NORTH CAROLINA CENTER FOR
PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH INC.

NEWS RELEASE

For release on Tuesday, June 16, 2009:
May be broadcast Tuesday a.m. and
may appear in Tuesday newspapers.
For an electronic version of the news release
or for a full copy of the report, go to
www.nccppr.org/Press
enter username: Press
password: policy
then click on demographics of aging.

For more information,
call Mebane Rash
at the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research
at 919-832-2839.

RISING AGING POPULATION WILL COMPLICATE NC'S FUTURE STATE BUDGET ISSUES

A new study by the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research finds that North Carolina's older population is expected to double by 2030, rising from 1.1 million to 2.2 million. By 2030, one of every five Americans will be 65 or older. The Center says these demographic changes will force North Carolina to deal with four public policy issues: differences in financial well-being among the elderly, the different needs of urban and rural seniors, work force shortages in health professions, and state budget implications.

"The Baby Boomers are the second largest generation in American history, and they are going to start turning 65 in 2011," says Mebane Rash, the editor of the Center's journal, *North Carolina Insight*. "In 2011, the state will still be recovering from the Great Recession – just when it needs to respond to this demographic shift. Right now, we are not ready."

North Carolina's Elderly Population To Double by 2030

In 1900, the United States was an agricultural nation in which half of all Americans were younger than age 22. In 1900, North Carolina had one of the nation's youngest populations with half younger than 18. Only 3.5 percent of all Tar Heels were 65 and older. Even in 1960, North Carolina was still an extremely young state with just 7 percent of all residents 65 or older. But by 2000, 12 percent of all North Carolinians were 65 or older. And by 2030, the number of elderly will double and rise to 18 percent of the population.

The Center's study finds that North Carolina's future older population will differ demographically from the current population in four ways. First, there will be 2.5 times more Tar Heels aged 85 and older. Second, the ratio of older men to older women is expected to rise from 67 men per 100 women to 77 men per 100 women. Third, non-whites are expected to form a larger share of the older population – 21 percent in 2030 compared to 19 percent in 2006. Fourth, for many of North Carolina's elderly, Social Security will be their only source of income.

The Center said two factors are driving these changes. One is the aging of the 2.4 million Baby Boomers who have lived in North Carolina since 2000. The other factor is North Carolina's increasing appeal as a migration destination, particularly for older people from other parts of the country. North Carolina's attractiveness stems from its temperate climate, beautiful beaches and mountains, relatively low taxes, and comparatively modest living costs.

The Changing Nature of Retirement

"Retirement" was largely unknown a century ago. In 1900, the few people who reached age 65 faced limited prospects. Most had few financial resources, so older individuals typically lived with relatives or infrequently in institutions. The social expectation was for the elderly to stop working, stop exercising, and prepare for the end of life. Overall, older adults now are more secure financially and able to live independently. Turning 65 is now a common event marking the start of retirement, a creative and enjoyable period of life that is seen as the reward for a lifetime of work. Retirement now constitutes almost a quarter of a lifetime for those that live to be 84 or older.

Longer life expectancies are a big part of this shift in expectations. In the past, the typical 65-year-old would live for just seven more years to about age 72. Currently, health advances and other factors have allowed more people to reach age 65, and those who do are apt to live even longer – 19 years more on average.

The Impact of Changing Demographics on State Policy

The Center says these demographic changes will force North Carolina to deal with four public policy issues: differences in financial well-being among the elderly, the different needs of urban and rural seniors, work force shortages in health professions, and state budget implications.

In terms of *financial well-being*, the Baby Boom generation should reach older age having earned more money, having built more wealth, and anticipating higher retirement incomes than previous generations. However, this overall prosperity clouds important differences in the distribution of income and wealth, which likely will be much more unequal than in the past.

Conventional wisdom holds that retired Americans derive their incomes from a three-legged stool of Social Security, pension benefits, and personal assets. But for many – especially older women – Social Security is the only leg. The typical older household receives 38 percent of its annual income from Social Security, but this average masks variations in income and age. Older households in the bottom 40 percent in income, for example, derive more than 80 percent of their income from Social Security. Even middle-income households draw two-thirds of their income from that program. The oldest old aged 85 and above rely heavily upon Social Security – some exclusively.

