

Oregon
by the

# Numbers 

## Key measures for

Oregon and its counties


## Acknowledgments

The production team wishes to acknowledge the rural partners, statewide organizations, local communities and sovereign governments whose wisdom and expertise have contributed to the quality of this publication.

We recognize the inherent shortcomings in data collected through our government systems, especially data about communities of color and geographically isolated places. In particular, we acknowledge the extent to which such data can contribute to highlighting or erasing phenomena in ways that do not reflect people's lived experiences. We strive to make available data that all Oregonians can utilize so that all corners of our state and all of its communities feel represented here.

## Production Team

Shannon Caplan, Assistant Professor of Practice, Oregon State University Extension Service<br>David Keyes, Data Visualization Specialist<br>Elissa Schloesser, Information Designer

Kasi Allen, Director of Learning and Knowledge Management, The Ford Family Foundation
Mandy Elder, Communications Specialist, The Ford Family Foundation
Nora Harrison, Communications Consultant, The Ford Family Foundation

September 15, 2021

For more information about this project:
The Ford Family Foundation
(541) 957-5574

OBTN@tfff.org
@FordFamilyFound
\#OregonByTheNumbers

Photo credits:
Lauren Reber Photography - www.laurenreberphoto.com

## Oregon <br> by the <br> Numbers <br> Key measures for <br> Oregon and its counties <br> 2021 Edition

Welcome to the 2021 edition of Oregon by the Numbers. Our annual indicator report was once again produced in historic times, as communities across Oregon addressed the effects of a global pandemic, social unrest in our nation, and historic wildfires at home. Because reports like Oregon by the Numbers rely on large datasets and population-level measures, we always experience a time lag between when the data are collected and when they are reported - creating a sense of looking back a few years. Therefore, the 2021 edition of Oregon by the Numbers does not tell us the story of what happened to Oregonians during the unprecedented challenges of 2020-2021. Those trends will not be revealed in the data for at least another year.

The Ford Family Foundation commits to evolving this publication over time to help inform the needs of Oregon's diverse communities. As Oregonians face new problems to solve, decision makers across our state find themselves needing not only high-quality data, but new kinds of data. As an example, we now include child care availability in Oregon by the Numbers. We hope this annual publication helps inform those decisions.

We provide a printed version of the report in even years (2018, 2020 and so on) and refresh the data online in odd years. For the most part, the 2021 edition of Oregon by the Numbers simply updates the data made available in the 2020 edition, using the same format and measures. The digital PDF download of the current report can be found on our website (www.tfff.org), along with an archive of prior reports. Users who would like a hard copy can order one at amazon.com.

While much of the future remains uncertain, these last two years have taught us powerful lessons about the resilience and resourcefulness of Oregonians across our state. As always, we hope Oregon by the Numbers helps you learn something about the place where you live as well as other parts of the state. One of our goals is to help all of Oregon see all of Oregon.

We are eager to learn about how Oregonians use this report and how we can improve it. Please send an email to obtn@tfff.org or connect with us via social media @FordFamilyFound.

Sincerely,

Anne C. Kubisch<br>President<br>The Ford Family Foundation<br>Roseburg, Oregon

## This report

This is the 4th edition of Oregon by the Numbers. The original concept for this annual indicator report stemmed from a single question:

## What essential measures should all Oregon decision makers be able to easily access for their community?

Over the years, experts in a variety of fields have provided insights into this question, yielding a rich collection of indicators. All fall into one of the six topic areas that make up the Oregon by the Numbers report.

Demographics and Land: Measures describing the people and places of each county

Community: Measures of social well-being
Education: Measures of academic achievement available at the county level

Economy: Measures pertaining to enterprise, income and the exchange of goods and services

Health: Measures of individual wellness, aggregated by county

Infrastructure: Measures of resources supporting individual self-reliance and family livelihoods

The data assembled here build on The Ford Family Foundation's long-term investment in the Rural Communities Explorer (RCE) (http://oe.oregonexplorer.info/rural/ CommunitiesReporter/) at Oregon State University. The RCE is a free web-based data resource that brings together numerous population-level measures in one place, with the goal of making community data readily available to residents across the state. The project has continued to evolve for more than 15 years with input from the
nonprofit sector, higher education, philanthropy and rural comunities themselves.

Oregon by the Numbers contains a suite of community measures across a range of topics and issues, relying extensively on secondary data from a variety of sources stored on the Communities Reporter Tool database from the RCE. Comprised of county profiles for all 36 counties as well as corresponding summaries for each measure, with rankings whenever possible, the Oregon by the Numbers report targets a broad audience. County profiles are designed to display data at-a-glance, readily accessible to youth and adults alike, enabling all readers to learn something new about the place where they live. Measure summaries provide more specificity for those interested in the "why" and "how." Maps on the measure summaries show counties colored based on their ranks (top: ranks 1-12, middle: ranks 13-24 and bottom: ranks 25-36). Whenever possible, county-level values are compared with Oregon, rural Oregon and urban Oregon.

While each measure in Oregon by the Numbers was selected with practical use in mind, the report is not a diagnostic tool. Instead, Oregon by the Numbers serves as a snapshot of the state and its counties at a particular moment in time. Because most measures here stem from government-funded data collection efforts, the numbers can often reflect historic bias and stereotypes. For example, we select measures for which data is available in all of Oregon's 36 counties, regardless of their size, so that no county feels erased, marginalized or missing. We encourage users to be critical consumers of the data and hope readers will inform the production team about any issues or concerns they encounter.

## Data Highlights

Oregonians have lived through experiences in the last two years that will surely shape the future of our state for decades to come: economically, educationally, socially, geographically. We are recovering and healing. We are resilient. We also know that new challenges appear on the horizon before we have fully recovered from the previous ones - case in point, wildfires. Below is a map of the fires that ravaged Oregon last summer. It was unlike anything Oregonians had seen in living memory. However, only a few days into Summer 2021, a new series of wildfires erupted with the Bootleg Fire becoming the largest in the nation and growing
large enough to create its own weather systems. Firefighters are warning that we have entered a new era, one in which the old playbooks no longer apply.

Meanwhile, across the state, numerous groups have conducted targeted research and created new data tools that might help us see each other's circumstances more clearly and perhaps find more common cause. In this section, we highlight a few Oregon-based data projects for readers - to build awareness and to celebrate some of the excellent work taking place across our state.

## Summer 2020 Oregon Wildfires



## The Oregon Specific Poverty Measure (ORPM)

The Official Poverty Measure (OPM) in the United States was proposed in 1963 by the Social Security Administration - defined then as three times the "subsistence food budget," using 1961 research from the USDA based on 1955 data from the Household Consumption Survey. It's true. While the measure has been updated annually by the Consumer Price Index, so much has changed in American lives since then and little about this key measure of well-being has changed in 60 years. Thankfully, a team from Oregon State University has been working to develop an Oregon-specific Poverty

Measure (ORPM) using a combination of national survey data and state administrative data. Their research provides a window into the effectiveness of social assistance programs for specific demographic groups. The data also suggests new opportunities for reducing poverty across the state of Oregon.

During the pandemic, this team developed projections about the likely impacts of federal stimulus payments on child poverty. Below is a visualization of their results, illustrating how the policy of issuing federal stimulus
payments reduced poverty for Oregon's children in 2020.

The lines show projected child poverty in Oregon as measured by the Oregonspecific Poverty Measure, with the orange showing the rate with pandemic-related government stimulus payments given to parents and the gray without those payments. The big takeaway here is that the safety net can indeed be effective, especially in the wake of unexpected events like the COVID-19 pandemic. Social policy can have a significant impact on the lives of children and their families.


## COVID-19 Farmworker Study

http://covid19farmworkerstudy.org/

In another innovative Oregonbased research project, scholars and policy advocates from Portland State University, Oregon State University, University of Oregon and a coalition of numerous community-based organizations collaborated to conduct Oregon's COVID-19 Farmworker Study.

Using a phone-based, rapid response and engaged survey methodology with 300 participating farmworkers, this study is the first of its kind for Oregon. The results strongly substantiate COVID-19's negative impact on the state's estimated 174,000 farmworkers and their families. Low estimates suggest that Oregon farmworkers suffered infection rates nearly double their population representation, in working conditions complicated by wildfire, while they strived to produce food so that everyone could eat. Still, many lacked access to COVID-19 testing.

Farmworkers faced significant barriers to accessing medical attention, including cost of care, loss of wages, and fear of losing their job. The survey also showed how the pandemic
differentially affected subgroups, such as Oregon's Indigenous farmworkers from Mexico and Guatemala, who speak at least 26 languages, and female farmworkers, who reported losing more wages than men as they worked to balance their children's care with making ends meet. A series of indepth interviews followed the survey, designed to highlight the powerful human stories connected to the results.

One of the highlights of the farmworker study is the utilization of an embedded data collection model that ensures those most impacted
by the research will have access to the results. The work also points to a number of possible interventions for the future, including but not limited to: providing access to culturally informed mental health supports, improving access to child care, investing in digital literacy programs, enhancing safety net supports, strengthening Oregon occupational safety enforcement, and so on. This research is also coordinated with parallel efforts in California and Washington. The figure below shows the number of respondents in Oregon by region.

## Reported Childcare Sites by Gender

In the last two weeks, where do you leave your children under the age of 12 in your care when you are working?


## Oregon's Shared Fate

The Ford Family Foundation is a "rural" funder, headquartered in Roseburg, Oregon. What do we mean by "rural"? There is no single definition. In fact, even our federal agencies define "rural" in more than a dozen different ways. The Ford Family Foundation has its own definition, grounded in its explicit commitment to serving rural Oregon and Siskiyou County, California. We combine multiple factors: size, proximity to a metropolitan area and the nature of the community to discern whether or not we consider a community "rural."

While we find county-level "rural" or "urban" designations problematic, we view 26 of Oregon's 36 counties as exclusively "rural" for grantmaking purposes. The other 10 counties either comprise the Portland metropolitan area or contain an urban center with more than 50,000 people. ${ }^{1}$

Because we have no standard or agreed-upon "rural" definition in the United States, making comparisons across communities for research and policy purposes can prove difficult. Generally, Oregon by the Numbers uses the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of rural: any area or population 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.

In our experience, this practice tends to underestimate what most Oregonians would perceive of as "rural" in the 21st century. For

[^0]example, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's definition, a county like the Foundation's home county (Douglas County) has a population that is only $41 \%$ rural, even though we view it as $100 \%$ "rural." An additional challenge we face in Oregon is the concentration of the state's population in a small number of counties, whereas most of the land is very sparsely populated.

Areas that are both sparsely populated and at great distance from more densely populated ones have unique social circumstances, especially the effort needed to access basic goods and services. The USDA has developed a special coding system to delineate areas into four different levels based on the travel time by car to population centers of various sizes. They are called "frontier and remote" or "FAR" codes. FAR Level 1 is at least one hour away from an urban center of 50,000 or more people, meaning residents must travel long distances to access complex medical procedures or purchase more expensive goods, such as appliances. FAR Level 4 is similarly remote, but with travel time to communities as small as 2,500 . Over $40 \%$ of Oregon is designated FAR Level 4, meaning access to basic needs, such as groceries and gasoline, can be challenging.

While the FAR coding system helps policy makers get a better sense of the living conditions in geographically remote areas, the language can prove problematic, especially the word, "frontier." For many people, this word has become synonymous with freedom and wide open spaces. However, for many others, this same word signifies forced removal and genocide. Both are true. We continue to learn how complicated the truth can be.

Not long ago, Oregon's population was roughly distributed between rural and urban with one rural resident for every one urban resident. However, as Oregon's population has grown in recent years, that growth has largely taken place in urban areas, leading to increasing urbanization and growing disparities between the state's rural and urban communities - a trend we see nationwide.

While the exact ratio varies according to the definition of rural you use, Oregon's rural/urban split now stands at one rural resident for every two urban residents. Regardless of whether you live in a rural or urban community, we are all Oregonians. As residents of the same state, we have one shared fate. We hope Oregon by the Numbers will help all of Oregon see all of Oregon.

## Oregon's Population Density by Census Tract



Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B01003, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

## Ten things to do with Oregon by the Numbers

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

1. Look at the map of the 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 that place. What is something your county could improve on?
3. Oregon becomes a more diverse state every year. Which county can boast having the largest percentage of people of color?
4. Find the Population Pyramid summary on page 106. What patterns do you see related to the age of Oregon's rural and urban populations?
5. Life expectancy in Oregon varies across the state. See page 107. In which county are Oregonians expected to live the longest?
6. 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 98.
7. Which industries employ the most Oregonians in each county? Take a guess and then review the data on pages 110-112.
8. In what counties does it look like students are succeeding in school? How are those counties doing on other measures related to kids like foster care?
9. Not all Oregon counties have broadband access. Explore the data related to this challenge on page 136.
10. Turn to Notable Features on pages 104-105. 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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## BAKER COUNTY

Total population

## 16,019

Rural population
41\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
67

## FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

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

## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



| COMMUNITY | BAKER | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14.7\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 16.2\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 15.1 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 25.0 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 80.7\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 10.8 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 47.1\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 73.2\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 81.4\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 23.7\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4.5\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 49.7\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 4.1 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,260 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs ( 1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$529 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6.9\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 75.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 56.0\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 51.1\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 39.6\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 73.1\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 8.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 25.4\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 14.8\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 18,508 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^1]
## BENTON COUNTY



## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land
26\%

## Developed/cultivated land

679 mi $^{2}$


Corvallis Watershed Wild Animal Refuge

Corvallis


## HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 17\%

 22\%39\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.5\%
Asian: 7.1\%
Black/African American: 1.0\%
Hispanic/Latino: 7.4\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Some other race: $0.2 \%$
Two or more races: 3.4\%
White: 80.2\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Educational services


Food services and drinking places


Professional and technical services


|  | BENTON | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMMUNITY | $\mathbf{1 0 . 8 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Food insecurity | $\mathbf{1 3 . 9 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| Child poverty* | $\mathbf{3 . 8}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{2 6 . 0}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{8 8 . 9 \%}$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Voter participation |  |  |  |  |

## EDUCATION

Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds)
3rd grade reading
9th grade on track
5-year high school graduation rate
4-year college degree or greater

| $\mathbf{1 0 . 4}$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5 3 . 7 \%}$ | $46.5 \%$ | $42.2 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{9 1 . 4 \%}$ | $85.3 \%$ | $82.7 \%$ | $86.5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{8 8 . 0 \%}$ | $81.6 \%$ | $77.9 \%$ | $83.2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 4 . 1 \%}$ | $33.7 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{3 . 0 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{5 9 . 6 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 5 8 1}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 6}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |



HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{5 . 4 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 2 . 0 \%}$ | $76.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{6 1 . 5 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 7 . 4 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{1 1 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |  |



INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 9 . 9 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{6 5 . 5 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{6 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}$ | $6.1 \%$ |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{2 , 7 7 7}$ | 5,160 | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 0 3}$ |

[^2]
## CLACKAMAS COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land
54\%

Developed/cultivated land
21\% Portland Mt Hood National Forest Timberline Lodge Trillium Lake ${ }^{\bullet}$

HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP
$\square$
43\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Asian: 4.2\%
Black/African American: 0.9\%
Hispanic/Latino: 8.7\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: 3.3\%
White: 81.9\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES



| COMMUNITY | CLACKAMAS | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | $\mathbf{9 . 1 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Child poverty* | $\mathbf{9 . 2 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | $\mathbf{7 . 2}$ |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{1 7 . 9}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | $\mathbf{8 4 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 . 0} \%$ |  |  |



EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | $\mathbf{9 . 3}$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd grade reading | $\mathbf{5 4 . 5 \%}$ | 4.7 |  |  |
| 9th grade on track | $\mathbf{8 8 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}$ |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | $\mathbf{8 6 . 9 \%}$ | $85.3 \%$ | $82.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 6 . 5 \%}$ |
| 4-year college degree or greater | $\mathbf{3 7 . 4 \%}$ | $81.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}$ |

ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{3 . 3 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{6 4 . 6 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{9 . 0}$ | 6.5 | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 2 9}$ |  | $\$ 1,613$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 3 4}$ |  | $\$ 1,668$ |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{6 . 8 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 7 . 0 \%}$ | $76.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{6 1 . 4 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 8 . 8 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{2 4 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | 98.2\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 14.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 45.1\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 5.7\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 4,407 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^3]
## CLATSOP COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE




|  | CLATSOP | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Child poverty* | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{9 . 8}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{3 3 . 6}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | $\mathbf{8 1 . 3} \%$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |

## EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | $\mathbf{8 . 3}$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 3rd grade reading | $\mathbf{4 1 . 1 \%}$ | 4.7 |  |  |
| 9th grade on track | $\mathbf{8 6 . 7 \%}$ | $85 \%$ | $42.2 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}$ |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | $\mathbf{7 9 . 3} \%$ | $81.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}$ |
| 4-year college degree or greater | $\mathbf{2 4 . 4 \%}$ | $33.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}$ |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 7 \%}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{5 7 . 8 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{4 . 0}$ | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 7 0 0}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{8 . 3 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{6 8 . 0 \%}$ | $76.0 \%$ |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{6 8 . 6 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 9 . 7 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{3 1 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 7 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{9 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{3 4 . 5 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{6 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | 16.0 |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{9 , 5 2 2}$ | 5,160 | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ |

[^4]
## COLUMBIA COUNTY

Total population
51,375
Rural population
44\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
57

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE




COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty* Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) Voter participation

## EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | $\mathbf{7 . 3}$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 3rd grade reading | $\mathbf{4 0 . 9 \%}$ | 4.7 |  |  |
| 9th grade on track | $\mathbf{8 0 . 3 \%}$ | $86.5 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}$ |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2 \%}$ | $85.3 \%$ | $82.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 6 . 5 \%}$ |
| 4-year college degree or greater | $\mathbf{1 8 . 5 \%}$ | $33.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}$ |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{4 . 4 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{5 7 . 9} \%$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | 6.5 | 2.3 | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ |  | $\$ 1,613$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 3 4}$ |  |  |  |

## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{6 . 4 \%}$ |  | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 2 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}$ |  |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{5 8 . 9 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 6 . 9 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{2 9 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 4 . 4 \%}$ | $97.6 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{3 1 . 7 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{1 3 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 1 \%}$ |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{5 , 2 9 7}$ | 5,160 | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 0 3}$ |

