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by
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ABSTRACT

Few economic indicators have more salience and pervasive financial impact on everyday lives in the United States than poverty measures. Nevertheless, policymakers, researchers, advocates, and legislators generally do not understand the details of poverty measure mechanics. These detailed mechanics shape and reshape poverty measures and the too often uninformed responses and remedies. This Article will build a bridge from personal portraits of families living in poverty to the resource allocations that failed them by exposing the specific detailed mechanics underlying the Census Bureau’s official (OPM) and supplemental poverty measures (SPM). Too often, when we confront the problem of poverty, the focus is on the lives and behavior of those suffering the burdens of poverty and not on the inadequacy of resource allocations in antipoverty programs. The purpose of poverty measures should be to expose the effectiveness and failures of antipoverty programs so that they can be improved, not to scrutinize the lives and characteristics of those who are enduring these hardships.

This Article exposes poverty measures through the details of the United States’ current antipoverty programs, including the demographics of the populations who are included as beneficiaries and those that are left without adequate resources to survive. After reverse engineering the OPM and SPM, the Article describes the raw data from the starting population universes but then reveals the details of U.S. citizens and residents who have been intentionally excluded from the poverty analysis. The Article reveals that the excluded population is likely disproportionately poor and, thus, their erasure from the starting population universe understates derived poverty rates. Therefore, as a starting point, the OPM and SPM exclude millions of vulnerable Americans from the Census Bureau’s poverty measurement analyses. Nevertheless, the Article continues its poverty measure analysis using the Census Bureau’s original databases and rebuilds the OPM and SPM from the original population universes by applying each resource allocation program by program until demographic patterns emerge of who is lifted out of poverty proportionately or disproportionately in accordance with their pre-allocation poverty percentages in the population universes. By shifting the focus from Americans who suffer scarcity to the details of each antipoverty program and the demographics of who and in what proportion they are served by these programs, we better understand why almost 50 million Americans, including 16 million children, are not adequately provided for; do not have the necessary life resources; are struggling day in and day out; have been “nickel and dimed”; and are not getting by in the United States; and who, because of the misallocation (not lack) of resources, suffer the persistent and pernicious plight of poverty.

* William S. Boyd Professor of Law, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
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I. INTRODUCTION

“Few topics in American society have more myths and stereotypes surrounding them than poverty, misconceptions that distort both our politics and our domestic policy making.”¹

A. What Is Poverty?

If I keep missing school, then I see my future poor, on the streets, in a box, not even, and asking for money everywhere, everybody, and then stealing stuff from stores. And, yeah, I don’t want to steal stuff. I don’t want to do any of that stuff. I want to get an education and a good job. I believe that I’m going to get a perfect job that I like and that I want to do. People can’t stop you from believing in your own dreams. [Kaylie, age ten.]²

Mollie Orshansky was a government economist in the 1960s who designed the poverty thresholds that the U.S. Census Bureau uses today to define poverty in the official poverty measure (OPM).³ However, her goal was not to measure poverty but rather “to assess the relative risks of low economic status (or, more broadly, the differentials in opportunity) among different demographic groups of families with children.”⁴ After President Lyndon Johnson declared “war on poverty” in January 1964, the newly formed Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which administered most of the antipoverty programs under the leadership of R. Sargent Shriver, adopted Orshansky’s poverty thresholds as a working definition of poverty for statistical, planning, and budget purposes in May 1965.⁵

After the OEO adopted her poverty thresholds, Ms. Orshansky answered the illusive question “What is poverty?” as follows: “[P]overty, like beauty, lies in the eye of the beholder. Poverty is a value judgment; it is not something one can verify or demonstrate, except by inference and suggestion, even with a measure

---

¹ Mark R. Rank, Poverty in America Is Mainstream, N.Y. TIMES: OPINIONATOR (Nov. 2, 2013, 2:30 PM), https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/11/02/poverty-in-america-is-mainstream/ (demonstrating that poverty in America is pervasive and a result of certain life cycle events that cause reduced cash flow and increased expenses, resulting in the inability to sustain a basic quality of life).
² Jezza Neumann & Lauren Mucciolo, Poor Kids, FRONTLINE (PBS television broadcast Nov. 20, 2012), http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/film/poor-kids/transcript/ [hereinafter Poor Kids] (“My name is Kaylie Hegwood and I live in Stockton, Iowa. [Doing cartwheels] Oh, yay! That one was good! That one was good. I am 10 years old, and I live with my mother and my brother, Tyler. And he is 12 years old. I don’t think we’re a rich family but, like, I think we’re kind of a poor family. I’m hungry.”).
⁴ Id. at 3.
⁵ Id. at 3–4.
of error. . . . [W]hen it comes to defining poverty, you can only be more subjective or less so. You cannot be nonsubjective.”

The analogy of “defining poverty” to “beholding beauty” is jarring because, subjectively or objectively, there is nothing particularly beautiful about poverty.7 Poverty is hunger,8 homelessness,9 and harmful to the

6. Mollie Orshansky, How Poverty Is Measured, MONTHLY LAB. REV., Feb. 1969, at 37, 37 (setting forth a description of poverty from a Social Security Administration economist who was the original designer of the U.S. poverty guidelines implemented in connection with President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty in 1963–64 and still used today in the OPM); see also Fisher, supra note 3 (describing how Mollie Orshansky, an economist in the Social Security Administration, developed a poverty threshold that the federal government adopted as its official statistical definition of poverty in August of 1969).

7. Linda Tirado, This Is Why Poor People’s Bad Decisions Make Perfect Sense, HUFFINGTON POST: THE BLOG (Nov. 22, 2013, 5:18 PM), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-tirado/why-poor-peoples-bad-decisions-make-perfect-sense_b_4326233.html (“We don’t apply for jobs because we know we can’t afford to look nice enough to hold them. I would make a super legal secretary, but I’ve been turned down more than once because I ‘don’t fit the image of the firm,’ which is a nice way of saying ‘gtfo, pov.’ I am good enough to cook the food, hidden away in the kitchen, but my boss won’t make me a server because I don’t ‘fit the corporate image.’ I am not beautiful. I have missing teeth and skin that looks like it will when you live on B12 and coffee and nicotine and no sleep. Beauty is a thing you get when you can afford it, and that’s how you get the job that you need in order to be beautiful. There isn’t much point trying.”). But see Pam Fessler, In Appalachia, Poverty Is in the Eye of the Beholder, NAT’L PUB. RADIO (Jan. 18, 2014, 10:38 AM), http://www.npr.org/2014/01/18/263629452/in-appalachia-poverty-is-in-the-eye-of-the-beholder (describing that some poor individuals in Appalachia do not believe they are poor when faith and family are included in the analysis and feel that the stigma of poverty in Appalachia might be worse than the status itself).

8. INTERFAITH FOOD PANTRY, ADVOCACY ACADEMY HANDBOOK 6 (2016), http://mcifp.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Advocacy-Handbook.pdf (“More than 48.1 million Americans lived in households that struggled against hunger in 2014. The 2014 numbers were a slight decline (of fewer than a million people) from 2013, with the rate declining from 15.8 to 15.4 percent. The number of individuals in households that faced the deepest struggles with hunger—‘very low food security’—was 5.5 percent in 2014. 15.3 million children lived in food insecure households in 2014, compared to 15.8 million in 2013.” (quoting Food and Research and Action Center (www.frac.org) webpage that is no longer available)); see also ALISHA COLEMAN-JENSEN ET AL., U.S. DEP’T OF AGRIC., ERR-194, HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES IN 2014, at 8–10 (2015), https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/45425/53740_err194.pdf?v=42515 (finding that 14% of households or 17.4 million households were food insecure which is significantly lower statistically than in 2011 when the percentage reached a high of 14.9%).

9. NAT’L ALLIANCE TO END HOMELESSNESS, THE STATE OF HOMELESSNESS IN AMERICA 3 (2016) (“On a single night in January 2015, 564,708 people were experiencing homelessness—meaning they were sleeping outside or in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. From 2014 to 2015, overall homelessness decreased by 2.0 percent and homelessness decreased among every major sub-population: unsheltered persons (1.2 percent), families (4.6 percent), chronically homeless individuals (1.0 percent), and veterans (4.0 percent). . . . In 2014, 7 million people in poor households were doubled up with family and friends, the most common prior living situation before becoming homeless. This represents a 9 percent decrease from 2013 and the first significant decrease in the size of this at-risk population since the Great Recession. Forty-seven states and D.C. had decreases. Still, the number of people in poor households living doubled up is 52 percent higher now than in 2007, prior to the recession.” (footnotes omitted)); see also HUD 2015 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs Homeless Populations and Subpopulations, U.S. DEP’T HOUS. & URB. AFF. (Oct. 27, 2015), https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/reportmanagement/published/CoC_PopSub_NatlTerrDC_2015.pdf.
mind, body, and soul. Poverty is situational, generational, urban, rural, with an absolutist core and relative qualities. Poverty is expensive, persistent, pervasive, and criminalized in the United States today.

10. Eric Jensen, Teaching with Poverty in Mind: What Being Poor Does to Kids’ Brains and What Schools Can Do About It 6–7 (2009) (defining poverty as “a chronic and debilitating condition that results from multiple adverse synergistic risk factors and affects the mind, body, and soul” and noting “It’s safe to say that poverty and its attendant risk factors are damaging to the physical, socioemotional, and cognitive well-being of children and their families. Data from the Infant Health and Development Program show that 40 percent of children living in chronic poverty had deficiencies in at least two areas of functioning (such as language and emotional responsiveness) at age 3.” (citations omitted)).


