


# Data for Decision Makers



## Birmingham, Iowa City Profile

report created: 12/17/2024

### Population profile

The 2020 population for Birmingham is 367. Between 2010 and 2020 the population decreased by 18.1%. The City of Birmingham is in Van Buren County. Van Buren County saw a 4.8% population decrease between 2010 and 2020.

Van Buren County Cities - Total Population<sup>1</sup>


City	2000	2010	2020
<b>Birmingham</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>448</b>	<b>367</b>
Male Total	221	231	183
Female Total	202	217	184
Bonaparte	458	433	359
Cantril	257	222	224
Farmington	756	664	579
Keosauqua	1,066	1,006	936
Milton	550	443	380
Stockport	284	296	272
Van Buren County Total	7,809	7,570	7,203
State of Iowa Total	2,926,324	3,046,355	3,190,369

<sup>†</sup>City is located in multiple counties, total population is provided.

Neighboring Cities - Percent Population Change

	'90-'00	'00-'10	'10-'20
Fairfield	-2.7%	-0.5%	-0.5%
Hillsboro	35.8%	-12.2%	-9.4%
Keosauqua	4.5%	-5.6%	-7.0%
Libertyville	23.1%	-3.1%	-13.0%
Stockport	9.2%	4.2%	-8.1%
Birmingham	9.6%	5.9%	-18.1%
Van Buren County	1.7%	3.1%	-4.8%
State of Iowa	5.4%	4.1%	4.7%

City and County Percent Population Change<sup>1</sup>



#### Regional Director

Cindy Hall  
2606 W. Burlington Ave.  
Fairfield, IA 52556  
hallc@iastate.edu  
641-682-5491

#### County Office

Jennifer Plowman  
20493 Hwy 1  
Keosauqua, IA 52565  
jbathje@iastate.edu  
319-293-3039

<https://indicators.extension.iastate.edu>

# Demographic Profile

# Birmingham, Iowa

Birmingham's population is predominantly White. The City of Birmingham, compared to Van Buren County, had a lower percentage of young people (17 or younger) and a lower percentage of older people (65 and older) in 2020. New household relationship categories were reported for 2020 that are not comparable with 2010.<sup>3</sup>

**Percentage of Population by Race/Hispanic Origin<sup>1</sup>**

Race Groups	City		County	
	2010	2020	2010	2020
One race only	98.7%	96.7%	99.3%	97.2%
White	97.8%	95.6%	98.3%	96.1%
White alone, not Hispanic	96.2%	94.0%	97.4%	95.5%
Black or African American	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%
Two or more races	1.3%	3.3%	0.7%	2.8%
Hispanic origin <sup>a</sup>	2.0%	2.2%	1.2%	1.6%

<sup>a</sup> Hispanics can be of any race.

**Households by Family or Nonfamily Type<sup>1,3</sup>**

	City		County	
	2010	2020	2010	2020
Total households	191	177	3,108	2,984
Family households <sup>a,b</sup>	62.8%	66.7%	66.2%	64.3%
Married couple family <sup>b</sup>	48.2%	45.5%	55.4%	52.7%
With own children	16.2%	16.4%	18.7%	17.9%
Other family <sup>c</sup>	14.7%	16.4%	10.8%	11.6%
Male householder <sup>c</sup>	6.8%	5.1%	3.9%	4.4%
With own children	5.2%	1.7%	2.4%	2.3%
Female householder <sup>c</sup>	7.9%	11.3%	7.0%	7.2%
With own children	5.2%	6.2%	4.3%	3.6%
Nonfamily households <sup>d</sup>	37.2%	33.3%	33.8%	35.7%
Male living alone	16.8%	15.3%	14.3%	15.4%
Female living alone	13.1%	19.2%	14.9%	14.9%

**Households by Couple or Non-couple Type<sup>1,3</sup>**

	City		County	
	2010	2020	2010	2020
Total households	191	177	3,108	2,984
Married couple <sup>b</sup>	48.2%	45.5%	55.4%	52.7%
Cohabiting couple <sup>b,f</sup>	NA <sup>e</sup>	7.3%	NA <sup>e</sup>	6.6%
Male householder <sup>g</sup>	NA <sup>e</sup>	20.9%	NA <sup>e</sup>	19.9%
Female householder <sup>g</sup>	NA <sup>e</sup>	28.8%	NA <sup>e</sup>	20.8%


<sup>a</sup>Householder and at least one other person related to the householder. <sup>b</sup>For 2020 includes same-sex couples. <sup>c</sup>No spouse present, but at least one relative present. <sup>d</sup>In 2010 included same-sex couples whether married or not (if no relatives present). <sup>e</sup>2010 not comparable with 2020. <sup>f</sup>For 2020 householder has an unmarried partner. <sup>g</sup>For 2020 no spouse or partner present, but relatives, nonrelatives may be present or householder may be living alone.