[^5]
## COOS COUNTY

Total population
63,686
Rural population
38\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)

## 45

## FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES



## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



| COMMUNITY | COOS | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 15.6\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 23.9\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 19.0 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 32.8 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 79.3\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 5.9 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 42.5\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 74.9\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 64.6\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 17.8\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4.8\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 50.8\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 6.0 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,081 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs ( 1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$684 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5.9\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 75.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 54.3\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 58.5\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 36.8\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 91.9\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 11.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 33.7\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 16.0\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 4,998 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^6]
## CROOK COUNTY

Total population
23,011
Rural population
48\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
128

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE




COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty* Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) Voter participation

## EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 7.3 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd grade reading | 47.6\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 87.3\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 78.4\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4-year college degree or greater | 19.8\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{5 . 1 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{5 1 . 6 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ | 6.5 | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 9 5}$ |  | $\$ 1,613$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 5 7 9}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{8 . 4 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 7 . 0 \%}$ | $76.0 \%$ |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{7 3 . 1 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{6 5 . 5 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{3 4 . 5 \%}$ | $25.5 \%$ |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 7 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{5 . 3 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{1 3 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | $16.0 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{5 , 0 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 0 3}$ |

[^7]
## CURRY COUNTY

Total population
22,650
Rural population
39\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
107

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


POPULATION BY AGE



|  | CURRY | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMMUNITY | $\mathbf{1 4 . 6 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Food insecurity | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| Child poverty* | $\mathbf{1 6 . 4}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{6 . 9}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{8 1 . 0} \%$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Voter participation |  |  |  |  |

## EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 5.5 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd grade reading | 41.2\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 91.7\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 78.2\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4-year college degree or greater | 24.6\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{5 . 1 \%}$ | $3.7 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{4 2 . 0} \%$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{7 . 3}$ | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 7 0}$ | $\$ 1,613$ | $\$ 1,330$ | $\$ 1,668$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 7 7 7}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{4 . 9 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{5 8 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{5 3 . 5 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 6 . 4 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{2 9 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 5 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{9 . 2 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{1 8 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}$ | $6.1 \%$ |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{5 , 5 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ | 4,303 |

[^8]Total population
186,251
Rural population
28\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
182

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE




COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty*
Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)
Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation

| DESCHUTES | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 0 . 5 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 2 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 . 5}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| $\mathbf{8 5 . 3 \%}$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |

EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 9.0 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd grade reading | 61.0\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 88.8\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 84.3\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4-year college degree or greater | 35.4\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{3 . 9 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{6 3 . 1 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{- 2 . 0}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 1 8}$ | 6.5 | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 4}$ |  |  | $\$ 1,613$ |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{6 . 9 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 5 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}$ |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{6 4 . 1 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 9 . 9 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{2 4 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 8 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{2 3 . 6 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{6 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | 16.0 |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{3 , 9 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ |

[^9]
## DOUGLAS COUNTY

Total population
109,114
Rural population
41\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
72

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

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

## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE




COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty*
Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)
Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation

| DOUGLAS | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 7 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 2 . 1 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 . 5}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 8 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 7}$ | 30.6 |
| $\mathbf{7 9 . 0 \%}$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |



EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 6.2 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd grade reading | 40.8\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 82.9\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 71.8\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4-year college degree or greater | 17.3\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{4 . 8 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{5 1 . 1 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ | 6.5 | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 9 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 7 7 3}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | 7.8\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 76.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 58.0\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 56.5\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 31.5\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 94.4\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 10.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 32.6\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 20.7\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 10,242 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^10]
## GILLIAM COUNTY

Total population
1,878

Rural population
100\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
70

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land
8\%

Developed/cultivated land
1,223 $\mathrm{mi}^{\mathbf{2}}$

 O Condon

## HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 13\%

```
31%
```

44\%
Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 3.9\%
Asian: 0.8\%
Black/African American: 0.0\%
Hispanic/Latino: 6.1\%
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.7\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
| Two or more races: 0.5\%

## TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES




| COMMUNITY | GILLIAM | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Child poverty* | $\mathbf{4 . 8 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) |  | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{3 2 . 7}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | $\mathbf{8 6 . 1 \%}$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |

## EDUCATION



| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 9.4 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 rd grade reading | 54.5\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 95.0\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 77.3\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4-year college degree or greater | 17.4\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |

## ECONOMY

|  | Unemployment rate | 3.6\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Labor force participation rate | 55.9\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
|  | Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 69.2 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
|  | Property tax (per person) | \$4,564 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
|  | Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$593 |  |  |  |
|  | HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
|  | Low weight births | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
|  | Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 75.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
|  | Good physical health | 68.7\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
|  | Good mental health | 59.8\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| (1) | Tobacco use | 39.3\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
|  | INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
|  | Broadband access | 63.2\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
|  | Child care (slots per 100 children) | 24.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
|  | Transit service | 0.0\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
|  | Mobile homes | 16.1\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
|  | Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 88,945 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^11]
## GRANT COUNTY

Total population
7,189
Rural population
100\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
18

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

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

## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



| COMMUNITY | GRANT | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 15.7\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 24.0\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 12.2 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 3.8 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 84.6\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 9.9 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3 rd grade reading | 57.1\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 89.1\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 92.6\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 18.9\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6.7\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 53.7\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 11.2 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,146 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$598 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 10.0\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 69.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 54.3\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 52.9\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 30.9\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 63.9\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 8.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 49.0\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 23.2\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 7,840 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^12]
## HARNEY COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land 75\%

Developed/cultivated land 4\%


HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP
$\square$
47\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 1.4\%
Asian: 0.0\%
Black/African American: 0.5\%
Hispanic/Latino: 5.1\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 6.0\%
White: 87.0\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


| COMMUNITY | HARNEY | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 15.1\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 10.0\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 22.4 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 14.1 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 82.9\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 12.0 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 51.3\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 94.7\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 86.8\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 18.4\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5.2\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 54.8\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 7.6 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,088 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs ( 1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$588 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6.8\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 77.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 69.8\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 54.8\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 31.1\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 73.8\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 2.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 9.3\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 23.5\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 12,622 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^13]
## HOOD RIVER COUNTY

Total population
23,209
Rural population
52\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)

## 95

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE



533 mi $^{2}$


Public land
73\%
Developed/cultivated land


HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP
 38\%

45\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Asian: 1.6\%
Black/African American: 0.6\%
Hispanic/Latino: 31.4\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.0\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 2.0\%
White: 63.7\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Crop production


Food services and drinking places


Professional and technical services


| HOOD RIVER | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 . 1 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{5 . 1 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6 . 3}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 . 1}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| $\mathbf{8 4 . 8 \%}$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |

## EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | $\mathbf{6 . 0}$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 3rd grade reading | $\mathbf{4 8 . 2 \%}$ | 4.7 |  |  |
| 9th grade on track | $\mathbf{8 6 . 4 \%}$ | $85 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}$ |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | $\mathbf{8 8 . 6 \%}$ | $81.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}$ |
| 4-year college degree or greater | $\mathbf{3 2 . 0 \%}$ | $33.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}$ |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{3 . 1 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{6 7 . 7 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{8 . 4}$ | 6.5 | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 2}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{6 . 8 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{8 2 . 0 \%}$ | $76.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{5 7 . 0 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 9 . 0 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{3 5 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 7 . 0 \%}$ | $97.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{2 1 . 6 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{1 3 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{1 3 , 7 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ |  |  |  |
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## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land
52\%

Developed/cultivated land
11\%


## HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 13\% 24\%

37\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 1.1\%
Asian: 1.3\%
Black/African American: 0.7\%
Hispanic/Latino: 12.8\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.3\%
Some other race: 0.2\%
Two or more races: 2.8\%
White: $80.8 \%$

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Ambulatory health care services


| COMMUNITY | JACKSON | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 13.1\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 21.1\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 11.8 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 37.2 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 80.3\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 5.7 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 42.0\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 86.1\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 82.7\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 27.8\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4.3\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 57.3\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 2.7 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,347 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$747 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7.1\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 71.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 60.6\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 55.4\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 27.2\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 96.8\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 12.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 45.6\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 12.4\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 4,595 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |
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## JEFFERSON COUNTY

Total population
23,607
Rural population
63\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
60

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

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

## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE




| JEFFERSON | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 2 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 3 . 5 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2 . 6}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 . 1}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| $\mathbf{7 5 . 0} \%$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |

## EDUCATION



| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | $\mathbf{4 . 7}$ of $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 3rd grade reading | $\mathbf{4 2 . 1 \%}$ | 4.7 |  |  |
| 9th grade on track | $\mathbf{7 9 . 3 \%}$ | $85 \%$ | $42.2 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | $\mathbf{8 2 . 6 \%}$ | $81.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}$ | $83.2 \%$ |
| 4-year college degree or greater | $\mathbf{1 9 . 4 \%}$ | $33.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}$ |

## ECONOMY

|  | Unemployment rate | 5.0\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Labor force participation rate | 52.9\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
|  | Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | -5.4 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
|  | Property tax (per person) | \$1,187 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
|  | Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$611 |  |  |  |
|  | HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
|  | Low weight births | 7.1\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
|  | Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 76.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
|  | Good physical health | 50.3\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
|  | Good mental health | 49.1\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| 国合 | Tobacco use | 23.0\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
|  | INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
|  | Broadband access | 98.9\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
|  | Child care (slots per 100 children) | 16.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
|  | Transit service | 21.4\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
|  | Mobile homes | 20.2\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
|  | Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 8,616 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^16]Total population
86,251
Rural population
45\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
87

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE




Food insecurity
Child poverty*
Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)
Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation

| JOSEPHINE | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 5 . 1 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 5 . 6 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 4 . 5}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 1 . 8}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| $\mathbf{7 6 . 3 \%}$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |

## EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 5.9 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 rd grade reading | 48.3\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 81.9\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 75.7\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 17.5\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{4 . 9 \%}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{4 9 . 0 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2}$ | 6.5 | $\mathbf{2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 8 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 7 2 2}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{5 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 2 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}$ |  |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{5 8 . 5 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 8 . 2 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{3 8 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{8 9 . 4 \%}$ | $97.6 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{3 0 . 1 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{1 6 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 1 \%}$ |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{5 , 9 3 4}$ | 5,160 | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 3 0 3}$ |
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## KLAMATH COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE



| COMMUNITY | KLAMATH | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 16.0\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 26.9\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 15.0 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 13.0 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 76.4\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 5.1 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 38.9\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 82.3\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 76.1\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 20.0\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 6.0\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 53.1\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | -4.1 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,020 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$567 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7.0\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 79.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 62.8\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 59.6\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 33.1\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 93.1\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 15.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 54.5\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 15.8\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 7,102 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |
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## LAKE COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE



54 Oregon by the Numbers

| COMMUNITY | LAKE | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14.9\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 22.8\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 14.2 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 11.9 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 81.9\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 8.3 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 40.8\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 81.7\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 90.5\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 16.4\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 5.3\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 51.6\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 5.1 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,575 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$574 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 8.6\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 70.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 59.5\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 69.4\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 19.8\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 50.7\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 5.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 0.0\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 19.9\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 8,861 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |
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## LANE COUNTY

Total population
373,340
Rural population
18\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
73

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

## BP CLUS COQ COW

GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land 58\%

## Developed/cultivated land

 10\%

## HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 17\%

 28\%45\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.9\%
Asian: 2.7\%
Black/African American: 1.0\%
Hispanic/Latino: 8.9\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Some other race: 0.2\%
Two or more races: 4.3\%
White: 81.8\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Educational services


Food services and drinking places


Ambulatory health care services

| COMMUNITY | LANE | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 13.8\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 19.9\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 13.7 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 27.2 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 82.3\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 8.2 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 45.5\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 85.1\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 76.9\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 30.5\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4.0\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 59.7\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 2.2 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,415 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$780 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 6.4\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 77.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 57.9\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 53.0\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 25.7\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 99.1\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 16.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 56.8\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 8.4\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 4,210 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |
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## LINCOLN COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land
29\%

Developed/ cultivated land
6\%


HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 15\%

 34\%49\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 2.5\%
Asian: 1.2\%
| Black/African American: 0.4\%
Hispanic/Latino: 9.2\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 4.0\%
White: $82.5 \%$

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES

Food services and drinking places

Accommodation

Educational services

| COMMUNITY | LINCOLN | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 14.7\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 24.9\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 18.0 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 22.1 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 81.0\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 7.5 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3rd grade reading | 35.5\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 9th grade on track | 78.2\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 85.1\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 24.9\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 4.3\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 49.0\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 0.4 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$2,361 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$697 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 7.5\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 73.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 57.1\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 58.7\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 34.9\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 98.2\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 10.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 39.8\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 12.8\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 8,000 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^21]
## LINN COUNTY

Total population
125,048
Rural population
32\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
64

## FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES



MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land 40\% Developed/cultivated land 2,309 $\mathbf{m i}^{2}$


27\%

O Albany
Middle Santiam Wilderness ${ }^{\circ}$

Mt Washington
Willamette National Forest ${ }^{\bullet}$

## HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 12\%

 29\%41\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.7\%
Asian: 1.0\%
|Black/African American: 0.5\%
Hispanic/Latino: 9.1\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: 3.5\%
White: 84.9\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Educational services


Food services and drinking places


Primary metal manufacturing


[^22]
## MALHEUR COUNTY



## POPULATION BY AGE



62 Oregon by the Numbers
TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Educational services


Food services and drinking places


Justice, public order and safety activities


| COMMUNITY | MALHEUR | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3 \%}$ | $11.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Child poverty* | $\mathbf{3 0 . 5 \%}$ | $16.6 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{2 5 . 4}$ | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{2 8 . 2}$ | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | $\mathbf{7 2 . 8} \%$ | $82.0 \%$ |  |  |



EDUCATION

| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 6.8 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3rd grade reading | 37.6\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9th grade on track | 88.5\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5-year high school graduation rate | 87.9\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4-year college degree or greater | 13.7\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |



ECONOMY

| Unemployment rate | $\mathbf{4 . 0 \%}$ |  | $3.7 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor force participation rate | $\mathbf{4 9 . 8 \%}$ | $62.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $65.6 \%$ |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | $\mathbf{\$ 8 8 1}$ | $\$ 1,613$ | $\$ 1,330$ | $\$ 1,668$ |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | $\mathbf{\$ 5 4 4}$ |  |  |  |



## HEALTH

| Low weight births | $\mathbf{9 . 0 \%}$ | $6.7 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | $\mathbf{7 9 . 0 \%}$ | $76.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Good physical health | $\mathbf{5 3 . 6 \%}$ | $60.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Good mental health | $\mathbf{5 6 . 2 \%}$ | $57.3 \%$ |  |  |
| Tobacco use | $\mathbf{2 9 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ |  |  |

INFRASTRUCTURE

| Broadband access | $\mathbf{9 5 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0}$ | 15.0 | 11.0 |
| Transit service | $\mathbf{3 1 . 5 \%}$ | $53.1 \%$ |  |
| Mobile homes | $\mathbf{1 6 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}$ | 16.0 |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | $\mathbf{1 0 , 5 3 4}$ | 5,160 | $\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}$ |

[^23]
## MARION COUNTY

Total population
339,641
Rural population
13\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
52

## FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES



## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME



## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land 35\%

Developed/cultivated land
1,193 mi ${ }^{2}$



HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

## 13\%

 35\%48\%
Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

## POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Asian: 2.0\%
| Black/African American: 1.1\%
Hispanic/Latino: 26.6\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.9\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: 3.3\%
White: 65.5\%

## TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES

6\%



| COMMUNITY | MARION | OREGON | RURAL | URBAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food insecurity | 11.8\% | 11.9\% |  |  |
| Child poverty* | 19.5\% | 16.6\% | 15.8\% | 16.9\% |
| Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) | 7.0 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 7.2 |
| Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) | 33.3 | 27.7 | 22.7 | 30.6 |
| Voter participation | 78.9\% | 82.0\% |  |  |
| EDUCATION |  |  |  |  |
| Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) | 5.0 of 26 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 3 rd grade reading | 36.4\% | 46.5\% | 42.2\% | 48.0\% |
| 9 th grade on track | 84.8\% | 85.3\% | 82.7\% | 86.5\% |
| 5 -year high school graduation rate | 81.2\% | 81.6\% | 77.9\% | 83.2\% |
| 4 -year college degree or greater | 23.5\% | 33.7\% | 24.1\% | 38.2\% |
| ECONOMY |  |  |  |  |
| Unemployment rate | 3.9\% | 3.7\% |  |  |
| Labor force participation rate | 61.4\% | 62.3\% | 55.1\% | 65.6\% |
| Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) | 6.1 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 7.4 |
| Property tax (per person) | \$1,203 | \$1,613 | \$1,330 | \$1,668 |
| Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) | \$736 |  |  |  |
| HEALTH |  |  |  |  |
| Low weight births | 5.8\% | 6.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.6\% |
| Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds | 73.0\% | 76.0\% |  |  |
| Good physical health | 59.9\% | 60.1\% |  |  |
| Good mental health | 56.7\% | 57.3\% |  |  |
| Tobacco use | 24.6\% | 25.5\% |  |  |
| INFRASTRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |
| Broadband access | 99.9\% | 97.6\% |  |  |
| Child care (slots per 100 children) | 12.0 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 16.0 |
| Transit service | 56.3\% | 53.1\% |  |  |
| Mobile homes | 8.4\% | 7.9\% | 16.0\% | 6.1\% |
| Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) | 5,444 | 5,160 | 9,603 | 4,303 |

[^24]Total population
11,303
Rural population
46\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
62

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


## POPULATION BY AGE



Public land
17\%

Developed/ cultivated land
30\%

Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge


## HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

```
14%
``` 28\%

42\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.5\%
| Asian: 0.6\%
Black/African American: 0.2\%

| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.5\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 2.4\%
White: 59.3\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Food manufacturing




