

REFERENCES

- Appalachian Regional Commission. 1972. *Appalachia – An Economic Report: Trends in Employment, Income and Population*. Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission.
- Appalachian Regional Commission. 1979. *Appalachia – A Reference Book*. Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission.
- Appalachian Regional Commission. 1981. *Appalachia – A Reference Book: Supplement to the Second Edition*. Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission.
- Butler, Margaret A. and Calvin L. Beale. 1994. *Rural-Urban Continuum Codes for Metro and Non-metro Counties, 1993. Staff Report No. 9425*. Washington, D.C.: Agriculture and Rural Economy Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Caudill, Harry M. 1963. *Night Comes to the Cumberland*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Cook, Peggy J. and Karen L. Mizer. 1994. *The revised ERS County Typology : An overview*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Couto, Richard A. 1994. *An American Challenge: A Report on Economic Trends and Social Issues in Appalachia*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Dix, K. 1978. “Appalachia: Third World Pillage?” In B. Ergood and B.E. Kuhre (Eds.) *Appalachia: Social Context, Past and Present*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Duncan, Cynthia M. 1985. *Capital and the State in Regional Economic Development: The Case of the Coal Industry in Central Appalachia*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press.
- Duncan, Cynthia M. 1992. “Persistent Poverty in Appalachia: Scarce Work and Rigid Stratification.” In Cynthia M. Duncan (Ed.) *Rural Poverty in America*. New York: Auburn House.
- Fuguitt, Glenn V. David L. Brown and Calvin L. Beale. 1989. *Rural and Small Town America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Goodstein, Eban. 1989. “Landownership, Development, and Poverty in Southern Appalachia.” *Journal of Developing Areas*, 23(4): 519-533.
- Harrington, Michael. 1962. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York:

Macmillan.

Haynes, Ada F. 1997. *Poverty in Central Appalachia: Underdevelopment and Exploitation*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Isserman, Andrew, and Terance Rephann. 1995. "The Economic Effects of the Appalachian Regional Commission: An empirical assessment of 26 Years of Regional Development Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 61(3):345-364.

Jensen, J. Bradford. 1998. *Birth and Death of Manufacturing Plants and Restructuring in Appalachia=s Industrial Economy, 1963-1992*. Appalachian Regional Commission.

Lichter, Daniel T. and Diane K. McLaughlin. 1995. "Changing Economic Opportunities, Family Structure, and Poverty in Rural Areas." *Rural Sociology*, 60(4): 688-706.

Lyson, Thomas A., and William L. Falk (eds.). 1993. *Forgotten Places: Uneven Development in Rural America*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

National Research Council, 1997. *Small-Area Estimates of School-Age Children in Poverty: Interim Report 1: Evaluation of 1993 County Estimates for Title I Allocations*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, 1998. *Small-Area Estimates of School-Age Children in Poverty: Interim Report 2: Evaluation of Revised 1993 County Estimates for Title I Allocations*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, 1999. *Small-Area Estimates of School-Age Children in Poverty: Interim Report 3: Evaluation of 1995 County and School District Estimates for Title I Allocations*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

National Research Council, 2000. *Small-Area Income and Poverty Estimates: Priorities for 2000 and Beyond*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

President's Appalachian Regional Commission. 1964. *Appalachia: A Report by the President's Appalachian Regional Commission*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Raitz, Karl B., and Richard Ulack. 1984. *Appalachia: A Regional Geography*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

U.S. Census Bureau. 1982. *Census of Population and Housing, 1980: Summary Tape File 3* [machine-readable data files]. Washington: The Bureau [Producer and Distributor].

U.S. Census Bureau. 1992. *Census of Population and Housing, 1990: Summary Tape File 3* [machine-readable data files]. Washington: The Bureau [Producer and Distributor].

U.S. Census Bureau. 1999a. *Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates: Intercensal Estimates for States, Counties, and School Districts*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
Website: www.census.gov/hhes/saipe/techdoc.

U.S. Census Bureau. 1999b. *USA Counties 1998* [CD-ROM]. Washington: The Bureau [Producer and Distributor].

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2000. *Regional Economic Information System 1969-98*. [CD-ROM]. Washington: The Bureau [Producer and Distributor].

Vogt, W. Paul. 1993. *Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology : A Nontechnical Guide for the Social Sciences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Weller, Jack E. 1965. *Yesterday's People: Life in Contemporary Appalachia*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press.

