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How many persons of the ages 60 and over or 65 and over are living in South Dakota counties? How rapidly is this segment of our population growing? Answers to these questions are essential to planning efforts for the many federal, state, and local programs dealing with the unique needs of the elderly.

The U.S. National Clearinghouse on Aging, in conjunction with the Bureau of the Census, has annualiy estimated the population of those 60 and over $(60+)$ and 65 and over ( $65+$ ) since 1974.' In order to provide a better understanding of the Clearinghouse's estimates for South Dakota's counties, and to make this information available to more people, the Rural Sociology Department at South Dakota State University, Brookings, has prepared this Population Update bulletin.

## South Dakota Statistics

The U.S. 1970 Census showed South Dakota had 80,274 people $65+$ years of age, which was $12.1 \%$ of the state's population. (Table 1). By 1975 , the figure had jumped to 85,400 ( $12.5 \%$ ), 5,000 more than in 1970.

Turner County showed the largest proportion $65+$ population in 1975 , with $20 \%$ of its total population in this age group. The smallest percentage of elderly people, $5 \%$, was in the Indian reservation county of Shannon. Looking at the state as a whole, the $65+$ population

Figure 1. Percentage of Population 65 and Over, 1975

increased by 6.3\% from 1970 to 1975. (Table 2) The rate of increase of $1.2 \%$ per year is just about the same rate as during the 1960's.

Out of the state's 67 counties, 59 had increases in their elderly populations. Stanley County had the greatest increase of $22 \%$ in the $65+$ population. Eight counties had declines in the $65+$ age group. The greatest decline was Faulk County with $-7 \%$.

The data estimates for the $65+$ population are based on Medicare enrollments, and are considered to have a "high degree of reliability" by the Clearinghouse on the Aging. ${ }^{2}$ The data for the $60+$ population estimates are based on adjusted county ratios, and are only rough estimates. However, the $60+$ estimates are included in Population Update because they partially indicate future trends for the $65+$ population.

Table 1 lists the following by county: the total population, the number of persons $60+$ and $65+$, the total state population as of April 1, 1970, and the population estimates as of July 1, 1975. The data shown for 1970 are U.S. 1970 Census counts, and the data shown for 1975 are the Clearinghouse estimates.

Table 2 shows the percentage of the total state population that was $60+$ and $65+$ in 1970 and 1975, and also shows the percentage change and number change between those years. The estimates for 1975 in Table 1 have been rounded by the Clearinghouse to the nearest hundred; however, percentage figures presented in Table 2 are based on the estimates before rounding.

Figure 1 and 2 show the $65+$ percentages from Table 1 arranged on state maps.

Figure 1 shows the highest percentage of persons $65+$ is predominately in the eastern half of the state. Fall River County is the only county in the western half of the state to fall into either of the two higher percentage classifications. One apparent reason for high percentages of persons $65+$ in individual counties concerns the presence or absence of urban (places with a population $2500+$ ) in 1970. None of the eleven counties that have the largest percentage of persons $65+$ have urban places. Instead, they contain a number of small towns which have become desirable retirement

