8-31-2016

Clatsop County Latinos: A Demographic and Economic Profile

Marisa Zapata
Portland State University, mazapata@pdx.edu

Amanda Hudson
Portland State University

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_fac
Part of the Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons, and the Urban Studies and Planning Commons

Citation Details
https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_fac/172

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Studies and Planning Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.
Clatsop County Latinos: A Demographic and Economic Profile

Marisa A. Zapata, PhD
Assistant Professor
Portland State University

Amanda Hudson
Doctoral Student
Portland State University

August 31, 2016
Acknowledgements

This report was commissioned by the Nathan Cogan Family Fund, administered by the Oregon Jewish Community Foundation, to provide better insight into the lives and needs of Latinos living in Clatsop County, Oregon. Since 2004 Nathan Cogan’s interest in the needs of Hispanic/Latino community housing on the Northwest Coast has been partly sparked by his family’s ownership of a beach home in Cannon Beach. He has collaborated with faculty in PSU’s Urban Studies College to determine, for example, how a NW coast study might possibly contribute to federal, state and county support to improve the endemic housing crisis facing the Coastal area. Mr. Cogan’s personal interest in this work and support of it demonstrates what individuals can do to help support the needs of society’s most vulnerable populations.

We would also like to thank Clatsop County actors whom provided us with data, reports, and interviews. In addition to the two co-authors, Carson Gorecki assisted in data analysis and editing. Any errors in reporting or interpreting the data are the authors’ alone. This report is followed-up by a working paper with recommendations about how Clatsop government actors, particularly planners and community developers, can best serve Latinos living in their jurisdictions.
Latinos in Clatsop County: Existing Conditions

Introduction .................................................................................................................................................. 5

Why this report ............................................................................................................................................. 5

Report Team ................................................................................................................................................. 6

Terminology .................................................................................................................................................. 6

Data Notes .................................................................................................................................................... 6

History of Latinos in Oregon ......................................................................................................................... 7

Present-day Demographics ........................................................................................................................... 9

  Growth rate ............................................................................................................................................... 9

  Population Characteristics ...................................................................................................................... 10

Housing ....................................................................................................................................................... 12

  Homeownership and Renter Occupancy ............................................................................................... 12

  Housing Affordability ............................................................................................................................ 12

  Housing Supply ....................................................................................................................................... 13

  Latinos in Focus ....................................................................................................................................... 15

Economics .................................................................................................................................................... 18

  Poverty .................................................................................................................................................... 18

  Income .................................................................................................................................................... 19

  Employment ............................................................................................................................................ 20

  Types of jobs ........................................................................................................................................... 21

Education .................................................................................................................................................... 23

  Attainment .............................................................................................................................................. 23

  Primary & Secondary Education ........................................................................................................... 23

  Test Scores ............................................................................................................................................. 24

  Dropout Rates ........................................................................................................................................ 26

Health .......................................................................................................................................................... 28

  Insurance Coverage .............................................................................................................................. 28

Transportation ............................................................................................................................................. 30

Conclusion ................................................................................................................................................... 31

Appendix – City Profiles .............................................................................................................................. 32

  City Profile: Astoria, Oregon .................................................................................................................. 32

  City Profile: Cannon Beach, OR ............................................................................................................. 34
Introduction
Demographic change continues at an unprecedented rate across Oregon. In part driven by Latino population growth, the state’s future will include a population that only recently began to call Oregon home. Clatsop County is one area that is experiencing this population change (See Figure 1). Clatsop County has long remained ethnically homogenous. Yet, the rapid growth of the Latino population coincides at a time where the White population decreases in much of the county. There are few reports, describing the needs of the Latino population in the areas of planning and community. This report details several key demographic and economic indicators for the Latino community from secondary data sources to help planners, community developers, and policy makers understand the unique needs of the Hispanic population. The picture these data sources display, tells the story of a young, family oriented community struggling to find affordable housing and economic opportunities.

Figure 1: Clatsop County, OR

Why this report
The purpose of this study is to articulate some of the needs of the Latino community living in Clatsop County, OR. We hope this study serves as an informed starting point to address the challenges Latinos face particularly within the area of urban planning and community development. The project was made possible by a gift from the Nathan Cogan Family Fund, administered by Oregon Jewish Community Foundation. The idea for the study came from observations from Mr. Cogan’s experience in Clatsop County. He noticed the increase of the Latino population as well as what appeared to be their concentration in the service industry, and worried about the stability of their future in Clatsop County. This study is the background report for a working paper of recommendations detailed in a separate document.
Report Team
The report team includes Marisa A. Zapata, an assistant professor at Portland State University, and Amanda Hudson a doctoral student at the same university. Both are in the Toulan School of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University. Dr. Zapata studies plan-making and land-use policy from a racial equity framework. She is especially concerned about the futures of Latino populations. Ms. Hudson studies participatory democracy and is a student coordinator for PSU’s Chiron Studies, a peer-centered learning experience.

