

Number of Eligible Districts at Various Eligibility Levels

	# of Districts Eligible at 20%	# of Districts Eligible at 25%	# of Districts Eligible at 30%
ALABAMA	67	35	28
ALASKA	16	13	10
ARIZONA	110	85	69
ARKANSAS	190	120	74
CALIFORNIA	226	137	105
COLORADO	64	42	27
CONNECTICUT	7	7	5
DELAWARE	5	1	1
FLORIDA	43	21	13
GEORGIA	117	86	59
HAWAII	1	1	1
IDAHO	26	6	4
ILLINOIS	87	35	23
INDIANA	24	7	4
IOWA	29	3	2
KANSAS	59	21	6
KENTUCKY	115	85	63
LOUISIANA	52	14	37
MAINE	56	26	17
MARYLAND	4	2	2
MASSACHUSETTS	24	11	10
MICHIGAN	147	83	48
MINNESOTA	64	22	26
MISSISSIPPI	119	103	79
MISSOURI	232	156	97
MONTANA	98	70	52
NEBRASKA	111	77	59
NEVADA	3	1	1
NEW.HAMPSHIRE	14	6	4
NEW.JERSEY	39	24	21
NEW.MEXICO	71	57	46
NEW.YORK	98	37	21
NORTH.CAROLINA	48	23	15
NORTH.DAKOTA	76	48	34
OHIO	102	57	39
OKLAHOMA	297	205	140
OREGON	53	21	14
PENNSYLVANIA	102	41	26
RHODE.ISLAND	3	2	2
SOUTH.CAROLINA	51	35	27
SOUTH.DAKOTA	72	42	33
TENNESSEE	82	36	26
TEXAS	576	409	286
UTAH	3	1	1
VERMONT	32	16	9
VIRGINIA	43	23	8
WASHINGTON	100	66	47
WEST.VIRGINIA	41	28	14
WISCONSIN	47	20	8
WYOMING	11	6	4
DISTRICT.OF.COLUMBIA	1	1	1
PUERTO RICO	1	1	1
Total	4059	2475	1749

Note: All columns include districts with more than 10,000 poor children

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Children	Total Children	Pov. %	Locale Code
The Republicans				
Tom Petri WI-06				
ADAMS-FRIENDSHIP AREA S	466	1,842	25.30%	7
CASHTON SCH DIST	286	868	32.95%	7
MONTELLO SCH DIST	186	925	20.11%	7
NECEDAH AREA SCH DIST	151	655	23.05%	7
TRI-COUNTY AREA SCH DIST	157	775	20.26%	7
WAUTOMA AREA SCH DIST	347	1,443	24.05%	7
Marge Roukema NJ-5				
	none			
Cass Ballenger NC-10				
STATESVILLE CITY	763	2,949	25.87%	.
Howard P. McKeon CA-25				
	none			
Michael N. Castle DE-At Large				
CAPITAL SCH DIST	1452	6869	21.14%	4
INDIAN RIVER SCH DIST	1185	5840	20.29%	7
LAKE FOREST SCH DIST	688	3284	20.95%	7
LAUREL SCH DIST	474	2135	22.20%	6
WOODBIDGE SCH DIST	724	1924	37.63%	7
Joe Knollenberg MI-11				
	none			
James M. Talent MO-2				
	none			
Frank Riggs CA-1				
ARENA UNION ELEMENTARY	96	455	21.10%	7
BIG LAGOON UNION ELEMENT	46	180	25.56%	7
BRIDGEVILLE ELEMENTARY	56	215	26.05%	7
CLOVERDALE UNIFIED	304	1470	20.68%	3
DEL NORTE COUNTY UNIFIED	1151	4549	25.30%	6
FLIELDBROOK ELEMENTARY	56	211	26.54%	6
KELSEYVILLE UNIFIED	429	1695	25.31%	6
KLAMATH-TRINITY JOINT UN	522	1385	37.69%	7
KONOCTI UNIFIED	1003	2980	33.66%	6
LAYTONVILLE UNIFIED	115	560	20.54%	7

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Children	Total Children	Pov. %	Locale Code
The Republicans				
LOLETA UNION ELEMENTARY	37	157	23.57%	7
LUCERNE ELEMENTARY	129	452	28.54%	7
MANCHESTER UNION ELEMENT	45	114	39.47%	7
MATTOLE UNION ELEMENTARY	47	129	36.43%	
MENDOCINO UNIFIED	245	971	25.23%	7
ORICK ELEMENTARY	48	95	50.53%	7
PACIFIC UNION ELEMENTARY	251	562	44.66%	1
PENINSULA UNION ELEMENTA	62	278	22.30%	7
RIO DELL ELEMENTARY	157	621	25.28%	6
ROUND VALLEY UNIFIED	198	500	39.60%	7
SOUTHERN TRINITY JOINT U	35	168	20.83%	7
UPPER LAKE UNION ELEMENT	194	898	21.60%	7
Bill Goodling PA-19				
YORK CITY S D	2770	7416	37.35%	2
Sam Johnson TX-3				
BLUE RIDGE ISD	100	388	25.77%	7
MCKINNEY ISD	1229	5075	24.22%	3
James Greenwood PA-8				
none				
Lindsey Graham SC-3				
LAURENS SCHOOL DISTRICT	795	3817	20.83%	6
LEXINGTON SCHOOL DISTRIC	355	1736	20.45%	7
MCCORMICK COUNTY SCH DIS	431	1718	25.09%	7
SALUDA COUNTY SCH DIST	550	2289	24.03%	6
ARANSAS CO ISD	1049	2872	36.53%	6
BASTROP ISD	1083	4404	24.59%	3
BAY CITY ISD	1203	4653	25.85%	6
BLOOMINGTON ISD	332	839	39.57%	7
BOLING ISD	207	783	26.44%	7
CALDWELL ISD	403	1566	25.73%	6
CALHOUN CO ISD	987	4234	23.31%	6
COUPLAND ISD	28	119	23.53%	7
DAWSON ISD	38	96	39.58%	7
DIME BOX ISD	119	211	56.40%	7
EDNA ISD	470	1534	30.64%	6
EL CAMPO ISD	1034	3935	26.28%	6
FLATONIA ISD	182	556	32.73%	7
GONZALES ISD	774	2382	32.49%	6
GRANGER ISD	121	347	34.87%	7
HEMPSTEAD ISD	238	914	26.04%	3
LEXINGTON ISD	190	832	22.84%	7
LOUISE ISD	132	608	21.71%	7
LOCKHART ISD	1175	3442	34.14%	3

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Children	Total Children	Pov. %	Locale Code
The Republicans				
MCFADDIN ISD	10	27	37.04%	
NIXON-SMILEY CONS ISD	327	968	33.78%	7
NURSERY ISD	74	205	36.10%	2
PALACIOS ISD	624	1587	39.32%	6
PRAIRIE LEA ISD	88	221	39.82%	7
REFUGIO ISD	216	911	23.71%	6
RICE CONS ISD	522	1475	35.39%	7
ROYAL ISD	523	1246	41.97%	3
SAN MARCOS ISD	1864	6678	27.91%	2
SNOOK ISD	112	424	26.42%	7
SOMERVILLE ISD	160	594	26.94%	7
	48	208	23.08%	7
John Peterson PA-5				
AUSTIN AREA S D				
BRADFORD AREA S D	912	3723	24.50%	6
CLARION-LIMESTONE A S D	268	1231	21.77%	7
CRANBERRY AREA S D	423	1942	21.78%	7
GALETON AREA S D	142	532	26.69%	7
KEYSTONE CENTRAL S D	1318	6147	21.44%	7
NORTH CLARION CO S D	226	1108	20.40%	7
NORTHERN POTTER S D	220	978	22.49%	7
NORTHERN TIOGA S D	727	2941	24.72%	7
OIL CITY AREA S D	708	3180	22.26%	6
OSWAYO VALLEY S D	140	672	20.83%	7
OTTO ELDRED S D	202	972	20.78%	7
PORT ALLEGANY S D	257	1274	20.17%	7
PUNXSUTAWNEY AREA S D	845	4072	20.75%	6
TITUSVILLE AREA S D	666	3126	21.31%	6
UNION S D	280	947	29.57%	7
Van Hilleary TN-4				
BEDFORD CO SCH DIST	1191	5788	20.58%	6
CAMPBELL CO SCH DIST	2387	6804	35.08%	7
CLAIBORNE CO SCH DIST	1608	5100	31.53%	7
COFFEE CO SCH DIST	702	3416	20.55%	6
CLEVELAND CITY SCH DIST	1280	4862	26.33%	5
CUMBERLAND CO SCH DIST	1571	6082	25.83%	6
DAYTON CITY ELEM SCH DIS	340	1061	32.05%	6
FAYETTEVILLE CITY ELEM S	331	1128	29.34%	6
FENTRESS CO SCH DIST	1091	2903	37.58%	7
GILES CO SCH DIST	975	4714	20.68%	6
GRAINGER CO SCH DIST	801	3100	25.84%	7
HARDIN CO SCH DIST	1141	4191	27.23%	6
MANCHESTER CITY SCH DIST	269	1331	20.21%	6
ONEIDA CITY SCH DIST	214	708	30.23%	6
PICKETT CO SCH DIST	211	811	26.02%	7
RHEA CO SCH DIST	776	3633	21.36%	7

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Children	Total Children	Pov. %	Locale Code
The Republicans				
SCOTT CO SCH DIST	1156	3373	34.27%	7
TULLAHOMA CITY SCH DIST	629	2978	21.12%	6
UNION CO SCH DIST	612	2707	22.61%	7
WARREN CO SCH DIST	1316	6101	21.57%	6
WAYNE CO SCH DIST	633	2600	24.35%	7
Harris Fawell IL-13				
ROCKDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT	84	386	21.76%	2
Peter Hoekstra MI-2				
BALDWIN COMMUNITY SCHOOL	554	989	56.02%	7
BEAR LAKE SCHOOL DISTRIC	61	286	21.33%	7
BUCKLEY COMM SCHOOL DIST	158	410	38.54%	7
MUSKEGON CITY SCHOOL DIS	3405	7479	45.53%	2
FERRY COMMUNITY SCHOOL D	89	260	34.23%	7
HART PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTR	423	1375	30.76%	7
HESPERIA COMM SCHOOL DIS	287	1069	26.85%	7
HOLTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS	357	1206	29.60%	7
KALEVA NORMAN DICKSON SC	254	785	32.36%	7
MANISTEE AREA PUBLIC SCH	507	2076	24.42%	6
MANTON CONSOLIDATED SCHO	241	815	29.57%	7
MARTIN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	209	1013	20.63%	7
MASON COUNTY CENTRAL SD	307	1387	22.13%	7
MESICK CONSOLIDATED SCH	208	802	25.94%	7
NEWAYGO PUBLIC SCHOOL DI	332	1421	23.36%	7
ORCHARD VIEW SCHOOLS	629	2369	26.55%	2
WALKERVILLE RURAL COMM S	101	281	35.94%	7
WHITE CLOUD PUBLIC SCHOO	396	1215	32.59%	7
CITY OF MUSKEGON HEIGHTS	1638	2962	55.30%	4
Mark Edward Souder IN-4				
SOUTH ADAMS SCHOOLS	609	2320	26.25%	4
WESTVIEW SCHOOL CORPORAT	899	3935	22.85%	7
ANDERSON COMMUNITY SCHOO	2841	13231	21.47%	2
MUNCIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	2666	10249	26.01%	2
RANDOLPH SOUTHERN SCHOOL	185	712	25.98%	7
EDINBURGH COMMUNITY SCH	269	1047	25.69%	3
RICHMOND COMMUNITY SCHOO	1936	8031	24.11%	5
Charlie Norwood GA-10				
CLARKE COUNTY SCH DIST	3409	12379	27.54%	2
ELBERT COUNTY SCH DIST	965	3831	25.19%	6
FRANKLIN COUNTY SCH DIST	685	2832	24.19%	7
JEFFERSON CITY SCH DIST	131	515	25.44%	6
LINCOLN COUNTY SCH DIST	347	1521	22.81%	7
MADISON COUNTY SCH DIST	892	4065	21.94%	7

