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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

- Public policy makers and economic development practitioners have become increasingly concerned with maintaining and improving the quality of life of their political jurisdictions as a way to maintain their competitive advantage. Greensboro is no exception to this rule.

- The overall purpose of this report is to provide an annual update of the Greensboro performance metrics first identified in the 2003 State of the City Report. The 2015 Update focuses only on the Greensboro metrics. In 2016, a more comprehensive State of the City Report will be published that compares Greensboro to our peer cities.

- Part of the agenda is to stimulate discussion and to educate the general public about the overall performance of Greensboro. The long-term goal for the city of Greensboro is to see increased efficiency, progress and improvement over time for each of the selected metrics.

B. METHODOLOGY

- The benchmark indicators were chosen based on consultation with the Greensboro Partnership and are consistent with the metrics used in prior State of the City Reports with a few exceptions. The list of benchmark indicators includes measures that capture population and demographics, economic growth, education, and health and wellness.

- All the metrics are reported for 2013 unless otherwise indicated.

- It is important to note that data on average wage rates by industry, tax base, high school drop-out rates, and health and wellness are only available at the county level.

C. MAJOR FINDINGS

THE OVERALL ‘STATE OF THE CITY’ IS ONE OF A MIXED RECOVERY

- Much like the rest of the nation, Greensboro continues to experience a fledgling recovery of sorts as the economy continues to turnaround although we continue to face some significant challenges.
Population growth rates continued to be positive but lag behind other large cities in North Carolina

- Greensboro experienced a modest population growth rate of 1.1% between 2012 and 2013 but lagged behind other major cities in the state including Charlotte (2.4%), Durham (2.4%), and Raleigh (2.0%).

Median Earnings and Per Capita Income Increased Significantly Especially Relative to Some Nearby Cities

- Median earnings in Greensboro increased significantly (i.e., 4.2%) from $25,671 in 2012 to $26,738 in 2013. By contrast, median earnings over the same time period declined in Durham (-3.0%), Charlotte (-1.2%), and Raleigh (-0.9%).

- Per capita income in Greensboro increased significantly from $23,912 in 2012 to $27,202 in 2013 – a 13.8% increase. By contrast, per capita income in Durham (7.4%), Raleigh (4.8%), Winston-Salem (3.0%), and Charlotte (1.5%) all experienced more modest relative gains.

- The substantive gains in per capita income in Greensboro suggest that the economic recovery may be partly due to the healthy return on investment in non-earnings. While wages and salaries (or earnings) have risen over time, it is the large gains in non-earnings (especially dividends) that may be most contributing to the substantive increases in per capita income.

Mixed Signals in Greensboro’s Housing Market

- Although median house values in Greensboro increased by 10.7% from $140,300 in 2012 to $155,300 in 2013, the proportion of homes that were owner-occupied dropped below 50% for the first time in recent years.

Greensboro’s Manufacturing Renaissance Falters But Continues to Generate High-Paying Jobs

- Greensboro experienced a substantive decrease in the percentage of its workforce employed in manufacturing declining from 13.1% in 2012 to 11.9% in 2013 interrupting a three year expansion in share. However, average manufacturing wage rates ($58,608) were higher than for any other industry except financial services.

Growth in the Financial Services Industry Appears to Have Faltered Although Wage Gains Were Substantive

- From 2012 to 2013, the financial services industry contracted from 8.0% of Greensboro’s labor force in 2012 to just 6.8% in 2013. However, average wage
rates increased from $58,949 in 2012 to $61,644 in 2013 – the highest wage rates in the city and the largest relative increase (4.6%) much like in last year’s Report.

**Education And Health Services Contracted Although It Still Accounts For Nearly One-Quarter Of All Jobs In Greensboro**

- Education and health services continue to be major industries in the local economy accounting for nearly one-quarter of all jobs in Greensboro. After five years of growth, education and health services decreased from 26.1% of all jobs in 2012 to 24.1% in 2013 – the largest relative decline (-2.0%) of the major industry groups analyzed in this Report. Average wage rates also declined slightly from $42,732 in 2012 to $42,509 in 2013 – the largest absolute decrease in wages in this Report.

**Tax Base Growth Is Flat**

- Partly as a result of the 2012 revaluation and subsequent appeals of value, the Guilford County tax base increased only marginally from $37.01 billion in 2012/13 to $37.03 billion in 2013/14.

**Poverty Rates Continue To Creep Back Up**

- For the second straight year, the percentage of the city population in poverty increased from 20.0% in 2012 to 20.6% in 2013 meaning one in five Greensboro residents were in poverty. (Note: for a family of four with two children under the age of 18, the household is considered poor if total household income is below $23,624 in 2013).

**High School Dropout Rates Remain Very Low**

- The Guilford County County school system high school dropout rate remained one of the lowest rates in all of North Carolina for major urban school systems declining from 2.15% in 2011/12 to 2.07% in 2012/13.

