

# **Geography, Population, and Income of Platform Tennis Communities**

**Prepared by Gary Horvath**

**Ed. M., MBA, PPTA, USPTA Master Professional**

**Broomfield, CO**

**303.460.9767**

**GHShorts@aol.com**

**for**

**USA Professional Platform Tennis Association**

**American Platform Tennis Association**

**Platform Tennis Magazine**

**RJ Reilly, Inc.**

**Wilson Racquet Sports**

**Viking Athletics**

**May 2001**

## **Purpose of Study**

With the exception of limited primary research conducted by private firms, the platform tennis industry lacks research that provides information about the communities where platform tennis is played. This brief summary provides a limited look at the geography, population, and household income of the counties where platform tennis is played.

The project has been completed on a pro bono basis by Gary Horvath in hopes that it may complement information held by those individuals/companies who have supported the formation of the USA PPTA. This report uses credible data sources to provide confirmation of beliefs held by many in the industry.

## **Methodology**

The counties included in this study were identified through personal knowledge of the industry, discussions with members of the industry, and the APTA Tournament Schedule. Sources for the study include *Demographics USA* and the *U.S. Census Bureau*.

This study is limited to a review of geography, population, and income of counties where platform tennis is played because this information provides a foundation for understanding some of the challenges and opportunities facing the industry. In addition, current data was available as a result of the recent release of 2000 Census data. Finally, time constraints also limited the scope of this study.

## **Limitations of the Study**

A more accurate study of the demographics, acquired through secondary research, for the communities where platform tennis is played, would include the following:

- Tighter definition of what constitutes a platform tennis community,
- Better identification of the location of the facilities and their associated zip codes,
- Research that is based on the zip codes surrounding facilities with platform tennis courts rather than county data.

The county data most likely overstates the population and geographic size of the area surrounding facilities. Also, it mostly likely understates the income for the platform tennis communities.

Any review of secondary data can only give a glimpse of the demographics for communities where platform tennis is played. A more accurate study would include a combination of primary research involving actual players combined with secondary research of the surrounding communities.

Despite these limitations, this report provides insight into the industry if the data is used properly.

## Geography – Location and Size of Communities

Platform tennis is played by a small number of players. Courts are clustered in small geographic communities widely dispersed throughout the United States.

- The size of area of the states where platform tennis is played is 1.0 million square miles, or 28.6% of the area of the US.
- The size of the counties where platform tennis is played is 38,274 square miles, or 1% of the area of the US.
- The concentration of people per square mile for 56 of the 57 counties is greater than the average for the U.S.
- The concentration of people per square mile for 47 of the 57 counties is greater than the average for their respective states.
- On the average there are 1,204 people per square mile in the counties where platform tennis is played.
- Organized platform tennis programs can be found in 20 of the 50 states.
- Organized platform tennis programs can be found in 57 of the 3140, or 1.8%, counties within the US.
- If there were 281,422 platform tennis players in 2000, then .1%, or 1 out of 1,000 people in the U.S. population would be play platform tennis players. As a point of reference, about 7% of the U.S. population plays tennis.

## Population

Although platform tennis is considered to be a winter sport played in the northern states, it is now played in about half of the states in the US. This is a mixed blessing. On a positive note, the migration of the population from the Northeast and Midwest to the South and West is a factor that has fostered the expansion of the sport to other states. On the down side, there is lower population growth in many of the communities where platform tennis has historically been concentrated.

Platform tennis is a well-kept secret, even in the areas of the country where it is most popular. There are about 45 million people living within the counties where platform tennis is currently played.

- The population in the states where platform tennis is played is 165.3 million, or 58.7% of the total population.
- The population of the counties where platform tennis is played is 44.5 million, or 15.8% of the total U.S. population. If 281,422 played the sport in 2000, then .6%, or 6 out of 1000, of the players within the immediate vicinity of facilities play the sport. The sport is not widespread within the counties where it is played.
- Only 5 of the 20 states where platform tennis is played had population growth rates greater than the U.S. population growth rate (13.1%) from 1990 to 2000.
- Twenty-seven of the 57 counties, or 46%, experienced population growth rates greater than the growth of their state from 1990 to 2000.
- Only 15 of the 57 counties, or 27%, experienced population growth rates greater than the growth of U.S. from 1990 to 2000.
- Eight of the 57 counties experienced negative growth rates from 1990 to 2000.

Geography, Population, and Income of Platform Tennis Communities

## **Median Household Income**

The counties in which platform tennis is played have household incomes substantially greater than other counties in their state and in the United States.

- Fifty-three of the 57 counties had median household incomes greater than the median household income for the US.
- Forty-seven of the 57 counties had median household incomes greater than the median household income for their state.
- The range of median household incomes for the 57 counties was \$28,897 to \$67,919. The median for these 57 counties was \$47,467. This value is 28% greater than the median household income for the US.

