Capital Region Compares Favorably to State and National Trends

An examination of patterns and trends from the 2005-09 and 2010-14 5-year American Community Surveys (ACS) shows that the Capital Region’s trends compare favorably to those of the State and Nation.

The 2010-14 5-year ACS provides the first opportunity since the Census Bureau commissioned the annual ACS studies to compare 5-year surveys without overlapping years. The first 5-year survey encompassed the years 2005 through 2009 with a new report issued annually. Comparisons, however, with surveys with overlapping years (such as 2005-09 & 2006-10) were less reliable due to shared data from overlapping years. Now, with the release of the 2010-14 5-year ACS, the Capital District Regional Planning Commission can effectively compare the 2005-09 & the 2010-14 ACS’ and comment on changing demographics over a ten-year period.

As part of a larger effort to compare the demographic trends of the four counties, the Region, State, and Nation, CDRPC will be publishing a full report that highlights trends in Population, Housing, Household Income, Poverty Rate, Educational Attainment, Labor Force Participation, and Journey to Work data. This issue of Capital District Data will highlight the following areas:

1. Educational Attainment
2. Median Household Income
3. Population Below the Poverty Level
4. Labor Force Participation

Firstly, it is important to address some inherent challenges when comparing the 2005-09 & 2010-14 ACS’.

Margins of Error: The ACS is not sent to every household within the country, therefore, the survey is a sample of the population and provides estimates only. With any estimate, there is a margin of error associated with it that represents a high and low count for the estimate. For example, if an estimate of 50 households has a margin of error of 5, the estimate could range as low as 45 households, and as high as 55 households.

A Note From the Editor: A New Year for Capital District Data

We here at the Capital District Regional Planning Commission hope that everyone had a very happy holiday. The new year is always a time for resolutions and new beginnings, and we are no different. As always, our resolution to our readers is to provide the most up-to-date data available with the unbiased reporting that you have come to expect from our organization. We take great pride in our reputation as an objective voice that can be relied upon to provide data and information to the Capital Region. Here at CDRPC, we live by the Joe Friday mantra “Just the facts.”

While our commitment to objective data will not change, the nature of data and its dissemination has changed. For 38 years, Capital District Data (CDD) has provided a bi-monthly resource for our readers to be put in touch with the latest data available. But the world has changed, the dissemination of data cannot fit into the pages of a bi-monthly newsletter alone. As such, we have taken steps to upgrade our web site to provide access to the most current data available from a range of secondary data sources. Over the next year (and probably beyond) CDD will undergo a gradual process- a process that we hope will improve not just the quantity of data that CDRPC provides, but also the quality.

While the exact details of the upcoming changes are still being finalized, our readers can expect the same commitment to data dissemination and analysis that they have come to expect from the publication. We are always interested in your feedback, with any thoughts or comments you may have.

We are very excited for this new era for CDRPC and Capital District Data as a data resource center. As always, we will do our very best to serve the Region.

Sincerely,

Daniel M. Harp Jr.
Editor
High School Graduate or Above

B.A. Degree or Above

M.A. Degree
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**Statistical Significance:** When comparing the 2005-09 & 2010-14 ACS, these margins of error become critical in determining if any change occurred and if it is significant. Statistical significance compares two estimates and their corresponding margins of error and determines if the two estimates are sufficiently different from one another. Statistical significance is most commonly an issue when two estimates have margins of error that could result in overlap. For instance, if Estimate A is 50 with a margin of error of 5, and Estimate B is 60 with a margin of error of 10, the two estimates may not be statistically significant. A good rule of thumb is, if the two estimates and their margins of error overlap, the differences between the two estimates is not statistically significant. With the above example, Estimate A could be as high as 55, and Estimate B could be as low as 50, meaning that the estimates are not statistically significant and that we cannot determine if any change occurred. In most cases, the data presented here will be statistically significant.

**Actual Significance:** While statistical significance is useful for determining the veracity of data, it does not always tell the full story. While two estimates may indeed be statistically significant, that does not necessarily mean that the difference between them is noteworthy. Determining actual significance is subjective and varies from case to case. While most of the data presented here is statistically significant, that does not necessarily mean that the change is actually significant. A 2% change in median household income, for example, may be statistically significant, but depending on the actual value of that 2%, it may not make a great deal of difference in the grand scheme of things.

**Constant Dollars:** Median Household Income for the 2005-09 & 2010-14 has been held in 2014 constant dollars so that an accurate comparison can be made between the two surveys. Originally, the 2005-09 survey was held in 2009 constant dollars.

