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2009 Poverty Thresholds
U.S. Bureau of the Census

Poverty threshold for a four-person family unit is $21,954

Poverty thresholds for one person:

• Under age 65 is $11,161

• 65 or over is $10,289
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Richmond Regional Planning District Poverty Rate = 10.2%
Percent Increase of Poverty Rates: 2000-2009

- Chesterfield: 23%
- Hanover: 12%
- Henrico: 42%
- Richmond: 22%
- Goochland: 25%
- Powhatan: -20%
- Charles City: 7%
- New Kent: -6%
Poverty Rates Among Virginia First Cities
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)
Locality Percent of Metro Poverty Population
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)

- Richmond: 46%
- Hanover: 5%
- Henrico: 27%
- Chesterfield: 19%
- Powhatan: 1%
- Goochland: 2%
Numbers of People in Poverty
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates for Localities Above 20,000)

- Suburbs: 54%
- City: 46%
Family Income: $0 - $40,000
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Median Household Income
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)

Charles City: $49,747
Chesterfield: $71,661
Hanover: $76,926
Henrico: $59,807
Goochland: $75,581
New Kent: $69,478
Powhatan: $75,118
Richmond: $37,735
Disparity Between Poorest and Wealthiest Census Tracts
Based on Median Household Income
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)

Ratio of Census Tract with Highest Household Income to Lowest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>1.2-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>5.0-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>2.5-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>2.5-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>9.5-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>1.3-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>1.4-------1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richmond</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.0-----1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single wealthiest tract = $217,153 (Henrico)
Single poorest tract = $10,526 (Richmond)

Ratio: 21.0------1
Two Tracts, Two Worlds, Same City

Distance: 3.5 miles
Children Under 18 Living in Poverty
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>12.60%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Female Householders with Children Under 18 Living in Poverty
(2005-2009 American Community Survey Estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>47.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>29.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of All Poor by Race
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates for Localities Above 20,000)

- Black: 48%
- Hispanic: 9%
- Asian: 3%
- White: 40%
Percent of All Races Living in Poverty: 1990-2009
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates for Localities Above 20,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20.70%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ratio of Poverty Population to Total Population

Black: 78% higher
White: 40% lower
Latino: 125% higher
Asian: same

Bar graph showing the percentage of poverty population to total population for different races.
Percent of Poor by Race Living in City and Suburbs
(2005-2009 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates for Localities Above 20,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Latino Poverty

Jeff Davis Highway

Midlothian

Hull Street
• Five Census tracts in Richmond have poverty rates exceeding 50%.

• 69% of residents in Census 301 (Gilpin Court) live in poverty.
Subsidized Housing Concentration in Richmond

Kenny McLemore, Housing Policy Analyst
Dept. of Economic and Community Development, City of Richmond
Location Key:
A- Henrico County Western Government Center
B- St. John’s Woods
C- Belmont Woods
D- Walmsley
E- Beuhlah
F- Bellwood
G- Oregon Hill
H- Washington Park
I- Brookland Park
J- Portions of N. Highland Park & Providence Park
K- VUU & portions of Barton Heights
L- Highland Park Southern Tip
M- Portions of Oakwood & Church Hill North
N- Portions of Fairmont, Woodville, & Church Hill North
O- Portions of Chimborazo & Church Hill
P- Portions of Fulton & Shockoe Bottom
Q- Byrd Park

Change in Poverty
Poverty Concentration
Less than 20% in both 2000 & 2009
Greater than 20% in 2000 and Less than 20% in 2009
Less than 20% in 2000 and Greater than 20% in 2010
Greater than 20% in both 2000 & 2009
Redlining of Richmond
1937 and 2010
Notices of Trustee Sales Filed from 2007 through 2009
Within Boundaries Formerly Defined by HOLC in 1937

Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME), Will Sanford, Research Analyst

Areas graded A & B in 1937
Areas graded C & D in 1937

- Areas graded A & B in 1937: 78
- Areas graded C & D in 1937: 651
Detailed studies of city records will be made to determine areas of tax delinquency, lowest assessment and revenue production, areas where normal growth is impeded by slum conditions and finally those slum areas most attractive to private developers.

Richmond News Leader
October 25, 1950
Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike (I-95)
The Loss of Navy Hill

“All of our history, traditions, good times and bad times were destroyed.”

