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## 2010 CENSUS Age Characteristics

## Introduction

The Department of Planning and Zoning's previous Research Report, Issue 19, provided a summary of the 2010 Census results for Howard County. In that report, data regarding population, age, race, housing, household type and relationship information were summarized.

This current report, Issue 20, discusses age in more detail and includes comparisons between different locations within the County. Furthermore, Howard County is compared to regional, state, and national figures.

## Howard County Compared to Maryland and U.S.

The figures below summarize the 2010 population by age in Howard County compared to Maryland and the United States. Both narrow and wide age cohorts are shown to provide various levels of detail as well as to provide data to serve a range of needs (Figure 1). For example, the 55 and older cohort would apply to the "active adult" community defined in the Howard County Zoning Regulations, whereas the 65 and older cohort applies to what is commonly thought of as the "typical" retirement age.

Overall, the Howard County population has a greater percentage of school-aged children (age 5 to 19) than the State of Maryland and the U.S. as a whole (Figure 2). The County also has a greater percentage of residents aged 35 to 59, a large portion of which are the parents of the larger school-aged cohort. This reflects Howard County's status as a "bedroom community," with a strong draw for families with children to the County's reputable school system, low crime rate, nice built environment and other amenities. This trend is typical of growing suburbs around the country.

The percentage of Howard County's under 5 population is slightly less than the State and the U.S. which may be an indication that the percentage of the school age population in Howard County in the near future may decrease relative to where it has been. These trends should be watched closely as the population ages and future migration patterns emerge.

Total 2010 Population by Age

| Age | United States |  | Maryland |  | Howard County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Under 5 | 20,201,362 | 6.5\% | 364,488 | 6.3\% | 17,363 | 6.0\% |
| 5 to 9 | 20,348,657 | 6.6\% | 366,868 | 6.4\% | 20,557 | 7.2\% |
| 10 to 14 | 20,677,194 | 6.7\% | 379,029 | 6.6\% | 22,451 | 7.8\% |
| 15 to 19 | 22,040,343 | 7.1\% | 406,241 | 7.0\% | 20,352 | 7.1\% |
| 20 to 24 | 21,585,999 | 7.0\% | 393,698 | 6.8\% | 14,727 | 5.1\% |
| 25 to 29 | 21,101,849 | 6.8\% | 393,548 | 6.8\% | 17,729 | 6.2\% |
| 30 to 34 | 19,962,099 | 6.5\% | 368,494 | 6.4\% | 17,632 | 6.1\% |
| 35 to 39 | 20,179,642 | 6.5\% | 377,409 | 6.5\% | 19,716 | 6.9\% |
| 40 to 44 | 20,890,964 | 6.8\% | 418,163 | 7.2\% | 23,157 | 8.1\% |
| 45 to 49 | 22,708,591 | 7.4\% | 461,585 | 8.0\% | 26,164 | 9.1\% |
| 50 to 54 | 22,298,125 | 7.2\% | 440,619 | 7.6\% | 23,421 | 8.2\% |
| 55 to 59 | 19,664,805 | 6.4\% | 377,989 | 6.5\% | 19,178 | 6.7\% |
| 60 to 64 | 16,817,924 | 5.4\% | 317,779 | 5.5\% | 15,593 | 5.4\% |
| 65 to 69 | 12,435,263 | 4.0\% | 226,596 | 3.9\% | 10,770 | 3.8\% |
| 70 to 74 | 9,278,166 | 3.0\% | 159,761 | 2.8\% | 6,846 | 2.4\% |
| 75 to 79 | 7,317,795 | 2.4\% | 124,579 | 2.2\% | 4,823 | 1.7\% |
| 80 to 84 | 5,743,327 | 1.9\% | 98,580 | 1.7\% | 3,454 | 1.2\% |
| 85 to 89 | 3,620,459 | 1.2\% | 64,771 | 1.1\% | 2,086 | 0.7\% |
| 90 and Over | 1,872,974 | 0.6\% | 33,355 | 0.6\% | 1,066 | 0.4\% |
| Total | 308,745,538 | 100\% | 5,773,552 | 100\% | 287,085 | 100\% |

Youth and School-Aged Population

| Under 5 | $20,201,362$ | $6.5 \%$ | 364,488 | $6.3 \%$ | 17,363 | $6.0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 to 9 | $20,348,657$ | $6.6 \%$ | 366,868 | $6.4 \%$ | 20,557 | $7.2 \%$ |
| 10 to 14 | $20,677,194$ | $6.7 \%$ | 379,029 | $6.6 \%$ | 22,451 | $7.8 \%$ |
| 15 to 19 | $22,040,343$ | $7.1 \%$ | 406,241 | $7.0 \%$ | 20,352 | $\mathbf{7 . 1 \%}$ |
| Sub-Total | $\mathbf{8 3 , 2 6 7 , 5 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 . 0} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 6 , 6 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{8 0 , 7 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 1 \%}$ |

