These indicators were derived from data produced by the U.S. Census Bureau and may differ from data produced by other entities.

## DC's Elderly Population Diversity

## INTRODUCTION

By Joy Phillips, PhD
This report presents a statistical profile of selected demographic, social, housing and economic characteristics of the 60 years and older population in the District of Columbia based on the 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS). The information includes population size, age and sex composition, marital status, living arrangements, disability, income, poverty, housing cost burden, tenure and vehicles available.

The older population is an important segment of the District's population, and within it exist distinct groups with different lifestyles and needs. To this end, this report focuses on selected older age groups including people aged 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, 75-79, 80-84, $85-89$ and $90-94$ years, drawing comparisons among them when necessary.

Note: The 95 and over age group is not featured due to the small number of people in that age group and the resulting statistical reliability and confidentially issues.

## ELDERLY POPULATION HIGHLIGHTS

- The 60 years and older population shows significantly more older females than older males with the disparity between the sexes increasing with age.
- Among the older population, those aged 70-74 had the highest sex ratio (84), while the population 90-94 had the lowest sex ratio (36), representing nearly three females for every male.

The sex ratio is defined as the number of males per 100 females. A sex ratio of exactly 100 would indicate an equal number of males and females, with a sex ratio over 100 indicating a greater number of males. A sex ratio below 100 implies a greater number of females.

- There were significantly more unmarried institutionalized men and women than married institutionalized men and women 60 years and older.
- Disability rate increases with age and therefore heightened the prospect that people with personal care or physical limitations were more likely to be institutionalized than people who did not have limitations.
- In general, both household income and personal income decrease, and poverty rate increases as people become older, especially as relates to women.
- Incomes of elderly householders are normally lower because households are smaller, they are less likely to be employed, and the value of their pension may have eroded over time.
- Beside the fact that there are more females in the population than males for the 60 and older age groups, poverty numbers and percentages are generally higher for females compared to males.
- Home ownership is the main financial asset for many older people since their houses may be fully paid for.
- A higher percentage of older elderly women were more likely to be homeowners than older elderly men.
- Many in the 60 years and older population did not have access to a vehicle in their household and females were significantly less likely to have vehicles than males.


## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

The 2012-2016 ACS 5-year population estimates reported 107,600 District residents over the age of 60, about 16.3 percent of the total population (Table 1). The 2012-2016 estimate was up 12,200 or 12.8 percent over the 2006-2010 estimate of 95,345 people 60 years and older. The growth trend between 2006-2010 and 2012-2016 differed by age group with the fastest gains occurring in the youngest of the 60 years and older age groups. The number of people in age groups 60-64, 65-69, and 70-74 grew by 15 percent, 19 percent and 22 percent, respectively, while the $75-79$ age group grew by 6 percent and the 85 and older grew by 10 percent. The only age group which showed a decline was the $80-84$ years old which decreased by 936 people or 9 percent. The significant increase in the younger of the elderly population maybe a reflection of the aging of Baby Boomers into the 60 and older age groups.

In the 2012-2016 period, more than half of the older population were between the ages of 60 and 69 . There were more older females $(62,700)$ than older males $(44,800)$, with the disparity in numbers between the sexes increasing with age (Table 1). Of the 9,346 aged 80-84, 5,550 were females and 3,796 were males - almost one and a half times more females than males. The disparity was more pronounced for those aged $90-94$ where there were nearly three times as many females $(3,282)$ as males $(1,194)$.
The sex ratio, a measure of sex composition, also portrayed the disparity in the number of males and females among the District's older population. The sex ratio among the older population is a result of higher life expectancy of females relative to males. For the 2012-2016 period, the District-wide sex ratio (all ages) was 90 compared with 71 for the 60 and older population. Among the older population, those aged $70-74$ had the highest sex ratio (84), while the population 90-94 had the lowest sex ratio (36), representing nearly three females for every male (Figure 1).


