

Section 11: Industry

Changing Conditions on the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas: 1990–2000

September 2004

Annabel R. Kirschner, Professor and Chair, and Julie Steinkopf Rice, Research Assistant
Department of Community and Rural Sociology, Washington State University,
Pullman, WA

Supported by a grant from the Olympic Natural Resources Center, the Port of Bremerton, and
Kitsap County

Section 11

Industry

Introduction

In viewing how areas are changing, it is important to examine the industrial base of that area and how that has changed as well. Different industries have different wage rates thus influencing the overall household income of an area. Often they also differ in the extent to which they employ men or women. And the educational requirements by industry vary.

However, it is very difficult to measure change by industry in area census tracts between 1990 and 2000 because a new industrial classification system was instituted by the U.S., Canadian and Mexican governments in the late 1990s. This is called the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) and replaced the Standard Industrial Classification codes instituted during the 1930s. The need to improve the SIC coding system became increasingly acute as industries developed and took on importance that had not even existed in the 1930s. NAICS classifies industries on how each business operates (SIC codes often classified industries based on the customers they served). NAICS gives a more accurate view of an area's industrial structure at the beginning of the 21st century than was possible with SIC codes. But it is extremely difficult to compare the two over time. New industries were recognized and new industrial categories were created. In addition, a number of existing industries changed categories. Thus this report will deal only with 2000 data.

It is important to note that the census provides data by industry on where workers live, not where they work.

Below are the major industrial categories under NAICS that are available at the census tract level and major changes that have occurred to these.

Agricultural, Forestry, fishing and hunting and mining

Important changes in this category include the fact that logging, formerly classified under manufacturing, was placed into this category. Also, with the data available for census tracts, it is not possible to separate out mining from the other industrial categories.

Construction

As well as categories that were in the SIC construction industry, this category now includes industries related to the management of construction sites and projects (formerly classified in management services), and land subdividers and developers (formerly in real estate).

Manufacturing

Much of this overall category remains the same (although many individual manufacturing industries were re-numbered). However, logging was placed in forestry, and most aspects related to publishing were placed in the new category of information. Added to this category were on-site bakeries formerly in retailing and a new category of computer electronic product manufacturing.

Wholesale and Retail Trade Redefined

Classifying industries by their operations instead of the customers served caused a major shift in industries between the wholesale and retail sectors. Many sectors previously classified in the wholesale sector have shifted into the retail sector.

Transportation, Warehousing and Utilities

This contains the categories formerly under transportation, communications and public utilities. Added to this sector were transportation related to sightseeing and tourism formerly in amusement and recreation services.

Information

This is an entirely new sector comprised of 34 industries and recognizes the emergence of the information economy. It includes industries that produce information and cultural products, disseminate information and process data. Twenty of the industries are new while the remainder, such as publishing (mentioned above), come from other former SIC sectors.

Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Rental and Leasing

The NAICS Finance, Insurance and Real Estate sectors are quite similar to the SIC categories. However, rental and leasing operations (including vehicle, medical, costume, and appliance rentals) formerly under business services have been added to this category.

Professional, Scientific, Management, Administrative and Waste Management Services

This new sector includes 29 newly identified industries and includes industries from four different SIC categories. This sector includes the management of corporations and enterprises as well as legal services, accounting, auditing and bookkeeping services, architectural services, surveying operations, graphic design, computer programming, management consulting services, research and development, advertising, market research, employment agencies, travel agencies, and waste collection and management.

Educational Health and Social Services

This sector includes industries in the former SIC categories of educational, health and social services as well as 12 new industries.

Arts, Entertainment, Recreation, Accommodation and Food Services

This sector is comprised of industries formerly in the service sector classified under the SIC codes of amusement and recreation services and hotels and lodging places and in the retail sector of eating and drinking places.

Other Services (except Public Administration)

This sector has four major sub-categories—repair and maintenance, personal and laundry services, religious, grant making, civic, professional and similar organizations and private households. It brings together industries from a variety of SIC categories including auto and repair services, miscellaneous repair services, personal services, membership organizations, and social services.

Public Administration

This is similar to the SIC category of public administration but also includes some categories formerly classified under social services.

Variation by Industry at the County/Sub-County Level

Clallam County

The *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector was over-represented in Clallam County's economy compared with the state (6.0% compared to 2.5%) in 2000. Employment in this sector was heavily concentrated in the western part of the county where between 10.7% and 19.2% of the civilian population worked in this sector.

Construction was somewhat over-represented in the county compared with the state (8.2% compared to 7.0%) and employment in this sector was most prevalent in the Sequim area.

Employment in *manufacturing* in Clallam County was well below the state average (6.5% compared to 12.5%). But this sector represented 9.5% of the civilian employment in the Forks area. The largest number of workers in this sector (1,026) were located in the Port Angeles area.

Wholesale trade represented a small percent of employment at both the county and state level (2.6% compared to 4.1%).

On the other hand, employment in *retail trade* was equally represented in the county and state economies (12.8% and 12.1%). Employment in this sector was concentrated around the Port Angeles and Sequim areas.

The *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector was also equally represented in the county and state's economies but at a lower level (5.1% and 5.4% respectively). This represented 11.1% of the civilian employment in the Crescent Lake area.

The *information* sector was small at the state level (3.4%) and extremely small at the county level, (1.6%). No sub-county area even approached the state's average.

Finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing was somewhat under-represented in the county compared to the state (4.4% compared to 6.1% of the civilian employment).

Employment in this sector was most prevalent numerically in the Port Angeles area and represented 5.4% of the employment in the Sequim area.

Employment in *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* was under-represented in the county compared to the state (6.5% compared to 9.8%).

Employment in this sector was most prevalent in the Port Angeles and Sequim areas, but still well below the state average.

The *educational/health/social services* sector represented the largest sector for both the county and the state at 21.7% and 19.4% respectively. With the exception of the Crescent Lake area, between 21.8% and 23.5% of the civilian labor force in all sub-county areas was employed in this sector in 2000.