\section*{COMMUNITY}

Food insecurity
Child poverty*
Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)
Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation
\begin{tabular}{|c|ccc|}
\hline MORROW & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 1 . 1 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 2 . 8 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{6 . 2}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 6 . 6}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 7 . 3} \%\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccl}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & \(\mathbf{7 . 0}\) of \(\mathbf{2 6}\) & \multicolumn{3}{|c}{7.7} \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & \(\mathbf{3 7 . 4 \%}\) & \(46.5 \%\) & \(42.2 \%\) & \(48.0 \%\) \\
\hline 9th grade on track & \(\mathbf{9 4 . 6 \%}\) & \(85.3 \%\) & \(82.7 \%\) & \(86.5 \%\) \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & \(\mathbf{8 5 . 6 \%}\) & \(81.6 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & \(\mathbf{9 . 0 \%}\) & \(33.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{4 . 0 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{6 0 . 2 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{- 1 1 . 9}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 2 1}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 5 3 7}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|cc|c}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{5 . 4 \%}\) & & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{7 9 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}\) & & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{4 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{7 0 . 9 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{3 6 . 7 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{7 8 . 5 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}\) & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{9 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{5 . 8 \%}\) & \(53.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{3 3 . 2 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & 16.0 \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{1 6 , 3 3}\) & 5,160 & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

Total population
804,606
Rural population
1\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
69

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}
 \(466 \mathrm{mi}^{2}\)


Public land 36\%

Developed/cultivated land


\section*{HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP}

\section*{11\%} 32\%

43\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.7\%
Asian: 7.3\%
Black/African American: 5.3\%
Hispanic/Latino: 11.6\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.6\%
Some other race: 0.2\%
Two or more races: 4.5\%
White: 69.7\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Educational services


Food services and drinking places


Professional and technical services


COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty* Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)

Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation
EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccc}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & \(\mathbf{8 . 2}\) of \(\mathbf{2 6}\) & & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & \(\mathbf{4 6 . 7 \%}\) & 4.7 & & \\
\hline 9th grade on track & \(\mathbf{8 6 . 8 \%}\) & \(85 \%\) & \(\mathbf{4 2 . 2 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}\) \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & \(\mathbf{8 0 . 4 \%}\) & \(81.3 \%\) & \(82.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{8 6 . 5 \%}\) \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & \(\mathbf{4 5 . 9 \%}\) & \(33.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{3 . 2 \%}\) & \multicolumn{2}{|c}{\(3.7 \%\)} & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{6 9 . 4 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{1 2 . 1}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 2 , 0 3 9}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 3 4}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|cc|c}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{7 . 0 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) & \(6.6 \%\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{7 4 . 0 \%}\) & \(76.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{5 8 . 4 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{5 3 . 8 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{2 2 . 8 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|cc|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{9 8 . 9 \%}\) & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(97.6 \%\)} & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{2 2 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{8 5 . 9 \%}\) & \(53.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{1 . 8 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{6 . 1 \%}\) \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{3 , 8 2 1}\) & 5,160 & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) & 4,303 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{POLK COUNTY}

Total population
83,037
Rural population
20\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
72

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}



Educational services


Food services and drinking places


Nursing and residential care facilities
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline COMMUNITY & POLK & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline Food insecurity & 11.5\% & 11.9\% & & \\
\hline Child poverty* & 14.0\% & 16.6\% & 15.8\% & 16.9\% \\
\hline Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) & 4.5 & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) & 14.1 & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline Voter participation & 80.9\% & 82.0\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{EDUCATION} \\
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & 5.7 of 26 & 7.7 & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & 30.6\% & 46.5\% & 42.2\% & 48.0\% \\
\hline 9 9th grade on track & 85.2\% & 85.3\% & 82.7\% & 86.5\% \\
\hline 5 -year high school graduation rate & 84.7\% & 81.6\% & 77.9\% & 83.2\% \\
\hline 4 -year college degree or greater & 31.0\% & 33.7\% & 24.1\% & 38.2\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{ECONOMY} \\
\hline Unemployment rate & 4.0\% & 3.7\% & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & 60.2\% & 62.3\% & 55.1\% & 65.6\% \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & 4.9 & 6.5 & 2.3 & 7.4 \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \$1,115 & \$1,613 & \$1,330 & \$1,668 \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \$736 & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{HEALTH} \\
\hline Low weight births & 6.9\% & 6.7\% & 7.1\% & 6.6\% \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & 80.0\% & 76.0\% & & \\
\hline Good physical health & 56.0\% & 60.1\% & & \\
\hline Good mental health & 55.6\% & 57.3\% & & \\
\hline Tobacco use & 18.8\% & 25.5\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{INFRASTRUCTURE} \\
\hline Broadband access & 99.7\% & 97.6\% & & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & 11.0 & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & 33.1\% & 53.1\% & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & 7.7\% & 7.9\% & 16.0\% & 6.1\% \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & 5,210 & 5,160 & 9,603 & 4,303 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{SHERMAN COUNTY}

Total population
1,642
Rural population
100\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
5

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

\section*{BP CLUS COQ COW
GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP}

\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}


72 Oregon by the Numbers
TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Professional and technical services


Heavy and civil engineering construction


Food services and drinking places


\section*{COMMUNITY}

Food insecurity
Child poverty* Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)

Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation
\begin{tabular}{|c|ccc|}
\hline SHERMAN & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 3 . 5 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 9 . 9 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{0 . 0}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 7 . 7}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{8 5 . 4 \%}\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & 10.5 of 26 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{7.7} & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & 40.0\% & 46.5\% & 42.2\% & 48.0\% \\
\hline 9th grade on track & 78.3\% & 85.3\% & 82.7\% & 86.5\% \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & 87.5\% & 81.6\% & 77.9\% & 83.2\% \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & 17.3\% & 33.7\% & 24.1\% & 38.2\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{3 . 4 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{5 3 . 1 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{- 2 . 0}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 8 4}\) & & \(\$ 1,613\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 5 9 3}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{7 5 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}\) & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{6 8 . 7 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{5 9 . 8 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{3 9 . 3 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{7 3 . 5 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}\) & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{1 4 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{0 . 0} \%\) & \(53.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{2 1 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 0}\) \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{7 4 , 2 3 7}\) & 5,160 & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{TILLAMOOK COUNTY}

Total population
26,389
Rural population
70\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
64

\section*{FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES}


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}


Public land
53\%

Developed/ cultivated land
7\%


\section*{HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP}

\section*{13\% 34\%}

47\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.9\%
Asian: 0.7\%
Black/African American: 0.4\%
Hispanic/Latino: 10.3\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.5\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: 2.8\%
White: 84.3\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Food manufacturing


Food services and drinking places


Educational services


COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty*
Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)
Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation
\begin{tabular}{|c|ccc|}
\hline TILLAMOOK & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 3 . 6 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 9 . 8 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 . 0}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 2 . 2}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{8 2 . 8 \%}\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & 6.7 of 26 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{7.7} & \\
\hline 3 rd grade reading & 34.4\% & 46.5\% & 42.2\% & 48.0\% \\
\hline 9th grade on track & 86.4\% & 85.3\% & 82.7\% & 86.5\% \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & 88.3\% & 81.6\% & 77.9\% & 83.2\% \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & 21.8\% & 33.7\% & 24.1\% & 38.2\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{4 9 . 8 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{4 . 0}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 2 , 1 2 1}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 6 1 0}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|cc|c}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{6 . 6 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) & \(6.6 \%\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{6 8 . 0 \%}\) & \(76.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{6 0 . 8 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{5 5 . 5 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{2 3 . 7 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{9 8 . 5 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}\) & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{7 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{3 2 . 0} \%\) & \(53.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{1 0 . 3 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & 16.0 \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{9 , 9 5 8}\) & \(\mathbf{5 , 1 6 0}\) & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{UMATILLA COUNTY}

Total population
77,129
Rural population
29\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
22

\section*{FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES \\ BP CLUS COQ COW \\ GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP}

\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}



COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty*
Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)
Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation
\begin{tabular}{|c|ccc|}
\hline UMATILLA & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 3 . 2 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 5 . 9 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 1 . 1}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{2 3 . 8}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{7 3 . 7 \%}\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccl}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & \(\mathbf{6 . 7}\) of \(\mathbf{2 6}\) & & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & \(\mathbf{4 3 . 1 \%}\) & 46.7 & & \\
\hline 9th grade on track & \(\mathbf{8 4 . 6 \%}\) & \(82.2 \%\) & \(48.0 \%\) \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & \(\mathbf{8 1 . 2 \%}\) & \(81.6 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & \(\mathbf{1 7 . 2 \%}\) & \(33.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{4 . 7 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{5 8 . 5 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(\mathbf{6 5 . 6 \%}\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 7 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 5 7 7}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{6 . 7 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{7 0 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 6 . 0 \%}\) & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{6 3 . 1 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{6 4 . 5 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{2 7 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{9 4 . 6 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}\) & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{1 1 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{4 4 . 6 \%}\) & \(53.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{1 5 . 6 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 0}\) \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{8 , 6 2 1}\) & 5,160 & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{UNION COUNTY}

Total population
26,337
Rural population
42\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
32

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES
BP CLUS COQ COW
GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP

\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}


Public land Developed/cultivated land
49\%


HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

\section*{16\%} 28\%

44\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.8\%
Asian: 1.1\%
Black/African American: 0.7\%
Hispanic/Latino: 4.8\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1.5\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 2.4\%
White: 88.7\%

\section*{TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline COMMUNITY & UNION & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline Food insecurity & 13.5\% & 11.9\% & & \\
\hline Child poverty* & 16.0\% & 16.6\% & 15.8\% & 16.9\% \\
\hline Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) & 6.3 & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) & 21.2 & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline Voter participation & 80.2\% & 82.0\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{EDUCATION} \\
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & 11.0 of 26 & 7.7 & & \\
\hline 3 rd grade reading & 48.7\% & 46.5\% & 42.2\% & 48.0\% \\
\hline 9 9th grade on track & 84.3\% & 85.3\% & 82.7\% & 86.5\% \\
\hline 5 -year high school graduation rate & 89.4\% & 81.6\% & 77.9\% & 83.2\% \\
\hline 4 -year college degree or greater & 24.5\% & 33.7\% & 24.1\% & 38.2\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{ECONOMY} \\
\hline Unemployment rate & 4.7\% & 3.7\% & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & 58.7\% & 62.3\% & 55.1\% & 65.6\% \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & 4.1 & 6.5 & 2.3 & 7.4 \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \$1,023 & \$1,613 & \$1,330 & \$1,668 \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \$553 & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{HEALTH} \\
\hline Low weight births & 8.0\% & 6.7\% & 7.1\% & 6.6\% \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & 77.0\% & 76.0\% & & \\
\hline Good physical health & 64.4\% & 60.1\% & & \\
\hline Good mental health & 62.4\% & 57.3\% & & \\
\hline Tobacco use & 34.6\% & 25.5\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{INFRASTRUCTURE} \\
\hline Broadband access & 89.5\% & 97.6\% & & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & 13.0 & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & 43.9\% & 53.1\% & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & 16.0\% & 7.9\% & 16.0\% & 6.1\% \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & 9,978 & 5,160 & 9,603 & 4,303 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{WALLOWA COUNTY}

Total population
7,004
Rural population
100\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)

\section*{55}


\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}



COMMUNITY
Food insecurity
Child poverty* Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) Voter participation

\section*{EDUCATION}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccc}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & \(\mathbf{1 3 . 8}\) of \(\mathbf{2 6}\) & & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & \(\mathbf{7 0 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{4 6 . 5}\) & & \\
\hline 9th grade on track & \(\mathbf{8 9 . 9 \%}\) & \(82.2 \%\) & \(48.0 \%\) \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & \(\mathbf{9 6 . 5 \%}\) & \(85.3 \%\) & \(82.7 \%\) & \(86.5 \%\) \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & \(\mathbf{2 6 . 4 \%}\) & \(81.6 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{ECONOMY}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{5 . 7 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{5 5 . 1 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(\mathbf{6 5 . 6 \%}\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{- 1 . 6}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 1 2}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 6 0 9}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|cc|c}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{5 . 7 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(7.1 \%\) & \(6.6 \%\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{6 3 . 0 \%}\) & \(76.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{6 8 . 3 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{6 3 . 7 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & ID & \(25.5 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Broadband access & 85.7\% & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{97.6\%} \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & 10.0 & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & 35.1\% & 53.1\% & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & 14.7\% & 7.9\% & 16.0\% & 6.1\% \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & 6,112 & 5,160 & 9,603 & 4,303 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

ID: Insufficient data per source

\section*{WASCO COUNTY}

Total population
26,130
Rural population
33\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
82

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

\section*{BP CLUS COQ COW \\ GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP}

\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}


Public land
44\%
Developed/cultivated land


HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

\section*{13\%} 35\%

48\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 3.0\%
Asian: 0.9\%
Black/African American: 0.3\%
Hispanic/Latino: 18.2\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.6\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 2.5\%
White: 74.6\%

\section*{TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline COMMUNITY & WASCO & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline Food insecurity & 12.5\% & 11.9\% & & \\
\hline Child poverty* & 15.4\% & 16.6\% & 15.8\% & 16.9\% \\
\hline Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) & 12.9 & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) & 25.4 & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline Voter participation & 79.0\% & 82.0\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{EDUCATION} \\
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & 4.6 of 26 & 7.7 & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & 44.5\% & 46.5\% & 42.2\% & 48.0\% \\
\hline 9 9th grade on track & 74.5\% & 85.3\% & 82.7\% & 86.5\% \\
\hline 5 -year high school graduation rate & 78.6\% & 81.6\% & 77.9\% & 83.2\% \\
\hline 4 -year college degree or greater & 19.6\% & 33.7\% & 24.1\% & 38.2\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{ECONOMY} \\
\hline Unemployment rate & 4.0\% & 3.7\% & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & 59.3\% & 62.3\% & 55.1\% & 65.6\% \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & -4.2 & 6.5 & 2.3 & 7.4 \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \$1,389 & \$1,613 & \$1,330 & \$1,668 \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \$814 & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{HEALTH} \\
\hline Low weight births & 5.0\% & 6.7\% & 7.1\% & 6.6\% \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & 75.0\% & 76.0\% & & \\
\hline Good physical health & 68.7\% & 60.1\% & & \\
\hline Good mental health & 59.8\% & 57.3\% & & \\
\hline Tobacco use & 39.3\% & 25.5\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{INFRASTRUCTURE} \\
\hline Broadband access & 89.9\% & 97.6\% & & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & 19.0 & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & 17.8\% & 53.1\% & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & 16.8\% & 7.9\% & 16.0\% & 6.1\% \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & 14,236 & 5,160 & 9,603 & 4,303 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{WASHINGTON COUNTY}

Total population
589,481
Rural population
6\%

Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)

\section*{86}

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES


MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}



\section*{COMMUNITY}

Food insecurity
Child poverty* Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.)

Index crime (per 1,000 pop.)
Voter participation
\begin{tabular}{|c|ccc|}
\hline WASHINGTON & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline \(\mathbf{9 . 0 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 1 . 5 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{3 . 7}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1 8 . 2}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{8 4 . 8 \%}\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccc}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & \(\mathbf{9 . 5}\) of \(\mathbf{2 6}\) & & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & \(\mathbf{5 4 . 9 \%}\) & 4.7 & & \\
\hline 9th grade on track & \(\mathbf{9 0 . 5 \%}\) & \(86.5 \%\) & \(\mathbf{4 2 . 2 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}\) \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & \(\mathbf{8 8 . 6 \%}\) & \(81.3 \%\) & \(82.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{8 6 . 5 \%}\) \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & \(\mathbf{4 4 . 4 \%}\) & \(33.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{3 . 0 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{6 9 . 0 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{1 2 . 4}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 8 2 1}\) & & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 5}\) & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 3 4}\) & & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|cc|c}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{6 . 7 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) & \(6.6 \%\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{7 8 . 0 \%}\) & \(76.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{6 3 . 9 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{6 2 . 2 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{2 0 . 3 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|cc|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{9 9 . 8 \%}\) & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(97.6 \%\)} & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{1 8 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{5 6 . 1 \%}\) & \(53.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{2 . 4 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{6 . 1 \%}\) \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{3 , 0 3 9}\) & 5,160 & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) & \(\mathbf{4 , 3 0 3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

\section*{WHEELER COUNTY}

Total population
1,415
Rural population
100\%
Net migration, 2010-2018 (per 1,000 population)
58

FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES

\section*{BP CLUS COQ COW \\ GR KLA SLZ UMA WSP}

\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}


Public land
29\%

Developed/cultivated land
1,715 \(\mathbf{~ m i}^{2}\)



\section*{HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP}

\section*{16\%} 40\%

56\% Below Poverty Level and ALICE Threshold

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.6\%
Asian: 0.3\%
Black/African American: 0.0\%
Hispanic/Latino: 8.6\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.1\%
Some other race: 0.0\%
Two or more races: 3.0\%
White: \(87.3 \%\)

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES



Animal production

\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccc}
\hline COMMUNITY & WHEELER & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline Food insecurity & \(\mathbf{1 5 . 4 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline Child poverty* & \(\mathbf{2 1 . 6 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{0 . 0}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{0 . 0}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline Voter participation & \(\mathbf{9 0 . 2 \%}\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


EDUCATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & 12.5 of 26 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{7.7} \\
\hline 3 rd grade reading & 48.0\% & 46.5\% & 42.2\% & 48.0\% \\
\hline 9th grade on track & 50.8\% & 85.3\% & 82.7\% & 86.5\% \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & 29.3\% & 81.6\% & 77.9\% & 83.2\% \\
\hline 4 -year college degree or greater & 14.9\% & 33.7\% & 24.1\% & 38.2\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{4 . 2 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{4 0 . 7 \%}\) & \(62.3 \%\) & \(55.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{9 . 0}\) & 6.5 & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 8 2}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 5 4 2}\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & ID & \(76.0 \%\) & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{2 9 . 7 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{5 5 . 7 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & ID & \(25.5 \%\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|ccc|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{9 7 . 6 \%}\) & & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{6 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 & 16.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{4 . 7 \%}\) & \(53.1 \%\) & & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{2 1 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 0 \%}\) & \(6.1 \%\) \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{1 4 , 0 2 8}\) & 5,160 & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) & 4,303 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

ID: Insufficient data per source

\section*{YAMHILL COUNTY}


\section*{MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME}


\section*{POPULATION BY AGE}


Public land
17\%

Pheasant Creek Falls \(\bullet \quad{ }^{\circ}\)

Developed/cultivated land Total land area 718 mi \(^{2}\)
 Mt Hebo

Bald Creek State Scenic Viewpoint

O McMinnville

\section*{POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 1.0\%
Asian: 1.4\%
| Black/African American: 0.8\%
Hispanic/Latino: 15.9\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: 3.3\%
White: 77.2\%