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Children	Total Children	Pov. %	Locale Code
The Republicans				
RICHMOND COUNTY SCH DIST	9833	36464	26.97%	2
WILKES COUNTY SCH DIST	545	2135	25.53%	6
MCDUFFIE COUNTY SCH DIST	1210	4224	28.65%	4
Robert Schaeffer CO-4				
AGUILAR REORGANIZED 6	73	123	59.35%	7
AKRON R-1	97	452	21.46%	7
ARRIBA-FLAGLER C-20	62	248	25.00%	7
AULT-HIGHLAND RE-9	261	907	28.78%	7
BYERS 32J	86	270	31.85%	7
CHERAW 31	48	213	22.54%	7
CROWLEY COUNTY RE-1	174	536	32.46%	7
DEER TRAIL 26J	35	148	23.65%	7
FORT MORGAN RE-3	623	2844	21.91%	6
FOWLER R-4J	119	433	27.48%	7
GRANADA RE-1	79	240	32.92%	7
GREELEY 6	2958	12828	23.06%	2
KARVAL RE-2	19	94	20.21%	7
KIM REORGANIZED 88	26	66	39.39%	7
LAMAR RE-2	610	2309	26.42%	6
LAS ANIMAS RE-1	187	849	22.03%	7
LONE STAR 101	14	57	24.56%	7
MANZANOLA 3J	76	210	36.19%	7
MC CLAVE RE-2	35	165	21.21%	7
MIAMI/YODER 60 J	82	191	42.93%	7
ROCKY FORD R-2	604	1341	45.04%	6
PRAIRIE RE-1	32	100	32.00%	7
PRIMERO REORGANIZED 2	52	231	22.51%	7
WILEY RE-1	57	281	20.28%	7
FORT LUPTON RE-8	526	2230	23.59%	3
Fred Upton GA-6				
BANGOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS	690	1742	39.61%	7
BENTON HARBOR AREA SCHOO	4568	8114	56.30%	2
BLOOMINGDALE PUBLIC SCH	474	1235	38.38%	7
CASSOPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOL	486	1668	29.14%	7
COVERT PUBLIC SCHOOLS	380	608	62.50%	7
DECATUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS	339	1191	28.46%	7
HAGAR TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DI	19	81	23.46%	7
HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOL D	485	1456	33.31%	7
KALAMAZOO CITY SCHOOL DI	4620	15243	30.31%	2
MARCELLUS COMMUNITY SCHO	185	913	20.26%	7
NEW BUFFALO AREA SCHOOL	203	901	22.53%	7
THREE RIVERS COMMUNITY S	747	3481	21.46%	6
SOUTH HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOO	856	3061	27.96%	4

Nathan Deal GA-9

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Children	Total Children	Pov. %	Locale Code
The Republicans				
BUFORD CITY SCH DIST	391	1672	23.39%	3
CALHOUN COUNTY SCH DIST	443	1122	39.48%	7
DALTON CITY SCH DIST	803	3722	21.57%	6
FANNIN COUNTY SCH DIST	632	2774	22.78%	7
GAINESVILLE CITY SCH DIS	963	2984	32.27%	6
GILMER COUNTY SCH DIST	564	2472	22.82%	7
STEPHENS COUNTY SCH DIST	1026	3958	25.92%	6
UNION COUNTY SCH DIST	479	2021	23.70%	7
Joe Scarborough FL-1				
ESCAMBIA COUNTY SCH DIST	13351	47073	28.36%	2
HOLMES COUNTY SCH DIST	950	2963	32.06%	6
WALTON COUNTY SCH DIST	1465	4780	30.65%	
SANTA ROSA COUNTY SCH DI	3421	15844	21.59%	4

Bill Barrett NE-3

About 155 districts qualify

Locale Codes:

- 1=Large Central City
- 2=Mid-size Central City
- 3=Urban fringe of a large city
- 4=Urban fringe of a mid-size city
- 5=Large Town
- 6=Small Town
- 7=Rural Area

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Kids	Total Kids	Pov %	Locale Code
--	-----------	------------	-------	-------------

Democrats

William Clay MO-01

ST LOUIS CITY SCHOOL DIS	28,205	68,448	41.21%	1
JENNINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT	802	3,764	21.31%	3

George Miller CA -07

none

Dale E. Kildee MI-09

BEECHER COMMUNITY SCH DI	2,002	3,510	57.04%	2
BENDLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	548	1,562	35.08%	3
FLINT CITY SCHOOL DISTRI	13,475	29,739	45.31%	2
PONTIAC CITY SCHOOL DIST	6,608	16,426	40.23%	2
WESTWOOD HEIGHTS SCH DIS	341	1,432	23.81%	2

Matthew G. Martinez CA-31

ALHAMBRA CITY ELEMENTARY	4,616	18,319	25.20%	3
AZUSA UNIFIED	2,717	12,256	22.17%	3
BALDWIN PARK UNIFIED	4,457	17,146	25.99%	3
EL MONTE CITY SCHOOL DIS	4,576	16,759	27.30%	3
GARVEY ELEMENTARY	3,651	11,836	30.85%	3
MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY	4,819	13,536	35.60%	3
ROSEMEAD ELEMENTARY	1,214	4,594	26.43%	3

Major E. Owens NY-11

New York City

Donald M. Payne NJ-10

CITY OF ORANGE TWP	1,555	4,948	31.43%	3
EAST ORANGE	3,868	13,186	29.33%	3
ELIZABETH CITY	5,408	18,877	28.65%	3
IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	2,375	11,400	20.83%	3
JERSEY CITY	13,124	39,141	33.53%	2
NEWARK CITY	24,446	56,935	42.94%	1

Patsy Mink HI-02

Hawaii

Robert E. Andres NJ-01

CAMDEN CITY	12,359	21,757	56.80%	2
HI NELLA	54	140	38.57%	
LAUREL SPRINGS BORO	104	417	24.94%	3
PAULSBORO BORO	441	1,282	34.40%	3

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Kids	Total Kids	Pov %	Locale Code
Democrats				
WOODBURY CITY	395	1,963	20.12%	3
WOODLYNNE BORO	120	469	25.59%	3
Tim Roemer IN-03				
	none			
Robert C. Scott VA-03				
CHARLES CITY CO P S	245	1,171	20.92%	7
HOPEWELL CTY P S	1,053	4,235	24.86%	4
NORFOLK CTY P S	12,097	38,520	31.40%	1
PETERSBURG CTY P S	2,128	6,093	34.93%	2
RICHMOND CTY P S	10,858	28,394	38.24%	2
RICHMOND CO P S	314	1,247	25.18%	7
Lynn Woolsey CA-06				
GUERNEVILLE ELEMENTARY	197	777	25.35%	7
LAGUNA JOINT ELEMENTARY	15	62	24.19%	2
RESERVATION ELEMENTARY	7	14	50.00%	7
ROSELAND ELEMENTARY	363	1,662	21.84%	2
Carlos Romero-Barcelo PR				
Chaka Fattah PA-02				
PHILADELPHIA CITY S D	92,964	263,609	35.27%	1
Ruben Hinojosa TX-15				
ALICE ISD	2,232	6,199	36.01%	6
ARANSAS PASS ISD	867	2,119	40.92%	3
BEEVILLE ISD	1,509	4,762	31.69%	6
BROOKS ISD	830	1,940	42.78%	6
CUERO ISD	542	1,976	27.43%	6
DONNA ISD	3,991	6,717	59.42%	4
EDCOUCH-ELSA ISD	2,523	3,472	72.67%	4
EDINBURG ISD	7,942	15,241	52.11%	2
GEORGE WEST ISD	340	1,272	26.73%	6
GOLIAD ISD	261	1,212	21.53%	7
HIDALGO ISD	1,493	1,858	80.36%	4
INGLESIDE ISD	316	1,527	20.69%	3
KARNES CITY ISD	409	1,055	38.77%	6
KENEDY ISD	534	1,042	51.25%	6
LA GLORIA ISD	51	81	62.96%	6
LA JOYA ISD	5,718	8,162	70.06%	4

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Kids	Total Kids	Pov %	Locale Code
Democrats				
LA VILLA ISD	480	750	64.00%	7
LASARA ISD	152	278	54.68%	7
LAURELES ISD	8	24	33.33%	
LYFORD ISD	873	1,497	58.32%	7
MATHIS ISD	1,176	2,235	52.62%	3
MCALLEN ISD	9,574	20,738	46.17%	2
MERCEDES ISD	2,788	4,308	64.72%	4
MISSION CONS ISD	5,380	9,137	58.88%	2
MONTE ALTO ISD	366	650	56.31%	4
NORDHEIM ISD	36	92	39.13%	7
ODEM-EDROY ISD	337	1,278	26.37%	7
PAWNEE ISD	22	90	24.44%	7
PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	9,798	17,036	57.51%	4
PROGRESO ISD	986	1,289	76.49%	7
RAYMONDVILLE ISD	1,558	3,022	51.56%	6
RICARDO ISD	199	658	30.24%	5
RIVIERA ISD	149	394	37.82%	7
RUNGE ISD	198	394	50.25%	7
SHARYLAND ISD	1,392	2,928	47.54%	2
SINTON ISD	788	2,157	36.53%	3
SKIDMORE-TYNAN ISD	250	722	34.63%	7
TAFT ISD	720	1,590	45.28%	3
THREE RIVERS ISD	193	700	27.57%	7
VALLEY VIEW ISD	1,187	1,356	87.54%	4
WESLACO ISD	6,746	11,395	59.20%	4
WESTHOFF ISD	26	122	21.31%	7
YOAKUM ISD	494	1,726	28.62%	6
YORKTOWN ISD	258	822	31.39%	7

Carolyn McCarthy NY-04

HEMPSTEAD UNION FREE SCH	1,953	6,496	30.06%	3
ROOSEVELT UNION FREE SCH	623	3,058	20.37%	3

John F. Tierney MA-06

LYNN SCH DIST	4,351	13,326	32.65%	2
SALEM SCH DIST	1,252	4,610	27.16%	3

Ron Kind WI-03

ALMA CENTER SCH DIST	115	562	20.46%	7
AUGUSTA SCH DIST	334	939	35.57%	7
BLACK RIVER FALLS SCH D	368	1,809	20.34%	6
CHETEK SCH DIST	267	1,112	24.01%	7
CLEAR LAKE SCH DIST	167	703	23.76%	7

Authorizing Committee

	Poor Kids	Total Kids	Pov %	Locale Code
Democrats				
GILMANTON SCH DIST	64	242	26.45%	7
GRANTON AREA SCH DIST	117	526	22.24%	7
HILLSBORO SCH DIST	156	714	21.85%	7
LAFARGE SCH DIST	85	347	24.50%	7
NORTH CRAWFORD SCH DIST	135	635	21.26%	7
NORWALK-ONTARIO SCH DIST	149	596	25.00%	7
PLUM CITY SCH DIST	94	411	22.87%	7
SENECA SCH DIST	102	403	25.31%	7
STANLEY-BOYD AREA SCH DI	302	1,380	21.88%	7
WAUZEKA-STEUBEN SCH DIST	87	421	20.67%	7

Loretta Sanchez CA-46

GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED	8,981	43,709	20.55%	3
SANTA ANA UNIFIED	14,539	48,222	30.15%	1

Harold E. Ford, Jr. TN-09

MEMPHIS CITY SCH DIST	42,048	114,506	36.72%	1
-----------------------	--------	---------	--------	---

Dennis J. Kucinich OH-10

CLEVELAND CITY SD	47,631	93,049	51.19%	1
-------------------	--------	--------	--------	---

Locale Codes:

- 1=Large Central City
- 2=Mid-size Central City
- 3=Urban fringe of a large city
- 4=Urban fringe of a mid-size city
- 5=Large Town
- 6=Small Town
- 7=Rural Area

Appropriations Committee

Rep.	Eligible School Districts	Children in Poverty	Total Children	Poverty%	Locale Code
The Republicans					
John Porter IL-10	none				
Bill Young FL-10	PINELLAS COUNTY SCH DIST	18355	106697	17.20%	2
Henry Bonilla TX-23	ALPINE ISD	348	1225	28.41%	6
	ASHERTON ISD	219	457	47.92%	7
	BALMORHEA ISD	130	257	50.58%	7
	BRACKETT ISD	232	598	38.80%	7
	BUENA VISTA ISD	42	148	28.38%	7
	CARRIZO SPRINGS CONS ISD	1245	2440	51.02%	6
	CROCKETT CO CONS CSD	312	931	33.51%	6
	CROCKETT ISD	770	1949	39.51%	6
	CRYSTAL CITY ISD	1124	2253	49.89%	6
	CULBERSON COUNTY ISD	281	883	31.82%	6
	DELL CITY ISD	51	197	25.89%	7
	DEVINE ISD	406	1538	26.40%	6
	EAGLE PASS ISD	6798	10300	66.00%	6
	ECTOR COUNTY ISD	7400	27213	27.19%	2
	FT HANCOCK ISD	198	359	55.15%	7
	FT STOCKTON ISD	1065	3040	35.03%	6
	GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY ISD	94	228	41.23%	7
	HONDO ISD	620	1793	34.58%	6
	IRAAN-SHEFFIELD ISD	137	630	21.75%	7
	KERMIT ISD	420	1843	22.79%	6
	KNIPPA ISD	71	230	30.87%	7
	LA PRYOR ISD	276	461	59.87%	7
	MARFA ISD	256	630	40.63%	7
	MEDINA VALLEY ISD	376	1815	20.72%	7
	MIDLAND ISD	4414	22010	20.05%	2
	NATALIA ISD	307	780	39.36%	7
	NUECES CANYON CONS ISD	155	340	45.59%	7
	PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD	1160	3839	30.22%	6
	PRESIDIO ISD	730	982	74.34%	6
	RANKIN ISD	101	390	25.90%	7
	SABINAL ISD	210	470	44.68%	7
	SIERRA BLANCA ISD	63	154	40.91%	7
	TERLINGUA CSD	28	110	25.45%	7
	TERRELL COUNTY ISD	88	334	26.35%	7
	UNITED ISD	4802	12685	37.86%	2
	UTOPIA ISD	64	138	46.38%	7
	UVALDE CONS ISD	2324	5111	45.47%	6
	VALENTINE ISD	52	105	49.52%	7
	WEBB CONS ISD	105	283	37.10%	7
	SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CONS	4452	9183	48.48%	5
Ernest Jim Istook OK-5					

