Our community mapshop ends largely where it begins -- with a recognition that we, at the University of Kentucky, must do more to educate ourselves as to the conditions of our communities.
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The map above addresses the estimated time for a Cardinal Valley resident to reach the UK Good Samaritan Hospital when utilizing public transit. Each zone was created by determining travel time from various properties, discerning trends, and then formulating groups which encompassed a standardized interval. This does not include specific data (i.e. particular length of walk to bus stops from each parcel) which plays a vital role in overall time for each specific resident. Rather than provide quantitative data with a particular solution in mind, this map seeks to serve as a broad explanation of a need. By relating the lack of vehicle ownership with the inherit use of public transit, it is clear health care is rather inaccessible for the residents of Cardinal Valley. Through this visualization one should conclude the neighborhood is need of more resources, or rather more efficient use of the resources already available.

Maps Created By: Catherine Brown; Data Sourced from: U.S. Census Bureau, Lexington Open Portal, LexTran
Who owns Woodhill, Lexington, KY?

Woodhill is a neighborhood in southeast Lexington, Kentucky, United States. Its boundaries are Richmond Road to the west, New Circle Road to the north, Palumbo Drive to the east, and Man o' War Boulevard to the south. Identified are the 3 block groups of the neighborhood.

How to identify gentrification:

- Property is being bought and sold
  
  Houses being sold for a profit or undergoing foreclosure.

- "Real" coffee shops open nearby
  
  Common grounds, Starbucks, and Panera Bread Co.

- Household sizes decrease
  
  Less families and more single-household millennials

- Changing demographics and incomes

  More affluence in a community means higher cost of living and rising rent prices.
Lynnwood Ct is a cul de sac located in a block group that is experiencing the most property sales and is currently the whitest block group in the neighborhood.

*395 Lynnwood Ct
Transferred 3 times
$47,500 in 1989
$74,000 in 2015
$26,500 increase

*391 Lynnwood Ct
FORECLOSURE
Transferred 7 times
2013 sold for $57,000
($47,900 less than previous sale)
2014 sold for $108,500
$51,500 increase

*387 Lynnwood Ct
FORECLOSURE
Transferred 9 times
Sold $36,200.
2016 sold for $82,900
$46,700 increase

*383 Lynnwood Ct
Transferred 6 times
Sold for $72,000 in 2005
Sold for $95,000 in 2006
$23,000 increase

*386 Lynnwood Ct
Transferred 6 times
Sold for $57,000 in 2012
Sold for $75,000 in 2015
$18,000 increase

Who owns Woodhill, Lexington, KY?
Part 1

The four indicators used in this study were chosen based on the themes of socioeconomic, minority, transportation, and household characteristics. These data sets combined create a quick look at the social vulnerability index score that neighborhoods at block group level based on a percentage range of least vulnerable and most vulnerable.

Four Indicators

- No Vehicle
- Minority Population (defined by Census)
- Below Poverty
- # of Households with children 18 yrs and younger

Top 10 Vulnerable Census Tracts, Block Groups

1. Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 1
2. Census Tract 11, Block Group 4
3. Census Tract 4, Block Group 2
4. Census Tract 3, Block Group 3
5. Census Tract 2, Block Group 1
6. Census Tract 11, Block Group 1
7. Census Tract 13, Block Group 2
8. Census Tract 10, Block Group 1
9. Census Tract 19, Block Group 1
10. Census Tract 11, Block Group 2

Social Vulnerability Score

\[ \text{Score} = 1 + \frac{(X - A)(B - a)}{B - A} \]

vulnerability scale

- Lower: <25%
- Higher: >100%

Maps by: Alexa King
Part 2

To the left is a series of four choropleth maps that illustrate the degree of vulnerability of each indicator. The percentage of vulnerability is based on the normalized raw counts of each indicator in all block groups located in the interior of New Circle road.

