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Research has suggested that areas for which the poverty rate (the percentage of the population that is below poverty, or economic hardship as measured by comparing income against a dollar amount that represents a low level of need) reaches $20 \%$ experience more acute systemic problems than in lower-poverty areas. Recent congresses have enacted antipoverty policy interventions that target resources on local communities based on the characteristics of those communities, rather than solely on those of individuals or families. One such policy, dubbed the 10-20-30 provision, was first implemented in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA, P.L. 111-5). Title I, Section 105 of ARRA required the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate at least $10 \%$ of funds from three rural development program accounts to persistent poverty counties - counties that maintained poverty rates of $20 \%$ or more for the past 30 years, as measured by the 1980, 1990, and 2000 decennial censuses.

One notable characteristic of this provision is that it did not increase spending for the rural development programs addressed in ARRA, but rather targeted existing funds differently. Since ARRA, Congress has applied the 10-20-30 provision for other programs in addition to rural development programs, and may continue to do so, using more recent estimates of poverty rates. Doing this, however, requires updating the list of counties with persistent poverty, and that requires making certain decisions about the data that will be used to compile the list.

Poverty rates are computed using data from household surveys fielded by the U.S. Census Bureau. The list of counties identified as persistently poor may differ by roughly 60 to 100 counties in a particular year, depending on the surveys selected to compile the list and the rounding method used for the poverty rate estimates. In the past, the decennial census was the only source of county poverty estimates across the entire country. After 2000, however, the decennial census is no longer used to collect income data. However, there are two newer data sources that may be used to provide poverty estimates for all U.S. counties: the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates program (SAIPE). The Census Bureau implemented both the ACS and SAIPE in the mid-1990s. Therefore, to determine whether an area is persistently poor in a time span that ends after the year 2000, policymakers and researchers must first decide whether ACS or SAIPE poverty estimates will be used for the later part of that time span. Which of these surveys is the best data source to use for compiling an updated list of counties with persistent poverty may differ based on the specific area or policy for which the antipoverty intervention is intended.

When defining persistent poverty counties in order to target funds for programs or services, the following factors may be relevant:

- Characteristics of interest: SAIPE is suited for analysis focused solely on poverty or median income; ACS for poverty and income and other topics (e.g., housing characteristics, disability, education level, occupation, veteran status).
- Geographic areas of interest: SAIPE is recommended for counties and school districts only; ACS may be used to produce estimates for other small geographic areas as well (such as cities, towns, and census tracts).
- Reference period of estimate: Both data sources produce annual estimates. However, the SAIPE estimate is based on one prior year of data while ACS estimates draw on data from the past five years.
- Rounding method for poverty rates: Rounding to $20.0 \%$ (one decimal place) yields a shorter list of counties with persistent poverty than rounding to $20 \%$ (whole number).
- Special populations: Poverty status is not defined for all persons. This includes unrelated individuals under age 15 (e.g., children in foster care), institutionalized persons, and residents of college dormitories; the homeless are not explicitly targeted by household surveys; and areas with large numbers of students living off-campus may have higher poverty rates than might be expected, because poverty is measured using cash income and does not include student loans.
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## Introduction

Antipoverty interventions that provide resources to local communities, based on the characteristics of those communities, have been of interest to Congress. One such policy, dubbed the 10-20-30 provision, was implemented in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA, P.L. 111-5). Title I, Section 105 of ARRA required the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate at least $10 \%$ of funds provided in that act from three rural development program accounts to persistent poverty counties; that is, to counties that have had poverty rates of $20 \%$ or more for the past 30 years, as measured by the 1980, 1990, and 2000 decennial censuses. ${ }^{1}$

One notable characteristic of this provision is that it did not increase spending for the rural development programs addressed in ARRA, but rather targeted existing funds differently. Given Congress's interest both in addressing poverty (economic hardship as measured by comparing income against a dollar amount that represents a low level of need) $)^{2}$ and being mindful about levels of federal spending, the $113^{\text {th }}$ through the $117^{\text {th }}$ Congresses included 10-20-30 language in multiple appropriations bills, some of which were enacted into law. ${ }^{3}$ However, the original language used in ARRA could not be re-used verbatim, because the decennial census-the data source used by ARRA to define persistent poverty-stopped collecting income information. As a consequence, the appropriations bills varied slightly in their definitions of persistent poverty counties as it was applied to various programs and departments. This variation occurred even within different sections of the same bill if the bill included language on different programs. In turn, because the definitions of persistent poverty differed, so did the lists of counties identified as persistently poor and subject to the 10-20-30 provision. The bills included legislation for rural development, public works and economic development, technological innovation, and brownfields site assessment and remediation.

Most recently, in the $117^{\text {th }}$ Congress, much of the language used in these previous bills was included in P.L. 117-103 (the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022). ${ }^{4}$ References to persistent poverty counties, with provisions other than a $10 \%$ set-aside, also appeared in P.L. 117-58 (the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act). Additionally, more than 40 other bills introduced but not

[^0]enacted as of the cover date of this report also referred to persistent poverty counties, with or without requiring a $10 \%$ set-aside specifically.

This report discusses how data source selection, and the rounding of poverty estimates, can affect the list of counties identified as persistently poor. After briefly explaining why targeting funds to persistent poverty counties might be of interest, this report explores how persistent poverty is defined and measured, and how different interpretations of the definition and different data source selections could yield different lists of counties identified as persistently poor. This report does not compare the 10-20-30 provision's advantages and disadvantages against other policy options for addressing poverty, nor does it examine the range of programs or policy goals for which the 10-20-30 provision might be an appropriate policy tool.

## Motivation for Targeting Funds to Persistent Poverty Counties

Research has suggested that areas for which the poverty rate (the percentage of the population that is below poverty) reaches $20 \%$ experience systemic problems that are more acute than in lower-poverty areas. The poverty rate of $20 \%$ as a critical point has been discussed in academic literature as relevant for examining social characteristics of high-poverty versus low-poverty areas. ${ }^{5}$ For instance, property values in high-poverty areas do not yield as high a return on investment as in low-poverty areas, and that low return provides a financial disincentive for property owners to spend money on maintaining and improving property. ${ }^{6}$ The ill effects of high poverty rates have been documented both for urban and rural areas. ${ }^{7}$ Depending on the years in which poverty is measured and the data sources used, between 360 and 500 counties have been

[^1]identified as persistent poverty counties, out of a total of 3,143 counties or county-equivalent areas nationwide. Therefore, policy interventions at the community level, and not only at the individual or family level, have been and may continue to be of interest to Congress. ${ }^{8}$

## Defining Persistent Poverty Counties

Persistent poverty counties are counties that have had poverty rates of $20 \%$ or greater for at least 30 years. The county poverty rates for 1999 and previous years are measured using decennial census data. For more recent years, either the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) or the American Community Survey (ACS) are used. Both of these Census Bureau data sources were first implemented in the mid-1990s and both provide poverty estimates no longer available from the decennial census. ${ }^{9}$ The data sources used, and the level of precision of rounding for the poverty rate, affects the list of counties identified as persistent poverty counties, as will be described below.

## Computing the Poverty Rate for an Area

Poverty rates are computed by the Census Bureau for the nation, states, and smaller geographic areas such as counties. ${ }^{10}$ The official definition of poverty in the United States is based on the money income of families and unrelated individuals. Income from each family member (if family members are present) is added together and compared against a dollar amount called a poverty threshold, which represents a level of economic hardship and varies according to the size and characteristics of the family (ranging from one person to nine persons or more). Families (or unrelated individuals) whose income is less than their respective poverty threshold are considered to be in poverty (sometimes also described as below poverty). ${ }^{11}$

[^2]Every person in a family has the same poverty status. Thus, it is possible to compute a poverty rate based on counts of persons. This is done by dividing the number of persons below poverty within a county by the county's total population, ${ }^{12}$ and multiplying by 100 to express the rate as a percentage.

## Data Sources Used in Identifying Persistent Poverty Counties

Poverty rates are computed using data from household surveys. Currently, the only data sources that provide poverty estimates for all U.S. counties are the ACS and SAIPE. Before the mid1990s, the only poverty data available at the county level came from the Decennial Census of Population and Housing, which is collected once every 10 years. In the past, these data were the only source of estimates that could determine whether a county had persistently high poverty rates (ARRA referred explicitly to decennial census poverty estimates for that purpose). However, after Census 2000, the decennial census has no longer collected income information in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and as a result cannot be used to compute poverty estimates. ${ }^{13}$ Therefore, to determine whether an area is persistently poor in a time span that ends after 2000, it must first be decided whether ACS or SAIPE poverty estimates will be used for the later part of that time span.
The ACS and the SAIPE program serve different purposes. The ACS was developed to provide continuous measurement of a wide range of topics similar to that formerly provided by the decennial census long form, available down to the local community level. ACS data for all counties are available annually, but are based on responses over the previous five-year time span (e.g., 2016-2020). The SAIPE program was developed specifically for estimating poverty at the county level for school-age children and for the overall population, for use in funding allocations for the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-382). SAIPE data are also available annually, and reflect one calendar year, not five. However, unlike the ACS, SAIPE does not provide estimates for a wide array of topics. For further details about the data sources for county poverty estimates, see the Appendix.