**Health And Wellness Generated Mixed Signals**

- For the second straight year, the infant mortality rate increased from 7.9 per 1,000 live births in 2012 to 8.6 in 2013, although the teenage pregnancy rate declined from 34.1 per 1,000 to 30.3 – part of an encouraging long-term downward trend.
Table 1. Greensboro Metrics: 2012 and 2013 Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>276,566</td>
<td>279,639</td>
<td>+1.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>+1.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. 20-34</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>-0.2 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. 65 or more</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>+0.6 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>+3.1 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>-1.7 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-0.6 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Household Size</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time (mins)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>+1.4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>-0.8 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median House Value ($)</td>
<td>140,300</td>
<td>155,300</td>
<td>+$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Economic Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Earnings ($)</td>
<td>25,671</td>
<td>26,738</td>
<td>+1,067 (+4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income ($)</td>
<td>23,912</td>
<td>27,202</td>
<td>+3,290 (+13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i. % Total Workforce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>-1.2 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>+2.5 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-1.2 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>+1.8 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>-2.0 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Entertainment/Accom/Food</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>+0.9 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-0.7 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii. Average Wage Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Industry (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>42,993</td>
<td>43,459</td>
<td>+466 (+1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>56,663</td>
<td>58,608</td>
<td>+1,945 (+3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>27,387</td>
<td>27,244</td>
<td>-143 (-0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>58,949</td>
<td>61,644</td>
<td>+2,695 (+4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>46,874</td>
<td>47,427</td>
<td>+553 (+1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>42,732</td>
<td>42,509</td>
<td>-223 (-0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Ent/Acc/Food (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>15,395</td>
<td>15,260</td>
<td>-135 (-0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>45,436</td>
<td>45,272</td>
<td>-164 (-0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Base ($) (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>37.01 billion (2012/13)</td>
<td>37.03 billion (2013/14)</td>
<td>+0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (%)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>+0.6 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Drop-Out Rate (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>2.15 (2011/12)</td>
<td>2.07 (2012/13)</td>
<td>-0.08 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled in H.S. or less</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>-0.6 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled in College or more</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>+0.6 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% H.S. Diploma or less</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>-5.2 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% College Degree or more</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>+3.4 %pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Health and Wellness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Preg. Rate (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- Public policy makers and economic development practitioners have become increasingly concerned with maintaining and improving the overall quality of life of their political jurisdictions as a way to maintain their competitive advantage. Greensboro is no exception to this rule.

- Since the early 2000s, Greensboro has conducted several ‘benchmarking’ studies that have quantified community performance measures over time. Action Greensboro commissioned two Benchmark Studies that generated substantial community discussion: the 2001 McKinsey Report and the 2002 Market Street Services Action Plan. The McKinsey Report concluded that “Greater Greensboro is slightly better off today than many of its peer cities in the Southeast” but questioned whether the community could maintain its overall level of prosperity. The McKinsey findings triggered a follow-up study by Market Street Services which recommended that Greensboro should begin to track a number of performance measures “to help the community benchmark progress made through its economic development efforts.”

- The Action Greensboro Benchmark Report completed in 2003 was the first comprehensive empirical assessment of the overall economic performance of the Greensboro community relative to a carefully chosen peer group of cities. The Report concluded that Greensboro is much better-off than many of its peer group, although recent job losses have the potential to substantially jeopardize the city’s standing.

- The follow-up 2007 State of the City Report concluded that Greensboro was lagging behind its competitors particularly in terms of average wage rates and tax base growth. The overall state of the city appeared to be less than robust, in part, because of the significant job losses the city absorbed in the early 2000s.

- Although the 2009 State of the City Report indicated that Greensboro was showing signs of recovery as both median earnings and per capita income increased after several years of decline, the 2010 Report suggested that Greensboro was impacted disproportionately by the national recession relative to the peer city group.

- The 2011 Report indicated that despite the national recession, median earnings and per capita income showed signs of resilience in Greensboro although the poverty rate jumped significantly. That said, the 2012 Report indicated that median earnings and per capita income declined markedly, and poverty rates remained high, although Greensboro experienced a manufacturing revitalization that included high paying jobs. However, the 2013 and 2014 State of the City Report suggested some of the first signs of a fledgling recovery as the
manufacturing sector continued to grow along with financial services although the 2014 Report saw median earnings, per capita income, and the overall tax base decline slightly and the poverty rate creep back up.
PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

- The overall purpose of this report is to provide an annual update of the Greensboro performance metrics identified in the 2014 State of the City Report. The 2015 Update focuses only on the Greensboro metrics and is the tenth annual update that tracks the overall performance of our city. In 2016, a more comprehensive State of the City Report will be published that compares Greensboro to our peer cities.

- Part of the agenda is to stimulate discussion and to educate the general public about the overall performance of Greensboro. The long-term goal for the city of Greensboro is to see increased efficiency, progress and improvement over time for each of the selected community performance indicators.
PROJECT METHODOLOGY

A. DETERMINING THE METRICS

- The metrics were chosen based on consultation with the Greensboro Partnership and are consistent with the metrics used in the first State of the City Report published in 2007 (which was based on 2005 data).

- All the metrics are reported for 2013 unless otherwise indicated.

- It is important to note that data on average wage rates by industry, tax base, high school drop-out rates, and health and wellness are only available at the county level.

- The list of benchmark indicators includes measures that capture population and demographics, economic growth, education, and health and wellness.

- POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC METRICS INCLUDED:
  
  o Annual City Population Estimates (Source: U.S. Census Annual Population Estimates July 1st)
  
  o Age Distribution (Source: ACS) (Median age, %20-34, %65 and over)

  o Racial/Ethnic Composition (Source: ACS) (% white, African American, Hispanic)

  o Residential Sprawl indicators (Source: ACS) (Mean household size, Mean travel time)

  o Home Ownership and Value (Source: ACS) (% owner-occupied, median house value)

- ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB METRICS INCLUDED:

  o Median Earnings for all Workers (Source: ACS)

  o Per Capita Income (Source: ACS)

  o Jobs: Labor Force Composition by Industry (Source: ACS)

  o Average Wages by Industry (county only) (Source: BLS)
• Tax Base (county only) (Source: Guilford County Tax Department)  
  (Total Taxable Valuation of Real Property)

• Poverty Rate (Source: ACS)

• **EDUCATION METRICS INCLUDED:**

  • High School Drop-Out Rate (county only) (Source: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction)

  • School Enrollment (Source: ACS)  
    (% High School or less, % College or more)

  • Educational Attainment (Source: ACS)  
    (% HS or less, % BA or more)

• **HEALTH AND WELLNESS METRICS INCLUDED:**

  • Infant Mortality Rates (county only) (Source: NCDPH)

  • Teenage Pregnancy Rates (county only) (Source: NCDPH) (15-19 years old)

• (Note: ACS – American Community Survey; BLS – Bureau of Labor Statistics;  
  and NCDPH – North Carolina Division of Public Health)

**B. UPDATING AND REFINING THE METRICS**

Some of the benchmark metrics reported in previous State of the City reports have been updated and refined over time. These include the following metrics:

• The U.S. Census Bureau **annual city population estimates** are continually adjusted and updated over time. The 2009 through 2013 data provided in Table One reflect these changes and consequently are more accurate estimates than those included in previous State of the City reports that were based on ACS data that tend to have higher margins of error. It should also be noted that the **annual population estimates** reflect administrative records on births, deaths and migration, and are not the same as the city population data published as part of the 2000 and 2010 Census which is a comprehensive count of the actual population. Consequently, the 2010 Census city population data is not directly comparable to the 2009 through 2013 annual population estimate data because they are calculated in different ways and so is not included in this Report.

• It should also be noted that the definitions for the % **owner-occupied** metric, the **school enrollment** metric and the **educational attainment** metric have been
revised to more closely follow the convention adopted by the American Community Survey methodology. The % owner-occupied housing metric is now divided into the total number of occupied units available in Greensboro (rather than total housing units which included vacant units as in previous State of the City reports.) The school enrollment metric simply measures the percentage of the student population aged three or over that is enrolled in either K-12 (which includes nursery or preschool) or college, respectively. By contrast, the educational attainment metric captures the percentage of the population aged 25 or older with a high school diploma or less and with a college degree or more. Previously, both of these education metrics were divided into the total city population. The 2009 through 2013 data included in Table One has been amended to reflect these definitional changes and, thus, no longer match the data in previous State of the City reports for these specific metrics.
FINDINGS: GREENSBORO 2009 - 2013

Comparing the 2013 Greensboro metrics back to the previous State of the City reports helps the community to benchmark progress made through its economic development efforts over time (Table One). By developing a time-series, it becomes possible to place an emphasis on outcomes in judging the success of the city’s economic development programs.

A. POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS

POPULATION CHANGE

- Net population change is a straightforward measure about whether a city is growing, stagnating or declining. Maintaining consistent net population increases over time suggests that a community is prosperous and able to attract and keep workers. Conversely, cities that have experienced substantial population losses over time may be unable to retain workers which may be a ‘red-flag’ for prospective businesses.

- The population of Greensboro increased from 276,566 in 2012 to 279,639 in 2013 – a modest increase of 1.1%. Greensboro’s population growth rate lagged behind several of their competitors including Charlotte (2.4%), Durham (2.4%), and Raleigh (2.0%) although Winston-Salem (0.9%) experienced a more sluggish growth rate over the same time period.

AGE DISTRIBUTION

- Analyzing the age distribution of a city can provide some insight into the underlying attractiveness of the city’s economy. A city with a significant number of college-aged 20-34 year olds suggests a potentially contemporary economy with ‘cutting-edge’ occupations. Conversely, as the population of a city ages, there will be a much greater demand for medical services which can lead to significant demands on scarce public resources.

- Between 2012 and 2013, the median age in Greensboro increased noticeably from 33.6 to 34.8 years old while the percentage of the population between 20 – 34 years old declined from 24.9% in 2012 to 24.7% in 2013. Based on the 2009 to 2013 trends outlined in Table One, the median age of the city in 2013 reversed a three year decline that first began in 2010 although the decline in the percent of the population aged between 20 – 34 years old has now continued since 2011 when it peaked at 25.4%. By contrast, the percentage of the population that was classified as elderly (65 years or more) increased from 12.0% in 2012 to 12.6% in 2013.
Table 1. Greensboro Benchmark Metrics: 2009 – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>267,650</td>
<td>269,628</td>
<td>272,637</td>
<td>276,566</td>
<td>279,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. 20-34</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pop. 65 or more</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Household Size</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time (mins)</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median House Value ($)</td>
<td>143,800</td>
<td>149,300</td>
<td>151,300</td>
<td>140,300</td>
<td>155,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Economic Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Earnings ($)</td>
<td>26,205</td>
<td>23,953</td>
<td>25,761</td>
<td>25,671</td>
<td>26,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income ($)</td>
<td>24,982</td>
<td>23,832</td>
<td>24,208</td>
<td>23,912</td>
<td>27,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i. % Total Workforce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Entertainment/Accom/Food</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii. Average Wage Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Industry (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>40,040</td>
<td>41,080</td>
<td>41,835</td>
<td>42,993</td>
<td>43,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>51,293</td>
<td>54,017</td>
<td>55,117</td>
<td>56,663</td>
<td>56,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>25,933</td>
<td>26,491</td>
<td>26,512</td>
<td>27,387</td>
<td>27,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>50,867</td>
<td>53,612</td>
<td>55,614</td>
<td>58,949</td>
<td>61,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>42,963</td>
<td>43,572</td>
<td>44,652</td>
<td>46,874</td>
<td>47,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Health (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>41,611</td>
<td>41,892</td>
<td>42,420</td>
<td>42,732</td>
<td>42,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Ent/Acc/Food (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>14,599</td>
<td>14,733</td>
<td>14,942</td>
<td>15,395</td>
<td>15,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>42,968</td>
<td>44,103</td>
<td>44,666</td>
<td>45,436</td>
<td>45,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Base ($) (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>36.5 billion</td>
<td>36.8 billion</td>
<td>37.1 billion</td>
<td>37.01 billion</td>
<td>37.03 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (%)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled in H.S. or less</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled in College</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% H.S. Diploma or less</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% College Degree or more</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Health and Wellness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Preg Rate (Guilford Co)</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Racial Composition