Appropriations Committee

Rep.	Eligible School Districts	Children in Poverty	Total Children	Poverty%	Locale Code
Jay Dickey AK-4	BLACKWELL SCH DIST	365	1642	22.23%	6
	BOWRING SCH DIST	33	144	22.92%	7
	BRAMAN SCH DIST	30	145	20.69%	7
	CANEY SCH DIST	56	203	27.59%	7
	CRESCENT SCH DIST	196	615	31.87%	7
	LUTHER SCH DIST	187	779	24.01%	7
	OKLAHOMA CITY SCH DIST	15270	46268	33.00%	1
	PECKHAM SCH DIST	51	131	38.93%	7
	SHIDLER SCH DIST	66	270	24.44%	7
	ALTHEIMER SCH DIST	288	567	50.79%	7
	AMITY SCH DIST	74	316	23.42%	7
	ARKADELPHIA SCH DIST	609	2271	26.82%	6
	ARKANSAS CITY SCH DIST	62	148	41.89%	7
	BRADLEY SCH DIST	288	554	51.99%	7
	CADDO HILLS SCH DIST	181	584	30.99%	7
	DELTA SPECIAL SCH DIST	103	363	28.37%	7
	DERMOTT SCH DIST	797	1468	54.29%	6
	DOLLARWAY SCH DIST	872	2193	39.76%	2
	DUMAS SCH DIST	739	2160	34.21%	6
	EL DORADO SCHOOL DISTRICT	1569	5734	27.36%	6
	EMMET SCH DIST	39	168	23.21%	7
	FAIRVIEW SCH DIST	572	2372	24.11%	6
	FORDYCE SCH DIST	334	1251	26.70%	6
	FOREMAN SCH DIST	216	667	32.38%	7
	DE QUEEN SCH DIST	408	1668	24.46%	6
	GARLAND SCH DIST	63	142	44.37%	
	GLENWOOD SCH DIST	126	548	22.99%	7
	GOULD SCH DIST	173	505	34.26%	7
	GRADY SCH DIST	144	338	42.60%	7
	GURDON SCH DIST	248	910	27.25%	7
	HAMBURG SCHOOL DISTRICT	614	1865	32.92%	6
	HERMITAGE SCH DIST	224	536	41.79%	7
	HOPE SCH DIST	878	3117	28.17%	6
	HORATIO SCH DIST	134	451	29.71%	7
	HOT SPRINGS ELEM # 14-J	64	167	38.32%	7
	HUTTIG SCH DIST	70	267	26.22%	7
	JUNCTION CITY SCH DIST	218	680	32.06%	7
	KIRBY SCH DIST	105	474	22.15%	7
	LAKESIDE SCH DIST	544	1357	40.09%	6
	LEWISVILLE SCH DIST	159	574	27.70%	7
	LOCKESBURG SCH DIST	103	513	20.08%	7
	MAGNOLIA SCHOOL DISTRICT	725	3082	23.52%	6
	MALVERN SCH DIST	645	2849	22.64%	6
	MC GEHEE SCH DIST	449	1238	36.27%	6
	MC NEIL SCH DIST	80	370	21.62%	7
	MONTICELLO SCH DIST	600	2193	27.36%	6
	MOUNT IDA SCH DIST	182	549	33.15%	7

Appropriations Committee

Rep.	Eligible School Districts	Children in Poverty	Total Children	Poverty%	Locale Code
	NASHVILLE SCH DIST	499	1866	26.74%	6
	ODEN SCH DIST	75	245	30.61%	7
	PARKDALE SCH DIST	64	115	55.65%	
	PINE BLUFF SCHOOL DISTRI	2779	7958	34.92%	2
	PRESCOTT SCH DIST	324	1272	25.47%	6
	RISON SCH DIST	196	707	27.72%	7
	SARATOGA SCH DIST	71	323	21.98%	7
	SMACKOVER SCH DIST	181	806	22.46%	7
	SPARKMAN SCH DIST	111	463	23.97%	7
	STAMPS SCH DIST	350	947	36.96%	7
	STEPHENS SCH DIST	229	672	34.08%	7
	STRONG SCH DIST	140	505	27.72%	7
	TAYLOR SCH DIST	179	319	56.11%	7
	TEXARKANA SCH DIST	1854	6364	29.13%	2
	UNION SCH DIST	76	327	23.24%	6
	WABBASEKA TUCKER	116	460	25.22%	
	WALDO SCH DIST	212	588	36.05%	7
	WALKER SCH DIST	137	202	67.82%	6
	WARREN SCHOOL DISTRICT	435	1734	25.09%	6
	WATSON CHAPEL SCH DIST	1079	3982	27.10%	2
	WASHINGTON SCH DIST	47	135	34.81%	
	WILMAR SCH DIST	78	271	28.78%	
	WINTHROP SCH DIST	37	160	23.13%	
Dan Miller Fla-13	none				
Anne Meagher Northup KY-3	JEFFERSON CO	24661	117001	21.08%	1
Roger Wicker MS-1	ABERDEEN SCHOOL DISTRICT	1051	2601	40.41%	6
	BALDWYN SEPARATE SCHOOL	233	1011	23.05%	6
	BENTON COUNTY SCHOOL DIS	617	1754	35.18%	7
	CALHOUN COUNTY SCHOOL DI	750	2941	25.50%	7
	CHOCTAW COUNTY SCHOOL DI	495	2101	23.56%	7
	COFFEEVILLE SCHOOL DISTR	389	1117	34.83%	7
	CORINTH SCHOOL DISTRICT	756	2111	35.81%	6
	EAST TALLAHATCHIE CON SC	824	2079	39.63%	7
	HOLLY SPRINGS SCHOOL DIS	862	2186	39.43%	6
	HOUSTON SEPARATE SCHOOL	562	2193	25.63%	6
	IUKA SEPARATE SCHOOL DIS	265	1070	24.77%	
	LEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRI	1094	5126	21.34%	7
	MARSHALL COUNTY SCHOOL D	1592	4402	36.17%	7
	MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOL	505	1379	36.62%	7
	NETTLETON SCHOOL DISTRIC	312	1322	23.60%	7
	NEW ALBANY PUBLIC SCHOOL	412	1850	22.27%	6
	NORTH PANOLA CON SCHOOL	1365	2681	50.91%	7
	NORTH TIPPAAH SCHOOL DIST	452	1314	34.40%	7
	OKOLONA SEPARATE SCHOOL	361	1288	28.03%	6
	OXFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT	608	2688	22.62%	6

Appropriations Committee

Rep.	Eligible School Districts	Children in Poverty	Total Children	Poverty%	Locale Code
	PONTOTOC CITY SCHOOLS	365	1823	20.02%	6
	PRENTISS COUNTY SCHOOL D	713	2987	23.87%	6
	SENATOBIA MUNICIPAL SCH	379	1278	29.66%	6
	SOUTH PANOLA SCHOOL DIST	1536	4477	34.31%	6
	SOUTH TIPPAAH SCHOOL DIST	545	2569	21.21%	6
	TATE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTR	928	3414	27.18%	7
	UNION PUBLIC SCHOOL DIST	228	716	31.84%	7
	WATER VALLEY SCHOOL DIST	385	1420	27.11%	6
	WEBSTER COUNTY SCHOOL DI	575	2094	27.46%	7
	WINONA SEPARATE SCHOOL D	560	1274	43.96%	6
Democrats					
Nancy Pelosi CA-8					
	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED	14964	81479	18.37%	1
Rosa DeLauro CT-3					
	NEW HAVEN SCH DIST	9159	20396	44.91%	2
Steny Hoyer MD-5					
	PRINCE GEORGES CO PUBLIC	10863	123165	8.82%	3
David Obey WI-7					
	ALMOND-BANCROFT SCH DIS	146	527	27.70%	7
	BAYFIELD SCH DIST	169	526	32.13%	7
	BRUCE SCH DIST	148	726	20.39%	7
	CHETEK SCH DIST	267	1112	24.01%	7
	DRUMMOND SCH DIST	85	418	20.33%	7
	GILMANTON SCH DIST	64	242	26.45%	7
	GLIDDEN SCH DIST	75	322	23.29%	7
	HAYWARD COMMUNITY SCH DI	607	2101	28.89%	7
	LAKE HOLCOMBE SCH DIST	107	518	20.66%	7
	SIREN SCH DIST	127	452	28.10%	7
	FLAMBEAU SCH DIST	206	800	25.75%	7
	WINTER SCH DIST	135	510	26.47%	7
Louis Stokes OH-11					
	CLEVELAND CITY SD	47631	93049	51.19%	1
	EAST CLEVELAND CITY SD	3390	7670	44.20%	3
Nita Lowey NY-18					
	YONKERS CITY SCHOOLS	6282	27571	22.78%	3

Locale Codes:

- 1=Large Central City
- 2=Mid-size Central City
- 3=Urban fringe of a large city
- 4=Urban fringe of a mid-size city
- 5=Large Town
- 6=Small Town
- 7=Rural Area

T. Corwin
12/11/97

Eligibility of LEAs for Education Opportunity Zones Program

1. A couple weeks ago, people made a tentative decision to use, for the Opportunities Zones program, the same eligibility criteria that the Administration has proposed for the HEA Title V "Recruiting New Teachers for Underserved Areas" program.

Under that proposal, "underserved areas" are defined as LEAs that:

- Serve an area in which at least 20 percent of the school-aged children are from low-income families or in which there are at least 10,000 such children; or
- Are among the three LEAs serving the highest numbers of children from low-income families in the State.

These criteria seem to do a good job at limiting eligibility to LEAs with significant concentrations of poor children (a decision we reached, for Title V, after looking at which districts would and wouldn't qualify, under these criteria versus some competing ones). In all, an estimated 4,272 LEAs, or 28 percent of "regular" (non- special ed or other special purpose) LEAs would qualify.¹ They serve about 17.7 million children, including 5.5 million poor children (slightly over 59 percent of poor children nationally).

Virtually all (99.5 percent) of the eligible districts would qualify under the 20 percent criterion, a level that seemed to do the best job of differentiating the poor from the non-poor districts. Allowing LEAs with 10,000 poor kids but not 20 percent poverty to participate also seemed like a good idea because a group of large but not so poor cities, which we thought ought to be eligible, only qualified on that basis.² Finally, late in the process we added the additional criterion, making eligible the three LEAs serving the highest numbers of poor kids, because, without this provision: (1) In Nevada, only one LEA would be eligible, and in a few other States there weren't very many (although, as I recall, they at least had 3), and (2) the largest cities in a

¹A word here about the data used in this analysis: the Department does not actually have current data on numbers and percentages of poor kids by LEA. We do have data of that nature from the 1990 Census, and we have updated, 1995 data by county (but not LEA). The data set I am drawing from was constructed on the assumption that the relative distribution of poor kids within counties stayed constant between 1990 and 1995. In my analysis for the Title V deliberations I referred to this as a "synthetic" data base. Since, then, however, I have learned that the Census Bureau is using the same type of methodology to produce Congressionally mandated updates of LEA child poverty data, so I am much more comfortable in using it here.

² Examples: San Francisco, Seattle, Portland (OR), Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Clark County (Las Vegas).

few States -- Iowa, Utah, Montana, a few others -- would have been cut out, and for political and maybe other reasons it seemed like a good idea to keep them in. In doing so, we added in, without thinking about it, at least a couple large, low-poverty suburban LEAs³, which we may not want to do in the Opportunity Zones program.

2. I suggested narrowing the range of eligibles to LEAs that: (1) met the poverty criteria; and (2) serve either urban (city) or rural communities.

This seemed to make sense, because we are framing the proposal as an urban-rural initiative. In addition, we can anticipate receiving many applications but making only a small number of awards, so it would save effort (for both potential applicants and the Department) to limit the universe of eligibles up front.

The NCES “Common Core of Data” codes school districts into the following categories:

1. Large central city (central city of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) with a population of 400,000 or more or a population density of 6,000 persons per square mile)
2. Mid-size central city (central city of an MSA, but not a city under category 1)
3. Urban fringe of a large city (place within the MSA of a large central city, but not the large central city itself)
4. Urban fringe of a mid-size city (place within the MSA of a mid-size city, but not the mid-size central city itself)
5. Large town (place not within an MSA, but with a population of at least 25,000 and defined as “urban”)
6. Small town (place not within an MSA, but with a population of 2,500-25,000)
7. Rural (place with a population of less than 2,500)
8. Unknown (districts that NCES can’t classify, including 273 that meet the poverty criteria)

I believe that these codings reflect official OMB/Census categories.