The *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector for Clallam County, at 9.8%, was somewhat above the state's average of 7.9%. Employment in this sector was highest in the Sequim and Port Angeles areas, at 10.4% and 10.1%, respectively. A total of

1,520 workers in the Port Angeles area were employed in this sector.

County employment in the *other services* sector was 6.2%, slightly higher than the state's average of 4.8%. The highest percent of employment in this sector occurred in the Port Angeles and Sequim areas, at 6.5% and 7.7%, respectively.

Employment in the *public administration* sector was over-represented in the county (8.6%) compared to the state (5.0%). A large percent of the civilian labor force was employed in this sector in the western portion of the county where percents ranged between 13.8% and 32.1% in 2000.

Grays Harbor County

Employment in the *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector in the county, at 7.3%, was well above the state's average of 2.5%. The percent of workers employed in this sector was highest in the areas of the Quinalt Reservation, Southeast/Oakville, a section of Aberdeen, and South Shore/Westport, where percents ranged between 11% to 13.6%.

At 7.7%, employment in the *construction* sector in the county was just slightly higher than the state's average of 7.0%. The highest number and percent of workers in this sector was in the North Beach/Ocean Shores area, with 310 workers or 13.8% of the civilian labor force.

Employment in the *manufacturing* sector for the county was consistent with the state's average, with both at 12.5%. The highest percent of workers employed in this sector was in the McCleary area, at 19.2%.

Wholesale trade represented a small percent of employment at both the county and state level, at 2.6% and 4.1%, respectively. However, a section of Aberdeen was at 5.1%, slightly above the state's average.

Retail trade at the county level was 13%, slightly above the state's average of 12.1%. The

highest percent of employment in this sector occurred in the Aberdeen area where percents ranged between 15% and 18.5%.

Employment in the *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector for the county was 4.8%, just below the state's average of 5.4%.

Employment in the *information* sector was minimal for the county, at 1.5% or 411 workers. By comparison, the state's average was 3.4%. In one section of Aberdeen, however, the percent of workers employed in this sector was 4.2%.

Finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing was under-represented at the county level when compared to the state's average, at 4.1% and 6.1%, respectively. The highest number and percent of workers employed in this sector at the sub-county level was in the North Beach/Ocean Shores area, with 136 workers or 6% of the labor force.

Employment in the *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* sector for the county, at 4.1%, was well below the state's average of 9.8%.

The *educational/health/social services* sector represented the largest sector for both the state and the county, at 19.4% and 19.8%, respectively. At the sub-county level a section of Aberdeen had the highest percent, at 26.4%. The percent of workers employed in this sector was also high in the Central Park area, at 25%, and in the Hoquiam area where percents ranged between 22% and 22.8%.

Employment in the *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector was at 9.9% for the county—just above the state's average of 7.9%. The North Beach/Ocean Shores area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, at 22.2%. Percents were also high in the Hoquiam area where they were between 9.2% and 12.3%.

Employment in the *other services* sector for the county was 5.7%. The state's average,

for comparison, was 4.8%. A section of Aberdeen had the highest percent, at 10.3%.

The *public administration* sector was somewhat over-represented in the county when compared to the state, at 7.2% and 5%, respectively. The highest percent of workers employed in this sector occurred in the areas of the Quinalt Reservation (11.1%) and Montesano (11%). The Montesano area also had the highest number of the civilian labor force working in this sector.

Jefferson County

Employment in the *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector for the county was small, just 3.7%, slightly above the state's average of 2.5%. At the sub-county level the Quilcene Bay area had the highest number and percent of the civilian labor force employed in this sector, with 166 workers or 15.2% of the civilian labor force.

The *construction* sector was somewhat over-represented in Jefferson County, at 10.5%, when compared to the state at 7%. The West End area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, at 18.3%. The highest number of workers in this sector occurred in the Port Townsend area, with 352 workers.

Employment in the *manufacturing* sector for the county, at 10.4%, was slightly below the state's average of 12.5%. Over half of the county's workers in this sector were located in the Discovery Bay and Port Townsend areas. The highest percent of workers in this sector was in the Discovery Bay area at 14.4%.

The *wholesale trade* sector was under-represented in the county (1.8%) when compared to the state's average (4.1%). Nearly half of all workers in this sector were located in the Port Townsend area, with 82 workers.

Employment in the *retail trade* sector was slightly lower for the county when compared to the state, at 11.3% and 12.1%, respectively. The highest percent of workers employed in this

sector occurred in the areas of Port Townsend (13.6%) and Marrowstone Island (14.7%). The Port Townsend area also had the highest number of workers in this sector.

Employment in the *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector for the county was consistent with the state's average, with both at 5.4%. The highest percent of workers employed in this sector was in the Port Ludlow and Marrowstone Island areas, at 8.9% and 7.3%, respectively.

Employment in the *information* sector was minimal for the county at 2.4% (or 258 workers) and also for the state at 3.4%. The Port Townsend area had the highest number of workers employed in this sector.

Finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing was under-represented in the county when compared to the state, at 3.6% and 6.1%, respectively. The highest percent of workers employed in this sector occurred in the areas of Port Ludlow (4.5%) and Marrowstone Island (4.4%).

Employment in the *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* sector for the county, at 8%, was slightly below the state's average of 9.8%. At the sub-county level the Port Ludlow area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, at 14.6%. Approximately one-third of all workers in the county employed in this sector were located in the Port Townsend area.

The *educational/health/social services* sector had the highest percent of employed workers for both the state and the county, at 19.4% and 18.3%, respectively. Nearly half of all workers in this sector were in the Port Townsend area.

Employment in the *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector for the county was 12.7%, well above the state's average of 7.9%. The Port Townsend area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector at 15.7%.

Employment in the *other services* sector for the county was 5.3%, just slightly above the state's average of 4.8%. The Port Townsend area had the highest number of workers in this sector, with 211 workers.

The *public services* sector was slightly over-represented in the county at 6.6% when compared to the state at 5%. The highest percent was in the West End area, 16.2%, while the highest number of workers in this sector occurred in the Discovery Bay and Port Townsend areas.

