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Key Findings

The City Expands: Growth and Urban Decentralization

Like most urban areas in the United States, Franklin County has experienced a pattern of urban decentralization over the past fifty years. People, housing, jobs and infrastructure have moved outward from the city, producing population loss in most of the city’s core urban communities. Franklin County and the City of Columbus have experienced overall population growth since 1970 (a 40% increase for Franklin County and 46% increase for the City of Columbus); a substantial portion of Columbus’ growth was a result of annexation, which expanded the city’s geographical area within Franklin County. At the same time, many core neighborhoods lost population. In short, distant neighborhoods have captured much of the region’s growth. ¹ Over one-third of the county’s census tracts -- mostly in the suburbs -- doubled the number of housing units from 1970 to 2005/2009. However, most tracts within the I-270 loop experienced stagnant housing unit growth (or loss), and saw increases in vacant properties during this time period. From 2000 to 2005/2009, census tracts in which at least 15% of the housing units were vacant quadrupled, from 9% to 36%.

Reversal of Fortune: The Recession and the Housing Crisis Hit Home

Unemployment rates soared across the county as adjusted median household income declined. Franklin County households overall experienced a loss of income from 1970 to 2005/2009: 83% of all tracts lost income. The decline was gradual (in each decade census tracts across the county experienced decreases in income), yet the 2000s saw the worst decline in median household income.

Housing cost, as a proportion of income paid for housing, particularly for renters, has increased throughout the County since 1970. In 1970 and 1980, most of the census tracts that had high rates of residents paying more than 35% of their income on rent were in the central city. But from 1990 to 2009, housing cost burden spread to more suburban areas.

Between 2000 and 2005/2009 the poverty rate across Franklin County increased. Eighty-four percent of census tracts experienced an increase in poverty and 29% of census tracts experienced over a 100% increase in poverty. In 2009, at least a quarter of the population in 32% of census tracts were in poverty -- and one tract had a 100% poverty rate.

In the 1990s, public assistance was drastically reduced across Franklin County.

In many neighborhoods in Franklin County, this reversal of fortune has literally stopped revitalization in its tracks. As one respondent described:

“Vacancies…have stymied past progress and we’ve had to reorient our focus on stabilizing neighborhood housing markets rather than...on...economic development, infrastructure, and preserving affordable housing.”

Changing Demographics

In 1970 and 1980, the Latino population was less than 2% of the overall population in nearly all census tracts (i.e. in 1970 only three tracts had more than 3% Latino populations). However, by 2000, the Latino population had increased significantly in many census tracts. By 2005/2009, 9% of all census tracts had Latino populations greater than 10%. The Latino population is a small but growing presence in Franklin County.
In 1970, few areas had significant numbers of foreign-born residents – only 2 census tracts had a foreign-born population that made up over 10% of the population – but by 2005/2009 there were significant populations of foreign-born residents throughout Franklin County, especially in northern Franklin County. This trend began in 1990 and by 2005/2009, 27% of census tracts had a foreign born population that made up 10% of the population or greater. Overall, **40% of the county’s census tracts experienced a 300% increase or greater in foreign-born populations.** Of the foreign-born populations, a significant number of residents are **non-citizens**.

There was a substantial change in the population that does not speak English in Franklin County between 1980 and 2005/2009. In 1980, in 98% of census tracts, less than 2% of the population did not speak English. In 2005/2009, **one-fourth of census tracts had more than 10% of their populations who did not speak English.** The increase in the non-English speaking population was most noticeable in the 2000s, began in northwest portion of the county, and expanded to the rest of the county.

**Education Improves, but Segregation and Disparities Remain**

Franklin County and its neighborhoods have seen **tremendous growth in educational attainment** in the past fifty years (**Figures 30 and 31**). Overall, the proportion of the population that obtained a High School Degree or equivalent increased across Franklin County from 1970 to 2009. However, the rate varied: In 2009, 45.5% of census tracts had a 90% or greater high school degree achievement rate; 26.9% of tracts had more than 95% rate and 3 even had a 100% rate. On the other hand, **four census tracts had less than a 50% high school graduation rate, illustrating clear achievement gaps.**

Similarly, the percentage of **residents with a college degree increased substantially from 1970 to 2009**, yet disparities remain: by 2000, most northern Franklin County census tracts had at least a 50% college degree rate, while many southern Franklin County tracts had a less than 30% college degree rate.

Economic and racial **residential segregation persisted throughout the decades** in Franklin County, particularly for African Americans. Although less drastic in 2010 than in 1970, there remains a clear concentration of African Americans in the Near East side neighborhoods. Most census tracts in Franklin County were predominantly White in 1970. Between 1970 and 1980 some census tracts on the Near East side experienced a 65% loss or greater of the White population. Between 1980 and 2000, the White population changed very little throughout the county. However, **central city neighborhoods experienced an increase in the White population between 2000 and 2005/2009 --** some experienced more than a 44% increase.

Residential segregation patterns correlate with segregation into neighborhoods of varying socio-economic conditions. Vacancy rates, educational attainment and poverty rates are higher in African American and Latino neighborhoods, on average, than White and Asian neighborhoods in the Columbus region. Our “opportunity analysis” of neighborhood conditions reveals alarming disparities. **While 1 in 2 Whites and 7 in 10 Asians live in areas of high opportunity, only 3 in 10 Hispanics or Latinos and less than 1 in 5 African Americans live in areas of high opportunity.** Furthermore, an analysis of the county’s foreign-born population shows that while 60% or more of immigrants from North America, Asia, and Europe live in high opportunity neighborhoods, less than 25% of immigrants from Central America, Africa, and the Caribbean, a group that represents 46% of all immigrants, live in high opportunity neighborhoods.

Segregation also has occurred by class, with Columbus following a national trend of more residents concentrated in very poor or very affluent neighborhoods, and a decline in the number of residents living in middle income neighborhoods. Columbus reflected a national trend of neighborhoods polarized
into very high and very low income neighborhoods, with middle income neighborhoods declining. In 2005/2009, 5% of census tracts, predominantly in the suburbs, had median household incomes over $100,000, while 12% of census tracts, predominantly in the inner city, had median household incomes less than $25,000. In addition, Northern Franklin County, especially the northwest, had consistently lower rates of unemployment, while southern Franklin County had higher rates of unemployment. The central city generally had the highest rates of unemployment. From 1970 to 2009, urban tracts experienced much higher poverty rates than suburban ones.

Survey of community development organizations: shared challenges, shared hope

Our voluntary on-line survey illuminates the characteristics, activities and challenges of some the area’s community development organizations. In general, the survey respondents represented small, professionally staffed, well-established organizations (i.e. over 15 years of experience), focused most often on housing, employment, community organizing, and services. A very high level of partnership was reported: fully two-thirds of survey respondents indicated that they have 5 or more partnerships. Only one respondent had no active partnerships. The respondents partnered for resource sharing, service delivery, and strategy building.

Respondents cited challenges posed by the larger economy, such as increased poverty, unemployment, and foreclosure/vacancy as the most significant regional challenges to neighborhoods in Central Ohio. When it came to neighborhood trends most impacting service areas, respondents most often cited foreclosure, then poverty and unemployment. Many respondents saw similar trends occurring nationally, with one respondent stating,

“[This] problem is national and international in scope and remedy. Until wage and employment structure (and related factors) are addressed, [the] above interventions have limited impact.”

Not surprisingly, the worsening problems brought on by unemployment, poverty, and housing have spurred demand for community programs. Unfortunately, this increased need comes at a time of decreased funding. Respondents cited funding as the top challenge facing their organization. Respondents reported corresponding shifts in their programming, with many respondents indicating they had reached out to form even more partnerships to address these new challenges; in particular, they were partnering to strategize. In the face of anticipated decreases in funding from traditional sources, respondents were concerned. One respondent said:

“Funding decreased this year but additional reserves were used to stabilize our programs. Next year could see a much greater decline in services if funding sources decline further.”

Respondents claimed that they have learned to become more adaptable in the face of these challenges, learned how to do more with less, and learned how to reach out to more funders for help with service delivery. They have sought out new funding opportunities, attempted to market their services more effectively, and increased volunteer opportunities. However, many stressed the need for more strategic planning aimed at finding effective solutions to shared problems. One respondent indicated that:

“Collaborations/partnerships are critical. However, there is little to no assistance in the form of funding to help organizations design successful partnerships. They take time and human resources that can be dedicated to those partnerships.”

When asked about future service area needs, respondents indicated housing market change most often, followed by an increase in poverty. When asked about critical regional and neighborhood trends,
respondents were most concerned about an increase in poverty. Given a choice of fourteen potential programs considered “most vital to address area needs,” job placement was the top program cited, followed by vacant structure demolition and maintenance, and affordable housing.

Survey respondents cited “community engagement” more than any other asset listed as the biggest asset of their survey area. That community engagement was so highly valued indicates a shared hope for the future, even in the face of such daunting challenges. Research supports this hope: communities with greater civic participation and social capital have been shown to be healthier and more economically vibrant. Communities are able to utilize civic engagement to be better organized, identify new solutions, advocate for policy changes and other benefits.
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1. Preface

The Kirwan Institute was commissioned by The Community Development Collaborative of Greater Columbus to assess the trends which have shaped community conditions and impacted community development in Franklin County’s diverse neighborhoods. This study is intended to provide data analysis and mapping to help inform Columbus’ and Franklin County’s community development capacity and strategy in the context of regional change. This study will inform a facilitated discussion at the Community Development Collaborative Neighborhood Summit on January 24, 2012, regarding how area nonprofit, for profit, government and philanthropic sectors can envision a strategic, proactive response to the demographic and economic changes underway in Franklin County.