There also are important *rural/urban differences* in North Carolina's older population. In 2006, the state's 85 rural counties were home to 57 percent of the older population – some 611,720 residents. Rural counties have more older residents in sheer numbers and as a proportion of county population. In 2030, 53 percent of older North Carolinians will live in rural counties. Of the 20 counties expected to have the highest proportions of elderly, 10 are in the West (Alleghany, Ashe, Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Madison, Mitchell, Polk, Transylvania, and Yancey), and ~~seven~~ nine are in the East (Bertie, Carteret, Chowan, Hertford, Jones, Northampton, Pamlico, Perquimans, and Washington). A study by Jim Mitchell of East Carolina University found that older rural adults in Eastern North Carolina have "higher rates of disability, lower incomes, less education, and lower reading ability than their counterparts in small and larger towns."

The counties with the youngest populations will fall into two categories: large urban counties like Mecklenburg and Wake and counties with military bases like Cumberland and Onslow. With the oldest populations clustered in the economically distressed west and northeast, seniors in these counties are more apt to be single, poor, and ill. Yet those places often lack needed services. For example, transportation for the elderly who are spread out in rural counties is already a major problem.

The Center says there are two important *work force challenges*: the retirement of the Baby Boomers and the impact on work force shortages in critical fields such as health care. With 86 percent of older adults leaving the work force, the impending retirement of the Baby Boom generation may deprive North Carolina of enough workers needed to compete economically. The North Carolina Commission on Workforce Development warned in a 2007 report that the "retirement of one-quarter of the state's workforce … has the potential to leave a gaping hole in the supply of workers over the next two decades." This could worsen work force shortages that are already severe in some fields such as nursing.

State budget issues will include the escalating cost of medical care. Not only have medical costs consistently outstripped the rate of inflation in recent decades, but older adults also are bearing more of the costs. This is due in part to the reduction of employer-sponsored health care coverage for retirees. While most older adults receive health insurance through federal Medicare or Medicaid programs, these programs are struggling to keep pace with the increasing cost of medical treatment, especially end-of-life care. Left unaddressed, medical costs likely will surge with the growth in the older population.

Because North Carolina pays 27 percent of the cost of Medicaid, the state budget will be directly affected if Medicaid continues to function as the main source of long-term care coverage. Medicaid paid for 50.5 percent of all long-term care costs for the elderly in State Fiscal Year 2006-07, up from 44.8 just the year before. Thus, without changes in the way health care is paid for, North Carolina will continue to face state budget challenges as it tries to help older citizens afford health care.

Mebane Rash, editor of the Center's journal, says, "The state needs to be prepared to meet the demand for services in both urban and rural communities across the state. The needs will be different in different communities, and our elderly are part of the solution. The state needs to be prepared to re-engage elders in the work force and to follow their good examples in their high rates of voting, charitable contributions, and volunteering."

Bill Friday, former President of the UNC System, says, "Thoughtful North Carolinians need to consider the talent pool of the elders that are living in our state. They are people of great ability. Some are people with international experience. They all have something to contribute. The question is how to best utilize this great accumulation of talent."

About the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

The Center's report on the rising aging population in North Carolina is part of a larger study of key issues facing the state's aging population to be published in the Center's journal, *North Carolina Insight*. Last month, the Center released research on fraud committed against the elderly. The larger study also will include reports on the crisis in the number of caretakers for the elderly, the contributions of the aging to society, the impact of the growing aging population on the state budget, and the need for an aging policy plan for the future. Reports will be released as they are completed.

The N.C. Center for Public Policy Research is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit research organization created in 1977 to evaluate state government programs and to study public policy issues facing North Carolina. The Center is supported in part by a grant from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation in Winston-Salem, with additional support from nine other private foundations, 137 corporate contributors, and almost 500 individual and organizational members. This research on the rising aging population in North Carolina is funded by grants from the Kate B. Reynolds Charitable Trust of Winston-Salem, The Hillsdale Fund of Greensboro, and Mission Health System of Asheville.

The Center publishes a journal called *North Carolina Insight*, a citizens' guide to the legislature, and in-depth research reports such as a study of governance of the state's public universities. The Center recently has conducted studies of the history of mental health reform in North Carolina, key issues facing community colleges in North Carolina, how to prevent high school dropouts, and ways to reduce domestic violence.