Former Navy Hill Resident (quoted in Seldon Richardson’s Built by Blacks)
The Memorialization of Navy Hill

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORIES OF OUR
DEMISED LOVE ONES
JULY 17, 1993

LOVE AND MEMORIES NEVER DIE AS DAYS ROLL
ON AND YEARS PASS BY. DEEP IN OUR HEARTS
MEMORIES ARE KEPT OF THE ONES WE LOVED
AND SHALL NEVER FORGET
DONATED BY
THE Bob CURRY SOCIETY
THE NAVY HILL REUNION AND FRIENDS
Bob Curry President P.H.W. Penick, Treasurer
In the late 1960s, Fulton had 3,000 residents in about 836 buildings across 330 acres that included seven churches, restaurants, stores, schools, and a movie theater.
Locality Share of Total Jobs in Planning District
(Source: Virginia Employment Commission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henrico County is the region’s largest employer.

Between 1990 and 2009, the region gained 83,517 jobs. The City lost 40,159 jobs.

Between 2003 and 2009, the region gained 10,943 jobs. The City lost 7,869 jobs.
Job Trends
Virginia Employment Commission

High Wage: $60,000 +
- Manufacturing
- Information
- Finance & Insurance
- Professional & Technical Services

Middle: $35,001-59,999
- Utilities
- Construction
- Wholesale Trade
- Transportation & Warehousing
- Real Estate & Rental Leasing
- Mgt of Companies
- Educational Service
- Health & Social Services
- Public Administration

Low: $35,000 & Below
- Retail Trade
- Admin. & Waste Services
- Arts, Entertainment, & Recreation
- Accommodation & Food Services
- Other Services, Ex. Pub Administration
Households Without Automobiles: 2009

- Chesterfield: 2.50%
- Hanover: 2.60%
- Henrico: 4.90%
- Richmond: 18.80%
Households with 0-1 Car Only: 2009

- Chesterfield: 26.80%
- Hanover: 20.50%
- Henrico: 39.10%
- Richmond: 61.10%
Of the 2,136 square miles encompassed by the eight localities-

- Chesterfield = 434 sm.
- Hanover = 468 sm.
- Henrico = 238 sm.
- Richmond = 60 sm.
- Goochland = 281 sm.
- Powhatan = 261 sm.
- Charles City = 181 sm.
- New Kent = 213 sm.
• Market rent for 2-bedroom apartment = $930

• At 30% of income, income necessary to rent = $37,200

• 30% of all state employees in Virginia earn less than $35,000

• Hourly wage needed for 2-bedroom apt. = $17.88

• Average wage for renters in Richmond = $14.74

• Federal minimum wage = $7.25
Changing Opportunity Along Interstate 64
Housing Opportunities Made Equal (HOME), Will Sanford, Research Analyst

### Opportunity Score

- **Very High**
  - Short Pump
  - Deep Run
  - Staples Mill Area
  - Bryan Park
  - Carver Newtowne-West
  - Jackson Ward
  - Gilpin Court
  - Whitcomb Court
  - Creighton Court
  - Sandston

- **High**
  - Bryan Park
  - Carver Newtowne-West
  - Jackson Ward
  - Gilpin Court
  - Whitcomb Court
  - Creighton Court
  - Sandston

- **Moderate**
  - Short Pump
  - Deep Run
  - Staples Mill Area
  - Bryan Park
  - Carver Newtowne-West
  - Jackson Ward
  - Gilpin Court
  - Whitcomb Court
  - Creighton Court
  - Sandston

- **Low**
  - Short Pump
  - Deep Run
  - Staples Mill Area
  - Bryan Park
  - Carver Newtowne-West
  - Jackson Ward
  - Gilpin Court
  - Whitcomb Court
  - Creighton Court
  - Sandston

### Table: Opportunity Score by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Pump</th>
<th>Deep Run</th>
<th>Crestview (Broad Street &amp; Glenside)</th>
<th>Staples Mill Area</th>
<th>Bryan Park</th>
<th>Carver Newtowne-West</th>
<th>Jackson Ward</th>
<th>Gilpin Court</th>
<th>Whitcomb Court</th>
<th>Creighton Court</th>
<th>Sandston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeownership Rate</strong></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty Rate</strong></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Population with Public Assistance Income</strong></td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Population Traveling More than 45 Minutes to Work</strong></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Visited a Doctor in Past 12 Months</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropout Rate</strong></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math Score</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of Adults Reported Not Getting Social/Emotional Support They Need: 2010
(Centers for Disease Control & Prevention’s Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System)