We thank The Community Development Collaborative of Greater Columbus (CDCGC) for this exciting opportunity to explore our region together. We are grateful for the generous support of The Columbus Foundation, which made this study possible, and we thank the sponsors of the Community Development Neighborhood Summit, which promises to bring together a vibrant community of practitioners, academics and residents to generate productive ideas for the future of Franklin County. We have been helpfully guided in our research by the members of the Community Development Neighborhood Summit Planning Committee. Last but not least, we thank the survey respondents who took time out of their busy work revitalizing neighborhoods and strengthening communities to provide their thoughts on the past, present and future of community development in Columbus and Franklin County. We hope this report provides a useful and complementary perspective on community development, alongside the decades of research, investment, and community building that has made Columbus the vibrant city it is today.
2. Introduction

Neighborhoods and communities represent the foundation of our city, county and region. The following study seeks to highlight the trends that impact community development in Franklin County. We seek to better understand our past and prepare for our future by asking, how have Franklin County’s various communities changed over the past fifty years? What successes should be celebrated, and provide inspiration for the future? Which persistent and emerging challenges require continued action and investment? What are the opportunities presented for Franklin County to achieve a prosperous, equitable and sustainable future? We employ a variety of methods, exploring historical and contemporary data for our neighborhoods, surveying community development organizations and reviewing the robust literature related to our neighborhoods. Although not exhaustive, this study identifies key issues and trends shaping community development concerns in Franklin County today.

The Importance of Community Development: Why Neighborhoods Matter to Children and Families

Neighborhood conditions and access to opportunity can play a significant role in life outcomes. Five decades of social science research has documented the connection between racially and economically isolated neighborhoods and depressed outcomes for individuals. Housing location is one of the primary mechanisms for accessing opportunity in our society. In the U.S., to live in a neighborhood of high concentrated poverty (40% of the residents below the poverty level) means that you and your family’s life chances can be greatly constrained, even if you yourself are not poor. Although the majority of poor families in the U.S. are white, most people living in concentrated poverty are people of color. A family living in this environment faces much to overcome.

Concentrated poverty can depress student academic achievement regardless of individual promise. New studies are showing that living in a severely disadvantaged neighborhood is the equivalent to missing an entire year of school. Meant to be the great engine of equal opportunity, our public education system is instead growing more racially and economically segregated, transferring and expanding inequality across generations. Unfortunately, neighborhood polarization only seems to be growing nationwide: researchers recently found that the number of middle class neighborhoods declined by 30% since 1970, while low income and high income neighborhoods grew by 32% and 53%, respectively.

Neighborhood racial and economic segregation can also have negative health consequences: a review of research on neighborhood effects on health concluded that residents of poor, segregated neighborhoods experience poorer health outcomes because of increased exposure to the toxic substances that are disproportionately sited in their communities, and because of barriers to sustaining healthy behaviors, such as limited access to good grocery stores. Recently, researchers in Seattle found that property values, more than income or education levels, were the best predictor of obesity rates, most likely due to the neighborhood presence or absence of grocery stores with affordable, healthy food within safe walking distance.

Nationwide, children in high poverty, urban communities have levels of lead in their blood that are nine times above the average, a condition linked to attention deficit disorder and irreversible loss of cognitive functioning. Children growing up in very poor families with low social status can also experience unhealthy levels of stress hormones, which impair neural development. Health problems can deplete a student’s attention span or cause the student to miss school and fall behind. The impact of health status on school achievement is so important that an estimated 25% of the achievement gap in education is attributable to differences in child and maternal health. In short, neighborhood context and access to opportunity—from preventative health care to high-performing schools -- can deeply
affect children’s opportunities to learn and grow.

In 2008, the Federal Reserve in connection with the Brookings Institute released a compendium of 16 case studies of concentrated poverty across the United States, *The Enduring Challenge of Concentrated Poverty in America*. The Federal Reserve study underscored that “high-poverty communities experience one or more forms of isolation…residents are often physically, socially, racially, and linguistically separated from the larger economy and community.” These multiple isolations can compound and reinforce one another. Opportunity is thus more than a single measure of well-being such as income or wealth; it is a robust measure of participation in community life over time. In community development terms, this means that single-issue policies do not adequately address the multiple oppressions of poverty and isolation. The Federal Reserve study also found that “many of these [concentrated poverty] communities have experienced significant demographic changes, including a rise in immigrant households, a rise in single-parent families, or both.” As families change, their needs, their strengths, and their opportunity “ladders” change as well.

The challenges facing concentrated poverty neighborhoods are long-term, multi-faceted, and connected. For some communities these challenges are only growing, exacerbated by the economic downturn and the fallout from the housing and economic crisis. Community development organizations have long been on the front lines of the challenges connected with concentrated poverty and isolation from opportunity. The need for them has never been greater, and their importance in holding together the fabric of a community is only growing.

When these communities struggle, the entire region can be impacted. Residents of struggling neighborhoods face many obstacles to success and may not be able to meet their full potential, representing not only an individual tragedy but a societal tragedy. The high school dropout who falls prey to the challenges in the community could have been the community’s next business leader, educator, entrepreneur, community organizer, or political leader. This individual story is tragic, but an entire community of youth lost this way threatens economically vibrant communities and a sustainable future. Inequities represent wasted human capacity and human potential. As the economist Richard Florida states in *The Flight of the Creative Class*:

“Rising inequality is a deadweight drag on our economic competitiveness...The basic formula is simple: Those companies, regions and countries that reduce waste and effectively harness their productive assets have a huge advantage in the Darwinian competition that powers creative capitalism.”

As we move further into our changing 21st century economy, the push for collaboration, innovation, and the education of all of our children grows in importance. The economic future will not look like the economy of the 20th century, a model of mass production or employment built around unskilled labor. The future will be based on innovation and a work force that is skilled with technical prowess and more advanced decision-making capability. Innovation is the road to regional and societal wealth in the 21st century. But an innovation-based economy will struggle to succeed without an educated and skilled labor force, or without civically engaged communities.

As we grow more diverse as a city, a county, a state, and a nation, inequity and isolation for many vulnerable communities is unfortunately increasing. Yet our regions are increasingly important economic engines in a globalized world. Regional development that does not account for this diversity, and which does not face and address growing inequities, will lag behind. In fact, a 2006 Federal Reserve
study found that a skilled workforce, high levels of racial inclusion, and improved income equality correlated strongly and positively with economic growth at the regional level.16

*Columbus in Context: A Review of Recent Studies*

Many recent rankings portray the Columbus metropolitan region in a positive light. In 2011, *Forbes* ranked Columbus as the third best city in the country for technology jobs, second best city for working mothers, and in the top twenty for the best cities for women in business.17 *New Geography* recognized Columbus as the ninth most successful city in attracting recent college graduates and Columbus experienced a significant jump in the Milken ranking of best performing economies in the last year, from 108 to 53.18 Other recent rankings acknowledge Columbus as young children-friendly and commuter-friendly.19

A helpful comparative analysis for Franklin County is Community Research Partner’s *Benchmarking Central Ohio 2011*, which compares the region to fifteen others, including Cleveland, Indianapolis, Chicago, Austin, Portland, and Charlotte. Community Research Partners analyzed a wide array of indicators in the categories of population vitality, economic strength, personal prosperity, community well-being, and lifelong learning. The result depicts a region without a clear trend, but rather is excelling in some areas, falling behind in others, and settling at average for some.

Comparatively, Central Ohio’s population is young and less racially diverse, although the region ranked third in new foreign-born residents, perhaps signaling a trend toward greater diversity. Central Ohio fared well in economic indicators, especially in job growth, employment, and number of Fortune 1,000 companies, but fared poorly in small business development. In spite of the largely positive economic rankings, Central Ohio ranked low in personal prosperity, having the highest percentage of population below the poverty line. However, the wealth gap is comparably low, signifying a relatively equitable community economically.

Although Central Ohio ranked average in community well-being indicators, the region fared poorly in environmentally-conscious rankings, with the second-highest percentage of commuters driving alone and the highest carbon emissions from residential energy use. On the other hand, lifelong learning indicators showed Columbus achieving relatively high results, including the second-lowest rate of high-school drop-outs. However, Central Ohio had the thirteenth worst rate of educational attainment, a surprising finding, given it is home to the third largest university in the country, Ohio State University. In sum, Central Ohio has a fairly healthy and growing economy that is not always translating into personal prosperity for all of its residents. Trends such as recent economic gains and a relatively large new immigrant populations suggest that Franklin County may be moving towards a more sustainable and diverse future.

Community Research Partners’ recent report *Helping Central Ohioans Thrive* depicts the current human services needs of the region, analyzing the need for self-sufficiency, health, education, basic needs, independent living, and community services. Our report parallels the *Helping Central Ohioans Thrive* findings that Central Ohio is becoming more diverse and disproportionately more impoverished.

The recession has not only impacted human service demands in Franklin County, but it has also resulted in the need for strong housing strategies. In 2008, a wide range of stakeholders came together to develop the *Columbus and Franklin County Foreclosure Working Group Prevention and Recovery Advisory Plan*, which outlined strategies to deal with already-vacant properties to complement foreclosure prevention efforts, including the acquisition, maintenance, and rehabilitation of vacant properties. The working group targeted specific Franklin County and Columbus neighborhoods, employing different strategies in each. Perhaps most importantly, the stakeholders illustrate a belief in
the long-term viability of the region’s neighborhoods. A related 2009 report, *A Housing Market Assessment of Franklin County, Ohio Neighborhood Stabilization Program 2*, affirms a commitment from Franklin County to working with local communities through long-term partnerships with community groups.

The *Columbus and Franklin County Consolidated Plan 2010-2014*, developed by Franklin County, the City of Columbus, and Community Research Partners in 2010, targets certain areas for revitalization and emphasizes supportive services, noting a duplication of services, a spatial mismatch of services, and trends towards more dispersed, impoverished, and diverse populations which require human services. One of the most important results of the Consolidated Plan is that the City of Columbus and Franklin County joined forces to develop united goals, hopefully making the region more strategic in tackling its issues.