Upcoming studies will examine other key issues facing the state's aging population and policies on financial aid for students in colleges and universities.

The Center's 47-page study of the rising aging population in North Carolina is part of a larger study to be published in the Center's journal, *North Carolina Insight*. It is available to download electronically for $10. If you become a Center member, at $36, you will receive all other articles in the Center's study of aging as they are completed, future issues of *Insight*, and the Center's quarterly newsletters for a year. To order or join the Center, call Tammy Bromley at (919) 832-2839, or send an email to *tbromley@nccppr.org*.

* * *

For more information, call Mebane Rash, editor of *North Carolina Insight*, at the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research, at (919) 832-2839, or email her at *mrash@nccppr.org*.

Table 3: Older Population in N.C. by County and Selected Age Groups, 2006
With Rankings of Percentage of Total Population Age 65+

		Select 2006 Population			
County	Type	Total Population	Median Age (2005)	# Age 65+	% Age 65+
1. Alamance	Urban	142,661	36.5	19,574	13.72%
2. Alexander	Rural	36,177	37.8	4,686	12.95%
3. Alleghany	Rural	10,912	44.6	2,129	19.51%
4. Anson	Rural	25,472	37.9	3,574	14.03%
5. Ashe	Rural	25,499	43.7	4,798	18.82%
6. Avery	Rural	17,674	40.4	3,456	19.55%
7. Beaufort	Rural	46,355	42.1	7,759	16.74%
8. Bertie	Rural	19,094	41.1	3,089	16.18%
9. Bladen	Rural	32,921	38.9	4,943	15.01%
10. Brunswick	Rural	94,945	44.3	17,094	18.00%
11. Buncombe	Urban	222,174	39.8	33,885	15.25%
12. Burke	Rural	90,054	37.9	13,039	14.48%
13. Cabarrus	Urban	156,395	35.6	16,695	10.67%
14. Caldwell	Rural	79,841	39.1	11,525	14.43%
15. Camden	Rural	9,271	40.5	1,080	11.65%
16. Carteret	Rural	63,584	45.4	11,024	17.34%
17. Caswell	Rural	23,546	39.6	3,400	14.44%
18. Catawba	Urban	153,784	36.7	19,730	12.83%
19. Chatham	Rural	60,052	39.7	8,268	13.77%
20. Cherokee	Rural	26,309	46.0	5,351	20.34%
21. Chowan	Rural	14,695	42.9	2,595	17.66%
22. Clay	Rural	10,008	49.1	2,248	22.46%
23. Cleveland	Rural	98,373	37.7	14,003	14.23%
24. Columbus	Rural	54,637	38.2	7,883	14.43%
25. Craven	Rural	94,875	36.4	14,126	14.89%
26. Cumberland	Urban	299,060	30.8	27,279	9.12%
27. Currituck	Rural	23,770	39.8	2,625	11.04%
28. Dare	Rural	33,935	42.3	4,489	13.23%
29. Davidson	Urban	156,236	38.2	20,542	13.15%
30. Davie	Rural	40,035	39.3	5,734	14.32%
31. Duplin	Rural	52,790	35.0	6,728	12.74%
32. Durham	Urban	246,896	32.4	23,250	9.42%
33. Edgecombe	Rural	53,964	37.7	6,434	11.92%
34. Forsyth	Urban	332,355	36.4	41,402	12.46%