Terminology
We use the terms ‘Latino’ and ‘Hispanic’ interchangeably in this report. Generally, Latino refers to people who are from or whose families are from Latin America while Hispanic also includes people from Spain. Acceptance, preference, or adamant rejection for these and other identity terms changes over time, across geographies, and within different Latino sub-populations. Actors in Latino communities should ask about their preferences. Lastly, Latinos can also be of any race. When we describe a population as “White,” we are referring to White community members whom do not identify as Hispanic. The Census Bureau asks if people if they are Hispanic, and then asks for respondents’ racial identities, allowing researchers to disaggregate data.1 2

Data Notes
The report draws on existing data sources to paint a portrait of the Latino population. The data include information from the U.S. Census, existing plans and policies, an oral history project, and organizational websites that detail information about Latinos living in Clatsop County. Data were analyzed at various scales including county, municipality, neighborhood, and U.S. Census tracks. We relied on U.S. Census data to form much of the report.

Census data about marginalized populations come with limitations. Marginalized populations are known to be under-counted in the Census when compared to the White population (Anderson 2015). Further, because some members of the Latino community have undocumented immigration status, they avoid contact with government officials and requests, while other Latinos may not understand the Census Bureau labels for race ethnicity leading to classification errors (Visser 2014). This means that the data captured by the US Census Bureau may not include much of the undocumented population living in a given geography. Because undocumented Latino immigrants are more likely to be poorer and less educated than documented Hispanic immigrants and citizens, we assume the demographic and economic indicators presented in this report are actually worse than they appear (i.e. poverty rate is higher, wages are lower).

---

1 The Census Bureau reports information about race and ethnicity where Latinos are included in the counts of the different racial groups as well where Hispanics are removed from the different racial groups and treated as additional racial group. When Latinos are removed from the racial groups, the Census Bureau will write White non-Hispanic, Hispanic non-White, etc. to limit confusion.

2 Please visit the following website for an infographic on how the Census Bureau has measured race and ethnicity from 1790-2010: http://www.census.gov/population/race/data/MREAD_1790_2010.html.
For many decades, the US Decennial Census provided the only in-depth population data. Starting in 2005, the US Census Bureau administered the American Community Survey (ACS), a sampled survey of selected US households. ACS data are resulted at 1, 3, and 5 year increments. The 5 year estimates are considered the most reliable. There are additional challenges with ACS when compared with the decennial census. Because data are sampled, as opposed to the total population count from the decennial census, results for sub-populations can include high margins of error and weak data integrity the data. Decennial data provides greater data reliability when compared with ACS; however, beginning in 2010, the US Census Bureau stopped collecting detailed data related to poverty, unemployment, and housing. We compared the questions asked on both surveys to determine the reliability ACS data, and felt that it was not significantly different than 2010 data. We have used 2009-2013 ACS data where possible because it is more current than the decennial 2010 data. Much of the analysis in this report was completed prior to the release of the 2011-2015 ACS 5-year estimates. After comparing the several key indicators, we found the trends to be consistent with what the 2009-2013 data presented. However, we do want to highlight that the economic indicators appear to have worsened for Latinos in the 2011-2015 ACS 5-year estimates.

We do not break down the data by Clatsop cities in several cases because the margin of error was too high. For instance, in some instances the predicted number might be 20 Latinos in the sample with a margin of error at +/- 50. In places where some cities are included, most of the margin of errors were too great to include Gearhart or Warrenton individually.

Despite the limitations of the U.S. Census data, we believe that there are important themes that emerge. Many of the concerns raised by the census data are similar to issues that Latino populations face across the country including in places where Latino populations are the majority.

In addition to the US Census Bureau, quantitative metrics were collected from the Oregon Department of Education, Clatsop County Department of Health, Oregon Department of Education District Level Assessment Results 2014-15, Clatsop Vision 2030 Together, and Oregon Health Authority.

History of Latinos in Oregon

While the intense growth of Latino population of Latinos, they have long had a presence in Oregon’s history. The names of some of the oldest “discovered” places such as Cape Blanco, Cape Ferrelo, and Heceta Head reflect the 16th century Spanish exploration. Latinos established early agricultural and livestock trade and many migrated from Alta California to engage in mining and ranching. In 1819, through the Transcontinental Treaty, the Spanish relinquished claims to the Oregon Territory to the US government. Oregon became a state in 1859 and Latinos, primarily Mexican, continued to play a large role in the region as mule packers and miners in the Oregon Gold Rush.

There were numerous instances whereby the State of Oregon systematically excluded and discriminated against people of color. One such example that had a significant impact was exclusion laws within the Oregon Constitution. After the passage of the 14th Amendment, lawmakers added exceptions particularly aimed at preventing people of color (mostly African-Americans) from settling, voting, or

---

3 In 1868, the 14th amendment established full citizenship rights for people of Mexican heritage born in the U.S., though often the Indian heritage of Mexicans was used to exclude and deny rights.
owning property. Some cities in Oregon became “Sundown Towns,” posting notices that African Americans and other people of color were not allowed within city boundaries overnight. It was not until 1927, after numerous campaigns by the NAACP, that Oregon overturned its exclusion laws.

