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## Subject: $\quad$ Racial Equity Profile for Montgomery County

In the April 2018 resolution (Resolution No. 18-1095) articulating a vision for racial equity and a commitment to develop a Racial Equity and Social Justice Policy for Montgomery County, the County Council tasked the Office of Legislative Oversight to complete a baseline report describing disparities by race and ethnicity across a variety of measures of opportunity by May 31, 2019. OLO contracted with the Jupiter Independent Research Group of Silver Spring, Maryland in November of 2018 to complete this task. Jupiter's final report - Racial Equity Profile for Montgomery County, is attached.

This memorandum provides an overview of Jupiter's Racial Equity Profile report and offers analysis based on the data compiled in this report. This memorandum also offers advice for how to use the information compiled to advance racial equity and social justice in local decision-making.

Background: Many communities across the country have developed equity indicators and other tools to measure opportunity in their communities. Equity profiles summarize data points across several indicators of well-being to offer a snapshot of racial inequities and disparities across a community. Profiles often include measures of economic security, health, educational attainment, and connectedness. Equity profiles are useful for establishing benchmarks for racial equity efforts and for tracking the progress of these efforts aimed at narrowing disparities and improving outcomes among communities of color.

Montgomery County's Racial Equity Profile serves as a benchmark report to describe racial and ethnic inequities by policy area. As the County embarks on a commitment to advance racial equity in decisionmaking, agency and departmental leadership and staff across the County need to improve their understanding of the racial disparities that impact their constituents.

Report Objectives and Methods: As noted in the report, two objectives guided Jupiter's compilation of data for their Racial Equity Profile of Montgomery County.

- To provide a collection of tables on different demographic factors from various sources (but primarily census data) by race and ethnicity for Montgomery County Maryland. Most of the charts and tables cover the last five to ten years.
- To identify disparities, where relevant, between different racial/ gender groups in different categories. Disparities are generally presented as a measure of minority groups (Asian, Black, Latino, Other) relative to the White population.


## Racial Equity Profile for Montgomery County

When data are available, the Racial Equity Profile also compares data on Montgomery County to state and national data. The Racial Equity Profile, however, does not analyze the causes of any disparities nor provide recommendations to mitigate any identified disparities.

In collaboration with the Office of Legislative Oversight, Jupiter compiled data by race and ethnicity across the following ten measures:

- Population indicators that provide general demographic data on population, median age, percent foreign born and English proficiency.
- Education indicators that describe data on public school enrollment, high school completion, suspensions, graduation, college attainment and apprenticeships.
- Business indicators that describe data on business revenue and participation in Small Business Development Centers.
- Employment indicators that describe data on unemployment, labor force participation and construction earnings.
- Economic security indicators that describe data on poverty, child poverty, gross rent as a percent of income and children in foster care.
- Housing indicators that describe data on homeownership and mortgage loans
- Health indicators that describe data on health insurance, infant mortality, heart disease mortality, stroke mortality and breast cancer mortality.
- Criminal justice indicators that describe data on arrests and juvenile intake.
- Transportation indicators that describe data on households with no vehicle, use of public transportation to work and mean travel time to work.
- Connectedness indicators that describe data on residents who recently moved to Montgomery County and on broadband access.

The Profile describes prevalence rates by race and ethnicity across these measures and describes disparities by comparing the prevalence rates of people of color (i.e. Asians, African Americans, Latinx and Others) to prevalence rates among White residents. For example, the chart on the next page compares prevalence rates by race and ethnicity in unaffordable rents (exceeding 30\% of income), unemployment, arrests, having no vehicle, having no health insurance, child poverty, and out-of-school suspensions. A review of this shows that rates of:

- Gross rents exceeding 30 percent of household income, unemployment, arrests, no health insurance, child poverty, and out-of-school suspensions were higher for Black and Latino residents compared to White residents.
- No health insurance and child poverty were higher for Asian residents compared to White residents.
- Gross rents exceeding 30 percent of household income, unemployment, and having no vehicle were equal for Asian and White residents.
- Arrests and out-of-school suspensions were lower for Asian residents than for White residents.


# Racial Equity Profile for Montgomery County 

## Racial Disparities by Race/Ethnicity Compared to White



Data Findings: The data compiled in the Racial Equity Profile demonstrate consistent disparities in outcomes across several policy areas, generally showing that White residents experienced the best outcomes for the vast majority of measures considered. The exception to this pattern was better outcomes for Asian residents compared to White residents on a few measures including arrests.

For Black residents, the widest disparities with White residents occurred where Black residents on average experienced worse outcomes than White residents:

- Minority firm revenue
- Juvenile intake
- Children in foster care
- Child poverty
- Out-of-school suspensions
- High school dropout
- Overall poverty
- Unemployment
- Infant mortality
- No vehicle

For Latino residents, the widest disparities where Latino residents experienced worse outcomes that White residents on average occurred in:

- Minority firm revenue
- High school dropout
- No high school degree
- No health insurance
- Child poverty
- Juvenile intake
- Arrests
- Overall poverty
- Out-of-school suspensions
- Management occupations

For Asian residents, however, the widest disparities with White residents varied with some measures demonstrating worse outcomes than White residents and other measures demonstrating better outcomes. Among measures where Asian residents experienced worse outcomes than White residents, the widest disparities occurred in:

- Minority firm revenue
- Child poverty
- No health insurance
- Overall poverty
- No high school degree

Among measures where Asian residents experienced better outcomes than White residents, the widest disparities occurred in:

- Arrests
- Children in foster care
- Breast cancer mortality
- High school dropout
- Heart disease
- Out-of-school suspensions

The wide disparities evident across these measures suggest that local government efforts aimed at narrowing disparities should initially focus on the following policy areas:

- Minority business development
- Adult and juvenile justice
- Child welfare
- Public education
- Workforce development
- Higher education
- Economic security
- Public Health

Next Steps: This Racial Equity Profile offers a starting point for County agencies and departments to consider the disparities and inequities that characterize their policy areas. This profile, based on data from the American Community Survey and other existing datasets, provides a preliminary overview of the state of racial and ethnic inequities in the County. This profile serves as a potential first step for understanding the pervasiveness of racial and ethnic disparities across the County and for collecting more specific information by agency and department to inform local decision-making with a racial equity lens.

As the County Council begins developing Racial Equity and Social Justice Legislation that requires the County Council and County Government to apply a racial equity lens to governmental decision-making, OLO recommends that County agencies and departments use their internal and external datasets to compile more specific data on inequities and disparities in outcomes within their specific purview. Data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and place will be essential to understanding the state of disparities and inequities within specific agencies and departments. Agency and departmental reviews of current disparities and inequities should also identify gaps in data that should be addressed to inform data-driven decision-making.
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## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

## BACKGROUND

In November 2018, Jupiter Independent Research Groups began a racial Equity Study for Montgomery County, Maryland. The study reviewed demographic data for the period 2007 through 2018.

## REPORT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this report are:

1) To provide a collection of tables on different demographic factors from various sources (but primarily census data) by race and ethnicity for Montgomery County Maryland. Most of the charts and tables cover the last five to ten years.
2) To identify disparities, where relevant, between different racial/ gender groups in different categories. The report does not analyze the causes of any disparities, or provide recommendations to mitigate any identified disparities.

## OVERVIEW OF REPORT APPROACH

Jupiter Independent Research Group collected demographic data in the categories of:

- Population
- Education
- Business
- Employment
- Construction
- Health
- Criminal justice
- Poverty
- Housing
- Transportation
- Connectedness

Disparity is generally presented as a measure of minority groups (Asian, Black, Latino, Other) relative to the White population. In a few instances, the disparity is presented as the difference between the minority group metrics and white metric.

Some disparities may also result from variations in racial/ethnic definitions based on different data sources. For example, some sources treat Latino as a separate racial/ethnic category, and some sources treat Latino as a compilation of multiple races. The definition of Other also varies based on the data source.

## DATA SOURCES

The data from this report comes from a variety of sources is primarily from the American Community Survey. Additional sources include Healthy Montgomery, Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, Maryland Small Business Development Center, Maryland State Department of Education, Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, Montgomery County Police Department, Montgomery County Public Schools, US Census Public Use Microsample (IPUMS), and the US Census Survey of Business Owners.

The Montgomery County Office of Legislative Oversight provided considerable assistance in the collection of local data, particularly in the areas of education and criminal justice.

## REPORT ORGANIZATION

In addition to this introductory chapter, this report consists of Chapter 2.0, Demographic bar charts and tables, Appendix A, with more detailed tables, and Appendix B with extended definitions.

## CHAPTER 2: TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

## GENERAL POPULATION

This section of the report presents general demographic data by race and ethnicity on population, median age, percent foreign born and English proficiency. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States.

## POPULATION

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $53.2 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ | $75.6 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $16.7 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
|  | Black | $19.8 \%$ | $31.0 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $19.1 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ |
|  | Other | $10.2 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |



## Source: American Community Survey

Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Additional population data is provided in Appendix A, Table 1 - Total Population 2007, 2017.

