ON BEHALF OF OUR ENTIRE PROJECT TEAM, WE ARE PLEASED TO TRANSMIT OUR GEORGIA REPORT FROM THE STUDY ON PERSISTENT POVERTY IN THE SOUTH. THE SOUTHEAST REGION REPORT WAS RELEASED IN DECEMBER 2002, UNDER THE TITLE IT'S A MATTER OF WEALTH: DISMANTLING PERSISTENT POVERTY IN THE SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES. AS A FOLLOW-UP TO THAT PUBLICATION, THIS REPORT FOCUSES ON SPECIFIC ISSUES RELATED TO THE 91-COUNTY REGION OF PERSISTENT POVERTY IN GEORGIA AND INCORPORATES RESEARCH COMMISSIONED BY THE GEORGIA RURAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL.

A sense of urgency for breaking the cycle of persistent poverty in Georgia has become increasingly evident. It is vital to the quality of life for those living in the impoverished region. It is vital to the economic well-being of our entire state. And it is vital to the generations of Georgians yet to come.

A close look at the health of our economy and the human capital throughout the state suggests a distinction between those areas that have been more prosperous and those that continue to struggle. This report proposes specific recommendations for developing a strategy to adjust this imbalance and increase capacity for economic and human capital development within the persistent poverty region.

We would like to extend a warm note of thanks and appreciation to Benjy Griffith for his financial donation and continuing support throughout the study. We are most appreciative of the ground work for this study that was completed for the Southeast Region report by the entire research team and would like to thank those who played a pivotal role in the Georgia analysis: John McKissick, David Lynn, and Mick Ragsdale from the University of Georgia and Matt Bishop from the Georgia Rural Development Council.

We hope that we have contributed to your understanding of the needs of the many impoverished families in our region.
One of the more recent studies, conducted during the 1990s by Ron Wimberley and Libby Morris, defined the region as a crescent-shaped area of 623 counties in 11 southern states where 34% of the nation’s poor reside. This region has been commonly referred to as the Black Belt, a term made well known in 1901 by Booker T. Washington to describe the color of the rich southern soil on which slaves worked.

Various federal initiatives have been established to help direct funds into this region for economic and human development. The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) was created in 1965 and over time has shown a positive impact on the region served. Since 2000, the Delta Regional Authority (DTA) has been serving counties in the Mississippi Delta. Beyond these initiatives, however, continuing pockets of poverty exist and signal an unsolved mystery: Why does this poverty persist and what can be done to break the cycle?

Senator Zell Miller (D-GA) secured federal funds in fall 2001 to attempt to unravel this puzzle. A generous match by Macon businessman Benjy Griffith enabled the University of Georgia to study two issues in the historic cotton-growing area.

Is there a region of persistent poverty in the Southeast composed of rural counties that are not served by other federal commissions or special initiatives?

Is there a need for a federal initiative in the study area and, if so, what is an appropriate structure?
The economic peril facing the Southeast Region results from, and in turn contributes to, the widespread and persistent nature of the region’s poverty. It not only affects those living in the region but also drains the economic health of our entire nation. The basic engine for creating wealth in the region is disadvantaged when compared with other economic regions and the nation as a whole. The economy of the rural South is at risk because it lacks an able workforce and the tools with which to build wealth. This situation will continue to worsen unless and until the region gains the innate ability to produce and sustain wealth through the creation of goods and services in manufacturing, service, and/or agriculture. A federal commission could provide the leadership and coordination to unleash the region’s potential and generate long-lasting wealth.

The State of Georgia lies at the geographic heart of this Southeast Region. A closer look at the state-specific data from the Southeast Region study reveals a unique picture of persistent poverty in our own backyard, a picture that confirms previous research commissioned by the Georgia Rural Development Council. The report concludes:

The economic peril facing the Southeast Region results from, and in turn contributes to, the widespread and persistent nature of the region’s poverty. It not only affects those living in the region but also drains the economic health of our entire nation. The basic engine for creating wealth in the region is disadvantaged when compared with other economic regions and the nation as a whole. The economy of the rural South is at risk because it lacks an able workforce and the tools with which to build wealth. This situation will continue to worsen unless and until the region gains the innate ability to produce and sustain wealth through the creation of goods and services in manufacturing, service, and/or agriculture. A federal commission could provide the leadership and coordination to unleash the region’s potential and generate long-lasting wealth.