Perhaps the most notorious of Oregon’s racist past was the explosive growth of the Klu Klux Klan in the 1920s. Through aggressive recruitment, the KKK established local chapters in many of Oregon’s cities, including Astoria. They held rallies for national leaders and Klan members were elected to local governments. In 1921, “Oregon was so firmly in the grasp of the hooded nightriders that the governor admitted they controlled the state” (KKK: A History of Racism, Southern Poverty Law). While their reign was brief, succumbing to internal corruption, their impact has been to brand Oregon historically as a racist White utopia.

Latinos have long occupied a nebulous space in the history of racial discrimination in the US, with discrimination greatly varying based on skin-tone. While technically considered White under the law in some places, those of Native American descent where barred from owning property, voting, and public education. According to one history, “de facto segregation was prevalent due to local practices of drawing school attendance lines to correspond with residential segregation” (Looking Back in Order to Move Forward).

In 1910, Oregon had the 7th largest population of Mexican-national workers. Mostly migrant farmers, they were contracted to work on the sugar beet farms due to labor shortages. This practice of importing Mexican labor would continue until 1964 under the Bracero Program. Many Mexican families settled in Oregon as “Oregon’s agriculture relied on the large numbers of Mexican resident and migrant workers until wide spread mechanization in the 1950’s” (Looking Back in Order to Move Forward).

Beginning with the Great Depression, US policy began to target Mexican immigrants. Seen as a threat to the American workforce, more than one-third of the population, 500,000 people, were deported and repatriated to Mexico—this included US born citizens. In 1935, the State of Oregon officially segregated Mexican students due to their Indian descent, though the exception for “White Mexicans” remained in place.

It was through the Civil Rights Movement and the Chicano Movement that many of the discriminatory laws and practices were abolished. However, it is quite apparent that widespread discrimination in the form of mass deportations, political slander, militarization of the border, hate crimes and linguistic discrimination results in a major disadvantage to this community.

---

Historically, the term “White Mexicans” referred to fair skinned descendants of the Spanish without Indian heritage or appearance.
Present-day Demographics

Growth rate

Over the last decade, Clatsop County saw its Latino population increase by 77.7%. Latinos in Clatsop County now make up 7.7% of the population; with the White Alone population consisting of 87.2% (Population Research Center, 2010 Census SF1) (See Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clatsop County</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>35,630</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone, Not Latino</td>
<td>32,263</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Clatsop County Population Growth 2000-2010, White not Hispanic and Hispanic Not White

The map below visualizes the growth rate, demonstrating an exponential growth rate among Latinos and a population change in the White population ranging from moderate growth to decline (Figure 2).

![Clatsop County: 2000-2010 Growth Rate by Census Tract](image)

Figure 2: Clatsop County Growth Rate by Census Tract 2000

The next map below breaks population growth down by census tract block group (See Figure 3). Over the last 10 years, we see the more urban areas of Astoria, Seaside, and Cannon Beach with increasing
percentages of Latinos. Latinos in some Astoria areas approach nearly a quarter of the population.

**Figure 3: Latinos Population Growth 2000-2010 (Population Research Center: 2010 Census SF1)**

The largest proportion of the Latino population resides in and around the cities of Astoria, Cannon Beach and Seaside (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Astoria, Oregon</th>
<th>Cannon Beach, Oregon</th>
<th>Gearhart, Oregon</th>
<th>Seaside, Oregon</th>
<th>Warrenton, Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>9,518</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>7,639</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Latino Population by Place, Clatsop County, OR (Social Explorer: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)*

**Population Characteristics**

The Latino population is young and largely comprised of families with school-aged children. Nearly 40% of the population is under the age of 18. The median age of Latinos is 23.5 years of age, more than 20 years younger than the median age of Whites (46.7 years of age) (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates) (See Figure 4). The Hispanic population is equally distributed by sex with 49.5% male and 50.5% female.

---

5 Amounts do not total 100%, the remaining race/ethnic group data has been omitted.
Contrary to the popular perception, this population growth is not solely related to foreign migration. The majority (60.2%) of Latinos living in Clatsop County, and counted by the U.S. Census are US born, with 33.9% being native to Oregon. The large percentage of Oregon-born residents can be explained by the proportion of children in the Latino community. Latinas have higher fertility rates, with 7.8% percent of women giving birth in the last 12 months, when compared to the 4.8% fertility rates of women in the White alone population (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates). These results contribute to larger household sizes with Latino families averaging 3.47 compared to 2.23 for the White Alone population (American Factfinder: 2010 Census SF1).

Of the 39.8% of the total Latino population that are foreign born, 15.6% are naturalized US citizens (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates). The majority of Latinos are English proficient or native speakers. Almost 70% of the population above 5 years of age and sampled by the US Census Bureau are fluent in English, whether that is English only households (36.2%), or households that report that they speak English “very well” (33.2%).