Source: DC Office of Planning/State Data Center

## LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Living arrangements for the District's elderly population varies by age and gender. For men 60 years and older, the percentage of unmarried men ( 51.6 percent) was slightly above married men ( 48.4 percent) (Table 2 ). For women, the differences were substantial with unmarried women comprising 68 percent of all women 60 years and older and married women the other 32 percent. There were significantly more unmarried institutionalized men and women than married institutionalized men and women 60 years and older (Table 3). Of the total institutionalized 60 years and older population in the District, 87 percent were unmarried. This was expected and most likely due to the absence of a partner at home to take care of them.

Regardless of the age group within the 60 years and older range, about 30 percent of men lived alone (Table 4). For women, the age groups from 60 years to 74 years showed about 38 percent living alone. However, from 75 years to 94 years, women living alone increased six percentage points to 44 percent. There were more women living alone in the 90-94 years age group than not living alone. The other types of living arrangements by age group were only available for the 65 years and older population. This data showed 40 percent lived alone; 33 percent lived with a spouse; two percent lived with an unmarried partner; one percent lived with the child of the householder; 20 percent lived with other relatives; and four percent lived with other nonrelatives. (Table 5).

## GENDER RELATED INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND DISABILITY

The probability of institutionalization generally increases with advancing age and more women are likely to be institutionalized than men due to the longer life expectancy rate of women. In the 2012-2016 ACS data for the District of Columbia, between 2.3 percent and 2.6 percent of men 60 to 74 years old, per five-year age group, were institutionalized (Table 6). The percentage rose to 17.7 percent for $90-94$ years old men. Similarly, for women, institutionalization rose from one percent for the 60-64 years old to 14 percent for the $90-94$ years old. While the number of women aged 60 years and older institutionalized was higher than men, the percent of all 60 years and older men institutionalized was higher than women at 3.2 percent $(1,447 \mathrm{men})$ for men and 2.5 percent $(1,570)$ for women.

In general, women are more likely to be institutionalized because they are less likely to be married. Since spouses are the main caretakers of the elderly, an older man is more likely to have a spouse than an elderly woman. Women also have a longer life expectancy than men and therefore tend to outlive men. In addition, husbands are on average several years older than their wives.

Disability rate increases with age and therefore heightened the prospect that people with personal care or physical limitations were more likely to be institutionalized than people who didn't have limitations. Further, people with more than one limitation were more likely to be institutionalized than those who only had one limitation. As shown in Table 7, people with more than one limitation were institutionalized at least twice as much as those with one limitation.

## ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

In general, both household income and personal income decrease, and poverty rate increases as people become older, especially as relates to women. The median household income decreased from $\$ 70,531$ for householders in age group 65-69 years to $\$ 42,875$ for householders in age group 90-94 years (Table 8). Similarly, median personal income decreased from $\$ 32,266$ for persons $65-69$ years to $\$ 20,000$ for those $90-94$ years.

Beside the fact that there are more females in the population than males for the 60 and older age groups, poverty numbers and percentages are generally higher for females compared to males. Men are more likely to have multiple sources of income. Incomes of elderly householders are normally lower because households are smaller, they are less likely to be employed, and the value of their pension may have eroded over time. The most common type of income received by the 60 years and older population was social security ( 54 percent) (Table 9). Although women are generally more dependent on Social Security, they receive lower average amounts than men due to differences in their earnings history.

Poverty rates for males were at their highest for the 60-64 years age group at 16.9 percent and lowest for the 90-94 years age group at 5.2 percent (Table 10). For females, poverty rates were highest for the $90-94$ years age group at 21.5 percent and lowest for the 65-69 years age group at 11.2 percent. While male poverty rates were below 10 percent in three of the seven age groups, female poverty rates remained above 10 percent for all age groups 60 years and older.

## HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Home ownership is the main financial asset for many older people since their houses may be fully paid for. According to the 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, 44 percent of District adults 60 years and older owned their homes free and clear (no mortgage) (Table 11). A higher percentage of older elderly women were more likely to be homeowners than older elderly men. About 58.4 percent of female householders 60 years and older were homeowners, compared to 41.6 percent of male householders who were homeowner in the same age range (Table 12).

Among homeowners 60 years and older, females were more cost burdened than males for each age group, especially for those 90-94 years where females were almost three times more cost burdened than males (Table 13). Since women in general have lower incomes than men, it is not surprising that they have to spend more of their income on housing.

Rental housing burden fluctuated among age groups 60 and over for both males and females. At age groups 60-64, 65-69, 80-84 and 85-89, a higher percentage of males were cost burdened compared to females. However, at age groups 70-74, 75-79 and 90-94, a higher percentage of females were cost burdened compared to males.

## VEHICLE AVAILABLE

All but two percent of District residents 65 years and older had telephones access in their households. Many, however, did not have access to a vehicle in their household and females were significantly less likely to have vehicles than males. For males 60 years and older, the percent with no vehicle ranged from 17.8 percent for the $75-79$ years old to 35.4 percent for the 90-94 years old (Table 14). For females, the percent with no vehicles ranged from 28.8 percent for the $75-79$ years old to 58 percent for the $90-94$ years old. As expected, the driving ability of the older elderly decreases as they age. The absence of a vehicle in the household means that older people must rely on others or public transportation to get them from place to place.

Table 1: Population 60 Years and Older by Age and Sex: 2006-2010 and 2012-2016
2012-2016 ACS 5-Year

|  | Total Population |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| $\mathbf{6 0}$ years and older | $\mathbf{1 0 7 , 5 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 , 8 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 7 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| $60-64$ years | 32,545 | 30.3 | 14,381 | 32.1 | 18,164 | 28.9 |
| $65-69$ years | 24,083 | 22.4 | 10,249 | 22.9 | 13,834 | 22.0 |
| $70-74$ years | 18,389 | 17.1 | 8,372 | 18.7 | 10,017 | 16.0 |
| $75-79$ years | 12,672 | 11.8 | 4,902 | 10.9 | 7,770 | 12.4 |
| $80-84$ years | 9,346 | 8.7 | 3,796 | 8.5 | 5,550 | 8.8 |
| $85-89$ years | 6,067 | 5.6 | 1,937 | 4.3 | 4,130 | 6.6 |
| $90-94$ years | 4,476 | 4.2 | 1,194 | 2.7 | 3,282 | 5.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2006-2010 ACS 5-Year

|  | Total Population |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| $\mathbf{6 0}$ years and older | $\mathbf{9 5 , 3 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 , 6 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 , 6 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| $60-64$ years | 28,237 | 29.6 | 12,906 | 32.5 | 15,331 | 27.5 |
| $65-69$ years | 20,202 | 21.2 | 9,164 | 23.1 | 11,038 | 19.8 |
| $70-74$ years | 15,035 | 15.8 | 6,348 | 16.0 | 8,687 | 15.6 |
| $75-79$ years | 11,975 | 12.6 | 4,858 | 12.2 | 7,117 | 12.8 |
| $80-84$ years | 10,282 | 10.8 | 3,783 | 9.5 | 6,499 | 11.7 |
| 85 and older | 9,614 | 10.1 | 2,600 | 6.6 | 7,014 | 12.6 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS)