TOP EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRIES


Educational services


Food services and drinking places


\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccc}
\cline { 2 - 5 } COMMUNITY & YAMHILL & OREGON & RURAL & URBAN \\
\hline Food insecurity & \(\mathbf{1 1 . 1 \%}\) & \(11.9 \%\) & & \\
\hline Child poverty* & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 3 \%}\) & \(16.6 \%\) & \(15.8 \%\) & \(16.9 \%\) \\
\hline Foster care rate (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{4 . 7}\) & 8.3 & 14.4 & 7.2 \\
\hline Index crime (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{1 6 . 4}\) & 27.7 & 22.7 & 30.6 \\
\hline Voter participation & \(\mathbf{8 1 . 8} \%\) & \(82.0 \%\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{EDUCATION}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|ccc}
\hline Kindergarten ready (Letter sounds) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1}\) of \(\mathbf{2 6}\) & & & \\
\hline 3rd grade reading & \(\mathbf{5 0 . 0} \%\) & 4.7 & & \\
\hline 9th grade on track & \(\mathbf{8 1 . 2 \%}\) & \(85 \%\) & \(\mathbf{4 2 . 2 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{4 8 . 0 \%}\) \\
\hline 5-year high school graduation rate & \(\mathbf{8 7 . 6 \%}\) & \(81.6 \%\) & \(\mathbf{7 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{8 3 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline 4-year college degree or greater & \(\mathbf{2 6 . 9 \%}\) & \(33.7 \%\) & \(\mathbf{2 4 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{3 8 . 2 \%}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


ECONOMY
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c|c}
\hline Unemployment rate & \(\mathbf{3 . 4 \%}\) & & & \\
\hline Labor force participation rate & \(\mathbf{6 0 . 3 \%}\) & \(62 \%\) & & \\
\hline Job growth (per 1,000 pop.) & \(\mathbf{7 . 4}\) & \(65.1 \%\) & \(65.6 \%\) \\
\hline Property tax (per person) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 3 6}\) & & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 1 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 3 0}\) \\
\hline Rent costs (1 bedroom/1 bath) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 3 4}\) & & \(\mathbf{2 . 3}\) & \(\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{HEALTH}
\begin{tabular}{l|c|c|c}
\hline Low weight births & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & \(6.7 \%\) & \(7.1 \%\) \\
\hline Vaccination rate, 2-year-olds & \(\mathbf{7 9 . 0 \%}\) & \(76.0 \%\) & \\
\hline Good physical health & \(\mathbf{5 9 . 8 \%}\) & \(60.1 \%\) & \\
\hline Good mental health & \(\mathbf{5 8 . 7 \%}\) & \(57.3 \%\) & \\
\hline Tobacco use & \(\mathbf{3 2 . 1 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

INFRASTRUCTURE
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline Broadband access & \(\mathbf{9 9 . 3 \%}\) & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(97.6 \%\)} & & \\
\hline Child care (slots per 100 children) & \(\mathbf{1 0 . 0}\) & 15.0 & 11.0 \\
\hline Transit service & \(\mathbf{4 7 . 9 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{5 3 . 1 \%}\) & \\
\hline Mobile homes & \(\mathbf{1 0 . 7 \%}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 9 \%}\) & 16.0 \\
\hline Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) & \(\mathbf{4 , 2 3 3}\) & \(\mathbf{5 , 1 6 0}\) & \(\mathbf{9 , 6 0 3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).
}

Data by Measure

\section*{Measure selection}

The process of selecting measures for the first edition (2018) of Oregon by the Numbers began with a comprehensive analysis of existing indicator reports followed by a juried ranking for the final selection. The process helped guarantee inclusion of the most broadly desired measures, while simultaneously leveraging the knowledge of experts to ensure relevance. To begin, researchers at Oregon State University used a crossover matrix of measures and reports to generate a short list of candidate measures for Oregon by the Numbers (based on data already available in the Communities Reporter Tool). They then reviewed the short list to determine causal or covariant relationships of the measures, prioritizing those with central influence and/or those that best function as overall indicators of societal progress.

From there, the list went to the Board and staff of The Ford Family Foundation for review and revision based on internal research and input from rural residents. Each year, the production team updates the text and measures based on reader feedback and new data that may have become available, populating each topic area with a sufficient number and type of measures to ensure relevance to all Oregon counties. While we want to prioritize continuity of measures from one year to the next, we also want to ensure that the report incorporates the best available data. So, there will be changes from time to time.

\section*{American Community Survey}

Oregon by the Numbers relies on multiple measures 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 mid-20th century. Collected on a continuous basis since 2005, the ACS gives 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, based on a five-year estimate. These are now updated annually.

While ACS data provide unprecedented access to information about key issues for real-time decision making, there are limitations. Some people do not respond to the ACS due to concerns about confidentiality. The results are estimates based on an annual survey, not direct counts, and therefore subject to statistical error. The Census Bureau publishes the margin of error associated with each ACS estimate. For small communities and/ or for sub-groups within the population (e.g. age categories, racial/ethnic groups), the margin of error can be large relative to the estimate. In this report, any necessary cautions about margin of error are noted on the measure summary page. Despite the shortcomings noted above, ACS results help determine how our government systems distribute billions of dollars each year. The data can also suggest opportunities for community engagement.

\section*{A note about rounding}

In this report, data are often rounded from their original sources. Generally, we round to the nearest tenth place. However, county profiles have some values rounded to the nearest whole number to help with readability. This practice can occasionally yield confusing results when comparing values on county profiles to measure pages. For example, a value of 2.49 rounds to 2.5 when rounded to the tenth place but rounds to 2 when rounded to the nearest whole number.

\section*{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. Shifts in total population can affect funding from state and federal agencies. Such changes also suggest the extent to which the county is attracting new residents or whether the economy is prospering or struggling. As a measure, Total Population is useful in planning for current and future community needs.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Population \\
\hline & Oregon & 4,129,803 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 2,843,477 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 1,286,326 \\
\hline 1 & Multnomah & 804,606 \\
\hline 2 & Washington & 589,481 \\
\hline 3 & Clackamas & 410,463 \\
\hline 4 & Lane & 373,340 \\
\hline 5 & Marion & 339,641 \\
\hline 6 & Jackson & 216,574 \\
\hline 7 & Deschutes & 186,251 \\
\hline 8 & Linn & 125,048 \\
\hline 9 & Douglas & 109,114 \\
\hline 10 & Yamhill & 104,831 \\
\hline 11 & Benton & 91,107 \\
\hline 12 & Josephine & 86,251 \\
\hline 13 & Polk & 83,037 \\
\hline 14 & Umatilla & 77,129 \\
\hline 15 & Klamath & 66,921 \\
\hline 16 & Coos & 63,686 \\
\hline 17 & Columbia & 51,375 \\
\hline 18 & Lincoln & 48,547 \\
\hline 19 & Clatsop & 39,102 \\
\hline 20 & Malheur & 30,412 \\
\hline 21 & Tillamook & 26,389 \\
\hline 22 & Union & 26,337 \\
\hline 23 & Wasco & 26,130 \\
\hline 24 & Jefferson & 23,607 \\
\hline 25 & Hood River & 23,209 \\
\hline 26 & Crook & 23,011 \\
\hline 27 & Curry & 22,650 \\
\hline 28 & Baker & 16,019 \\
\hline 29 & Morrow & 11,303 \\
\hline 30 & Lake & 7,837 \\
\hline 31 & Harney & 7,267 \\
\hline 32 & Grant & 7,189 \\
\hline 33 & Wallowa & 7,004 \\
\hline 34 & Gilliam & 1,878 \\
\hline 35 & Sherman & 1,642 \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 1,415 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B01003, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{RURAL POPULATION}

Definition: The percentage of people who reside outside of urban areas or clusters in a given county, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

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 "Oregon's Shared Fate," page 10). Because this measure makes use of Census data released every decade, researchers are exploring alternatives for future reports.

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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census, Table P2, 2010, updated decennially. Released 2012.

\section*{NET MIGRATION}

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

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. It is important for businesses and local leaders to understand net migration in order to anticipate the county's future demands. Population change resulting from migration requires different resources than change caused by births and deaths. Understanding the various contributors to population change is important for long-range planning.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Deschutes & 182.2 \\
\hline 2 & Crook & 127.9 \\
\hline 3 & Curry & 106.7 \\
\hline 4 & Clackamas & 101.1 \\
\hline 5 & Hood River & 94.7 \\
\hline 6 & Josephine & 87.5 \\
\hline 7 & Washington & 86.0 \\
\hline 8 & Jackson & 85.5 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 81.9 \\
\hline 9 & Benton & 81.8 \\
\hline 9 & Wasco & 81.8 \\
\hline 11 & Lincoln & 79.6 \\
\hline & Oregon & 77.2 \\
\hline 12 & Lane & 73.1 \\
\hline 13 & Polk & 72.4 \\
\hline 14 & Douglas & 71.8 \\
\hline 15 & Gilliam & 70.5 \\
\hline 16 & Multnomah & 69.5 \\
\hline 17 & Baker & 67.4 \\
\hline 18 & Yamhill & 66.0 \\
\hline 19 & Tillamook & 64.0 \\
\hline 20 & Linn & 63.7 \\
\hline 21 & Morrow & 62.0 \\
\hline 22 & Jefferson & 60.1 \\
\hline 23 & Wheeler & 57.6 \\
\hline 24 & Clatsop & 56.7 \\
\hline 25 & Columbia & 56.6 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{26} & Wallowa & 54.5 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 53.8 \\
\hline 27 & Marion & 51.5 \\
\hline 28 & Lake & 47.3 \\
\hline 29 & Coos & 45.1 \\
\hline 30 & Union & 31.7 \\
\hline 31 & Klamath & 22.4 \\
\hline 32 & Umatilla & 22.1 \\
\hline 33 & Grant & 18.1 \\
\hline 34 & Sherman & 5.1 \\
\hline 35 & Harney & -0.1 \\
\hline 36 & Malheur & -12.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Portland State University, Population Research Center, Annual Population Report, 2010-2019, Migration since 2010, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED TRIBES}

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

Burns Paiute Tribe

Cow Creek Band of
Umpqua Tribe

Confederated Tribes of Siletz

\section*{CLUS}

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians

GR Confederated Tribes of
Grande Ronde

Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation

\section*{COQ}

Coquille Indian Tribe

KLA
Klamath Tribes

\section*{WSP}

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs

Oregon is Indian country. Dozens of Indigenous tribes and bands once inhabited the land 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 dxuring that time.

This report highlights Oregon's 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.

Numerous Indian-affiliated organizations operate throughout Oregon that are not associated with the state's nine federally recognized tribes, so the information provided here does 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 have land and relationships within Oregon that are not represented here. For example, the Nez Perce tribe, federally recognized in Idaho, has bought back thousands of acres of traditional homeland in Wallowa County, Oregon.

Ultimately, Indian history is Oregon history. Oregon Senate Bill 13 directs the Department of Education to develop curriculum about the Native American experience in Oregon and to provide professional development for all teachers in support of that curriculum. This effort provides an opportunity for all students to learn our state's full history, beginning with the experiences of Oregon's first human inhabitants.

\section*{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

\section*{}

COW Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe




\section*{GR Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde}


Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation



\section*{KLA Klamath Tribes}

Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs



\section*{LARGEST COMMUNITIES}

\section*{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 metropolitan areas are the largest communities for multiple counties: Portland for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington; Salem for Marion and Polk. Note that a number of Oregon's larger communities do not appear on this list because there is a larger community in the same county. Examples include Beaverton, Gresham, Hillsboro and Springfield.

\begin{tabular}{|rlr|rlll|lllll}
\hline \# & Community & County & Pop & \# & Community & County & Pop & \# & Community & County & Pop \\
\hline 1 & Portland & Clackamas & 645,291 & 13 & Roseburg & Douglas & 23,083 & 25 & Hood River & Hood River & 7,715 \\
\hline 2 & Portland & Multnomah & 645,291 & 14 & Klamath Falls & Klamath & 21,335 & 26 & Madras & Jefferson & 6,777 \\
\hline 3 & Portland & Washington & 645,291 & 15 & Hermiston & Umatilla & 17,423 & 27 & Brookings & Curry & 6,431 \\
\hline 4 & Salem & Marion & 169,259 & 16 & Coos Bay & Coos & 16,229 & 28 & Tillamook & Tillamook & 5,231 \\
\hline 5 & Salem & Polk & 169,259 & 17 & The Dalles & Wasco & 15,448 & 29 & Boardman & Morrow & 3,439 \\
\hline 6 & Eugene & Lane & 168,302 & 18 & St. Helens & Columbia & 13,559 & 30 & Burns & Harney & 2,740 \\
\hline 7 & Bend & Deschutes & 93,917 & 19 & La Grande & Union & 13,310 & 31 & Lakeview & Lake & 2,638 \\
\hline 8 & Medford & Jackson & 81,145 & 20 & Ontario & Malheur & 10,966 & 32 & John Day & Grant & 2,244 \\
\hline 9 & Corvallis & Benton & 58,028 & 21 & Newport & Lincoln & 10,559 & 33 & Enterprise & Wallowa & 2,033 \\
\hline 10 & Albany & Linn & 53,521 & 22 & Prineville & Crook & 10,035 & 34 & Condon & Gilliam & 659 \\
\hline 11 & Grants Pass & Josephine & 37,545 & 23 & Astoria & Clatsop & 9,836 & 35 & Wasco & Sherman & 440 \\
\hline 12 & McMinnville & Yamhill & 34,010 & 24 & Baker City & Baker & 9,752 & 36 & Fossil & Wheeler & 393 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B01003, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{MEDIAN INCOME}

\section*{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 well-being for residents. One drawback is that this measure treats all households equally regardless of the number of people in the household. The size of the household has an impact on how the income is distributed to individuals. However, 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.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Washington & \$82,215 \\
\hline 2 & Clackamas & \$80,484 \\
\hline 3 & Multnomah & \$69,176 \\
\hline 4 & Deschutes & \$67,043 \\
\hline 5 & Hood River & \$65,679 \\
\hline 6 & Yamhill & \$63,902 \\
\hline & Oregon & \$62,818 \\
\hline 7 & Polk & \$62,691 \\
\hline 8 & Columbia & \$62,257 \\
\hline 9 & Benton & \$62,077 \\
\hline 10 & Marion & \$59,625 \\
\hline 11 & Linn & \$55,893 \\
\hline 12 & Clatsop & \$54,886 \\
\hline 13 & Umatilla & \$54,699 \\
\hline 14 & Morrow & \$54,269 \\
\hline 15 & Jackson & \$53,412 \\
\hline 16 & Jefferson & \$53,277 \\
\hline 17 & Wasco & \$53,105 \\
\hline 18 & Lane & \$52,426 \\
\hline 19 & Union & \$52,171 \\
\hline 20 & Wallowa & \$51,224 \\
\hline 21 & Sherman & \$51,071 \\
\hline 22 & Tillamook & \$49,895 \\
\hline 23 & Crook & \$49,006 \\
\hline 24 & Curry & \$48,440 \\
\hline 25 & Lincoln & \$47,882 \\
\hline 26 & Gilliam & \$47,500 \\
\hline 27 & Douglas & \$47,267 \\
\hline 28 & Klamath & \$46,491 \\
\hline 29 & Baker & \$45,998 \\
\hline 30 & Josephine & \$45,616 \\
\hline 31 & Coos & \$45,051 \\
\hline 32 & Grant & \$44,712 \\
\hline 33 & Malheur & \$43,313 \\
\hline 34 & Wheeler & \$40,926 \\
\hline 35 & Harney & \$40,735 \\
\hline 36 & Lake & \$37,898 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B19013, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{HOUSEHOLDS IN FINANCIAL HARDSHIP}

Definition: The percentage of households in a county with annual incomes below what is needed to cover the basic costs of living in the 21st century.

ALICE is an acronym that stands for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed. ALICE describes the growing number of households in our country that do not earn enough income to afford the basic necessities. The ALICE research group, supported by United Way, defines basic household necessities as: food, housing, transportation, health care, child care and a smartphone plan. More than 20 states now participate as partners in the ALICE effort. Oregon is among them.

The ALICE research quantifies the number of households at the county level that are experiencing daily financial hardship. The research helps raise awareness about a growing population that does not qualify as poor but faces impossible choices day to day. ALICE households cannot save or build wealth because they do not earn enough to survive financially in our modern economy.

Prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, Oregon saw unemployment fall to historic lows while gross domestic product (GDP) grew. However, the costs associated with basic needs, especially housing, increased sharply while wages increased modestly, with significant consequences for working families. In 2018, researchers estimated that income in \(44 \%\) of Oregon's more than 1.6 million households was not enough to afford basic necessities. A closer look indicates that \(12 \%\) of these households were living below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and another 32\% were ALICE households.

To the right is a ranked table listing the percentage of "households in financial hardship" (poverty + ALICE) for each Oregon county. In addition, a set of maps shows how the ALICE threshold varies across the state. Geography is a determining factor, as is the age of the people in the household. Households in which the head of household is 65 or older tend to require less income to meet basic needs than households in which the head of household is younger than 65.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Crook & 56\% \\
\hline 1 & Wheeler & 56\% \\
\hline 3 & Malheur & 54\% \\
\hline 3 & Yamhill & 54\% \\
\hline 5 & Jefferson & 53\% \\
\hline 5 & Lake & 53\% \\
\hline 7 & Coos & 49\% \\
\hline 7 & Lincoln & 49\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 48\% \\
\hline 9 & Klamath & 48\% \\
\hline 9 & Marion & 48\% \\
\hline & Wasco & 48\% \\
\hline 12 & Columbia & 47\% \\
\hline 12 & Curry & 47\% \\
\hline 12 & Harney & 47\% \\
\hline 12 & Tillamook & 47\% \\
\hline 16 & Baker & 46\% \\
\hline 16 & Clatsop & 46\% \\
\hline 16 & Douglas & 46\% \\
\hline 16 & Josephine & 46\% \\
\hline 20 & Grant & 45\% \\
\hline 20 & Hood River & 45\% \\
\hline 20 & Lane & 45\% \\
\hline 20 & Sherman & 45\% \\
\hline 20 & Umatilla & 45\% \\
\hline 20 & Wallowa & 45\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 44\% \\
\hline 26 & Gilliam & 44\% \\
\hline 26 & Union & 44\% \\
\hline & Washington & 44\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 43\% \\
\hline 29 & Clackamas & 43\% \\
\hline 29 & Multnomah & 43\% \\
\hline 31 & Morrow & 42\% \\
\hline 32 & Linn & 41\% \\
\hline 33 & Benton & 39\% \\
\hline 34 & Jackson & 37\% \\
\hline 34 & Polk & 37\% \\
\hline 36 & Deschutes & 35\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: United Way ALICE Project, 2018, Released 2020.