## Adult Population

| 20 to 24 | $21,585,999$ | $7.0 \%$ | 393,698 | $6.8 \%$ | 14,727 | $5.1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 25 to 29 | $21,101,849$ | $6.8 \%$ | 393,548 | $6.8 \%$ | 17,729 | $6.2 \%$ |
| 30 to 34 | $19,962,099$ | $6.5 \%$ | 368,494 | $6.4 \%$ | 17,632 | $6.1 \%$ |
| 35 to 39 | $20,179,642$ | $6.5 \%$ | 377,409 | $6.5 \%$ | 19,716 | $6.9 \%$ |
| 40 to 44 | $20,890,964$ | $6.8 \%$ | 418,163 | $7.2 \%$ | 23,157 | $8.1 \%$ |
| 45 to 49 | $22,708,591$ | $7.4 \%$ | 461,585 | $8.0 \%$ | 26,164 | $9.1 \%$ |
| 50 to 54 | $22,298,125$ | $7.2 \%$ | 440,619 | $7.6 \%$ | 23,421 | $8.2 \%$ |
| Sub-Total | $\mathbf{1 4 8 , 7 2 7 , 2 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 5 3 , 5 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 2 , 5 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 7 \%}$ |

## Eligibility for Age Restricted Housing in Howard County

| 55 and Older | $76,750,713$ | $24.9 \%$ | $1,403,410$ | $24.3 \%$ | 63,816 | $22.2 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 60 and Older | $57,085,908$ | $18.5 \%$ | $1,025,421$ | $17.8 \%$ | 44,638 | $15.5 \%$ |
| 65 and Older | $40,267,984$ | $13.0 \%$ | 707,642 | $12.3 \%$ | 29,045 | $10.1 \%$ |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Figure 1: 2010 Population Breakdown

Howard County Population Compared to Maryland and the U.S.

| Age | Howard County $\%$ <br> Population | Population Compared to <br> Maryland | Population Compared to <br> United States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 <br> 5 to 9 | $6.0 \%$ | 0.96 | 0.92 |
| 10 to 14 | $7.2 \%$ | 1.13 | 1.09 |
| 15 to 19 | $7.8 \%$ | 1.19 | 1.17 |
| 20 to 24 | $7.1 \%$ | 1.01 | 0.99 |
| 25 to 29 | $5.1 \%$ | 0.75 | 0.73 |
| 30 to 34 | $6.2 \%$ | 0.91 | 0.90 |
| 35 to 39 | $6.1 \%$ | 0.96 | 0.95 |
| 40 to 44 | $6.9 \%$ | 1.05 | 1.05 |
| 45 to 49 | $8.1 \%$ | 1.11 | 1.19 |
| 50 to 54 | $9.1 \%$ | 1.14 | 1.24 |
| 55 to 59 | $8.2 \%$ | 1.07 | 1.13 |
| 60 to 64 | $6.7 \%$ | 1.02 | 1.05 |
| 65 to 69 | $5.4 \%$ | 0.99 | 1.00 |
| 70 to 74 | $3.8 \%$ | 0.96 | 0.93 |
| 75 to 79 | $2.4 \%$ | 0.86 | 0.79 |
| 80 to 84 | $1.7 \%$ | 0.78 | 0.71 |
| 85 to 89 | $1.2 \%$ | 0.70 | 0.65 |
| 90 and over | $0.7 \%$ | 0.65 | 0.62 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
*GREEN indicates the Howard County population cohort share of the total county population is greater than that of the state and U.S. and RED indicates it is less. The values are derived by dividing the county percent share by the state and U.S. percent shares.

Figure 2: Population Compared to Maryland and the U.S.

Figure 3 below summarizes the ten year growth by age cohort from 2000 to 2010 for Howard County, the State of Maryland, and the U.S. Whereas the overall population of the U.S. increased by 9.7 percent over the ten years, Maryland's population increased by 9.0 percent and Howard County's population increased by a larger 15.8 percent.

The red numbers in Figure 3 highlight ten year population declines for specific age cohorts, and Figure 4 shows the cohort changes graphically. All three geographies had declines in the 30 to 34,35 to 29, and 40 to 44 age cohorts. Howard County had greater percentage decreases in the younger 20 to 34 and 35 to 39 age cohorts compared to both Maryland and the U.S., whereas the decrease in the 40 to 44 age cohort was not as much by comparison. This larger decrease in the 20 to 39 age group could be a result of relatively higher housing prices in Howard County over the last decade as first time home buyers move to less expensive areas.

Overall, however, the major factor in the declining population in the 30 to 44 age cohorts in Howard County and throughout the U.S. is a result of smaller numbers of residents that were born after the end of the baby boom in 1964. Those born in 1965 turned 45 in 2010. The oldest boomers, born in 1946, turned 64 in 2010. So baby boomers moved up into the 45 to 64 age cohorts over the last ten years, which is clearly shown by the large percentage increases for those cohorts in Figure 3. Other significant percentage increases occurred for those older than 80 years of age. Howard County, in particular, saw very large percent increases for residents aged 80 and over. Figure 4 shows the absolute growth by cohort for Howard County.

