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Report To Goodwill Industries
On Characteristics of Proposed Store
Site at 60th and Ames

by
Center for Applied Urban Research

December, 1981
Prologue

The Center for Applied Urban Research compiled this brief report on behalf of Goodwill Industries, Inc. The report examines several demographic characteristics of the area surrounding a proposed Goodwill store site at 60th and Ames Streets in Omaha.

The study area includes all census tracts which fall within a two mile radius of the proposed site, and covers an area of approximately sixteen square miles. The thirteen census tracts in the study area lay predominantly within the Omaha city limits (with the exception of the northern end of Census Tract 63 and 65.02 and the northwestern corner of Census Tract 65.01).

Data for the report was compiled by census tract. The data sources included the 1980 Census of Population and Housing, and the City of Omaha's Intercensal Estimating System (ICES).

Introduction

The study area examined may be considered "transitional" in many respects. That is, there are significant differences in many of the demographic characteristics across the area. The variations occur from east to west or north to south, and include such variables as population change, age of population, size of households, income, and racial composition.

Population Numbers and Change

The study area included 69,279 residents in 1980, over the 13 Census Tracts examined (See Maps). (The U.S. Bureau of the Census
constructs census tracts to include approximately 4,000 residents each.) That residential population constituted 17 percent of the total Douglas County population in 1980. The density of population averaged to approximately 4,330 persons per square mile, over the roughly 16 square mile area.

The study area lost population from 1970 to 1980. (See table and maps.) The loss amounted to 7,684 fewer residents in 1980 than in 1970. However, that 10 percent loss was distributed unevenly across the total area. While most census tracts (10 of the 13) lost population during the decade, losses by tract varied from 8 percent to nearly 26 percent of 1970 populations. In addition, tracts with population gains were all located to the northwest, while the greatest losses occurred south of the central part of the study area.

The study area's population loss during the 1970's was due to an excess of residential out-movement over in-movement. However, each census tract did gain population due to "natural change" (births in excess of deaths). The tracts with greatest gains due to natural change exceeded the county's 8.9 percent gain and lay predominantly in the north and east sections of the area. The location of those gains due to natural change reflect the location of the more youthful population, as well as the childbearing subgroup.

Population and Buying Power

Household size, as well as total population numbers is a good indicator of market potential of an area. (See table and map.) All but one census tract within the study area had average household sizes in excess of the Douglas County average of 2.66 persons per
household. Tracts with the largest household size occurred both to the east and to the far northwest in the study area, and the tract with smallest household size was located in the southwest.

Income is perhaps the best indicator of buying power. (See table and map.) Because the latest (1980) data on income will not be released by the US Bureau of the Census until Spring, 1982, estimates of income computed by the City of Omaha for 1977 were examined. The individual tract data was compared to the city-wide median income, which equaled $16,178 in 1977. As an indication of relatively lower income, the census tracts to the far east of the study area fell farthest below the city-wide median for 1977. As an indicator of relatively higher income, the two northwestern tracts had median incomes most above the city-wide median.

Owner-occupancy of housing structures (units) may also lend information on both buying power and type of goods desired. (See table and map.) Owner-occupants are typically less mobile and are far more likely to invest in their residences than are renters. All tracts within the study area had owner-occupancy rates in excess of the City of Omaha's 57 percent average. In addition, much of the area had owner-occupancy above 70 percent, and rates above 80 percent exist in the southcentral and northwest part of the study area.

Population Characteristics and Buying Preferences

Populations can be classified in a number of ways to gain insights into buying preferences. In addition to a few of the variables discussed above, the "older" population (65 or more years of age), and race-ethnic population groups were examined
as subgroups which should exhibit specific preferences. (See
 table and maps.)

The older population examined here by census tract is estimated
for 1980 by the City of Omaha. The only 1980 Census data by age
available for Nebraska to date are the state-wide figures. Thirteen
percent of Nebraska's population is over age sixty-five. Seven of
the thirteen census tracts examined have older populations equal to
or greater than that state-wide figure. In addition, those tracts
with the greatest percentage of older residents (up to 19.8 percent
of all residents) lay south of the central point in the study area,
and those with the fewest older residents lay to the north within
study area.

Several racial-ethnic groups are present within the study area,
including Indians and persons of Spanish origin. The largest
single group, however, is Black Americans. Six of the thirteen
tracts examined have proportions of Blacks greater than the city-wide
average of 12.1 percent. Proportions range from 0.4 percent to 71.6
percent Black, and the Black population varies across the study
area from higher proportions in the east and northeast to lower
proportions in the southwest.

Summary

The demographic data compiled here are intended to assist
Goodwill Industries in evaluating the site at 60th and Ames Streets
for possible development. In general, the data analyzed exhibits
areal variations from east to west and north to south.