This report offers an assessment of the challenges of persistent poverty in Georgia and the initiatives that offer glimmers of hope. Strategic recommendations are also proposed for assuring a robust economy and vibrant quality of life for all Georgians.
being produced and marketed overseas. Decisions once made locally must now consider national and international factors and adjust to their implications.

Changing demographics. Immigration of significant numbers of Hispanics and an increasingly older workforce population contribute to a more diverse, yet a more complex, society.

Technology explosion. The rapid pace of new technological developments continues, changing the flavor of the jobs and the skill set required. With new technology, many occupations, such as farming, now require less physical labor—forcing many to find work in areas where enhanced skills are mandatory.

Pockets of poverty thus remain—and will continue to exist unless appropriate policies and programs are instituted. New, fresh approaches are needed to examine the nature and extent of persistent poverty in Georgia and to generate effective solutions. With this perspective, we used the same definitions and methodology as the study of persistent poverty in the Southeast to identify the counties in Georgia that meet the definition of persistent poverty (Figure 2).

Of the 242 counties in the Southeast Region of persistent poverty, 91 (or 38%) are in Georgia. Eighty-four of the counties are non-metropolitan and commonly characterized as rural.

Nearly one-fourth (or 24%) of the population living in the Southeast Region of persistent poverty reside in Georgia, and slightly more than one-fourth (25%) of the total number of poor people living in this region call Georgia their home. A total of 1.8 million Georgians live in the 91 counties of persistent poverty, or 22% of the state’s total population.

Currently, the majority of the population in the 91 persistent poverty counties is White (61.3%). More than one-third (36.1%) is African-American, and another 3.4% is Hispanic American.10 However, this racial/ethnic composition is shifting rapidly throughout the state. From 1990 to 2000, the Hispanic population in Georgia grew faster than any other racial group. Thirty counties experienced Hispanic growth rates of 500% or more, and 16 of those 30 counties are located within the persistent poverty region. During the same time period, five counties within the persistent poverty region had African-American growth rates greater than the rate for the State as a whole (34.7%). In contrast, 21 counties in the persistent poverty region experienced a decline in the percentage of White residents.11

Nearly one in three of the 242 counties in the Southeast Region of persistent poverty is in Georgia.
THE HUMAN COST OF POVERTY

The toll of persistent poverty in Georgia on human vitality and quality of life cannot be underestimated. The burden falls disproportionately on children and the elderly living in the 91-county region; more than 1 in 4 residents under the age of 18, and nearly 1 in 5 over the age of 65 live in poverty.15

A few key indicators show clear evidence of the region’s compromised social condition.

Low birth weight. The average rate of low birth weight babies per 1,000 births from 1996 to 1998 was 12% higher in the persistent poverty region than the rate for Georgia (96.5 vs. 86.2).16

Education. The percent of persons age 25 and older without a high school diploma in the region (29.5%) is 38% higher than the percent for the state (21.4%).17

Adult vitality. Eighty-four of the 91 persistent poverty counties (92%) are classified as average, weak, or distressed by the Georgia Rural Development Council’s Human Capital Vitality Index for Adults.18 None are classified as vibrant, and only 7 counties are classified as strong (Figure 3). Thus, many counties in the region of persistent poverty may be characterized by disproportionately high rates of adult crime, low literacy, poor health status, and high food stamp participation.

Vitality for children and youth. Most (75%) of Georgia’s weak or distressed counties as classified on the Georgia Rural Development Council’s Human Capital Vitality Index for Youth and Children19 are located in the persistent poverty region (Figure 4). Thus, many counties in the region of persistent poverty may be characterized by disproportionately high rates of juvenile arrests, high school dropouts, child mortality, and teen pregnancy.