| Table 2: Elderly Population Marital Status by Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men |  | Women |  |
| Age Group | Married | Unmarried | Married | Unmarried |
| $60-64$ | 6,096 | 8,285 | 6,355 | 11,809 |
| $65-69$ | 5,259 | 4,990 | 5,055 | 8,779 |
| $70-74$ | 4,335 | 4,037 | 3,253 | 6,764 |
| $75-79$ | 2,677 | 2,225 | 1,961 | 5,809 |
| $80-84$ | 1,787 | 2,009 | 1,079 | 4,471 |
| $85-89$ | 968 | 969 | 708 | 3,422 |
| $90-94$ | 592 | 602 | 197 | 3,085 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 1 , 7 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 , 1 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 , 6 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 , 1 3 9}$ |
| Percent | $\mathbf{4 8 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 . 6 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 7 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 3 0 \%}$ |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS) |  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Elderly Population Marital Status by Institutionalization

|  |  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age Group | Marital Status | Institutional | Non-institutional | Total | Institutional | Non-institutional | Total |
| $60-64$ | Married | 66 | 6,030 | $\mathbf{6 , 0 9 6}$ | 0 | 6,355 | $\mathbf{6 3 5 5}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 301 | 7,984 | $\mathbf{8 , 2 8 5}$ | 176 | 11,633 | $\mathbf{1 1 , 8 0 9}$ |
| $65-69$ | Married | 28 | 5,231 | $\mathbf{5 , 2 5 9}$ | - | 5,055 | $\mathbf{5 , 0 5 5}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 212 | 4,778 | $\mathbf{4 , 9 9 0}$ | 97 | 8,682 | $\mathbf{8 , 7 7 9}$ |
| $70-74$ | Married | 11 | 4,324 | $\mathbf{4 , 3 3 5}$ | 67 | 3,186 | $\mathbf{3 , 2 5 3}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 194 | 3,843 | $\mathbf{4 , 0 3 7}$ | 85 | 6,679 | $\mathbf{6 , 7 6 4}$ |
| $75-79$ | Married | - | 2,677 | $\mathbf{2 , 6 7 7}$ | 9 | 1,952 | $\mathbf{1 , 9 6 1}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 146 | 2,079 | $\mathbf{2 , 2 2 5}$ | 146 | 5,663 | $\mathbf{5 , 8 0 9}$ |
| $80-84$ | Married | 7 | 1,780 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 8 7}$ | 9 | 1,070 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 7 9}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 161 | 1,848 | $\mathbf{2 , 0 0 9}$ | 224 | 4,247 | $\mathbf{4 , 4 7 1}$ |
| $85-89$ | Married | 45 | 923 | $\mathbf{9 6 8}$ | 37 | 671 | $\mathbf{7 0 8}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 65 | 904 | $\mathbf{9 6 9}$ | 263 | 3,159 | $\mathbf{3 , 4 2 2}$ |
| $90-94$ | Married | 113 | 479 | $\mathbf{5 9 2}$ | 10 | $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 7}$ |
|  | Unmarried | 98 | 504 | $\mathbf{6 0 2}$ | 447 | 2,638 | $\mathbf{3 , 0 8 5}$ |
| Total | Married | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 4 4 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 , 4 7 6}$ |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 , 1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 , 9 4 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 4 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 , 7 0 1}$ |  |  |

Table 4: Elderly Population Living Arrangements by Age Group

|  |  | Age Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Living alone [Population] |  | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & 60-74 \end{aligned}$ | Percent $60-74$ | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90-94 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & 75-94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent } \\ 75-94 \end{gathered}$ |
| Male | Living alone | 4,150 | 3,075 | 2,586 | 9,811 | 29.7\% | 1,511 | 1,165 | 638 | 293 | 3,607 | 30.50\% |
|  | Not alone | 10,231 | 7,174 | 5,786 | 23,191 | 70.3\% | 3,391 | 2,631 | 1,299 | 901 | 8,222 | 69.50\% |
| Female | Living alone | 6,278 | 5,358 | 4,352 | 15,988 | 38.0\% | 3,133 | 2,469 | 1,807 | 1,686 | 9,095 | 43.90\% |
|  | Not alone | 11,886 | 8,476 | 5,665 | 26,027 | 42.0\% | 4,637 | 3,081 | 2,323 | 1,596 | 11,637 | 56.10\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS)