Wood, Lawrence E., and Gregory A. Bischak. 2000. *Progress and Challenges in Reducing Economic Distress in Appalachia: An analysis of National and Regional Trends Since 1960*. Washington: Appalachian Regional Commission.

APPENDIX A

Small Area Income and Poverty Estimate Program Methodology

The data analyzed in this report are based in part on estimates of people in poverty prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau as part of its Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program. Portions of these estimates have been the subject of considerable analytical scrutiny due to the fact that federal legislation calling for estimates of the numbers of related children ages 5-17 living in poverty also called on the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences to establish a panel of experts to study the estimates and to make a recommendation to the Secretary of the Department of Education regarding their statistical adequacy for allocating to federal funds to school districts under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Findings by the NRC Panel on Estimates of Poverty for Small Geographic Areas have, to date, been reported in three published interim reports (National Research Council, 1997, 1998, 1999).

With respect to the Census Bureau's estimates *for counties* of children ages 5-17 in families with incomes below the poverty level, the NRC panel, on the basis of its own studies as well as Census Bureau evaluations of its estimation model and reasonable alternative models, issued a carefully and narrowly worded recommendation: "[T]hat the Census Bureau's revised 1993 county estimates of poor school-age children be used in the Title I allocations for the 1998-1999 school year" (National Research Council, 1998:3).

Three things must be noted with respect to this recommendation:

First, the scope of the recommendation pertains exclusively to the use of the Census Bureau's estimates of poor school-age (5-17) children for making allocations to counties under the Title I program. The recommendation is based on the panel's conclusion that use of the revised model-based estimates for 1993 is preferable to using outdated 1990 Census-based estimates for such allocations, and, in particular, the panel withholds any mention of the potential utility of these numbers for other uses. Indeed, the Census Bureau's own technical documentation for the SAIPE program (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999a) specifically cautions the user who wishes, for example, to

compare census-based estimates of poverty with inter-censal model-based estimates of poverty, or inter-censal estimates for two different years, exactly what we attempt to do in the present report.

Second, the recommendation pertains only to the Census Bureau's estimates of poor school-age (5-17) children. At the present time, the Bureau's SAIPE program is producing estimates of the number of poor and poverty rates for age groups 0-17, 5-17 and all ages. While the full extent of the Census Bureau's examination of the models for age groups 0-17 and all ages is unknown, some evaluation data are available on the Census Bureau's homepage (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999a). It is important to note, however, that the models for estimates of poverty of persons 0-17 and all ages were not examined by the NRC panel. It is the estimates of total poverty that are the focus of the present report.

Third, even the estimates of poor school-age (5-17) children suffer from errors that often are quite large. Based on the NRC panel studies (see, in particular, National Research Council, 1998), we know that the revised 1993 estimates of poor school-age children are based on a model which suffers a small bias in the estimates with respect to county size and proportion of Hispanic residents. Moreover, the model shows evidence of "variance heterogeneity with respect to both CPS sample size and poverty rate" (p. 41). Both are observations that prompted the panel to suggest further research into alternative model specifications. Indeed, while the NRC panel concluded that the Census Bureau's estimation model performed as well as, or better than, alternative models that were tested, the panel recommended considerable further model experimentation and testing. Data users who have examined the county estimates have noted, as do we, that most of the estimates have uncomfortably wide confidence intervals.

Finally, the NRC panel has drawn attention to the fact that census-based estimates of poverty and CPS-based model estimates of poverty have systematic differences that arise from differences in data collection procedures between the decennial census and the CPS (see, in particular, National Research Council, 1997:Appendix B). There is some evidence that when compared to the 1990 Census, CPS-based poverty estimates of the number and proportion of school-age children are higher. This fact, when considered alongside the additional fact that census-based estimates of poverty themselves are based on a sample of the population (and thereby suffer from sampling

error), adds further complexity to the task of gauging the trends in poverty among counties between 1990 and any subsequent year -- a task we herein undertake.

APPENDIX B

Economic Research Service Economic and Policy Typology Definitions

Farming dependent counties: Farming contributed a weighted annual average of 20 percent or more of total labor and proprietor income over the three years from 1987 to 1989.

Mining dependent counties: Mining contributed a weighted annual average of 15 percent or more of total labor and proprietor income over the three years from 1987 to 1989.