## **Concluding Thoughts – Opportunities**

There appear to be opportunities for expansion of the sport in local and untapped markets:

- Current areas of play - On the downside, there is limited population growth in many of the communities where platform tennis has historically been strong; however, expansion should be possible in these areas because a critical mass already exists and because market penetration in these areas is miniscule. Approximately 45 million people live in the 57 counties where organized platform tennis is currently played.
- Untapped markets - Opportunities for expansion exist in untapped areas as the population migrates from the Northeast and Midwest to the West and South. Opportunities for growth also exist in wealthier counties.

Region	State	County	2000 County Population	County Change in Population '90 v '00	1997 County Median HH Income	County Area Sq. Miles	Population per Sq. Mile County	2000 State Population	State Change in Population '90 v '00	1997 State Median HH Income	State Area Sq. Miles	Population per Sq. Mile State
1	CT	Fairfield	882,567	6.6%	\$56,872	626	1,409.9	3,405,565	3.6%	\$46,648	4,845	702.9
1	CT	Litchfield	182,193	4.7%	48,011	920	198.0	3,405,565	3.6%	46,648	4,845	702.9
1	CT	Middlesex	155,071	8.3%	53,624	369	420.2	3,405,565	3.6%	46,648	4,845	702.9
1	NJ	Bergen	884,118	7.1%	59,557	234	3,778.3	8,414,350	8.6%	47,903	7,417	1,134.5
1	NJ	Essex	793,633	2.0%	39,823	126	6,298.7	8,414,350	8.6%	47,903	7,417	1,134.5
1	NJ	Mercer	350,761	7.7%	49,251	226	1,552.0	8,414,350	8.6%	47,903	7,417	1,134.5
1	NJ	Monmouth	615,301	11.2%	57,985	472	1,303.6	8,414,350	8.6%	47,903	7,417	1,134.5
1	NJ	Morris	470,212	11.6%	67,919	469	1,002.6	8,414,350	8.6%	47,903	7,417	1,134.5
1	NJ	Union	522,541	5.8%	50,254	103	5,073.2	8,414,350	8.6%	47,903	7,417	1,134.5
1	NY	Nassau	1,334,544	3.6%	61,026	287	4,650.0	18,976,457	5.5%	36,369	47,214	401.9
1	NY	Suffolk	1,419,369	7.4%	53,560	912	1,556.3	18,976,457	5.5%	36,369	47,214	401.9
1	NY	Westchester	923,459	5.6%	55,040	433	2,132.7	18,976,457	5.5%	36,369	47,214	401.9
2	CT	Hartford	857,153	6.0%	46,011	735	1,166.2	3,405,565	3.6%	46,648	4,845	702.9
2	CT	New Haven	824,008	2.5%	44,412	606	1,359.7	3,405,565	3.6%	46,648	4,845	702.9
2	MA	Essex	723,416	8.0%	44,187	501	1,443.9	6,349,097	5.5%	43,015	7,840	809.8
2	MA	Hampden	456,228	0.0%	36,746	618	738.2	6,349,097	5.5%	43,015	7,840	809.8
2	MA	Middlesex	1,465,396	4.8%	53,268	823	1,780.6	6,349,097	5.5%	43,015	7,840	809.8
2	MA	Nantucket	9,520	58.3%	48,151	48	198.3	6,349,097	5.5%	43,015	7,840	809.8
2	MA	Norfolk	650,308	5.6%	54,528	400	1,625.8	6,349,097	5.5%	43,015	7,840	809.8
2	NY	Albany	294,565	0.6%	40,490	523	563.2	18,976,457	5.5%	36,369	47,214	401.9
2	RI	Newport	85,433	-2.0%	43,684	104	821.5	1,048,319	4.5%	36,699	1,045	1,003.2
2	RI	Washington	123,546	12.3%	47,467	333	371.0	1,048,319	4.5%	36,699	1,045	1,003.2
3	DE	New Castle	500,265	13.2%	47,819	426	1,174.3	783,600	17.6%	41,315	1,954	401.0
3	MD	Baltimore	754,292	9.0%	44,715	599	1,259.3	5,296,486	10.8%	45,289	9,774	541.9
3	MD	Montgomery	873,341	14.5%	62,130	496	1,760.8	5,296,486	10.8%	45,289	9,774	541.9
3	PA	Lancaster	470,658	11.3%	43,119	949	496.0	12,281,054	3.4%	37,267	44,817	274.0
3	PA	Lehigh	312,090	7.2%	41,477	347	899.4	12,281,054	3.4%	37,267	44,817	274.0
3	PA	Philadelphia	1,517,550	-4.3%	28,897	135	11,241.1	12,281,054	3.4%	37,267	44,817	274.0
3	VA	Albemarle	79,236	16.2%	46,371	723	109.6	7,078,515	14.4%	40,209	39,594	178.8

