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Introduction

This report is one of a series of publications on how Maine is changing. The previous volumes (1990 and 2004) were compilations of papers concerning multiple aspects of Maine’s changing economy, demographics, and resources. This volume explores changes in Maine’s population and housing over the past two decades incorporating data released in 2011 from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing.

The analysis was undertaken as part of two federally funded projects seeking to enhance Maine’s sustainability. The first is the Sustainability Solutions Initiative (SSI), a five-year project funded by the National Science Foundation under the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR) program and headquartered at the University of Maine. SSI comprises more than two dozen projects being conducted by colleges and universities across Maine. One of these is the Sustainable Urban Regions Project, a joint project of faculty at the Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine and University of Maine, which seeks to build new analytic capabilities to explore how Maine’s urban areas are changing and to help envision the elements of more sustainable urban areas.

The second project is the Sustain Southern Maine (SSM) initiative, a 3-year project funded by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Greater Portland Council of Governments is the prime recipient of this grant, with the Muskie School one of a number of partner institutions participating in the work, including Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission and Cumberland County Government. This initiative seeks to identify improvements to achieve sustainability and efficiencies through a series of municipal pilot projects, a suite of regionally applicable policy recommendations and action steps, synthesized data and mapping, and relationship building across sectors.

This report was prepared primarily by three students in the master’s program in Community Planning & Development (MCPD) of the Muskie School who served in 2011-2012 as research assistants for the Sustainable Urban Regions Project (*) and two MCPD students who served during the same period as research assistants in the Sustain Southern Maine Project (**):

Abraham Dailey*
Scott Hastings**
Sadie Lloyd*
Natalie McWilliams**
Scott Workman*

Professor Charles Colgan and Professor Jack Kartez provided direction for the project.

The analysis was constructed primarily from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing and the 2006-2010 American Community Survey. Data from these sources were supplemented with data from the Census Population Estimates, the Internal Revenue Service, and the New England Economic Partnership. Data sources for all graphs and tables are provided in the Appendix. In addition, some data are archived in the Sustain Southern Maine Data Commons, a facility also built on a framework developed as part of SURP and SSI.
Key Findings

Population Growth

- Maine’s population grew by 53,265 or 4.2% between 2000 and 2010, which was faster than between 1990 and 2000 (3.8%) but significantly slower than the U.S. (9.7%) Over the past 20 years, Maine added 100,260 or 8.2% (an average annual growth of .04%).

- Maine’s population growth rate was faster than New England as a whole (3.8%) but slightly slower than the Northern New England states of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont (4.8%).

Migration

- Population growth over the last decade was driven primarily by significant in-migration from 2000 to about 2005; after 2005 in-migration slowed significantly and turned negative at the end of the decade because of the recession.

- In 2008-2009 in-migrants to Maine came predominantly from northeastern states as well as Florida, Texas, and California. Among northeastern states, more people moved to Maine from Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire than moved from Maine to these states.

- Those who moved to Maine between 2005 and 2010 tended to be younger (61% were under 35) and better educated (nearly 40% had a college or graduate degree).

Diversity

- Maine’s population is still overwhelmingly white (95%) but the proportion of non-whites has nearly tripled over the past 20 years. Blacks and Asian/Pacific Islanders have more than doubled, but the largest growth rate has been in “other races”.

- The non-white population increased in every county in Maine, as did the Hispanic population.

Age

- Maine is the “oldest state in the country” by median age (42.7 compared with the U.S. at 37.2), but New Hampshire and Vermont are just behind Maine among the oldest states.

- Maine’s older median age is largely a function of a smaller young population (under 34 is 43% of Maine vs. 47% of U.S.) as well as a larger population over 65 (16% of Maine vs. 14% of the U.S.) These changes have been driven by a large drop in the younger population over the past 20 years (down 21% for ages 18-34) and a 29% increase in those over 65 in the same period.

- Rural areas furthest from the cities are seeing the biggest drop in school-age children, increasing the concentration of older people in these communities. Older people dominate rural areas and many coastal towns, while the younger adults (18-34) are primarily in the suburbs.

Population Change Within Maine

- Population growth was generally more evenly spread across Maine’s counties in the last decade in contrast to earlier decades. Inland and “Rim” counties grew at faster rates than in 1990-2000, primarily because of growth in Oxford County. Growth in coastal counties as a whole slowed dramatically from earlier decades because of population declines in Washington County and very little growth in the midcoast.
• The focus of population growth over the past decade has been in Maine’s urban centers. Maine’s metropolitan areas, micropolitan areas, and service centers accounted for 87% of the growth in population over 2000-2010. This is partly because of the size of these regions, but the importance of urban areas is also shown in the service centers of rural counties, which combined reversed a population decline in 1990-2000 with growth over 2000-2010.