Manufacturing dependent counties: Manufacturing contributed a weighted annual average of 30 percent or more of total labor and proprietor income over the 3 years from 1987 to 1989.

Government dependent counties: Government contributed a weighted annual average of 25 percent or more of total labor and proprietor income over the 3 years from 1987 to 1989.

Services dependent counties: Service activities (private and personal services, agricultural services, wholesale and retail trade, finance and insurance, transportation and public utilities) contributed a weighted annual average of 50 percent or more of total labor and proprietor income over the 3 years from 1987 to 1989.

Non-specialized counties: Counties not classified as a specialized economic type over the 3 years from 1987 to 1989.

Retirement destination counties: The population aged 60 years and over in 1990 increased by 15 percent or more during 1980-90 through in-migration of people.

Federal lands counties: Federally owned lands made up 30 percent or more of a county's land area in the year 1987.

Commuting counties: Workers aged 16 years and over commuting to jobs outside their county of residence were 40 percent or more of all the county's workers in 1990.

Persistent poverty counties: Persons with poverty-level income in the preceding year were 20 percent or more of total population in each of 4 years: 1960, 1970, 1980 and 1990.

Transfer dependent counties: Income from transfer payments (Federal, state and local) contributed a weighted annual average of 25 percent or more of total personal income over the 3 years from 1987 to 1989.

APPENDIX C

Appalachian Poverty Measures

**Table C.1:
Appalachian Poverty by State**

	1979 Census	1989 estimates	1989 Census	1993 estimates	1995 estimates
Alabama	16.9%	15.6%	16.1%	16.8%	15.5%
Georgia	12.5%	9.8%	10.2%	11.5%	10.5%
Kentucky	26.0%	27.0%	29.0%	28.5%	26.9%
Maryland	11.9%	12.0%	12.5%	13.2%	12.9%
Mississippi	22.3%	20.4%	22.6%	21.1%	18.7%
New York	12.0%	10.6%	12.9%	14.3%	14.1%
North Carolina	13.8%	11.9%	12.4%	13.1%	12.4%
Ohio	12.6%	16.0%	17.4%	16.8%	14.4%
Pennsylvania	10.0%	11.2%	12.5%	13.3%	11.9%
South Carolina	12.6%	10.9%	11.6%	12.6%	11.6%
Tennessee	16.6%	15.6%	16.1%	17.8%	14.9%
Virginia	15.6%	17.5%	17.9%	17.6%	16.5%
West Virginia	15.0%	17.2%	19.7%	21.7%	19.9%
ARC counties	14.1%	14.1%	15.3%	16.1%	14.6%

Note: Poverty rates by state within Appalachia only include counties designated as Appalachian.

