



A Bureau of Business Research Report  
From the University of Nebraska–Lincoln

---

## **Final Report**

### **Corrections for the 2019 Nebraska Thriving Index Report**

Prepared by Dr. Eric Thompson  
Prepared for the University of Nebraska Rural Futures Institute

July 18, 2020  
Bureau of Business Research  
Department of Economics  
College of Business  
University of Nebraska–Lincoln  
Dr. Eric Thompson, Director

## Introduction

This report summarizes required corrections for the original print version of the *2019 Nebraska Thriving Index* report and changes to the original report results due to the corrections. The required corrections are summarized below before corrected results are presented. Specifically, the corrected and uncorrected values for the original print version of the *2019 Nebraska Thriving Index* report are compared, as are values for each of the eight sub-indexes and each of the 48 individual component measures.

Note that there are now two sets of *2019 Nebraska Thriving Index* values. The “corrected” values for the *2019 Nebraska Thriving Index* are values that should have appeared in the original print version of the 2019 report. Conversely, the “revised” values for the *2019 Nebraska Thriving Index* are values that reflect the corrections outlined below, as well as other efforts to continuously improve the index, such as ongoing revisions and updates to the Nebraska Thriving Index including: (a) one new measure, (b) the removal of two existing measures, (c) revisions to the underlying data (from the data source), and in some cases, (d) values from improved data sources. The “revised” values align with the *2020 Nebraska Thriving Index* report so the two years can be compared and are available on-line at [RuralProsperityNE.unl.edu](http://RuralProsperityNE.unl.edu). It is advised that the “revised” values are used when making time series comparisons.

## Corrections

There were three primary types of errors requiring correction. Each is described below.

### Area 1

The first type of error relates to entering data values in the wrong order. This primarily occurred due to differences in the alphabetical order of counties in various data sources used in the Nebraska Thriving Index. For example, some data sources list Madison County, Nebraska ahead of McPherson County, Nebraska in the alphabetical order, or La Plata County, Colorado ahead of Lake County, Colorado. For 11 measures, this inconsistency in alphabetical order was not properly accounted for in all cases when entering data. Such errors at the county level led to errors in the values for the regions which contain those counties. The impacted measures are discussed in Part C of the Results section of this report (see Pages 6 and 7). Further, for nine measures, inconsistency between the alphabetical order of Madison and McPherson counties in Nebraska also led to an adding error which inflated measure values in the North 81 region (which includes Madison County) and led to small differences in values for the Southwest region (which includes McPherson County). Industrial diversity values also were entered in the wrong order for the Siouxland and Southeast regions in Nebraska, resulting in a large change in the value of that measure in the Siouxland region.

Incorrect entry of data due to differences in alphabetical order often occurred in just a handful of the more than 800 counties in the Thriving Index data set. Nonetheless, these errors had a broader impact on regional index values. Specifically, an incorrect data entry for any county in one of the six to nine peer regions in a region group would impact the index value for all regions

in the group. That is, all regions in a group are used to calculate the mean and standard deviation value for that group. These means and standard deviations are used to calculate the index value for all regions in the group.

### **Area 2**

The second type of error was improperly accessing data for four individual measures. The wrong data was accessed for the Share of Workers in Non-Employer Establishments measure and the Count of Qualified Opportunity Zones measure. A portion of the data also was accessed incorrectly for the Count of 4-Year Colleges measure, primarily in Iowa, Colorado and Illinois. There also was missing data for some Iowa counties for the People per Arts & Recreation Worker measure. These errors impacted values for the Economic Opportunity & Diversity, Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business and Quality of Life sub-indexes.

### **Area 3**

The third type of error occurred due to incorrect assignment of counties in three peer comparison regions. In particular, four counties were incorrectly excluded from the Iowa 7 region, one county was incorrectly excluded from the Iowa 8 region and three counties were incorrectly added to the Illinois 2 region. Iowa 7 and Illinois 2 are peer regions in the Siouxland region group. Iowa 7 and Iowa 8 are peer regions for in the Southeast region group. Index values throughout the Nebraska Thriving Index were impacted in these two region groups.

## **Results**

This section summarizes corrected results. Corrected and uncorrected values for the *2019 Nebraska Thriving Index* report are compared first. Second, corrected and uncorrected values are presented for each of the eight sub-indexes of the Nebraska Thriving Index. Revised values for each of 48 individual component measures are presented last.

Table 1: Corrected Versus Uncorrected Value for the 2019 Nebraska Thriving Index in Nebraska Regions

Region Name	Region Number	2019 Nebraska Thriving Index Value		2019 Nebraska Thriving Index Rank	
		Uncorrected Value	Corrected Value	Uncorrected Rank	Corrected Rank
North 81	6 Nebraska	144	145	1	1
Northeast	5 Nebraska	103	105	3	3
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	98	96	3	3
Sandhills	2 Nebraska	109	109	2	2
Siouxland	9 Nebraska	105	83	3	4
Southeast	7 Nebraska	112	115	3	3
Southwest	3 Nebraska	95	100	5	5
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	136	134	1	1

### *Part A -- Corrected and Uncorrected Values for the 2019 Nebraska Thriving Index*

The errors described in the previous Corrections section did not significantly impact the aggregate value for the Nebraska Thriving Index for seven of eight Nebraska regions, as seen in Table 1 above. The table compares the uncorrected and corrected values and rankings for the Nebraska Thriving Index for each Nebraska region. Values and rankings change little for most Nebraska regions. In the corrected results, the micropolitan and small metropolitan North 81 and Tri-Cities regions continue to significantly outperform their peer regions and Nebraska Thriving Index values are well above 100. Other non-metropolitan Nebraska regions have values near 100, performing largely in line with their peers.

Only the Siouxland region shows a significant change, falling from a value of 105 in the uncorrected results to a value of 83 after errors were corrected. The rank of Siouxland among its peer regions also fell from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup>. As will be seen later, this difference primarily arose due to correcting two errors: the incorrect inclusion of extra counties in peer region Illinois 2, and an error in entering an incorrect regional value for the industry diversity measure for the Siouxland region.

Appendix Table 1 (see Page 17) shows corrected and uncorrected Nebraska Thriving Index values for each of the peer comparison regions. Most comparison region values changed by very little. One notable exception was Illinois 2.