- Cities that are ethnically diverse frequently tend to be more progressive and innovative although integrating impoverished minorities into a contemporary workforce can sometimes pose substantial challenges.

- Greensboro is rapidly becoming a more diverse city, however, the percent of Greensboro’s population that was classified as white increased from 47.3% in 2012 to 50.4% in 2013 reversing a three year decline in market share from a five year high of 52.6% in 2010. By contrast, the percent of the Greensboro population classified as African-American declined from 42.7% in 2012 to 41.0% in 2013.

- During the past five years, the Hispanic population in Greensboro has mimicked trends in the African American population. The percentage of the population classified as Hispanic has steadily increased of late from 6.6% in 2010 to a record high of 7.8% in 2012 but, much like the African American community, that figure declined to 7.2% in 2013.

Residential Sprawl Indicators

- Recent sprawl studies have indicated that Greensboro and the Piedmont Triad metropolitan area have some of the most sprawling growth patterns in the United States. Relatively simple measures of sprawl include the way in which we utilize land (e.g., mean household size) and the length of our daily journey-to-work commutes (e.g., mean travel time).

- Analyzing the average number of persons resident in each dwelling unit provides some insight into how efficiently each city is utilizing land with respect to density. In Greensboro, the mean household size has changed little with no consistent long-term trends, decreasing from a mean of 2.37 persons in 2012 to 2.31 persons per household in 2013.

- Regarding mean travel time, Greensboro experienced a noticeable increase in journey to work commute times from 19.2 minutes in 2012 to 20.6 minutes in 2013 which is part of a general trend of increasing commute times.

Home Ownership and Value

- A high percentage of home ownership illustrates a propensity for residential stability in a community and signals a vote of confidence in the overall quality of life of the area. If a large proportion of the population opts to invest in the real estate market instead of renting, it implies a long-term commitment to the community.
• Homeownership in Greensboro declined precipitously from 56.5% of the housing stock in owner-occupied units in 2011 to 50.7% in 2012 – a decline of nearly 6 percentage points. The recent recession is likely a major causal factor and this trend has continued through 2013 where the percent owner-occupied dropped to 49.9% of the housing stock.

• Despite the continued declines in home ownership levels in Greensboro from 2011 to 2013, the median house value increased markedly from $140,300 in 2012 to $155,300 (a 10.7% increase) which correlates well with the four year rise in house prices from $143,100 in 2008 to $151,300 in 2011. The unusually low median house value of $140,300 in 2012 looks to be an exception to the rule as the Greensboro community continues to slowly emerge from the 2009 recession.

B. ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOBS

Economic growth on its own may not be the most important indicator of economic change for a city economy. Simple employment growth can impoverish a local economy if high-wage, high-skill jobs are replaced with low-wage, low-skill jobs. Job creation without a concern for the composition of skills needed may be a flawed economic development strategy. Substantial job growth must occur in robust and productive industries if an economy is to maintain a competitive advantage over other cities.

MEDIAN EARNINGS

• Median earnings are an excellent measure of the overall skill level of the community and the quality of jobs being created in an area. Earnings are defined as the sum of wage and salary disbursements and are often used as a proxy for income generated specifically from participation in production.

• Overall median earnings in Greensboro increased significantly (4.2%) from $25,671 in 2012 to $26,738 in 2013. By contrast, some of our competitors experienced significant declines in median earnings over the same time period including Durham (-3.0%), Charlotte (-1.2%), and Raleigh (-0.9%). However, Winston-Salem increased median earnings by a remarkable 11.4% to $25,433 in 2013 although this was still well below Greensboro median earnings. By contrast, median earnings in Raleigh were the highest of the five North Carolina cities at $31,725 while Charlotte was second at $29,938.

PER CAPITA INCOME

• Per capita income is an excellent measure of the overall accumulation of wealth although it is not a direct measure of wages and salaries because it also includes income derived from non-earnings in such things as interest, dividend, rent and transfer payments.
Greensboro experienced the largest percentage increase in per capita income of the five largest North Carolina cities increasing from $23,912 in 2012 to $27,202 in 2013 – a 13.8% increase. All the other cities also reported increases in per capita income including Durham (7.4%), Raleigh (4.8%), Winston-Salem (3.0%) and Charlotte (1.5%). The three Research Triangle cities experienced per capita incomes around $31,000 while Winston-Salem had the lowest per capita income at $24,565. The substantive gains in per capita income across the board suggest that the economic recovery may be partly due to the healthy return on investment in non-earnings. While wages and salaries (or earnings) have risen over time, it is the large gains in non-earnings (especially dividends) that may be most contributing to the substantive increases in per capita income.