*Understanding Our Neighborhoods: the Kirwan Institute Approach*

 Recognizing that much important work has been done documenting the community development opportunities and challenges within Columbus and Franklin County, this study provides a unique view. We focus on changing demographics, especially with respect to immigrant communities, low-income communities, and communities of color; and on major regional trends shaping neighborhood development. Data from the Census, including economic data, neighborhood stability data, and education data were collected, mapped, and analyzed for spatial and temporal trends. In addition to a straightforward spatial mapping of these key trends, we provide an *Opportunity Map* for Franklin County’s neighborhoods, and overlays showing how particular populations are currently located with respect to opportunity. A detailed methodology for opportunity mapping is provided in the Appendix. *In addition to this report, a robust collection of interactive maps and data, a “data book,” and a focused literature review on the role of government incentives in community development are accessible at kirwaninstitute.org.*

Franklin County contains a rich mosaic of neighborhoods. Sometimes neighborhood boundaries are well documented and clear; other times, they are ambiguous and contested. Our map analysis attempted to identify and cluster census tracts in a way which corresponded closest to known neighborhood boundaries. These neighborhood identifications can be seen in *Figures 1 and 2.*
Figure 1: Regional Reference Map
Figure 2: Neighborhood Reference Map
3. Regional Trends

Neighborhoods and communities are never static, but are dynamic environments which experience periods of growth, decline and rebirth. Neighborhoods do not exist in isolation from other neighborhoods, from the region or from broader social and economic trends. The following section of this report tracks some of the major trends which have shaped our neighborhoods over the past fifty years. We utilize historic census data to analyze regional trends in population, housing, income and education.

Methodology

This historical analysis utilizes data from the Neighborhood Change Database (NCDB), which normalizes historical U.S. Census data to the most current Census tract delineation for clearer comparison. The most recent NCDB data is normalized to 2000 Census tracts. The 2005/2009 American Community Survey, which provides estimate data for 2005 to 2009, shares similar census tract boundaries with the 2000 Census data. However, the 2010 Census data has different tract boundaries. Therefore, 2005/2009 data offers more consistent long-term trend data for descriptive analysis than 2010 data. Thus, references to changes in the number of census tracts utilizes the 1970 to 2005/2009 American Community Survey data. When the following section includes information regarding 1970 census tracts, it is based on the data from the normalized census tracts rather than historical 1970 census tracts. All economic numbers have been adjusted to 2011 dollars. However, for spatial representation in maps, we recognize that the 2010 U.S. Census provides more current and precise information, and therefore it is used elsewhere in the report and visualized in this section’s maps when available.

Growth and Urban Decentralization

Like most urban areas in the United States, Franklin County has experienced a pattern of urban decentralization over the past fifty years. People, housing, jobs and infrastructure have moved outward from the city, producing population loss in most of the city’s core urban communities. As illustrated in the maps documenting patterns of population change and housing unit change, population and housing growth has continually pushed into Franklin County’s periphery and more recently into surrounding counties in the region. Franklin County and the City of Columbus have experienced overall population growth since 1970 (a 40% increase for Franklin County and 46% increase for the City of Columbus); a substantial portion of Columbus’ growth was a result of annexation, which expanded the city’s geographical area within Franklin County.

At the same time, many core neighborhoods lost population. In short, distant neighborhoods have captured much of the region’s growth. From 1970 to 2009, many areas outside of the I-270 loop went from a rural-sized population to a suburban-sized population. Over one-third of the county’s census tracts -- mostly in the suburbs -- doubled the number of housing units from 1970 to 2005/2009. However, most tracts within the I-270 loop experienced stagnant housing unit growth (or loss) and saw increases in vacant properties during this time period. From 2000 to 2005/2009, the number of census tracts in which 15% of their housing units were vacant quadrupled, from 9% to 36%. These geographic patterns of population change and housing development can be seen in Figures 3, 4 and 5.

Even census tracts in neighborhoods that have experienced significant reinvestment still have smaller populations than in 1970 (Figure 6). The reason for this is complex. Household size has shrunk both nationally and locally, and this is reflected in changing demographics in all urban neighborhoods. As seen in Figure 7, household size decreased from 1970 to 2005/2009 across Franklin County. In 1970, 69% of census tracts had average household sizes greater than three, but in 2005/2009 this had been lowered to 3%. Additionally, neighborhoods that have experienced reinvestment have also experienced
a shift in tenure for households: many historic homes which had been converted to multifamily units in the past were then converted back to single-family use and owner occupancy. This decreases the number of housing units in the neighborhood even during a time of reinvestment and revitalization (Figure 8).

**Challenging Times**

From 1970 to 2009, suburban Franklin County tracts generally had higher household median incomes than urban tracts. In 2005/2009, 5% of census tracts, predominantly in the suburbs, had median household incomes over $100,000, while 12% of census tracts, predominantly in the inner city, had median household incomes less than $25,000. That said, Franklin County households overall experienced a loss of income from 1970 to 2005/2009: 83% of all tracts lost income. The decline was gradual (in each decade census tracts across the county experienced decreases in income), yet the 2000s saw the worst decline in median household income (Figures 9 and 10). (All figures adjusted for inflation and represent 2011 dollars).

Unemployment increased from 1970 to 1980, decreased the following two decades, and then skyrocketed from 2000 to 2005/2009. Many tracts experienced a 50% or greater increase in unemployment. Northern Franklin County, especially the northwest, had consistently lower rates of unemployment, while southern Franklin County had higher rates of unemployment. The central city generally had the highest rates of unemployment (Figures 11 and 12).

From 1970 to 2009, urban tracts experienced much higher poverty rates. Between 2000 and 2005/2009 the poverty rate across Franklin County overall increased. Eighty-four percent of census tracts experienced an increase in poverty, and 29% of census tracts experienced over a 100% increase in poverty. In 2009, at least a quarter of the population in 32% of census tracts were in poverty -- and one tract had a 100% poverty rate (Figures 13 and 14). In the 1990s, public assistance was drastically reduced across Franklin County. The number of residents receiving public assistance remained comparably low in 2009 even though poverty and unemployment increased (Figures 15). This shift is more a reflection of federal policy changes which occurred in the 1990’s (primarily welfare reform) than a shift in need in Franklin County.

Housing cost, as a proportion of income paid for housing, particularly for renters, has increased throughout the County since 1970 (Figure 16). In 1970 and 1980, most of the census tracts that had high rates of residents paying more than 35% of their income on rent were in the central city. But from 1990 to 2009, this trend spread out to more suburban areas, resulting in a general increase in residents spending 35% or more of their income on rent. In 1980 and 1990, the most expensive rents were in the suburbs, especially in northwest Franklin County. However, median rents decreased in 2000 and 2005/2009 overall, even in the suburbs. In 2009, central city census tracts experienced an increase in median rents, potentially due to new housing demand in revitalizing core neighborhoods. Overall from 1970 to 2009, median rents increased in a little over half of census tracts, and many of the largest changes were in the suburbs.

**Changing Demographics**

Franklin County has become much more diverse since 1970 with regards to race, language, and foreign-born populations. In 1970, 69% of census tracts were at least 97% White; in 2009, only 2% of census tracts were. In 2005/2009, a greater portion of the population spoke Spanish, more immigrants were
from Africa and Asia, and more residents did not speak English well or at all – and these numbers were rising throughout Franklin County.

Franklin County’s Asian population is concentrated in suburban census tracts. In northwest Franklin County, Asians make up more than 15% of the population. Largely, the Asian population increased as the overall population increased (Figure 17). In 1970, the African American population was heavily concentrated in the near east side. Today, the western half of the county still has few tracts where African Americans make up at least 10% of the population. The African American population experienced moderate growth from 1970 to 2005/2009. Although some census tracts experienced very large percent increases in single decades, these were areas with small African American populations to begin with. By the 2000s, the African American population within the I-270 loop was either the same or decreasing in many census tracts (Figure 18).

In 1970 and 1980, the Latino population was less than 2% of the overall population in nearly all census tracts (i.e. in 1970 only three tracts had more than 3% Latino populations). However, by 2000, the Latino population had increased significantly in many census tracts. By 2005/2009, 9% of all census tracts had Latino populations greater than 10%. The Latino population is a small but growing presence in Franklin County (Figure 19).

Most census tracts in Franklin County were predominantly White in 1970. Between 1970 and 1980 some census tracts on the Near East side experienced a 65% loss or greater of the White population. Between 1980 and 2000, the White population changed very little throughout the county. However, central city neighborhoods experienced an increase in the White population between 2000 and 2005/2009 -- some of these areas experienced more than a 44% increase. However, residential segregation has persisted through the years between the White and non-White populations, especially between the White and the African American population (Figure 20).

In 1970, few areas had significant numbers of foreign-born residents – only 2 census tracts had a foreign-born population that made up over a 10% of the population – but by 2005/2009 there were significant populations of foreign-born residents throughout Franklin County, especially in northern Franklin County. This trend began in 1990 and by 2005/2009, 27% of census tracts had a foreign born population that made up 10% of the population or greater. Overall, 40% of the county’s census tracts experienced a 300% increase or greater in foreign-born population (Figures 21 and 22).

There was a substantial change in the population that does not speak English in Franklin County between 1980 and 2005/2009 (Figure 23). In 1980, in 98% of census tracts, less than 2% of the population did not speak English. In 2005/2009, one-fourth of census tracts had more than 10% of their population who did not speak English. The increase in the non-English speaking population was most noticeable in the 2000s, began in northwest portion of the county, and expanded to the rest of the county. In 1980, few residents in Franklin County identified as Spanish speakers. Between 1990 and 2000, there was a significant increase in the Spanish-speaking population. In 2005/2009, one-fifth of census tracts had populations with at least 10% of the population which spoke Spanish (Figure 24). From 1970 to 2005/2009, immigrants from Africa, Asia, and Latin America increased substantially throughout Franklin County (Figures 25 through 28).

