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A PLACE WITH A UNIQUE PERSONALITY

In his path-breaking 1961 analysis of urbanization and sprawl on America’s northeastern seaboard, French-Ukrainian geographer Jean Gottman singled out Princeton as a “place with a distinct personality.”¹ He called it a prototype “brains town.” Even in 1961, it wasn’t really a “prototype,” for there were other such towns around the country—and certainly forbes in Europe. But it was and is, an “archetype”—representative of those places that specialize in the export of educated students, the manufacture of ideas, of literature, of art, and of invention and innovation. Even today, a professor at the University of California, Enrico Moretti, has singled it out as one of the nation’s “brains hubs,” ranking the Trenton-Princeton metropolitan area as the 10th highest concentration in the country (in percentage terms) of people with college degrees and consequent high salaries for much of the workforce (see the sections on income and education that follow).²

Nonetheless, even among its peer communities, Princeton stands out with a unique personality. Situated on the farthest edges of two giant metropolitan areas, it presents a pastoral, Arcadian, “small town” ambience that belies the fact that—

- It ranks 23rd as a center of employment in New Jersey. Over 30,000 people come to jobs within its precincts each day, 23,000 from elsewhere.

- Over half of workers who live in Princeton work in Princeton, compared to only about 20% for most suburbs in New Jersey.

- Over 26% of residents who work in town walk or bicycle to work.

- It is an international town, 25% of its residents were born outside the U.S., a fifth more than the state (itself among top three or four most diverse states), and twice the percentage for the nation. More than 21% of the population turns over every year and about 600-800 come from abroad.

- Because college students comprise 30% of its population, it is a youthful town, yet its percentage of seniors over age 65 is higher than the state or country as a whole.

- It is a town with more non-family households, more householders living alone, more unmarried couples, more seniors heading households—yet more family households with children (but fewer per home). The rate of childbearing by mothers between 35 and 50 is higher than in the state or rest of the country and 56% of these children are born to mothers with a graduate degree.

- Despite its reputation for “affluence,” the disparity between the lowest 20% of its households in income and the top 20% is one of the widest in New Jersey.

- Although it takes pride in its diversity, only its Asian residents exceed the statewide and U.S. averages. Only 37% of its Hispanic/Latino residents were born outside the U.S. or Puerto Rico. The census has found no poor African-American families in Princeton. Fifty-seven percent of Princeton residents living below the poverty threshold are white and non-Latino.


² Enrico Moretti, The New Geography of Jobs, First Mariner Books; 2013
Rear View

COLLEGE STUDENTS 28%-30% OF THE TOWN'S POPULATION

Princeton’s population increased 13.3% from 1990 to 2010. About 1,625 (48%) of the 3,358 added residents were college students. Their share of the town’s population grew from about 28% to about 30%.

Enrolled College Students in Population, 1990-2012

The Census reported that the former borough’s population jumped by 2,000 from 1990 to 2000—now an acknowledged miscount (see p.24). The borough’s non-college student population actually declined during the period. All of the growth in the non-college student portion of the population occurred in the former township. The table is adjusted to take the miscount into account.

A MORE INTERNATIONAL POPULATION

The percentage of foreign-born residents increased from 18.8% in 1990 to 24.7% in 2010.

Ethnic/Racial Change (#), 1990-2010

From 1990 to 2010, Princeton’s historic African-American population declined by 18.5% and its non-Latino white population dropped 2.6% while the numbers of Asian and Hispanic/Latino residents doubled. Some of the reduction in non-Latino white residents may simply be because census respondents changed the way they define themselves.

YOUTHFUL TOWN, BUT MANY SENIORS

Because of its large number of college students, Princeton’s median age (half below, half above) is 34.2 years, yet the percent of its population over 65 is higher than for the state or nation.

High Turnover

Thanks to the ebb and flow of college students, researchers, and business executives, 21.4% of the population turns over every year (compared to 10% for New Jersey and 15.2% for the U.S.). About 3% who come to Princeton each year are from abroad.
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PRINCETON IS NOT AS ETHNICALLY OR RACIALLY DIVERSE AS STATE OR U.S.

