

Aging with Dignity



A Profile of Senior Residents in
Fayetteville Street Corridor Neighborhoods
August 11, 2008

Prepared by:
Unity in the Community for Progress (UCP)
Durham, North Carolina

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Purpose	6
Section One: Overview	9
Global Seniors.....	10
United States Seniors.....	11
North Carolina Seniors.....	11
Durham County Seniors.....	12
Section Two: Study Area Demographics	14
Population and Population Growth.....	15
Sex Distribution.....	15
Racial Population.....	17
Racial Distribution.....	17
Population Growth Rate by Race	18
Population in Households.....	19
Average Household Size by Tenure.....	20
Types of Households.....	20
Units in Structure.....	21
Housing Vacancy.....	23
Occupancy Status by Tenure.....	23
Tenure by Year Householder Moved In.....	23
Year Structure Built.....	24
Number of Rooms.....	25
Housing Value.....	26
Income.....	26
Poverty Level.....	27

Section Three: Seniors in the Study Area.....	28
Population.....	28
Share of Population.....	28
Share of Population Ages 65 – 74.....	29
Share of Population Ages 75 – 84.....	29
Share of Population Ages 85 and over.....	30
Population by Age and Race.....	31
Population by Age by Census Tract.....	31
Sex, Age and Racial Distribution.....	31
Population in Households.....	31
Family and Non-family Households.....	32
Marital Status.....	32
Living Alone.....	32
Tenure.....	33
Tenure by Age by Census Tract.....	33
Tenure by Units in Structure.....	34
Tenure by Age of Senior Householder by Units in Structure...	35
Poverty Level.....	36

Executive Summary

With all the challenges facing Durham's communities today, the elders in the neighborhoods around NCCU stood out like beacons of achievement and stability. Their achievements were all the more significant given that they were accomplished in a climate with more adverse social, economic and political conditions for African Americans locally, statewide and nationally.

While seniors in these historic communities mirrored the trends for Durham County seniors, there were notable exceptions that make NCCU's master plan one of the most unfortunate and short-sighted plans ever proposed for this community. These exceptions occurred over and over again in all census tracts in the Study Area but primarily in tract 13.03 – the tract these seniors have shared with the university for over one hundred years.

- **Age of seniors**

The share of seniors in the neighborhoods surrounding NCCU equaled or exceeded the county share in all senior age groups in tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04.

- **Share of married couples**

Seniors in the Study Area also exceeded the county's percentage of married couples in tract 13.03.

- **Seniors with incomes in 1999 at or above poverty level**

The greater share of married couples no doubt contributed to their comprising a larger share of persons at or above the poverty level than in Durham County. There were twice as many seniors in tract 13.03 with incomes at or above the poverty level as in the county.

- **Homeownership**

Seniors in the Study Area owned their homes in tracts 13.01 and 13.03 at two to three times the county's share while seniors over 75 owned their homes in these same tracts at three to four times the county's share. In fact, tracts 13.01 and 13.03 were the top two census tracts in all of Durham County for the share of seniors owning their own homes for the age groups 75 – 84 and those over 85.

- **Single-family home occupancy**

Seniors lived predominantly in single-family homes with the percent of single-family homes in tract 13.03 almost triple the county's percentage and the percent of senior-owned single-family homes in tract 13.01 almost double the county's percentage. Seniors over the age of 75 in tracts 13.01 and 13.03 occupied the highest percentage of homes in the Study Area for all sizes of housing and all age groups over 15.

In light of Durham County's having the lowest homeownership rate in the state and in light of the Study Area's being one of the oldest and having most stable home ownership census tracts in entire county, we failed to understand the university's choice of these neighborhoods as the location for its initial expansion --- versus an already-vacant area only 5 minutes from the university with more land than the 22 acres called for in its master plan.

We also failed to understand the university's reluctance to work with the surrounding community to enhance home ownership, student safety and beautification of the entire corridor – in what we considered a win-win scenario for all parties.

Compared to Durham County demographics, demographics of the seniors in neighborhoods surrounding NCCU were even more impressive and made a compelling case against any actions by the university that would destabilize this historic community and the seniors who reside there.

It is unfortunate and ironic that NCCU has chosen tract 13.03, which reflected some of our community's the strongest economic dynamics, as the location for its initial expansion. In addition to the aforementioned positive dynamics for seniors in these neighborhoods, the university's plan would create physical, emotional and financial hardships for our elder community.

While there would be monetary compensation for homes purchased, seniors would be deprived of the future market appreciation their largest assets – their homes. The threat of eminent domain as a result of the approval of the master plan has already discouraged any free market transactions that might financially benefit seniors and their families. Therefore any market value compensation they would receive has already been diminished.

What's more, market value compensation for their current homes might not be sufficient to purchase homes in today's market, subjecting seniors to the hardship of taking on debt late in life -- if they are able to secure financing at all.

Effectively, the master plan has become a plan to convert the collective wealth of this community into debt and to convert homeowners into more renters. Our seniors and our community will be poorer as a result of its execution. This plan is nothing short of a wealth transfer of the most horrific proportions.

But this issue is not simply an economic issue. It is an issue of fairness and justice for citizens of Durham and the state of North Carolina.

Purpose

Unity in the Community for Progress (UCP) is a coalition of neighborhood groups, residents, business owners and concerned citizens who have decided to work together to create a brighter future for our community. The UCP serves as a planning and advocacy organization for the preservation and restoration of neighborhoods in our member communities who are at risk. In this capacity, our members routinely evaluate planning, zoning and development issues that affect its member neighborhoods. The North Carolina Central University (NCCU) master plan was but one of the issues that the UCP evaluated and consequently expressed grave concern about.

After the UCP reviewed the master plan, we first asked the university to seek alternate locations that were less land-intensive and less costly to taxpayers – and to preserve the homes of residents throughout the Fayetteville Street corridor. Second, we urged the university to work closely with our community to develop some mutually-agreeable solutions. Third, we requested that the university quantify the cumulative development impacts of its plan along with other redevelopment projects to be built in the Fayetteville Street corridor over the next five years. And finally we urged the university to place neighborhood preservation as the centerpiece of its plan -- including preservation of historic neighborhoods, historic structures, businesses, traffic patterns and most of all, our community capital which created the social connections that have sustained this community and the university for the past century.

The following concerns were presented to the university in a letter to Chancellor Nelms in February 2008 at his request:

- ❖ Displacement of elderly and financially-challenged residents
- ❖ Adverse and unknown transportation impacts
- ❖ Adverse and unknown environmental impacts
- ❖ Economic impacts
- ❖ Parking impacts
- ❖ Zoning impacts
- ❖ Coordination with city, county and state agencies
- ❖ Reduction in affordable housing
- ❖ Lack of notification and information to all affected residents
- ❖ Competition with local business corridor
- ❖ Effect of student attrition on underlying assumptions used in master plan
- ❖ Failure to consider satellite campus and parking in the master plan
- ❖ Destruction of Fayetteville Street Local Historic District

While the UCP took the lead in evaluating the impacts of the university's master plan on the historic Fayetteville Street community and urged the university to look at alternative locations that would help neighbors preserve their homes, it should be said that advocacy for our community is not new.

Ten years before the push began to increase enrollment at NCCU and before the campus expanded west of Fayetteville Street, community members had already anticipated the need to

protect the area's historic residential neighborhoods and business district from large-scale commercial development from downtown and from NCCU expansion.

In 1998 community members began working with city officials on zoning safeguards to protect the Fayetteville Street's history, neighborhoods and business district from government-led development and private developments that would create "development pressure" on the surrounding neighborhoods to change -- possibly resulting in gentrification, rapidly-rising property taxes, national competition for local businesses and property taking by eminent domain.

In 2000 community members in conjunction with the Durham Business & Professional Chain created the Fayetteville Street Local Historic District from Umstead Street to Nelson Street to help preserve the area's heritage and distinctive architectural styles. Members felt that a local historic district would spark the rebuilding process by first preserving the area's structures and regulating the exterior appearance of homes and buildings along the corridor. It is Durham's only local African American historic district.