• Within Maine’s metropolitan regions there is a potentially important trend as the long-standing spread of population growth in the suburbs and stagnation or decline in the cities reversed. The bulk of population growth was still in the suburbs, but the core cities in all three of Maine’s metro regions (Portland, Lewiston-Auburn, and Bangor-Brewer) all saw growth in population, with the exception of Auburn, in contrast to stasis or decline in previous years.

Households

• Fewer Maine people are living in traditional families. There has been a drop in male-headed households (3%) and a significant increase in female-headed households (20%). The drop in male-headed households was accompanied by a large increase (19%) in men living alone.

• Average household size in Maine continued to drop, from 2.39 to 2.32 in 2010. This is much smaller than the U.S. average household size of 3.14, which has remained stable over the past decade. Average family sizes have also declined in Maine from 2.9 to 2.83, reflecting the declining number of children being born in Maine.

Housing

• In 2010, the Maine housing market was at the end of a sharp collapse in construction and prices. 2004 saw more new single family housing permits in Maine than at any time since 1980 (nearly 9,000), but new permits dropped to less than 3,000 by 2009, a level not seen since the severe recession of the early 1980s.

• Housing construction usually follows population growth, but in Maine a large seasonal housing market (one in four new houses over the last decade was for seasonal use) means that some places in Maine (e.g. Piscataquis, Knox, and Sagadahoc counties) have seen substantially faster housing growth than population growth.

• In Maine’s urban regions, housing unit growth continued to be faster outside the urban core, but housing growth in the central cities was significantly faster over the past decade than in 1990-2000, further evidence of the possible urban turnaround.

• Housing in Maine is overwhelmingly owner-occupied rather than rental occupied. This changed little from 2000 to 2010, even though renting increased nationwide.

• By national or regional standards, Maine housing is more reasonably priced, but housing affordability remains an issue because income growth has not kept pace with housing price growth, even taking into account the falls in housing prices since 2006. Median household prices doubled between 2000 and 2010 while household incomes have been largely unchanged.
Population Growth in Maine

Maine added 53,265 people from 2000-2010, a growth rate of 4.2%. This was slightly faster than the state’s growth in the previous decade of 3.8%.

Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont grew faster than New England as a whole, but New England (and the Northeast as a whole) grew at less than half of the U.S. (Figure 1).

However, Maine’s population growth over 2000-2010 was heavily influenced by fast growth at the end of the 1990s and in the early part of the 2000’s (Figure 2). After 2004 the pace of in-migration and population growth slowed and then stopped during the recession as net in-migration turned to net out-migration in 2009 and 2010. In-migration and population growth will have to await a period of more robust economic growth to resume.
Measuring migration within the U.S. is most easily done using data from the Internal Revenue Service which measures where people file their annual returns. Using these data, most people who moved to Maine between 2008 and 2009 came from the Northeast and along the East Coast down through North Carolina, as well as from Florida, Texas, and California (Figure 3). Out-migrants most commonly move from Maine to neighboring states, as well as to more distant states like Florida, California, and North Carolina (Figure 4).

Maine loses more residents than it gains to almost every state (Florida, Texas, and North Carolina taking a particularly large share). There are nine states (Montana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire) from which Maine receives more migrants than it sends (Figure 5).
Details of migrants are available from the American Community Survey. The 2010 5-year sample of the survey shows that, although Maine has a reputation for sending young people out of state, 44% of in-migrants between 2005 and 2010 were 18 to 34 year olds (Figure 6). It is notable that this growth was measured later in the decade when overall population growth was slowing in the State.

![Figure 6](image)

Compared to those moving within the State, migrants moving to Maine from other states or countries are more highly educated, holding more bachelors and advanced degrees (Figure 7). In contrast, those who move within Maine tend to have less education, either a high school diploma, some college or an associate’s degree.

![Figure 7](image)
DIVERSITY

In 2010, 5% of the population was non-white (Figure 9). While some locations in Maine see the white population grow by more people than the non-white population, the rate of growth for the non-white population is faster. For example, over the past decade the black population has grown by 132% (9,000 people). The white population grew by 56,611 people, a growth rate of just over 2%. (Figure 10).

The largest ethnic group in 2010 was “2 or more races” a category recently added by the Census to reflect the complex nature of race and ethnicity.
Growth in the non-white population has been occurring throughout Maine, not just in Southern Maine and city centers as may be expected. Between 2000 and 2010 every county in the State gained non-white residents even when they lost whites. Almost half of the counties in the State gained more non-white residents than white. Androscoggin, Aroostook, Knox, and Washington counties all saw declines in white people (Figure 11).