Despite significant changes in the town's racial and ethnic makeup since 1990, only the percentage of Asian residents exceeds that for New Jersey or the country as a whole. Many nearby municipalities have still greater numbers and percentages of Asian residents.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Population</th>
<th>Princeton</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Latino White</td>
<td>69.30%</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
<td>63.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerindian</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other/Multi-racial</strong></td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLLEGE STUDENTS ACCOUNT FOR MUCH OF PRINCETON'S DIVERSITY

Half of Asian, 40% of Black/African American, one-third of Hispanic/Latino, and 25% of non-Latino white residents are students at one of the town's institutions of higher education.

![College Student % of Each Ethnic/Racial Group, 2008-2012]

- **Non-Latino white** residents account for the largest number of foreign-born—about 12.5% of Princeton's total population. Though 56% of households and 73% of families have incomes over $100,000, 56% of individuals living at or below the poverty threshold in Princeton are non-Latino white residents.
**Households are Changing**

Households in Princeton changed significantly since 1990, as they have in the rest of the country — changes accentuated in Princeton by our large populations of college students, independent professionals and artists, and seniors.

The number of households increased by 12% since 1990, but non-family households multiplied by more than 20%.

**More Seniors and Those Who Live Alone**

The number of householders who live alone increased by 24%, and the number of householders over age 65 grew by 78%. This contributed to the seeming contradiction that, while Princeton's family households have more children than families in New Jersey and the U.S., our overall average of children per household is lower than for the state or nation (see opposite page).

**Family Size Shrank**

Over the two decades, the number of families with children under age 18 rose by 32%, but the number of children per family declined.

**Ethnic/Racial Changes**

The number of African-American households declined precipitously during the two decades. The number of non-Latino white householders who live alone doubled. The number of Latino and Asian households rose two-fold.
AND FAMILIES
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Fewer In Households, More in Non-Family Households

In 2010, the census estimated that 19.5% of Princeton's residents did not live in a household—most of them college students living in dormitories, or residents in nursing facilities—compared with about 2.5% in the state and nation. And more residents live in non-family households and fewer in family households than in New Jersey or the U.S.

Households Compared to NJ & U.S. (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Total Population</th>
<th>NJ%</th>
<th>U.S%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Population</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>97.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>66.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily Households</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>33.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family households consist of individuals related to the householder by birth, marriage, or adoption. A nonfamily household may be a household living alone, or with unrelated individuals.

Smaller Households and Families

Households and families are smaller in Princeton than in the state or the country as a whole.

Average Household & Family Size Compared with NJ and U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number</th>
<th>Princeton</th>
<th>NJ%</th>
<th>U.S%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average family size</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Family Households

Princeton's percentage of unmarried couples and householders living alone (non-family households)—exceeds the overall proportions in New Jersey and the country.

Non-Family Households Compared to NJ & U.S. (%)

Princeton mothers ages 15-34 bore children at a lower rate per 1,000 than their counterparts in New Jersey or the U.S. in the previous 12 months during 2008-2012. However, those aged 35-50 had children at a higher rate than mothers in the state or nation. And 56% of Princeton mothers during those years held graduate degrees.
Number of Homes Declined in Borough 1990-2010

The number of housing units in the former township grew by 20% between 1990 and 2012, but the former borough lost 26.

Housing Costs Since 2000

Since 2000, the percentage of Princeton homeowners with housing costs above 30% of income jumped 7.5 points to include about one-third of homeowners.

Costs for renters increased more dramatically, so that about 45% of Princeton renters pay out 30% of their income for housing today, compared to 38.5% of renters in 2000.

Increases in Monthly Housing Costs 1990-2012

Between 1990 and 2012, monthly housing costs increased by 4-6 points, except for those in the former township not carrying a mortgage.

