



THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

1620 EYE STREET, NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
TELEPHONE (202) 293-7330
FAX (202) 293-2352
URL: www.usmayors.org

A Call to Action: Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities

November 5, 2009

I. Executive Summary

The national recession is not over for Main Street America. In cities and metropolitan areas across the Nation, unemployment rates continue to rise. Every day, mayors hear personally from their constituents – many who have lost their jobs, many who cannot find new jobs, many who are under-employed, and others who are desperately afraid of what lies ahead.

At the same time, the ongoing recession has had a devastating impact on city budgets. Cities of all sizes and in all parts of the Nation have been forced to institute layoffs, furloughs, service reductions, and fee increases. On top of this, many states have reduced funding to local governments in order to close their own budget gaps – exacerbating the city budget crisis.

Knowing that immediate action was needed to prevent our nation from spiraling into an even deeper recession, the Nation's mayors strongly supported leadership provided by the new Obama Administration and the 111th Congress to pass and implement the \$787 billion American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). We were very pleased that the bill contained funding for programs we championed to create jobs and long-term economic benefit such as the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant, the Community Development Block Grant, the COPS Program, the Byrne/JAG Program, transit grants, and targeted MPO funding for city surface transportation projects. The funding provided to cities through these and other programs in ARRA are already helping to save and create jobs – and will create a more sustainable, energy independent economy for years to come.

But the truth remains that because Congress chose to use existing funding mechanisms, only 0.87 percent of ARRA funds were provided directly to cities. The Administration has recognized this fact, and is working with mayors to help expedite the hundreds of billion of dollars sent through the states – so that these critical resources can serve their intended purposes at the local level.

It is also a fact that while ARRA provided billions in general fiscal relief to state governments to help them close their budget gaps and thus reduce the need for layoffs and service reductions – no such fiscal assistance was provided to cities.

Mayors know that once ARRA is fully implemented, millions of jobs will be saved or created and lasting benefits will be realized. But we also know that the American people are demanding that we save or create more jobs NOW. As the Administration has said, unemployment rates have far exceeded predictions, and now approach 10 percent nationally.

As Members of Congress head home in the coming months, they will hear the same stories of pain and fear that mayors hear every day – and Congress will be forced into action. This time, it is critical that the actions taken be locally focused in a way that will have the most immediate impact on job savings and creation.

II. The Unemployed are Concentrated in Metro Areas

The Conference of Mayors recently conducted a survey of its Workforce Development Council members regarding local unemployment rates. In many cases, cities were able to provide not only unemployment rates for the metropolitan areas, but also for the city proper.

Some staggering unemployment numbers were found in this survey including 13.9 percent in Long Beach, California; 13.4 percent in Las Vegas, Nevada; 19.4 percent in National City, California; 14.9 percent in Providence, Rhode Island; 11.5 percent in St. Louis, Missouri; and 10.9 percent in Cleveland, Ohio. (See full survey listings in Appendix #1.)

It is also important to understand the extent to which very large percentages of states' unemployed workers are concentrated in metropolitan statistical areas. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' most recent data for Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs or metro areas), from August 2009:

- In Georgia, the Atlanta and Augusta metro areas account for 62 percent of the state's unemployed. (Atlanta alone has 57 percent.)
- In Ohio, the Akron, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Toledo metro areas account for 42 percent of the unemployed. (Columbus alone has 29 percent.)
- In Iowa, the Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, and Waterloo metro areas account for 31 percent of the unemployed. (Des Moines alone has 17 percent.)
- In Texas, the Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and Austin metro areas account for 65 percent of the unemployed. (Dallas alone has 27 percent.)
- In Florida, the Miami, Orlando, and Tampa metro areas account for 58 percent of the unemployed. (Miami alone has 31 percent.)
- In Arizona, the Phoenix and Tucson metro areas account for 75 percent of the unemployed. (Phoenix alone has 62 percent.)
- In California, the Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Francisco metro areas account for 57 percent of the unemployed. (Los Angeles alone has 33 percent.)
- In Colorado, the Denver and Colorado Springs metro areas account for 65 percent of the unemployed. (Denver alone has 53 percent.)
- In Washington, the Seattle and Spokane metro areas account for 59 percent of the unemployed. (Seattle alone has 53 percent.)
- In Maryland, the Baltimore metro area accounts for 51 percent of the unemployed.
- In Michigan, the Detroit metro area accounts for 50 percent of the unemployed.

Because many of the nation's largest MSAs encompass cities located in two or more states, calculations of percentages of unemployed workers within individual states for those metro areas is more difficult. But even without this calculation, the heavy concentration of unemployed workers in these areas is easy to see, based on the sheer size of the unemployed population.

In the Chicago metro area, for example, there are 472,300 unemployed workers; in the Philadelphia metro area, there are 263,000; in the Boston metro area, 212,900; in the Minneapolis metro area, 143,900. There are 89,800 unemployed workers in the Providence metro area, and New Jersey's 433,700 unemployed are spread across that urban state's metro areas, including the Trenton metro area with 16,500 and the Atlantic City metro area with 16,700.

