activity in their children as well, potentially reducing health costs for multiple generations.


Top third Middle third
 Bottom third 10

| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Grant | 51.0\% |
| 2 | Clatsop | 40.0\% |
| 3 | Union | 39.4\% |
| 4 | Josephine | 32.0\% |
| 5 | Benton | 30.4\% |
| 5 | Polk | 30.4\% |
| 7 | Jackson | 29.6\% |
| 8 | Washington | 27.6\% |
| 9 | Multnomah | 25.9\% |
| 10 | Wallowa | 25.7\% |
| 11 | Klamath | 25.4\% |
| 12 | Deschutes | 25.2\% |
|  | Oregon | 24.4\% |
| 13 | Columbia | 24.4\% |
| 14 | Lane | 24.1\% |
| 14 | Lincoln | 24.1\% |
| 16 | Clackamas | 23.0\% |
| 17 | Douglas | 22.0\% |
| 18 | Marion | 21.9\% |
| 19 | Linn | 21.8\% |
| 20 | Hood River | 17.6\% |
| 21 | Tillamook | 17.4\% |
| 22 | Yamhill | 17.3\% |
| 23 | Malheur | 16.9\% |
| 24 | Coos | 14.9\% |
| 25 | Umatilla | 12.2\% |
| 26 | Jefferson | 10.2\% |
| 27 | Baker | 6.2\% |
|  | Crook | ID |
|  | Curry | ID |
|  | Gilliam | ID |
|  | Harney | ID |
|  | Lake | ID |
|  | Morrow | ID |
|  | Sherman | ID |
|  | Wasco | ID |
|  | Wheeler | ID |

## ID: Insufficient data

Source: Oregon Health Authority, Adult Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2012-2015, updated biennially. Released 2017.

## ADULT SMOKING

Definition: The percentage of adults who report that they currently smoke cigarettes.

Data are from aggregated sampling across years. Smoking is one of the most preventable causes of disease and death. The effects of smoking can increase the risk of cancer, heart disease and respiratory diseases for smokers themselves as well as their family members.


Top third
 Bottom third ID

| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Lincoln | 31.5\% |
| 2 | Tillamook | 30.9\% |
| 3 | Coos | 29.9\% |
| 4 | Crook | 26.3\% |
| 5 | Curry | 25.6\% |
| 6 | Josephine | 24.7\% |
| 7 | Douglas | 24.2\% |
| 8 | Baker | 23.5\% |
| 9 | Klamath | 23.2\% |
| 10 | Malheur | 22.0\% |
| 11 | Clatsop | 21.0\% |
| 12 | Linn | 20.3\% |
| 13 | Columbia | 19.8\% |
| 14 | Jackson | 19.6\% |
| 15 | Lake | 19.0\% |
| 15 | Lane | 19.0\% |
| 17 | Umatilla | 18.4\% |
| 18 | Multnomah | 18.1\% |
|  | Oregon | 17.9\% |
| 19 | Yamhill | 17.7\% |
| 20 | Deschutes | 17.3\% |
| 21 | Clackamas | 16.5\% |
| 21 | Marion | 16.5\% |
| 23 | Morrow | 15.7\% |
| 24 | Grant | 15.4\% |
| 25 | Polk | 14.3\% |
| 26 | Union | 13.7\% |
| 27 | Jefferson | 12.7\% |
| 28 | Wheeler | 12.2\% |
| 29 | Washington | 12.0\% |
| 30 | Harney | 10.9\% |
| 31 | Benton | 10.6\% |
| 32 | Hood River | 8.8\% |
|  | Gilliam | ID |
|  | Sherman | ID |
|  | Wallowa | ID |
|  | Wasco | ID |

ID: Insufficient data
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Adult Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2012-2015, updated biennially. Released 2017.

## HEALTHY DIET

## Definition: The percentage of adults who report eating the recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables, meaning five or more servings of fruits and vegetables per day.