As a first cut, we had NCES do a run assuming that we would allow the participation only of LEAs that fall into categories 1, 2, 6, and 7. Categories 3 and 4 seemed to define suburbia, and category 5 seemed to define nonmetropolitan communities too large to be considered rural.

³ Fairfax County, VA (6.1 percent poverty), Baltimore County, MD (9.2 percent).

Obviously, these assumptions are open to debate. (See below.)

3. Results and Analysis

Leaving aside the issue of whether and how to include the three LEAs in the State with the largest numbers of poor children (which I'll get to a little later), the criteria set forth above would limit eligibility to about 3,742 LEAs, or 25 percent of regular LEAs nationally. This group of districts serves 15.3 million children, 4.8 million of them poor (or 51 percent of poor children in the Nation).

The vast majority (90 percent) of these districts are rural, and they particularly show up in poorer States that have many small districts. For example, 62 out of 127 districts in Alabama would qualify, and 56 of those districts are in categories 6 and 7. For Texas, 539 out of 1,043 districts would be eligible, and 501 of them are rural.

In the more urbanized, particularly northeastern States, by comparison, the eligible districts would be heavily urban. In Connecticut only 6 LEAs, all in category 2, would qualify. Similarly, 7 of the 8 eligible New Jersey districts fall into the urban categories.

Going with this option would, in addition to focusing the program more specifically on urban and rural areas, decrease the total number of eligible districts by about one-eighth while still focusing the program on districts with concentrations of poor children. The districts identified as eligible seem to be reasonably appropriate for the type of program we are developing. There would be quite a number of LEAs, particularly on the rural side, potentially competing for a small number of grants, but that may be avoidable. (See discussion below.)

4. Additional Issues and Options

A number of districts that probably should be eligible are in category 3 and thus didn't make the original cut. Category 3 includes 286 LEAs (with 1.5 million poor children), including a number of very urbanized ones. Some of them include:

California -- Compton, Fontana, Inglewood, Lynwood, Richmond

Florida -- Broward County

Georgia -- DeKalb County, Marietta

Kentucky -- Covington, Newport

Maryland -- Prince Georges County

Massachusetts -- Revere, Salem, Somerville

Michigan - Hamtramck, Highland Park, Ypsilanti

New Jersey -- Burlington, East Orange, Elizabeth, Hoboken, Irvington, New Brunswick,
Passaic, Paterson

New York -- Hempstead, Peekskill, Yonkers

Most of these are poor, urbanized places that, I guess, don't get counted in categories 1 or 2 because they are not the central cities in their MSAs. The remainder are urbanized but primarily suburban places like Broward, DeKalb, and Prince Georges counties. (Most suburban districts are not included because they don't have the poverty levels.) Taken as a whole, they have an average poverty rate of about 25 percent, compared to 31.5 percent for the eligible districts in categories 1, 2, 6, and 7.

Because I don't see a reason why we would allow Newark, Jersey City, and Camden to participate but not Paterson and Elizabeth, or Poughkeepsie and Newburgh but not Yonkers, I guess my recommendation is to make the category 3 districts, eligible, although it would expand the pool of eligibles even further and I am a little uneasy about inclusion of the suburban districts.

If we think there will be too many districts eligible (resulting in too many disappointed applicants, too much work for the Department, etc.), we might increase the poverty threshold for the rural districts. Raising the threshold from 20 percent to 30 percent would reduce the number of eligible rural LEAs from 3,364 to 1,428. But this change would have a major impact on the Midwestern States. All of the 11 formerly eligible rural Indiana districts would fall out. Only 2 districts in Iowa, instead of 29, would be eligible. I wouldn't recommend this one.

What about the issue of whether to make the 3 districts with the largest numbers of poor kids eligible? (These could be defined as either the three largest that fall within the geographic categories or the three largest period.) To me, the main issue is whether we care that, in some States (Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, New Hampshire, the Dakotas, Vermont, Wyoming), only rural LEAs will be able to compete for the program. I don't care, because I don't think we have envisioned the program as dealing with the needs of places like Cheyenne or Billings, which are of a very different magnitude from those of Detroit and Philadelphia. Those States will still be able to compete for rural grants; admittedly, we are expecting to put less money into the rural portion of the program, but these are not populous States and we shouldn't expect them to get a large portion of the money. In a few other States, only a few (or even only one) urban LEA would qualify, but these are States like Maine or Nevada that have only a few urbanized places. In addition, not going with the big three cuts out Fairfax County and a few similar places, which we know are not the intended target. In sum, I wouldn't include this factor this time around.

Finally, at some point, we will have to decide what to do about Maine and Puerto Rico, which don't have urban or rural LEAs because they don't have any LEAs. I don't think that we are aiming to fix SEAs, so I can't see giving grants to the Statewide systems for those two places. There may be sub-State administrative units for Honolulu or San Juan, or the rural areas, that have the same types of problems as the city and rural LEAs we want to reach, but I haven't heard about them. On the other hand, I think we can simply clarify, in our regulatory definition (or however we will codify the eligibility rules) that DC is an urban LEA.

Number of Eligible Districts at Various Eligibility Levels

	# of Districts Eligible at 20%	# of Districts Eligible at 25%	# of Districts Eligible at 30%
ALABAMA	67	35	28
ALASKA	16	13	10
ARIZONA	110	85	69
ARKANSAS	190	120	74
CALIFORNIA	226	137	105
COLORADO	64	42	27
CONNECTICUT	7	7	5
DELAWARE	5	1	1
FLORIDA	43	21	13
GEORGIA	117	86	59
HAWAII	1	1	1
IDAHO	26	6	4
ILLINOIS	87	35	23
INDIANA	24	7	4
IOWA	29	3	2
KANSAS	59	21	6
KENTUCKY	115	85	63
LOUISIANA	52	14	37
MAINE	56	26	17
MARYLAND	4	2	2
MASSACHUSETTS	24	11	10
MICHIGAN	147	83	48
MINNESOTA	64	22	26
MISSISSIPPI	119	103	79
MISSOURI	232	156	97
MONTANA	98	70	52
NEBRASKA	111	77	59
NEVADA	3	1	1
NEW.HAMPSHIRE	14	6	4
NEW.JERSEY	39	24	21
NEW.MEXICO	71	57	46
NEW.YORK	98	37	21
NORTH.CAROLINA	48	23	15
NORTH.DAKOTA	76	48	34
OHIO	102	57	39
OKLAHOMA	297	205	140
OREGON	53	21	14
PENNSYLVANIA	102	41	26
RHODE.ISLAND	3	2	2
SOUTH.CAROLINA	51	35	27
SOUTH.DAKOTA	72	42	33
TENNESSEE	82	36	26
TEXAS	576	409	286
UTAH	3	1	1
VERMONT	32	16	9
VIRGINIA	43	23	8
WASHINGTON	100	66	47
WEST.VIRGINIA	41	28	14
WISCONSIN	47	20	8
WYOMING	11	6	4
DISTRICT.OF.COLUMBIA	1	1	1
PUERTO RICO	1	1	1
Total	4059	2475	1749

Note: All columns include districts with more than 10,000 poor children

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
Alabama	MOBILE COUNTY	large	24,028	78,531	30.5968
	BIRMINGHAM CITY	mid-size	16,734	47,782	35.0216
Alaska	ANCHORAGE SCH DIST	mid-size	4,868	45,085	10.7974
	FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOR	mid-size	1,591	16,167	9.841
Arizona	PHOENIX ELEM SCHOOL DIST	large	6,415	11,420	56.1734
	TUCSON UNIFIED DISTRICT	large	17,010	65,219	26.0814
	MESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST	large	10,257	66,618	15.3967
	PHOENIX UHS DISTRICT 210	large	6,691	93,239	7.1762
Arkansas	PINE BLUFF SCHOOL DISTRI	mid-size	2,779	7,958	34.9208
	NORTH LITTLE ROCK SCH DI	mid-size	3,028	11,133	27.1984
	LITTLE ROCK SCH DIST	mid-size	6,106	30,496	20.0223
	PULASKI CO SPECIAL SCH D		4,087	24,628	16.5949
California	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	large	265,828	731,751	36.3277
	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	large	38,420	137,769	27.8873
	FRESNO UNIFIED	large	31,591	72,235	43.7336
	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	large	26,358	78,850	33.428
	OAKLAND UNIFIED	large	19,175	62,834	30.5169
	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	large	17,926	56,957	31.4729
	SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIF	mid-size	17,311	45,047	38.4288
	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED	large	14,964	81,479	18.3655
	SANTA ANA UNIFIED	large	14,539	48,222	30.1501
	COMPTON UNIFIED	fringe	16,459	34,441	47.789
Colorado	DENVER COUNTY 1	large	20,177	67,942	29.6974
	PUEBLO CITY 60	mid-size	5,553	19,744	28.125
	COLORADO SPRINGS 11		5,310	32,433	16.3722
	JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	fringe	5,792	82,284	7.039
Connecticut	NEW HAVEN SCH DIST	mid-size	9,159	20,396	44.9059
	BRIDGEPORT SCH DIST	mid-size	8,987	25,526	35.2072
	WATERBURY SCH DIST	mid-size	4,628	17,050	27.1437
	NORWICH SCH DIST	mid-size	1,581	6,041	26.1712
	HARTFORD SCH DIST	mid-size	14,891	26,384	56.4395
	NEW LONDON SCH DIST	mid-size	1,102	3,578	30.7993
	NEW BRITAIN SCH DIST	mid-size city fringe	3,876	10,806	35.869
	STAMFORD SCH DIST		1,787	14,597	12.2422
	MERIDEN SCH DIST		1,618	9,762	16.5745
Delaware	WOODBRIIDGE SCHOOL DIST	rural	724	1,924	37.6299
	LAUREL SCHOOL DISTRICT	small town	474	2,135	22.2014
	LAKE FOREST SCHOOL DIST	rural	688	3,284	20.95
	INDIAN RIVER SCHOOL DIST	rural	1,185	5,840	20.2091
	CHRISTINA SCH DIST	mid-size	2,996	22,194	13.4991
	RED CLAY CONSOLIDATED SC	mid-size	2,399	21,848	10.9804
	COLONIAL SCH DIST	fringe	1,459	12,139	12.0191
	CAPITAL SCH DIST	mid-size city fringe	1,452	6,869	21.1384

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
District of Columbia	BRANDYWINE SCH DIST		1,363	14,660	9.2974
	D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS	large	19,804	80,008	24.7525
Florida	DADE COUNTY SCH DIST	large	104,000	329,898	31.5249
	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCH	large	29,649	141,589	20.9402
	DUVAL COUNTY SCH DIST	large	24,249	120,356	20.1477
	ORANGE COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	21,122	112,256	18.8159
	PINELLAS COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	18,355	106,697	17.2029
	POLK COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	14,870	69,549	21.3806
	ESCAMBIA COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	13,351	47,073	28.3623
	VOLUSIA COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size city fringe	10,730	52,014	20.6291
	BREVARD COUNTY SCH DIST		9,143	61,069	14.9716
	BROWARD COUNTY SCH DIST	fringe	31,590	177,832	17.764
	PALM BEACH COUNTY SCH DI		21,309	115,995	18.3706
Georgia	ATLANTA CITY SCH DIST	large	32,866	65,165	50.435
	CHATHAM COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	11,092	40,374	27.4731
	RICHMOND COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	9,833	36,464	26.9663
	MUSCOGEE COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	9,488	31,857	29.7831
	BIBB COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	8,624	28,774	29.9715
	DOUGHERTY SCH DIST	mid-size	7,416	21,330	34.7679
	FULTON COUNTY SCH DIST		6,780	50,489	13.4287
	CLAYTON COUNTY SCH DIST		5,433	36,152	15.0282
	COBB COUNTY SCH DIST		5,336	73,864	7.2241
	GWINNETT COUNTY SCH DIST		3,755	66,607	5.6375
	DEKALB COUNTY SCH DIST	fringe	13,360	82,722	16.1505
Hawaii	HONOLULU		15,712	149,435	10.5143
	HAWAII		5,230	27,706	18.8768
	MAUI		1,913	21,148	9.0458
	KAUAI		991	10,804	9.1725
Idaho	BOISE CITY IND SCH DIST	mid-size	3,021	24,925	12.1204
Illinois	CITY OF CHICAGO SCHOOL D	large	185,119	508,488	36.4058
	PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	mid-size	5,729	20,666	27.7219
	EAST ST LOUIS SCHOOL DIS	mid-size	9,026	15,520	58.1572
	ROCKFORD SCHOOL DIST 205	mid-size	5,757	32,698	17.6066
Indiana	INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHO	large	21,674	65,156	33.2648
	GARY COMMUNITY SCHOOL CO	mid-size	10,700	26,028	41.1096
	MUNCIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	2,666	10,249	26.0123
	FORT WAYNE COMMUNITY SCH	mid-size	5,882	39,528	14.8806
	SOUTH BEND COMMUNITY SCH		4,807	27,357	17.5714
	EVANSVILLE-VANDEBURGH S		4,719	28,010	16.8476
	HAMMOND CITY SCHOOLS		3,181	16,275	19.5453
Iowa	DES MOINES INDEPENDENT C	mid-size	5,769	33,048	17.4564
	DAVENPORT COMMUNITY SCHO	mid-size	3,826	20,057	19.0756
	CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY S	mid-size	2,785	38,208	7.289