III. What Is Happening Now in Cities/Metro Areas

In an effort to better understand the employment and city budget crises faced by cities today, the Conference of Mayors is conducting a brief survey of America's mayors. To date 158 cities ranging in size from Los Angeles and Chicago to those having populations fewer than 10,000 have responded. These cities are spread across 41 states and Puerto Rico. Their responses take us beyond anecdotal information to show the extent to which so many of our cities are sharing the same problems and experiences, and identifying the same needs for assistance to help restore their solvency and put their residents back to work.

- The three employment sectors most often identified by mayors as experiencing the highest levels of unemployment are construction (by 73.5 percent), manufacturing (by 56 percent), and retail (by 46 percent).
- Two-thirds of the cities (66 percent) project that they will experience a budget shortfall in the current fiscal year.
- Most often cited as the local causes of the expected shortfalls are decline in anticipated sales tax revenue (by 70 percent), decline in anticipated service fees (by 55 percent), and decline in anticipated property tax revenues (by 40 percent).
- Seventy-two percent of the mayors report that cuts in state funding to their cities (either grants or passed-through revenues) have contributed to their budget shortfalls.
- Actions most often being taken to avoid budget shortfalls this year include postponing projects or initiatives (by 81 percent), eliminating city positions through attrition (by 75 percent), and reducing purchasing and procurement (by 73 percent).
- Just over four in five mayors responding (81 percent) anticipate a budget shortfall in their next fiscal year.
- Of these mayors, 39 percent expect that next year's shortfall will be larger than the current year's; 22 percent expect it to be much larger. One-fourth of the mayors expect it will be about the same. Fourteen percent expect the shortfall will be smaller, and only one of the cities expects it will be much smaller.

- Just over half of the mayors (51 percent) report that their budget situation has affected their ability to engage in job-creating projects.
- The vast majority of mayors (86 percent) report that they have been authorized to begin work using ARRA funds provided directly to their cities, and/or they have received the direct ARRA funding so that work could begin and workers could be hired.
- Seventy-seven percent of these cities have received direct funding through the Community Development Block Grant; 70 percent have received it through the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant; 68 percent have received it through the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant. Forty-six percent have received COPS hiring grants.
- Mayors say that additional federal assistance can be most effective in creating jobs and meeting local needs if it is focused on local transportation projects such as transit, roads, and bridges (91 percent of the mayors cite this), community and economic development (83 percent cite this), water and sewer projects (71 percent cite this), energy and environmental projects (67 percent cite this), and public safety personnel (55 percent cite this).
- Most mayors (60 percent) believe that conditions in their cities are serious enough that a program of targeted fiscal assistance is warranted to help prevent further drastic city budget reductions.

IV. What Lies Ahead for Cities/Metro Areas

According to The U.S. Conference of Mayors Metro Economies Center and IHS Global Insight, the Nation's 362 metropolitan areas account for 86 percent of all jobs, and 90 percent of the Nation's labor income and gross domestic product.

IHS Global Insight projects that unemployment will peak in early 2010 at 10.1 percent, and it will stay above 9 percent through 2011.

Job losses will continue into 2010, with payroll levels not regaining their 2007 peak until late 2012. Even then the jobless rate will be 8.2 percent, 3.5 percentage points higher than the late 2007 level. Only in 2014 will the national rate of unemployment fall to 7.5 percent.

Metro economies over this time will follow a similar trajectory marked by stubbornly persistent unemployment, but wide differences will emerge among metros, with many falling well behind even this slow pace.

- The average unemployment rate for 2010 will, in 311 of the 363 (85.7 percent) metro areas, exceed that of 2009.
- In 2010, unemployment rates in 260 metros (71.3 percent) will exceed 8 percent, in 200 metros (55.1 percent) will exceed 9 percent, in 139 metros (38.3 percent) will exceed 10 percent, and in 20 metros (5.5 percent) will exceed 15 percent.

- In 2011, 110 metros (30.3 percent) will experience unemployment rates greater than 10 percent, and 51 (14.0 percent) will experience rates greater than 12 percent.
- In 2012, unemployment rates in 114 metros (31.4 percent) will exceed 9 percent, and in 79 metros (21.8 percent) will exceed 10 percent.

Appendix #2 contains individual metro area unemployment forecasts for 2010 through 2012.

V. What is Needed

During The U.S. Conference of Mayors Fall Leadership Meeting in Seattle, Washington on October 2-4, 2009, over 35 mayors signed a letter to President Obama highlighting their concerns regarding jobs losses and budget shortfalls, and outlining actions that could be taken to reverse negative trends. Following is a list of funding priorities to create more jobs and address fiscal stress in our cities:

1. Targeted Fiscal Relief for High Unemployment Cities and Metro Economies

Cities all across the country have faced significant layoffs and budgetary cutbacks this summer, with dire local revenue projections in the coming years. ARRA provided significant fiscal assistance to states, but none to local governments. The recession is now having drastic effects at the local level. Therefore, the Administration and Congress, working with mayors, should develop a fiscal assistance program targeted to cities with high rates of unemployment and budget shortfalls. This is needed to prevent even deeper layoffs in critical areas such as public safety and public works.

