



### **CRIA Research Summary**

### **Community Resilience Indicators in RAPT**

The Resilience Analysis and Planning Tool (RAPT) includes 20 community resilience indicators identified through analysis by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Argonne National Laboratory. The research methodology and findings of this analysis are provided in the full report, <u>Community Resilience</u> <u>Indicator Analysis: County-level Analysis of Commonly Used Indicators from Peer-Reviewed Research: 2019</u> <u>Update</u> (CRIA). All 20 CRIA indicators are included in RAPT with county data. In addition, 12 indicators also have census tract data.

The Connection to Resilience sections in this research summary provide the rationale for why researchers identified the indicator as an effective measure of community resilience. The lowercase letter citations refer to the specific source methodology. The eight community resilience assessment methodologies examined in CRIA were:

- a. Australian National Disaster Resilience Index (ANDRI)
- b. Baseline Resilience Indicators for Communities (BRIC)
- c. Community Disaster Resilience Index (CDRI)
- d. Community Resilience Index (CRI2)
- e. Disaster Resilience of Place (DROP)
- f. Resilient Capacity Index (RCI)
- g. Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)
- h. The Composite Resilience Index (TCRI)

This research summary also includes a description of the different binning methods used in CRIA and the methodology used to create the aggregate indicator.

RAPT is available at <u>FEMA.gov/RAPT</u>.

# **Population Indicators**

| Educational Attainment – Lack of High School Diploma:                                   |   |                     |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Census Tra  | ct and Co   | ounty Da            | ta             |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| Metric  |   |                     |                |                     | Data         | Source                     |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| Percentage of<br>school diploma   | population o<br>a (including (  | over age 25<br>GED) | without a h    | igh                 | U.S.<br>2015 | Census Ame<br>5–2019 five- | erican<br>year e | Comn<br>estima      | nunity Surve<br>tes, Table S | y (ACS)<br>1501 |  |
| National Avera  | ige   |                     |                |                     | Binn         | ing Method                 | S                |                     |                              |                 |  |
| 12% over age 2  | 12% over age 25 without a high school diploma Census Tract: Jenks County: Jenks Caspall   Community Resilience Methodologies Community Resilience Methodologies |                     |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| Community Re  | Community Resilience Methodologies  |                     |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| # of 8  | ANDRI   | BRIC                | CDRI           | CF                  | RI2          | DROP                       | R                | CI                  | SVI                          | TCRI            |  |
| 7   | Х   | Х                   | Х              | 2                   | х            | Х                          | )                | x                   | Х                            |                 |  |
| Connection to   | Resilience  |                     |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| Higher levels o   | feducation  | are associat        | ted with hea   | alth, a             | s well       | as an impro                | ved a            | bility t            | o communio                   | cate and        |  |
| comprehend ir   | nformation. <sup>t</sup>  | ),g                 |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| Education is in   | cluded as ar  | n input to eq       | onomic resi    | ilience             | e as hig     | gher levels o              | f edu            | cation              | is a charact                 | eristic of a    |  |
| strong labor fo   | rce and sup   | ports individ       | duals' ability | / to ac             | cess c       | ommunity r                 | esour            | ces. <sup>c,f</sup> |                              |                 |  |
| Higher levels o   | feducation  | can improv          | e the capaci   | ity to <sub>l</sub> | prepar       | e for, and re              | espon            | d to, t             | he stress of                 |                 |  |
| disasters. <sup>a,e,h</sup>   |   |                     |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |
| For individuals   | with lower  | levels of ed        | ucation, the   | pract               | ical ar      | nd bureaucra               | atic hu          | urdles              | to assist in (               | coping          |  |
| with, and recovering from, a disaster are much more difficult to navigate. <sup>g</sup> |   |                     |                |                     |              |                            |                  |                     |                              |                 |  |

| Unemploy  | Unemployment Rate: Census Tract and County Data |             |               |        |         |                |            |        |                          |           |
|---|---|-------------|---------------|--------|---------|----------------|------------|--------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Metric  |   |             |               |        | Data    | Source         |            |        |                          |           |
| Percentage of   | the labor fo                                    | rce unemplo | oyed          |        | ACS     | 2015–2019      | five-year  | est    | imates, Tak              | ole S2301 |
| National Avera  | age   |             |               |        | Binn    | ing Method     | S          |        |                          |           |
| 5.3% unemplo  | yment rate                                      |             |               |        | Cens    | sus Tract: Fis | her        | Со     | ounty: Fishe             | r Jenks   |
|   |   |             |               |        | Jenk    | S              |            |        |                          |           |
| Community Re  | Community Resilience Methodologies              |             |               |        |         |                |            |        |                          |           |
| # of 8  | ANDRI   | BRIC        | CDRI          | CF     | RI2     | DROP           | RCI        |        | SVI                      | TCRI      |
| 7   | Х   | Х           | Х             | )      | K       | Х              |            |        | Х                        | Х         |
| Connection to   | Resilience                                      |             |               |        |         |                |            |        |                          |           |
| High levels of e  | employment                                      | contribute  | to a healthy  | / comi | munit   | y economy,     | which su   | рро    | orts commu               | nity      |
| resilience. <sup>a,b,d,e</sup>  | e,h   |             |               |        |         |                |            |        |                          |           |
| Employment a  | lso provides                                    | residents w | ith financia/ | l reso | urces   | that contrib   | ute to the | eir li | ivelihoods. <sup>.</sup> | ·<br>·    |
| Unemployed p  | ersons do n                                     | ot have the | employee b    | enefit | t plans | s that provid  | e income   | e an   | d health co              | st        |
| assistance in the event of injury or death. <sup>g</sup>  |   |             |               |        |         |                |            |        |                          |           |
| Counties with   | higher levels                                   | s of unempl | oyment may    | y have | fewe    | r community    | y resourc  | es t   | o support r              | esidents' |
| needs and a population that is both less prepared for a disaster and less able to cope with the aftermath. <sup>h</sup> |   |             |               |        |         |                |            |        |                          |           |