Kitsap County

Employment in the *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector for the county was just .9%—well below the state's average of 2.5% and the lowest of all the counties included in this study.

Employment in the *construction* sector for the county was 7.7%, just above the state's average of 7%. The highest percent of workers employed in this sector occurred in the areas of Kingston, Port Gamble City, and West of Bremerton, where percents ranged between 11% and 12.8%.

The *manufacturing* sector was under-represented in Kitsap County when compared to the state, at 11% and 12.5%, respectively. The highest percent of workers employed in this sector was in the Port Orchard/Parkwood area at 18%. The Southeast corner also had a high percent of workers employed in this sector, ranging between 13% and 17.7%.

Employment in the *wholesale trade* sector was very low for the county, at 2%. The state's average, for comparison, was 4.1%.

In contrast, employment in the *retail trade* sector for the county was slightly above the state's average, at 12.6% and 12.1%, respectively. The Bremerton area had the highest percent of

workers employed in this sector, with percents ranging between 15% to 19.7% in some sections.

The *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector was under-represented in the county, at 4.3%, when compared to the state's average of 5.4%. The Southeast Corner had the highest number of workers employed in this sector.

Employment in the *information* sector for the county was 2.8%, or 2,705 workers. For comparison, the state's average was 3.4%.

Employment in the *finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing* sector for the county was 5.7%, just below the state's average of 6.1%. The Bremerton area had the highest percent of the civilian labor force employed in this sector, with percents in some sections ranging between 8.1% and 14.9%.

Employment in the *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* sector was 10.4%, just above the state's average of 9.8%. Bainbridge Island had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, with percents ranging between 19.1% and 22.9%.

The *educational/health/social services* sector had the highest percent of employed workers for both the state and the county, at 19.4% and 19.7%, respectively. The Bremerton area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector where percents in many sections ranged between 20% to 30.5%.

Employment in the *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector for the county was 8.7%, somewhat above the state's average of 7.9%. The Bremerton area had the highest percent of the civilian labor force employed in this sector, with percents in many sections ranging between 8.9% to 18.1%. The Silverdale area also had a high percent of workers employed in this sector, with percents between 8.2% and 12.6%.

Employment in the *other services* sector was identical between the county and the state, with both at 4.8%.

The *public administration* sector was over-represented in the county when compared to the state, at 9.5% and 5%, respectively. In many sections of Bremerton the percent of workers in this sector ranged between 10.1% and 20.4%. The Silverdale area also had a high percent of workers employed in this sector, with percents between 10.1% and 17.4%. Numerically, the Central Hood Canal area and a section of the Southeast Corner area had the highest number of workers in this sector.

Mason County

Employment in the *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector for the county was 4.6%, nearly double the state average of 2.5%. The Skokomish Reservation area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, at 11.8%. The percent of workers in this sector was also high in the Shelton area, where percents ranged between 4.4% and 8.8%.

The *construction* sector was somewhat over-represented in the county (9.4%) as compared to the state (7%). The Allyn-Grapeview and North Canal areas had the highest number of workers employed in this sector. The highest percent of workers in this sector was in the Oakland Bay area, at 13.2%.

Employment in the *manufacturing* sector for the county, at 11.7%, was just below the state's average of 12.5%. The Mason Lake area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector at 14.1%. The Shelton area also had a high percent of workers in this sector, with percents between 9.9% and 13.5%.

Wholesale trade represented a small percent of employment at both the county and state level (2.7% compared to 4.1%).

Retail trade at the county level was 11.8%, slightly below the state's average of 12.1%. The North Canal area had the highest percent and number of workers in this sector, at 15% or 309 workers. The Shelton area also had high percents of workers employed in this sector, between 9.9% and 13.2%.

Employment in the *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector for the county was 5.3%, nearly identical to the state's average of 5.4%. The percent of workers in this sector was highest in the Shelton area where percents ranged between 3.3% and 7.5%.

The *information* sector was small at the state level (3.4%) and extremely small at the county level, (2.0% or 377 workers). Only one section of Shelton approached the state's average of 4.5%.

Employment in the *finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing* sector for the county was 4.1%, somewhat below the state's average of 6.1%. Over two-thirds of workers employed in this sector were in the Shelton area, where percents for most sections ranged between 4.5% and 5%. The South area and the West area also had a high percent of workers employed in this sector, at 5.8% and 5%, respectively.

Employment in the *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* sector was 6.2%, well below the state's average of 9.8%. At the sub-county level, 10% of the civilian labor force in the Mason Lake area was employed in this sector, and 9% of the labor force in Oakland Bay area. The Shelton area also had high percents of workers in this sector, with percents between 4.5% and 8.8%.

The *educational/health/social services* sector had the highest percent of employed workers for both the state and the county, at 19.4% and 17.5%, respectively. The Mason Lake area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, at 20.9%. This was closely

followed by the Shelton area where percents for most sections were between 16.6% and 20.5%.

Employment in the *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector for the county was 7.2%, just below the state's average of 7.9%. The Skokomish Reservation area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector at 14%. The North Canal area and a section of Shelton also had a high percent of workers in this sector, at 10% and 11.7%, respectively.

Employment in the *other services* sector for the county was 5.2%, just above the state's average of 4.8%. The Oakland Bay area had the highest percent of workers in this sector, at 8.1%.

The *public administration* sector was over-represented at the county level (12.3%) compared to the state's average (5%). The sub-county areas of the Skokomish Reservation and the South Canal area had the highest percent of workers employed in this sector, at 22.5% and 17.5%, respectively. Over one-third of all workers in this sector were located in the Shelton area where percents were also high, ranging between 10% and 14.8%.

Pacific County

Employment in the *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector for the county was 8.3%, well above the state's average of 2.5%. At the sub-county level, approximately one-third of all workers in this sector were in the East area. The South Bend area also had a high percent of workers in this sector at 12.2%.

The *construction* sector in the county was close to the state's average, at 6.8% and 7%, respectively. Employment in this sector was distributed fairly evenly at the sub-county level, although the highest percent of workers in this sector was in the Long Beach area at 9.2%.