County	Percentage of Total Population			Population Ranks		
	% Young Old	% Older Old	% Oldest Old	% Age 65+	% Young Old	% Oldest Old
Alamance	49.42%	36.01%	14.57%	57	89	13
Alexander	57.77%	32.27%	9.97%	67	8	94
Alleghany	55.19%	31.94%	12.87%	12	21	42
Anson	48.04%	36.12%	15.84%	52	96	4
Ashe	52.33%	34.26%	13.40%	15	63	33
Avery	44.44%	44.47%	11.08%	11	99	87
Beaufort	54.04%	33.25%	12.71%	23	38	50
Bertie	51.44%	37.10%	11.46%	29	78	81
Bladen	50.09%	31.16%	18.75%	38	87	2
Brunswick	58.87%	33.20%	7.93%	17	3	100
Buncombe	49.10%	36.25%	14.66%	35	93	12
Burke	54.34%	32.91%	12.75%	45	33	48
Cabarrus	53.09%	33.47%	13.44%	87	55	32
Caldwell	55.64%	32.46%	11.90%	47	15	73
Camden	57.13%	31.85%	11.02%	83	9	88
Carteret	53.98%	35.17%	10.85%	21	39	90
Caswell	53.94%	33.88%	12.18%	46	43	63
Catawba	54.43%	33.32%	12.25%	68	32	59
Chatham	49.10%	35.38%	15.52%	55	92	5
Cherokee	53.34%	32.59%	14.07%	8	52	21
Chowan	50.21%	35.57%	14.22%	20	85	19
Clay	49.38%	35.23%	15.39%	4	90	8
Cleveland	52.45%	33.90%	13.65%	50	61	28
Columbus	55.60%	31.88%	12.52%	48	16	52
Craven	53.36%	36.25%	10.39%	41	51	93
Cumberland	59.75%	30.77%	9.47%	94	2	97
Currituck	58.06%	31.20%	10.74%	85	7	91
Dare	58.41%	33.35%	8.24%	65	4	99
Davidson	54.81%	33.20%	11.99%	66	26	69
Davie	54.34%	33.61%	12.05%	49	34	67
Duplin	54.22%	33.16%	12.62%	72	35	51
Durham	51.45%	33.75%	14.80%	93	77	11
Edgecombe	53.96%	33.25%	12.79%	80	40	47
Forsyth	52.17%	34.91%	12.92%	75	68	39

(continues)

Table 3: Older Population in N.C. by County and Selected Age Groups, 2006 With Rankings of Percentage of Total Population Age 65+

		Select 2006 Population				
County	Type	Total Population	Median Age (2005)	# Age 65+	% Age 65+	
35. Franklin	Rural	55,886	36.7	5,895	10.55%	
36. Gaston	Urban	199,397	37.6	25,343	12.71%	
37. Gates	Rural	11,527	40.3	1,528	13.26%	
38. Graham	Rural	7,995	43.4	1,412	17.66%	
39. Granville	Rural	54,473	37.2	5,933	10.89%	
40. Greene	Rural	20,157	35.7	2,390	11.86%	
41. Guilford	Urban	451,905	35.4	54,193	11.99%	
42. Halifax	Rural	55,521	39.1	8,472	15.26%	
43. Harnett	Rural	106,283	33.4	10,161	9.56%	
44. Haywood	Rural	56,447	43.6	11,072	19.61%	
45. Henderson	Rural	99,033	43.5	21,314	21.52%	
46. Hertford	Rural	23,581	40.9	3,447	14.62%	
47. Hoke	Rural	42,303	30.9	3,045	7.20%	
48. Hyde	Rural	5,341	41.5	880	16.48%	
49. Iredell	Rural	146,206	37.2	17,921	12.26%	
50. Jackson	Rural	35,562	36.7	4,942	13.90%	
51. Johnston	Rural	152,143	34.7	13,868	9.12%	
52. Jones	Rural	10,204	41.5	1,743	17.08%	
53. Lee	Rural	56,908	36.3	7,810	13.72%	
54. Lenoir	Rural	57,662	39.7	9,053	15.70%	
55. Lincoln	Rural	71,894	37.6	8,478	11.79%	
56. Macon	Rural	32,395	46.3	7,386	22.80%	
57. Madison	Rural	20,355	40.7	3,383	16.62%	
58. Martin	Rural	24,342	40.5	3,925	16.12%	
59. McDowell	Rural	43,414	39.0	6,607	15.22%	
60. Mecklenburg	Urban	827,445	33.8	68,832	8.32%	
61. Mitchell	Rural	15,681	43.5	3,047	19.43%	
62. Montgomery	Rural	27,638	37.7	3,709	13.42%	
63. Moore	Rural	83,162	43.3	17,456	20.99%	
64. Nash	Rural	92,312	37.4	12,480	13.52%	
65. New Hanover	Urban	182,591	37.2	24,166	13.24%	
66. Northampton	Rural	21,247	42.1	3,945	18.57%	
67. Onslow	Rural	150,673	24.0	11,420	7.58%	
68. Orange	Urban	120,100	32.1	11,599	9.66%	
69. Pamlico	Rural	12,785	45.2	2,615	20.45%	