Racial Minorities

1. Census Tract 11, Block Group 4---------85.8%
2. Census Tract 11, Block Group 1---------77.8%
3. Census Tract 3, Block Group 1----------72%

No Vehicle

1. Census Tract 2, Block Group 1----------87%
2. Census Tract 1.01, Block Group 1------80%
3. Census Tract 4, Block Group 4----------76%

# Households w/ Children >18 yrs

1. Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 1--- 82.1%
2. Census Tract 4, Block Group 2-------- 80.3%
3. Census Tract 10, Block Group 2------- 80.3%

Below Poverty Level

1. Census Tract 9, Block Group 2--------100%
2. Census Tract 9, Block Group 3-------- 98%
3. Census Tract 8.01, Block Group 1----- 80.3%

Maps by: Alexa King
Data Sources: CDC, U.S. Census Bureau, Lexington Open Portal.
Tables: Overall Social Vulnerability: 4 variables. Household Characteristic: Households by Presence of People under 18 yrs by Household Type.; ACS2018 5Y estimate; B11005. Transportation: Tenure by Vehicles Available; ACS2018 5Y estimate; B25044. Minorities : Hispanic or Latino Origin; ACS2018 5Y estimate; B03003. Minorities : Race; ACS2018 5Y estimate; B02001. Socioeconomic: Poverty Status of Individuals in the past 12 months by Household Type; ACS 2018 5Y; B17017.
Part 3

To the left is a series of zoning maps that depict the land uses for the top four vulnerable block groups that are located in the interior of New Circle Road. Based on my analysis, these neighborhoods all have parks within or in close proximity and have a diversity of residential typologies, businesses, and industries. These land use maps suggest that the land uses located within the neighborhoods boundaries are not substantial to these vulnerable communities.

**Neighborhoods**

1. Census Tract 20.01, Block Group 1 - Cardinal Hill
2. Census Tract 11, Block Group 4 - St. Martins Village
3. Census Tract 4, Block Group 2 - Williams Wells Brown
4. Census Tract 3, Block Group 3 - Martin Luther King

**Zoning**

Maps by: Alexa King
Data Sources: Lexington Open Portal.
Disparities in Housing Affordability
In Selected Areas of Lexington

Casey Lyons
University of Kentucky

The Affordable Housing Trust Fund has been used more in the North Limestone neighborhood than anywhere else, but housing prices are still increasing in the area. Because the fund defines “affordable” on the basis of the median income for all of Fayette County, the units are affordable to the middle class, but not to the longtime residents of this historically poor area. This drives the gentrification of the area by bringing in richer renters and displacing the poorer ones.

Median rent in U. S. Dollars for each block group are shown in gray text.

Census Tract 11 shows similar incomes across all 4 block groups, with higher rent areas spending larger portions of their income on rent.

In Census Tract 4, the median rent in Block Group 1 is $796 per month, and in Block Group 2 it is only $439 per month. However, both block groups spend about 30% of their incomes on rent, suggesting higher incomes in Block Group 1.

The block groups in Census Tract 16 show disparity in affordability. Block Group 1’s median rent is $648 per month, 46.3% of its median household income. Block Group 2 has a median rent of $870 per month, only 24.7% of its median household income.

Data sources: American Community Survey 2018 5-year estimates tables B25064 and B25071, Affordable Housing Trust Fund data provided by Affordable Housing Trust Fund
Highlighted block groups are at highest risk demographically during COVID-19 pandemic. Risk determined by age, race, and economic standing.

This map is concerned with these high risk block groups that lack easy access to grocery stores. Like here at Block Group 2, Tract 39.06

Maybe the biggest opportunity is here: Block Group 2, Tract 11.
Spatiotemporal changes of racial segregation from 2012 to 2018

Shishir Sarker

Northwestern parts of Lexington faced highest increase of White Population.

Northern part specially the highlighted census tract experienced the highest decrease of white population.

Change in white population (>10%), inclusive of margin of error, 2012-2018

- Increase
- Decrease
Census tract 30 experienced the highest increase of black Population in Lexington

Census tract 2 experienced the highest decrease of white population in Lexington

Change in black population (>10%), inclusive of margin of error, 2012-2018

- Increase
- Decrease