Race and Hispanic Origin

Continuing trend of racial diversity

The in-migrating minority population contributed overwhelmingly to Montgomery County’s high growth periods. Between 1970 and 1980, the increase in nonwhite population accounted for 107 percent of the total population growth. During the County’s high growth period, 1980 to 1990, when the total population increased by one-third, 60 percent of this growth was new, nonwhite residents. As evidence of the County’s increasing diversity, between 1990 and 1997, minorities accounted for 120 percent of the total population growth. Since 1970, the minority population in Montgomery County has increased nearly ten fold. The annual growth rates of minorities, ranging from 14.5 percent in the 1970s to 5.0 percent per year in the 1990s, substantially exceed the rates for non-Hispanic white population, -0.1 percent and -0.3 percent respectively. The State Data Center of the Maryland Department of Planning predicts by year 2020 the minority population in Montgomery County will reach 40 percent of the total population.

According to the 1997 Census Update Survey, 73.0 percent of Montgomery County’s resident population is white, 13.4 percent are black and another 10.9 percent are Asian or Pacific Islanders. Those of Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) comprise 8.6 percent of the County’s residents. In comparison, the nation is 82.7 percent white, 12.7 percent black, 3.7 percent Asian, and 11.0 percent Hispanic/Latino. Montgomery County has the largest Hispanic and Asian populations in the State; in fact, almost half of Maryland’s Hispanic and Asian
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populations live in the County. Hispanics/Latinos, with an annual growth rate since 1990 of 6.1 percent is the fastest growing minority group in the County, followed by Asians at 5.3 percent growth per year. The black population increased by 4.1 percent per year while the non-Hispanic white majority has a negative annual growth rate of -0.3 percent.

Nonwhite and white in-migration

About 19 percent of all white households in Montgomery County moved into the area between 1992 and 1997. During the same period, 31.6 percent of the total nonwhite households moved into the County. Proportionately more nonwhite in-movers come from outside the metropolitan area (17.0 percent) than new white households (11.0 percent). For the first time, a higher percentage of nonwhite in-movers are arriving from other parts of Maryland, 8.4 percent, rather than the District of Columbia, 4.5 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous 1992 Place of Residence of 1997 Households by Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1992 Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Montgomery County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside County:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from N. Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Out of Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51: Previous Place of Residence by Race

The I-270 Corridor is the first choice for both types of in-movers. Almost one quarter of all new residents moved into this area. The second and third relocation choices diverge by race with nonwhites choosing Colesville (20.0 percent) and Silver Spring/Takoma Park (14.7 percent) while whites are moving into Bethesda/Chevy Chase (16.8 percent) and Kensington/Wheaton (16.6 percent). Nonwhite households left single-family structures and usually moved into garden apartments (46.5 percent) while most white households did not change housing structure types when they moved (38.5 percent moved into single-family detached). Coincidental with higher rates of multi-family occupancy, more new nonwhite households are renters (71.0 percent) than white households (53.5 percent). New nonwhite households are paying less for housing, but are carrying a greater housing cost burden. Only 27.8 percent of new white owners are paying more than 25 percent of their income on housing costs compared to half of nonwhite owners. Of the new renter households, more nonwhite households spend over one-quarter of their income on rent, 45.9 percent, compared to 30.3 percent of white tenants.

The new nonwhite households are larger, 2.78 persons per household, than the white in-movers averaging 2.38 persons. The nonwhite head of household at 38 years old is younger than the average white householder by two years. While the majority of both groups are married couple households (62.7 percent of white and 59.5 percent of nonwhite), nonwhite households are more likely to be single parents (13.8 percent) than
white in-movers (4.7 percent). White and nonwhite singles are drawn to the County with one-quarter of the new white households and one fifth of nonwhite in-movers.

Nonwhite average household size remains larger than white's

The average household size of nonwhite households at 3.00 is nearly half a person larger than white residences at 2.54 persons per household. The larger household size of minority households may be attributed to younger families, higher fertility rates and proclivity for extended families to live together – particularly recent immigrants. Among single-family households, nonwhites average 3.66 persons per household compared to 2.80 for whites. For multi-family households, nonwhite households average 2.42 compared to 1.70 for white households.

Basically, there was no change in multi-family average household size in both white and nonwhite households between 1987 and 1997, but change occurred in single-family structures over this time period. The average household size of single-family white households dropped from 2.87 in 1987 to 2.80 ten years later. In contrast, the average number of nonwhite persons living in single-family homes jumped from 3.51 in 1987 to 3.66 in 1997.

Since owner-occupied dwellings usually house families (81.0 percent of owner occupied households are families compared to 61.0 percent in rental units), the average household size, 2.79 persons per owner occupied household, is larger than the average for rental units, 2.29. Among owners, nonwhites average 3.40 persons per household, compared to 2.64 for whites. For renters, nonwhite households average 2.71 compared to 1.96 for white households. In all categories of structure type and ownership, nonwhites show greater average household sizes than whites.

