Identifying Measures of Distress for Economic Development

November 2023

Alison Turner, Greg Guibert, Amanda Savitt, Jocelyn Lewandowski, and Iain Hyde

National Economic Research and Resilience Center

Argonne National Laboratory

This report was prepared by Argonne National Laboratory using Federal funds under Interagency Agreement Number 20230656502028346030 from the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Economic Development Administration or the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Contents

Introduction 1
Uses of Economic Distress Measures 1
Eligibility for Federal Assistance 1
Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation 2
Historical Perspective on Economic Distress 3
Limitations of Previous Metrics 3
Alignment of Federal Distress Criteria 4
Understanding Economic Distress through the Lens of the Economic Development Administration 4
The Economic Development Administration's Definition of Economic Distress 4
New Markets Tax Credit Program: Community Revitalization by Rewarding Private Investment 5
Opportunity Zones (Internal Revenue Service) 6
Distressed Cities and Persistent Poverty Technical Assistance Program (Department of Housing and Urban Development) 6
Promise Zones (Department of Housing and Urban Development) 6
Alignment and Divergence in Measures of Economic Distress 6
Alignment in Distress Measures 6
Divergences in Distress Measures 7
Broadening the Scope of Distress: Emerging Leadership 7
Economic Development Districts 7
Regional Commissions 7
Research Groups 7
Broadening the Scope of Distress: New Metrics and Methods 9
The Promise and Challenges of Using Extended Measures of Distress 9
Conclusion 11
Table of Commonly Used Distress Measures 12

Introduction

Tracking measures of distress[i] can create channels of empowerment throughout a community. The idiom "that which goes unmeasured goes unnoticed" serves as a reminder of the need for effective and changing community metrics to illuminate unseen patterns. Over the last 20 years, federal requirements and expectations around measuring distress have increased but the measuring and recording of distress has stayed somewhat the same.[1] Expanding the horizons of widely used measures of economic distress starts to paint a more complete picture of local economic development challenges, opportunities, and the resources needed to ensure quality of life. Economic distress measures serve as important tools for local economic development professionals, providing structure and narrowing focus on key areas of investment. The use of distress measures can illuminate unseen challenges and enable professionals to formulate strategies and justify resource allocation tailored to address the unique needs, stresses, and opportunities within their localities. A keen identification of distress measures plays a crucial role in fostering sustainable and equitable economic growth at the local level.

Addressing community distress is a cornerstone responsibility of economic developers. At its core, economic development is not just about boosting financial metrics or attracting businesses; it's about enhancing the quality of life for all residents. When parts of a community face economic hardships, such as unemployment, lack of access to essential services, or declining infrastructure, it can lead to broader societal challenges, from increased crime rates to reduced educational opportunities. Economic developers, therefore, have the imperative task of identifying these distress signals and implementing strategies to alleviate them. By doing so, they not only ensure economic growth but also foster a more equitable, resilient, and vibrant community for everyone.

This paper serves as a roadmap to understand the current landscape of distress measures and the origins of distress metrics in economic development, as well as to guide practitioners toward using distress measures, both traditional and novel, within the local economic development context.

Uses of Economic Distress Measures

Economic distress data is most commonly used in two key areas of economic development: applying for federal assistance and strategic planning.

Eligibility for Federal Assistance

In recent years, federal requirements around data-driven designations of distress have increased including the expansion of definitions of distress,[2] the introduction and expansion of geospatial mapping to support applicants,[3] and requirements around data management planning.[4] Federal agencies, through authorities and resources authorized through the DATA Act (2014), the GREAT Act (2019), and the Streamlining Federal Grants Act (2023), have increased technical assistance offerings to assist potential applicants in meeting the increase in requirements. .

[i] Definitions of measures of distress can vary greatly. The purpose of distress measures is to identify populations that are impoverished or under resourced in order to invest funds to those places and populations who have been historically underfunded, barred from access to capital, exploited for land, work, or natural resources, or otherwise have experienced long periods of poverty and low economic upward mobility.

Many federal programs allocate funding based on demonstrable need according to predetermined distress measures. Some of these allocations are automatic, or formula grants; Medicaid,[5] Community Development Block Grants (CDBG),[6] Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP),[7] Emergency Food Assistance Program (TFAP),[8] Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOWA),[9] and others are funds allocated based on population of need according to their predetermined distress metrics. Some allocations are competitive, requiring applicants to demonstrate distress to be awarded funding. Both automatic and competitive awards generally use similar metrics of distress in allocation, though for competitive awards, measures of distress need to be discovered and given context by the community to create a compelling application. Focusing on frequently used measures such as poverty rate, per capita median income, and unemployment rate help to create a lens of focus around disparities in the workforce and wealth within communities and may shed light on local issues that expand traditional local metrics of distress.