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
Kansas	SIOUX CITY COMMUNITY SCH		2,747	16,052	17.1131
	WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOO		2,734	14,761	18.5218
	COUNCIL BLUFFS COMMUNITY		1,888	20,552	9.1865
	WICHITA	large	10,260	54,634	18.7795
	KANSAS CITY	mid-size	7,547	25,162	29.9936
	TOPEKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	mid-size	3,554	17,021	20.8801
Kentucky	SHAWNEE MISSION PUBLIC S		1,934	36,389	5.3148
	JEFFERSON CO	large	24,661	117,001	21.0776
Louisiana	ORLEANS PAR SCH BRD	large	47,144	98,577	47.8245
	EAST BATON ROUGE PAR SCH	mid-size	17,429	75,336	23.135
	CADDO PAR SCH BRD	mid-size	16,740	51,975	32.2078
	JEFFERSON PAR SCH BRD	fringe	17,665	87,083	20.2852
Maine	PORTLAND	mid-size	2,066	8,452	24.4439
	LEWISTON	mid-size	1,300	6,172	21.0629
	BANGOR	mid-size	962	4,908	19.6007
Maryland	BALTIMORE CITY P S SYSTE	large	41,575	123,164	33.7558
	BOARD OF ED ALLEGANY	mid-size	2,742	12,137	22.5920738
	DORCHESTER CO. BOARD	small town	1,070	4,889	21.8858662
	PRINCE GEORGES CO PUBLIC	fringe	10,863	123,165	8.8199
	BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC	fringe	9,586	104,400	9.182
	MONTGOMERY CO PUBLIC SCH	fringe	7,622	120,363	6.3325
	ANNE ARUNDEL CO PUBLIC S		5,662	73,608	7.6921
Massachusetts	BOSTON SCH DIST	large	24,140	73,684	32.7615
	SPRINGFIELD SCH DIST	mid-size	9,663	29,052	33.261
	WORCESTER SCH DIST	mid-size	7,798	25,593	30.4693
	LOWELL SCH DIST	mid-size	6,899	18,250	37.8027
	NEW BEDFORD SCH DIST	mid-size	5,441	17,460	31.1627
	BROCKTON SCH DIST	mid-size	4,818	16,627	28.977
	LYNN SCH DIST	mid-size	4,351	13,326	32.6505
	FALL RIVER	mid-size	3,716	15,545	23.9048
	HOLYOKE SCH DIST	mid-size	3,482	8,439	41.2608
	LAWRENCE SCH DIST	mid-size	8,326	15,339	54.2799
	CHELSEA SCH DIST	fringe	1,995	4,802	41.5452
	CAMBRIDGE SCH DIST		1,741	8,909	19.542
	SOMERVILLE SCH DIST	fringe	1,715	7,809	21.9618
Michigan	DETROIT CITY SCHOOL DIST	large	101,816	209,575	48.5821
	FLINT CITY SCHOOL DISTRI	mid-size	13,475	29,739	45.3109
	GRAND RAPIDS CITY SCH DI	mid-size	9,686	33,845	28.6187
	SAGINAW CITY SCHOOL DIST	mid-size	6,934	15,517	44.6865
	PONTIAC CITY SCHOOL DIST	mid-size	6,608	16,426	40.2289
	LANSING PUBLIC SCHOOL DI	mid-size	6,381	24,550	25.9919
	KALAMAZOO CITY SCHOOL DI	mid-size	4,620	15,243	30.309
	BATTLE CREEK PUBLIC SCHO	mid-size	3,478	9,300	37.3978
	HAMTRAMCK	fringe	1,353	2,867	47.1

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
Minnesota	HIGHLAND PARK	fringe	2,298	4,053	56.6
	MINNEAPOLIS SPECIAL SCH	large	17,828	49,017	36.3711
	SAINT PAUL SCH DIST	large	11,780	43,775	26.9103
	DULUTH SCH DIST	mid-size	2,598	15,718	16.5288
Mississippi	JACKSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DI	mid-size	12,103	38,811	31.1845
	GREENVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOL	large town	4,545	10,642	42.7081
Missouri	ST LOUIS CITY SCHOOL DIS	large	28,205	68,448	41.2065
	KANSAS CITY SCH DIST 33	large	17,327	42,058	41.1979
	SCHOOL DIST OF ST JOSEPH	mid-size	3,047	14,144	21.5427
	SPRINGFIELD R XII	mid-size	4,934	25,915	19.0392
	INDEPENDENCE SCH D NO 30		2,252	11,939	18.8626
	COLUMBIA SCH DIST 93		2,249	13,950	16.1219
Montana	BILLINGS ELEM # 2	mid-size	1,947	16,066	12.1188
	GREAT FALLS EL # 1	mid-size	1,723	13,177	13.0758
	MISSOULA ELEM # 1	large town	1,526	9,182	16.6195
Nebraska	OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	large	10,306	52,771	19.5297
	LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	mid-size	2,803	31,572	8.8781
Nevada	CLARK COUNTY SCH DIST	large	23,220	124,439	18.6597
	WASHOE COUNTY	mid-size	4,951	39,478	12.5411622
New Hampshire	MANCHESTER SCH DIST	mid-size	2,165	15,122	14.3169
	NASHUA SCH DIST	mid-size	1,449	12,819	11.3035
New Jersey	NEWARK CITY	large	24,446	56,935	42.9367
	JERSEY CITY	mid-size	13,124	39,141	33.5301
	TRENTON CITY	mid-size	4,881	15,957	30.5885
	CAMDEN CITY	mid-size	12,359	21,757	56.8047
	ATLANTIC CITY	mid-size	2,968	5,779	51.3584
	EAST ORANGE	fringe	3,868	13,186	29.3341
	PASSAIC CITY	fringe	3,192	10,840	29.4465
	PATERSON CITY	fringe	9,247	28,668	32.2555
	ELIZABETH CITY	fringe	5,408	18,877	28.6486
New Mexico	ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOO	large	20,782	96,131	21.6184
	LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SCHOOL	small town	6,518	19,600	33.2551
	GALLUP-MCKINLEY COUNTY P	small town	7,633	13,870	55.0324
New York	KINGS	large	183,991	434,427	42.3526
	BRONX	large	107,126	233,963	45.7876
	NEW YORK	large	69,581	181,278	38.3836
	QUEENS	large	54,854	298,631	18.3685
	BUFFALO CITY SCHOOLS	large	22,623	54,041	41.8627
	ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	15,740	38,428	40.9597
	ALBANY CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	3,521	12,200	28.8607
	SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	8,334	24,532	33.972

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
	UTICA CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	3,870	10,865	35.619
	YONKERS CITY SCHOOLS	fringe	6,282	27,571	22.7848
	HEMPSTED	fringe	1,953	6,496	30.06
	PEEKSKILL	fringe	656	2,800	23.43
	WHITE PLAINS		537	6,114	8.7831
North Carolina					
	MECKLENBURG COUNTY	large	13,744	85,426	16.0888
	CUMBERLAND COUNTY	mid-size	10,030	46,617	21.5158
	NEW HANOVER COUNTY		3,977	19,880	20.005
	ROBESON COUNTY	rural	7,199	23,963	30.0421
	FORSYTH COUNTY		6,682	42,523	15.7138
	PITT COUNTY	mid-size city fringe	4,914	18,508	26.5507
	GASTON COUNTY		4,679	32,187	14.5369
	WAKE COUNTY		7,453	67,675	11.0129
	GREENSBORO CITY		3,652	20,851	17.5147
North Dakota					
	MINOT 1	large town	1,256	8,381	14.9863
	BISMARCK 1	mid-size	1,127	11,589	9.7247
	FARGO 1	mid-size	1,114	11,408	9.7651
Ohio					
	CLEVELAND CITY SD	large	47,631	93,049	51.1892
	COLUMBUS CITY SD	large	24,550	75,451	32.5377
	CINCINNATI CITY SD	large	23,803	66,023	36.0526
	TOLEDO CITY SD	mid-size	15,849	50,884	31.1473
	DAYTON CITY SD	mid-size	13,392	33,664	39.7814
	AKRON CITY SD	mid-size	12,665	37,507	33.767
	YOUNGSTOWN CITY SD	mid-size	8,117	18,576	43.6962
	CANTON CITY SD	mid-size	4,831	13,598	35.5273
Oklahoma					
	OKLAHOMA CITY SCH DIST	large	15,270	46,268	33.0034
	TULSA CITY SCH DIST	large	14,399	48,655	29.5941
Oregon					
	PORTLAND SCH DIST IJ	large	11,659	59,573	19.5709
	SALEM/KEIZER SCH DIST 24	mid-size	4,766	31,005	15.3717
	EUGENE SCH DIST 04J	mid-size	2,234	19,871	11.2425
	SPRINGFIELD SCH DIST 019		2,135	11,145	19.1566
	BEAVERTON SCH DIST 48J		1,976	28,126	7.0255
Pennsylvania					
	PHILADELPHIA CITY S D	large	92,964	263,609	35.2659
	PITTSBURGH S D	large	17,307	51,450	33.6385
	READING S D	mid-size	5,411	13,494	40.0993
	ERIE CITY S D	mid-size	5,394	18,892	28.5518
	HARRISBURG CITY S D	mid-size	4,394	9,340	47.045
	LANCASTER S D	mid-size	3,938	11,783	33.421
	ALLENTOWN CITY S D	mid-size	3,558	15,407	23.0934
	SCRANTON CITY S D	mid-size	2,998	12,230	24.5135
Rhode Island					
	PROVIDENCE SCH DIST	mid-size	11,152	25,925	43.0164
	CENTRAL FALLS SCH DIST	mid-size city fringe	1,252	3,237	38.6777881
	WOONSOCKET SCH DIST	mid-size	1,729	7,328	23.5944323
South Carolina					

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
South Dakota	CHARLESTON COUNTY SCH DI	mid-size	13,392	50,256	26.6476
	RICHLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	mid-size	8,333	32,105	25.9555
	GREENVILLE COUNTY SCH DI	mid-size city fringe	7,243	58,766	12.3252
	RAPID CITY 51-4	mid-size	2,579	14,376	17.9396
	SIOUX FALLS 49-5	mid-size	1,902	18,191	10.4557
Tennessee	MEMPHIS CITY SCH DIST	large	42,048	114,506	36.7212
	NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON CO SC	large	18,331	80,904	22.6577
	CHATTANOOGA CITY SCH DIS	mid-size	7,625	25,114	30.3616
	KNOX CO SCH DIST	mid-size	9,709	53,954	17.995
Texas	HOUSTON ISD	large	80,864	199,288	40.5765
	DALLAS ISD	large	56,002	145,530	38.4814
	EL PASO ISD	mid-size	27,742	64,651	42.9104
	FORT WORTH ISD	mid-size	23,417	74,177	31.5691
	YSLETA ISD	mid-size	17,497	50,656	34.5408
	AUSTIN ISD	mid-size	15,853	68,042	23.2988
	CORPUS CHRISTI ISD	mid-size	13,131	43,800	29.9795
	SAN ANTONIO ISD	large	32,030	63,937	50.0962
	BROWNSVILLE ISD	mid-size	20,505	34,999	58.5874
Utah	OGDEN CITY SCH DIST	mid-size	2,913	12,617	23.0878973
	SAN JUAN CO SCH DIST	rural	1,273	3,910	32.5575448
	SOUTH SANPETE CO SCH DIS	rural	556	2,637	21.0845658
	GRANITE SCH DIST	mid-size	8,473	79,593	10.6454
	SALT LAKE CITY SCH DIST	mid-size	4,685	26,760	17.5075
Vermont	BURLINGTON SCH DIST	mid-size	807	4,191	19.2555
	RUTLAND CITY SCH DIST	large town	502	2,612	19.219
	BENNINGTON ID SCH DIST	large town	461	2,736	16.8494
Virginia	NORFOLK CTY P S	large	12,097	38,520	31.4045
	RICHMOND CTY P S	mid-size	10,858	28,394	38.2405
	FAIRFAX CO P S	fringe	8,642	142,109	6.0812
Washington	SEATTLE	large	10,873	55,421	19.6189
	TACOMA	mid-size	7,990	32,937	24.2584
	SPOKANE	mid-size	6,859	32,474	21.1215
West Virginia	RALEIGH COUNTY SCH DIST	rural	4,102	15,842	25.8932
	CABELL COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	3,884	15,956	24.3419
	KANAWHA COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size city fringe	8,050	36,116	22.2893
Wisconsin	MILWAUKEE SCH DIST	large	46,505	118,280	39.3177
	RACINE SCH DIST	mid-size	4,575	26,313	17.3868
	MADISON METROPOLITAN SCH	mid-size	3,815	25,816	14.7777
	KENOSHA SCH DIST	mid-size	3,381	18,690	18.0899
	GREEN BAY AREA SCH DIST	mid-size	3,173	21,787	14.5637
Wyoming	NATRONA CO SCH DIST NO 0	mid-size	1,928	13,299	14.4973

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
	LARAMIE CO SCH DIST NO 0	mid-size	1,688	13,413	12.5848

T. Corwin
12/11/97

Eligibility of LEAs for Education Opportunity Zones Program

1. A couple weeks ago, people made a tentative decision to use, for the Opportunities Zones program, the same eligibility criteria that the Administration has proposed for the HEA Title V "Recruiting New Teachers for Underserved Areas" program.