If Head of Household is:
Age 65 or older

Then the minimum income
needed for basic necessities is:
\$35,000
\(\$ 40,000\)
\$45,000
\$50,000
\$60,000
\$75,000

\section*{NOTABLE FEATURES}

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

Researchers from Oregon State University Extension Service 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.

\section*{Baker}

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

\section*{Benton}

Corvallis Watershed Wild Animal Refuge
Marys Peak
Alsea Falls Recreational Site

\section*{Clackamas}

Mount Hood National Forest
Timberline Lodge
Trillium Lake

\section*{Clatsop}

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

\section*{Columbia}

Forest Grove District State Forest
Collins Beach
Multnomah Channel

\section*{Coos}

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

\section*{Crook}

Ochoco National Forest
Prineville Reservoir Wildlife Area
Ochoco Wayside State Park

\section*{Curry}

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

\section*{Deschutes}

Mount Bachelor Ski Area
Tumalo Falls
Lava River Cave

\section*{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

\section*{Harney}

Steen Mountains
Malheur National Wildlife Refuge
Alvord Hot Springs

\section*{Hood River}

Mount Hood National Forest
Mount Hood Meadows Ski Area
Eagle Creek

\section*{Jackson}

Bear Creek Greenway
Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument
Oregon Vortex

Jefferson
The Cove Palisades State Park
Black Butte
Lake Billy Chinook

\section*{Josephine}

Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserves Indian Mary Park
Rogue River-Siskiyou National Park

\section*{Klamath}

Crater Lake National Park
Winema National Forest
Klamath Marsh National Wildlife Refuge

\section*{Lake}

Fremont National Forest
Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge Derrick Cave

\section*{Lane}

Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area
Sea Lion Caves
Three Sisters

\section*{Lincoln}

Oregon Coast Aquarium
Yaquina Bay State Recreation Site
South Beach State Park

\section*{Linn}

Mount Washington
Middle Santiam Wilderness
Willamette National Forest

\section*{Malheur}

Lake Owyhee State Park
Succor Creek Natural Area
Ontario State Recreation Site

\section*{Marion}

Silver Falls State Park
Enchanted Forest
Oregon State Capitol

\section*{Morrow}

Umatilla National Forest
Umatilla National Wildlife Refuge
Willow Creek Dam

\section*{Multnomah}

Multnomah Falls
Mount Hood National Forest
Mark O Hatfield Wilderness

\section*{Polk}

Basket Slough National Wildlife Refuge Valley of the Giants
Sarah Helmick State Recreation Site

\section*{Sherman}

Deschutes River State Recreation Area
Cottonwood Canyon State Park
John Day Dam

\section*{Tillamook}

Tillamook State Forest
Nehalem Bay State Park
Cape Meares National Wildlife Refuge

\section*{Umatilla}

Umatilla National Forest
Bridge Creek Wildlife Area
Hat Rock State Park

\section*{Union}

Umatilla National Forest
Eagle Cap Mountain Peak
Hilgard Junction State Park

\section*{Wallowa}

Wallowa Lake State Park
Zumwalt Prairie
Wallowa Whitman National Forest

\section*{Wasco}

Mount Hood National Forest
Deschutes River Recreation Site
Memaloose State Park

\section*{Washington}

L L Stub Stewart State Park
Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge
Tualatin Hills Nature Park

\section*{Wheeler}

Ochoco National Forest
Painted Hills
Umatilla National Forest
Yamhill
Mount Hebo
Pheasant Creek Falls
Bald Creek State Scenic Viewpoint

Source: Rural Communities Explorer, 2020.
Released 2020.


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) followed by separate distributions for rural and urban populations (below).


Rural

\section*{Oregon}


\section*{Urban}


Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B01001, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{LIFE EXPECTANCY}

\section*{Definition: The average number of years a person can expect to live.}

Life expectancy is one measure of overall community health. Increasingly, researchers report strong connections between life expectancy and geography because so many social, environmental, behavioral and biological factors contribute to this outcome. Better access to health care and healthy activities can increase life expectancy. Higher rates of risky and unhealthy behaviors can lower life expectancy. Diet, tobacco and alcohol use, frequency of preventive health behaviors, employment in dangerous industries, and biological factors like cardiovascular disease can contribute to differences in life expectancy for men and women. In Oregon, men have a life expectancy of 77 years, while women have a life expectancy of 82 years. The separate calculations for men and women appear on most county profiles earlier in this report. Separate calculations may not be possible in counties with smaller populations.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Years \\
\hline 1 & Benton & 83.8 \\
\hline 2 & Gilliam & 82.9 \\
\hline 3 & Washington & 82.6 \\
\hline 4 & Wheeler & 82.2 \\
\hline 5 & Hood River & 82.0 \\
\hline 6 & Clackamas & 81.2 \\
\hline 7 & Deschutes & 80.9 \\
\hline 8 & Morrow & 80.8 \\
\hline 9 & Wallowa & 80.5 \\
\hline 10 & Grant & 80.2 \\
\hline & Oregon & 79.9 \\
\hline 11 & Sherman & 79.8 \\
\hline 12 & Polk & 79.7 \\
\hline 12 & Yamhill & 79.7 \\
\hline 14 & Marion & 79.5 \\
\hline 15 & Columbia & 79.4 \\
\hline 15 & Lane & 79.4 \\
\hline 15 & Multnomah & 79.4 \\
\hline 18 & Jackson & 79.1 \\
\hline 19 & Malheur & 78.9 \\
\hline 20 & Union & 78.8 \\
\hline 21 & Clatsop & 78.7 \\
\hline 21 & Tillamook & 78.7 \\
\hline 21 & Umatilla & 78.7 \\
\hline 24 & Crook & 78.6 \\
\hline 25 & Baker & 78.4 \\
\hline 26 & Wasco & 78.2 \\
\hline 27 & Lake & 78.0 \\
\hline 28 & Linn & 77.9 \\
\hline 29 & Jefferson & 77.8 \\
\hline 30 & Harney & 77.6 \\
\hline 30 & Lincoln & 77.6 \\
\hline 32 & Douglas & 77.3 \\
\hline 33 & Curry & 77.1 \\
\hline 34 & Josephine & 76.8 \\
\hline 35 & Coos & 76.6 \\
\hline 36 & Klamath & 76.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Vital Statistics, Table 6-57, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{RACE/ETHNICITY}

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

Oregon is becoming an increasingly diverse state. Understanding the distribution of racial and ethnic groups within communities is essential for promoting equal opportunity and addressing policies and practices that create barriers for marginalized and underserved populations. Tracking race and ethnicity is important for building inclusive communities, implementing programs and accessing funding. Reporting race and ethnicity data may be required under state and federal statute. Rural and urban breakouts and the maps to the right provide additional insights about the distribution of racial and ethnic groups across the state.

Federal and state policies and economic forces have shaped Oregon's demographics since the state's founding. For example:
- Black exclusion laws enacted during the early days of the state deterred Black/ African Americans from settling in Oregon.
- The federal Bracero Program during World War II brought Mexican men to alleviate farm-labor shortages and to work on railroad maintenance.
- Today, immigration policies continue to shape Oregon's demographics.

\section*{Oregon}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.9\%
Asian: 4.3\%
Black/African American: 1.8\%
Hispanic/Latino: 13.0\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.4\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: 3.7\%
White: \(75.7 \%\)

\section*{Rural}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 1.5\%
Asian: 1.4\%
Black/African American: 0.6\%
Hispanic/Latino: 9.9\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.2\%
Some other race: 0.1\%
Two or more races: \(2.8 \%\)
White: 83.5\%

\section*{Urban}

American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.7\%
Asian: 5.6\%
Black/African American: 2.4\%
Hispanic/Latino: 14.4\%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 0.5\%
Some other race: 0.2\%
Two or more races: 4.1\%
White: 72.1\%

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B03002, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{RACE/ETHNICITY}

These maps show counties where the population of each race/ethnicity group is above the state average.


\section*{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. (Notes: Employment data are not available when fewer than four establishments of that industry are in a county. This can exclude major employers, such as hospitals. Each county profile shows the top three employment industries in ranked order from left to right.)


Administrative and support services


Agriculture \& forestry support activity


Ambulatory health care services


\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Employment Department, Economic Data, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{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.


Food
manufacturing


\section*{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.


Wood product
manufacturing


\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Employment Department, Economic Data, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{LAND AREA}

\section*{Definition: The total land area within the boundary of each county, measured in square miles.}

Every 10 years the U.S. Census Bureau uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology to delineate jurisdictional and census boundaries. 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.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline & Oregon & 98,378 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 76,753 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 21,625 \\
\hline 1 & Harney & 10,226 \\
\hline 2 & Malheur & 9,930 \\
\hline 3 & Lake & 8,358 \\
\hline 4 & Klamath & 6,136 \\
\hline 5 & Douglas & 5,134 \\
\hline 6 & Lane & 4,722 \\
\hline 7 & Grant & 4,529 \\
\hline 8 & Umatilla & 3,231 \\
\hline 9 & Wallowa & 3,152 \\
\hline 10 & Baker & 3,088 \\
\hline 11 & Deschutes & 3,055 \\
\hline 12 & Crook & 2,987 \\
\hline 13 & Jackson & 2,802 \\
\hline 14 & Wasco & 2,395 \\
\hline 15 & Linn & 2,309 \\
\hline 16 & Morrow & 2,048 \\
\hline 17 & Union & 2,038 \\
\hline 18 & Curry & 1,988 \\
\hline 19 & Clackamas & 1,883 \\
\hline 20 & Coos & 1,806 \\
\hline 21 & Jefferson & 1,791 \\
\hline 22 & Wheeler & 1,715 \\
\hline 23 & Josephine & 1,642 \\
\hline 24 & Tillamook & 1,333 \\
\hline 25 & Gilliam & 1,223 \\
\hline 26 & Lincoln & 1,194 \\
\hline 27 & Marion & 1,192 \\
\hline 28 & Clatsop & 1,084 \\
\hline 29 & Sherman & 831 \\
\hline 30 & Polk & 744 \\
\hline 31 & Washington & 726 \\
\hline 32 & Yamhill & 718 \\
\hline 33 & Columbia & 688 \\
\hline 34 & Benton & 679 \\
\hline 35 & Hood River & 533 \\
\hline 36 & Multnomah & 466 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

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


\section*{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 space 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.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Malheur & 78.4\% \\
\hline 2 & Deschutes & 77.9\% \\
\hline 3 & Lake & 75.3\% \\
\hline 4 & Harney & 74.9\% \\
\hline 5 & Hood River & 73.0\% \\
\hline 6 & Josephine & 68.1\% \\
\hline 7 & Grant & 61.7\% \\
\hline 8 & Klamath & 60.2\% \\
\hline 9 & Wallowa & 58.8\% \\
\hline 10 & Lane & 58.4\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 57.3\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 55.7\% \\
\hline 11 & Curry & 54.9\% \\
\hline 12 & Clackamas & 54.5\% \\
\hline 13 & Tillamook & 53.3\% \\
\hline 14 & Jackson & 52.2\% \\
\hline 15 & Baker & 51.7\% \\
\hline 16 & Douglas & 51.4\% \\
\hline 17 & Jefferson & 50.8\% \\
\hline 18 & Crook & 50.5\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 49.9\% \\
\hline 19 & Union & 48.7\% \\
\hline 20 & Wasco & 43.9\% \\
\hline 21 & Linn & 39.6\% \\
\hline 22 & Multnomah & 36.0\% \\
\hline 23 & Marion & 34.6\% \\
\hline 24 & Lincoln & 29.2\% \\
\hline 25 & Wheeler & 29.0\% \\
\hline 26 & Coos & 28.4\% \\
\hline 27 & Umatilla & 26.8\% \\
\hline 28 & Benton & 26.4\% \\
\hline 29 & Clatsop & 26.0\% \\
\hline 30 & Morrow & 16.7\% \\
\hline 31 & Yamhill & 16.5\% \\
\hline 32 & Washington & 15.3\% \\
\hline 33 & Sherman & 12.3\% \\
\hline 34 & Polk & 11.9\% \\
\hline 35 & Gilliam & 8.4\% \\
\hline 36 & Columbia & 8.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Department of Forestry: Land Management Layer, 2020, collected annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{DEVELOPED OR CULTIVATED LAND}

\section*{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. Over time, shifts change the provision of ecosystem services such as climate regulation, natural hazard regulation, water purification, waste management, pollination or pest control. The conversion of land to developed or cultivated status also can indicate economic growth in a county.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Percent \\
\hline 1 & Marion & 46.9\% \\
\hline 2 & Washington & 45.7\% \\
\hline 3 & Yamhill & 44.8\% \\
\hline 4 & Sherman & 44.3\% \\
\hline 5 & Polk & 42.8\% \\
\hline 6 & Multnomah & 41.8\% \\
\hline 7 & Benton & 34.2\% \\
\hline 8 & Umatilla & 32.8\% \\
\hline 9 & Morrow & 30.0\% \\
\hline 10 & Gilliam & 28.8\% \\
\hline 11 & Linn & 27.0\% \\
\hline 12 & Clackamas & 21.3\% \\
\hline 13 & Columbia & 13.7\% \\
\hline 14 & Union & 13.2\% \\
\hline 15 & Wasco & 10.9\% \\
\hline 16 & Jackson & 10.8\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 10.5\% \\
\hline 17 & Lane & 10.2\% \\
\hline 18 & Hood River & 9.4\% \\
\hline 19 & Douglas & 8.7\% \\
\hline 19 & Josephine & 8.7\% \\
\hline 21 & Klamath & 8.1\% \\
\hline 22 & Jefferson & 7.6\% \\
\hline 23 & Baker & 7.3\% \\
\hline 24 & Coos & 6.7\% \\
\hline 25 & Tillamook & 6.5\% \\
\hline 26 & Lincoln & 6.4\% \\
\hline 27 & Clatsop & 5.7\% \\
\hline 28 & Deschutes & 5.3\% \\
\hline 29 & Malheur & 4.4\% \\
\hline 30 & Harney & 4.3\% \\
\hline 31 & Crook & 3.8\% \\
\hline 32 & Wallowa & 3.7\% \\
\hline 33 & Curry & 3.4\% \\
\hline 34 & Lake & 3.2\% \\
\hline 35 & Wheeler & 1.4\% \\
\hline 36 & Grant & 1.2\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Geological Survey,
Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium, National Land Cover Database, 2016, updated every five years. Released 2019.

\section*{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 have developed 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.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Klamath & 16.0\% \\
\hline 2 & Grant & 15.7\% \\
\hline 3 & Coos & 15.6\% \\
\hline 4 & Wheeler & 15.4\% \\
\hline 5 & Harney & 15.1\% \\
\hline 5 & Josephine & 15.1\% \\
\hline 7 & Lake & 14.9\% \\
\hline 7 & Wallowa & 14.9\% \\
\hline 9 & Baker & 14.7\% \\
\hline 9 & Douglas & 14.7\% \\
\hline 9 & Lincoln & 14.7\% \\
\hline 12 & Curry & 14.6\% \\
\hline 13 & Crook & 14.3\% \\
\hline 13 & Malheur & 14.3\% \\
\hline 15 & Jefferson & 14.2\% \\
\hline 16 & Lane & 13.8\% \\
\hline 17 & Tillamook & 13.6\% \\
\hline 18 & Sherman & 13.5\% \\
\hline 18 & Union & 13.5\% \\
\hline 20 & Umatilla & 13.2\% \\
\hline 21 & Jackson & 13.1\% \\
\hline 21 & Linn & 13.1\% \\
\hline 23 & Gilliam & 12.8\% \\
\hline 24 & Wasco & 12.5\% \\
\hline 25 & Clatsop & 12.3\% \\
\hline 26 & Columbia & 12.2\% \\
\hline 27 & Multnomah & 12.0\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 11.9\% \\
\hline 28 & Marion & 11.8\% \\
\hline 29 & Polk & 11.5\% \\
\hline 30 & Morrow & 11.1\% \\
\hline 30 & Yamhill & 11.1\% \\
\hline 32 & Benton & 10.8\% \\
\hline 33 & Deschutes & 10.5\% \\
\hline 34 & Clackamas & 9.1\% \\
\hline 35 & Washington & 9.0\% \\
\hline 36 & Hood River & 8.1\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap, 2018, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{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 Federal Poverty Level (FPL) 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 basic necessities and 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, all of which result in a greater demand for services. 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.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Malheur & 30.5\% \\
\hline 2 & Klamath & 26.9\% \\
\hline 3 & Umatilla & 25.9\% \\
\hline 4 & Josephine & 25.6\% \\
\hline 5 & Lincoln & 24.9\% \\
\hline 6 & Crook & 24.3\% \\
\hline 7 & Grant* & 24.0\% \\
\hline 8 & Coos & 23.9\% \\
\hline 9 & Jefferson & 23.5\% \\
\hline 10 & Lake* & 22.8\% \\
\hline 10 & Morrow & 22.8\% \\
\hline 12 & Douglas & 22.1\% \\
\hline 13 & Jackson & 21.1\% \\
\hline 14 & Wallowa* & 21.0\% \\
\hline 15 & Lane & 19.9\% \\
\hline 16 & Tillamook & 19.8\% \\
\hline 17 & Marion & 19.5\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{18} & Multnomah & 17.0\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 16.9\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 16.6\% \\
\hline 19 & Yamhill & 16.3\% \\
\hline 20 & Baker & 16.2\% \\
\hline 21 & Linn & 16.1\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{22} & Union & 16.0\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 15.8\% \\
\hline 23 & Wasco & 15.4\% \\
\hline 24 & Deschutes & 14.2\% \\
\hline 25 & Polk & 14.0\% \\
\hline 26 & Benton & 13.9\% \\
\hline 27 & Columbia & 13.8\% \\
\hline 28 & Curry & 11.5\% \\
\hline 29 & Washington & 11.5\% \\
\hline 30 & Clackamas & 9.2\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{31} & Clatsop & 7.9\% \\
\hline & Gilliam* & ID \\
\hline & Harney* & ID \\
\hline & Hood River & ID \\
\hline & Sherman* & ID \\
\hline & Wheeler* & ID \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table S1701, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.