A complete comparison of demographic, social and economic characteristics can be found on page 16.

These data speak to both the current compromised quality of life in the persistent poverty region, as well as the grim prognosis for the next generation.
THE ECONOMIC IMPACT

To better understand the consequences of persistent poverty, we examined the economic structure and competitiveness of Georgia’s persistent poverty counties relative to the counties in the state that have not experienced persistent poverty. In comparing the 91-county persistent poverty region (PPR) to counties in the state not marked by persistent poverty (non-PPR), we discovered that the PPR counties:

- Produce less goods and services in total and per person
- Have a lower output of goods and services
- Are more dependent on low-wage manufacturing than non-PPR counties for economic output and employment
- Have less diversity in the types of industry available
- Have a low value per acre of agriculture
- Are more dependent on government and dividends for household income, while their household income is lower than non-PPR counties.

Analysis of disparities between PPR counties and the state as a whole are also compelling, particularly in terms of income and unemployment levels. The per capita income in the 91-county persistent poverty region is more than $5,500 lower than the average in the entire state of Georgia. At the same time, the impoverished region’s unemployment rate is 29% higher than the rate for the state (7.1% vs. 5.3%).

These findings confirm complementary research sponsored by the Georgia Rural Development Council. This research evaluated the economic vitality of every county as classified by the Georgia Rural Development Council’s Economic Vitality Index. Each county is marked with an index score and placed into one of four categories: declining rural, lagging rural, developing, or existing-emerging growth centers. The two top tiers of fiscal capacity in Georgia include those counties with an index score of 111% or better. Georgia, the top tier of fiscal capacity includes those counties related to basic education and social services. In this case, employment would increase by 856,000 (Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate), and services.

It is natural to ask what would be gained if we “fix” the problem of persistent poverty in Georgia. To answer this question, we estimated the return—or financial gain—to both households and the government that could be expected from a successful effort to eliminate the output gaps between the 91 counties in the PPR region and the rest of the state (the non-PPR, counties).

If the economic gaps between the non-PPR and PPR were eliminated in the service sector alone, the PPR region would:

- Enjoy additional income of $18 billion.
- Boast 389,000 additional jobs.
- Return $1.5 billion to government coffers—$692 million to state and local governments and an additional $809 million to the federal treasury.

These gains (or “opportunity costs”) are even more impressive if we could close the gap in each of the most disadvantaged sectors as well—trade, FIRE (Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate), and services. This could be accomplished by $586,000 jobs and $5 billion would be returned to the public sector for reallocation to other priority investments.

It has become increasingly clear through various economic measures that the persistent poverty region is disproportionately disadvantaged.

Economic vitality. Every county classified as declining rural or lagging rural on the Georgia Rural Development Council’s Economic Vitality Index (54 counties) is located within the persistent poverty region of Georgia. Of the state’s 16 rapidly developing counties, none are located in the persistent poverty region; and only five of the state’s 91 persistent poverty counties are considered developing on the Index.

Fiscal capacity. The relative income generating potential of counties is an indicator of how well they are able to raise sufficient revenues for needs related to basic education and social services. In Georgia, the top tier of fiscal capacity includes those counties with an index score of 111% or better. Fourteen counties in Georgia are in that top tier. Of those 14 counties, only four are located within the 91-county persistent poverty region. The two bottom tiers of fiscal capacity in Georgia include those counties with an index score of 75% or worse.

Sixty-one (61) of Georgia’s 159 counties fall in the 91-county persistent poverty region. The two bottom tiers of fiscal capacity in Georgia include those counties with an index score of 75% or worse. Sixty-one (61) of Georgia’s 159 counties fall in the two bottom tiers of fiscal capacity. Of those 61, the majority (46 counties or 75.4%) is located within the 91-county persistent poverty region.