Population Change by Age From 2000 to 2010

| Age | United States |  | Maryland |  | Howard County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Under 5 | 1,025,564 | 5.3\% | 11,095 | 3.1\% | (885) | -4.8\% |
| 5 to 9 | $(200,848)$ | -1.0\% | $(24,450)$ | -6.2\% | (161) | -0.8\% |
| 10 to 14 | 149,122 | 0.7\% | $(13,106)$ | -3.3\% | 2,602 | 13.1\% |
| 15 to 19 | 1,820,453 | 9.0\% | 50,122 | 14.1\% | 5,082 | 33.3\% |
| 20 to 24 | 2,621,998 | 13.8\% | 79,569 | 25.3\% | 3,694 | 33.5\% |
| 25 to 29 | 1,720,513 | 8.9\% | 50,678 | 14.8\% | 1,735 | 10.8\% |
| 30 to 34 | $(548,289)$ | -2.7\% | $(37,157)$ | -9.2\% | $(2,893)$ | -14.1\% |
| 35 to 39 | $(2,527,022)$ | -11.1\% | $(87,379)$ | -18.8\% | $(5,405)$ | -21.5\% |
| 40 to 44 | $(1,550,899)$ | -6.9\% | $(33,205)$ | -7.4\% | (382) | -1.6\% |
| 45 to 49 | 2,616,187 | 13.0\% | 62,195 | 15.6\% | 5,788 | 28.4\% |
| 50 to 54 | 4,712,577 | 26.8\% | 84,977 | 23.9\% | 5,475 | 30.5\% |
| 55 to 59 | 6,195,568 | 46.0\% | 109,342 | 40.7\% | 6,561 | 52.0\% |
| 60 to 64 | 6,012,477 | 55.6\% | 116,050 | 57.5\% | 7,455 | 91.6\% |
| 65 to 69 | 2,901,718 | 30.4\% | 58,354 | 34.7\% | 5,063 | 88.7\% |
| 70 to 74 | 420,725 | 4.7\% | 6,718 | 4.4\% | 2,183 | 46.8\% |
| 75 to 79 | $(98,018)$ | -1.3\% | $(3,912)$ | -3.0\% | 1,295 | 36.7\% |
| 80 to 84 | 797,960 | 16.1\% | 15,951 | 19.3\% | 1,027 | 42.3\% |
| 85 to 89 | 830,641 | 29.8\% | 20,556 | 46.5\% | 723 | 53.0\% |
| 90 and over | 423,205 | 29.2\% | 10,668 | 47.0\% | 286 | 36.7\% |
| Change | 27,323,632 | 9.7\% | 477,066 | 9.0\% | 39,243 | 15.8\% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Figure 3: Population Change from 2000 to 2010


Figure 4: Howard County Population Change from 2000 to 2010

## Exploring Population Further - Population Pyramids

Another visualization tool useful in showing demographic trends is a population pyramid, which shows population by age cohorts separated by gender. Refer to Figures 5 through 10 below.

Howard County, like Maryland and the U.S. as a whole, has a greater percentage of male children than female children, and conversely, a greater percentage of elderly women than elderly men. Birth rates for boys are greater than that of girls, but typically women have a longer life expectancy than men. Overall, the percentage difference between men and women are very small and are generally no more than one to two tenths of a percent.

Similar to national and state trends, the population in Howard County is aging and "pushing upward" in the pyramid as one can observe when comparing the decade change from 2000 to 2010 (Figures 9 and 10). Compared to Maryland and the U.S. Howard County's pyramid shows more pronounced population "bulges" clearly showing population growth and loss at specific stages in life. For example, young to middle-aged adults with children move to the county due to its highly rated school system, and then after high school graduation a high percentage of that age group leaves the county during their college years.


Figure 5: 2010 U.S. Population by Age \& Gender


Figure 6: 2000 U.S. Population by Age \& Gender


Figure 7: 2010 Maryland Population by Age \& Gender


Figure 8: 2000 Maryland Population by Age \& Gender

Howard County 2010 Population by Age \& Gender


Figure 9: 2010 Howard County Population by Age \& Gender


Figure 10: 2000 Howard County Population by Age \& Gender

The aging or the population has been a frequent topic of discussion in the press and among policy makers both nationally and locally. The discussion has focused on the baby boomers, defined as those born between 1946 and 1964, which currently make up a significant share of the population. Howard County is no exception. To quote from the report, 2000 Census Age Characteristics, prepared by DPZ in April, 2002 (Research Report Issue 5):
"those who currently make up the greatest percentage of the total population... will slide into the older age cohorts."

It should come as no surprise, and is clearly shown in the charts above, that this is exactly what has happened. In 2000, with almost 87,000 residents, the baby boomers made up 35 percent of the total population in Howard County. In 2010 they were 30 percent of the total (about 84,000 residents). This trend, if it continues with county residents deciding to age in place, is likely to have the single biggest impact on the future social, economic and fiscal structure of the county. In 2000 the largest age cohort was 35 to 39 (Figure 10). Ten years later by 2010 the largest age cohort was 45 to 49 (Figure 9). By 2020 the baby boomers will be between the ages of 56 and 74 years old.