ID: Insufficient data for
comparison/ranking

\section*{FOSTER CARE}

Definition: The number of children in a county in foster care per 1,000 residents under 18 years of age.

Children may enter Oregon's foster care system when they cannot safely remain at home. Children in foster care may have experienced physical abuse (including sexual abuse), neglect (including abandonment), and/or mental abuse. In addition to the trauma of instability at home, children in foster care often encounter instability in many facets of their life - education, for example. They may experience compromised educational outcomes compared to their peers, including but not limited to attendance, test scores and high school completion. Data reported here are point-in-time counts conducted on the same date across the state. Children must rely on the adults in their communities to protect them from abuse and neglect.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Malheur & 25.4 \\
\hline 2 & Harney & 22.4 \\
\hline 3 & Douglas & 20.5 \\
\hline 4 & Coos & 19.0 \\
\hline 5 & Lincoln & 18.0 \\
\hline 6 & Curry & 16.4 \\
\hline 7 & Baker & 15.1 \\
\hline 8 & Klamath & 15.0 \\
\hline 9 & Josephine & 14.5 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 14.4 \\
\hline 10 & Lake & 14.2 \\
\hline 11 & Lane & 13.7 \\
\hline 12 & Wasco & 12.9 \\
\hline 13 & Jefferson & 12.6 \\
\hline 14 & Grant & 12.2 \\
\hline 15 & Jackson & 11.8 \\
\hline 16 & Umatilla & 11.1 \\
\hline 17 & Crook & 10.8 \\
\hline 18 & Columbia & 10.6 \\
\hline 19 & Clatsop & 9.8 \\
\hline 20 & Multnomah & 9.4 \\
\hline & Oregon & 8.3 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 7.2 \\
\hline 21 & Marion & 7.0 \\
\hline 21 & Tillamook & 7.0 \\
\hline 23 & Linn & 6.7 \\
\hline 24 & Hood River & 6.3 \\
\hline 24 & Union & 6.3 \\
\hline 26 & Morrow & 6.2 \\
\hline 27 & Yamhill & 4.7 \\
\hline 28 & Polk & 4.5 \\
\hline 29 & Benton & 3.8 \\
\hline 30 & Clackamas & 3.7 \\
\hline 30 & Washington & 3.7 \\
\hline 32 & Deschutes & 3.5 \\
\hline 33 & Sherman & 0.0 \\
\hline 33 & Wheeler & 0.0 \\
\hline & Gilliam & ID \\
\hline & Wallowa & ID \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Department of Human
Services, Population Research Center
at Portland State University, 2019,
updated annually. Released 2020.
ID: Insufficient data for comparison/ranking

\section*{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.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Multnomah & 55.1 \\
\hline 2 & Jackson & 37.2 \\
\hline 3 & Clatsop & 33.6 \\
\hline 4 & Marion & 33.3 \\
\hline 5 & Coos & 32.8 \\
\hline 6 & Gilliam & 32.7 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 30.6 \\
\hline 7 & Douglas & 28.2 \\
\hline 7 & Malheur & 28.2 \\
\hline & Oregon & 27.7 \\
\hline 9 & Sherman & 27.7 \\
\hline 10 & Lane & 27.2 \\
\hline 11 & Benton & 26.0 \\
\hline 12 & Wasco & 25.4 \\
\hline 13 & Baker & 25.0 \\
\hline 14 & Umatilla & 23.8 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 22.7 \\
\hline 15 & Tillamook & 22.2 \\
\hline 16 & Lincoln & 22.1 \\
\hline 17 & Linn & 22.0 \\
\hline 18 & Josephine & 21.8 \\
\hline 19 & Deschutes & 21.5 \\
\hline 20 & Union & 21.2 \\
\hline 21 & Washington & 18.2 \\
\hline 22 & Jefferson & 18.1 \\
\hline 23 & Clackamas & 17.9 \\
\hline 24 & Crook & 16.6 \\
\hline 24 & Morrow & 16.6 \\
\hline 26 & Yamhill & 16.4 \\
\hline 27 & Hood River & 16.1 \\
\hline 28 & Harney & 14.1 \\
\hline 28 & Polk & 14.1 \\
\hline 30 & Klamath & 13.0 \\
\hline 31 & Lake & 11.9 \\
\hline 32 & Curry & 6.9 \\
\hline 33 & Columbia & 6.6 \\
\hline 34 & Grant & 3.8 \\
\hline 35 & Wallowa & 0.6 \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon State Police,
Population Research Center at Portland State University, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{VOTER PARTICIPATION}

Definition: The percentage of registered voters who participated in the 2020 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.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Wheeler & 90.2\% \\
\hline 2 & Benton & 88.9\% \\
\hline 3 & Wallowa & 87.9\% \\
\hline 4 & Gilliam & 86.1\% \\
\hline 5 & Sherman & 85.4\% \\
\hline 6 & Deschutes & 85.3\% \\
\hline 7 & Clackamas & 84.9\% \\
\hline 8 & Hood River & 84.8\% \\
\hline 8 & Washington & 84.8\% \\
\hline 10 & Grant & 84.6\% \\
\hline 11 & Harney & 82.9\% \\
\hline 12 & Tillamook & 82.8\% \\
\hline 13 & Lane & 82.3\% \\
\hline 14 & Multnomah & 82.2\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 82.0\% \\
\hline 15 & Lake & 81.9\% \\
\hline 16 & Yamhill & 81.8\% \\
\hline 17 & Crook & 81.5\% \\
\hline 18 & Columbia & 81.4\% \\
\hline 19 & Clatsop & 81.3\% \\
\hline 20 & Curry & 81.0\% \\
\hline 20 & Lincoln & 81.0\% \\
\hline 22 & Polk & 80.9\% \\
\hline 23 & Baker & 80.7\% \\
\hline 24 & Jackson & 80.3\% \\
\hline 25 & Union & 80.2\% \\
\hline 26 & Coos & 79.3\% \\
\hline 27 & Douglas & 79.0\% \\
\hline 27 & Wasco & 79.0\% \\
\hline 29 & Marion & 78.9\% \\
\hline 30 & Linn & 78.5\% \\
\hline 31 & Morrow & 77.3\% \\
\hline 32 & Klamath & 76.4\% \\
\hline 33 & Josephine & 76.3\% \\
\hline 34 & Jefferson & 75.0\% \\
\hline 35 & Umatilla & 73.7\% \\
\hline 36 & Malheur & 72.8\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Office of the Oregon Secretary of State, 2020, updated biennially. Released 2020.

\section*{KINDERGARTEN READY (LETTER SOUNDS)}

Definition: The average number of letter sounds in the English alphabet that children identify when shown paired upper and lowercase letters. Scores are reported out of 26 possible.

Decades of educational research suggest that particular early achievement measures can predict readiness for learning, longterm academic outcomes and emotional development. Oregon's kindergarten readiness assessment includes measures in three areas: early literacy, early math and approaches to learning. It intentionally aligns with Oregon's Early Learning Standards, Kindergarten Common Core State Standards and those used in Head Start classrooms. Children cannot pass or fail the assessment as it simply provides a snapshot of the skills and knowledge students possess when entering kindergarten. Unlike standardized tests used in the later grades, teachers administer the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment through a series of low-stakes, unpressured teacher-student conversations. The letter sounds score is highly correlated with reading ability and future academic success.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Score \\
\hline 1 & Wallowa & 13.8 \\
\hline 2 & Wheeler & 12.5 \\
\hline 3 & Harney & 12.0 \\
\hline 4 & Union & 11.0 \\
\hline 5 & Baker & 10.8 \\
\hline 6 & Sherman & 10.5 \\
\hline 7 & Benton & 10.4 \\
\hline 8 & Grant & 9.9 \\
\hline 9 & Washington & 9.5 \\
\hline 10 & Gilliam & 9.4 \\
\hline 11 & Clackamas & 9.3 \\
\hline 12 & Deschutes & 9.0 \\
\hline 13 & Clatsop & 8.3 \\
\hline 13 & Lake & 8.3 \\
\hline 15 & Lane & 8.2 \\
\hline 15 & Multnomah & 8.2 \\
\hline & Oregon & 7.7 \\
\hline 17 & Lincoln & 7.5 \\
\hline 18 & Columbia & 7.3 \\
\hline 18 & Crook & 7.3 \\
\hline 20 & Yamhill & 7.1 \\
\hline 21 & Morrow & 7.0 \\
\hline 22 & Malheur & 6.8 \\
\hline 23 & Tillamook & 6.7 \\
\hline 23 & Umatilla & 6.7 \\
\hline 25 & Douglas & 6.2 \\
\hline 25 & Linn & 6.2 \\
\hline 27 & Hood River & 6.0 \\
\hline 28 & Coos & 5.9 \\
\hline 28 & Josephine & 5.9 \\
\hline 30 & Jackson & 5.7 \\
\hline 30 & Polk & 5.7 \\
\hline 32 & Curry & 5.5 \\
\hline 33 & Klamath & 5.1 \\
\hline 34 & Marion & 5.0 \\
\hline 35 & Jefferson & 4.7 \\
\hline 36 & Wasco & 4.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Kindergarten Assessment, 2019-2020, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{THIRD GRADE READING}

Definition: The percentage of third graders who meet or exceed required reading scores on state standardized tests.

In third grade, students are expected to begin reading independently, if they are not doing so already. They are making the shift from learning to read to reading to learn. For the rest of their schooling, students' ability to read confidently and proficiently will directly impact their likelihood of learning successfully in every subject area. Bridging the reading achievement gap becomes harder as students get older, so third grade serves as a critical point for assessing needs and getting students the supports they need. Research shows that reading scores at younger grades predict measures of future academic success, especially high school graduation rates. Standardized test scores provide one window into a student's early reading abilities and a community's need to provide additional reading supports for children in general.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Wallowa & 70.0\% \\
\hline 2 & Deschutes & 61.0\% \\
\hline 3 & Grant & 57.1\% \\
\hline 4 & Washington & 54.9\% \\
\hline 5 & Clackamas & 54.5\% \\
\hline 5 & Gilliam & 54.5\% \\
\hline 7 & Benton & 53.7\% \\
\hline 8 & Harney & 51.3\% \\
\hline 9 & Yamhill & 50.0\% \\
\hline 10 & Union & 48.7\% \\
\hline 11 & Josephine & 48.3\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{12} & Hood River & 48.2\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 48.0\% \\
\hline 13 & Wheeler & 48.0\% \\
\hline 14 & Crook & 47.6\% \\
\hline 15 & Baker & 47.1\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{16} & Multnomah & 46.7\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 46.5\% \\
\hline 17 & Lane & 45.5\% \\
\hline 18 & Wasco & 44.5\% \\
\hline 19 & Umatilla & 43.1\% \\
\hline 20 & Linn & 42.6\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{21} & Coos & 42.5\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 42.2\% \\
\hline 22 & Jefferson & 42.1\% \\
\hline 23 & Jackson & 42.0\% \\
\hline 24 & Curry & 41.2\% \\
\hline 25 & Clatsop & 41.1\% \\
\hline 26 & Columbia & 40.9\% \\
\hline 27 & Douglas & 40.8\% \\
\hline 27 & Lake & 40.8\% \\
\hline 29 & Sherman & 40.0\% \\
\hline 30 & Klamath & 38.9\% \\
\hline 31 & Malheur & 37.6\% \\
\hline 32 & Morrow & 37.4\% \\
\hline 33 & Marion & 36.4\% \\
\hline 34 & Lincoln & 35.5\% \\
\hline 35 & Tillamook & 34.4\% \\
\hline 36 & Polk & 30.6\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Department of
Education, 2018-2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{NINTH GRADE ON TRACK}

Definition: The percentage of ninth graders who have attended school regularly and successfully completed all required courses during their first year of high school.

The ninth grade academic year serves as a pivotal point of transition for students. Being academically on track in ninth grade predicts future academic success, especially a greater likelihood of high school completion across all demographics. Students who are not on track at the end of ninth grade start tenth grade behind, making them less likely to graduate on time or perhaps at all. Identifying struggling students early in their high school careers allows for more timely interventions. As a state, Oregon is an early implementer of the "ninth grade on track" indicator as part of its high school accountability system.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Gilliam & 95.0\% \\
\hline 2 & Harney & 94.7\% \\
\hline 3 & Morrow & 94.6\% \\
\hline 4 & Curry & 91.7\% \\
\hline 5 & Benton & 91.4\% \\
\hline 6 & Washington & 90.5\% \\
\hline 7 & Wallowa & 89.9\% \\
\hline 8 & Grant & 89.1\% \\
\hline 9 & Deschutes & 88.8\% \\
\hline 10 & Malheur & 88.5\% \\
\hline 11 & Clackamas & 88.3\% \\
\hline 12 & Crook & 87.3\% \\
\hline 13 & Multnomah & 86.8\% \\
\hline 14 & Clatsop & 86.7\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 86.5\% \\
\hline 15 & Hood River & 86.4\% \\
\hline 15 & Tillamook & 86.4\% \\
\hline 17 & Jackson & 86.1\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 85.3\% \\
\hline 18 & Polk & 85.2\% \\
\hline 19 & Lane & 85.1\% \\
\hline 20 & Marion & 84.8\% \\
\hline 21 & Umatilla & 84.6\% \\
\hline 22 & Union & 84.3\% \\
\hline 23 & Douglas & 82.9\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 82.7\% \\
\hline 24 & Klamath & 82.3\% \\
\hline 25 & Josephine & 81.9\% \\
\hline 26 & Lake & 81.7\% \\
\hline 27 & Yamhill & 81.2\% \\
\hline 28 & Columbia & 80.3\% \\
\hline 29 & Jefferson & 79.3\% \\
\hline 30 & Sherman & 78.3\% \\
\hline 31 & Lincoln & 78.2\% \\
\hline 32 & Linn & 76.1\% \\
\hline 33 & Coos & 74.9\% \\
\hline 34 & Wasco & 74.5\% \\
\hline 35 & Baker & 73.2\% \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 50.8\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Department of Education, 2018-2019, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{FIVE-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATE}

Definition: The percentage of students in a high school cohort who earned a standard high school diploma within five years of starting high school.

High school graduation rate indicates a community's well-being as well as the skill of its workforce. Over the last few decades, the gap in wages between those with a high school diploma and those without one has provided strong incentive for students to complete high school. Still, across Oregon, a significant group of students require more time to graduate. The reasons are many - from family struggles to academic issues. Such students need adequate support to complete their secondary education in a timely fashion. Students who do not achieve this benchmark will likely face significant challenges attaining adult milestones such as gaining employment or continuing their education. Tracking the five-year high school graduation rate provides communities with a clearer measure of high school completion. It also encourages policies and practices that will support students who need more time to finish their high school requirements.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Wallowa & 96.5\% \\
\hline 2 & Grant & 92.6\% \\
\hline 3 & Lake & 90.5\% \\
\hline 4 & Union & 89.4\% \\
\hline 5 & Hood River & 88.6\% \\
\hline 5 & Washington & 88.6\% \\
\hline 7 & Tillamook & 88.3\% \\
\hline 8 & Benton & 88.0\% \\
\hline 9 & Malheur & 87.9\% \\
\hline 10 & Yamhill & 87.6\% \\
\hline 11 & Sherman & 87.5\% \\
\hline 12 & Clackamas & 86.9\% \\
\hline 13 & Harney & 86.8\% \\
\hline 14 & Morrow & 85.6\% \\
\hline 15 & Columbia & 85.2\% \\
\hline 16 & Lincoln & 85.1\% \\
\hline 17 & Polk & 84.7\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{18} & Deschutes & 84.3\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 83.2\% \\
\hline 19 & Jackson & 82.7\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{20} & Jefferson & 82.6\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 81.6\% \\
\hline 21 & Baker & 81.4\% \\
\hline 22 & Marion & 81.2\% \\
\hline 22 & Umatilla & 81.2\% \\
\hline 24 & Multnomah & 80.4\% \\
\hline 25 & Clatsop & 79.3\% \\
\hline 26 & Wasco & 78.6\% \\
\hline 27 & Crook & 78.4\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{28} & Curry & 78.2\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 77.9\% \\
\hline 29 & Linn & 77.7\% \\
\hline 30 & Gilliam & 77.3\% \\
\hline 31 & Lane & 76.9\% \\
\hline 32 & Klamath & 76.1\% \\
\hline 33 & Josephine & 75.7\% \\
\hline 34 & Douglas & 71.8\% \\
\hline 35 & Coos & 64.6\% \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 29.3\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Department of Education, 2018-2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE OR GREATER}