The Federal government defines those whose monthly housing costs exceed 30% of income as "cost-burdened."
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Housing Values in Princeton

Over 75% of homes in Princeton are valued at more than $500,000 vs. 25% for the state and 12% for the U.S. The median value 2008-2012 was $714,544. The percentage of homes valued over $1 million (25.4%) is more than seven times the share in New Jersey (3.3%); eleven times that in the U.S. (2.3%)

Owners and Renters

Only more non-Latino white residents (70%) live in homes they own than rent, though almost half of Asian residents own their homes.

Estimated Housing Values (%), 2008-2012
Princeton Compared With NJ & U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Princeton</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These housing values do not reflect the actual "affluence" of most of the community (see next section). Despite this disparity, the percentage of householders in Princeton with housing costs in excess of 30% of their income is lower than the percentages statewide and throughout the country.

Housing Costs Over 30% of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Owner, mortgage</th>
<th>Owner, no mortgage</th>
<th>Renters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Towns: Turnover and Stability

Reflecting the ebb and flow of researchers, scholars, and business executives, over a fifth of Princeton's householders move in every year, twice the percent for New Jersey and 50% higher than for the U.S.

Moved into Princeton One Year Ago
Compared to NJ & U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>From abroad</th>
<th>From elsewhere in U.S.</th>
<th>Moved within one year ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underlying this constant flux of people is a far more permanent community. Over 40% of householders moved here before 1999. About 12% lived here before 1980 and 6% before 1970. About 25% of our homes were built before 1939 compared to about 18% in state and 14% in the country, but far fewer new homes have been built here.
As “Education Hub,” Incomes High, Stable, and Rising

Economic geographer Enrico Moretti has identified the Princeton area as one of the country’s “education hubs” where employment is stable and growing and incomes are high and continue to rise, despite down drafts in the national economy. Princeton’s average household income has risen significantly higher since 1990 even while household incomes in the state and nation rose and fell, and even declined.

Princeton’s average and median household incomes (half of households above, half below) are well above those statewide and in the U.S.

1 Enrico Moretti, The New Geography of Jobs, First Mariner Books;2013

“Affluence” Partly a Statistical Artifact

High incomes in the top 5% of Princeton’s households “pull up” the “average” of the town’s household income and exaggerates the overall “affluence” of most community residents.

If we rank each 20% (quintile) of households by income, a more realistic portrait emerges.

The bottom 20% of households in Princeton has an average income of $18,500. The top income in the quintile is about $33,000. The only community in Mercer County with lower incomes in its bottom quintile is Trenton. Incomes for Princeton’s other quintiles are comparable to those in many neighboring towns.

---

1 Enrico Moretti, The New Geography of Jobs, First Mariner Books;2013
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Princeton Ranks 91st in Household Income

New Jersey has the second highest median household income in the country. There are 90 communities in the state with higher average household incomes. However, the gap between incomes received by the lowest 20% of households in Princeton and those received by the top 20% is one of the widest in the Garden State. The bottom quintile's incomes are only 3.6% of the top 20%.

About 29% of Princeton's households earn more than $200,000. An estimated 20.4% earn less than $35,000, over the top income level for the bottom quintile. The sources of household income in Princeton differ appreciably from New Jersey or the country as a whole. In the aggregate, our households receive less income from salaries and wages (in %), but two or three times (in %) from interest and dividends and nearly twice the state and national percentage in self-employment income.

Incomes by Ethnicity/Race

During 2008-2012, the Census Bureau estimated that 56.5% of non-Latino white, 44.3% of Asian, and 35.5% of Black/African-American households received more than $100,000 in come per year.

About 30.6% of Black/African-American, 29% of Asian, and 18% of non-Latino white households received less than $35,000. Low income Hispanic/Latino residents are missed by the census surveys, so we must discount the estimates.

Princeton's Poverty Threshold

- During 2008-2012, an estimated 1,450 individuals lived on incomes below the poverty threshold, 776 of them with incomes lower than 50% of that level. An estimated 3,543 received incomes at only 200% of the threshold.