For a location to have the best chance of alleviating economic distress, it is imperative that the distress metrics for that area are accurate and stewarded by the community themselves. National data provides broad insight, but often needs to be paired with locally derived data to most effectively uncover and address pockets of distress.

Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation

Local stewardship of data is predominately supported by local legislative and planning efforts. For example, a policymaker needs to know the status of impoverished children and families within their district; a planning organization needs to understand the location of food deserts to better understand where to try to recruit a grocery store or farmers market. Expanding beyond the distress criteria most commonly used today can enable economic development professionals to strategically plan and allocate resources where they are most needed. By identifying areas that are economically lagging, or facing challenges such as high unemployment, low-income, or sweeping business closures, economic development professionals can formulate targeted strategies to alleviate these issues. Quality metrics that drive planning and legislative action are often guided by questions from those that exist within the distress that is being measured. For example, questions such as “why doesn’t child x have access to y resource?” and “why does the bus route to x neighborhood take y minutes longer than another one close by?” When developing local measures of economic distress, questions from across the community can help frame new measures of distress. A review of *the Introduction to the Access, Process, and Outcome Framework for Equity in Economic Development* may help establish procedures to ensure diversity in measurement.

Using a diverse suite of distress criteria, outside the unemployment, industry, and wage information that is frequently used in economic development planning, can lead to a more nuanced understanding of gaps in infrastructure and social systems. This diversity in quantitative planning facilitates a responsible and ethical process and informed decision-making by providing a data-driven foundation upon which strategies and initiatives can be built. By understanding the specific economic challenges and distress factors prevalent in a locality, economic development professionals can tailor their strategies to address these issues. This might involve prioritizing certain sectors, focusing on specific demographic groups, or leveraging local assets to drive economic revitalization.

Historical Perspective on Economic Distress

Evaluating distress across the United States became a common practice out of the Depression in the 1940s. Many programs within the New Deal required new information about unemployment, income, and distribution of public funding.[10] Due to its origins, in the early stages of economic analysis, unemployment rates, bankruptcy filings, and the influx of individuals seeking public assistance were the predominant measures of economic distress.[11] These indicators, albeit straightforward, generally only captured a superficial layer of the economic hardships faced by individuals and communities.[12]

Limitations of Previous Metrics

While traditional distress indicators were effective in capturing explicit indications of economic distress, they have important limitations. Traditional indicators are predominately reactive, highlighting economic distress that has already occurred. They also often fail to account for the underlying systemic issues that precipitated economic downturns. Factors such as wage stagnation, underemployment, and the erosion of worker rights have been largely overlooked.[13] Moreover, traditional distress indicators, as written in federal legislation, often do not capture specific segments of the population who have been affected nor the long-term effects of economic distress, such as the decline in mental well-being, increased substance abuse, or the breakdown of community structures.[14]

In addition to the limitations of simple distress metrics, local economies have become more complex, with intricate webs of global trade, technological advancements, and evolving labor markets, that necessitate a more comprehensive approach to understanding and measuring economic distress. The 2008 Global Financial Crisis provides a compelling case study in understanding the shift in the use of distress indicators. Traditional distress indicators, coupled with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and changes in the stock market, painted a positive picture until the moment the crisis unfolded, revealing the stark disconnect between common indicators of economic distress or health, and the underlying economic reality.[15] The 2008 crisis underscored the importance of developing and utilizing more robust and comprehensive metrics to gauge economic health and preemptively identify signs of distress. This evolution highlights the need for refining and expanding our understanding of economic distress, ensuring that metrics and indicators accurately reflect the complexities of modern economies.[16]

Over time, due to advanced methods for collecting and processing data across the nation, metrics used to gauge economic distress have improved. For example, recent decades have seen a shift towards more comprehensive and nuanced economic indicators including a more robust use of calculated indicators such as the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI)[ii] or the Economic Development Capacity Index (EDCI). Additionally, metrics using disaggregated data, slicing performance on lines of race, age, and income, have become more frequently used, beginning the process of shedding light on the contours of economic distress within a region.[17] This shift from surface level metrics to more informed indicators has created a shift for economists and policymakers to recognize the importance of understanding the underlying causes of economic distress, moving beyond mere symptomatic analysis.[18]