JOBS: LABOR FORCE COMPOSITION BY INDUSTRY

Economic diversity is frequently promoted as a means through which to achieve economic stability where the underlying logic is that a higher level of economic diversification is associated with long-term economic stability. Most economic diversity studies focus on employment composition by major sector as a simple way to capture diversity.

After a four year upward trend in the percentage of the Greensboro workforce employed in manufacturing – which grew from 11.1% of the total workforce in 2009 to 13.1% of all workers in 2012 – the sector decreased to 11.9% in 2013. Although, nationally, the manufacturing sector has been one of the most robust sectors of the economy since emerging from recession, that growth must now be questioned in Greensboro as it appears it may now be the exception to the rule.

Since 2011, the share of jobs in retail in Greensboro has steadily increased from a five year low of 11.1% in 2011 to 14.5% in 2013 – perhaps a sign that the retail sector is once again hiring as the community emerges out of the Great Recession. More troubling, retail is not particularly well paid but it experienced the largest percentage growth in job share (2.5%) of the major industries included in this Report.

A major component of any city economy is financial services – particularly in the downtown area where financial services tend to congregate because of proximity to City Hall, the courthouse and each other. Greensboro experienced a significant decrease in the percentage of the labor pool employed in financial services – accounting for just 6.8% of the labor force in 2013 compared to 8.0% in 2012. Other than education/health, the 1.2 percentage point decrease in the share of financial services jobs is the largest relative decline of any industry in Greensboro.

Professional, Scientific and Management jobs specialize in a wide range of activities including legal advice, accounting, architectural and engineering services, computer services, consulting and research, logistics, plus a wide range
of management and administrative services. In all cases, these activities require a high degree of expertise and training, and they are the sorts of high-wage, high-skill jobs that robust city economies should be attracting to the local area. After a three year decline in the proportion of jobs in this sector, the share of Professional, Scientific and Management jobs in Greensboro increased from 7.8% in 2012 to 9.6% in 2013 – the second highest relative increase of the major industry groupings analyzed in this Report behind only Retail.

- Traditionally, **education and health service jobs** make up one of the largest sectors of any city economy accounting for over one-fifth of all jobs on average. Greensboro is no exception to this rule with education and health accounting for nearly one-quarter of all jobs in the city. However, the share of jobs in education and health services declined noticeably from 26.1% in 2012 to 24.1% in 2013 – the largest relative decline of all the major industry groupings analyzed in this Report. Furthermore, this relative decline is made more acute by the four previous years of relative gains where education and health services grew from 24.2% of all jobs in 2009 to 26.1% in 2012. Much of this may be attributable to the substantive budget cuts experienced in both the K-12 school systems and most of the higher education institutions in the city in recent years.

- An important part of any city economy is the **arts and entertainment, accommodation and food industry** particularly in downtown areas which tend to act as important focal points for the industry. Greensboro’s share in this industry increased from 10.7% in 2012 to 11.6% in 2013 – the third largest relative gain of any major industry in Greensboro for that time period and a turnaround from a four year decline in the share of jobs attributable to this sector of the economy from 2009 through 2012. Although the Greensboro city center has recently experienced a rebirth of sorts – particularly the nightclubs and bars along South Elm Street – more could be done to attract young urban professionals to the city. It is likely that the ongoing efforts to the build the Tanger Performing Arts Center and related hotel development may help to build on recent successes.

- It is clear that the **transportation logistics and warehousing industry** has the potential to become a major player in the Greensboro economy particularly with the opening of the mid-Atlantic FedEx hub in 2009 at Piedmont Triad International Airport and the rapidly expanding FedEx ground hub near Kernersville. As Greensboro has slowly emerged from the Great Recession, this sector of the economy has also slowly rebounded. However, the percentage of jobs in transportation and warehousing was just 4.8% in 2013 compared to 5.5% in 2012.

**Average Wages By Industry**

Analyzing average wages can provide a more detailed insight into the variation in skill levels by major industrial groupings – assuming that higher wages are a reflection of more specialized skills that require higher levels of training and expertise. The following
data is derived from the North Carolina Employment Security Commission (ESC) and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) because the 2013 American Community Survey does not report data on average wages by specific industry. It should also be noted that ESC data by city is not available so the data is reported at the county level.

- **Overall average wages** in Guilford County increased from $42,993 in 2012 to $43,459 in 2013 – a 1.1% increase (+ $466).

- Although many Southeastern cities have experienced substantial manufacturing job losses in recent years, those manufacturing workers that remain employed tend to be involved in high-wage, high-skill activities. Guilford County’s average wage rates in manufacturing increased 3.4% (+ $1,945) from $56,663 in 2012 to $58,608 in 2013 – the second highest average wage of any industry in the county. Manufacturing companies in Guilford County continue to experience robust wage growth and pay better than nearly any other major industry, part of a positive long-term trend.

- **Retail** jobs on the whole paid poorly offering an average wage of just $27,387 in 2012 and $27,244 in 2013. Only the arts and entertainment/accommodation and food industry generated lower average wage rates and retail was one of four sectors of the local economy that experienced a net decline in average wages (-0.5%).

- The **financial services** sector generated the highest average wage rate in the local economy (i.e., $61,644 in 2013) and experienced the highest relative wage gains (+4.6%) of any industry in Guilford County from 2012 to 2013. Guilford County appears to be cultivating a well paid, highly skilled financial cluster in the city and it seems to be a sector of the economy that deserves additional attention.