- Of those living on incomes below the threshold, about 14.3% were children or youths below age 18; 16.8% age 65 and over.

- An estimated 56.6% were women, 67% of them not living in families.

- About 56.6% of individuals living below the poverty threshold are non-Latino white, 18.8% are Asian, 10.6% Hispanic/Latino (an undercount), and 8.5% Black/African-American.

- Just over 34% of individuals with incomes below the poverty threshold were foreign-born.

- An estimated 255 families had incomes below the threshold, half of them headed by a woman. With no spouse present.
Meeting Human Needs

Despite general wellbeing in Princeton, there are human needs that community service organizations attempt to fill. Aside from those living in nursing facilities, there are 1,730 residents with disabilities; 1,450 who have incomes below the poverty threshold (and 3,543 who have incomes only 200% above that level); some of our 4,445 (and growing in number) of seniors over age 65; and children and youths under 18.

1,739 With Disabilities
By Age and % Persons
Not in Nursing Facilities

Poverty in Princeton

The number of individuals with incomes below the poverty threshold is about the same today as in 1990—1,450. Though the number of families with incomes at that level has increased from 229 to 255 these families have fewer children, so their numbers dropped by about 10-11% even while the number of seniors below the threshold increased by about 17%.

HUMAN NEEDS

Families With Low Incomes

Half the families living below the poverty threshold are married couples, over 90% of them with children. The other half of families at that level are headed by a woman without a spouse present, 71% of them with children.

Families with Incomes from Below to 150% Poverty Threshold 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Married couple families with children &lt;18</th>
<th>Female headed families with children &lt;18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Threshold</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 130% Poverty Threshold</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45 153 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130%–150% Poverty Threshold</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11  77 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 246 of the 1,450 individuals living on incomes below the poverty threshold are children in school.

Few Families Get Cash Assistance

Only 11 of 128 married couples with incomes below the poverty threshold received cash public assistance and they appear to be over age 65. Only 27 of the 127 female-headed households at this income level received such aid.

Cash Assistance Income for Families Incomes Below Poverty Level 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>Married couples</th>
<th>Female-headed families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Social Security</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No public assistance</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Only 22% Of Families Below Threshold Receive Food Stamps

Of the 224 households that received Food Stamps during 2008-2011, only 57 had incomes below the poverty threshold. The remainder had incomes up to 200% of the poverty level.

224 Families Received Food Stamps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Household</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple families</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed families, no spouse</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-headed Households, no spouse</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family households</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity and Poverty

- While African-Americans accounted for 9% of individuals living below the poverty threshold, no African-American families had incomes at that level.

- While Asian individuals account for 19% of individuals living below the poverty threshold, Asian families accounted for 33% at that income level.

- About 13% of the families and individuals below the poverty threshold were Hispanic/Latino; all of them female-headed with no spouse present. However, the estimates for low-income Hispanic/Latino residents are unreliable because so many are not reached by census surveys.

Non-Latino Whites Account for Half of Individuals Below Poverty Threshold

During 2008-2012, 57% of individuals living below the poverty threshold in Princeton were white and not Latino. Almost half of the families with incomes below the poverty threshold were also non-Latino white, about 42% headed by a woman with no spouse present.

% 1,450 Individuals By Ethnicity/ Race Incomes Below Poverty Level 2008-2012

- Asian 59%
- Hispanic/Latino 11%
- Black/African American 8%
- Non-Latino white 57%
- Other 4%
Insulated Princeton
Education, Jobs, and Income

Enrico Moretti, professor of economic geography at the University of California in Berkeley, argues that, just as there is a widening gap in income between individuals and households at the top and the remaining 90%, one has opened between “places” as well, namely “hubs of innovation and education” and once-prosperous centers of production with less credentialed workforces. He asserts that workers with less education find better jobs and earn higher wages in education hubs than those who work in the old manufacturing towns. He ranks the Trenton-Princeton metropolitan area (Mercer County) tenth in percent of those with college degrees.