[ii] The Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) is an alternative economic metric to the more commonly used Gross Domestic Product (GDP). While GDP measures the total economic output of a country, GPI seeks to provide a more holistic view of economic well-being by accounting for both the positive contributions and the negative externalities associated with economic activity. Talberth, John, Clifford Cobb, and Noah Slattery. "The Genuine Progress Indicator: A Tool for Sustainable Development." Solutions Journal 1, no. 5 (2007): 87-95

Alignment of Federal Distress Criteria

Departments and agencies across the federal government have programs that address persistent economic distress. The most common agencies that provide financial or technical assistance are the Department of Commerce, including the Economic Development Administration (EDA), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In some cases, applicants may seek to leverage multiple funding programs to more comprehensively address factors contributing to distress.

Understanding not only the programs available from these agencies, but also how they can work together, creates pathways toward blending distress measures, using these metrics for market research and site selection, and identifying additional local metrics that can help better inform or contextualize these federally focused metrics.

Understanding Economic Distress through the Lens of the Economic Development Administration

As the only agency focused entirely on economic development, the EDA plays a critical role in in identifying, measuring, and distributing funds as guided by measures of economic distress.[19] EDA plays a pivotal role in fostering regional economic development efforts in areas experiencing economic distress. Understanding how EDA defines economic distress and how this definition has evolved over time provides insight into the approach towards promoting economic growth and resilience.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act,[20] which provides authorities for many of EDA's programs, primarily defines economic distress in terms of unemployment and per capita income levels. Specifically, an area is considered to be experiencing economic distress if it has an unemployment rate that is, at a minimum, one percentage point higher than the national average, or per capita income that is 80% or less than the national average.[21] These criteria serve as benchmarks to identify regions that are struggling economically and may therefore benefit from targeted development assistance and investment.

In addition to these primary criteria, EDA also considers special need criteria such as sudden and severe economic disruptions including natural disasters and business closure. These additional

USING DISTRESS METRICS FOR EDA'S RECOMPETE PROGRAM

A key example of distress metrics expansion is the creation of new programs through the American Rescue Plan Act or the CHIPS and Science Act such as the Distressed Area Recompete Pilot Program (Recompete). Recompete will invest $200 million to create renewed economic opportunities in underinvested or "forgotten" areas experiencing persistent distress. Rather than focusing on unemployment or income, the program targets areas where prime-age (25-54 years) employment significantly trails the national average, with the goal to close this gap through large, flexible investments.

Both Local Labor Markets (LLMs) and Local Communities (LCs) were eligible to apply for this opportunity based on their distress criteria. More information can be found about the Recompete Program here.

considerations allow EDA to respond to various economic challenges and disruptions that may not be fully captured by unemployment and income metrics alone.

Historically, EDA's approach and criteria for defining economic distress have evolved to reflect the changing economic landscape and to address emerging challenges and disparities. While the core criteria related to unemployment and per capita income have remained relatively consistent, EDA has adapted its investment strategies and programs to address various forms of economic distress and to support diverse aspects of regional economic development.

For instance, in the past, EDA has adjusted its focus and programs in response to specific economic challenges, such as the decline of manufacturing in certain regions, or the economic impacts of natural disasters. EDA has also expanded its scope to address new and emerging forms of economic distress, such as those resulting from global economic shifts, technological changes, or public health crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic.[22]

Moreover, EDA has increasingly recognized the importance of fostering inclusive and sustainable economic development. This has involved not only addressing immediate signs of economic distress but also working to enhance long-term economic resilience and inclusivity. This means ensuring that economic development efforts benefit all members of the community and enhance the ability of regions to withstand and adapt to future economic challenges and disruptions.

EDA's approach to defining and addressing economic distress, while rooted in specific, quantifiable criteria related to unemployment and income, has also evolved to encompass a broader understanding of economic challenges and disparities. This evolution reflects a commitment to addressing the diverse nature of economic distress and to fostering economic development that is not only robust but also resilient, sustainable, and inclusive.