**Labor Force Participation:** The Census Bureau measures the labor force as the population of workers over the age of 16. The Labor Force Participation rate is not the same as the unemployment rate. Labor Force Participation measures how many people within that population are employed, or actively seeking employment, and does not count those that are not seeking employment or those that are full time students. Unemployment rates measure the percentage of workers who are unemployed and part of the Labor Force. Therefore, if 70% of the population 16 years of age and older is in the labor force that does not equate to the remaining 30% being unemployed.

**Educational Attainment for Those 25 Years of Age and Older**

In terms of educational attainment, the Capital Region’s greatest advantage over New York State, and the Nation, is with those achieving a high school diploma (or equivalent) or greater. Region wide in 2010-14, 92.1% of those 25 years of age and older had finished high school. This compares very favorably to the State’s overall rate of 85.4% and the Nation’s rate of 86.3%. From 2005-09 to 2010-14, the Region increased the number of people with at least a high school education by 7.3%, to 528,280 people. This was stronger than New York State’s overall increase of 3.6%, though slightly less than the Nation’s increase of 8.1%.

Of the four counties, Saratoga County leads the way with those who have at least a high school education at 93.8%. The county with the largest increase between the two surveys was Albany County, which increased 9.2% from 172,485 to 188,428 people, an increase from 90.8% to 92.5% of the population. Meanwhile, a 6.0% increase in Rensselaer’s population with at least a high school degree ensured that all four counties within the Region exceed 90%.

When educational attainment is pared down to those with a Bachelor’s Degree or higher, there is a wider variation in the statistics. The Capital Region still stacks up favorably compared to the State and the Nation, with 35.0% of its residents reporting a B.A. Degree or higher in 2010-14. New York State is only slightly behind at 33.7%, and the National rate is 29.3%. Of the three areas, the Capital Region grew the most between the two surveys, increasing its number of residents with a Bachelor’s Degree by 12.9% from the 2005-09 level. The State, in contrast, increased by 8.1%, and the Nation by 12.6%.

The counties show a greater variance in the percentage of residents with a Bachelor’s Degree. Both Albany County (38.7%) and Saratoga County (38.0%) are seeing their educational attainment of Bachelor Degrees approach 40%. Meanwhile, Rensselaer County (28.5%) and Schenectady County (29.8%) have yet to surpass 30%. Rensselaer County did see an improvement from 2005-09 to 2010-14, increasing from 26.4% to 28.5%. Schenectady County remained virtually flat, increasing from 29.2% to 29.8% - a good example of a statistically significant change that was not actually very significant.

The Capital Region’s trend of exceeding the academic achievements of the State and Nation extends to those that achieve a Master’s Degree, or greater. 15.8% of those in the Capital Region have at least a Master’s Degree, compared to 14.6% and 11.0% for the State and Nation, respectively. All three saw modest increases from the 2005-09 ACS, with the Region increasing 12.2% from 80,619 to 90,460.

Albany and Saratoga counties again led the Region, with 18.6% and 15.9%, respectively. Albany County’s population with at least a Master’s Degree increased 13.5% from the
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2005-09 to the 2010-14 surveys and accounts for 41.9% of those with Master’s Degree’s within the Region. Saratoga County experienced the greatest increase, increasing 15.3% to 24,672- accounting for 27.3% of the Region’s Master’s Degrees. Rensselaer and Schenectady counties both experienced 7.9% growth. Rensselaer County’s apparent growth from 2005-09 to the 2010-14 survey is within the margin of error and is therefore the only example of a non-statistically significant change.

Median Household Income

Median Household Income has been flat for a generation for much of the country and the 2005-09 & 2010-14 ACS’ bear that out. Despite the continued improvement to the economy, median household incomes have lagged behind expenses.

After adjusting for inflation, the Capital Region experienced a modest decline in the median household income from 2005-09 to 2010-14; declining 1.3% to $62,249. While a decline is never pleasant, the Capital Region fared better than either the State or Nation. Overall, New York State’s median household income declined 3.5% to $58,687, while the National median household income tumbled 5.8% to $53,482.

This trend continues with the counties as well. The median household income in three of the four counties declined between the two survey’s, with Schenectady County declining the most. The median household income in Schenectady County in the 2010-14 ACS was $57,025, a 4.7% decline from the previous survey. Even Saratoga County, with the highest median household income of $70,581 in 2010-14, experienced a decline of 0.7% from 2005-09. Albany County’s median household income declined 1.4% to $59,940 in 2010-14. Only Rensselaer County saw an increase in its median household income, increasing to $60,140 in 2010-14, an increase of only 1.0%.