[^3]
# Considerations When Identifying and Targeting Persistent Poverty Counties 

## Selecting the Data Source: Strengths and Limitations of ACS and SAIPE Poverty Data

Because poverty estimates can be obtained from multiple data sources, the Census Bureau has provided guidance on the most suitable data source to use for various purposes. ${ }^{14}$

## Characteristics of Interest: SAIPE for Poverty Alone; ACS for Other Topics in Addition to Poverty

The Census Bureau recommends using SAIPE poverty estimates when estimates are needed at the county level, especially for counties with small populations, and when additional demographic and economic detail is not needed at that level. ${ }^{15}$ When additional detail is required, such as for county-level poverty estimates by race and Hispanic origin, detailed age groups (aside from the elementary and secondary school-age population), housing characteristics, or education level, the ACS is the data source recommended by the Census Bureau.

## Geographic Area of Interest: SAIPE for Counties and School Districts Only; ACS for Other Small Areas

For counties (and school districts) of small population size, SAIPE data have an advantage over ACS data in that the SAIPE model uses administrative data to help reduce the uncertainty of the estimates. However, ACS estimates are available for a wider array of geographic levels, such as ZIP code tabulation areas, census tracts (subcounty areas of roughly 1,200 to 8,000 people), cities and towns, and greater metropolitan areas. ${ }^{16}$

## Reference Period of Estimate: SAIPE for One Year, ACS for a Five-Year Span

While the ACS has greater flexibility in the topics measured and the geographic areas provided, it can only provide estimates in five-year ranges for the smallest geographic areas. Five years of survey responses are needed to obtain a sample large enough to produce meaningful estimates for populations below 65,000 persons. In this sense the SAIPE data, because they are based on a single year, are more current than the data of the ACS. The distinction has to do with the reference period of the data-both data sources release data on an annual basis; the ACS estimates for small areas are based on the prior five years, not the prior year alone.

[^4]
## Other Considerations

## Treatment of Special Populations in the Official Poverty Definition

Regardless of the data source used to measure it, poverty status is not defined for persons in institutions, such as nursing homes or prisons, nor for persons residing in military barracks. These populations are excluded from totals when computing poverty statistics. Furthermore, the homeless population is not counted explicitly in poverty statistics. The ACS is a household survey, thus homeless individuals who are not in shelters are not counted. SAIPE estimates are partially based on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) administrative data and tax data, so the part of the homeless population that either filed tax returns or received SNAP benefits might be reflected in the estimates, but only implicitly.

In the decennial census, ACS, and SAIPE estimates, poverty status also is not defined for persons living in college dormitories. ${ }^{17}$ However, students who live in off-campus housing are included. Because college students tend to have lower money income (which does not include school loans) than average, counties that have large populations of students living off-campus may exhibit higher poverty rates than one might expect given other economic measures for the area, such as the unemployment rate. ${ }^{18}$

Given the ways that the special populations above either are or are not reflected in poverty statistics, it may be worthwhile to consider whether counties that have large numbers of people in those populations would receive an equitable allocation of funds. Other economic measures may be of use, depending on the type of program for which funds are being targeted.

## Persistence Versus Flexibility to Recent Situations

The 10-20-30 provision was developed to identify counties with persistently high poverty rates. Therefore, using that funding approach by itself would not allow flexibility to target counties that have recently experienced economic hardship, such as counties that had a large manufacturing plant close within the past three years. Other interventions besides the 10-20-30 provision may be more appropriate for counties that have had a recent spike in the poverty rate.

## Effects of Rounding and Data Source Selection on Lists of Counties

In ARRA, persistent poverty counties were defined as "any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured by the 1980, 1990, and 2000 decennial censuses. ${ }^{19}$ Poverty rates published by the Census Bureau are typically reported to one decimal place. The numeral used in the ARRA language was the whole number 20. Thus, for any collection of poverty data, there are two reasonable approaches to compiling a list of persistent poverty counties: using poverty rates of at least $20.0 \%$ in all three years, or using

[^5]poverty rates that round up to the whole number $20 \%$ or greater in all three years (i.e., poverty rates of $19.5 \%$ or more in all three years). The former approach is more restrictive and results in a shorter list of counties; the latter approach is more inclusive.

Table 1 illustrates the number of counties identified as persistent poverty counties using the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses, and various ACS and SAIPE datasets for the last data point, under both rounding schemes. The rounding method and data source selection can each have large impacts on the number of counties listed. From 2011 to 2018, using SAIPE for the latest year resulted in more counties being identified as persistently poor than were identified by using the ACS; since then, the reverse has been true. Compared to using $20.0 \%$ as the cutoff (rounded to one decimal place), rounding up to $20 \%$ from $19.5 \%$ adds approximately 40 to 60 counties to the list. Taking both the data source and the rounding method together, the list of persistent poverty counties could vary by roughly 60 to 100 counties in a given year depending on the method used.

## Table I. Number of Counties Identified as Persistently Poor, Using Different Datasets and Rounding Methods

Counties identified as having poverty rates of $20 \%$ or more (applying rounding methods as indicated below) in 1989 (from 1990 Census), 1999 (from Census 2000), and latest year from datasets indicated below.

| Dataset | Rounded to One Decimal Place (20.0\% or Greater) | Rounded to Whole Number (19.5\% or Greater) | Difference Between Rounding Methods |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACS, 2007-201I | 397 | 445 | 48 |
| ACS, 2008-2012 | 404 | 456 | 52 |
| ACS, 2009-2013 | 402 | 458 | 56 |
| ACS, 2010-2014 | 401 | 456 | 55 |
| ACS, 2011-2015 | 397 | 453 | 56 |
| ACS, 2012-2016 | 392 | 446 | 54 |
| ACS, 2013-2017 a | 386 | 436 | 50 |
| ACS, 2014-2018 a | 384 | 430 | 46 |
| ACS, 2015-2019 | 375 | 418 | 43 |
| ACS, 2016-2020 | 355 | 397 | 42 |
|  |  |  | Mean difference: 50.2 |
| SAIPE, 2011 | 433 | 495 | 62 |
| SAIPE, 2012 | 435 | 491 | 56 |
| SAIPE, 2013 | 427 | 490 | 63 |
| SAIPE, 2014 | 427 | 486 | 59 |
| SAIPE, 2015 | 419 | 476 | 57 |
| SAIPE, 2016 | 420 | 469 | 49 |
| SAIPE, 2017 | 411 | 460 | 49 |
| SAIPE, 2018 | 395 | 443 | 48 |


| Dataset | Rounded to One <br> Decimal Place <br> (20.0\% or <br> Greater) | Rounded to <br> Whole <br> Number (19.5\% <br> or Greater) | Difference <br> Between <br> Rounding <br> Methods |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAIPE, 2019 | 361 | 407 | 46 |
| SAIPE, 2020 | 306 | 354 | 48 |

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulation of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census, Census 2000, 20I2-2020 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, and American Community Survey five-Year Estimates for 2007-20II, 2008-20I2, 2009-20I3, 20I0-2014, 20II-2015, 20I2-2016, 2013-20I7, 2014-20I8, 2015-2019, and 2016-2020.
Notes: ACS: American Community Survey. SAIPE: Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates. Comparisons between ACS and SAIPE estimates are between datasets released in the same year (both are typically released in December of the year following the reference period). There are 3,143 county-type areas in the United States.
The selection of the data source and rounding method has a large effect on the number of counties identified as being in persistent poverty. The longest list of persistent poverty counties (SAIPE, I9.5\% or greater, that is, rounded up to the whole number 20\%) minus the shortest list of persistent poverty counties (ACS, 20.0\% or greater) yields the maximum difference. Comparing datasets that were released in the same year, the maximum differences in the lists of counties were:

SAIPE 20II, whole number - ACS, 2007-20II, one decimal $=98$ counties
SAIPE 2012, whole number - ACS, 2008-2012, one decimal $=87$
SAIPE 2013, whole number - ACS, 2009-2013, one decimal $=88$
SAIPE 2014, whole number - ACS, 2010-2014, one decimal $=85$
SAIPE 2015, whole number - ACS, 2011-2015, one decimal $=79$
SAIPE 2016, whole number - ACS, 2012-2016, one decimal $=77$
SAIPE 2017, whole number - ACS, 2013-2017, one decimal $=74$
SAIPE 2018, whole number - ACS, 2014-2018, one decimal $=59$
ACS, 2015-2019, whole number - SAIPE 2019, one decimal $=57$
ACS, 2016-2020, whole number - SAIPE 2020, one decimal $=91$
The lists of persistent poverty counties vary by about 80 counties on average (mean: 79.5), depending on which data source is used for the most recent poverty rate estimate, and which rounding method is applied to identify persistent poverty.
a. These counts include Rio Arriba County, New Mexico, despite an ACS data collection error that occurred in that county in both 2017 and 2018. The Census Bureau detected the error after the five-year data for 2013-2017 had been released, but before the 2014-2018 data had been released. As a result, the 2014-2018 poverty rate for Rio Arriba County was not published, and the 2013-2017 poverty rate (formerly reported as $26.4 \%$ ) was removed from the Census Bureau website. The 2012-2016 ACS poverty rate for Rio Arriba County was $23.4 \%$, and the 2018 SAIPE poverty rate was $22.0 \%$. Because the ACS poverty rate immediately before the error (2012-2016) and the SAIPE poverty rate were both above $20.0 \%$, Rio Arriba County is included in this table's counts of persistent poverty counties. For details see https://www.census.gov/ programs-surveys/acs/technical-documentation/errata/I25.html.

## Example List of Persistent Poverty Counties

The list of persistent poverty counties below (Table 2) is based on data from the 1990 Census, Census 2000, and the 2020 SAIPE estimates, and includes the 354 counties with poverty rates of $19.5 \%$ or greater (that is, counties with poverty rates that were at least $20 \%$ with rounding applied to the whole number). These same counties are mapped in Figure 1.