**Persistent Segregation**

Some forms of residential segregation – both economic and racial – persisted throughout the decades in Franklin County, particularly for African Americans. Although less drastic in 2010 than in 1970, there remains a clear concentration of African Americans in the Near East side neighborhoods. This area is also
struggling economically; housing vacancies and public assistance rates are highest in this area. Dissimilarity index rates (an index measuring residential segregation between groups) for the Columbus region remains relatively high (59.9), ranking the Columbus MSA as having the 22nd highest rate of African American/White residential segregation out of the largest 50 metropolitan areas. However, Columbus has experienced a gradual decline in dissimilarity rates in recent decades, dropping from 72.9 to today’s 59.9 index score, between 1980 and 2010. As seen in Figure 29, residential dissimilarity index scores for the region’s various racial and ethnic groups have declined for Asian and African American populations and increased for Latino populations. Segregation has also occurred by class, with Columbus following a national trend of more residents concentrated in very poor or very affluent neighborhoods, and a decline in the number of residents living in middle income neighborhoods (Figure 30). Residential segregation patterns correlate with segregation into neighborhoods of varying socio-economic conditions. As seen in Figure 31, vacancy rates, educational attainment and poverty rates are higher in African American and Latino neighborhoods, on average, than White and Asian neighborhoods in the Columbus region.
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Figure 12: Percent Change in Unemployment Rate 1990 to 2000 and 2000 to 2005/2009
Figure 13: Poverty Rate 1970 to 2005/2009
Figure 14: Percent Change in Poverty Rate 1990 to 2000 and 2000 to 2005/2009
Figure 15: Population Receiving Federal Public Assistance 1980 to 2005/2009; Source: U.S. Census Bureau
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Figure 24: Spanish Speaking Population Change 1980 to 2005/2009
Figure 25: Distribution of Non Native Born Population from Africa 1970 and 2005/2009
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Figure 26: Distribution of Non Native Born Population from Asia 1970 and 2005/2009
Figure 27: Distribution of Non Native Born Population from Europe 1970 and 2005/2009
Figure 28: Distribution of Non Native Born Population from Latin America 1990 and 2005/2009
Figure 29: Dissimilarity Index for African American, Asian and Latino population (in relation to White population) 1980 to 2010; Source: Brown University, Dissimilarity Index Database
Figure 30: Percentage of Families Living in Poor Neighborhoods (Neighborhoods with Median Incomes Lower than two-thirds of the Regional Average) and Affluent Neighborhoods (Neighborhoods with Incomes more than 1.5 times the Regional Average) by Decade; Analysis Calculated by Brown University, Income Segregation Database.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>College Attainment Rate</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 31: Differences in Vacancy, College Attainment and Poverty Rates for Neighborhoods of the Average White, African American, Latino and Asian person in the Columbus region; Analysis Calculated by Brown University, Separate but Unequal Neighborhood Segregation Database.*
4. Celebrating our Success

A Legacy of Community Development

Franklin County’s community development infrastructure is a critical asset to the region. This civic infrastructure dates back to the late 19th century, with the introduction of settlement houses. Settlement houses were developed in England in the mid-19th century as a response to urban poverty and unemployment. They quickly caught on in America, starting in cities such as Chicago and New York in the 1880’s. The Godman Guild was established in 1898 on the near north side, in what was then Flytown. More settlement houses followed as the city grew. Settlement Houses acted as a shelter and refuge for low-income residents, new immigrants, minorities, and poor mothers and children. For over a century, they have provided families with emergency assistance, job training, childcare, and other social services aimed at helping people realize economic and social opportunity (Figure 32).

Today, settlement houses are no longer residences, but act as ‘community centers,’ providing social services to the surrounding community. Central Ohio’s settlement houses currently serve nearly 62,000 residents. Their coverage area contains 35% of the population; they serve 61% of Columbus residents categorized as living below the poverty line. They administered $228,000 in grant money in 2008-2009.

Current initiatives include the Small Group Transportation Program, a program that helps those living in independent subsidized housing by providing reliable transportation on a weekly basis. All told, the partnership has provided nearly 43,000 hours of free transportation to Central Ohio residents. Another program called Transit Arts helps build capacity among young people (12-19) by using arts-related projects to build skills and character. In all, 21 teens were placed in jobs and internships as a result of the Transit Arts programs and related programs run by the settlement houses.

In the 1950’s and 60’s, the challenges brought by urban poverty and lack of opportunity led President Johnson to declare a ‘War on Poverty.’ As part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Community Action Agencies were created as a cornerstone of the program to turn around impoverished communities. Currently, Ohio has 50 CAAs, the most of any state. Central Ohio has two agencies, Impact Community Agency and The Breathing Association.

While CAAs have historically been known for their role in administering the Heating and Energy Assistance Program ( HEAP), they have also branched out into employment counseling, computer literacy, health services, WIC, and re-entry counseling. Currently, Ohio CAAs administer over $523 million dollars in resources. Among the highlights of current CAA programs are Impact’s Computer Literacy program, which provides free computer training, and a Lung Health Mobile Clinic run by a joint venture between The Breathing Association and Impact.

As seen in Figure 33, the Columbus region includes a number of Community Development Corporations and other community development entities. Many of Central Ohio’s current Community Development Corporations began in the early 90’s (Figure 34), largely as a response to federal funding cuts. In 1992, the Columbus Development Collaborative was founded as a way to organize the various activities of Central Ohio CDCs.

Today’s Community Development: Not Just Bricks and Mortar

Central Ohio community organizations have been able to provide diverse capacity building services to residents. Ranging from housing to economic development to environmental sustainability, these services combine to create a powerful network of services. Many of the services provided by local
organizations are centered on providing affordable housing. Programs such as Homes on the Hill’s **Scattered Site Lease Purchase Project** are aimed at building new, affordable and sustainable homes. The Franklin Development Association has started a project to create 60 affordable homes for local seniors. Dayspring Christian CDC has recently embarked on the creation of **Horizon Community**, a reclaimed area of 20 existing homes that will be retro-fitted and made available to people who are below 50 - 80% of the region’s median income. MiraCit Development Corporation recently completed construction on 74 senior apartment units.

Other initiatives are aimed at heightening financial literacy among homeowners and potential home buyers. The Greater Linden CDC offered a series of homebuyer education classes that served 94 Linden residents. **HomeToday** is an educational program offered by the Samaritan Project Development Corp, to help homeowners better understand how homeownership and credit work, and how to use that knowledge to become better homeowners. Many organizations such as Impact CA offer programs aimed at raising residents’ financial literacy, particularly in low income areas. Increase CDC offers a wide range of financial literacy programs ranging from a 5-week personal finance class to seminars on entrepreneurship and bank lending and also hosts the annual Entrepreneurs’ Conference and Expo.

Increase CDC also offers a program for loan funding, as do many community organizations in Central Ohio. The current state of the credit markets nationally and regionally has resulted in more and more people turning to community organizations in order to raise the capital need to improve their lives. The Ohio Statewide Development Corporation specializes in providing loans aimed at developing the financial and commercial capacity of local residents. These assistance programs help build community resources while creating a path to economic vitality for area residents.

Local community organizations also provide educational services for children and families. One program administered by Impact called the **Financial Literacy Experience (FLEX)**, teaches children basic financial skills. St. Stephen’s Settlement House offers afterschool programs aimed at educating students on the southwest side of Columbus who are below minimum reading and math proficiencies. In 2010, 74% of students showed improvement in reading skills while 78% showed improvement in math skills. Many settlement houses offer early child education and daycare services that not only allow for parents to pursue employment and education, but provide a wealth of educational experiences for the children. The Central Community House offers childcare programs aimed at language arts, group learning, and the development of reading skills. At Camp Mary Orton, run by the Godman Guild, children participated in the **Sci-Hi Bionic Design** event, where they were challenged to build a non-motorized machine with a limited budget. These programs not only educate children, but help build critical thinking and cooperative skills that are vital to future social and work relationships.

The ability to navigate in financial, social, and institutional environments is a cornerstone in continued personal success and community development. Many community organizations offer services ranging from family and substance abuse counseling, to workplace training and assistance with state and federal programs. The Gladden Community House offers the **G.I.F.T. Program**, where social workers help guide individuals and families through sessions that are designed to help develop coping strategies, critical thinking, and character development, as well as to build healthy relationships with others. The Southside Settlement House offers a program called **Project I.D.** that assists residents in obtaining the identification needed to apply for employment and receive benefits and housing.

Some families find themselves in need of basic services such as food, clothing, and shelter. The ongoing recession has only increased the need for these services as more and more families find themselves in economic peril. Fortunately, almost all Central Ohio community organizations offer food pantries, free
clothing outlets, and family shelters to assist families with basic needs while they try to recover from desperate circumstances. St. Stephen’s provides neighborhood services aimed at providing emergency food and help with obtaining heat and electricity. In 2010 alone, the program served 4,365 families and individuals with emergency food. The Clintonville-Beechwold Community Resource Center has seen the number of people they serve more than double (from 1076 to 2721 people) from 2007-2009. They distributed over 160,000 meals between 2008-2009 and served 6531 free meals to children in the Summer Lunch Program. Impact CA and The Breathing Association both offer heating and electricity services through the HEAP program, and many community organizations partner with local religious organization to organize food and toy drives for children.

Local community organizations are increasingly providing assistance with healthcare to low-income residents, providing help with obtaining prescriptions or paying health-related bills to help stave off bankruptcy. Neighborhood House offers prenatal health assistance and educational classes through their Neighborhood Nest program, providing invaluable health services to infants and mothers with few healthcare options. Additionally, some organizations provide preventative services. The Breathing Association, in partnership with Impact, runs a Mobile Medical Unit that provides medical testing in the areas of lung health and cancer prevention. The Breathing Association also offers an Asthma Outreach Coordinator who provides in-home asthma management assistance to residents. St. Stephen’s offers a Bike Loan program that helps local residents increase their level of physical activity. Programs such as Senior Options Care at Neighborhood House provide seniors with group sessions to help deal with issues such as healthcare, socialization, and employment. St. Stephen’s offers The Senior Services Program, to help seniors maintain self-sufficiency.

Local organizations are also involved in building community capacity by engaging in community building activities. Some of these involve awareness-raising about issues such as crime or blight, while others are aimed at organizing to change conditions in the neighborhood or build better relationships with neighbors. MiraClt produces an annual Autumnfest, a community celebration at Mock Park that helps foster community cohesiveness. Neighborhood House conducts a program to bring neighborhood residents together to work on community issues by hosting town hall meetings, partnering with civic associations, and going door to door to speak directly to residents. These programs build the capacity for residents to make change at the local and regional level.