|  | 1975 Estimate |  |  | 1970 U.S. Census |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Total Population | Population 60 and Over | Population 65 and Over | Total * Population | Population 60 and Over | Population 65 and Over |
| State total | 683300 | 116700 | 85400 | 665507 | 109559 | 80274 |
| AURORA | 4000 | 80\% | 600 | 4183 | 795 | 572 |
| BEADLE | 20000 | 3700 | 2700 | 20877 | 3593 | 2668 |
| BENNETT | 3300 | 500 | 300 | 3088 | 432 | 298 |
| BON HOMME | 7900 | 1900 | 1400 | 8577 | 1802 | 1338 |
| BROOKINGS | 22600 | 3200 | 2400 | 22158 | 3086 | 2292 |
| BROWN | 37800 | 5800 | 4300 | 36920 | 5419 | 3987 |
| BRULE | 5800 | 1100 | 800 | 5870 | 1014 | 752 |
| buffalo | 1800 | 200 | 100 | 1739 | 168 | 119 |
| Butte | 8400 | 1500 | 1100 | 7825 | 1389 | 992 |
| CAMPBELL | 2500 | 500 | 300 | 2866 | 453 | 309 |
| CHARLES MIX | 10500 | 2000 | 1500 | 9994 | 1812 | 1314 |
| CLARK | 5800 | 1200 | 900 | 5515 | 1233 | 937 |
| CLAY | 13400 | 1500 | 1100 | 12923 | 1514 | 1122 |
| CODINGTON | 19900 | 3800 | 2800 | 19140 | 3511 | 2599 |
| CORSON | 5000 | 600 | 400 | 4994 | 571 | 391 |
| CUSTER | 5300 | 900 | 700 | 4698 | 860 | 595 |
| DAVISON | 17800 | 3500 | 2700 | 17319 | 3291 | 2515 |
| DAY | 8500 | 2000 | 1500 | 8713 | 1982 | 1543 |
| DEUEL | 5700 | 1300 | 900 | 5686 | 1232 | 878 |
| DEWEY | 6000 | 600 | 400 | 5170 | 583 | 398 |
| DOUGLAS | 4500 | 900 | 700 | 4569 | 887 | 665 |
| EDMUNDS | 5600 | 1200 | 900 | 5548 | 1047 | 776 |
| FALL RIVER | 8400 | 2100 | 1600 | 7505 | 2071 | 1587 |
| FAULK | 3600 | 700 | 500 | 3893 | 732 | 569 |
| GRANT | 9700 | 1900 | 1400 | 9005 | 1821 | 1367 |
| GREGORY | 6500 | 1600 | 1200 | 6710 | 1483 | 1089 |
| HAAKON | 2700 | 500 | 300 | 2802 | 444 | 311 |
| HAMLIN | 5500 | 1300 | 1000 | 5172 | 1338 | 996 |
| HAND | 5400 | 1100 | 800 | 5883 | 1020 | 736 |
| HANSON | 3600 | 700 | 500 | 3781 | 734 | 559 |
| HARDING | 1800 | 300 | 200 | 1855 | 286 | 186 |
| HUGHES | 13500 | 1700 | 1200 | 11632 | 1489 | 1037 |
| HUTCHINSON | 9700 | 2600 | 1900 | 10379 | 2374 | 1789 |
| HYDE | 2400 | 500 | 300 | 2515 | 491 | 355 |
| JACKSON | 1600 | 300 | 200 | 1531 | 256 | 184 |
| JERAULD | 3000 | 800 | 600 | 3310 | 768 | 579 |
| Jones | 1600 | 300 | 200 | 1882 | 312 | 207 |
| KINGSBURY | 7200 | 1900 | 1400 | 7657 | 1828 | 1386 |
| LAKE | 10600 | 2400 | 1700 | 11456 | 2143 | 1565 |
| LAWRENCE | 16700 | 2900 | 2000 | 17453 | 2628 | 1883 |
| LIncoln | 12500 | 2700 | 2000 | 11761 | 2471 | 1844 |
| LYMAN | 4100 | 700 | 500 | 4060 | 612 | 429 |
| McCOOK | 6900 | 1500 | 1200 | 7246 | 1307 | 1146 |
| MCPHERSON | 4600 | 1100 | 800 | 5022 | 979 | 725 |
| MARSHALL | 5700 | 1300 | 1000 | 5965 | 1255 | 962 |
| MEADE | 18300 | 2000 | 1400 | 16618 | 1812 | 1301 |
| MELLETtE | 2400 | 400 | 300 | 2420 | 334 | 232 |
| MINER | 4100 | 1100 | 800 | 4454 | 1026 | 773 |
| MINNEHAHA | 100100 | 14700 | 10700 | 95209 | 13083 | 9519 |
| MOODY | 7600 | 1600 | 1100 | 7622 | 1503 | 1088 |
| PENNINGTON | 67400 | 7300 | 5000 | 59349 | 6531 | 4492 |
| PERKINS | 4800 | 900 | 600 | 4769 | 814 | 574 |
| POTTER | 4200 | 800 | 600 | 4449 | 784 | 584 |
| ROBERTS | 11800 | 2600 | 1900 | 11678 | 2424 | 1766 |
| SANBORN | 3400 | 800 | 600 | 3697 | 738 | 549 |
| SHANNON | 9400 | 700 | 500 | 8198 | 699 | 496 |
| SPINK | 10000 | 2000 | 1500 | 10595 | 2118 | 1559 |
| Stanley | 2500 | 400 | 200 | 2457 | 307 | 190 |
| SULLY | 2200 | 300 | 300 | 2362 | 344 | 256 |
| TODD | 7300 | 700 | 500 | 6606 | 587 | 412 |
| TRIPP | 8300 | 1300 | 1000 | 8171 | 1293 | 429 |
| TURNER | 9400 | 2500 | 1900 | 9872 | 2363 | 1788 |
| UNION | 10400 | 2000 | 1500 | 9643 | 1894 | 1432 |
| WALWORTH | 7800 | 1500 | 1100 | 7842 | 1461 | 1056 |
| WASHABAUGH | 1500 | 200 | 100 | 1389 | 137 | 91 |
| YANKTON | 17900 | 3500 | 2600 | 19039 | 3358 | 2469 |
| ZIEBACH | 2700 | 300 | 200 | 2221 | 233 | 167 |