Data are from aggregated sampling across years. Fruits and vegetables contain vitamins, minerals and fiber that are all essential to a healthy diet. Benefits of a healthy diet include decreased risk of chronic diseases, hypertension, cancer, obesity and micronutrient deficiencies. Good nutrition is also associated with mental health benefits.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Morrow | 48.8\% |
| 2 | Grant | 30.9\% |
| 3 | Lake | 28.3\% |
| 4 | Lincoln | 27.9\% |
| 5 | Jackson | 25.0\% |
| 6 | Douglas | 24.8\% |
| 7 | Josephine | 24.5\% |
| 8 | Union | 24.4\% |
| 9 | Multnomah | 23.9\% |
| 10 | Baker | 22.6\% |
| 10 | Jefferson | 22.6\% |
| 12 | Polk | 21.8\% |
| 13 | Clackamas | 21.5\% |
| 13 | Yamhill | 21.5\% |
| 15 | Marion | 21.2\% |
|  | Oregon | 20.3\% |
| 16 | Washington | 20.0\% |
| 17 | Wallowa | 19.9\% |
| 18 | Benton | 19.8\% |
| 19 | Linn | 18.1\% |
| 20 | Tillamook | 17.7\% |
| 21 | Lane | 16.9\% |
| 22 | Clatsop | 16.7\% |
| 23 | Coos | 14.6\% |
| 24 | Hood River | 14.5\% |
| 25 | Columbia | 14.2\% |
| 26 | Malheur | 12.4\% |
| 27 | Klamath | 12.3\% |
| 28 | Umatilla | 12.1\% |
| 29 | Deschutes | 11.7\% |
| 30 | Crook | 7.7\% |
| 31 | Curry | 5.9\% |
|  | Gilliam | ID |
|  | Harney | ID |
|  | Sherman | ID |
|  | Wasco | ID |
|  | Wheeler | ID |

ID: Insufficient data
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Adult Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2012-2015, updated biennially. Released 2017.

## VACCINATION RATE, TWO-YEAR-OLDS

Definition: The percentage of two-year-olds in a given year who have received their required immunizations - rates of 95\% or greater are suppressed to $95 \%$ to prevent identification of individuals.

In Oregon, children entering preschool, child care or Head Start currently must receive: four doses Diphtheria/Tetanus/Pertussis (DTaP); three Polio; one Varicella (chickenpox); one Measles/Mumps/ Rubella (MMR); three Hepatitis B; two Hepatitis A; and three or four Hib (Haemophilus). Vaccines have prevented countless cases of disease and saved millions of lives. The economic impact of prevented disease due to vaccines and the foregone cost of treatment is significant when compared to vaccination costs.

| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Hood River | 78\% |
| 2 | Malheur | 76\% |
| 2 | Yamhill | 76\% |
| 4 | Crook | 74\% |
| 4 | Morrow | 74\% |
| 6 | Douglas | 73\% |
| 6 | Jefferson | 73\% |
| 6 | Lake | 73\% |
| 6 | Marion | 73\% |
| 6 | Washington | 73\% |
| 11 | Klamath | 72\% |
| 12 | Baker | 71\% |
| 12 | Benton | 71\% |
| 12 | Clackamas | 71\% |
| 12 | Harney | 71\% |
|  | Oregon | 70\% |
| 16 | Coos | 70\% |
| 16 | Lane | 70\% |
| 16 | Tillamook | 70\% |
| 19 | Deschutes | 69\% |
| 19 | Jackson | 69\% |
| 19 | Lincoln | 69\% |
| 19 | Multnomah | 69\% |
| 19 | Polk | 69\% |
| 24 | Linn | 68\% |
| 24 | Umatilla | 68\% |
| 24 | Wallowa | 68\% |
| 27 | Union | 67\% |
| 28 | Clatsop | 65\% |
| 28 | Josephine | 65\% |
| 30 | Columbia | 63\% |
| 31 | Grant | 61\% |
| 32 | Curry | 51\% |
|  | Gilliam | ID |
|  | Sherman | ID |
|  | Wasco | ID |
|  | Wheeler | ID |

ID: Insufficient data
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Oregon Child Immunization Rates, 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## LOW WEIGHT BIRTHS

## Definition: The percentage of live babies who weigh less than 2,500 grams (5.5 lbs) at birth.

Low weight births indicate risk factors for both child and maternal health. For the child, low birth weight is a predictor of premature morbidity and death, risk for developmental problems, and respiratory and cardiovascular disease later in life. For the mother, low birth weight indicates a number of concerns including adverse health behavior, limited access to care, socioeconomic and environmental risks.

| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Wheeler | 17.6\% |
| 2 | Sherman | 11.8\% |
| 3 | Crook | 9.2\% |
| 4 | Lake | 8.6\% |
| 5 | Klamath | 8.3\% |
| 6 | Baker | 8.1\% |
| 7 | Malheur | 7.5\% |
| 7 | Yamhill | 7.5\% |
| 9 | Wasco | 7.2\% |
| 10 | Jefferson | 7.1\% |
| 11 | Washington | 6.9\% |
| 11 | Coos | 6.9\% |
| 13 | Multnomah | 6.8\% |
|  | Rural | 6.7\% |
| 14 | Hood River | 6.7\% |
| 14 | Umatilla | 6.7\% |
| 14 | Lane | 6.7\% |
| 17 | Curry | 6.6\% |
| 17 | Jackson | 6.6\% |
|  | Oregon | 6.5\% |
|  | Urban | 6.5\% |
| 19 | Linn | 6.5\% |
| 20 | Lincoln | 6.4\% |
| 20 | Polk | 6.4\% |
| 22 | Deschutes | 6.3\% |
| 22 | Tillamook | 6.3\% |
| 22 | Columbia | 6.3\% |
| 25 | Marion | 6.2\% |
| 26 | Josephine | 6.0\% |
| 27 | Gilliam | 5.9\% |
| 28 | Clackamas | 5.7\% |
| 29 | Clatsop | 5.6\% |
| 30 | Douglas | 5.5\% |
| 31 | Grant | 5.4\% |
| 32 | Benton | 5.2\% |
| 33 | Wallowa | 5.1\% |
| 34 | Morrow | 4.9\% |
| 35 | Union | 4.5\% |
| 36 | Harney | 2.2\% |

Source: Oregon Health Authority, Center for Health Statistics, 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

## BROADBAND ACCESS

## Definition: The percentage of households served by broadband internet ( 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload).

The internet has changed the way people access information, shop, work and view entertainment. Today, access to high volume data transfer rates has become a key requirement for economic and community development. Access to broadband is determined by the advanced telecommunications capability benchmark as defined by the FCC. The existing benchmark speed is 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload. To calculate the percentage of households served by broadband, census blocks were analyzed to see if they met the FCC's advanced broadband benchmark. Households in census blocks that met the FCC's advanced broadband criteria households were aggregated and then divided by the total number of households in a county to calculate the percentage of households served by broadband internet. It is important to recognize that while broadband may be available for a household to purchase, the cost may prohibit having an actual broadband subscription. This measure shows only the percentage of households that could have broadband access.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Multnomah | 98.2\% |
| 2 | Benton | 98.0\% |
| 3 | Marion | 97.7\% |
| 4 | Deschutes | 97.1\% |
| 5 | Linn | 96.7\% |
|  | Urban | 96.5\% |
| 6 | Crook | 96.5\% |
| 7 | Washington | 95.9\% |
| 8 | Polk | 95.2\% |
| 9 | Wallowa | 94.8\% |
| 10 | Curry | 93.9\% |
| 10 | Tillamook | 93.9\% |
| 12 | Clackamas | 91.4\% |
|  | Oregon | 91.1\% |
| 13 | Douglas | 89.6\% |
| 14 | Jackson | 88.8\% |
| 15 | Coos | 87.9\% |
| 16 | Jefferson | 87.6\% |
| 17 | Lincoln | 86.8\% |
| 18 | Lane | 85.7\% |
|  | Rural | 85.3\% |
| 19 | Umatilla | 84.6\% |
| 20 | Clatsop | 84.1\% |
| 21 | Klamath | 83.0\% |
| 22 | Yamhill | 81.0\% |
| 23 | Wasco | 78.4\% |
| 24 | Josephine | 76.6\% |
| 25 | Hood River | 74.1\% |
| 26 | Grant | 71.4\% |
| 27 | Union | 69.4\% |
| 28 | Columbia | 69.3\% |
| 29 | Malheur | 67.5\% |
| 30 | Lake | 62.1\% |
| 31 | Gilliam | 57.1\% |
| 32 | Morrow | 54.7\% |
| 33 | Baker | 6.5\% |
| 34 | Sherman | 1.0\% |
| 35 | Harney | 0.0\% |
| 35 | Wheeler | 0.0\% |

Source: FCC Fixed Broadband Deployment Data, FCC Staff Block Estimates, 2015,
updated annually. 2016 data delayed until 2018.