Many service organizations are also moving into environmental programs. The Franklin Development Association helps to administer a local community garden, and St. Stephen’s administers a community garden where over 70 volunteers receive vegetables and fruits from harvest in exchange for hands-on labor. Some programs are aimed at education and creativity. The Godman Guild partners with OSU Extension and Local Matters to produce the Grow Our Own Winter Workshop Series, which educates the public about urban gardening and its connection to public arts and community well-being. The Clintonville-Beechwold CRC program Going Green creates environmentally friendly grocery bags from donated fabrics. These events not only help sustain the environment, but help build community relationships and educate the public about sustainable living practices.

Together, these programs help weave a net of social services that empower local residents, helping them find the tools needed to return to self-sufficiency and find their own road to increased opportunity. From this position of empowerment, people are able to reinvest human, social, and financial capital back into their communities, where it can be used to revitalize their neighborhoods.
Educational & Skills Development

Franklin County and its neighborhoods have seen tremendous growth in educational attainment in the past fifty years (Figures 35 and 36). Overall, the proportion of the population that obtained a High School Degree or equivalent increased across Franklin County from 1970 to 2009. However, the rate varied across the county. The suburbs – particularly the northern suburbs – consistently had a higher rate than southern parts of the county and the inner city. In 2009, 45.5% of census tracts had a 90% or greater high school degree achievement rate; 26.9% of tracts had more than 95% rate and three even had a 100% rate. On the other hand, four tracts had less than a 50% high school graduation rate, illustrating clear achievement gaps.

The percentage of residents with a college degree increased substantially from 1970 to 2009. Throughout the decades, northwest Franklin County’s college degree percentage was much higher than the rest of the county. By 2000, most northern Franklin County census tracts had at least a 50% college degree rate, while many southern Franklin County tracts had a less than 30% college degree rate. In 2009, 69% of tracts had a rate of over 50%, but 18.9% had less than a 10% rate. Two tracts had no college graduates, while over 80% of residents in three other tracts were college graduates.
Figure 32: Settlement Houses in Central Ohio, Note: The South Side Settlement House (founded in 1899) recently suspended operations and is not included on this map.
Figure 33: Locations of CDC’s and other Community Development Organizations in Columbus
Figure 34: Timeline of CDC's Established in Columbus after 1992

CDC’s in Columbus: Timeline of Progress

Figure 35: Population with a High School Degree or Equivalent 1970 and 2005/2009
Figure 36: Population with a College Degree 1970 to 2005/2009
5. The Nation’s Challenges Hit Home

The Recession and the Housing Crisis: Reversal of Fortune

With the release of Census 2010 figures, new nation-wide data on poverty, unemployment, wealth and inequality have begun to be analyzed – and the picture is troubling. Nationwide, the number of people in high poverty neighborhoods increased by 5 million people since 2000, a significant setback from the progress of the 1990s. More than nine million people now live in neighborhoods of extreme (or concentrated) poverty, where over 40% of residents live in poverty. One in four African Americans, one in six Hispanics, and one in eight American Indians in metropolitan America live in a census tract in which 30 percent or more of the population is in poverty; one out of nine foreign-born residents also lives in high poverty neighborhoods. In comparison, one in 25 non-Hispanic whites lives in one of these tracts.

As a recent Brookings study finds, concentrated poverty nearly doubled in Midwestern metro areas from 2000 to 2005-2009. The study notes:

“Taken together, Midwestern metro areas registered a 79 percent increase in extreme-poverty neighborhoods in the 2000s. The number of poor living in these tracts almost doubled over the decade, pushing the concentrated poverty rate in the region’s metro areas up by a staggering 5 percentage points, to a level that surpassed that in Northeastern metro areas.”

Of the top ten metro areas with the greatest increases in concentrated poverty, three are in Ohio: Toledo, Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, and Dayton.

In addition, the report notes that the population in extreme poverty neighborhoods rose more than twice as fast in suburbs as it did in cities from 2000 to 2005-2009. The number of extreme poverty neighborhoods in suburban communities grew by 54 percent, compared to 18 percent in cities, and the poor population in these suburban neighborhoods rose by 41 percent – more than twice the 17 percent growth in cities.

The impacts of the housing crisis have been extreme. Nearly half of all subprime loans went to African American and Latino borrowers, even though many qualified for prime loans. African American and Latino homeowners are expected to lose $164 - $213 billion in assets due to the housing crisis. In the wake of the foreclosure crisis, the median wealth of white households is now 20 times that of black households and 18 times that of Hispanic households. Many neighborhoods which had faced a number of challenges already, such as high poverty, disinvestment or vacant properties prior to the foreclosure epidemic, are now facing extreme conditions. The growth in vacant properties is further dragging down property values, creating blight and safety risks, and in some cases spiraling stable neighborhoods into a permanent state of distress, as well as undermining entire cities. In many communities, the number of vacant homes is several thousand times that of the number of homes potentially salvaged by the Neighborhood Stabilization Program. By all accounts, the Department of Treasury’s foreclosure mitigation efforts have not performed well enough. In short, the scale and scope of the crisis has overwhelmed the federal response.

The Suburbanization of Everything: Rising Diversity, Poverty and Unemployment in the Suburbs

Immigration has driven growing suburban diversity across the country, as many immigrant populations and ethnic enclaves are relocating to suburban areas. In 2007, the Census Bureau found that 40% of immigrants were moving directly to suburban areas. Approximately half the nation’s immigrant
population and 40% of the poor immigrant population live in our nation’s suburbs. The National Suburban Poll produced by the National Center for Suburban Studies at Hofstra University suggests that some ethnic groups are more likely to be suburban newcomers. For example, approximately two out of three Latinos in their 2009 national suburban survey had lived in their community for less than five years, nearly twice the rate reported for Whites.

However, suburbanization does not always equal better opportunity. Myron Orfield’s study of 15 major metropolitan regions showed that although minority suburbanization had increased, nearly 80% of African American and Latinos who moved to the suburbs relocated into fiscally distressed communities with higher public service needs and fewer public resources. Poverty, once considered a primarily inner city or rural phenomena, has now entered the suburbs. By 2005, the number of impoverished residents living in the suburbs surpassed the number of poor living in central cities for the first time. Recent data from the Brookings Institution found that the number of poor persons increased by 25% between 2000 and 2008 for suburbs in our nation’s largest metropolitan areas.

Unemployment has also increased in our nation’s suburbs. Research by Brookings found that unemployment and public assistance needs increased at the same pace in both cities and suburbs between December 2007 and December 2008. While one in three suburban residents reported that they had known someone who had lost a home to foreclosure, approximately three out of four had either lost a job or knew someone who had lost their job during the recession. This exposure to job loss for suburban residents had increased from approximately one in two suburban residents in the previous year. These trends should make us rethink our traditional views of “suburbia.”

Vulnerable & Marginalized Children and Youth

The foreclosure crisis and the recession is having, and will continue to have, a very strong effect on our nation’s children, many of whom were already vulnerable. The recently released national child poverty rate for 2010, at 21.6%, is the highest since the ACS survey began a decade ago. On average, more than one in five children in the US (15.75 million kids) lived in poverty in 2010. Ten states had child poverty rates above one in four, and both Black and Hispanic national child poverty rates were higher than average – at 38.2 % and 32.3%, respectively. In Ohio in 2010, the Black child poverty rate reached a staggering 47.6%, more than double the White child poverty rate, at 18.1%. The Hispanic child poverty rate in Ohio was also extremely high in 2010, at 37.7%.

Families dealing with unemployment and reduced income struggle to provide adequate nutrition, health care and stable housing, all of which has been shown to affect academic achievement. For example, medical research shows that “children who go hungry in kindergarten are noticeably behind their peers in reading and math by third grade.” The impact of the recession on children has already been severe and will potentially be long-lasting. Childhood obesity may rise from parents’ reliance on cheap meals, behavioral problems could increase if adolescents who are not in school cannot find jobs, and state and local budget cuts could limit the availability of pre-kindergarten programs.

The unemployment and underemployment rates for young workers have risen greatly during the recession. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) tracks unemployment and underemployment in the U.S., and the data from 2010 illustrates the drastic difference between young workers are the rest of the workforce. Young workers (ages 16 to 24) have historically had more difficulty finding stable employment than prime age workers (ages 25 to 54). In 2010, younger teen workers (16 and 17 year olds) experienced the highest rate of unemployment, with nearly one in three searching for work at the height of the recession. In April 2010, the unemployment rate for older teens (18 to 19 year olds) was...
24.1 percent and the unemployment rate for young adults (20 to 24) was 17.2 percent. In addition, a significant portion of youth are underemployed workers (would like to work full-time), discouraged workers, and people marginally attached to the workforce. 

Not only have jobs disappeared, but the cost of college has increased in the past few decades significantly, which impacts low and moderate income students more than higher income students. For those who choose to go to school, the increasing amount of school loans, credit card debt and car loans, make it harder for young workers to build assets. While the national percentage of homeowners decreased from 2006 to 2008 1.5%, the decrease for people under 25 years was 4.8%, and for people 25-29 the decrease was 4.5%.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that between now and 2018, the fastest growing segment of the job market will be occupations that require a bachelor’s degree. Meanwhile, occupations in the bottom half of wage earnings, such as health care services and food services, have seen large growth in the past few years, while manufacturing jobs are decreasing. As noted in a 2010 Bureau of Labor Statistics report, “If we continue to see disproportionate growth in the bottom half of the job distribution, then we will be facing a cementing of the growing inequality and polarization of opportunity that has characterized the past three decades of economic restructuring in the U.S.” The region’s future economic health will be threatened unless we give our youth the opportunity to obtain the skills and education they need.