This aging of the population has been recognized for some time now. Howard County's 2000 General Plan included several policies to ensure adequate housing and services to accommodate
future needs for aging county residents, and subsequent action has been taken on these policies. The Howard County Zoning Regulations were amended to include a new Planned Senior Community (PSC) District in addition to other changes to address the needs for senior housing. In addition, an annual 250 unit "set-aside" for senior housing in eligible areas of the county's water and sewer Planned Service Area was added to the Adequate Public Facilities allocations chart. Since these changes were put in place, almost 2,500 age-restricted homes have been built in the county, about 1 in every 5 new homes.

Howard County's pattern of population growth generally follows both statewide and national trends with some idiosyncrasies. For example, both national and state trends show an increase in the number of children under five, whereas Howard County's under 5 populations decreased by almost 5 percent. Another notable difference is the 75 to 79 age cohort which increased in Howard County yet decreased at the national and statewide level.

## Intra-State and Regional Comparisons

Figure 11 and Map 1 below show the median age in the year 2010 for each jurisdiction in Maryland. The average age in Maryland is 38 years old. In Howard County, the average age is a slightly higher 38.4 years old. This is a change from the last Census in 2000 when the median age in Howard County at 35.5 years old was less than the Maryland median age of 36 years old. Overall, the median age across the State has risen over the last ten years as the population has aged.

Based on the 2010 Census results, Howard County has the $8^{\text {th }}$ youngest population in Maryland (tied with Anne Arundel County). This ranks Howard in the lower third of the 24 jurisdictions in Maryland in terms of its median age. Baltimore City has the youngest population in the State with a median age of only 34.4. By contrast, Worchester County on the eastern shore has the oldest population with a median age of 48.1 years old in 2010. This represents a significant age range of about 14 years. Several other eastern shore counties as well as Garrett, Allegany and Washington counties in the west have relatively older populations compared to the Statewide average.

In general, with only a few exceptions, the more central counties in the State tend to have younger populations. These are also the counties that have experience the greatest population increases during the decade. The nine central jurisdictions - Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, Carroll, Frederick, Prince George's, Harford, Anne Arundel, and Baltimore City - had a total population growth of 348,709 residents, 73.1 percent of the total statewide growth of 477,066 residents (even including Baltimore City's population decline of 30,193). By contrast, the six counties with the greatest median ages in the State had a total population growth of only 19,468 residents. This is approximately 4 percent of the total 477,066 in statewide growth. This follows expected patterns, with new residents and new families with children moving to the stronger job growth areas in central Maryland.


Figure 11: 2010 Median Age by Maryland Jurisdiction

## Median Age by <br> Maryland Jurisdiction in 2010



Legend (Equal Interval)

| 45.5 TO 48.1 YEARS OLD |
| :---: |
| 42.7 TO 45.4 YEARS OLD |
| 40.0 TO 42.6 YEARS OLD |
| 37.2 TO 39.9 YEARS OLD |
| 34.4 TO 37.1 YEARS OLD |



Map 1: 2010 Median Age by Maryland Jurisdiction

Figure 12 and Map 2 below compare the percentage of those 65 and older for all jurisdictions in the State. Howard County has the third smallest percentage with only 10.1 percent of its population aged 65 and older in 2010. The statewide average in 2010 was 12.3 percent, up from 11.3 percent in 2000. The greatest percentage in 2010 is in Talbot County with 23.7 percent of its population aged 65 and older. In general, the same trend from 2000 is continuing to hold true, with the more central and faster growing counties in the state having relatively smaller concentrations of older residents. Most every jurisdiction is increasing in age. A notable exception in central Maryland is Baltimore City. The median age in Baltimore City has decreased from 35 in 2000 to 34.4 years old in 2010, and its percentage of 65 and over population has decreased from 13.2 percent to 11.7 percent over the same time period.

Although Howard County currently has one of the smallest percentages of older residents in the state, it is poised to have one of the most rapidly aging populations. The single biggest factor impacting the degree to which the population will age is whether or not residents decide to age in place or move out of the county. Current trends suggest that people tend to want to age in place, and the County's recently revised zoning and subdivision regulations are aimed to both support and encourage this. How future social and economic pressures and choices alter this trend, to a lesser or greater degree, will dictate the rapidity and extent of this phenomenon and resulting impacts.


Figure 12: 2010 Percent of Population Age 65 and Over by MD Jurisdiction

# Percent Population 65+ by Maryland Jurisdiction in 2010 



Map 2: 2010 Percent Population 65 and Over by Maryland Jurisdiction

The charts below show the age breakdown in 2010 for neighboring counties as well as Baltimore City. The first chart (Figure 13) shows the absolute age characteristics and the second (Figure 14) shows the percentage of total for each of the nine local jurisdictions. These nine jurisdictions also have the largest populations in the State in the order shown.

