



PPIC

PUBLIC POLICY
INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

Anticipating Changes in Regional Demand for Nursing Homes

Technical Appendices

CONTENTS

Appendix A: Data and Methods	2
Appendix B: Detailed Tables	8

Laurel Beck and Landon Gibson

Appendix A: Data and Methods

This report builds on *Planning for California’s Growing Senior Population* by Laurel Beck and Hans Johnson. In that report, we used data from the California Department of Finance (DOF) and the American Community Survey (ACS) to project the number of seniors who would be requiring some assistance with daily activities in the year 2030, as well as the number of seniors who would be living in nursing homes. In this report, we summarize DOF projections on how the overall size and racial/ethnic makeup of the 65-and-older population will develop in eight regions of the state. We then expand on the earlier nursing home projections by incorporating regions into the regression analysis. Finally, we use data from the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) to look at the current capacity of nursing homes in each region, and how they can approach meeting growing demand for skilled nursing services.

The three data sources for this project are the **DOF Detailed Population Projections** for 2030, OSHPD Long-Term Care Annual Utilization Data, and survey responses from the 2000 Decennial Census and 2010–2013 American Community Survey. The DOF projections include estimates of the number of people in each county for the year 2030, by age (year), gender, and racial/ethnic group. We group the estimates for the 58 counties into eight regional groups, as described in Table A1. Our regions are based on those defined by the **California Economic Strategy Panel**, although we have to combine some of theirs in order to have large enough sample sizes for our analysis.

TABLE A1
County composition of regions

Region	Name	Counties
1	Northern California	Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity
2	Sacramento Area	El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, Yuba
3	Bay Area	Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma
4	San Joaquin Valley/ Central Sierra	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Mono, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tulare, Tuolumne
5	Central Coast	Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara
6	Los Angeles	Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura
7	Inland Empire	Riverside, San Bernardino
8	Southern Border Region	Imperial, San Diego

NOTE: Analysis at the region, rather than county, level is necessary to maintain sufficient sample sizes within subpopulations based on age, gender, race/ethnicity, and marital status from survey data for projections.

The **OSHPD Long-Term Care Annual Utilization Data** provides summary information on long-term care and skilled nursing facilities throughout the state. It includes estimates of the number of total and occupied beds in each facility, summary patient demographic and payment characteristics, as well as details about the size and ownership of the facility. We use these data to describe the current and historic capacity and occupancy of the state’s skilled nursing facilities. While OSHPD does give some information on the age and race of its

patients, it does not account for ethnicity in a way that makes the data comparable to our projections using the DOF and ACS data. This is especially problematic, because the Latino senior population is large and growing so quickly in the state.

Finally, we use the public-use microdata samples of the 2000 census as well as the combined 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013 American Community Surveys available from the University of Minnesota’s Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. We use responses to questions about age, gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, ability to care for oneself, and whether or not the respondent lives in institutional group quarters. While the ACS has large sample sizes for the state of California (around 300,000 annually), the number of respondents within a county, especially when broken down by age, gender, race/ethnicity, and marital status, becomes rather small. This limitation is the primary reason that we aggregate the data up to regions, and combine the years with fewer respondents. Another significant limitation of the data is that “institutional group quarters” includes facilities other than nursing homes, most notably correctional facilities. We use data from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to attempt to account for the corrections population. Please see the [Technical Appendix](#) from the previous report for more details.

Our approach in estimating the nursing home population closely follows the work in the 2015 report, although we include regional dummies in all of our logistic regression analysis. Inclusion of these regional indicators allows the likelihood of reporting the outcome variable to vary across regions, even after controlling for the other demographic characteristics in the model. However, we do not interact regions with gender, marital status, age groups, or race/ethnicity, so the effects of falling into any of those categories do not vary across regions in our estimates. While that approach would offer more flexibility in identifying trends across races (for example) across regions, the models would lose a lot of precision when run on much smaller samples.

Please see Table A2 for the names and definitions of the variables we use in our regressions. First, we use the ACS and decennial census to project the distribution of marital status for seniors based on their age (in five-year bands), gender, and race/ethnicity. We then use logistic regression models to estimate the probability of having difficulty with self-care, using age, gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, year, and regional dummies as independent variables. These coefficients are presented in Table A3. Next, we use a separate logistic regression, adding difficulty with self-care as an independent variable, to predict the probability of living in institutional group quarters. The coefficients of that regression are presented in Table A4.