14. For an evocative understanding of the myths and realities of rural poverty, see Cynthia M. Duncan, Worlds Apart: Why Poverty Persists in Rural America (1999); Lisa R. Pruitt, Missing the Mark: Welfare Reform and Rural Poverty, 10 J. GENDER RACE & JUST. 439, 447–51 (2007) (finding that welfare reform has compromised antipoverty programs for women and children living in rural areas so that they are overrepresented in measurements of poverty and underrepresented among those receiving resources); Lisa R. Pruitt, Spatial Inequality As Constitutional Infirmity: Equal Protection, Child Poverty and Place, 71 MONT. L. REV. 1, 17 (2010) (finding that “rural poor tend to be spatially marginalized just as they are also socially marginalized” similar to racial minorities and that one study found that “half of all rural poor are segregated in high poverty areas,” but that rural minorities have even greater rates of concentrations of poverty (citations omitted)).

15. Jensen, supra note 10 (discussing the definition of poverty as situational, generational, absolute, relative, urban, and rural).

16. Poor families suffer financial penalties relative to their wealthier counterparts because many of their necessary goods and services cost more due to the facts and circumstances of their economic status. A. Yesim Orhun, Frugality is Hard to Afford, MICH. ROSS (Feb. 24, 2016), https://michiganross.umich.edu/tfia-articles/frugality-hard-afford (demonstrating that low-income households suffer a “poverty penalty” as they pay 5.5% more per roll of toilet paper than higher income households who can take advantage of bulk purchases and other cost-savings strategies).

17. An important aspect of poverty is the amount of time it is experienced or its persistence. “Persistent poverty also demonstrates a strong regional pattern, with nearly 84 percent of persistent-poverty counties in the South, comprising of more than 20 percent of all counties in the region.” Geography of Poverty, U.S. DEP’T AGRIC. ECON. RES. SERV., http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/rural-poverty-well-being/geo-pov.aspx (last updated Mar. 1, 2017).

18. John Iceland, Poverty in America: A Handbook (3d ed. 2013) (describing the pervasiveness of poverty in America); Child Poverty Pervasive in Large American Cities, New Census Data Show, NAT’L CTR. FOR CHLDR. POVERTY, http://www.nccp.org/media/releases/release_162.html (last visited Nov. 14, 2017) (“At 30.6 percent, the child poverty rate for all U.S. large cities (defined as the 71 cities with a total population of 250,000 or higher in 2007) is substantially higher than the 19.9 percent poverty rate for all children in the United States in 2013.”).

19. Karen Dolan & Jodi L. Carr, The Poor Get Prison: The Alarming Spread of the Criminalization of Poverty, INST. FOR POL’Y STUD. 5, 6 (Mar. 18, 2015), http://www.ips-dc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/IPS-The-Poor-Get-Prison-Final.pdf (“Poor people, especially people of color, face a far greater risk of being fined, arrested, and even incarcerated for minor offenses than other Americans. A broken taillight, an unpaid parking ticket, a minor drug offense, sitting on a sidewalk, or sleeping in a park can all result in jail time. . . . Poverty leads easily to criminal charges from unpaid debts, unrenwed licenses and the like. Criminal charges in turn lead to ever-mounting debt and, despite laws prohibiting debtor’s prisons, to incarceration.”); see also Kaaryn S. Gustafson, Cheating Welfare: Public Assistance and the Criminalization of Poverty (2011) (demonstrating that the boundaries between the
Defining poverty has been and continues to be politically charged and controversial. Although poverty is a concrete phenomenon for those that live it, as Justice Stewart of the U.S. Supreme Court noted about pornography, poverty too may be indefinable, but you know it when you see it. After declaring “war on poverty” in 1964, President Johnson and his wife, “Lady Bird,” brought poverty into the living rooms of America’s upper and middle classes with their media-rich, televised, white-hat-and-heels poverty tour in Appalachia. More recently, amidst the heat and humidity in August 2011, Tavis Smiley and Cornel West embarked on, and later televised, an 18-city “Call to Conscience” poverty tour designed to highlight and humanize the plight of America’s poor during the most recent unprecedented economic downturn. They wrote a poverty manifesto, which attempts to define, describe, demystify, demythologize, deconstruct, and propose a remedy for poverty in the twenty-first century. Nevertheless, poverty continues to be elusive to encapsulate. However, the federal government does measure it annually.

**B. How Is Poverty Measured?**

When you look at a homeless shelter, there are an awful lot of people in there who do have an education, who did go to school, and all it took was one paycheck, one electricity or utility bill that they didn’t pay, that can cause things to start going wrong.

---

20. COUNCIL OF ECON. ADVISORS, THE WAR ON POVERTY 50 YEARS LATER: A PROGRESS REPORT 7 (2014), https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/docs/50th_anniversary_cea_report-_final_post_embargo.pdf (noting that defining poverty requires determining what constitutes basic needs for various households and what resources should be included); U.S. DEP’T OF HEALTH, EDUC., & WELFARE, A MEASURE OF POVERTY: A REPORT TO CONGRESS AS MANDATED BY THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1974, at 2 (1976) (“The dictionary assigns to the word poverty a limited if imprecise meaning: lack of money or personal possessions. However, even a cursory review of the literature on poverty reveals that for many people the word has connotations broader or more narrow than the dictionary definition.”); NAT’L RESEARCH COUNCIL, MEASURING POVERTY: A NEW APPROACH 19 (Constance F. Citro & Robert T. Michael eds., 1995) (describing the development of the poverty thresholds by Ms. Mollie Orshansky in the early 1960s and noting “We define poverty as economic deprivation.”).

21. ICELAND, supra note 18, at 12 (addressing the question of what is poverty).


23. Poverty Tours April–May 1964 (Navy Films 1964), LYNDON B. JOHNSON PRESIDENTIAL LIBR., http://www.lbjlibrary.org/press/civil-rights-tax-cuts-and-the-war-on-poverty (President Lyndon B. Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson, in a highly publicized and produced media tour, visit Appalachia, including the rural home of Mr. Tom Fletcher and his wife and eight children. Mr. Fletcher was an unemployed sawmill worker living in Inez, Kentucky.).


25. Id. at 169–72; see also HANDLER & HASENFELD, supra note 11, at 316–48 (setting forth a comprehensive remedy for poverty in America).

The federal government has officially measured poverty since the mid-1960s. Beginning annually in 1969, the government has publicly released OPM statistics. In response to decades of criticism of the OPM, the federal government has developed an alternative, more modern and relevant measure that they are now producing together with the OPM annually. The new measure is titled the “supplemental poverty measure (SPM)” and has been generated and produced beginning in November of 2011 reflecting 2010 data. The U.S. Census Bureau generates annual income and poverty reports summarizing the annual OPM and SPM statistics.

As Mollie Orshansky, the creator of the U.S. poverty thresholds wisely observed, “[i]there is no particular reason to count the poor unless you are going to do something about them.” Reporting on the percentage of poor under the OPM and SPM is only useful if advocates and policy makers use the data to determine why, to what extent, how, and for whom the United States’ resource allocation systems have failed. Rather than focusing on the people living in poverty as the problem, scholars need to better understand our current resource allocation systems, how they are deficient, and how best to remedy the misallocation of resources. The mechanics of deriving the OPM and SPM can provide some of this data and information. Once the details of antipoverty relief are exposed, advocates can better address and remedy poverty or the very serious long-term problem of misallocation of resources in the United States.

The U.S. Census Bureau and Department of Labor provide explicit technical explanations of the OPM and SPM, but these explanations lack transparency, are not generally accessible, and do not resonate with non-number savvy individuals. On the other hand, sociologists including Barbara

---


28. COUNCIL OF ECON. ADVISORS, supra note 20, at 7 (recounting that the Office of Economic Opportunity has computed the official poverty measure internally since 1965).


32. Orshansky, supra note 6, at 37 (describing poverty as a subjective value judgement).

33. See, e.g., Julie A. Nice, Forty Years of Welfare Policy Experimentation: No Acres, No Mule, No Politics, No Rights, 4 NW. J.L. & SOC. POL’Y 1, 1 (2009) (finding that America has spent “four decades funding massive policy experimentation designed to discover how best to keep poor people off the welfare rolls” and it has succeeded in its war against welfare despite having failed miserably in its war against poverty).


Ehrenreich, Matthew Desmond, Jonathan Kozol, Katherine S. Newman, as well as others, including Smiley and West, have provided detailed ethnographies of families and individuals living in poverty. These stories are effective and resonate deeply by painting humanized portraits of the daily challenges of living without adequate resources. However, this scholarship is not designed to present a macro view of poverty or even the legal and demographic details of antipoverty program successes and institutional failures. There is a telling gap between these two approaches and presentations in poverty scholarship.