![Figure 11 Change in Number of White and Non-White People by County](image)

A similar pattern is present with respect to the Hispanic population, which the Census does not consider a separate ethnic group but a linguistic group. The increase in diversity trend is also clear. Over the last decade, every county in Maine saw growth in the Hispanic population. Oxford and Cumberland counties saw their Hispanic populations double (Cumberland went from 2,526 people in 2000 to 5,045 people in 2010, while Oxford went from 292 people in 2000 to 587 people in 2010). A number of other counties saw similar growth (Figure 12).

![Figure 12 Number of Hispanic and Latino People by County 2000 and 2010](image)
Maine is well known as “the oldest state in the country”. While the median age in the U.S. in 2010 was 37.2 years, in Maine it was 42.7 years (Figure 13). In fact, “old” is characteristic of all northern New England and much of the Northeast. New England as a whole has a significantly smaller portion of its population under 18 than the U.S. (21% vs. 24%) (Figure 14). This is notably the case in all three northern New England states, where all three states have lower proportions of all ages under 34 than the U.S. (Figure 15)
In Maine, a quarter of the population was under 18 in 1990; in 2010 just over a fifth of the population was under 18. More than a quarter of the population in 1990 was 18-34, and by 2010 this had dropped to under 20%. The drop in these younger age groups was accompanied by a 9% increase in those 35-64, making Maine in 2010 primarily middle aged. The proportion of the population over 65 did increase but only by 2.6 percentage points. In fact, this increase was the smallest change over the two decades for any of these four age groups (Figures 16 and 17).

Figure 15  Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, 2010 Age Breakdown

Figure 16  1990 Age Distribution in Maine

Figure 17  2010 Age Distribution in Maine
The significant shifts in the distribution of Maine’s age groups is made even clearer in Figure 18 which shows the growth rates behind the changes in shares in figures 16 and 17. The U.S. saw the fastest growth in the youngest and oldest age groups, while Maine and New England saw declines in the younger age groups, 0-18 in the case of Maine and 18-34 in the case of New England. New England and Maine saw large increases in the middle age groups, while the U.S. saw only a modest increase.

Figure 18 Regional Percent Change in Age Categories, 1990-2010

There is a distinct geography to the age distribution in Maine. Figures 19-21 display the specialization ratio of age groups by town, which is simply the ratio of the proportion of an age group of a town to the proportion of that age group in the state. Those towns designated as “more” had a higher proportion of their population in that age group than in the state.

In 2000, the “least young” towns were concentrated in relatively few towns in the midcoast and inland/northern towns and in rural areas furthest from the cities. In 2010 these areas had noticeably expanded. The young workforce (those between 18 and 34) is relatively concentrated in the suburbs surrounding major city centers like Greater Portland and the Bangor-Brewer area (Figure 20). The older population lives in rural rim towns and along the coast, which is partly the result of the mirror effect of declining younger people in these towns and partly the result of many of these communities, especially in coastal areas, being retirement centers. There appears to be a subtle trend, however, of inward movement closer to city centers (Figure 21).
Figure 19 Concentration of Children

Figure 20 Concentration of Young Working Adults
Figure 21 Concentration of Older and Retired Adults
Discussions of growth in Maine frequently focus on large regions within the state: north and south, rim counties, coastal and inland. Over the last ten years, the stories of these varied regions have shown both consistency with past trends and important changes.

Between 1990 and 2000 there were distinct trends in growth (Figure 22). Coastal counties such as Lincoln, Hancock, and York saw the most rapid growth. Lincoln County grew by 10.5%, Hancock County by 10.3%, and York County by 13.5%. Inland counties like Aroostook and Piscataquis saw the greatest loss of people during that time; Aroostook County lost 15% of its population and Piscataquis 7.6%.

But between 2000 and 2010, while the State as a whole experienced more growth, no county grew as fast as in the previous decade. This reflected a more even distribution of growth across Maine counties. Between 2000 and 2010, Waldo, Penobscot, Cumberland, and Oxford Counties saw the largest increases in population. For Penobscot, this helped to replace population loss from ten years prior. In Aroostook County, the loss was much less substantial than it had been, with population declining by only 2.8% (Figure 23). There was distinct slowdown in growth in coastal areas, particularly the mid-coast. Over 1990-2000, four counties lost population; over 2000-2010 only two did.
Northern & Southern Maine

Figure 24 shows counties divided (somewhat arbitrarily) into Northern and Southern Maine. Southern Maine is made up of York, Cumberland, Sagadahoc, Androscoggin, Lincoln, Kennebec, and Knox Counties, while the remaining counties make up Northern Maine.

