

Table 3 - State Poverty Rates Official vs SPM - Geographically Adjusted with the Rent Index: 2009

	Official**	SE	SPM Geo Adjusted	SE	Difference	SE Diff
Alabama	16.8	1.6	15.9	1.3	0.9	0.9
Alaska	12.1	1.1	11	1.0	1.1	0.8
Arizona	21.3	1.5	21.6	1.9	-0.4	1.0
Arkansas	19.1	2.5	15.9	2.6	3.2	1.4 *
California	15.5	0.6	22.4	0.6	-7.0	0.4 *
Colorado	12.4	1.0	14.8	1.1	-2.4	0.7 *
Connecticut	8.6	0.7	11.1	0.9	-2.5	0.7 *
Delaware	12.4	1.1	13.9	1.1	-1.5	0.9 *
District of Columbia	18.0	1.2	23.1	1.4	-5.1	1.1 *
Florida	14.6	0.8	19.5	0.9	-4.8	0.6 *
Georgia	18.5	1.3	18.8	1.2	-0.4	0.8
Hawaii	12.6	1.2	18	1.3	-5.5	1.2 *
Idaho	13.9	2.2	11.6	1.6	2.3	1.3 *
Illinois	13.3	0.8	13.8	0.9	-0.5	0.6
Indiana	16.4	1.3	14.8	1.3	1.6	0.9 *
Iowa	10.9	0.9	7.9	0.8	3.0	0.8 *
Kansas	13.9	1.7	11.1	1.4	2.9	1.0 *
Kentucky	17.1	1.5	13.2	1.4	3.9	1.1 *
Louisiana	14.3	1.6	12.8	1.1	1.6	1.4
Maine	11.6	1.0	9.6	0.9	2.0	0.8 *
Maryland	9.7	0.7	14	0.9	-4.3	0.7 *
Massachusetts	10.9	1.0	13.6	1.2	-2.7	0.8 *
Michigan	14.2	1.0	12.4	0.8	1.8	0.7 *
Minnesota	11.1	0.9	10.7	1.0	0.5	0.7
Mississippi	23.2	1.3	17	1.4	6.3	1.6 *
Missouri	15.6	1.1	12.8	1.4	2.8	1.0 *
Montana	13.5	1.6	10.5	1.5	3.0	1.2 *
Nebraska	10.0	0.8	9.1	1.0	0.9	0.6
Nevada	13.1	1.2	17.2	1.3	-4.0	0.9 *
New Hampshire	7.9	0.8	10.4	0.8	-2.5	0.6 *
New Jersey	9.5	0.8	12.2	1.0	-2.7	0.6 *
New Mexico	19.6	1.6	15.8	1.5	3.8	1.1 *
New York	15.9	0.7	17.6	0.8	-1.7	0.6 *
North Carolina	17.0	1.2	14.3	1.0	2.6	0.8 *
North Dakota	11.0	1.5	8.4	0.9	2.6	0.9 *
Ohio	13.5	0.8	11.5	0.7	2.0	0.6 *
Oklahoma	13.0	1.1	10.8	1.1	2.2	1.2 *
Oregon	13.7	1.2	13.3	1.3	0.4	1.0
Pennsylvania	11.2	0.8	10.5	0.7	0.6	0.6
Rhode Island	13.2	1.1	12.2	1.0	1.1	1.1
South Carolina	13.8	1.0	13.8	1.1	0.1	0.7
South Dakota	14.3	2.2	11.6	1.3	2.7	1.5 *
Tennessee	16.7	1.6	14.3	1.5	2.4	1.0 *
Texas	17.4	0.8	16.5	0.7	0.9	0.5 *
Utah	9.8	1.1	9.5	1.0	0.3	1.1
Vermont	9.6	0.9	8.3	0.9	1.3	0.8 *
Virginia	10.8	1.2	11.7	0.9	-0.9	0.7
Washington	11.9	0.9	11.2	0.9	0.7	0.6
West Virginia	16.0	1.5	11.3	1.2	4.6	1.1 *
Wisconsin	11.1	1.0	10.7	0.9	0.5	0.7
Wyoming	9.3	0.9	9	1.0	0.4	1.0