New Markets Tax Credit Program: Community Revitalization by Rewarding Private Investment

The New Markets Tax Credit Program (NMTC), originally enacted in 2000, is administered by the U.S. Department of the Treasury's Community Development Financial Institutions Fund. To qualify for the NMTC Program, a community must be deemed "Low-Income." Specifically, the poverty rate for a population census tract or contiguous community area must be at least 20%, or the median family income for the tract does not exceed 80% of statewide median family income or metropolitan area median family income (for tracts in a metropolitan area).[23] In 2004, Congress amended the definition of low-income communities to include the following:

- **High out-migration rural county census tracts:** In the 20-year period ending with the most recent year the census was conducted, net out-migration of inhabitants from the county was at least 10% of the population of the county at the beginning of such period;
- **Low-population/Empowerment Zone (EZ) Census Tracts:** A census tract with a population of less than 2000 if the tract is within an empowerment zone and is contiguous to one or more Low-Income Communities (LICs);[iii] and

[iii] Low-Income Communities, are designated areas that have specific economic characteristics, typically characterized by lower-than-average income levels and other indicators of economic distress. In the context of U.S. tax policy, particularly with regard to Opportunity Zones, a census tract qualifies as a Low-Income Community (LIC) if it meets one of three criteria.

- **Targeted populations:** Certain individuals, or an identifiable group of individuals, including an Indian tribe, who are low-income persons, or otherwise lack adequate access to loans or equity investments.

Opportunity Zones (Internal Revenue Service)

Opportunity Zones are a designed to spur economic development and job creation in distressed communities. They allow investors to receive tax benefits by investing in a Qualified Opportunity Fund, which then invests in designated Opportunity Zones. These zones are typically low-income communities, defined as any population census tract where the poverty rate is at least 20% or any tract not located within a metropolitan area and where the median family income does not exceed 80% of statewide median income.[24]

Distressed Cities and Persistent Poverty Technical Assistance Program (Department of Housing and Urban Development)

The Distressed Cities Technical Assistance (DCTA) program offered by HUD aims to improve the capacity of distressed cities and counties to administer and manage their HUD-funded community development programs, especially those experiencing persistent poverty. Eligibility for this program is determined by specific criteria, such as having a population of 40,000 or fewer, and either a poverty rate of at least 20% or having been designated as a Promise Zone or participating in the Strong Cities, Strong Communities (SC2) initiative.[25]

Promise Zones (Department of Housing and Urban Development)

Promise Zones are high-poverty communities where the federal government partners with local leaders to increase economic activity, improve educational opportunities, leverage private investment, reduce violent crime, enhance public health, and address other priorities identified by the community. The eligibility and selection for Promise Zones involve a competitive grant application where communities must demonstrate a need (e.g., high poverty), a strong local commitment to addressing the problems, and a compelling strategy to implement solutions.[26]

Alignment and Divergence in Measures of Economic Distress

While there are common threads in how federal agencies perceive and measure economic distress, notable divergences and potential gaps warrant attention.

Alignment in Distress Measures

All of the aforementioned programs, and many other federal programs focused on relieving economic distress in one way or another, define distress through unemployment rates or income levels, including poverty rate. For example, the Opportunity Zones program identifies low-income communities as those with a poverty rate of at least 20% or where median family income does not exceed 80% of the statewide median. This definition aligns closely with EDA's Public Works and Economic Adjustment Assistance income-related criteria which states "per capita income is not more than 80% of the national average," as well as the Distressed Cities and Persistent Poverty Technical Assistance program targeting cities with a poverty rate of at least 20%.

Divergences in Distress Measures

The Promise Zones program, as well as special need criteria, and regional challenge grant eligibility from EDA (such as eligibility for the Build Back Better Regional Challenge or the Recompete Program) place emphasis on collaborative efforts and identifying novel ways to address workforce gaps as part of their eligibility and selection criteria. This approach diverges from HUD, USDA, and EDA's more quantitative and economically focused criteria, introducing a more holistic and strategy-oriented dimension to understanding and addressing economic distress.

Broadening the Scope of Distress: Emerging Leadership

The more locally centered measures of distress are, the more descriptive they will be. Several national coalitions have spent years developing regional and local libraries of descriptive metrics for measuring economic distress. These organizations work within either a geographic focus or a sector focus. For example, regional commissions focus on distress criterion for regions across the United States,[27] while many research institutions focus on sectors of distress such as income and wealth, aging, social mobility, housing, transportation, or environmental distress.