The Census Bureau provides a macroanalysis of poverty using the exhaustive, annual statistics and data inherent in the OPM and SPM. Ethnographers present a micro view of poverty from ground zero, inside sparse apartments and trailers as our neighbors wake up in hunger to unsatisfying breakfasts of coffee and cigarettes in dangerously warm (or cold) spaces, because they kept the “stove burners on overnight to fend off winter’s chill.” This Article intends to fill the void between these two levels of analysis, striving to find a middle ground analysis between the sterile, overwhelming statistics and raw data and the vibrant, in-the-living-room and on-the-streets visceral details of life stories. This Article fills this gap in the scholarship by tying antipoverty programs and statistics to the thoughts of the children and their parents who must navigate poverty and the related programs day in and day out, because the United States systematically misallocates our resources.

37. KATHRYN J. EDIN & H. LUKE SHAEFEr, $2.00 A DAY: LIVING ON ALMOST NOTHING IN AMERICA (2015).
41. See supra note 24 and accompanying text.
42. For an excellent analysis of the “poor voices literature,” see Ezra Rosser, Getting to Know the Poor, 14 YALE HUM. RTS. & DEV. L.J. 66, 69 (2011) (describing the strengths and limitations of this literature and noting that “unless such voices inspire greater commitment to anti-poverty efforts and lead to policy improvements, the efforts may amount to little more than poverty as entertainment”).
43. Id.
44. Id. at 71 (agreeing with Mari Matsuda’s statement that “It is a lie that there is no knowledge, no theory, no eloquence among the poor. . . . Pragmatic method is enriched, I believe, by weighting it to retrieve subordinated voices in order to attain a truer account of social reality and human possibilities” (quoting Mari J. Matsuda, Pragmatism Modified and the False Consciousness Problem, 63 S. CAL. L. REV. 1763, 1768 (1990) (alteration in original))).
45. DESMOND, supra note 38, at 137 (recounting the stories of eight poor families in Milwaukee and their landlords).
While few economic indicators have the salience and pervasive financial impact on the lives of countless Americans as have measures of poverty, many policymakers, researchers, advocates, and legislators do not fully comprehend the detailed mechanics used to derive them. These detailed mechanics meaningfully shape the resulting poverty measures and in turn, the United States’ failed response. By exposing the specific mechanics underlying poverty measures, this Article will try to build a bridge from in-depth personal portraits of families living in poverty to specific resource allocations that have failed. The Article unpacks and rebuilds the Census Bureau’s poverty measures by using the Census Bureau’s database. By using the Census Bureau’s raw data and by rebuilding the OPM and SPM step-by-step through each antipoverty resource allocation and the imposition of necessary expenses, this Article exposes the demographics of individuals lifted out, pushed into, or left behind at each step. By looking at the before and after allocation demographics, the Article evaluates how each resource allocation is disproportionate or proportionate to the needs of these individuals and their representation in the population universes. This exercise informs our ability to evaluate the success or failure of these programs, including any inherent biases that undermine antipoverty goals. For example, the most significant antipoverty programs’ resource allocations (e.g., Social Security retirement and unemployment benefits) track “compensation” and, thus, exacerbate demonstrable, systemic, and institutional biases resulting in higher compensation for White men.

When we evaluate poverty measurements, too often the focus is on the lives and characteristics of the poor and not on the failure of the process and institutions that caused their poverty, but, as Orshansky describes, the only reason to measure poverty is to do something about it. The purpose of poverty measures should be to expose the effectiveness or failure of antipoverty programs, not to denigrate its victims. This Article will expose the strengths and weaknesses in poverty measurements by focusing on the design and effectiveness of antipoverty programs including revealing the populations they serve and those who are left behind. By shifting the focus from the poor to current antipoverty programs, we will better understand why almost 50 million Americans, including about 16 million children, are not adequately provided for; do not have the necessary life resources; are struggling day in and day out; have been “nickel and dimed”; and are not getting by in America; and who, because of the misallocation of resources, are suffering the pervasive, persistent, and pernicious plight of poverty.

II. POVERTY MEASURES 101

A. Who Is Measured? Who Is Excluded?

When we can’t afford to pay our bills, like, our house bills and stuff, I’m afraid, like, we’ll get homeless and me and my brother will starve. You never know what’ll happen in your life . . . . [Kaylie, age ten]"
The OPM and SPM poverty measurements are used broadly to describe who is living in poverty today. However, the population universe that is the starting point for these measurements excludes millions of people who are disproportionately likely to be poor. Both the OPM and the SPM are based upon data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC), which is conducted by the Department of Labor and the Census Bureau to obtain employment, social, and demographic data.50 The CPS is a household survey performed monthly, primarily to obtain labor force statistics. The CPS ASEC is an annual supplemental survey generally performed in March to gather data from the prior calendar year.51 The CPS ASEC data is collected from households in all fifty states and the District of Columbia through a sample of about 100,000 addresses.52 The estimates derived from these household surveys “are controlled to independent national population estimates by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin.”53 National population “estimates are based on 2010 Census population counts and are updated annually taking into account births, deaths, emigration, and immigration.”54

The population universe used for the OPM and the SPM is the “resident civilian noninstitutionalized population of the United States,”55 plus military personnel who live in a household with another civilian adult (either on or off a military compound),56 limiting the calculation to certain U.S. residents in noninstitutionalized civilian households, regardless of immigration status.57 However, this population specifically excludes millions of U.S. citizens and residents who reside outside of the fifty states and Washington D.C. as well as millions of institutionalized and homeless individuals.58 Specifically, all of the roughly 3.8 million residents (whether or not U.S. citizens) of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Island areas under U.S. sovereignty or jurisdiction (principally American Samoa, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands) are excluded from the starting population used to measure poverty.59 In addition, all 1.4 million members of the Armed Forces who do not

52. DENAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, supra note 34, at 1.
53. Id.
54. Id. Population counts are mandated by the U.S. Constitution every ten years. U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, cl. 3. The data collected determines the number of seats each state has in the U.S. House of Representatives and is also used to distribute billions in federal funds to local communities. What Is the Census?, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, http://www.census.gov/2010census/about/ (last visited Nov. 15, 2017); see also U.S. and World Population Clock, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, https://www.census.gov/popclock/ (last visited Nov. 15, 2017).
55. See DENAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, supra note 34, at 1.
57. The Current Population Survey with ASEC supplement does include data as to whether an individual is born in the United States or a foreign country, but does not include immigration status. Therefore, the poverty data includes unauthorized immigrants.
58. U.S. citizens who are residents of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands are specifically excluded from the starting population that is analyzed for purposes of determining the poverty rate. See U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, supra note 56, at 2-1 to 2-2.
live in a household with a civilian and all institutionalized and homeless individuals are excluded from the starting population.  

Because the U.S. resident civilian noninstitutionalized population universe is based upon household surveys, people who are homeless or are living in institutions are excluded from its data set. Accordingly, U.S. residents living in institutions such as prisons, long-term care hospitals, dormitories, and nursing homes are excluded from the OPM and SPM analysis and results. Students who live in dormitories are only included in the population to the extent their parents include them in their own household survey. The Census Bureau and Department of Labor exclude these various categories from the OPM and SPM data sets for arguably practical and statistically sound reasons. For example, the homeless population is transitory, difficult to count, and generally neither the Census Bureau nor the Department of Labor include these individuals in the CPS or CPS ASEC. Individuals who are living in institutions often have basic services provided to them and are not able to work, so employment or work is generally not a relevant concept.

The Census Bureau does survey and determine population estimates and economic and social data for Puerto Rico, but that data is separately reported from the OPM and SPM. The Census Bureau’s most recent poverty rate for Puerto Rico was about three times that of the OPM and SPM, or 43.5%. While poverty rates are not readily available for all of the U.S. territories, the following statistics are telling. The

---

60. U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, supra note 56, at 2-1 to 2-2, 9-9 (describing the universe as only including members of the Armed Forces who are residents in the United States, that is, excluding all members of the Armed Forces on active duty stationed outside of the United States as well as all Armed Forces living without a civilian adult in the fifty states and the District of Columbia); see infra Table 1 (setting forth the population of excluded individuals from the OPM and SPM population universe).

61. See DENAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, supra note 34, at 1 (describing the source of estimates).

62. Id.; see also Group Quarters/Residence Rules, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, http://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/glossary.html (last revised Apr. 13, 2016) (defining “Group Quarters” and specifying that institutions include correctional facilities, nursing homes, and mental hospitals).

63. Group Quarters/Residence Rules, supra note 62 (noting that the CPS ASEC includes individuals who are “usual residents” at a sample address, with usual “defined as the place where the person lives and sleeps most of the time, or the place he or she considers to be his or her usual residence”). Therefore, even though a college dorm or shelter would be included in the CPS ASEC sample, most students living in dorms or homeless individuals sheltering for a short period would not be included in the population universe. Id.; see also Poverty Glossary, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, http://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/about/glossary.html (last revised May 16, 2016) (defining “Institutional Group Quarters” as “facilities for people under formally authorized, supervised care or custody at the time of interview, such as correctional facilities, nursing facilities, in-patient hospice facilities, mental (psychiatric) hospitals, group homes for juveniles, and residential treatment centers for juveniles”).


66. Id.
unemployment rate in American Samoa was almost 30% in 2005, and Northern Mariana Islands suffered an 11.2% unemployment rate in 2010. The poverty rate in Guam in 2001 was 23% and almost 29% in the Virgin Islands in 2002. Thus, the exclusion of these U.S. individuals from the OPM and SPM understates not only the official number of people living in poverty, but the percentage of poor in the United States as well.