From 1990 to 2000 Northern Maine experienced a decline of 5,627 people or 1.1%. The closing of Loring Air Force Base in Aroostook County accounted for much of this net loss, but population also declined in Aroostook, Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Washington. Although Aroostook and Washington counties continued to decline over 2000-2010, Northern Maine as a whole grew by 17,003 people (3.4%).

Southern Maine accounted for all the growth between these two regions over 1990-2000, and population growth has continued but slowed by 16,000 or from 7.2% between 1990 and 2000 to 4.7% over 2000-2010 (Figure 25).

![Figure 24 Northern and Southern Counties](image)

![Figure 25 Percent Population Growth Northern vs. Southern Maine](image)
The Rim Counties

The concept of the “rim counties” is sometimes used in place of northern and southern regions. Figure 26 shows the rim counties, which comprise Maine’s western, northern, and easternmost counties.

Population change in rim and non-rim counties was similar to trends seen in Northern and Southern Counties. From 1990 to 2000, rim counties lost over 12,000 people, or 4.4% of their population, a larger drop than “Northern” Maine because the Penobscot Bay counties of Waldo and Hancock are excluded from the Rim. By 2010 however, population had grown by 1%.

Non-rim counties on the other hand grew throughout the period, but adding about 9,000 fewer people over 2000-2010 than 1990-2000 (a drop in growth rates from 6.2% to 5%) (Figure 27).
Coastal and Inland Counties

The analysis of northern/southern and rim counties suggests that the big shift in the geography of population change over the past decade was in the coastal and inland areas, and Figure 29 shows this was indeed the case.

From a decline of 12,261 over 1990-2000 the inland counties swung to growth of nearly 22,000 over 2000-2010.

In total, coastal counties added over 28,000 fewer people from 2000-2010 than in the previous decade. This drop occurred in all of the coastal counties’ growth. (Washington County continued to decline). The largest drops by far were in the midcoast region from Sagadahoc to Knox counties.

Figure 28 Coastal and Inland Counties

![Map showing Coastal and Inland Counties]

Figure 29 Percent Population Growth Coastal vs. Inland Maine

![Bar chart showing population growth]
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The I-95 Corridor

Maine is unique among the states in having only one interstate highway running through the state. The highway connects urban areas, southern coastal regions, and inland central Maine.

Since there has been little growth north of Bangor, this analysis focuses on the corridor from Old Town to Kittery. In this region, growth has been consistent across both decades, accelerating in the 2000-2010 decade. Growth in the non-corridor towns however exceeded that in corridor towns in both decades, though the gap closed notably in the last ten years. These patterns of growth are heavily influenced by what is happening in Maine’s metropolitan areas, which are the key links in the corridor.

Figure 30 Interstate Towns South of Old Town

Figure 31 Population Change
Interstate vs. Non-Interstate Towns
In 2010, nearly 2 in 3 Mainers live in an urban region (i.e., a metropolitan area, micropolitan area, or rural service center). These urban areas received 87.3% of all the population growth over 2000-2010, with the metropolitan areas (Figure 33) accounting for three-quarters of this growth. All three urban region types increased their growth over 1990-2000.
Maine’s metropolitan areas accounted for most of the growth, while the micropolitan regions (those with core cities between 10,000 and 49,999) (Figure 35) increased their share of population growth over 2000-2010.

Service center towns are the urban centers of Maine’s rural areas (Figure 36). The population in service center towns declined by 4.2% from 1990-2000, but in the most recent decade these towns gained some population back and grew by 2.4%. The areas outside the service centers in the rural counties declined by 4.3% from 1990 to 2000 but grew by 4.4% from 2000 to 2010 (Figure 34).

Within each of the metro areas, there were important shifts in growth. Over several decades, the predominant pattern was movement of people out of city centers and into the suburbs, a pattern often described as “sprawl”. From 1990-2000, all of the growth in the metro areas was in the suburbs as the central cities saw a combined 4.2% decline in population.

But by 2010, cities began reclaiming lost population and grew by 2.8% over the past decade (Figure 37) accounting for 20% of metro area growth.
FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS

There have been important changes in the composition of Maine households and families over the last decade. For a number of reasons the traditional family is becoming a smaller and smaller part of the population. Between 2000 and 2010, males as head of household declined by 3%, while females as head of household grew by 20% (Figure 39). The number of males in non-family households grew by 19% and the number of females by 14%. There was a 19% growth in men living alone and a 10% growth in households headed by women. The trend is thus for more females to be in the head of household role, while more men are in non-family households.