Almost 90% of Latinos call Mexico their recent or ancestral home (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates). They primarily come from the Mexican states of Michoacán and Oaxaca (Lower Columbia Hispanic Council 2012). Additionally, there are smaller portions of people originating from Puerto Rico (4%), Cuba (1%), and other Latin American countries (7%).

---

6 Household size by race/ethnicity is not available in ACS 2013 data.

7 American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates
Housing

Homeownership and Renter Occupancy
Current housing trends reflect a more expensive housing market with less available housing stock for homeowners. The county homeowner vacancy rate sits at 3.59% (Census 2010). Cannon Beach stands out with a 12.4% homeowner vacancy rate; however, this likely reflects the secondary home market. Astoria’s and Seaside’s home owner vacancy rates sat at about 3% and 5%, respectively (Census 2010). In 2010, Clatsop County’s vacant renter housing was 9.16%, a down from 2000 where the rate was almost twice as high at 14.8% (Census 2010). Recent studies by several cities in Clatsop County indicate that the vacancy rates are even tighter now (See the Astoria Affordable Housing Study from 2015 and the Cannon Beach Housing Report from 2013).

Seasonal rental housing makes up a significant portion of that the rental market. In 2000, units designated as seasonal or for occasional use comprised 62% of all vacancies and 15.7% of total housing units. By 2010, the portion of seasonal housing increased to represent 74% of all housing vacancies and 20% of total housing units. Comparatively, seasonal rentals make up 35% of Oregon’s statewide vacancies and only 3.3% of all housing units.

Housing Affordability
Even if housing is available, it must also be affordable. In Clatsop County, the median value of owner-occupied housing units is $265,500, about $20,000 greater than the state of Oregon. The estimated median house or condo value in 2013 was $247,555, a significant increase from $138,800 in 2000 (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates, 2000 Census). More than 55% of owner occupied units in Clatsop County are valued between $200,000-500,000.

However, when examining the three cities at the focus of this study, the differences in their property values stand out. In Astoria, forty-four percent of owner occupied housing units are valued between $200,000-299,999. In Seaside, the portion of those represented in the same range is similar – 32%. In Cannon Beach, however, the housing values skew dramatically towards up with 34% of units valued between $500,000-999,999. The median housing unit value of Cannon Beach, at $593,800 in 2013, is more than double those of Astoria, Seaside, and the county as a whole. Even more strikingly, 24% of owner-occupied housing in Cannon beach is valued at 1 million dollars or more. Compared to Astoria where only 0.8% and Seaside with 2.2% of the owner-occupied units are valued at over 1 million, Cannon Beach’s concentration of wealth stands out.

Meanwhile, median incomes are $49,000 and $37,000 for White alone and Latino households respectively across the county. Both are less than statewide median of $51,000. A significant 46% of renters are considered rent burdened in Clatsop County are rent burdened, paying more than 35% of their monthly wages for housing costs (See Table 3). This effects their ability to achieve long term

---

8 Vacancy rates are based on available housing for renters and homeowners. Second homes, seasonal housing, etc. are excluded from the analysis.
9 Tourist driven communities, especially those where tourist may spend expended periods of time, have unique housing markets. In particular, the vacancy rate will be much higher than in non-tourist dominated small and medium sized communities. In the second quarter of 2016, the national rental vacancy rate was 6.7% and the homeowner vacancy rate was 1.7% where 3.2% of the total housing inventory used as seasonal housing (U.S. Census Bureau 2016).
financial stability, purchase a home, and provide for their children. While the situation for renters is more severe, a third of households with mortgages in Clatsop are also paying over 35% of their monthly household income to cover their home costs.

Table 3: Housing Rent Burden by City (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of households paying more than 35% of income on rent</th>
<th>Clatsop County</th>
<th>Astoria</th>
<th>Cannon Beach</th>
<th>Seaside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Gross Rent ($)</th>
<th>812</th>
<th>693</th>
<th>773</th>
<th>925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Percent Renter-occupied | 37.3% | 50.3% | 46.2% | 50.5% |

Rent burden creates and unstable housing situation, and can lead to houselessness. According to the 2015 point in time count, a HUD mandated biennial count of the houseless population, Clatsop County had the fourth largest homeless population in the Oregon (682 people), but is ranked 19th in the total population in the state. While the count reflected a decrease in the number of people experiencing homelessness from 2013, with the number of people living with significant rent burden and low vacancy rates, many people in Clatsop County are likely living in unstable housing situations. School districts also track the housing status of their students, and in 2014-2015, Clatsop County school districts counted about 235 students as houseless.\(^\text{10}\) We could not locate disaggregated data about racial and ethnic backgrounds of the population experiencing homelessness.