### *Part B -- Corrected and Uncorrected Values for the 2019 Nebraska Thriving Index report Sub-Indexes*

Table 2 (see Page 5) points out differences between corrected and uncorrected index values by bolding values that differ. About half of the sub-index values are bolded. This is expected given that about one dozen individual measures were impacted by the alphabetical order issue, as discussed in Area 1 of the Corrections section (see Page 1). Such an error for even one county in one of the four to nine measures in a sub-index would change the aggregate sub-index value.<sup>1</sup>

Table 2 shows the corrected and uncorrected sub-index values for each of the eight sub-indexes:

- Growth (GRW)
- Economic Opportunity & Diversity (EOD)
- Other Prosperity (OP)
- Demographic Growth & Renewal (DGR)
- Education and Skill (EAS)
- Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business (ICDB)
- Quality of Life (QOL)
- Social Capital (SCAP)

The color of bold indicates the magnitude of the difference. A number bolded in black implies a small difference of between 1 and 10 (a difference of between 0.01 to 0.1 standard deviations). A

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted in Area 1 of the Corrections section, a difference in a data entry error impacting one of the six to nine regions in a region group has potential to impact the index value for all regions in that group. That is, for each measure the value for all regions in a group are used to calculate the mean and standard deviation values, which are in turn used to calculate sub-index values.

number bolded in blue implies a difference between 11 and 50 (0.1 to 0.5 standard deviations). Large differences of 51 and above (more than 0.5 standard deviations) are bolded in red.

For most sub-indexes and region groups, even when differences are present they are modest, as signified by being bolded in black or occasionally in blue. There are, however, notable exceptions. Larger differences are more common for sub-indexes within the Siouxland region group and in all regions for the Economic Opportunity & Diversity (EOD) and Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business (ICDB) sub-indexes.

Sub-index values are commonly bolded in blue or even red for the Siouxland region. As noted earlier, this occurs because there were changes to the counties included in two of Siouxland's peer comparison regions. There also were county changes for two comparison peers for the Southeast region, but this did not lead to large changes in sub-index values for the Southeast.

Large differences, however, are identified in several cases for the North 81 region. This is because of the adding up issue for North 81 which was discussed in Area 1 of the Corrections section. As will be seen in Section C of this report's Results section, this adding up error led to significant differences between corrected and uncorrected values for several variables. These differences are evident in the North 81 sub-index values for the Other Prosperity (OP) sub-index, and especially for the Education & Skill (EAS) and Quality of Life (QOL) sub-indexes.

Generally speaking, corrections were more common and larger for the Economic Opportunity & Diversity (EOD) and Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business (ICDB) sub-indexes. These sub-indexes include one or two of the measures described in Area 2 of the Corrections section. Incorrect data were accessed for these measures so large differences are common between corrected and uncorrected values, leading to a large correction in the sub-index value.

Table 3 (see Page 5) shows the corrected and uncorrected rankings for each Nebraska region. Changes in rank follow the pattern of changes in value from Table 2.<sup>2</sup> The color of bold indicates the magnitude of the difference. A number bolded in black indicates a difference in rank of one, while a number bolded in blue indicates a difference of two and a number bolded in red indicates a difference of three. Larger changes in rank were most common in Southeast and North 81 regions.

In the corrected results, Growth and Social Capital continue to be Strengths for Nebraska regions. For the Growth sub-index, four regions are ranked first among their peer regions with an average rank of 2.50 (versus 2.63 in the uncorrected sub-indexes). For the Social Capital sub-index, the average rank is 2.38 (unchanged). The Education & Skill sub-index also continues to be a Concern for Nebraska regions, with an average rank of 4.38 (versus 4.25).

However, in the corrected results, Economic Opportunity & Diversity qualifies as a Strength for Nebraska regions with two regions ranked first among their peers and an average rank of 3 (versus 3.13 in the uncorrected sub-indexes). Quality of Life no longer qualifies as a Strength given an average rank of 3.13 (versus 2.75). Appendix Table 2 (see Page 18) shows corrected and uncorrected values for sub-indexes for each of the peer comparison regions.

---

<sup>2</sup> Change in rank can be more severe than the change in value if members of a region group have index values which are close together.

Table 2: Corrected Versus Uncorrected Value for Sub-Indexes in Nebraska Regions

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected								Uncorrected							
		GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP	GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP
North 81	6 Nebraska	203	<b>120</b>	<b>111</b>	122	<b>79</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>233</b>	212	203	113	69	122	181	90	162	212
Northeast	5 Nebraska	151	<b>54</b>	91	127	89	<b>116</b>	<b>85</b>	127	151	45	91	127	89	101	90	127
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	<b>6</b>	<b>211</b>	52	46	112	<b>112</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>141</b>	4	232	52	46	112	100	101	133
Sandhills	2 Nebraska	104	<b>273</b>	109	-91	165	<b>65</b>	<b>30</b>	214	104	248	109	-91	165	89	37	214
Siouxland	9 Nebraska	<b>181</b>	<b>-115</b>	<b>-72</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>137</b>	228	-29	-43	291	22	18	163	191
Southeast	7 Nebraska	<b>170</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>103</b>	149	160	89	125	100	96	74	106	149
Southwest	3 Nebraska	<b>82</b>	<b>145</b>	61	74	<b>15</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>131</b>	127	85	123	61	74	13	133	142	127
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	161	<b>152</b>	144	123	81	<b>115</b>	187	110	161	165	144	123	81	120	187	110

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 3: Corrected Versus Uncorrected Ranks for Sub-Indexes in Nebraska Regions

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected								Uncorrected							
		GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP	GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP
North 81	6 Nebraska	1	<b>3</b>	3	2	<b>4</b>	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	4	1	2
Northeast	5 Nebraska	2	5	2	3	4	3	5	2	2	5	2	3	4	3	5	2
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	7	1	6	4	3	3	<b>4</b>	4	7	1	6	4	3	3	3	4
Sandhills	2 Nebraska	3	1	2	6	2	5	6	1	3	1	2	6	2	5	6	1
Siouxland	9 Nebraska	1	6	6	1	6	6	1	2	1	6	6	1	6	6	1	2
Southeast	7 Nebraska	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	4	<b>4</b>	6	<b>5</b>	3	2	7	2	4	6	6	4	3
Southwest	3 Nebraska	4	<b>2</b>	5	5	7	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	2	4	3	5	5	7	2	1	2
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	1	<b>2</b>	2	2	5	<b>3</b>	1	3	1	1	2	2	5	2	1	3

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 1; Bolded in Blue when difference is 2; and Bolded in Red when difference is 3

## *Part C -- Corrected Values for Individual Measures in the 2019 Nebraska Thriving Index*

Tables 4 through 11 show the corrected values for individual measures. Uncorrected values are not shown but measures are bolded when corrected values differ from uncorrected values. Each table refers to the measures in an individual sub-index. Table 4 (see Page 8) shows the values for the Growth sub-index.