## MEDIAN AGE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | 44.6 | 42.5 | 40.7 |
|  | Asian | 40.4 | 38.5 | 37.1 |
|  | Black | 35.6 | 36.8 | 34.2 |
|  | Latino | 31.1 | 28.9 | 29.2 |
|  | Other | 28.6 | 27.9 | 29.9 |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The Asian median age was a little over 4 years less than the White median age. |
|  | The Black median age was $\mathbf{9}$ years less than the White median age. |
|  | The Latino median age was $\mathbf{1 3 . 5}$ years less than the White median age. |
|  | The Other median age was 28.6 years less than the White median age. |

Source: American Community Survey

## Definitions:

Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Median age means that half the people are younger than this age and half are older.
Additional median age data is provided in Appendix A, Table 2 - Median Age (Years) 2017, and Table 3 -
Median Age (Years) 2010.

FOREIGN BORN

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $12.6 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $29.6 \%$ | $70.0 \%$ | $66.3 \%$ |
|  | Black | $15.4 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $27.4 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ |
|  | Other | $15.0 \%$ | $53.5 \%$ | $40.9 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The Asian percent foreign born was $\mathbf{2 3 4 . 9}$ percent of the White percent foreign born. |
|  | The Black percent foreign born was $\mathbf{1 2 2 . 2}$ percent of the White percent foreign born. |
|  | The Latino percent foreign born was $\mathbf{2 1 7 . 5}$ percent of the White percent foreign born. |
|  | The Other percent foreign born was $\mathbf{1 1 9 . 0}$ percent of the White percent foreign born. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Foreign born means born outside of the United States.
Additional data on the foreign born is provided in Appendix A, Table 4 - Foreign Born 2007, 2017.

SPEAKS ENGLISH "LESS THAN WELL"

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $7.6 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $29.9 \%$ | $29.2 \%$ | $32.6 \%$ |
|  | Black | $6.9 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $36.0 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ |
|  | Other | $40.0 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were nearly four times as likely (393.4 percent) as Whites to speak English 'less than well'. |
|  | Blacks were somewhat less likely (90.8 percent) as Whites to speak English 'less than well.' |
|  | Latinos were more than four times as likely (473.7 percent) as Whites to speak English 'less than well'. |
|  | Others were more than five times as likely (526.3 percent) as Whites to speak English 'less than well'. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Speaking English "less than well," or limited English proficiency, means individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English.

Additional language facility data is provided in Appendix A, Table 5 - Speak English Less Than "Very Well" 2010, 2017.

## OVERALL MARKET PLACE

This section of the report presents general data by race and ethnicity on median income and occupational distribution. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States.

## MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $\$ 119,426$ | $\$ 90,570$ | $\$ 63,704$ |
|  | Asian | $\$ 109,147$ | $\$ 100,019$ | $\$ 83,456$ |
|  | Black | $\$ 72,587$ | $\$ 64,120$ | $\$ 40,232$ |
|  | Latino | $\$ 71,847$ | $\$ 71,376$ | $\$ 61,914$ |
|  | Other | $\$ 75,723$ | $\$ 61,183$ | $\$ 49,793$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Median household income for Asians was $\mathbf{9 1 . 4}$ percent of median household income for Whites. |
|  | Median household income for Blacks was $\mathbf{6 0 . 8}$ percent of median household income for Whites. |
|  | Median household income for Latinos was $\mathbf{6 0 . 2}$ percent of median household income for Whites. |
|  | Median household income for Others was $\mathbf{6 3 . 4}$ percent of median household income for Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Median household income means half the households have income above this level and half the households are below this level. A household includes, individuals, families and unrelated individuals.

Additional household income data is provided in Appendix A, Table 6 - Median Household Income 2010, 2017.

## MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, SCIENCE, AND ARTS OCCUPATIONS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $63.9 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ | $40.1 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $62.0 \%$ | $60.3 \%$ | $52.1 \%$ |
|  | Black | $45.4 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $24.9 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ |
|  | Other | $13.9 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{5 0 1 7}$ | Asians were about as likely (97.0 percent) to be in the management, business, science and arts <br> occupations as Whites. |
|  | Blacks were much less likely (71.0 percent) to be in the management, business, science and arts <br> occupations as Whites. |
|  | Latinos were less than half as likely (39.0 percent) to be in the management, business, science and <br> arts occupations as Whites. |
|  | Others were much less likely (21.75 percent) to be in the management, business, science and arts <br> occupations as Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
The occupations listed under management, business, science, and arts are listed in Appendix B-2.
Additional occupational data is provided in Appendix A, Table 7 - Occupation 2010, 2017.

## EMPLOYMENT

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on unemployment, labor force participation and construction earnings. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States.

## PERCENT UNEMPLOYED

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $2.3 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $2.3 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
|  | Black | $5.6 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $4.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |
|  | Other | $5.1 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asian unemployment was the same as White unemployment. |
|  | Black unemployment was 243.5 percent of White unemployment. |
|  | Latino unemployment was 173.9 percent of White unemployment. |
|  | Other unemployment was 221.7 percent of White unemployment. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Other includes Some Other Races.
Unemployment means in the labor force and looking for work.
Additional unemployment data is provided in Appendix A, Table 8 - Unemployed 2010, 2017.

## PERCENT IN THE LABOR FORCE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $69.6 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | $62.8 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $69.1 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ | $64.9 \%$ |
|  | Black | $74.7 \%$ | $68.5 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $79.0 \%$ | $77.1 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ |
|  | Other | $78.8 \%$ | $78.8 \%$ | $69.3 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asians were $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ percent less likely to be in the labor force than Whites. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{5 . 1}$ percent more likely to be in the labor force than Whites. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{9 . 4}$ percent more likely to be in the labor force than Whites. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{9 . 2}$ percent more likely to be in the labor force than Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Other includes Some Other Races.
Labor force participation means employed, or looking for work.
Additional labor force participation data is provided in Appendix A, Table 9-Percent In The Labor Force 2010, 2017.

## CONSTRUCTION EARNINGS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $\$ 4,176$ | $\$ 4,378$ | $\$ 4,191$ |
|  | Asian | $\$ 4,291$ | $\$ 4,477$ | $\$ 4,374$ |
|  | Black | $\$ 4,113$ | $\$ 4,118$ | $\$ 3,976$ |
|  | Latino | $\$ 4,158$ | $\$ 4,361$ | $\$ 4,171$ |
|  | Other | $\$ 4,089$ | $\$ 4,222$ | 43,964 |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2016 | Asian construction earnings were $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 8}$ percent of White construction earnings. |
|  | Black construction earnings were 98.5 percent of White construction earnings. |
|  | Latino construction earnings were 99.6 percent of White construction earnings. |
|  | Other construction earnings were 97.9 percent of White construction earnings. |

Source: Quarterly Workforce Indicators
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Others in Quarterly Workforce Indicators were American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, Other Pacific Islanders, Two or more races.

Construction earnings means average monthly earnings in construction.
Additional construction earnings data is provided in Appendix A, Table 10 - Average construction Monthly Earnings and Percent of White Average 2012-2016.

## BUSINESS

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on business revenue and participation in Small Business Development Centers (SBDC). Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States for business revenue. SBDC data was not available for Maryland and the United States.

NUMBER OF MINORITY FIRMS AS A PERCENT OF ALL FIRMS

| Year | Number of Minority Firms | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | Asian | $13.8 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |
|  | Black | $14.7 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $14.7 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |
|  | Other | $7.0 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2012 | Asians were $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{1 3 . 8}$ percent of the number of firms. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ percent of the number of firms. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ percent of the number of firms. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{1 0 . 2}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ percent of the number of firms. |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Survey of Business Owners
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Others are American Indians, Alaska Natives, Some Other Race.
Number of firms refers to firms (not establishments) with and without paid employees.
All firms include publicly traded firms that are not identified by ethnicity or race.
Additional data on the number of businesses is provided in Appendix A, Table 11 - Business Firms 2012.

MINORITY FIRM REVENUE AS A PERCENT OF ALL FIRM REVENUE

| Year | Minority Firm Revenue | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | Asian | $4.2 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
|  | Black | $1.7 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $1.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
|  | Other | $0.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2012 | Asians were $\mathbf{1 3 . 8}$ percent of the number of firms and 4.2 percent of the revenue of firms. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ percent of the number of firms and 1.7 percent of the revenue of firms. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ percent of the number of firms and $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ percent of the revenue of firms. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ percent of the number of firms and $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ percent of the revenue of firms. |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Survey of Business Owners
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Other includes Alaska Natives, American Indians, and Some Other Races.
Number of firms refers to firms (not establishments) with and without paid employees.
All firms include publicly traded firms that are not identified by ethnicity or race.
Additional business revenue data is provided in Appendix A, Table 12 - Number of Firms, Revenue 2012.

## SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER CLIENTS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $58.1 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | $4.3 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Black | $21.3 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | $56.4 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Other | $16.3 \%$ | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asians were $\mathbf{1 3 . 8}$ percent of businesses and $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ percent of SBDC clients. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ percent of businesses and $\mathbf{2 1 . 3}$ percent of SBDC clients. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{1 4 . 7}$ percent of business and $\mathbf{5 6 . 4}$ percent of SBDC clients. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{7 . 0}$ percent of business and $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ percent of SBDC clients. |

Source: Maryland Small Business Development Center, special tabulations
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Other includes Native Hawaiians, American Indians, Unknown, No response.
SBDC clients refer to people counseled by the SBDC. SBDC counseling areas are listed in Appendix B-3.
Additional SBDC data is provided in Appendix A, Table 13 - SBDC Clients 2018.