## **CRIA Research Summary**

| Disability:  | Census T  | Data         |             |         |        |                       |           |       |              |                     |
|--|---|--------------|-------------|---------|--------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|--------------|---------------------|
| Metric   |   |              |             |         |        | Source                |           |       |              |                     |
| Percentage of the non-institutionalized population<br>with a disability <sup>1</sup> |   |              |             |         |        | 2015–2019             | five-year | esti  | imates, Tab  | ole S1810           |
| National Average   |   |              |             |         |        | ing Method            | S         |       |              |                     |
| 12.6% with a disability  |   |              |             |         |        | sus Tract: Je<br>Pall | nks       | Со    | unty: Jenks  | s Caspall           |
| Community Re   | esilience Me  | thodologies  |             |         |        |                       |           |       |              |                     |
| # of 8   | ANDRI   | BRIC         | CDRI        | CR      | RI2    | DROP                  | RCI       |       | SVI          | TCRI                |
| 6  | Х   | Х            |             |         |        | Х                     | Х         |       | Х            | Х                   |
| Connection to  | Resilience  |              |             |         |        |                       |           |       |              |                     |
| Individuals wit  | h disabilitie   | s tend to be | more vulne  | rable   | to phy | sical, social         | , and eco | nom   | nic challeng | ges. <sup>b,f</sup> |
| Having functio   | nal, mobility   | y, or access | needs can n | nake re | espon  | ding to disa          | sters mo  | re ch | nallenging,  | including           |
| adapting to ex   | dapting to extreme circumstances and dealing with the increased stress. <sup>a,f,h</sup>  |              |             |         |        |                       |           |       |              |                     |
| During an eme<br>individuals wit   | During an emergency, family members, neighbors, or a caretaker may be less able to provide support to<br>individuals with special needs that require the assistance of others. <sup>g</sup> |              |             |         |        |                       |           |       |              |                     |

| Limited En   | glish Lan  | guage Pr      | oficiency      | : Ce           | nsus                                    | Tract an       | d Cour                | ity   | Data         |            |
|--|--|---------------|----------------|----------------|---|----------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|------------|
| Metric   |  |               |                |                | Data Source                             |                |                       |       |              |            |
| Percentage of  | limited Engl   | ish-speaking  | g household    | s <sup>2</sup> | ACS                                     | 2015–2019      | five-year             | esti  | imates, Tab  | le S1602   |
| National Avera   | ige  |               |                |                | Binn                                    | ing Method     | s                     |       |              |            |
| 4.4% limited E   | nglish-speak   | ing househo   | olds           |                | Census Tract: Jenks County: Jenks Caspa |                |                       |       | Caspall      |            |
|  |  |               |                |                | Casp                                    | all            |                       |       |              |            |
| Community Re   | silience Me  | thodologies   |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |
| # of 8 ANDRI BRIC CDRI CRI2 DROP RCI SVI TCRI  |  |               |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |
| 6  | Х  | Х             | Х              |                |   | Х              |                       |       | Х            | Х          |
| Connection to  | Resilience   |               |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |
| Proficiency in I   | English supp   | orts commu    | inity resilier | nce be         | cause                                   | of improved    | d ability t           | о со  | ommunicate   | e between  |
| individuals, as  | well as allow  | ving individu | uals to bette  | er acce        | ess cor                                 | mmunity res    | ources. <sup>a,</sup> | c,g   |              |            |
| Greater numbe  | ers of profic  | ient English  | speakers ca    | n be v         | ital fo                                 | or effective o | ommuni                | catio | on interacti | ons in the |
| event of a disa  | ster. <sup>b,h</sup>   |               |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |
| In communitie  | n communities where the first language is neither English nor Spanish, accurate translations of advisories |               |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |
| may be scarce.   | g  |               |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |
| Communities with fewer English-speaking residents may demonstrate lower levels of resilience. <sup>e</sup> |  |               |                |                |   |                |                       |       |              |            |

Per the American Community Survey (ACS) question wording, this definition would include individuals with the following conditions: serious difficulty hearing, seeing, walking, and/or dressing; serious difficulty because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition; serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, making decisions, or doing errands alone.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A "limited English-speaking household" is one in which no member 14 years and older speaks only English or speaks a non-English language and speaks English "very well." In other words, all members 14 years and older have at least some difficulty with English (<u>https://census.gov/library/visualizations/2017/comm/english-speaking.html.html</u>, accessed August 7, 2018).

| Home Own   | nership: (   | Census Ti     | ract and     | Cour    | nty-L       | evel Data      | a          |                 |                    |  |
|--|--|---------------|--------------|---------|-------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| Metric   |  |               |              |         | Data Source |                |            |                 |                    |  |
| Percentage of owner-occupied housing units   |  |               |              |         |             | 2015–2019      | five-year  | estimates, Tal  | ole DP04           |  |
| National Avera   | age  |               |              | Binn    | ing Method  | S              |            |                 |                    |  |
| 63.8% of hous  | ing units are  | owner-occ     | upied        |         | Cens        | sus Tract: Jei | nks        | County: Jenk    | s Caspall          |  |
|  |  |               |              |         | Casp        | all            |            |                 |                    |  |
| Community Re   | Community Resilience Methodologies   |               |              |         |             |                |            |                 |                    |  |
| # of 8   | # of 8 ANDRI BRIC CDRI CRI2 DROP RCI SVI TCRI  |               |              |         |             |                |            |                 |                    |  |
| 6  | Х  | Х             | Х            |         |             | Х              | Х          |                 | Х                  |  |
| Connection to  | Resilience   |               |              |         |             |                |            |                 |                    |  |
| Home owners  | hip is often i   | ncluded as a  | a measure o  | of a co | mmur        | nity's econor  | nic stren  | gth and thus is | a marker           |  |
| of community   | resilience. <sup>b,o</sup>   | c,e,h         |              |         |             |                |            |                 |                    |  |
| Home owners  | hip is also us   | ed to reflec  | t residents' | levels  | of pla      | ice attachme   | ent to the | eir communitie  | :S. <sup>c,f</sup> |  |
| Low levels of h  | Low levels of home ownership can indicate a community with a faltering economy and a population with |               |              |         |             |                |            |                 |                    |  |
| less long-term   | commitmer  | nt to the cor | nmunity, wl  | hich co | ould h      | amper both     | individu   | al and commu    | nity               |  |
| mitigation actions to prepare for disaster as well as recovery efforts. <sup>a,f</sup> |  |               |              |         |             |                |            |                 |                    |  |