The regression analysis provides coefficients that allow us to predict the likelihood of living in institutional group quarters in two periods, 2000 and the combined 2010–2013 sample. We then used CDCR data to adjust for the prison population. Finally, we create our 2030 projections assuming that the trend in the adjusted percent living in group quarters will continue at the same relative rate through 2030. Please see the [Technical Appendix](#) from the previous report for more details on our projection methods.

Assumptions and Limitations

Our analysis is sensitive to the assumption that the overall trend away from group quarters will continue at the same relative rate through the year 2030. Nationally, the percentage of seniors in nursing care at any given time fell from 4.2 percent in 1985 to 3.6% in 2004. AARP estimates that the rate was 2.4% in California in 2010.¹ Our projections would have 1.3% of seniors in nursing homes in 2030. The nursing home utilization rate within some of our population subgroups decreased dramatically between 2000 and 2013, and a continued decrease at that rate would result in unrealistically low projected utilization for those subgroups in 2030. This is likely due, in part, to

¹ Reinhard, et al. 2014.

the large growth in availability of HCBS alternatives within that time period. We believe that it is more likely that the rate of decline in nursing home utilization will decrease rather than increase, which would make our projection of demand a potential lower bound. This assumption has significant effects on our findings: if the decline in utilization were to decrease by half across all subgroups, instead of remaining constant, we would project 65-and-older demand for nursing homes closer to 135,000 people (a 24.7% increase over this report’s projection of 108,300).

The results presented here are generated by running a single logistic regression model for each outcome variable, with indicators for region and time period (2000 or 2010–2013). This approach means that the demographic characteristics included in the model are not interacted with the time periods. We also constructed projections using two other methods: with two separate regressions (one for each time period) with regional indicators, and with eight separate regressions (one per region) with time dummies. These projections yielded much larger estimates than the results we present. The growth/decline rates in both difficulties with self-care and nursing home utilization were very noisy due to the smaller sample sizes across the regressions. The higher numbers were largely driven by unsustainable trends within particular age/gender/race/marital status cells. Using either of those approaches would require us to make many subjective decisions about what growth is “too” high. We prefer the one-equation approach because of its precision, and believe it reinforces the interpretation of these projections as a lower bound on potential demand.

One potential issue with our projections is migration of seniors, especially if they are moving across regions in order to access affordable nursing care. The Department of Finance includes [historic migration trends](#) based on Census records, births and deaths, and labor force data. Our projections will not account for migration if the trends of seniors migrating across regions in the future differ from what DOF has observed in the past. While this is certainly possible, given the increased diversity and changing geographic distribution of the 65-and-over population, we do not make any assumptions on how migration patterns will change beyond those of the DOF. While the ACS does include questions about whether the respondent has moved within the past year, we do not incorporate those responses into our models, in part because of the trends already incorporated by DOF.

TABLE A2
Definitions of variables

Variable	Variable definition
Agegrp (control is age 65–69)	Age Group
72.5	aged 70–74
77.5	aged 75–79
82.5	aged 80–84
87.5	aged 85–89
92.5	aged 90+
Gender (control is male)	
Female	
marst	Marital Status (control is married)
divsep	Divorced/Separated
widowed	Widowed
nevermarried	Never Married
reth	Race/Ethnicity (control is white)

Variable	Variable definition
afam	African American
api	Asian/Pacific Islander
hispan	Latino
other	Other race/ethnicity
diffcare	Indicator of difficulties with self-care
gq	Indicator of living in group quarters
Region (control is Northern California)	
2	Sacramento Area
3	Bay Area
4	San Joaquin Valley/Central Sierra
5	Central Coast
6	Los Angeles
7	Inland Empire
8	Southern Border Region
tempyr (control is year 2000)	
2012	Part of combined 2010–2013 sample
_cons	Regression constant

SOURCES: ACS, Decennial Census, and authors' calculations.