## ECONOMIC SECURITY

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on poverty, child poverty, gross rent as a percent of income and children in foster care. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States.

POVERTY - ALL RESIDENTS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $4.0 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $5.8 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |
|  | Black | $11.2 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $11.1 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ | $20.3 \%$ |
|  | Other | $14.6 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $19.4 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The Asian poverty rate was $\mathbf{1 4 5 . 0}$ percent of the White poverty rate. |
|  | The Black poverty rate was $\mathbf{2 8 0 . 0}$ percent of the White poverty rate. |
|  | The Latino poverty rate was $\mathbf{2 7 7 . 5}$ percent of the White poverty rate. |
|  | The Other poverty rate was $\mathbf{3 6 5 . 0}$ percent of the White poverty rate. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Poverty is defined as where a family's total income is less than the family's threshold, which depends on family size but not geography. The federal poverty threshold for a family of four in 2017 was $\$ 24,600$. The poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains or noncash benefits (such as food stamps, public housing, etc.).

Additional poverty data is provided in Appendix A, Table 14 - Poverty Rates 2010, 2017.

## CHILD POVERTY

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $3.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $5.8 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ |
|  | Black | $18.7 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $33.1 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $15.8 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ |
|  | Other | $20.2 \%$ | $20.9 \%$ | $28.0 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The poverty rate for Asian children was 105.8 percent of the poverty rate of White children. |
|  | The poverty rate for Black children was 550.0 percent of the poverty rate of White children. |
|  | The poverty rate for Latino children was 464.7 percent of the poverty rate of White children. |
|  | The poverty rate for Other children was $\mathbf{5 9 4 . 1}$ percent of the poverty rate of White children. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Child refers to 18 years of age or younger.
Poverty is where a family's total income is less than the family's threshold, which depends on family size but not geography. The federal poverty threshold for a family of four in 2017 was $\$ 24,600$. The poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains or noncash benefits (such as food stamps, public housing, etc.).

Additional child poverty data is provided in Appendix A, Table 14 - Poverty Rates 2010, 2017.

## GROSS RENT MORE THAN 30 PERCENT OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN LAST 12 MONTHS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $44.7 \%$ | $46.3 \%$ | $47.0 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $42.7 \%$ | $44.8 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ |
|  | Black | $54.5 \%$ | $53.2 \%$ | $56.3 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $62.2 \%$ | $55.0 \%$ | $55.3 \%$ |
|  | Other | $71.6 \%$ | $58.1 \%$ | $57.2 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asians rate of paying more than 30 percent of income on rent was $\mathbf{9 5 . 5}$ percent of the White rate. |
|  | Blacks rate of paying more than 30 percent of income on rent was $\mathbf{1 2 1 . 9}$ percent of the White rate. |
|  | Latino rate of paying more than 30 percent of income on rent was $\mathbf{1 3 9 . 1}$ percent of the White rate. |
|  | Other rate of paying more than 30 percent of income on rent was $\mathbf{1 6 0 . 1}$ percent of the White rate. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Gross rent is the contract rent plus the estimated average monthly cost of utilities and fuels if these are paid by the renter (or paid for the renter by someone else). Gross rent does not apply to housing cost for owner-occupied housing.

Additional gross rent data is provided in Appendix A, Table 15 - Rent More Than 30 \% of Income 2010, 2017.

## CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland* | United States** |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | White | $17.2 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $1.9 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
|  | Black | $52.9 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $18.2 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
|  | Other | $9.8 \%$ | NA | NA |

*2015 data from Child Trends
**2016 data from Annie Casey Foundation


| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were $\mathbf{1 4 . 3}$ percent of the school age population and $\mathbf{1 . 9}$ percent of the children in foster care. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{2 1 . 3}$ percent of the school age population and $\mathbf{5 2 . 9}$ percent of the children in foster care. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{3 2 . 1}$ percent of the school age population and $\mathbf{1 8 . 2}$ percent of the children in foster <br> care. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{4 . 6}$ percent of the school age population and $\mathbf{9 . 8}$ percent of the children in foster care. |

Source: Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, special tabulations

## Definitions:

Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Foster care means any length of time out of home placement due to neglect or abuse.
Additional foster care data is provided in Appendix A, Table 16 - Number of Children in Foster Care 2014, 2016, 2018 and Table 17 - Length of Time in Foster Care 2018.

## HOMEOWNERSHIP

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on homeownership and mortgage loans. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States for homeownership and some mortgage loan categories.

## HOMEOWNERSHIP RATE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $73.2 \%$ | $76.7 \%$ | $70.7 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $74.3 \%$ | $64.8 \%$ | 60.5 |
|  | Black | $42.5 \%$ | $45.8 \%$ | $42.2 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $49.1 \%$ | $51.7 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ |
|  | Other | $46.8 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asian homeownership rate was 101.5 percent of the White homeownership rate. |
|  | Black homeownership rate was 58.1 percent of the White homeownership rate. |
|  | Latino homeownership rate was 67.1 percent of the White homeownership rate. |
|  | Other homeownership rate was 63.9 percent of the White homeownership rate. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Homeownership means owner-occupied units.
Additional homeownership data is provided in Appendix A, Table 18 - Owning Versus Renting 2010, 2017.

HOME MORTGAGE LOANS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $\$ 409,850$ | $\$ 262,920$ | NA |
|  | Asian | $\$ 391,342$ | $\$ 286,800$ | NA |
|  | Black | $\$ 328,090$ | $\$ 286,351$ | NA |
|  | Latino | $\$ 308,036$ | NA | NA |
|  | Other | $\$ 301,984$ | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The average mortgage for Asians was 95.5 percent of the average mortgage for Whites. |
|  | The average mortgage for Blacks was 80.1 percent of the average mortgage for Whites. |
|  | The average mortgage for Latinos was $\mathbf{7 5 . 2}$ percent of the average mortgage for Whites. |
|  | The average mortgage for Others was $\mathbf{7 3 . 7}$ percent of the average mortgage for Whites. |

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Home mortgage loans include both FHA and conventional loans, including loans for home purchases, refinancing and home improvement.

Additional home mortgage data is provided in Appendix A, Table 19 - All Mortgage Loans Originated 2012, 2017.

## EDUCATION

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on public school enrollment, high school graduation, out of school suspensions, dropouts, graduation, college, and apprenticeships. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States where comparable data was available.

## PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $29.3 \%$ | $37.3 \%$ | NA |
|  | Asian | $14.3 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | NA |
|  | Black | $21.3 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ | NA |
|  | Latino | $30.1 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | NA |
|  | Other | $4.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | NA |

Note: source only has state and local data


| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2018 | Asians were $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{1 4 . 3}$ percent of the school population. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{2 1 . 3}$ percent of the school population. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{3 0 . 1}$ percent of the school population. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{1 0 . 2}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{4 . 6}$ percent of the school population |

Source: Maryland State Department of Education
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Public school enrollment means the number of students registered to attend a school as of September 30 (includes ungraded special education and pre-kindergarten students).

Additional school enrollment data is provided in Appendix A, Table 20 - Public School Enrollment 20132017.

NO HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE OR GED

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $5.6 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $8.1 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |
|  | Black | $5.4 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $31.6 \%$ | $35.4 \%$ | $31.3 \%$ |
|  | Other | $38.2 \%$ | $46.0 \%$ | $37.3 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were about one-and-half times as likely (144.6 percent) to have no high school degree percent <br> as Whites. |
|  | Blacks were about as likely (96.4 percent) to have no high school degree percent as Whites. |
|  | Latinos were more than five-and-half times as likely (564.3 percent) to have no high school degree <br> percent as Whites. |
|  | Others were almost seven times as likely (682.1 percent) to have no high school degree percent as <br> Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey

## Definitions:

Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
No high school degree or GED means people 25 or older without a high school diploma or General Education Diploma.

Additional lack of a high school degree or GED data is provided in Appendix A, Table 22 - Less Than High School Diploma 2010, 2017.

ONLY HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE OR GED

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $10.6 \%$ | $23.8 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $9.7 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
|  | Black | $22.2 \%$ | $29.1 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $23.2 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $28.1 \%$ |
|  | Other | $27.3 \%$ | $24.8 \%$ | $29.2 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were less likely (91.5 percent) than Whites of having only a high school degree. |
|  | Blacks were more than twice as likely (209.4 percent) as Whites of having only a high school degree. |
|  | Latinos were more than twice likely (218.8 percent) as Whites of having only a high school degree. |
|  | Others were more than two-and-half times as likely (257.5 percent) as Whites of having only a high <br> school degree. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
High school degree only means people 25 or older with only a high school diploma or General Education Diploma.

Additional high school graduation data is provided in Appendix A, Table 21 - High School Graduate (Includes Equivalency) 2010, 2017.

## SUSPENSION RATE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $0.6 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | $0.4 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Black | $3.3 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | $1.7 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Other | $1.2 \%$ | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The suspension rate for Asians was $\mathbf{6 6 . 7}$ percent of the suspension rate for Whites. |
|  | The suspension rate for Blacks was $\mathbf{5 5 0 . 0}$ percent of the suspension rate for Whites. |
|  | The suspension rate for Latinos was $\mathbf{2 8 3 . 3}$ percent of the suspension rate for Whites |
|  | The suspension rate for Others was $\mathbf{2 0 0 . 0}$ percent of the suspension rate for Whites. |

Source: Montgomery County Public Schools Security at a Glance

## Definitions:

Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Others are Two or More Races.
Suspension rate means out of school suspensions, including expulsions. Montgomery County Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) calculated the Montgomery County suspension rate from Maryland state data.