| Table 5: Living Arrangements for the 65 Years and Older Population |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent |
| 65 years and over: | 71,786 | 100.0 |
| Lives alone | 28,601 | 39.8 |
| Householder living with spouse or spouse of householder | 24,003 | 33.4 |
| Householder living with unmarried partner or unmarried partner <br> of householder | 1,486 | 2.1 |
| Child of householder | 452 | 0.6 |
| Other relatives | 14,149 | 19.7 |
| Other nonrelatives | 3,095 | 4.3 |
| Source: US Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survee 5-Year Estimates (Table B09021) |  |  |

Table 6: Elderly Population Institutionalized by Gender

|  | Men |  |  | Women |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age Group | Population | Institutionalized | Percent <br> Institutionalized | Population | Institutionalized | Percent <br> Institutionalized |
| $60-64$ | 14,381 | 367 | $2.6 \%$ | 18,164 | 176 | $1.0 \%$ |
| $65-69$ | 10,249 | 240 | $2.3 \%$ | 13,834 | 97 | $0.7 \%$ |
| $70-74$ | 8,372 | 205 | $2.4 \%$ | 10,017 | 152 | $1.5 \%$ |
| $75-79$ | 4,902 | 146 | $3.0 \%$ | 7,770 | 155 | $2.0 \%$ |
| $80-84$ | 3,796 | 168 | $4.4 \%$ | 5,550 | 233 | $4.2 \%$ |
| $85-89$ | 1,937 | 110 | $5.7 \%$ | 4,130 | 300 | $7.3 \%$ |
| $90-94$ | 1,194 | 211 | $17.7 \%$ | 3,282 | 457 | $13.9 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 4 , 8 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 , 7 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 \%}$ |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-20165-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7: Disability by Limitations by Institutionalization by Age Group

|  |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disability [Population] |  | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90-94 |
| Institutional | No limitation | 206 | 11 | 96 | 24 | - | 14 | 11 |
|  | One limitation | 78 | 105 | 40 | 47 | - | 3 | 10 |
|  | More than one | 259 | 221 | 221 | 230 | 401 | 393 | 647 |
| Total |  | 543 | 337 | 357 | 301 | 401 | 410 | 668 |
| Non-institutional | No limitation | 24,220 | 18,115 | 13,506 | 8,232 | 4,995 | 2,666 | 762 |
|  | One limitation | 3,808 | 2,721 | 2,291 | 1,699 | 1,429 | 903 | 454 |
|  | More than one | 3,974 | 2,910 | 2,235 | 2,440 | 2,521 | 2,088 | 2,592 |
| Total |  | 32,002 | 23,746 | 18,032 | 12,371 | 8,945 | 5,657 | 3,808 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS)

Table 8: Median Household and Personal Income by Age Group

|  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Type | $\mathbf{6 0 - 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 - 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 - 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 - 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 - 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 - 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 - 9 4}$ |
| Median Household Income | $\$ 70,264$ | $\$ 70,531$ | $\$ 65,600$ | $\$ 52,739$ | $\$ 45,290$ | $\$ 50,392$ | $\$ 42,875$ |
| Median Personal Income | $\$ 30,113$ | $\$ 35,266$ | $\$ 32,646$ | $\$ 25,089$ | $\$ 22,974$ | $\$ 25,089$ | $\$ 20,065$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS)

| Table 9: Earnings Status by Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population | Earnings | 60+ by Gender |
| Male | With Earnings | 18,544 |
|  | No Earnings | 26,287 |
| Female | With Earnings | 19,080 |
|  | No Earnings | 43,667 |
|  |  |  |
| Population | Social Security | 60+ by Gender |
| Male | With Social Security | 23,577 |
|  | No Social Security | 21,254 |
| Female | With Social Security | 33,923 |
|  | No Social Security | 28,824 |
|  |  |  |
| Population | Retirement Income | 60+ by Gender |
| Male | Retirement Income | 15,804 |
|  | None | 29,027 |
| Female | Retirement Income | 23,638 |
|  | None | 39,109 |
| Note: Some people received more than one type of income |  |  |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016-Y-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS) |  |  |


