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Section VI-B
Disparities in Access to Opportunity — Employment

KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

■ Protected class groups experience disparities in access to jobs and labor markets. Blacks and Hispanics face greater barriers in accessing jobs due to lower educational attainment, distance from jobs and lack of public transportation services. People with disabilities are less likely to be employed, and have lower earnings and income. Women are in the labor force and employed at percentages similar to men, with the exception of foreign-born women, where culture may be a factor in their entry into the labor force.

■ A person’s place of resident affects his or her ability to obtain a job. The majority of the region’s jobs, 60 percent, are in areas with low concentrations of minorities and persons in poverty. The areas with very high concentrations offer the fewest job opportunities. The lack of good public transportation can limit employment options for many residents.

■ However, other barriers exist besides physical proximity to jobs for those living in areas of poverty and minority concentrations. Low educational attainment or achievement, due in part to lack of access to educational opportunities, limits job prospects and earnings potential.
Analysis of labor force access and quality

The labor market engagement index provides a summary description of the relative intensity of labor market engagement and human capital in a neighborhood. This is based upon the level of employment, labor force participation, and educational attainment in a census tract. Values are percentile ranks and range from 0 to 100. The higher the score, the higher the labor force participation and human capital in a neighborhood. The labor market index for the Kansas City region ranges from a high of 72.32 for non-Hispanic Asians to a low of 27.81 for non-Hispanic blacks who fall below the federal poverty line. Non-Hispanic Asians and whites below the poverty line have higher scores than all non-Hispanic black and Hispanic persons.

The lowest index scores for every race/ethnicity are in Kansas City, Kansas, both in total population and those below the poverty line, with the exception of people of certain races/ethnicities who fall below the poverty line in Leavenworth. The labor market index is highest in Blue Springs and Kansas City, Missouri, for non-Hispanic whites. However, index scores for other races and ethnicities are much higher in Blue Springs, with smaller variations among races and ethnicities than in Kansas City, Missouri.

Table 1: Labor Market Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KCK</th>
<th>KCMO</th>
<th>Blue Springs</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>KC Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*</td>
<td>39.61</td>
<td>69.53</td>
<td>69.83</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>68.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>66.78</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>39.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>68.22</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>49.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander*</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>60.23</td>
<td>71.11</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>72.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>53.79</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>57.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population below Federal Poverty Line</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>53.31</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>57.28</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>27.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>34.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander*</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>52.22</td>
<td>52.30</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>56.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td>83.00</td>
<td>53.40</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>49.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-Hispanic

The labor market engagement index provides a measure of unemployment rate, labor-force participation rate, and percent of the population ages 25 and above with at least a bachelor’s degree.
Map 1: Labor Market Index and R/ECAPs

Map 2: Labor Market Index and Race/Ethnicity
Map 1 shows the labor market indexes and the location of the R/ECAPs. Those living within these areas of high concentration of persons of color and poverty experience the lowest propensity for economic opportunity – higher unemployment, lower labor force participation and lower wage jobs, and lower educational attainment. These areas are in Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas City, Kansas.

Map 2 shows labor market indexes combined with race/ethnicity. Black and Hispanic persons are more likely to reside in areas with low labor market indexes, including the northeast area and the Armourdale/Rosedale area of Kansas City, Kansas; and the northeast and central core east of Troost in Kansas City, Missouri. Southern Leavenworth has a lower Labor Market Index and some concentration of non-white population.

The pattern is somewhat different for foreign-born persons. Map 3 shows the labor market index and national origin. Persons from Mexico are concentrated in northeast and Westside neighborhoods of Kansas City, Missouri, and in northeast and southeast Kansas City, Kansas, all with lower labor market indexes. Persons from India, China, Vietnam and Korea are concentrated in Johnson County, Kansas, with a higher labor market index.

**Map 3: Labor Market Index and National Origin**

Analysis of job accessibility

The Figure 1 chart shows the number of jobs by community for the entitlement communities in the Kansas City region. Kansas City, Missouri, has the greatest number of jobs and the city of Leavenworth has the fewest jobs.
This measure of jobs is actually a count of workers by where they work. By also counting them by where they live and subtracting the latter from the former, we can estimate the net commuting into each city, and so measure whether a community is, overall, job-rich or job-poor.

As shown on Figure 2, among the cities participating in this assessment, Kansas City, Missouri, has the largest net commuting, as 75,500 more people come to work in the city than it has workers living in the city. Kansas City, Kansas, also is relatively job-rich, attracting nearly 10,000 more workers than it has working residents. Conversely, both Independence and Blue Springs are relatively job-poor. In each city, nearly 11,000 more residents leave to work elsewhere in the region than there are people working within their city. Leavenworth’s workers and residents are roughly in balance.
In part because Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas, contain more jobs than working residents, their residents also have the best access to the region’s jobs overall. Figure 3 shows that nearly 40 percent of the jobs in the metropolitan area are within 10 miles of the population center of Kansas City, Missouri, and 36 percent are within 10 miles of the center of Kansas City, Kansas. The population center of Independence has access to 22 percent of the region’s jobs within a 10-mile radius. Such a radius drawn around the population centers of Blue Springs and Leavenworth includes significant rural land area, as they are located close to the edge of the urbanized area of the region. As a result, only 10 percent of the region’s jobs are within 10 miles of the city center in Blue Springs, and only 2 percent are within 10 miles of the Leavenworth population center.