Additional school suspension data is provided in Appendix A, Table 23 - Out of School Suspension (Including Expulsions) 2011-2018.

## DROPOUTS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $2.1 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | $0.9 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Black | $6.3 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | $13.8 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Other | $4.7 \%$ | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The Asian dropout rate was 42.9 percent of the White dropout rate. |
|  | The Black dropout rate was $\mathbf{3 0 0 . 0}$ percent of the White dropout rate. |
|  | The Latino dropout rate was $\mathbf{6 5 7 . 1}$ percent of the White dropout rate. |
|  | The Other dropout rate was $\mathbf{2 2 3 . 8}$ percent of the White dropout rate. |

Source: Maryland State Department of Education, report card
Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Other refers to Two or More Races.
Dropout rate means the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year - for any reason, except death. The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9-12 served by the school.

Additional labor force participation data is provided in Appendix A, Table 24 - Four Year Adjusted Cohort Dropout 2010-2017.

## GRADUATION

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | White | $96.6 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | $97.3 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Black | $88.2 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | $78.5 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Other | $93.3 \%$ | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | The Asian graduation rate was $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 3}$ percent of the White graduation rate. |
|  | The Black graduation rate was $\mathbf{9 1 . 9}$ percent of the White graduation rate. |
|  | The Latino graduation rate was $\mathbf{8 1 . 8}$ percent of the White graduation rate. |
|  | The Other graduation rate was $\mathbf{9 7 . 2}$ percent of the White graduation rate. |

Source: Maryland State Department of Education, report card
Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Other refers to Two or More Races.
Graduation rate means the four-year adjusted rate of students graduating from high school. See Appendix B-1 (Definitions) for further clarification.

Additional graduation data is provided in Appendix A, Table 25 - Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation 2010-2018.

COLLEGE DEGREE ATTAINMENT

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $64.8 \%$ | $42.8 \%$ | $34.5 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $68.0 \%$ | $63.4 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ |
|  | Black | $43.8 \%$ | $28.5 \%$ | $20.6 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $25.1 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |
|  | Other | $54.9 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | Asians had college rate of $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 9}$ percent of Whites. |
|  | Blacks had college rate of $\mathbf{6 7 . 6}$ percent of Whites. |
|  | Latinos had college rate of $\mathbf{3 8 . 7}$ percent of Whites. |
|  | Others had college rate of 84.7 percent of Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Other refers to Two or More Races.
College degree attainment means people 25 or older with a bachelor's degree or above.
Additional college degree attainment data is provided in Appendix A, Table 26 - College Degree attainment 2015, 2017.

## APPRENTICES

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland* | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $29.7 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | $2.6 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Black | $20.6 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | $43.9 \%$ | NA | NA |
|  | Other | $3.2 \%$ | NA | NA |

*Minorities were 38.8 percent of Maryland apprentices as compared to 70.3 percent of Montgomery County apprentices.


| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asians were $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ percent of apprentices. |
|  | Blacks were $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{2 0 . 6}$ percent of apprentices. |
|  | Latinos were $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{4 3 . 9}$ percent of apprentices. |
|  | Others were $\mathbf{1 0 . 2}$ percent of the population and 3.2 percent of apprentices. |

Source: Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, special tabulations
Definitions:
Latino in the Maryland Department of Labor data is treated as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.

Apprentices are participants in registered apprenticeship programs in the state of Maryland. This list of apprenticeship occupations is in Appendix B-4.

Additional apprenticeship data is provided in Appendix A, Table 27 - Registered Apprentices 2014-2018.

## HEALTH

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on health insurance, infant mortality, heart disease mortality, stroke mortality and breast cancer mortality. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States where comparable data was available.

NO HEALTH INSURANCE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $3.8 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $5.8 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ |
|  | Black | $7.3 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $19.4 \%$ | $22.0 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ |
|  | Other | $26.6 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were more than one-and-half times as likely (152.6 percent) as Whites to not have health <br> insurance. |
|  | Blacks were almost twice as likely (192.1 percent) as Whites to not have health insurance. |
|  | Latinos were more than five times as likely (510.5 percent) as Whites to not have health insurance. |
|  | Others were seven times as likely ( $\mathbf{7 0 0 . 0}$ percent) as Whites to not have health insurance. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Health insurance coverage means government or private health insurance.
Additional health insurance data is provided in Appendix A, Table 28 - Health Insurance Coverage 2010, 2017.

INFANT MORTALITY

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 5}$ | White | 3.7 | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | 3.8 | NA | NA |
|  | Black | 8.8 | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | 4.9 | NA | NA |
|  | Other | 5 | NA | NA |

NA: based on state and local data


| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2013-15 | The Asian infant mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 7}$ percent of the White infant mortality rate. |
|  | The Black infant mortality rate was $\mathbf{2 3 7 . 8}$ percent of the White infant mortality rate. |
|  | The Latino infant mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 3 2 . 4}$ percent of the White infant mortality rate. |
|  | The Other infant mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 3 5 . 1}$ percent of the White infant mortality rate. |

Source: MCDHHS/PHS/Planning \& Epidemiology; Maryland DHMH/VSA; CDC/U.S. Census bridged Population Files (2013-2015); Healthy Montgomery

Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Infant mortality means infant deaths per 1,000 live births.
Additional infant mortality data is provided in Appendix A, Table 29 - Infant Mortality (deaths per 1,000 live births) 2008-2010, 2013-2015.

HEART DISEASE MORTALITY

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 5}$ | White | 110 | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | 59.8 | NA | NA |
|  | Black | 127.8 | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | 55.7 | NA | NA |
|  | Other | 111.3 | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2013-15 | The Asian heart disease mortality rate was $\mathbf{5 4 . 4}$ percent of the White heart disease mortality rate. |
|  | The Black heart disease mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 1 6 . 2}$ percent of the White heart disease mortality rate. |
|  | The Latino heart disease mortality rate was $\mathbf{5 0 . 6}$ percent of the White heart disease mortality rate. |
|  | The Other heart disease mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 2}$ percent of the White heart disease mortality rate. |

Source: MCDHHS/PHS/Planning \& Epidemiology; Maryland DHMH/VSA; CDC/U.S. Census bridged Population Files (2013-2015); Healthy Montgomery

Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Heart disease mortality means age-adjusted death due to heart disease per 1,000 population.
Age-adjusted means correcting for the fact that older people have more deaths from heart disease.
Additional heart disease data is provided in Appendix A, Table 30 - Age-Adjusted Mortality Due to Heart Disease (deaths per 100,000 population) 2008-2010, 2013-2015.

## STROKE MORTALITY

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 5}$ | White | 23.7 | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | 23.2 | NA | NA |
|  | Black | 27.5 | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | 19.7 | NA | NA |
|  | Other | 24.7 | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2013-15 | The Asian stroke mortality rate was $\mathbf{9 7 . 9}$ percent of the White stroke mortality rate. |
|  | The Black stroke mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 1 6 . 0}$ percent of the White stroke mortality rate. |
|  | The Latino stroke mortality rate was $\mathbf{8 3 . 1}$ percent of the White stroke mortality rate. |
|  | The Other stroke mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 2}$ percent of the White stroke mortality rate. |

Source: Source: MCDHHS/PHS/Planning \& Epidemiology; Maryland DHMH/VSA; CDC/U.S. Census bridged Population Files (2013-2015); Healthy Montgomery

Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Stroke mortality means age-adjusted death due to stroke per 1,000 population. Age-adjusted means correcting for the fact that older people have more deaths from heart disease.

Additional data on stroke is in Appendix A, Table 31 - Age-Adjusted Mortality Due to Stroke (deaths per 100,000 population) 2008-2010, 2013-2015.

BREAST CANCER MORTALITY

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 5}$ | White | 19.5 | NA | NA |
|  | Asian | 7.3 | NA | NA |
|  | Black | 25.6 | NA | NA |
|  | Latino | 10.9 | NA | NA |
|  | Other | 20.1 | NA | NA |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2013-15 | The Asian breast cancer mortality rate was $\mathbf{3 7 . 4}$ percent of the White breast cancer mortality rate. |
|  | The Black breast cancer mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 3 1 . 3}$ percent of the White breast cancer mortality rate. |
|  | The Latino breast cancer mortality rate was $\mathbf{5 5 . 9}$ percent of the White breast cancer mortality rate. |
|  | The Other breast cancer mortality rate was $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 1}$ percent of the White breast cancer mortality rate. |

Source: Source: MCDHHS/PHS/Planning \& Epidemiology; Maryland DHMH/VSA; CDC/U.S. Census bridged Population Files (2013-2015); Healthy Montgomery

Definitions:
Latino is treated here as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Breast cancer mortality means age-adjusted death due to breast cancer per 100,000 females.
Age-adjusted means correcting for the fact that older people have more deaths from breast cancer.
Additional breast cancer data is provided in Appendix A, Table 32 - Age-Adjusted Mortality Rate Due to Breast Cancer (deaths per 100,000 females) 2008-2010, 2013-2015.