In 2005 hundreds of community stakeholders and neighborhood groups along the corridor created the Historic Fayetteville Street Neighborhood Master Plan to guide the community's development over the next twenty years. The plan culminated eight months of work with city department heads and staff, NC Department of Transportation, Triangle Transit Authority, DATA, NCCU and city consultants to show the community's grave concern about its future — and propose solutions. A copy of this plan was presented to NCCU former chancellor James Ammons and current chancellor Charlie Nelms.

Since that time, recommendations from the Historic Fayetteville Street Neighborhood Master Plan have been included in a variety of plans and studies, including the NCCU Master Plan, the City of Durham's RKG Economic Development Assessment and Targeted Neighborhood Commercial Corridor Streetscape Design.

As we discussed NCCU's master plan and proposed expansion at our monthly Monday meetings, we decided to find out first-hand how residents viewed the school's expansion plan and to find out more about the seniors living in the historic African American community around the school. We also realized that their lack of physical presence in public, due to health and mobility issues, may have contributed to the false impression that they were absent from our community – and consequently had no opinions about the master plan.

While conducting the UCP's door-to-door survey of residents' views about the master plan, UCP members were also struck by the large number of seniors still living in the area. The proportion of seniors who still lived in the area and who would be displaced by the university's expansion, particularly those over 85 (oldest of our seniors), not only amazed us but also troubled us – and caused us to further question the notion that everyone had their bags packed and were ready to go.

After knocking on 210 doors and talking with residents in the area, tabulating survey results and adding demographic data from the census, some really interesting findings emerged. Many of these findings were contrary to the conventional wisdom about seniors in general and about senior residents in the neighborhoods throughout the Fayetteville Street corridor.

When UCP members completed our survey of whether residents living in the neighborhoods in the path of the NCCU master plan wanted stay or leave, our members were also struck by the number of people, owners and renters alike, who stated that they wanted to stay in their homes.

This finding was a contradiction to long-running media reports that most of the residents were ready to leave to make way for the new college complex. In fact, our findings were consistent with aging-in-place studies of American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) and other agencies where seniors expressed a desire to remain in their own homes as long as possible.

By combining demographic data with survey results, we were able to put faces on this population by weaving in the opinions of and conversations with the seniors who participated in our survey. Our findings were so compelling that we decided to summarize them in a report and release the results to the public for several reasons.

First, the study gave a broader segment of seniors a voice in the future development of their own neighborhoods than the few interviewed by the local and university media. Second, the study presented neighborhood dynamics as representative of those in Durham County and refuted much of the misinformation that dominated the mainstream media.

And finally, this report presented our community's cultural perspective on aging. For example, this study showed that African American households had greater inter-generational dynamics than the county's senior population. While some of these dynamics placed greater burdens on seniors, other relationships demonstrated their resilient spirit and creativity. While many viewed the senior years as a winding down time, we knew first-hand of many seniors throughout the Study Area who viewed it as quite the opposite – as a time to give back and share in the good things that a long life has bestowed on them.

As the architects of our community's enduring social, economic and political infrastructure, our seniors' long lives, wisdom and unique perspectives on life have added a richness to this community that is more valuable than gold. Free from the constraints of work, they represented a valuable resource to our community which should be treasured – not uprooted.

Unity in the Community for Progress is pleased to release this study of the seniors and the neighborhoods that have co-existed with North Carolina Central University -- and that are responsible to a large degree for the university's existence and success. While other demographic groups are present and important in the Fayetteville Street corridor, the focus of this study is on the population aged 65 and older because we feel this group would suffer the most harm if displaced from their long-time homes and neighborhoods.

Section One: Overview

The population of residents 65 years of age and older (hereinafter called seniors) in the census tracts surrounding Fayetteville Street was very similar to the population of seniors in the state of North Carolina and Durham County in the 1990 and 2000 census. This fact alone challenged the assumption that this group was somehow expendable (defined by Webster as “open to sacrifice in the interests of gaining an objective”) due to age. This fact also dispelled the notion of expendability as a rationale for displacing this stable senior population.

This report used US 2000 census data and other demographic sources to present similarities and differences in the senior population in census tracts 12.01, 12.02, 13.01, 13.03, 13.04 and 14 (hereinafter known as the Study Area) surrounding NCCU. Although these six tracts exhibited similarities with Durham County census figures, there were notable exceptions which challenged the conventional wisdom and cast this population in a new light.

NCCU is located in tract 13.03 and portions of this tract, along with tracts 12.02 and 14 have been identified in the university’s master plan as tracts for displacement of thousands of residents – many of them seniors. We estimated that over six hundred residents have already been moved from Fayetteville Street Apartments (aka Fayette Place) in anticipation of the construction of housing for the university’s growing student population.

This displacement is also projected to remove over 900 affordable housing units from the Durham housing market, which ranked lowest in the homeownership rate for the entire state of North Carolina – despite a decade of economic growth from 1990 to 2000.

This study utilized data from the 1990 and 2000 U. S. census as well as other demographic sources. Data sources have been footnoted to indicate the census tables from which the data was tabulated. Some data have been presented in absolute numbers but most have been presented as percentages for ease of comparison. Data selection from 100-percent tables (where everyone was counted) versus sampled tables resulted in rounding differences in some categories.

The African American community in Durham had and has a unique demographic and cultural profile. By highlighting some of the dynamics among senior age groups in the Study Area, our goal was to enhance our understanding of seniors in the Study Area -- and to make a compelling case against their displacement by the university’s expansion.

The study demonstrated that seniors in Study Area were similar to seniors in Durham County and other areas by using comparisons of different geographies – national, state and county. Section One presented an overview of seniors in other geographies -- other countries, the United States, North Carolina and Durham County. Section Two depicted seniors in the overall Study Area that is comprised of the six census tracts around the Fayetteville Street Corridor. And finally Section Three looked specifically at the age groups 65 and over in the Study Area. This approach made it easier to identify similarities as well as highlight disparities between seniors in the Study Area and other areas.

Global Seniors

Our planet along with its inhabitants is aging. Despite the hype about the youth culture, the scenario unfolding worldwide is of a population growing older. This trend holds true for developed countries like the United States and developing countries like China and India.

The reasons behind the aging trend are beyond the scope of the study but the impacts of an increasingly older population can have vast implications in all areas of our lives from health care to housing. When coupled with other demographic factors, the implications of an aging population can be uplifting or devastating. In Europe, where an aging population is coupled with a falling birth rate, countries with populations that fail to replace themselves may be faced with fewer younger workers to fund pension systems, smaller markets for business, rising taxes and reduced national productivity. On the other end of the spectrum, a large influx of seniors can add retirement wealth to a nation but stress a country's social support and retirement systems at the same time.

“In 2000, 420 million people in the world were 65 and older, or 7 percent of the world's population. This number is projected to increase to 974 million by 2030” according to 65+ in the United States: 2005.

The 2000 census reported that the world's population over the age of 65 was growing by 800,000 people a month (Business & Legal Reports, Census: Over-65 Population Growing Rapidly, January 2, 2002). This growth, according to this study, was fueled by declines in fertility and improvements in adult mortality. In many countries, seniors over the age of 80 comprised the fastest-growing component of the population.

Other highlights of the world's growing senior population included:

- Italy replaced Sweden as the world's oldest country in 2000 with 18% of Italians having celebrated at least a 65th birthday
- More than one-third of the world's oldest seniors (over 80 years) lived in three countries – China (11.5 million), the United States (9.2 million) and India (6.2 million)
- Japan had the highest average life expectancy at birth (81 years) followed by Singapore (80 years) and other developed countries –Australia, Canada, Italy, Iceland, Sweden and Switzerland (79 years)
- United States life expectancy fell in the 76 – 78 year range

United States Seniors

“The older population is on the threshold of a boom. According to U.S. Census Bureau projections, a substantial increase in the number of older people will occur during the 2010 and 2030 period, after the first Baby Boomers turn 65 in 2011. The older population in 2030 is

projected to be twice as large as in 2000, growing from 35 million to 72 million and representing nearly 20 percent of the total U.S. population at the latter date” according to 65+ in the United States: 2005.