County	Percentage of Total Population			Population Ranks		
	% Young Old	% Older Old	% Oldest Old	% Age 65+	% Young Old	% Oldest Old
Franklin	54.69%	32.99%	12.32%	88	29	57
Gaston	53.86%	34.16%	11.97%	73	45	71
Gates	54.91%	33.64%	11.45%	62	25	82
Graham	53.82%	34.07%	12.11%	19	46	65
Granville	55.47%	33.15%	11.38%	86	18	84
Greene	54.18%	31.84%	13.97%	81	36	23
Guilford	51.71%	34.71%	13.58%	79	75	29
Halifax	50.85%	35.69%	13.46%	34	82	31
Harnett	55.01%	32.80%	12.18%	92	23	61
Haywood	51.96%	35.18%	12.86%	10	71	44
Henderson	45.61%	38.95%	15.44%	5	97	7
Hertford	52.28%	34.46%	13.26%	43	64	35
Hoke	58.16%	32.05%	9.79%	100	5	96
Hyde	52.27%	31.36%	16.36%	27	65	3
Iredell	53.67%	34.23%	12.09%	78	47	66
Jackson	56.37%	32.34%	11.29%	54	14	86
Johnston	56.46%	31.96%	11.58%	95	13	78
Jones	52.21%	36.32%	11.47%	22	67	80
Lee	51.97%	36.03%	12.00%	56	70	68
Lenoir	53.13%	35.47%	11.40%	32	54	83
Lincoln	56.53%	32.14%	11.32%	82	12	85
Macon	50.35%	36.57%	13.08%	3	83	38
Madison	52.26%	33.55%	14.19%	25	66	20
Martin	52.13%	34.09%	13.78%	30	69	24
McDowell	53.96%	34.09%	11.96%	37	41	72
Mecklenburg	54.75%	32.42%	12.83%	96	28	45
Mitchell	51.13%	36.69%	12.18%	13	79	64
Montgomery	53.30%	33.89%	12.81%	60	53	46
Moore	45.30%	39.34%	15.36%	6	98	9
Nash	51.86%	35.86%	12.28%	59	73	58
New Hanover	52.89%	34.93%	12.18%	64	58	62
Northampton	49.76%	35.84%	14.40%	16	88	16
Onslow	61.94%	29.57%	8.49%	99	1	98
Orange	53.49%	33.61%	12.91%	91	50	40
Pamlico	54.80%	33.46%	11.74%	7	27	75

(continues)

Table 3: Older Population in N.C. by County and Selected Age Groups, 2006 With Rankings of Percentage Percentage of Total Population Age 65+

		Select 2006 Population			
County	Type	Total Population	Median Age (2005)	# Age 65+	% Age 65+
70. Pasquotank	Rural	39,591	37.3	5,063	12.79%
71. Pender	Rural	48,630	40.4	7,126	14.65%
72. Perquimans	Rural	12,337	44.7	2,447	19.83%
73. Person	Rural	37,341	39.4	5,010	13.42%
74. Pitt	Rural	145,619	31.8	14,380	9.88%
75. Polk	Rural	19,226	45.8	4,418	22.98%
76. Randolph	Rural	140,410	36.9	17,902	12.75%
77. Richmond	Rural	46,555	36.5	6,383	13.71%
78. Robeson	Rural	129,021	33.2	13,321	10.32%
79. Rockingham	Rural	93,063	39.9	14,183	15.24%
80. Rowan	Urban	136,254	37.0	19,049	13.98%
81. Rutherford	Rural	63,867	39.8	10,386	16.26%
82. Sampson	Rural	63,561	35.2	8,118	12.77%
83. Scotland	Rural	37,094	36.0	4,318	11.64%
84. Stanly	Rural	59,358	38.0	8,665	14.60%
85. Stokes	Rural	46,168	38.7	6,507	14.09%
86. Surry	Rural	72,687	38.9	11,618	15.98%
87. Swain	Rural	13,445	40.1	2,239	16.65%
88. Transylvania	Rural	29,780	46.4	7,071	23.74%
89. Tyrrell	Rural	4,187	40.0	627	14.97%
90. Union	Rural	175,272	34.7	14,466	8.25%
91. Vance	Rural	43,810	35.6	5,511	12.58%
92. Wake	Urban	786,522	33.5	60,565	7.70%
93. Warren	Rural	19,605	41.3	3,480	17.75%
94. Washington	Rural	13,227	41.2	2,197	16.61%
95. Watauga	Rural	42,700	31.6	5,247	12.29%
96. Wayne	Rural	113,847	35.4	14,011	12.31%
97. Wilkes	Rural	67,310	39.9	10,279	15.27%
98. Wilson	Rural	76,624	37.0	10,144	13.24%
99. Yadkin	Rural	38,056	38.4	5,700	14.98%
100. Yancey	Rural	18,421	43.5	3,486	18.92%
North Carolina		**8,856,505**	**36.0**	**1,077,824**	**12.17%**