2. The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program (EECBG)

Mayors are strong and vocal supporters of the Administration's efforts to address global warming, with 1,000 signatories to The U.S. Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement, which mirrors the Kyoto Protocol greenhouse gas reduction goals. The U.S. Conference of Mayors Green Jobs Index, prepared by Global Insight, forecasts that one in ten new jobs will be generated in the green sector. Providing additional funding for the EECBG will create additional green jobs in community-based carbon reduction projects, demonstrating to the public that climate protection is key to economic growth and energy security. As we await implementation of energy/climate protection legislation following passage by Congress, these are projects that people at the local level can participate in now.

3. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program at Inflation Adjusted Dollars

Because of the failure to adjust for inflation over the last 28 years, the steady erosion of CDBG funding has short-changed low and moderate income communities in their efforts to revitalize neighborhoods. Inflation adjusted funding would address many of the delayed projects in cities across the Nation and build on the proven record of an effective affordable housing, community infrastructure development, and revitalization programs. Mayors could put people back to work immediately with this pent up demand.

4. The COPS Program

For the \$1 billion available through the Recovery Act, the COPS Office received 7,200 applications requesting \$8.36 billion to hire, rehire, or avoid laying off 39,000 officers; it was able to make 1,046 awards for 4,699 officers – only one in eight of the officers requested. The large number of unfunded applications demonstrates that police departments could immediately begin hiring additional officers or avoid laying off current officers if more funds were available.

5. Summer Youth Jobs – 2010

The Recovery Act-funded Summer Jobs Program numbers speak for themselves. The employment rate for the Nation's young people has deteriorated to the lowest level ever recorded since World War II. The \$1.2 billion in stimulus monies under the Recovery Act created jobs for nearly 300,000 low-income teens and young adults and provided comprehensive career readiness training for tens of thousands more. The program surpassed expectations in both job creation and stimulative effect, and the Nation's mayors call on the Administration to provide additional funding for the summer of 2010.

6. The TIGER Grant Program – Round II

For the \$1.5 billion available through the Recovery Act for the TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) Discretionary Grants, the U.S. Department of Transportation received nearly 1,400 applications requesting \$57 billion for transportation projects that improve the environment, the livability of cities and metro areas, and strengthen the economy. The number of applications and funding requests demonstrates the need to rebuild transportation infrastructure in ways that are energy efficient and environmentally sensitive – nearly half the applications were for multimodal, transit, railroad, and port investments. With the delay in reauthorizing the federal surface transportation law (SAFETEA-LU), we urge that an additional round of TIGER grants be funded immediately.

7. School Construction

America's schools are in dire need of modernization and repair. Every day, many of our children attend school in overcrowded classrooms with faulty electrical systems, broken windows, peeling paint and leaking roofs. Existing schools are bursting at the seams and hold class in "temporary" trailers, converted closets, and hallways. A federal investment to modernize school buildings, improve their energy efficiency, and equip them with first-class technology would create badly needed jobs in the construction industry, one of the industries hardest hit by the recent economic downturn. In addition, by helping local school districts create schools that are energy efficient and more reliant on renewable sources of energy, we could greatly reduce the emissions that contribute to global warming.

8. Small Business Access to Credit

Because small businesses create the vast majority of new jobs in local communities, mayors commend the Administration for taking action to help improve their access to capital. The financial crisis caused banks and financial institutions to stop lending to small businesses, which made it difficult for many of them to borrow the money they need to remain in business. The Administration has taken a number of steps to restart the flow of credit to small businesses, including increasing small business loans by \$13 billion since the enactment of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act last February. We also commend the Administration for recently announcing support for new initiatives to lower the cost of borrowing to small businesses and increase the maximum size of Small Business Administration loans, and we recommend that significant new resources be made available through this initiative. In addition, many small businesses today have had their access to more flexible products, like revolving lines of credit, either eliminated or significantly curtailed. These credit facilities are essential to small business growth and success given that the cost of capital is only paid when used/accessed.

9. City Access to Treasury/TARP Credit

As a result of the recession and the tightening of credit markets, cities have had difficulty accessing the municipal bond market, or have faced borrowing rates in excess of traditional norms. This has made it difficult for cities to finance needed infrastructure improvements that create jobs – even though municipal governments are among the most dependable and stable institutional borrowers in the nation. Therefore, we recommend that the U.S. Department of the Treasury use a portion of the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) to help finance municipal bond infrastructure projects at a rate that benefits municipal governments and taxpayers, and guarantees a positive rate of return for the federal government.

VI. Conclusion

The above targeted budget initiatives would stem layoffs in cities, create jobs immediately (because funds would be distributed directly to cities and counties) and support priorities of mayors, the Administration and Congress: green jobs to address global warming; community funds for local infrastructure projects that states rarely fund; public safety jobs within cities; youth employment that will change lives; and targeted help for the communities that did not see a new job in this decade and face poor job creation prospects in the future.