As has been the case for several decades, the average family and household size continues to decline (Figure 40). In 2000 the average household size was 2.39 people (Figure 42). By 2010 that had gone down about 3% to 2.32 people. Average household size in Maine is smaller than the rest of New England and the U.S., although small household sizes are characteristic of northern New England. Declining family sizes are the trend in New England and the U.S. The same is the case with households, with the exception of the U.S. where the average household size remained 3.14 people over the past decade. Maine was 2.9 people, and by 2010 was down to 2.83 people, lower than New England and the U.S. (Figure 40).

Between 2000 and 2010 the number of family households grew in all counties except for Washington, Aroostook, and Knox (Figure 41). The number of non-family households grew at a faster rate than family households (for example, family households in Franklin County grew by 4.9% while non-family households grew by 20%), and non-family households grew in all counties (Figure 42). The growth in families across counties reflected overall population change trends, but the growth in non-family households showed a bias towards being greater in rural counties.
Figure 40
Average Household Size

Figure 41
Growth in Family Households

Figure 42
Growth in Non-Family Households
In 2000, non-family households made up 34% of households. In 2010, this figure had grown to 37%. More family households have a female head of household. Females as head of household grew from 26% of households in 2000 to 31% in 2010. There was a very slight decline in single female head of householders, from 55% to 54%, with a corresponding increase in single male head of householders. More non-family households have a male head of household (Figure 45).

Figure 43 Family and Household Makeup
HOUSING

In 2010, Maine’s housing stock was 89% single family housing, one of the highest in the county. Seventeen percent of Maine’s housing stock is for seasonal use, the highest proportion in the country. Maine added 140,549 units over the last two decades, of which 64,017 were added from 2000-2010.

The 2010 Census measured Maine’s housing stock in the most turbulent period in housing in the last thirty years. Growth in new single family housing permits was fairly steady in Maine from the early 1990s onward, peaking between 2005 and 2006 at 9,000 permits. (Figure 45). The housing crisis reduced this to 2000 permits by 2010. Single family detached units had the greatest rate of growth. (Figure 44).

Multifamily units grew by less than half the rate of single family units over 2000-2010, and the number of new single family units being added in 2010 was fewer than 300 per quarter. (Figure 45)
The pattern of housing growth is often assumed to follow closely the pattern of population growth, but this is not always the case. The ratio of the rate of housing growth to the rate of population growth in Maine’s counties shows that there are some significant disparities (Figure 48). For example, Piscataquis County has a 5.2 ratio of housing change to population change. This means that for every one additional person since 2000 there were 5.2 additional housing units built. Knox and Sagadahoc have even higher housing to population ratios in the more recent decade (18.1 and 22.8 respectively). The large growth in housing in these counties suggests both a large number of new seasonal properties and a significant supply/demand imbalance in other units.

Figure 46  Housing Change Compared to Population Change
Seasonal Housing

Seasonal housing in Maine represented 24% of new housing units between 2000 and 2010. Seasonal housing represents the largest share of new housing growth in rural towns and in some coastal towns (especially in central and eastern Maine), exhibited by the towns in red in figure 47. Piscataquis County and Knox County had high proportions of new units for seasonal use, although Sagadahoc did not suggesting that the high housing to population ratio in that county had other causes.

Seasonal housing in Maine is similar to that in Vermont, where the share of housing growth over the past decade was about the same as Maine (Figure 48). In fact, Maine and Vermont lead the U.S. in the proportion of their housing stock represented by seasonal housing, with Vermont dominated by the winter season and the mountains, and Maine by the summer particularly near the ocean coast and lakes.

Figure 47  Seasonal Housing Growth as a Percent of Overall Town Housing Growth

Figure 48  Seasonal Housing in New England
A shifting pattern of population growth within Maine’s urban regions was noted previously. This shift towards greater growth in the core cities of the metro areas and continued somewhat slower growth in the suburbs is also reflected in the trends in housing development (Figure 49). From 1990 to 2000 new housing in metropolitan Maine grew faster in suburban areas than core cities in all three metro areas, with gap between the suburbs and the largest cities in the Lewiston-Auburn metro area.

Housing growth in the core cities of each metro area accelerated significantly from 2000-2010 in comparison with 1990-2000. In all three metro areas the growth rates of new housing units in the suburbs, though still much larger than the core cities, declined from 2000-2010 compared with the previous decade. The largest shift in growth rates in the core cities was in the Bangor region, while the largest slowing of growth rates in the suburbs occurred in the Portland metro area.