Average Salaries for College Grads & HS Grads
Top 11 Metro Areas Ranked by % College Grads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Salary of high school graduates</th>
<th>Salary of college graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Everett, WA</td>
<td>$52,412</td>
<td>$64,921-68,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton-Princeton, NJ</td>
<td>54,015</td>
<td>$69,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$61,911</td>
<td>$72,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>$51,452</td>
<td>$63,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa, AZ</td>
<td>$58,070</td>
<td>$72,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>$51,191</td>
<td>$65,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC/MD/VA</td>
<td>$62,184</td>
<td>$70,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford, CA</td>
<td>$57,203</td>
<td>$73,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the Trenton-Princeton metro area ranks 10th in its percentage of college degree holders, it places third in college degree median salaries and fourth in high school graduate median salaries.

These comparisons change if one measures the differences by towns instead of metropolitan area. For example, if we compare peer communities on a municipal, rather than metropolitan basis, only Palo Alto exceeds Princeton in its percentage of degree holders.

Educational Attainment in Princeton
Remarkably, over half of Princeton’s population over age 25 holds a graduate degree.

Earnings and Education in Princeton
The more advanced the level of educational attainment, the higher average earnings. However, a pronounced difference in gender compensation is apparent. Women with a high school education earn more than their male counterparts. However, as women obtain higher and higher educational credentials, the gap between the compensation they receive and that men obtain steadily widens.

Estimated Average Earnings by Educational Attainment
2008-2012

The “0” in the above table indicates that the data was not available.

1 Enrico Moretti, The New Geography of Jobs, First Mariner Books; 2013
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Diversity in Princeton's Schools

The unique personality of Princeton poses special challenges for its schools. As noted earlier in this summary, Princeton has a significant number of families and children who are economically disadvantaged. In addition, there is a constantly rotating population of children who come to the schools with limited English.

The New Jersey Department of Education has defined "peer groups" of schools with reasonably comparable social characteristics and uses these "peer groups" to compare performance. Princeton's "peer group" consists of 30 schools, mostly in central and northern parts of the state.

Princeton ranks fourth in its peer group in the number of children who have "limited English." (West Windsor-Plainsboro ranks fifth.)

Schools Meet The Challenge

By most measures, Princeton's public schools and teachers meet these challenges.

One of the gauges of career readiness is the percent and performance of students taking the SAT.

![Career Readiness Graph]

Princeton HS SAT Takers Compared

- Participating in SAT: Princeton 96.00%, Peer 85.30%, State 74.40%
- % Scoring above 1550: Princeton 84.00%, Peer 58.60%, State 43.00%

![Princeton HS SAT Scores Compared Graph]

Princeton HS SAT Scores Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group % NJ</th>
<th>Composite SAT Score</th>
<th>Critical Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Princeton High School</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>613.6</td>
<td>629.1</td>
<td>613.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Average</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![% Enrollment in Post-Secondary Education Graph]

% Enrollment in Post-Secondary Education

- Total: 66.00%, Non-Latino White: 71.40%, Hispanic: 43.00%, African American: 38.00%, Asian: 72.70%, Multi-racial: 44.00%, Students with disability: 75.00%
The Property Tax

New Jersey ranks fifth among the states in its reliance upon property taxes. The median amounts of property taxes paid per household in New Jersey—as a percent of median home value and median income—are the highest in the nation.

Princeton's reliance on the property tax is slightly lower than the statewide municipal average because it receives more revenue from fees, contributions in lieu of taxes and other sources.

Selected Sources for Municipal Revenue
Princeton, NJ & Nation-wide Compared
2014

- Municipalities Nation-wide
- New Jersey Municipalities
- Princeton

Federal/State Transfers
- 2.0%
- 3.4%
- 6.0%
- 38.9%

Income Taxes
- 2.9%
- 0.0%
- 0.0%
- 6.6%

Sales and Gross Receipts
- 3.3%
- 0.0%
- 0.0%
- 6.8%

Fees, contributions in lieu of taxes
- 14.5%
- 19.6%
- 23.1%
- 25.0%

Property Taxes
- 55.9%
- 55.9%
- 42.4%

Princeton 12th Highest in New Jersey

Nonetheless, in 2013, the average total property tax in Princeton was 12th highest in the state (tax at base of bar, average residential value at top.)