Employment in the *manufacturing* sector for the county was 9.9%, somewhat below the

state's average of 12.5%. Approximately two-thirds of workers employed in this sector were located in the Raymond and South Bend areas.

The *wholesale trade* sector was extremely small at the county level, at 1.9%. For comparison, the state's average was 4.1%.

The *retail trade* sector was slightly under-represented at the county level (10%) compared to the state's average (12.1%). The sub-county areas with the highest percent of workers employed in this sector were Long Beach and both sections of Ocean Park, at 11.3%, 11.8% and 11.2%, respectively.

Employment in the *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector for the county was 4.5%, just below the state's average of 5.4%. Approximately one-quarter of all workers in this sector were located in the East area.

The *information* sector represented a small portion of employment at both the county and the state level, at 2.3% and 3.4%, respectively.

Employment in the *finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing* sector for the county was 3.7%, well below the state's average of 6.1%. Employment was fairly evenly distributed throughout all sub-county areas.

Employment in the *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* sector was 5.8% for the county, well below the state's average of 9.8%. Nearly one-quarter of all workers in this sector lived in the South Bend area.

The *educational/health/social services* sector had the highest percent of employed workers for both the state and the county, at 21.3% and 19.4%, respectively. This was one of the highest percents of all the counties in this study area. Several sub-county areas exceeded the state's average in the percent of workers employed in this sector. In the Long Beach City area,

26% of all workers were employed in this sector. Both sections of the Ocean Park area and the Long Beach area also had high percents, at 24.6%, 24.8%, and 24%, respectively.

Employment in the *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector for the county was 12.6 %, well above the state's average of 7.9%. In the Long Beach City area, nearly one-quarter (23.6%) of all workers were employed in this sector. A section of Ocean Park also had a high percent of workers in this sector, at 20.6%, as well as the Long Beach area, at 15.5%.

Employment in the *other services* sector for the county was 6%, somewhat above the state's average of 4.8%.

The *public administration* sector was over-represented at the county level (6.9%) compared to the state's average (5%). The East area had the highest percent of workers in this sector, at 9.8%.

Wahkiakum County

The *agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining* sector was extremely over-represented in Wahkiakum County's economy compared with the state, at 14.6% and 2.5%, respectively. This was also the highest portion of employment in this sector for all the counties included in the study area.

Employment in the *construction* sector for the county was 7.9%, just above the state's average of 7%.

Employment in the *manufacturing* sector was slightly below the state's average, at 10.1% and 12.5%, respectively.

Wholesale trade represented a small percent of employment at both the county and state level (1.6% compared to 4.1%).

Retail trade for the county was well below the state's average, at 6.9% for the county and 12.1% for the state.

Employment in the *transportation/warehousing/utilities* sector for the county was 6.2%, somewhat above the state's average at 5.4%.

Employment in the *information* sector was 3.3% for the county, nearly identical to the state's average of 3.4%.

Finance/insurance/real estate/rental/leasing was under-represented in the county when compared to the state, at 3.5% and 6.1%, respectively.

Employment in the *professional/scientific/management/administrative/waste management* sector was 3.5% for the county, well below the state's average of 9.8%.

The *educational/health/social services* sector had the highest percent of employed workers for both the state and the county, at 24.6% and 19.4%, respectively.

The *arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services* sector for Wahkiakum County, at 6.3%, was somewhat below the state's average of 7.9%.

County employment in the *other services* sector was 5%, slightly higher than the state's average of 4.8%.

The *public administration* sector was over-represented at the county level (6.5%) compared to the state's average (5%).

Table 11.1 Employed civilian population 16 years and older by industry

Area	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining		Construction		Manufacturing		Wholesale Trade		Retail Trade		Transportation and warehousing, and utilities		Information		Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Washington	68,976	2.5	194,871	7.0	348,646	12.5	113,526	4.1	338,772	12.1	150,985	5.4	95,669	3.4	170,622	6.1
Clallam	1,478	6.0	2,006	8.2	1,578	6.5	648	2.6	3,119	12.8	1,255	5.1	385	1.6	1,073	4.4
BNA 9801	90	19.2	27	5.8	3	0.6	4	0.9	15	3.2	12	2.6	0	0.0	4	0.9
BNA 9802	59	12.9	15	3.3	15	3.3	15	3.3	29	6.3	19	4.1	4	0.9	3	0.7
^{C1} BNA 9803	470	17.0	126	4.6	262	9.5	59	2.1	280	10.2	146	5.3	10	0.4	45	1.6
BNA 9806	139	10.7	98	7.5	71	5.4	56	4.3	90	6.9	145	11.1	16	1.2	54	4.1
^{C2} BNA 9807	559	3.7	1,271	8.4	1,026	6.8	420	2.8	2,088	13.8	750	5.0	318	2.1	732	4.8
^{C3} BNA 9819	161	3.7	469	10.7	201	4.6	94	2.1	617	14.1	183	4.2	37	0.8	235	5.4
Grays Harbor	2,001	7.3	2,119	7.7	3,437	12.5	722	2.6	3,572	13.0	1,315	4.8	411	1.5	1,119	4.1
^{G1} Tract 1	222	11.3	156	7.9	222	11.3	91	4.6	180	9.2	114	5.8	41	2.1	52	2.6
Tract 2	12	0.5	310	13.8	143	6.3	22	1.0	205	9.1	97	4.3	22	1.0	136	6.0
Tract 4	192	6.9	236	8.4	345	12.3	93	3.3	380	13.6	151	5.4	54	1.9	80	2.9
Tract 5	226	9.1	141	5.6	388	15.5	27	1.1	339	13.6	98	3.9	8	0.3	125	5.0
Tract 6	37	2.7	105	7.6	266	19.2	21	1.5	176	12.7	78	5.6	19	1.4	53	3.8
									0							
Tract 7	223	13.3	158	9.4	177	10.5	27	1.6	125	7.4	86	5.1	15	0.9	64	3.8
Tract 8	92	5.2	176	9.9	166	9.3	28	1.6	220	12.3	115	6.4	23	1.3	67	3.8
Tract 9	166	6.8	179	7.3	368	15.0	47	1.9	454	18.5	70	2.8	26	1.1	96	3.9
Tract 10	172	11.0	81	5.2	168	10.7	54	3.5	267	17.1	45	2.9	34	2.2	64	4.1
Tract 11	66	4.0	94	5.7	124	7.5	34	2.1	249	15.0	77	4.6	69	4.2	94	5.7
Tract 12	98	5.8	93	5.5	222	13.1	86	5.1	295	17.4	92	5.4	35	2.1	82	4.8
Tract 13	95	6.6	119	8.2	196	13.5	35	2.4	159	11.0	81	5.6	16	1.1	56	3.9
Tract 14	57	6.3	79	8.8	128	14.2	16	1.8	81	9.0	54	6.0	12	1.3	44	4.9
Tract 15	80	5.2	111	7.2	218	14.2	59	3.8	173	11.3	58	3.8	29	1.9	45	2.9
Tract 16	263	13.6	81	4.2	306	15.8	82	4.2	269	13.9	99	5.1	8	0.4	61	3.1
Jefferson	406	3.7	1,146	10.5	1,127	10.4	201	1.8	1,232	11.3	584	5.4	258	2.4	392	3.6
BNA 9501	19	9.6	36	18.3	2	1.0	4	2.0	2	1.0	9	4.6	0	0.0	3	1.5
^{J1} BNA 9502	166	15.2	136	12.5	93	8.5	13	1.2	110	10.1	59	5.4	29	2.7	30	2.8
BNA 9503	65	4.0	186	11.5	157	9.7	23	1.4	108	6.7	143	8.9	18	1.1	72	4.5
BNA 9504	31	1.9	188	11.6	177	10.9	39	2.4	238	14.7	118	7.3	35	2.2	72	4.4
BNA 9505	49	2.1	248	10.4	345	14.4	40	1.7	237	9.9	149	6.2	74	3.1	99	4.1
^{J2} BNA 9506	76	1.9	352	8.9	353	8.9	82	2.1	537	13.6	106	2.7	102	2.6	116	2.9