Franklin County Community Development: Resource Challenges in a Time of Greater Need

In many ways, Franklin County reflects these troubling trends. Unemployment rates soared across the county as adjusted median household income declined. 64.0% of census tracts had increases in unemployment; 29.2% experienced increased 25% or more. This last decade experienced the worst decline in median household income, and 22.7% of census tracts experienced a 25% decrease in median household income or greater. 28.8% of census tracts experienced over a 100% increase in poverty and 85.2% experienced some type of increase in poverty. Not surprisingly, more people were paying 35% or more of their income on rent in 2009 – 78.8% experienced an increase and 36.4% experienced a 50% or greater increase.

In many neighborhoods in Franklin County, this reversal of fortune has literally stopped revitalization in its tracks. As one respondent described:

“Vacancies...have stymied past progress and we’ve had to reorient our focus on stabilizing neighborhood housing markets rather than...on...economic development, infrastructure, and preserving affordable housing.”

Many of the new mortgage protections established under Dodd-Frank will address the abuses that led to the foreclosure crisis. However, new regulations alone will not solve on-going credit discrimination and financial exploitation in communities of color. There is a real challenge and opportunity to help families in Franklin County rebuild their credit histories, access sustainable and fair credit on non-discriminatory terms, and find down payment assistance. This could come in the form of supporting the work of Community Development Financial Institutions, shared-equity (including community land trusts) projects, alternative banking options (such as the Bank On Cities campaign of the National League of Cities, and the like.

The recession and the housing crisis pose the largest challenge to community development in our region today. Accordingly, many survey respondents pointed to poverty, along with the attendant problems of unemployment and residential foreclosure, as their biggest challenges within Central Ohio.
neighborhoods. Not surprisingly, these problems are spurring demand for new and expanded community programs. Many of the organizations have made an attempt to respond, but in the face of decreased funding from traditional sources, are finding that task daunting. In short, survey respondents found themselves in an increasingly complex human services environment that is growing in scale and in complexity. The twin trends of suburbanization and increased diversity have made deep changes in the social and economic landscape of the city. The challenges that used to face a discrete, hegemonic, and geographically monolithic population have now spread unevenly through the county, and the economic recession of the past decade has seen some suburban neighborhoods go into steep decline while other neighborhoods, some of them right next door have thrived. As one service organization member described:

“[the] funding landscape is too narrow, with many having made commitments to specific areas at the expense of other areas, which have not been served.”

Many service organizations have formed partnerships around service delivery and resource sharing, but in an increasingly difficult environment, these efforts are beginning to feel more like band-aids, rather than long-term solutions. Many groups have begun to form partnerships around strategic planning but find themselves hamstrung by reduced funding and support from traditional channels. However, many organizations saw strength in the local capacity for community engagement, an invaluable tool in the face of shrinking resources.

Franklin County’s Geography of Opportunity

The following Opportunity Map of Franklin County is based on a set of data that represents four categorizations of opportunity: Housing & Neighborhood, Transportation & Employment, Health & Safety, and Education. Each of these categories is formed using a set of indicators at the neighborhood level (See Figure 37). (The complete methodology for the neighborhood opportunity analysis can be found in Appendix A.) The values of these indicators and categories have been indexed to create a composite opportunity score for each census tract. While this score does not capture every meaningful aspect of our various communities, it does provide a way to visualize neighborhood strengths and weaknesses. It also provides a way to understand how different groups of people are situated throughout the county. Figures 41 to 45 maps this opportunity analysis, illustrating neighborhood opportunity scores for each census tract in the County, ranking them from Very Low to Very High in relation to how they performed on numerous indicators.
The interstate highways tell much of the story of opportunity in Columbus. Interstate 70 is a particularly significant geographic division of opportunity within Franklin County, as 97% of the county’s high and very high opportunity census tracts are located north of I-70. Interstates 270 and 71 further demarcate areas of opportunity, as 91% of the high and very high opportunity tracts within the I-270 loop are located in the northwest quadrant of the loop, bounded by I-270, I-71, and I-70. These figures illustrate that opportunity has a geographic footprint in the region, and that high opportunity generally tends to fall in the northern half of the county, and in the northwest quadrant of the loop. When population distribution is taken into consideration, analysis shows that about 45% of the county’s population lives in high or very high opportunity areas, while nearly a quarter live in areas of moderate opportunity, with a third of the population living in areas of low or very low opportunity.

Disaggregation of the opportunity data reveals inequities throughout the opportunity landscape. For instance, while 1 in 2 Whites and 7 in 10 Asians live in areas of high opportunity, only 3 in 10 Hispanics or Latinos and less than 1 in 5 African Americans live in areas of high opportunity. Figures 38 to 45 illustrate how each of these populations and how subsidized housing is situated in terms of neighborhood opportunity. An analysis of the county’s foreign-born populations shows that while 60% or more of immigrants from North America, Asia, and Europe live in high opportunity neighborhoods, less than 25% of immigrants from Central America, Africa, and the Caribbean (a group that represents almost half, 46%, of all immigrants) live in high opportunity neighborhoods. Analysis of various HUD subsidized housing sites indicates larger concentrations of subsidized housing in low opportunity neighborhoods than in higher opportunity ones. These opportunity disparities illustrate the different contexts in which families attempt to access opportunity across the county.

Figure 37: Neighborhood Indicators Used for Opportunity Mapping Analysis [Full Methodology Provided in Appendix A.]
Figure 38: Distribution of Racial Populations by Neighborhood Opportunity Areas (% of Distribution Represented in Bar Chart, Absolute Numbers Presented in Table); Source: Neighborhood Opportunity Index Analysis and Census 2010
Figure 39: Distribution of Foreign Born Populations by Neighborhood Opportunity Areas (% of Distribution Represented in Bar Chart, Absolute Numbers Presented in Table); Source: Neighborhood Opportunity Index Analysis and Census 2010
Figure 40: Distribution of Total Housing Units, Subsidized Housing Units and Subsidized Housing Residents (Subsidized Units from the 2008 HUD Picture of Subsidized Housing) by Neighborhood Opportunity Areas (% of Distribution Represented in Bar Chart, Absolute Numbers Presented in Table); Source: Neighborhood Opportunity Index Analysis, Census 2010 and 2008 HUD Picture of Subsidized Housing
Figure 41: Comprehensive Neighborhood Opportunity Index for Franklin County
Figure 42: View of Urban Core Area; Franklin County Opportunity Map.
Figure 43: Franklin Count Opportunity Map and Distribution of Racial/Ethnic Populations in 2010
Figure 44: Franklin County Opportunity Map and Distribution of Site Based HUD Developments; Picture of Subsidized Housing 2008
Figure 45: Franklin County Opportunity Map and Distribution of Housing Vouchers; Picture of Subsidized Housing 2008
6. Understanding our Opportunities

Diversity as an Asset: Immigration, Growth & Opportunity

As Franklin County grows increasingly racially, ethnically, linguistically and religiously diverse, as our suburbs and urban neighborhoods struggle with similar challenges of rising poverty and unemployment, and as the recession takes its toll on a generation of children, our need for community development capacity, strength, and expertise will only grow. CDCs have welcomed newcomers to Columbus from the late 19th Century on, and can lead the way in expanding access to opportunity for families who come to Columbus to live out their dreams.

Columbus has significant assets in education, health care, business and community life that can be leveraged to provide entryways to opportunity for all. Unfortunately, some persistent racial and economic disparities remain in Franklin County. We are all hurt by these inequities. Although the symptoms of a region at risk may first become apparent in our most vulnerable and marginalized communities, the harm will not be confined to these groups. For example, the subprime crisis initially harmed our urban, disinvested communities of color before spreading to suburban and exurban markets and higher-income white communities, eventually affecting the entire global housing and credit system. In the domain of health, researchers found that the very existence of inequities between groups hurts the health of all groups.57 Racial and economic disparities threaten a sustainable, economically healthy, globally competitive city and county.

Columbus’ newest individuals and families need to be recognized for their potential contributions to our community’s cultural, economic, educational, spiritual and civic lives. Columbus is trending against many of its Midwestern neighbors’ population and economic declines precisely because it is becoming a robust immigrant gateway. However, it will take a concerted effort to ensure that all of our residents can access educational, housing, health and civic opportunities, regardless of their race, language, or zip code. As people settle from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and as we become a more global city and region, immigrant outreach and inclusion into all Columbus has to offer must be paramount.

Robust Urban Revitalization: Housing, Jobs, Education, and Health

Columbus can be proud of its renewed urban revitalization efforts. Despite the discouraging national, regional, and even state trends showing increases in unemployment, poverty, and foreclosure, and despite some local setbacks in these areas, Columbus retains remarkable urban strengths: vibrant urban neighborhoods, large and small downtown businesses, outstanding educational assets, a growing farm-to-table/fresh food movement, expanding medical, health care and biotechnology investments, and an engaged and active citizenry. As seen in Figures 46 to 47, several of Franklin County’s core urban census tracts have experienced an increase in gross rents and increases in median home value between 2000 and 2005/2009. These gains come at a time of national, state and regional housing market decline. As energy costs rise, as household formation continues to be delayed, and as baby boomers retire, there will be more opportunities to expand and capitalize on the strengths of urban living. Recent investments in urban neighborhoods like Weinland Park by the business, philanthropic, and educational stakeholders in the City point to a shared sense of optimism in, and commitment to, the city’s urban future.
Survey respondents identified “housing market change” and “poverty increase” as the top changes they anticipate in their service area. CDCs can help meet these challenges by continuing to provide a wide portfolio of housing options for people in many income brackets, from market-rate housing to affordable rentals to community land trusts. As the federal government wrestles with housing finance restructuring, there is a real need to act locally in the meantime: to help vulnerable families in Franklin County rebuild their credit histories, access sustainable and fair credit on non-discriminatory terms, and find down payment assistance. CDCs can partner with financial institutions to help stabilize renters and homeowners in revitalizing areas.

Yet as community development institutions know well, neighborhood revitalization is about more than bricks and mortar investments, as important as these are. As a corollary to anticipating increased poverty in their service areas and across the region, survey respondents cited “job placement” as their upcoming most vital program need. Youth employment programs are a popular model for preparing youth for the workforce. Training programs should focus on low income minority workers, as they are most greatly impacted by youth unemployment. Summer jobs, although temporary, offer wages, but more importantly, they provide valuable work experience that “can lay the groundwork for future employment.”