* Statistically difference from zero at the 90 percent confidence level

** Official estimates do not match published estimates because universe includes unrelated children

Source: Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement: 2010 Further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates is available at <www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60_236sapdf>

These estimates replace estimates presented in the Geographic Adjustments of Supplemental Poverty Measure Thresholds: Using the American Community Survey Five-Year Data on Housing Costs Trudi J Renwick (US Census Bureau) presented at the Western Economic Association meetings in June 2011 The estimates differ as a result of changes in the tax calculations employed to estimate after-tax income The Census Bureau is conducting research to incorporate the newly reported information in the CPS ASEC on family relationships and expenses Webster (2011) describes these new methods Some of these changes were included in the paper listed above, however, these changes are not included in the estimates presented in this table The estimates presented here employ the tax calculations previously released on the CPS 2010 ASEC micro-data file in October of 2010 These revised estimates are released for the purpose of presenting 2009 estimates comparable to those described in the upcoming report The Research SUPPLEMENTAL POVERTY MEASURE: 2010 that will present SPM estimates for calendar year 2010 based on the CPS 2011 ASEC

Table 4 - State Poverty Rates Official vs SPM - Not Geographically Adjusted : 2009

	Official**	SE	SPM Not Geo Adjusted	SE	Difference	SE Diff
Alabama	16.8	1.6	20	1.3	-3.2	1.2 *
Alaska	12.1	1.1	9.9	0.9	2.2	0.8 *
Arizona	21.3	1.5	21.9	1.7	-0.6	0.8
Arkansas	19.1	2.5	21.2	2.8	-2.1	1.2 *
California	15.5	0.6	16.3	0.6	-0.9	0.3 *
Colorado	12.4	1.0	14.6	1.0	-2.3	0.7 *
Connecticut	8.6	0.7	8.7	0.8	-0.1	0.6
Delaware	12.4	1.1	12.5	1.0	-0.1	0.9
District of Columbia	18.0	1.2	16.5	1.3	1.5	1.3
Florida	14.6	0.8	17	0.8	-2.4	0.5 *
Georgia	18.5	1.3	20.3	1.3	-1.8	0.6 *
Hawaii	12.6	1.2	11.6	1.1	0.9	1.0
Idaho	13.9	2.2	14.5	1.9	-0.7	1.1
Illinois	13.3	0.8	14	0.9	-0.7	0.7
Indiana	16.4	1.3	17.5	1.3	-1.1	0.8
Iowa	10.9	0.9	10.5	0.8	0.4	0.8
Kansas	13.9	1.7	12.6	1.4	1.4	1.1
Kentucky	17.1	1.5	17.6	1.9	-0.5	0.9
Louisiana	14.3	1.6	14.7	1.4	-0.3	1.1
Maine	11.6	1.0	11.3	1.0	0.3	0.8
Maryland	9.7	0.7	10.2	0.8	-0.5	0.6
Massachusetts	10.9	1.0	10.3	1.0	0.6	0.8
Michigan	14.2	1.0	13.3	0.9	0.9	0.6
Minnesota	11.1	0.9	10.9	1.0	0.2	0.6
Mississippi	23.2	1.3	21.5	1.5	1.7	1.2
Missouri	15.6	1.1	15.4	1.4	0.2	1.0
Montana	13.5	1.6	14.2	1.6	-0.7	1.1
Nebraska	10.0	0.8	11.8	1.0	-1.8	0.8 *
Nevada	13.1	1.2	14.3	1.2	-1.2	0.9
New Hampshire	7.9	0.8	9.4	0.7	-1.5	0.6 *
New Jersey	9.5	0.8	9.9	0.9	-0.4	0.6
New Mexico	19.6	1.6	17.8	1.4	1.8	1.0 *
New York	15.9	0.7	15.1	0.7	0.7	0.6
North Carolina	17.0	1.2	16.7	1.1	0.3	0.7
North Dakota	11.0	1.5	12.5	1.3	-1.5	0.8 *
Ohio	13.5	0.8	13.8	0.8	-0.3	0.6
Oklahoma	13.0	1.1	14.1	1.4	-1.1	1.1
Oregon	13.7	1.2	15.3	1.2	-1.6	1.0
Pennsylvania	11.2	0.8	11.6	0.7	-0.4	0.6
Rhode Island	13.2	1.1	11.5	1.0	1.7	1.1
South Carolina	13.8	1.0	15.7	1.2	-1.8	0.7 *
South Dakota	14.3	2.2	15.2	1.6	-0.9	1.2
Tennessee	16.7	1.6	18.4	1.7	-1.7	1.0 *
Texas	17.4	0.8	17.6	0.8	-0.2	0.6
Utah	9.8	1.1	11.4	1.1	-1.5	1.1
Vermont	9.6	0.9	8.3	1.0	1.3	0.8
Virginia	10.8	1.2	11.8	1.1	-1.0	0.5 *
Washington	11.9	0.9	11.4	0.9	0.4	0.7
West Virginia	16.0	1.5	15.1	1.5	0.9	1.1
Wisconsin	11.1	1.0	11.6	1.0	-0.5	0.8
Wyoming	9.3	0.9	10.7	1.0	-1.4	0.9