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining		Construction		Manufacturing		Wholesale Trade		Retail Trade		Transportation and warehousing, and utilities		Information		Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kitsap	925	0.9	7,552	7.7	10,759	11.0	1,957	2.0	12,325	12.6	4,179	4.3	2,705	2.8	5,609	5.7
Tract 801.01 Bremerton	0	0.0	45	5.0	106	11.7	9	1.0	168	18.6	38	4.2	27	3.0	45	5.0
Tract 801.02 Bremerton	15	0.8	121	6.6	158	8.7	40	2.2	300	16.4	61	3.3	40	2.2	89	4.9
Tract 802 Bremerton	16	1.1	95	6.6	166	11.5	36	2.5	284	19.7	65	4.5	34	2.4	70	4.9
Tract 803 Bremerton	3	0.3	63	5.5	119	10.3	28	2.4	158	13.7	26	2.3	26	2.3	73	6.3
Tract 804 Bremerton	5	0.3	128	7.8	192	11.7	18	1.1	246	15.0	85	5.2	61	3.7	26	1.6
K ¹ Tract 805 Bremerton	20	1.8	99	9.0	80	7.3	29	2.6	155	14.1	79	7.2	47	4.3	19	1.7
Tract 806 Bremerton	0	0.0	136	6.0	294	13.0	68	3.0	269	11.9	76	3.4	78	3.4	116	5.1
Tract 807 Bremerton	0	0.0	98	6.5	225	15.0	15	1.0	216	14.4	55	3.7	41	2.7	77	5.1
Tract 808.98 Bremerton	0	0.0	5	1.1	24	5.3	6	1.3	60	13.3	11	2.4	13	2.9	27	6.0
Tract 809.98 Bremerton	0	0.0	109	6.3	221	12.8	40	2.3	208	12.0	69	4.0	30	1.7	140	8.1
Tract 810 Bremerton	0	0.0	126	8.1	166	10.6	27	1.7	266	17.1	24	1.5	26	1.7	119	7.6
K ² Tract 811 Bremerton	7	0.3	157	6.9	291	12.8	35	1.5	299	13.1	117	5.1	90	4.0	112	4.9
K ³ Tract 814 Bremerton	12	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	5.3	10	8.8	6	5.3	0	0.0
Tract 901.01 Port Gamble Reservation	29	1.4	183	8.6	192	9.0	46	2.2	317	14.9	86	4.0	86	4.0	137	6.4
Tract 901.02 Kingston	42	1.9	266	12.0	245	11.1	60	2.7	228	10.3	124	5.6	41	1.9	96	4.3
Tract 902 Port Gamble City	116	3.0	419	11.0	480	12.6	53	1.4	423	11.1	127	3.3	100	2.6	258	6.8
K ⁴ Tract 903 Bangor Trident Base	20	2.8	29	4.0	18	2.5	12	1.7	115	16.0	14	1.9	21	2.9	66	9.2
Tract 904 Poulsbo	47	2.4	182	9.4	142	7.4	76	3.9	239	12.4	77	4.0	42	2.2	128	6.6
Tract 905 Poulsbo	45	1.5	267	8.7	194	6.4	53	1.7	387	12.7	124	4.1	133	4.4	295	9.7
Tract 906.01 Port Madison Reservation	67	2.6	253	9.6	168	6.4	50	1.9	357	13.6	86	3.3	84	3.2	129	4.9
Tract 906.02 Port Madison Reservation	0															
Tract 907 Bainbridge Island	21	1.4	153	10.2	139	9.3	41	2.7	173	11.6	63	4.2	50	3.3	103	6.9
Tract 908 Bainbridge Island	35	1.5	127	5.5	243	10.5	48	2.1	201	8.7	110	4.7	69	3.0	196	8.4
Tract 909 Bainbridge Island	29	1.4	119	5.9	99	4.9	27	1.3	149	7.4	99	4.9	109	5.4	300	14.9
Tract 910 Bainbridge Island	8	0.3	98	4.1	145	6.1	118	5.0	206	8.7	85	3.6	63	2.6	179	7.5
Tract 911 Silverdale	17	0.6	207	7.0	186	6.3	122	4.1	209	7.1	128	4.3	151	5.1	234	7.9
Tract 912.01 Silverdale	25	1.2	119	5.8	206	10.0	41	2.0	282	13.8	53	2.6	33	1.6	82	4.0
Tract 912.01 Silverdale	11	0.7	69	4.5	104	6.8	13	0.9	244	16.0	20	1.3	23	1.5	84	5.5