Population Below Poverty Level

Between the 2005-09 and 2010-14 ACS’, the Region’s percentage of people living below the poverty level increased at a higher rate than it did statewide. The Region saw the number of people living below poverty increase 14.8% from 81,493 to 93,533, while Statewide it grew 13.9% to just under 3 million. The Region does compare favorably, however, to the National trends. Nationally, those living below poverty increased 20.8% from over 39.5 million in 2005-09 to 47.8 million in 2010-14.

Schenectady County saw the percentage of people living below poverty increase the most within the Region, jumping 22.3% to 12.8% of the population in 2010-14. Overall, Albany County has the highest total percentage of people living below the poverty level at 13.6%. Rensselaer County’s population under the poverty level grew 20% to 13.0% of the county’s population in 2010-14. Saratoga County has the lowest percentage of people living below the poverty level at 6.8%. From 2005-09 to 2010-14, the percentage of people living below the poverty level in the Saratoga County did not change at a statistically significant level.

Labor Force Participation

Across the board, the population 16 and older grew from 2005-09 to 2010-14. As a result, the number of those 16 years and older in the labor force, as well as those employed, increased accordingly. The Capital Region’s population 16+ increased 3.9% to 688,755 in 2010-14, surpassing the
overall growth statewide of 2.3%, but falling short of the national growth of 5.5%. In conjunction with the growth in the overall population, the labor force increased 2.3% to 455,372, and the number of people employed increased 1.7% to 420,475.

However, despite this growth, the overall percentages of labor force participation and employment are on a downward trajectory. In 2005-09 the Capital Region had a 67.2% labor force participation rate, this declined to 66.1% in 2010-14, meaning that as a percentage of the population fewer people were employed, or actively seeking employment, in 2010-14. Statewide the labor force participation rate remained steady at 63.5% in both 2005-09 and 2010-14. Nationwide, labor force participation declined from 65.0% to 63.9%.

In 2005-09 the Capital Region enjoyed an employment rate of 92.9%, and only saw modest declines in 2010-14 to 92.3%. Employment as a percentage of those in the labor force declined more dramatically state and nationwide, with the State seeing the percentage decline from 92.7% to 90.9% in 2010-14, and the national percentage decline from 92.1% to 90.2% in 2010-14.

The counties experienced more of a mixed bag of results across the two surveys. Saratoga County maintained the highest labor force participation rate across both surveys
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and remained very stable; in 2010-14, 68.3% of those 16+ were either employed or actively seeking employment. Schenectady County was the lone county to increase the percentage in the labor force, increasing from 63.5% in 2005-09 to 64.9% in 2010-14. Lastly, Albany and Rensselaer counties saw their labor force participation decline; Albany County declined modestly to 65.1% and Rensselaer County declined more notably to 66.8%.

Employment as a percentage of those in the labor force declined in each of the four counties in the Region as well as the State and Nation. Saratoga County in 2005-09 led the Region with 94.9% of its population employed, in 2010-14 this had slipped to 92.6%. Albany County slipped from 94.0% in 2005-09 to 93.1% in 2010-14. Rensselaer and Schenectady counties experienced very similar changes in their employment rates. In 2005-09, Rensselaer County had an employment percentage of 93.2% and Schenectady County 93.4%. In 2010-14, in both counties, the percentage of those employed in the labor force stood at 91.4%.

Overall, the Capital Region compares favorably to state and nation-wide trends. In particular, the Region outperforms the state and nation in educational attainment for those over the age of 25. In the coming months, CDRPC will have a full overview of the Region’s demographic and economic patterns and trends available on its website at www.cdrpc.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>148.2</td>
<td>149.8</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>153.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer County</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga County</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>112.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>408.8</td>
<td>406.4</td>
<td>404.6</td>
<td>405.2</td>
<td>408.6</td>
<td>412.4</td>
<td>414.7</td>
<td>417.7</td>
<td>415.5</td>
<td>414.6</td>
<td>412.7</td>
<td>418.7</td>
<td>418.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer County</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga County</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Price Index</th>
<th>2013-14 Percent Change in CPI: 1.622%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. City Average</td>
<td>236.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Urban Average</td>
<td>251.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change From Same Month in Previous Year</th>
<th>Nov 14</th>
<th>Dec 14</th>
<th>Jan 15</th>
<th>Feb 15</th>
<th>Mar 15</th>
<th>Apr 15</th>
<th>May 15</th>
<th>Jun 15</th>
<th>Jul 15</th>
<th>Aug 15</th>
<th>Sep 15</th>
<th>Oct 15</th>
<th>Nov 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. City Average</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Urban Average</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New York State Department of Labor and the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics figures are in 1,000s
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