Appendix #1

USCM Workforce Development Council Survey: City/Metro Unemployment Rates for 2009

City	State	Unemployment Rate	Month	Notes
Akron	OH	10.1%	August	City
Albany	NY	7.0%	August	MSA- Albany-Schenectady-Troy
Arlington Heights	IL	7.3%		City
Baltimore	MD	11.3%		City
Barlett	IL	8.9%		City
Batavia	IL	8.3%		City
Bonita	CA	10.0%	September	CDP
Boston	MA	8.4%	August	MSA- Boston-Cambridge-Quincy
Bostonia	CA	12.9%	September	CDP
Bridgeport	CT	11.9%	August	City
Broward County	FL	9.8%	September	County
Buffalo	NY	10.8%	September	City
Buffalo Grove	IL	8.3%		City
Burnsville	MN	7.5%	August	City
Canton	OH	13.0%		City
Carlsbad	CA	6.8%	September	City
Casa de Oro Mount	CA	8.9%	September	CDP
Charleston	NC	9.7%	August	MSA-Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville
Chattanooga	TN	9.6%	August	MSA
Chicago	IL	9.8%	September	City
Chula Vista	CA	11.9%	September	City
Cincinnati	OH	10.1%		City
Clarksville	TN	11.0%	August	MSA
Cleveland	OH	10.9%	September	City
Columbus	OH	8.8%	August	City
Columbus	GA	9.6%	August	MSA
Concord	CA	12.1%	September	City
Coronado	CA	6.6%	September	City
Cupertino	CA	7.7%	September	City-Preliminary
Dallas	TX	8.7%	September	City
Dayton	OH	12.9%		City
Del Mar	CA	5.1%	September	City
Denver	CO	7.4%	August	MSA-Denver-Aurora-Broomfield
Des Plaines	IL	9.5%		City
Detroit	MI	17.0%	August	MSA-Detroit, Warren-Livonia
Durham	NC	8.0%	August	MSA-Durham-Chapel Hill
El Cajon	CA	13.9%	September	City
Elgin City	IL	11.8%		City
Elk Grove	IL	8.6%		City
Elyria	OH	10.2%		City
Encinitas	CA	7.3%	September	City

A Call to Action:
Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
Page 9

City	State	Unemployment Rate	Month	Notes
Escondido	CA	10.7%	September	City
Evanston	IL	7.2%		City
Fallbrook	CA	11.8%	September	CPD
Flagstaff	AZ	8.3%	September	MSA-Preliminary
Fort Wayne	IN	10.5%	August	City
Fort Wayne	IN	10.2%	August	MSA
Fort Worth	TX	8.3%		Fort Worth-Arlington
Ft. Lauderdale	FL	9.8%	September	MSA
Glendale	CA	11.1%	September	City
Glenview	IL	6.8%	September	City- preliminary
Green Bay	WI	8.0%	August	MSA
Hammond	IN	11.3%	August	City
Hanover Park	IL	10.1%		City
Hartford	CT	8.1%	August	MSA Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford
Hoffman Estates	IL	8.0%		City
Houston	TX	8.4%	August	MSA-Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown
Imperial Beach	CA	16.3%	September	City
Indianapolis	IN	8.9%	August	City
Indianapolis	IN	8.2%	August	MSA- Indianapolis-Carnel
Kansas City	MO	8.8%	August	MSA
La Mesa City	CA	8.6%	September	City
Lake Havasu-Kingman	AZ	10.6%	September	MSA- Preliminary
Lakeside	CA	10.4%	September	CPD
Las Vegas	NV	13.4%	August	City
Lemon Grove	CA	12.8%	September	City
Long Beach	CA	13.9%	September	City
Lorain	OH	12.8%		City
Los Altos	CA	6.1%	September	City-Preliminary
Los Angeles	CA	14.0%	September	City-Preliminary
Louisville	KY	10.3%	August	MSA-Louisville-Jefferson County
Lubbock	TX	5.7%	August	MSA
Macon	GA	10.5%	September	City
Mansfield	OH	12.8%		City
Miami	FL	11.3%		MSA
Milpitas	CA	12.1%	September	City-Preliminary
Milwaukee	WI	11.9%	August	City
Minneapolis	MN	7.7%	August	MSA-Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington
Mortan Grove	IL	7.5%		City
Mount Prospect	IL	7.9%		City
Mountain View	CA	8.7%	September	City-Preliminary
Nashville	TN	9.8%	August	MSA-Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--
National City	CA	19.4%	September	City
New Orleans	LA	11.2%	August	City
New Philadelphia	OH	11.4%		City

A Call to Action:
Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
Page 10

City	State	Unemployment Rate	Month	Notes
New York	NY	10.3%	September	City
Niles	IL	8.4%		City
Norfolk	VA	6.6%	August	MSA- Virginia Beach, Norfolk, Newport News
Northbrook	IL	6.3%		City
Oakland	CA	11.3%	September	MD-Oakland-Fremont-Hayward
Oceanside	CA	9.8%	September	City
Orlando	FL	10.9%	August	SMSA
Palatine	IL	7.7%		City
Palo Alto	CA	6.4%	September	City-Preliminary
Park Ridge	IL	7.4%		City
Pasadena	CA	9.7%	September	City
Peoria	IL	10.9%	August	MSA
Philadelphia	PA	10.7%	August	City- Based on BLS Statistics
Phoenix	AZ	8.5%	September	MSA-Preliminary
Pittsburgh	PA	7.9%	August	MSA
Portland	OR	11.9%	August	City
Poway	CA	6.1%	September	City
Prescott	AZ	9.5%	September	MSA-Preliminary
Providence	RI	14.9%		City
Ramona	CA	9.3%	September	CDP
Revere	MA	9.2%		City
Richmond	CA	17.9%	September	City
Rochester	NY	8.0%	September	City
Sacramento	CA	14.2%	September	City
San Bernardino	CA	18.1%	September	City
San Diego	CA	10.2%	September	City
San Francisco	CA	9.7%	September	City
San Francisco	CA	10.7%	August	MSA-San Francisco- Oakland-Fremont
San Marcos	CA	10.2%	September	City
Santa Ana	CA	14.7%	September	City
Santa Clara	CA	10.8%	September	City-Preliminary
Santee	CA	8.6%	September	City
Savannah	GA	8.5%	August	MSA
Schaumburg	IL	8.1%		City
Scranton	PA	9.1%	August	MSA-Scranton-Wilkes-Barre
Seattle	WA	8.9%	September	City
Skokie	IL	8.2%		City
Solana Beach	CA	6.3%	September	City
South Bend	IN	12.3%	August	City
Spokane	WA	8.5%	August	MSA
Spring Valley	CA	10.9%	September	CDP
St. Louis	MO	11.5%	September	City
St. Paul	MN	7.7%	August	MSA-Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington
Streamwood	IL	10.3%		City