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining		Construction		Manufacturing		Wholesale Trade		Retail Trade		Transportation and warehousing, and utilities		Information		Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Kitsap County, continued</i>																
^{K5} Tract 912.02	19	0.4	185	4.2	341	7.8	37	0.8	630	14.4	149	3.4	116	2.7	293	6.7
^{K6} Tract 913	32	0.8	283	7.2	449	11.3	79	2.0	528	13.3	157	4.0	75	1.9	135	3.4
Tract 914	6	0.4	142	9.1	194	12.5	21	1.4	132	8.5	45	2.9	54	3.5	126	8.1
Tract 915	0	0.0	95	5.6	154	9.1	23	1.4	231	13.6	62	3.7	32	1.9	91	5.4
Tract 916	7	0.2	117	4.1	274	9.5	33	1.1	531	18.4	106	3.7	52	1.8	142	4.9
Tract 917	0	0.0	226	7.2	458	14.6	51	1.6	463	14.7	101	3.2	84	2.7	142	4.5
Tract 918	4	0.3	74	5.6	147	11.1	12	0.9	111	8.4	43	3.3	42	3.2	61	4.6
Tract 919	5	0.4	45	3.2	198	14.0	24	1.7	143	10.1	38	2.7	33	2.3	79	5.6
Tract 920	26	1.2	278	12.8	200	9.2	48	2.2	229	10.5	102	4.7	39	1.8	121	5.6
Tract 921	19	0.9	184	9.1	287	14.3	33	1.6	177	8.8	70	3.5	80	4.0	60	3.0
Tract 922	0	0.0	244	10.8	192	8.5	46	2.0	312	13.8	64	2.8	53	2.3	174	7.7
Tract 923	23	1.0	271	11.7	331	14.2	61	2.6	266	11.5	147	6.3	108	4.6	80	3.4
Tract 924	0	0.0	199	7.4	331	12.3	45	1.7	443	16.5	105	3.9	49	1.8	128	4.8
Tract 925	0	0.0	165	8.4	354	18.0	50	2.5	301	15.3	69	3.5	43	2.2	71	3.6
Tract 926	7	0.3	189	7.4	329	12.9	36	1.4	343	13.4	223	8.7	65	2.5	132	5.2
Tract 927	29	0.8	273	7.8	524	15.0	66	1.9	359	10.3	212	6.1	57	1.6	161	4.6
^{K7} Tract 928	22	0.5	460	9.5	633	13.0	83	1.7	526	10.8	318	6.5	137	2.8	218	4.5
^{K8} Tract 929	136	3.2	449	10.5	760	17.7	98	2.3	435	10.1	256	6.0	62	1.4	195	4.5
Mason	884	4.6	1,822	9.4	2,255	11.7	528	2.7	2,275	11.8	1,024	5.3	377	2.0	798	4.1
^{M1} BNA 9602	120	5.7	201	9.6	258	12.3	58	2.8	251	12.0	112	5.3	39	1.9	104	5.0
BNA 9603	59	2.9	223	10.8	260	12.6	57	2.8	309	15.0	122	5.9	7	0.3	72	3.5
BNA 9604	42	1.8	267	11.3	278	11.8	75	3.2	265	11.3	149	6.3	43	1.8	70	3.0
BNA 9605	41	2.8	111	7.6	178	12.2	48	3.3	178	12.2	83	5.7	49	3.3	68	4.6
^{M2} BNA 9606	169	6.1	179	6.4	303	10.9	65	2.3	295	10.6	148	5.3	43	1.5	140	5.0
BNA 9607	57	8.8	65	10.0	80	12.3	34	5.2	86	13.2	49	7.5	29	4.5	7	1.1
BNA 9609	80	4.4	159	8.7	181	9.9	55	3.0	239	13.1	95	5.2	35	1.9	88	4.8
BNA 9610	101	5.0	195	9.7	270	13.5	50	2.5	198	9.9	67	3.3	62	3.1	90	4.5
BNA 9611	93	6.0	205	13.2	170	11.0	27	1.7	191	12.3	61	3.9	35	2.3	42	2.7
BNA 9612	11	1.1	73	7.1	145	14.1	20	2.0	115	11.2	81	7.9	26	2.5	36	3.5

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining		Construction		Manufacturing		Wholesale Trade		Retail Trade		Transportation and warehousing, and utilities		Information		Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Mason County, continued</i>																
BNA 9613 South	90	6.8	139	10.5	112	8.5	35	2.6	142	10.7	48	3.6	6	0.5	77	5.8
BNA 9614 Skokomish Reservation	21	11.8	5	2.8	20	11.2	4	2.2	6	3.4	9	5.1	3	1.7	4	2.2
Pacific	663	8.3	545	6.8	789	9.9	151	1.9	797	10.0	360	4.5	184	2.3	299	3.7
BNA 9502 Raymond	142	8.2	93	5.4	249	14.4	35	2.0	172	10.0	40	2.3	61	3.5	47	2.7
BNA 9503 South Bend	175	12.2	84	5.9	225	15.7	21	1.5	127	8.9	64	4.5	14	1.0	57	4.0
^{P1} BNA 9504 East	228	14.6	92	5.9	147	9.4	33	2.1	132	8.5	90	5.8	37	2.4	38	2.4
BNA 9505 Long Beach	48	4.5	99	9.2	87	8.1	24	2.2	121	11.3	46	4.3	36	3.4	45	4.2
BNA 9506 Long Beach city	25	4.6	34	6.3	23	4.3	3	0.6	53	9.8	12	2.2	17	3.2	31	5.8
BNA 9507 Ocean Park	28	2.8	87	8.7	26	2.6	14	1.4	118	11.8	48	4.8	5	0.5	46	4.6
^{P2} BNA 9508 Ocean Park	17	2.6	56	8.5	32	4.8	21	3.2	74	11.2	60	9.1	14	2.1	35	5.3
Wahkiakum	227	14.6	123	7.9	157	10.1	25	1.6	108	6.9	96	6.2	51	3.3	55	3.5
BNA 9501	227	14.6	123	7.9	157	10.1	25	1.6	108	6.9	96	6.2	51	3.3	55	3.5

Data from U.S. Census table P049 SF3.