Average Property Taxes and Residential Values
Top 12 NJ Municipalities in 2013

- Average Total
- Property Tax
- Average Residential Property Value

12. Princeton
$17,070
$799,624

11. Demarest Borough
$17,120
$799,409

10. Glen Ridge
$17,490
$799,849

9. Mendham Township
$17,673
$831,203

8. Essex Fells
$17,665
$835,617

7. Basking Ridge
$18,211
$1,132,658

6. Teaneck
$18,269
$877,908

5. Mountain Lakes
$18,679
$892,536

4. Alpine
$19,510

3. Millburn Township
$20,857
$1,078,440

2. Loch Arbour
$21,778
$1,071,877

1. Princeton

Net Value of Taxable Property 20th in State

Though it is 78th in size of its population, the net value of Princeton’s taxable property is 20th in the state.

Rank 40th in % Exempt Property

Princeton ranks 40th in New Jersey in its percent of exempt property, but the valuation of that property is the third highest.

#1 Valuation of Exempt Education Property

Princeton ranks first in the state in the percent and valuation of exempt educational property

Exemptions By Class
Top 10 NJ Municipalities
2013

- Public Schools
- Other Education
- Public Property
- Churches/Charities/Government
- Other
IN PRINCETON

Contributions from Exempt Institutions
May Be Highest (in %) in Nation

No formal initiative exists to track voluntary contributions by exempt institutions to municipal budgets or in lieu of taxes. However, a national study by the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. and other organizations in 2011 measured these contributions as a percent of the municipal budget or property taxes. By those measures, it found the former Princeton Borough to be one of the top recipients of such contributions. The study covered the period from fiscal 2008 through 2011. The findings are extended through FY 2013 in the chart and take account of the newly negotiated level of contributions from Princeton University.

Exempt Institution Contributions
% Municipal Budget & Property Tax Revenue
FY 2008-FY 2013

Town Ranks 10th in Taxes
Raised for County Government

While our municipal government collects the property tax, only 22% is for municipal government while 48.2% is for schools, 29.8% for county government.

Among New Jersey’s municipalities in 2013, Princeton ranked 10th in the amount of property tax collected for county government, 49th in the amount of its school levy, and 55th in the amount for municipal government.
Princeton Daily Workforce 23rd in State

Though 78th in population among New Jersey's municipalities, even after adjusting for the hospital's relocation in 2012, Princeton's workforce of 30,501 is the 23rd largest in the state on an average weekday.

23,615 Daily In-Commutes

After the hospital move, our estimated daily workforce consists of 6,886 residents who work in town and 23,615 in-commuters from elsewhere.

From Where Do They Come?

Commuters come to work Princeton each day from as far afield as Connecticut, Baltimore and Washington, DC, but 40% travel from homes in nearby communities in the U.S. 1 corridor (plus Burlington and Bucks counties). Fewer than 25% of Princeton residents who out-commute work in the corridor. Nearly 15% commute to New York City. About 3,000 in-commuters, and just over 1,000 of our out-commuters, cross U.S. 1 back and forth between home and work each day. Could they be served by transit?

An Education and Research Economy

Around 45% of Princeton's out-commuters and in-commuters hold jobs in education, health, and research, just about twice the percentage in New Jersey's total workforce.
ECONOMY

Princeton's Educational and Cultural Role Reflected In Resident Occupations

Nearly a third of resident workers have jobs in education, science, or arts and entertainment. The number employed in health (5.2%) has declined since the hospital's relocation.