| Mobility –  | Mobility – Lack of Vehicle: Census Tract and County Data  |                |                         |         |             |                                       |                    |                  |            |  |
|---|---|----------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--|
| Metric  |   |                |                         |         | Data Source |                                       |                    |                  |            |  |
| Percentage of occupied housing units with no vehicles available |   |                |                         |         |             | 2015–2019                             | five-year          | estimates, Ta    | ble B08201 |  |
| National Average  |   |                |                         |         |             | Binning Methods                       |                    |                  |            |  |
| 8.6% of households are without a vehicle                        |   |                |                         |         | Cens        | Census Tract: Jenks County: Head Tail |                    |                  |            |  |
|   |   |                |                         |         | Casp        | all                                   |                    | Breaks           |            |  |
| Community Re  | silience Me   | thodologies    |                         |         |             |                                       |                    |                  |            |  |
| # of 8  | ANDRI   | BRIC           | CDRI                    | CF      | RI2         | DROP                                  | RCI                | SVI              | TCRI       |  |
| 6   | Х   | Х              | Х                       |         |             | Х                                     |                    | Х                | Х          |  |
| Connection to   | Resilience  |                |                         |         |             |                                       |                    |                  |            |  |
| Access to trans   | sportation h  | elps individ   | uals support            | t their | livelih     | noods and p                           | rovides c          | ritical mobility | to adapt   |  |
| to the extreme  | e circumstar  | ices of a disa | aster. <sup>c,e,h</sup> |         |             |                                       |                    |                  |            |  |
| Communities v   | Communities where fewer individuals have access to a vehicle may have less resilience to a disaster. <sup>b</sup> |                |                         |         |             |                                       |                    |                  |            |  |
| Lack of access  | to vehicle ca   | an be especi   | ially problen           | natic i | n tern      | ns of evacua                          | tion in u          | rban areas wh    | ere        |  |
| automobile ov   | vnership is l   | ower, espec    | ially among             | inner   | city p      | oor populati                          | ions. <sup>g</sup> |                  |            |  |

| Age 65 and                                   | d Older: (       | Census Tr                | act and (    | Cour      | nty D     | ata                                    |           |                |           |
|--|------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| Metric                                       |                  |                          |              |           | Data      | Source                                 |           |                |           |
| Percentage of                                | ion 65 years     | and older                | ACS          | 2015–2019 | five-year | estimates, Ta                          | ble S0101 |                |           |
| National Avera                               | age              |                          |              |           | Binn      | ing Methods                            | 5         |                |           |
| 15.6% of popu                                | lation 65 ye     | ars and olde             | er           |           | Cens      | sus Tract: Fis                         | her       | County: Jenk   | s Caspall |
|  |                  |                          |              |           | Jenk      | S                                      |           |                |           |
| Community Re                                 | silience Me      | thodologies              |              |           |           |  |           |                |           |
| # of 8                                       | ANDRI            | BRIC                     | CDRI         | CF        | RI2       | DROP                                   | RCI       | SVI            | TCRI      |
| 5  | Х                | Х                        |              |           |           | Х                                      |           | Х              | Х         |
| Connection to                                | Resilience       |                          |              |           |           |  |           |                |           |
| Several metho<br>resilience <sup>a,b,e</sup> | dologies no      | ted that the             | percentage   | of eld    | derly a   | dults in the                           | populati  | on could affec | t         |
| Those over 65                                | tend to be l     | ess mobile. <sup>†</sup> | 1            |           |           |  |           |                |           |
| Those over 65                                | may find it      | more difficu             | It to prepar | e for c   | lisaste   | ers and to ad                          | ant to ex | treme circum   | stances h |
| Many poople (                                |                  | uiro accistan            | co from fom  |           | ighho     | $\frac{13}{10}$ and $\frac{10}{10}$ au | rs which  | might not ho   |           |
|  |                  | ine assistant            |              | iny, ne   | iginoo    | is, and othe                           | is, which | i migni not be | available |
| during a disast                              | er. <sup>®</sup> |                          |              |           |           |  |           |                |           |

| Household              | Income:                  | Census <sup>-</sup> | Fract and       | Ι Οοι   | inty    | Data          |            |      |               |          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|---------------|------------|------|---------------|----------|
| Metric                 |                          |                     |                 |         | Data    | Source        |            |      |               |          |
| Median house           | hold income              | 5                   |                 |         | ACS     | 2015–2019     | five-year  | est  | timates, Tab  | le S1903 |
| National Avera         | ige                      |                     |                 |         | Binn    | ing Method    | S          |      |               |          |
| \$ 62,843              |                          |                     |                 |         | Cens    | sus Tract: M  | anual      | С    | ounty: Manı   | lar      |
| Community Re           | silience Me              | thodologies         |                 |         |         |               |            |      |               |          |
| # of 8                 | ANDRI                    | BRIC                | CDRI            | CR      | RI2     | DROP          | RCI        |      | SVI           | TCRI     |
| 5                      | Х                        |                     | Х               | >       | <       |               |            |      | Х             | Х        |
| Connection to          | Resilience               |                     |                 |         |         |               |            |      |               |          |
| Research has s         | hown that t              | here is a str       | ong relatior    | nship k | betwe   | en individua  | ls' financ | cial | resources a   | nd their |
| resilience to a        | disaster. <sup>0,0</sup> |                     |                 |         |         |               |            |      |               |          |
| Low-income he          | ouseholds a              | re at greate        | r risk becaus   | se the  | y tend  | to live in lo | wer-qual   | lity | housing situ  | lated in |
| higher risk are        | as, are less l           | ikely to have       | e prepared f    | for a d | lisaste | r, and have   | fewer res  | sou  | irces to supp | oort     |
| recovery. <sup>c</sup> |                          |                     |                 |         |         |               |            |      |               |          |
| The median ho          | ousehold inc             | ome of a co         | mmunity m       | ay also | o refle | ect its econo | mic resili | iend | ce and the c  | ommunity |
| resources avai         | lable to sup             | port recover        | ۶. <sup>h</sup> |         |         |               |            |      |               |          |