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services		Educational, health and social services		Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services		Other services (except public administration)		Public Administration	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Washington	272,466	9.8	541,214	19.4	221,656	7.9	135,379	4.8	140,940	5.0
Clallam	1,593	6.5	5,301	21.7	2,392	9.8	1,516	6.2	2,111	8.6
BNA 9801 Neah Bay	13	2.8	110	23.5	31	6.6	9	1.9	150	32.1
BNA 9802 East of Neah Bay	25	5.4	108	23.5	21	4.6	10	2.2	136	29.6
^{C1} BNA 9803 Forks	92	3.3	510	18.5	251	9.1	127	4.6	380	13.8
BNA 9806 Crescent Lake	65	5.0	301	23.1	113	8.7	48	3.7	107	8.2
^{C2} BNA 9807 Port Angeles	1,034	6.9	3,291	21.8	1,520	10.1	984	6.5	1,101	7.3
^{C3} BNA 9819 Sequim	364	8.3	981	22.4	456	10.4	338	7.7	237	5.4
Grays Harbor	1,129	4.1	5,463	19.8	2,721	9.9	1,575	5.7	1,972	7.2
^{G1} Tract 1 Quinalt Reservation	71	3.6	318	16.2	186	9.5	94	4.8	218	11.1
Tract 2 North Beach/Ocean Shores	73	3.2	416	18.5	501	22.2	162	7.2	154	6.8
Tract 4 Montesano	82	2.9	642	23.0	119	4.3	113	4.0	308	11.0
Tract 5 Elma	117	4.7	508	20.4	172	6.9	133	5.3	214	8.6
Tract 6 McCleary	76	5.5	233	16.8	84	6.1	95	6.8	145	10.4
Tract 7 Southeast/Oakville	43	2.6	282	16.8	214	12.7	120	7.1	147	8.7
Tract 8 Central Park	75	4.2	447	25.0	127	7.1	75	4.2	175	9.8
Tract 9 Aberdeen	103	4.2	478	19.4	257	10.5	106	4.3	109	4.4
Tract 10 Aberdeen	62	4.0	212	13.6	192	12.3	161	10.3	51	3.3
Tract 11 Aberdeen	92	5.6	437	26.4	84	5.1	121	7.3	116	7.0
Tract 12 Aberdeen	95	5.6	290	17.1	127	7.5	90	5.3	88	5.2
Tract 13 Hoquiam	51	3.5	325	22.5	178	12.3	98	6.8	38	2.6
Tract 14 Hoquiam	48	5.3	198	22.0	83	9.2	71	7.9	29	3.2
Tract 15 Hoquiam	72	4.7	349	22.8	181	11.8	83	5.4	76	5.0
Tract 16 South Shore/Westport	69	3.6	328	16.9	216	11.1	53	2.7	104	5.4
									0	
Jefferson	867	8.0	1,989	18.3	1,379	12.7	572	5.3	712	6.6
BNA 9501 West End	13	6.6	38	19.3	22	11.2	17	8.6	32	16.2
^{J1} BNA 9502 Quilcene Bay	68	6.2	154	14.1	136	12.5	41	3.8	54	5.0
BNA 9503 Port Ludlow	235	14.6	236	14.6	139	8.6	89	5.5	142	8.8
BNA 9504 Marrowstone Island	94	5.8	272	16.8	170	10.5	135	8.3	50	3.1
BNA 9505 Discovery Bay	176	7.4	386	16.2	291	12.2	79	3.3	216	9.0
^{J2} BNA 9506 Port Townsend	281	7.1	903	22.8	621	15.7	211	5.3	218	5.5

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services		Educational, health and social services		Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services		Other services (except public administration)		Public Administration	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kitsap	10,252	10.4	19,373	19.7	8,534	8.7	4,675	4.8	9,301	9.5
Tract 801.01 Bremerton	61	6.8	220	24.4	71	7.9	56	6.2	57	6.3
Tract 801.02 Bremerton	140	7.7	421	23.1	227	12.4	72	3.9	141	7.7
Tract 802 Bremerton	86	6.0	277	19.3	149	10.4	92	6.4	68	4.7
Tract 803 Bremerton	127	11.0	213	18.5	130	11.3	102	8.9	83	7.2
Tract 804 Bremerton	129	7.9	420	25.7	145	8.9	90	5.5	91	5.6
^{K1} Tract 805 Bremerton	119	10.8	161	14.6	200	18.1	40	3.6	54	4.9
Tract 806 Bremerton	209	9.2	400	17.6	298	13.1	94	4.1	230	10.1
Tract 807 Bremerton	170	11.4	285	19.0	144	9.6	39	2.6	132	8.8
Tract 808.98 Bremerton	41	9.1	138	30.5	55	12.2	21	4.6	51	11.3
Tract 809.98 Bremerton	184	10.6	351	20.3	165	9.5	72	4.2	141	8.2
Tract 810 Bremerton	147	9.4	232	14.9	219	14.0	93	6.0	114	7.3
^{K2} Tract 811 Bremerton	217	9.5	383	16.8	310	13.6	95	4.2	161	7.1
^{K3} Tract 814 Bremerton	26	23.0	8	7.1	15	13.3	7	6.2	23	20.4
Tract 901.01 Port Gamble Reservation	280	13.1	320	15.0	132	6.2	100	4.7	224	10.5
Tract 901.02 Kingston	328	14.8	357	16.1	93	4.2	131	5.9	204	9.2
Tract 902 Port Gamble City	464	12.2	611	16.0	197	5.2	194	5.1	376	9.8
^{K4} Tract 903 Bangor Trident Base	22	3.1	209	29.1	92	12.8	11	1.5	89	12.4
Tract 904 Poulsbo	224	11.6	344	17.9	109	5.7	78	4.0	238	12.4
Tract 905 Poulsbo	285	9.3	559	18.3	391	12.8	191	6.3	131	4.3
Tract 906.01 Port Madison Reservation	415	15.8	404	15.4	244	9.3	142	5.4	225	8.6
Tract 906.02 Port Madison Reservation	150	10.0	267	17.9	114	7.6	60	4.0	160	10.7
Tract 907 Bainbridge Island	486	20.9	447	19.3	155	6.7	93	4.0	112	4.8
Tract 908 Bainbridge Island	384	19.1	433	21.5	148	7.3	27	1.3	92	4.6
<i>Kitsap County, continued</i>										
Tract 909 Bainbridge Island	493	20.7	534	22.4	189	7.9	139	5.8	124	5.2
Tract 910 Bainbridge Island	676	22.9	468	15.9	216	7.3	148	5.0	190	6.4
Tract 911 Silverdale	212	10.3	369	18.0	169	8.2	102	5.0	357	17.4
Tract 912.01 Silverdale	173	11.4	341	22.4	192	12.6	95	6.2	154	10.1