**Table C.2:
Poverty Rates by Developmental Districts for Appalachia.**

	1979 Census	1989 Census	1989 estimates	1993 estimates	1995 estimates
ALABAMA					
Northwest Alabama (1a)	15.5%	14.9%	16.7%	15.6%	14.9%
North Central Alabama (1b)	16.7%	13.5%	14.4%	14.5%	13.4%
Top of Alabama (1c)	15.6%	12.8%	13.6%	14.2%	13.3%
West Alabama (1d)	22.4%	20.1%	21.9%	20.6%	19.7%
Birmingham Regional (1e)	15.5%	15.9%	15.3%	17.0%	14.7%
East Alabama (1f)	18.0%	16.2%	17.2%	18.5%	18.0%
Central Alabama (1h)	18.2%	14.6%	14.5%	15.9%	13.7%
South Central Alabama (1i)	33.0%	34.1%	34.5%	35.3%	34.4%
GEORGIA					
Coosa Valley (2a)	13.2%	12.4%	12.5%	14.0%	14.2%
Georgia Mountains (2b)	14.4%	11.9%	12.2%	13.4%	12.1%
Chattahoochee-Flint (2c)	15.8%	13.4%	14.9%	13.4%	12.1%
Atlanta Regional (2d)	7.0%	4.5%	4.7%	6.6%	5.8%
Northwest Georgia (2e)	16.5%	14.0%	15.7%	16.7%	15.2%
North Georgia (2f)	14.9%	12.3%	12.5%	13.8%	13.4%
KENTUCKY					
Buffalo Trace (3a)	27.8%	25.9%	28.1%	26.5%	25.1%
FIVCO (3b)	18.2%	19.1%	21.8%	22.5%	21.5%
Bluegrass Area (3c)	22.2%	20.0%	22.3%	21.8%	19.7%
Gateway Area (3d)	26.2%	26.0%	28.5%	28.0%	26.4%
Big Sandy Area (3e)	22.4%	27.1%	29.5%	29.7%	28.5%
Lake Cumberland (3f)	30.1%	28.0%	29.1%	27.9%	26.2%
Cumberland Valley (3h)	30.2%	32.3%	33.5%	32.7%	31.0%
Kentucky River (3i)	30.5%	33.6%	36.3%	35.3%	33.6%
Barren River (3j)	29.1%	23.6%	26.9%	24.3%	23.7%
MARYLAND					
Tri-County W. Maryland (4a)	11.9%	12.0%	12.5%	13.2%	12.9%
MISSISSIPPI					
Northeast Mississippi (5a)	21.7%	21.5%	23.8%	21.4%	18.8%
Three Rivers (5b)	18.8%	15.4%	17.8%	16.9%	14.9%
Golden Triangle (5c)	25.6%	24.6%	26.6%	25.2%	22.6%
East Central (5d)	37.2%	33.0%	35.1%	29.8%	24.1%
North Central (5e)	24.6%	24.4%	26.4%	26.1%	23.9%
NEW YORK					
Southern Tier West (6a)	12.5%	13.3%	14.0%	17.0%	16.0%
Southern Tier Central (6b)	11.5%	10.7%	12.4%	14.3%	13.8%
Southern Tier East (6c)	12.0%	9.2%	12.5%	13.1%	13.4%
NORTH CAROLINA					
Southwestern North Carolina (7a)	18.8%	15.7%	17.2%	16.8%	16.4%
Land of Sky (7b)	13.6%	12.3%	11.9%	13.1%	12.3%
Isothermal (7c)	13.0%	10.7%	11.6%	12.5%	12.1%
Region D (7d)	18.4%	15.1%	16.8%	15.3%	14.8%

	1979 Census	1989 Census	1989 estimates	1993 estimates	1995 estimates
Western Piedmont (7e)	10.0%	9.7%	10.3%	11.2%	10.9%
Northwest Piedmont (7i)	12.1%	10.4%	10.6%	11.8%	10.7%
OHIO					
Ohio Valley (8a)	14.2%	17.1%	18.4%	17.2%	14.7%
Buckeye Hills-Hocking (8b)	14.3%	17.5%	20.3%	18.6%	16.1%
Ohio Mid-Eastern (8c)	10.9%	14.1%	14.6%	15.2%	13.0%
PENNSYLVANIA					
Northwest Pennsylvania (9a)	9.9%	12.3%	13.6%	14.8%	13.6%
North Central Pennsylvania (9b)	10.1%	11.7%	13.4%	14.2%	12.6%
Northern Tier (9c)	13.5%	11.9%	13.1%	14.0%	12.9%
ECD of Northeastern Pennsylvania	9.9%	9.7%	10.4%	11.7%	10.2%
Southwestern Pennsylvania (9e)	9.3%	11.4%	12.5%	13.4%	11.8%
Southern Alleghenies (9f)	11.3%	12.7%	13.9%	14.7%	13.6%
SEDA (9g)	11.9%	10.0%	12.5%	12.1%	11.1%
SOUTH CAROLINA					
South Carolina Appalachian (10a)	12.6%	10.9%	11.6%	12.6%	11.6%
TENNESSEE					
Upper Cumberland (11a)	20.2%	16.9%	18.6%	19.0%	16.2%
East Tennessee (11b)	16.8%	15.7%	16.0%	17.4%	14.6%
First Tennessee (11c)	16.1%	15.4%	16.5%	17.9%	15.3%
South Central Tennessee (11d)	15.3%	13.8%	14.8%	16.1%	13.6%
Southeast Tennessee (11e)	15.2%	15.1%	15.0%	18.0%	14.6%
VIRGINIA					
LENOWISCO (12a)	20.1%	25.7%	23.4%	24.2%	22.7%
Cumberland Plateau (12b)	16.1%	21.6%	21.5%	21.5%	21.2%
Mount Rogers (12c)	14.6%	16.0%	15.5%	16.1%	14.7%
New River Valley (12d)	15.7%	14.2%	17.8%	15.7%	14.2%
Fifth Planning (12e)	8.7%	8.4%	7.7%	8.6%	7.7%
Central Shenandoah (12f)	14.3%	11.2%	13.7%	11.6%	11.5%
WEST VIRGINIA					
Region 1 (13a)	17.3%	22.0%	24.1%	26.7%	24.5%
Region 2 (13b)	17.1%	20.6%	24.0%	25.0%	23.4%
Region 3 (13c)	11.7%	15.1%	16.7%	19.7%	17.3%
Region 4 (13d)	17.1%	20.9%	23.3%	25.4%	26.3%
Region 5 (13e)	13.7%	15.1%	18.6%	20.2%	19.1%
Region 6 (13f)	15.5%	16.6%	19.3%	20.7%	18.9%
Region 7 (13g)	18.8%	21.5%	23.9%	26.0%	24.4%
Region 8 (13h)	17.3%	14.1%	15.9%	17.0%	16.3%
Region 9 (13i)	14.1%	9.6%	11.4%	14.6%	13.0%
Region 10 (13j)	10.6%	14.5%	16.8%	18.2%	16.6%
Region 11 (13k)	9.3%	12.3%	14.9%	16.0%	14.7%