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

Those who earn a four-year college degree or higher generally experience increased lifetime earnings, enhanced worker benefits, more social mobility and improved health. This measure is an important indicator of human capital at the county level. It is frequently used to describe a community's labor force for purposes of economic development.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Benton & 54.1\% \\
\hline 2 & Multnomah & 45.9\% \\
\hline 3 & Washington & 44.4\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 38.2\% \\
\hline 4 & Clackamas & 37.4\% \\
\hline 5 & Deschutes & 35.4\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 33.7\% \\
\hline 6 & Hood River & 32.0\% \\
\hline 7 & Polk & 31.0\% \\
\hline 8 & Lane & 30.5\% \\
\hline 9 & Jackson & 27.8\% \\
\hline 10 & Yamhill & 26.9\% \\
\hline 11 & Wallowa & 26.4\% \\
\hline 12 & Lincoln & 24.9\% \\
\hline 13 & Curry & 24.6\% \\
\hline 14 & Union & 24.5\% \\
\hline 15 & Clatsop & 24.4\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 24.1\% \\
\hline 16 & Baker & 23.7\% \\
\hline 17 & Marion & 23.5\% \\
\hline 18 & Tillamook & 21.8\% \\
\hline 19 & Klamath & 20.0\% \\
\hline 20 & Crook & 19.8\% \\
\hline 21 & Wasco & 19.6\% \\
\hline 22 & Jefferson & 19.4\% \\
\hline 23 & Linn & 19.3\% \\
\hline 24 & Grant & 18.9\% \\
\hline 25 & Columbia & 18.5\% \\
\hline 26 & Harney & 18.4\% \\
\hline 27 & Coos & 17.8\% \\
\hline 28 & Josephine & 17.5\% \\
\hline 29 & Gilliam & 17.4\% \\
\hline 30 & Douglas & 17.3\% \\
\hline 30 & Sherman & 17.3\% \\
\hline 32 & Umatilla & 17.2\% \\
\hline 33 & Lake & 16.4\% \\
\hline 34 & Wheeler & 14.9\% \\
\hline 35 & Malheur & 13.7\% \\
\hline 36 & Morrow & 9.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{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. These rates represent Oregon prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.
\begin{tabular}{|r|r|}
\hline Rank & County \\
\hline 1 & Amount \\
\hline 2 & Klamath \\
\hline 3 & Wallowa \\
\hline 4 & Lake \\
\hline 5 & Harney \\
\hline 6 & Crook \\
\hline 6 & Curry \\
\hline 8 & Jefferson \\
\hline 9 & Josephine \\
\hline 10 & Coos \\
\hline 10 & Douglas \\
\hline 12 & Umatilla \\
\hline 12 & Union \\
\hline 14 & Baker \\
\hline 15 & Columbia \\
\hline 16 & Jackson \\
\hline 16 & Lincoln \\
\hline 16 & Linn \\
\hline 19 & Wheeler \\
\hline 20 & Lane \\
\hline 20 & \(4.8 \%\) \\
\hline 20 & Malheur \\
\hline 35 & \(4.7 \%\) \\
\hline 20 & Morrow \\
\hline 35 & Polk \\
\hline 20 & Wasco \\
\hline 25 & Deschutes
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Employment
Department, Economic Data, 2019,
updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{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 downturns and in areas that are economically depressed. Higher rates of labor force participation are generally viewed favorably. However, local factors, such as the age structure of the population or the sources of household income, can affect this measure in ways that warrant careful interpretation with respect to context. These rates represent Oregon prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Multnomah & 69.4\% \\
\hline 2 & Washington & 69.0\% \\
\hline 3 & Hood River & 67.7\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 65.6\% \\
\hline 4 & Clackamas & 64.6\% \\
\hline 5 & Deschutes & 63.1\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 62.3\% \\
\hline 6 & Marion & 61.4\% \\
\hline 7 & Yamhill & 60.3\% \\
\hline 8 & Morrow & 60.2\% \\
\hline 8 & Polk & 60.2\% \\
\hline 10 & Lane & 59.7\% \\
\hline 11 & Benton & 59.6\% \\
\hline 12 & Wasco & 59.3\% \\
\hline 13 & Union & 58.7\% \\
\hline 14 & Linn & 58.6\% \\
\hline 15 & Umatilla & 58.5\% \\
\hline 16 & Columbia & 57.9\% \\
\hline 17 & Clatsop & 57.8\% \\
\hline 18 & Jackson & 57.3\% \\
\hline 19 & Gilliam & 55.9\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 55.1\% \\
\hline 20 & Wallowa & 55.1\% \\
\hline 21 & Harney & 54.8\% \\
\hline 22 & Grant & 53.7\% \\
\hline 23 & Klamath & 53.1\% \\
\hline 23 & Sherman & 53.1\% \\
\hline 25 & Jefferson & 52.9\% \\
\hline 26 & Crook & 51.6\% \\
\hline 26 & Lake & 51.6\% \\
\hline 28 & Douglas & 51.1\% \\
\hline 29 & Coos & 50.8\% \\
\hline 30 & Malheur & 49.8\% \\
\hline 30 & Tillamook & 49.8\% \\
\hline 32 & Baker & 49.7\% \\
\hline 33 & Josephine & 49.0\% \\
\hline 33 & Lincoln & 49.0\% \\
\hline 35 & Curry & 42.0\% \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 40.7\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table B23025, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.
}

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 each county and across the state. These rates represent Oregon prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Gilliam & 69.2 \\
\hline 2 & Washington & 12.4 \\
\hline 3 & Josephine & 12.2 \\
\hline 4 & Multnomah & 12.1 \\
\hline 5 & Grant & 11.2 \\
\hline 6 & Clackamas & 9.0 \\
\hline 6 & Wheeler & 9.0 \\
\hline 8 & Hood River & 8.4 \\
\hline 9 & Harney & 7.6 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 7.4 \\
\hline 10 & Yamhill & 7.4 \\
\hline 11 & Curry & 7.3 \\
\hline & Oregon & 6.5 \\
\hline 12 & Marion & 6.1 \\
\hline 13 & Coos & 6.0 \\
\hline 14 & Malheur & 5.4 \\
\hline 15 & Lake & 5.1 \\
\hline 16 & Polk & 4.9 \\
\hline 17 & Columbia & 4.5 \\
\hline 18 & Crook & 4.2 \\
\hline 19 & Baker & 4.1 \\
\hline 19 & Union & 4.1 \\
\hline 21 & Clatsop & 4.0 \\
\hline 21 & Tillamook & 4.0 \\
\hline 23 & Douglas & 2.7 \\
\hline 23 & Jackson & 2.7 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 2.3 \\
\hline 25 & Umatilla & 2.3 \\
\hline 26 & Lane & 2.2 \\
\hline 27 & Benton & 1.0 \\
\hline 28 & Lincoln & 0.4 \\
\hline 29 & Wallowa & -1.6 \\
\hline 30 & Deschutes & -2.0 \\
\hline 30 & Sherman & -2.0 \\
\hline 32 & Linn & -2.2 \\
\hline 33 & Klamath & -4.1 \\
\hline 34 & Wasco & -4.2 \\
\hline 35 & Jefferson & -5.4 \\
\hline 36 & Morrow & -11.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Accounts, CA25N, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{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 and recreation, as well as public health. It is also a measure of relative tax burden. Property tax imposed excludes taxes allocated to urban renewal agencies and special assessments.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Gilliam & \$4,564 \\
\hline 2 & Sherman & \$4,084 \\
\hline 3 & Morrow & \$2,722 \\
\hline 4 & Lincoln & \$2,361 \\
\hline 5 & Tillamook & \$2,120 \\
\hline 6 & Clatsop & \$2,062 \\
\hline 7 & Multnomah & \$2,039 \\
\hline 8 & Clackamas & \$1,930 \\
\hline 9 & Deschutes & \$1,918 \\
\hline 10 & Washington & \$1,821 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{11} & Wheeler & \$1,682 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & \$1,668 \\
\hline & Oregon & \$1,613 \\
\hline 12 & Benton & \$1,581 \\
\hline 13 & Lake & \$1,575 \\
\hline 14 & Lane & \$1,415 \\
\hline 15 & Wasco & \$1,388 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{16} & Jackson & \$1,347 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & \$1,330 \\
\hline 17 & Columbia & \$1,330 \\
\hline 18 & Linn & \$1,321 \\
\hline 19 & Wallowa & \$1,312 \\
\hline 20 & Hood River & \$1,307 \\
\hline 21 & Crook & \$1,295 \\
\hline 22 & Baker & \$1,260 \\
\hline 23 & Yamhill & \$1,236 \\
\hline 24 & Marion & \$1,203 \\
\hline 25 & Jefferson & \$1,188 \\
\hline 26 & Umatilla & \$1,170 \\
\hline 27 & Curry & \$1,170 \\
\hline 28 & Grant & \$1,146 \\
\hline 29 & Polk & \$1,115 \\
\hline 30 & Harney & \$1,088 \\
\hline 31 & Coos & \$1,081 \\
\hline 32 & Union & \$1,023 \\
\hline 33 & Klamath & \$1,020 \\
\hline 34 & Douglas & \$913 \\
\hline 35 & Josephine & \$891 \\
\hline 36 & Malheur & \$880 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Department of
Revenue, Property Tax Statistics, Table
1.6, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{RENT COSTS (1 BEDROOM/1 BATH)}

Definition: The Fair Market Rent (FMR) price for a one-bedroom apartment.

Fair Market Rent (FMR) prices are developed each year for counties and metropolitan areas by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The figures are calculated using the rent prices paid by people who have recently moved and serve as the basis for federal housing assistance programs. FMRs can be used to look at changes in rent costs in an area over time or to compare the cost of rental housing across communities. In Oregon, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) agency calculates the Portland Metropolitan area (Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah, Washington, and Yamhill counties) as a single area. While rent prices vary considerably across each of these counties, the FMR is still important to consider due to its role in determining the amount of housing assistance available to low-income and other vulnerable populations.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Clackamas & \$1,234 \\
\hline 1 & Columbia & \$1,234 \\
\hline 1 & Multnomah & \$1,234 \\
\hline 1 & Washington & \$1,234 \\
\hline 1 & Yamhill & \$1,234 \\
\hline 6 & Benton & \$886 \\
\hline 7 & Deschutes & \$884 \\
\hline 8 & Hood River & \$882 \\
\hline 9 & Wasco & \$814 \\
\hline 10 & Lane & \$780 \\
\hline 11 & Curry & \$777 \\
\hline 12 & Douglas & \$773 \\
\hline 13 & Linn & \$761 \\
\hline 14 & Jackson & \$747 \\
\hline 15 & Marion & \$736 \\
\hline 15 & Polk & \$736 \\
\hline 17 & Josephine & \$722 \\
\hline 18 & Clatsop & \$700 \\
\hline 19 & Lincoln & \$697 \\
\hline 20 & Coos & \$684 \\
\hline 21 & Jefferson & \$611 \\
\hline 22 & Tillamook & \$610 \\
\hline 23 & Wallowa & \$609 \\
\hline 24 & Grant & \$598 \\
\hline 25 & Gilliam & \$593 \\
\hline 25 & Sherman & \$593 \\
\hline 27 & Harney & \$588 \\
\hline 28 & Crook & \$579 \\
\hline 29 & Umatilla & \$577 \\
\hline 30 & Lake & \$574 \\
\hline 31 & Klamath & \$567 \\
\hline 32 & Union & \$553 \\
\hline 33 & Malheur & \$544 \\
\hline 34 & Wheeler & \$542 \\
\hline 35 & Morrow & \$537 \\
\hline 36 & Baker & \$529 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of
Policy Development and Research, Fair Market Rents, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{LOW WEIGHT BIRTHS}

\section*{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 multiple concerns including adverse health behavior, limited access to care, socioeconomic and environmental risks.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Grant & 10.0\% \\
\hline 2 & Malheur & 9.0\% \\
\hline 3 & Lake & 8.6\% \\
\hline 4 & Crook & 8.4\% \\
\hline 5 & Clatsop & 8.3\% \\
\hline 6 & Union & 8.0\% \\
\hline 7 & Yamhill & 7.9\% \\
\hline 8 & Douglas & 7.8\% \\
\hline 9 & Lincoln & 7.5\% \\
\hline 10 & Jackson & 7.1\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{10} & Jefferson & 7.1\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 7.1\% \\
\hline 12 & Klamath & 7.0\% \\
\hline 12 & Multnomah & 7.0\% \\
\hline 14 & Baker & 6.9\% \\
\hline 14 & Deschutes & 6.9\% \\
\hline 14 & Polk & 6.9\% \\
\hline 17 & Clackamas & 6.8\% \\
\hline 17 & Harney & 6.8\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{17} & Hood River & 6.8\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 6.7\% \\
\hline 20 & Umatilla & 6.7\% \\
\hline 20 & Washington & 6.7\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{22} & Tillamook & 6.6\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 6.6\% \\
\hline 23 & Columbia & 6.4\% \\
\hline 23 & Lane & 6.4\% \\
\hline 25 & Linn & 6.2\% \\
\hline 26 & Coos & 5.9\% \\
\hline 27 & Marion & 5.8\% \\
\hline 28 & Wallowa & 5.7\% \\
\hline 29 & Benton & 5.4\% \\
\hline 29 & Morrow & 5.4\% \\
\hline 31 & Josephine & 5.3\% \\
\hline 32 & Wasco & 5.0\% \\
\hline 33 & Curry & 4.9\% \\
\hline 34 & Gilliam & 0.0\% \\
\hline 34 & Sherman & 0.0\% \\
\hline 34 & Wheeler & 0.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Center for Health Statistics, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.
}

\section*{VACCINATION RATE, 2-YEAR-OLDS}

Definition: The percentage of 2-year-olds in a given year who have received their required immunizations.

In Oregon, children entering preschool, child care or Head Start currently must receive the following vaccinations: 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.
* For this measure, data for Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco counties are reported together as North Central Public Health District. This value represents the whole district, so each county shows as the same value, but there is likely variation. This measure cannot be reported for Wheeler County reliably due to small sample size.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Hood River & 82\% \\
\hline 2 & Polk & 80\% \\
\hline 3 & Klamath & 79\% \\
\hline 3 & Malheur & 79\% \\
\hline 3 & Morrow & 79\% \\
\hline 3 & Yamhill & 79\% \\
\hline 7 & Washington & 78\% \\
\hline 8 & Clackamas & 77\% \\
\hline 8 & Crook & 77\% \\
\hline 8 & Harney & 77\% \\
\hline 8 & Lane & 77\% \\
\hline 8 & Union & 77\% \\
\hline 13 & Douglas & 76\% \\
\hline 13 & Jefferson & 76\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 76\% \\
\hline 15 & Baker & 75\% \\
\hline 15 & Coos & 75\% \\
\hline 15 & Deschutes & 75\% \\
\hline 15 & Gilliam* & 75\% \\
\hline 15 & Sherman* & 75\% \\
\hline 15 & Wasco* & 75\% \\
\hline 21 & Linn & 74\% \\
\hline 21 & Multnomah & 74\% \\
\hline 23 & Lincoln & 73\% \\
\hline 23 & Marion & 73\% \\
\hline 25 & Benton & 72\% \\
\hline 25 & Columbia & 72\% \\
\hline 25 & Josephine & 72\% \\
\hline 28 & Jackson & 71\% \\
\hline 29 & Lake & 70\% \\
\hline 29 & Umatilla & 70\% \\
\hline 31 & Grant & 69\% \\
\hline 32 & Clatsop & 68\% \\
\hline 32 & Tillamook & 68\% \\
\hline 34 & Wallowa & 63\% \\
\hline 35 & Curry & 58\% \\
\hline & Wheeler & ID \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Health Authority, Oregon Child Immunization Rates, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

ID: Insufficient data per source

\section*{GOOD PHYSICAL HEALTH}

\section*{Definition: The percentage of adults reporting that they have had no poor physical health days in the prior month.}

Poor physical health can disrupt daily activities, even if the symptoms do not require medical attention. These data are based on a selfassessment, meaning they do not rely on diagnoses or medical intervention. Adults were asked: "Thinking about your physical health, which includes physical illness and injury, for how many days during the past 30 days was your physical health not good?" Research shows that counties where residents report fewer unhealthy days also tend to have lower rates of disability, unemployment, poverty and mortality.
* For this measure, data for Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco counties are reported together as North Central Public Health District. This value represents the whole district, so each county shows as the same value, but there is likely variation.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Crook & 73.1\% \\
\hline 2 & Harney & 69.8\% \\
\hline 3 & Gilliam* & 68.7\% \\
\hline 3 & Sherman* & 68.7\% \\
\hline 3 & Wasco* & 68.7\% \\
\hline 6 & Clatsop & 68.6\% \\
\hline 7 & Wallowa & 68.3\% \\
\hline 8 & Union & 64.4\% \\
\hline 9 & Deschutes & 64.1\% \\
\hline 10 & Washington & 63.9\% \\
\hline 11 & Umatilla & 63.1\% \\
\hline 12 & Klamath & 62.8\% \\
\hline 13 & Benton & 61.5\% \\
\hline 14 & Clackamas & 61.4\% \\
\hline 15 & Tillamook & 60.8\% \\
\hline 16 & Jackson & 60.6\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 60.1\% \\
\hline 17 & Marion & 59.9\% \\
\hline 18 & Yamhill & 59.8\% \\
\hline 19 & Lake & 59.5\% \\
\hline 20 & Linn & 59.2\% \\
\hline 21 & Columbia & 58.9\% \\
\hline 22 & Josephine & 58.5\% \\
\hline 23 & Multnomah & 58.4\% \\
\hline 24 & Douglas & 58.0\% \\
\hline 25 & Lane & 57.9\% \\
\hline 26 & Lincoln & 57.1\% \\
\hline 27 & Hood River & 57.0\% \\
\hline 28 & Baker & 56.0\% \\
\hline 28 & Polk & 56.0\% \\
\hline 30 & Coos & 54.3\% \\
\hline 30 & Grant & 54.3\% \\
\hline 32 & Malheur & 53.6\% \\
\hline 33 & Curry & 53.5\% \\
\hline 34 & Jefferson & 50.3\% \\
\hline 35 & Morrow & 47.9\% \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 29.7\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Adult Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2014-2017, updated biennially. Released 2019.
}

Definition: The percentage of adults reporting that they had no days of poor mental health in the prior month.

Mental health is key to overall health. Due to stigma and the shortage of mental health providers, many mental health conditions go undiagnosed. These data are based on a self-assessment and are self-reported, meaning they do not rely on diagnoses or medical intervention. Adults were asked: "Thinking about your mental health, which includes stress, depression, and problems with emotions, for how many days during the past 30 days was your mental health not good?" Interventions to address low levels of good mental health should consider access to care. Data reported here are from aggregated sampling across years.
* For this measure, data for Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco counties are reported together as North Central Public Health District. This value represents the whole district, so each county shows as the same value, but there is likely variation.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Morrow & 70.9\% \\
\hline 2 & Lake & 69.4\% \\
\hline 3 & Crook & 65.5\% \\
\hline 4 & Umatilla & 64.5\% \\
\hline 5 & Wallowa & 63.7\% \\
\hline 6 & Union & 62.4\% \\
\hline 7 & Washington & 62.2\% \\
\hline 8 & Deschutes & 59.9\% \\
\hline 9 & Gilliam* & 59.8\% \\
\hline 9 & Sherman* & 59.8\% \\
\hline 9 & Wasco* & 59.8\% \\
\hline 12 & Clatsop & 59.7\% \\
\hline 13 & Klamath & 59.6\% \\
\hline 14 & Hood River & 59.0\% \\
\hline 15 & Clackamas & 58.8\% \\
\hline 16 & Lincoln & 58.7\% \\
\hline 16 & Linn & 58.7\% \\
\hline 16 & Yamhill & 58.7\% \\
\hline 19 & Coos & 58.5\% \\
\hline 20 & Josephine & 58.2\% \\
\hline 21 & Benton & 57.4\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 57.3\% \\
\hline 22 & Columbia & 56.9\% \\
\hline 23 & Marion & 56.7\% \\
\hline 24 & Douglas & 56.5\% \\
\hline 25 & Curry & 56.4\% \\
\hline 26 & Malheur & 56.2\% \\
\hline 27 & Wheeler & 55.7\% \\
\hline 28 & Polk & 55.6\% \\
\hline 29 & Tillamook & 55.5\% \\
\hline 30 & Jackson & 55.4\% \\
\hline 31 & Harney & 54.8\% \\
\hline 32 & Multnomah & 53.8\% \\
\hline 33 & Lane & 53.0\% \\
\hline 34 & Grant & 52.9\% \\
\hline 35 & Baker & 51.1\% \\
\hline 36 & Jefferson & 49.1\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon Health Authority, Adult Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2014-2017, updated biennially. Released 2019.
}

\section*{TOBACCO USE}

Definition: The percentage of adults who report that they currently use tobacco, including cigarettes, e-cigarettes, cigars, hookahs or smokeless tobacco.