TABLE A3

Predicting difficulties with self-care

	Coef.	Std. Err	Z-score	P> z	95% Confidence Int.	
agegrp						
72.5	0.277524	0.02198	12.63	0	0.234443	0.320604
77.5	0.691898	0.021141	32.73	0	0.650462	0.733333
82.5	1.146143	0.021221	54.01	0	1.104551	1.187734
87.5	1.661056	0.021967	75.62	0	1.618002	1.70411
92.5	2.42639	0.02264	107.17	0	2.382016	2.470763
sex						
female	0.244076	0.013135	18.58	0	0.218333	0.269819
marst						
divsep	0.362449	0.018949	19.13	0	0.325309	0.399589
widowed	0.392215	0.014872	26.37	0	0.363066	0.421363
nevermarried	0.525	0.026567	19.76	0	0.472929	0.577071
reth						
afam	0.605829	0.024233	25	0	0.558333	0.653325
api	0.158422	0.019263	8.22	0	0.120666	0.196177
hispan	0.318853	0.016756	19.03	0	0.286012	0.351694
other	0.503932	0.040348	12.49	0	0.424852	0.583011

		Coef.	Std. Err	Z-score	P> z	95% Confidence Int.	
region							
	2	-0.03755	0.039893	-0.94	0.347	-0.11574	0.040637
	3	-0.13588	0.034793	-3.91	0	-0.20407	-0.06769
	4	0.038186	0.037212	1.03	0.305	-0.03475	0.11112
	5	-0.26738	0.045722	-5.85	0	-0.35699	-0.17776
	6	0.052334	0.033904	1.54	0.123	-0.01412	0.118785
	7	-0.07131	0.038098	-1.87	0.061	-0.14598	0.00336
	8	-0.12236	0.038656	-3.17	0.002	-0.19813	-0.0466
tempyr							
	2012	-0.05886	0.011833	-4.97	0	-0.08205	-0.03566
	_cons	-3.3846	0.036406	-92.97	0	-3.45595	-3.31325

SOURCES: ACS, Decennial Census, and authors' calculations.

NOTES: n= 458,795. The estimates presented are log-odds ratios calculated using logistic regression analysis. The likelihood that a person to whom coefficient β applies will report difficulties with self-care can be calculated using the equation: $\text{prob}(\text{self-care difficulties}) = \frac{\exp(\beta)}{1 + \exp(\beta)}$. For a group to whom more than one coefficient applies, the sum of the relevant coefficients can be similarly used to calculate the probability of difficulties with self-care.

TABLE A4

Predicting living in institutional group quarters

		Coef.	Std. Err	Z-score	P> z	95% Confidence Int.	
agegrp							
	72.5	0.186243	0.049788	3.74	0	0.08866	0.283826
	77.5	0.584937	0.045515	12.85	0	0.495729	0.674145
	82.5	0.963979	0.044766	21.53	0	0.876238	1.051719
	87.5	1.29471	0.045607	28.39	0	1.205322	1.384098
	92.5	1.775713	0.046849	37.9	0	1.68389	1.867536
sex							
	female	0.043211	0.025534	1.69	0.091	-0.00683	0.093257
marst							
	divsep	0.438682	0.036146	12.14	0	0.367837	0.509526
	widowed	0.014105	0.030322	0.47	0.642	-0.04533	0.073536
	nevermarried	1.016316	0.041035	24.77	0	0.93589	1.096742
reth							
	afam	0.164155	0.044513	3.69	0	0.07691	0.2514
	api	-0.59345	0.0414	-14.33	0	-0.67459	-0.5123
	hispan	-0.44789	0.034818	-12.86	0	-0.51613	-0.37964
	other	-0.51691	0.087027	-5.94	0	-0.68748	-0.34634
diffcare							
	yes	2.691774	0.026319	102.28	0	2.640191	2.743358

	Coef.	Std. Err	Z-score	P> z	95% Confidence Int.	
region						
2	0.158697	0.073672	2.15	0.031	0.014302	0.303092
3	0.196504	0.066137	2.97	0.003	0.066879	0.32613
4	0.422611	0.070715	5.98	0	0.284012	0.56121
5	0.186906	0.084103	2.22	0.026	0.022068	0.351745
6	0.175951	0.064315	2.74	0.006	0.049896	0.302006
7	-0.06592	0.07231	-0.91	0.362	-0.20765	0.075802
8	0.111952	0.074353	1.51	0.132	-0.03378	0.25768
tempyr						
2012	-0.5431	0.022225	-24.44	0	-0.58666	-0.49954
_cons	-5.39672	0.072436	-74.5	0	-5.53869	-5.25475

SOURCES: ACS, Decennial Census, and authors' calculations.