Excluding 3.2 million institutionalized individuals from the OPM and SPM population universe makes some sense given that their costs of living may be covered by the government or are significantly different from more traditional households due to communal living and other nontraditional living circumstances. People who are incarcerated generally do not have any meaningful source of income, yet their housing, food, and clothing costs are covered by other sources. Similarly, members of the armed services living in military barracks have different costs of living than traditional households. However, consistent with the 3.8 million residents of Puerto Rico and the U.S. island territories and the 600,000 homeless, the 2.2 million incarcerated individuals and 1.4 million members of the armed forces not included in the population used for determining the OPM and SPM are likely to be disproportionately poor.

Since the 1970s, the prison population has increased 500%, with more than 11 million admissions annually. People who are incarcerated are disproportionately male and people of color. Although the rate of incarceration of women is growing at a much faster rate than the rate of incarceration of men,

72. See infra Table 1 (setting forth specific categories of individuals who are not included in the OPM and SPM population universe).
73. Trends in U.S. Corrections, supra note 71, at 2.
75. Trends in U.S. Corrections, supra note 71, at 5.
76. Id. at 4; see also Marie A. Failinger, Lessons Unlearned: Women Offenders, the Ethics of Care, and the Promise of Restorative Justice, 33 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 487, 489 (describing the explosion in rates of incarceration of women, while the overall crime rates in the same courts have dropped significantly); New Report Sheds Light on Women in Jail, the Fastest Growing Population Behind Bars, VERA INST. JUST. (Aug. 17, 2016), https://www.vera.org/newsroom/press-releases/new-report-sheds-light-on-women-in-jail-the-fastest-growing-population-behind-bars (describing the challenges women face in prison).
presently about 5%, or only 110,000 of the 2.2 million people incarcerated, are women.\textsuperscript{77} “More than 60% of the people in prison today are people of color.”\textsuperscript{78} Specifically, Black and Hispanic\textsuperscript{79} men are, respectively, nearly 6 and 2.3 times as likely to be incarcerated as their White male counterparts.\textsuperscript{80}

“Our national data systems, and the social facts they produce, are structured around normative domestic and economic life, systematically excluding prison inmates.”\textsuperscript{81} “Prisoners, though drawn from the lowest rungs in society, appear in no measures of poverty or unemployment. As a result, the full extent of the disadvantage of groups with high incarceration rates is underestimated.”\textsuperscript{82} Demographic data demonstrates that incarcerated individuals are disproportionately poor.\textsuperscript{83} While incarceration itself is tied to high unemployment rates and poverty,\textsuperscript{84} the poor are disproportionately likely to be incarcerated.\textsuperscript{85} According to a recent report “people in prison were, before they went to prison, some of the poorest people in this country.”\textsuperscript{86} The findings indicate that incarcerated people “in all gender, race, and ethnicity groups earned substantially less prior to their incarceration than their non-incarcerated counterparts of similar ages.”\textsuperscript{87} Incarcerated individuals had a median 2014 income of “$19,185 prior to their incarceration, which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{77} Trends in U.S. Corrections, supra note 71, at 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{78} Id. at 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{79} The term “Hispanic” versus the more inclusive term “Latinx” will be used throughout this Article consistent with its defined use in the OPM and SPM. While Latinx is the preferred term given that it is gender neutral and inclusive for those who are transgender or queer, “Hispanic” is a broadly defined term for purposes of poverty measures. For a robust discussion among scholars regarding the term “Latinx,” see Catalina (Kathleen) M. de Onis, An Exchange about the Politics of “Latinx”, IU PRESS, http://www.iupress.indiana.edu/em/email_images/Jrnls/deOnis_Latinx%20exchange_final_website.pdf (last visited Dec. 11, 2017). Consistent with U.S. federal government standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), this term is used not to denote race but rather Hispanic origin (also known as ethnicity). About Hispanic Origins, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, http://www.census.gov/topics/population/hispanic-origin/about.html (last revised Jan. 26, 2017). The OMB defines “Hispanic” as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race. “Persons who report themselves as Hispanic can be of any race and are identified as such in [our] data tables.” Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{80} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{81} Bruce Western & Becky Pettit, Incarceration and Social Inequality, DAEDALUS, Summer 2010, at 8, 16.
  \item \textsuperscript{82} Id. at 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{83} Melissa S. Kearney et al., Ten Economic Facts About Crime and Incarceration in the United States 7 (Hamilton Project at Brookings Inst., Policy Memo, 2014), https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/v8_THP_10CrimeFacts.pdf (noting that low-income youths are more likely to engage in violent and property crimes than are youths from middle- and high-income families and are significantly more likely to attack someone, join a gang, or steal something worth more than fifty dollars).
  \item \textsuperscript{84} Western & Pettit, supra note 81, at 16 (“Workers with prison records experience significant declines in earnings and employment. Parents in prison are likely to divorce or separate, and through the contagious effects of the institution, their children are in some degree ‘prisonized,’ exposed to the routines of prison life through visitation and the parole supervision of their parents. Yet much of this reality remains hidden from view. In social life, for all but those whose incarceration rates are highest, prisons are exotic institutions unknown to the social mainstream.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{85} Dolan & Carr, supra note 19, at 5 (“The poor, and especially poor people of color, have long been overrepresented in the prison population. This used to be attributed to the fact that the poor are more likely to be tempted by criminal activities such as theft and drug dealing. Just in the last ten years, however, it has become apparent that being poor is in itself a crime in many cities and counties, and that it is a crime punished by further impoverishment.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{86} Bernadette Rabuy & Daniel Kopf, Prisons of Poverty: Uncovering the Pre-Incarceration Incomes of the Imprisoned, PRISON POL’Y INITIATIVE (July 9, 2015), http://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/income.html.
  \item \textsuperscript{87} Id.
\end{itemize}
[was] 41% less than non-incarcerated people of similar ages."88 The incarceration population data reveals that “[n]ot only are the median incomes of incarcerated people prior to incarceration lower than non-incarcerated people, but incarcerated people are dramatically concentrated at the lowest ends of the national income distribution."89

Consistent with the economic demographic factors of the prison population, as well as the data for the population at large, incarcerated individuals suffer higher rates of serious mental illness and cognitive disability. Twenty percent of prison and jail populations are people with a serious mental illness.90 Moreover, “[p]rison inmates are four times as likely and jail inmates more than six times as likely to report a cognitive disability than the general population."91 This data confirms that incarcerated individuals are disproportionately poor and are people with disabilities. And people with disabilities are disproportionately poor because of higher rates of incarceration and of “barriers to employment, stable housing, and other necessary elements of economic security."92 In short, excluding incarcerated individuals from poverty measures understates the already high rates of poverty for people with disabilities as well as other demographic groups, including but, not limited to men and people of color.

Members of the armed forces also suffer poverty rates that are disproportionately high as compared to the population at large.93 “For decades, base pay for enlisted military members has hovered around the poverty line, as defined by the Department of Health and Human Services.”94 “According to a survey conducted by Jewish Family Service of San Diego . . . 60 percent of active duty military households reported being food insecure and 50 percent reported they cut the size of their meals or skipped meals because there wasn’t enough money for food.”95 Every military base in the country has a food bank and, in 2013, 23,000 active duty members of the armed services qualified for and received federal food stamp subsidies.96 From September 2014 to August 2015, active duty military service members spent $24,000,000

88. Id.
89. Id.
91. Id. (noting that “[c]ognitive disabilities—such as Down syndrome, autism, dementia, intellectual disabilities, and learning disorders—are among the most commonly reported”).
92. Id. at 3.
93. For a discussion on the demographics of those who serve in the military, see Amy Lutz, Who Joins the Military?: A Look at Race, Class, and Immigration Status, 36 J. Pol. & Mit. Soc. 167, 184 (2008) (concluding that socioeconomic background is the most significant determinant of whether or not an individual joins the military).
95. Kelcey Ellis, Food Helps Provide a “Home Away from Home,” FEEDING AM.: HUNGER BLOG (July 1, 2016), http://www.feedingamerica.org/hunger-in-america/news-and-updates/hunger-blog/food-helps-provide-a-home.html (explaining that “San Diego has three naval bases, three Marine Corps bases and one U.S. Coast Guard station, with approximately 95,000” members of the armed forces—with family members this population almost doubles to 175,000).
in federal food subsidy benefits and 45% of military school children are eligible for free or reduced price school lunches.97

These food insecurity statistics are not surprising given the demographic data of new recruits entering the armed services. A recent "analysis of recruiting data revealed that low- and middle-income families are supplying far more Army recruits than families with incomes of more than $60,000 a year."98 The same study found that 30% of new recruits joining the Army did not have a high school diploma, which was 20 percentage points higher than the Army’s goal of having a maximum of 10% of new recruits lacking high school diplomas.99 Given these attributes of the population who are entering the armed services it would be consistent with poverty measures to suggest that members of the armed services are more likely to be disproportionately poor than the OPM and SPM population universes.

Finally, consistent with the aging of the U.S. population, the number of individuals residing in nursing homes has been increasing and is expected to continue to increase.100 In 2014, there were about 1.37 million nursing home residents who were predominately eighty-five years and older, women, and poor.101 Sixty-three percent of these nursing home residents were Medicaid payers.102 In a demographic study of nursing home residents over more than a twenty-year period, Medicaid was the foremost payment source in all surveys and across all age groups.103 Thus, consistent with the other excluded categories of individuals, nursing home residents are likely to be disproportionately poor as compared to the general OPM and SPM population universes.