Tobacco use is the number-one contributor to preventable death in Oregon. It is a risk factor for developing chronic conditions and worsens outcomes for people with chronic conditions. Tobacco use also has economic consequences, costing billions of dollars in medical expenses, lost productivity and early death each year. While cigarette smoking is currently more common than other forms of tobacco use among adults, research shows that youth are increasingly using alternative forms.
* For this measure, data for Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco counties are reported together as North Central Public Health District. This value represents the whole district, so each county shows as the same value, but there is likely variation.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Baker & 39.6\% \\
\hline 2 & Gilliam* & 39.3\% \\
\hline 2 & Sherman* & 39.3\% \\
\hline 2 & Wasco* & 39.3\% \\
\hline 5 & Josephine & 38.3\% \\
\hline 6 & Coos & 36.8\% \\
\hline 7 & Morrow & 36.7\% \\
\hline 8 & Hood River & 35.2\% \\
\hline 9 & Lincoln & 34.9\% \\
\hline 10 & Union & 34.6\% \\
\hline 11 & Crook & 34.5\% \\
\hline 12 & Klamath & 33.1\% \\
\hline 13 & Yamhill & 32.1\% \\
\hline 14 & Clatsop & 31.7\% \\
\hline 15 & Douglas & 31.5\% \\
\hline 16 & Harney & 31.1\% \\
\hline 17 & Grant & 30.9\% \\
\hline 18 & Linn & 30.1\% \\
\hline 19 & Curry & 29.8\% \\
\hline 20 & Columbia & 29.5\% \\
\hline 21 & Malheur & 29.4\% \\
\hline 22 & Jackson & 27.2\% \\
\hline 23 & Umatilla & 27.1\% \\
\hline 24 & Lane & 25.7\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 25.5\% \\
\hline 25 & Marion & 24.6\% \\
\hline 26 & Deschutes & 24.5\% \\
\hline 27 & Clackamas & 24.4\% \\
\hline 28 & Tillamook & 23.7\% \\
\hline 29 & Jefferson & 23.0\% \\
\hline 30 & Multnomah & 22.8\% \\
\hline 31 & Washington & 20.3\% \\
\hline 32 & Lake & 19.8\% \\
\hline 33 & Polk & 18.8\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{34} & Benton & 11.3\% \\
\hline & Wallowa & ID \\
\hline & Wheeler & ID \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Health Authority, Adult Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2014-2017, updated biennially. Released 2019.

ID: Insufficient data per source

\section*{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, view entertainment and attend school. Today, access to high volume data transfer rates has become a key requirement for economic and community development as well as education. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) defines the advanced telecommunications capability benchmark for broadband. The existing benchmark speed is 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload. To calculate the percentage of households served by broadband, census blocks are analyzed to determine which ones meet the FCC's advanced broadband benchmark. Households in census blocks that meet the FCC's advanced broadband criteria are 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 even though broadband is available, the cost may prohibit residents from having a subscription. This measure reports the percentage of households with broadband available for purchase, not the percentage of households that have subscribed to broadband service.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Benton & 99.9\% \\
\hline 1 & Marion & 99.9\% \\
\hline 3 & Washington & 99.8\% \\
\hline 4 & Polk & 99.7\% \\
\hline 5 & Linn & 99.5\% \\
\hline 6 & Yamhill & 99.3\% \\
\hline 7 & Lane & 99.1\% \\
\hline 8 & Jefferson & 98.9\% \\
\hline 8 & Multnomah & 98.9\% \\
\hline 10 & Tillamook & 98.5\% \\
\hline 11 & Deschutes & 98.3\% \\
\hline 12 & Clackamas & 98.2\% \\
\hline 12 & Lincoln & 98.2\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 97.6\% \\
\hline 14 & Clatsop & 97.3\% \\
\hline 15 & Crook & 97.2\% \\
\hline 16 & Hood River & 97.0\% \\
\hline 17 & Jackson & 96.8\% \\
\hline 18 & Curry & 95.7\% \\
\hline 19 & Malheur & 95.1\% \\
\hline 20 & Umatilla & 94.6\% \\
\hline 21 & Columbia & 94.4\% \\
\hline 21 & Douglas & 94.4\% \\
\hline 23 & Klamath & 93.1\% \\
\hline 24 & Coos & 91.9\% \\
\hline 25 & Wasco & 89.9\% \\
\hline 26 & Union & 89.5\% \\
\hline 27 & Josephine & 89.4\% \\
\hline 28 & Wallowa & 85.7\% \\
\hline 29 & Morrow & 78.5\% \\
\hline 30 & Harney & 73.8\% \\
\hline 31 & Sherman & 73.5\% \\
\hline 32 & Baker & 73.1\% \\
\hline 33 & Grant & 63.9\% \\
\hline 34 & Gilliam & 63.2\% \\
\hline 35 & Lake & 50.7\% \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 0.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: FCC Fixed Broadband Deployment Data, FCC Staff Block Estimates, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{CHILD CARE}

Definition: The number of child care slots available per 100 children under 13 years of age.

All 36 Oregon counties are considered child care deserts, which means for every regulated child care slot, there are at least three children who might fill it. As a result, many families across Oregon cannot find child care for their children. The data reported here reflect child care slots found in child care centers or family child care homes. Inadequate access to such care prevents parents from participating in the workforce and young children from receiving the benefits of early education. Not every child needs access to formal child care. Some parents can rely on relatives or neighbors to care for children. Couples sometimes work different shifts with no overlapping hours so that they can avoid the need for child care. Still, there is a tremendous shortage of supply - a challenge made significantly worse by the COVID-19 crisis.


Top third
Middle third
Bottom third
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Gilliam & 24 \\
\hline 2 & Multnomah & 22 \\
\hline 3 & Wasco & 19 \\
\hline 4 & Benton & 18 \\
\hline 4 & Hood River & 18 \\
\hline 4 & Washington & 18 \\
\hline 7 & Jefferson & 16 \\
\hline 7 & Lane & 16 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 16 \\
\hline 9 & Klamath & 15 \\
\hline & Oregon & 15 \\
\hline 10 & Clackamas & 14 \\
\hline 10 & Sherman & 14 \\
\hline 12 & Deschutes & 13 \\
\hline 12 & Josephine & 13 \\
\hline 12 & Union & 13 \\
\hline 15 & Jackson & 12 \\
\hline 15 & Marion & 12 \\
\hline 17 & Coos & 11 \\
\hline 17 & Polk & 11 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 11 \\
\hline 17 & Umatilla & 11 \\
\hline 20 & Columbia & 10 \\
\hline 20 & Curry & 10 \\
\hline 20 & Douglas & 10 \\
\hline 20 & Lincoln & 10 \\
\hline 20 & Malheur & 10 \\
\hline 20 & Wallowa & 10 \\
\hline 20 & Yamhill & 10 \\
\hline 27 & Clatsop & 9 \\
\hline 27 & Morrow & 9 \\
\hline 29 & Baker & 8 \\
\hline 29 & Grant & 8 \\
\hline 29 & Linn & 8 \\
\hline 32 & Crook & 7 \\
\hline 32 & Tillamook & 7 \\
\hline 34 & Wheeler & 6 \\
\hline 35 & Lake & 5 \\
\hline 36 & Harney & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Child Care Research Partnership, 2020, updated biennially. Released 2021.

\section*{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, travel to their 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 or walking, generally impractical for most residents.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Multnomah & 85.9\% \\
\hline 2 & Benton & 65.5\% \\
\hline 3 & Lane & 56.8\% \\
\hline 4 & Marion & 56.3\% \\
\hline 5 & Washington & 56.1\% \\
\hline 6 & Klamath & 54.5\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 53.1\% \\
\hline 7 & Grant & 49.0\% \\
\hline 8 & Yamhill & 47.9\% \\
\hline 9 & Jackson & 45.6\% \\
\hline 10 & Clackamas & 45.1\% \\
\hline 11 & Umatilla & 44.6\% \\
\hline 12 & Union & 43.9\% \\
\hline 13 & Lincoln & 39.8\% \\
\hline 14 & Wallowa & 35.1\% \\
\hline 15 & Clatsop & 34.5\% \\
\hline 16 & Coos & 33.7\% \\
\hline 17 & Linn & 33.3\% \\
\hline 18 & Polk & 33.1\% \\
\hline 19 & Douglas & 32.6\% \\
\hline 20 & Tillamook & 32.0\% \\
\hline 21 & Columbia & 31.7\% \\
\hline 22 & Malheur & 31.5\% \\
\hline 23 & Josephine & 30.1\% \\
\hline 24 & Baker & 25.4\% \\
\hline 25 & Deschutes & 23.6\% \\
\hline 26 & Hood River & 21.6\% \\
\hline 27 & Jefferson & 21.4\% \\
\hline 28 & Wasco & 17.8\% \\
\hline 29 & Harney & 9.3\% \\
\hline 30 & Curry & 9.2\% \\
\hline 31 & Morrow & 5.8\% \\
\hline 32 & Crook & 5.3\% \\
\hline 33 & Wheeler & 4.7\% \\
\hline 34 & Gilliam & 0.0\% \\
\hline 34 & Lake & 0.0\% \\
\hline 34 & Sherman & 0.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Oregon State University, Oregon Department of Transportation, Transit Network Analysis Tool, 2019,
} collected annually. Released 2020.

\section*{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 people in the United States 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 micro-communities when mobile housing is clustered in parks.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Morrow & 33.2\% \\
\hline 2 & Harney & 23.5\% \\
\hline 3 & Grant & 23.2\% \\
\hline 4 & Sherman & 21.1\% \\
\hline 4 & Wheeler & 21.1\% \\
\hline 6 & Douglas & 20.7\% \\
\hline 7 & Jefferson & 20.2\% \\
\hline 8 & Lake & 19.9\% \\
\hline 9 & Curry & 18.5\% \\
\hline 10 & Malheur & 16.9\% \\
\hline 11 & Wasco & 16.8\% \\
\hline 12 & Gilliam & 16.1\% \\
\hline 12 & Josephine & 16.1\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{14} & Coos & 16.0\% \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 16.0\% \\
\hline 14 & Union & 16.0\% \\
\hline 16 & Klamath & 15.8\% \\
\hline 17 & Umatilla & 15.6\% \\
\hline 18 & Baker & 14.8\% \\
\hline 19 & Wallowa & 14.7\% \\
\hline 20 & Crook & 13.9\% \\
\hline 21 & Hood River & 13.7\% \\
\hline 22 & Columbia & 13.1\% \\
\hline 23 & Lincoln & 12.8\% \\
\hline 24 & Jackson & 12.4\% \\
\hline 25 & Linn & 11.6\% \\
\hline 26 & Yamhill & 10.7\% \\
\hline 27 & Tillamook & 10.3\% \\
\hline 28 & Lane & 8.4\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{28} & Marion & 8.4\% \\
\hline & Oregon & 7.9\% \\
\hline 30 & Polk & 7.7\% \\
\hline 31 & Deschutes & 6.8\% \\
\hline 32 & Benton & 6.3\% \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{32} & Clatsop & 6.3\% \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 6.1\% \\
\hline 34 & Clackamas & 5.7\% \\
\hline 35 & Washington & 2.4\% \\
\hline 36 & Multnomah & 1.8\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Table DP04, 2015-2019, 5-year estimates updated annually. Released 2020.
\(\rightarrow\)

\section*{VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (TOTAL)}

\section*{Definition: An estimate (in millions) of the total vehicle miles traveled on Oregon state-owned highways within each county. This number is calculated by summing measurements of average daily traffic on designated roadways.}

In previous editions of Oregon by the Numbers, we have reported vehicle miles traveled. Total vehicle miles traveled is considered an indicator of transportation infrastructure. The measure helps determine distribution of state and federal funding for roadway building and maintenance. It can also be used to evaluate emissions and air pollution. Based on reader feedback that these values alone are difficult to interpret, Oregon by the Numbers now includes vehicle miles traveled per capita (next page). These two measures are based on the same data but tell different stories, so maps and rankings are included for each.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline & Oregon & 21,862 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 15,278 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 6,583 \\
\hline 1 & Multnomah & 3,140 \\
\hline 2 & Marion & 1,893 \\
\hline 3 & Clackamas & 1,866 \\
\hline 4 & Washington & 1,864 \\
\hline 5 & Lane & 1,595 \\
\hline 6 & Linn & 1,197 \\
\hline 7 & Douglas & 1,150 \\
\hline 8 & Jackson & 1,017 \\
\hline 9 & Deschutes & 760 \\
\hline 10 & Umatilla & 700 \\
\hline 11 & Josephine & 515 \\
\hline 12 & Klamath & 484 \\
\hline 13 & Yamhill & 457 \\
\hline 14 & Polk & 432 \\
\hline 15 & Wasco & 388 \\
\hline 16 & Lincoln & 386 \\
\hline 17 & Clatsop & 374 \\
\hline 18 & Hood River & 351 \\
\hline 19 & Malheur & 337 \\
\hline 20 & Coos & 316 \\
\hline 21 & Baker & 311 \\
\hline 22 & Columbia & 279 \\
\hline 23 & Union & 268 \\
\hline 24 & Tillamook & 264 \\
\hline 25 & Benton & 262 \\
\hline 26 & Morrow & 207 \\
\hline 27 & Jefferson & 205 \\
\hline 28 & Gilliam & 177 \\
\hline 29 & Sherman & 131 \\
\hline 30 & Curry & 128 \\
\hline 31 & Crook & 118 \\
\hline 32 & Harney & 93 \\
\hline 33 & Lake & 72 \\
\hline 34 & Grant & 58 \\
\hline 35 & Wallowa & 44 \\
\hline 36 & Wheeler & 20 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Department of
Transportation, 2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (PER CAPITA)}

Definition: The number of vehicle miles traveled in a county per person, calculated as the number of vehicle miles traveled on Oregon state-owned highways within a county divided by the total population of the county.

Vehicle miles traveled per capita is used in transportation planning, including decisions on highway expansion, as well as tracking the effectiveness of different land use development strategies. It is important to note that per-capita vehicle miles traveled are not directly a reflection of how much county residents drive. Counties with high commercial traffic and smaller populations will end up having a larger per-capita vehicle miles traveled. Vehicle miles traveled (per capita) is included on each county profile.

In future reports, the data for vehicle miles traveled will likely reflect impacts of COVID-19 on travel, including stay-at-home orders and interruptions to freight and the supply chain.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Rank & County & Amount \\
\hline 1 & Gilliam & 88,945 \\
\hline 2 & Sherman & 74,237 \\
\hline 3 & Baker & 18,508 \\
\hline 4 & Morrow & 16,333 \\
\hline 5 & Wasco & 14,236 \\
\hline 6 & Wheeler & 14,028 \\
\hline 7 & Hood River & 13,783 \\
\hline 8 & Harney & 12,622 \\
\hline 9 & Malheur & 10,534 \\
\hline 10 & Douglas & 10,242 \\
\hline 11 & Union & 9,978 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{12} & Tillamook & 9,958 \\
\hline & Rural Oregon & 9,603 \\
\hline 13 & Clatsop & 9,522 \\
\hline 14 & Linn & 9,461 \\
\hline 15 & Lake & 8,861 \\
\hline 16 & Umatilla & 8,621 \\
\hline 17 & Jefferson & 8,616 \\
\hline 18 & Lincoln & 8,000 \\
\hline 19 & Grant & 7,840 \\
\hline 20 & Klamath & 7,102 \\
\hline 21 & Wallowa & 6,112 \\
\hline 22 & Josephine & 5,934 \\
\hline 23 & Curry & 5,561 \\
\hline 24 & Marion & 5,444 \\
\hline 25 & Columbia & 5,297 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{26} & Polk & 5,210 \\
\hline & Oregon & 5,160 \\
\hline 27 & Crook & 5,043 \\
\hline 28 & Coos & 4,998 \\
\hline 29 & Jackson & 4,595 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{30} & Clackamas & 4,407 \\
\hline & Urban Oregon & 4,303 \\
\hline 31 & Yamhill & 4,233 \\
\hline 32 & Lane & 4,210 \\
\hline 33 & Deschutes & 3,937 \\
\hline 34 & Multnomah & 3,821 \\
\hline 35 & Washington & 3,039 \\
\hline 36 & Benton & 2,777 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Oregon Department of
Transportation, Population Research
Center at Portland State University,
2019, updated annually. Released 2020.

\section*{For more information}

The data contained in this report are available on the Rural Communities Explorer:
http://oregonexplorer.info/rural

Explore more data topics by state, county and city: http://oe.oregonexplorer.info/rural/CommunitiesReporter/

Oregon by the Numbers 2021 is available for pdf download: http://www.tfff.org/OBTN

Sign up to receive a notification when the next edition of this report is available:
http://www.tfff.org/OBTN

Send your feedback to:
OBTN@tfff.org
Write a review of Oregon by the Numbers:
http://www.tfff.org/OBTN
@FordFamilyFound
\#OregonByTheNumbers


\title{
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]:    ${ }^{1}$ For federal data available only at the county level, this report uses the designations of "metropolitan" and "non-metro" from the Office of Management and Budget. According to this definition, three counties that The Ford Family Foundation considers rural are defined as urban: Columbia, Josephine and Yamhill. This is due to their proximity to larger urban areas in adjacent counties.

[^1]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^2]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^3]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^4]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^5]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^6]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^7]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^8]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^9]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^10]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^11]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^12]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^13]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^14]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^15]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^16]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^17]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^18]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^19]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^20]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^21]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^22]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^23]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

[^24]:    * Interpret with caution for small counties (population under 10,000).