The production of goods and services per worker is lower in the PPR than in the non-PPR, thus giving the non-PPR a competitive edge over the PPR. The productive capacity of goods and services underlies the creation of wealth. Creation of wealth will be necessary in the PPR if persistent poverty is to be eliminated.
**POSITIVE DIRECTIONS**

Within the 91-county persistent poverty region of Georgia, there are several rural communities that display leadership for improving the vitality of economic and human capital development efforts. All of the counties share a sizable growth in population from 1980 to 2000, and at least a 15% increase in per capita income from 1995 to 2000. The downtown areas in the main cities of many of these counties are recognized nationally as Main Street cities and have received technical assistance and resources to build a stronger local economy. Furthermore, the percent of high school graduates in each county is above the state average.

**Douglas/Coffee County** has provided extensive leadership and local commitment for development along US Highway 441, including efforts to attract a Wal-Mart Distribution Center. The county has received a South Georgia EXCEL (Early Learning Opportunities Act) Grant and implements a Girl Power Program for high-risk girls ages 9-15.

**Dublin/Laurens County** serves as a regional center for education and training through several institutions—including satellite campuses for University of Georgia, Middle Georgia College, and Georgia Southern University as well as the Heart of Georgia Technical College whose campus contains the DuBose Porter Business and Industry Training Center. The county built a welcome center along I-16 to increase tourism. Bank of America and the United Way provide funds for a “Success by 6 Initiative” to ensure that all children reach school age healthy, well-nurtured, and ready to succeed.

**Colquitt/Miller County** initiated extensive downtown development and historic preservation efforts with the Tarrer Inn, Cotton Hall, and the entire town square is listed on the National Historic Register. In addition, Colquitt has been recognized as a Better Hometown Community, Georgia’s small town equivalent to a Main Street City. The county also exhibits a strong community vision and commitment to rural arts and culture, as exemplified by its production of Swamp Gravy, the “Official Folk Life Play of Georgia,” which has received national attention.

**Thomasville/Thomas County** is a leader in agribusiness development through the GENESIS Food Park, a restored manufacturing building that now houses a vegetable processing plant serving several counties. With Thomasville’s downtown area generally known as the retail hub for parts of southwest Georgia and north Florida, the city recently partnered with Flowers Industries to relocate over 100 jobs to the historic JC Penney’s building. The county has shown great foresight by incorporating technological innovation and providing high-speed Internet service.

**Tifton/Tift County** is Georgia’s center for farm experimentation and agricultural education, and houses the Agrirama, University of Georgia Rural Development Center, and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College. In response to their human capital development efforts for youth and children, Tifton has distinguished itself as the “Reading Capital of the World.”

Locally-initiated community economic development offers a ray of hope for breaking the cycle of persistent poverty.
IMPEDIMENTS TO BUILDING WEALTH

The human and economic realities of persistent poverty in Georgia pose major challenges to building wealth. While several counties have taken bold steps to address persistent poverty, we still have 91 counties whose poverty rates have been among the worst in the nation over the last three census periods. These counties share several characteristics worth of note.

- Poor return on state investments. Georgia has experienced a lower return than expected on investments. In particular, the state’s investment strategies, including incentives for rural Georgia, have not produced the anticipated increase in wealth in rural Georgia.
- Insufficient job opportunities. Low-wage manufacturing is not the answer for building wealth. The growth in manufacturing jobs has produced low-wage and low-skill opportunities. The manufacturing sector provides the largest percentage of output in both PPR and non-PPR counties, but PPR counties have a significantly lower output per capita and per square mile. Interestingly, food processing is the largest manufacturing industry in both the PPR and non-PPR but does not appear to benefit the economies of each region in the same way.
- Barriers to workforce development. Georgia’s workforce is not competitive. One factor is the low education levels found among working adults in PPR counties. Compounding this is the loss of population or slow growth in the region, undermining support for a strong workforce and the ability to attract high-paying jobs.
- Housing shortages. Mobile homes are far too common in the PPR, and skilled labor to build adequate, safe housing is in short supply.

LACK OF ECONOMIC FLEXIBILITY. Georgia’s economic capacity and diversity are not sufficiently developed in the PPR to respond to shifts in economic needs and conditions. The state’s economy is not sophisticated enough, for example, to absorb major job losses like the shifts in the textile industry without serious consequences. Limitations linked with persistent poverty. Areas dominated by persistent poverty traditionally do not attract new industry, place less emphasis on school and healthcare systems, and have a limited tax capacity to pay for services.