Table 2. Percentage Measures: Population 60 and Over and 65 and Over in 1970 and 1975
(1975 Estimate)
Percent of
Total Population
Change-1970 to 1975

| County | Total Population |  | 60 Years and Over |  | 65 Years and Over |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 60 and Over | 65 and Over | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| State, total | 17.1 | 12.5 | 7100 | 6.5 | 5100 | 6.3 |
| AURORA | 21.0 | 15.1 | (Z) | 5.5 | (Z) | 8.4 |
| BEADLE | 18.3 | 13.6 | 100 | 2.2 | 100 | 2.1 |
| BENNETT | 14.9 | 10.3 | 100 | 15.3 | (Z) | 15.1 |
| BON HOMME | 23.6 | 17.5 | $\pm 00$ | 3.2 | (Z) | 3.1 |
| BROOKINGS | 14.1 | 10.5 | 100 | 3.0 | 100 | 2.9 |
| BROWN | 15.4 | 11.3 | 400 | 7.2 | 300 | 7.0 |
| BRULE | 18.2 | 13.4 | (z) | 3.6 | (Z) | 3.5 |
| BuFFALO | 8.6 | 6.1 | (Z) | -6.0 | (Z) | -5.9 |
| BUTTE | 18.4 | 13.2 | 200 | 11.3 | 100 | 11.2 |
| CAMPBELL | 20.4 | 13.9 | 100 | 12.8 | (Z) | 12.6 |
| CHARLES MIX | 19.3 | 14.0 | 200 | 11.9 | 200 | 11.8 |
| CLARK | 21.1 | 16.1 | ( Z ) | 0.9 | (Z) | -1.0 |
| CLAY | 11.5 | 8.5 | (Z) | 1.5 | (Z) | 1.3 |
| CODINGTON | 19.0 | 14.0 | 300 | 7.3 | 200 | 7.2 |
| CORSON | 11.7 | 8.0 | (Z) | 2.3 | (Z) | 2.3 |
| CUSTER | 17.8 | 12.3 | 100 | 10.0 | 100 | 9.9 |
| DAVISON | 19.5 | 14.9 | 200 | 5.6 | 100 | 5.5 |
| DAY | 23.2 | 18.1 | (Z) | 0.8 | (z) | 0.6 |
| DEUEL | 22.7 | 16.1 | 100 | 5.8 | (Z) | 5.6 |
| DEWEY | 9.9 | 6.8 | (Z) | 1.4 | (Z) | 1.5 |
| DOUGLAS | 20.6 | 15.5 | (z) | 4.6 | (Z) | 4.7 |
| EDMUNDS | 20.9 | 15.5 | 100 | 11.6 | 100 | 11.7 |
| FALL RIVER | 24.6 | 18.8 | (Z) | 0.6 | (Z) | 0.7 |
| FAULK | 18.9 | 14.7 | (Z) | -6.6 | (Z) | -6.7 |
| GRANT | 19.4 | 14.5 | 100 | 3.2 | (Z) | 3.1 |
| GREGORY | 25.0 | 18.4 | 100 | 9.3 | 100 | 9.3 |
| HAAKON | 16.7 | 11.7 | (Z) | 2.5 | (Z) | 2.3 |
| HAMLIN | 24.6 | 18.3 | ( Z ) | 0.4 | (Z) | 0.3 |
| HAND | 20.7 | 14.9 | 100 | 8.9 | 100 | 8.8 |
| HANSON | 19.0 | 14.4 | (z) | -5.6 | (Z) | -5.7 |
| HARDING | 16.8 | 10.9 | (Z) | 10.5 | (Z) | 10.2 |
| HUGHES | 12.5 | 8.7 | 200 | 13.6 | 100 | 13.5 |
| HUTCHINSON | 26.5 | 19.9 | 200 | 8.8 | 200 | 8.7 |
| HYDE | 19.8 | 14.3 | (Z) | -1.4 | (Z) | -1.7 |
| JACKSON | 17.3 | 12.4 | (Z) | 11.3 | (Z) | 10.9 |
| JERAULD | 25.3 | 19.1 | (z) | 0.9 | (Z) | 0.9 |
| JONES | 18.8 | 12.0 | (z) | -8.5 | (z) | -0.5 |
| KINGSBURY | 25.8 | 19.6 | (z) | -1.6 | (Z) | 1.4 |
| LAKE | 22.5 | 16.4 | 300 | 11.7 | 200 | 11.6 |
| LAWRENCE | 17.0 | 12.2 | 200 | 8.5 | 200 | 8.4 |
| LINCOLN | 21.9 | 16.3 | 300 | 10.9 | 200 | 10.8 |
| LYMAN | 16.7 | 11.7 | 100 | 11.8 | 100 | 11.7 |
| МсСООк | 22.3 | 16.9 | (2) | 2.5 | (Z) | 2.4 |
| McPHERSON | 24.2 | 17.9 | 100 | 14.7 | 100 | 14.5 |
| MARSHALL | 22.1 | 16.9 | (Z) | 0.4 | (z) | 0.5 |
| MEADE | 10.8 | 7.8 | 200 | 9.3 | 100 | 9.2 |
| MELLETTE | 15.2 | 10.6 | (Z) | 9.0 | (Z) | 9.1 |
| MINER | 25.5 | 19.2 | (z) | 2.3 | (Z) | 2.2 |
| MINNEHAHA | 14.6 | 10.6 | 1600 | 12.0 | 1100 | 11.9 |
| MOODY | 20.8 | 15.1 | 100 | 5.2 | 100 | 5.1 |
| PENNINGTON | 10.8 | 7.4 | 800 | 11.8 | 500 | 11.7 |
| PERKINS | 18.2 | 12.8 | 100 | 6.5 | (Z) | 6.4 |
| POTTER | 18.7 | 13.9 | (z) | 0.5 | (Z) | 0.3 |
| ROBERTS | 22.3 | 16.3 | 200 | 8.7 | 200 | 8.7 |
| SANBORN | 22.3 | 16.6 | (Z) | 3.7 | (Z) | 3.6 |
| SHANNON | 7.0 | 5.0 | (Z) | -5.7 | (Z) | -3.8 |
| SPINK | 20.6 | 15.1 | -100 | -3.3 | -100 | -3.4 |
| StANLEY | 14.7 | 9.1 | 100 | 21.8 | (Z) | 22.1 |
| SULLY | 15.8 | 11.7 | (Z) | (z) | (Z) | (Z) |
| TODD | 8.9 | 6.3 | 100 | 11.2 | (Z) | 11.2 |
| TRIPP | 16.1 | 11.6 | (Z) | 3.6 | (Z) | 3.4 |
| TURNER | 26.4 | 20.0 | 100 | 4.7 | 100 | 4.8 |
| UNION | 19.0 | 14.3 | 100 | 4.4 | 100 | 4.3 |
| WALWORTH | 19.7 | 14.2 | 100 | 5.7 | 100 | 5.6 |
| WASHABAUGH | 9.8 | 6.5 | (z) | 9.5 | (z) | 9.9 |
| YANKTON | 19.7 | 14.5 | 200 | 5.2 | 100 | 5.1 |
| ZIEBACH | 10.2 | 7.3 | (Z) | 17.2 | (Z) | 16.8 |