	Percentage of Total Population			Population Ranks		
County	% Young Old	% Older Old	% Oldest Old	% Age 65+	% Young Old	% Oldest Old
Pasquotank	48.45%	36.99%	14.56%	69	95	14
Pender	55.16%	34.30%	10.54%	42	22	92
Perquimans	52.55%	33.80%	13.65%	9	59	27
Person	53.53%	33.73%	12.73%	61	48	49
Pitt	52.97%	33.91%	13.12%	90	56	37
Polk	43.46%	36.49%	20.05%	2	100	1
Randolph	53.87%	33.65%	12.48%	71	44	54
Richmond	52.37%	35.64%	11.98%	58	62	70
Robeson	55.43%	32.94%	11.63%	89	19	77
Rockingham	51.87%	34.63%	13.50%	36	72	30
Rowan	48.84%	35.67%	15.49%	53	94	6
Rutherford	50.24%	34.70%	15.06%	28	84	10
Sampson	53.52%	33.30%	13.18%	70	49	36
Scotland	54.47%	32.65%	12.88%	84	31	41
Stanly	50.96%	35.28%	13.76%	44	81	25
Stokes	55.52%	32.00%	12.48%	51	17	55
Surry	50.20%	35.52%	14.28%	31	86	17
Swain	52.93%	33.01%	14.07%	24	57	22
Transylvania	49.31%	36.42%	14.27%	1	91	18
Tyrrell	51.04%	35.25%	13.72%	40	80	26
Union	58.12%	30.95%	10.94%	97	6	89
Vance	54.47%	33.32%	12.21%	74	30	60
Wake	56.63%	31.80%	11.57%	98	11	79
Warren	52.50%	35.80%	11.70%	18	60	76
Washington	51.66%	33.91%	14.43%	26	76	15
Watauga	54.05%	33.09%	12.86%	77	37	43
Wayne	56.69%	33.41%	9.90%	76	10	95
Wilkes	54.98%	33.19%	11.83%	33	24	74
Wilson	53.95%	33.56%	12.49%	63	42	53
Yadkin	55.21%	32.46%	12.33%	39	20	56
Yancey	51.81%	34.91%	13.28%	14	74	34
North Carolina	**53.31%**	**34.02%**	**12.68%**			

Sources: Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; U.S. Census Bureau; Office of the State Demographer; North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center.

Life Expectancy in the U.S.

1930	1950	1970	1990	2006
59.7	68.2	70.8	75.4	78.1

Source: National Center for Health Statistics, *The Washington Post.*

Table 1: Older Population by State and Selected Age Groups, 2006
Ranked by Percentage of Total U.S. Population Age 65+

		Number of Older Residents		Percentage of Total Population		Population Ranks	
State	**Total Population**	**Age 65+**	**Age 85+**	**Age 65+**	**Age 85+**	**Number Age 65+**	***Percent Age 65+***
United States	**299,398,484**	**37,260,352**	**5,296,817**	**12.45%**	**1.77%**	**NA**	**NA**
Florida	18,089,888	3,037,704	462,545	16.79%	2.56%	2	1
West Virginia	1,818,470	278,692	36,073	15.33%	1.98%	34	2
Pennsylvania	12,440,621	1,885,323	294,824	15.15%	2.37%	5	3
Iowa	2,982,085	435,657	75,180	14.61%	2.52%	30	4
North Dakota	635,867	92,874	16,797	14.61%	2.64%	47	5
Maine	1,321,574	192,639	27,012	14.58%	2.04%	39	6
South Dakota	781,919	111,183	19,075	14.22%	2.44%	46	7
Hawaii	1,285,498	179,370	26,888	13.95%	2.09%	40	8
Arkansas	2,810,872	390,421	54,889	13.89%	1.95%	31	9
Rhode Island	1,067,610	147,966	25,123	13.86%	2.35%	43	10
Montana	944,632	130,592	19,000	13.82%	2.01%	44	11
Delaware	853,476	114,574	14,553	13.42%	1.71%	45	12
Connecticut	3,504,809	470,443	76,395	13.42%	2.18%	29	13
Alabama	4,599,030	615,597	79,530	13.39%	1.73%	22	14
Ohio	11,478,006	1,531,994	216,992	13.35%	1.89%	7	15