- The United States ranked 32 on the list of countries with high proportions of people 65 and older
- The median age in the U.S. rose from 22.9 in 1900 to 35.3 in 2000 and is projected to increase to 39.0 by 2030
- Persons over 85 is projected to grow rapidly after 2030 when the Baby Boomers begin to move into this age group
- The number of persons over 100 has increased from about 37,000 in 1990 to over 50,000 in 2000. About 80 percent are women.
- Older non-Hispanic White women and African American women were more likely to live alone (about 40% each) than were older Asian and Hispanic women (about 20 percent each).

According to William Frey in the Brookings Institution’s “Mapping the Growth of Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st Century”, the World War II generation that is entering its seniors years is growing fastest in the Intermountain West and South Atlantic states, especially in suburban areas there.

Frey stated that “After minimal growth in the 1990s, and modest gains during the current decade, the U. S. senior population will begin to mushroom when the leading edge of the huge baby boom generation – born between 1946 and 1965 – reaches age 65 in the year 2011.” Frey also reported the following findings in this study of U. S. seniors:

- Among those aged 65 to 74, married couples predominate
- By ages 75 to 84 and especially for those aged 85 and over, female-headed non-family households are more common as women have outlived their husbands
- These older households tend to exhibit higher rates of poverty and lower incomes
- In states where the senior population will grow fastest over the next 35 years, “aging in place” rather than migration will drive growth

North Carolina Seniors

In the United States and North Carolina, a growing older population has already begun to place heavy demands on health care systems and the workplace – as seniors exit the workplace and enter the health care system in growing numbers.

In North Carolina, which is one of the top retirement destinations, seniors are attracted by the milder climate and proximity to family and health care and have measurably increased the population of some counties.

The UNC Institute of Aging reported the following highlights about North Carolina seniors:

- The median age increased from 26.5 years in 1970 to 35.3 years in 2000 – and is projected to be 38.2 years in 2030
- The median age for all minorities is expected to increase at a greater rate than for the general population --- from 30.4 years in 2000 to 35.1 years in 2030
- North Carolina had a significantly larger share of African American seniors (16%) than the United States (8%)
- The number of seniors aged 65+ increased by 21.1% between 1990 and 2000
- Older adults are the fastest growing segment of North Carolina’s population
- The 65+ age cohort is expected to increase to approximately 18% of the state’s population by 2030 – while all other age cohorts are expected to decline in their share of the state’s population
- The number of seniors 65 and older will more than double between 2000 and 2030, increasing from 969,000 in 2000 to 2.145 million by 2030
- The number of seniors 85 and older will more than double, increasing from 105,000 in 2000 to 258,000 in 2030
- North Carolina ranked 11th in the number of multi-generational households in the nation
- Half of grandparents living in North Carolina with their grandchildren reported themselves as primary caregivers for their grandchildren

Durham County Seniors

Seniors in Durham County are expected to follow the national and state growth trends. The share of seniors in the county’s population is forecast to increase from 9.7% in 2000 to 12.8% in 2020. Other highlights include:

- The number of seniors aged 65 and older is projected to increase by 73.3% from 2000 to 2020
- The fastest growing component is projected to be seniors aged 95 and older which will increase by 168.0% from 2000 to 2020
- The next fastest growing component is projected to be seniors aged 60 – 64 which will increase by 123.6% from 2000 to 2020

- The number of seniors aged 65 – 74 is forecast to grow by 109.7% from 2000 to 2020
- The number of seniors aged 75 – 84 and 85 – 94 is projected to grow at a slower rate from 2000 to 2020 at 30.1% and 43.2% respectively

Section Two: Study Area Demographics

The Study Area comprised six out of fifty three census tracts in Durham County. A comparison of the Study Area with Durham County found similarities, such as growing racial diversity, a larger share of single-person households, more family households than non-family households and more female-headed non-family households.

The Study Area differed from the county's demographics with a slower growth rate over the past decade, a greater proportion of very young and very old persons, larger ratio of females to males, larger share of African Americans, larger household size (particularly for renters), more female-headed family households, larger share of 2, 3-4 and 5-9 unit structures and a larger share of housing over 30 years old.

Study Area Population and Population Growth

The Study Area population increased from 13,110 persons to 13,777 persons, representing a modest gain of 667 persons from 1990 to 2000 and representing a 5.1% growth rate. The figures below represent the absolute change in the number of persons from 1990 to 2000 and the corresponding growth rate by census tract in the Study Area. Tracts 13.01 and 13.03 lost population, while growth in tracts 12.02 and 13.04 was essentially flat. Only tract 12.01 registered a larger growth rate (37.8%) than the county growth rate of 22.8%.

	1990	2000	Absolute Change	Growth Rate
12.01	1,048	1,444	396	37.8%
12.02	962	990	28	2.9%
13.01	1,528	1,410	(-118)	(-7.7%)
13.03	3,649	3,642	(- 7)	(- 0.2%)
13.04	2,843	2,882	39	1.4%
14	3,080	3,409	329	10.7%
Total Study Area	13,110	13,777	667	5.1%
Durham County	181,835	223,314	41,479	22.8%
North Carolina	6,628,637	8,049,313	1,420,676	21.4%
United States	248,709,873	281,421,906	32,712,033	13.2%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table DP-1: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics

Study Area Age Distribution

The Study Area contained a greater percentage of younger persons and older persons than in Durham County. In fact, the Study area contained a larger percentage of persons under the age of 35 in all age groups than in Durham County, NC and the US. The Study Area also contained a larger percentage of persons over the age of 65 in all age groups than in Durham County.

Although the focus of this study is on seniors, it is noteworthy that the percentage of young people in some Study Area census tracts were double and triple the county's percentage for those same age groups. These included age groups Under 5, 5 – 9, 10 – 14 and 15 – 19 in tracts 12.02, 13.03 and 14. While NCCU student enrollment accounted for the larger share of younger persons in tract 13.03, the larger share of young persons in census tracts 12.02 and 14 was attributed to public housing complexes located in each of those tracts.

	US	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Under 5	6.8%	6.7%	6.9%	8.8%	7.1%	19.0%	7.0%	2.8%	9.4%	13.4%
5 – 9	7.3%	7.0%	6.6%	8.8%	7.9%	17.7%	8.5%	3.3%	9.8%	11.9%
10 – 14	7.3%	6.8%	6.1%	7.4%	6.8%	10.4%	7.4%	3.5%	7.3%	10.9%
15 – 19	7.2%	6.7%	6.7%	10.6%	7.8%	7.5%	6.2%	21.0%	6.4%	7.1%
20 – 34	20.9%	22.3%	28.4%	28.4%	31.9%	24.7%	19.2%	40.8%	24.6%	21.8%
35 – 49	23.1%	23.0%	22.7%	16.6%	22.6%	12.8%	23.8%	10.3%	18.5%	17.3%
50 – 64	14.8%	15.4%	12.9%	9.1%	7.7%	5.4%	11.7%	8.0%	11.3%	9.0%
65 – 74	6.5%	6.6%	4.9%	5.1%	3.9%	1.2%	7.1%	4.8%	6.7%	4.9%
75 – 84	4.4%	4.1%	3.5%	3.6%	3.2%	0.7%	6.0%	3.8%	4.2%	2.9%
85+	1.5%	1.3%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	0.6%	3.0%	1.6%	1.7%	0.9%
65+	12.4%	12.0%	9.7%	10.2%	8.3%	2.5%	16.0%	10.2%	12.6%	8.7%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table DP-1: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics

Study Area Sex Distribution

The sex distribution in the Study Area overall showed a greater percentage of females and conversely a smaller percentage of males than in the Durham County distribution. There was also a greater variation in this ratio in individual census tracts in the Study Area. Tract 13.03 had the highest percentage of females (about 60%) while Tract 12.01 had the highest percentage of males (58.0%). NCCU's student population comprised almost half of the persons in Tract 13.03 and helped increase the disparity in the sex ratio.