Mentoring programs, paid training, and counseling are other possible efforts that could aid in the youth workforce in the short-term to ensure they remain part of the labor force.

There are many promising ways to open up the pathways of opportunity for more children and youth, with respect to education and care as well. Children who are born to mothers who receive prenatal care, and children who are under the care of a primary care physician, start out with a distinct advantage. Those who have access to early education and positive, encouraging role models can thrive in spite of depressed material circumstances. Impoverished students do better in school if they live in middle class neighborhoods or attend more affluent schools. Children who move to lower poverty areas see reductions in obesity, positive increases in mental health, and improved safety. Intergenerational gains ensue when students of color attend desegregated schools. Diverse educational settings contribute to all students’ ability to participate in a democratic society. In short, children who have access to quality, reliable, affordable supports and services have more chances to live out their dreams.

Survey of community development organizations: shared challenges, shared hope

Our voluntary on-line survey illuminates the characteristics, activities and challenges of some the area’s community development organizations. Full survey results are attached in the Appendix. Note that because many of the questions could have more than one answer, the results do not always add up to 100%. In addition, because some organizations had more than one respondent (the survey was sent to people in different departments, for example), the survey results are not statistically representative nor do they represent all neighborhoods equally. Rather, the survey gives a general sense of the most frequently cited challenges and opportunities by those who answered the survey (fifty-eight respondents in all).

In general, the survey respondents represented small, professionally staffed, well-established organizations (i.e. over 15 years experience), focused most often on housing, employment, community organizing, and services. A very high level of partnership was reported: fully two-thirds of survey respondents indicated that they have 5 or more partnerships; only one respondent had no active partnerships. The most frequently listed partners were The United Way, the City of Columbus, Franklin...
The respondents served a variety of people, from very low income and homeless residents to the underemployed, families, the recently incarcerated, and homeowners. Renters and very low to low income families were most often cited as “primary” populations served. Respondents varied in their geographic service areas from traditional urban areas like Weinland Park and the King-Lincoln District to areas further outside the city, such as Groveport and Madison County. Other organizations do not serve a geographically tied population at all, but rather serve specific populations.

Respondents cited challenges posed by the larger economy, such as increased poverty, unemployment, and foreclosure/vacancy as the most significant regional challenges to neighborhoods in Central Ohio. When it came to neighborhood trends most impacting service areas, respondents most often cited foreclosure, then poverty and unemployment. Many respondents saw similar trends occurring nationally, with one respondent stating,

“[This] problem is national and international in scope and remedy. Until wage and employment structure (and related factors) are addressed, [the] above interventions have limited impact.”

Not surprisingly, the worsening problems brought on by unemployment, poverty, and housing, have spurred demand for community programs. Unfortunately, this increased need came at a time of decreased funding. Respondents cited funding as the top challenge facing their organization. Respondents reported corresponding shifts in their programming, with many respondents indicating they had reached out to form even more partnerships to address these new challenges; in particular, they were partnering to strategize. In the face of anticipated decreases in funding from traditional sources, respondents were concerned. One respondent said:

“Funding decreased this year but additional reserves were used to stabilize our programs. Next year could see a much greater decline in services if funding sources decline further.”

Respondents claimed that they have learned to become more adaptable in the face of these challenges, learned how to do more with less, and learned how to reach out to more funders for help with service delivery. They have sought out new funding opportunities, attempted to market their services more effectively, and increased volunteer opportunities. However, many stressed the need for more strategic planning aimed at finding effective solutions to shared problems. One respondent indicated that:

“Collaborations/partnerships are critical. However, there is little to no assistance in the form of funding to help organizations design successful partnerships. They take time and human resources that can be dedicated to those partnerships.”

When asked about future service area needs, respondents indicated housing market change most often, followed by an increase in poverty. When asked about critical regional and neighborhood trends, respondents were most concerned about an increase in poverty. Given a choice of fourteen potential programs considered “most vital to address area needs,” job placement was the top program cited, followed by vacant structure demolition and maintenance, and affordable housing.

Survey respondents cited “community engagement” more than any other asset listed as the biggest asset of their survey area. That community engagement was so highly valued indicates a shared hope for the future, even in the face of such daunting challenges. Research supports this hope: communities with greater civic participation and social capital have been shown to be healthier and more economically vibrant. Communities are able to utilize civic engagement to be better organized, identify new solutions, advocate for policy changes and other benefits. Disadvantaged and marginalized
communities are the least likely to be actively engaged in public affairs, whereas communities with more resources, income and wealth are more likely to be engaged and connected to strong social, institutional and community networks. To effectively support civic engagement in communities who are disadvantaged requires resources to meet this resource gap. Entrepreneurialism is also tightly linked to civic engagement: a virtuously reinforcing cycle exists between the entrepreneurial community and a civically engaged community.

Immigrant communities are often well poised to embrace civic engagement because they can have higher levels of social capital; however, barriers remain. Impediments to engagement include: language, literacy and cultural barriers; limited experience with local political processes; fear of political repercussions for interacting with government or speaking out in regards to public policy; and limited time and resources. Additionally, disadvantaged youth are far less likely to be civically engaged as their non-disadvantaged peers. Civic engagement with youth provides an emerging opportunity to add diverse voices to public dialogue, debate and the insights of youth. But youth engagement can also be a transformative interaction for youth in disadvantaged communities. Engagement can provide an empowering educational experience and also nurture crucial relationships with positive peers, mentors and role models.

Luckily, with Columbus’ long legacy of community development, and with partnering clearly in the DNA of community development organizations, the seeds for increasing civic engagement, reducing unhealthy disparities, and leveraging our assets have been sown. We look forward to the conversations that this report produces, but more important, we look forward to the new ways organizations, volunteers and residents engage in robust and engaged neighborhood building.
Median Rent

Overall Change from 1970 to 2009
Adjusted for Inflation; In 2009 Dollars

Figure 46: Change in Median Rent 1970 to 2005/2009; Adjusted for Inflation in 2009 Dollars
Figure 47: Change in Median Home Value 2000 to 2005/2009; Adjusted for Inflation in 2009 Dollars
Appendix A: Literature Review Methodology & Data Notes

Opportunity Mapping Data & Methodology

I. General Methodology
The methods employed by the Kirwan Institute to represent the landscape of opportunity are designed to capture the complex relationships between the multitude of factors that play a role in what it means to have the opportunities essential for successful life outcomes. None of the indicators or categories of data are weighted in the index, reflecting the need for strong structures environments in every area represented within the index.

The Comprehensive Opportunity Score is developed using statistical z-scores for each indicator, and all four categories. The score for each category is based on the average of the z-scores within it, and the comprehensive score is based on the average of the z-scores of the categories.

II. Franklin County Opportunity Indicators & Data
The indicators chosen for this Franklin County Opportunity mapping project are subdivided into four categories, including: Neighborhood and Housing, Transportation and Employment, Health and Safety, and Education. The following chart illustrates the indicators and their respective categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood &amp; Housing</th>
<th>Transportation &amp; Employment</th>
<th>Health &amp; Safety</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Median Home Value</td>
<td>• Transit Access</td>
<td>• Medically Underserved Rating</td>
<td>• Student Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poverty Rate</td>
<td>• Mean Commute Time</td>
<td>• Number of Primary Care Providers</td>
<td>• School Performance Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>• Job Access</td>
<td>• Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>• Educational Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreclosure Rate</td>
<td>• Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>• Job Growth Rate</td>
<td>• Student Attendance Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rate of Cost- Burdened Households</td>
<td>• Job Growth Rate</td>
<td>• Incarceration Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Neighborhood and Housing Indicators: These indicators represent the health of neighborhoods and their housing markets. Data for each indicator in this category is available for Census tracts, therefore no geoprocessing was necessary in order to adjust the data to the tracts. The following table illustrates the description, source, and date(s) for each indicator:
b. **Transportation and Employment Indicators:** These indicators represent resident mobility, proximity to, and participation in the labor market. For some indicators in this category, geoprocessing methods were employed in order to adjust the data to Census tract geography. The following table illustrates the description, source, and date(s) for each indicator, and precedes a description of the methodology for those indicators which were not collected by tract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Value</td>
<td>Median value of homes in the tract</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>% of residents living under the Poverty Line</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>% of vacant residential properties</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure Rate</td>
<td>% of mortgages that have gone into foreclosure</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Cost-Burdened</td>
<td>% of residents spending 30% or more of household income on housing costs</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Access</td>
<td>% of each census tract that is within 1/2 mile of public transit service</td>
<td>COTA</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Commute Time</td>
<td>Average travel time (in minutes) to work for area commuters</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Access</td>
<td>The number of employees within 3 miles of tract</td>
<td>ESRI Business Data</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>% of residents who reported being unemployed</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Growth Rate</td>
<td>Rate of Job Growth in the nearest zip code, between 2006-2009</td>
<td>County Business Patterns</td>
<td>2006-2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transit access indicator was developed by creating a ½ mile buffer around all COTA service route lines, and calculating the percentage of the buffer area in each tract. If no transit service runs through a tract, the percentage would be 0%, however, up to 100% of a tract can be within ½ mile of one or more bus routes.

To capture job access, a 3 mile buffer of each tract was created and spatially joined to business and employment location data. Therefore, each tract is attributed with the estimated number of jobs which are inside and within linear miles from the tract boundaries.

For job growth rate, since the data used is only available by zip code, each tract was attributed with the percent change in jobs between 2006 and 2009 for the zip code in which the tract resides. The following table illustrates the description, source, and date(s) for each indicator, and precedes a description of the methodology for those indicators which were not collected by tract.

c. **Health and Safety Indicators:** These indicators represent proximity to health services, as well as a narrow representation of overall criminal activity.
The number of primary care providers was counted for each tract, based on a database of the locations of businesses with the (NAICS) codes beginning with ‘62111’.