Housing Supply

Another component of housing affordability is the physical number of housing units, or supply. Construction of new housing remains limited and new housing units meet the needs of the wealthiest home owners. New housing may also not fulfill the needs of year-round residents. The housing supply must – in or to be considered adequate – meet the needs of community members in terms of quality and size. The majority of residents have moved into their current housing since 2000. Almost 76% of all residents in Seaside moved into their housing since 2000. However, much of the housing units are older. Twenty-three percent of the housing units in Clatsop County were built in 1939 or earlier. In Astoria, just over 60% of housing was built prior to 1949. Older housing requires proper renovation and upkeep to avoid issues with mold, dust, heating, and cooling amongst other issues. While the County did see an upswing in new housing construction in the 1990s and the first decade of the 2000s – 28% of the current housing stock was built during that time – the recession brought housing construction to a halt. The number of new housing built captures the effects of the 2009 recession with 2010 building rates falling dramatically (See Figure 5).

\(^{10}\) The HUD point in time counts and school district counts are not directly comparable as the point in time counts and the school district definitions of homelessness are different. HUD does not include people who are doubled up as homeless.
Prior to 2009, the houses that were being constructed were valued much higher when compared to 2000 (See Table 4). Building more high-end housing will not meet the needs of many year-round Clatsop County residents whose median-household incomes put the new construction out of reach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Median Value of Housing Units ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>240,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>214,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>270,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>227,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>223,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>267,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>278,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>339,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>267,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Median</td>
<td>256,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Clatsop County Median Housing Unit Value by Year Built (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

In terms of the housing stock, the majority of houses are single family homes (69.8%). Cannon Beach stands out with almost 80% single family homes. In Astoria, the next largest portions of housing units by structures include 3-4 unit (10.6%) and 20+ units (10.1%). Seaside has 11.7% of its housing stock in 20+ units. Cannon Beach has no 20+ units and few structures over 3-4 units.
Latinos in Focus

Many Clatsop County residents experience housing challenges. From too little housing, to older housing, to pricing that exceeds wages, there is much to be concerned about. Latinos experience these challenges at disproportionate rates when compared to whites. In this section, we present the indicators with the most concerning disparities. We do not break down this information by Clatsop cities as in several cases the margin of error was too high for Latino populations.

Compared to the 64% of Whites who live in owner-occupied housing, Latinos call owner-occupied housing home just 27% of the time (See Table 5). The other 73% of Latinos rent their homes. With most Latinos living as renters, concerns about landlord exploitation, safe housing, and language and culturally appropriate service provision become even more important. Given the number of Latino renters, the percent of Latinos living in apartments with at least 3 units is not surprising. Of note, approximately 11% of Latinos live in apartment buildings with 20-49 units. With only 2% of the White population living in apartment complexes of that size, these rates indicate the real possibility that Latinos are living in racial isolation and segregation. Almost 8% of Whites live in mobile homes. Few to any Latinos live in mobile homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>White Alone</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>14,416</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>9,173</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Homeownership Rates for Clatsop County, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

As of 2010, average household size was notably larger for Latinos than Whites (See Figure 6). Overall household sizes across the county range from 1.77 to 2.42 depending on the city and whether the household is living in owner occupied versus renter occupied housing. Even in owner-occupied housing, Latinos have up to two times the number of people living in households than Whites.
Latinos also live in housing units with more people per room. Sixteen percent of Latino households have more than one occupant per room while only 2% of White alone-led households only have more than 1 occupant per room (See Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White alone, not Hispanic or Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 or less occupants per room</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 or more occupants per room</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Clatsop County Occupants per Room, Hispanic or Latino v. White Alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

Seventy-seven percent of Latinos live in family households compared to 61% of Whites. While the percentages of Latinos and Whites living in married couple households are comparable, ‘other,’ male with no female, and female with no male head of households are all significantly higher for Latinos than Whites. This means that when Latinos are living in family households, they live in a range of familial relationships where Whites tend to live in married couple households. On the other hand, Whites are much more likely to live in nonfamily households and to live alone when compared with Latinos (32% Whites live alone compared with 17% of Latinos). In terms of formulating housing policy or developing housing programs for Latinos, organizations should understand the importance of family structure in Latino households.

Figure 6: Household Size for Occupied Housing Units, Hispanic or Latino v. White Alone, not Hispanic or Latino (US 2010 Decennial Census)
Rent Burden. Rent burden remains a significant issue for many residents in Clatsop County for both Whites and Latinos. As discussed above, over one-third of Latinos and Whites pay 35% or more of their monthly pay for rent. Latinos tend to pay less for rent – almost 80% pay between $500-999 for rent compared to the approximately 60% of Whites who pay rent within that range (See Table 7). Nearly 20% of Whites pay $1000-1,499 per month for rent compared to 6% of Latinos. Low incomes limit the housing options available to Latinos. A fact best illustrated by a comparison between income and housing costs. Since 2000, the median costs of homeownership have grown between 55% and 58%. Similarly, median gross rent has increased 49.5% over the last 13 years. Median household incomes, meanwhile, have not kept pace. The median income for Hispanic or Latino households has only grown 38% over the same period and actually decreased slightly between 2012 and 2013. White median income grew even less over the same time period (25%), most likely due to their higher incomes to start out with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupied units paying rent (excluding units where GRAPI cannot be computed)</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White alone, not Hispanic or Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15.0 percent</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 to 19.9 percent</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 to 24.9 percent</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0 to 29.9 percent</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0 to 34.9 percent</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0 percent or more</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Clatsop County Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income (GRAPI), Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

In summary, Clatsop County residents face a challenging housing market. This market looks considerably different across the county where Astoria has an older housing stock with lower median household incomes and almost no vacancies while Cannon Beach has a newer, million-dollar housing market. The number of seasonal vacation rental units continue to grow, further constraining the housing market.