Montgomery County has the largest total population with 941,777 residents in 2010. However, despite Montgomery's greatest total population, Baltimore County has almost as many residents 65 years and older, with only 3,000 less. This is an indication of Baltimore County's relatively older population.

A similar anomaly occurs for Howard County. Howard County is the sixth most populous jurisdiction in the region (and the state) with 287,085 residents in 2010. However, Harford County with a smaller total population of 244,826 actually has more residents aged 65 and older. Carroll County, with almost 120,000 less total residents than Howard, has only about 7,000 less residents that are 65 and older. This shows the extent of Howard County's relatively young population.


Figure 13: 2010 Population by Age in Central Maryland Jurisdictions


Figure 14: 2010 Percent Population by Age in Central Maryland Jurisdictions

## Comparisons Within Howard County - Year 2010

The tables below summarize the 2010 population by age in Howard County by Regional Planning District (RPD): Columbia, Cooksville, Clarksville, Elkridge, Ellicott City, West Friendship and Laurel. (See the maps beginning on Page 20 for a view of the RPDs.) The first table (Figure 15) shows the population by age cohort for each RPD and the next two tables (Figures 16 and 17) show the percentage breakdowns.

For Figures 16 and 17 the percentages in red are those percentages that are less than the total percentage for the associated category, and the percentages in green are those percentages that are greater than the total percentage for the associated category. For example, as shown in Figure 16, 16.8 percent of all children under 5 in the County live in Elkridge. This is greater than the 14 percent of total County residents who live in Elkridge. These variations, although minor, do show the relative concentrations by age in the County between regions.

Generally, the differences between percentages are small, but patterns become apparent in the tables. For example, concentrations of red in Laurel and Elkridge for the higher age brackets indicate that, relatively speaking, there is less of a propensity for older residents to live in these regions as a whole compared to the other regions. The thematic maps further below (beginning on Page 20) show variations by census tract which depict even smaller areas within each RPD.

Figure 18 shows Howard County's population by broader age groups for each RPD graphically. Columbia, which has the greatest population, also has the largest population in each age category. This is generally the pattern followed by all the other regions as well. Unlike racial characteristics, as discussed in Research Report Issue 19, where there tends to be concentrations of races in certain regions, similar concentrations by age are less apparent, as would be expected. Minor variations or concentrations do exist, however, as indicated in the percentages in the tables as well as the maps beginning on Page 20.

These maps show a more detailed breakdown of the 2010 population in Howard County at the census tract level. The first map (Map 3) shows the median age shown thematically at equal intervals. The median age ranges from 30.9 to 46.3 years old. The subsequent maps show the populations by various age cohorts - the darker the shade the greater the number. For each pair, the first map displays the total populations and the second map shows the population densities. The density maps better show the population concentrations by normalizing the results given census tracts vary in acreage and also display a random series of dots that represent a certain number of residents as indicated in the map legend. (The dots are representative and do not show an actual location such as an address.) The following summarizes some of the observations:

- Younger populations live in Elkridge, Laurel and parts of Columbia. These areas have some of the smallest median age characteristics as well as higher concentrations of children under 5.
- Relatively older populations live in Clarksville, the older and more central parts of Columbia and parts of Ellicott City. Other areas in western Howard County, including the Cooksville and West Friendship areas, also have relatively older populations.
(410) 313-4370
- School age children, those 5 to 19, being a larger age cohort are more evenly distributed throughout the County. Relatively larger numbers of this age group live in parts of Laurel, Columbia, Elkridge and Ellicott City.
- The next cohort displayed in the maps, 20 to 54 year olds, also have concentrations in parts Laurel, Elkridge, Ellicott City and Columbia. This cohort includes the parents of the children discussed above.
- There is a relatively greater concentration of residents 55 and older in the western part of the County as well as higher concentrations in the older communities in Columbia, Elkridge, Laurel and Ellicott City.
- Maps 12 and 13 show concentrations of residents 90 and over. Higher concentrations of this cohort live parts of west Columbia and Ellicott City.