All eight sub-indexes show significant corrections for the Siouxland and Southeast region groups. The correction of values for these two region groups occurred due to the change in counties included in the Illinois 2, Iowa 7 and Iowa 8 peer comparison regions, as described in Area 3 of the Corrections section. The magnitude of changes were largest in the Siouxland region.

Other required corrections are described below, for each sub-index.

**Growth:** No other corrections were required for four of five measures in the Growth sub-index, as seen in Table 4. Corrections were necessary, however, for the Growth in Households with Children measure. This is a measure where data for a few counties were entered incorrectly due to the alphabetical order issue described in Area 1 of the Corrections section.

**Economic Opportunity and Diversity:** No other corrections were necessary for three of seven measures in the Economic Opportunity & Diversity sub-index, as seen in Table 5 (see Page 9). Further, for another measure, Non-Farm Proprietor's Per 1,000 Workers, corrections were only required in the North 81 region group. This was necessary due to the incorrect entry of data for Lee County, Illinois, which is part of a peer region in the North 81 group. Corrections were more broad-based, however, among three of seven measures: Share of Workers in Non-Employer Establishments, Occupation Diversity and Industry Diversity. The reasons for corrections varied. Large corrections were made for the Share of Workers in Non-Employer Establishments measure across the region groups. As discussed in Area 2 of the Corrections section, the wrong data were accessed for this measure. Corrections also were broad-based, although smaller in magnitude, for the Occupation Diversity measure. Corrections were necessary because work at home employment was included in the uncorrected estimates. There were also broad-based corrections for the Industry Diversity measure due to the assignment of some county data to the wrong region. Further, a very large correction was made for the industry diversity value for the Siouxland region and a small correction to the Southeast region due to the data entry error described in Area 1 of the Corrections section. Finally, a correction was made to the North 81 region due to the adding up issue, which is also described in Area 1 of the Corrections section.

**Other Prosperity:** No other corrections were necessary for three of five measures in the Other Prosperity sub-index, as seen in Table 6 (see Page 10). However, corrections were necessary for the Poverty Rate and Share of Income from Dividends, Interest and Rent measures. These are measures where data were entered incorrectly in McPherson and Madison counties and summed incorrectly for the North 81 and Southwest regions in Nebraska as described in Area 1 of the Corrections section. These corrections only led to large changes in value for the Share of Income from Dividends, Interest and Rent measure in the North 81 region group.

**Demographic Growth & Renewal:** No other corrections were necessary for measures in the Demographic Growth & Renewal sub-index, as seen in Table 7 (see Page 11).

**Education & Skill:** No other corrections were necessary for two of four measures in the Education & Skills sub-index, as seen in Table 8 (see Page 12). Corrections were necessary, however, for the High School Attainment Rate and College Attainment Rate measures. There was an adding up problem for the North 81 region which also had a small impact on the Southwest Nebraska region (which contains McPherson County), as described in Area 1 of the Corrections section. Large differences resulted for the North 81 region group and very small differences resulted in other region groups where Southwest Nebraska is a peer region.

**Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business:** No other corrections were necessary for two of six measures in the Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business sub-index, and only small changes were necessary for the Broadband Internet Access measure, as seen in Table 9 (see Page 13). For the broadband measure, incorrect data was entered in counties in multiple states due to differences in the alphabetical order of the data sources, as described in Area 1 of the Corrections section. Fortunately, this error resulted in only small differences in values in the region groups. For the Weekly Wage Rate measure, there was both an alphabetical order and an adding up problem for the North 81 region (which also had a small impact on the Southwest Nebraska region), as described in Area 1 of the Corrections section. For the Count of 4-Year Colleges measure, a portion of the data were accessed incorrectly, primarily in Iowa, Colorado and Illinois. This resulted in large corrections in values, as discussed in Area 2 of the Corrections section. Finally, large corrections were made for the Count of Qualified Opportunity Zones measure because the wrong data were accessed for that measure, as discussed in Area 2 of the Corrections section.

**Quality of Life:** In the Quality of Life sub-index, the Iowa 1 region was accidentally used instead of the Iowa 11 region as a peer comparison in the Southwest Nebraska region. This led to corrected values for most of the Quality of Life measures in the Southwest region group. There were also significant differences for the People per Arts & Recreation Worker measure in most region groups due to missing data for some Iowa counties, as discussed in Area 2 of the Corrections section. Finally, five of the measures in the Quality of Life Sub-Index were impacted by the alphabetical order or adding up issues discussed in Area 1 in the Corrections section. For the Commute Time and Relative Weekly Wage Rate measures, there was an alphabetical order issue for two counties and an adding up problem for the North 81 region, which led to large changes in values for North 81 (especially for commute time) but smaller changes in other region groups. For the climate amenity variable, there were both broad-based data entry errors due to the alphabetical order issue, and an adding up issue for the North 81 region but these errors primarily led to smaller changes in index values. For the Property Crime and Violent Crime measures, data entry errors due to the alphabetical error issue were more broad-based, but again primarily led to smaller changes in index values. There were no other necessary corrections for four of the ten measures.

**Social Capital:** There was an error in calculating the standard deviation for the Panhandle region group, leading to broad-based changes in index values for that group, as is seen in Table 11 (see Page 16). Further, an error in data entry for the voter turnout measure in one Minnesota County (due to the alphabetical order issue) led to a small difference in the index value for one region in the Tri-Cities region group.



Table 4: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Growth Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected				
		Total Employment Growth	Private Employment	Private Wage Growth (Per Job)	Growth in Households with Children	Growth in Dividends, Interest and Rent Income
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	155	28	253	237	342
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	51	-20	23	211	125
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	-33	254	85	10	-4
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	220	43	8	206	51
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	214	98	281	81	166
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	93	44	40	-14	108
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	194	81	208	75	198
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	33	-2	144	41	61
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	214	276	85	268	222
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-76	15	-124	77	-45
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	54	56	121	-37	6
Southwest	3 Nebraska	79	66	141	83	62
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	-95	-37	69	64	32
Northeast	5 Nebraska	75	1	256	63	162
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	138	54	-31	296	-110
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	225	195	16	23	163
Southwest	3 Nebraska	2	-8	218	68	89
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-14	-13	207	-21	59
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	80	209	148	171	185
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	287	-72	24	127	156
Northeast	5 Nebraska	183	32	223	65	202
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	198	154	168	291	217
Southwest	3 Nebraska	92	22	194	74	116
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-30	-10	74	68	48
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	9	219	-27	13	-28
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	337	-65	359	153	119
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	46	61	78	256	-71
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	10	4	63	-39	253
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	22	232	38	154	167
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	236	87	47	55	73
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	172	-5	285	-19	34
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	183	83	42	300	243
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	76	130	287	52	25
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	61	-107	106	59	326
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	86	71	136	157	203
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	201	-55	158	187	114
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	9	-16	160	83	125
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	-16	236	35	96	-6
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	36	41	147	-14	47
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	282	182	-58	-27	41
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	79	55	99	96	80
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	227	281	57	288	240
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-89	0	-102	91	-27
Northeast	5 Nebraska	205	71	150	89	216
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	29	-18	101	53	79
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	87	142	264	27	8
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	52	45	84	-28	23
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	83	159	149	151	266
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	243	197	-4	76	107
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	-8	180	-22	34	145
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-63	-85	264	-57	34
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	73	0	71	300	-74
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	9	-84	95	122	120
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	191	109	228	29	63

