

Jewish Population in the United States, 2006

STARTING WITH THIS ISSUE of the *American Jewish Year Book* (hereafter AJYB) responsibility for producing annual estimates of the Jewish population of the United States has passed from United Jewish Communities (UJC), the coordinating body for the 155 Jewish federations and 400 independent Jewish communities in the country, to Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami and Arnold Dashefsky of the University of Connecticut. UJC has remained involved by providing access to its e-mail distribution list of “federated” Jewish communities and “network communities,” as well as contributing additional useful input.¹

Unlike previous years when hundreds of letters were mailed to solicit information about community size, we used the Internet as the principal method to contact local Jewish communities. None of the Jewish communities that completed scientific studies since 2000 were contacted since it was highly unlikely that any of them had estimates that were more recent than those available from these studies. Of the more than 500 communities that were e-mailed, only about 30 provided responses either confirming their estimate or expressing a desire to increase or decrease it. For those communities that did not reply, estimates have been retained from previous years.

While the method for contacting Jewish communities has been significantly modified from traditional mail to e-mail, the sources for these estimates remain consistent with those of previous years. Basically, the estimates derive from two sources:

Source One: *Scientific Estimates*. Such estimates are based upon the results of some type of scientific study of a community. In almost all cases, these studies involved the use of random digit dialing (RDD) telephone surveys.

¹The authors thank Dr. Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Dr. Jonathon Ament, and the UJC staff for their assistance in the collection of some of the data for this study. Both Laurence and Jonathon also provided very useful comments on an earlier draft of this article. Dr. Bruce Phillips of Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles assisted us with the San Francisco vignette and the estimates of Jewish population in that city. Sam Richardson, a graduate assistant, helped with the research, and Lorri Lafontaine, program assistant, gave technical assistance; both are with the Mandell L. Berman Institute-North American Jewish Data Bank at the University of Connecticut. The authors are also indebted to Dr. Jim Schwartz, Jeffrey Scheckner, and Dr. Barry Kosmin, who authored this AJYB article in previous years as UJC employees. Many of the estimates in this article were based upon their efforts.

Source Two: *Informant Estimates*. For communities where no scientific study has been completed, a local informant was contacted. These informants generally have access to information on the number of households on the local Jewish federation's mailing list and the number of households that belong to local Jewish organizations and synagogues.

More than 80 percent of the total of more than 6.4 million Jews estimated by this article is based upon scientific studies; only 20 percent is based upon the less reliable informant procedure.

All estimates are for Jews, both in households and institutions, and do not include non-Jews living in households with Jews. The estimates of Jewish population include both Jews who are affiliated with the Jewish community and Jews who are not affiliated.

Population estimation is not an exact science, and therefore readers should not assume that because a number changed from the last year for which new estimates were provided (for 2001 in the 2002 AJYB) that the change has all occurred in the past five years. Rather, it most likely occurred over a longer period, but has only recently been substantiated.

We have endeavored to provide readers with the most reliable estimates available, utilizing statistics derived, whenever possible, from scientifically-based studies in the archive of the Mandell L. Berman Institute-North American Jewish Data Bank at the University of Connecticut. Readers are invited to offer suggestions for improving the accuracy of the estimates and the portrayal of the data. Please send all correspondence to Ira M. Sheskin at isheskin@miami.edu.

Based upon a summation of local Jewish community studies (Table 3), the estimated size of the American Jewish community at the beginning of 2006 is more than 6.4 million (Table 1), about 1.2 million more than the Jewish population identified in the UJC's 2000–01 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS 2000–01).² The next section of this report explains the reasons for this significant difference.

Why the AJYB Estimate Differs from the NJPS 2000–01 Estimate

In a mid-twentieth-century AJYB article on American Jewish demography, Ben B. Seligman observed:

² See Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Steven M. Cohen, Jonathon Ament, Vivian Klaff, Frank Mott, and Danyelle Peckerman, *Strength, Challenge and Diversity in the American Jewish Population* (New York, 2003).

Comprising the largest Jewish national grouping in the world, American Jews are as yet unable to ascertain with any degree of precision how many persons make up that grouping, where they live, how old they are, where they came from, and how they earn their livelihood. Full and detailed demographic information comparable to census data which is available about Canadian Jewry is almost entirely lacking. And in the absence of sufficient and reliable data, the interested person—who may be a scholar preparing a treatise on some special phase of Jewish life or a community leader responsible for certain aspects of local social planning—must depend on well-informed guesses advanced by well-informed observers.³

More than a half-century later, are these observations still true? The answer is: “yes and no.” Yes, we cannot state even with the demographic precision available from the Canadian census⁴ the composition of the American Jewish population; but no, the availability of three National Jewish Population Surveys (1971, 1990, and 2000–01) and about 100 local Jewish demographic surveys—55 of them completed with the “precision” of random digit dialing (available on www.jewishdatabank.org)—has added immensely to our fund of knowledge. Yes, scholars and community planners are still interested in examining these data; but no, they do not need to depend on guesses. Rather, the aforementioned data sets lend a greater degree of precision to the generalizations they may make.

The truth is that, short of a full census as is carried out in Israel, we cannot know with any degree of certainty the actual number of Jews living in the United States on a certain date. Even the U.S. Census Bureau’s enumeration of the U.S. population, at a cost of billions of dollars, is not as precise as desired.

This article produces a national estimate of the number of Jews in the U.S. by the simple summation of more than 535 local estimates. Let us call this the AJYB estimate, which comes to more than 6.4 million Jews. NJPS 2000–01 produced an estimate of 5.2 million Jews using random digit dialing. We believe that the AJYB methodology probably overestimates the Jewish population and that the NJPS methodology probably underestimates it.

³Ben B. Seligman, “The American Jew: Some Demographic Features,” *AJYB* 1950, vol. 51, p. 3.

⁴Even the Canadian data are not as precise as might be desired. The questions about religion and ethnicity, used to identify the Jewish population, are asked only on the “long-form” questionnaire completed by a 20-percent sample of Canadian households, creating a sampling error on the estimates of the Jewish population and its characteristics.

AJYB OVERESTIMATES

Four reasons may be posited for why the AJYB methodology overestimates the U.S. Jewish population.

First, according to NJPS 2000–01, about 12 percent of American Jewish households spend two months or more away from their primary residence. Of that 12 percent, 20 percent spend part of the year outside the U.S. and, therefore, are *not* being double counted. Of the remainder, many spend time in Florida, California, and Arizona. Thus, some Jews are being reported twice in Table 3. Recognizing this problem, Table 3 reports (where the data are available) “part-year” Jews (those who spend three–seven months in a second community) separately, and they are *not* included in the total count. Yet, doubtlessly, an unknown number of part-year Jews are being double counted because many local Jewish community studies have not made distinctions between part-year Jews and full-year Jews.

Second, according to NJPS 2000–01, about 5 percent of American Jews are students. Local Jewish demographic studies do not interview students who live in dormitories, but do interview those who live off-campus. In most studies, when respondents are asked the number of persons who live in their household, they are told to include persons who are temporarily away from home, such as students. Thus a parent in, for example, Miami, will report her/his child as a resident of Miami, but if that same child attends Emory University in Atlanta and lives off-campus, that child will also be counted as part of the Atlanta Jewish community. Thus students are likely to be double counted.

Third, the more than 50 local Jewish demographic studies that account for more than 80 percent of the more than 6.4 million Jews have been completed over a two-decade period, the vast majority of them over the past 15 years. Some persons are being double counted because they have moved from one community to another. For example, imagine a household that moved from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to Sarasota, Florida, in 1999. This household would have been counted both in the 1996 Milwaukee Jewish demographic study and in the 2001 Sarasota Jewish demographic study. As a second example, Boynton Beach, Florida, has added more than 20,000 Jews to its population between 1999 and 2006. Many of these persons were probably counted in the 2001 New York Jewish demographic study. Thus, some households that move—and American Jews are about twice as mobile as Americans in general—are being double counted.

Fourth, about 20 percent of the total number presented in Table 3 is based upon an “informant methodology.” That is, a Jewish community leader has been contacted and asked for an estimate of the Jewish population. In some cases, informants may overreport the Jewish population of their area. We do not believe that this is a significant contributor to inaccuracy, for two reasons. First, it is probably balanced by some communities that underreport. Second, many of the communities for which we rely upon informants are small. Whether a community reports 500 Jews or 250 Jews has relatively little impact upon the overall number.

NJPS UNDERESTIMATES

For a variety of technical reasons, we believe that the estimate of Jewish population provided by NJPS 2000–01 is an underestimate of the Jewish population. In its main report on the study, UJC acknowledged that an undercount may have occurred.⁵ One piece of evidence for an underestimation is that a test completed after NJPS 2000–01 showed that Jews were significantly more likely to refuse to participate in the survey screener (by answering the question: “What is your religion, if any?” and three follow-up questions about Jewish parentage and Jewish upbringing) than were non-Jews.⁶ NJPS 2000–01 reports that Jews are found in 4.2 percent of U.S. households. If we suppose that, had Jews cooperated at the same rate as non-Jews, the percentage of U.S. households containing a Jew would have increased to 4.5 percent, then instead of reporting 5.2 million Jews, NJPS 2000–01 would have reported about 5.9 million. If

⁵See Kotler-Berkowitz et al., *Strength, Challenge and Diversity*, p. 31.

⁶A list of 31 Distinctive Jewish Names (DJNs) was used for this test. These names were Berman, Caplan, Cohen, Epstein, Feldman, Freedman, Friedman, Goldberg, Goldman, Goldstein, Greenberg, Grossman, Jaffe, Kahn, Kaplan, Katz, Kohn, Levin, Levine, Levinson, Levy, Lieberman, Rosen, Rosenberg, Rosenthal, Schwartz, Shapiro, Siegel, Silverman, Weinstein, and Weiss. Hundreds of thousands of households, both Jewish and non-Jewish, were contacted via random digit dialing as part of NJPS 2000–01. All of these households were researched in a computerized reverse telephone directory, facilitating placing a surname next to many of the telephone numbers. These numbers were then divided into two groups. The first consisted of households that had participated in the screener by answering the questions concerning their religion, and the second of households that refused to answer the screener questions. Among the first group (those that answered the screener), 0.16 percent of households had one of the 31 DJNs, while among the second group (those that refused to respond to the screener), 0.37 percent of households had one of the 31 DJNs. This is significant evidence, even given that not all DJN households are Jewish, that Jews were overrepresented among those who refused to participate in the survey. Note that this procedure was implemented in a way that protected the anonymity of all NJPS 2000–01 respondents.

that were the case, the AJYB and the NJPS would be in better agreement. Moreover, many of the local studies employ publicity about the study aimed at the Jewish community and a team of local, mostly Jewish, interviewers. Both the publicity and the strategy of “Jewish community members calling other Jewish community members” act to increase the response rate among Jews in these studies. NJPS 2000–01, in contrast, used no publicity, and the vast majority of the interviewers were neither Jewish nor, as in any national study, local. Thus, NJPS 2000–01 did not benefit from either of the two major techniques employed in many local studies to increase the Jewish response rate.

Note that NJPS 2000–01 was not designed to produce accurate estimates on the local or state level, and it is thus impossible to compare local or state totals from NJPS with those from Tables 1–3 below.

U.S. Jewish Population in World Perspective

In Sergio DellaPergola’s article “World Jewish Population, 2006” in this volume (pp. 559–601), the number of Jews in the world is estimated at 13,090 million at the beginning of 2006, and the largest Jewish populations are in Israel (5,313,800), the U.S. (5,275,000), France (491,500), Canada (373,500), the UK (297,000), and Russia (228,000). The U.S. estimate is based upon “a cautious compromise” between two national Jewish population surveys in 2000–01, one of which is NJPS.

Has the Jewish population of Israel now surpassed the Jewish population of the U.S.? Three points need to be considered:

1. As explained in the “World Jewish Population” article, the Jewish population data for Israel are based upon modern census techniques, and are therefore considerably more reliable than the U.S. estimates, which are based on survey research techniques.
2. The estimate of 5.2 million Jews found in NJPS 2000–01, being based on a survey research procedure, has a margin of error around the 5.2 estimate. The estimate for Israel, based upon updates of the Israeli census, also has a margin of error around the estimate of 5,313,800. Thus even if one accepts NJPS as accurate, the margin of error around the figure of 5.2 million includes within it the number of Jews in Israel. At the very least, just as in a presidential poll where the difference between two percentages is within the margin of error and the race is too close to call, so we conclude that it is premature to assert that the Jewish population of Israel has surpassed that of the U.S.