NOTES: n= 458,795. The estimates presented are log-odds ratios calculated using logistic regression analysis. The likelihood that a person to whom coefficient β applies will reporting institutionalization in group quarters can be calculated using the equation: $\text{prob}(\text{self-care difficulties}) = \exp(\beta)/(1+\exp(\beta))$. For a group to whom more than one coefficient applies, the sum of the relevant coefficients can be similarly used to calculate the probability of institutionalization in group quarters.

Appendix B: Detailed Tables

TABLE B1

Percent increase in the senior population ages 65 and older from 2012 to 2030

	American Indian	Asian	African American	Latino	Multi-Race	Pacific Islander	White
Northern California	129	212	146	181	169	232	56
Sacramento Area	159	137	132	183	205	216	67
Bay Area	152	128	86	161	178	143	57
San Joaquin Valley/Central Sierra	129	148	146	183	139	210	48
Central Coast	177	93	58	170	189	165	43
Los Angeles	103	105	73	160	130	110	42
Inland Empire	110	168	164	193	159	161	62
Southern Border	117	121	119	159	191	145	57
Statewide	128	121	97	169	158	151	52

SOURCE: Authors' calculations from California Department of Finance data.

The following tables show the projected populations of all seniors, those living in households that will have self-care limitations, and those who will be living in nursing homes in the year 2030. The tables include breakdowns of these populations by age, gender, and racial/ethnic group. Each table has a panel for all eight regions of the state. Table B2 presents the populations as raw numbers, and Table B3 converts those numbers to percentages of the specific region's senior population. For more information on state level projections and historical trends in marital status, please see Appendix A, and Beck and Johnson (2015). Finally, Table B4 includes data from OSHPD on nursing home capacity across regions over the period of 2004–2014.

TABLE B2

Number of seniors by region and by selected characteristics, 2030

	All seniors (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (2030)	Living in nursing homes (2030)
Northern California			
Total Population:	306,438	30,778	4,559
Age:			
65–69	73,982	3,393	304
70–74	75,253	4,465	433
75–79	66,715	5,916	748
80–84	49,881	6,691	1,026
85–89	25,634	5,233	933
90+	14,973	5,080	1,115
Gender:			
Female	164,930	18,921	2,836
Male	141,508	11,857	1,722
Ethnicity:			
African American	3,290	592	116

	All seniors (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (2030)	Living in nursing homes (2030)
Asian/Pacific Islander	8,039	967	88
Latino	25,612	3,056	286
Other	15,580	2,304	271
White	253,917	23,859	3,797
Sacramento Area			
Total Population:	575,221	58,789	8,046
Age:			
65–69	159,986	7,922	668
70–74	146,339	9,342	852
75–79	115,903	11,010	1,295
80–84	83,046	11,856	1,702
85–89	43,345	9,323	1,568
90+	26,602	9,336	1,961
Gender:			
Female	317,279	37,383	5,218
Male	257,942	21,406	2,827
Ethnicity:			
African American	31,776	4,703	793
Asian/Pacific Islander	75,865	8,434	735
Latino	77,526	9,085	838
Other	17,330	2,272	249
White	372,724	34,294	5,430
Bay Area			
Total Population:	1,865,321	195,654	24,786
Age:			
65–69	521,197	26,312	2,039
70–74	469,458	30,639	2,573
75–79	377,181	36,804	4,000
80–84	272,395	40,107	5,352
85–89	139,510	30,850	4,849
90+	85,580	30,942	5,973
Gender:			
Female	1,016,786	123,735	15,957
Male	848,535	71,918	8,830
Ethnicity:			
African American	104,391	16,009	2,743
Asian/Pacific Islander	499,429	55,433	4,820
Latino	278,239	32,633	3,018
Other	40,941	5,195	560
White	942,321	86,383	13,644
San Joaquin Valley/Central Sierra			
Total Population:	875,434	92,864	11,763
Age:			
65–69	251,635	13,257	988
70–74	224,019	15,076	1,234
75–79	173,427	17,365	1,887