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services		Educational, health and social services		Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services		Other services (except public administration)		Public Administration	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Kitsap County, continued</i>										
^{K5} Tract 912.02 Silverdale	444	10.2	940	21.5	476	10.9	190	4.4	545	12.5
^{K6} Tract 913 Central Hood Canal Area	258	6.5	927	23.4	285	7.2	199	5.0	550	13.9
Tract 914 Bremerton	178	11.5	322	20.7	111	7.1	103	6.6	120	7.7
Tract 915 Bremerton	174	10.3	446	26.3	125	7.4	72	4.2	192	11.3
Tract 916 Bremerton	231	8.0	618	21.4	364	12.6	152	5.3	259	9.0
Tract 917 Bremerton	232	7.4	679	21.6	201	6.4	99	3.2	406	12.9
Tract 918 Bremerton	71	5.4	370	28.0	140	10.6	49	3.7	198	15.0
Tract 919 Tracyton	138	9.7	323	22.8	138	9.7	104	7.3	151	10.6
Tract 920 West of Bremerton	224	10.3	416	19.1	134	6.2	132	6.1	225	10.3
Tract 921 Gorst	192	9.5	485	24.1	146	7.2	79	3.9	202	10.0
Tract 922 Port Orchard	153	6.8	375	16.5	214	9.4	117	5.2	322	14.2
Tract 923 Port Orchard	87	3.7	481	20.7	171	7.4	121	5.2	176	7.6
Tract 924 Parkwood	162	6.0	617	23.0	264	9.8	147	5.5	193	7.2
Tract 925 Port Orchard/Parkwood	177	9.0	338	17.2	169	8.6	84	4.3	147	7.5
Tract 926 Manchester	160	6.3	518	20.3	181	7.1	134	5.2	236	9.2
Tract 927 Southworth	431	12.3	649	18.5	180	5.1	184	5.3	376	10.7
^{K7} Tract 928 Southeast corner	356	7.3	1,033	21.3	345	7.1	168	3.5	558	11.5
^{K8} Tract 929 Southeast corner	336	7.8	664	15.5	321	7.5	157	3.7	423	9.9
Mason	1,199	6.2	3,382	17.5	1,395	7.2	1,008	5.2	2,367	12.3
^{M1} BNA 9602 West	140	6.7	358	17.1	165	7.9	106	5.1	187	8.9
BNA 9603 North Canal	101	4.9	316	15.4	205	10.0	95	4.6	232	11.3
BNA 9604 Allyn-Grapeview	166	7.1	431	18.3	176	7.5	98	4.2	294	12.5
BNA 9605 South Canal	97	6.6	272	18.6	112	7.7	48	3.3	179	12.2
^{M2} BNA 9606 Shelton	126	4.5	570	20.5	243	8.7	151	5.4	355	12.7
BNA 9607 Shelton	57	8.8	38	5.8	76	11.7	7	1.1	65	10.0
BNA 9609 Shelton	81	4.5	352	19.3	97	5.3	105	5.8	253	13.9
BNA 9610 Shelton	124	6.2	332	16.6	112	5.6	107	5.3	297	14.8
BNA 9611 Oakland Bay	139	9.0	272	17.5	49	3.2	125	8.1	143	9.2
BNA 9612 Mason Lake	102	10.0	214	20.9	57	5.6	55	5.4	90	8.8

Table 11.1, continued

Area	Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services		Educational, health and social services		Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services		Other services (except public administration)		Public Administration	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Mason County, continued</i>										
BNA 9613 South	59	4.5	206	15.6	78	5.9	98	7.4	232	17.5
BNA 9614 Skokomish Reservation	7	3.9	21	11.8	25	14.0	13	7.3	40	22.5
Pacific	460	5.8	1,699	21.3	1,009	12.6	479	6.0	554	6.9
BNA 9502 Raymond	99	5.7	327	18.9	205	11.9	105	6.1	151	8.7
BNA 9503 South Bend	116	8.1	245	17.1	157	11.0	68	4.7	79	5.5
^{P1} BNA 9504 East	51	3.3	375	24.0	87	5.6	99	6.3	153	9.8
BNA 9505 Long Beach	51	4.8	202	18.8	166	15.5	83	7.7	64	6.0
BNA 9506 Long Beach city	14	2.6	140	26.0	127	23.6	28	5.2	32	5.9
									0	
BNA 9507 Ocean Park	70	7.0	246	24.6	206	20.6	60	6.0	44	4.4
^{P2} BNA 9508 Ocean Park	59	8.9	164	24.8	61	9.2	36	5.5	31	4.7
Wahkiakum	54	3.5	382	24.6	98	6.3	77	5.0	101	6.5
BNA 9501	54	3.5	382	24.6	98	6.3	77	5.0	101	6.5

Data from U.S. Census table P049 SF3.