Economic Development Districts

Economic Development Districts (EDDs) are regions containing at least one geographical area within their service boundaries that meets regional distress criteria and are supported by EDA as a multi-jurisdictional place-based planning district. EDDs help lead the locally based, regionally driven economic development planning process that leverages the involvement of the public, private, and non-profit sectors to establish a strategic blueprint (i.e., an economic development roadmap) for regional collaboration. Through this effort, EDDs are required to have an EDA-approved Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). These requirements for designation create the structure for these offices to steward place-based measures of economic distress and to act as the center for regional innovation around expanding to new measures to accurately describe local issues.

Regional Commissions

Federal Regional commissions were established in 1965 to address sections of the country under notable economic distress beginning with the Appalachian Regional Commission. The eight federal commissions are comprised of a federal co-chair appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate, and the governors of each state within the commission. The commissions work to create collective engagement around improving areas of distress within a region, often focused on persistent poverty, low educational attainment, and low social mobility. Because of their collective nature, the commissions can strategize around key regional issues while simultaneously uplifting the voices of those smaller locations with the greatest need.

Research Organizations

Non-governmental research organizations most commonly work within a single identified sector of distress. These groups can be a great resource for data and thought leadership around persistent poverty and innovative solutions building around distress. There are many examples of sector-focused research groups developing new literature around distress. The Brookings Institute is an example of an organization focused on a suite of distress spaces and Purdue University is an example of an organization focused on better models of economic distress.

The Brookings Institution

The Brookings Institution has produced a library of research about community distress. Although some of these publications rely on traditional measures of distress (e.g., the prime age unemployment rate in Helping America's distressed communities recover from the COVID-19 recession and achieve long-term prosperity), Brookings has also considered relevant equity-focused indicators through its Inclusive Economic Indicators Lab (IEI Lab). The IEI Lab has synthesized research efforts regarding inclusive economic indicators and compiled them for ease of use. These indicators are divided into three broad categories and additional subcategories:

- Economic indicators
  - Growth/prosperity
  - Labor market
  - Income
  - Wealth indicators
- Economic drivers
  - Business environment
  - Education/talent
  - Housing affordability and access indicators
- Other enablers
  - Health
  - Public safety/criminal justice
  - Civic engagement
  - Environmental sustainability indicators.

Purdue University

Purdue University's Community Capitals Framework (CCF) is a model developed to understand and evaluate the factors contributing to community development and sustainability. It identifies seven types of capital (natural, cultural, human, social, political, financial, and built) that communities can leverage to support sustainable development and improve overall community vitality. While it doesn't specifically define economic distress, the CCF provides a comprehensive lens through which to understand and assess the various assets and challenges within a community, thereby offering insights into aspects that might be contributing to economic distress or potential pathways for fostering economic development and resilience.[28]

CCF introduces a broader perspective by considering various forms of capital (e.g., human, social, cultural) as integral to community development and sustainability. This framework diverges from classic measures of distress by offering a more complex approach to understanding community vitality and economic well-being.

Broadening the Scope of Distress: New Metrics and Methods

Many new metrics of distress incorporate multiple data sources or a deeper level of analysis to more precisely identify and evaluate the most distressed portions of a community. One of the reasons blended or mixed methods metrics can be helpful is that often data quality from distressed areas is lower than that in areas with better resources.[29] Using mixed methods data can thus create a mesh to fill gaps in potentially weak quantitative areas.[30]

Beyond blended metrics, new data sources as well as the disaggregation of traditional demographic information can help to better pinpoint and describe economic distress. New data, such as information from local 311 calls[31] or language analysis of local newspapers[32], can start to shed light on new areas of distress within a community. Disaggregation of traditional metrics can better inform planners and policymakers to segments of the population that may be under additional distress. A classic example of using disaggregated geographic data to determine different resource needs is the evaluation of housing and home ownership on the basis of race across the United States.

Regardless of whether the focus is on blended indices, new distress data , or new techniques in disaggregation, there are some core themes emerge as a through line for all new measures of economic distress:

- **Inclusivity and Equity:** Current measures might overlook disparities within communities, such as those related to race, gender, or specific underserved neighborhoods. Incorporating metrics that highlight such disparities could ensure that economic development efforts are inclusive and equitable.
- **Long-Term Economic Resilience:** While existing criteria identify immediate signs of economic distress, there may be a lack of focus on factors that contribute to long-term economic resilience, such as education, workforce development, climate risk, economic diversity, and technological adaptability.
- **Quality of Life:** Factors such as healthcare access, housing affordability, and environmental sustainability, which significantly impact the quality of life and economic well-being, might be underrepresented in current economic distress measures.