Note: Some developmental districts include non-Appalachian counties that do not appear in this table.

Table C.3:
Poverty Rates by Urban Continuum Code for Appalachia

Beale Code (93)	Number of counties	1979 Census	1989 estimates	1989 Census	1993 estimates	1995 estimates
Metro-core	7	8.4%	9.6%	10.3%	11.3%	9.8%
Metro-fringe	12	12.4%	11.3%	12.2%	12.9%	11.2%
Metro-medium	59	12.8%	12.8%	13.3%	14.9%	13.1%
Metro-small	31	12.6%	12.8%	14.3%	15.2%	14.2%
Non-metro, 20,000 urban population, adjacent to metro	20	13.1%	14.1%	15.4%	15.9%	14.5%
Non-metro, 20,000 urban population, non-adjacent to metro	11	15.9%	15.1%	18.2%	18.5%	16.6%
Non-metro, 2,500-19,999 urban population, adjacent to metro	83	15.6%	15.0%	16.4%	16.9%	15.5%
Non-metro, 2,500-19,999 urban population, non-adjacent to metro	78	18.9%	19.7%	21.6%	21.6%	19.9%
Non-metro, rural, adjacent to metro	40	19.6%	17.4%	19.7%	19.5%	18.1%
Non-metro, rural non-adjacent to metro	65	25.1%	24.9%	26.0%	25.1%	23.7%
ARC counties	409	14.1%	14.1%	15.3%	16.1%	14.6%

**Table C.4:
Poverty Rates by USDA Non-metropolitan Economic and Policy Functions**

ERS Code	Number of counties	1979 Census	1989 SAIPE	1989 Census	1993 SAIPE	1995 SAIPE
Commuting	71	19.7%	18.3%	19.9%	19.9%	18.1%
Farming	6	25.2%	20.7%	22.6%	20.6%	19.6%
Federal Lands	24	19.1%	17.3%	18.5%	18.3%	17.3%
Government	24	25.9%	26.2%	28.5%	26.6%	24.8%
Manufacturing	128	15.4%	14.5%	15.8%	16.2%	14.9%
Mining	41	19.3%	22.5%	25.3%	26.4%	23.8%
Not Specified	65	18.9%	18.4%	19.5%	19.9%	18.2%
Poverty	93	27.0%	27.1%	28.9%	28.0%	26.0%
Retirement	19	15.7%	11.9%	12.9%	13.4%	12.4%
Service	32	15.4%	16.0%	17.8%	18.3%	16.8%
Transfer	91	22.2%	25.4%	27.4%	27.2%	25.3%
ARC Non-metro	297	17.2%	17.1%	18.8%	18.9%	17.4%

APPENDIX D

Distressed Status Designation Methodology

This report determines distressed status of Appalachian counties using the current ARC indicators. The poverty data to determine distressed status was derived from the 1980 and 1990 U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing (U.S. Census Bureau, 1982 and 1992) and the U.S. Census Bureau Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999a). This report uses three-year average unemployment rates derived from *USA Counties 1998* (U.S. Census Bureau, 1999b) and three-year average per capita market income derived from the *Regional Economic Information System 1969-98* (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2000). The use of the three-year averages for unemployment and per capita market income accounts for the differences in distressed counties between this report and Wood and Bischak (2000).