## Howard County Population by Age by Regional Planning District - 2010

| Age | Elkridge | Ellicott City | West Friendship | Cooksville | Clarksville | Columbia | Laurel | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 | 2,915 | 3,533 | 669 | 567 | 688 | 6,307 | 2,684 | 17,363 |
| 5 to 9 | 3,250 | 4,680 | 1,134 | 1,045 | 1,196 | 6,466 | 2,786 | 20,557 |
| 10 to 14 | 3,099 | 5,050 | 1,402 | 1,435 | 1,786 | 6,708 | 2,971 | 22,451 |
| 15 to 19 | 2,535 | 4,643 | 1,281 | 1,219 | 1,568 | 6,282 | 2,824 | 20,352 |
| 20 to 24 | 2,232 | 2,934 | 614 | 587 | 765 | 5,430 | 2,165 | 14,727 |
| 25 to 29 | 3,323 | 3,042 | 421 | 372 | 461 | 7,473 | 2,637 | 17,729 |
| 30 to 34 | 3,332 | 3,022 | 392 | 318 | 421 | 7,350 | 2,797 | 17,632 |
| 35 to 39 | 3,414 | 4,105 | 742 | 650 | 724 | 7,149 | 2,932 | 19,716 |
| 40 to 44 | 3,742 | 5,021 | 1,318 | 1,149 | 1,320 | 7,375 | 3,232 | 23,157 |
| 45 to 49 | 3,713 | 5,838 | 1,605 | 1,570 | 1,963 | 7,924 | 3,551 | 26,164 |
| 50 to 54 | 2,862 | 5,330 | 1,471 | 1,416 | 1,900 | 7,378 | 3,064 | 23,421 |
| 55 to 59 | 1,875 | 4,652 | 1,246 | 1,066 | 1,492 | 6,576 | 2,271 | 19,178 |
| 60 to 64 | 1,421 | 3,570 | 1,168 | 871 | 1,133 | 5,882 | 1,548 | 15,593 |
| 65 to 69 | 917 | 2,410 | 915 | 653 | 806 | 4,135 | 934 | 10,770 |
| 70 to 74 | 586 | 1,621 | 574 | 392 | 519 | 2,528 | 626 | 6,846 |
| 75 to 79 | 426 | 1,264 | 441 | 257 | 382 | 1,651 | 402 | 4,823 |
| 80 to 84 | 288 | 1,056 | 248 | 183 | 237 | 1,191 | 251 | 3,454 |
| 85 to 89 | 173 | 585 | 99 | 108 | 159 | 812 | 150 | 2,086 |
| 90 and Over | 39 | 341 | 46 | 41 | 82 | 468 | 49 | 1,066 |
| Total | 40,142 | 62,697 | 15,786 | 13,899 | 17,602 | 99,085 | 37,874 | 287,085 |

## Youth and School-Aged Population

| Under 5 | 2,915 | 3,533 | 669 | 567 | 688 | 6,307 | 2,684 | 17,363 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 to 9 | 3,250 | 4,680 | 1,134 | 1,045 | 1,196 | 6,466 | 2,786 | 20,557 |
| 10 to 14 | 3,099 | 5,050 | 1,402 | 1,435 | 1,786 | 6,708 | 2,971 | 22,451 |
| 15 to 19 | 2,535 | 4,643 | 1,281 | 1,219 | 1,568 | 6,282 | 2,824 | 20,352 |
| Sub-Total | 11,799 | 17,906 | 4,486 | 4,266 | 5,238 | 25,763 | 11,265 | 80,723 |

Adult Population

| 20 to 24 | 2,232 | 2,934 | 614 | 587 | 765 | 5,430 | 2,165 | 14,727 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 to 29 | 3,323 | 3,042 | 421 | 372 | 461 | 7,473 | 2,637 | 17,729 |
| 30 to 34 | 3,332 | 3,022 | 392 | 318 | 421 | 7,350 | 2,797 | 17,632 |
| 35 to 39 | 3,414 | 4,105 | 742 | 650 | 724 | 7,149 | 2,932 | 19,716 |
| 40 to 44 | 3,742 | 5,021 | 1,318 | 1,149 | 1,320 | 7,375 | 3,232 | 23,157 |
| 45 to 49 | 3,713 | 5,838 | 1,605 | 1,570 | 1,963 | 7,924 | 3,551 | 26,164 |
| 50 to 54 | 2,862 | 5,330 | 1,471 | 1,416 | 1,900 | 7,378 | 3,064 | 23,421 |
| Sub-Total | 22,618 | 29,292 | 6,563 | 6,062 | 7,554 | 50,079 | 20,378 | 142,546 |

Elgible for Age-Restricted Housing in Howard County

| 55 and Older | 5,725 | 15,499 | 4,737 | 3,571 | 4,810 | 23,243 | 6,231 | 63,816 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60 and Older | 3,850 | 10,847 | 3,491 | 2,505 | 3,318 | 16,667 | 3,960 | 44,638 |
| 65 and Older | 2,429 | 7,277 | 2,323 | 1,634 | 2,185 | 10,785 | 2,412 | 29,045 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Figure 15: 2010 Howard County Population by RPD and Age Cohorts

Howard County Population by Age by Regional Planning District - 2010
(As Percent of Total Population by Age Cohort)