	All seniors (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (2030)	Living in nursing homes (2030)
80–84	121,028	18,132	2,440
85–89	65,171	14,535	2,314
90+	40,154	14,499	2,900
Gender:			
Female	470,716	57,613	7,507
Male	404,718	35,251	4,255
Ethnicity:			
African American	36,520	5,283	879
Asian/Pacific Islander	77,649	8,568	742
Latino	295,266	34,313	3,146
Other	23,687	3,263	368
White	442,312	41,437	6,626
Central Coast			
Total Population:	264,365	27,332	3,638
Age:			
65–69	69,619	3,498	270
70–74	67,670	4,344	372
75–79	55,539	5,268	603
80–84	39,117	5,561	784
85–89	20,105	4,318	715
90+	12,315	4,343	894
Gender:			
Female	143,748	17,066	2,319
Male	120,617	10,266	1,318
Ethnicity:			
African American	3,908	616	110
Asian/Pacific Islander	15,728	1,846	166
Latino	71,583	8,292	759
Other	6,418	879	99
White	166,728	15,700	2,503
Los Angeles			
Total Population:	3,019,127	332,475	40,423
Age:			
65–69	870,590	46,887	3,411
70–74	770,647	53,417	4,219
75–79	592,539	61,298	6,344
80–84	414,715	64,487	8,248
85–89	224,865	52,097	7,875
90+	145,771	54,289	10,326
Gender:			
Female	1,656,997	211,703	26,395
Male	1,362,130	120,773	14,028
Ethnicity:			
African American	191,495	29,725	5,140
Asian/Pacific Islander	567,119	65,635	5,815

	All seniors (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (2030)	Living in nursing homes (2030)
Latino	1,011,919	119,872	11,117
Other	49,670	6,495	713
White	1,198,924	110,749	17,639
Inland Empire			
Total Population:	979,566	103,418	13,293
Age:			
65–69	287,857	15,414	1,184
70–74	254,244	17,331	1,461
75–79	191,307	19,319	2,153
80–84	132,105	19,936	2,746
85–89	71,507	16,030	2,606
90+	42,546	15,388	3,143
Gender:			
Female	529,563	64,560	8,481
Male	450,003	38,858	4,812
Ethnicity:			
African American	69,160	10,205	1,708
Asian/Pacific Islander	79,757	8,762	753
Latino	317,462	36,593	3,339
Other	16,685	2,143	232
White	496,502	45,716	7,261
Southern Border			
Total Population:	742,288	77,570	10,018
Age:			
65–69	210,086	10,717	830
70–74	189,622	12,434	1,051
75–79	148,106	14,463	1,605
80–84	104,733	15,366	2,099
85–89	55,052	12,117	1,943
90+	34,689	12,473	2,490
Gender:			
Female	405,419	49,190	6,472
Male	336,869	28,380	3,546
Ethnicity:			
African American	28,249	4,095	684
Asian/Pacific Islander	90,666	10,312	908
Latino	192,551	23,036	2,152
Other	14,675	1,842	198
White	416,147	38,285	6,076

SOURCES: Authors' calculations based on data from the California Department of Finance, Decennial Census, and American Community Survey.

NOTES: Please see Appendix A for more details on how these projections were created.

TABLE B3

Percentage distribution of seniors in California by region and by selected characteristics, 2030

	All seniors (%) (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (%) (2030)	Living in nursing homes (%) (2030)
Northern California			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	24%	11%	7%
70–74	25%	15%	9%
75–79	22%	19%	16%
80–84	16%	22%	23%
85–89	8%	17%	20%
90+	5%	17%	24%
Gender:			
Female	54%	61%	62%
Male	46%	39%	38%
Ethnicity:			
African American	1%	2%	3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	3%	2%
Latino	8%	10%	6%
Other	5%	7%	6%
White	83%	78%	83%
Sacramento Area			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	28%	13%	8%
70–74	25%	16%	11%
75–79	20%	19%	16%
80–84	14%	20%	21%
85–89	8%	16%	19%
90+	5%	16%	24%
Gender:			
Female	55%	64%	65%
Male	45%	36%	35%
Ethnicity:			
African American	6%	8%	10%
Asian/Pacific Islander	13%	14%	9%
Latino	13%	15%	10%
Other	3%	4%	3%
White	65%	58%	67%

	All seniors (%) (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (%) (2030)	Living in nursing homes (%) (2030)
Bay Area			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	28%	13%	8%
70–74	25%	16%	10%
75–79	20%	19%	16%
80–84	15%	20%	22%
85–89	7%	16%	20%
90+	5%	16%	24%
Gender:			
Female	55%	63%	64%
Male	45%	37%	36%
Ethnicity:			
African American	6%	8%	11%
Asian/Pacific Islander	27%	28%	19%
Latino	15%	17%	12%
Other	2%	3%	2%
White	51%	44%	55%
San Joaquin Valley/Central Sierra			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	29%	14%	8%
70–74	26%	16%	10%
75–79	20%	19%	16%
80–84	14%	20%	21%
85–89	7%	16%	20%
90+	5%	16%	25%
Gender:			
Female	54%	62%	64%
Male	46%	38%	36%
Ethnicity:			
African American	4%	6%	7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	9%	9%	6%
Latino	34%	37%	27%
Other	3%	4%	3%
White	51%	45%	56%
Central Coast			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			