National Averages and Distressed Standards (in parentheses)

1980

Poverty Rate - 12.4% (18.6%; 24.8%)

Unemployment Rate - 6.87% (10.3%)

Per Capita Market Income - \$9,124 (\$6,083)

1990

Census Poverty Rate - 13.1% (19.7%; 26.2%)

SAIPE Poverty Rate - 13.1% (19.7%; 26.2%)

Unemployment Rate – 5.9% (8.85%)

Per Capita Market Income - \$18,114 (\$12,076)

1994

SAIP Poverty Rate - 15.1% (22.7%; 30.2%)

Unemployment Rate – 6.14% (9.21%)

Per Capita Market Income - \$21,271 (\$14,181)

1996

SAIPE Poverty Rate – 13.8% (20.7%; 27.6%)

Unemployment Rate – 5.25% (7.87%)

Per Capita Market Income - \$23,089 (\$15,393)

APPENDIX E

Appalachian Distressed Counties 1980 – 1996

Table E.1:
Distressed Counties, 1980, 1990, 1994, and 1996 (Bold Text = Distressed)

County	State	1990		1994		1996	
		Estimate	Upper Bound	Estimate	Upper Bound	Estimate	Upper Bound
Bibb	Alabama	PUI	PUI	I	P I	None	P
Fayette	Alabama	None	PUI	None	None	None	P
Franklin	Alabama	U	PUI	None	None	None	None
Lawrence	Alabama	PUI	PUI	None	None	None	None
Pickens	Alabama	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Talladega	Alabama	PU	PUI	I	P I	P I	P I
Winston	Alabama	UI	PUI	None	None	None	P
Union	Georgia	P* I	None	None	None	None	None
Adair	Kentucky	P* I	P I	P I	P I	PUI	PUI
Bath	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Bell	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Breathitt	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Carter	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Casey	Kentucky	P* I	P* I	P I	P* I	P I	P*U
Clay	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Clinton	Kentucky	P* I	P* I	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Cumberland	Kentucky	P* I	P* I	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Elliott	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Estill	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	P I	P* I	P I	P*U
Floyd	Kentucky	P	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Green	Kentucky	P I	P I	I	P I	UI	PUI
Harlan	Kentucky	P*	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Jackson	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	P*U	P*U
Johnson	Kentucky	P	PUI	P I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Knott	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Knox	Kentucky	P* I	P* I	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Laurel	Kentucky	P	P I	P I	P* I	P I	P I
Lawrence	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Lee	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	P*U	P*U
Leslie	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	P* I	P* I	P*U	P*U
Letcher	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Lewis	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Lincoln	Kentucky	PUI	P* I	P I	P I	P I	P*U
McCreary	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Magoffin	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Martin	Kentucky	P*	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Menifee	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI

P = County poverty rate at or above 150% of national average

P* = County poverty rate at or above 200% of national average

U = County unemployment rate at or above 150% of national average

I = County per capita market income at or below 2/3 of national average

County	State	1990		1994		1996	
		1990	1990	Estimate	Upper Bound	Estimate	Upper Bound
Monroe	Kentucky	P* I	P* I	P	P	P	P*
Morgan	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Owsley	Kentucky	PUI	P* I	P* I	P* I	P*U	P*U
Perry	Kentucky	P	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Pike	Kentucky	P	PU	PU	P*U	PU	P*U
Powell	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	P I	P* I	P I	P*U
Rockcastle	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	P I	P* I	P I	P*U
Rowan	Kentucky	P I	P* I	P I	P* I	P I	P*U
Russell	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	P I	P I	PUI	PUI
Wayne	Kentucky	P* I	PUI	P* I	P* I	P*U	P*U
Whitley	Kentucky	PUI	P* I	P* I	P* I	P*U	P*U
Wolfe	Kentucky	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	P*U	P*U
Benton	Mississippi	P I	PUI	P I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Chickasaw	Mississippi	P I	PUI	None	P	U	PU
Choctaw	Mississippi	P* I	PUI	P I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Clay	Mississippi	P I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Kemper	Mississippi	P* I	PUI	P I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Marshall	Mississippi	P* I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Noxubee	Mississippi	PUI	PUI	P* I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Oktibbeha	Mississippi	P* I	P* I	P I	P* I	P I	P*U
Prentiss	Mississippi	I	PUI	I	I	I	P I
Tippah	Mississippi	P I	PUI	I	P I	I	I
Tishomingo	Mississippi	None	PUI	I	I	UI	UI
Webster	Mississippi	P I	PUI	I	P I	P I	P I
Winston	Mississippi	P* I	PUI	P I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Graham	North Carolina	PUI	PUI	UI	PUI	UI	PUI
Madison	North Carolina	P* I	P I	None	None	None	P
Swain	North Carolina	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Adams	Ohio	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	UI	PUI
Athens	Ohio	P I	P* I	P I	P I	I	P I
Jackson	Ohio	U	PUI	I	P I	I	P I
Meigs	Ohio	None	P I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Monroe	Ohio	None	PUI	U	U	UI	PUI
Pike	Ohio	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	UI	PUI
Scioto	Ohio	U	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Vinton	Ohio	I	PUI	UI	PUI	UI	PUI
Bledsoe	Tennessee	PUI	I	P I	P I	P I	P I
Campbell	Tennessee	PUI	PUI	P I	P* I	PUI	PUI
Claiborne	Tennessee	PUI	P I	P I	P I	P I	P I
Clay	Tennessee	P* I	P I	None	P	U	PU
Cocke	Tennessee	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Cumberland	Tennessee	PUI	I	None	None	None	None
Fentress	Tennessee	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Grundy	Tennessee	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Hancock	Tennessee	PUI	P* I	P* I	P* I	P*U	P*U

P = County poverty rate at or above 150% of national average
P* = County poverty rate at or above 200% of national average
U = County unemployment rate at or above 150% of national average
I = County per capita market income at or below 2/3 of national average

County	State	1990		1994		1996	
		1990	1990	Estimate	Upper Bound	Estimate	Upper Bound
Jackson	Tennessee	PUI	P I	I	P I	I	I
Johnson	Tennessee	P* I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Meigs	Tennessee	U	PUI	UI	UI	UI	PUI
Monroe	Tennessee	PUI	UI	I	P I	UI	PUI
Morgan	Tennessee	P* I	PUI	P I	P I	I	P I
Overton	Tennessee	PUI	UI	I	P I	UI	PUI
Pickett	Tennessee	P* I	P I	P I	P I	PUI	PUI
Rhea	Tennessee	P	UI	UI	PUI	UI	UI
Scott	Tennessee	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Buchanan	Virginia	P	PU	PU	PU	PUI	PUI
Dickenson	Virginia	U	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Lee	Virginia	P* I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Russell	Virginia	None	PUI	UI	PUI	UI	PUI
Barbour	West Virginia	P	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Boone	West Virginia	None	P*U	PU	P*U	PU	P*U
Braxton	West Virginia	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Calhoun	West Virginia	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Clay	West Virginia	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Doddridge	West Virginia	P I	P I	PUI	PUI	P I	P*U
Fayette	West Virginia	U	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Gilmer	West Virginia	P I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Jackson	West Virginia	U	PUI	U	PU	None	P
Lewis	West Virginia	I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Lincoln	West Virginia	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Logan	West Virginia	None	PUI	PU	P*U	PUI	PUI
McDowell	West Virginia	PU	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Mason	West Virginia	U	PUI	U	PU	UI	PUI
Mingo	West Virginia	P	PUI	P*U	P*U	PUI	PUI
Monroe	West Virginia	P I	PUI	I	P I	I	P I
Nicholas	West Virginia	U	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Pocahontas	West Virginia	U	PUI	U	PU	U	PU
Preston	West Virginia	PUI	UI	UI	PUI	UI	PUI
Randolph	West Virginia	None	PUI	PU	PU	PU	PU
Ritchie	West Virginia	UI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Roane	West Virginia	UI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Summers	West Virginia	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Taylor	West Virginia	UI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Tucker	West Virginia	I	UI	UI	UI	UI	PUI
Upshur	West Virginia	I	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Wayne	West Virginia	P	PUI	P I	P I	P I	P I
Webster	West Virginia	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Wirt	West Virginia	UI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI
Wyoming	West Virginia	PU	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI	PUI

P = County poverty rate at or above 150% of national average
P*= County poverty rate at or above 200% of national average
U= County unemployment rate at or above 150% of national average
I = County per capita market income at or below 2/3 of national average