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 5: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Economic Opportunity & Diversity Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected						
		Employer Establishments Per 1,000 Residents	Non-Farm Proprietors per 1,000 Persons	Industry Diversity	Entrepreneurial Activity	Occupation Diversity	Share of Telecommuters	Share of Workers in Non-Employer Establishments
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	347	<b>310</b>	<b>59</b>	301	<b>-119</b>	58	<b>-113</b>
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	148	<b>111</b>	<b>118</b>	239	<b>3</b>	223	<b>175</b>
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	1	<b>51</b>	<b>96</b>	11	<b>82</b>	101	<b>140</b>
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	48	<b>-20</b>	<b>175</b>	17	<b>235</b>	232	<b>178</b>
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	154	<b>223</b>	<b>-114</b>	87	<b>144</b>	25	<b>-43</b>
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	93	<b>77</b>	<b>215</b>	126	<b>144</b>	-51	<b>139</b>
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	-3	9	<b>75</b>	1	<b>104</b>	29	<b>162</b>
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	52	263	<b>-38</b>	138	<b>5</b>	61	<b>156</b>
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	206	179	<b>-5</b>	105	<b>-4</b>	270	<b>-25</b>
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	175	88	<b>231</b>	307	<b>297</b>	96	<b>198</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-51	-56	150	-12	<b>171</b>	-19	<b>-26</b>
Southwest	3 Nebraska	173	124	<b>213</b>	99	<b>75</b>	83	<b>194</b>
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	206	150	<b>239</b>	239	<b>200</b>	298	<b>141</b>
Northeast	5 Nebraska	125	95	<b>-154</b>	67	<b>-43</b>	68	<b>107</b>
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	147	230	<b>112</b>	279	<b>156</b>	144	<b>191</b>
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	-50	-37	<b>105</b>	-8	<b>199</b>	80	<b>177</b>
Southwest	3 Nebraska	206	175	<b>193</b>	122	<b>-79</b>	254	<b>137</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	103	49	<b>34</b>	60	<b>42</b>	-96	<b>-67</b>
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	176	174	<b>146</b>	91	<b>58</b>	41	<b>-51</b>
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	352	366	<b>160</b>	364	<b>-155</b>	380	<b>448</b>
Northeast	5 Nebraska	36	-11	<b>75</b>	-14	<b>156</b>	56	<b>97</b>
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	168	67	<b>-20</b>	76	<b>87</b>	196	<b>8</b>
Southwest	3 Nebraska	148	42	<b>239</b>	71	<b>137</b>	87	<b>112</b>
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	149	25	<b>260</b>	250	<b>280</b>	95	<b>114</b>
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	-8	179	<b>47</b>	71	<b>45</b>	8	<b>74</b>
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>-73</b>	<b>-310</b>	<b>-88</b>	<b>-295</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-56</b>
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>141</b>	<b>-23</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>-18</b>
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>102</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>212</b>
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>28</b>
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>247</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>195</b>
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	<b>-88</b>	25	<b>147</b>	<b>-75</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>-76</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>182</b>
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>31</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>-3</b>	196	<b>-11</b>
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	<b>103</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>124</b>	174
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>205</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>110</b>
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>-28</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>-50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>365</b>
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>208</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>168</b>
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>-38</b>	<b>-63</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>54</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>102</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>-55</b>	<b>8</b>
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>193</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	189	122	<b>231</b>	95	<b>89</b>	81	<b>211</b>
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	216	182	<b>2</b>	102	<b>7</b>	286	<b>5</b>
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	191	83	<b>250</b>	321	<b>318</b>	95	<b>215</b>
Northeast	5 Nebraska	45	-3	<b>86</b>	-12	<b>118</b>	22	<b>180</b>
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	91	273	<b>-32</b>	138	<b>16</b>	57	<b>175</b>
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	-51	123	<b>36</b>	121	<b>25</b>	102	<b>-16</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	6	-74	<b>165</b>	-26	188	-30	<b>4</b>
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	271	212	<b>149</b>	274	<b>51</b>	-14	<b>119</b>
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	44	94	<b>11</b>	-2	<b>134</b>	231	<b>35</b>
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	148	54	<b>158</b>	72	<b>134</b>	72	<b>-32</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	174	76	111	207	<b>40</b>	-50	<b>104</b>
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	<b>-54</b>	-49	<b>250</b>	-8	<b>42</b>	171	<b>106</b>
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	70	-26	<b>-128</b>	58	<b>-139</b>	-40	<b>44</b>
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	68	227	<b>63</b>	133	249	155	<b>282</b>