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 11

City	State	Unemployment Rate	Month	Notes
Silicon Valley	CA	11.8%		MSA
Sunnyvale	CA	10.1%		City
Syracuse	NY	8.1%	September	City
Tacoma	WA	8.8%	August	MSA-Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue
Tampa	FL	11.3%	August	MSA-Tamps-St. Petersburg-Clearwater
Toledo	OH	13.2%		City
Tucson	AZ	8.2%	September	MSA-Preliminary
Tulsa	OK	7.1%	August	MSA
Valley Center CDP	CA	4.8%	September	CDP
Valparaiso	IN	7.5%	August	City
Vista	CA	11.4%	September	City
Washington	DC	6.0%	August	MSA- Washington-Arlington-Alexandria
Wheeling	IL	8.1%		City
Wilmette	IL	6.1%		City
Youngstown	OH	13.2%	August	City
Yuma	AZ	20.7%	September	MSA-Preliminary

Appendix #2

Metro Unemployment Forecast (From IHS Global Insight)

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Abilene, TX	6.21	5.73	5.07
Akron, OH	10.88	10.38	9.84
Albuquerque, NM	7.54	6.78	6.14
Alexandria, LA	7.22	6.75	6.22
Albany, GA	10.3	9.7	8.86
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	9.36	8.48	7.66
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	7.49	7	6.47
Altoona, PA	7.55	6.96	6.5
Amarillo, TX	5.66	5.21	4.6
Ames, IA	5.38	5.1	4.82
Anchorage, AK	7.65	7.37	7.11
Anderson, IN	10.85	10.63	10.32
Ann Arbor, MI	9.3	8.71	8.25
Anniston-Oxford, AL	10.47	9.76	9
Anderson, SC	12.46	11.91	10.88
Appleton, WI	9.29	9.86	9.65
Asheville, NC	8.9	8.4	7.67
Atlantic City-Hammonton, NJ	12.02	9.81	8.09
Athens-Clarke County, GA	7.43	7.17	6.7
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	10.12	9.34	8.42
Auburn-Opelika, AL	8.43	7.9	7.32
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	9.39	8.95	8.29
Austin-Round Rock, TX	7.42	6.86	6.04
Bakersfield, CA	15.58	13.55	12.31
Baltimore-Towson, MD	7	6.29	5.43
Bangor, ME	9.29	8.95	8.29
Barnstable Town, MA	7.39	7.52	7.31
Baton Rouge, LA	7.42	6.97	6.57
Battle Creek, MI	12.91	12.27	11.9
Bay City, MI	13.19	12.51	12.12
Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	11.05	10.22	8.94
Bellingham, WA	7.83	6.95	6.31
Bend, OR	14.98	13.51	11.5
Billings, MT	5.19	4.88	4.67
Binghamton, NY	8.92	8.41	7.84
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	9.79	8.99	8.14
Bismarck, ND	3.98	3.93	3.6
Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford, VA	7.22	6.62	6.09

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 13

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Bloomington-Normal, IL	7.96	7.9	7.27
Bloomington, IN	7.17	7.05	6.88
Boston-Quincy, MA	9.1	8.42	7.61
Boise City-Nampa, ID	9.64	7.94	6.78
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	8.78	8.16	7.41
Boulder, CO	6.74	6.7	5.89
Bowling Green, KY	11.31	9.51	8.38
Bremerton-Silverdale, WA	7.37	6.71	6.22
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	7.7	7.18	6.48
Brownsville-Harlingen, TX	10.75	9.94	8.83
Brunswick, GA	8.99	8.49	7.78
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	9.12	8.6	7.99
Burlington, NC	11.67	10.77	9.61
Burlington-South Burlington, VT	6.75	6.72	6.17
Canton-Massillon, OH	12.73	12.06	11.35
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	12.55	11.81	10.61
Carson City, NV	13.44	12.2	10.9
Casper, WY	7.22	6.22	5.53
Cedar Rapids, IA	7.26	6.87	6.34
Champaign-Urbana, IL	8.85	8.75	8.04
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	11.36	10.48	9.33
Chattanooga, TN-GA	9.67	9.13	8.31
Cheyenne, WY	6.7	6.11	5.62
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	10.75	10.55	9.67
Chico, CA	13.4	12.11	11.27
Charleston-North Charleston-Summerville, SC	9.43	8.99	8.18
Charlottesville, VA	5.06	4.57	4.13
Charleston, WV	8.3	7.88	7.34
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	10.16	9.45	8.84
Clarksville, TN-KY	11.04	10.03	9.1
Cleveland, TN	10.75	10.12	9.21
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	9.3	8.89	8.51
Coeur d'Alene, ID	10.4	7.73	6.58
Columbus, IN	9.38	9.01	8.59
College Station-Bryan, TX	6.15	5.67	5.01
Colorado Springs, CO	8.65	8.66	7.79
Columbus, GA-AL	9.74	9.26	8.58
Columbia, MO	6.42	6.01	5.68
Columbus, OH	9.23	8.89	8.48
Corpus Christi, TX	7.78	7.15	6.31
Corvallis, OR	8.01	7.42	6.36