The 1987 to 1997 period shows a continuing decline in average household size for whites in both owner and renter categories and it also reveals contrasting gains in nonwhite average household size across the tenure groups. The overall average household size nudged up 0.03 during the period, from 2.62 to 2.65. Among renters, white households registered a 0.11 decrease in size (1.96) while nonwhite households increased by 0.09 (2.71). For owners, white owners were the only ones to experience a reduction in average household size (-0.09); nonwhites remained the same.

Nonwhite tenure status shifts to renters

About 77 percent of white householders in 1997 are owners compared to only 52.6 percent of nonwhite householders. A nearly identical 73.2 percent of white householders also live in single-family houses. The same holds true for nonwhite households with 55.1 percent occupying single-family housing.
Since 1977, the tenure of nonwhite households remained evenly split between owners and renters until 1997, when the balance shifted to renters, 52.6 percent. In contrast, white households steadily gained in homeownership, from 65.0 percent in 1977 to 73.0 percent in 1987, then rising to 76.9 percent in 1997. White households are well-positioned to participate in home purchases - with higher median incomes of $70,515, older householders who have resided in the County twice as long (averaging 12 years versus 6 years), and almost three quarters having previously lived in a single-family structure. Nonwhites confront a less advantageous marketing position – lower median household incomes ($53,391), younger heads, and a higher percentage of single parent households.

Renter households are far more diverse in Montgomery County than owner households. Almost 45 percent of renters, or 40,120 out of 89,485 rental households, are nonwhite compared to almost four times as many white owner households than nonwhite owners, that is, 46,440 nonwhite owners out of over 221,000 total owner occupied households. Nonwhites in the County are disproportionately found in rental housing.

Housing costs stretch a higher percentage of nonwhite households

Owner costs are stretching a higher percent of nonwhite households with 31.7 percent spending more than 25 percent of their incomes on housing compared to 18.8 percent of white owner-occupied households. Nonwhite owners are spending on average $100 more per month on housing costs than white households, $1,326 and $1,230 respectively. While this differential may not in itself be a hardship, paired with a lower median income, ownership for some nonwhite households may be burdensome. The 1996 median household income for nonwhite owners at $72,205 is 10.0 percent below the median for white owner occupied households.

Nonwhite renters are paying less for housing than white tenants, $760 compared to $827 per month. But again, a higher percentage of nonwhite households face a greater housing cost burden than white renters, with 45.3 percent of nonwhite renters paying more than 25 percent of their income on rent versus 35.5 percent of white

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure by Race</th>
<th>% of Households Single-Family</th>
<th>% of Households Multi-Family</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Avg Length of Residence Single-Family</th>
<th>Avg Length of Residence Multi-Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>175,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>46,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>221,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>49,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>40,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>89,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>215,765</td>
<td>95,370</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>311,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53: Structure Type and Length of Residence by Tenure and Race

Renter households are far more diverse in Montgomery County than owner households. Almost 45 percent of renters, or 40,120 out of 89,485 rental households, are nonwhite compared to almost four times as many white owner households than nonwhite owners, that is, 46,440 nonwhite owners out of over 221,000 total owner occupied households. Nonwhites in the County are disproportionately found in rental housing.
renters. The 1996 median household income for white renters is $44,106 and $36,980 for nonwhite tenants.

**Better educated and wealthier**

Montgomery County’s minority groups are much wealthier and better educated than they are nationally. The County’s median household income for blacks is $50,325, twice the United States’ median for blacks; the median household income for Asians is $65,630, 45 percent higher than the country’s median; and the median household income for Hispanics (of any race) is $47,310, 78 percent higher than the national median.

The County’s minority adult (25 years or older) population is very well educated. Almost 44 percent of the county’s black adults have a Bachelor’s degree or more, compared to 13 percent for blacks nationwide; 68 percent of Asian adults have at least a Bachelor’s degree, compared to 42 percent of Asians nationwide; and 39 percent of local Hispanics have at least a Bachelor’s degree, compared with 10 percent in the nation. A higher percentage of resident Asian adults have college degrees, 68 percent, than the white population, 62 percent.
## Race & Hispanic Origin

Montgomery County, MD

1997 Census Update Survey

### Table 55: Profile by Race and Hispanic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race &amp; Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>TOTAL COUNTY</th>
<th>1997 Census Update Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Household Population**: 823,500
  - **% of Total Population**: 100%
  - **% Female**: 53.2%

#### Age Distribution:
- **% 0-4 Years Old**: 7.1%
  - **Race**: 6.8%
  - **Hispanic**: 7.3%
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 7.4%
- **% 5-17 Years Old**: 18.4%
  - **Race**: 17.1%
  - **Hispanic**: 23.9%
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 19.7%
- **% 18-29 Years Old**: 26.9%
  - **Race**: 26.2%
  - **Hispanic**: 28.0%
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 28.8%
- **% 30-44 Years Old**: 23.0%
  - **Race**: 24.4%
  - **Hispanic**: 17.2%
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 22.5%
- **% 45-64 Years Old**: 26.9%
  - **Race**: 26.2%
  - **Hispanic**: 28.0%
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 28.8%
- **% 65-74 Years Old**: 5.1%
  - **Race**: 6.3%
  - **Hispanic**: 2.0%
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 1.9%
- **Average Age**
  - **Race**: 36.0
  - **Hispanic**: 37.6
  - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 30.5