Thus, almost nine million Americans, who are demographically disproportionately poor, are not even considered in U.S. poverty measures. The poverty suffered by these individuals is effectively made invisible by this exclusion and thus not even included in the resulting analysis and discourse. Unfortunately, homeless and incarcerated populations have grown dramatically in recent decades and they are, for obvious reasons, meaningfully poorer than traditionally-housed Americans.104


98. Carissa Wyant, Who’s Joining the U.S. Military? Poor, Women and Minorities Targeted, MINTPRESS NEWS (Dec. 18, 2012), http://www.mintpressnews.com/whos-joining-the-us-military-poor-women-and-minorities-targeted; see also Lutz, supra note 93, at 167 (citing a 2006 study concluding that “blacks are overrepresented in the military” and that “people who serve in the military come from more well-off neighborhoods than those who have not joined the military although the economic elite are underrepresented in armed service”).

99. See Johnny Edwards, War Toll Is Heaviest in Poor, Rural Areas, AUGUSTA CHRON. (Sept. 1, 2010), http://chronicle.augusta.com/news/metro/2010-09-01/war-toll-heaviest-poor-rural-areas# (“Allendale and Barnwell counties have suffered South Carolina’s highest and second-highest death rates per capita during the Iraq war. At the same time, they are among the state’s most sparsely populated areas and make several top 10 lists for poverty and unemployment rates.”).


101. Lauren Harris-Kojetin et al., Long-term Care Providers and Services Users in the United States: Data from the National Study of Long-Term Care Providers, 2013–2014, VITAL & HEALTH STAT., Feb. 2016, at x, xi, 36–39 (finding that nursing home residents were approximately 67% women, 42% 85-or-older, and 14% African American).

102. Id. at 39.

103. Id.

104. See supra notes 9, 64, 71–89, and accompanying text.
Thus, as a threshold issue, the OPM and SPM exclude almost 3% of the population, thereby understating the number of poor individuals as well as the percentage of Americans who live in poverty. These excluded individuals are estimated and generally categorized as follows:

Table 1: Americans Excluded from OPM and SPM Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>51,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td>52,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>167,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>107,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>3,411,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PR and U.S. Island Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,789,700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces (including overseas)</td>
<td>1,449,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized individuals</td>
<td>3,233,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless individuals</td>
<td>564,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Not in OPM and SPM</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,094,231</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2.9% of 316,168,000 SPM pop.)

Excluding these Americans from the OPM and SPM databases effectively removes their voices from the poverty measurement and general poverty discourse. This exclusion is offensive to the dignity of these individuals; that many scholars and advocates do not even know these individuals are excluded is

111. *American FactFinder*, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU, https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk (last visited Sept. 16, 2017) (reporting population as of March 2015 for civilian population at 319,401,815 less 315,462,107 civilian noninstitutionalized population = 3,939,708 institutionalized population, less members of the armed services living with civilians and dorm residents counted by families of 705,893 (derived from the total population included in the 2014 SPM all population of 316,168,000 (see SPM 2014, supra note 35, at tbl.2))).
112. U.S. DEP’T OF HOUSING & URB. DEV., THE 2015 ANNUAL HOMELESS ASSESSMENT REPORT (AHAR) TO CONGRESS: PART 2: ESTIMATES OF HOMELESSNESS IN THE UNITED STATES xix (2016). “Of all people experiencing homelessness on a single night in January 2015, 206,286, or 37 percent, were in families with children” and “36,907 people were experiencing homelessness as unaccompanied youth (under age 25).” Id. at xix–xx.
113. See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at tbl.2 (SPM population of civilian noninstitutionalized population plus military living with an adult civilian = 316,168,000).
even more disconcerting. Yet, their life stories inform, disturb, and demonstrate without doubt that U.S. institutions have failed these individuals.

These individuals include people like Dee Dee, who was twenty-four years old when she was incarcerated for second degree assault. Her story informs the misallocation of resources in America, but yet it is completely erased from the federally designed poverty measurement and resulting discourse.

Dee Dee’s experience while growing up was brutal and chaotic. She was removed from her parent’s home and placed in state-supervised care at the age of seven. Her parents were alcoholics and never registered their children in school. Dee Dee and her three siblings were neglected, malnourished, and physically abused. They were first placed in the care of an aunt, but she died when Dee Dee was eleven. Dee Dee was placed in the care of a second aunt for several years, but because this aunt could not effectively control the children, they moved on to another aunt and their third caretaker. By their early teens, Dee Dee and one brother were diagnosed as “emotionally disturbed.” She completed eight years of schooling and began to abuse alcohol in her teens.

These individuals are excluded from the population universe, but how are the individuals who are included organized for measuring whether they have enough resources? The next section will describe how the population universe is broken down into measurement units for the OPM and SPM.

1. How Are Measurement Units Determined?

The payment on our house was due in two weeks, and I guess my parents just didn’t have the money at the time because he was explaining to us business was slow. And we lost our whole house and everything, so we was back to ground zero. Then we moved to a homeless shelter. Anything that could fit in a book bag or a suitcase, you could take it. [Jonny, age 13]  

Both of the poverty measures, OPM and SPM, compare resources for one or more individuals, who are analyzed together as a measurement unit, to a specific poverty threshold tailored for the size and demographics of the measurement unit to determine if all members of the unit should be characterized as poor. Financial resources are aggregated for all individual unit members before the total amount is compared to the relevant poverty threshold, because the government assumes that members of the unit share resources. The determination of who is or is not included in a unit could be dispositive with respect to the poverty determination for all of the unit members. One of many distinctions between the OPM and SPM is that they include different populations in their measurement units to analyze whether a

115. *Id.* at 30.
family/household/measurement unit is poor.\textsuperscript{119}

\textit{a. OPM Family Unit.} The OPM uses the census-defined family as its measurement unit. This measurement unit “includes all individuals residing together who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption” and treats unrelated individuals aged 15 and above as a separate family unit.\textsuperscript{120} Thus, all related family unit members have the same poverty status.\textsuperscript{121} Unrelated individuals aged 15 and above are treated separately as a unit of one. As marriage rates have been on the decline for decades and correspondingly cohabitation has been on the rise, this approach to aggregating income seems inconsistent with social trends and household budget realities.\textsuperscript{122} A recent report by the Pew Research Center found that, after decades of declining marriage rates, the rate of Americans aged 25 and older who have never been married reached 42 million or 20\% of the population in 2012, an historic high.\textsuperscript{123} Children under 15 who are not related to anyone who is at least 15 in the household (e.g., foster children) are excluded entirely from the OPM, because the survey does not ask for income data from anyone under 15. In 2014, this approach excluded another 354,000 children from the OPM population data set.\textsuperscript{124} These individuals are included in the SPM, because the SPM’s household measurement “unit” is broader.\textsuperscript{125}

\textbf{OPM Family Unit Example:} Assume Jane and her three children live with Jo, her live-in partner, and an unrelated ten-year-old foster child, Dick. Under the OPM, Jane and her three children will constitute one family unit. Jo will constitute a separate family unit of one. Assume Jo provides enough cash income to exceed the highest poverty threshold for a family of six. Under these circumstances, Jane and her three children will be classified as living in poverty with no income and a poverty threshold for four. Jo will be treated as not living in poverty under a poverty threshold for one. Because Dick is an unrelated individual under fifteen, he will be excluded from the OPM population. Thus, under the OPM, four residents are living under the poverty threshold, one resident is living above the threshold, and one individual is excluded completely from any analysis.

\textit{b. SPM Household Unit.} The SPM uses a broader unit for measuring resources that acknowledges that household members may share resources even if not married or related. This approach to analyzing

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{120} \textit{See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 3.}

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{See} DE NAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, supra note 34, at app. B (describing how to calculate poverty under the OPM).

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{See The Decline of Marriage and Rise of New Families,} PEW RES. CTR. (Nov. 18, 2010), http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/11/18/the-decline-of-marriage-and-rise-of-new-families/ (concluding that while marriage rates have been declining for decades, “family—in all its emerging varieties—remains resilient. The survey finds that Americans have an expansive definition of what constitutes a family. And the vast majority of adults consider their own family to be the most important, most satisfying element of their lives.”).

\textsuperscript{123} Wendy Wang & Kim Parker, Record Share of Americans Have Never Married: As Values, Economics and Gender Patterns Change, PEW RES. CTR. (Sept. 24, 2014), http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/09/24/record-share-of-americans-have-never-married/ (describing the never married rate as 23\% for men and 17\% for women in 2012 compared to 10\% and 8\% in 1960).

\textsuperscript{124} All people in the SPM population of civilian noninstitutionalized population plus military living with an adult civilian = 316,168,000 (SPM 2014, supra note 35, at tbl.2), less same population universe in the OPM but without under age 15 unrelated individuals of 315,804,000 (DE NAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, supra note 34, at tbl.B-1) = 364,000 unrelated under age 15 individuals (e.g., foster children).

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 1.}
household resources and expenses is more consistent with the current state of how households manage their resources and budgets. The SPM “unit” includes all individuals at the same address if related by marriage, birth, adoption, or if they cohabitate, plus related children and any unrelated children that are cared for at that address by the household members (e.g., foster children). Thus, all members of the household “unit” as defined above have the same poverty status.