		1990	% of Total		2000	% of Total
Tract 12.01	Male	437	41.7%		837	58.0%
	Female	611	58.3%		607	42.0%
	Total	1,048	100.0%		1,444	100.0%
Tract 12.02	Male	367	38.1%		413	41.7%
T	Female	595	61.9%		577	58.3%
	Total	962	100.0%		990	100.0%
Tract 13.01	Male	646	42.3%		671	47.6%
	Female	882	57.7%		739	52.4%
	Total	1,528	100.0%		1,410	100.0%
Tract 13.03	Male	1,341	36.7%		1,469	40.3%
	Female	2,308	63.3%		2,173	59.7%
	Total	3,649	100.0%		3,642	100.0%
Tract 13.04	Male	1,272	44.7%		1,314	46.6%
	Female	1,571	55.3%		1,588	54.4%
	Total	2,843	100.0%		2,882	100.0%
Tract 14	Male	1,301	42.4%		1,470	43.1%
	Female	1,771	57.6%		1,939	56.9%
	Total	3,072	100.0%		3,409	100.0%
Study Area	Male	5,372	41.0%		6,174	44.8%
	Female	7,738	59.0%		7,603	55.2%
	Total	13,110	100.0%		13,777	100.0%
Durham County	Male	85,765	47.2%		107,630	48.2%
	Female	96,070	52.8%		115,684	51.8%
	Total	181,835	100.0%		223,314	100.0%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table DP-1: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics

Study Area Population in Racial Groups

The Study Area became more racially diverse along with Durham County from 1990 to 2000. This diversity was driven primarily by growing White and Hispanic populations moving into the Study Area. The change in the total number of persons by racial groups over the past decade is indicated in the table below.

	12.01		12.02		13.01		13.03		13.04		14	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
African American	1,031	1,291	939	949	1,514	1,322	3,612	3,561	2,796	2,398	3,057	3,207
White	15	108	18	14	8	43	19	25	33	176	17	89
American Indian	2	6	1	3	0	3	9	5	7	3	1	0
Asian	0	1	4	4	1	0	5	4	0	0	1	1
Total	1,048	1,444	962	990	1,528	1,410	3,649	3,642	2,843	2,882	3,080	3,409
Hispanic	5	87	0	12	2	37	26	23	23	469	12	87

Study Area Share of Population by Race

Durham County has been described as one of the most racially diverse counties in North Carolina with no one racial group in the majority. African Americans were still very much in the majority in the census tracts around the Fayetteville Street Corridor. The change in percentage (change in share) of each racial group over the past decade is indicated in the table below:

	Durham Co.	12.01		12.02		13.01		13.03		13.04		14		
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
African American	37.2%	39.5%	98.4%	89.4%	97.6%	95.9%	99.1%	93.8%	99.0%	97.8%	98.3%	83.2%	99.3%	94.1%
White	60.4%	50.9%	1.4%	7.3%	1.9%	1.4%	0.5%	3.0%	0.5%	0.7%	1.2%	6.1%	0.6%	2.6%
American Indian	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian	1.8%	3.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic	0.4%	7.6%	0.5%	6.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%	2.5%	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%	16.3%	0.4%	4.2%

Study Area Population Growth Rate by Race

	Durham Co.	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
African American	30.2%	(-1.7%)	25.2%	(-22.2%)	(-12.7%)	31.6%	(-14.2%)	4.9%
White	3.5%	311.8%	606.7%	1.1%	437.5%	(-1.4%)	433.3%	423.5%
American Indian	55.3%	0.0%	200.0%	200.0%	----	(-44.4%)	(-57.1%)	(-100.0%)
Asian	127.3%	(-9.1%)	-----	-----	(-100.0%)	(-20.0%)	0.0%	(-9.1%)
Hawaiian	(-87.6%)	(-90.0%)	-----	-----	(-80.0%)	(-100.0%)	(-85.7%)	(-100.0%)
Hispanic	2473.9%	1035.3%	1640.0%	-----	2.5%	(-11.5%)	1939.1%	1100.0%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table P7: Race

While the Study Area grew overall by 5.1%, the growth rate was not uniform across racial groups or census tracts. From 1990 – 2000, the overall growth rate for African Americans and Asians declined. The growth rates for Hispanics (1035.3%) and Whites (311.8%) reflected their entry into the Study Area at a pace greater than other racial groups.

Study Area Population in Households

Households described the living arrangements of persons living in a variety of housing types – a kind of lifestyle indicator. Housing units described physical structures while households described the personal living arrangements between the persons living in homes. Therefore, a household is also defined as an occupied housing unit.

The census described households and living arrangements within those households in many ways. One way that the census described persons was whether the persons lived in households (occupied housing units) or not (in group quarters or homeless). Groups quarters were further divided between institutional (jail, sanitarium, etc.) and non-institutional living arrangements.

The Study Area contained two census tracts with a significant number of persons living in group quarters – institutional (jail) and non-institutional (college). The 2000 census found 391 persons in the institutional count for the Durham County Jail in tract 12.01. The census also found 1,834 students living in group quarters (non-institutional) at NCCU in tract 13.03.

Although the census subtracted persons living in group quarters from the household count, it included persons in group quarters in income calculations. Therefore care must be exercised when drawing conclusions about the income in tracts with large numbers of persons living in group quarters, which may have caused incomes to appear lower than they really were in these two tracts.

Population	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Persons in Households	11,541	1,050	990	1,408	1,808	2,876	3,409
Persons in Group Quarters:							
Institutional	391	391	0	0	0	0	0
Non-institutional	1,845	3	0	2	1,834	6	0
Total Persons in Group Quarters	2,236	394	0	1,410	3,642	2,882	0
Total Population	13,777	1,444	990	1,410	3,642	2,882	3,409

Households and Persons per Household (Household Size)

The Study Area contained 4,481 households. Of the six tracts in the Study Area, tract 14 contained the largest number of households but did not contain the largest number of persons due to the subtraction of tract 13.03's student population at NCCU before calculating the number of households. This means students in group quarters at NCCU in tract 13.03 were counted in the population count but were ineligible to be counted as households.

The Study Area had more persons per household in every category except having approximately 20% fewer two person households (26.1% vs. 33.6%) than in the county.

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Total Households	89,015	4,481	400	319	610	795	1,099	1,258
1 person	30.0%	30.9%	37.0%	16.0%	43.1%	34.7%	30.2%	25.1%
2 person	33.6%	26.1%	18.0%	23.2%	21.8%	31.4%	25.1%	28.9%
3 person	16.6%	19.0%	17.0%	27.0%	16.2%	16.9%	20.2%	19.4%
4 person	11.8%	12.0%	13.5%	18.2%	7.5%	10.1%	11.7%	13.6%
5 person	4.9%	6.7%	8.8%	7.5%	6.7%	4.3%	6.9%	7.1%
6 person	1.9%	3.0%	4.9%	4.1%	2.3%	1.6%	3.5%	3.3%
7 person	1.3%	2.3%	1.8%	4.1%	2.3%	1.0%	2.3%	2.7%

Source: US 2000 Census Table HCT 6: Household Size

Average Household Size by Tenure

The average household size in the Study Area (2.58) was larger than that for the state and the county and indicated that more persons were living in each household in the Study Area. As expected, the tracts with the highest average household sizes were tracts 12.02 and 14 where public housing complexes were located. This finding is consistent with the Study Area having more persons per household from the previous section.

The average household size was also calculated for residents as owners or renters (called tenure). The average household size for renters (1.87) was higher in the Study Area and in all census tracts than in the county and state. Homeowner households contained fewer persons per household.