Region	State	County	2000 County Population	County Change in Population '90 v '00	1997 County Median HH Income	County Area Sq. Miles	Population per Sq. Mile County	2000 State Population	State Change in Population '90 v '00	1997 State Median HH Income	State Area Sq. Miles	Population per Sq. Mile State
4	NY	Monroe	735,343	3.0%	\$41,954	659	1,115.8	18,976,457	5.5%	\$36,369	47,214	401.9
4	OH	Cuyahoga	1,393,978	-1.3%	36,754	458	3,043.6	11,353,140	4.7%	36,029	40,948	277.3
4	OH	Franklin	1,068,978	11.2%	39,498	540	1,979.6	11,353,140	4.7%	36,029	40,948	277.3
4	OH	Hamilton	845,303	-2.4%	38,763	407	2,076.9	11,353,140	4.7%	36,029	40,948	277.3
4	OH	Licking	145,491	13.4%	39,845	687	211.8	11,353,140	4.7%	36,029	40,948	277.3
4	OH	Lucas	455,054	-1.6%	37,064	340	1,338.4	11,353,140	4.7%	36,029	40,948	277.3
4	PA	Allegheny	1,281,666	-4.1%	38,893	730	1,755.7	12,281,054	3.4%	37,267	44,817	274.0
5	IL	Cook	5,376,741	5.3%	40,181	946	5,683.7	12,419,293	8.6%	41,179	55,584	223.4
5	IL	Dupage	904,161	15.7%	62,825	334	2,707.1	12,419,293	8.6%	41,179	55,584	223.4
5	IL	Lake	644,356	24.8%	63,354	448	1,438.3	12,419,293	8.6%	41,179	55,584	223.4
5	IL	Rock Island	149,374	0.4%	59,137	367	407.0	12,419,293	8.6%	41,179	55,584	223.4
5	IN	Marion	800,454	7.9%	37,686	396	2,021.3	6,080,485	9.7%	37,909	35,867	169.5
5	KS	Johnson	451,086	27.1%	59,870	477	945.7	2,688,418	8.5%	36,488	81,815	32.9
5	MI	Kalamazoo	238,603	6.8%	41,517	562	424.6	9,938,444	6.9%	38,883	56,804	175.0
5	MI	Kent	574,335	14.7%	44,512	856	671.0	9,938,444	6.9%	38,883	56,804	175.0
5	MI	MacComb	788,149	9.9%	49,601	480	1,642.0	9,938,444	6.9%	38,883	56,804	175.0
5	MI	Washtenaw	322,895	14.1%	64,510	710	454.8	9,938,444	6.9%	38,883	56,804	175.0
5	MI	Wayne	2,061,132	-2.4%	35,357	614	3,356.9	9,938,444	6.9%	38,883	56,804	175.0
5	MN	Hennigen	1,116,200	8.1%	48,054	557	2,003.9	4,919,479	12.4%	41,591	79,610	61.8
5	MO	St. Louis	1,016,315	2.3%	47,825	508	2,000.6	5,595,211	9.3%	34,502	68,886	81.2
5	WI	Milwaukee	940,164	-2.0%	37,229	242	3,885.0	5,363,675	9.6%	39,800	54,310	98.8
5	WI	Racine	188,831	7.9%	44,675	333	567.1	5,363,675	9.6%	39,800	54,310	98.8
5	WI	Waukesha	360,767	18.4%	61,562	556	648.9	5,363,675	9.6%	39,800	54,310	98.8
6	AZ	Maricopa	3,072,149	44.8%	40,134	9,203	333.8	5,130,632	40.0%	34,751	113,635	45.2
6	CA	Marin	247,289	7.5%	60,967	520	475.6	33,871,648	13.6%	39,595	155,959	217.2
6	CO	Boulder	291,288	29.3%	50,245	742	392.6	4,301,261	30.6%	40,853	103,718	41.5
6	CO	Jefferson	527,056	20.2%	54,175	772	682.7	4,301,261	30.6%	40,853	103,718	41.5
6	CO	San Miguel	6,594	80.5%	42,160	1,287	5.1	4,301,261	30.6%	40,853	103,718	41.5

		Population	Percent Change	Median Household Income	Area Square Miles	Population per Sq. Mile
<b>Total</b>	<b>Counties</b>	44,527,932			36,987	1,203.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>States</b>	502,932,148			2,203,685	228.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>USA</b>	281,421,906	13.1%	\$37,005	3,537,441	79.6