- The average wage rates in the **professional and business services** sector experienced the third highest relative wage growth in the community (+1.2%) increasing from $46,874 in 2012 to $47,427 in 2013, the third highest average wages of any major industry in the community.

- Although **education and health services** is the largest job generator in the city, it experienced a slight decline in average wages of -0.5% going from $42,732 in 2012 to $42,509 in 2013 – a troubling sign for such a large part of the local economy.

- The **arts and entertainment/accommodation and food industry** generated the lowest average wages of all the major industry groupings in this report where the average wage rate was $15,395 in 2012 compared to just $15,260 in 2013 – a 0.9% decline, the largest relative drop of all the major industry groups analyzed in this Report. That said, performing artists and spectator sports paid an average wage of $27,557 in 2013 compared to just $19,361 in the hotel sector and $14,483 for restaurants and bars.
• Guilford County has been touted lately as an emerging transportation and warehousing market and it offers the fourth highest average wage rates in the community which were $45,436 in 2012 and $45,272 in 2013 – a slight decline of -0.4%.

**TAX BASE YIELD**

One of the key metrics in determining the success or failure of a community is its ability to grow its property tax base. Healthy, thriving communities that are able to attract high value-added companies to the tax base should experience significant increases in total taxable real estate. The following data was obtained from the Guilford County Tax Department – it should be noted that data by city was not available so the data is reported at the county level.

• The overall tax base in Guilford County increased marginally (+0.05%) from $37.01 billion in 2012/13 to $37.03 billion in 2013/14. Much of the explanation for the stagnant tax base is likely partly attributable to the lingering effects of the recession and the 2012 revaluation on the local community.

Analyzing the percentage of total taxable real estate derived from residential properties can provide some insight into how well communities are ‘holding back’ land for industrial development. Industrial properties tend to generate better tax yields than residential properties on a per acre basis so it becomes important not to have an unusually high amount of the total tax base come from residential properties.

• The percentage of the total property tax base generated from residential properties was 68.9% in 2012/13 and increased slightly to 69.1% in 2013/14.

**POVERTY RATE**

The poverty rate is an indication of the magnitude of the various social problems that can adversely impact the competitive advantage of a local community. The U.S. Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds to define the poverty rate that vary by household size and composition to detect who is poor. For example, for a family of four with two children under the age of 18, the household is considered poor if total household income is below $23,624 in 2013.

• The Greensboro poverty rate increased between 2012 and 2013 going from 20.0% to 20.6% of the population which compared unfavorably to the 2013 U.S. national average of 15.8%. Since 2009, the poverty rate in Greensboro has been stubbornly high and well above the national average.

• That said, the 2013 poverty rate of several neighboring cities was noticeably higher including Winston-Salem (26.7%) and High Point (23.0%), although Durham (18.2%), Charlotte (17.0%), and Raleigh (15.1%) were all lower.
C. EDUCATION

A crucial indicator of the level of workforce preparedness in a city is the level of educational achievement in the community. For example, urban school systems experiencing above average high school drop-out rates are places that are unlikely to be economically sustainable in the long-term.

HIGH SCHOOL DROP-OUT RATES

- The Guilford County Schools high school dropout rate remains very low and has declined every year since 2008. In 2011/12 the high school dropout rate was 2.15% and in 2012/13 it had declined further to 2.07% – one of the lowest dropout rates in North Carolina for major urban school systems.

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

By analyzing the percentage of the population aged three years and older that is enrolled in school, it becomes possible to assess the relative mix of the K-12 system (includes nursery schools and preschool) relative to the enrollment demand for community colleges and university in a particular community. Communities with rapidly growing K-12 systems and disproportionately smaller college populations over time are unlikely to compete in the contemporary knowledge economy.

- The percentage of the Greensboro student population enrolled in K-12 systems decreased from 59.0% of the student population in 2012 to 58.4% in 2013. By contrast, the college population increased slightly from 41.0% in 2012 to 41.6% in 2013.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Another way of measuring the skill levels of the adult population is by ranking the educational attainment of the population aged 25 or older. Communities with a substantial share of adults with a high school education or less are unlikely to be competitive in the contemporary knowledge economy.

- The percentage of the Greensboro population with a high school diploma or less and a college degree or more were heading in different directions but with similarly positive implications.

- In 2012, the percentage of the population with a high school diploma or less was 36.6% compared to 31.4% in 2013 – a significant decline and a positive trend line given the need for skills in the contemporary knowledge economy.
- By contrast, the percentage of the population with a college degree increased noticeably from 35.0% in 2012 to 38.4% in 2013 – an encouraging trend line and a return to the long-term trend of increasing this share over time, particularly after the brief decline in the share of college degree holders from 2011 to 2012.

- It should be noted that the statistics do not round to 100% because a significant proportion of the Greensboro population has either an associate degree or some college credit but no degree (i.e., 30.3% of the population in 2013 compared to just 28.6% in 2012).

**D. Health and Wellness**

Health and wellness metrics can be robust measures of the overall quality of life of a community. Mature, diverse economies that provide opportunities for all of the population tend to be communities that experience few underlying social problems.

**Infant Mortality Rate**

Infant mortality rate is one of several health and wellness metrics that can accurately measure the distribution of wealth and opportunity across a community. Well-educated, affluent communities tend to experience lower infant mortality rates. Data was collected at the county level from the Guilford County Department of Health.