Resident Workers & Daily Workforce

Although nearly 60% of the Daily Workforce consists of professionals, managers and researchers, many are residents. Though a significant percentage of the 23,600 in-commuters are teachers and staff of our town government as well as faculty in the institutions of higher education, a large number provide the services, sales, office support, construction, maintenance, and production needs of the town's economy.

Between 5 and 7 Percent Self-Employed

Princeton attracts about 1,960 independent, unincorporated professionals, writers, artists, researchers and consultants. About 57% are resident, the rest in-commute.

Resident Worker Earnings and Daily Workforce Earnings

The estimated median earnings for resident workers ($46,868) were actually lower than for the daily workforce ($47,437) during 2008-2012.
PRINCETON'S

Jobs Diffusing Out of Princeton to Neighboring Towns

Since 2006, some Princeton University administrative workers have transferred to offices in West Windsor and Princeton Health Care System relocated to Plainsboro in mid-2012. As a result, in-commutes to Princeton declined while Princeton residents who work at these re-located institutions changed from being in-town workers to being out-commuters. Still, tentative estimates are that slightly more than half of working residents still hold jobs in town.

Getting to Work: Residents

More than half of Princeton workers who live in town work in town, about two and a half times the percentage for New Jersey and six times that for the U.S.

Getting to Work: Resident Workers
Compared to NJ & U.S. (%)

Similarly, the way Princeton's workers get to their jobs differs significantly. The percentage who walk or bike is about seven times that for New Jersey and the U.S., while the number who drive is about 40% the percentages for the state and nation.

Getting to Work: Daily Workforce

In contrast, those who in-commute to Princeton jobs match the state and national proportions more closely. About 71% arrive by motor vehicle. The percent who come by transit is only about half that of residents who out-commute. In-commuters rely more on bus transit while more Princeton out-commuters use rail.
### Traffic

**Decline in In-Commuters Does Not Mean Less Traffic**

Though the number of in-commuters, emergency vehicles, and trucks entering Princeton has declined since the medical center’s relocation, other sources of traffic are projected to continue to increase. An estimated 170,000 motor vehicle trips pass through Princeton’s streets each day.

Prior to the medical center’s move in 2012, about 32-33% of those trips were either in-commuters, or Princeton residents out-commuting. Over 45% were non-work-related car trips—residents running errands or dropping kids off at school, and visitors coming to town for business or pleasure or just passing through. About 16% of the traffic is composed of trucks and buses. We can only infer or “guessimate” how many heavy trucks just pass through. That awaits a direct count.

**Managing Traffic Requires Regional Solutions**

Employment and commuting patterns in Princeton and neighboring towns are tangled up together. Traffic knots cannot be untied without a shared strategy. Four thousand area workers travel back and fourth each day between Princeton and municipalities on the opposite side of U.S. 1.

Most area employment growth is in neighboring municipalities.

### Changes in Resident In-Town Workers and Daily Workforce, 2000-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change Resident In-Town Workers</th>
<th>% Change Daily Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainsboro</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Brunswick</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Windsor</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Hill</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell Twp.</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell Boro</td>
<td>-12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>-33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Windsor</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightstown</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbury</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Might We Be Headed?

1. Future Population Partly Subject to Choice

Population projections for communities Princeton’s size have not, as yet, been generated by the U.S. Census Bureau or the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) has projected Princeton’s population out to 2040, but already has proven to be mistaken. Assuming that Princeton is near physical “build out,” the agency projected very modest future population growth (2,400 persons) between 2010 and 2040. The Census Bureau’s “official” Current Population Estimate for Princeton in 2014 (29,008) is already at the level projected by DVRPC for 2020 (red line in chart).

In contrast with the previous decade when the former borough experienced modest declines in its residential population, because of residential projects already under way we will see growth in the residential population of both the former borough and the former township. Decisions about zoning and the desired character of residential development, along with developments along U.S. 1 will influence the size and character of our population.

2. Anticipated Development

It is foolhardy at this stage to forecast precisely what the impacts of these developments will be. Their precise character and timing is unknown and up for debate. In addition, market forces are in play that reflect changes in where corporations wish to locate their facilities, and where young singles and marrieds want to live.