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 6: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Other Prosperity Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected					Share of Income from Dividends, Interest and Rent
		Non-Farm Proprietor Personal Income	Total Personal Income Stability	Life Span	Percent in Poverty		
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	-6	161	191	<b>173</b>	<b>37</b>	
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	-50	-113	119	<b>34</b>	<b>273</b>	
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	120	155	127	<b>166</b>	<b>173</b>	
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	21	113	2	<b>-3</b>	<b>25</b>	
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	242	217	262	<b>254</b>	<b>115</b>	
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	207	19	-41	<b>-19</b>	<b>-40</b>	
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	100	175	99	55	<b>26</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	16	-133	148	<b>92</b>	276	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	269	81	256	267	202	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-22	212	-34	63	14	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	57	65	29	-39	<b>90</b>	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	71	147	31	<b>83</b>	-2	
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	-70	80	67	177	7	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	14	33	215	<b>173</b>	17	
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	73	73	155	130	270	
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	199	226	-46	-53	44	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	-6	-3	139	188	-5	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-15	-107	136	122	66	
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	194	121	193	181	207	
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	-4	4	163	206	177	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	33	199	132	75	<b>102</b>	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	95	110	272	265	269	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	23	172	71	<b>100</b>	<b>76</b>	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-11	234	13	83	91	
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	242	-26	7	-10	-12	
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>-76</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>-27</b>	<b>-114</b>	<b>-314</b>	
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>39</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>-40</b>	<b>-57</b>	<b>60</b>	
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>-6</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>149</b>	
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>196</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>118</b>	
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>190</b>	<b>-82</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>204</b>	
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	<b>-18</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>-25</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>43</b>	
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>57</b>	
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>146</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>58</b>	155	
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	<b>-85</b>	<b>-130</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>266</b>	
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>103</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>-84</b>	<b>259</b>	
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>-55</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>-28</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>3</b>	<b>-75</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>197</b>	
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>176</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>-56</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>-26</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>37</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>-52</b>	<b>65</b>	
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>260</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>126</b>	
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	55	166	13	<b>90</b>	<b>-20</b>	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	258	104	232	288	182	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-41	228	-50	69	-4	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	85	193	80	60	<b>8</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	-1	-100	127	99	255	
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	179	-11	202	57	197	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	41	88	10	-41	72	
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	142	141	46	111	279	
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	123	193	262	116	69	
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	68	174	76	159	77	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-34	-111	-11	41	-10	
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	32	-57	50	-119	162	
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	-96	71	-80	194	123	
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	256	126	163	184	-25	

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 7: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Demographic Growth & Renewal Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected					
		Dependency Ratio	Median Age	Percent Hispanic	Percent Non-White	Long-Run Population Growth	Millennial and Gen Z Balance Change
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	54	181	334	-100	105	155
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	74	102	47	144	96	184
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	41	-26	125	69	-26	-57
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	298	262	77	262	273	175
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	-1	82	141	35	119	105
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	110	94	-48	113	99	175
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	-36	180	119	260	69	169
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	-11	-72	39	-33	20	256
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	138	213	54	121	227	71
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	160	115	258	154	110	149
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	266	-18	-60	58	-74	94
Southwest	3 Nebraska	77	73	196	-17	166	-82
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	14	57	66	41	2	96
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-40	91	26	83	-13	109
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	294	290	44	103	273	211
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	135	22	253	245	138	13
Southwest	3 Nebraska	-8	35	48	-28	22	-53
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	44	-14	-25	2	-65	60
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	90	179	49	21	126	236
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	-201	-140	-35	-56	-179	66
Northeast	5 Nebraska	24	75	37	107	26	87
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	112	88	19	46	232	34
Southwest	3 Nebraska	81	30	57	-15	153	-48
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	123	48	74	60	80	76
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	197	227	246	236	96	237
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>503</b>
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>69</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>46</b>
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>30</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>138</b>
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>156</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>146</b>
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>-44</b>	<b>-42</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>11</b>
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	<b>263</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>187</b>
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>-16</b>	239	<b>275</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>86</b>
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	<b>-101</b>	<b>-110</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>-155</b>	<b>225</b>
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>84</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>-56</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>183</b>
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>91</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>151</b>
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>-3</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>232</b>
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>257</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>-53</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>172</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>-42</b>	<b>139</b>
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>68</b>	<b>-55</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	99	66	211	-23	163	-68
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	158	217	57	86	228	87
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	178	111	277	112	103	166
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-10	182	128	196	58	186
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	13	-92	41	-35	6	274
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	-6	129	63	257	140	15
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	281	-34	-65	36	-95	110
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	56	107	239	68	110	157
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	144	104	64	45	87	20
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	68	38	-14	29	51	16
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	15	-1	57	47	-141	63
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	314	323	199	323	259	309
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	14	34	217	177	-6	23
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	19	32	1	57	159	82

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 8: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Education & Skill Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected			
		Labor Force Participation Rate	High School Attainment Rate	College Attainment Rate	Percent of Knowledge Workers
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	307	<b>-33</b>	<b>227</b>	-185
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	81	<b>93</b>	<b>205</b>	161
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	64	<b>93</b>	<b>50</b>	93
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	97	<b>73</b>	<b>153</b>	175
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	216	<b>8</b>	<b>158</b>	152
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	-42	<b>301</b>	<b>-77</b>	108
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	135	148	<b>6</b>	66
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	99	<b>302</b>	<b>20</b>	158
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	221	<b>72</b>	253	161
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	86	<b>-38</b>	<b>177</b>	233
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-105	<b>152</b>	<b>64</b>	88
Southwest	3 Nebraska	94	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	-88
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	145	<b>87</b>	<b>131</b>	83
Northeast	5 Nebraska	164	<b>226</b>	<b>21</b>	14
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	165	-113	303	256
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	-47	113	<b>17</b>	180
Southwest	3 Nebraska	148	<b>125</b>	<b>29</b>	-49
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	72	230	59	23
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	207	110	152	23
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	133	261	<b>109</b>	156
Northeast	5 Nebraska	58	225	<b>52</b>	147
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	241	<b>159</b>	260	193
Southwest	3 Nebraska	-29	<b>107</b>	<b>62</b>	72
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-47	64	<b>196</b>	228
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	144	-27	<b>-2</b>	-35
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>-160</b>	<b>-173</b>
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>45</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>163</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>-6</b>
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>173</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>214</b>
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>84</b>
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	<b>-93</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	86	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>97</b>
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>243</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>-53</b>
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	95	<b>186</b>	<b>-114</b>	<b>75</b>
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>53</b>	<b>-36</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>56</b>
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>102</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>-52</b>	<b>149</b>
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>194</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>79</b>
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>131</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>276</b>
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>-150</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>43</b>
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>101</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	89	<b>-5</b>	<b>10</b>	-33
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	226	<b>58</b>	267	179
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	79	<b>-57</b>	<b>184</b>	241
Northeast	5 Nebraska	133	138	<b>-3</b>	98
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	94	300	<b>13</b>	177
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	126	163	<b>100</b>	-41
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-128	143	<b>61</b>	117
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	200	77	61	-17
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	176	145	101	129
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	91	223	52	113
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	-161	175	-47	-17
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	161	-84	255	148
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	-12	210	-91	-76
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	41	40	189	244