| Table 10: Poverty Status by Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | Poverty <br> [All People] | $\mathbf{6 0 - 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 - 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 - 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 - 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 - 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 - 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 - 9 4}$ |  |
|  | Above poverty | 11,175 | 8,535 | 7,246 | 4,340 | 3,144 | 1,692 | 862 |  |
| Female | Below poverty | 2,270 | 1,099 | 920 | 389 | 421 | 132 | 47 |  |
|  | Above poverty | 15,104 | 11,987 | 8,658 | 6,401 | 4,173 | 3,270 | 2,201 |  |
|  | Below poverty | 2,635 | 1,506 | 1,160 | 1,214 | 1,098 | 554 | 604 |  |
| Male | Percent Below <br> Poverty | $16.9 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |  |
|  | Percent Below <br> Poverty | $14.9 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ |  |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 11: Householders by Age by Mortgage Status |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | District of Columbia | Percent 60 Years and Over |
|  | Estimate |  |
| Total: | 112,672 |  |
| Housing units with a mortgage: | 86,201 |  |
| Householder 15 to 34 years | 12,373 |  |
| Householder 35 to 44 years | 21,657 |  |
| Householder 45 to 54 years | $\mathbf{1 9 , 6 9 1}$ |  |
| Householder 55 to 59 years | 8,537 |  |
| Householder 60 to 64 years | 8,144 |  |
| Householder 65 to 74 years | 10,525 |  |
| Householder 75 years and over | 5,274 |  |
| Householders 60 years and over | 23,943 |  |
|  |  |  |
| Housing units without a mortgage: | 26,471 |  |
| Householder 15 to 34 years | 1,606 |  |
| Householder 35 to 44 years | 1,414 |  |
| Householder 45 to 54 years | 2,781 |  |
| Householder 55 to 59 years | 2,064 |  |
| Householder 60 to 64 years | 3,097 |  |
| Householder 65 to 74 years | 6,792 |  |
| Householder 75 years and over | 8,717 |  |
| Householders 60 years and over | 18,606 |  |
| Total householders 60 years and over: | 42,549 |  |
| Householders 60 years and | 18,606 |  |
| over without a mortgage |  |  |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-20165-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PuMS) |  |  |


| Table 12: Earnings Status by Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenure - Own/Rent [Householders] |  | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90-94 | Total |
| Male | Homeowner | 4,630 | 4,298 | 3,563 | 2,338 | 1,497 | 966 | 401 | 17,693 |
|  | Renter | 4,062 | 2,510 | 2,149 | 1,058 | 979 | 415 | 230 | 11,403 |
| Female | Homeowner | 6,340 | 5,283 | 4,572 | 3,228 | 2,503 | 1,543 | 1,403 | 24,872 |
|  | Renter | 5,644 | 3,689 | 2,735 | 2,018 | 1,514 | 1,301 | 846 | 17,747 |
| Total | Homeowners | 10,970 | 9,581 | 8,135 | 5,566 | 4,000 | 2,509 | 1,804 | 42,565 |
| Total | Renters | 9,706 | 6,199 | 4,884 | 3,076 | 2,493 | 1,716 | 1,076 | 29,150 |
| Male | Householders | 8,692 | 6,808 | 5,712 | 3,396 | 2,476 | 1,381 | 631 | 29,096 |
|  | Male Homeowners <br> (\%) of All Male <br> Householders | 53.3 | 63.1 | 62.4 | 68.8 | 60.5 | 69.9 | 63.5 | 61.0\% |
|  | Male homeowner (\%) of All Homeowners | 42.2 | 44.9 | 43.8 | 42.0 | 37.4 | 38.5 | 22.2 | 41.6\% |
| Female | Householders | 11,984 | 8,972 | 7,307 | 5,246 | 4,017 | 2,844 | 2,249 | 42,619 |
|  | Female Homeowner (\%) of All Female Householders | 52.9 | 58.9 | 62.6 | 61.5 | 62.3 | 54.3 | 62.4 | 58.4\% |
|  | Female homeowner (\%) of All Homeowners | 57.8 | 55.1 | 56.2 | 58.0 | 62.6 | 61.5 | 77.8 | 58.4\% |
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 13: Cost Burden Status, Owners and Renters by Gender