These and other impending developments give rise, however, to the following strategic planning challenges:

- They will generate increased in-commutation and other traffic, which in turn will increase the demand for expanded transit and better traffic management.
- They will increase the demand for reasonably-priced housing closer to places of work.
- They will increase the demand for executive housing and help drive up the cost of housing in Princeton.
- They will create new competition for Princeton’s downtown retail and food businesses.
3. Diversity in Incomes in Danger

The gap between the bottom 20% of Princeton’s households and the top 20% is one of the widest in the state. This disparity leads to issues that are both social and physical.

Most immediately, they express themselves in the Witherspoon neighborhood. The redevelopment of Merwick/Stanworth university housing and the impending construction of units on the Avalon site inevitably increase the demand for neighborhood services and enhance the desirability of housing in a walkable neighborhood close to downtown. This, in turn, will tempt some owners to sell their properties, particularly those housing some of the community’s lowest income residents. The policy choice is to allow market forces to work and experience the same kinds of social displacements that have occurred in the past, or to ameliorate such displacements through interventions of various kinds—not an easy task because, in many cases, the primary displaces will be undocumented workers and families.

This is only the most immediate example of potential consequences for the community’s income diversity as housing prices rise. As the previously described developments take place in the surrounding area, market demands for housing in Princeton will increase and drive housing prices still higher. This may well squeeze out those with incomes that, up until now, still enabled them to live in Princeton.

Local options to deal with this issue are limited because of current hostility at the state level to interventions of the kind required and to the phase out of Federal assistance once available to support such interventions.

4. An Older Population

Despite its youthful population because of the college students, Princeton has a larger percentage of its population above age 65 than the state or the nation.

The number of seniors in Princeton has increased steadily from 3,312 in 1990 to 4,015 in 2010. We can expect that number to balloon as more and more of the War Baby generation reach age 65 over the next several years.

This year, Princeton was the first municipality in New Jersey to receive the “age-friendly” designation from AARP and a separate recognition from New Jersey Future. However, as in the case of the census, the designations have not caught up with consolidation. The core neighborhoods in central Princeton were so designated. But areas of the former township were not designated because housing and services are too dispersed to meet the criteria.

Ironically, the census group block with the largest concentration of seniors is in the northeast section of the former township. This is, in part, because the largest assisted living facility in Princeton is in that block group. However, the area still has the largest concentration of seniors (increased by the recent completion of Copperwood).

Given the increase in Princeton’s older population,
ABOUT THE DATA

To keep things simple in this leaflet, no data sources are cited, except in the case of non-public sources.

All sources are, of course, spelled out in detail in the Princeton Statistical Portrait reference volume from which they are drawn.

In this first trial-run year, most of the information was selected so that we could compare Princeton to other municipalities, the state, and the nation. For that reason, much of the information comes from the decennial U.S. Censuses in 1990, 2000, and 2010, plus the American Community Survey conducted each year by the Census Bureau.

At present it takes five years of these surveys to produce reliable estimates for communities of Princeton’s size. Fortunately, consolidated Princeton’s population is approaching 30,000, the minimum size for reliable three-year estimates. In addition, at the time this leaflet was prepared, the new surveys are for a consolidated Princeton, which will save us considerable work converting data about the former borough and township. Future census survey estimates should also have smaller margins of error because of the consolidated municipality’s larger size.

Although specific numbers are used throughout this summary, the census data should be viewed as estimates with a 90% chance of being accurate within a specified margin of error. Thus the numbers should be taken as just that—estimates. We can use them for strategic planning purposes, but they are not sufficiently reliable to be used to design or implement projects.

Tax data comes from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs.

Most local and state education data come from the New Jersey Department of Education.

Traffic counts are provided by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and the New Jersey Department of Transportation.

Traffic origin and destination information comes from the U.S. Census Bureau analyzed and updated by the Research Division of New Jersey Transit and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission.
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