## CRIMINAL JUSTICE

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on arrests and juvenile intake. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States where comparable data was available.


#### Abstract

ARRESTS |  | Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 | Whites were $\mathbf{5 3 . 2}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{2 7 . 4}$ percent of arrests. |
|  |  | Asians were $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ percent of arrests. |
| Blacks were $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{4 3 . 9}$ percent of arrests. |  |
| Latinos were $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ percent of the population and $\mathbf{2 5 . 9}$ percent of arrests. |  |


Source: Office of Legislative Oversight analysis of Montgomery County Police Department

Definitions:
Latino in the OLO Report data is treated as a race/ethnicity and not a combination of multiple races.
Types of arrests are listed in Appendix B-4.
Additional data on arrests is provided in Appendix A, Table 33-Arrests 2015-2017

## JUVENILE INTAKE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $13.0 \%$ | 30.0 | NA |
|  | Black | $58.0 \%$ | 62.1 | NA |
|  | Latino/Other | $29.0 \%$ | 7.9 | NA |

NA: based solely on state and county data


| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Whites were $\mathbf{2 9 . 3}$ percent of the school age population and $\mathbf{1 3 . 0}$ percent of the juvenile intake. |
|  | Blacks were 21.3 percent of the school age population and 58.0 percent of the juvenile intake. |
|  | Latinos/Others were 34.7 percent of the school age population and 29.0 percent of the juvenile <br> intake. |

Source: Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, Data Resource Guides
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Others were not reported.
Juvenile intake refers to a complaint to the Juvenile Court involving an alleged delinquent or unruly act by a juvenile.

Additional juvenile intake data is provided in Appendix A, Table 34 - Juvenile Intake 2013-2017.

## TRANSPORTATION

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on households with no vehicle, use of public transportation to work and mean travel time to work. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States.

MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK - PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $13.6 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $11.7 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
|  | Black | $19.8 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $10.1 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $12.8 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ |
|  | Other | $12.1 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were less likely (86.0 percent) than Whites to take public transportation. |
|  | Blacks were about one-and-half times as likely (145.6 percent) as Whites to take public <br> transportation. |
|  | Latinos were less likely (94.1 percent) than Whites to take public transportation. |
|  | Others were less likely (89.0 percent) than Whites to take public transportation. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Public transportation excludes taxis.
Additional public transportation data is provided in Appendix A, Table 35 - Commuting to Work 2010, 2017.

# MEAN TRAVEL TIME TO WORK (MINUTES) 

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | 33.8 | 31.9 | 26.1 |
|  | Asian | 36.2 | 33.0 | 30.2 |
|  | Black | 36.0 | 35.8 | 28.8 |
|  | Latino | 35.5 | 34.1 | 28.0 |
|  | Other | 35.6 | 35.2 | 29.1 |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The mean travel time to work for Asians was 2.4 minutes longer than the mean travel time for <br> Whites. |
|  | The mean travel time to work for Blacks was $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ minutes longer than the mean travel time for <br> Whites. |
| The mean travel time to work for Latinos was 1.7 minutes longer than the mean travel time for <br> Whites. |  |
| The mean travel time to work for Others was 1.8 minutes longer than the mean travel time for <br> Whites. |  |

## Source: American Community Survey

## Definitions:

Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Mean travel time refers to the average number of minutes that it usually took the person to get from home to work each day during the reference week.

Additional travel time to work data is provided in Appendix A, Table 37 - Mean Travel Time to Work (MINUTES) 2010, 2017.

NO VEHICLE

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $5.5 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $6.0 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ |
|  | Black | $12.8 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $4.1 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ |
|  | Other | $6.4 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Asians were more likely (109.1 percent) than Whites to not have a vehicle. |
|  | Blacks were more than twice as likely (232.7 percent) as Whites to not have a vehicle. |
|  | Latinos were less likely (74.5 percent) than Whites to not have a vehicle. |
|  | Others were less likely (116.4 percent) than Whites to not have a vehicle. |

## Source: American Community Survey

Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
No vehicle refers to people who do not have a car.
Additional lack of a vehicle data is provided in Appendix A, Table 36 - No Vehicle 2010, 2017.

## CONNECTEDNESS

This section of the report presents data by race and ethnicity on people who have moved to Montgomery County and have broadband access. Comparisons are made to the state of Maryland and the United States where comparable data was available.

MOVED ONE YEAR AGO

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland | United States |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $4.8 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $5.0 \%$ | $29.2 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
|  | Black | $8.0 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $4.5 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |
|  | Other | $5.8 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |



| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2017 | Asian residents were more likely to have moved from another county (104.2 percent) than Whites. |
|  | Black residents were more than one-and-half times as likely to have moved from another county <br> (166.7 percent) than Whites. |
|  | Latino residents were less likely to have moved from another county (93.8 percent) than Whites. |
|  | Other residents were more likely to have moved from another county (120.8 percent) than Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Moved means moved from a different county, inside or outside the state, one year ago.
Additional data on moving into the County is in Appendix A, Table 38 - Total of People Who Have Moved into The County 2017.

## WITH INTERNET ACCESS

| Year | Racial/Ethnic Group | Montgomery County | Maryland* | United States* |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | White | $95.4 \%$ | $88.8 \%$ | $84.5 \%$ |
|  | Asian | $98.0 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ | $91.2 \%$ |
|  | Black | $92.4 \%$ | $84.4 \%$ | $75.6 \%$ |
|  | Latino | $94.6 \%$ | $86.7 \%$ | $80.4 \%$ |
|  | Other | $94.9 \%$ | $83.1 \%$ | $80.2 \%$ |

*American Community Survey broadband internet access


| Year | Disparity in Montgomery County |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | The percentage of Asians with broadband access was $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 7}$ percent of the percentage of Whites. |
|  | The percentage of Blacks with broadband access was $\mathbf{9 6 . 9}$ percent of the percentage of Whites. |
|  | The percentage of Latinos with broadband access was $\mathbf{9 9 . 2}$ percent of the percentage of Whites. |
|  | The percentage of Others with broadband access was $\mathbf{9 9 . 5}$ percent of the percentage of Whites. |

Source: American Community Survey, Integrated Public Use Micro Sample
Definitions:
Latinos are an ethnicity rather than a race. Therefore, Latinos are included in multiple racial groups.
Internet access refers to broadband-internet access.
Additional internet access data is provided in Appendix A, Table 39 - Internet Access 2017.
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TABLE 1 - TOTAL POPULATION 2007, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | 577,071 | 180,924 | 214,970 | 207,392 | 110,897 |
|  | $53.2 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $19.8 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 578,268 | 159,796 | 132,814 | 115,832 | 76,429 |
|  | $61.0 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 2 - MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) 2017

| Age Categories | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 years | 5.3\% | 4.8\% | 6.9\% | 9.8\% | 9.7\% |
| 5 to 17 years | 14.8\% | 15.0\% | 18.3\% | 21.2\% | 22.3\% |
| 18 to 24 years | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 9.4\% | 10.0\% | 11.9\% |
| 25 to 34 years | 11.3\% | 13.7\% | 14.5\% | 15.1\% | 16.1\% |
| 35 to 44 years | 12.1\% | 15.9\% | 14.7\% | 16.3\% | 17.9\% |
| 45 to 54 years | 14.6\% | 16.0\% | 14.3\% | 12.8\% | 11.1\% |
| 55 to 64 years | 15.7\% | 13.0\% | 11.4\% | 8.3\% | 6.2\% |
| 65 to 74 years | 10.8\% | 8.6\% | 6.4\% | 4.0\% | 2.6\% |
| 75 years and over | 8.5\% | 6.0\% | 4.1\% | 2.6\% | 2.2\% |
| Median age (years) | 45 | 40 | 36 | 31 | 29 |

Source: American Community Survey
TABLE 3 - MEDIAN AGE (YEARS) 2010

| Age Categories | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 years | $5.5 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |
| 5 to 17 years | $15.9 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ | $20.4 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ to 24 years | $6.5 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ to 34 years | $12.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $21.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ to $\mathbf{4 4}$ years | $13.2 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ |
| 45 to 54 years | $16.7 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 5}$ to 64 years | $14.5 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6 5}$ to 74 years | $7.7 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7 5}$ years and <br> over | $8.1 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Median age <br> (years) | 43 | 39 | 34 | 30 | 30 |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 4 - FOREIGN BORN 2007, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | 49,666 | 116,155 | 60,502 | 107,854 | 58,816 |
|  | $12.6 \%$ | $29.6 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 51,994 | 92,393 | 47,274 | 81,654 | 46,655 |
|  | $16.2 \%$ | $28.9 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $25.5 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 5 - SPEAK ENGLISH LESS THAN "VERY WELL" 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $8.1 \%$ | $34.0 \%$ | $9.0 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ | $53.4 \%$ |
| 2017 | $7.6 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $36.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 6 - MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other | American <br> Indian / <br> Alaska <br> Native | Native <br> Hawaiian / <br> Pacific <br> Islander | Other <br> Race |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | $\$ 106,920$ | $\$ 100,689$ | $\$ 62,487$ | $\$ 65,731$ | $\$ 65,264$ | $\$ 63,816$ | $\$ 71,205$ | $\$ 60,772$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 119,426$ | $\$ 109,147$ | $\$ 72,587$ | $\$ 71,847$ | $\$ 75,723$ | $\$ 76,076$ | $\$ 87,679$ | $\$ 63,414$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 7 - OCCUPATION 2010, 2017