![Figure 49 Rate of Change in Housing in Urban Regions](image-url)
Housing Tenure

One aspect of Maine’s housing that has changed little over the last decade is the way people pay for their housing. Between 2000 and 2010 the proportion of renter versus owner occupied housing in Maine changed very little. Renter-occupied units took up a 1% greater share in 2010 than it had in 2000, while owner occupied units took up 1% less (Figure 50).

The age of renters and owners is also fairly predictable. As might be expected, renters tend to be younger while those who own their home tend to be older, with the switch from renting to owning generally happening in a person’s mid-30s (Figure 51).

From that age, the likelihood of someone renting their home steadily declines until the ages of 65 and above, when people begin to choose once again to rent instead of own. The majority of people aged 15-24 rent. The population aged 25-34 is nearly evenly divided between owners and renters, though the majority, 52%, of the population in this age group rent. This demonstrates a wealth gap between those 34 and younger and those 35 and older. Above the age of 35 more than 70% of the population owns their home.
One change of note is that middle-aged people are starting to rent more. The share of renters 35 to 44 years old grew by 11% from 2000 to 2010, while the share of renters 45 to 54 years old grew by 15%.

Housing affordability is an issue in much of Maine. Although Maine’s home prices have not escalated nearly as rapidly as in other parts of New England and the U.S., affordability issues in Maine are still significant because of changes in incomes rather than property values. Between 2000 and 2010 median home values nearly doubled across Maine, with increases ranging from 47% in Aroostook County to 94% in Hancock County. Over these same years, real median household incomes (adjusted by the consumer price index) fell in all but three counties. This means that the traditional affordability of the ratio of median house price to median income has deteriorated across the decade despite the recession in housing.

Figure 54 shows the ratio of the housing affordability measure by county to the same measure in Maine to identify where affordability is the most serious issue. In Androscoggin, Cumberland, Knox, Lincoln, Sagadahoc, and York Counties home ownership is less affordable than the State on average. Cumberland, Knox, Penobscot, Sagadahoc, and Somerset are all counties where renting is less affordable compared to the State as a whole. Owning is especially affordable in Aroostook, Franklin, and Washington Counties, and renting is most affordable in Lincoln and Washington Counties.

Figure 52  Percent of Total Housing by Age
Figure 53  Percent Change of Home Values and Household Income 2000-2010

Figure 54  Housing Affordability by County Relative to the State Average
Maine’s Regions
In 2010, 36% of Maine people lived in Southern Maine, up from 33% in 1990. The region added 71,033 people over the 20-year period, though the growth slowed over the last decade. York County grew faster over 1990-2000, and Cumberland County over 2000-2010. The further suburbs of the Portland metro area in both Cumberland and York Counties showed the fastest growth rates over both decades, but Brunswick saw the biggest population decline due to the closing of the Naval Air Station.

The region’s age profile is very similar to Maine, with a somewhat larger proportion of young adults (25-44) in the region. Portland is the youngest town in Cumberland County, and Waterboro in York county. The island communities of Casco Bay have been Cumberland County’s oldest towns in 1990-2000 (Long Island), and 2000-2010 (Chebeague Island). Ogunquit remained the oldest town in York county over both decades.

Southern Maine has the highest proportion of non-white population at 7.2% of the population (the same as Androscoggin County). This is more than a doubling of the share since 2000.

The region added 53,950 housing units over 1990-2000, a growth rate of 8.3%. Over the twenty years, growth was about evenly divided between Cumberland and York counties. However, within the decades the patterns are very different, with York County growing faster in the 1990s and Cumberland County faster from 2000-2010.

### Table: Population Growth Rates Share of Regional Growth Share of Maine Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>243,135</td>
<td>265,612</td>
<td>281,674</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>164,587</td>
<td>186,742</td>
<td>197,131</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>407,722</td>
<td>452,354</td>
<td>478,805</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,227,928</td>
<td>1,274,923</td>
<td>1,328,361</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-18</td>
<td>19-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF Units</td>
<td>MF Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>75,878</td>
<td>88,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>60,660</td>
<td>73,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>136,538</td>
<td>161,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>444,698</td>
<td>517,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Fastest Growing Towns and Slowest Growing Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fastest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Slowest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Largest Decline</th>
<th>Population Change</th>
<th>Fastest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Slowest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Sebago</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Harpswell</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>-84%</td>
<td>Casco</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>Noyes</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Sumerick</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Ogunquit</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>Ogunquit</td>
<td>-334</td>
<td>Waterboro</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>Ogunquit</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Oldest Town</td>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>Youngest Town</td>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>Oldest Town</td>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>Youngest Town</td>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>Gorham</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>Chebeague Island</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Ogunquit</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>Waterboro</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>Ogunquit</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>Waterboro</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The past 10 years have seen a significant change in the population of Western Maine, with population growth in all three counties accelerating from 2000 levels. Overall, the region added 9,434 people, the largest portion of which was in Oxford County (5,231). Androscoggin County reversed a population decline of 1,466 from 1990-2000, adding 3,909 people in the last decade. Franklin County also increased its population at nearly three times the rate of the 1990s.