Under that proposal, "underserved areas" are defined as LEAs that:

- Serve an area in which at least 20 percent of the school-aged children are from low-income families or in which there are at least 10,000 such children; or
- Are among the three LEAs serving the highest numbers of children from low-income families in the State.

These criteria seem to do a good job at limiting eligibility to LEAs with significant concentrations of poor children (a decision we reached, for Title V, after looking at which districts would and wouldn't qualify, under these criteria versus some competing ones). In all, an estimated 4,272 LEAs, or 28 percent of "regular" (non- special ed or other special purpose) LEAs would qualify.¹ They serve about 17.7 million children, including 5.5 million poor children (slightly over 59 percent of poor children nationally).

Virtually all (99.5 percent) of the eligible districts would qualify under the 20 percent criterion, a level that seemed to do the best job of differentiating the poor from the non-poor districts. Allowing LEAs with 10,000 poor kids but not 20 percent poverty to participate also seemed like a good idea because a group of large but not so poor cities, which we thought ought to be eligible, only qualified on that basis.² Finally, late in the process we added the additional criterion, making eligible the three LEAs serving the highest numbers of poor kids, because, without this provision: (1) In Nevada, only one LEA would be eligible, and in a few other States there weren't very many (although, as I recall, they at least had 3), and (2) the largest cities in a

¹ A word here about the data used in this analysis: the Department does not actually have current data on numbers and percentages of poor kids by LEA. We do have data of that nature from the 1990 Census, and we have updated, 1995 data by county (but not LEA). The data set I am drawing from was constructed on the assumption that the relative distribution of poor kids within counties stayed constant between 1990 and 1995. In my analysis for the Title V deliberations I referred to this as a "synthetic" data base. Since, then, however, I have learned that the Census Bureau is using the same type of methodology to produce Congressionally mandated updates of LEA child poverty data, so I am much more comfortable in using it here.

² Examples: San Francisco, Seattle, Portland (OR), Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Clark County (Las Vegas).

few States -- Iowa, Utah, Montana, a few others -- would have been cut out, and for political and maybe other reasons it seemed like a good idea to keep them in. In doing so, we added in, without thinking about it, at least a couple large, low-poverty suburban LEAs³, which we may not want to do in the Opportunity Zones program.

2. I suggested narrowing the range of eligibles to LEAs that: (1) met the poverty criteria; and (2) serve either urban (city) or rural communities.

This seemed to make sense, because we are framing the proposal as an urban-rural initiative. In addition, we can anticipate receiving many applications but making only a small number of awards, so it would save effort (for both potential applicants and the Department) to limit the universe of eligibles up front.

The NCES “Common Core of Data” codes school districts into the following categories:

1. Large central city (central city of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) with a population of 400,000 or more or a population density of 6,000 persons per square mile)
2. Mid-size central city (central city of an MSA, but not a city under category 1)
3. Urban fringe of a large city (place within the MSA of a large central city, but not the large central city itself)
4. Urban fringe of a mid-size city (place within the MSA of a mid-size city, but not the mid-size central city itself)
5. Large town (place not within an MSA, but with a population of at least 25,000 and defined as “urban”)
6. Small town (place not within an MSA, but with a population of 2,500-25,000)
7. Rural (place with a population of less than 2,500)
8. Unknown (districts that NCES can’t classify, including 273 that meet the poverty criteria)

I believe that these codings reflect official OMB/Census categories.

As a first cut, we had NCES do a run assuming that we would allow the participation only of LEAs that fall into categories 1, 2, 6, and 7. Categories 3 and 4 seemed to define suburbia, and category 5 seemed to define nonmetropolitan communities too large to be considered rural.

³ Fairfax County, VA (6.1 percent poverty), Baltimore County, MD (9.2 percent).

Obviously, these assumptions are open to debate. (See below.)

3. Results and Analysis

Leaving aside the issue of whether and how to include the three LEAs in the State with the largest numbers of poor children (which I'll get to a little later), the criteria set forth above would limit eligibility to about 3,742 LEAs, or 25 percent of regular LEAs nationally. This group of districts serves 15.3 million children, 4.8 million of them poor (or 51 percent of poor children in the Nation).

The vast majority (90 percent) of these districts are rural, and they particularly show up in poorer States that have many small districts. For example, 62 out of 127 districts in Alabama would qualify, and 56 of those districts are in categories 6 and 7. For Texas, 539 out of 1,043 districts would be eligible, and 501 of them are rural.

In the more urbanized, particularly northeastern States, by comparison, the eligible districts would be heavily urban. In Connecticut only 6 LEAs, all in category 2, would qualify. Similarly, 7 of the 8 eligible New Jersey districts fall into the urban categories.

Going with this option would, in addition to focusing the program more specifically on urban and rural areas, decrease the total number of eligible districts by about one-eighth while still focusing the program on districts with concentrations of poor children. The districts identified as eligible seem to be reasonably appropriate for the type of program we are developing. There would be quite a number of LEAs, particularly on the rural side, potentially competing for a small number of grants, but that may be avoidable. (See discussion below.)

4. Additional Issues and Options

A number of districts that probably should be eligible are in category 3 and thus didn't make the original cut. Category 3 includes 286 LEAs (with 1.5 million poor children), including a number of very urbanized ones. Some of them include:

California -- Compton, Fontana, Inglewood, Lynwood, Richmond

Florida -- Broward County

Georgia -- DeKalb County, Marietta

Kentucky -- Covington, Newport

Maryland -- Prince Georges County

Massachusetts -- Revere, Salem, Somerville

Michigan -- Hamtramck, Highland Park, Ypsilanti

New Jersey -- Burlington, East Orange, Elizabeth, Hoboken, Irvington, New Brunswick, Passaic, Paterson

New York -- Hempstead, Peekskill, Yonkers

Most of these are poor, urbanized places that, I guess, don't get counted in categories 1 or 2 because they are not the central cities in their MSAs. The remainder are urbanized but primarily suburban places like Broward, DeKalb, and Prince Georges counties. (Most suburban districts are not included because they don't have the poverty levels.) Taken as a whole, they have an average poverty rate of about 25 percent, compared to 31.5 percent for the eligible districts in categories 1, 2, 6, and 7.

Because I don't see a reason why we would allow Newark, Jersey City, and Camden to participate but not Paterson and Elizabeth, or Poughkeepsie and Newburgh but not Yonkers, I guess my recommendation is to make the category 3 districts, eligible, although it would expand the pool of eligibles even further and I am a little uneasy about inclusion of the suburban districts.

If we think there will be too many districts eligible (resulting in too many disappointed applicants, too much work for the Department, etc.), we might increase the poverty threshold for the rural districts. Raising the threshold from 20 percent to 30 percent would reduce the number of eligible rural LEAs from 3,364 to 1,428. But this change would have a major impact on the Midwestern States. All of the 11 formerly eligible rural Indiana districts would fall out. Only 2 districts in Iowa, instead of 29, would be eligible. I wouldn't recommend this one.

What about the issue of whether to make the 3 districts with the largest numbers of poor kids eligible? (These could be defined as either the three largest that fall within the geographic categories or the three largest period.) To me, the main issue is whether we care that, in some States (Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Montana, New Hampshire, the Dakotas, Vermont, Wyoming), only rural LEAs will be able to compete for the program. I don't care, because I don't think we have envisioned the program as dealing with the needs of places like Cheyenne or Billings, which are of a very different magnitude from those of Detroit and Philadelphia. Those States will still be able to compete for rural grants; admittedly, we are expecting to put less money into the rural portion of the program, but these are not populous States and we shouldn't expect them to get a large portion of the money. In a few other States, only a few (or even only one) urban LEA would qualify, but these are States like Maine or Nevada that have only a few urbanized places. In addition, not going with the big three cuts out Fairfax County and a few similar places, which we know are not the intended target. In sum, I wouldn't include this factor this time around.

Finally, at some point, we will have to decide what to do about ^{Hawaii} ~~Maine~~ and Puerto Rico, which don't have urban or rural LEAs because they don't have any LEAs. I don't think that we are aiming to fix SEAs, so I can't see giving grants to the Statewide systems for those two places. There may be sub-State administrative units for Honolulu or San Juan, or the rural areas, that have the same types of problems as the city and rural LEAs we want to reach, but I haven't heard about them. On the other hand, I think we can simply clarify, in our regulatory definition (or however we will codify the eligibility rules) that DC is an urban LEA.

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Agenda -- January 9, 1998

I. Eligibility Issues (see attached)

II. Flexibility Options

III. Update on Legislative/Outreach Strategy

A. Discussions with Obey/staff

B. Great City Schools et al

C. Planning for meeting with Hill and Groups

IV. Materials Needed for Roll-out

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Eligibility Issues -- January 9, 1998

Assumptions: Want to wind up with districts that will exemplify the sorts of real challenges faced by many urban and rural districts. Should try to keep number of applications to a manageable level. Use census poverty, rather than free and reduced price lunches, because of availability for all districts. Assume that legislative process is more likely to expand, rather than shrink, the range of eligible districts, no matter what we propose.

I. Current Proposal (from Corwin, would make eligible LEAs that:

Track record

- Are high-need:
 - At least 20% of students from low-income families; or
 - There are at least 10,000 poor children.
- And are urban or rural:
 - Large or mid-sized central city
 - Urban Fringe of a large city
 - Small town or rural area

II. Options to Further Limit Eligibility

- Increase poverty threshold for all districts to 25%
- Increase poverty threshold for all districts to 30%
- Increase poverty threshold for rural districts to 30%
- Remove "urban fringe" category

III. Options to Broaden Eligibility

- Make 3 districts (in each state) with largest numbers of poor kids eligible
- Make 3 districts with largest numbers of kids in both urban and rural categories eligible

IV. Non-LEA Jurisdictions (HI, PR, DC)

- Sub-SEA divisions

V. Very Large Jurisdictions (NYC, Chicago, etc.)

- NYC: Should the whole district be eligible to apply on behalf of a portion of its community districts? Or should community districts be eligible?
- How to address size problem in other cities.

Focus on specific areas

VI. Native Americans

- Tribal Schools *BIA - supportive*
- How to capture other schools with large numbers of Native American students?

To: Bill Kincaid
From: Jim Butler
Subject: EOZ Eligibility

At the 20 percent or 10,000 poor children level, approximately 3,742 districts would be eligible, or about 25% of regular LEAs. Over 99 percent qualify based on 20 percent of children being from households above the poverty level. These districts serve about 15.3 million children, about one-third of all children nationally. Approximately 4.8 million of the children served by these districts come from households living below the poverty level, or about 51 percent of all poor children nationally.

If the large urban fringe districts are included, 268 additional districts gain eligibility. These additional districts would result in 4,010 districts, 27% of all regular LEAs, being eligible for grants. These "fringe" districts serve an additional 1.9 million children, of whom over 476,000 are poor. Poverty levels in these urban fringe districts are not as high as in the large or mid-size urban centers. The large and mid-size urban centers have a poverty rate of about 31.5 percent while the poverty rate in the urban fringe districts is about 25 percent.

There are 3,364 rural districts with over 20 percent living above the poverty level. These districts serve approximately 4.9 million children, of whom about 1.5 million live below the poverty level. If the qualifying percentage for rural is raised to 30 percent, 1,428 rural districts would be eligible. The districts that would lose eligibility serve 2.1 million children, and over 822,000 of these children live below the poverty level. The reduction would have a large impact on the Midwestern states. For example, none of the rural districts in Indiana would retain eligibility, although 5 mid-size cities would be eligible. Iowa would go from 29 eligible districts to 2, and Iowa has no qualifying urban districts. Additionally, Idaho would go from 29 districts to 4. In Texas, currently 501 rural districts are eligible. An increase to a poverty level of 30 percent would eliminate 267 districts, leaving 234 rural districts within the state eligible. In Mississippi 114 rural districts are eligible (plus 5 mid-size cities), at the higher poverty level 77 would remain eligible.