3. We have argued above that the estimate of 5.2 million Jews from NJPS 2000–01 is too low. We have also argued that the methodology of simply summing local estimates to arrive at a national estimate (in this case, 6.4 million) doubtless overestimates the size of the Jewish population. However, even if one gives credence to only a minority of the arguments tendered above, we believe it unlikely that only 5,275,000 Jews live in the U.S., especially as more than 80 percent of the 6.4 million estimate (over 5 million people) is supported by recent scientific studies.

While we believe that the Jewish population of Israel will eventually overtake the Jewish population of the U.S., that is unlikely to have happened as of 2006.

New Features in the Local Population Estimates

Table 3 in the Appendix provides estimates for more than 535 Jewish communities and parts of communities. In some cases, the geographic areas in Table 3 are Jewish federation service areas. In other cases, where data allow, we have disaggregated Jewish federation service areas into smaller geographic units. So, for the first time, separate estimates are provided for such places as Boulder, Colorado, and Boynton Beach, Florida.

Included also for the first time in this table is information for each community as to whether the estimate is based on a scientific study or an informant estimate. Estimates for communities in boldface type are based on a scientific study. Almost all such studies used random digit dialing (RDD) techniques for part of their sampling. RDD is the currently accepted best practice for making Jewish population estimates. The boldface date is the year the field work for that study was conducted.

Estimates for communities that are not in boldface type are based on the informant methodology. Because detailed records are not available for many communities as to the last time an informant contact was made, only a range of years (pre-1997 or 1997–2001) is available for most communities. And where the date in the “Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study” column of Table 3 is more recent than the date of the latest study shown in boldface type, the study estimate has been either confirmed or changed by a local informant at a date after the study.

We have also decided, for the first time, to present the number of Jews who live in part-year households (households that live in a community for 3–7 months of the year) in communities for which such information

is available, as part of Table 3. Jews in part-year households are an essential part of some Florida Jewish communities, joining local synagogues and making donations to local Jewish charities. Our methodology allows the reader to gain a better perspective on the size of certain Jewish communities without double counting the persons in these households in the totals produced in Tables 1–2. Note that Jews in part-year households are reported with respect to the community that constitutes their “second home.”

Local Population Changes

Because population changes based upon scientific studies have a greater degree of validity than those based upon local informants, this section divides the discussion of local population changes into changes based on new scientific studies and changes based on new informant estimates.

NEW SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

Seventeen new local scientific studies were completed in the U.S. since the previous estimates in 2001. Based on these, the communities reporting the largest growth are San Francisco, California, which increased by 107,900 to 227,800; Atlanta, Georgia, which increased by 33,900 to 119,800; Northern Virginia (Alexandria-Arlington-Fairfax County-Prince William County-Loudoun County), which increased by 32,300 to 67,300; West Palm Beach, Florida (Palm Beach County excluding Boca Raton and Delray Beach), which increased by 27,350 to 101,350; San Diego, California, which increased by 19,000 to 89,000; Montgomery and Prince Georges County, Maryland, which increased by 16,500 to 121,000; and South Palm Beach, Florida (Boca Raton and Delray Beach), which increased by 14,500 to 107,500. The total increase for Palm Beach County, Florida, was 41,850, and for Greater Washington it was 51,300.

Increases of 5,000–10,000 since the previous estimates in 2001 were found in Chicago, Illinois (9,500); Howard County, Maryland (6,000); Jacksonville, Florida (5,800); and Atlantic County, New Jersey (5,200). Increases of less than 3,000 were found for Rhode Island (2,650); Washington, D.C. (2,500); Nashville, Tennessee (1,800); St. Paul, Minnesota (1,700); Stuart-Port St. Lucie, Florida (1,500); Tucson, Arizona (1,400); and Hartford, Connecticut (600).

The Las Vegas estimate of 67,500 Jews is based upon a 2005 study. The

previous AJYB estimate of 75,000 was based upon informant updates of a 1995 study that estimated 55,600 Jews. Thus, the Jewish population of Las Vegas has increased by 11,900 persons since the previous study.

The greatest decreases were reported for Detroit, Michigan (-24,000) and Miami, Florida (-11,700). For Miami, this continues a trend of decreasing Jewish population since 1975, although the rate of decrease has slowed down considerably in recent years, in part due to an influx of Jews from Latin America, Israel, and the former Soviet Union. A decrease was also reported for Minneapolis (-2,200).

NEW INFORMANT ESTIMATES

Based on new informant estimates, significant increases are reported for East Bay, California (an increase of 45,500); San Jose, California (30,000); Denver-Boulder, Colorado (5,700); Monmouth County, New Jersey (5,000); Kansas City, Kansas (4,000); and Hoboken, New Jersey (400). Lower estimates are reported for Kansas City, Missouri (-3,100); Toledo-Bowling Green, Ohio (-2,000), and Akron-Kent, Ohio (-500). A Danville, Illinois, informant reported a total of fewer than 100 Jews, and this community was therefore removed from the listings.

SPECIAL NOTE ON THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

A 1986 study produced an estimated Jewish population in the San Francisco Bay Area of 210,000. The study was sponsored by three Jewish federations: the Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties; the Jewish Community Federation of the Greater East Bay; and the Jewish Community Federation of Silicon Valley (then the Jewish Federation of Greater San Jose).

A 2004 study was completed only for the Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties. From 1986 through 2003, U.S. Census data show that the total population of the area not covered by the 2004 study increased more quickly than the area covered by the 2004 study. Thus, to develop a new estimate of the Jewish population of Greater East Bay and Silicon Valley, the growth rate for the Jewish population for the San Francisco Federation was applied to the 1986 estimates for East Bay and Silicon Valley. While this is admittedly a "rough" procedure, it seems more realistic than continuing to publish 18-year-old data. The estimate for Greater East Bay and Silicon Valley was confirmed as reasonable by a local informant.

SPECIAL NOTE ON GULF COAST COMMUNITIES

In 2005, Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans and other Gulf Coast communities in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, scattering much of their Jewish populations to other locales. The estimates for Alexandria, Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, Lafayette, and New Orleans, Louisiana; Biloxi/Gulfport, Diamondhead, Hattiesburg, and Jackson, Mississippi; and Mobile, Alabama shown in Table 3 were not changed from the figure reported in the 2002 AJYB. We hope to provide new estimates for these communities next year, after the situation becomes clearer.

Vignettes of Recently Completed Local Studies

Seven local demographic studies have been completed since the last article on population appeared in the 2004 AJYB: Atlantic and Cape May counties, Miami, Minneapolis, St. Paul, San Francisco, South Palm Beach, and West Palm Beach. Since all local studies produce much information about a Jewish community beyond its size, this section presents a few of the major findings of each study.

In reading these vignettes, it is important to bear in mind the difference between the number of Jews in a community and the number of persons in Jewish households, which also includes non-Jewish spouses and children not being raised as Jews. Also, in these vignettes, when a community is compared to other Jewish communities, the comparison is to communities that have completed scientific studies during the past two decades. Full reports of the results of these studies are available from the North American Jewish Data Bank at www.jewishdatabank.org. Finally, while random digit dialing (RDD) produces the most truly random sample, most studies, for economic reasons, combine RDD sampling with the use of Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sampling, or sampling from mailing lists (known as List sampling). In all surveys that employ either DJN or List sampling, weighting factors are used to combine the samples so as to remove much of the bias introduced by their use.

ATLANTIC AND CAPE MAY COUNTIES, NEW JERSEY.

The area covered by this 2004 study includes the resort town of Atlantic City. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for the study, which was based upon 625 telephone interviews, 212

of which were completed using RDD sampling and the rest using DJN sampling. In Atlantic and Cape May counties, 23,100 persons live in 10,000 Jewish households. Of those 23,100 persons, 87 percent (20,300) are Jewish. An additional 100 Jews live in institutions, making a grand total of 20,400 Jews. Of that number, 12,200 live in Atlantic and Cape May counties for eight or more months of the year, and 8,200 live there for three–seven months of the year (part-year population).

The number of Jewish households decreased by 11 percent (1,200 households) from 1994–99, and then remained the same from 1999–2004. Results suggest that the size of the Jewish population should remain relatively stable over the next few years. A geographic shift has occurred in the location of the Jewish population, with a decrease on the island and an increase on the mainland. From 1994 through 2004, the percentage of area Jewish households on the island decreased from 69 to 59 percent, while the percentage on the mainland increased from 26 to 34 percent. Even so, 5,900 Jewish households live on the island as compared to only 3,400 on the mainland. These results suggested that the best location for Jewish facilities is probably on the island, but as close as possible to a bridge leading to the mainland.

One of the most interesting findings is that 36 percent of Jewish households are part-year households (reside in Atlantic and Cape May counties for less than eight months of the year), half of them spending the remainder of the year in Pennsylvania. Most of these households maintain significant relationships with other Jewish communities, and many do not participate in, and are unaware of, the local Jewish federation and its agencies.

Of special note is the finding that 34 percent of the Jewish population is 65 years old and over, the eighth highest percentage among about 50 comparison Jewish communities, reflecting the role of Atlantic City as a retirement community.

As is true in many other Jewish communities, the level of Jewish involvement is much higher in the traditional area of Jewish settlement (the island) than on the mainland. For example, the percentage of Jewish respondents who are “Just Jewish” is higher on the mainland (39 percent) than on the island (21 percent), and the percentage of married couples who are intermarried is higher on the mainland (41 percent) than on the island (13 percent).

A strong, although not perfect, relationship was found between household income and synagogue membership. Of households earning an annual income under \$25,000, synagogue membership is 23 percent. That

figure rises to 31 percent for households earning \$25,000–\$50,000, 49 percent for households earning \$50,000–\$100,000, 36 percent for households earning \$100,000–\$200,000, and 65 percent for households earning \$200,000 and over. Strong relationships were also found between formal childhood Jewish education and adult Jewish behaviors. For example, 54 percent of Jewish households in which an adult had attended a Jewish day school and 45 percent of households in which an adult had attended a synagogue school are synagogue members today, as compared to 27 percent of households in which no adult had either type of formal Jewish education as a child.

MIAMI, FLORIDA

This 2004 study covered all of Miami-Dade County, Florida. Ira Shekin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 1,808 telephone interviews, all of which were completed using RDD sampling.

Miami is one of the largest Jewish communities in the country: 121,300 persons live in 54,000 Jewish households, of whom 112,300 persons (93 percent) are Jewish. An additional 1,000 Jews live in institutions, for a grand total of 113,300 Jews. Of these, 106,300 Jews live in Miami for eight or more months of the year and 7,000 Jews for three–seven months of the year (part-year population).

From 1994 through 2004, the number of Jews in Miami decreased by 18 percent (from 138,600 Jews to 113,300 Jews). This was due to an excess of deaths over births (median age in Miami is 51 years), an outmigration to Broward and Palm Beach counties, and a change in the migration stream of elderly retirees from the north to South Florida that is increasingly aimed at Broward and Palm Beach counties, not Miami.

In regard to residence, 47 percent (57,500 persons, down from 61,000 in 1994) of the Jewish population live in North Dade; 36 percent (43,300 persons, down from 51,000 in 1994), in South Dade; and 17 percent (20,500 persons, down from 34,500 in 1994), in the Beaches. Only 7 percent of Jewish households are in residence for three–seven months of the year, as compared to 9 percent in Broward County and 19 percent in Palm Beach County. The study shows Miami to be a considerably more “rooted” community than either of those counties, with a much higher percentage of persons who are locally born or who have lived in the community for 20 or more years.

One of the most distinctive aspects of the Miami Jewish community is

that 31 percent of adults are foreign born, the highest of about 45 American Jewish communities. Also, 9,500 Jewish adults are Hispanic (up from 5,300 in 1994) and 18,000 persons live in households with one or more Hispanic Jewish adults. About 12,000 Jewish adults are Sephardi (up from 7,400 in 1994) and 22,000 persons live in households with one or more Sephardi Jewish adults. Roughly 6,700 Jewish adults are Israeli (up from 5,800 in 1994) and 11,600 persons live in households with one or more Israeli adults. Some 5,900 persons live in households that came from the former Soviet Union.