Latinos call rental units home at much significant levels than Whites. Latinos also have slightly larger household sizes and live with more occupants per room when compared to Whites. Latinos also tend to pay less for rent than Whites, though their incomes are also much lower. While their rent burden rate above 30% is slightly less than Whites, both populations have a significant number of people living in unstable housing situations.
Economics

Clatsop County was hit hard by the recession, and unemployment and percentages of those in poverty remain higher than statewide averages. This is especially concentrated among Latino populations. Even in areas with Latinos exhibiting higher rates of employment, they earn significantly less and a substantial proportion of the population is below poverty level.

Poverty

The average Latino is twice as likely to earn below poverty level compared to the White Alone population. According to the American Community Survey 2013 5-Year estimates, 29.7% of all Latinos live below poverty, compared to 15.1% of the White alone population (See Figure 7). Latino families fare even worse, relatively with 25% of Latino families living in poverty with only 12% of White families living in poverty. Latinos also fare significantly worse when it comes to overall income levels and public assistance.\textsuperscript{11} Additionally, Latinos are significantly more likely to be recipients of public assistance, with 15.7% receiving cash public assistance and 29.4% receiving SNAP benefits (compared to 1.9% and 16.3% respectively in the White population).

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{poverty_status_bar_chart.png}
\caption{Poverty Status by Family Type, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} The reported numbers will only tell part of the story. Undocumented immigrants are not eligible for cash assistance such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Migrant or seasonal farmworkers have the right to expedited SNAP benefits, though this must be issued to qualifying individuals through the Oregon Department of Human Services (oregonlawhelp.org).
According to the county’s 2030 Vision Together plan, poverty is concentrated in its more interior and rural areas (). Latinos, however, are concentrated in the urban, more affluent areas, yet still experience disproportional levels of poverty.

**Income**

Median household income for Latino households is $37,500, compared to $45,855 for the White population (See Figure 8). The Clatsop County median household income is $44,683. The following figure looks at individual and household earnings and in every category, Latinos earn at least $10,000 beneath those in the White population. The family household comparison is the largest difference with White families earning $25,000 more per year than Latinos. In the cities of Astoria, Cannon Beach, and Seaside, Latino households make 64%, 36%, and 69% of White household medians incomes respectively.

![Clatsop County: Median Household Income Adjusted for Inflation by Individual & Household Type, 2013](image)

**Figure 8: Median Household Income by Individual and Household Type by Ethnicity (American Factfinder: 2013 ACS 5 Year Estimates)**

Median family income (MFI) is another important, albeit slightly different, indicator as it is often used to calculate housing affordability and need. MFI is also used in determining whether families and individuals are eligible for government assistance for housing. Traditional categories used to allocate funding and build affordable housing use the following categories of MFI: 0-30%; 30-60%; 60-90%; 90-110%. The following table (Table 8) shows the dollar amounts of those categories for Clatsop County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MFI Percent Category</th>
<th>MFI Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>$0-16,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-60%</td>
<td>16,681-33,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-90%</td>
<td>33,601-50,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 MFI differs from household income in that it is typically calculated using a family of 4. Households may contain as few as one person, whereas families by definition must contain at least two members.
Table 8: Median Family Income by Housing Assistance Categories

Figure 9 shows the rates of Whites and Latinos living at different percentages of median family income. Forty percent of all Latino families make less than 63% of Clatsop County’s MFI of $55,600 (See Figure 9).13 Latino families are twice as likely to have incomes in the lowest bracket, under 27% of MFI. The opposite can be said at the other end of the income spectrum, as 49% of White, non-Latino families have incomes greater than 109% of the county MFI as compared to only 24% of Latino families.

Figure 9: Median Family Income Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: 2013 ACS 5 Year Estimates, Oregon Housing and Community Services, 2013)14

Employment

Unemployment, for the Latino population varies dramatically by city. The countywide unemployment rate is 6.3% for Latinos, and 9.9% for the White Alone population, one of the few metrics where Latinos are faring better than Whites (See Figure 10). The gap in employment is even greater in the more urban areas of the county. In the cities of Cannon Beach and Seaside they are significantly higher than that of the White populations. Latinos are more likely to be engaged in low wage employment.

13 Income limits for housing are specified to family size. See the following income guide for 2013 income limits: http://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/APMD/HPM/docs/2013/Clatsop_County_2013_Rent_Income_Limits.pdf

14 The ACS Census Bureau income breaks were compiled to get to the conventional MFI brackets as closely as possible. (<30, 30-60, 61-90, 90-110, >110).