| Income Inequality: County Data   |               |               |               |        |            |               |              |             |                     |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------|------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Metric   |               |               |               |        | Data       | Source        |              |             |                     |
| Gini Index <sup>3</sup>  |               |               |               | ACS 2  | 015–2019 f | ive-year est  | imates, Tabl | e B19083    |                     |
| National Avera   | age           |               |               |        | Binni      | ng Method     |              |             |                     |
| .48  |               |               |               |        | Jenks      | Caspall       |              |             |                     |
| Community Resilience Methodologies   |               |               |               |        |            |               |              |             |                     |
| # of 8   | ANDRI         | BRIC          | CDRI          | C      | RI2        | DROP          | RCI          | SVI         | TCRI                |
| 4  |               | Х             |               |        | Х          | Х             | Х            |             |                     |
| Connection to  | Resilience    |               |               | ·      |            |               |              |             |                     |
| The economic   | environmer    | nt is a major | factor in a o | comn   | nunity's   | s resilience; | and when i   | ncome ineq  | uality is           |
| present, earni   | ngs tend to l | be distribute | ed in a way   | that o | does no    | ot support b  | roader com   | munity goal | s. <sup>b,d,e</sup> |
| In addition, a skewed distribution of economic resources may negatively affect the cohesiveness of the |               |               |               |        |            |               |              | of the      |                     |
| residents' response to a disaster. <sup>f</sup>  |               |               |               |        |            |               |              |             |                     |

| Lack of Health Insurance: Census Tract and County Data |                      |                |                     |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |
|--|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------|--|----------------|-------------|-------|--------------------|------------|
| Metric   |                      |                |                     |         | Data Source                                    |                |             |       |                    |            |
| Percentage of  | the populat          | ion without    | health              |         | ACS 2015–2019 five-year estimates, Table S2701 |                |             |       |                    |            |
| insurance cove   | erage                |                |                     |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |
| National Avera   | ige                  |                |                     |         | Binn   | ing Method     | S           |       |                    |            |
| 8.8% without h   | nealth insura        | ance           |                     |         | Census Tract: Fisher County: Fisher Jenks      |                |             |       | r Jenks            |            |
|  |                      |                |                     |         | Jenk   | S              |             |       |                    |            |
| Community Re   | silience Me          | thodologies    |                     |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |
| # of 8   | ANDRI                | BRIC           | CDRI                | CF      | RI2  | DROP           | RCI         |       | SVI                | TCRI       |
| 4  |                      | Х              | Х                   |         |  | Х              | Х           |       |                    |            |
| Connection to  | Resilience           |                |                     |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |
| Health is a crit                                       | ical compon          | ent of comr    | nunity well-        | being   | as an  | unhealthy p    | opulatio    | n ha  | as more diff       | iculty     |
| accessing com  | munity supp          | oort, or enga  | aging in the        | proce   | ss of b  | ouilding disa  | ster resili | enc   | ce. <sup>c,e</sup> |            |
| Communities v  | with more ir         | ndividuals co  | overed by he        | ealth i | nsurar   | nce tend to l  | nave high   | er    | measures o         | f physical |
| and mental he  | alth. <sup>b,e</sup> |                |                     |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |
| Health insuran   | ce coverage          | e is one indic | ation of ind        | lividua | als' cap                                       | pacity to effe | ectively r  | esp   | ond to and         | recover    |
| from a crisis, b                                       | oth mentall          | y and physic   | cally. <sup>f</sup> |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |
| Communities v  | with lower p         | ercentages     | of individua        | ls witl | h heal   | th insurance   | may hav     | /e lo | ower levels        | of         |
| resilience. <sup>e</sup>                               |                      |                |                     |         |  |                |             |       |                    |            |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Gini Index or coefficient uses a scale of 0–1 to measure the difference between the ideal distribution of income (perfect equality [0] where 50 percent of the population would receive 50 percent of the available income) and the actual distribution.<sup>g</sup> The closer the number is to 1, the greater the income inequality.

| Single-Pare  | Single-Parent Households: Census Tract and County Data |             |                |                      |          |             |              |            |             |                     |
|--|--|-------------|----------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Metric   |  | Data Source |                |                      |          |             |              |            |             |                     |
| Percentage of single-parent households   |  |             |                |                      |          | 015–2019 fi | ve-year      | esti       | mates, Tabl | e DP02 <sup>4</sup> |
| National Average   |  |             |                |                      |          | ng Method   |              |            |             |                     |
| 21.3% of famil   | y household  |             | Censu<br>Caspa | ıs Tract: Jen<br>III | ks       | Со          | ounty: Jenks | Caspall    |             |                     |
| Community Re   | silience Me  | thodologies |                |                      |          |             |              |            |             |                     |
| # of 8   | ANDRI  | BRIC        | CDRI           | C                    | CRI2     | DROP        | RCI          |            | SVI         | TCRI                |
| 3  | Х  |             |                |                      | Х        |             |              |            | Х           |                     |
| Connection to  | Resilience   |             |                |                      |          |             |              |            |             |                     |
| Single-parent l  | nouseholds   | are more vu | Inerable to    | a dis                | aster be | ecause they | tend to      | hav        | e lower     |                     |
| socioeconomic status and fewer sources of social support than that of two-parent families. <sup>d,g</sup>                                  |  |             |                |                      |          |             |              |            |             |                     |
| Single-parent households are also vulnerable as all daily responsibilities fall to one parent, making recover more difficult. <sup>g</sup> |  |             |                |                      |          |             |              | g recovery |             |                     |