The southeast is experiencing population loss, and the northwest
population gain. Increase due to natural change is more substantial to the northeast, and older Omahans are more numerous in the south and southwest. Households are relatively large throughout the area, but particularly to the extreme east. Incomes increase from east to west and northwest, but home ownership is prevalent throughout the area. In addition, sizeable minority populations, especially Blacks, lie to the east-northeast within the area.
### TABLE 1

**SELECTED DEMOGRAPHICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 Census Tracts Examined</th>
<th>Population Change 1970-80</th>
<th>Components of Population Change</th>
<th>Older Population (Age 65 or more)</th>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Population No. %</td>
<td>Natural Increase Mobility</td>
<td>Persons Per Household No. %</td>
<td>Median IncomeNo. %</td>
<td>%Change 1970-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner Occupied Households No. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>-543 - 12.4</td>
<td>1,222 3.2 806 81.0</td>
<td>2,045 53.3 1,609 43.5 30 .8</td>
<td>95 2.5 69.4 - 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>-948 - 14.8</td>
<td>2,222 2.8 1,807 81.3</td>
<td>5,316 97.3 91 1.7 12 .2</td>
<td>47 9 480.8 - 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>-662 - 17.9</td>
<td>1,772 2.7 1,385 78.2</td>
<td>4,360 98.8 16 4 - - -</td>
<td>26 6 700 - 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>-948 - 16.8</td>
<td>1,738 2.8 1,379 79.3</td>
<td>4,446 96.0 179 3.8 9 .2</td>
<td>68 1.5 2,457 - 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>-662 - 16.7</td>
<td>1,938 2.8 1,320 68.1</td>
<td>3,456 71.7 1,281 28.2 17 .4</td>
<td>90 1.2 612.4 - 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.01</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>-474 - 13.7</td>
<td>964 3.4 694 68.9</td>
<td>1,163 71.8 82 28.2 17 .4</td>
<td>90 1.2 612.4 - 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>-1,533 - 25.7</td>
<td>1,525 3.2 1,161 76.1</td>
<td>2,456 55.3 1,691 42.6 42 .9</td>
<td>111 2.5 200.2 - 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.01</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>-399 - 11.6</td>
<td>935 3.5 630 69.3</td>
<td>1,452 47.6 1,533 50.2 37 .2</td>
<td>44 1.4 881.1 + 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>-380 - 10.4</td>
<td>3,372 2.9 2,374 70.4</td>
<td>6,740 69.2 2,879 23.5 22 .2</td>
<td>93 1.0 1,462.2 +3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>-1203 - 18.6</td>
<td>2,016 2.9 1,710 64.8</td>
<td>5,480 96.8 51 .9 16 .3</td>
<td>115 2.0 59.4 - 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.01</td>
<td>7,262</td>
<td>219 3.1 58.8</td>
<td>2,469 2.9 1,847 73.9</td>
<td>7,117 98.0 78 1.1 12 .2</td>
<td>57 8 310.5 +31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.02</td>
<td>5,554</td>
<td>153 2.8 11.7</td>
<td>1,612 3.4 1,448 98.9</td>
<td>8,024 98.1 595 10.7 22 .4</td>
<td>13 2 925.9 +69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.01</td>
<td>7,356</td>
<td>655 - 8.2</td>
<td>3,101 2.5 1,802 58.1</td>
<td>7,223 98.2 61 .8 16 .2</td>
<td>74 1.0 256.8 +40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.02</td>
<td>4,729</td>
<td>282 6.3</td>
<td>7.6 - 10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparative Figures**

| Omaha County Average | Omaha County | Omaha County | Omaha County | Omaha County
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311.681</td>
<td>-10.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a/ Information on households population 65 or over, and housing units for 1980 is derived from the Intercensal Estimating System (ICES), provided by the City of Omaha Planning Department and the Housing and Community Development Department.

*b/ Persons per household calculated for Omaha city limits only.

*c/ Median Income figures are for 1977.

*d/ Census Tracts 66.01 and 66.02 were the same tract in 1970 but were split in 1980.
Population Change, 1970-80, As A Percent

- 15% or more loss
- 10 to 14.9% loss

Natural Change In Population, Percent

- More than 10% gain

Persons Per Household, 1980

- Less than county average
- Greater than 3.0

Median Income, 1977, By Census Tract

- Less than county median
- $4,000 or more below county median
Percent of Units Owner-occupied
- 70 to 79.9 percent
- 80 or more percent

Percent of Population Elderly
- 10 to 14.9 percent
- 15 or more percent

Black Population As Percent of Total
- 10 to 24.9 percent
- 25 to 49.9 percent
- 50 or more percent

Housing Unit Change, 1970-80, As Perce
- 5.0 to 50 % gain
- More than 50 % gain
- More than 50 % loss