| Occupation Categories | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other | Not Latino |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management, business, science, \& arts | 63.9\% | 62.0\% | 45.4\% | 24.9\% | 13.9\% | 62.2\% |
| Service | 10.6\% | 13.6\% | 19.7\% | 31.3\% | 39.2\% | 11.9\% |
| Sales and office | 17.1\% | 16.4\% | 23.2\% | 16.1\% | 13.5\% | 18.2\% |
| Natural resources, construction, \& maintenance | 5.1\% | 1.7\% | 3.5\% | 20.9\% | 28.5\% | 3.1\% |
| Production, transportation, \& material moving | 3.4\% | 6.3\% | 8.2\% | 6.7\% | 4.8\% | 4.5\% |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Management, business, science, \& arts | 63.2\% | 59.9\% | 48.4\% | 21.6\% | 11.9\% | 62.7\% |
| Service | 10.0\% | 14.7\% | 17.2\% | 34.2\% | 44.8\% | 11.0\% |
| Sales and office | 18.9\% | 17.9\% | 24.2\% | 17.2\% | 12.5\% | 19.6\% |
| Natural resources, construction, \& maintenance | 5.0\% | 3.5\% | 2.9\% | 17.3\% | 18.4\% | 3.2\% |
| Production, transportation, \& material moving | 2.9\% | 4.0\% | 7.2\% | 9.7\% | 12.3\% | 3.6\% |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 8 - UNEMPLOYED 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $3.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| 2017 | $2.3 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 9 - PERCENT IN THE LABOR FORCE 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $72.9 \%$ | $71.3 \%$ | $71.0 \%$ | $79.6 \%$ | $76.4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $69.6 \%$ | $69.1 \%$ | $74.7 \%$ | $79.0 \%$ | $78.8 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

## TABLE 10 - AVERAGE CONSTRUCTION MONTHLY EARNINGS AND PERCENT OF WHITE AVERAGE 2012-2016

| Year | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\$ 5,437$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 4,172$ | $76.7 \%$ | $\$ 3,817$ | $70.2 \%$ | $\$ 3,463$ | $67.3 \%$ | $\$ 3,578$ | $65.8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\$ 5,483$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 4,197$ | $76.5 \%$ | $\$ 3,908$ | $71.3 \%$ | $\$ 3,594$ | $69.2 \%$ | $\$ 3,604$ | $65.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\$ 5,713$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 4,277$ | $74.9 \%$ | $\$ 3,998$ | $70.0 \%$ | $\$ 3,761$ | $69.7 \%$ | $\$ 3,813$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\$ 5,839$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 4,454$ | $76.3 \%$ | $\$ 4,178$ | $71.6 \%$ | $\$ 3,933$ | $71.1 \%$ | $\$ 3,955$ | $67.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\$ 6,019$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 4,634$ | $77.0 \%$ | $\$ 4,255$ | $70.7 \%$ | $\$ 4,047$ | $71.1 \%$ | $\$ 4,043$ | $67.2 \%$ |

Source: Quarterly Workforce Indicators

TABLE 11 - BUSINESS FIRMS 2012

| Firms | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of firms <br> with or without paid <br> employees | 16,359 | 17,538 | 17,532 | 8,333 |
| \% of total firms | $13.8 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| Sales of firms with or <br> without paid <br> employees | $4,678,987$ | $1,940,781$ | $1,681,336$ | 674,807 |
| $\%$ of total firms | $4.2 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |

Source: Survey of Business Owners 2012

TABLE 12 - NUMBER OF FIRMS, REVENUE 2012

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Meaning of Race } \\ \text { code }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number of firms } \\ \text { with or without paid } \\ \text { employees }\end{array}$ | \% of Total Firms | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Sales, receipts, or } \\ \text { value of shipments } \\ \text { of firms with or } \\ \text { without paid }\end{array}$ | \% of Total Firms |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| employees (\$1,000) |  |  |  |  |$]$|  |
| :--- |
| Black or African <br> American |
| American Indian and <br> Alaska Native |
| Asian |

Source: Survey of Business Owners 2012

TABLE 13 - SBDC CLIENTS 2018

| Race | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 489 | 58.2\% |
| Asian | 36 | 4.3\% |
| Black | 179 | 21.3\% |
| American Indian / Alaskan Native | 4 | 0.5\% |
| Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.1\% |
| No Response | 96 | 11.4\% |
| Unknown | 36 | 4.3\% |
| Total |  |  |
| Ethnicity | Number | Percent |
| Latino | 474 | 56.4\% |
| Non-Latino | 276 | 32.8\% |
| No Response | 34 | 4.0\% |
| Unknown | 57 | 6.8\% |
| Total | 841 |  |

Source: Montgomery County SBDC Segmentation Report 7_1_2013 to 12_5_2018

TABLE 14 - POVERTY RATES 2010, 2017

| Population Category | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All people | 4.0\% | 5.8\% | 11.2\% | 11.1\% | 14.6\% |
| Under 18 years | 3.4\% | 3.6\% | 18.7\% | 15.8\% | 20.2\% |
| Total population | 544,323 | 161,254 | 196,882 | 207,392 | 110,897 |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population Category | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| All people | 4.4\% | 5.7\% | 12.1\% | 12.1\% | 12.8\% |
| Under 18 years | 4.0\% | 6.4\% | 17.8\% | 14.1\% | 15.4\% |
| Total population | 552,393 | 133,402 | 163,904 | 159,110 | 105,989 |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 15 - RENT MORE THAN 30 \% OF INCOME 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $46.3 \%$ | $41.4 \%$ | $60.2 \%$ | $62.8 \%$ | $69.1 \%$ |
| 2017 | $44.7 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $54.5 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ | $71.6 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 16 - NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE 2014, 2016, 2018

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 62 | 67 | 72 |
| Asian | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| Black | 196 | 184 | 221 |
| Latino | 79 | 86 | 76 |
| Other | 43 | 50 | 41 |
| Total | 387 | 394 | 418 |

Source: Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services

TABLE 17 - LENGTH OF TIME IN FOSTER CARE 2018

| Length of time in care | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <1 yr. old | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 11 | 23 |
| $\mathbf{1 - 5}$ yrs. old | 19 | 2 | 60 | 11 | 13 | 105 |
| $\mathbf{6 - 1 0}$ yrs. old | 13 | 0 | 44 | 6 | 6 | 69 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 - 1 3}$ yrs. old | 8 | 0 | 29 | 16 | 4 | 57 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 - 1 7}$ yrs. old | 22 | 4 | 32 | 24 | 3 | 85 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 - 2 1}$ yrs. old | 10 | 2 | 46 | 17 | 4 | 79 |
| Total | 72 | 8 | 221 | 76 | 41 | 418 |

Source: Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services

TABLE 18 - OWNING VERSUS RENTING 2010, 2017

| Home Residency Category | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  | Other |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 222,498 | 53.1\% | 50,722 | 12.1\% | 64,823 | 15.5\% | 49,715 | 11.9\% | 31,199 | 3.9\% | 418,957 | 100\% |
| Owner occupied | 162,910 | 73.2\% | 37,688 | 74.3\% | 27,578 | 42.5\% | 24,412 | 49.1\% | 14,119 | 46.8\% | 266,707 | 63.7\% |
| Renter occupied | 59,588 | 26.8\% | 13,034 | 25.7\% | 37,245 | 57.5\% | 25,303 | 50.9\% | 17,080 | 56.0\% | 152,250 | 36.3\% |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Home Residency Category | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  | Other |  | Grand Total |  |
| Total | 225,561 | 57.3\% | 42,475 | 10.8\% | 59,449 | 15.1\% | 39,749 | 10.1\% | 26,333 | 3.6\% | 393,567 | 100\% |
| Owner occupied | 172,845 | 76.6\% | 30,862 | 72.7\% | 26,916 | 45.3\% | 23,899 | 60.1\% | 14,486 | 55.2\% | 269,008 | 68.4\% |
| Renter occupied | 52,716 | 23.4\% | 11,613 | 27.3\% | 32,533 | 54.7\% | 15,850 | 39.9\% | 11,847 | 45.2\% | 124,559 | 31.6\% |

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data

TABLE 19 - ALL MORTGAGE LOANS ORIGINATED 2012, 2017

| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race/Ethnicity | Number of <br> Mortgage Loans | Dollar Value of <br> Mortgage Loans | Average Mortgage <br> Loan | \% of Average Loan <br> to White Borrower |  |
| White | 12,247 | $\$ 5,019,431,000$ | $\$ 409,850$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Asian | 3,539 | $\$ 1,384,961,000$ | $\$ 391,342$ | $95.5 \%$ |  |
| Black | 2,703 | $\$ 886,828,000$ | $\$ 328,090$ | $80.1 \%$ |  |
| Latino | 2,747 | $\$ 846,174,000$ | $\$ 308,036$ | $75.2 \%$ |  |
| Other | 190 | $\$ 57,377,000$ | $\$ 301,984$ | $73.7 \%$ |  |


| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race/Ethnicity | Number of <br> Mortgage Loans | Dollar Value of Mortgage <br> Loans | Average Mortgage <br> Loan | \% of Average Loan <br> to White Borrower |  |
| White | 31,027 | $\$ 11,000,472,000$ | $\$ 354,545$ | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| Asian | 8,268 | $\$ 2,801,404,000$ | $\$ 338,825$ | $95.6 \%$ |  |
| Black | 2,941 | $\$ 835,645,000$ | $\$ 284,136$ | $80.1 \%$ |  |
| Latino | 2,600 | $\$ 751,575,000$ | $\$ 289,067$ | $81.5 \%$ |  |
| Other | 251 | $\$ 75,027,000$ | $\$ 298,913$ | $84.3 \%$ |  |