**Figure 10: Unemployment Percentage by Place, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (ACS 2013 ACS 5 Year Estimates)**

Types of jobs

Latinos are more likely to be engaged in low wage employment. The following figure details the high percentages of Latinos in manual labor and low-skill work and their underrepresentation in professional and office work (See Figure 11). The majority are employed in service occupations, production, transportation, and material moving. This is problematic as these jobs are traditionally low-wage and often provide little or no benefits.

---

15 Gearhart and Warrenton were omitted due to insufficient data.
Figure 11: Occupations by Industry, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)
Education
According to the Clatsop County Health Department, education is a chief concern for the long term health and prosperity of the region. Research shows that those who complete high school and college have substantial increases in lifetime earnings and other predictors of well-being.¹⁶

Attainment
Latinos and Whites alone have significantly disproportionate levels of educational achievement. The rate of high school completion among Latinos is particularly low with 29.1% of the population without a diploma (See Figure 12). Low educational attainment is particularly problematic as the County is relying on educational and vocational training as a force for economic diversification.¹⁷ Because many Latinos do not attend or graduate college, we focus on K-12 education.

Figure 12: Educational Attainment, Hispanic or Latino v. White Alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

Primary & Secondary Education
Clatsop’s school districts have begun to see the impact of the fast growing Latino youth population (See Figure 13). The following chart details the ethnic makeup of each district, easily making the schools the most diverse places in the region. Countywide, Latino students make up a total of 16.6% of the student population, but only 7.8% of the total population.

¹⁶ Clatsop County Health Department, 2013
¹⁷ Clatsop Vision 2030
Research has consistently shown that students of color score lower than their White counterparts in standardized testing, and Latinos in Clatsop County are no exception. The following graphs show the percentage of students by district who scored “meets/exceeds expectations” on the State’s standardized test for Language Arts and Math (See Figure 14). Across the board, White students scored higher. The gaps are the most substantial in the school districts of Astoria and Seaside, the districts with the largest number of Latino students.

18 Astoria SD serves Astoria; Jewell SD serves Jewell; Knappa SD serves Knappa, Svensen, Brownsmead, and Burnside; Seaside SD serves Seaside, Cannon Beach, and Gearhart; Warrenton-Hammond SD serves Warrenton and Hammond.
Figure 14: School District Test Scores Results “Meets/Exceeds Expectations” by Ethnicity (Oregon Department of Education District Level Assessment Results 2014-15\textsuperscript{19})

\textsuperscript{19} Jewell SD omitted due to insufficient data
Dropout Rates

As noted by the County Health Assessment, overall dropout rate is higher in Clatsop County when compared to the statewide average. Rates for Latinos are worse (See Figure 15). Though the most recent data show an improvement, many averages equal or fall below statewide rates. Furthermore, if students were ever English language learners, have current limited English proficiency, or are migrants they are even more likely to drop out. Latino advocates and school districts are aware of the need to create programming to support Latinos. For instance, the Northwest Regional Education Service District provides English learner and migrant education services. Through a partnership between the Lower Columbia Hispanic Council and Clatsop Community College, general educational development, known as the GED, preparation courses are available in Spanish in Astoria and Seaside.
Figure 15: Clatsop County Dropout Rates by Total Population Percent (Oregon Department of Education 2013/14 Dropout Rates)
Health
Latinos experience health disparities in the form of reduced access to health care, perilous work conditions, and food insecurity. Statewide, Latinos have high rates of obesity (31%) and diabetes (9.6%). Additionally, only 62% of Latino mothers received prenatal care within the first trimester compared to 74% of White mothers.20

Insurance Coverage
With the recent expansion of health insurance access under the Affordable Care Act, many people who were previously unable are now able to access health care. This has been especially beneficial to children. As seen below, Latino children have comparable rates of insurance coverage compared to their White counterparts (See Figure 16). Children have fewer barriers to coverage, as they are able to access the state health plan and federal health care exchanges regardless of the status of their parents’ documentation.21 Latino adults of working age who are more than twice as likely to be uninsured than the White population.

Figure 16: Health Insurance Coverage by Age, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

Documented immigrants are eligible for limited federal coverage. They are also subject to the individual mandate that is part of the Affordable Care Act. Undocumented immigrants, however, are not eligible for any federal coverage and cannot purchase private full-cost insurance. There are few government health benefits that those without a lawful residency status are eligible for. Pregnant women who do not qualify for the Oregon Health Plan (OHP) due to immigration status may still receive emergency care.

---

20 Oregon Health Authority 2013
21 Children of undocumented parents are also eligible for SNAP, TANF, and OHP.
medical care through a program called Citizen-Alien Waived Emergency Medical (CAWEM). Victims of domestic abuse may be eligible for emergency cash assistance through Temporary Assistance for Domestic Violence Survivors (TA-DVS) and relocation assistance. Figure 17 details the percent uninsured by ethnicity, nativity, and citizenship status. The results show that those who are not White, native-born, American citizens have substantially less access to health insurance and healthcare. The Lower Columbia Hispanic Council received funding to help enroll eligible Latinos into insurance programs. Hopefully their work will result in a higher insured rate for Latinos.