The age profile of the region is similar to the state’s, but it does trend slightly younger in terms of higher proportions of the population under 24, and a slightly smaller proportion over 64.

The region’s nonwhite population has more than doubled from 1990-2000, led by Androscoggin County in which the non-white population grew to 7.2% in 2010 compared with 3% in 2000. The Hispanic population, though still small, also grew throughout the region.

Carabassett Valley was the fastest growing town in the region, but this town’s small year-round population makes a fast growth rate somewhat artificial. Hebron in southern Oxford County was the fastest growing among larger towns, with Wales in Androscoggin County second.

The mill towns of Lisbon, Jay, and Rumford led their respective counties in population declines, totalling 881, of which Rumford saw the largest share (-576).
The region added 8,708 people over the past 20 years, most of it during the past decade (6,376). The vast majority of that change was in Kennebec County which added 5,037 in the past year. This was substantially more than in 1990-2000, which saw only 1,210 added; Somerset County added about the same number of people (1,122 and 1,339) in each of the past two decades.

The region’s percent of population that is nonwhite remains below the statewide percentage, but like the State, that share has grown over the past ten years, in the region’s case by more than one percentage point. The share of the Hispanic population also increased by small amounts in the region.

The Central region has about the same age profile as the state, with the exception of the 45-64 group of which the Central region had a slightly greater proportion.

Population changes in the Augusta urban region present an interesting set of contrasts. Sidney to the north of Augusta is the fastest growing town in Kennebec County, but Randolph to the south is the slowest growing, and Gardner had the largest population decline. Consistent with these population patterns, Sidney saw the fastest housing growth and Randolph the slowest. At the same time, the oldest towns in Kennebec County have been the Augusta suburbs Manchester (1990) and Hallowell (2010).

In Somerset County, the upper Kennebec River valley saw both the fastest growing town in terms of population (Jackman) and the slowest growing (Carratunk). The region was also where the fastest growth in new housing could be found (Moose River) and the slowest growing (Bingham).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Growth Rates</th>
<th>Share of Regional Growth</th>
<th>Share of Maine Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>115,904</td>
<td>117,114</td>
<td>122,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>49,767</td>
<td>50,883</td>
<td>52,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>165,671</td>
<td>168,003</td>
<td>174,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,227,928</td>
<td>1,274,923</td>
<td>1,328,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>0-18</th>
<th>19-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Nonwhite</th>
<th>Percent Hispanic</th>
<th>Avg Family Size</th>
<th>Avg Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>SF Units</th>
<th>MF Units</th>
<th>Seasonal Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>37,132</td>
<td>43,286</td>
<td>13,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>21,006</td>
<td>24,821</td>
<td>6,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>58,138</td>
<td>68,107</td>
<td>19,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>444,698</td>
<td>517,748</td>
<td>128,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fastest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Slowest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Largest Decline</th>
<th>Population Change</th>
<th>Fastest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Slowest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>Gardiner</td>
<td>-98%</td>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Jackman</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Caratunk</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>Skowhegan</td>
<td>-227%</td>
<td>Moose River</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oldest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Youngest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Oldest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Youngest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>Hallowell</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>Waterville</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>Caratunk</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>Canaan</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Midcoast region grew by 15,052 over the past 20 years, a growth rate of 11.3%, second only to southern Maine's. But three quarters of the past 20 years' growth (11,508) occurred from 1990-2000. Over 2000-2010, the Midcoast population growth was only half the state's rate.

Over 2000-2010, three quarters of the growth (2,506) occurred in Waldo County. Lincoln County grew by 841, while Knox and Sagadahoc counties grew by less than 200 people combined, meaning their population was essentially unchanged over the decade.

The region is older than the state, with lower proportions of all age groups under 44 and higher proportions of age groups over 45. The proportion of the population over 65 is significantly higher than the state. This is true in all four counties, but especially in Knox and Lincoln Counties.

The region has a smaller portion of non-white and Hispanic populations than the state. The share of both has grown over the past decade, but only by small amounts.