## **Community Indicators**

| Connection to Civic and Social Organizations: County Data |            |                |                     |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |
|---|------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------|------------------------|--------------|---------------|------------|--|
| Metric  |            |                |                     |                    | Data     | Source                 |              |               |            |  |
| Number of civic a   | ind social | organizatio    | ns per              |                    | U.S. C   | ensus Burea            | au, 2017 Co  | unty Busine   | SS         |  |
| 10,000 people   |            |                |                     |                    | Patte    | rns⁵, Table (          | 00A1, NAICS  | Code 8134     |            |  |
| National Average  |            |                |                     |                    | Binnir   | ng Method              |              |               |            |  |
| .82 civic and socia                                       | al organiz | ations per 1   | 0,000 peop          | le                 | Head     | Tail Breaks            |              |               |            |  |
| Community Resili  | ience Met  | thodologies    |                     |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |
| # of 8 ANDRI BRIC CDRI CRI2 DROP RCI SVI TCRI             |            |                |                     |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |
| 6 X X X X X X X   |            |                |                     |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |
| Connection to Re  | silience   |                |                     |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |
| This measure indi   | icates the | e level of cor | nmunity en          | gage               | ment b   | y looking at           | the level of | civic infrast | ructure    |  |
| through which rea   | sidents su | upport their   | communiti           | es. <sup>b,d</sup> | ,e,f     |                        |              |               |            |  |
| Participation in ci                                       | vic organ  | izations pro   | vides a mec         | hani               | sm for I | residents to           | invest in an | d take from   | their      |  |
| community and a   | lso increa | ases networ    | king and tru        | sted               | relatio  | nships. <sup>c,f</sup> |              |               |            |  |
| The availability of                                       | f formal s | ocial netwo    | rks can be c        | ritica             | durin    | g response a           | and recovery | y to quickly  | mobilize   |  |
| resources and dis   | seminate   | e informatio   | n. <sup>b,c,d</sup> |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |
| Residents who pa  | articipate | in local civio | organizatio         | ons c              | an use   | them for he            | lp and provi | de mutually   | beneficial |  |
| cooperation during a crisis. <sup>b,d</sup>               |            |                |                     |                    |          |                        |              |               |            |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The 2021 RAPT update includes Single Parent Household data from Table DP02 because it provides both census tract and county-level data. Table B09005 was used in the original version but only provides county-level data.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> While U.S. Census County Business Patterns (CBP) has 2017 data, the dataset has significantly fewer records available and therefore this update to RAPT will continue to use the CBP 2016 dataset in order to provide the most comprehensive data possible.

| Hospital Capacity: County Data   |   |      |      |   |   |                |     |     |      |  |  |
|--|---|------|------|---|---|----------------|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| Metric   | Metric  |      |      |   |   |                |     |     |      |  |  |
| The number of hospitals per 10,000 people  |   |      |      |   | U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 County Business<br>Patterns <sup>5</sup> , Table 00A1, NAICS code 622110 |                |     |     |      |  |  |
| National Average   |   |      |      |   |   | Binning Method |     |     |      |  |  |
| .17 hospitals per 10,000 people  |   |      |      |   | Jenks   | Caspall        |     |     |      |  |  |
| Community Resilience Methodologies   |   |      |      |   |   |                |     |     |      |  |  |
| # of 8   | ANDRI   | BRIC | CDRI | C | CRI2  | DROP           | RCI | SVI | TCRI |  |  |
| 5  | Х   | Х    | Х    |   |   | Х              |     |     | Х    |  |  |
| Connection to  | Resilience  |      |      |   |   |                |     |     |      |  |  |
| This measure represents essential community infrastructure, both because it represents the capacity of the healthcare system to support residents' overall health and to provide critical emergency medical care. <sup>a,b,c,e,h</sup> |   |      |      |   |   |                |     |     |      |  |  |
| Lack of this critidisasters. <sup>c</sup>  | Lack of this critical capacity negatively affects a community's ability to respond to and recover from disasters <sup>c</sup> |      |      |   |   |                |     |     |      |  |  |

| Medical Professional Capacity: County Data         |  |              |              |       |          |             |               |              |                           |
|--|--|--------------|--------------|-------|----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Metric   |  |              |              |       | Data     | Source      |               |              |                           |
| The number of health-diagnosing and treating       |  |              |              |       | ACS 2    | 015–2019 fi | ive-year esti | mates, Tabl  | e S2401                   |
| practitioners per 1,000 population                 |  |              |              |       |          |             |               |              |                           |
| National Avera                                     | age  |              |              |       | Binniı   | ng Method   |               |              |                           |
| 19health diagnosing and treating practitioners per |  |              |              |       | Jenks    | Caspall     |               |              |                           |
| 1,000 population                                   |  |              |              |       |          |             |               |              |                           |
| Community Resilience Methodologies                 |  |              |              |       |          |             |               |              |                           |
| # of 8   | ANDRI  | BRIC         | CDRI         | C     | CRI2     | DROP        | RCI           | SVI          | TCRI                      |
| 5  | Х  | Х            | Х            |       | Х        | Х           |               |              |                           |
| Connection to                                      | Resilience   |              |              |       |          |             |               |              |                           |
| Availability of                                    | physicians is  | linked with  | the overall  | phys  | ical and | d mental he | alth of comr  | nunity resic | lents. <sup>b,c,d,e</sup> |
| Lack of access                                     | to physician   | s is related | to lower lev | els o | f overa  | ll communit | y resilience  | as indicated | l by low                  |
| birthweight ar                                     | nd prematur  | e mortality. | ł            |       |          |             |               |              |                           |
| Physicians are                                     | Physicians are a critical emergency resource in the response to and recovery from a disaster. <sup>a</sup> |              |              |       |          |             |               |              |                           |