**SPM Household Unit Example:** Assume Jane and her three children live with Jo, her live-in partner, and an unrelated ten-year-old foster child, Dick. Under the SPM, Jane, her three children, Jo, and Dick will constitute one family unit. Assume Jo provides enough cash income to exceed the highest poverty threshold for a family of six. Under these facts and circumstances, the entire household of six would be classified as living above the applicable poverty threshold for six.

2. What Are the Poverty Thresholds?

a. Overview: Poverty Thresholds ≠ Poverty Guidelines

i. Poverty Thresholds Generally. Poverty thresholds and poverty guidelines are annual dollar amounts used by the government for different purposes to determine whether a family or household unit is considered poor. Poverty thresholds are used to determine poverty measurements for statistical analysis. Poverty thresholds are generated annually in January of the following year and are adjusted again in September of that year in connection with the Census Bureau’s issuance of the poverty measures for the prior year. For example, poverty thresholds for 2016 were issued by the Census Bureau in January 2017 and adjusted in September 2017 when the 2016 OPM and SPM were issued. The Census Bureau uses these poverty thresholds to compare against the aggregate income of a measurement unit (family or household as defined under the OPM or SPM, respectively) to determine if the individuals in that unit have adequate annual resources—that is, whether they are living above, at, or below poverty.

ii. Poverty Guidelines Generally. Poverty guidelines are different from poverty thresholds and are used to determine eligibility for some, but not all, federal, state, and local government programs. Poverty guidelines are created for prospective administrative use, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services publishes them in the Federal Register in January of each year.

---

126. Id. at 3.
129. Id.
131. Examples of federal programs that do not use the poverty guidelines are the Earned Income Tax Credit (I.R.C. § 32) and the Child Tax Credit (I.R.C. § 24).
132. ASPE FAQ, supra note 128.
The government calculates the poverty guidelines by adjusting the prior year’s poverty thresholds for price changes using the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U).\footnote{\textit{2016 HHS Poverty Update}, \textit{supra} note 133, at 4036.} For example, poverty guidelines issued in January 2017 for that year’s government programs will be calculated using the 2015 poverty thresholds (finalized in September of 2016), adjusted for price differences from 2015 to 2016 using the CPI-U.\footnote{\textit{For examples of calculating the poverty guidelines from the poverty thresholds see \textit{Computations for the 2016 Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines for the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia}, U.S. DEP’T HEALTH & HUM. SERVS., ASSISTANT SEC’Y FOR PLAN. & EVALUATION (Apr. 25, 2016), \url{https://aspe.hhs.gov/basic-report/computations-2016-poverty-guidelines}; \textit{Computations for the 2015 Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines for the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia}, U.S. DEP’T HEALTH & HUM. SERVS., ASSISTANT SEC’Y FOR PLAN. & EVALUATION (Dec. 1, 2015), \url{https://aspe.hhs.gov/computations-2015-annual-update-hhs-poverty-guidelines-48-contiguous-states-and-district-columbia}.} Poverty guidelines include simple adjustments for families of different sizes through standardizing an additional amount to be added for each individual (rounded to the nearest $10 increment) and geographic locations “(with different guidelines for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia; Alaska; and Hawaii).”\footnote{\textit{Wis. IRP, \textit{supra} note 127; see also 2016 HHS Poverty Update, \textit{supra} note 132, at 4036–37.}} For example, the increments for each additional person under the 2017 guidelines are as follows: $4,180 for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia; $5,230 for Alaska; and $4,810 for Hawaii.\footnote{\textit{The poverty guideline additional amounts are set forth at \textit{ASPE, U.S. Federal Poverty Guidelines Used to Determine Financial Eligibility for Certain Federal Programs}, U.S. DEP’T HEALTH & HUM. SERVS., ASSISTANT SEC’Y FOR PLAN. & EVALUATION, \url{https://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty-guidelines} (last visited Nov. 17, 2017) [hereinafter \textit{U.S. Federal Poverty Guidelines}].}}

Government programs often use a multiple of the poverty guidelines (such as 125%, 150%, 185%, or 250% of the poverty line) to determine whether a family is eligible for certain social benefits.\footnote{\textit{See 2016 HHS Poverty Update, \textit{supra} note 133, at 4037; see also ASPE FAQ, \textit{supra} note 128 (Q: “I have a chart showing multiples (e.g., 125 percent, 150 percent, etc.) of last year’s poverty guidelines. How can I get an updated version of that chart based on this year’s guidelines?”; A: “The only way to get an official update of a chart showing percentage multiples of the poverty guidelines is to contact the organization or office that prepared it.”); \textit{Wis. IRP, \textit{supra} note 127.}}} Examples of federal programs that use the guidelines in determining eligibility are Head Start, Low-Income Home Energy Assistance, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly Food Stamp Program), National School Lunch Program, Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons, and Job Corps.\footnote{\textit{Wis. IRP, \textit{supra} note 127.}}

\textit{b. OPM Poverty Thresholds.} The poverty thresholds used in the OPM derive from the original version of the federal poverty measure, which was developed by economist Mollie Orshansky of the Social Security Administration in 1963–64.\footnote{\textit{Gordon M. Fisher, \textit{The Development and History of the U.S. Poverty Thresholds—A Brief Overview}, U.S. DEP’T HEALTH & HUM. SERVS., ASSISTANT SEC’Y FOR PLAN. & EVALUATION (Jan. 1, 1997), \url{www.aspe.hhs.gov/history-poverty-thresholds}; \textit{Wis. IRP, \textit{supra} note 127.}}} “Orshansky presented the poverty thresholds as a measure of income inadequacy, not income adequacy” in her January 1965 article.\footnote{\textit{Mollie Orshansky, \textit{Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile}, SOC. SECURITY BULL., Jan. 1965, at 3.}} She stated, “if it is not possible to state unequivocally ‘how much is enough,’ it should be possible to assert with confidence how much, on an average, is too little.”\footnote{\textit{Orshansky, \textit{supra} note 141, at 3.}} Orshansky’s poverty thresholds were intended to be applied to after-tax income,
but, under the OPM, they are applied to before-tax income as provided by the Census Bureau. Given regressive sales, payroll, and property tax systems for lower-income households this obvious misapplication leads to a meaningful understatement of households suffering poverty in the OPM.

Orshansky derived the poverty thresholds from “the Department of Agriculture’s 1955 Household Food Consumption Survey (the latest available such survey at the time) [showing] that families of three or more persons spent about one third of their after-tax money income on food.” Orshansky “calculated poverty thresholds for families of three or more persons by taking the dollar costs of the economy food plan for families of those sizes and multiplying the costs by a factor of three.” In addition, “[s]he derived poverty thresholds for two-person families by multiplying the dollar cost of the food plan . . . by a somewhat higher multiplier (3.7) also derived from the 1955 survey.” Orshansky “derived poverty thresholds for one-person units directly from the thresholds for two-person units. . . .” Several years later, “[i]n August 1969, the [U.S.] Bureau of the Budget [predecessor of the Office of Management and Budget] designated the poverty thresholds with [certain] revisions as the federal government’s official statistical definition of poverty.”

The original threshold matrix had 124 alternatives that included distinctions for farm and nonfarm families, gender of the head of the household, age of the household members, and family size. The current threshold matrix has 48 alternatives including family size and age of the head of household (for families with one or two adults and up to one child), as well as additional number of children (capped at “eight or more” children). Each year the original poverty thresholds derived from the 1955 survey data have been updated for price changes using the CPI-U.

c. SPM Poverty Thresholds. The SPM poverty thresholds are designed to represent the “amount spent on a basic set of goods that includes food, clothing, shelter, and utilities (FCSU), and a small additional amount to allow for other needs (e.g., household supplies, personal care, and nonwork-related transportation).” The Bureau of Labor Statistics produces the thresholds based upon five years of quarterly expenditure data for family units with “exactly two children using Consumer Expenditure Survey...

---

143. Fisher, supra note 140.
144. NEWMAN & O’BRIEN, supra note 40, at 86–124 (demonstrating the regressive tax rates for low-income families inherent in state and local sales and property taxes). Payroll tax rates are routinely described as regressive given that they start on dollar one of earned income and are capped generally at higher income dollar amounts. Policy Basics: Federal Payroll Taxes, CTR. ON BUDGET & POL’Y PRIORITIES (Mar. 23, 2016), https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-tax/policy-basics-federal-payroll-taxes (affirming that payroll taxes are regressive and that about 33% of all tax revenue is generated by federal payroll taxes that disproportionately burden lower income households).
145. Fisher, supra note 140.
146. Id.
147. Id.
148. Id.
150. Fisher, supra note 140.
152. See id. (current and historical poverty thresholds); see also supra note 134 and accompanying text.
153. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 1. The threshold is determined based upon the average expenditures on FSUC over all two-child consumer units in the 30th to 36th percentile range in Consumer Expenditure Surveys multiplied by 1.2 (to account for expenditures in addition to FSCU). Id. at 16.
(CE) data.” The Bureau adjusts the thresholds to reflect the needs of different family sizes and composition, incorporating economies of scale, number of adults versus children, and geographic differences in housing costs. Expenditures on shelter and utilities are determined differently for renters, owners with mortgages, and owners without mortgages. The government is required to adjust the thresholds “to reflect real change in expenditures on this basic bundle of goods around the 33rd percentile of the expenditure distribution.” The calculation of FSCU must also include noncash benefits that are counted on the resource side for FSCU so that the concept of a threshold functions properly for the SPM calculations. So any FSCU noncash benefits (e.g., housing vouchers, SNAP, utility subsidies) must be included in the threshold so that poverty is not underestimated (e.g., included as a resource for the household unit, but not included in the threshold for the same unit).

d. Sample Poverty Thresholds and Poverty Guidelines. Not surprisingly, SPM poverty thresholds (for the majority of units that are renters and mortgagees) are higher than the OPM poverty thresholds, which are higher than the arguably backward-in-time looking poverty guidelines.