	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Owner occupied	1.76	1.34	0.71	0.59	0.34	0.70	1.15	0.75	0.53
Renter occupied	0.73	1.06	1.87	2.63	3.18	2.43	2.30	2.69	2.82
Total	2.49	2.40	2.58	2.63	3.10	2.31	2.27	2.62	2.71

Type of Households

Family households were households where persons were related by birth, marriage or adoption and non-family households were households where unrelated people lived together including persons living alone. There were over 50% more family households than non-family households in both Durham County (60.7% vs. 39.3%) and in the Study Area (63.8% vs. 36.2%) The percent of family households in the Study Area was slightly larger than that the percent in Durham County (63.8% vs. 60.7%).

Durham County ranked third highest in the state in the percent of non-family households and second highest in the percent of single-person households (New Snapshot of North Carolina's Population and Housing).

Study Area census tracts with the greatest percentage of family households were 12.02 (78.1%) and 14 (71.0%) – the same tracts with the highest percentage of public housing and the highest percentage of female-headed households.

In Durham County family households, male-headed households comprised the greater percentage (38.5%) than female-headed households (22.2%). The reverse was true in the Study Area where females comprised the greater percentage (44.2%) than males (19.5%).

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Family Household								
Male Householder	38.5%	19.5%	18.5%	6.9%	18.4%	24.9%	24.6%	15.9%
Female Householder	22.2%	44.2%	39.5%	71.2%	30.2%	33.6%	41.1%	55.1%
Total Family HH	60.7%	63.8%	58.0%	78.1%	48.5%	58.5%	65.7%	71.0%
Non-Family Household								
Male	17.2%	14.6%	16.8%	6.9%	23.4%	16.6%	12.7%	11.8%
Living Alone	12.2%	11.8%	14.3%	4.7%	18.7%	14.0%	10.1%	9.5%
Female	22.1%	21.7%	25.3%	15.0%	28.0%	24.9%	21.6%	17.2%
Living Alone	17.8%	19.2%	22.8%	11.3%	24.4%	20.8%	20.1%	15.7%
Total Non-Family HH	39.3%	36.2%	42.0%	21.9%	51.5%	41.5%	34.3%	29.0%
Total Households	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: US 2000 Census Table QT-P10: Households and Families

In non-family households, females comprised a greater share than males in Durham County (22.1% vs. 17.2%) and in the Study Area (21.7% vs. 14.6%). In non-family households, females living alone also comprised a greater share than males in Durham County (17.8% vs. 12.2%) and in the Study Area (19.2 vs. 11.8%). This finding was true in all census tracts in the Study Area

Units in Structure in Study Area

Single Family Housing (detached and attached) comprised 61.2 % of the county's total housing stock versus almost half (49.0%) of the Study Area's total housing stock. However, the percent of single-family housing exceeded the county share in tracts 13.01 (62.3%) and 13.03 at (75.5%).

The Study Area and all census tracts contained almost two to four times the number of 2-unit structures as the county. The Study Area and all census tracts contained about twice the number of structures with 3 – 4 units except tracts 13.01 and 13.03 which contained roughly the same percent. For structures with 5 – 9 units, the Study Area also contained a greater percent than Durham County with tracts 12.02 and 14 reflecting larger public housing structures. Overall the Study Area contained about a quarter of structures with 10 or more units than the county.

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Occupied								
1 detached	53.5%	41.3%	27.0%	15.0%	50.8%	69.3%	36.6%	32.7%
1 attached	5.0%	3.2%	5.8%	11.1%	2.1%	0.0%	2.0%	4.4%
2	4.6%	14.0%	20.4%	18.6%	18.4%	16.0%	11.3%	9.0%
3 - 4	5.3%	11.9%	20.3%	29.3%	6.6%	4.2%	15.3%	10.5%
5 - 9	8.1%	13.8%	10.8%	20.5%	1.3%	2.0%	12.2%	30.1%
10 - 19	8.2%	2.7%	1.1%	3.6%	1.6%	0.0%	6.0%	2.6%
20 - 49	3.6%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	3.3%	1.5%
50 or more	3.9%	1.9%	0.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	0.7%
Mobile Home	1.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RV, Boat	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Occupied	93.7%	90.3%	86.3%	100.0%	83.1%	91.4%	92.9%	91.5%
	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Vacant								
1 detached	2.5%	4.5%	5.8%	0.0%	9.4%	6.2%	3.1%	2.0%
1 attached	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	0.7%	2.8%	4.6%	0.0%	3.7%	2.4%	0.3%	4.5%
3 - 4	0.4%	0.8%	2.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%
5 - 9	0.7%	0.8%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
10 - 19	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
20 - 49	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
50 +	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%
Mobile Home	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RV, Boat	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Vacant	6.3%	9.7%	13.7%	0.0%	16.9%	8.6%	7.1%	8.5%

Source: US Census 2000 Table H30: Units in Structure and H31: Units in Structure for Vacant Housing Units

Housing Vacancy in Study Area

The Study Area's share of vacant housing units as a percent of total units was about 50% greater than the county's share (9.7% vs. 6.3%). Also the share of vacant housing was higher in every census tract than the county's share except for tract 12.02 which had no vacant housing at the time of the 2000 census. Both Durham County and the Study Area had a smaller share of vacant housing than the state (11.1%).

Occupancy Status by Tenure

Durham County not only had a smaller share of owner-occupied housing units than the state – it had the lowest home ownership rate in the entire state according to the 2000 census. Likewise the Study Area had a smaller share of owner-occupied housing units than the county except in tract 13.03 with 56.2% of owner-occupied housing.

	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Owner Occupied	69.4%	54.3%	33.6%	17.0%	12.4%	36.8%	56.2%	28.0%	22.6%
Renter Occupied	30.6%	45.7%	66.4%	83.0%	87.6%	63.2%	43.8%	72.0%	77.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tenure by Year Householder Moved In

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Owner Occupied:								
Moved in 1999 to March 2000	6.2%	1.9%	3.0%	2.6%	1.1%	3.4%	0.0%	2.7%
Moved in 1995 to 1998	15.2%	2.6%	3.3%	2.6%	2.1%	5.6%	0.0%	1.0%
Moved in 1990 to 1994	10.0%	2.9%	0.0%	7.2%	3.7%	4.0%	2.4%	2.1%
Moved in 1980 to 1989	9.6%	3.6%	4.8%	0.0%	5.6%	5.2%	2.6%	4.1%
Moved in 1970 to 1979	6.5%	4.6%	4.8%	0.0%	6.1%	11.1%	1.5%	1.3%
Moved in 1969 or earlier	6.7%	14.8%	1.3%	0.0%	18.3%	27.0%	4.4%	11.4%
Total Owner-Occupied	54.3%	30.6%	17.1%	12.4%	36.9%	56.2%	17.1%	22.6%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table H38: Tenure by Year Householder Moved In

Homeowners who lived in the Study Area for 30 years or more were twice as numerous as homeowners who lived the county (14.8% vs. 6.7%). Homeowners in tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04 were three to four times more numerous than homeowners in the county. Homeowners in tract 14 were about twice as numerous as their county counterparts.

Renters who lived in the Study Area for 30 years or more comprised five times the percent of county renters. Renters comprised even greater percentages than in the county in the following tracts -- Tract 13.01 (18 times), Tract 12.01 (4 times), Tract 14 (4 times), Tract 13.03 (3 times) and Tract 13.04 (2 times).