Allison -

Please call Jim Butler at
401-0311. Clarify
whether he will bring
sufficient copies for the
meeting or whether we need
to make them. Thank. Bill

Number of Eligible Districts at Various Eligibility Levels

	# of Districts Eligible at 20%	# of Districts Eligible at 25%	# of Districts Eligible at 30%
ALABAMA	67	35	28
ALASKA	16	13	10
ARIZONA	110	85	69
ARKANSAS	190	120	74
CALIFORNIA	226	137	105
COLORADO	64	42	27
CONNECTICUT	7	7	5
DELAWARE	5	1	1
FLORIDA	43	21	13
GEORGIA	117	86	59
HAWAII	1	1	1
IDAHO	26	6	4
ILLINOIS	87	35	23
INDIANA	24	7	4
IOWA	29	3	2
KANSAS	59	21	6
KENTUCKY	115	85	63
LOUISIANA	52	14	37
MAINE	56	26	17
MARYLAND	4	2	2
MASSACHUSETTS	24	11	10
MICHIGAN	147	83	48
MINNESOTA	64	22	26
MISSISSIPPI	119	103	79
MISSOURI	232	156	97
MONTANA	98	70	52
NEBRASKA	111	77	59
NEVADA	3	1	1
NEW HAMPSHIRE	14	6	4
NEW JERSEY	39	24	21
NEW MEXICO	71	57	46
NEW YORK	98	37	21
NORTH CAROLINA	48	23	15
NORTH DAKOTA	76	48	34
OHIO	102	57	39
OKLAHOMA	297	205	140
OREGON	53	21	14
PENNSYLVANIA	102	41	26
RHODE ISLAND	3	2	2
SOUTH CAROLINA	51	35	27
SOUTH DAKOTA	72	42	33
TENNESSEE	82	36	26
TEXAS	576	409	286
UTAH	3	1	1
VERMONT	32	16	9
VIRGINIA	43	23	8
WASHINGTON	100	66	47
WEST VIRGINIA	41	28	14
WISCONSIN	47	20	8
WYOMING	11	6	4
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1	1	1
PUERTO RICO	1	1	1
Total	4059	2475	1749

Note: All columns include districts with more than 10,000 poor children

Poverty Percentages and Census Coding for Selected Districts

State	District	Census Code	Kids in Poverty	Total Kids	Percentage in Poverty
Alabama	MOBILE COUNTY	large	24,028	78,531	30.5968
	BIRMINGHAM CITY	mid-sized	16,734	47,782	35.0216
Alaska	ANCHORAGE SCH DIST	mid-sized	4,868	45,085	10.7974
	FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOR	mid-sized	1,591	16,167	9.841
Arizona	PHOENIX ELEM SCHOOL DIST	large	6,415	11,420	56.1734
	TUCSON UNIFIED DISTRICT	large	17,010	65,219	26.0814
	MESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST	large	10,257	66,618	15.3967
	PHOENIX UHS DISTRICT 210	large	6,691	93,239	7.1762
Arkansas	PINE BLUFF SCHOOL DISTRI	mid-size	2,779	7,958	34.9208
	NORTH LITTLE ROCK SCH DI	mid-size	3,028	11,133	27.1984
	LITTLE ROCK SCH DIST	mid-size	6,106	30,496	20.0223
	PULASKI CO SPECIAL SCH D		4,087	24,628	16.5949
California	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED	large	265,828	731,751	36.3277
	SAN DIEGO CITY UNIFIED	large	38,420	137,769	27.8873
	FRESNO UNIFIED	large	31,591	72,235	43.7336
	LONG BEACH UNIFIED	large	26,358	78,850	33.428
	OAKLAND UNIFIED	large	19,175	62,834	30.5169
	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED	large	17,926	56,957	31.4729
	SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIF	mid-size	17,311	45,047	38.4288
	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED	large	14,964	81,479	18.3655
	SANTA ANA UNIFIED	large	14,539	48,222	30.1501
Colorado	COMPTON UNIFIED	fringe	16,459	34,441	47.789
	DENVER COUNTY 1	large	20,177	67,942	29.6974
	PUEBLO CITY 60	mid-size	5,553	19,744	28.125
	COLORADO SPRINGS 11		5,310	32,433	16.3722
	JEFFERSON COUNTY R-1	fringe	5,792	82,284	7.039
Connecticut	NEW HAVEN SCH DIST	mid-size	9,159	20,396	44.9059
	BRIDGEPORT SCH DIST	mid-size	8,987	25,526	35.2072
	WATERBURY SCH DIST	mid-size	4,628	17,050	27.1437
	NORWICH SCH DIST	mid-size	1,581	6,041	26.1712
	HARTFORD SCH DIST	mid-size	14,891	26,384	56.4395
	NEW LONDON SCH DIST	mid-size	1,102	3,578	30.7993
	NEW BRITAIN SCH DIST	mid-size city fring	3,876	10,806	35.869
	STAMFORD SCH DIST		1,787	14,597	12.2422
	MERIDEN SCH DIST		1,618	9,762	16.5745
Delaware	WOODBRIIDGE SCHOOL DIST	rural	724	1,924	0.37629938
	LAUREL SCHOOL DISTRICT	small town	474	2,135	0.22201405
	LAKE FOREST SCHOOL DIST	rural	688	3,284	0.20950061
	INDIAN RIVER SCHOOL DIST	rural	1,185	5,840	0.20291096
	CHRISTINA SCH DIST	mid-size	2,996	22,194	13.4991
	RED CLAY CONSOLIDATED SC	mid-size	2,399	21,848	10.9804
	COLONIAL SCH DIST	fringe	1,459	12,139	12.0191

	CAPITAL SCH DIST	mid-size city fring	1,452	6,869	21.1384
	BRANDYWINE SCH DIST		1,363	14,660	9.2974
District of Columbia	D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS	large	19,804	80,008	24.7525
Florida	DADE COUNTY SCH DIST	large	104,000	329,898	31.5249
	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SCH	large	29,649	141,589	20.9402
	DUVAL COUNTY SCH DIST	large	24,249	120,356	20.1477
	ORANGE COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	21,122	112,256	18.8159
	PINELLAS COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	18,355	106,697	17.2029
	POLK COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	14,870	69,549	21.3806
	ESCAMBIA COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	13,351	47,073	28.3623
	VOLUSIA COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size city fring	10,730	52,014	20.6291
	BREVARD COUNTY SCH DIST		9,143	61,069	14.9716
	BROWARD COUNTY SCH DIST	fringe	31,590	177,832	17.764
	PALM BEACH COUNTY SCH DI		21,309	115,995	18.3706
Georgia	ATLANTA CITY SCH DIST	large	32,866	65,165	50.435
	CHATHAM COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	11,092	40,374	27.4731
	RICHMOND COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	9,833	36,464	26.9663
	MUSCOGEE COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	9,488	31,857	29.7831
	BIBB COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	8,624	28,774	29.9715
	DOUGHERTY SCH DIST	mid-size	7,416	21,330	34.7679
	FULTON COUNTY SCH DIST		6,780	50,489	13.4287
	CLAYTON COUNTY SCH DIST		5,433	36,152	15.0282
	COBB COUNTY SCH DIST		5,336	73,864	7.2241
	GWINNETT COUNTY SCH DIST		3,755	66,607	5.6375
	DEKALB COUNTY SCH DIST	fringe	13,360	82,722	16.1505
Hawaii	HONOLULU		15,712	149,435	10.5143
	HAWAII		5,230	27,706	18.8768
	MAUI		1,913	21,148	9.0458
	KAUAI		991	10,804	9.1725
Idaho	BOISE CITY IND SCH DIST	mid-size	3,021	24,925	12.1204
Illinois	CITY OF CHICAGO SCHOOL D	large	185,119	508,488	36.4058
	PEORIA SCHOOL DISTRICT 1	mid-size	5,729	20,666	27.7219
	EAST ST LOUIS SCHOOL DIS	mid-size	9,026	15,520	58.1572
	ROCKFORD SCHOOL DIST 205	mid-size	5,757	32,698	17.6066
Indiana	INDIANAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHO	large	21,674	65,156	33.2648
	GARY COMMUNITY SCHOOL CO	mid-size	10,700	26,028	41.1096
	MUNCIE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	2,666	10,249	26.0123
	FORT WAYNE COMMUNITY SCH	mid-size	5,882	39,528	14.8806
	SOUTH BEND COMMUNITY SCH		4,807	27,357	17.5714
	EVANSVILLE-VANDERBURGH S		4,719	28,010	16.8476
	HAMMOND CITY SCHOOLS		3,181	16,275	19.5453
Iowa	DES MOINES INDEPENDENT C	mid-size	5,769	33,048	17.4564
	DAVENPORT COMMUNITY SCHO	mid-size	3,826	20,057	19.0756
	CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY S	mid-size	2,785	38,208	7.289
	SIOUX CITY COMMUNITY SCH		2,747	16,052	17.1131
	WATERLOO COMMUNITY SCHOO		2,734	14,761	18.5218

Kansas	COUNCIL BLUFFS COMMUNITY		1,888	20,552	9.1865
	WICHITA	large	10,260	54,634	18.7795
	KANSAS CITY	mid-size	7,547	25,162	29.9936
	TOPEKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	mid-size	3,554	17,021	20.8801
	SHAWNEE MISSION PUBLIC S		1,934	36,389	5.3148
Kentucky	JEFFERSON CO	large	24,661	117,001	21.0776
Louisiana	ORLEANS PAR SCH BRD	large	47,144	98,577	47.8245
	EAST BATON ROUGE PAR SCH	mid-size	17,429	75,336	23.135
	CADDO PAR SCH BRD	mid-size	16,740	51,975	32.2078
	JEFFERSON PAR SCH BRD	fringe	17,665	87,083	20.2852
Maine	PORTLAND	mid-size	2,066	8,452	24.4439
	LEWISTON	mid-size	1,300	6,172	21.0629
	BANGOR	mid-size	962	4,908	19.6007
Maryland	BALTIMORE CITY P S SYSTE	large	41,575	123,164	33.7558
	BOARD OF ED ALLEGANY	mid-size	2,742	12,137	22.5920738
	DORCHESTER CO. BOARD	small town	1,070	4,889	21.8858662
	PRINCE GEORGES CO PUBLIC	fringe	10,863	123,165	8.8199
	BALTIMORE COUNTY PUBLIC	fringe	9,586	104,400	9.182
	MONTGOMERY CO PUBLIC SCH	fringe	7,622	120,363	6.3325
	ANNE ARUNDEL CO PUBLIC S		5,662	73,608	7.6921
Massachusetts	BOSTON SCH DIST	large	24,140	73,684	32.7615
	SPRINGFIELD SCH DIST	mid-size	9,663	29,052	33.261
	WORCESTER SCH DIST	mid-size	7,798	25,593	30.4693
	LOWELL SCH DIST	mid-size	6,899	18,250	37.8027
	NEW BEDFORD SCH DIST	mid-size	5,441	17,460	31.1627
	BROCKTON SCH DIST	mid-size	4,818	16,627	28.977
	LYNN SCH DIST	mid-size	4,351	13,326	32.6505
	FALL RIVER	mid-size	3,716	15,545	23.9048
	HOLYOKE SCH DIST	mid-size	3,482	8,439	41.2608
	LAWRENCE SCH DIST	mid-size	8,326	15,339	54.2799
	CHELSEA SCH DIST	fringe	1,995	4,802	41.5452
	CAMBRIDGE SCH DIST		1,741	8,909	19.542
	SOMERVILLE SCH DIST	fringe	1,715	7,809	21.9618
Michigan	DETROIT CITY SCHOOL DIST	large	101,816	209,575	48.5821
	FLINT CITY SCHOOL DISTRI	mid-size	13,475	29,739	45.3109
	GRAND RAPIDS CITY SCH DI	mid-size	9,686	33,845	28.6187
	SAGINAW CITY SCHOOL DIST	mid-size	6,934	15,517	44.6865
	PONTIAC CITY SCHOOL DIST	mid-size	6,608	16,426	40.2289
	LANSING PUBLIC SCHOOL DI	mid-size	6,381	24,550	25.9919
	KALAMAZOO CITY SCHOOL DI	mid-size	4,620	15,243	30.309
	BATTLE CREEK PUBLIC SCHO	mid-size	3,478	9,300	37.3978
	HAMTRAMCK	fringe	1,353	2,867	47.1
	HIGHLAND PARK	fringe	2,298	4,053	56.6
Minnesota	MINNEAPOLIS SPECIAL SCH	large	17,828	49,017	36.3711
	SAINT PAUL SCH DIST	large	11,780	43,775	26.9103
	DULUTH SCH DIST	mid-size	2,598	15,718	16.5288

Mississippi

JACKSON PUBLIC SCHOOL DI	mid-size	12,103	38,811	31.1845
GREENVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOL	large town	4,545	10,642	42.7081