* Statistically difference from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

** Official estimates do not match

published estimates because universe

Source: Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement: 2010. Further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates is available at <www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60_236sa.pdf>.

These estimates replace estimates presented in the Geographic Adjustments of Supplemental Poverty Measure Thresholds: Using the American Community Survey Five-Year Data on Housing Costs Trudi J. Renwick (U.S. Census Bureau) presented at the Western Economic Association meetings in June 2011. The estimates differ as a result of changes in the tax calculations employed to estimate after-tax income. The Census Bureau is conducting research to incorporate the newly reported information in the CPS ASEC on family relationships and expenses. Webster (2011) describes these new methods. Some of these changes were included in the paper listed above, however, these changes are not included in the estimates presented in this table. The estimates presented here employ the tax calculations previously released on the CPS 2010 ASEC micro-data file in October of 2010. These revised estimates are released for the purpose of presenting 2009 estimates comparable to those described in the upcoming report The Research SUPPLEMENTAL POVERTY MEASURE: 2010 that will present SPM estimates for calendar year 2010 based on the CPS 2011 ASEC.

Table 5 - State Poverty Rates SPM - Geographically Adjusted with the Rent Index vs SPM - Not Geographically Adjusted: 2009

	SPM Geo Adjusted	SE	SPM Not Geo Adjusted	SE	Difference	SE Diff
Alabama	15.9	1.3	20	1.3	-4.1	0.6 *
Alaska	11.0	1.0	9.9	0.9	1.1	0.4 *
Arizona	21.6	1.9	21.9	1.7	-0.3	0.4
Arkansas	15.9	2.6	21.2	2.8	-5.3	0.6 *
California	22.4	0.6	16.3	0.6	6.1	0.3 *
Colorado	14.8	1.1	14.6	1.0	0.2	0.2
Connecticut	11.1	0.9	8.7	0.8	2.4	0.4 *
Delaware	13.9	1.1	12.5	1.0	1.4	0.4 *
District of Columbia	23.1	1.4	16.5	1.3	6.6	1.0 *
Florida	19.5	0.9	17	0.8	2.5	0.4 *
Georgia	18.8	1.2	20.3	1.3	-1.4	0.6 *
Hawaii	18.0	1.3	11.6	1.1	6.4	0.7 *
Idaho	11.6	1.6	14.5	1.9	-2.9	0.6 *
Illinois	13.8	0.9	14	0.9	-0.2	0.3
Indiana	14.8	1.3	17.5	1.3	-2.8	0.7 *
Iowa	7.9	0.8	10.5	0.8	-2.6	0.6 *
Kansas	11.1	1.4	12.6	1.4	-1.5	0.3 *
Kentucky	13.2	1.4	17.6	1.9	-4.4	1.0 *
Louisiana	12.8	1.1	14.7	1.4	-1.9	0.6 *
Maine	9.6	0.9	11.3	1.0	-1.7	0.5 *
Maryland	14.0	0.9	10.2	0.8	3.8	0.5 *
