



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Paratransit Coordination Team  
**Date:** November 8, 2011  
**Subject:** **Funding Formula Data Sources**

### Availability of Data for the Funding Formula

#### Age

Current age data is available at a zip code level from the 2010 Census.

#### Income

Income data is not available in the 2010 Census. Income data is available from the American Community Survey (ACS) 2010 3-year samples for all places >20,000 in population. In Alameda County, these include:

- Alameda
- Ashland CDP (census defined place)
- Berkeley
- Castro Valley CDP (census defined place)
- Dublin
- Fremont
- Hayward
- Livermore
- Newark
- Oakland
- Pleasanton
- San Leandro
- San Lorenzo CDP (census defined place)
- Union City

This represents 92% of the population.

## Disability

Neither 2010 Census data nor ACS 3-year samples can be used for disability because it is not available at the zip code level to cover every city and unincorporated area of the County. Social Security Administration data is no longer available at the zip code level due to privacy concerns.

Staff explored other opportunities for identifying incidence of disability. Data from the American Community Survey (ACS) is available annually, but this is based on a smaller sample than the census data and is not available at a fine-grained enough level, limited to jurisdictions of 65,000 people or more. This only covers 75% of the county, not including small cities or unincorporated areas. Whether this can be used will be further discussed at the meeting.

**Figure 1 Percent of County's disability population residing in each area of the County (American Community Survey)**

	Disability from ACS*
North	53%
Central	19%
South	18%
East	10%

\*Average of 2005-2010 ACS 1-Year Estimates

To check the accuracy of this partial data, we did an analysis of how the disability-related census data that we could obtain correlated to age in the census data. If the percentages are comparable in terms of population, then perhaps the disability data could still be used.

In the analysis, we found the following differences in incidence of disability and aging by planning area:

- North County's population is more heavily urban, so it was expected that there would be a higher proportion of people with disabilities and seniors than the overall population, and that they are overrepresented in the ACS data.
- A higher proportion of Central County's population is in smaller unincorporated areas compared to the other planning areas, so they are underrepresented in the ACS data

The comparison is shown here:

**Figure 2 Comparison of Total Population by Planning Area: American Community Survey vs. Census 2010**

	ACS*	Census 2010
North	46%	41%
Central	18%	24%
South	23%	22%
East	13%	13%

\*Average of 2005-2010 ACS 1-Year Estimates

These discrepancies are even exaggerated for the aging population, a larger portion of North County's seniors are in urban areas, whereas a large portion of Central County's seniors are in unincorporated areas. Therefore North County is even more overrepresented and Central even less, as shown below:

**Figure 3 Comparison of Population Over 65 by Planning Area: American Community Survey vs. Census 2010**

	Over 65 from ACS*	Over 65 from Census 2010
North	50%	43%
Central	18%	25%
South	21%	20%
East	11%	12%

\*Average of 2005-2010 ACS 1-Year Estimates

What does this mean for the validity of the ACS Disability data?

It means that the 53% attributed to North County is likely too high and the 19% attributed to Central County is likely too low.

**Figure 4 Comparison Summary: American Community Survey vs. Census 2010**

	Disability	Aging Population		Total Population	
	Disability from ACS*	Over 65 from ACS*	Over 65 from Census 2010	ACS*	Census 2010
North	53%	50%	43%	46%	41%
Central	19%	18%	25%	18%	24%
South	18%	21%	20%	23%	22%
East	10%	11%	12%	13%	13%

\*Average of 2005-2010 ACS 1-Year Estimates

Given these discrepancies, could aging population (over 65) be used as a surrogate for disability?