## TRANSIT SERVICE

Definition: The percentage of residents served by public transit service, measured as the unduplicated population within a .25-mile radius of a given stop operated by a transit agency.

Public transit is an essential service for those who do not or cannot drive. It allows individuals without a private means of transportation to remain connected in their communities, reach jobs, access medical care and meet other basic needs. Public transit is particularly important in rural communities where travel distances to services are greater, thereby making alternatives, such as bicycles, generally impractical for most residents.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Multnomah | 85.4\% |
| 2 | Benton | 64.5\% |
| 3 | Lane | 57.0\% |
| 4 | Marion | 56.3\% |
| 5 | Washington | 55.6\% |
| 6 | Klamath | 54.4\% |
|  | Oregon | 49.8\% |
| 7 | Yamhill | 47.7\% |
| 8 | Clackamas | 45.3\% |
| 9 | Lincoln | 42.1\% |
| 10 | Union | 39.6\% |
| 11 | Clatsop | 39.2\% |
| 12 | Umatilla | 36.0\% |
| 13 | Wallowa | 35.3\% |
| 14 | Coos | 32.4\% |
| 15 | Linn | 31.9\% |
| 16 | Tillamook | 31.1\% |
| 17 | Douglas | 31.0\% |
| 18 | Josephine | 30.2\% |
| 19 | Columbia | 28.2\% |
| 20 | Malheur | 25.9\% |
| 21 | Deschutes | 24.9\% |
| 22 | Jefferson | 24.4\% |
| 23 | Baker | 23.0\% |
| 24 | Polk | 20.9\% |
| 25 | Grant | 19.9\% |
| 26 | Harney | 12.0\% |
| 27 | Hood River | 9.5\% |
| 28 | Curry | 9.2\% |
| 29 | Wheeler | 6.8\% |
| 30 | Crook | 5.9\% |
| 31 | Morrow | 5.1\% |
| 32 | Wasco | 2.3\% |
| 33 | Jackson | 1.9\% |
| 34 | Gilliam | 0.0\% |
| 34 | Lake | 0.0\% |
| 34 | Sherman | 0.0\% |

Source: Oregon State University, Oregon Department of Transportation, Transit Network Analysis Tool, 2017, collected annually. Released 2017.

## VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

Definition: The sum of distances traveled by all motor vehicles in a specified system of highways for a given period of time. Each road section is calculated by multiplying the average daily traffic by the length of the road section and the length of the time period. The Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for those sections are summed to calculate the VMT for a road or road system. Values are presented in millions.

Historically, vehicle miles traveled has been closely related to economic productivity. As the income and population increase, there is a corresponding increase in trips to access goods and services, and an increase in commercial traffic. Furthermore, VMT may be a consideration in planning and maintenance of road infrastructure, as well as treating vehicle-related pollution.


| Rank | County | Miles |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | Oregon | $\mathbf{2 1 , 3 6 9}$ |
|  | Urban | $\mathbf{1 5 , 0 1 4}$ |
|  | Rural | $\mathbf{6 , 3 5 6}$ |
| 1 | Multnomah | 3,096 |
| 2 | Clackamas | 1,892 |
| 3 | Washington | 1,821 |
| 4 | Marion | 1,807 |
| 5 | Lane | 1,613 |
| 6 | Linn | 1,160 |
| 7 | Douglas | 1,127 |
| 8 | Jackson | 1,005 |
| 9 | Deschutes | 721 |
| 10 | Umatilla | 685 |
| 11 | Josephine | 507 |
| 12 | Klamath | 477 |
| 13 | Yamhill | 446 |
| 14 | Polk | 441 |
| 15 | Clatsop | 375 |
| 16 | Wasco | 370 |
| 17 | Lincoln | 363 |
| 18 | Hood River | 324 |
| 19 | Malheur | 309 |
| 20 | Coos | 298 |
| 21 | Baker | 296 |
| 22 | Union | 262 |
| 23 | Benton | 253 |
| 24 | Columbia | 250 |
| 25 | Tillamook | 243 |
| 26 | Jefferson | 211 |
| 27 | Morrow | 199 |
| 28 | Gilliam | 173 |
| 29 | Curry | 130 |
| 30 | Sherman | 128 |
| 31 | Crook | 112 |
| 32 | Harney | 85 |
| 33 | Lake | 69 |
| 34 | Grant | 59 |
| 35 | Wallowa | 43 |
| 36 | Wheeler | 21 |
|  |  |  |

[^2]
## DEVELOPED OR CULTIVATED LAND

Definition: The percentage of total land cover classified as developed or cultivated (includes pasture) according to the National Land Cover Database.