The Hispanic Jews derive from Cuba (a group that largely arrived in the late 1950s and early 1960s), Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela. Migration from the latter three countries is relatively recent. More than 50 of the 1,800 interviews for the study were completed in Spanish.

With respect to age, 30 percent (37,000 persons) of the population are age 65 and over, including 18 percent (21,500 persons) who are age 75 and over. Miami is the ninth oldest of 50 comparison American Jewish communities, although Broward (46 percent age 65 and over) and Palm Beach (59 percent) counties are considerably older. Yet, 18 percent (21,700 persons) are age 17 and under, and households with children form a disproportionate share of new migrants to Miami.

Also of interest, 32 percent of households contain a single person living alone, the third highest percentage among 45 comparison Jewish communities, implying, particularly given the elderly nature of this population, that a significant need for social services exists in this community. Also contributing to social service needs is the fact that more than 12,000 Jewish households are of low income (household income under \$25,000), 1,900 households live below the federal poverty levels, and almost 400 households often or sometimes do not have enough to eat. Holocaust survivors and immigrants represent a disproportionate share of Jewish households living below the poverty levels.

On almost all measures of "Jewishness," Miami is one of the more "Jewish" American Jewish communities. For example, among 25–50 comparison Jewish communities (the number depending on the particular item measured), Miami has the second highest percentage of households that have a mezuzah on the front door (82 percent), who keep kosher in and out of the home (12 percent), and who refrain from using electricity on the Sabbath (7 percent). The 16 percent of married couples who are intermarried is the seventh lowest of 55 comparison Jewish communities.

Perhaps of even greater importance, on many measures of Jewish con-

nectedness the Miami Jewish community shows either stability or an increase from 1994 to 2004. For example, the percentage of households with children who are synagogue members increased from 55 percent to 64 percent over that decade. These findings are consistent with findings in other Jewish communities.

On most measures, informal Jewish education in childhood is positively correlated with adult Jewish behavior. For example, 10 percent of married couples in Jewish households in which an adult participated in Hillel or Chabad while in college (beyond High Holiday attendance) are intermarried, as compared to 21 percent of married couples in households in which no adult participated in Hillel or Chabad. Findings like these on informal education in Miami and those on formal education in Atlantic and Cape May counties (discussed above) support those who argue that federation financial assistance to formal and informal Jewish education can promote and preserve Jewish identity and continuity in the future.

The connections between the Miami Jewish community and Israel are significant. The 62 percent of Jewish respondents who are extremely or very emotionally attached to Israel is the highest of about 25 comparison Jewish communities. Interestingly, about 62 percent of Jewish households also contain a member who visited Israel, which is the highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities and has risen from 55 percent in 1994, and 27 percent of households with Jewish children age 0–17 have sent a Jewish child on a trip to Israel, the second highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. Perhaps, in part, because of the situation in Israel at the time of the study, 33 percent of Jewish respondents reported an increase in their level of emotional attachment to Israel compared to five years earlier, and only 4 percent reported a decrease.

Indicative of a trend toward lower levels of anti-Semitism in the United States, only 13 percent of Jewish respondents said they personally experienced anti-Semitism in the local community during the previous year. Supporting this trend is that 49 percent of respondents perceive a great deal or a moderate amount of anti-Semitism in the local community, a sharp drop from 73 percent in 1994. These results should be carefully studied by Jewish organizations, as they might indicate the need for a change in the emphasis given to fighting anti-Semitism.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

This 2004 study covered all of Hennepin County, Minnesota. Ira Shekin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this

study that was based upon 746 telephone interviews, of which 208 were completed using RDD sampling and 538 using DJN sampling. Due to the high percentage (12 percent) of adults from the FSU, the DJN sampling was supplemented with sampling by distinctive Russian (first) names so that FSU Jews could be properly represented. The survey was done as a joint project with the St. Paul Jewish community, but the results presented here (except as noted) are only for Minneapolis.

A total of 35,300 persons live in 13,850 Jewish households. Of the persons in Jewish households, 29,100 (82 percent) are Jewish. An additional 200 Jews live in institutions, for a grand total of 29,300 Jews. The number of Jewish households decreased by 14 percent (2,100 households) from 1994 through 1999, and then increased by 6 percent (900 households) from 1999 through 2004. Some portion of the recent increase is attributable to an influx of Jews from the FSU. The study shows the Jewish population of Minneapolis to be relatively stable and rooted in the area, with many adult children (63 percent) remaining in the locality after leaving their parents' homes, implying the existence of multigenerational families.

The geographic distribution of Jewish households in Minneapolis has changed. During the period 1994–2004, the percentage of area Jewish households in the city of Minneapolis decreased from 25 to 21 percent, the percentage in the inner ring of suburbs decreased from 57 to 54 percent, and the percentage in the outer ring of suburbs increased from 18 to 24 percent. The Jewish community, as a result, has considered extending services and programs to the outer ring.

The needs of new immigrants from the FSU are significant. The median income of FSU households is \$22,900, compared to \$81,700 for non-FSU households, and one-third of FSU households live below the poverty line. Fully 20 percent of FSU households needed help in coordinating services for an elderly or disabled person during the past year, and 28 percent of FSU households with adults age 18–64 needed help in finding a job or choosing an occupation. In the Twin Cities (Minneapolis and St. Paul), of those FSU households with elderly persons, 58 percent needed senior transportation in the past year; 46 percent needed in-home health care; 18 percent needed home-delivered meals; 16 percent needed adult day care; and 9 percent needed nursing-home care.

The level of Jewish involvement among FSU households is generally lower than among non-FSU households. For example, 61 percent of FSU households always or usually participate in a Passover seder, compared to 81 percent of non-FSU households. However, FSU households are more likely to express their Jewishness via connections to Israel. For

example, 67 percent of Jewish respondents in FSU households are extremely or very emotionally attached to Israel, compared to 50 percent of Jewish respondents in non-FSU households. Overall, 91 percent of FSU households are involved in Jewish activity (as defined by the survey), slightly lower than the 95-percent figure for non-FSU households.

The 54 percent of Jewish households that reported current synagogue membership is the sixth highest of about 55 comparison Jewish communities, and the 53-percent figure for current synagogue membership of households with children is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities. Contributing to the high level of synagogue membership is the fact that 46 percent of adults in Jewish households were born in the Twin Cities.

The organized Jewish community in Minneapolis is relatively well known and well regarded among Jews in Minneapolis. As a result, the Jewish federation has one of the most successful campaigns, on a per-household basis, of 55 Jewish federations, with about \$13,000,000 being raised from approximately 13,850 households.

Minneapolis has a greater need for social services than most other Jewish communities. Elderly households in Minneapolis tend to be less healthy than in other Jewish communities. For example, the 33 percent of elderly *couple* households and the 36 percent of elderly *single* households containing a health-limited member are both the third highest of about 25 comparison Jewish communities. The 18 percent of households with adults age 18–64 who needed help in finding a job or choosing an occupation in the past year is the highest of about 20 comparison Jewish communities. The 21 percent of households with elderly persons who needed senior transportation in the past year and the 17 percent who needed in-home health care are each the third highest of about 25 comparison Jewish communities. Many of these needs are driven by the FSU population.

Forty-six percent of Jewish respondents used the Internet for Jewish-related information in the past year, including 26 percent who used it for information about the Minneapolis Jewish community. Younger respondents were more likely to use the Internet for Jewish-related information than were older respondents, and younger respondents were much more likely to obtain information about the local Jewish community from the Internet than from either of the two Jewish newspapers. The Internet is quickly becoming an important and effective medium for informing and educating the Jewish community.

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

This 2004¹ study covered all of Dakota and Ramsey counties, Minnesota. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study that was based upon 494 telephone interviews, of which 203 were completed using RDD sampling and 291 using DJN sampling. Due to the high percentage (13 percent) of adults from the FSU, the DJN sampling was supplemented with sampling by distinctive Russian (first) names, so that FSU Jews could be properly represented. The survey was done as a joint project with the Minneapolis Jewish community, but the results presented in this vignette (except as noted) are only for St. Paul.

A total of 13,400 persons live in 5,150 Jewish households. Of those persons in Jewish households, 10,900 (81 percent) are Jewish. Some portion of the recent increase is attributable to an influx of households from the FSU. The study shows the Jewish population to be relatively stable and rooted in the area, with many adult children (65 percent) remaining in the locality after leaving their parents' homes, implying the existence of multigenerational families.

The geographic distribution of Jewish households in St. Paul has changed significantly. From 1994 through 2004, the percentage of area Jewish households in the city of St. Paul decreased from 68 to 47 percent, and the percentage in the southern suburbs increased from 26 to 47 percent. The percentage in the northern suburbs has not changed and remains only a small part of the population.

The needs of new immigrants from the FSU are significant. The median household income of FSU households is \$31,300, as compared to \$79,500 for non-FSU households. One-third of FSU households live below the poverty line. The need for social services in the FSU population is high: 24 percent of them needed help in coordinating services for an elderly or disabled person in the past year, and 23 percent of FSU households with adults age 18–64 needed help in finding a job or choosing an occupation. As noted above, of FSU households with elderly persons in the Twin Cities (Minneapolis and St. Paul), 58 percent needed senior transportation in the past year; 46 percent needed in-home health care; 18 percent needed home-delivered meals; 16 percent needed adult day care; and 9 percent needed nursing-home care.

The level of Jewish involvement among FSU households on many individual measures is generally lower than among non-FSU households. For example, 66 percent of FSU households always or usually participate

in a Passover seder, as compared to 77 percent of non-FSU households. However, FSU households are more likely to express their Jewishness via connections to Israel. For example, 71 percent of Jewish respondents in FSU households are extremely or very emotionally attached to Israel, compared to 46 percent of non-FSU households. Overall, 98 percent of FSU households are involved in Jewish activity (as defined by the survey), a statistic that is higher than the 92-percent figure for non-FSU households.

St. Paul has been much more successful at integrating FSU households into the Jewish community than has Minneapolis. In St. Paul, for example, 51 percent of FSU households are synagogue members as compared to 25 percent in Minneapolis. In St. Paul, 60 percent of FSU households are JCC members as compared to just 15 percent in Minneapolis.

The study points to a clear need for singles programs. As in every Jewish community where questions about singles programs have been asked, the vast majority of households with members that attended a singles program in the past year attended *Jewish* singles programs. Thus, while the intermarriage rate in this community is significant (39 percent of married couples are intermarried), single persons *are* attempting to find Jewish mates.

Membership levels are high in St. Paul. The 56 percent of Jewish households that reported current synagogue membership is the third highest of about 55 comparison Jewish communities. Note, however, that the 17-percent current synagogue membership of households under age 35 is the fifth lowest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. The 36 percent of Jewish households that reported current membership in the local JCC is the highest of about 45 comparison JCCs. The 48 percent of households that participated in or attended a program at the local JCC in the past year is the fourth highest of about 40 comparison JCCs. The high levels of membership in Jewish institutions may be related to the very low percentage that Jewish households represent of all households in the local area (1.6 percent). In St. Paul, unlike communities with high Jewish densities, one must join a Jewish institution to associate with other Jews.

Of Jewish children in St. Paul age 0–5 who attend a preschool/child-care program, only 35 percent attend a Jewish program. This Jewish market share is the fourth lowest of about 25 comparison Jewish communities, implying that steps should be taken to examine strategies for increasing enrolment in Jewish preschool/child care.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

This 2004 study covered Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties, as well as the northernmost part of Santa Clara County (Palo Alto, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, and Cupertino), California. Bruce Phillips of Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles, was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 1,621 interviews, 500 completed using RDD sampling and 1,016 using List sampling. Due to the high percentage (8 percent) of households from the FSU, the List sampling was supplemented with a list of FSU households.

San Francisco is one of the largest Jewish communities in the country. Of the 291,700 persons in 125,400 Jewish households, 227,800 persons (78 percent) are Jewish. From 1986 through 2004, the number of Jews increased by 92 percent (from 118,000 to 228,000). Jews represent about 10 percent of the area's population. The Jewish population has dispersed significantly to the north and the south since 1986.