The most local data available for incarceration rate is available at the zip code level, therefore each tract was attributed with the incarceration rate of the zip code in which it resides.

d. Education Indicators: These indicators represent the quality of local schools and educational resources. With the exception of educational attainment, each of the indicators in this category are based on the location of the three nearest schools within the school district of each Census tract. Therefore, a series of steps was taken in order to attribute this data to the tracts. It should be noted that the figures attributed to each tract are the average of the rates or scores of the three nearest primary schools from the center of each tract. The following table illustrates the description, source, and date(s) for each indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Poverty</td>
<td>% of primary school students receiving free or reduced price lunches</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Performance Index</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education Performance Index Number Per school</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td>% of adults (age 25+) who have attained an associates degree or more</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Attendance Rate</td>
<td>% of students attending primary schools on a regular basis</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Education</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Overlay Data and Analysis

The overlay analysis is intended to represent how different populations are situated across the County’s landscape of opportunity, as well as how the affordable housing access points are situated throughout the County. The following table illustrates the description, source, and date(s) for each indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>Total and population by race for each tract</td>
<td>US Census</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born Population</td>
<td>Foreign Born population by place of origin</td>
<td>American Community Survey</td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>Number of Section 8 vouchers, HUD-Subsidized Developments and units, and the total resident count for each tract</td>
<td>HUD User</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Survey Results: The following are results from an online survey of more than stakeholders affiliated with community development organizations.

How many partner organizations does your organization collaborate with?  

- Zero: 10%  
- 1 to 2: 20%  
- 3 to 5: 30%  
- More than 5: 40%  

What are your organization’s top community development priorities? (Choose up to 4)  

- Community Organizing: 20%  
- Services (Basic Needs): 30%  
- Housing: 50%  
- Financial education: 10%  
- Youth: 5%  
- Employment: 20%  
- Beautification: 15%
What is the biggest challenge facing your service area?

53 Responses

What is the biggest asset of your service area?

48 Responses
What are the primary demographics of the people your organization serves? (Choose up to 5) 53 Responses
How has your organization’s funding changed? (Choose up to 3) 47 Responses

What changes in your service area do you anticipate? (Choose up to 2) 45 Responses
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Appendix C: Neighborhood Region Map & Trends

Source: Jurisdiction, region, and neighborhood data based on 2000 Census tract boundaries.
## Population Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>10,409</td>
<td>6,567</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>5,109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>75,504</td>
<td>79,399</td>
<td>84,013</td>
<td>92,681</td>
<td>97,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>91,782</td>
<td>86,256</td>
<td>86,017</td>
<td>87,274</td>
<td>92,932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>45,027</td>
<td>32,604</td>
<td>28,698</td>
<td>25,399</td>
<td>19,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>17,795</td>
<td>12,852</td>
<td>11,249</td>
<td>10,302</td>
<td>11,539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>96,300</td>
<td>88,174</td>
<td>83,468</td>
<td>77,319</td>
<td>64,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>56,743</td>
<td>47,410</td>
<td>43,993</td>
<td>39,534</td>
<td>34,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>39,082</td>
<td>70,249</td>
<td>83,555</td>
<td>93,587</td>
<td>101,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>64,317</td>
<td>82,302</td>
<td>113,633</td>
<td>123,401</td>
<td>124,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>14,474</td>
<td>23,687</td>
<td>35,388</td>
<td>67,536</td>
<td>82,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>31,989</td>
<td>33,971</td>
<td>32,748</td>
<td>40,070</td>
<td>50,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>58,851</td>
<td>53,618</td>
<td>53,435</td>
<td>48,507</td>
<td>44,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population 1970-2009

![Population 1970-2009 graph](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Language and Foreign Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Foreign-Born Population 1970-2009

- **Near Northeast**
- **Near South**
- **Northeast**
- **Northside**
- **Outer West**
- **Southeast**
## Economic Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>12.5% 34.4% 33.8% 31.6% 34.9%</td>
<td>$39,975 $31,913 $44,834 $22,918 $26,712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>9.3% 21.2% 25.5% 29.5% 39.7%</td>
<td>$73,915 $65,194 $64,837 $51,716 $44,972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>10.8% 27.7% 31.3% 30.7% 45.0%</td>
<td>$59,373 $51,271 $48,858 $46,194 $39,811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>12.9% 35.4% 36.5% 35.0% 43.3%</td>
<td>$38,695 $29,547 $27,708 $26,525 $23,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>12.3% 33.5% 32.8% 29.0% 26.2%</td>
<td>$40,135 $34,206 $48,783 $43,893 $55,540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>8.8% 30.1% 33.8% 32.3% 41.7%</td>
<td>$62,064 $51,893 $45,937 $39,640 $31,397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>10.5% 30.0% 33.0% 30.7% 37.9%</td>
<td>$52,841 $45,951 $47,118 $42,636 $40,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>8.3% 20.9% 20.7% 22.8% 33.0%</td>
<td>$78,550 $71,302 $78,956 $62,284 $49,492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>9.0% 20.8% 21.6% 24.8% 31.5%</td>
<td>$83,875 $78,646 $84,740 $70,371 $63,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>8.4% 19.7% 19.3% 22.8% 32.3%</td>
<td>$73,142 $66,856 $73,984 $68,363 $58,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>8.1% 26.1% 28.7% 29.8% 32.8%</td>
<td>$65,279 $63,793 $63,009 $54,285 $48,238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>16.0% 43.1% 47.1% 43.8% 51.2%</td>
<td>$44,949 $37,286 $38,166 $29,764 $27,204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Household Income Adjusted 1970-2009

![Graph showing median household income adjusted from 1970 to 2009 across different regions. The graph includes lines for Downtown, Eastside, Near East, Near Northeast, Near South, Northside, Outer West, and Southeast. Each line shows a decrease in income over the years, with variation by region.]
Renters Who Spend 35% or More of their Income on Housing

- Inner West
- Near Northeast
- Near South
- Northeast
- Northside
- Outer West
- Southeast
- Southeast
- University District


Percentage: 0.0% to 60.0%
## Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unemployment Rate 1970-2009

- **Downtown**
- **Eastside**
- **Inner West**
- **Near East**
- **Near North**
- **Near Northeast**
- **Near South**
- **Northeast**
- **Northside**
- **Outer West**
- **Southeast**
- **University District**
## Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty Rate 1970-2009

![Graph showing poverty rate from 1970 to 2009 for different regions](image_url)
## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>2,898</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>25,365</td>
<td>33,926</td>
<td>38,493</td>
<td>43,572</td>
<td>48,131</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>29,530</td>
<td>33,376</td>
<td>33,509</td>
<td>37,123</td>
<td>41,058</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>16,809</td>
<td>15,302</td>
<td>13,396</td>
<td>13,113</td>
<td>12,586</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>6,688</td>
<td>6,629</td>
<td>6,936</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>30,459</td>
<td>35,135</td>
<td>34,615</td>
<td>33,864</td>
<td>33,882</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>20,164</td>
<td>19,756</td>
<td>19,141</td>
<td>18,790</td>
<td>19,080</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>11,284</td>
<td>27,329</td>
<td>35,905</td>
<td>42,043</td>
<td>48,181</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>23,059</td>
<td>37,063</td>
<td>53,133</td>
<td>59,038</td>
<td>61,867</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>4,515</td>
<td>9,636</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>29,641</td>
<td>35,705</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>10,978</td>
<td>11,815</td>
<td>16,721</td>
<td>21,939</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>18,999</td>
<td>21,175</td>
<td>21,531</td>
<td>21,088</td>
<td>20,141</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>Median Rent Adjusted</td>
<td>Median Home Value Adjusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$ 461</td>
<td>$ 391</td>
<td>$ 501</td>
<td>$ 488</td>
<td>$ 577</td>
<td>$ 194,769</td>
<td>$ 228,894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$ 824</td>
<td>$ 719</td>
<td>$ 781</td>
<td>$ 770</td>
<td>$ 819</td>
<td>$ 126,248</td>
<td>$ 104,435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$ 605</td>
<td>$ 620</td>
<td>$ 657</td>
<td>$ 694</td>
<td>$ 811</td>
<td>$ 103,567</td>
<td>$ 97,876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$ 538</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 458</td>
<td>$ 513</td>
<td>$ 612</td>
<td>$ 102,376</td>
<td>$ 123,834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$ 596</td>
<td>$ 543</td>
<td>$ 661</td>
<td>$ 767</td>
<td>$ 882</td>
<td>$ 209,110</td>
<td>$ 289,068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$ 659</td>
<td>$ 644</td>
<td>$ 661</td>
<td>$ 695</td>
<td>$ 758</td>
<td>$ 88,966</td>
<td>$ 87,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$ 553</td>
<td>$ 613</td>
<td>$ 698</td>
<td>$ 737</td>
<td>$ 757</td>
<td>$ 109,007</td>
<td>$ 145,193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$ 1,032</td>
<td>$ 828</td>
<td>$ 838</td>
<td>$ 846</td>
<td>$ 817</td>
<td>$ 147,422</td>
<td>$ 147,335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$ 819</td>
<td>$ 775</td>
<td>$ 880</td>
<td>$ 900</td>
<td>$ 830</td>
<td>$ 189,556</td>
<td>$ 171,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>$ 708</td>
<td>$ 704</td>
<td>$ 802</td>
<td>$ 853</td>
<td>$ 811</td>
<td>$ 160,510</td>
<td>$ 150,997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$ 604</td>
<td>$ 695</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td>$ 807</td>
<td>$ 806</td>
<td>$ 114,782</td>
<td>$ 125,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$ 670</td>
<td>$ 668</td>
<td>$ 689</td>
<td>$ 709</td>
<td>$ 748</td>
<td>$ 125,021</td>
<td>$ 157,634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Education

### Table: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Education: Population with at least a High School Degree or Equivalent</th>
<th>Education: Population with at least College Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner West</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Northeast</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near South</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer West</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart: High School Degree Achievement 1970-2009

[Graph showing high school degree achievement from 1970 to 2009 for different regions.]
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