| Age | Elkridge | Ellicott City | West Friendship | Cooksville | Clarksville | Columbia | Laurel | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 | 16.8\% | 20.3\% | 3.9\% | 3.3\% | 4.0\% | 36.3\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| 5 to 9 | 15.8\% | 22.8\% | 5.5\% | 5.1\% | 5.8\% | 31.5\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| 10 to 14 | 13.8\% | 22.5\% | 6.2\% | 6.4\% | 8.0\% | 29.9\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| 15 to 19 | 12.5\% | 22.8\% | 6.3\% | 6.0\% | 7.7\% | 30.9\% | 13.9\% | 100\% |
| 20 to 24 | 15.2\% | 19.9\% | 4.2\% | 4.0\% | 5.2\% | 36.9\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| 25 to 29 | 18.7\% | 17.2\% | 2.4\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 42.2\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| 30 to 34 | 18.9\% | 17.1\% | 2.2\% | 1.8\% | 2.4\% | 41.7\% | 15.9\% | 100\% |
| 35 to 39 | 17.3\% | 20.8\% | 3.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 36.3\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| 40 to 44 | 16.2\% | 21.7\% | 5.7\% | 5.0\% | 5.7\% | 31.8\% | 14.0\% | 100\% |
| 45 to 49 | 14.2\% | 22.3\% | 6.1\% | 6.0\% | 7.5\% | 30.3\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| 50 to 54 | 12.2\% | 22.8\% | 6.3\% | 6.0\% | 8.1\% | 31.5\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| 55 to 59 | 9.8\% | 24.3\% | 6.5\% | 5.6\% | 7.8\% | 34.3\% | 11.8\% | 100\% |
| 60 to 64 | 9.1\% | 22.9\% | 7.5\% | 5.6\% | 7.3\% | 37.7\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| 65 to 69 | 8.5\% | 22.4\% | 8.5\% | 6.1\% | 7.5\% | 38.4\% | 8.7\% | 100\% |
| 70 to 74 | 8.6\% | 23.7\% | 8.4\% | 5.7\% | 7.6\% | 36.9\% | 9.1\% | 100\% |
| 75 to 79 | 8.8\% | 26.2\% | 9.1\% | 5.3\% | 7.9\% | 34.2\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| 80 to 84 | 8.3\% | 30.6\% | 7.2\% | 5.3\% | 6.9\% | 34.5\% | 7.3\% | 100\% |
| 85 to 89 | 8.3\% | 28.0\% | 4.7\% | 5.2\% | 7.6\% | 38.9\% | 7.2\% | 100\% |
| 90 and Over | 3.7\% | 32.0\% | 4.3\% | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 43.9\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |
| Total | 14.0\% | 21.8\% | 5.5\% | 4.8\% | 6.1\% | 34.5\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |

Youth and School-Aged Population

| Under 5 | 16.8\% | 20.3\% | 3.9\% | 3.3\% | 4.0\% | 36.3\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 to 9 | 15.8\% | 22.8\% | 5.5\% | 5.1\% | 5.8\% | 31.5\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| 10 to 14 | 13.8\% | 22.5\% | 6.2\% | 6.4\% | 8.0\% | 29.9\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| 15 to 19 | 12.5\% | 22.8\% | 6.3\% | 6.0\% | 7.7\% | 30.9\% | 13.9\% | 100\% |
| Sub-Total | 14.6\% | 22.2\% | 5.6\% | 5.3\% | 6.5\% | 31.9\% | 14.0\% | 100\% |

Adult Population

| 20 to 24 | 15.2\% | 19.9\% | 4.2\% | 4.0\% | 5.2\% | 36.9\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 to 29 | 18.7\% | 17.2\% | 2.4\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 42.2\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| 30 to 34 | 18.9\% | 17.1\% | 2.2\% | 1.8\% | 2.4\% | 41.7\% | 15.9\% | 100\% |
| 35 to 39 | 17.3\% | 20.8\% | 3.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 36.3\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| 40 to 44 | 16.2\% | 21.7\% | 5.7\% | 5.0\% | 5.7\% | 31.8\% | 14.0\% | 100\% |
| 45 to 49 | 14.2\% | 22.3\% | 6.1\% | 6.0\% | 7.5\% | 30.3\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| 50 to 54 | 12.2\% | 22.8\% | 6.3\% | 6.0\% | 8.1\% | 31.5\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| Sub-Total | 15.9\% | 20.5\% | 4.6\% | 4.3\% | 5.3\% | 35.1\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |

Elgible for Age-Restricted Housing in Howard County

| 55 and Older | 9.0\% | 24.3\% | 7.4\% | 5.6\% | 7.5\% | 36.4\% | 9.8\% | 100\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60 and Older | 8.6\% | 24.3\% | 7.8\% | 5.6\% | 7.4\% | 37.3\% | 8.9\% | 100\% |
| 65 and Older | 8.4\% | 25.1\% | 8.0\% | 5.6\% | 7.5\% | 37.1\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |

Figure 16: 2010 Howard County Population Percentage by RPD

## Howard County Population by Age by Regional Planning District (RPD) - 2010

(As Percent of Total RPD Population by Age Cohort)