LAYING A FOUNDATION

The findings from the Study on Persistent Poverty in the South augment several recommendations for breaking the cycle of poverty that have been presented in previous reports. These include the State of Rural Georgia Report published by the Georgia Rural Development Council, and multiple publications by the Southern Growth Policy Board. Together they serve to provide a coherent strategy that, if supported with strong and sustained leadership over time, can indeed foster meaningful change.

Many of the recommendations speak to the need for a shift from industrial development to community development. The key components of that strategy are outlined below.

- Partner with local leadership. Local leadership must be an active and committed participant in the development process. Without the commitment and initiative of local leaders, the state’s return on investment in rural communities has been, and will continue to be, minimal.
- Involve local community residents. The needs and concerns of those living in persistent poverty throughout Georgia must be recognized as policies are developed to address the issues at hand. Local leadership needs to ensure that the views of residents remain represented at the state level.
- Begin with building a workforce capable of competing for quality jobs. A competitive workforce rests at the heart of all successful development efforts. Garnering the resources and sustaining the commitment to improving educational attainment means involving the entire community. A stronger workforce is important for discouraging businesses in Georgia from importing workers from outside the state.
- Maximize and measure return on investment. Many of Georgia’s most distressed communities have received significant state assistance yet continue to lag in social and economic indicators. Investment must focus on achieving results. Enhancing return on investment will require setting both short- and long-term benchmarks, greater coordination among

Poverty continues to take its toll and will not abate on its own.
investment partners, and a realistic assessment of communities’ capacity for development.

**Leverage private sector investment.** As state partners and investors in rural Georgia, local private sector participation is essential for achieving results and accomplishing community and regional social, community, and economic development goals.

**Empower regional entities to design and implement regional development objectives.** Long-range development goals and challenges cross jurisdictional boundaries and require regional cooperation. Allocation of scarce resources should be directed toward regionally developed solutions sponsored by multi-jurisdictional entities and authorities. Regional growth must be based on natural markets and a critical mass of the population. Success will not occur if support for only county-by-county efforts is continued.

**Reexamine economic growth policy and state reinvestment practices.** Less emphasis should be placed on competing for low-wage manufacturing jobs that seem to perpetuate persistent poverty throughout the state. Instead, more diverse job opportunities should be identified that will boost family income levels. In addition, policies should place first priority on the retention and expansion of existing jobs in the state before investing in attracting new jobs.

**Fine-tune investments to adjust for readiness.** There are various stages in the economic development process. Some rural communities are not in a position to attract large employers, regardless of the incentives offered. Many require assistance in completing key infrastructure projects and workforce training. Investments in rural areas must follow assessments of community readiness and respond with resources for services and financing according to specific needs.

**Focus investments to capitalize on local assets.** Communities have a variety of strengths and weaknesses that shape their development efforts. State assistance, limited by uniform rules and federal regulations, often fails to capitalize on unique, non-traditional approaches for development and local innovation. Assistance programs for rural communities should recognize regional and local differences and be adaptable to a variety of obstacles and opportunities instead of using a one-size-fits-all approach. Again, the need to combine efforts of counties may be important to address in policies designed to maximize the development of local assets.

**Ensure coordination among all government entities and maximize utilization of existing resources.** Common development policies and objectives that cut across agencies and programs are needed to facilitate investment in rural Georgia. Currently, communities must adjust development approaches to accommodate the varying objectives, requirements, and funding cycles of direct assistance programs. Common targets and greater coordination among state agencies to address the comprehensive, multi-faceted set of development opportunities and challenges facing rural communities would enhance development efforts in rural Georgia.