This list of 354 counties (out of a total of 3,143 nationwide) is similar but not identical to a list that would be compiled if ACS data were used with 1990 and 2000 Census data to determine counties with persistent poverty.

Table 2. List of Persistent Poverty Counties, Based on 1990 Census, Census 2000, and 2020 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE), Using Poverty Rates of 19.5\% or Greater

| Count | FIPS <br> Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 <br> Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 01005 | Alabama | Barbour | 2 | 25.2 | 26.8 | 25.5 |
| 2 | 01011 | Alabama | Bullock | 2 | 36.5 | 33.5 | 30.8 |
| 3 | 01013 | Alabama | Butler | 2 | 31.5 | 24.6 | 20.6 |
| 4 | 01023 | Alabama | Choctaw | 7 | 30.2 | 24.5 | 20.4 |
| 5 | 01025 | Alabama | Clarke | I,7 | 25.9 | 22.6 | 19.5 |
| 6 | 01035 | Alabama | Conecuh | 2 | 29.7 | 26.6 | 22.9 |
| 7 | 01047 | Alabama | Dallas | 7 | 36.2 | 31.1 | 26.7 |
| 8 | 01053 | Alabama | Escambia | 1 | 28.1 | 20.9 | 20.4 |
| 9 | 01061 | Alabama | Geneva | 2 | 19.5 | 19.6 | 21.0 |
| 10 | 01063 | Alabama | Greene | 7 | 45.6 | 34.3 | 27.9 |
| 11 | 01065 | Alabama | Hale | 7 | 35.6 | 26.9 | 21.9 |
| 12 | 01085 | Alabama | Lowndes | 7 | 38.6 | 31.4 | 21.9 |