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data

TABLE 20 - PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 2013-2017

| Year | All Students | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 148,780 | 49,043 | $33.0 \%$ | 21,242 | $14.3 \%$ | 31,713 | $21.3 \%$ | 39,647 | $26.7 \%$ | 7135 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 151,295 | 48,440 | $32.0 \%$ | 21,749 | $14.4 \%$ | 32,338 | $21.4 \%$ | 41,445 | $27.4 \%$ | 7323 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 154,434 | 47,976 | $31.1 \%$ | 21,902 | $14.2 \%$ | 33,139 | $21.5 \%$ | 43,844 | $28.4 \%$ | 7573 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 156,380 | 47,301 | $30.3 \%$ | 22,215 | $14.2 \%$ | 33,460 | $21.4 \%$ | 45,577 | $29.2 \%$ | 7827 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 159,010 | 46,599 | $29.3 \%$ | 22,680 | $14.3 \%$ | 33,902 | $21.3 \%$ | 47,855 | $30.1 \%$ | 7974 |

Source: Maryland State Department of Education

TABLE 21 - HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE (INCLUDES EQUIVALENCY) 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | $13.2 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ | $24.3 \%$ |
| 2017 | $10.6 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 22 - LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $5.4 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $34.2 \%$ | $46.6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $5.6 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $31.6 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 23 - OUT OF SCHOOL SUSPENSION (INCLUDING EXPULSIONS) 2011-2018

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 - 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 - 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5 - 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6 - 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Students | $2.5 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| White | $1.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Asian | $0.7 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Black | $5.5 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Latino | $2.5 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Other | $1.8 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |

Source: MCPS Security at a Glance

TABLE 24 - FOUR YEAR ADJUSTED COHORT DROPOUT 2010-2017

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Students | $7.4 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $6.27 \%$ | $5.59 \%$ | $5.74 \%$ | $5.69 \%$ | $6.16 \%$ |
| White | $3.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $3.03 \%$ | $2.97 \%$ | $2.66 \%$ | $2.55 \%$ | $2.05 \%$ |
| Asian | $2.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.41 \%$ | $1.27 \%$ | $1.15 \%$ | $1.05 \%$ | $0.87 \%$ |
| Black | $11.2 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $8.69 \%$ | $6.79 \%$ | $6.69 \%$ | $6.12 \%$ | $6.25 \%$ |
| Latino | $14.3 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $12.21 \%$ | $11.10 \%$ | $11.90 \%$ | $12.27 \%$ | $13.76 \%$ |
| Other | $2.9 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $3.68 \%$ | $3.29 \%$ | $3.79 \%$ | $4.39 \%$ | $4.70 \%$ |

Source: http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov

TABLE 25 - FOUR YEAR ADJUSTED COHORT GRADUATION 2010-2018

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Students | $86.2 \%$ | $86.8 \%$ | $87.4 \%$ | $88.3 \%$ | $89.7 \%$ | $89.4 \%$ | $89.8 \%$ | $89.5 \%$ | $89.5 \%$ |
| White | $93.7 \%$ | $93.9 \%$ | $94.0 \%$ | $94.7 \%$ | $95.0 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ | $95.0 \%$ | $96.4 \%$ | $96.0 \%$ |
| Asian | $94.7 \%$ | $94.3 \%$ | $95.2 \%$ | $95.0 \%$ | $95.0 \%$ | $95.0 \%$ | $95.0 \%$ | $96.4 \%$ | $97.3 \%$ |
| Black | $78.1 \%$ | $81.3 \%$ | $82.3 \%$ | $83.9 \%$ | $86.4 \%$ | $86.8 \%$ | $87.7 \%$ | $88.2 \%$ | $88.2 \%$ |
| Latino | $74.2 \%$ | $75.3 \%$ | $76.7 \%$ | $77.5 \%$ | $80.0 \%$ | $79.6 \%$ | $80.4 \%$ | $78.5 \%$ | $78.5 \%$ |
| Other | $92.3 \%$ | $92.0 \%$ | $90.8 \%$ | $92.9 \%$ | $93.4 \%$ | $92.9 \%$ | $92.9 \%$ | $93.3 \%$ | $93.3 \%$ |

Source: http://reportcard.msde.maryland.gov

TABLE 26 - COLLEGE DEGREE ATTAINMENT 2015, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $65.3 \%$ | $67.7 \%$ | $44.5 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $61.2 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $64.8 \%$ | $68.0 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ | $54.4 \%$ | $57.8 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 27 - REGISTERED APPRENTICES 2014-2018

| Race/ <br> Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ |  | 2017 |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 60 | $48.8 \%$ | 37 | $32.2 \%$ | 47 | $35.3 \%$ | 40 | $24.4 \%$ | 46 | $29.7 \%$ |
| Asian | 1 | $0.8 \%$ | 8 | $7.0 \%$ | 7 | $5.3 \%$ | 4 | $2.4 \%$ | 4 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Black | 18 | $14.6 \%$ | 15 | $13.0 \%$ | 21 | $15.8 \%$ | 39 | $23.8 \%$ | 32 | $20.6 \%$ |
| Latino | 41 | $33.3 \%$ | 53 | $46.1 \%$ | 56 | $42.1 \%$ | 79 | $48.2 \%$ | 68 | $43.9 \%$ |
| Other | 3 | $2.4 \%$ | 2 | $1.7 \%$ | 2 | $1.5 \%$ | 2 | $1.2 \%$ | 5 | $3.2 \%$ |
| Total | 123 | $100.0 \%$ | 115 | $100.0 \%$ | 133 | $100.0 \%$ | 164 | $100.0 \%$ | 155 | $100.0 \%$ |

Source: Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing \& Regulation, Open Records Request

TABLE 28 - HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE 2010, 2017

| Subject | White | Asian | Black | Latino / Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total population | 544,323 | 161,254 | 196,882 | 207,392 | 110,897 |
| Civilian noninstitutionalized population | 538,622 | 160,773 | 194,153 | 206,802 | 110,897 |
| With private health insurance | 86.0\% | 80.1\% | 69.2\% | 54.0\% | 43.2\% |
| With public coverage | 25.3\% | 21.8\% | 33.3\% | 30.8\% | 32.5\% |
| No health insurance coverage | 3.8\% | 5.8\% | 7.3\% | 19.4\% | 26.6\% |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subject | White | Asian | Black | Latino / Latino | Other |
| Total population | 552,393 | 133,402 | 163,904 | 159,110 | 73,503 |
| Civilian noninstitutionalized population | 546,024 | 132,557 | 161,378 | 158,190 | 73,301 |
| With private health insurance | 87.1\% | 79.2\% | 68.9\% | 47.7\% | 36.7\% |
| With public coverage | 19.5\% | 13.9\% | 22.4\% | 22.6\% | 23.1\% |
| No health insurance coverage | 7.0\% | 12.6\% | 15.3\% | 33.4\% | 42.1\% |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 29 - INFANT MORTALITY (DEATHS PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS) 2008-2010, 2013-2015

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 3.7 | 4 |
| Asian | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Black | 8.8 | 9.1 |
| Latino | 4.9 | 3 |
| Other | 5 | 5.9 |
| Overall | 4.9 | 5.2 |

TABLE 30 - AGE-ADJUSTED MORTALITY DUE TO HEART DISEASE (DEATHS PER 100,000 POPULATION) 2008-2010, 2013-2015

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 110 | 128.9 |
| Asian | 59.8 | 74.4 |
| Black | 127.8 | 154.1 |
| Latino | 55.7 | 58.9 |
| Other | 111.3 | 132.7 |
| Overall | 107.5 | 127.8 |

TABLE 31 - AGE-ADJUSTED MORTALITY DUE TO STROKE (DEATHS PER 100,000 POPULATION) 2008-2010, 2013-2015

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 23.7 | 23.3 |
| Asian | 23.2 | 29.9 |
| Black | 27.5 | 32.9 |
| Latino | 19.7 | 14.9 |
| Other | 24.7 | 30.9 |
| Overall | 24.5 | 30 |

TABLE 32 - AGE-ADJUSTED MORTALITY RATE DUE TO BREAST CANCER (DEATHS PER 100,000 FEMALES) 2008-2010, 2013-2015

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3 - 2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 2 0 1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | 19.5 | 19.2 |
| Asian | 7.3 | 7.6 |
| Black | 25.6 | 35.2 |
| Latino | 10.9 | 9.7 |
| Other | 20.1 | 21.8 |
| Overall | 23.7 | 24.8 |

Source: MCDHHS/PHS/Planning \& Epidemiology; Maryland DHMH/VSA; CDC/U.S. Census bridged Population Files (20132015); Healthy Montgomery