*' $Z$ ' values represent less than 100 persons
locations for the aged in our state. For example, Turner County has 10 such places. Of the 24 counties that fall into the second highest category, only nine have a town with a population of $2500+.^{3}$

Figure 2 shows the percentage change in the number of persons $65+$ between the years 1970 and 1975 for each of South Dakota's 67 counties. While there seems to be no apparent overall pattern of change, individual counties often border one or more counties with the same classification. Further in-depth analysis, considering such factors as changing agricultural and industrial trends, loss of farm population, and trends in net out-migration, would need to be taken into account to determine any direction to the change.

It is important to understand that the proportion of persons $60+$ or $65+$ years to those under the age of 60 or 65 can be

Figure 2. Percentage Change 65 Years and Over, 1970-1975

influenced by either adding or subtracting persons on either side of ages 60 or 65 . For example, the loss in population due to outmigration of persons in their twenties can affect the proportion of the population $65+$.

Whatever the reasons, it is apparent that our state is experiencing a change in the age structure of our population at all levels. Table 2 shows an increase of $6.5 \%$ in the number of persons $60+$ and $6.3 \%$ increase in the number of persons $65+$.

In general, the elderly people in South Dakota are comprising a larger segment of our state's population today than they ever have before. As citizens we need to reflect on the implications of this change for the economy and the welfare of our state. More than ever before the elderly people need to be taken into account in both planning and allocating state, federal and local funds and in researching the special needs of this segment of our state's population.
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