**Figure 3: Percent of Region’s Jobs Within 10 Miles of City Center**
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Source: Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES), 2011, as edited by MARC

Of the region’s approximately 1 million jobs, 60 percent are located in neighborhoods with low concentrations of minority population and persons in poverty. Conversely, less than 3 percent of all metro area jobs are located in areas with very high levels of minority and poverty concentration. This disparity is shown on Figure 4. This geographic distribution reflects the both the fact that such areas comprise a very small combined geographic area and that job opportunities are scarce within them.
Figure 4: Number of Jobs by Level of Poverty and Minority Concentration

Map 4 shows the density of jobs throughout the region, with high concentrations of jobs in the central core of Kansas City, Missouri, from the Missouri River south to the Country Club Plaza. There are also dense concentrations in Johnson County along I-35 and I-435. While there are more jobs in areas with low concentrations of poverty and minorities, most of the job centers there are widely dispersed with modest density.

This map makes clearer that while there are not as many jobs not directly within the areas of highest concentration of minority population and persons in poverty, the job centers in the central part of Kansas City are directly adjacent to some of the region’s most concentrated poor and minority neighborhoods.
The existence of areas with very high concentrations of poverty and minorities near the region’s biggest job centers is paradoxical, especially since the level transit service in these areas is relatively high for this region. For example, residents of the northeast R/ECAP in Kansas City, Kansas, can get to 7 percent of the region’s jobs within 30 minutes by transit and 32 percent of the region’s jobs within an hour (Map 5). Similarly, residents of northeast R/ECAP in Kansas City Missouri, can access 19 percent of the region’s jobs in 30 minutes by transit and 46 percent of the within 60 minutes (Map 6).
Map 5: Access to Jobs | Kansas City, Kansas, Northeast R/ECAP

Map 6: Access to Jobs | Kansas City, Missouri, Northeast R/ECAP
While commuting by transit typically takes longer than commuting by auto, a large percentage of the region’s jobs are accessible within a reasonable commute time for people living in and near the region’s R/ECAPs. This implies there are other barriers preventing people of color living in high poverty areas from getting decent jobs beyond just physical proximity or transportation. One such barrier appears to be the education level of the workers holding the jobs in areas of very high or high poverty and minority concentrations compared to the education level of the residents of those areas.

In the region’s R/ECAPs, there are substantially more residents who don’t have a high school degree than there are jobs for that level of education. Fully 19 percent of residents have less than a high school education, while only 13 percent of jobs are being performed by workers with that education level. Similarly, in the areas that have high levels of concentration, falling just below the threshold for designation as R/ECAPs, 15 percent of residents don’t have a degree while only 11 percent of the jobs are held by people without one. In contrast, areas with low concentrations of poverty and minorities actually have more jobs for workers without a degree than they have residents.

**Figure 5: Worker/Resident Balance**

Percent of Workers vs. Residents with no High School Degree, by Level of Concentration

![Graph showing worker and resident balance by level of concentration](image)

Source: Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES), 2011, as edited by MARC

The converse is true if we look at the high end of educational attainment, those with at least a bachelor’s degree. Then the areas with very high or high levels of concentration have a deficit of residents with the educational attainment to do the jobs that are available in them. More than one in four workers in the R/ECAPs have a Bachelor’s degree or higher, but fewer than one in 5 residents do. Similarly, for the areas with high concentrations, 27 percent of workers have attained at least a Bachelor’s degree compared to 22 percent of residents.
Disparities in educational attainment are associated with disparities in earnings potential, and this shows up in the difference in wages between the people who work in areas with concentrations of poverty and minorities and working people who live there. About 36 percent of residents in the highest areas of concentration earn less than $15,000 per year, compared with 22 percent of workers in such areas. In the areas that have high concentrations of poverty and minorities, but do not quite meet the R/ECAP criteria, 30 percent of residents earn less than $15,000 per year, while again only 22 percent of workers have wages that are that low. Meanwhile, in areas with low concentrations, the proportion of workers with low wages exceed the proportion of residents.

Source: Local Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES), 2011, as edited by MARC
Race and ethnicity also appear to also be factors in explaining how areas of concentrated poverty continue to exist despite their physical proximity to some of the region’s largest job centers. In the R/ECAP areas, the racial and ethnic composition of the workers does not match that of the residents. While 62 percent of working R/ECAP residents are white, 78 percent of the jobs in those areas are held by whites.

As a result, even though 33 percent of R/ECAP resident who are working are black, only 17 percent of the jobs in R/ECAPs are held by black workers. Blacks are a higher proportion of workers than residents in areas of moderate poverty and minority concentrations, which are largely in and around suburban job centers.
Similar results hold true for Hispanics. While they comprise 11 percent of R/ECAP resident who are working, Hispanics only hold 6 percent of the jobs in R/ECAPs. Like blacks, they are a higher proportion of the workforce employed in areas of moderate poverty and minority concentrations than they are of the working residents in those areas.

**Figure 7: Worker/Resident Balance**

Percent of Workers vs. Residents by Race (Hispanic), by Level of Concentration

Note: In this data set, Hispanics can be of any race, whereas most other data sets are tabulated by treating Hispanic ethnicity akin to race — that is, as one of several mutually exclusive racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, summing workers or residents across racial categories may produce totals exceeding 100 percent.