TABLE 33 - ARRESTS 2015-2017

| Year | Total | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 15,415 | 4,517 | $29.3 \%$ | 394 | $2.6 \%$ | 6,515 | $42.3 \%$ | 3,989 | $25.9 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 17,840 | 5,057 | $28.3 \%$ | 510 | $2.9 \%$ | 7,629 | $42.8 \%$ | 4,644 | $26.0 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 17,063 | 4,682 | $27.4 \%$ | 484 | $2.8 \%$ | 7,487 | $43.9 \%$ | 4,410 | $25.9 \%$ |

Source: Office of Legislative Oversight analysis of Montgomery County Police Department

TABLE 34 - JUVENILE INTAKE 2013-2017

| Race/Ethnicity | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | $13.6 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |
| Black | $68.3 \%$ | $71.7 \%$ | $53.8 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| Latino/Other | $18.2 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $27.2 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ |

Source: Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, Data Resource Guides 2015, 2017

TABLE 35 - COMMUTING TO WORK 2010, 2017

| Means of Transportation | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total population | 544,323 | 161,254 | 196,882 | 207,392 | 110,897 |
| Car, truck, or van drove alone | 66.2\% | 65.7\% | 60.1\% | 65.1\% | 64.6\% |
| Car, truck, or van carpooled | 8.1\% | 14.4\% | 10.8\% | 15.5\% | 17.6\% |
| Public transportation (excluding taxicab) | 13.6\% | 11.7\% | 19.8\% | 12.8\% | 12.1\% |
| Walked | 1.9\% | 1.8\% | 2.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.2\% |
| Other means | 2.4\% | 0.6\% | 1.2\% | 1.7\% | 1.5\% |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Means of Transportation | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| Total population | 556,937 | 134,144 | 168,254 | 166,738 | 74,738 |
| Car, truck, or van drove alone | 66.3\% | 66.2\% | 61.3\% | 59.6\% | 59.2\% |
| Car, truck, or van carpooled | 9.4\% | 14.6\% | 9.0\% | 18.5\% | 21.0\% |
| Public transportation (excluding taxicab) | 13.7\% | 12.9\% | 22.6\% | 15.7\% | 15.1\% |
| Walked | 2.0\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.7\% | 1.8\% |
| Other means | 1.3\% | 0.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 0.4\% |

Source: American Community Survey

## TABLE 36 - NO VEHICLE 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $6.2 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $5.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |

Source: American Community Survey

## TABLE 37 - MEAN TRAVEL TIME TO WORK (MINUTES) 2010, 2017

| Year | White | Asian | Black | Latino / Latino | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 32.6 | 35.5 | 37.8 | 34.1 | 33.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 33.8 | 36.2 | 36.0 | 35.5 | 35.6 |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 38 - TOTAL OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE MOVED INTO THE COUNTY 2017

| Categories | All |  | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moved to <br> Moco from <br> inside of MD | $1.6 \%$ | 6,561 | $1.2 \%$ | 1,287 | $1.0 \%$ | 5,059 | $3.2 \%$ | 2,823 | $1.9 \%$ | 2,500 | $3.6 \%$ |  |
| Moved to <br> Moco from <br> outside of MD | $3.8 \%$ | 19,684 | $3.6 \%$ | 5,150 | $4.0 \%$ | 7,589 | $4.8 \%$ | 3,863 | $2.6 \%$ | 2,889 | $3.0 \%$ |  |
| Total moved <br> to Moco | $5.4 \%$ | 26,246 | $4.8 \%$ | 6,437 | $5.0 \%$ | 12,648 | $8.0 \%$ | 6,686 | $4.5 \%$ | 5,389 | $5.8 \%$ |  |

Source: American Community Survey

TABLE 39 - INTERNET ACCESS 2017

| 2017 | White |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Latino |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total number | 6,408 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,642 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,489 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,504 | $100.0 \%$ | 1,074 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Internet access | 5,972 | $93.2 \%$ | 1,552 | $94.5 \%$ | 1,374 | $92.3 \%$ | 1,272 | $84.6 \%$ | 935 | $87.1 \%$ |

Source: IPUMS-USA

## APPENDIX B-1 - MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, SCIENCE, AND ARTS OCCUPATIONS

| MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, AND FINANCIAL OCCUPATIONS: |
| :--- |
| MANAGEMENT OCCUPATIONS |
| BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OCCUPATIONS |
| COMPUTER, ENGINEERING, AND SCIENCE OCCUPATIONS: |
| COMPUTER AND MATHEMATICAL OCCUPATIONS |
| ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING OCCUPATIONS |
| LIFE, PHYSICAL, AND SOCIAL SCIENCE OCCUPATIONS |
| EDUCATION, LEGAL, COMMUNITY SERVICE, ARTS, AND MEDIA OCCUPATIONS: |
| COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS |
| LEGAL OCCUPATIONS |
| EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND LIBRARY OCCUPATIONS |
| ARTS, DESIGN, ENTERTAINMENT, SPORTS, AND MEDIA OCCUPATIONS |
| HEALTHCARE PRACTITIONERS AND TECHNICAL OCCUPATIONS: |
| HEALTH DIAGNOSING AND TREATING PRACTITIONERS AND OTHER TECHNICAL OCCUPATIONS |
| HEALTH TECHNOLOGISTS AND TECHNICIANS |

Source: https://censusreporter.org/tables/B24060/

## APPENDIX B-2 - SBDC CLIENTS

| AREAS OF SBDC COUNSELING | Number | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BUSINESS ACCOUNTING/BUDGET | 32 | 3.80\% |
| BUSINESS PLAN | 166 | 19.74\% |
| BUY/SELL BUSINESS | 7 | 0.83\% |
| CASH FLOW MANAGEMENT | 7 | 0.83\% |
| CUSTOMER RELATIONS | 1 | 0.12\% |
| ECOMMERCE | 3 | 0.36\% |
| ENGINEERING R\&D | 1 | 0.12\% |
| FINANCING/CAPITAL | 74 | 8.80\% |
| FRANCHISING | 4 | 0.48\% |
| GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING | 95 | 11.30\% |
| HUMAN RESOURCES/EMPLOYEE MGT | 14 | 1.66\% |
| INTERNATIONAL TRADE | 3 | 0.36\% |
| LEGAL ISSUES | 42 | 4.99\% |
| MANAGING A BUSINESS | 230 | 27.35\% |
| MARKETING/SALES | 206 | 24.49\% |
| START-UP ASSISTANCE | 506 | 60.17\% |
| TAX PLANNING | 8 | 0.95\% |
| TECHNOLOGY/COMPUTERS | 12 | 1.43\% |
| NO RESPONSE | 0 | 0.00\% |
| UNKNOWN | 0 | 0.00\% |
| TOTAL | 841 |  |

## APPENDIX B-3 - APPRENTICESHIP TRADES



| STATIONARY ENGINEER |
| :--- |
| STEAMFITTER |
| STONE/MARBLE MASON |
| STRUCTURAL STEEL WORKER |
| TELECOMMUNICATIONS INSTALLER-TECH. |
| TILE SETTER |
| TRADE SHOW CARPENTER |

## APPENDIX B-4 - ARREST CATEGORIES

| AGG ASSAULT |
| :--- |
| ALL OTHER OFFENSES |
| ANIMAL CRUELTY |
| ARSON |
| ASSAULT - INTIMIDATION |
| ASSAULT - INTIMIDATION |
| ASSAULT - SIMPLE |
| AUTO THEFT |
| BURGLARY |
| BURGLARY TOOLS - POSSESS |
| CDS OFFENSE |
| COMM SEX OFF - PROSTITUTION |
| COUNTERFEITING |
| DAMAGE PROPERTY |
| DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE DRUGS |
| DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE LIQUOR |
| DRUNKENNESS |
| DUI |
| FMBEZZLEMENT |
| FX PARTE/PROTECT. ORDER VIOL. |
| EXTORTION |
| FAILING TO MOVE ON |
| FAMILY OFFENSE |
| FIRE CODE VIOLATION |
| FORGERY/COUNTERFEIT |



## APPENDIX C - EXTENDED DEFINITIONS

## DROPOUT RATE:

Maryland Department of Education defines the dropout rate as
The percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a Maryland approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or state-approved program during the current school year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer and students dropping out of evening high school and other alternative programs.

The dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9 12 served by the school.

## FOUR-YEAR ADJUSTED COHORT GRADUATION RATE:

Maryland Department of Education defines the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as
The number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. For any given cohort, students who are entering grade 9 for the first time form a cohort that is subsequently "adjusted" by adding any students who transfer into the cohort later during the next three years and subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrates to another country, or dies during that same period.

## AGE-ADJUSTED RATE:

To calculate the age-adjusted mortality rate, first calculate the age-specific mortality rate for each age group by dividing the number of deaths by the respective population, and then multiply the resulting number by 100,000. Next multiply each of the age-specific rates by the proportion of that year's population belonging to the particular age group. The ageadjusted rate is obtained by adding the resulting numbers.

## JUVENILE INTAKE:

Juvenile intake is defined by the state of Maryland as
The first contact that DJS will have with a youth. DJS operates juvenile intake offices in every county in Maryland in order to evaluate and assess each juvenile delinquency complaint brought by police, citizens or schools and determine whether the case should be forwarded to a State's Attorney to initiate a court case.