**Percentage of Population by Age<sup>1</sup>**

Age Groups	City		County	
	2010	2020	2010	2020
17 or younger	23%	23.2%	24.1%	23.9%
0 - 4	7.1%	6.0%	6.5%	6.2%
5 - 9	6.5%	6.3%	6.7%	6.8%
10 - 14	5.4%	6.8%	6.3%	6.9%
15 - 17	4%	4.1%	4.6%	4%
18 - 24	6.9%	6%	6.6%	6.8%
25 - 44	24.3%	21.3%	21.5%	20%
45 - 64	27.5%	29.2%	28.1%	26.3%
65 or older	18.3%	20.4%	19.8%	23.0%
65 - 84	16.5%	19.4%	16.8%	20.4%
85 or older	1.8%	1.1%	3.0%	2.6%
Median <sup>4</sup> Age (years)	41	44.8	43.3	44.4
Age Dependency <sup>a, 5</sup>	70.4	77.2	78.3	88.3
Old-Age	31.2	36.1	35.3	43.3
Child	39.2	41.1	43.0	45.0

<sup>a</sup>Age Dependency Ratio

**Birmingham, Iowa Population Pyramid,<sup>a</sup> 2020<sup>1</sup>**



<sup>a</sup>Each bar represents the percentage that an age-sex group comprises of the total population.

## Socioeconomic Profile

## Birmingham, Iowa

The median household income in Birmingham is greater than the median household income of Van Buren County. The median value of owner-occupied housing units is lower in Birmingham than for Van Buren County. There is a lower percentage of vacant housing units in Birmingham than there is for Van Buren County. Many housing units in Birmingham were built prior to 1940. There is a lower percentage of individuals 25 and older with a Bachelor's degree or higher in Birmingham compared to Van Buren County.

**Median Household and Per Capita Income, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Total Households	222	+/- 51	2,842	+/- 110
Less than \$34,999	18.9%	+/- 4.1%	27.1%	+/- 2.8%
\$35,000 To \$49,999	11.3%	+/- 6.7%	12.0%	+/- 2.6%
\$50,000 To \$99,999	52.3%	+/- 4.9%	36.2%	+/- 2.5%
\$100,000 Or More	17.6%	+/- 3.4%	24.8%	+/- 2.6%
Median <sup>4</sup> Household Income	\$58,750	+/- \$11,395	\$58,417	+/- \$2,717
Median Family Income	\$66,607	+/- \$15,084	\$70,893	+/- \$4,813
Per Capita Income	\$28,613	+/- \$4,248	\$32,188	+/- \$3,193

**Housing Characteristics, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Total Units	262	+/- 58	3,509	+/- 24
Vacant	15.3%	+/- 8.1%	19.0%	+/- 3.1%
Occupied	84.7%	+/- 8.1%	81.0%	+/- 3.1%
Occupied <sup>a</sup>	222	+/- 51	2,842	+/- 110
Owner	78.4%	+/- 10.4%	83.4%	+/- 2.8%
Renter	21.6%	+/- 10.4%	16.6%	+/- 2.8%
Rent <sup>b</sup>	\$811	+/- \$325	\$661	+/- \$144
Value <sup>c</sup>	\$95,400	+/- \$9,712	\$107,700	+/- \$10,503

<sup>a</sup>Occupied Units, <sup>b</sup>Median gross rent of renter-occupied units, <sup>c</sup>Median value of owner-occupied units


**Educational Attainment, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Population 25 and older	387	+/-91	5,072	+/-21
High School Graduate or Higher	87.6%	+/-6.4%	88.4%	+/-2.5%
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	8.8%	+/-4.3%	18.5%	+/-2.7%

\*MOE = the margin of error for American Community Survey estimates<sup>2</sup> which is a numerical value that when added to or subtracted from the point estimate value gives the range of a 90% confidence interval around the estimate.

\*\*MOE is high, use county estimate.

**Percent Housing by Year Built, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**



In Birmingham there is a higher percentage of workers in production, transportation, and material moving occupations than any other occupation category. The production, transportation, and material moving occupation category makes up 28.8% of occupations of the civilian employed population in the city.

**Occupation of the Civilian Employed Population, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Civilian employed population 16 years and over	281	+/- 84	3,060	+/- 200
Management, business, science, and arts	22.8%	+/- 10.4%	30.0%	+/- 4.2%
Service	***%	+/- ***%	12.0%	+/- 2.6%
Sales and office	25.6%	+/- 10.1%	17.4%	+/- 2.8%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance	***%	+/- ***%	17.5%	+/- 3.1%
Production, transportation, and material moving	28.8%	+/- 11.7%	23.0%	+/- 3.3%

## Socioeconomic Profile

## Birmingham, Iowa

Birmingham has a higher proportion of the population age 16 or older in the labor force than Van Buren County. A portion of those who are not in the labor force are people who are retired. Earnings data are provided for the population 16 and over who have earnings. Median earnings in Birmingham tend to be lower than the median earnings for Van Buren County. Families with children tend to have a higher rate of poverty than families without children.