| Affiliation with a Religion: County Data         |               |              |                |       |                        |   |                |                         |          |  |
|--|---------------|--------------|----------------|-------|------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------------|----------|--|
| Metric   |               |              |                |       | Data                   | Source                                    |                |                         |          |  |
| Percentage of the population that are religious  |               |              |                |       | Assoc                  | iation of Sta                             | atisticians of | <sup>E</sup> American F | eligious |  |
| adherents  |               |              |                | Bodie | s. 2010 U.S.           | Religion Ce                               | nsus.          |                         |          |  |
|  |               |              |                |       | http:/                 | http://www.usreligioncensus.org/index.php |                |                         |          |  |
| National Average                                 |               |              |                |       |                        | ng Method                                 |                |                         |          |  |
| 51.25% of the population are religious adherents |               |              |                |       | Jenks                  | Caspall                                   |                |                         |          |  |
| Community Resilience Methodologies               |               |              |                |       | ÷                      |   |                |                         |          |  |
| # of 8   | ANDRI         | BRIC         | CDRI           | (     | CRI2                   | DROP                                      | RCI            | SVI                     | TCRI     |  |
| 4  |               | Х            | Х              |       | Х                      | Х   |                |                         |          |  |
| Connection to                                    | Resilience    |              |                |       |                        |   |                |                         |          |  |
| Affiliation with                                 | a religious   | organizatio  | n or civic org | ganiz | ation ca               | an be used a                              | is a proxy m   | easure for s            | ocial    |  |
| connectedness                                    | s, and how r  | nuch a com   | munity may     | be a  | ble to r               | ely on the g                              | ood will of o  | other local c           | itizens, |  |
| leading to reci                                  | procity and   | mutually be  | neficial coo   | pera  | tion. <sup>b,d,d</sup> | e   |                |                         |          |  |
| Religious adhe                                   | rents can ac  | cess additio | onal support   | bey   | ond the                | eir family an                             | d neighbors    | . Religious             |          |  |
| organizations a                                  | are often or  | ganized to a | ctively prov   | ide p | physical               | and social s                              | upport to th   | neir congreg            | ations   |  |
| and communit                                     | ies during ti | mes of indiv | idual and c    | omm   | nunity c               | risis. <sup>b,c,d</sup>                   |                |                         |          |  |

| Presence of Mobile Homes: Census Tract and County Data |              |                         |                      |       |                |  |           |       |                |          |
|--|--------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|----------------|--|-----------|-------|----------------|----------|
| Metric   |              |                         |                      |       | Data           | Source   |           |       |                |          |
| Percentage of mobile homes                             |              |                         |                      |       | ACS 2          | ACS 2015–2019 five-year estimates, Table DP04    |           |       |                |          |
| National Average                                       |              |                         |                      |       |                | ng Methods                                       |           |       |                |          |
| 6.2% of housing units are mobile homes                 |              |                         |                      |       | Censu<br>Jenks | Census Tract: Fisher County: Jenks Caspall Jenks |           |       |                |          |
| Community Resilience Methodologies                     |              |                         |                      |       |                |  |           |       |                |          |
| # of 8   | ANDRI        | BRIC                    | CDRI                 | CRI2  |                | DROP   | RCI       |       | SVI            | TCRI     |
| 4  | Х            | Х                       |                      |       |                | Х  |           |       | Х              |          |
| Connection to  | Resilience   |                         |                      |       |                |  |           |       |                |          |
| Higher numbe   | rs of mobile | homes in a              | community            | are   | related        | to lower lev                                     | els of re | silie | ence becaus    | e of the |
| lower-quality of                                       | construction | of these ho             | omes and lac         | ck of | basem          | ents, which                                      | makes th  | nem   | n particularly | /        |
| susceptible to   | damage fro   | m hazards. <sup>b</sup> | ,e,g                 |       |                |  |           |       |                |          |
| Mobile homes   | are frequer  | ntly found o            | utside of me         | etrop | olitan a       | reas that m                                      | ay not b  | e re  | eadily access  | ible by  |
| interstate high  | ways or put  | olic transpor           | tation. <sup>g</sup> |       |                |  |           |       |                |          |

| Public School Capacity: County Data  |             |             |      |   |   |        |     |     |      |  |
|--|-------------|-------------|------|---|---|--------|-----|-----|------|--|
| Metric   | tric        |             |      |   |   | Source |     |     |      |  |
| The number of public schools per 5,000 population  |             |             |      |   | U.S. Department of Education. National Center for<br>Education Statistics. Elementary/Secondary<br>Information System. 2018-2019 school year.<br><u>https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi/</u> |        |     |     |      |  |
| National Average   |             |             |      |   | Binning Method  |        |     |     |      |  |
| 1.53 schools per 5,000 population  |             |             |      |   | Head Tail Breaks  |        |     |     |      |  |
| Community Re   | silience Me | thodologies |      |   |   |        |     |     |      |  |
| # of 8   | ANDRI       | BRIC        | CDRI | C | RI2   | DROP   | RCI | SVI | TCRI |  |
| 4  |             | Х           | Х    |   |   | Х      |     |     | Х    |  |
| Connection to  | Resilience  |             |      |   |   |        |     |     |      |  |
| Public schools are a measure of response and recovery capacity, as they represent the community's ability to provide safe shelter for individuals and facilitate evacuations. <sup>b,c,e,h</sup> |             |             |      |   |   |        |     |     |      |  |
| More availability of schools can increase the ability to maintain schooling after a disaster <sup>b</sup>  |             |             |      |   |   |        |     |     |      |  |