- The infant mortality rate increased from 7.9 per 1,000 live births in 2012 to 8.6 in 2013, part of a troubling three year increase in this rate.

**Teenage Pregnancy Rates**

A large number of teenage pregnancies can be considered a major risk factor for a community because it can lead to poverty and substantially hinder the overall performance and quality of the local area’s workforce. A high teenage pregnancy rate can imply that a community has some long-term systemic problems that have the potential to negatively impact the community. Data was collected at the county level from the North Carolina Division of Public Health.

- The teenage pregnancy rate declined from 34.1 per 1,000 females aged 15-19 years old in 2012 to 30.3 in 2013 – a notable drop and part of an encouraging long-term downward trend.
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

THE OVERALL ‘STATE OF THE CITY’ IS ONE OF A MIXED RECOVERY

- Much like the rest of the nation, Greensboro continues to experience a fledgling recovery of sorts as the economy continues to turnaround although we continue to face some significant challenges.

POPULATION GROWTH RATES CONTINUED TO BE POSITIVE BUT LAG BEHIND OTHER LARGE CITIES IN NORTH CAROLINA

- Greensboro experienced a modest population growth rate of 1.1% between 2012 and 2013 but lagged behind other major cities in the state including Charlotte (2.4%), Durham (2.4%), and Raleigh (2.0%).

MEDIAN EARNINGS AND PER CAPITA INCOME INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY ESPECIALLY RELATIVE TO SOME NEARBY CITIES

- Median earnings in Greensboro increased significantly (i.e., 4.2%) from $25,671 in 2012 to $26,738 in 2013. By contrast, median earnings over the same time period declined in Durham (-3.0%), Charlotte (-1.2%), and Raleigh (-0.9%).

- Per capita income in Greensboro increased significantly from $23,912 in 2012 to $27,202 in 2013 – a 13.8% increase. By contrast, per capita income in Durham (7.4%), Raleigh (4.8%), Winston-Salem (3.0%), and Charlotte (1.5%) all experienced more modest relative gains.

- The substantive gains in per capita income in Greensboro suggest that the economic recovery may be partly due to the healthy return on investment in non-earnings. While wages and salaries (or earnings) have risen over time, it is the large gains in non-earnings (especially dividends) that may be most contributing to the substantive increases in per capita income.

MIXED SIGNALS IN GREENSBORO’S HOUSING MARKET

- Although median house values in Greensboro increased by 10.7% from $140,300 in 2012 to $155,300 in 2013, the proportion of homes that were owner-occupied dropped below 50% for the first time in recent years.

GREENSBORO’S MANUFACTURING RENAISSANCE FAULTERS BUT CONTINUES TO GENERATE HIGH-PAYING JOBS

- Greensboro experienced a substantive decrease in the percentage of its workforce employed in manufacturing declining from 13.1% in 2012 to 11.9% in 2013 interrupting a three year expansion in share. However, average manufacturing
wage rates ($58,608) were higher than for any other industry except financial services.

GROWTH IN THE FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY APPEARS TO HAVE FALTERED
ALTHOUGH WAGE GAINS WERE SUBSTANTIVE

- From 2012 to 2013, the financial services industry contracted from 8.0% of Greensboro’s labor force in 2012 to just 6.8% in 2013. However, average wage rates increased from $58,949 in 2012 to $61,644 in 2013 – the highest wage rates in the city and the largest relative increase (4.6%) much like in last year’s Report.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH SERVICES CONTRACTED ALTHOUGH IT STILL ACCOUNTS
FOR NEARLY ONE-QUARTER OF ALL JOBS IN GREENSBORO

- Education and health services continue to be major industries in the local economy accounting for nearly one-quarter of all jobs in Greensboro. After five years of growth, education and health services decreased from 26.1% of all jobs in 2012 to 24.1% in 2013 – the largest relative decline (-2.0%) of the major industry groups analyzed in this Report. Average wage rates also declined slightly from $42,732 in 2012 to $42,509 in 2013 – the largest absolute decrease in wages in this Report.

TAX BASE GROWTH IS FLAT

- Partly as a result of the 2012 revaluation and subsequent appeals of value, the Guilford County tax base increased only marginally from $37.01 billion in 2012/13 to $37.03 billion in 2013/14.

POVERTY RATES CONTINUE TO CREEP BACK UP

- For the second straight year, the percentage of the city population in poverty increased from 20.0% in 2012 to 20.6% in 2013 meaning one in five Greensboro residents were in poverty. (Note: for a family of four with two children under the age of 18, the household is considered poor if total household income is below $23,624 in 2013).

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT RATES REMAIN VERY LOW

- The Guilford County County school system high school dropout rate remained one of the lowest rates in all of North Carolina for major urban school systems declining from 2.15% in 2011/12 to 2.07% in 2012/13.
HEALTH AND WELLNESS GENERATED MIXED SIGNALS

- For the second straight year, the infant mortality rate increased from 7.9 per 1,000 live births in 2012 to 8.6 in 2013, although the teenage pregnancy rate declined from 34.1 per 1,000 to 30.3 – part of an encouraging long-term downward trend.
TECHNICAL FOOTNOTES

Unless otherwise noted, most of the data utilized in the report was derived from the 2013 American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is a relatively new nationwide survey that allows communities online access to current demographic and housing data on an annual basis. Instead of waiting 10 years for the decennial census data, the annual ACS makes it possible for communities to make more accurate, timely and informed decisions.