**CONCLUSION**

What Georgia most lacks is a coherent, comprehensive strategy that responds to current conditions in our poverty counties, accommodates broader social and economic trends, and champions public policies that will break the cycle of poverty once and for all. State and local leaders can and must work together to design a systematic strategy that builds on the solid foundation that already exists and facilitates a systematic shift from industrial development to community development. Georgia’s strategy must be consistent with and supportive of any federal initiative designed to address persistent poverty in the South. Further delay will only further exacerbate the human suffering and economic costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>Southeast GA</th>
<th>GA All Other</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate (2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (2000)</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,500</td>
<td>63,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income a year (2000)</td>
<td>57,600</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of vintage homes per county (2000)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of mobile homes per household (2000)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population living in poverty (2000)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of children living in poverty, under 18 years of age (2000)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of elders living in poverty, age 65 and older (2000)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting Hispanic as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting White as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting African American as primary race or in combination with other races (2000)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting American Indian as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting Asian as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting other races as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of the population reporting more than one race as primary race (2000)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth rate per 1000 births (2000)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth rate per 1000 live births (2000)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All data are from the 2000 Census except for the low birth weight birth rates.
### Poverty-Related Data by County

#### Table 1: Poverty-Related Data by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Below Poverty Line</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>7,024,284</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>40,776,933</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>27,894,828</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>21,273,823</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>20,576,767</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11,374,848</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10,091,273</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Poverty-Related Data by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Below Poverty Line</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3: Poverty-Related Data by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Below Poverty Line</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 0-18</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 19-25</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-35</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36-45</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 46-55</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 56-65</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 66-75</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 76+</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

Listed below are additional related resources that can be accessed on the study’s website, www.cviog.uga.edu/poverty.

Appendix A: Principal Project Team, Study on Persistent Poverty in the South

Appendix B: Study on Persistent Poverty in the South, Georgia Maps

Appendix C: Georgia Rural Development Council Maps

Appendix D: An Economic Analysis of Georgia’s Persistent Poverty Counties

Appendix E: Persistently Poor Counties in Georgia: Closing the Gap

NOTES


2. Report and all related appendices can be found in the poverty study section of the website for the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia, www.cviog.uga.edu/poverty.

3. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, DP-1 data, the total population was 7,528,185.


5. Georgia Department of Natural Resources: www.dnr.state.ga.us.

6. From the 2001 Georgia Farm Gate Value Report published by the Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development at the University of Georgia.

7. From the University System of Georgia Board of Regents website, www.usg.edu.

8. From *Snapshots* published by the Georgia Center for Non-Profits.

9. From the 2001 U.S. Census, DP-3 data.

National Center for Health Statistics, and obtained from the Area Resource File (Quality Resource Systems, Inc., Fairfax, VA).

17 2000 U.S. Census, DP-2 data.

18 The Human Capital Vitality Index for Adults, commissioned by the Georgia Rural Development Council, classifies Georgia’s 159 counties from best to worst as Vibrant, Strong, Average, Weak, and Distressed, based on the social condition indicators of crime, literacy, health status, and food stamp participation.

19 The Human Capital Vitality Index for Youth and Children, commissioned by the Georgia Rural Development Council, classifies Georgia’s 159 counties from best to worst as Vibrant, Strong, Average, Weak, and Distressed, based on the social condition indicators of juvenile arrests, high school dropouts, child mortality, and teen pregnancy.

20 2000 U.S. Census, DP-3 data.

21 The Economic Vitality Index, commissioned by the Georgia Rural Development Council, classifies Georgia’s 159 counties from best to worst as Rapidly Developing, Developing, Existing & Emerging Growth Centers, Declining Rural, and Lagging Rural, based on employment growth, average wage growth, population growth, unemployment and poverty rates, and per capita income.

22 The fiscal capacity index, commissioned by the Georgia Rural Development Council, measures the ability of a jurisdiction to raise revenue. Sales tax, property tax, licenses, permits, fees, service charges, and other tax revenues are included in determining a jurisdiction’s fiscal capacity. Assuming the state average fiscal capacity is 100 percent, a fiscal capacity of 100 percent or more is better than the state average.

23 From Georgia County Snapshots published by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs.

24 Based on Adult Education Attainment 2000 data included on the County Fact Sheets developed by the Family Connection Partnership.

25 www.nusagorgia.org