| Count | FIPS <br> Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 01087 | Alabama | Macon | 3 | 34.5 | 32.8 | 27.9 |
| 14 | 01099 | Alabama | Monroe | 1 | 22.7 | 21.3 | 22.5 |
| 15 | 01105 | Alabama | Perry | 7 | 42.6 | 35.4 | 30.7 |
| 16 | 01107 | Alabama | Pickens | 7 | 28.9 | 24.9 | 22.7 |
| 17 | 01109 | Alabama | Pike | 2 | 27.2 | 23.1 | 19.7 |
| 18 | 01113 | Alabama | Russell | 3 | 20.4 | 19.9 | 20.3 |
| 19 | 01119 | Alabama | Sumter | 7 | 39.7 | 38.7 | 29.2 |
| 20 | 01131 | Alabama | Wilcox | 7 | 45.2 | 39.9 | 22.2 |
| 21 | 02050 | Alaska | Bethel Census Area | at large | 30.0 | 20.6 | 25.3 |
| 22 | 02158 | Alaska | Kusilvak Census Area ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | at large | 31.0 | 26.2 | 27.9 |
| 23 | 02290 | Alaska | Yukon-Koyukuk Census Area | at large | 26.0 | 23.8 | 20.5 |
| 24 | 04001 | Arizona | Apache | 1 | 47.1 | 37.8 | 32.4 |
| 25 | 04012 | Arizona | La Paz | 4 | 28.2 | 19.6 | 20.8 |
| 26 | 04017 | Arizona | Navajo | 1 | 34.7 | 29.5 | 23.3 |
| 27 | 05011 | Arkansas | Bradley | 4 | 24.9 | 26.3 | 20.6 |
| 28 | 05017 | Arkansas | Chicot | 1 | 40.4 | 28.6 | 26.8 |
| 29 | 05035 | Arkansas | Crittenden | 1 | 27.1 | 25.3 | 22.9 |
| 30 | 05037 | Arkansas | Cross | 1 | 25.4 | 19.9 | 21.2 |
| 31 | 05041 | Arkansas | Desha | I | 34.0 | 28.9 | 22.8 |
| 32 | 05073 | Arkansas | Lafayette | 4 | 34.7 | 23.2 | 19.8 |
| 33 | 05077 | Arkansas | Lee | 1 | 47.3 | 29.9 | 36.8 |
| 34 | 05079 | Arkansas | Lincoln | 1 | 26.2 | 19.5 | 23.6 |
| 35 | 05093 | Arkansas | Mississippi | I | 26.2 | 23.0 | 21.0 |
| 36 | 05095 | Arkansas | Monroe | 1 | 35.9 | 27.5 | 23.8 |
| 37 | 05103 | Arkansas | Ouachita | 4 | 21.2 | 19.5 | 20.5 |
| 38 | 05107 | Arkansas | Phillips | 1 | 43.0 | 32.7 | 22.1 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | 05111 | Arkansas | Poinsett | 1 | 25.6 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| 40 | 05123 | Arkansas | St. Francis | 1 | 36.6 | 27.5 | 30.1 |
| 41 | 05129 | Arkansas | Searcy | 1,3 | 29.9 | 23.8 | 22.3 |
| 42 | 05147 | Arkansas | Woodruff | 1 | 34.5 | 27.0 | 22.6 |
| 43 | 08011 | Colorado | Bent | 4 | 20.4 | 19.5 | 26.6 |
| 44 | 08023 | Colorado | Costilla | 3 | 34.6 | 26.8 | 21.8 |
| 45 | 12039 | Florida | Gadsden | 5 | 28.0 | 19.9 | 21.9 |
| 46 | 12047 | Florida | Hamilton | 5 | 27.8 | 26.0 | 24.2 |
| 47 | 12049 | Florida | Hardee | 17 | 22.8 | 24.6 | 21.2 |
| 48 | 12079 | Florida | Madison | 5 | 25.9 | 23.1 | 23.8 |
| 49 | 12107 | Florida | Putnam | 3 | 20.0 | 20.9 | 24.3 |
| 50 | 13003 | Georgia | Atkinson | 8 | 26.0 | 23.0 | 21.6 |
| 51 | 13005 | Georgia | Bacon | 1 | 24.1 | 23.7 | 21.1 |
| 52 | 13007 | Georgia | Baker | 2 | 24.8 | 23.4 | 23.7 |
| 53 | 13017 | Georgia | Ben Hill | 8 | 22.0 | 22.3 | 22.3 |
| 54 | 13027 | Georgia | Brooks | 8 | 25.9 | 23.4 | 20.6 |
| 55 | \|3031 | Georgia | Bulloch | 12 | 27.5 | 24.5 | 20.7 |
| 56 | 13033 | Georgia | Burke | 12 | 30.3 | 28.7 | 20.0 |
| 57 | 13037 | Georgia | Calhoun | 2 | 31.8 | 26.5 | 34.4 |
| 58 | 13043 | Georgia | Candler | 12 | 24.1 | 26.1 | 20.1 |
| 59 | 13059 | Georgia | Clarke | 9,10 | 27.0 | 28.3 | 24.6 |
| 60 | \|306| | Georgia | Clay | 2 | 35.7 | 31.3 | 24.1 |
| 61 | 13065 | Georgia | Clinch | 1 | 26.4 | 23.4 | 20.4 |
| 62 | I3071 | Georgia | Colquitt | 8 | 22.8 | 19.8 | 20.4 |
| 63 | 13075 | Georgia | Cook | 8 | 22.4 | 20.7 | 19.5 |
| 64 | 13081 | Georgia | Crisp | 2 | 29.0 | 29.3 | 24.5 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65 | 13087 | Georgia | Decatur | 2 | 23.3 | 22.7 | 25.6 |
| 66 | 13093 | Georgia | Dooly | 2 | 32.9 | 22.1 | 27.0 |
| 67 | 13095 | Georgia | Dougherty | 2 | 24.4 | 24.8 | 27.4 |
| 68 | 13099 | Georgia | Early | 2 | 31.4 | 25.7 | 24.0 |
| 69 | 13107 | Georgia | Emanuel | 12 | 25.7 | 27.4 | 26.4 |
| 70 | 13109 | Georgia | Evans | 12 | 25.4 | 27.0 | 19.6 |
| 71 | 13141 | Georgia | Hancock | 10 | 30.1 | 29.4 | 30.7 |
| 72 | 13163 | Georgia | Jefferson | 10 | 31.3 | 23.0 | 21.1 |
| 73 | 13165 | Georgia | Jenkins | 12 | 27.8 | 28.4 | 28.0 |
| 74 | 13167 | Georgia | Johnson | 10 | 22.2 | 22.6 | 25.9 |
| 75 | 13193 | Georgia | Macon | 2 | 29.2 | 25.8 | 31.1 |
| 76 | 13197 | Georgia | Marion | 2 | 28.2 | 22.4 | 20.6 |
| 77 | 13201 | Georgia | Miller | 2 | 22.1 | 21.2 | 19.8 |
| 78 | 13205 | Georgia | Mitchell | 2 | 28.7 | 26.4 | 38.2 |
| 79 | 13239 | Georgia | Quitman | 2 | 33.0 | 21.9 | 23.1 |
| 80 | 13243 | Georgia | Randolph | 2 | 35.9 | 27.7 | 27.4 |
| 81 | 13251 | Georgia | Screven | 12 | 22.9 | 20.1 | 20.7 |
| 82 | 13253 | Georgia | Seminole | 2 | 29.1 | 23.2 | 22.9 |
| 83 | 13259 | Georgia | Stewart | 2 | 31.4 | 22.2 | 31.3 |
| 84 | 13261 | Georgia | Sumter | 2 | 24.8 | 21.4 | 24.3 |
| 85 | 13263 | Georgia | Talbot | 2 | 24.9 | 24.2 | 20.8 |
| 86 | 13265 | Georgia | Taliaferro | 10 | 31.9 | 23.4 | 23.2 |
| 87 | 13267 | Georgia | Tattnall | 12 | 21.9 | 23.9 | 20.7 |
| 88 | 13269 | Georgia | Taylor | 2 | 29.5 | 26.0 | 23.2 |
| 89 | I3271 | Georgia | Telfair | 8 | 27.3 | 21.2 | 29.9 |
| 90 | 13273 | Georgia | Terrell | 2 | 29.1 | 28.6 | 27.8 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91 | 13277 | Georgia | Tift | 8 | 22.9 | 19.9 | 20.5 |
| 92 | 13279 | Georgia | Toombs | 12 | 24.0 | 23.9 | 22.2 |
| 93 | 13283 | Georgia | Treutlen | 12 | 27.1 | 26.3 | 23.4 |
| 94 | 13287 | Georgia | Turner | 8 | 31.3 | 26.7 | 22.2 |
| 95 | 13289 | Georgia | Twiggs | 8 | 26.0 | 19.7 | 20.0 |
| 96 | 13299 | Georgia | Ware | 1 | 21.1 | 20.5 | 26.0 |
| 97 | 13301 | Georgia | Warren | 10 | 32.6 | 27.0 | 23.4 |
| 98 | 13303 | Georgia | Washington | 10 | 21.6 | 22.9 | 21.3 |
| 99 | 13309 | Georgia | Wheeler | 12 | 30.3 | 25.3 | 35.6 |
| 100 | 13315 | Georgia | Wilcox | 8 | 28.6 | 21.0 | 27.9 |
| 101 | 17003 | Illinois | Alexander | 12 | 32.2 | 26.1 | 24.2 |
| 102 | 17153 | Illinois | Pulaski | 12 | 30.2 | 24.7 | 20.4 |
| 103 | 21001 | Kentucky | Adair | I | 25.1 | 24.0 | 22.1 |
| 104 | 21011 | Kentucky | Bath | 6 | 27.3 | 21.9 | 22.5 |
| 105 | 21013 | Kentucky | Bell | 5 | 36.2 | 31.1 | 29.8 |
| 106 | 21025 | Kentucky | Breathitt | 5 | 39.5 | 33.2 | 27.9 |
| 107 | 21045 | Kentucky | Casey | 1 | 29.4 | 25.5 | 22.7 |
| 108 | 21051 | Kentucky | Clay | 5 | 40.2 | 39.7 | 37.3 |
| 109 | 21053 | Kentucky | Clinton | I | 38.1 | 25.8 | 21.5 |
| 110 | 21057 | Kentucky | Cumberland | 1 | 31.6 | 23.8 | 21.0 |
| 111 | 21063 | Kentucky | Elliott | 5 | 38.0 | 25.9 | 28.8 |
| 112 | 21065 | Kentucky | Estill | 6 | 29.0 | 26.4 | 20.6 |
| 113 | 21071 | Kentucky | Floyd | 5 | 31.2 | 30.3 | 28.3 |
| 114 | 21075 | Kentucky | Fulton | I | 30.3 | 23.1 | 25.2 |
| 115 | 21095 | Kentucky | Harlan | 5 | 33.1 | 32.5 | 28.0 |
| 116 | 21099 | Kentucky | Hart | 2 | 27.1 | 22.4 | 22.1 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty <br> Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117 | 21109 | Kentucky | Jackson | 5 | 38.2 | 30.2 | 24.0 |
| 118 | 21115 | Kentucky | Johnson | 5 | 28.7 | 26.6 | 22.5 |
| 119 | 21119 | Kentucky | Knott | 5 | 40.4 | 31.1 | 27.7 |
| 120 | 21121 | Kentucky | Knox | 5 | 38.9 | 34.8 | 27.8 |
| 121 | 21127 | Kentucky | Lawrence | 5 | 36.0 | 30.7 | 22.3 |
| 122 | 21129 | Kentucky | Lee | 5 | 37.4 | 30.4 | 32.1 |
| 123 | 21131 | Kentucky | Leslie | 5 | 35.6 | 32.7 | 25.8 |
| 124 | 21133 | Kentucky | Letcher | 5 | 31.8 | 27.1 | 24.4 |
| 125 | 21135 | Kentucky | Lewis | 4 | 30.7 | 28.5 | 22.2 |
| 126 | 21147 | Kentucky | McCreary | 5 | 45.5 | 32.2 | 36.2 |
| 127 | 21153 | Kentucky | Magoffin | 5 | 42.5 | 36.6 | 30.9 |
| 128 | 21159 | Kentucky | Martin | 5 | 35.4 | 37.0 | 31.9 |
| 129 | 21165 | Kentucky | Menifee | 6 | 35.0 | 29.6 | 22.7 |
| 130 | 21169 | Kentucky | Metcalfe | 1 | 27.9 | 23.6 | 21.4 |
| 131 | 21171 | Kentucky | Monroe | 1 | 26.9 | 23.4 | 22.5 |
| 132 | 21175 | Kentucky | Morgan | 5 | 38.8 | 27.2 | 24.5 |
| 133 | 21189 | Kentucky | Owsley | 5 | 52.1 | 45.4 | 30.6 |
| 134 | 21193 | Kentucky | Perry | 5 | 32.1 | 29.1 | 22.0 |
| 135 | 21195 | Kentucky | Pike | 5 | 25.4 | 23.4 | 23.7 |
| 136 | 21197 | Kentucky | Powell | 6 | 26.2 | 23.5 | 20.5 |
| 137 | 21203 | Kentucky | Rockcastle | 5 | 30.7 | 23.1 | 22.4 |
| 138 | 21205 | Kentucky | Rowan | 5 | 28.9 | 21.3 | 24.4 |
| 139 | 21231 | Kentucky | Wayne | 5 | 37.3 | 29.4 | 23.6 |
| 140 | 21235 | Kentucky | Whitley | 5 | 33.0 | 26.4 | 21.7 |
| 141 | 21237 | Kentucky | Wolfe | 6 | 44.3 | 35.9 | 29.7 |
| 142 | 22001 | Louisiana | Acadia Parish | 3 | 30.5 | 24.5 | 20.7 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 143 | 22003 | Louisiana | Allen Parish | 4 | 29.9 | 19.9 | 21.1 |
| 144 | 22009 | Louisiana | Avoyelles Parish | 5 | 37.1 | 25.9 | 21.6 |
| 145 | 22013 | Louisiana | Bienville Parish | 4 | 31.2 | 26.1 | 22.8 |
| 146 | 22017 | Louisiana | Caddo Parish | 4 | 24.0 | 21.1 | 20.9 |
| 147 | 22021 | Louisiana | Caldwell Parish | 5 | 28.8 | 21.2 | 21.4 |
| 148 | 22025 | Louisiana | Catahoula Parish | 5 | 36.8 | 28.1 | 28.4 |
| 149 | 22027 | Louisiana | Claiborne Parish | 4 | 32.0 | 26.5 | 31.9 |
| 150 | 22029 | Louisiana | Concordia Parish | 5 | 30.6 | 29.1 | 28.6 |
| 151 | 22031 | Louisiana | De Soto Parish | 4 | 29.8 | 25.1 | 19.8 |
| 152 | 22035 | Louisiana | East Carroll Parish | 5 | 56.8 | 40.5 | 37.6 |
| 153 | 22037 | Louisiana | East Feliciana Parish | 5,6 | 25.0 | 23.0 | 19.9 |
| 154 | 22039 | Louisiana | Evangeline Parish | 4 | 35.1 | 32.2 | 24.5 |
| 155 | 22041 | Louisiana | Franklin Parish | 5 | 34.5 | 28.4 | 24.1 |
| 156 | 22045 | Louisiana | Iberia Parish | 3 | 25.8 | 23.6 | 22.5 |
| 157 | 22047 | Louisiana | Iberville Parish | 2,6 | 28.0 | 23.1 | 23.7 |
| 158 | 22049 | Louisiana | Jackson Parish | 5 | 23.9 | 19.8 | 20.9 |
| 159 | 22061 | Louisiana | Lincoln Parish | 5 | 26.6 | 26.5 | 21.7 |
| 160 | 22065 | Louisiana | Madison Parish | 5 | 44.6 | 36.7 | 33.6 |
| 161 | 22067 | Louisiana | Morehouse Parish | 5 | 31.0 | 26.8 | 23.3 |
| 162 | 22069 | Louisiana | Natchitoches Parish | 4 | 33.9 | 26.5 | 21.7 |
| 163 | 22071 | Louisiana | Orleans Parish | 1,2 | 31.6 | 27.9 | 21.1 |
| 164 | 22073 | Louisiana | Ouachita Parish | 5 | 24.7 | 20.7 | 23.7 |
| 165 | 22081 | Louisiana | Red River Parish | 4 | 35.1 | 29.9 | 23.7 |
| 166 | 22083 | Louisiana | Richland Parish | 5 | 33.2 | 27.9 | 22.5 |
| 167 | 22085 | Louisiana | Sabine Parish | 4 | 27.1 | 21.5 | 22.1 |
| 168 | 22091 | Louisiana | St. Helena Parish | 5,6 | 34.4 | 26.8 | 22.7 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) <br> Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 <br> Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | Poverty Rate, 2020 (from SAIPE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 169 | 22097 | Louisiana | St. Landry Parish | 3,4,5 | 36.3 | 29.3 | 22.6 |
| 170 | 22101 | Louisiana | St. Mary Parish | 3 | 27.0 | 23.6 | 19.8 |
| 171 | 22105 | Louisiana | Tangipahoa Parish | 1,5 | 31.5 | 22.7 | 20.1 |
| 172 | 22107 | Louisiana | Tensas Parish | 5 | 46.3 | 36.3 | 30.8 |
| 173 | 22117 | Louisiana | Washington Parish | 5 | 31.6 | 24.7 | 22.5 |
| 174 | 22119 | Louisiana | Webster Parish | 4 | 25.1 | 20.2 | 19.7 |
| 175 | 22123 | Louisiana | West Carroll Parish | 5 | 27.4 | 23.4 | 20.8 |
| 176 | 22125 | Louisiana | West Feliciana Parish | 5 | 33.8 | 19.9 | 21.9 |
| 177 | 22127 | Louisiana | Winn Parish | 5 | 27.5 | 21.5 | 22.6 |
| 178 | 24510 | Maryland | Baltimore city | 2,3,7 | 21.9 | 22.9 | 20.0 |
| 179 | 28001 | Mississippi | Adams | 3 | 30.5 | 25.9 | 27.2 |
| 180 | 28005 | Mississippi | Amite | 3 | 30.9 | 22.6 | 21.7 |
| I81 | 28009 | Mississippi | Benton | I | 29.7 | 23.2 | 19.8 |
| 182 | 28011 | Mississippi | Bolivar | 2 | 42.9 | 33.3 | 28.1 |
| 183 | 28017 | Mississippi | Chickasaw | 1 | 21.3 | 20.0 | 24.8 |
| 184 | 28021 | Mississippi | Claiborne | 2 | 43.6 | 32.4 | 34.1 |
| 185 | 28025 | Mississippi | Clay | 1 | 25.9 | 23.5 | 21.5 |
| 186 | 28027 | Mississippi | Coahoma | 2 | 45.5 | 35.9 | 39.6 |
| 187 | 28029 | Mississippi | Copiah | 2 | 32.0 | 25.1 | 22.5 |
| 188 | 28031 | Mississippi | Covington | 3 | 31.2 | 23.5 | 20.3 |
| 189 | 28035 | Mississippi | Forrest | 4 | 27.5 | 22.5 | 24.9 |
| 190 | 28037 | Mississippi | Franklin | 3 | 33.3 | 24.1 | 21.4 |
| 191 | 2804I | Mississippi | Greene | 4 | 26.8 | 19.6 | 21.4 |
| 192 | 28043 | Mississippi | Grenada | 2 | 22.3 | 20.9 | 21.4 |
| 193 | 28049 | Mississippi | Hinds | 2,3 | 21.2 | 19.9 | 25.9 |
| 194 | 28051 | Mississippi | Holmes | 2 | 53.2 | 41.1 | 34.5 |