Housing growth has been significantly faster in the region than population growth. Over the past twenty years, the number of housing units has grown by 33%. Seasonal housing growth was the major factor in housing unit growth; the number of seasonal units in the region grew by more than 40% by 33%. Seasonal housing growth was the major factor in housing unit growth. Over the past twenty years, the number of housing units has grown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Youngest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Oldest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Youngest Town</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Youngest Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fastest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Slowest Growing Town</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Largest Decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagadahoc</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Islesboro</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Eastern region is one of contrasts. Overall, the population grew by 11,222 (4.5%) over the past twenty years, but almost all of this growth (10,844) was from 2000-2010. Population declined in all counties except Hancock over 1990-2000, but grew in all counties except Washington in 2000-2010.

Hancock County’s growth slowed (from 4,843 in 1990-2000 to 2,627 over 2000-2010), while Penobscot County experienced a dramatic turnaround from a decline of -1,680 to growth of 9,002. Piscataquis County also turned from population decline in 1990-2000 (-1,418) to slight positive growth (+300). Washington County showed consistent decline over the two decades (-1,367 and -1,085).

The age profile of the region is generally similar to the state’s, but the region has slightly more people over 65 (except in Penobscot County) and slightly more people 19-24 (particularly in Penobscot County).

The region is almost the same as the state in terms of the proportion of non-white and Hispanic populations, with Washington County significantly greater than the region or state owing to Native American populations there.

The region added housing at a much faster pace than population. Population growth of 11,222 was accompanied by an increase of 28,784 single family units, of which only 8,553 were for seasonal use. Seasonal housing growth did accelerate over 2000-2010 (5,546 vs. 3,007 in 1990-2000). Washington County led the region in seasonal housing growth with a growth rate of 55% over the two decades, and at a relatively constant pace over both decades. Penobscot County added the most new housing units of all types, including seasonal units.

The Eastern region is one of contrasts. Overall, the population grew by 11,222 (4.5%) over the past twenty years, but almost all of this growth (10,844) was from 2000-2010. Population declined in all counties except Hancock over 1990-2000, but grew in all counties except Washington in 2000-2010.

Hancock County’s growth slowed (from 4,843 in 1990-2000 to 2,627 over 2000-2010), while Penobscot County experienced a dramatic turnaround from a decline of -1,680 to growth of 9,002. Piscataquis County also turned from population decline in 1990-2000 (-1,418) to slight positive growth (+300). Washington County showed consistent decline over the two decades (-1,367 and -1,085).

The age profile of the region is generally similar to the state’s, but the region has slightly more people over 65 (except in Penobscot County) and slightly more people 19-24 (particularly in Penobscot County).

The region is almost the same as the state in terms of the proportion of non-white and Hispanic populations, with Washington County significantly greater than the region or state owing to Native American populations there.

The region added housing at a much faster pace than population. Population growth of 11,222 was accompanied by an increase of 28,784 single family units, of which only 8,553 were for seasonal use. Seasonal housing growth did accelerate over 2000-2010 (5,546 vs. 3,007 in 1990-2000). Washington County led the region in seasonal housing growth with a growth rate of 55% over the two decades, and at a relatively constant pace over both decades. Penobscot County added the most new housing units of all types, including seasonal units.
The 1990s saw the closure of Loring Air Force Base and a 15% drop in Aroostook County’s population. The decade from 2000-2010 saw continued population loss (-2,066 or -2.8%). Over the past 20 years, Aroostook has lost 17% of its 1990 population or 17,066.

Aroostook is older than Maine, with smaller proportions of all age groups below 45 and larger proportions of the age groups above 45. The older population and lack of younger population is associated with the lower family and household sizes in Aroostook County and the larger drop in household and family sizes between 2000 and 2010.

However, the nonwhite proportion of Aroostook’s population is about the same as in Maine. Aroostook’s Hispanic population is notably smaller than the state’s and grew less than other regions.

Aroostook has seen an increase in housing units despite a fall in population. The County added 2,576 units, of which 881 were for seasonal use. The County saw a decline of nearly 600 multifamily housing units over the past twenty years; this was not associated with the closing of Loring because the County lost 124 multifamily units in the past decade.
Appendix: Sources

The principal sources for the figures and tables in this report are the Census of Population and Housing for 1990, 2000, and 2010. Additional data is taken from the American Community Survey (ACS), which is a sample survey that provides detailed data such as income and education. The ACS is conducted in larger communities every 1-3 years, and statewide every 5 years. ACS data used in this report came from the 2010 ACS, which covered the period 2005-2010.

For more information: www.census.gov.

Other data sources include:

Tax Statistics series from the Internal Revenue Service (www.irs.gov/taxstats)

New England Economic Partnership (www.neepecon.org)
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