Table 2: Two Adults, Two Children Household  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24,339</td>
<td>24,036</td>
<td>24,008</td>
<td>23,624</td>
<td>23,283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155. The parameters allow for differing needs of adults and children and for economies of scale for consumption within the consumer unit. SPM 2014, supra note at 35, at 3.
156. Id. (describing that American Community Survey data on rents is used to adjust housing costs for different geographic regions).
157. Id.
158. See id. at 1; Developing a Supplemental Poverty Measure, supra note 30, at 3–4.
159. See SPM 2014, supra note at 35, at 1.
160. The poverty guidelines are issued in January each year so that households can use them to determine if they qualify for certain programs during that year. As such, they are based upon the most up to date OPM poverty thresholds, which is finalized in September of the prior year for the preceding calendar year. While the poverty threshold is adjusted with the CPI-U, as evidenced, the poverty guidelines are lower than the poverty thresholds. See supra notes 134–137 and accompanying text.
162. SPM 2015, supra note 29, at 3; see also PROCTOR, SEMEGA & KOLLAR, supra note 64, at 43.
164. U.S. Federal Poverty Guidelines, supra note 137.
B. What Resources Are Included for Each Unit to Determine If They Are Poor?

A primary purpose of poverty measurements is to determine the demographics of those who are not allocated sufficient resources.168 This Article has presented the mechanics of the poverty thresholds under the OPM and the SPM as well as the different compositions of the units for analysis under the two measures. The OPM and SPM also include different financial resources to compare to the relevant poverty threshold to determine if a household is poor. Both the OPM and SPM include as financial resources all cash income including most significantly pre-tax market income (i.e., wages, self-employment income, business income, interest, dividends, rents, royalties, income from estates and trusts, alimony, retirement and pension income, but excludes capital gains and losses).169 OPM and SPM cash resources also include Social Security retirement, survivor, and disability benefits; Supplemental Security Income (SSI);170 unemployment compensation; and veterans’ benefits.171 Finally, cash benefits from Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF)172 and from child support are also included as resources for both measures.173 This is the total aggregate resource accumulation for OPM. As noted by critics, OPM only includes pre-tax cash benefits even though in-kind benefits are a meaningful part of many low-income household resources.174

The SPM is more expansive and includes noncash, in-kind benefits including food security benefits in the form of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), school lunches, and Special Suppemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC) as resources.175 In addition to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM: Owners w/out mortgage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>22,298</th>
<th>21,806</th>
<th>21,380</th>
<th>21,397</th>
<th>21,400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPM: Owners w/mortgage166</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26,336</td>
<td>25,930</td>
<td>25,844</td>
<td>25,639</td>
<td>25,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPM: Renters167</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26,104</td>
<td>25,583</td>
<td>25,460</td>
<td>25,144</td>
<td>25,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


166. Renters and homeowners with a mortgage represent 76% of all household units. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 3–4.

167. SPM 2015, supra note 29, at tbl.1; SPM 2014, supra note at 35, at tbl.1; SPM 2013, supra note 165, at tbl.1.


169. How the Census Bureau Measures Poverty, supra note 130; see also SPM 2014, supra note 35.

170. See infra Part II.B.2.

171. See infra Part II.B.3.

172. See infra Part II.B.4.

173. Because child support is paid to a family from an individual who has an obligation to support a child in the household, it is not separately analyzed as a government antipoverty program in this Article. However, it is included as a resource for data analysis. The 2014 SPM report indicates that child support payments received lifted about 950,000 individuals, predominately children, out of poverty calculated by multiplying the difference made by child support by total SPM population. See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at tbl.2, 9 & tbl.4a. Note, however, that that the difference determined with respect to child support is within the margin of error. Id.


175. See infra Part II.B.5.
food security benefits, SPM includes as a resource housing security benefits, which include rental supplements and subsidies and utility assistance programs. In addition to cash income and in-kind benefits, SPM reduces these resources by state, local, and federal income and payroll taxes, work and related child care expenses, child support paid, and medical out-of-pocket expenses (MOOP). Once this net amount is calculated for each household unit, it is compared to the relevant threshold to determine if the household lives in poverty.

This Article will next present and explain each of the household resources as well as the demographics and percentages of the individuals that are lifted out of poverty by these resources. The first and most significant by far of any of the household resources is market income.

1. Market Income

When it was good, it was good. I can remember having five or six jobs a month that were lined up back to back, and I mean decent paying jobs, $4,000, $5,000, $7,000, whatever it was. And all of a sudden, just right about the time when everybody was saying, you know, the recession is coming about, the recession is coming about, people just plain old stopped fixing on their houses, stopped making repairs. [Tom Davis, father of Jonny, Jaylan, Joshua, and Jasmine].

The Census Bureau includes as a financial resource a household or family unit’s pre-tax cash income from all earnings (including wages, salaries, tips, commissions, bonuses, self-employment, and partnership income), worker’s compensation, pension or retirement income, interest, dividends, net rental and royalty income, income from estates and trusts, alimony, and any miscellaneous income. Capital gains and losses are explicitly excluded from this income measure.
Not surprisingly, market income is the most meaningful antipoverty relief of any resource for all demographics.\(^{184}\) Under the OPM and SPM, more than 77% of the population universe, or about 244 to 245 million individuals, are lifted above poverty thresholds with market income.\(^{185}\) However, consistent with income inequality data, market income is not uniformly allocated among all populations.\(^{186}\) Under the current structure, if we only consider market income, about 22% of the analyzed population universe lives without adequate resources or in poverty.\(^{187}\) Market income disproportionately lifts working-age, able-bodied White men out of poverty under the OPM and SPM.\(^{188}\) Blacks, Native Americans, senior citizens, and people with disabilities are disproportionately excluded from their proportionate share of market income based upon population.\(^{189}\) Whites and Asians receive a disproportionately greater share of market income than their population percentage under the OPM and the SPM.\(^{190}\) Whites are 61.8% of the population universe under the OPM and SPM, but received, respectively, 64.6% and 65.2% of market income. Blacks are 12.2% of the population universe, but they received only 10.3% of total market income under the OPM and SPM. People with disabilities were 9.4% of the population and received only 5.9% and 6.0% under the OPM and SPM measurements, respectively. Given that market income is by far the most significant household unit resource lifting more household units out of poverty than all other resources these inconsistent allocations are meaningful to families who do not receive their pro rata share.

Hispanics are 16.7% of the population universe and received only 16.3% and 15.8% of market income under the OPM and SPM, respectively. “Hispanic” is defined for purposes of poverty measurement consistently with the U.S. federal government standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). These standards specify that race and Hispanic origin (also known as ethnicity) are two separate and distinct concepts.\(^{191}\) The OMB defines “Hispanic” as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race. “Persons who report themselves as Hispanic can be of any race and are identified as such in [our] data tables.”\(^{192}\)

As a result of this disproportionate allocation of market income, poverty rates vary dramatically among races, ethnicity, gender, age, and disability.\(^{193}\) Asians, Whites and working-age people have the lowest poverty rates, ranging from 17 to 19%, because they receive the most significant allocations of market income relative to their representation in the population universes used by the Census Bureau.\(^{194}\) Hispanic, Black, Native American, Pacific Islander, and multi-racial individuals suffer the highest poverty rates, ranging from 20 to 37%, as a result of disproportionate market income allocation.\(^{195}\)

---

184. See infra Table 3 (demonstrating that about 244 million individuals are lifted out of poverty with market income as compared to all the other relief described in each of the charts set forth in this Article).

185. See infra Table 3.

186. See infra Table 3.

187. See infra Table 3.

188. See infra Table 3.

189. See infra Table 3.

190. See infra Table 3.

191. Hispanic Origins, supra note 79.

192. Id.

193. See infra Table 3.

194. See infra Table 3. Statistics are derived from U.S. Census Bureau data and have been determined using the Poverty Calculator, USPOVERTYDATA, http://uspovertydata.com/povcal/ (last visited Dec. 7, 2017) [hereinafter Poverty Calculator]. Unless otherwise stated, statistics sourced to the Poverty Calculator have been disentangled using the features of that tool. For information regarding development of the tool, see Matt Breunig, Introducing the Interactive Poverty Calculator, DEMOS (Sept. 3, 2014), http://www.demos.org/blog/9/3/14/introducing-interactive-poverty-calculator.

195. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194; see infra Table 3.
rates for these demographic groups vary between the OPM and SPM calculations, this trend is consistent and prominent.