| Count | FIPS <br> Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 195 | 28053 | Mississippi | Humphreys | 2 | 45.9 | 38.2 | 33.3 |
| 196 | 28055 | Mississippi | Issaquena | 2 | 49.3 | 33.2 | 43.3 |
| 197 | 28063 | Mississippi | Jefferson | 2 | 46.9 | 36.0 | 30.8 |
| 198 | 28065 | Mississippi | Jefferson Davis | 3 | 33.3 | 28.2 | 25.2 |
| 199 | 28069 | Mississippi | Kemper | 3 | 35.1 | 26.0 | 25.2 |
| 200 | 28075 | Mississippi | Lauderdale | 3 | 22.8 | 20.8 | 22.5 |
| 201 | 28079 | Mississippi | Leake | 2 | 29.6 | 23.3 | 21.0 |
| 202 | 28083 | Mississippi | Leflore | 2 | 38.9 | 34.8 | 25.3 |
| 203 | 28093 | Mississippi | Marshall | 1 | 30.0 | 21.9 | 22.7 |
| 204 | 28097 | Mississippi | Montgomery | 2 | 34.0 | 24.3 | 21.2 |
| 205 | 28103 | Mississippi | Noxubee | 3 | 41.4 | 32.8 | 26.2 |
| 206 | 28105 | Mississippi | Oktibbeha | I,3 | 30.1 | 28.2 | 23.5 |
| 207 | 28107 | Mississippi | Panola | 2 | 33.8 | 25.3 | 21.0 |
| 208 | 28113 | Mississippi | Pike | 3 | 32.9 | 25.3 | 26.5 |
| 209 | 28119 | Mississippi | Quitman | 2 | 41.6 | 33.1 | 29.9 |
| 210 | 28125 | Mississippi | Sharkey | 2 | 47.5 | 38.3 | 30.3 |
| 211 | 28127 | Mississippi | Simpson | 3 | 22.7 | 21.6 | 21.2 |
| 212 | 28133 | Mississippi | Sunflower | 2 | 41.8 | 30.0 | 34.8 |
| 213 | 28135 | Mississippi | Tallahatchie | 2 | 41.9 | 32.2 | 32.0 |
| 214 | 28143 | Mississippi | Tunica | 2 | 56.8 | 33.1 | 26.7 |
| 215 | 28147 | Mississippi | Walthall | 3 | 35.9 | 27.8 | 23.5 |
| 216 | 28151 | Mississippi | Washington | 2 | 33.8 | 29.2 | 27.7 |
| 217 | 28153 | Mississippi | Wayne | 4 | 29.5 | 25.4 | 22.1 |
| 218 | 28157 | Mississippi | Wilkinson | 3 | 42.2 | 37.7 | 28.4 |
| 219 | 28159 | Mississippi | Winston | I | 26.6 | 23.7 | 21.8 |
| 220 | 28161 | Mississippi | Yalobusha | 2 | 26.4 | 21.8 | 21.2 |


| Count | FIPS <br> Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | Poverty <br> Rate, <br> 2020 <br> (from <br> SAIPE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 221 | 28163 | Mississippi | Yazoo | 2 | 39.2 | 31.9 | 31.0 |
| 222 | 29035 | Missouri | Carter | 8 | 27.6 | 25.2 | 20.3 |
| 223 | 29069 | Missouri | Dunklin | 8 | 29.9 | 24.5 | 20.2 |
| 224 | 29085 | Missouri | Hickory | 4 | 21.9 | 19.7 | 19.6 |
| 225 | 29149 | Missouri | Oregon | 8 | 27.4 | 22.0 | 22.0 |
| 226 | 29153 | Missouri | Ozark | 8 | 22.1 | 21.6 | 20.3 |
| 227 | 29155 | Missouri | Pemiscot | 8 | 35.8 | 30.4 | 35.3 |
| 228 | 29181 | Missouri | Ripley | 8 | 31.5 | 22.0 | 21.3 |
| 229 | 29203 | Missouri | Shannon | 8 | 24.1 | 26.9 | 21.8 |
| 230 | 29215 | Missouri | Texas | 8 | 22.9 | 21.4 | 20.3 |
| 231 | 29223 | Missouri | Wayne | 8 | 29.0 | 21.9 | 23.2 |
| 232 | 29510 | Missouri | St. Louis city | 1 | 24.6 | 24.6 | 20.8 |
| 233 | 30003 | Montana | Big Horn | at large | 35.3 | 29.2 | 28.9 |
| 234 | 30005 | Montana | Blaine | at large | 27.7 | 28.1 | 20.9 |
| 235 | 30035 | Montana | Glacier | at large | 35.7 | 27.3 | 24.3 |
| 236 | 30085 | Montana | Roosevelt | at large | 27.7 | 32.4 | 23.8 |
| 237 | 30107 | Montana | Wheatland | at large | 21.3 | 20.4 | 20.9 |
| 238 | 35003 | New Mexico | Catron | 2 | 25.6 | 24.5 | 22.8 |
| 239 | 35006 | New Mexico | Cibola | 2 | 33.6 | 24.8 | 25.1 |
| 240 | 35013 | New Mexico | Doña Ana | 2 | 26.5 | 25.4 | 20.5 |
| 241 | 35019 | New Mexico | Guadalupe | 2 | 38.5 | 21.6 | 22.8 |
| 242 | 35023 | New Mexico | Hidalgo | 2 | 20.7 | 27.3 | 19.8 |
| 243 | 35029 | New Mexico | Luna | 2 | 31.5 | 32.9 | 22.3 |
| 244 | 35031 | New Mexico | McKinley | 2,3 | 43.5 | 36.1 | 32.0 |
| 245 | 35033 | New Mexico | Mora | 3 | 36.2 | 25.4 | 19.8 |
| 246 | 35037 | New Mexico | Quay | 3 | 25.1 | 20.9 | 22.0 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 247 | 35039 | New Mexico | Rio Arriba | 3 | 27.5 | 20.3 | 19.7 |
| 248 | 35045 | New Mexico | San Juan | 3 | 28.3 | 21.5 | 21.5 |
| 249 | 35047 | New Mexico | San Miguel | 3 | 30.2 | 24.4 | 20.9 |
| 250 | 35051 | New Mexico | Sierra | 2 | 19.6 | 20.9 | 22.1 |
| 251 | 35053 | New Mexico | Socorro | 2 | 29.9 | 31.7 | 25.1 |
| 252 | 36005 | New York | Bronx | 13,14,15,16 | 28.7 | 30.7 | 24.4 |
| 253 | 37015 | North Carolina | Bertie | 1 | 25.9 | 23.5 | 22.8 |
| 254 | 37017 | North Carolina | Bladen | 7,9 | 21.9 | 21.0 | 21.6 |
| 255 | 37047 | North Carolina | Columbus | 7 | 24.0 | 22.7 | 21.3 |
| 256 | 37065 | North Carolina | Edgecombe | 1 | 20.9 | 19.6 | 24.1 |
| 257 | 37083 | North Carolina | Halifax | 1 | 25.6 | 23.9 | 23.9 |
| 258 | 37117 | North Carolina | Martin | 1 | 22.3 | 20.2 | 20.1 |
| 259 | 37131 | North Carolina | Northampton | 1 | 23.6 | 21.3 | 21.7 |
| 260 | 37155 | North Carolina | Robeson | 9 | 24.1 | 22.8 | 26.6 |
| 261 | 37177 | North Carolina | Tyrrell | 3 | 25.0 | 23.3 | 20.8 |
| 262 | 37181 | North Carolina | Vance | 1 | 19.6 | 20.5 | 21.3 |
| 263 | 37187 | North Carolina | Washington | 1 | 20.4 | 21.8 | 24.3 |
| 264 | 38005 | North Dakota | Benson | at large | 31.7 | 29.1 | 24.2 |
| 265 | 38079 | North Dakota | Rolette | at large | 40.7 | 31.0 | 21.3 |
| 266 | 38085 | North Dakota | Sioux | at large | 47.4 | 39.2 | 28.3 |
| 267 | 39009 | Ohio | Athens | 6,15 | 28.7 | 27.4 | 22.0 |
| 268 | 40001 | Oklahoma | Adair | 2 | 26.7 | 23.2 | 22.3 |
| 269 | 40021 | Oklahoma | Cherokee | 2 | 28.8 | 22.9 | 19.6 |
| 270 | 40023 | Oklahoma | Choctaw | 2 | 32.7 | 24.3 | 19.5 |
| 271 | 40055 | Oklahoma | Greer | 3 | 23.4 | 19.6 | 22.9 |
| 272 | 40057 | Oklahoma | Harmon | 3 | 34.2 | 29.7 | 23.3 |