The Promise and Challenges of Using Extended Measures of Distress

Extending the use of economic distress measures to include indicators associated with equity, resilience, and quality of life can provide a more holistic view of the economic health and well-being of a community. Incorporating these indicators can provide a more inclusive understanding of economic well-being that goes beyond mere financial and employment statistics. Consequently, policymakers can make better informed decisions by considering a broader range of factors affecting the population and policies and interventions can be more targeted to address specific issues.

Researchers can develop a more comprehensive understanding of economic dynamics by considering a broader range of indicators. In turn, this can lead to the development of innovative solutions to economic challenges by considering diverse aspects of economic well-being, ensuring that economic policies and interventions are designed to promote fairness and reduce inequalities.

At the same time, there are no perfect solutions and when incorporating or exploring new measures of distress. There are difficulties and challenges to keep in mind:

- **Complexity in Data Collection and Analysis**: Equity, resilience, and quality of life are multidimensional concepts that are challenging to quantify and measure accurately.
    - **Data Availability:** Reliable data on these new indicators might be scarce or non-existent in some contexts.
    - **Standardization:** Developing standardized metrics and geographies that are universally applicable and accepted can be challenging.
    - **Data Infrastructure:** Adequate infrastructure might be needed to collect, analyze, and report on new indicators.
    - **Privacy:** Collecting data is collecting information about people; privacy standards must be evaluated when collecting and evaluating data.
- **Complexity in Interpretation:** Effectively constructing a narrative around the distress in a community is as important as the data collection itself. Interpretation fuels action.
    - **Interpretation**: The interpretation of data might become more complex with the addition of new variables and analysts and policymakers might require training to understand and utilize new indicators effectively.
    - **Staffing Capacity:** Offices may not have the required staff or time to evaluate and interpret new measures of distress.
    - **Distribution Channels**: It is critical that an office has the distribution and communication channels to not only publish information on new measures of distress but also to hold conversations about the need for new measures.
- **Policy Implications:** Selecting measures of distress to both inform and evaluate policy requires an understanding of constituent needs and clear communication around metrics.
    - **Policy Alignment:** Policies might need to be reevaluated and realigned to cater to the new indicators, which can be a complex and politically challenging process.
    - **Resource Allocation**: There might be conflicts in resource allocation, as focusing on new indicators might realign resources from other areas.
    - **Structural Inertia**: The creation and use of new metrics and measures will not immediately alter the mandated use of more traditional indicators currently in use as federal grant eligibility criteria.

Conclusion

Traditional measures of distress provide a scaffold for analyzing the needs of the local economy but as data collection, surveying, and mixed methods indices become more easily accessible, so does the ability to create more detailed, place-based, and forward-looking measures. Increased requirements around measurement and evaluation, as well as expanding definitions of distress, create an opportunity to evaluate local economic distress in new ways and can guide how to allocate resources and programs towards resolution. If nothing else, expanding the horizon on distress metrics, from both a geographic and sector perspective can create shared burden for stewarding local distress metrics, a broader audience for describing those metrics, and channels for change.

Table of Commonly Used Distress Measures

Indicator	Source
Income	
Gini Index (Income Inequality)	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Low to Moderate Income (LMI)	U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development
Per Capita Income	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Persistent Poverty Indicator	U.S. Economic Development Administration
Poverty Rate	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Workforce	
Educational attainment	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Layoff warn notices	U.S. Dept. of Labor
Low population density	U.S. Census Bureau
Outmigration	U.S. Census Bureau, On the Map Tool
Local economy	
Global Trade Networks	U.S. Census Bureau, USA Trade
Gross Domestic Product (GDP)	U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis
Historical Redlining Information	University of Richmond, Mapping Inequality Tool
General welfare	
Access to health insurance	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Access to mental health resources	Mental Health America
Child Poverty	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Climate Risk	Argonne National Labs, CLIMRR
Infant mortality	U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Natural Disaster Declarations	Federal Emergency Management Agency
Section 8 Housing Vouchers	U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development
SNAP Recipients	U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service
Substance abuse	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
Combined indicators	
Brookings' Inclusive Economic Indicators	The Brookings Institute
Community Capitals Index	Purdue University
Economic Development Capacity Index	Argonne National Labs, National Economic Research and Resilience Center
Genuine Progress Indicator	Gross National Happiness USA