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 14

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Columbia, SC	9.06	8.6	7.95
Cumberland, MD-WV	8.48	7.78	6.73
Danville, IL	12.72	12.57	11.56
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	8.55	7.89	6.94
Dalton, GA	13.13	11.83	10.38
Danville, VA	11.88	10.64	9.53
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	9.21	8.84	8.02
Dayton, OH	11.91	11.26	10.63
Decatur, AL	10.82	10	9.13
Detroit-Livonia-Dearborn, MI	17.6	16.49	15.75
Decatur, IL	13.77	13.37	12.06
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	10.69	10.09	9.08
Denver-Aurora-Broomfield, CO	8.41	8.19	7.18
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	6.69	6.22	5.79
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	16.84	15.66	14.84
Dothan, AL	9.08	8.5	7.87
Dover, DE	7.34	6.31	5.35
Dubuque, IA	7.86	7.44	7.02
Duluth, MN-WI	11.47	11.43	10.72
Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	7.73	7.24	6.46
Eau Claire, WI	7.9	8.52	8.47
El Centro, CA	26.72	24.96	23.96
Elizabethtown, KY	10.69	9.18	8.28
Elkhart-Goshen, IN	16.1	15.63	15.01
Elmira, NY	9.63	9.02	8.36
El Paso, TX	10.26	9.82	8.85
Erie, PA	9.7	8.73	7.97
Eugene-Springfield, OR	12.8	12.06	10.47
Evansville, IN-KY	8.47	8.08	7.73
Fairbanks, AK	7.42	7.11	6.87
Fayetteville, NC	9.11	8.74	8.12
Fargo, ND-MN	5.07	4.96	4.63
Farmington, NM	7.24	6.4	5.72
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	6.24	6.35	5.89
Flagstaff, AZ	8.26	8.04	7.45
Florence-Muscle Shoals, AL	10.61	9.94	9.22
Flint, MI	16.46	15.67	15.23
Florence, SC	12.16	11.55	10.75
Fond du Lac, WI	9.56	10.2	10.04
Fresno, CA	16.93	15.22	13.55
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	6.85	7.06	6.54

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 15

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Fort Smith, AR-OK	8.6	8.8	8.01
Fort Wayne, IN	10.3	9.95	9.53
Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL	6.99	6.74	6.18
Gadsden, AL	10.46	9.83	9.14
Gainesville, FL	6.71	6.33	5.68
Gainesville, GA	9.37	8.83	8.07
Glens Falls, NY	8.58	8.14	7.64
Goldsboro, NC	9.03	8.64	8.01
Green Bay, WI	9.16	9.86	9.73
Greeley, CO	9.04	9.21	8.46
Greensboro-High Point, NC	11.21	10.49	9.4
Great Falls, MT	5.59	5.37	5.2
Grand Forks, ND-MN	5.61	5.56	5.13
Grand Junction, CO	9.33	9.25	8.28
Greenville, NC	10.15	9.69	8.98
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	12.1	11.43	11.03
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC	10.06	9.47	8.56
Gulfport-Biloxi, MS	9.11	9.2	8.59
Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV	9.52	8.8	7.7
Hanford-Corcoran, CA	16.42	14.9	13.89
Harrisonburg, VA	5.31	4.82	4.37
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	7.66	6.98	6.4
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	8.11	7.6	6.93
Hattiesburg, MS	8.71	8.85	8.34
Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC	13.66	12.53	11.27
Hinesville-Fort Stewart, GA	8.23	7.91	7.38
Holland-Grand Haven, MI	13.42	12.6	12.05
Honolulu, HI	5.87	5.46	5.11
Hot Springs, AR	7.59	7.84	7.37
Houma-Bayou Cane-Thibodaux, LA	5.6	5.14	4.7
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	8.5	7.67	6.64
Huntsville, AL	8.08	7.45	6.73
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	8.76	8.12	7.55
Idaho Falls, ID	7.29	6.77	5.81
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	8.52	8.31	8.01
Iowa City, IA	5.4	5.1	4.69
Ithaca, NY	6.2	5.89	5.53
Jackson, MI	15.18	14.35	13.84
Jackson, MS	8.1	7.79	7.17
Janesville, WI	12.42	13.19	12.93
Jackson, TN	11.51	10.74	9.69