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 9: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Infrastructure & Cost of Doing Business Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected					Count of 4-Year Colleges	Count of Qualified Opportunity Zones
		Broadband Internet Access	Presence of Interstate	Weekly Wage Rate	Top Marginal Income Tax Rate			
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	<b>179</b>	-9	<b>-45</b>	91	<b>162</b>	<b>93</b>	
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	<b>165</b>	-9	<b>82</b>	-30	<b>235</b>	<b>-87</b>	
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	188	238	<b>57</b>	198	<b>-14</b>	<b>171</b>	
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	<b>-26</b>	134	<b>230</b>	144	<b>192</b>	<b>227</b>	
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	<b>149</b>	-9	<b>-12</b>	-79	<b>-14</b>	<b>53</b>	
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	<b>-42</b>	72	<b>220</b>	144	<b>144</b>	<b>26</b>	
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	<b>-38</b>	9	<b>194</b>	201	<b>140</b>	<b>188</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	63	106	<b>72</b>	1	<b>-8</b>	<b>-13</b>	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	58	9	<b>102</b>	1	<b>224</b>	<b>-20</b>	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	275	87	<b>139</b>	201	<b>182</b>	<b>52</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	201	141	-116	1	<b>-8</b>	<b>168</b>	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	97	293	175	201	<b>-8</b>	<b>226</b>	
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	308	-31	<b>165</b>	43	<b>191</b>	<b>-2</b>	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-14	-100	<b>203</b>	43	<b>131</b>	<b>17</b>	
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	96	248	<b>-104</b>	309	<b>43</b>	<b>105</b>	
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	<b>125</b>	127	<b>130</b>	129	<b>193</b>	<b>249</b>	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	125	151	<b>190</b>	43	<b>-83</b>	<b>22</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	232	17	-14	-41	<b>-83</b>	<b>14</b>	
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	-32	122	<b>134</b>	43	<b>122</b>	<b>38</b>	
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	-135	49	<b>430</b>	107	<b>4</b>	<b>-63</b>	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-4	49	<b>154</b>	107	<b>155</b>	<b>147</b>	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	59	49	<b>35</b>	-81	<b>240</b>	<b>-37</b>	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	84	334	<b>130</b>	107	<b>4</b>	<b>180</b>	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	201	127	<b>83</b>	107	<b>196</b>	<b>27</b>	
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	199	49	<b>35</b>	207	<b>9</b>	<b>191</b>	
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>-38</b>	<b>-14</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>13</b>	
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>126</b>	<b>-38</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>230</b>	
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>103</b>	<b>-38</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>0</b>	
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>155</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>183</b>	
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>173</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-27</b>	
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	<b>-126</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>49</b>	
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>-45</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>-56</b>	
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>136</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>111</b>	31	<b>159</b>	<b>141</b>	
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	<b>-53</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>153</b>	31	<b>9</b>	<b>132</b>	
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>159</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>92</b>	
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>71</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>83</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>-21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>-25</b>	
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>114</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>259</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>-67</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>109</b>	
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>279</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>52</b>	
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	75	294	<b>187</b>	215	<b>-12</b>	<b>208</b>	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	38	-7	<b>107</b>	38	<b>240</b>	<b>-37</b>	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	244	76	<b>147</b>	215	<b>194</b>	<b>35</b>	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-53	-7	<b>207</b>	215	<b>149</b>	<b>170</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	43	95	<b>75</b>	38	<b>-12</b>	<b>-31</b>	
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	213	154	<b>75</b>	-34	<b>74</b>	<b>193</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	174	133	<b>-130</b>	38	<b>-12</b>	<b>149</b>	
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	<b>-82</b>	154	224	205	<b>35</b>	<b>156</b>	
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	<b>219</b>	0	24	10	<b>87</b>	<b>9</b>	
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	161	-19	38	66	<b>313</b>	<b>241</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	90	57	-73	66	<b>-14</b>	<b>-4</b>	
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	<b>164</b>	245	250	279	<b>110</b>	<b>203</b>	
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	<b>97</b>	18	54	66	<b>11</b>	<b>-43</b>	
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	<b>42</b>	192	88	10	<b>59</b>	<b>36</b>	

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Table 10: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Quality of Life Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected									
		Commute Time	Percent of Housing Built Pre-1960	Relative Weekly Wage	Health Care Practitioners Per Capita	Natural (Climate) Amenities	People Per Arts & Recreation Worker	Count of Parks	Violent Crime Rate	Property Crime Rate	Daycare Providers Per Capita
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	<b>369</b>	124	<b>334</b>	177	<b>151</b>	<b>329</b>	46	<b>264</b>	<b>189</b>	349
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	<b>173</b>	-48	<b>225</b>	83	<b>42</b>	<b>177</b>	89	<b>26</b>	<b>293</b>	63
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	<b>23</b>	5	<b>12</b>	20	<b>68</b>	<b>28</b>	46	<b>213</b>	<b>140</b>	3
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	<b>82</b>	244	<b>69</b>	57	<b>223</b>	<b>96</b>	307	<b>23</b>	<b>-7</b>	58
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	<b>73</b>	137	<b>68</b>	321	<b>-87</b>	<b>-29</b>	46	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	160
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	<b>56</b>	162	<b>75</b>	59	<b>186</b>	<b>139</b>	46	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>	135
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	<b>-15</b>	115	<b>17</b>	-33	66	<b>95</b>	218	208	209	-27
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>-34</b>	14	<b>105</b>	226	58	<b>227</b>	2	217	224	175
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	<b>179</b>	176	<b>70</b>	213	30	<b>184</b>	2	71	128	246
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	<b>204</b>	50	<b>83</b>	5	305	<b>30</b>	218	97	109	4
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>23</b>	-69	<b>328</b>	135	2	<b>-92</b>	2	-98	-40	72
Southwest	3 Nebraska	<b>195</b>	235	<b>39</b>	51	177	<b>132</b>	161	117	-28	93
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	<b>215</b>	-29	126	-40	102	<b>10</b>	85	173	<b>169</b>	102
Northeast	5 Nebraska	<b>102</b>	1	106	-87	-15	<b>57</b>	85	239	<b>252</b>	90
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	<b>186</b>	252	239	188	204	<b>-4</b>	112	133	<b>102</b>	256
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	-47	160	-42	103	208	<b>160</b>	180	-42	<b>-20</b>	-38
Southwest	3 Nebraska	<b>210</b>	59	<b>113</b>	17	39	<b>84</b>	14	185	<b>54</b>	140
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>121</b>	-86	201	120	-46	<b>-79</b>	-182	56	<b>44</b>	131
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	<b>142</b>	104	<b>142</b>	222	15	<b>239</b>	154	159	<b>215</b>	159
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	<b>68</b>	-45	<b>-255</b>	79	28	<b>-210</b>	84	224	182	139
Northeast	5 Nebraska	<b>-122</b>	20	<b>91</b>	-24	3	<b>74</b>	165	214	253	91
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	<b>143</b>	80	<b>162</b>	284	-28	<b>165</b>	-92	122	136	246
Southwest	3 Nebraska	<b>164</b>	137	<b>121</b>	82	99	<b>112</b>	96	153	-89	159
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	<b>177</b>	-42	<b>180</b>	24	<b>210</b>	<b>6</b>	165	139	109	108
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	<b>134</b>	226	<b>100</b>	89	206	<b>171</b>	170	-42	66	-30