Missouri

ST LOUIS CITY SCHOOL DIS	large	28,205	68,448	41.2065
KANSAS CITY SCH DIST 33	large	17,327	42,058	41.1979
SCHOOL DIST OF ST JOSEPH	mid-size	3,047	14,144	21.5427
SPRINGFIELD R XII	mid-size	4,934	25,915	19.0392
INDEPENDENCE SCH D NO 30		2,252	11,939	18.8626
COLUMBIA SCH DIST 93		2,249	13,950	16.1219

Montana

BILLINGS ELEM # 2	mid-size	1,947	16,066	12.1188
GREAT FALLS EL # 1	mid-size	1,723	13,177	13.0758
MISSOULA ELEM # 1	large town	1,526	9,182	16.6195

Nebraska

OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS	large	10,306	52,771	19.5297
LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS	mid-size	2,803	31,572	8.8781

Nevada

CLARK COUNTY SCH DIST	large	23,220	124,439	18.6597
WASHOE COUNTY	mid-size	4,951	39,478	12.5411622

New Hampshire

MANCHESTER SCH DIST	mid-size	2,165	15,122	14.3169
NASHUA SCH DIST	mid-size	1,449	12,819	11.3035

New Jersey

NEWARK CITY	large	24,446	56,935	42.9367
JERSEY CITY	mid-size	13,124	39,141	33.5301
TRENTON CITY	mid-size	4,881	15,957	30.5885
CAMDEN CITY	mid-size	12,359	21,757	56.8047
ATLANTIC CITY	mid-size	2,968	5,779	51.3584
EAST ORANGE	fringe	3,868	13,186	29.3341
PASSAIC CITY	fringe	3,192	10,840	29.4465
PATERSON CITY	fringe	9,247	28,668	32.2555
ELIZABETH CITY	fringe	5,408	18,877	28.6486

New Mexico

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOO	large	20,782	96,131	21.6184
LAS CRUCES PUBLIC SCHOOL	small town	6,518	19,600	33.2551
GALLUP-MCKINLEY COUNTY P	small town	7,633	13,870	55.0324

New York

KINGS	large	183,991	434,427	42.3526
BRONX	large	107,126	233,963	45.7876
NEW YORK	large	69,581	181,278	38.3836
QUEENS	large	54,854	298,631	18.3685
BUFFALO CITY SCHOOLS	large	22,623	54,041	41.8627
ROCHESTER CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	15,740	38,428	40.9597
ALBANY CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	3,521	12,200	28.8607
SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	8,334	24,532	33.972
UTICA CITY SCHOOLS	mid-size	3,870	10,865	35.619
YONKERS CITY SCHOOLS	fringe	6,282	27,571	22.7848
HEMPSTED	fringe	1,953	6,496	30.06
PEEKSKILL	fringe	656	2,800	23.43

North Carolina

MECKLENBURG COUNTY	large	13,744	85,426	16.0888
CUMBERLAND COUNTY	mid-size	10,030	46,617	21.5158
NEW HANOVER COUNTY		3,977	19,880	20.005

	ROBESON COUNTY	rural	7,199	23,963	30.0421
	FORSYTH COUNTY		6,682	42,523	15.7138
	PITT COUNTY	mid-size city fring	4,914	18,508	26.5507
	GASTON COUNTY		4,679	32,187	14.5369
	WAKE COUNTY		7,453	67,675	11.0129
	GREENSBORO CITY		3,652	20,851	17.5147
North Dakota	MINOT 1	large town	1,256	8,381	14.9863
	BISMARCK 1	mid-size	1,127	11,589	9.7247
	FARGO 1	mid-size	1,114	11,408	9.7651
Ohio	CLEVELAND CITY SD	large	47,631	93,049	51.1892
	COLUMBUS CITY SD	large	24,550	75,451	32.5377
	CINCINNATI CITY SD	large	23,803	66,023	36.0526
	TOLEDO CITY SD	mid-size	15,849	50,884	31.1473
	DAYTON CITY SD	mid-size	13,392	33,664	39.7814
	AKRON CITY SD	mid-size	12,665	37,507	33.767
	YOUNGSTOWN CITY SD	mid-size	8,117	18,576	43.6962
	CANTON CITY SD	mid-size	4,831	13,598	35.5273
Oklahoma	OKLAHOMA CITY SCH DIST	large	15,270	46,268	33.0034
	TULSA CITY SCH DIST	large	14,399	48,655	29.5941
Oregon	PORTLAND SCH DIST IJ	large	11,659	59,573	19.5709
	SALEM/KEIZER SCH DIST 24	mid-size	4,766	31,005	15.3717
	EUGENE SCH DIST 04J	mid-size	2,234	19,871	11.2425
	SPRINGFIELD SCH DIST 019		2,135	11,145	19.1566
	BEAVERTON SCH DIST 48J		1,976	28,126	7.0255
Pennsylvania	PHILADELPHIA CITY S D	large	92,964	263,609	35.2659
	PITTSBURGH S D	large	17,307	51,450	33.6385
	READING S D	mid-size	5,411	13,494	40.0993
	ERIE CITY S D	mid-size	5,394	18,892	28.5518
	HARRISBURG CITY S D	mid-size	4,394	9,340	47.045
	LANCASTER S D	mid-size	3,938	11,783	33.421
	ALLENTOWN CITY S D	mid-size	3,558	15,407	23.0934
	SCRANTON CITY S D	mid-size	2,998	12,230	24.5135
Rhode Island	PROVIDENCE SCH DIST	mid-size	11,152	25,925	43.0164
	CENTRAL FALLS SCH DIST	mid-size city fring	1,252	3,237	38.6777881
	WOONSOCKET SCH DIST	mid-size	1,729	7,328	23.5944323
South Carolina	CHARLESTON COUNTY SCH DI	mid-size	13,392	50,256	26.6476
	RICHLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT	mid-size	8,333	32,105	25.9555
	GREENVILLE COUNTY SCH DI	mid-size city fring	7,243	58,766	12.3252
South Dakota	RAPID CITY 51-4	mid-size	2,579	14,376	17.9396
	SIOUX FALLS 49-5	mid-size	1,902	18,191	10.4557
Tennessee	MEMPHIS CITY SCH DIST	large	42,048	114,506	36.7212
	NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON CO SC	large	18,331	80,904	22.6577
	CHATTANOOGA CITY SCH DIS	mid-size	7,625	25,114	30.3616
	KNOX CO SCH DIST	mid-size	9,709	53,954	17.995
Texas					

	HOUSTON ISD	large	80,864	199,288	40.5765
	DALLAS ISD	large	56,002	145,530	38.4814
	EL PASO ISD	mid-size	27,742	64,651	42.9104
	FORT WORTH ISD	mid-size	23,417	74,177	31.5691
	YSLETA ISD	mid-size	17,497	50,656	34.5408
	AUSTIN ISD	mid-size	15,853	68,042	23.2988
	CORPUS CHRISTI ISD	mid-size	13,131	43,800	29.9795
	SAN ANTONIO ISD	large	32,030	63,937	50.0962
	BROWNSVILLE ISD	mid-size	20,505	34,999	58.5874
Utah	OGDEN CITY SCH DIST	mid-size	2,913	12,617	23.0878973
	SAN JUAN CO SCH DIST	rural	1,273	3,910	32.5575448
	SOUTH SANPETE CO SCH DIS	rural	556	2,637	21.0845658
	GRANITE SCH DIST	mid-size	8,473	79,593	10.6454
	SALT LAKE CITY SCH DIST	mid-size	4,685	26,760	17.5075
Vermont	BURLINGTON SCH DIST	mid-size	807	4,191	19.2555
	RUTLAND CITY SCH DIST	large town	502	2,612	19.219
	BENNINGTON ID SCH DIST	large town	461	2,736	16.8494
Virginia	NORFOLK CTY P S	large	12,097	38,520	31.4045
	RICHMOND CTY P S	mid-size	10,858	28,394	38.2405
	FAIRFAX CO P S	fringe	8,642	142,109	6.0812
Washington	SEATTLE	large	10,873	55,421	19.6189
	TACOMA	mid-size	7,990	32,937	24.2584
	SPOKANE	mid-size	6,859	32,474	21.1215
West Virginia	RALEIGH COUNTY SCH DIST	rural	4,102	15,842	25.8932
	CABELL COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size	3,884	15,956	24.3419
	KANAWHA COUNTY SCH DIST	mid-size city fring	8,050	36,116	22.2893
Wisconsin	MILWAUKEE SCH DIST	large	46,505	118,280	39.3177
	RACINE SCH DIST	mid-size	4,575	26,313	17.3868
	MADISON METROPOLITAN SCH	mid-size	3,815	25,816	14.7777
	KENOSHA SCH DIST	mid-size	3,381	18,690	18.0899
	GREEN BAY AREA SCH DIST	mid-size	3,173	21,787	14.5637
Wyoming	NATRONA CO SCH DIST NO 0	mid-size	1,928	13,299	14.4973
	LARAMIE CO SCH DIST NO 0	mid-size	1,688	13,413	12.5848

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Fax: 202-401-6139

facsimile
TRANSMITTAL

date: 1/7/97

to: Bill Gineaid

office: _____

fax #: 456-7028

from: Jim Butler

office: ED/Budget Service

telephone #: 401-0311

pages: 9 pages(s) total, including cover sheet.

remarks: Bill,
Handouts for today's E02 meeting.
Jim

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Eligibility Issues -- December 18, 1997

Assumptions: Want to wind up with districts that will exemplify the sorts of real challenges faced by many urban and rural districts. Assume that legislative process is more likely to expand, rather than shrink, the range of eligible districts, no matter what we propose.

I. Standing Proposal (from Tom), would make eligible LEAs that:

- Are high-need:
 - At least 20% of students from low-income families; or
 - There are at least 10,000 poor children.
- And are urban or rural:
 - Large or mid-sized central city
 - Urban Fringe of a large city
 - Small town or rural area

II. Options to Further Limit Eligibility

- Increase poverty threshold for all districts to 25%
- Increase poverty threshold for rural districts to 30%
- Remove "urban fringe" category

III. Options to Broaden Eligibility

- Make 3 districts with largest numbers of poor kids eligible
 - Mke 3 districts with largest numbers of kids in both urban and rural categories eligible

IV. Non-LEA Jurisdictions (HI, PR, DC)

- Sub-SEA divisions

V. Very Large Jurisdictions (NYC, Chicago, etc.)

- NYC: Should the whole district be eligible to apply on behalf of a portion of its community districts? Or should community districts be eligible?
- How to address size problem in other cities.

want to keep it as applicable to a manageable #.

*Census pov
Free vs.
rural
price/vol*

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY
600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Fax: 202-401-6139

Please give
a copy to
White C.
- Bill

facsimile
TRANSMITTAL

date: 12/19/97
to: Bill Kincaid
office: _____
fax #: 456-5881
from: Jim Butler
office: Budget Service
telephone #: 401-8311
pages: 2 pages(s) total, including cover sheet.

remarks: Bill,
A table showing different eligibility levels. Hope
to hear something on specific places very soon.
If any place specific you'd like to know about
just call.

Jim

All Columns Include Districts With More Than 10,000 Poor Children

	# of Districts Eligible at 20%	# of Districts Eligible at 25%	# of Districts Eligible at 30%
ALABAMA	67	35	28
ALASKA	16	13	10
ARIZONA	110	85	69
ARKANSAS	190	120	74
CALIFORNIA	226	137	105
COLORADO	64	42	27
— CONNECTICUT	7	7	5
— DELAWARE	5	1	1
FLORIDA	43	21	13
GEORGIA	117	86	59
HAWAII	1	1	1
— IDAHO	26	6	4
ILLINOIS	87	35	23
— INDIANA	24	7	4
* — IOWA	29	3	2
KANSAS	59	21	6
KENTUCKY	115	85	63
? LOUISIANA	52	(14)	37
MAINE	56	26	17
— MARYLAND	4	2	2
MASSACHUSETTS	24	11	10
MICHIGAN	147	83	48
? MINNESOTA	64	(22)	26
MISSISSIPPI	119	103	79
MISSOURI	232	156	97
MONTANA	98	70	52
NEBRASKA	111	77	59
— NEVADA	3	1	1
— NEW HAMPSHIRE	14	6	4
NEW JERSEY	39	24	21
NEW MEXICO	71	57	46
NEW YORK	98	37	21
NORTH CAROLINA	48	23	15
NORTH DAKOTA	76	48	34
OHIO	102	57	39
OKLAHOMA	297	205	140
OREGON	53	21	14
PENNSYLVANIA	102	41	26
RHODE ISLAND	3	2	2
SOUTH CAROLINA	51	35	27
SOUTH DAKOTA	72	42	33
TENNESSEE	82	36	26
TEXAS	576	409	286
— UTAH	3	1	1
VERMONT	32	16	9
VIRGINIA	43	23	8
WASHINGTON	100	66	47
WEST VIRGINIA	41	28	14
WISCONSIN	47	20	8
WYOMING	11	6	4
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	1	1	1
PUERTO RICO	1	1	1
Total	4059	2475	1749