In the past, the San Francisco Jewish community had been viewed as very different from the Jewish community nationally. The 2004 study shows that this community now more closely resembles the national Jewish community, in part because of the steady migration of Jews from elsewhere in the country to San Francisco, but also because the national community has changed to look much more like San Francisco. Thus while the last study showed the intermarriage rate in San Francisco to be much higher than the national rate, now the intermarriage rate, 56 percent, is almost the same as the national figure. Intermarried couples in San Francisco are, in fact, more connected to the Jewish community than is the case nationally.

Due to San Francisco having a high intermarriage rate for a longer period of time than most other communities, adults with only one Jewish parent have become a significant portion of the Jewish population. Younger adults with two Jewish parents are much more likely to be involved in the Jewish community than younger adults who are the product of intermarriage. While formal connections with the Jewish community, such as synagogue membership, have decreased in San Francisco since the previous study, informal connections to Jewish identity remain strong. While overall levels of Jewish observance have decreased since 1986, observance has increased for in-married couples and decreased for intermarried couples. Moreover, 40 percent of Jews indicate that their interest in Judaism has increased over the past five years.

Little change is evident in the age distribution in San Francisco since 1986, and the median age is three years younger than for Jews nationwide. Since 1986, the percentage of single-person households increased from 33 to 44 percent, while the percentage of couples with children has decreased from just over one-third to less than one-quarter of households. More than 80 percent of Jewish adults have earned a four-year college degree or higher, yet almost one-tenth of households are considered to be low-income (150 percent of federal poverty levels). Poverty rates are highest among single-person households, FSU households, single-parent families, and young adults. As a result of the recent "dot-com bust," 10 percent of engineers are unemployed and seeking work.

About 8 percent of Jewish households (16,000 persons) are from the FSU; 4 percent of households (12,000 persons) are Israeli; and 8 percent of households (13,000 Jews) are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transsexual.

A total of 28 percent of respondents indicate that there is a great deal or a moderate amount of anti-Semitism in the Bay Area, down from 43 percent in 1986. But despite this perceived decrease, the percentage of those who claimed to have had personal experience with anti-Semitism increased from 19 percent in 1986 to 24 percent in 2004. The most widely cited experience of anti-Semitism was "unfair criticism of Israel," an option not included in the 1986 study.

Finally, Jewish households are more likely to donate more of their philanthropic dollars to non-Jewish causes than to Jewish ones, particularly among younger Jewish households.

SOUTH PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

This 2005 study covered the Boca Raton and Delray Beach areas of Palm Beach County, Florida. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 1,511 telephone interviews, all of them completed using RDD sampling. South Palm Beach is one of the largest Jewish communities in the country, with 136,800 persons living in 73,000 Jewish households, of whom 130,900 persons (96 percent) are Jewish. An additional 400 Jews live in institutions, for a grand total of 131,300 Jews. Of those Jews, 107,500 live in South Palm Beach for eight or more months of the year, and 23,800 Jews live there for three–seven months of the year (part-year population).

From 1995 through 2005, the number of Jews in Jewish households increased by 19 percent, from 110,450 to 130,900. The rate of population

growth has been slowing, and, based both upon demographic theory and empirical evidence from Miami and Broward County, it will continue to do so. In a retirement community such as South Palm Beach, almost all those who came from elsewhere to retire there at about age 65 will be lost to mortality within 25 years. That is, at some point in the next decade or so, it is likely that new Jewish in-migrants will start to replace the earlier ones who are dying out. Such has been happening for many years in Miami, and started to happen in Broward County during the 1990s. Another factor to consider is that South Palm Beach is rapidly approaching the point of being fully built out.

While the overall geographic distribution of Jewish households has not changed in the past decade, the distribution of Jewish children has changed significantly, suggesting that both formal and informal programs of Jewish education may need to be offered from additional locations. In 1995, only 4 percent of Jewish children age 0–17 lived in Delray Beach, as compared to 17 percent in 2005. The number of children in Jewish households in Delray Beach increased from 200 to 2,000 during that period.

South Palm Beach is not “home” for many Jewish households, as only 0.4 percent of adults in Jewish households were born in Palm Beach County, and 19 percent of Jewish households live there for only three to seven months of the year. These factors lead to a high level of attachment to other Jewish communities, as shown by the 20 percent of households that donated to Jewish federations outside South Palm Beach in the past year. Furthermore, 39 percent of Jewish respondents reported that they feel “not very much” or “not at all” a part of the Palm Beach County Jewish community. This accounts, as well, for the low levels of membership in local synagogues and JCCs.

South Palm Beach is a retirement community, and the needs of the elderly must continue to be a major focus of service provision. Although the number of persons age 65 and over in Jewish households increased by only 4,850 between 1995 and 2005, the figure is deceptive. The number of persons age 65–74 actually *decreased* by 15,800, but it was more than offset by increases of 12,150 in the number age 75–84 and 8,500 in those 85 and over. As the very elderly population increases, a higher demand for services for them can be expected.

The 40 percent of persons age 75 and over in Jewish households—a rise from 29 percent in 1995—is the highest of about 45 comparison Jewish communities. And the fact that only 21 percent of those Jewish households have adult children living in Palm Beach County (with an additional

8 percent in Broward County or Miami) implies that a local support system will not be available for many elderly as they age.

In terms of Jewish identity, South Palm Beach has two groups of Jews. The first consists of the elderly population, most of whom live in large condominium housing developments and, despite varying levels of Jewish involvement, are in no danger of losing their Jewish identity. The second group consists of younger households, and these exhibit lower levels of Jewish identification.

Consistent with the findings in a number of other Jewish communities in which comparisons can be made over time between the results of two demographic studies, levels of Jewish connectedness have remained relatively constant over the past decade. For example, the percentage of households that always or usually light Sabbath candles was 23 percent in 1995 and 22 percent in 2005.

There is a strong relationship between household income and synagogue membership, suggesting that cost may be an important reason why more Jewish households are not synagogue members. The percentage of synagogue membership steadily rises from 15 percent of households earning under \$25,000 annually to 27 percent of those earning \$25,000–\$50,000, 34 percent of those earning \$50,000–\$100,000, 42 percent of those earning \$100,000–\$200,000, and 65 percent of those earning \$200,000 or more.

This study, like many others, confirms the existence of strong positive correlations between informal Jewish education while young (specifically, overnight camp, teenage youth group, and college Hillel or Chabad) and Jewish behavior as adults, although we cannot attribute a cause-and-effect relationship. Thus 44 percent of Jewish households in which an adult attended or worked at a Jewish sleep-away camp as a child are synagogue members, compared to 28 percent of other Jewish households. This argues that to build for the future and to preserve Jewish connectedness, the community should support programs of informal Jewish education.

As is the case in all Jewish demographic studies, this one shows, on most measures of “Jewishness,” a significant positive correlation with visits to Israel, particularly if the Israel trip was sponsored by a Jewish organization. Connections between the South Palm Beach Jewish community and Israel are particularly strong. Sixty-one percent of Jewish households contain a member who visited Israel, which is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. The 61 percent of Jewish respondents who are extremely or very emotionally attached to Israel—an increase

from 50 percent in 1995—is the second highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities.

Philanthropic giving among older Jews is relatively high, 76 percent of households age 65 and over having donated to Jewish charities in the past year. Also, 15 percent of households donated at least \$100 to the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County in the past year, and 32 percent donated at least that amount to other Jewish charities. Moreover, 4 percent of those older households gave at least \$1,000 to the federation, and 7 percent gave that amount to other Jewish charities. These findings suggest that this Jewish community should place significant emphasis on endowment giving.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLORIDA

This 2005 study covered the areas of Palm Beach County, Florida, stretching from Boynton Beach in the south to Jupiter in the north. Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami was the principal investigator for this study, which was based upon 1,534 telephone interviews, all completed using RDD sampling.

West Palm Beach is one of the largest Jewish communities in the country, with 137,300 persons living in 69,000 Jewish households, of whom 123,600 persons (90 percent) are Jewish. An additional 650 Jews live in institutions, for a grand total of 124,250. Of those 124,250 Jews, 101,350 live in West Palm Beach for eight or more months of the year, and 22,900 of them for three–seven months (part-year population). From 1999 to 2005, the number of Jews in Jewish households increased by 31 percent, from 94,300 to 123,600.

Nevertheless, as noted earlier, both demographic theory and empirical evidence from Miami, Broward County, and South Palm Beach suggest that the rate of population increase will eventually slow down. In a retirement community such as West Palm Beach, almost all those who retire there at about age 65 will be lost to mortality within 25 years, and at some point in the next decade or so, it is likely that many new Jewish migrants will start replacing those who are dying off. The result will be slowing population growth.

The geographic distribution of Jewish households has changed significantly since 1987, when the main Jewish community campus in the central area was being developed. Significant decreases in Jewish population have occurred there, while significant increases have occurred in Boynton Beach and in the North. The percentage of persons in Jewish house-

holds in West Palm Beach who live in Boynton Beach increased from 12 percent in 1987, to 37 percent in 1999, and 43 percent in 2005 (from 9,250, to 37,300, to 58,600 persons). At the same time, the percentage of persons in Jewish households that live in the North (Palm Beach Gardens, North Palm Beach, and Jupiter) increased from 7 percent in 1987, to 13 percent in 1999, and 15 percent in 2005 (from 5,500, to 13,600, to 20,800 persons). These changes surely require a rethinking of the location of Jewish community facilities and services.

Similar to the findings for South Palm Beach, West Palm Beach is not “home” for many Jewish households. Only 2 percent of adults in West Palm Beach Jewish households were born there, and 18 percent of Jewish households live there for only three–seven months of the year. These factors lead to a high level of attachment to other Jewish communities, as shown by the 21 percent of households that donated to Jewish federations outside West Palm Beach in the past year. Also, 45 percent of Jewish respondents reported that they feel “not very much” or “not at all” part of the Palm Beach County Jewish community. Programs with themes that can “bond” people to the local Jewish community should receive particular attention.

West Palm Beach is a retirement Jewish community, and thus the needs of the elderly must continue to be a major focus of service provision. Compared to 1999, there are 14,050 more persons age 65 and over in Jewish households in 2005, including 11,950 more of those age 75 and over and 2,950 more age 85 and over. A steadily higher demand for social services for the elderly can be expected.

The 32 percent of those age 75 and over is the second highest of about 45 comparison Jewish communities. The fact that only 16 percent of such Jewish households have adult children who live in the county (with an additional 4 percent living in Broward County or Miami) implies that there will not be a local support system for many elderly persons as they continue to age.

As in other Jewish communities in which change over time can be measured, levels of Jewish connectedness have remained relatively constant over the past years, although for this community several key measures showed a significant decrease. For example, the percentage of West Palm Beach Jewish households that are current synagogue members, either in West Palm Beach or elsewhere, decreased from 37 percent in 1999 to 30 percent in 2005.

Like South Palm Beach, West Palm Beach has two groups of Jews. The first, the elderly population, mostly live in large condominium housing

developments, and, despite varying levels of Jewish connectedness, are in no danger of losing their Jewish identity. The second group consists of younger households that exhibit lower levels of Jewish connectedness. For example, 46 percent of Jewish respondents under age 35 and 40 percent of those age 35–49 identify as “Just Jewish,” as compared to 29 percent of all Jewish respondents, and while the overall intermarriage rate for Jewish couples is only 16 percent, the rate rises to 45 percent for couples age 35–49.

Only 46 percent of Jewish children age 5–12 currently attend formal Jewish education, the fifth lowest proportion of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. The figure is only 16 percent for Jewish teenagers age 13–17, the sixth lowest of the comparison Jewish communities. And only 12 percent of Jewish children age 5–12 attend a Jewish day school, the fourth lowest of about 25 comparison Jewish communities.

On most measures of “Jewishness” this study shows a significant positive correlation with visits to Israel, particularly if the trip was sponsored by a Jewish organization. Connections of the West Palm Beach Jewish community with Israel are strong: 55 percent of Jewish households contain a member who visited Israel, which is the sixth highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities, and went down slightly from 57 percent in 1999. The 54 percent of Jewish respondents who are extremely or very emotionally attached to Israel is the fifth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities, an increase from 45 percent in 1999.

As in most comparison Jewish communities, a disproportionate number of donations and a disproportionate share of the total dollars donated to the Jewish federation derive from elderly households. Thus 5 percent of households under age 35, 18 percent of those age 35–49, and 23 percent of those age 50–64 donated to the Jewish federation in the past year, compared to 33 percent of households age 65–74 and 50 percent of those age 75 and over.