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 16

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Jefferson City, MO	7.4	6.95	6.57
Johnson City, TN	10.37	9.69	8.77
Johnstown, PA	8.98	8.27	7.72
Jonesboro, AR	7.49	7.69	7.18
Joplin, MO	7.96	7.44	7
Jacksonville, FL	9.97	9.57	8.61
Jacksonville, NC	8.36	7.93	7.3
Kalamazoo-Portage, MI	11.75	11.14	10.78
Kankakee-Bradley, IL	14.17	13.94	12.77
Kansas City, MO-KS	8.85	8.32	7.77
Kennewick-Pasco-Richland, WA	7.01	6.48	6.08
Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX	7.21	6.69	5.97
Kingsport-Bristol-Bristol, TN-VA	9.68	8.95	8.08
Kingston, NY	8.22	7.76	7.25
Knoxville, TN	9.32	8.65	7.78
Kokomo, IN	13.09	12.77	12.33
Lake Charles, LA	7.25	6.8	6.25
La Crosse, WI-MN	7.59	8.1	7.97
Lafayette, LA	6.25	5.7	5.18
Lafayette, IN	9.6	9.2	8.74
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	11.01	10.37	9.31
Lancaster, PA	8.16	7.56	6.89
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	11.47	9.83	8.76
Lansing-East Lansing, MI	11.37	10.73	10.35
Laredo, TX	9.18	8.43	7.42
Las Cruces, NM	7.13	6.46	5.91
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	13.58	12.28	10.91
Lawrence, KS	5.73	5.31	4.85
Lawton, OK	6.26	6.54	5.8
Lebanon, PA	6.89	6.24	5.74
Lewiston-Auburn, ME	9.67	9.28	8.49
Lewiston, ID-WA	7.27	6.59	5.92
Lexington-Fayette, KY	9.11	7.66	6.84
Lima, OH	11.6	11.18	10.68
Lincoln, NE	4.79	5.16	5.03
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	7.03	7.2	6.67
Logan, UT-ID	4.67	4.5	4.25
Longview, TX	8	7.22	6.24
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	10.67	9.34	8.57
Longview, WA	13.29	11.44	10.32
Lubbock, TX	5.63	5.22	4.65

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 17

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Lynchburg, VA	6.68	6.01	5.42
Macon, GA	10.08	9.53	8.74
Madera-Chowchilla, CA	15.05	13.64	12.71
Madison, WI	6.59	6.27	5.91
Manchester-Nashua, NH	7.66	7.17	6.44
Mansfield, OH	14.26	13.49	12.67
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission, TX	11.66	10.71	9.38
Medford, OR	13.49	12.78	11.17
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	10.89	10.46	9.57
Merced, CA	19.23	17.49	16.34
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	10.46	9.95	8.93
Michigan City-La Porte, IN	12.07	11.54	10.95
Midland, TX	5.96	5.35	4.59
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	9.32	9.37	9.01
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	8.45	8.44	8.11
Missoula, MT	6.51	6.11	5.84
Mobile, AL	9.99	9.14	8.28
Modesto, CA	17.65	15.48	13.82
Monroe, LA	8.68	8.01	7.31
Monroe, MI	14.54	13.85	13.44
Montgomery, AL	9.92	9.29	8.61
Morgantown, WV	5.79	5.59	5.24
Morristown, TN	13.4	12.49	11.26
Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA	9.6	8.66	7.93
Muncie, IN	10.18	10.01	9.76
Muskegon-Norton Shores, MI	16.05	15.12	14.51
Myrtle Beach-North Myrtle Beach-Conway, SC	12.37	11.89	11.01
Napa, CA	9.46	8.43	7.74
Naples-Marco Island, FL	10.45	9.87	8.89
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	9.83	9.15	8.22
New Haven-Milford, CT	8.8	8.29	7.56
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	7.54	6.98	6.4
Niles-Benton Harbor, MI	13.81	13.1	12.67
Norwich-New London, CT	7.51	7.11	6.53
New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA (MSA)	9.14	8.38	7.64
Ocala, FL	12.15	11.51	10.39
Ocean City, NJ	12.39	10.2	8.5
Odessa, TX	8.83	7.78	6.55
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	6.57	6.43	6.11
Oklahoma City, OK	7.25	7.64	6.86
Olympia, WA	7.33	6.67	6.16

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 18

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	5.75	5.65	5.66
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	10.53	9.91	8.81
Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	8.53	9.21	9.16
Owensboro, KY	10.58	9.02	8.1
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	10.68	9.38	8.51
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	10.45	9.83	8.82
Panama City-Lynn Haven-Panama City Beach, FL	9.19	8.73	7.89
Parkersburg-Marietta-Vienna, WV-OH	10.5	9.96	9.28
Pascagoula, MS	10.05	10.5	10.1
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	9.15	8.62	7.73
Peoria, IL	12.51	12	10.68
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	8.57	7.71	6.99
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	9	8.7	8
Pine Bluff, AR	9.78	10.29	10.2
Pittsfield, MA	8.21	8.16	7.89
Pittsburgh, PA	7.81	7.14	6.58
Pocatello, ID	7.15	6.12	5.29
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	7.85	7.5	6.79
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	11.53	10.26	8.8
Port St. Lucie, FL	12.22	11.57	10.45
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	8.65	8.16	7.51
Prescott, AZ	9.94	9.59	8.81
Provo-Orem, UT	5.85	5.73	5.45
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	12.47	11.64	10.57
Pueblo, CO	8.94	9.29	8.71
Punta Gorda, FL	11.6	11.07	10.09
Racine, WI	11.25	12.08	11.96
Raleigh-Cary, NC	8.2	7.59	6.78
Rapid City, SD	5.15	4.96	4.82
Reading, PA	9.18	8.34	7.64
Redding, CA	16.57	14.94	13.85
Reno-Sparks, NV	13.74	12.42	11.03
Richmond, VA	7.22	6.5	5.79
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	13.63	11.93	10.5
Roanoke, VA	7	6.21	5.52
Rockford, IL	16.84	16.34	14.77
Rome, GA	11.22	10.58	9.67
Rochester, MN	8.64	9.1	8.67
Rocky Mount, NC	13.31	12.6	11.44
Rochester, NY	8.92	8.5	7.95
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA	8.99	8.08	7.48