The 2013 ACS provided data for geographic areas with a total population of 65,000 or more. The annual sample size expanded from about 800,000 addresses in 1,240 counties in 2004 to approximately 3 million addresses in 3,219 U.S. counties in 2013. The data is available at the following web link:

http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t

Those metrics based on the 2013 ACS data included:

- median age of the population
- % population 20-34
- % population 65 or more
- % white, black and Hispanic
- mean household size (persons)
- mean travel time (minutes) to work for workers over age 16
- % owner-occupied housing units
- median house value ($)
- median worker earnings ($). (Earnings are defined as the sum of wage or salary income and net income from full and part-time employment. "Earnings" represent the amount of income received regularly for people 16 years old and over before deductions for personal income taxes, Social Security, bond purchases, union dues, Medicare deductions, etc.)
- per capita income ($). (Income is defined as the sum of wage and salary income plus income derived from such things as interest, dividend, rent and transfer payments.)
- % of the total workforce employed in manufacturing (NAICS 31-33)
- % of the total workforce employed in retail – private sector only (NAICS 44-45)
- % of the total workforce employed in financial services (NAICS 52-53)
- % of the total workforce employed in professional, scientific and management services (NAICS 54-56)
- % of the total workforce employed in education/health services (NAICS 61-62)
- % of the total workforce employed in arts and entertainment, accommodation, and food and drinks (NAICS 71-72)
- % of the total workforce employed in transportation and warehousing (NAICS 48-49)
- % poverty rate (percentage of people whose income in the last 12 months is below the poverty level.) The U.S. Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds to define the poverty rate that vary by size and composition to detect who is poor. When the Social Security Administration (SSA) created the poverty
definition in 1964, it focused on family food consumption. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) used its data about the nutritional needs of children and adults to construct food plans for families. Within each food plan, dollar amounts varied according to the total number of people in the family and the family's composition; that is, the number of children within each family. The cheapest of these plans, the Economy Food Plan, was designed to address the dietary needs of families on an austere budget. Since the Economy Food Plan budgets varied by family size and composition, so too did the poverty thresholds. The poverty thresholds are revised annually to allow for changes in the cost of living as reflected in the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The poverty thresholds are the same for all parts of the country; they are not adjusted for regional, state, or local variations in the cost of living. To determine a person's poverty status, one compares the person's total family income in the last twelve months with the poverty threshold appropriate for that person's family size and composition:

- % enrolled in high school or less
- % enrolled in college or more
- % of population over age 25 with a H.S. diploma or less
- % of population over age 25 with a college degree or more

The total population data is based on the annual population estimates published by the U.S. Census Bureau and not the ACS data (see the Methodology section of the Report for additional details). The U.S. Census Bureau produces estimates of total resident population for all areas of general-purpose government on an annual basis. The Census Bureau develops county population estimates with a demographic procedure called an "administrative records component of population change" method. For the household population, the components of population change are births, deaths, net domestic migration, net international migration, and net military movement to and from overseas. Change in the non-household population is measured by the net change in the population living in group quarters facilities. The city population estimates are derived using the "Distributive Housing Unit Method" which uses housing unit estimates to distribute the county population to subcounty areas within the county. Housing unit estimates use building permits, mobile home shipments, and estimates of housing unit loss to update housing unit change since the last census. The Census Bureau develops a household population estimate by applying the occupancy rate and average persons per household (PPH) from the latest census at the subcounty level to an estimate of housing units. The final estimate is calculated by adding the population in group quarters to the household population. The assumption implicit in this method is that changes in the occupancy rate and/or the PPH are measured by the updated county population estimate and that the rate of change in the occupancy rate and/or PPH is uniform within counties. The U.S. Census Bureau annual population estimates data is available at the following web link:

http://www.census.gov/popest/data/index.html

The average wage rate data is derived from the North Carolina Employment Security Commission and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) because the 2013 ACS does not report data on average wages by industry. BLS data was not available for Greensboro so all average wage rate data is for Guilford County. (Wage or salary income includes
total money earnings received for work performed as an employee during the past 12 months. It includes wages, salary, armed forces pay, commissions, tips, piece-rate payments, and cash bonuses earned before deductions were made for taxes, bonds, pensions, union dues, etc. The average wages of workers in each industry was calculated in the following manner: 

\[
\frac{\text{Federal Wages} + \text{State Wages} + \text{Local Government Wages} + \text{Private Wages}}{\text{Federal Employees} + \text{State Employees} + \text{Local Government Employees} + \text{Private Employees}} = \text{Average Wages.} \quad (\text{Note: not all industries reported workers in both the public and private sectors})
\]

The BLS wage rate data is available at the following web link:

http://www.bls.gov/cew/

The **tax base** data (total taxable valuation of real property) comes from Greg French, Assistant Tax Director of the Guilford County Tax Department. The data is collected at the county level.

The **high school dropout rate** data was obtained from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and the reported figure is for Guilford County not the city of Greensboro. The data is available at the following web link:

http://www.ncpublicschools.org/research/dropout/reports/

The **health and wellness** data was collected from the North Carolina Division of Public Health, NC State Center for Health Statistics. The infant mortality rate was calculated based on the number of infant deaths under one year of age per 1,000 live births. The teenage pregnancy rate was calculated based on the number of live-births, fetal deaths, and induced abortions per 1,000 females aged between 15-19 years old. Both metrics were not available for Greensboro and were reported at the county level. The data is available at the following web link:

http://www.schs.state.nc.us/data/county.cfm