New Studies in Progress

The authors are aware of several new studies that will soon be completed: Atlanta (Jack Ukeles and Ron Miller of Ukeles Associates); Boston (Leonard Saxe, Brandeis University); Detroit (Ira Sheskin, University of Miami); and Las Vegas (Ira Sheskin, University of Miami). New population estimates based on the Atlanta, Detroit, and Las Vegas studies have been provided in Table 3. Estimates for Boston were not yet available at press time. Vignettes on all four communities will appear in

AJYB 2007. An additional seven Jewish communities are reported to be actively planning population studies, and we will report on their progress next year.

State and Regional Totals

Tables 1 and 2 show the total Jewish population of each state, census region, and census division. Overall, about 2.2 percent of Americans are Jewish, but the percentage is 4 percent or higher in New York (8.4 percent), New Jersey (5.5 percent), Washington, D.C. (5.1 percent), Massachusetts (4.3 percent), and Maryland (4.2 percent). Eight states have a Jewish population of 200,000 or more: New York (1,618,000); California (1,194,000); Florida (653,000); New Jersey (480,000); Pennsylvania (285,000); Illinois (279,000); Massachusetts (275,000); and Maryland (235,000). The four states with the largest Jewish population account for more than 60 percent of the more than 6.4 million American Jews.

Note that, in addition to the state totals shown in Table 1, Florida has 81,000 Jews who spend from three to seven months of the year there.

Table 2 shows that, on a regional basis, the Jewish population is distributed very differently from the American population as a whole. While only 18 percent of Americans live in the Northeast, 44 percent of Jews live there. While 22 percent of Americans live in the Midwest, 11 percent of Jews do. While 36 percent of Americans live in the South, 22 percent of Jews do. Approximately equal percentages of all Americans (23 percent) and Jews (24 percent) live in the West.

IRA M. SHESKIN
ARNOLD DASHEFSKY

TABLE 1: JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1/1/2006

| State | Estimated Jewish Population | Total Population | Estimated Jewish Percent of Total |
|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Alabama | 9,000 | 4,557,808 | 0.2% |
| Alaska | 3,425 | 663,661 | 0.5% |
| Arizona | 106,100 | 5,939,292 | 1.8% |
| Arkansas | 1,675 | 2,779,154 | 0.1% |
| California | 1,194,190 | 36,132,147 | 3.3% |
| Colorado | 78,620 | 4,665,177 | 1.7% |
| Connecticut | 111,830 | 3,510,297 | 3.2% |
| Delaware | 13,500 | 843,524 | 1.6% |
| Washington, D.C. | 28,000 | 550,521 | 5.1% |
| Florida | 653,435 | 17,789,864 | 3.7% |
| Georgia | 127,245 | 9,072,576 | 1.4% |
| Hawaii | 6,990 | 1,275,194 | 0.5% |
| Idaho | 1,100 | 1,429,096 | 0.1% |
| Illinois | 278,810 | 12,763,371 | 2.2% |
| Indiana | 17,420 | 6,271,973 | 0.3% |
| Iowa | 6,140 | 2,966,334 | 0.2% |
| Kansas | 18,225 | 2,744,687 | 0.7% |
| Kentucky | 11,450 | 4,173,405 | 0.3% |
| Louisiana | 16,190 | 4,523,628 | 0.4% |
| Maine | 10,315 | 1,321,505 | 0.8% |
| Maryland | 235,350 | 5,600,388 | 4.2% |
| Massachusetts | 275,030 | 6,398,743 | 4.3% |
| Michigan | 87,665 | 10,120,860 | 0.9% |
| Minnesota | 46,685 | 5,132,799 | 0.9% |
| Mississippi | 1,500 | 2,921,088 | 0.1% |
| Missouri | 59,165 | 5,800,310 | 1.0% |
| Montana | 850 | 935,670 | 0.1% |
| Nebraska | 6,850 | 1,758,787 | 0.4% |
| Nevada | 69,600 | 2,414,807 | 2.9% |
| New Hampshire | 9,970 | 1,309,940 | 0.8% |
| New Jersey | 480,000 | 8,717,925 | 5.5% |
| New Mexico | 11,250 | 1,928,384 | 0.6% |
| New York | 1,618,320 | 19,254,630 | 8.4% |
| North Carolina | 26,345 | 8,683,242 | 0.3% |
| North Dakota | 430 | 636,677 | 0.1% |
| Ohio | 144,955 | 11,464,042 | 1.3% |
| Oklahoma | 5,050 | 3,547,884 | 0.1% |
| Oregon | 31,850 | 3,641,056 | 0.9% |

TABLE 1: JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 2006 (CONTINUED)

| State | Estimated Jewish Population | Total Population | Estimated Jewish Percent of Total |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Pennsylvania | 284,875 | 12,429,616 | 2.3% |
| Rhode Island | 18,750 | 1,076,189 | 1.7% |
| South Carolina | 11,335 | 4,255,083 | 0.3% |
| South Dakota | 295 | 775,933 | 0.0% |
| Tennessee | 19,300 | 5,962,959 | 0.3% |
| Texas | 130,970 | 22,859,968 | 0.6% |
| Utah | 4,400 | 2,469,585 | 0.2% |
| Vermont | 5,510 | 623,050 | 0.9% |
| Virginia | 97,840 | 7,567,465 | 1.3% |
| Washington | 43,135 | 6,287,759 | 0.7% |
| West Virginia | 2,335 | 1,816,856 | 0.1% |
| Wisconsin | 28,330 | 5,536,201 | 0.5% |
| Wyoming | 430 | 509,294 | 0.1% |
| TOTAL | 6,452,030 | 296,410,404 | 2.2% |

TABLE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. JEWISH POPULATION BY REGIONS, 1/1/2006

| | Total Population | Percent Distribution | Estimated Jewish | Percent Distribution |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Northeast | 54,641,895 | 18.4% | 2,814,600 | 43.6% |
| Middle Atlantic | 40,402,171 | 13.6% | 2,383,195 | 36.9% |
| New England | 14,239,724 | 4.8% | 431,405 | 6.7% |
| Midwest | 65,971,974 | 22.3% | 694,970 | 10.8% |
| East North Central | 46,156,447 | 15.6% | 557,180 | 8.6% |
| West North Central | 19,815,527 | 6.7% | 137,790 | 2.1% |
| South | 107,505,413 | 36.3% | 1,390,520 | 21.6% |
| East South Central | 17,615,260 | 5.9% | 41,250 | 0.6% |
| South Atlantic | 56,179,519 | 19.0% | 1,195,385 | 18.5% |
| West South Central | 33,710,634 | 11.4% | 153,885 | 2.4% |
| West | 68,291,122 | 23.0% | 1,551,940 | 24.1% |
| Mountain | 20,291,305 | 6.8% | 272,350 | 4.2% |
| Pacific | 47,999,817 | 16.2% | 1,279,590 | 19.8% |
| TOTAL | 296,410,404 | 100.0% | 6,452,030 | 100.0% |

TABLE 3: COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATION OF 100 OR MORE, 1/1/2006

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area** | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population*** |
|----------------|--|----------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| ALABAMA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Birmingham | 5,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Dothan | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Huntsville | 750 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Mobile | 1,100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Montgomery | 1,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Tuscaloosa | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 250 | | |
| | | | Total | 9,000 | | |
| ALASKA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Anchorage | 2,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Fairbanks | 540 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Juneau | 285 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Kenai Peninsula | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | | |
| | | | Total | 3,425 | | |
| ARIZONA | | | | | | |
| | 2002 | 1 | Cochise County (2002) | 450 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Flagstaff | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lake Havasu City | 200 | | |
| | 2002 | 1 | Phoenix (2002) | 82,900 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Prescott | 300 | | |
| | 2002 | 1 | Tucson (2002) | 21,400 | | 1,000 |

^NSee Notes below. *1 indicates that the estimate includes the entire county in which the named place is located, 2 indicates that the estimate also includes one additional county. **Boldface type indicates the estimate comes from a scientific study in the year indicated. ***Part-year population shown only for communities where such information is available.

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|------------|--|----------------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | 1997-2001 | | Yuma | 150 | | |
| | 2002 | 1 | Santa Cruz County (2002) | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | | |
| | | | Total | 106,100 | | 1,000 |
| ARKANSAS | 1997-2001 | | Fayetteville | 175 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Hot Springs | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Little Rock | 1,100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 250 | | |
| | | | Total | 1,675 | | |
| CALIFORNIA | 1997-2001 | | Antelope Valley-Lancaster-Palmdale | 3,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bakersfield-Kern County | 1,600 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Chico-Oroville-Paradise | 750 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Eureka | 1,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Fairfield | 800 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Fresno | 2,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Long Beach ^N | 18,000 | | |
| | 1997-2002 | | Los Angeles-Pasadena-Santa Monica (1997) ^N | 519,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Mendocino County (Redwood Valley-Ukiah) | 600 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Merced County | 190 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Modesto | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Monterey Peninsula | 2,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Murrieta Hot Springs | 550 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Napa County | 1,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Orange County ^N | 60,000 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|------------------|--------------|
| 1997-2002 | | Palm Springs (1998)^N | 12,000 | 5,000 |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | Redding Area | 150 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Riverside-Corona-Moreno Valley | 2,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Sacramento ^N | 21,300 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Salinas | 1,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | San Bernardino-Fontana area | 3,000 | |
| 2003 | 1 | San Diego (2003) | 89,000 | |
| 2006 | | Alameda County (Oakland) (1986) | 40,000 | |
| 2006 | | Contra Costa County (1986) | 60,000 | |
| | | East Bay Total | | 100,000 |
| 2004 | | Marin County (2004) | 26,100 | |
| 2004 | | North Peninsula (2004) | 40,300 | |
| 2004 | | San Francisco County (2004) | 65,800 | |
| 2006 | 1 | Sonoma County (Petaluma-Santa Rosa) (2004) | 23,100 | |
| 2004 | | South Peninsula (Palo Alto) (2004) | 72,500 | |
| 2004 | | San Francisco Total (2004) | | 227,800 |
| 2006 | | San Jose (Silicon Valley) (1986) | 63,000 | |
| | | San Francisco Bay Area ^N | | 390,800 |
| 1997-2001 | | San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys-Ontario ^N | 30,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles | 2,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | Santa Barbara | 7,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | Santa Cruz-Aptos | 6,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Santa Maria | 500 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | South Lake Tahoe | 150 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Stockton | 850 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Sun City | 200 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Tulare and Kings counties (Visalia) | 350 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Vallejo area | 900 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Ventura County | 15,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 200 | |
| | | Total | 1,194,190 | 5,000 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study ¹ | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|-------------|---|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| COLORADO | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Aspen | 750 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Colorado Springs | 1,500 | | |
| | 2006 | | Boulder (1997) | 13,800 | | |
| | 2006 | | Denver-Evergreen (1997) | 58,600 | | |
| | | | Greater Denver Total ^N | | 72,400 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Fort Collins-Greeley-Loveland | 2,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Grand Junction | 320 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Pueblo ^N | 425 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Steamboat Springs | 250 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Telluride | 125 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Vail-Breckenridge-Eagle | 650 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 200 | | |
| | | | Total | 78,620 | | |
| CONNECTICUT | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bridgeport-Shelton ^N | 13,000 | | |
| | 1999-2001 | | Danbury-Newtown ^N | 3,200 | | |
| | 2006 | | Greenwich | 6,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Stamford-Darien-New Canaan | 9,200 | | |
| | 2001 | | Westport-Weston-Wilton-Norwalk (2001) | 11,450 | | |
| | | | Fairfield County Total | | 42,850 | |
| | | | Bloomfield-Hartford-West Hartford | 15,800 | | |
| | | | East Hartford-Glastonbury-Manchester; | | | |
| | | | South Windsor (and adjacent Tolland County) | 4,800 | | |
| | | | Farmington Valley (and adjacent Litchfield County) | 6,400 | | |
| | | | Bristol-New Britain; | | | |