| Count | FIPS <br> Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 273 | 40063 | Oklahoma | Hughes | 2 | 26.9 | 21.9 | 21.4 |
| 274 | 40107 | Oklahoma | Okfuskee | 2 | 29.4 | 23.0 | 21.7 |
| 275 | 40119 | Oklahoma | Payne | 3 | 21.7 | 20.3 | 20.1 |
| 276 | 40133 | Oklahoma | Seminole | 5 | 24.0 | 20.8 | 21.2 |
| 277 | 40141 | Oklahoma | Tillman | 4 | 22.9 | 21.9 | 21.9 |
| 278 | 45005 | South Carolina | Allendale | 6 | 35.8 | 34.5 | 31.6 |
| 279 | 45009 | South Carolina | Bamberg | 6 | 28.2 | 27.8 | 21.0 |
| 280 | 45011 | South Carolina | Barnwell | 2 | 21.8 | 20.9 | 21.6 |
| 281 | 45029 | South Carolina | Colleton | 1,6 | 23.4 | 21.1 | 20.1 |
| 282 | 45033 | South Carolina | Dillon | 7 | 28.1 | 24.2 | 22.2 |
| 283 | 45049 | South Carolina | Hampton | 6 | 27.7 | 21.8 | 19.6 |
| 284 | 45061 | South Carolina | Lee | 5 | 29.6 | 21.8 | 23.0 |
| 285 | 45067 | South Carolina | Marion | 7 | 28.6 | 23.2 | 21.8 |
| 286 | 45069 | South Carolina | Marlboro | 7 | 26.6 | 21.7 | 26.0 |
| 287 | 45089 | South Carolina | Williamsburg | 6 | 28.7 | 27.9 | 25.4 |
| 288 | 46007 | South Dakota | Bennett | at large | 37.6 | 39.2 | 28.3 |
| 289 | 46017 | South Dakota | Buffalo | at large | 45.1 | 56.9 | 32.8 |
| 290 | 46023 | South Dakota | Charles Mix | at large | 31.4 | 26.9 | 24.0 |
| 291 | 46031 | South Dakota | Corson | at large | 42.5 | 41.0 | 37.1 |
| 292 | 46041 | South Dakota | Dewey | at large | 44.4 | 33.6 | 24.9 |
| 293 | 4607I | South Dakota | Jackson | at large | 38.8 | 36.5 | 28.7 |
| 294 | 46085 | South Dakota | Lyman | at large | 24.7 | 24.3 | 23.9 |
| 295 | 46095 | South Dakota | Mellette | at large | 41.3 | 35.8 | 29.9 |
| 296 | 46102 | South Dakota | Oglala Lakota ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | at large | 63.1 | 52.3 | 38.1 |
| 297 | 46121 | South Dakota | Todd | at large | 50.2 | 48.3 | 42.5 |
| 298 | 46137 | South Dakota | Ziebach | at large | 51.1 | 49.9 | 43.9 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | Poverty <br> Rate, <br> 2020 <br> (from <br> SAIPE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 299 | 47013 | Tennessee | Campbell | 2,3 | 26.8 | 22.8 | 20.0 |
| 300 | 47029 | Tennessee | Cocke | 1 | 25.3 | 22.5 | 19.7 |
| 301 | 47067 | Tennessee | Hancock | 1 | 40.0 | 29.4 | 28.6 |
| 302 | 47069 | Tennessee | Hardeman | 7 | 23.3 | 19.7 | 22.0 |
| 303 | 47095 | Tennessee | Lake | 8 | 27.5 | 23.6 | 36.4 |
| 304 | 47151 | Tennessee | Scott | 3 | 27.8 | 20.2 | 19.8 |
| 305 | 48025 | Texas | Bee | 34 | 27.4 | 24.0 | 23.1 |
| 306 | 48041 | Texas | Brazos | 17 | 26.7 | 26.9 | 22.3 |
| 307 | 48047 | Texas | Brooks | 15 | 36.8 | 40.2 | 28.7 |
| 308 | 48061 | Texas | Cameron | 34 | 39.7 | 33.1 | 24.4 |
| 309 | 48107 | Texas | Crosby | 19 | 29.5 | 28.1 | 19.8 |
| 310 | 48123 | Texas | DeWitt | 34 | 25.3 | 19.6 | 20.5 |
| 311 | 48127 | Texas | Dimmit | 23 | 48.9 | 33.2 | 25.5 |
| 312 | 48131 | Texas | Duval | 15 | 39.0 | 27.2 | 20.0 |
| 313 | 48145 | Texas | Falls | 17 | 27.5 | 22.6 | 20.0 |
| 314 | 48163 | Texas | Frio | 23 | 39.1 | 29.0 | 22.3 |
| 315 | 48169 | Texas | Garza | 19 | 23.1 | 22.3 | 20.6 |
| 316 | 48207 | Texas | Haskell | 19 | 20.8 | 22.8 | 20.0 |
| 317 | 48215 | Texas | Hidalgo | 15,28,34 | 41.9 | 35.9 | 23.9 |
| 318 | 48225 | Texas | Houston | 8 | 25.6 | 21.0 | 20.0 |
| 319 | 48229 | Texas | Hudspeth | 23 | 38.9 | 35.8 | 24.2 |
| 320 | 48247 | Texas | Jim Hogg | 15 | 35.3 | 25.9 | 20.1 |
| 321 | 48249 | Texas | Jim Wells | 34 | 30.3 | 24.1 | 20.1 |
| 322 | 48273 | Texas | Kleberg | 34 | 27.4 | 26.7 | 20.8 |
| 323 | 48283 | Texas | La Salle | 23,28 | 37.0 | 29.8 | 24.0 |
| 324 | 48315 | Texas | Marion | 4 | 60.6 | 22.4 | 20.0 |


| Count | FIPS <br> Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Poverty } \\ & \text { Rate, } \\ & 2020 \\ & \text { (from } \\ & \text { SAIPE) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 325 | 48323 | Texas | Maverick | 23 | 50.4 | 34.8 | 20.0 |
| 326 | 48347 | Texas | Nacogdoches | 1 | 25.2 | 23.3 | 19.5 |
| 327 | 48405 | Texas | San Augustine | 1 | 29.7 | 21.2 | 19.6 |
| 328 | 48427 | Texas | Starr | 28 | 60.0 | 50.9 | 25.2 |
| 329 | 48479 | Texas | Webb | 28 | 38.2 | 31.2 | 19.9 |
| 330 | 48489 | Texas | Willacy | 34 | 44.5 | 33.2 | 24.7 |
| 331 | 48505 | Texas | Zapata | 28 | 41.0 | 35.8 | 24.6 |
| 332 | 48507 | Texas | Zavala | 23 | 50.4 | 41.8 | 27.2 |
| 333 | 51027 | Virginia | Buchanan | 9 | 21.9 | 23.2 | 23.7 |
| 334 | 51105 | Virginia | Lee | 9 | 28.7 | 23.9 | 26.0 |
| 335 | 51195 | Virginia | Wise | 9 | 21.6 | 20.0 | 20.3 |
| 336 | 51660 | Virginia | Harrisonburg city | 6 | 21.5 | 30.1 | 22.2 |
| 337 | 51720 | Virginia | Norton city | 9 | 26.7 | 22.8 | 20.5 |
| 338 | 51730 | Virginia | Petersburg city | 4 | 20.3 | 19.6 | 20.8 |
| 339 | 51750 | Virginia | Radford city | 9 | 32.2 | 31.4 | 24.6 |
| 340 | 53047 | Washington | Okanogan | 4 | 21.5 | 21.3 | 19.8 |
| 341 | 54001 | West Virginia | Barbour | I | 28.5 | 22.6 | 20.8 |
| 342 | 54013 | West Virginia | Calhoun | 2 | 32.0 | 25.1 | 20.0 |
| 343 | 54015 | West Virginia | Clay | 2 | 39.2 | 27.5 | 23.3 |
| 344 | 54019 | West Virginia | Fayette | 3 | 24.4 | 21.7 | 20.8 |
| 345 | 54021 | West Virginia | Gilmer | 1 | 33.5 | 25.9 | 23.0 |
| 346 | 54043 | West Virginia | Lincoln | 3 | 33.8 | 27.9 | 20.6 |
| 347 | 54045 | West Virginia | Logan | 3 | 27.7 | 24.1 | 22.3 |
| 348 | 54047 | West Virginia | McDowell | 3 | 37.7 | 37.7 | 31.8 |
| 349 | 54059 | West Virginia | Mingo | 3 | 30.9 | 29.7 | 24.9 |
| 350 | 54087 | West Virginia | Roane | 2 | 28.1 | 22.6 | 20.7 |


| Count | FIPS Geographic Identification Code | State | County | Congressional District(s) Representing the Countya | Poverty Rate, 1989 (from 1990 Census) | Poverty Rate, 1999 (from Census 2000) | Poverty Rate, 2020 (from SAIPE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 351 | 54089 | West Virginia | Summers | 3 | 24.5 | 24.4 | 21.1 |
| 352 | 54101 | West Virginia | Webster | 3 | 34.8 | 31.8 | 23.7 |
| 353 | 54109 | West Virginia | Wyoming | 3 | 27.9 | 25.1 | 21.3 |
| 354 | 55078 | Wisconsin | Menominee | 8 | 48.7 | 28.8 | 22.6 |