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Renter Occupied								
Moved in 1999 to March 2000	20.6%	22.7%	37.7%	30.6%	17.5%	14.2%	28.8%	18.2%
Moved in 1995 to 1998	16.9%	26.5%	22.1%	34.5%	26.4%	15.6%	24.0%	34.9%
Moved in 1990 to 1994	4.8%	8.3%	6.5%	14.7%	8.0%	6.2%	8.4%	8.8%
Moved in 1980 to 1989	2.2%	5.4%	11.3%	3.6%	1.0%	5.2%	4.4%	7.2%
Moved in 1970 to 1979	0.8%	4.0%	5.3%	2.3%	1.3%	1.0%	5.2%	6.0%
	0.5%	2.6%	0.0%	2.0%	9.0%	1.6%	1.2%	2.2%
Total Renter Occupied	45.8%	69.4%	82.9%	87.6%	63.1%	43.8%	72.0%	77.4%

Source: US 2000 Census Table H38: Tenure by Year Householder Moved In

Year Structure Built

The Study Area had a larger percent of housing stock built before 1960 compared to the county's percent. The Study Area contained roughly twice the housing in the oldest category – homes built before 1939 (or earlier) – and in the category through 1969. Starting in 1970 the amount of housing in the Study Area declined each decade until virtually no housing was built by the time of the 2000 census.

It is interesting to note that all census tracts in the Study Area contained a larger percent of older housing stock than the county except tract 12.01 (homes built between 1940 and 1959) and tract 12.02 (homes built between 1940 and 1949). This means that most homes in the census tracts in the Study Area have exceeded the 50 year benchmark for historic designation and reflect an historic and stable neighborhood. This is particularly true in tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 14.

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Built 1999 to March 2000	3.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.05	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Built 1995 - 98	10.2%	1.2%	0.0%	6.8%	0.9%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%
Built 1990 - 94	9.9%	1.5%	3.8%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	1.6%	0.5%
Built 1980 - 89	20.6%	7.2%	37.0%	16.3%	1.4%	4.7%	2.6%	3.8%
Built 1970 - 79	18.4%	12.0%	12.7%	10.7%	4.1%	16.3%	15.8%	10.4%
Built 1960 - 69	14.2%	26.5%	24.9%	35.5%	18.8%	22.0%	33.0%	26.4%
Built 1950 - 59	10.3%	26.0%	8.5%	14.3%	23.3%	27.3%	31.1%	31.0%
Built 1940 - 49	6.1%	14.3%	3.4%	3.9%	30.0%	14.3%	8.7%	16.3%
Built 1939 or earlier	6.4%	11.2%	9.7%	12.4%	17.9%	15.5%	3.8%	11.7%

Source: US Census 2000 Table H34: Year Structure Built

Number of Rooms

Homes with five or less rooms comprised 75.3% of Study Area homes compared with 58.7% of Durham County Homes. Homes with six or more rooms were half as numerous in the Study Area as in the county.

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
1 room	1.4%	1.6%	2.7%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	3.3%	0.5%
2 rooms	5.3%	6.8%	8.7%	6.5%	6.3%	4.3%	6.4%	8.5%
3 rooms	11.5%	15.1%	22.6%	20.2%	11.1%	7.8%	15.8%	17.6%
4 rooms	19.2%	27.7%	37.8%	21.5%	20.3%	20.1%	32.3%	30.7%
5 rooms	21.4%	24.0%	19.0%	29.0%	24.6%	33.3%	20.0%	22.1%
6 rooms	17.3%	14.3%	5.5%	10.4%	15.4%	19.2%	11.8%	16.8%
7 rooms	10.4%	5.3%	1.3%	10.1%	10.2%	6.9%	4.3%	2.7%
8 rooms	7.2%	3.6%	2.3%	2.3%	5.0%	5.5%	5.7%	0.7%
9 or more	6.4%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	2.8%	0.6%	0.4%

Source: US 2000 Census Table H23: Rooms

Housing Value

About a quarter of homes in the Study Area were valued under \$ 60,000 compared to only 7% of Durham County homes at the time of the 2000 census. About 82% of homes in the Study Area were valued under \$ 100,000 compared to just a third of county homes. Clearly the Study Area contained more moderately priced homes than the county.

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
\$ 0 - \$ 59,999	6.9%	26.7%	73.5%	18.4%	21.7%	21.4%	18.5%	37.7%
\$ 60,000 - \$ 99,999	24.1%	55.5%	26.5%	81.6%	66.1%	63.4%	45.5%	49.3%
\$ 100,000 - \$ 149,999	33.9%	14.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.2%	10.8%	29.6%	9.5%
\$ 150,000 - \$ 999,999	34.6%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	6.4%	3.5%
\$ 1,000,000 and over	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table H84: Value for all owner-occupied units

Income

Durham County had a total of 89,015 households according to the 2000 Census. Over half of the county's households (51.4%) earned less than \$ 45,000. Another 25% of county households earned between \$ 45,000 and \$ 74,999. Just 10.5% of Durham County's households earned between \$ 75,000 and \$ 99,999 and only 10.8% of Durham's households earned \$ 100,000 to \$ 199,999. A very small 2.06% percent of households earned \$ 200,000.

Of Durham County's households who earned less than \$ 45,000, 21,319 of these households were headed by African Americans and 19,818 headed by Whites – about 1,501 households or a 7.5% difference. From this comparison it was apparent that almost as many White households as African American households were considered as moderate income in the 2000 census.

Of Durham County's households who earned \$ 45,000 - \$ 74,999, the disparity in the number of African American and White households increased with White households outnumbering African American households almost two to one. For households earning \$ 75,000 - \$ 99,000 White households outnumbered African American households by almost three to one.

For households who earned \$ 100,000 - \$ 199,999, African American households comprised a fraction of this category with White households being five times more numerous than African American households. The percentage of households who earned \$ 200,000+ comprised just 2.06% of all Durham County households and White households outnumbered African American households by almost eight to one.

Poverty Level

The Study Area's poverty level was almost three times that of Durham County residents (33.4% vs. 13.4%) with the highest levels in tracts 12.02 and 14.

Conclusions

Contrary to conventional wisdom, the demographics of neighborhoods surrounding NCCU compared favorably with those of Durham County. These neighborhoods contained a larger share of young people than in Durham County indicating potential growth for the county's population in these age groups. They also contained a larger share of seniors in all age groups over 65 than in Durham County indicating the depth of stability in these neighborhoods.

Although the Study Area experienced a modest growth rate over the past decade and a slight trend toward more racial diversity, it remained predominantly African American and was not an area of great transition or upheaval.

This stability was also evident in the percent of homeowners and renters who had lived in their homes for thirty years or more --- and at a percent greater than that of their Durham County counterparts. Homes were moderately priced and household incomes were comparable to county residents for households who earned less than \$45,000 in 1999. Also a larger percentage of Study Area homes were over 50 years old than in the county indicating the potential for wide-reaching historic home designation throughout the area.

While the overall homeownership rate was less than that of the county, homeownership was higher than the county's rate in tract 13.03 – the same tract shared with NCCU. Although just less than half the Study Area's homes were single-family, the dominance of single-family structures in two census tracts surrounding NCCU (13.01 and 13.30) further indicated that this was not a community on the verge of collapse or mass exodus.

By all indications from the findings in this section, the neighborhoods around NCCU have been stable for almost a century, have historic significance and have contributed great social capital to NCCU and the City and County of Durham.

Section Three: Study Area Seniors

Seniors in the Study Area were similar to their Durham County counterparts in having twice as many females than males in the population, having a greater percent of family households than non-family households and living in predominantly single-family homes.

However, seniors in the Study Area had a greater share of population in certain age groups and in various types of households than their Durham County counterparts. While African Americans remained the largest racial group, growth and share of the population indicated a slight trend toward more diversity.

Senior females outnumbered senior males 2:1 in every racial group and in every census tract in the Study Area and more senior females lived alone in the Study Area. Seniors in the Study Area also had a larger share of single-person households than in the county.

Seniors also owned their homes at 2 -3 times the county's share for all seniors over 65 and at 3 to 4 times the county's share for seniors over 75.

Senior Population in the Study Area

Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
21,574	1,403	120	25	226	373	363	296

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table

The 2000 census counted 1,403 seniors who lived in the Study Area and 21,574 seniors who lived in Durham County.

Senior Share of Population

US	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
12.4%	12.0%	9.7%	10.2%	8.3%	2.5%	16.0%	10.2%	12.6%	8.7%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table :

Although Durham County seniors comprised a smaller share of the total population than in the nation and the state of North Carolina, seniors in the Study Area comprised a greater proportion of total population (10.2%) than seniors in the county (9.7%).