<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>-163</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>-152</b>	<b>14</b>
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	135	11	138	98	118	162	249	-29	136	77
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	109	231	-21	52	-67	-8	53	202	-47	-134
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	136	85	182	216	83	139	53	14	175	165
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	167	-25	134	92	52	196	53	214	175	176
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	-130	241	-81	-28	282	-89	53	168	0	111
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-14</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>51</b>
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	146	113	-95	192	59	25	39	119	65	71
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	155	-18	-112	379	-134	-205	-5	178	48	105
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	268	299	137	164	165	49	207	119	208	-26
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	-101	160	47	-81	90	40	94	181	1	371
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	121	29	120	157	183	138	-5	205	220	197
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	-16	150	159	70	178	206	243	-82	63	157
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	154	-62	210	55	39	19	-5	41	-34	55
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	157	7	175	116	-50	190	-5	174	269	21
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>-31</b>	<b>95</b>
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	196	185	126	181	43	200	3	77	137	262
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	221	47	132	-11	325	63	235	105	116	-2
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-2	117	101	-47	80	121	235	225	225	-35
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	-22	8	142	193	72	239	3	234	241	185
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	22	92	-105	221	22	-31	60	56	66	85
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	36	-83	247	109	14	-45	3	-104	-45	72
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>284</b>
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	43	79	-14	196	34	173	-33	191	158	65
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	14	41	200	132	96	224	58	65	185	72
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	201	-96	237	64	86	-15	-33	-31	72	224
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	203	234	112	-80	193	10	226	6	-119	-26
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	94	-49	195	-61	108	-97	81	-100	164	101
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	-16	208	-31	176	-44	50	118	213	76	46



Table 11: Corrected Values for Individual Measures Within the Social Capital Sub-Index

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected					Share of Tree City USA Counties
		Number of 501c3 Organizations per 1,000 Persons	Volunteer Rate (State)	Volunteer Hours per Resident (State)	Voter Turnout		
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	84	330	217	132	298	
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	305	79	186	165	93	
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	33	17	-10	-40	-25	
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	-14	58	58	111	125	
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	183	223	261	265	205	
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	123	58	58	111	77	
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	-55	201	201	110	181	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	297	1	1	150	120	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	71	1	1	210	-70	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	82	201	201	-81	171	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	151	1	1	162	78	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	138	201	201	2	187	
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>-39</b>	<b>151</b>	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	<b>135</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>175</b>	
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	<b>177</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>-19</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>249</b>	
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	<b>-25</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>196</b>	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	<b>227</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>188</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>233</b>	<b>-96</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>-51</b>	
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	<b>46</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>151</b>	
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	435	195	190	183	69	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	67	195	190	169	212	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	110	-54	-67	247	-33	
Southwest	3 Nebraska	133	195	190	85	217	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	114	195	190	20	201	
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	16	47	63	-10	38	
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>-47</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>-124</b>	<b>276</b>	
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>114</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>77</b>	
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>220</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>98</b>	
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>48</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>209</b>	
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>238</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>10</b>	
Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan & Reg. Plan. Comm.	2 Illinois	<b>-35</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-123</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-44</b>	
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>152</b>	294	119	-12	191	
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>140</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>55</b>	
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Dev. Commission	4 Minnesota	<b>249</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>144</b>	
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>180</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>-18</b>	<b>90</b>	
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>61</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>-53</b>	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>139</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>163</b>	
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>-86</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>206</b>	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	<b>88</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>124</b>	
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>171</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>-78</b>	
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	105	207	123	-3	205	
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	47	-11	4	144	-58	
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	57	207	123	-61	188	
Northeast	5 Nebraska	-60	207	123	73	199	
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	240	-11	4	102	137	
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	242	114	290	273	19	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	116	-11	4	110	94	
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	51	262	87	7	142	
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	282	138	223	222	102	
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	9	-27	-10	71	192	
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Dev. Assoc.)	4 Iowa	180	-27	-10	70	37	
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	1	90	39	-38	185	
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	115	-27	-10	70	-196	
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	80	138	223	<b>220</b>	59	

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above

Appendix Table 1: Corrected Versus Uncorrected Value for the 2019 Nebraska Thriving Index

Region Name	Region Number	2019 Nebraska Thriving Index	
		Uncorrected Value	Corrected Value
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>145</b>
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	93	107
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	77	71
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	117	118
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	129	122
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	75	78
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>105</b>
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	87	85
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	139	135
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	109	108
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	47	46
Southwest	3 Nebraska	94	99
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>
Northeast	5 Nebraska	87	85
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	163	148
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	81	92
Southwest	3 Nebraska	86	85
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	44	40
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	132	128
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>109</b>
Northeast	5 Nebraska	103	104
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	128	125
Southwest	3 Nebraska	100	101
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	106	105
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	76	77
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>83</b>
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	75	71
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	120	101
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	135	130
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	98	103
Southwestern Illinois metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission	2 Illinois	90	66
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>115</b>
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	124	119
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission	4 Minnesota	82	81
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	146	147
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	97	91
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	100	97
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	93	95
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	49	51
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	75	86
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	140	137
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	109	109
Northeast	5 Nebraska	102	104
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	77	83
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	108	102
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	41	41
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>134</b>
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	121	114
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	79	88
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	27	28
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	110	113
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	28	28
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	116	114