| | | | |
|-----------|---|--------|--------|
| | Middletown (adjacent Middlesex County); Meriden-Wallingford (adjacent New Haven County); Plymouth-Terryville (adjacent Litchfield County) | 5,000 | |
| | Windsor-Suffield | 800 | |
| 2000 | Hartford County Total (including northern Middlesex County, western Tolland County, eastern Litchfield County, northern New Haven County) (2000) | | 32,800 |
| 1997-2001 | Torrington | 580 | |
| | Other Places | 50 | |
| | Litchfield County Total (excluding towns adjacent Hartford County) | | 630 |
| 1997-2001 | Lower Middlesex County ^N | 1,600 | |
| 1997-2001 | Middletown (included in Hartford County total). | | |
| | Middlesex County total (excluding towns adjacent Hartford County) | | 1,600 |
| 1987 | New Haven (1987)^N | 24,300 | |
| | Meriden-Wallingford (included in Hartford Co. total) | | |
| 1997-2001 | Waterbury-Cheshire ^N | 4,500 | |
| | New Haven County Total (excluding towns adjacent Hartford County) | | 28,800 |
| pre-1997 | Colchester-Lebanon; Hebron (adjacent Tolland County) | 300 | |
| 1997-2001 | New London-Norwich | 3,850 | |
| | New London County Total (including adjacent Tolland County) | | 4,150 |
| 2006 | Storrs-Columbia | 400 | |
| 2006 | Other Places | 100 | |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|----------------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | Tolland County Total (excluding towns adjacent Hartford and New London Counties) | | 500 | |
| | pre-1997 | | Danielson | 100 | | |
| | 2006 | | Willimantic | 300 | | |
| | 2006 | | Other Places | 100 | | |
| | | | Windham County Total | | 500 | |
| | | | Total | 111,830 | | |
| DELAWARE | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Kent and Sussex Counties (Dover) (1995) | 1,600 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Newark area (1995) | 4,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Wilmington area (1995) | 7,600 | | |
| | | | Total | 13,500 | | |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | | | | | |
| | 2003 | | District of Columbia (2003) | 28,000 | | |
| | 2003 | | Montgomery and Prince Georges counties (2003) | 121,000 | | |
| | 2003 | | Northern Virginia (Alexandria-Arlington-Fairfax County-Prince William County, Loudon County) (2003) | 67,300 | | |
| | | | Greater Washington Total | | 216,300 | |
| FLORIDA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Brevard County | 5,000 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Crystal River | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Daytona Beach | 2,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Fort Myers-Arcadia-Port Charlotte-Punta Gorda | 8,000 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--------|---------|
| 1997-2001 | | Fort Pierce | 1,060 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Gainesville | 2,200 | |
| 2002 | 2 | Jacksonville (2002) | 12,900 | 200 |
| 1997-2001 | | Key West | 650 | |
| pre-1997 | | Lakeland | 1,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Naples-Collier County | 4,200 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Ocala-Marion County | 500 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Orlando (1993) ^N | 20,700 | 400 |
| 1997-2001 | | Pasco County (New Port Richey) | 1,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | 2 | Pensacola | 975 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Pinellas County (St. Petersburg-Clearwater) (1994) | 24,200 | 1,500 |
| 2001 | 2 | Sarasota-Manatee-Venice (2001) | 12,200 | 3,300 |
| 2005 | | Boca Raton (2005) | 59,700 | 13,000 |
| 2005 | | Delray Beach (2005) | 47,800 | 10,800 |
| 2005 | | South Palm Beach Subtotal (2005) | | 107,500 |
| 2005 | | Boynton Beach (2005) | 45,600 | 10,700 |
| 2004 | | Lake Worth (2005) | 21,600 | 3,300 |
| 2005 | | Town of Palm Beach (2005) | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 2005 | | West Palm Beach (2005) | 8,300 | 2,000 |
| 2005 | | Wellington/Royal Palm Beach (2005) | 9,900 | 1,400 |
| 2005 | | North Palm Beach/Palm Beach Gardens/ Jupiter (2005) | 13,950 | 3,500 |
| 2005 | | West Palm Beach Subtotal (2005) | | 101,350 |
| | | Palm Beach County Total (2005) | | 208,850 |
| 2004 | | North Dade (North Miami Beach-Aventura) (2004) | 50,900 | 4,500 |
| 2004 | | South Dade (Kendall-Coral Gables) | 37,700 | 800 |
| 2004 | | The Beaches (Miami Beach) | 17,700 | 1,700 |
| | | Miami Total (2005) | | 106,300 |
| 1999 | | Hollywood-Hallandale (1999) | 32,900 | 3,400 |

JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 2006 / 167

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|---------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | 1999 | | Pembroke Pines-Cooper City-Davie-Weston (1999) | 44,200 | | 1,900 |
| | 1999 | | Plantation-N Lauderdale-Tamarac-Lauderdale Lakes-Sunrise (1999) | 65,600 | | 5,700 |
| | 1999 | | Coral Springs-Parkland (1999) | 28,000 | | |
| | 1999 | | Margate-Coconut Creek-Wynmoor-Palm Aire-Century Village (1999) | 30,300 | | 7,400 |
| | 1999 | | Fort Lauderdale (1999) | 11,300 | | 2,400 |
| | 1999 | | Broward County Total (1999) | | 212,300 | 20,800 |
| | | | Southeast Florida (Miami, Broward, Palm Beach Counties) | | 527,450 | 74,500 |
| | 2005 | | Stuart-Port St. Lucie (2005)^N | 5,800 | | 900 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Tallahassee | 2,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Tampa | 20,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Vero Beach | 400 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Winter Haven | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | | |
| | | | Total | 653,435 | | 80,800 |
| GEORGIA | 1997-2001 | | Albany Area | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Athens | 600 | | |
| | | | Atlanta (2005) | 119,800 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Augusta ^N | 1,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Brunswick | 120 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Columbus | 750 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Dalton | 125 | | |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----------|---|---|---------|
| | 1997-2001 | | Macon | 1,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Savannah | 3,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Valdosta | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 250 |
| | | | Total | 127,245 |
| HAWAII | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Hilo | 280 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Oahu (Honolulu) | 6,400 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Kauai | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Maui | 210 |
| | | | Total | 6,990 |
| IDAHO | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Boise | 800 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Ketchum | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Moscow-Lewiston | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 |
| | | | Total | 1,100 |
| ILLINOIS | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Aurora area | 750 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bloomington-Normal | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Champaign-Urbana | 1,400 |
| | 2000 | | Chicago (2000) ^N | 270,500 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Decatur | 130 |
| | 1997-2001 | | DeKalb | 180 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Elgin ^N | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Joliet | 210 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Kankakee | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Peoria | 800 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Quad Cities-Ill. portion (Moline-Rock Island) | 400 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Quincy | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Rockford-Freeport ^N | 1,100 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|---------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | 1997-2001 | | Southern Illinois (Carbondale-East St. Louis) ^N | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Springfield | 1,090 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Waukegan | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 250 | | |
| | | | Total | 278,810 | | |
| INDIANA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bloomington | 1,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Evansville | 400 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Fort Wayne | 900 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Gary-Northwest Indiana | 2,000 | | |
| | 2006 | 2 | Indianapolis | 10,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Lafayette | 550 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Michigan City | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Muncie | 120 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | South Bend-Elkhart ^N | 1,850 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Terre Haute | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 200 | | |
| | | | Total | 17,420 | | |
| IOWA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Cedar Rapids | 420 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Council Bluffs | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Des Moines-Ames | 2,800 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Iowa City | 1,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Postville | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Quad Cities-Iowa portion (Davenport) | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Sioux City | 400 | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|---|--------|--------|
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Waterloo | 170 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 250 | |
| | | | Total | 6,140 | |
| KANSAS | | | | | |
| | 2006 | | Kansas City area-Kansas portion (1985)^N | 16,000 | |
| | 2006 | | Kansas City area-Missouri portion (1985)^N | 4,000 | |
| | | | Kansas City Total | | 16,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lawrence | 200 | |
| | pre-1997 | | Manhattan | 425 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Topeka | 400 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Wichita ^N | 1,100 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | |
| | | | Total | 18,225 | |
| KENTUCKY | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Covington-Newport area | 500 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lexington ^N | 2,000 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Louisville | 8,700 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Paducah | 150 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | |
| | | | Total | 11,450 | |
| LOUISIANA | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Alexandria ^N | 175 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Baton Rouge ^N | 1,600 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lake Charles area | 200 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | New Orleans | 13,000 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Shreveport-Monroe | 815 | |
| | pre-1997 | | South Central La. (Lafayette) ^N | 250 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 150 | |
| | | | Total | 16,190 | |
| MAINE | | | | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Augusta | 140 | |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|---------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| | 1997-2001 | | Bangor | 3,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lewiston-Auburn | 500 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Rockland area | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Southern Maine (Biddeford-Saco-Brunswick-Bath-Portland) ^N | 6,000 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Waterville | 225 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 150 | | |
| | | | Total | 10,315 | | |
| MARYLAND | 1997-2001 | | Annapolis area | 3,000 | | |
| | 1999-2001 | 2 | Baltimore (1999) | 91,400 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Cumberland | 275 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Easton | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Frederick | 1,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Hagerstown | 325 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Harford County | 1,200 | | |
| | 1999-2001 | | Howard County (Columbia) (1999) | 16,000 | | |
| | 2003 | | Montgomery and Prince Georges counties (2003) | 121,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Ocean City | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Salisbury | 400 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 250 | | |
| | | | Total | 235,350 | | |
| MASSACHUSETTS | 1997-2001 | | Amherst area | 1,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Andover-Lawrence ^N | 2,850 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--------|---------|
| 2002 | | Attleboro area (2002) | 800 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Boston (1995) | 21,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Brockton-South Central (1995) | 31,500 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Brookline (1995) | 20,300 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Framingham (1995) | 19,700 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Near West (1995) | 35,800 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Newton (1995) | 27,700 | |
| 1997-2001 | | North Central (1995) | 22,900 | |
| 1997-2001 | | North Shore (1995) | 18,600 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Northeast (1995) | 7,700 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Northwest (1995) | 13,600 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Southeast (1995) | 8,500 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Boston Region Total (1995)^N | | 227,300 |
| | | (new estimate due by end of 2006) | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Cape Cod-Barnstable County | 3,250 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Fall River area | 1,100 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | Greenfield | 1,100 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Haverhill | 800 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Holyoke | 600 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Lowell area | 2,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | Martha's Vineyard | 300 | |
| 1997-2001 | | New Bedford ^N | 2,600 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Newburyport | 280 | |
| 1997-2001 | | North Berkshire County (North Adams) | 400 | |
| 1997-2001 | | North Worcester County (Fitchburg-Gardener-Leominster) | 1,500 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Northampton | 1,200 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Pittsfield-Berkshire County | 4,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Plymouth area | 1,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | South Worcester County (Southbridge-Webster) | 500 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Springfield ^N | 10,000 | |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|-----------|--|----------------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| MICHIGAN | 1997-2001 | | Taunton area | 1,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Worcester - Central Worcester County (1986) | 11,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 150 | | |
| | | | Total | 275,030 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Ann Arbor | 7,000 | | |
| | 2006 | | Bay City | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Benton Harbor area | 240 | | |
| | 2005 | | Detroit (2005) ^N | 72,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Flint | 1,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Grand Rapids | 1,850 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Jackson | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Kalamazoo | 1,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lansing area | 2,100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Midland | 120 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Mt. Pleasant ^N | 130 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Muskegon | 210 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Saginaw | 115 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Traverse City | 200 | | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Other places | 350 | | | |
| | | Total | 87,665 | | | |
| MINNESOTA | 1997-2001 | 2 | Duluth | 485 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Rochester | 550 | | |
| | 2004 | 1 | Minneapolis (2004) | 29,300 | | |
| | 2004 | 2 | St. Paul (2004) | 10,900 | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---|---|--------|--------|
| | 2004 | 8 | Twin Cities Surrounding Counties (2004)^N | 5,300 | |
| | | | Twin Cities Total (2004) | | 45,500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 150 | |
| | | | Total | 46,685 | |
| MISSISSIPPI | 1997-2001 | | Biloxi-Gulfport | 250 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Greenville | 120 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Hattiesburg | 130 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Jackson | 550 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 450 | |
| | | | Total | 1,500 | |
| MISSOURI | 1997-2001 | | Columbia | 400 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Joplin | 100 | |
| | 2006 | | Kansas City area-Kansas portion (1985)^N | 16,000 | |
| | 2006 | | Kansas City area-Missouri portion (1985)^N | 4,000 | |
| | | | Kansas City Total | | 16,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | St. Joseph | 265 | |
| | 2006 | 2 | St. Louis (1995) | 54,000 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Springfield | 300 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | |
| | | | Total | 59,165 | |
| MONTANA | 1997-2001 | 1 | Billings | 300 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Butte-Helena | 100 | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Kalispell | 150 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Missoula | 200 | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 | |
| | | | Total | 850 | |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|---------------|--|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| NEBRASKA | 1997-2001 | | Lincoln-Grand Island-Hastings | 700 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Omaha | 6,100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 50 | | |
| | | | Total | 6,850 | | |
| NEVADA | 2005 | 1 | Las Vegas (2005) | 67,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Reno-Carson City | 2,100 | | |
| | | | Total | 69,600 | | |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | 1997-2001 | | Bethlehem-Franconia-Littleton | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Concord | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Dover-Rochester | 600 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Hanover-Lebanon | 600 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Keene | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Laconia ^N | 270 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Manchester area (1983) | 4,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Nashua area | 2,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Portsmouth-Exeter | 1,250 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Salem | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 | | |
| | | | Total | 9,970 | | |
| NEW JERSEY | 2004 | | Atlantic County (2004) | 11,700 | | 7,300 |
| | 2004 | | Cape May County- Wildwood (2004) | 500 | | 900 |
| | | | Atlantic and Cape May Counties Total | | 12,200 | 8,200 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|----------------|---------|---------------|
| 2001 | | Bergen County (2001) | 83,700 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Bridgeton | 110 | | |
| 2006 | | Cherry Hill-Southern N.J. (Camden-Gloucester-Mt. Holly-Willingboro) (1991)^N | 49,000 | | |
| 2006 | | East Essex | 10,800 | | |
| 2006 | | Livingston | 12,600 | | |
| 2006 | | North Essex | 15,600 | | |
| 2006 | | South Essex | 20,300 | | |
| 2006 | | West Orange-Orange | 16,900 | | |
| 2006 | | Essex County (Newark) Total (1998)^N | | 76,200 | |
| 1997-2001 | 1 | Flemington | 1,500 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Bayonne | 1,600 | | |
| 2006 | | Hoboken | 1,800 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Jersey City | 6,000 | | |
| 2001 | | North Hudson County (2001)^N | 2,800 | | |
| | | Hudson County Total | | 12,200 | |
| 2006 | | Middlesex County (Edison-New Brunswick) ^N | 45,000 | | |
| 2006 | | Monmouth County (1997) | 64,000 | | 6,000 |
| 2006 | | Morris County (1998) | 33,500 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Ocean County (Lakewood) | 29,000 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Passaic County | 17,000 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Princeton area | 3,000 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Somerset County (Bridgewater-Somerville) ^N | 11,000 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Sussex County | 4,100 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Trenton ^N | 6,000 | | |
| 2006 | | Union County (Elizabeth) ^N | 30,000 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Vineland ^N | 1,890 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Warren County | 400 | | |
| 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 200 | | |
| | | Northeastern NJ ^N | | 405,700 | |
| | | Total | 480,000 | | 14,200 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|-------------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| NEW MEXICO | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Albuquerque | 7,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Las Cruces | 600 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Los Alamos | 250 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Santa Fe (Las Vegas) | 2,500 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Taos | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 100 | | |
| | | | Total | 11,250 | | |
| NEW YORK | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Albany | 12,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Amsterdam | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Auburn | 115 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Broome County (Binghamton) | 2,400 | | |
| | 2006 | 1 | Buffalo (1995) | 18,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Catskill | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Cortland | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Ellenville | 1,600 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Elmira-Corning ^N | 950 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Fleischmanns | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Geneva-Canandaigua-Newark-Seneca Falls | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Glens Falls-Lake George ^N | 800 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Gloversville | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Herkimer | 130 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Hudson | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Ithaca area | 2,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Jamestown | 100 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|------------------|-----------|
| 1997-2001 | | Kingston-New Paltz-Woodstock ^N | 4,300 | |
| 2002 | | Bronx (2002) | 45,000 | |
| 2002 | | Brooklyn (2002) | 456,000 | |
| 2002 | | Manhattan (2002) | 243,500 | |
| 2002 | | Queens (2002) | 186,000 | |
| 2002 | | Staten Island (2002) | 42,700 | |
| 2002 | | Nassau County (2002) | 221,000 | |
| 2002 | | Suffolk County (2002) | 90,000 | |
| 2002 | | Westchester County (2002) | 129,000 | |
| | | New York Total (2002)^N | | 1,412,000 |
| 1997-2001 | | Niagara Falls | 150 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Olean | 100 | |
| 1997-2001 | 2 | Oneonta | 300 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Orange County (Middletown-Monroe- Newburgh-Port Jervis) | 19,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Plattsburg | 250 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Potsdam | 200 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Poughkeepsie-Dutchess County | 3,600 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Putnam County | 1,000 | |
| 2006 | 2 | Rochester (1999) | 21,050 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Rockland County | 90,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Rome | 100 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Saratoga Springs | 600 | |
| 1997-2001 | 2 | Schenectady | 5,200 | |
| pre-1997 | | Sullivan County (Liberty-Monticello) | 7,425 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Syracuse ^N | 9,000 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Troy area | 800 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Utica ^N | 1,100 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Watertown | 100 | |
| 1997-2001 | | Other places | 600 | |
| | | Total | 1,618,320 | |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|----------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| NORTH CAROLINA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Asheville ^N | 1,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Chapel Hill-Durham | 4,600 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Charlotte (1997) ^N | 8,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Fayetteville | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Gastonia | 210 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Greensboro-High Point | 2,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Greenville | 240 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Hendersonville | 250 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Hickory | 260 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Raleigh-Wake County | 6,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Southeastern NC (Wilmington-Elizabethtown-Jacksonville-Whiteville) | 1,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Winston-Salem | 485 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 500 | | |
| | | | Total | 26,345 | | |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Fargo | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Grand Forks | 130 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 | | |
| | | | Total | 430 | | |
| OHIO | | | | | | |
| | 2006 | 2 | Akron-Kent (1999) | 3,500 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Athens | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Butler County (Hamilton-Middletown-Oxford) | 900 | | |
| | 2006 | 2 | Canton-New Philadelphia (1955) | 1,000 | | |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----------|---|--|---------|
| | 1997-2001 | | Cincinnati ^N | 22,500 |
| | 2006 | | Cleveland (1996) ^N | 81,500 |
| | 2001 | 1 | Columbus (2001) | 22,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Dayton | 5,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Elyria-Oberlin | 155 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Lima | 180 |
| | pre-1997 | | Lorain | 600 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Mansfield | 150 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Marion | 125 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Sandusky-Freemont-Norwalk | 105 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Springfield | 200 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Steubenville | 115 |
| | 2006 | | Toledo-Bowling Green (1994) ^N | 3,900 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Wooster | 175 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Youngstown-Warren (2002) ^N | 2,300 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Zanesville | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other Places | 350 |
| | | | Total | 144,955 |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Oklahoma City-Norman | 2,300 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Tulsa | 2,650 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 |
| | | | Total | 5,050 |
| OREGON | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bend | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Corvallis | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Eugene | 3,250 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Medford-Ashland-Grants Pass | 1,000 |
| | 2006 | | Portland | 25,500 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Salem | 1,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 |
| | | | Total | 31,850 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|--------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Altoona | 575 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Butler | 250 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Chambersburg | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Erie | 850 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Harrisburg (1994) | 7,100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Hazleton-Tamaqua | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Johnstown | 275 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lancaster area | 3,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Lebanon | 350 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lehigh Valley (Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton) | 8,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | New Castle | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Oil City | 100 | | |
| | 2006 | | Bucks County (1997) | 34,800 | | |
| | 2006 | | Chester County (Oxford-Kennett Square-Phoenixville-West Chester) (1997) | 10,100 | | |
| | 2006 | | Delaware County (Chester-Coatesville) (1997) | 15,700 | | |
| | 2006 | | Montgomery County (Norristown) (1997) | 58,900 | | |
| | 2006 | | Philadelphia (1997) | 86,600 | | |
| | 2006 | | Philadelphia Total (1997) ^N | | 206,100 | |
| | pre-1997 | | Pike County | 300 | | |
| | 2002 | | Pittsburgh (Ambridge-Greensburg-Jeanette-McKeesport-Washington-Waynesburg) (2002) ^N | 42,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Pottstown | 650 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Pottsville | 120 | | |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|---|--|----------------|
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Reading | 2,200 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Scranton | 3,100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Sharon-Farrell | 300 |
| | 1997-2001 | | State College | 700 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Stroudsburg | 600 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Sunbury-Lewisburg-Shamokin ^N | 200 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Uniontown area | 150 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Upper Beaver County (Beaver Falls) | 180 |
| | pre-1997 | | Wayne County (Honesdale) | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Wilkes-Barre ^N | 3,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Williamsport-Lock Haven | 225 |
| | 1999-2001 | | York (1999) | 1,800 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 900 |
| | | | Total | 284,875 |
| RHODE ISLAND | | | | |
| | 2002 | | Providence-Pawtucket (2002) | 7,500 |
| | 2002 | | West Bay (2002) | 6,350 |
| | 2002 | | East Bay (2002) | 1,100 |
| | 2002 | | South County (Washington County) (2002) | 1,800 |
| | 2002 | | Northern Rhode Island (2002) | 1,000 |
| | 2002 | | Newport County (2002) | 1,000 |
| | | | Total | 18,750 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Charleston | 5,500 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Columbia | 2,750 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Florence area | 220 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Greenville | 1,200 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Myrtle Beach-Georgetown | 475 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Rock Hill-York | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Spartanburg | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Sumter-Kingstree ^N | 140 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|--------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| SOUTH DAKOTA | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 450 | | |
| | | | Total | 11,335 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Sioux Falls | 195 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 | | |
| TENNESSEE | | | Total | 295 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Chattanooga | 1,450 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Knoxville | 1,800 | | |
| | 2006 | | Memphis | 7,800 | | |
| | 2002 | | Nashville (2002) | 7,800 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Oak Ridge | 250 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 200 | | |
| TEXAS | | | Total | 19,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Amarillo ^N | 200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Austin | 13,500 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Baytown | 300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Beaumont | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Brownsville-Harlingen-San Padre Island | 450 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | College Station-Bryan | 400 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Corpus Christi | 1,400 | | |
| | 2006 | 2 | Dallas (1988) | 45,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | El Paso | 5,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Fort Worth | 5,000 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Galveston | 400 | | |

| | | | | |
|---------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|---------|
| | 2006 | 2 | Houston (1986) ^N | 45,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Laredo | 130 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Longview | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Lubbock | 230 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | McAllen ^N | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Midland-Odessa | 200 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Port Arthur | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | San Antonio (1990) | 11,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Tyler | 400 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Waco ^N | 300 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Wichita Falls | 260 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 600 |
| | | | Total | 130,970 |
| UTAH | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Ogden | 150 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Salt Lake City | 4,200 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 50 |
| | | | Total | 4,400 |
| VERMONT | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bennington area | 500 |
| | pre-1997 | | Brattleboro | 350 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Burlington | 2,500 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Manchester area | 325 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Montpelier-Barre | 550 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Rutland | 625 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | St. Johnsbury-Newport | 140 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Stowe | 150 |
| | pre-1997 | | Woodstock | 270 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 100 |
| | | | Total | 5,510 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|------------|--|----------------|---|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| VIRGINIA | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Blacksburg (Radford) | 175 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Charlottesville | 1,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Danville area | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Fredericksburg ^N | 500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Lynchburg area | 275 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Martinsville | 100 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Newport News-Hampton-Williamsburg ^N | 2,400 | | |
| | 2001 | | Norfolk-Virginia Beach (Chesapeake-Portsmouth-Suffolk) (2001) | 10,950 | | |
| | 2003 | | Northern Virginia (Alexandria-Arlington-Fairfax County-Prince William County, Loudon County) (2003) | 67,300 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Petersburg-Colonial Heights | 350 | | |
| | 2006 | | Richmond (1994) ^N | 12,500 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Roanoke | 900 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Staunton-Lexington ^N | 370 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Winchester ^N | 270 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 150 | | |
| | | | Total | 97,840 | | |
| WASHINGTON | | | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Bellingham | 525 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Olympia | 560 | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Port Angeles | 100 | | |
| | 2000 | | Seattle (2000) ^N | 37,200 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Spokane | 1,500 | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|---|--|--------|
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Tacoma | 2,000 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Tri Cities ^N | 300 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Vancouver-Longview-Kelso | 600 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Yakima-Ellensburg | 150 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 200 |
| | | | Total | 43,135 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | | | |
| | pre-1997 | | Bluefield-Princeton | 200 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Charleston | 975 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Clarksburg | 110 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Huntington | 250 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Morgantown | 200 |
| | pre-1997 | | Parkersburg | 110 |
| | 1997-2001 | 2 | Wheeling | 290 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 200 |
| | | | Total | 2,335 |
| WISCONSIN | | | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Appleton area | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Beloit-Janesville | 120 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Green Bay | 500 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Kenosha | 300 |
| | 1997-2001 | | La Crosse | 100 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Madison | 5,000 |
| | 2006 | | Milwaukee-Waukesha (1996) ^N | 21,100 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Oshkosh-Fond du Lac | 170 |
| | 1997-2001 | 1 | Racine | 200 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Sheboygan | 140 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Wausau ^N | 300 |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 300 |
| | | | Total | 28,330 |

| State | Date of Informant Confirmation or Latest Study | # of Counties* | Geographic Area | Jewish Population | Regional Totals | Part-Year Jewish Population |
|---------|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| WYOMING | 1997-2001 | | Casper | 150 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Cheyenne-Laramie | 230 | | |
| | 1997-2001 | | Other places | 50 | | |
| | | | Total | 430 | | |

Notes to Table 3

CALIFORNIA

Long Beach—includes in Los Angeles County: Long Beach, Signal Hill, Cerritos, Lakewood, Rossmoor, and Hawaiian Gardens, and in Orange County: Los Alamitos, Cypress, Seal Beach, and Huntington Harbor.