This measure tracks the conversion and designation of land for human purposes. This shift changes the provision of ecosystem services such as climate regulation, natural hazard regulation, water purification and waste management, pollination or pest control. It also can indicate economic growth in a county.

| Rank | County |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Percent |
| 2 | Washington |
| 3 | Multnomah |
| 4 | $43.9 \%$ |
| 5 | Pamhill |
| 6 | Pherman |
| 7 | $41.3 \%$ |
| 8 | Unatilla |
| 9 | Morrow |
| 10 | Linn |
| 11 | Gilliam |
| 12 | Clackamas |
| 13 | Union |
| 14 | Columbia |
|  | Oregon |
| 15 | Jackson |
| 15 | Lane |
| 17 | $29.5 \%$ |
| 18 | Hood River |

Source: US Geological Survey, Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium, National Land Cover Database, 2011, updated every 5 years. 2016 data releases December 2018.

## MOBILE HOMES

Definition: The percentage of housing units reported as mobile homes.

Mobile homes are an often maligned but important source of affordable housing. They represent the largest segment of non-subsidized affordable housing in the United States. These homes, whether single or double wide, provide low-cost housing for millions of Americans, who most often own their mobile home and lease the land it sits on. While mobile homes do present a range of challenges, they also provide housing opportunities for individuals and families experiencing economic hardship, and they have the potential to develop microcommunities when mobile housing is clustered in parks.


| Rank | County | Percent |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Morrow | $29.3 \%$ |
| 2 | Harney | $26.7 \%$ |
| 3 | Lake | $25.9 \%$ |
| 4 | Sherman | $24.1 \%$ |
| 5 | Jefferson | $23.6 \%$ |
| 6 | Grant | $19.9 \%$ |
| 7 | Wheeler | $19.5 \%$ |
| 8 | Curry | $19.4 \%$ |
| 9 | Douglas | $19.2 \%$ |
| 10 | Malheur | $17.3 \%$ |
| 11 | Klamath | $17.2 \%$ |
| 12 | Wallowa | $16.9 \%$ |
| 13 | Josephine | $16.5 \%$ |
| 14 | Coos | $15.5 \%$ |
| 15 | Crook | $15.2 \%$ |
| 15 | Wasco | $15.2 \%$ |
| 17 | Columbia | $15.1 \%$ |
| 18 | Umatilla | $14.9 \%$ |
| 19 | Union | $14.7 \%$ |
| 20 | Gilliam | $13.9 \%$ |
| 21 | Jackson | $13.8 \%$ |
| 22 | Baker | $13.7 \%$ |
| 23 | Lincoln | $13.5 \%$ |
| 24 | Linn | $11.8 \%$ |
| 25 | Hood River | $11.2 \%$ |
| 26 | Tillamook | $11.1 \%$ |
| 27 | Yamhill | $10.5 \%$ |
| 28 | Lane | $9.0 \%$ |
| 29 | Marion | $8.9 \%$ |
| 34 | Clatsop | $\mathbf{~}$ |

[^3]

## Like this report? Want to learn more?

Check out Oregon's
Rural Communities Explorer and try the Communities Reporter Tool. http://oe.oregonexplorer.info/rural/ CommunitiesReporter/


[^0]:    ID: Insufficient data
    Source: US Census Bureau, Decennial Census (for trend), American Community Survey, Table S1701, 2012-2016, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2017.

[^1]:    * Satellite campuses located in these counties

[^2]:    Source: Oregon Department of
    Transportation, 2016, updated annually. Released 2017.

[^3]:    Source: US Census Bureau, American
    Community Survey, Table DP04,
    2012-2016, 5-year estimates
    updated annually. Released 2017.