Appendix Table 2: Corrected Versus Uncorrected Value for Sub-Indexes

Region Name	Region Number	Corrected								Uncorrected							
		GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP	GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP
<b>North 81</b>	<b>6 Nebraska</b>	203	120	111	122	79	78	233	212	203	113	69	122	181	90	162	212
Area 15 Regional Planning Commission	1 Iowa	78	145	53	108	135	59	112	166	78	112	46	108	106	48	77	166
Blackhawk Hills Resource Conservation and Development	1 Illinois	62	69	148	21	75	140	56	-5	62	111	149	21	69	129	77	-5
Pioneer Trails Regional Planning Commission	1 Missouri	106	124	32	224	124	150	115	68	106	109	41	224	103	151	137	68
Mid-Minnesota Development Commission	1 Minnesota	168	68	218	80	133	15	69	227	168	90	223	80	111	31	99	227
Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments	2 Missouri	54	106	25	91	73	94	94	85	54	64	39	91	87	98	78	85
<b>Northeast</b>	<b>5 Nebraska</b>	151	54	91	127	89	116	85	127	151	45	91	127	89	101	90	127
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	55	91	80	33	145	37	121	114	55	105	80	33	145	49	114	114
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	213	104	215	137	177	62	130	42	213	131	215	137	177	71	125	42
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	-31	199	47	158	114	156	110	115	-31	182	47	158	115	165	120	115
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	40	22	40	44	50	64	26	78	39	18	40	44	50	81	22	78
Southwest	3 Nebraska	86	137	66	69	9	164	117	146	89	118	66	69	7	137	120	146
<b>Panhandle</b>	<b>1 Nebraska</b>	6	211	52	46	112	112	91	141	4	232	52	46	112	100	101	133
Northeast	5 Nebraska	111	38	90	43	106	47	83	161	109	71	90	43	107	38	87	153
Southeast Wyoming Regional Economic Development	1 Wyoming	69	180	140	203	153	116	167	157	70	186	140	203	153	200	179	170
Southern Colorado Economic Development District	1 Colorado	124	67	74	134	66	159	62	51	127	12	74	134	66	103	59	71
Southwest	3 Nebraska	74	144	63	3	63	75	91	166	75	134	62	3	62	93	100	159
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	44	18	40	1	96	21	28	72	40	45	40	1	96	50	16	67
Tri-Cities	4 Nebraska	159	91	179	117	123	71	155	130	157	134	179	117	123	79	145	124
<b>Sandhills</b>	<b>2 Nebraska</b>	104	273	109	-91	165	65	30	214	104	248	109	-91	165	89	37	214
Northeast	5 Nebraska	141	56	108	59	120	101	77	166	140	55	108	59	121	98	77	166
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	206	83	202	89	213	44	122	41	205	93	202	89	214	67	110	41
Southwest	3 Nebraska	99	119	88	43	53	140	103	164	103	103	88	43	51	125	119	164
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	30	167	82	77	110	123	108	144	29	151	82	77	111	142	109	144
Great Plains Development Inc.	1 Kansas	37	59	40	207	20	115	109	31	37	73	40	207	20	96	107	31

Region Name	Region Number	GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP	GRW	EOD	OP	DGR	EAS	ICDB	QOL	SCAP
<b>Siouxland</b>	<b>9 Nebraska</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>-115</b>	<b>-72</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>137</b>	228	-29	-43	291	22	18	163	191
Southeast Iowa Regional Planning Commission	5 Iowa	<b>74</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>86</b>	78	35	74	14	51	100	128	119
Northwest Regional Development Commission	2 Minnesota	<b>58</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>224</b>	57	190	150	35	116	85	70	258
Iowa Northland Regional Council of Governments	6 Iowa	<b>122</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>114</b>	101	129	130	126	193	99	143	159
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>100</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>112</b>	53	197	100	-42	96	121	146	116
Southwestern Illinois metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission	2 Illinois	<b>94</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>-42</b>	109	83	94	122	79	103	78	52
<b>Southeast</b>	<b>7 Nebraska</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>103</b>	149	160	89	125	100	96	74	106	149
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>114</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>184</b>	117	121	132	156	99	103	84	179
Upper Minnesota Valley Regional Development Commission	4 Minnesota	<b>89</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>226</b>	87	115	93	-17	53	33	65	223
Planning & Development District III	1 South Dakota	<b>131</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>131</b>	127	189	119	150	101	185	167	130
Southern Iowa Council of Governments	8 Iowa	<b>121</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>34</b>	172	91	52	88	161	97	77	40
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>72</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>84</b>	75	163	86	92	124	27	147	84
Southwest Iowa Planning Council	9 Iowa	<b>69</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>49</b>	72	36	102	110	142	135	95	49
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	<b>51</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>68</b>	56	65	42	83	1	45	32	67
North Iowa Area Council of Governments	7 Iowa	<b>84</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>48</b>	42	99	101	28	86	118	112	14
<b>Southwest</b>	<b>3 Nebraska</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>145</b>	61	74	15	<b>161</b>	<b>131</b>	127	85	123	61	74	13	133	142	127
Northwest Iowa Planning and Development Commission	3 Iowa	<b>219</b>	<b>114</b>	213	139	183	<b>63</b>	<b>141</b>	25	218	138	213	139	183	66	135	25
Panhandle	1 Nebraska	<b>-25</b>	<b>210</b>	40	158	112	<b>152</b>	<b>123</b>	103	-26	190	40	158	112	161	137	103
Northeast	5 Nebraska	146	<b>63</b>	85	123	92	<b>114</b>	<b>102</b>	108	146	50	85	123	92	98	115	108
Region XII Council of Governments	11 Iowa	<b>49</b>	<b>103</b>	76	35	146	<b>35</b>	<b>129</b>	94	48	116	76	35	146	46	54	94
Southwest Regional Development Commission	3 Minnesota	<b>106</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>125</b>	100	87	<b>112</b>	<b>49</b>	188	105	67	124	100	87	123	73	188
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	35	<b>33</b>	34	39	<b>48</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>20</b>	62	35	22	34	39	49	73	17	62
<b>Tri-Cities</b>	<b>4 Nebraska</b>	161	<b>152</b>	144	123	81	<b>115</b>	187	110	161	165	144	123	81	120	187	110
Region Nine Development Commission	5 Minnesota	124	<b>78</b>	153	77	138	<b>58</b>	<b>89</b>	193	124	88	153	77	138	116	75	193
East Central Intergovernmental Association	12 Iowa	66	<b>87</b>	111	31	120	<b>134</b>	<b>109</b>	47	66	103	111	31	120	46	105	47
MIDAS Council of Governments (Mid-Iowa Development Association)	4 Iowa	18	<b>95</b>	-25	7	-12	<b>20</b>	<b>71</b>	50	18	91	-25	7	-12	35	53	50
Flint Hills Economic Development District	3 Kansas	<b>74</b>	<b>65</b>	14	288	120	<b>208</b>	<b>76</b>	55	75	39	14	288	120	202	88	55
Region 6 Planning Commission	10 Iowa	52	<b>-23</b>	42	77	8	<b>34</b>	<b>43</b>	-10	53	-32	42	77	8	29	56	-10
West Central Initiative	6 Minnesota	124	<b>168</b>	141	58	129	<b>71</b>	<b>80</b>	144	124	159	141	58	129	86	89	144

Unbolded when NO difference between correct and corrected; Bolded in Black when the difference is 10 or less (0.1 standard deviations or less); Bolded in Blue when difference is from 11 and 50; and Bolded in Red when difference is 51 or above