(continues)

Table 1: Older Population by State and Selected Age Groups, 2006
Ranked by Percentage of Total U.S. Population Age 65+

		Number of Older Residents		Percentage of Total Population		Population Ranks	
State	**Total Population**	**Age 65+**	**Age 85+**	**Age 65+**	**Age 85+**	**Number Age 65+**	***Percent Age 65+***
Missouri	5,842,713	778,891	113,789	13.33%	1.95%	16	16
Vermont	623,908	82,966	11,714	13.30%	1.88%	48	17
Massachusetts	6,437,193	855,962	137,022	13.30%	2.13%	13	18
Nebraska	1,768,331	234,655	39,128	13.27%	2.21%	37	19
Oklahoma	3,579,212	473,545	65,571	13.23%	1.83%	28	20
New York	19,306,183	2,522,686	371,667	13.07%	1.93%	3	21
Wisconsin	5,556,506	724,034	111,159	13.03%	2.00%	19	22
Kansas	2,764,075	357,709	59,518	12.94%	2.15%	33	23
New Jersey	8,724,560	1,127,742	166,529	12.93%	1.91%	9	24
Oregon	3,700,758	478,180	70,969	12.92%	1.92%	26	25
Arizona	6,166,318	790,286	105,104	12.82%	1.70%	14	26
South Carolina	4,321,249	553,396	68,701	12.81%	1.59%	23	27
Kentucky	4,206,074	537,294	69,463	12.77%	1.65%	24	28
Tennessee	6,038,803	769,222	97,712	12.74%	1.62%	17	29
Michigan	10,095,643	1,260,864	174,758	12.49%	1.73%	8	30
Mississippi	2,910,540	362,172	49,582	12.44%	1.70%	32	31
Indiana	6,313,520	784,219	111,190	12.42%	1.76%	15	32
New Mexico	1,954,599	242,600	31,309	12.41%	1.60%	36	33
New Hampshire	1,314,895	162,629	23,118	12.37%	1.76%	42	34
District of Columbia	581,530	71,331	10,770	12.27%	1.85%	49	35
Louisiana	4,287,768	523,346	67,599	12.21%	1.58%	25	36
Wyoming	515,004	62,750	8,367	12.18%	1.62%	50	37
North Carolina	**8,856,505**	**1,076,951**	**136,229**	**12.16%**	**1.54%**	**10**	**38**
Minnesota	5,167,101	627,394	101,634	12.14%	1.97%	21	39
Illinois	12,831,970	1,534,476	227,074	11.96%	1.77%	6	40
Virginia	7,642,884	887,768	112,129	11.62%	1.47%	12	41
Maryland	5,615,727	650,568	85,783	11.58%	1.53%	20	42
Washington	6,395,798	738,369	107,032	11.54%	1.67%	18	43
Idaho	1,466,465	169,173	23,384	11.54%	1.59%	41	44
Nevada	2,495,529	276,943	27,841	11.10%	1.12%	35	45
California	36,457,549	3,931,514	555,473	10.78%	1.52%	1	46
Colorado	4,753,377	477,186	61,232	10.04%	1.29%	27	47
Texas	23,507,783	2,334,459	302,646	9.93%	1.29%	4	48
Georgia	9,363,941	912,874	113,362	9.75%	1.21%	11	49
Utah	2,550,063	225,539	29,235	8.84%	1.15%	38	50
Alaska	670,053	45,630	4,148	6.81%	0.62%	51	51

Source: Administration on Aging, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. On the Internet at *http://www.aoa.gov/prof/Statistics/statistics.asp.*