Figure 17: Percent Uninsured by Ethnicity and Citizenship Status (American Factfinder: ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)
Transportation

As a whole, 42.8% of all workers that live in Clatsop County are traveling at least 50 miles to work, primarily to the southeast, indicating a commute toward the Portland-Vancouver Metro.\textsuperscript{22}

![Figure 18: Clatsop County Residents Distance and Direction Traveled to Work (US Census LEHD OnTheMap 2013)](image)

However, Latinos in Clatsop County live comparatively close to their place of employment. Whites and Latinos share similar modes of transportation in similar percentages, the only exception being that Latinos are twice as likely to carpool as Whites are. The public transportation authority for Clatsop County is the Sunset Empire Transportation District.\textsuperscript{23} Due to a shortage of funding, service has declined since 2011, a 46% decrease in total passengers. Exacerbating transportation issues, Oregon Ballot Measure 88, an effort to provide driver licenses to those unable to prove legal residency in the U.S., was defeated in 2014. Notably, the Clatsop County Sheriff endorsed the opposition to Measure 88. This leaves many Latino immigrants with very few transportation options.

\textsuperscript{22} 2013 US Census Local Employer-Household Dynamics OnTheMap
\textsuperscript{23} A transportation district employee indicated that race and ethnicity demographic information is not collected for riders (personal communication, C. Gorecki).
Conclusion

The Clatsop County Latino population continues to grow, increasingly calling the urban areas of the county home. They work in the service and agricultural economy. Hispanics make less and have lower educational attainment when compared to the White non-Hispanic population. Latinos tend to rent and live together with their families. Many spend more than 30% of their income on housing costs. While Hispanics are struggling, they like living in Clatsop County, and look forward to a prosperous future.

To support that future, we recommend that Clatsop County government actors and community developers work more closely with the Latino community to understand their needs, and how they are distinct from the White community. In terms of data and future research, we located few government reports or university studies that included disaggregated quantitative data measures, particularly in planning and housing related areas. We found only one report that assembled a large amount qualitative data – The Lower Columbia Hispanic Council’s Latinos of Clatsop County. We suggest that additional surveys and in-depth research take place to ensure the needs of the Latino community are identified, effectively bench-marked, and acted on. This report serves as a starting point for data metrics that can be used to understand how planning and policy decisions affect the community. However, future research should be targeted, for instance about what types of affordable housing would most meet the needs of Latino populations. Future programs and policies should include data collection and analysis for evaluation and monitoring; however, action is most needed in key areas such as housing and economic development.
Appendix – City Profiles
City Profile: Astoria, Oregon

Figure 19: Astoria, Hispanic or Latino Population by Block Group (ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

**Total Population:** 9,518

**Median Household Income (in 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars):** $42,143

**Per Capita Income (in 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars):** $25,057

**Unemployment Rate:** 5.4%

**Poverty Status (Percentage of all people below poverty in the last 12 months):** 21.1%

**Percent Latino:** 12.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Characteristics</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White Alone (not Hispanic or Latino)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment for 16 Years Old In Civilian Labor Force:</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars):</td>
<td>$29,531</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars)</td>
<td>$12,011</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Status In 2013</td>
<td>417(^{24})</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9: Astoria Economic Characteristics, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)*

\(^{24}\) Determined from 1,143 respondents  
\(^{25}\) Determined from 7,463 respondents
Figure 20: Cannon Beach, Hispanic or Latino Population by Block Group (ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)

Total Population: 1,553
Median household income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars): $40,917
Per Capita Income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars): $38,474
Unemployment Rate: 1.2%
Poverty Status (Percentage of all people below poverty in the last 12 months): 24.5%
Percent Latino: 10.9%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Characteristics</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White Alone (not Hispanic or Latino)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment for 16 Years Old In</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (In 2013</td>
<td>$23,897</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation Adjusted Dollars):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income (In 2013 Inflation</td>
<td>$8,295</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Status In 2013</td>
<td>76(^{26})</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10: Cannon Beach Economic Characteristics, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)*

\(^{26}\) Determined from 164 respondents  
\(^{27}\) Determined from 1,147 respondents


Total Population: 6,455

Median household income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars): $44,888

Per Capita Income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars): $25,409

Unemployment Rate: 6.9%

Poverty Status (Percentage of all people below poverty in the last 12 months): 14.5%

Percent Latino: 9.6%

*Figure 21*: Seaside, Hispanic or Latino Population by Block Group (ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)
### Economic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Characteristics</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White Alone (not Hispanic or Latino)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Populations</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>5,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment for 16 Years Old In Civilian Labor Force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,667</td>
<td>$45,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income (In 2013 Inflation Adjusted Dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,053</td>
<td>$27,471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Status In 2013</td>
<td>203(^{28})</td>
<td>706(^{29})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{28}\) Determined from 609 respondents  
\(^{29}\) Determined from 5,480 respondents  

**Table 11:** Seaside Economic Characteristics, Hispanic or Latino v. White alone, not Hispanic or Latino (ACS 2013 5 Year Estimates)
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