Massachusetts	13.6	1.2	10.3	1.0	3.3	0.5 *
Michigan	12.4	0.8	13.3	0.9	-0.9	0.2 *
Minnesota	10.7	1.0	10.9	1.0	-0.3	0.4
Mississippi	17.0	1.4	21.5	1.5	-4.6	1.0 *
Missouri	12.8	1.4	15.4	1.4	-2.6	0.4 *
Montana	10.5	1.5	14.2	1.6	-3.7	0.9 *
Nebraska	9.1	1.0	11.8	1.0	-2.7	0.7 *
Nevada	17.2	1.3	14.3	1.2	2.9	0.6 *
New Hampshire	10.4	0.8	9.4	0.7	1.1	0.3 *
New Jersey	12.2	1.0	9.9	0.9	2.3	0.4 *
New Mexico	15.8	1.5	17.8	1.4	-2.1	0.5 *
New York	17.6	0.8	15.1	0.7	2.4	0.4 *
North Carolina	14.3	1.0	16.7	1.1	-2.4	0.5 *
North Dakota	8.4	0.9	12.5	1.3	-4.1	0.6 *
Ohio	11.5	0.7	13.8	0.8	-2.3	0.3 *
Oklahoma	10.8	1.1	14.1	1.4	-3.4	0.9 *
Oregon	13.3	1.3	15.3	1.2	-2.0	0.3 *
Pennsylvania	10.5	0.7	11.6	0.7	-1.0	0.3 *
Rhode Island	12.2	1.0	11.5	1.0	0.7	0.3 *
South Carolina	13.8	1.1	15.7	1.2	-1.9	0.4 *
South Dakota	11.6	1.3	15.2	1.6	-3.6	0.6 *
Tennessee	14.3	1.5	18.4	1.7	-4.0	0.6 *
Texas	16.5	0.7	17.6	0.8	-1.2	0.3 *
Utah	9.5	1.0	11.4	1.1	-1.9	0.4 *
Vermont	8.3	0.9	8.3	1.0	-0.1	0.5
Virginia	11.7	0.9	11.8	1.1	-0.1	0.5
Washington	11.2	0.9	11.4	0.9	-0.2	0.4
West Virginia	11.3	1.2	15.1	1.5	-3.8	0.6 *
Wisconsin	10.7	0.9	11.6	1.0	-1.0	0.3 *
Wyoming	9.0	1.0	10.7	1.0	-1.7	0.4 *

* Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement: 2010. Further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates is available at <www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60_236sa.pdf>.

These estimates replace estimates presented in the Geographic Adjustments of Supplemental Poverty Measure Thresholds: Using the American Community Survey Five-Year Data on Housing Costs Trudi J. Renwick (U.S. Census Bureau) presented at the Western Economic Association meetings in June 2011. The estimates differ as a result of changes in the tax calculations employed to estimate after-tax income. The Census Bureau is conducting research to incorporate the newly reported information in the CPS ASEC on family relationships and expenses. Webster (2011) describes these new methods. Some of these changes were included in the paper listed above, however, these changes are not included in the estimates presented in this table. The estimates presented here employ the tax calculations previously released on the CPS 2010 ASEC micro-data file in October of 2010. These revised estimates are released for the purpose of presenting 2009 estimates comparable to those described in the upcoming report The Research SUPPLEMENTAL POVERTY MEASURE: 2010 that will present SPM estimates for calendar year 2010 based on the CPS 2011 ASEC.