| Population Change: County Data     |                              |                        |                     |        |  |               |                |                |                        |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------|--|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Metric                             |                              |                        |                     |        | Data                                     | Source        |                |                |                        |
| The net migrat                     | ion (interna                 | tional and c           | lomestic) of        |        | U.S. C                                   | Census Burea  | au, Populati   | on Division.   | Table:                 |
| individuals.                       |                              |                        |                     |        | Popu                                     | lation, Popu  | lation Cha     | nge, and Es    | timated                |
|                                    |                              |                        |                     |        | Components of Population Change: April 1 |               |                |                |                        |
|                                    |                              |                        |                     |        | to Jul                                   | y 1, 2019 (C  | O-EST2019      | )-alldata)     |                        |
| National Avera                     | ige                          |                        |                     |        | Binniı                                   | ng Method     |                |                |                        |
| The average co                     | ounty popula                 | ation has gr           | own by 274          |        | Jenks                                    | Caspall       |                |                |                        |
| people due to                      | migration fr                 | om July 201            | 5 to July 201       | 19     |  |               |                |                |                        |
| Community Posiliance Mathadologies |                              |                        |                     |        |  |               |                |                |                        |
| # of 8                             |                              | BRIC                   | CDRI                |        | `RI2                                     |               | RCI            | SV/I           | TCRI                   |
| # 01 0<br>                         | X                            | X                      | CDIN                |        | X  | DIGI          | X              | 501            | TCINI                  |
| Connection to                      | Resilience                   | Λ                      |                     |        | <u></u>                                  |               | Λ              | I              | <u> </u>               |
| Communities                        | where large                  | numbers of             | residents ha        | ave li | ived for                                 | extended p    | eriods are l   | ikely to have  | e strong               |
| place attachm                      | ent, be inve                 | sted in the v          | vell-being of       | the    | commi                                    | unity before  | a disaster.    | and willing t  | o respond              |
| to revitalize a                    | community                    | after a disas          | ter. <sup>b,f</sup> |        |  |               |                |                |                        |
| Familiarity can                    | help individ                 | luals naviga           | te a commu          | nity   | during                                   | an acute cris | sis, as well a | is know how    | to access              |
| ,<br>services after t              | he crisis has                | s passed. <sup>f</sup> |                     | ,      | 0  |               |                |                |                        |
| A rapid influx of                  | of new resid                 | ents may re            | sult in lower       | leve   | els of at                                | tachment to   | the comm       | unity, less fa | amiliarity             |
| with local haza                    | ords and how                 | v to prepare           | for them, a         | nd fe  | ewer co                                  | ommunity co   | onnections t   | that can pro   | vide                   |
| support during                     | g a crisis. <sup>b,d,f</sup> |                        |                     |        |  |               |                |                |                        |
| A reduction in                     | population                   | will reduce            | ocal tax inco       | ome    | and co                                   | mmunity res   | sources to r   | espond to a    | disaster. <sup>b</sup> |

| Hotel/Motel Capacity: County Data              |   |             |              |        |                  |   |               |              |       |  |
|--|---|-------------|--------------|--------|------------------|---|---------------|--------------|-------|--|
| Metric   | 1etric  |             |              |        |                  | Source  |               |              |       |  |
| The number o<br>5,000 populati                 | er of hotels/motels/casinos per<br>Ilation  |             |              |        |                  | U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 County Business<br>Patterns <sup>5</sup> , Table 00A1, NAICS Codes 72111 and<br>721120 |               |              |       |  |
| National Average                               |   |             |              |        | Binniı           | ng Method   |               |              |       |  |
| .90 hotels/motels/casinos per 5,000 population |   |             |              |        | Head Tail Breaks |   |               |              |       |  |
| Community Resilience Methodologies             |   |             |              |        |                  |   |               |              |       |  |
| # of 8   | ANDRI   | BRIC        | CDRI         | C      | CRI2             | DROP  | RCI           | SVI          | TCRI  |  |
| 3  |   | Х           | Х            |        |                  |   | Х             |              |       |  |
| Connection to                                  | Resilience  |             |              |        |                  |   |               |              |       |  |
| Hotels and mo                                  | tels can pro  | vide import | ant capacity | / to h | ouse in          | dividuals wl  | no have to le | eave their h | omes, |  |
| either to find s                               | either to find safe shelter from the disaster or as temporary housing during the recovery phase. <sup>b,e</sup> |             |              |        |                  |   | ,e            |              |       |  |
| Fewer local ho                                 | Fewer local hotels and motels may mean that individuals have to leave an area, making recovery from a           |             |              |        |                  |   |               |              |       |  |
| disaster more                                  | disaster more difficult. <sup>a</sup>   |             |              |        |                  |   |               |              |       |  |

| Rental Property Capacity: Census Tract and County Data |              |                |               |       |  |                            |           |       |                      |                    |  |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------|--|----------------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|--------------------|--|
| Metric   |              |                |               |       | Data   | Source                     |           |       |                      |                    |  |
| Rental Vacancy Rate of Total Housing Units             |              |                |               |       | ACS 2015–2019 five-year estimates, Table DP04 <sup>6</sup> |                            |           |       |                      |                    |  |
| National Average                                       |              |                |               |       | Binnii   | ng Methods                 |           |       |                      |                    |  |
| 6% rental vacancy rate                                 |              |                |               |       | Census Tract: Fisher<br>Jenks                              |                            |           | Co    | County: Fisher Jenks |                    |  |
| Community Resilience Methodologies                     |              |                |               |       |  |                            |           |       |                      |                    |  |
| # of 8   | ANDRI        | BRIC           | CDRI          | C     | CRI2   | DROP                       | RCI       |       | SVI                  | TCRI               |  |
| 3  |              | Х              | Х             |       |  | Х                          |           |       |                      |                    |  |
| Connection to  | Resilience   |                |               |       |  |                            |           |       |                      |                    |  |
| While low num  | nbers of vac | ant housing    | units may s   | eem   | to be a  | positive inc               | licator o | f ec  | conomic resi         | lience, it         |  |
| does denote a  | lack of phys | sical capacity | y to house ii | ndivi | duals w  | ho have bee                | en displa | ced   | d by a disaste       | er. <sup>b,e</sup> |  |
| A greater pres   | ence of vaca | ant housing    | units provid  | es in | nmedia   | tely availabl              | e housin  | ig st | tock so resid        | ents do            |  |
| not need to le   | ave their co | mmunities b    | ecause of a   | lack  | of hous  | sing stock. <sup>b,e</sup> | 2         |       |                      |                    |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The 2020 RAPT update includes Rental Vacancy Rate data from Table DP02 because it provides both census tract and county-level data. Table B25004 was used in previous versions but only provides county-level data.