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) tabulation of data from U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census, Census 2000, 2020 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, and Nation-Based Relationship File for Congressional Districts and Counties (116 th Congress, the latest available as of the cover date of this report).
Notes: FIPS: Federal Information Processing Standard.
a. Numbers are ordinal, referring to the name of the congressional district(s) present in the county. For example, Barbour County, Alabama, is represented by Alabama's $2^{\text {nd }}$ Congressional District (indicated by the 2). A congressional district may span multiple counties; conversely, a single county may be split among multiple congressional districts. Part of Clarke County, Alabama, for example, is represented by Alabama's Ist Congressional District (indicated by the I) and part by the 7th Congressional District (indicated by the 7). Counties labeled "at large" are located in states that have one member of the House of Representatives for the entire state.
b. Changed name and geographic code effective July I, 2015, from Wade Hampton Census Area (02270) to Kusilvak Census Area (02158).
c. Changed name and geographic code effective May I, 2015, from Shannon County (46113) to Oglala Lakota County (46IO2).

Figure I. Persistent Poverty Counties Using Two Rounding Methods, Based on 1990 Census, Census 2000, and 2020 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates


Source: Created by Congressional Research Service (CRS) using data from U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census, Census 2000, and 2020 Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates.

# Appendix. Details on the Data Sources 

## Decennial Census of Population and Housing, Long Form

Poverty estimates are computed using data from household surveys, which are based on a sample of households. In order to obtain meaningful estimates for any geographic area, the sample has to include enough responses from that area so that selecting a different sample of households from that area would not likely result in a dramatically different estimate. If estimates for smaller geographic areas are desired, a larger sample size is needed. A national-level survey, for instance, could produce reliable estimates for the United States without obtaining any responses from many counties, particularly counties with small populations. In order to produce estimates for all 3,143 county areas in the nation, however, not only are responses needed from every county, but those responses have to be plentiful enough from each county so that the estimates are meaningful (i.e., their margins of error are not unhelpfully wide).

Before the mid-1990s, the only data source with a sample size large enough to provide meaningful estimates at the county level (and for other small geographic areas) was the decennial census. The other household surveys available prior to that time did not have a sample size large enough to produce meaningful estimates for small areas such as counties. Income questions were asked on the census long form, which was sent to one-sixth of all U.S. households; the rest received the census short form, which did not ask about income. While technically still a sample, one-sixth of all households was a large enough sample to provide poverty estimates for every county in the nation, and even for smaller areas such as small towns. The long form was discontinued after Census 2000, and therefore poverty data are no longer available from the decennial census for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. ${ }^{20}$ Beginning in the mid-1990s, however, two additional data sources were developed to ensure that poverty estimates for small areas such as counties would still be available: the American Community Survey (ACS), and the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates program (SAIPE).

## American Community Survey (ACS)

The ACS replaced the decennial census long form. It was developed to accommodate the needs of local government officials and other stakeholders who needed detailed information on small communities on a more frequent basis than once every 10 years. To that end, the ACS questionnaire was designed to reflect the same topics asked in the census long form.
In order to produce meaningful estimates for small communities, however, the ACS needs to collect a number of responses comparable to what was collected in the decennial census. ${ }^{21}$ In order to collect that many responses while providing information more currently than once every 10 years, the ACS collects information from respondents continuously, in every month, as opposed to at one time of the year, and responses over time are pooled to provide estimates at varying geographic levels. To obtain estimates for geographic areas of 65,000 or more persons,

[^6]one year's worth of responses are pooled-these are the ACS one-year estimates. For the smallest geographic levels, which include the complete set of U.S. counties, five years of monthly responses are needed: these are the ACS five-year estimates. Even though data collection is ongoing, the publication of the data takes place only once every year, both for the one-year estimates and the estimates that represent the previous five-year span.

## Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE)

The SAIPE program was developed in the 1990s in order to provide state and local government officials with poverty estimates for local areas in between the decennial census years. In the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA, P.L. 103-382), which amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), Congress recognized that providing funding for children in disadvantaged communities created a need for poverty data for those communities that were more current than the once-a-decade census. In the IASA, Congress provided for the development and evaluation of the SAIPE program for its use in Title I-A funding allocations. ${ }^{22}$
SAIPE estimates are model-based, meaning they use a mathematical procedure to compute estimates using both survey data (ACS one-year data) and administrative data (from tax returns and numbers of participants in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP). The modeling procedure produces estimates with less variability than estimates computed from survey data alone, especially for counties with small populations.

## Guidance from the U.S. Census Bureau, "Which Data Source to Use" ${ }^{23}$

The CPS ASEC ${ }^{24}$ provides the most timely and accurate national data on income and is the source of official national poverty estimates, hence it is the preferred source for national analysis. Because of its large sample size, the ACS is preferred for subnational data on income and poverty by detailed demographic characteristics. The Census Bureau recommends using the ACS for 1 -year estimates of income and poverty at the state level. Users looking for consistent, state-level trends should use CPS ASEC 2-year averages and CPS ASEC 3-year averages for state to state comparisons.

For substate areas, like counties, users should consider their specific needs when picking the appropriate data source. The SAIPE program produces overall poverty and household income 1 -year estimates with standard errors usually smaller than direct survey estimates. Users looking to compare estimates of the number and percentage of people in poverty for counties or school districts or the median household income for counties should use SAIPE, especially if the population is less than 65,000 . Users who need other characteristics such as poverty among Hispanics or median earnings, should use the ACS, where and when available.

[^7]The SIPP ${ }^{25}$ is the only Census Bureau source of longitudinal poverty data. As SIPP collects monthly income over 2.5 to 5 year panels, it is also a source of poverty estimates for time periods more or less than one year, including monthly poverty rates.

Table A-1 below reproduces the Census Bureau's recommendations, summarized for various geographic levels:

Table A-I. U.S. Census Bureau's Guidance on Poverty Data Sources by Geographic Level and Type of Estimate

| Geographic Level | Cross-Sectional Estimates |  |  | Longitudinal Estimates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Income/Poverty Rate | Detailed Characteristics | Year-to-Year Change |  |
| United States | CPS ASEC | CPS ASEC/ <br> ACS I-year estimates for detailed race groups | CPS ASEC | SIPP |
| States | ACS I-year estimates CPS ASEC 3-year averages | ACS I-year estimates | ACS I-year estimates |  |
| Substate (areas with populations of 65,000 or more) | ACS I-year estimates/ SAIPE for counties and school districts | ACS I-year estimates | ACS I-year estimates / SAIPE for counties and school districts | None |
| Substate (areas with populations less than 20,000$)^{\text {a }}$ | SAIPE for counties and school districts/ <br> ACS using 5-year period estimates for all other geographic entities/ <br> Decennial Census 2000 and prior | ACS 5-year estimates/ Decennial Census 2000 and prior | SAIPE for counties and school districts/ ACS using 5-year period estimates for all other geographic entities | None |
| State-to-Nation comparison | CPS ASEC | CPS ASEC | CPS ASEC |  |

Source: Congressional Research Service (CRS) formatted reproduction of table by U.S. Census Bureau, with an expansion to the notes. Original table downloaded from http://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/ guidance/data-sources.html, March 24, 2022.

## Notes:

ACS: American Community Survey.
CPS ASEC: Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement.
SAIPE: Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates.
SIPP: Survey of Income and Program Participation.
a. Author's note: Data for areas with populations of 20,000 to 65,000 persons previously had been produced using ACS three-year estimates, but are now only produced using the ACS five-year estimates. ACS threeyear estimates are no longer produced (with 20II-2013 data as the last in the series). For details, see https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/guidance/estimates.html.