Table 6 - Impact of Geographic Adjustments on Poverty Rates - Selected Groups

	SPM with Geo Adjustment	SE	SPM-Not Geographically Adjusted	SE	Difference	SE	
RESIDENCE							
Metro Area- Inside Principal City	19.6	0.4	18.4	0.3	1.23	0.2	*
Metro Area- Outside Principal City	13.1	0.3	12.1	0.2	0.97	0.1	*
Outside Metro Area	13.5	0.5	17.6	0.5	-4.13	0.2	*
REGION							
Northeast	13.7	0.4	12.1	0.3	1.54	0.2	*
Midwest	12.1	0.3	13.6	0.3	-1.51	0.1	*
South	15.8	0.3	16.8	0.3	-1.07	0.1	*
West	18.7	0.4	15.7	0.4	2.98	0.2	*
Tenure Status							
Owner- Mortgage	8	0.2	8	0.2	0.04	0.1	
Owner-No Mortgage	13.8	0.4	14.4	0.4	-0.59	0.1	*
Renter	28	0.4	26.8	0.4	1.17	0.2	*
AGE							
Children	17.3	0.3	16.9	0.3	0.39	0.1	*
Adults	14.4	0.2	14.2	0.2	0.27	0.1	*
Elderly	15.5	0.4	15.6	0.4	-0.11	0.2	

* Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement: 2010. Further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates is available at <www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60_236sa.pdf>.

These estimates replace estimates presented in the Geographic Adjustments of Supplemental Poverty Measure Thresholds: Using the American Community Survey Five-Year Data on Housing Costs Trudi J. Renwick (U.S. Census Bureau) presented at the Western Economic Association meetings in June 2011. The estimates differ as a result of changes in the tax calculations employed to estimate after-tax income. The Census Bureau is conducting research to incorporate the newly reported information in the CPS ASEC on family relationships and expenses. Webster (2011) describes these new methods. Some of these changes were included in the paper listed above, however, these changes are not included in the estimates presented in this table. The estimates presented here employ the tax calculations previously released on the CPS 2010 ASEC micro-data file in October of 2010. These revised estimates are released for the purpose of presenting 2009 estimates comparable to those described in the upcoming report The Research SUPPLEMENTAL POVERTY MEASURE: 2010 that will present SPM estimates for calendar year 2010 based on the CPS 2011 ASEC.

Table 7 - Distribution of People in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: Impact of Geographic Adjustment

	SPM with Geo Adjustment	SE	SPM-Not Geographically Adjusted	SE	Difference	SE	
RESIDENCE							
Metro Area- Inside Principal City	41.4	0.8	39.4	0.8	1.95	0.3	*
Metro Area- Outside Principal City	44.7	0.8	42.1	0.8	2.61	0.3	*
Outside Metro Area	13.9	0.6	18.5	0.8	-4.55	0.3	*
REGION							
Northeast	16.1	0.4	14.5	0.3	1.57	0.2	*
Midwest	17.2	0.4	19.7	0.5	-2.47	0.2	*
South	38.1	0.5	41.3	0.5	-3.26	0.2	*
West	28.6	0.5	24.5	0.5	4.17	0.3	*
Tenure Status							
Owner- Mortgage	25.7	0.5	26	0.5	-0.3	0.2	
Owner-No Mortgage	18.8	0.5	20	0.5	-1.13	0.2	*
Renter	55.4	0.7	54	0.7	1.43	0.3	*
AGE							
Children	27.9	0.3	27.7	0.3	0.17	0.1	
Adults	59.3	0.3	59.1	0.3	0.14	0.1	
Elderly	12.9	0.3	13.2	0.3	-0.31	0.1	*

* Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

Source: Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement: 2010. Further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates is available at <www.census.gov/hhes/www/p60_236sa.pdf>.

These estimates replace estimates presented in the Geographic Adjustments of Supplemental Poverty Measure Thresholds: Using the American Community Survey Five-Year Data on Housing Costs Trudi J. Renwick (U.S. Census Bureau) presented at the Western Economic Association meetings in June 2011. The estimates differ as a result of changes in the tax calculations employed to estimate after-tax income. The Census Bureau is conducting research to incorporate the newly reported information in the CPS ASEC on family relationships and expenses. Webster (2011) describes these new methods. Some of these changes were included in the paper listed above, however, these changes are not included in the estimates presented in this table. The estimates presented here employ the tax calculations previously released on the CPS 2010 ASEC micro-data file in October of 2010. These revised estimates are released for the purpose of presenting 2009 estimates comparable to those described in the upcoming report The Research SUPPLEMENTAL POVERTY MEASURE: 2010 that will present SPM estimates for calendar year 2010 based on the CPS 2011 ASEC.