#### Educational Attainment:
- **Persons 25 Years and Older**: 559,835
  - **% Less than High School Diploma**: 8.4%
    - **Race**: 7.4%
    - **Hispanic**: 11.8%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 9.3%
  - **% High School Graduate**: 27.9%
    - **Race**: 27.5%
    - **Hispanic**: 36.7%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 19.6%
  - **% Associate or Trade School**: 4.5%
    - **Race**: 4.2%
    - **Hispanic**: 7.5%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 3.4%
  - **% Bachelor's Degree**: 28.6%
    - **Race**: 29.2%
    - **Hispanic**: 23.9%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 31.9%
  - **% Grad, Professional or Doctoral**: 30.6%
    - **Race**: 31.7%
    - **Hispanic**: 20.2%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 35.7%

- **Number of Employed Residents**: 464,115
  - **% Females Who Are Employed**: 67.4%
  - **Women with Children Under Age 6**: 61,205
    - **% Employed**: 68.1%

- **Employer**:
  - **% Private for Profit**: 49.7%
    - **Race**: 49.2%
    - **Hispanic**: 50.5%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 52.5%
  - **% Private not for Profit**: 13.2%
    - **Race**: 12.9%
    - **Hispanic**: 13.3%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 15.7%
  - **% Self-Employed**: 11.3%
    - **Race**: 11.9%
    - **Hispanic**: 6.9%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 10.4%
  - **% Government**: 25.8%
    - **Race**: 26.0%
    - **Hispanic**: 29.2%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 21.3%

- **Work Location**:
  - **% In the County**: 57.9%
    - **Race**: 58.8%
    - **Hispanic**: 53.0%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 56.4%
  - **% Inside the Beltway**: 18.4%
    - **Race**: 18.1%
    - **Hispanic**: 20.2%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 18.3%
  - **% Outside the Beltway**: 39.5%
    - **Race**: 40.7%
    - **Hispanic**: 32.8%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 38.1%
  - **% Elsewhere in Maryland**: 9.2%
    - **Race**: 9.1%
    - **Hispanic**: 9.3%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 9.6%
  - **% to Washington, D.C.**: 23.6%
    - **Race**: 22.7%
    - **Hispanic**: 28.7%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 23.5%
  - **% to Virginia**: 8.0%
    - **Race**: 8.2%
    - **Hispanic**: 7.2%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 8.3%

- **Work Trip**:
  - **% Driving**: 81.6%
    - **Race**: 82.5%
    - **Hispanic**: 76.7%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 82.0%
  - **% Carpool**: 32.5%
    - **Race**: 73.6%
    - **Hispanic**: 67.6%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 71.4%
  - **% Public Transit or Rail**: 13.2%
    - **Race**: 12.1%
    - **Hispanic**: 19.2%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 13.1%
  - **% Walk/Bicycle/Other**: 1.9%
    - **Race**: 1.8%
    - **Hispanic**: 2.3%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 1.6%
  - **% Working at Home**: 3.3%
    - **Race**: 3.5%
    - **Hispanic**: 1.9%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 3.3%

- **Access to Metrorail**:
  - **% Car**: 53.2%
    - **Race**: 55.2%
    - **Hispanic**: 34.6%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 59.8%
  - **% Carpool**: 17.1%
    - **Race**: 13.3%
    - **Hispanic**: 35.5%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 24.4%
  - **% Walk/Bicycle**: 29.7%
    - **Race**: 31.5%
    - **Hispanic**: 29.9%
    - **PACIFIC ISLANDER**: 15.8%

* Insufficient data for reliable estimates.
1 Those of Hispanic origin may be of any race.
2 Ages 16 and older and employed full- or part-time.
## Race & Hispanic Origin (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL COUNTY</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>ASIAN or PACIFIC HISPANIC</th>
<th>HISPANIC ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>ISLANDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households by Race of HH Head</td>
<td>311,135</td>
<td>239,615</td>
<td>38,115</td>
<td>26,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Households</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rental</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Monthly Costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners</td>
<td>$1,244</td>
<td>$1,230</td>
<td>$1,172</td>
<td>$1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>$804</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>$744</td>
<td>$818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in Same Home 5 Years Ago</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Years in Same Home</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Household Head</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Households with Foreign Born Head or Spouse</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households by Type:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Family Households</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Married-Couple</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Single-Parent</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Nonfamily Households</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Householder Living Alone</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Households:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 1 Person</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 2 Persons</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 3 Persons</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 4 Persons</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 5+ Persons</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Cars</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Households with Computers</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% with Internet Connection</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Household Income Distribution:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Under $15,000</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $15,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $30,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $50,000 to $69,999</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $70,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% $100,000+</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Median Household Income</td>
<td>$66,085</td>
<td>$70,515</td>
<td>$50,325</td>
<td>$65,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Households Spending More Than 25% of Income on Housing Costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Insufficient data for reliable estimates.
1 Those of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

Source: 1997 Census Update Survey; Montgomery County Planning Dept, Research and Technology Center, July 1999.
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