[^8]b. Use non-overlapping periods for ACS trend analysis with multiyear estimates. For example, comparing 2006-20I0 ACS five-year estimates with 201I-2015 ACS five-year estimates is preferred for identifying change.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ While the 1980-2000 period is actually 20 years, local communities have traditionally relied upon the decennial census data for small areas up to 10 years after their publication, hence the reference to " 30 years." However, since the late 1990s newer data sources have become available for small communities at intervals shorter than 10 years, which has implications that will be discussed in this report.
    ${ }^{2}$ For a more thorough discussion of how poverty is defined and measured, see CRS Report R44780, An Introduction to Poverty Measurement, by Joseph Dalaker.
    ${ }^{3}$ Additionally, in the $112^{\text {th }}$ Congress, the 10-20-30 provision was proposed as an amendment to H.R. 1 but was not adopted.
    ${ }^{4}$ In the $117^{\text {th }}$ Congress, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117-103) included 10-20-30 language in numerous sections: Section 736, in reference to loans and grants for rural housing, business and economic development, and utilities; Section 533, in reference to grants authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and grants authorized by section 27 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980; Division E, Title I, in reference to the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund Program Account; and Division G, Title II, in reference to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 and its role in authorizing funding for brownfields site assessment and remediation. Further, Division L, Title I of the act refers to persistent poverty counties, though without specifying a figure of $10 \%$ to be set aside. That portion of the act set aside $\$ 20$ million for National Infrastructure Investment grants for "projects in historically disadvantaged communities or areas of persistent poverty," and \$20 million for Transit Infrastructure Grants for areas of persistent poverty; both of these programs include persistent poverty counties in their definitions. It also enabled the Secretary of Transportation to prioritize persistent poverty counties to receive technical assistance under the Thriving Communities Initiative.

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ For instance, George Galster of Wayne State University conducted a literature review that suggested "that the independent impacts of neighborhood poverty rates in encouraging negative outcomes for individuals like crime, school leaving, and duration of poverty spells appear to be nil unless the neighborhood exceeds about 20 percent poverty." Galster distinguishes the effects of living in a poor neighborhood from the effects of being poor oneself but not necessarily in a poor neighborhood. Cited in George C. Galster, "The Mechanism(s) of Neighborhood Effects: Theory, Evidence, and Policy Implications," presented at the Economic and Social Research Council Seminar, "Neighbourhood Effects: Theory \& Evidence," St. Andrews University, Scotland, UK, February 2010.
    Additionally, the Census Bureau has published a series of reports examining local areas (census tracts) with poverty rates of $20 \%$ or greater. See, for instance, Alemayehu Bishaw, Craig Benson, Emily Shrider, and Brian Glassman, "Changes in Poverty Rates and Poverty Areas Over Time: 2005 to 2019," American Community Survey Brief 20-08, December 2020; Alemayehu Bishaw, "Changes in Areas With Concentrated Poverty: 2000 to 2010," U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey Reports ACS-27, June 2014; and Leatha Lamison-White, "Poverty Areas," U.S. Census Bureau Statistical Brief, June 1995.
    ${ }^{6}$ The effects of poverty rates on property values are explored by George C. Galster, Jackie M. Cutsinger, and Ron Malega in "The Costs of Concentrated Poverty: Neighborhood Property Markets and the Dynamics of Decline," pp. 93113 in N. Retsinas and E. Belsky, eds., Revisiting Rental Housing: Policies, Programs, and Priorities (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2008). They indicate that "the relationship between changes in a neighborhood's poverty rate and maintenance choices by local residential property owners will be lumpy and non-linear. Substantial variations in poverty rates in the low-moderate range yield no deviations in the owner's decision to highly maintain the building.... Past some percentage of poverty, however, the owner will switch to an undermaintenance mode whereby net depreciation will occur."
    ${ }^{7}$ See, for instance, a 2008 report issued jointly by the Federal Reserve System and the Brookings Institution, "The Enduring Challenge of Concentrated Poverty in America: Case Studies from Communities Across the U.S.," David Erickson et al., eds., 2008. Additional research into concentrated poverty in both rural and urban areas has been undertaken for decades; for example, educational attainment and health disability were discussed in a rural context by Calvin Beale in "Income and Poverty," chapter 11 in Glenn V. Fuguitt, David L. Brown, and Calvin L. Beale, eds., Rural and Small Town America, Russell Sage Foundation, 1988.

[^2]:    ${ }^{8}$ In the $117^{\text {th }}$ Congress, P.L. 117-103 (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022) used 10-20-30 provisions in multiple sections (see footnote 4 for details), and P.L. 117-58 (Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act) referred to persistent poverty counties without specifically using a figure of $10 \%$ for a set-aside. Of the public laws passed by the $116^{\text {th }}$ Congress, P.L. 116-6 (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019), P.L. 116-93 (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020), and P.L. 116-94 (Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020) used the 10-20-30 provision; multiple other bills with the provision were introduced but not enacted into public law. Of the public laws passed by the $115^{\text {th }}$ Congress, 10-2030 language was included in P.L. 115-31 (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017), P.L. 115-141 (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018), and P.L. 115-334 (Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018), as well as multiple bills introduced but not enacted. In the $114^{\text {th }}$ Congress, no bills containing 10-20-30 language were enacted into public law, but 10-20-30 language was included in H.R. 1360 (America's FOCUS Act of 2015), H.R. 5393 (Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017), H.R. 5054 (Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017), H.R. 5538 (Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017), and S. 3067 and H.R. 5485 (Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017). However, the Consolidated Appropriations Acts for 2017, 2018, and 2019 used language analogous to the bills introduced in the $114^{\text {th }}$ Congress, with some modification. Additionally, in the $113^{\text {th }}$ Congress, H.R. 5571 (The 10-20-30 Act of 2014) was introduced and referred to committee but not passed.
    ${ }^{9}$ The decennial census does not collect income information in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, but still asks for income information in American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Neither ACS nor SAIPE poverty estimates are currently available for these island areas.
    ${ }^{10}$ There are two definitions of poverty used in the United States: one for statistical purposes, which is used by the Census Bureau and described in Statistical Policy Directive 14 by the Office of Management and Budget; and the other for program administration purposes, which is used by the Department of Health and Human Services and is referred to in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Measuring the poverty rates of counties, which are in turn used in the 10-20-30 plan, is a statistical use of poverty data; thus, the statistical definition of poverty (used by the Census Bureau) applies.
    ${ }^{11}$ For further details about the official definition of poverty, see CRS Report R44780, An Introduction to Poverty

[^3]:    Measurement, by Joseph Dalaker.
    ${ }^{12}$ Poverty rates are computed using adjusted population totals because there are some individuals whose poverty status is not determined. These include unrelated individuals under age 15, such as foster children, who are not asked income questions and who are not related to anyone else in their residence by birth, marriage, or adoption; persons living in military barracks; and persons in institutions such as nursing homes or prisons. Some surveys (such as those described in this report) do not compute poverty status for persons living in college dormitories. These persons are excluded from the total population when computing poverty rates. Furthermore, people who have no traditional housing and who do not live in shelters are typically not sampled in household surveys.
    ${ }^{13}$ The decennial census still collects income information in American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Neither the ACS nor the SAIPE program is conducted for these island areas; decennial census data are the only small-area poverty data available for them. The 2020 Census questionnaire for these island areas covered the same topics as the ACS; see the Island Areas Censuses Operation Detailed Operational Plan at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/2020-census/planning-management/planning-docs/IAC-detailed-op-plan.html. For Puerto Rico, ACS estimates are still produced, but SAIPE estimates stopped being produced after 2003. For details see https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe/technical-documentation/methodology/puerto-rico.html.

[^4]:    ${ }^{14}$ This guidance is posted on the Census Bureau's website at https://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/ guidance/data-sources.html, and is reproduced in the Appendix.
    ${ }^{15}$ SAIPE county-level estimates are available for the poverty status of the total population, persons under age 18, and related children ages 5 to 17 living in families, and for median household income.
    ${ }^{16}$ Some bills, including Division L, Title I of P.L. 117-103 (see footnote 3) define areas of persistent poverty to include census tracts with poverty rates "not less than 20 percent" along with persistent poverty counties and "any territory or possession of the United States" per 49 U.S.C. §6702(a)(1).

[^5]:    ${ }^{17}$ Details on the poverty universe in the ACS are available at https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/ tech_docs/subject_definitions/2020_ACSSubjectDefinitions.pdf\#page=112 and for the SAIPE estimates at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe/guidance/model-input-data/denominators/poverty.html.
    ${ }^{18}$ For some counties, the percentage-point difference could be large when off-campus students are excluded. Using ACS data for 2009-2011, Whitman County, WA, experienced the largest poverty rate difference among all counties when off-campus students were excluded-its poverty rate fell by 16.5 percentage points. For the United States as a whole, the poverty rate fell from $15.2 \%$ to $14.5 \%$ when off-campus students were excluded (based on the same dataset). For details, see Alemayehu Bishaw, "Examining the Effect of Off-Campus College Students on Poverty Rates," Working Paper SEHSD 2013-17, U.S. Census Bureau, May 1, 2013.
    ${ }^{19}$ P.L. 111-5, Section 105.

[^6]:    ${ }^{20}$ Poverty estimates from the decennial census continue to be produced for American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. SAIPE and ACS estimates are not. See footnote 13.
    ${ }^{21}$ A sample of approximately 18.3 million households received the Census 2000 long form. Scott Boggess and Nikki L. Graf, "Measuring Education: A Comparison of the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey," presented at Joint Statistical Meetings, San Francisco, CA, August 7, 2003. http://census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/ working-papers/2003/acs/2003_Boggess_01_doc.pdf.
    From 2014 to 2018, 17.7 million housing unit addresses were sampled in the ACS. http://www.census.gov/acs/www/ methodology/sample-size-and-data-quality/sample-size/index.php.

[^7]:    ${ }^{22}$ Details about the origins of the SAIPE project are available on the Census Bureau's website at https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/saipe/about/origins.html.
    ${ }^{23}$ Downloaded from http://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/guidance/data-sources.html, March 24, 2022.
    ${ }^{24}$ Author's note: CPS ASEC: Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

[^8]:    ${ }^{25}$ Author's note: SIPP: Survey of Income and Program Participation; mentioned here only as part of a quotation.