| Age | Elkridge | Ellicott City | West Friendship | Cooksville | Clarksville | Columbia | Laurel | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 5 | 7.3\% | 5.6\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 3.9\% | 6.4\% | 7.1\% | 6.0\% |
| 5 to 9 | 8.1\% | 7.5\% | 7.2\% | 7.5\% | 6.8\% | 6.5\% | 7.4\% | 7.2\% |
| 10 to 14 | 7.7\% | 8.1\% | 8.9\% | 10.3\% | 10.1\% | 6.8\% | 7.8\% | 7.8\% |
| 15 to 19 | 6.3\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 8.8\% | 8.9\% | 6.3\% | 7.5\% | 7.1\% |
| 20 to 24 | 5.6\% | 4.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 5.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.1\% |
| 25 to 29 | 8.3\% | 4.9\% | 2.7\% | 2.7\% | 2.6\% | 7.5\% | 7.0\% | 6.2\% |
| 30 to 34 | 8.3\% | 4.8\% | 2.5\% | 2.3\% | 2.4\% | 7.4\% | 7.4\% | 6.1\% |
| 35 to 39 | 8.5\% | 6.5\% | 4.7\% | 4.7\% | 4.1\% | 7.2\% | 7.7\% | 6.9\% |
| 40 to 44 | 9.3\% | 8.0\% | 8.3\% | 8.3\% | 7.5\% | 7.4\% | 8.5\% | 8.1\% |
| 45 to 49 | 9.2\% | 9.3\% | 10.2\% | 11.3\% | 11.2\% | 8.0\% | 9.4\% | 9.1\% |
| 50 to 54 | 7.1\% | 8.5\% | 9.3\% | 10.2\% | 10.8\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 8.2\% |
| 55 to 59 | 4.7\% | 7.4\% | 7.9\% | 7.7\% | 8.5\% | 6.6\% | 6.0\% | 6.7\% |
| 60 to 64 | 3.5\% | 5.7\% | 7.4\% | 6.3\% | 6.4\% | 5.9\% | 4.1\% | 5.4\% |
| 65 to 69 | 2.3\% | 3.8\% | 5.8\% | 4.7\% | 4.6\% | 4.2\% | 2.5\% | 3.8\% |
| 70 to 74 | 1.5\% | 2.6\% | 3.6\% | 2.8\% | 2.9\% | 2.6\% | 1.7\% | 2.4\% |
| 75 to 79 | 1.1\% | 2.0\% | 2.8\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 1.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.7\% |
| 80 to 84 | 0.7\% | 1.7\% | 1.6\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 1.2\% | 0.7\% | 1.2\% |
| 85 to 89 | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% | 0.8\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% |
| 90 and Over | 0.1\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

Youth and School-Aged Population

| Under 5 | 7.3\% | 5.6\% | 4.2\% | 4.1\% | 3.9\% | 6.4\% | 7.1\% | 6.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 to 9 | 8.1\% | 7.5\% | 7.2\% | 7.5\% | 6.8\% | 6.5\% | 7.4\% | 7.2\% |
| 10 to 14 | 7.7\% | 8.1\% | 8.9\% | 10.3\% | 10.1\% | 6.8\% | 7.8\% | 7.8\% |
| 15 to 19 | 6.3\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 8.8\% | 8.9\% | 6.3\% | 7.5\% | 7.1\% |
| Sub-Total | 29.4\% | 28.6\% | 28.4\% | 30.7\% | 29.8\% | 26.0\% | 29.7\% | 28.1\% |

Adult Population

| 20 to 24 | 5.6\% | 4.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.2\% | 4.3\% | 5.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 to 29 | 8.3\% | 4.9\% | 2.7\% | 2.7\% | 2.6\% | 7.5\% | 7.0\% | 6.2\% |
| 30 to 34 | 8.3\% | 4.8\% | 2.5\% | 2.3\% | 2.4\% | 7.4\% | 7.4\% | 6.1\% |
| 35 to 39 | 8.5\% | 6.5\% | 4.7\% | 4.7\% | 4.1\% | 7.2\% | 7.7\% | 6.9\% |
| 40 to 44 | 9.3\% | 8.0\% | 8.3\% | 8.3\% | 7.5\% | 7.4\% | 8.5\% | 8.1\% |
| 45 to 49 | 9.2\% | 9.3\% | 10.2\% | 11.3\% | 11.2\% | 8.0\% | 9.4\% | 9.1\% |
| 50 to 54 | 7.1\% | 8.5\% | 9.3\% | 10.2\% | 10.8\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 8.2\% |
| Sub-Total | 56.3\% | 46.7\% | 41.6\% | 43.6\% | 42.9\% | 50.5\% | 53.8\% | 49.7\% |

Elgible for Age-Restricted Housing in Howard County

| 55 and Older | $14.3 \%$ | $24.7 \%$ | $30.0 \%$ | $25.7 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 2 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60 and OIder | $9.6 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $22.1 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 5 \%}$ |
| 65 and Older | $6.1 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 1 \%}$ |  |

Figure 17: 2010 Howard County Population Percentage by Age Cohort

Howard County 2010 Population Matrix


Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 18: 2010 Howard County Population Matrix by RPD


Map 3: 2010 Median Age by Census Tract



Map 5: 2010 Population by Density - Under 5


Map 6: 2010 Population - School Age (5 to 19)


Map 7: 2010 Population Density - School Age (5 to 19)


Map 8: 2010 Population - Adult (20 to 54)


Map 9: 2010 Population Density - Adult (20 to 54)


Map 10: 2010 Population - Age Restricted (55 and Older)


Map 11: 2010 Population Density - Age Restricted (55 and Older)


Map 12: 2010 Population - 90 and Older


Map 13: 2010 Population Density - 90 and Older