	All seniors (%) (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (%) (2030)	Living in nursing homes (%) (2030)
65–69	26%	13%	7%
70–74	26%	16%	10%
75–79	21%	19%	17%
80–84	15%	20%	22%
85–89	8%	16%	20%
90+	5%	16%	25%
Gender:			
Female	54%	62%	64%
Male	46%	38%	36%
Ethnicity:			
African American	1%	2%	3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6%	7%	5%
Latino	27%	30%	21%
Other	2%	3%	3%
White	63%	57%	69%
Los Angeles			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	29%	14%	8%
70–74	26%	16%	10%
75–79	20%	18%	16%
80–84	14%	19%	20%
85–89	7%	16%	19%
90+	5%	16%	26%
Gender:			
Female	55%	64%	65%
Male	45%	36%	35%
Ethnicity:			
African American	6%	9%	13%
Asian/Pacific Islander	19%	20%	14%
Latino	34%	36%	28%
Other	2%	2%	2%
White	40%	33%	44%
Inland Empire			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	29%	15%	9%
70–74	26%	17%	11%
75–79	20%	19%	16%

	All seniors (%) (2030)	With self-care limitations, living in households (%) (2030)	Living in nursing homes (%) (2030)
80–84	13%	19%	21%
85–89	7%	16%	20%
90+	4%	15%	24%
Gender:			
Female	54%	62%	64%
Male	46%	38%	36%
Ethnicity:			
African American	7%	10%	13%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8%	8%	6%
Latino	32%	35%	25%
Other	2%	2%	2%
White	51%	44%	55%
Southern Border			
Total Population:	100%	100%	100%
Age:			
65–69	28%	14%	8%
70–74	26%	16%	10%
75–79	20%	19%	16%
80–84	14%	20%	21%
85–89	7%	16%	19%
90+	5%	16%	25%
Gender:			
Female	55%	63%	65%
Male	45%	37%	35%
Ethnicity:			
African American	4%	5%	7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	12%	13%	9%
Latino	26%	30%	21%
Other	2%	2%	2%
White	56%	49%	61%

SOURCES: Authors' calculations based on data from the California Department of Finance, Decennial Census, and American Community Survey.

NOTES: Please see Appendix B for more details on how these projections were created.

TABLE B4

Nursing home capacity across regions 2004–2014

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Northern California	4,168	3,627	3,868	3,592	3,973	3,877	3,901	4,055	4,055	4,034	4,034
Sacramento Area	5,919	5,400	5,862	6,039	5,761	5,818	6,234	6,333	6,151	6,396	6,319
Bay Area	20,972	19,434	19,720	19,020	19,700	20,875	20,412	21,150	20,865	20,663	20,982
San Joaquin Valley/Central Sierra	12,429	12,003	12,217	12,081	11,891	11,919	12,401	12,139	12,329	12,532	12,366
Central Coast	2,720	2,880	2,783	2,783	2,823	2,929	2,929	2,929	2,929	2,929	2,929
Los Angeles	45,258	43,566	43,377	43,698	44,105	43,966	44,496	44,292	45,028	45,157	45,699
Inland Empire	9,120	8,581	8,543	8,616	8,707	8,635	8,868	9,038	8,969	8,918	8,976
Southern Border	8,842	8,531	8,297	7,530	8,124	8,730	8,446	8,266	8,884	8,672	8,556
Statewide	109,428	104,022	104,667	103,359	105,084	106,749	107,687	108,202	109,210	109,301	109,861

SOURCES: California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, Long-Term Care Data 2014.



PPIC

PUBLIC POLICY
INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

The Public Policy Institute of California is dedicated to informing and improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research.

Public Policy Institute of California
500 Washington Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94111
T: 415.291.4400
F: 415.291.4401
PPIC.ORG

PPIC Sacramento Center
Senator Office Building
1121 L Street, Suite 801
Sacramento, CA 95814
T: 916.440.1120
F: 916.440.1121