**Median Employment Earnings, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Population 16+ <sup>a</sup>	293	+/- 85	3,408	+/- 191
Median Earnings	\$35,234	+/- \$35	\$36,202	+/- \$1,697
Female	\$29,250	+/- \$10,265	\$24,071	+/- \$5,286
Female, full time <sup>b</sup>	\$38,750	+/- \$7,334	\$45,714	+/- \$8,134
Male	\$38,393	+/- \$11,537	\$42,314	+/- \$2,874
Male, full time <sup>b</sup>	\$43,750	+/- \$8,148	\$52,161	+/- \$5,761

<sup>a</sup> with earnings, <sup>b</sup> year round, \*\*MOE is high, use county estimate.

**Disability Status and Health Insurance Coverage of the Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Population <sup>a</sup>	523	+/-115	7,138	+/-21
With a disability <sup>b</sup>	18.4%	+/-5.5%	17.8%	+/-2.0%
With Health Insurance	93.7%	+/-4.7%	85.6%	+/-3.0%
With Private <sup>c</sup> Coverage	60.0%	+/-11.0%	58.1%	+/-3.6%
With Public <sup>d</sup> Coverage	46.5%	+/-9.2%	45.6%	+/-3.6%
No Health Insurance	**%	+/-**%	14.4%	+/-3.0%

<sup>a</sup>Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population, <sup>b</sup>limitations of activities or inability for full participation, <sup>c</sup>provided by employer, union, bought by individual, and some military plans, <sup>d</sup>includes Medicare, Medicaid, VA Health Care, children's CHIP, and some state plans, \*\*MOE is high, use county estimate.

\*MOE = the margin of error for American Community Survey estimates<sup>2</sup> which is a numerical value that when added to or subtracted from the point estimate value gives the range of a 90% confidence interval around the estimate.

**Employment Status, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Population 16+	419	+/- 96	5,758	+/- 31
in labor force	67.3%	+/- 8.9%	55.9%	+/- 3.1%
not in labor force	32.7%	+/- 8.9%	44.1%	+/- 3.1%
Civilian labor force	282	+/- 84	3,216	+/- 178
Unemployed	0.4%	+/- 1.1%	4.9%	+/- 1.9%

\*\*MOE is high, use county estimate.

**Individuals and Families Below Poverty Level, 2018-2022<sup>2</sup>**

	City		County	
	Estimate	MOE*	Estimate	MOE*
Total Population <sup>a</sup>	521	+/-115	7,101	+/-42
Below poverty	**%	+/-**%	11.1%	+/-2.5%
17 and under	**%	+/-**%	13.5%	+/-5.9%
18 - 64	**%	+/-**%	11.4%	+/-2.8%
65+	**%	+/-**%	8.0%	+/-2.1%
All Families	**%	+/-**%	8.0%	+/-2.6%
with children	**%	+/-**%	13.2%	+/-5.0%
Married Couple	**%	+/-**%	**%	+/-**%
with children	**%	+/-**%	**%	+/-**%
Female HH <sup>b</sup>	**%	+/-**%	**%	+/-**%
with children	**%	+/-**%	37.4%	+/-16.4%

<sup>a</sup> for whom poverty status is determined, <sup>b</sup> female householder, no husband present, \*\*MOE is high, use county estimate.

### Notes and Source Information:

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau; Decennial Censuses 1940 - 2020

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey 2018-2022

<sup>3</sup> For the 2020 Decennial Census, households are divided into subcategories by two different methods. One method (family or nonfamily) is based on the presence or absence of family relationships among the household members and the householder. Using family relationships (birth, marriage, or adoption) has been the usual way to classify households, and the data using this method has good comparability between 2010 and 2020. In 2020, the Census Bureau introduced an additional method to divide households into subcategories. This second method (couple or noncouple) is based on the presence or absence of a couple relationship for the householder. The relationship can be as a married spouse or as an unmarried partner and can be of the opposite or same sex. The 2020 data reported for the second method (except for married couples) does not have good comparability with data from 2010. For smaller towns, the couple or noncouple data are omitted in this profile.

<sup>4</sup> Median is the middle value of a distribution.

<sup>5</sup> The age dependency ratio compares, by age, those typically not in the labor force with those who typically are in the labor force. Old Age dependency is persons 65+ per 100 persons age 18-64. Child dependency is persons under age 18 per 100 persons age 18-64. The total age dependency ratio is persons under age 18 plus persons 65 or older per 100 persons age 18-64.

### This series was prepared by:

Christopher J. Seeger, Professor & Extension Specialist  
Bailey Hanson, Data Analyst III & Extension Specialist  
Sandra Burke, Research Scientist III & Extension Specialist  
Jay Maxwell, Data Analyst I & Extension Specialist

For more information on these and other topics, please call the Extension and Outreach specialists listed on the cover page or visit the ISU Extension and Outreach Indicators website at <https://indicators.extension.iastate.edu>

This institution is an equal opportunity provider. For the full non-discrimination statement or accommodation inquiries, go to [www.extension.iastate.edu/diversity/ext](http://www.extension.iastate.edu/diversity/ext).