Los Angeles—includes eastern parts of Ventura County and all parts of Los Angeles County not included in Long Beach.

Orange County—includes most of Orange County (excluding parts included in Long Beach).

Palm Springs—includes Palm Springs, Desert Hot Springs, Cathedral City, Palm Desert, and Rancho Mirage.

Sacramento—includes Yolo, Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento counties.

San Francisco Bay area—North Peninsula includes northern San Mateo County. South Peninsula includes southern San Mateo County and Palo Alto and Los Altos in Santa Clara County. San Jose includes remainder of Santa Clara County.

San Gabriel and Pomona Valleys—includes Alta Loma, Chino, Claremont, Cucamonga, La Verne, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona, San Dimas, and Upland.

COLORADO

Denver—includes Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Denver, and Jefferson counties.

Pueblo—includes all of Pueblo County and parts of southeastern Colorado, including Lamar and Trinidad.

CONNECTICUT

Bridgeport—includes Monroe, Easton, Trumbull, Fairfield, Bridgeport, Shelton, and Stratford.

Danbury—includes Danbury, Bethel, New Fairfield, Brookfield, Sherman, Newtown, Redding, and Ridgefield.

Hartford—includes Bloomfield-Hartford-West Hartford, East Hartford-Glastonbury-Manchester, South Windsor (and adjacent Tolland County), Farmington Valley (and adjacent Litchfield County), Bristol-New Britain, Middletown (and adjacent Middlesex County), Meriden-Wallingford (and adjacent New Haven County), Plymouth-Terryville (and adjacent Litchfield County), and Windsor-Suffield.

Lower Middlesex County—includes Branford, Guilford, Madison, Clinton, Westbrook, Old Saybrook, Old Lyme, Durham, and Killingworth.

New Haven—includes New Haven, East Haven, Guilford, Branford, Madison, North Haven, Hamden, West Haven, Milford, Orange, Woodbridge, Bethany, Derby, Ansonia, Quinnipiac, Meriden, Seymour, and Wallingford.

New London—includes central and southern New London County and parts of Middlesex and Windham counties.

Waterbury—includes Bethlehem, Cheshire, Litchfield, Morris, Middlebury, Southbury, Naugatuck, Prospect, Plymouth, Roxbury, Southbury, Southington, Thomaston,

Torrington, Washington, Watertown, Waterbury, Oakville, Woodbury, Wolcott, Oxford, and other parts of Litchfield County and northern New Haven County.

FLORIDA

Orlando—includes Orange and Seminole counties, southern Volusia County, and northern Osceola County.

Stuart-Port St. Lucie—includes Martin County and southern St. Lucie County.

GEORGIA

Augusta—includes Burke, Columbia, and Richmond counties.

ILLINOIS

Chicago—includes Cook and DuPage counties, and parts of Lake County.

Elgin—includes northern Kane County and southern McHenry County.

Rockford-Freeport—includes Winnebago, Boone, and Stephenson counties.

Southern Illinois—includes lower portion of Illinois south of Carlinville.

INDIANA ~

South Bend-Elkhart—includes St. Joseph and Elkhart counties.

KANSAS

Kansas City—includes Johnson and Wyandotte counties.

Wichita—includes Sedgwick County and Salina, Dodge City, Great Bend, Liberal, Russell, and Hays.

KENTUCKY

Lexington—includes Fayette, Bourbon, Scott, Clark, Woodford, Madison, Pulaski, and Jessamine counties.

LOUISIANA

Alexandria—includes Allen, Grant, Rapides, and Vernon parishes.

Baton Rouge—includes East Baton Rouge, Ascension, Livingston, St. Landry, Iberville, Pointe Coupee, and West Baton Rouge parishes.

South Central Louisiana—includes Abbeville, Lafayette, New Iberia, Crowley, Opelousas, Houma, Morgan City, Thibodaux, and Franklin.

MAINE

Southern Maine—includes York, Cumberland, and Sagadahoc counties.

MASSACHUSETTS

Andover-Lawrence—includes Andover, North Andover, Boxford, Lawrence, Methuen, Tewksbury, and Dracut.

Boston Metropolitan region—Brockton-South Central includes Avon, Bridgewa-

ter, Brockton, Canton, East Bridgewater, Easton, Foxborough, Halifax, Randolph, Sharon, Stoughton, West Bridgewater, Whitman, and Wrentham. Framingham includes Acton, Bellingham, Boxborough, Framingham, Franklin, Holliston, Hopkinton, Hudson, Marlborough, Maynard, Medfield, Medway, Milford, Millis, Southborough, and Stow. North Central includes Arlington, Belmont, Cambridge, Somerville, and Waltham. North Shore includes Lynn, Saugus, Nahant, Swampscott, Lynnfield, Peabody, Salem, Marblehead, Beverly, Danvers, Middleton, Wenham, Topsfield, Hamilton, Manchester, Ipswich, Essex, Gloucester, and Rockport. Northeast includes Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Medford, Revere, Winthrop, and Watertown. Northwest includes Bedford, Burlington, Carlisle, Concord, Lexington, Lincoln, Melrose, North Reading, Reading, Stoneham, Wakefield, Wilmington, Winchester, and Woburn. Near West includes Ashland, Dedham, Dover, Natick, Needham, Norfolk, Norwood, Sherborn, Sudbury, Walpole, Wayland, Wellesley, Weston, and Westwood. Southeast includes Abington, Braintree, Cohasset, Duxbury, Hanover, Hanson, Hingham, Holbrook, Hull, Kingston, Marshfield, Milton, Norwell, Pembroke, Quincy, Rockland, Scituate, and Weymouth.

New Bedford—includes New Bedford, Dartmouth, Fairhaven, and Mattapoisett.

Springfield—includes Springfield, Longmeadow, East Longmeadow, Hampden, Wilbraham, Agawam, and West Springfield.

MICHIGAN

Detroit—includes Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne counties.

Mt. Pleasant—includes Isabella, Mecosta, Gladwin, and Gratiot counties.

MINNESOTA

Twin Cities Surrounding Counties—includes Anoka, Carver, Goodhue, Rice, Scott, Shelburne, Washington, and Wright counties.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Laconia—includes Laconia, Plymouth, Meredith, Conway, and Franklin.

NEW JERSEY

Cherry Hill-Southern New Jersey—includes Camden, Burlington, and Gloucester counties.

Essex County-East Essex—includes Belleville, Bloomfield, East Orange, Irvington, Newark, Nutley in Essex County, and Kearney in Hudson County. North Essex includes Caldwell, Cedar Grove, Essex Fells, Fairfield, Glen Ridge, Montclair, North Caldwell, Roseland, Verona, and West Caldwell. South Essex includes Maplewood, Millburn, Short Hills, and South Orange in Essex County, and Springfield in Union County.

Middlesex County—includes in Somerset County: Kendall Park, Somerset, and Franklin; in Mercer County: Hightstown; and all of Middlesex County.

Northeastern N.J.—includes Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic,

Somerset, Union, Hunterdon, Sussex, Monmouth, and Ocean counties.

North Hudson County—includes Guttenberg, Hudson Heights, North Bergen, North Hudson, Seacaucus, Union City, Weehawken, West New York, and Woodcliff.

Somerset County—includes most of Somerset County (excluding parts included in Middlesex County) and parts of Hunterdon County.

Trenton—includes most of Mercer County (excluding parts included in Middlesex County).

Union County—includes Union County except Springfield, and adjacent areas of Somerset and Middlesex counties.

Vineland—includes most of Cumberland County and parts of Salem and Camden counties.

NEW YORK

Elmira-Corning—includes Chemung, Tioga, and Schuyler counties.

Glens Falls-Lake George—includes Warren and Washington counties, lower Essex County, and upper Saratoga County.

Kingston-New Paltz-Woodstock—includes eastern half of Ulster County.

New York Metropolitan area—for a New York area total, include Fairfield, Rockland, Putnam, and Orange counties and Northeastern New Jersey.

Syracuse—includes Onondaga County, western Madison County and most of Oswego County.

Utica—includes southeastern third of Oneida County.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville—includes Buncombe, Haywood, and Madison counties.

Charlotte—includes Mecklenburg County. For a Charlotte area total, include Rock Hill, South Carolina.

OHIO

Cincinnati—includes Hamilton and Butler counties. For a Cincinnati area total, include Covington and Newport, Kentucky.

Cleveland—includes Cuyahoga County and parts of Lake, Geauga, Portage, and Summit counties. For a

Cleveland area total, include Elyria, Lorain, and Akron.

Toledo-Bowling Green—includes Fulton, Lucas, and Wood counties.

Youngstown-Warren—includes Mahoning and Trumbull counties.

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia—For a Philadelphia area total, include Cherry Hill-Southern New Jersey, Princeton, Trenton, Wilmington and Newark.

Pittsburgh—includes Allegheny County and parts of Washington, Westmoreland, and Beaver counties.

JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 2006 / 193

Sunbury-Lewisburg-Shamokin—includes Shamokin, Lewisburg, Milton, Selinsgrove, and Sunbury.

Wilkes-Barre—includes Luzerne County (except Hazleton-Tamaqua).

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sumter-Kingstree—includes Sumter, Lee, Clarendon, and Williamsburg counties.

TEXAS

Amarillo—includes in Texas: Canyon, Childress, Borger, Dumas, Memphis, Pampa, Vega, and Hereford, and in New Mexico: Portales

Houston—includes Harris, Montgomery, and Fort Bend counties, and parts of Brazoria and Galveston counties.

McAllen—includes Edinburg, Harlingen, McAllen, Mission, Pharr, Rio Grande City, San Juan, and Weslaco.

Waco—includes McLennan, Coryell, Bell, Falls, Hamilton, and Hill counties.

VIRGINIA

Fredericksburg—includes parts of Spotsylvania, Stafford, King George, and Orange counties.

Newport News-Hampton-Williamsburg— includes Newport News, Hampton, Williamsburg, James City, York County, and Poquoson City.

Richmond—includes Richmond City, Henrico County, and Chesterfield County.

Staunton-Lexington—includes Augusta, Page, Shenandoah, Rockingham, Bath, and Highland counties.

Winchester—includes Winchester, Frederick, Clarke, and Warren counties.

WASHINGTON

Seattle—includes King County and parts of Snohomish and Kitsap counties.

Tri Cities—includes Pasco, Richland, and Kennewick.

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee—includes Milwaukee, Eastern Waukesha, and southern Ozaukee counties.

Wausau— includes Stevens Point, Marshfield, Antigo, and Rhinelander.