| Cost Burdened (30\% or more) Owner Occupied [Householders] |  | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90-94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | Burdened | 1,130 | 726 | 695 | 668 | 240 | 184 | 67 |
|  | Not burdened | 3,418 | 3,540 | 2,859 | 1,626 | 1,187 | 783 | 329 |
|  | Total Male Householders | 4,548 | 4,266 | 3,554 | 2,294 | 1,427 | 967 | 396 |
|  | Percent Cost Burdened | 24.8 | 17.0 | 19.6 | 29.1 | 16.8 | 19.0 | 16.9 |
| Female | Burdened | 1,986 | 1,818 | 1,653 | 1,320 | 983 | 464 | 629 |
|  | Not burdened | 4,346 | 3,407 | 2,921 | 1866 | 1452 | 1056 | 711 |
|  | Total Female Householders | 6,332 | 5,225 | 4,574 | 3,186 | 2,435 | 1,520 | 1,340 |
|  | Percent Cost Burdened | 31.4 | 34.8 | 36.1 | 41.4 | 40.4 | 30.5 | 46.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost burdened (30\% or more) Renter Occupied [Householders] |  | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | 75-79 | 80-84 | 85-89 | 90-94 |
| Male | Burdened | 2,012 | 1,439 | 956 | 515 | 670 | 170 | 66 |
|  | Not burdened | 1893 | 932 | 1128 | 444 | 253 | 126 | 123 |
|  | Total Male Householders | 3,905 | 2,371 | 2,084 | 959 | 923 | 296 | 189 |
|  | Percent Cost Burdened | 51.5 | 60.7 | 45.9 | 53.7 | 72.6 | 57.4 | 34.9 |
| Female | Burdened | 2,507 | 1,769 | 1,302 | 1,042 | 952 | 739 | 574 |
|  | Not burdened | 2,728 | 1,774 | 1,307 | 800 | 462 | 559 | 227 |
|  | Total Female Householders | 5,235 | 3,543 | 2,609 | 1,842 | 1,414 | 1,298 | 801 |
|  | Percent Cost Burdened | 47.9 | 49.9 | 49.9 | 56.6 | 67.3 | 56.9 | 71.7 |

[^0]Table 14: Vehicle Ownership by Age Group by Gender

| Vehicle Status |  | $\mathbf{6 0 - 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 - 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 - 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 - 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 - 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 - 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 - 9 4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | No vehicle | 3,470 | 2,284 | 1,957 | 840 | 738 | 373 | 322 |
|  | With vehicle | 9,975 | 7,350 | 6,209 | 3,889 | 2,827 | 1,451 | 587 |
|  | Total | 13,445 | 9,634 | 8,166 | 4,729 | 3,565 | 1,824 | 909 |
|  | No Vehicle $\%$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 4}$ |
|  | No vehicle | 5,420 | 3,913 | 2,903 | 2,195 | 1,788 | 1,728 | 1,630 |
|  | With vehicle | 12,319 | 9,580 | 6,915 | 5,420 | 3,483 | 2,096 | 1,175 |
|  | Total | 17,739 | 13,493 | 9,818 | 7,615 | 5,271 | 3,824 | 2,805 |

[^1]
[^0]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS)

[^1]:    Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS-PUMS)