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 19

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	11.93	10.44	9.44
Santa Cruz-Watsonville, CA	12.95	11.56	10.62
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	10.3	8.98	8.1
Santa Fe, NM	6.08	5.45	4.92
Saginaw-Saginaw Township North, MI	13.73	13.06	12.68
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	11.94	10.01	8.96
Salem, OR	11.92	11.19	9.69
Salinas, CA	13.85	12.53	11.65
Salisbury, MD	8.27	7.48	6.23
Salt Lake City, UT	6.28	6.13	5.82
San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	9.34	8.41	7.8
Sandusky, OH	12.39	11.95	11.43
San Angelo, TX	6.63	6.08	5.35
San Antonio, TX	7.2	6.76	6.05
Bradenton-Sarasota-Venice, FL	11.31	10.55	9.32
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	10.14	8.9	7.98
Savannah, GA	9.02	8.5	7.77
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	9.33	8.64	8.01
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	9.35	7.86	6.96
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA (MSA)	10.45	9	8.08
Sheboygan, WI	9.51	10.05	9.81
Sherman-Denison, TX	8.49	7.78	6.84
Shreveport-Bossier City, LA	8.34	7.83	7.21
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD	6.19	6	5.6
Sioux Falls, SD	5.33	4.84	4.46
South Bend-Mishawaka, IN-MI	11.32	10.98	10.6
Spartanburg, SC	12.44	11.81	10.89
Springfield, IL	8.48	8.5	7.9
Springfield, MA	9.87	9.22	8.38
Springfield, MO	8.4	7.78	7.26
Springfield, OH	11.79	11.24	10.65
Spokane, WA	8.99	7.72	7.01
State College, PA	5.88	5.43	5.09
St. Cloud, MN	10.37	10.33	10.42
St. George, UT	8.27	8.1	7.72
St. Joseph, MO-KS	8.49	7.87	7.34
St. Louis, MO-IL	10.01	9.55	8.85
Stockton, CA	16.64	14.72	13.41
Sumter, SC	13.51	12.78	11.85
Syracuse, NY	8.84	8.35	7.75
Tallahassee, FL	7.04	6.67	6.01

A Call to Action:
 Targeted Fiscal Assistance and Jobs for Cities
 Page 20

Metro	Unemployment (%)		
	2010	2011	2012
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	10.78	10	8.79
Terre Haute, IN	10.43	10.21	9.91
Texarkana, TX-Texarkana, AR	6.8	6.52	5.91
Toledo, OH	13.01	12.42	11.83
Topeka, KS	6.71	6.26	5.76
Trenton-Ewing, NJ	7.9	6.9	6.2
Tucson, AZ	8.8	8.7	8.17
Tulsa, OK	8.18	8.39	7.31
Tuscaloosa, AL	9.26	8.65	7.97
Tyler, TX	8.03	7.35	6.45
Utica-Rome, NY	8.29	7.88	7.42
Valdosta, GA	8.47	8.07	7.45
Vallejo-Fairfield, CA	11.58	10.25	9.31
Sebastian-Vero Beach, FL	13.19	12.37	11.08
Victoria, TX	7.73	6.98	6.03
Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton, NJ	12.69	10.45	8.71
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	6.53	6.25	5.64
Visalia-Porterville, CA	16.88	15.37	14.4
Waco, TX	7.03	6.48	5.73
Warner Robins, GA	7.54	7.24	6.74
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	5.65	5.13	4.56
Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	6.97	6.54	6
Wausau, WI	9.61	10.19	9.99
Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH	13.53	12.78	11.9
Wenatchee-East Wenatchee, WA	8.1	7.37	6.81
Wheeling, WV-OH	10.02	9.58	9.01
Wichita, KS	8.87	8.12	7.3
Wichita Falls, TX	7.86	7.2	6.32
Williamsport, PA	9.34	8.51	7.85
Wilmington, NC	10.12	9.66	8.95
Winchester, VA-WV	7.66	6.89	6.16
Winston-Salem, NC	9.7	9.05	8.07
Worcester, MA	10.36	9.57	8.64
Yakima, WA	8.78	8.2	7.78
York-Hanover, PA	8.73	7.89	7.19
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	13.7	12.87	11.97
Yuba City, CA	18.76	17.1	16.03
Yuma, AZ	20.6	20.43	19.53