Table 8. Correlations between State Poverty Rates and Other Deprivation Measures

State	Food-Insecure Households (%)	Marginally Attached Workers (per 10,000 working-age Adults)	Renters with Severe Housing-Cost Burden (gross rent > 50% of household income)	Owners Spending 30% or More on Housing (%)	Housing Units with 1.01 or More Occupants per Room (%)	Foreclosures (per 10,000 homes)	Homeless (% of population)	Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)	Property Crime (per 100,000 inhabitants)	Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 inhabitants)	Unemployment Rate (% ages 16 and over)	Bankruptcies (filings per 1,000)	
CORRELATIONS													
SPM	0.228	0.558	0.531	0.475	0.572	0.410	0.487	0.392	0.592	0.485	0.517	0.277	
OFFICIAL	0.692	0.316	0.183	-0.111	0.211	0.042	0.080	0.552	0.515	0.552	0.404	0.271	
SPM_NGA	0.609	0.211	0.137	-0.145	0.156	0.131	0.003	0.535	0.535	0.618	0.377	0.406	
SOURCE:	U.S. Department of Agriculture. <i>Household Food Security in the United States, 2007</i> . Tables 5 & 7. Data are for 2007.	AHDP calculation based on employment data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey and population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Marginally attached workers include working-age adults who want a job and who are available for work but have given up on searching for employment. This group is excluded from standard counts of the unemployed and from the unemployment rate. Data are for 2009.	U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2008. Table B25070. Figures do not include home owners or renters living in group quarters, such as college students living in dorms. Gross rent includes average monthly utility costs. Data are for 2008.	U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 2008. Tables GCT2515 and GCT2513. Data are for 2008.	U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 2008. Table GCT2509. Data are for April 2010.	RealtyTrac - http://www.realtytrac.com . Data are for April 2010.	National Alliance to End Homelessness. <i>Homelessness Counts, 2007</i> . Table 2. Data are for 2007.	National Alliance to End Homelessness. <i>Homelessness Counts, 2007</i> . Table 2. Data are for 2007.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <i>Infant Mortality Statistics from the 2005 Period Linked Birth/Infant Death Data Set</i> . National Vital Statistics Reports 57, no. 2 (July 30, 2008): Table 3. Data are for 2003-2005.	Federal Bureau of Investigation. <i>Crime in the United States, 2008</i> . Table 5. Data are for 2008.	Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Prison Inmates at Midyear 2008 - Statistical Tables. Tables 10, 15, 17. National data, which also include local inmates, not directly comparable with state data. Data are for 2008.	U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Civilian Noninstitutional Population (preliminary). Data are for May 2010.	American Bankruptcy Institute, Bankruptcy Filing Statistics. http://www.abiworld.org/ . Data are for 2009.

Source: Data are for 2007. American Human Development Project of the Social Science Research Council. HD Index and Supplemental Indicators by State 2010-2011 Dataset.

These estimates replace estimates presented in the Geographic Adjustments of Supplemental Poverty Measure Thresholds: Using the American Community Survey Five-Year Data on Housing Costs Trudi J. Renwick (U.S. Census Bureau) presented at the Western Economic Association meetings in June 2011. The estimates differ as a result of changes in the tax calculations employed to estimate after-tax income. The Census Bureau is conducting research to incorporate the newly reported information in the CPS ASEC on family relationships and expenses. Webster (2011) describes these new methods. Some of these changes were included in the paper listed above, however, these changes are not included in the estimates presented in this table. The estimates presented here employ the tax calculations previously released on the CPS 2010 ASEC micro-data file in October of 2010. These revised estimates are released for the purpose of presenting 2009 estimates comparable to those described in the upcoming report The Research SUPPLEMENTAL POVERTY MEASURE: 2010 that will present SPM estimates for calendar year 2010 based on the CPS 2011 ASEC.