### **Connection to Resilience Key:**

- <sup>a</sup> ANDRI: Phil Morley, Melissa Parsons, and Sarb Johal, 2017, "The Australian Natural Disaster Resilience Index: A System for Assessing the Resilience of Australian Communities to Natural Hazards," *Bushfire & Natural Hazards CRC*. Available at <u>https://www.bnhcrc.com.au/research/hazard-resilience/251</u>, accessed Match 27, 2018.
- <sup>b</sup> BRIC: Susan L. Cutter, Kevin D. Ash, and Christopher T. Emrich, 2014, "The Geographies of Community Disaster Resilience," *Global Environmental Change* 29, 65–77.
- <sup>c</sup> CDRI: Walter Gillis Peacock, et al., 2010, "Advancing Resilience of Coastal Localities: Developing, Implementing, and Sustaining the Use of Coastal Resilience Indicators: A Final Report," *Hazard Reduction and Recovery Center*, December. Available at <a href="https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ea56/1b67fb9fa11964a32e99c4da14ad32dd39de.pdf">https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/ea56/1b67fb9fa11964a32e99c4da14ad32dd39de.pdf</a>, accessed April 6, 2018.
- <sup>d</sup> CRI2: Kathleen Sherrieb, Fran H. Norris, and Sandro Galea, 2010, "Measuring Capacities for Community Resilience," *Social Indicators Research* 99: 227–247.
- <sup>e</sup> DROP: Susan L. Cutter, Christopher G. Burton, and Christopher T. Emrich, 2010, "Disaster Resilience Indicators for Benchmarking Baseline Conditions," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 7. Available at http://resiliencesystem.com/sites/default/files/Cutter\_jhsem.2010.7.1.1732.pdf, accessed April 6, 2018.
- <sup>f</sup> RCI: Kathryn A. Foster, 2014, "Resilience Capacity Index," Disaster Resilience Measurements: Stocktaking of Ongoing Efforts in Developing Systems for Measuring Resilience, United Nations Development Programme, 38. Available at https://www.preventionweb.net/files/37916\_disasterresiliencemeasurementsundpt.pdf, accessed April 6, 2018.
- g SVI: Barry E. Flanagan, et al., 2011, "A Social Vulnerability Index for Disaster Management," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 8. Available at <a href="https://svi.cdc.gov/Documents/Data/A%20Social%20Vulnerability%20Index%20for%20Disaster%20Management.pdf">https://svi.cdc.gov/Documents/Data/A%20Social%20Vulnerability%20Index%20for%20Disaster%20Management.pdf</a>, accessed April 6, 2018.
- <sup>h</sup> TCRI: T. Perfrement and T. Lloyd, 2015, "The Resilience Index: The Modelling Tool to Measure and Improve Community Resilience to Natural Hazards," *The Resilience Index*. Available at <u>https://theresilienceindex.weebly.com/our-solution.html</u>, accessed April 6, 2018.

### **Individual Indicator Binning Methodology**

To map the data for each indicator, the research team used the Python Spatial Analysis Library, PySAL, and its Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis sub-package. Python is an open-source, high-level programming language that is used in social science research. The package includes nine potential binning methods.<sup>7</sup>

Many classification methods group the data into bins based on mathematically determined "breaks" in the data. Instead of making arbitrary cuts in the data, these methods allowed the research team to group counties and census tracts that are close in value to each other and maximize the variance between bins. The team evaluated which binning method best fit the relationships of the breaks to that indicator's means and medians and could be consistently replicated. This analysis identified three binning methods as the best fit for the resilience indicators.

For the county-level datasets, the research team binned the dataset into 5 bins. For the indicators with census tract data, the research team binned the dataset into 7 bins to allow greater differentiation for this much larger dataset. For three of the 12 indicators with both county and census tract data, a different binning methodology was used to bin the county data and the census tract data.

#### Fisher-Jenks Breaks

The method aims to return class breaks such that classes are "internally homogenous while assuring heterogeneity among classes." The Python toolkit calculates squared deviations against class means.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The Python Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis package includes the following nine binning methods: Jenks Natural Breaks, Fisher-Jenks Breaks, Jenks-Caspall Breaks, Head/Tail Breaks, Maximum Breaks, Equal Intervals, Quantile, Percentiles, and Standard Deviation from the Mean.

#### Jenks-Caspall Breaks

The method aims to minimize the absolute deviation from within-class medians. Python's calculation focuses on within-class absolute deviations from the median.

#### Head/Tail Breaks

Algorithmically optimal breaks and the number of classes are based on the dataset itself. The Head/Tails Breaks method<sup>8</sup> works well with heavily tailed datasets, iterating through the data to minimize around the mean.

#### Other

In specific cases, the team used alternative criteria to select binning methodologies.

- <u>Income</u>: a convention for displaying income data already exists: \$0–20,000, \$20,001–\$40,000, etc. (an intuitive methodology that is similar to equal intervals).
- <u>Population change</u>: The population change dataset is provided by the U.S. Census as "net migration,"<sup>9</sup> which provides a positive (increase in population) or negative (decrease in population) number. Large population changes in either direction could cause challenges to resilience. The team chose to represent the population change data as standard deviations from zero, where less change is preferred to more change (regardless of whether the change is positive or negative).

### **Aggregate Indicator Binning Methodology**

The team developed a process to aggregate the county data from all 20 commonly used community resilience indicators to produce a map that shows relative resilience by county. The team first oriented all of the datasets in the same direction (higher number represents higher resilience) and then converted each county's data point to a standardized score value based on how many standard deviations above or below the indicator's national mean it was (except for population change calculated as standard deviations from zero). For datasets where data for a specific county were missing, the mean for that indicator was used to ensure that the aggregate value for the country was not increased or reduced by the missing data. The team then averaged the 20 standardized score values for each county to create an aggregated indicator by county. Because there is no validated weighting scheme for resilience indicators, the research team did not weight individual indicators in developing the aggregated indicator. Finally, the team sorted the county-level aggregated indicator into five bins based on standard deviation above or below the average.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Jiang, B., 2013, *Head/tail Breaks: A New Classification Scheme for Data with a Heavy-tailed Distribution.* The Professional Geographer, 65, 482-494.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> U.S. Census Bureau. <u>https://www.census.gov/glossary/#term\_Netmigration</u>, accessed April 6, 2018.