[1] US Economic Development Administration, "Economic Development Assistance Programs—Availability of Funds," Federal Register Vol. 60, No. 49 (Tuesday, March 14, 1995), 13866, https://cdn.preterhuman.net/texts/government_information/federal_register_1995_archive/1/1995_13866.pdf
[2] "Summary of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Bill (1974).
[3] "Chapter 3: National Objectives - Hud.Gov." hud.gov. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/DOC_16472.PDF.
[4] "Creating Data Management Plans for Extramural Research." Creating Data Management Plans for Extramural Research | Bureau of Transportation Statistics. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://ntl.bts.gov/ntl/public-access/creating-data-management-plans-extramural-research.
[5] "Exhibit 6. Federal Medical Assistance Percentages (Fmaps) and Enhanced Fmaps (E-Fmaps) by State." MACPAC, October 16, 2023. https://www.macpac.gov/publication/federal-medical-assistance-percentages-fmaps-and-enhanced-fmaps-e-fmaps-by-state-selected-periods/.
[6] "CDBG Formula and Appropriation Process Video." Hud Exchange. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/4895/cdbg-formula-and-appropriation-process-video/.
[7] "Enclosure: Estimated SNAP Allocations for FY 2024." usda.gov. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://snaped.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/documents/FY2024EstimatedFundingAllocation508.pdf.
[8] "TEFAP – State Plan Requests and Allocations for FY 24 Farm to Food Bank Projects." Food and Nutrition Service U.S. Department of Agriculture. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://www.fns.usda.gov/tefap/state-plan-requests-allocations-fy24-farm-to-food-bank-projects.
[9] "State Statutory Formula Funding." U.S. Department of Labor. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/budget/formula/state.
[10] Kennedy, David M. Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945. Oxford University Press, 1999.
[11] Cohen, Lizabeth. Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
[12] Rosen, Elliot A. Roosevelt, the Great Depression, and the Economics of Recovery. University of Virginia Press, 2005.
[13] Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. Paris: Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.
[14] Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2010). The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone. London: Penguin Books.
[15] Sorkin, A. R. (2009). Too Big to Fail. New York: Viking Press.
[16] Hassink, Robert. "Regional Resilience: A Promising Concept to Explain Differences in Regional Economic Adaptability?" Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 3, no. 1 (2010): 45-58
[17] Chapple, Karen, and Edward G. Goetz. Spatial Justice through Regionalism?" Urban Geography 36, no. 4 (2015): 498-527.
[18] Deaton, A. (2013). The Great Escape: Health, Wealth, and the Origins of Inequality. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
[19] Gao-19-85R, Economic Adjustment Assistance: Federal Programs Intended to Help Beneficiaries Adjust to Economic Disruption. Accessed October 20, 2023. https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-19-85r.pdf.
[20] "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. Public Law 89-136.
[21] Economic Development Administration. "Eligibility." U.S. Economic Development Administration, https://www.eda.gov/funding-opportunities/eligibility.htm.
[22] Economic Development Administration. "EDA CARES Act Recovery Assistance." U.S. Economic Development Administration, https://www.eda.gov/cares/.
[23] Department of Treasury. https://www.cdfifund.gov/sites/cdfi/files/2022-11/New_Markets_Tax_Credit_Program_FactSheet.pdf
[24]Internal Revenue Service. https://www.irs.gov/credits-deductions/businesses/opportunity-zones
[25] Housing and Urban Development. https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/comm_planning/cpdta/dcta

[26] Housing and Urban Development. https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/promise-zones/promise-zones-overview/
[27] Federal Regional Commissions and authorities. https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45997.
[28] Lionel Beaulieu. Promoting Community Vitality and Sustainability: The Community Capitals Framework. October 2014
[29] Raimondo, E., & Newcomer, K. E. (2017). Mixed-Methods Inquiry in Public Administration: The Interaction of Theory, Methodology, and Praxis. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 37(2), 183-201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X17697247
[30] Hendren, Kathryn, Qian Eric Luo, and Sanjay K. Pandey. "The State of Mixed Methods Research in Public Administration and Public Policy." Public Administration Review 78, no. 6 (November 2018): 904–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/(issn)1540-6210.
[31] "U.S. Data Catalog - 311 Calls." U.S. Data.gov Catalog. Accessed November 20, 2023. https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/?tags=311&publisher=data.sfgov.org.
[32] "The GDELT Project." GDELT. Accessed November 20, 2023. https://www.gdeltproject.org/.