The proportion of seniors in the Study Area also exceeded the state and US share in two tracts – 13.01 and 13.04 and the county share in three tracts – 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04.

Tract 13.01 was noteworthy for having some of the highest proportions of seniors in all age categories in the entire county. Of the county’s 53 census tracts, tract 13.01 ranked:

- 6th highest in the share of seniors 65 and older
- 6th highest in the share of seniors 65 – 74 and 75 - 84
- 5th highest in the share of seniors 85 – 89
- 4th highest in the share of seniors 90 and over

The one exception was tract 12.02 which had the lowest share of seniors in the Study Area -- probably due to the large percentage of commercial property and public housing in the tract. This tract also had the fewest number of housing units in the Study Area.

Share of Population Ages 65 - 74

US	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
6.5%	6.6%	4.9%	5.1%	3.9%	1.2%	7.1%	4.8%	6.7%	4.9%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table :

The overall share of 65 – 74 year-olds was slightly higher in the Study Area than in Durham County although both trailed the US and state in share. Seniors in tracts 13.01 and 13.04, however, comprised larger shares than in the overall county population, the state and the nation.

Share of Population Ages 75 - 84

US	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
4.4%	4.4%	3.5%	3.6%	3.2%	0.7%	6.0%	3.8%	4.2%	2.9%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table

The overall share of 75-85 year-olds was slightly higher in the Study Area than in Durham County but trailed the US and state. However, seniors in tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04 comprised larger shares than in the overall county population. And the proportion of seniors in tract 13.01 exceeded that of the county, state and nation.

Senior Share of Population Ages 85 and Over

US	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
1.5%	1.3%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	0.6%	3.0%	1.6%	1.7%	0.9%

The overall share of seniors 85 and older in the Study Area was on par with the nation but exceeded the share of this age group in the state and county. The share of seniors over 85 was twice that of the county, state and nation in tract 13.01 and a more than a third larger than the county’s share in tract 13.03 and 13.04.

Share of Population by Age by Census Tract

In the neighborhoods around NCCU, seniors not only comprised a slightly larger share of the population than their Durham County counterparts, they comprised a larger share in all senior age groups and comprised a greater share in certain Study Area census tracts.

Seniors in tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04 equaled or exceeded the county share for all senior age groups. The age groups where Study Area and census tract percentages equaled or exceeded the county’s share are highlighted in yellow.

Age	US	NC	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
0 - 4	6.8%	6.7%	6.9%	8.8%	7.1%	19.0%	7.0%	2.8%	9.4%	13.4%
5 – 9	7.3%	7.0%	6.6%	8.8%	7.9%	17.7%	8.5%	3.3%	9.8%	11.9%
10 – 14	7.3%	6.8%	6.1%	7.4%	6.8%	10.4%	7.4%	3.5%	7.3%	10.9%
15 – 19	7.2%	6.7%	6.7%	10.6%	7.8%	7.5%	6.2%	21.0%	6.4%	7.1%
20- 34	20.9%	22.3%	28.4%	28.4%	31.9%	24.7%	19.2%	40.8%	24.6%	21.8%
35 – 49	23.1%	23.0%	22.7%	16.6%	22.6%	12.8%	23.8%	10.3%	18.5%	17.3%
50 – 64	14.8%	15.4%	12.9%	9.1%	7.7%	5.4%	11.7%	8.0%	11.3%	9.0%
65 – 74	6.5%	6.6%	4.9%	5.1%	3.9%	1.2%	7.1%	4.8%	6.7%	4.9%
75 – 84	4.4%	4.1%	3.5%	3.6%	3.2%	0.7%	6.0%	3.8%	4.2%	2.9%
85+	1.5%	1.3%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	0.6%	3.0%	1.6%	1.7%	0.9%

Senior Population by Age and Race

The table below summarizes the number of seniors over 65 by race and sex. African Americans comprised the majority of seniors while the female to male ratio was approximately 2:1 across all racial groups.

Study Area	African American		White		Some Other Race		Two or More Races		Hispanic	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Persons over 65	462	919	6	10	0	1	2	3	1	2

Senior Sex, Age and Racial Distribution

The growing racial diversity reflected in Durham County was almost non-existent for seniors in the Study Area. African American seniors had a greater share of the total population in the Study Area (10.0%) than all other racial groups. Other than White seniors with a share of 0.1%, seniors in other racial groups had statistically insignificant shares of the population.

Other racial groups, in addition to having a much less share of the senior population, were significantly younger in the Study Area. For Whites, 95.8% were under the age of 50 along with 97.2% of Hispanics compared to 73.7% of African Americans.

Overall, there were twice as many senior females as males in the Study Area. Senior females also outnumbered males in every racial group and every census tract – with a 2:1 ratio in all tracts except 12.02 which had a 5:1 ratio.

Senior Population in Households

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
1 person household	7.0%	12.1%	17.0%	4.7%	19.2%	14.0%	11.5%	8.2%
2 person household	10.0%	13.6%	9.3%	2.8%	12.8%	22.6%	15.2%	11.0%
Families	9.6%	12.7%	7.8%	2.8%	12.0%	20.9%	14.3%	10.6%
Non-families	0.4%	0.9%	1.5%	0.0%	0.8%	1.8%	0.9%	0.5%
Total Households with one or more persons over 65	17.0%	25.7%	26.3%	7.5%	32.0%	36.6%	26.7%	19.2%
Households with no one over 65	83.0%	74.3%	73.8%	92.5%	68.0%	63.4%	73.3%	80.8%

Source: US 2000 Census Table P23: Households by presence of people 65 and over, household size and type

In the Study Area, 25.7% of households are contained one or more persons over 65 compared to Durham County (17.0%). All census tracts in the Study Area exceeded the county's percent of senior households except for tract 12.02. Senior single-person and two-person households in the Study Area all exceeded the county's percent. Seniors in the county and the Study Area had a greater percentage of family households than non-family households.

The same findings held true for households containing one or more persons over 75 (13.7%) compared to Durham County (8.6%).

Family and Non-Family Households

In addition to having a greater percent of senior households than the county, the Study Area also contained a greater percent of senior family and other type households than the county:

- The Study Area contained about 10.5% of senior family households compared to 7.8% in the county
- The Study Area contained somewhat less senior married-couple families (4.7%) than in the county (5.8%) except in tracts 13.03 and 13.04 which exceeded the county's percent (7.8% and 6.1% respectively)
- The Study Area contained almost three times the percent of other senior family households (5.8% vs. 2.0%) -- driven by the greater percent of female-headed households
- The Study Area contained a greater percentage of non-family households – driven by the greater percent of householders living alone

Marital Status

Durham County senior married couples comprised 5.8% of all households while Study Area senior married couples comprised 4.7%. However, married seniors in tracts 13.03 and 13.04 exceeded the county's percent of married couples at 7.8% and 6.1% respectively.

Living Alone

Senior females living alone with no husband in the Study Area were three times more numerous than their county counterparts. Senior males were about twice as numerous as in the Study Area as in the county but comprised a smaller share of households.

Tenure

Three census tracts consistently exceeded the county’s share for senior home ownership – Tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04. It is noteworthy that tract and 13.03 contained homes identified for purchase as part of the university’s expansion plan.

Seniors’ home ownership shares that equaled or exceeded the county’s share in the Study Area’s are highlighted in yellow in the table below. Other observations include:

- All seniors over 65 owned their own homes at a proportion 2 to 3 times the county’s share (11.5%) in Tracts 13.01 (20.7%) and 13.03 (31.8%) respectively
- Seniors 75 and over owned their own homes at a proportion 3 and almost 4 times the county’s share (5.3%) in Tracts 13.01 (16.3%) and 13.03 (19.5%)

For owner-occupied single-family structures, tract 13.03 exceeded the county’s share (69.3% vs. 59.5%).

It is also notable that the home ownership share among seniors in Tract 14 (10.5%) was close to the county’s rate of 11.5% despite the tract’s having a large number of rental units in McDougald Terrace, a large public housing complex. These statistics showed a community can remain stable with both home ownership and public housing co-existing in the same area.

Tenure by Age by Tract

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Owner Occupied								
15 – 24	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%
25 – 64	42.1%	15.1%	8.0%	12.4%	16.2%	23.1%	12.3%	12.1%
All Seniors:	11.5%	18.2%	9.0%	0.0%	20.7%	31.8%	15.7%	10.5%
65 – 74	6.2%	7.6%	7.5%	0.0%	4.3%	12.3%	8.4%	6.2%
75 +	5.3%	10.6%	1.5%	0.0%	16.3%	19.5%	7.3%	4.3%
Total	54.4%	33.6%	17.1%	12.4%	36.9%	56.2%	28.0%	22.6%

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Renter Occupied								
15 – 24	7.1%	6.4%	5.3%	22.5%	1.0%	2.5%	8.2%	12.3%
25 – 64	34.6%	50.0%	56.8%	56.7%	49.5%	35.5%	56.0%	56.9%
All Seniors:	4.1%	9.9%	20.9%	8.5%	12.7%	5.8%	7.8%	8.2%
65 – 74	1.8%	4.9%	9.8%	2.3%	5.6%	3.5%	4.3%	4.0%
75 +	2.3%	5.1%	11.1%	6.2%	7.1%	2.3%	3.5%	4.2%
Total	45.7%	66.4%	82.9%	87.6%	63.1%	43.8%	72.0%	77.4%

Although this study focused on senior home ownership, it is noteworthy that tract 13.03 was the only tract in the Study Area where any persons 15 – 24 owned a home. Ten (10) homes were owned by persons in this age group representing a 0.4% share of homes.

As expected and consistent with Durham County, the share of renters among seniors in the Study Area is greater than or on par with the county's share. The high share of renters in Tracts 12.02 and 14 was due to the presence of large public housing developments in both of those

Tenure by Units in Structure for Seniors

Type of Unit	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Single Family	10.8%	17.9%	9.0%	0.0%	20.7%	30.4%	15.7%	10.5%
2 – 4 units	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
5 – 19 units	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20 – 49 units	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
50 or more	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mobile Home	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RV, boat, van	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	11.5%	18.2%	9.0%	0.0%	20.7%	31.8%	15.7%	10.5%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table HCT 4: Tenure by Age of Householder by Units in Structure

Seniors in the Study Area who owned their homes lived almost exclusively in single-family homes with single-family homes representing 17.9% of Study Area housing units. A much smaller percentage (0.3%) occupied housing with 2 – 4 units and this housing was entirely located in tract 13.03. Other significant findings were:

- Percent of senior-owned single-family homes in tract 13.01 (20.7%) was almost double the county’s percentage
- Percent of senior-owned single-family homes in tract 13.03 (30.4%) was almost triple the county’s percentage
- Seniors over the age of 75 in tracts 13.01 (16.3%) and 13.03 (19.5%) occupied the highest percentage of homes in the Study Area for all sizes of housing and all age groups over 15 years of age

Senior Renters by Units in Structure

Type of Unit	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Single Family	1.2%	2.7%	6.3%	0.0%	3.4%	3.2%	1.3%	4.6%
2 – 4 units	0.8%	5.7%	6.5%	8.5%	9.3%	2.6%	4.7%	2.5%
5 – 19 units	0.7%	1.4%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.1%
20 – 49 units	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%
50 or more	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mobile Home	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RV, boat, van	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	4.1%	9.9%	20.9%	8.5%	12.7%	5.8%	7.8%	8.2%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table HCT 4: Tenure by Age of Householder by Units in Structure

The percentage of seniors who rented housing in the Study Area occupied more types of structures than home owners. Seniors in the Study Area (2.7%) and in every census tract rented a larger percentage of single-family homes than seniors in the county (1.2%). Seniors in the Study Area also rented homes with 2 -4 units at rates much greater than the county rate of (0.8%).

Tenure by Age of Senior Householder by Units in Structure

A greater percentage of seniors in both Durham County (11.5% vs. 4.1%) and in the Study Area (18.2% vs. 9.9%) owned their own homes rather than living in rental housing. When compared to persons younger than 65, Study Area seniors owned a greater percentage (18.2% vs.

15.5%) of their homes. Seniors also owned a greater percentage of their homes in tracts 13.01, 13.03 and 13.04. This finding is the reverse of the county where younger persons (42.7% vs. 11.5%) owned a greater percentage of units than seniors.

Owner Occupied	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Persons under 65	42.7%	15.5%	8.0%	12.4%	16.2%	24.4%	12.3%	12.1%
All Seniors	11.5%	18.2%	9.0%	0.0%	20.7%	31.8%	15.7%	10.5%
65 – 74	6.2%	6.9%	7.5%	0.0%	4.3%	12.3%	8.4%	6.2%
75 +	5.3%	10.7%	1.5%	0.0%	16.4%	19.5%	7.3%	4.3%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table HCT 4: Tenure by Age of Householder by Units in Structure

Renter Occupied	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Persons under 65	41.6%	56.4%	62.1%	79.2%	50.5%	38.0%	64.2%	69.2%
Seniors	4.1%	9.9%	20.9%	8.5%	12.7%	5.8%	7.8%	8.2%
65 - 74	1.8%	4.9%	9.8%	2.3%	5.9%	3.5%	4.3%	4.0%
75+	2.3%	5.1%	11.1%	6.2%	7.3%	2.3%	3.5%	4.2%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census 2000 HCT 4: Tenure by Age of Householder by Units in Structure

Poverty Level

For persons with incomes below the poverty level in 1999, seniors in both Durham County and the Study Area comprised a small share of those persons (1.2% and 2.8% respectively).

For persons with incomes at or above the poverty level, seniors in the Study Area comprised a larger share than in Durham County (9.6% vs. 8.2%). Also, there were twice as many seniors in tract 13.03 (18.5% vs. 8.2%) with incomes at or above the poverty level as in the county.

	Durham County	Study Area	12.01	12.02	13.01	13.03	13.04	14
Income below poverty level in 1999								
Under 65	12.2%	30.6%	24.1%	43.8%	26.0%	14.2%	29.1%	40.7%
65+	1.2%	2.8%	4.8%	1.1%	5.9%	2.8%	2.7%	1.3%
Total	13.4%	33.4%	28.9%	44.9%	31.9%	17.1%	31.6%	42.1%
Income at or above poverty level in 1999								
Under 65	78.4%	57.0%	65.1%	52.5%	58.3%	64.4%	58.3%	50.3%
65+	8.2%	9.6%	6.0%	2.6%	9.9%	18.5%	9.9%	7.7%
Total	86.6%	66.6%	71.1%	55.1%	68.1%	82.9%	68.2%	57.9%

Source: U. S. 2000 Census Table P87: Poverty status in 1999 by age

Conclusions

Against the odds, seniors in the neighborhoods around NCCU defied the conventional wisdom, worked, saved and created a community that was unique in the County and City of Durham. This was the case in demographic variable after variable for these venerable seniors. And again the demographics of neighborhoods surrounding NCCU compared favorably with those of Durham County – exceeding the county’s share of senior age groups, married couples, home ownership, single-family home occupancy and share of households with incomes in 1999 at or above the poverty level.

Again seniors in the Study Area remained predominantly African American. Their concentration in the community around NCCU has been a testament to their vision, self-determination and hard work – much like their counterparts in other areas of Durham.

Their stability was also evident in the percent of homeowners and renters who had lived in their homes for thirty years or more --- again at a percent greater than that of their Durham County senior counterparts.

The findings in this section indicated that seniors in the neighborhoods around NCCU formed the underpinning for the stability that our community has enjoyed for over a century. It is a history worth honoring and a history worth preserving.