Table 3: Antipoverty Relief of 2014 Market Income Under the OPM and SPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014</th>
<th>Population 196</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Poverty w/Market 197</th>
<th>Pop. in Poverty Post Market Income 198</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>315.804</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>243.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>195.208</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>157.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55.504</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>39.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38.518</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>25.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17.322</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>5.807</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2.465</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154.639</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>122.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>161.164</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>121.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>73.556</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>56.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>196.254</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>161.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>45.994</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>25.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>29.61</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

196. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: none; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”), OPM has a smaller population universe (about 364,000 children under 15) because it excludes unrelated children under 15 (e.g., foster children) as they are not asked about their sources of income. How the Census Bureau Measures Poverty, supra note 130. Recall that the OPM, unlike the SPM, does not include unrelated children in the household unit. See supra notes 124–125 and accompanying text.

197. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: none; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; and (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).

198. Id. (click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income”; Step 2: None; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”).

199. The number lifted out of poverty (243.622M) over the total population (315.804M) equals 77.1%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>Population&lt;sup&gt;200&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Poverty w/Market&lt;sup&gt;201&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Pop. in Poverty Post Market Income&lt;sup&gt;202&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>316.168</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>245.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>195.352</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>159.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55.614</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>38.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38.605</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>25.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17.328</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>5.815</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154.815</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>122.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>161.353</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>122.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>73.920</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>57.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>196.254</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>162.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>45.994</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median household income was stagnant or decreased from 2008 through 2014.<sup>204</sup> In 2014, median household income was 6.5% lower than median household income levels immediately before the recession in 2007.<sup>205</sup> In 2015, after seven years of decreases or stagnation, median household income experienced a record-breaking one year increase of 5.2%.<sup>206</sup> However, 2015 median household income was 1.6% lower than pre-recession median household income and 2.4% lower than peak median household income in 1999.<sup>207</sup> In 2016, median household income increased again by 3.2% for all units in the population universe.

---


201.  *Id.* (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: none; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; and (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page.


203.  The number lifted out of poverty (245.408M) over the total population (316.168M) equals 77.6%.

204.  DENAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, *supra* note 34, at 5.

205.  *Id.* at 5.


207.  PROCTOR, SEMEGA & KOLLAR, *supra* note 64, at 7.
This was the second annual increase for non-Hispanic White, Black, and Hispanic households. Although there were more women working full-time in 2014 than immediately before the recession, the female-to-male earnings ratio remained statistically static from 2007 through 2015, but increased by 1.1% to 80.5% in 2016. Real median household income by sex and race or Hispanic origin is consistent with these market income allocation statistics. In 2014 through 2016, median household income was as follows:

Table 4: 2014–16 Median Household Income Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2016 (Nominal Dollars)</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>% of Median</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>53,657</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>74,297</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>77,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60,256</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>42,491</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35,398</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time, year-round worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>50,383</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>51,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>39,621</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>40,742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts to equalize pay between men and women and increase the minimum wage might mitigate the disproportionate allocation of market income to White men who are statistically less likely to suffer minimum-wage working conditions. As the data further indicates, market income in the form of median household income was statistically higher for White women than for any other racial or Hispanic origin group, despite the lower ratio of women to men.


209. PROCTOR, SEMEGA & KOLLAR, supra note 64, at 10.

210. DE NAVAS-WALT & PROCTOR, supra note 34, at 5, 10; PROCTOR, SEMEGA & KOLLAR, supra note 64, at 6, 10 (noting that real median household income increased for the first time since 2007 by 5.2% from 2014); SEMEGA, FONTENOT & KOLLAR, supra note 208, at 5-7.

211. The dollar amounts for each year are stated in that year’s dollars (e.g., 2014 amounts are in 2014 dollars, not 2015 or 2016 dollars) because they are not adjusted for inflation to current year values. See, e.g., SEMEGA, FONTENOT & KOLLAR, supra note 208, at 2 n.2 & 6 tbl.1 (describing that the numbers for 2015 and 2016 are inflation adjusted to 2016 dollars).

212. In 2014, women’s median income was 78.6% of the median amount for men, and in 2015, it was 79.6% of the median amount for men.

investment income and private retirement pensions has not proportionately replaced earnings for seniors as they receive disproportionately less than their population share of market income. Seniors comprise about 15% of the OPM and SPM population universes but represent about 28% of individuals living in poverty. Almost 44% of all senior citizens aged 65 or older would live in poverty if only market income was considered as a financial resource; by race, the percentage of seniors living in poverty includes 42% of White, 50% of Hispanic, and 54% of Black senior citizens. Social Security benefits mitigate what would otherwise be a market income shortfall crisis by providing more than 90% of total income for about one-third of all senior citizens, including more than 90% of total income for 52% of Hispanic seniors, 45% of Black seniors, and 41% of Asian seniors. Social Security retirement benefits are an intentionally targeted antipoverty program that has had long-lasting and meaningful success. This dramatically successful antipoverty program is described in detail below.

Market income allocations are most disproportionate for people with disabilities, who represent over 9% of the population universe, but only receive 6% of market income allocations. This shortfall results in an after-market income poverty rate for people with disabilities greater than 50%.

Disability rights groups, like Disability Visibility and Work Without Limits, are affirmatively trying to better allocate market income to its community members, including people like Jessie Hampton. “Jessie Hampton always knew she wanted to work... What she really wanted was a job she could call her own. Today, Jessie works at a local supermarket as a porter and is a union member.” Jessie “enjoys... making her own money... having a job which gives [her] freedom and responsibility.” Another alternatively-abled colleague, Stephanie Major, while working at the University of Massachusetts Medical School, was recently described by her supervisor as someone who was hired for her abilities, not her disability. Similarly, Peter Johnson, working at Plymouth Rock Studios has not only secured market

38 (Dec. 28, 2015), http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/publications/economic-letter/2015/december/reducing-poverty-via-minimum-wages-tax-credit/ (arguing that minimum wage is not as well targeted to low-income families as other antipoverty strategies, including the earned income tax credit).

214. See supra Table 3.
215. See supra Table 3.
218. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194; see supra Table 3.
219. See supra Table 3.
220. See #CripTheVote: Ours Voices, Our Vote, DISABILITY VISIBILITY PROJECT (Jan. 27, 2016), https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/2016/01/27/cripthevote-our-voices-our-vote/ (working to #cripthevote as well as getting the voices and equal rights of people with disabilities heard, seen, felt, and in place); see also Francine J. Lipman, Enabling Work for People with Disabilities: A Post-Integrationist Revision of Underutilized Tax Incentives, 53 AM. U. L. REV. 393 (2003) (evaluating failed tax incentives in the context of disability rights theories and determining that people with disabilities need to affirmatively promote their alternatively-abled assets to employers with tax incentives that can mitigate costs for employers creating a more equitable allocation of market income).
223. Id.
income for his household, but has improved his employer’s bottom line. The lack of allocation of market income to people with disabilities is a failure of our resource allocation systems.

More than twenty-five years after the enactment of the Americans With Disabilities Act, individuals with disabilities continue to suffer extreme income inequality in a system sometimes described as designed to fail for these non-traditionally abled Americans. People with disabilities “are three times more likely than their non-disabled peers to live at or below the poverty line, twice as likely to be unemployed and seven times more likely to have a majority of their total income be from” government sources. The next section of this Article describes how and to what extent Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Programs (OASDI) and SSI fill this gaping gap.

2. OASDI and SSI

My mom can’t work and my mom can’t drive and my mom’s sick. [Brittany, age nine.]228

a. Social Security (OASDI) Antipoverty Benefits. After market income, OASDI lifts more individuals out of poverty than any other resource by almost 400%. During the Social Security Administration’s 2014 fiscal year, the government delivered $848.5 billion to 59 million beneficiaries. Seventy-one percent of beneficiaries were retired individuals and their families, 10% were survivors of deceased workers, and the remaining 19% were disabled individuals and their families. In 2014, without OASDI benefits 26 million more individuals would be living in poverty. The poverty rate would increase by 8% from 15% to 24% overall and to 50% for senior citizens aged 65 and older. By comparison, without SSI (and assuming no behavioral modifications), about 3.8 million more individuals would suffer poverty in 2014 under the SPM.

Assuming only market income is allocated among the OPM and SPM population universes, OASDI and SSI benefits considered together would lift about 24 million more individuals out of poverty. White

228. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
244. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9.
senior citizens disproportionately receive the most significant percentage of OASDI and SSI antipoverty benefits. Of the 24 million individuals lifted out of poverty by these benefits, about 17 to 18 million, or over 70%, are White including more than 12 million White senior citizens.236 Whites represent just over 50% of the poor population after only considering market income, but they represent over 70% of those lifted out of poverty by these benefits. While White senior citizens represent less than 30% of the population of poverty after-market income, they receive more than 60% of OASDI and SSI antipoverty benefits.237

All other races and Hispanics receive disproportionately less in benefits than their share of the after-market income poor population.238 For example, while Hispanics represent more than 20% of the after-market income poverty rate, they represent less than 10% of those lifted out of poverty by these antipoverty benefits.239 Black, Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander poor populations are treated similarly under the system, as demonstrated in the chart below.240 Notably, women as compared to men receive a slightly higher proportion share of antipoverty OASDI and SSI benefits, reportedly because they live longer than men.241 Finally, consistent with targeted goals of these programs, people with disabilities who represent just over 20% of the poor population after-market income represent almost 35% of the people who are lifted out of poverty by OASDI and SSI benefits.242 Thus, the targeting of these benefits seems to be effective, although after the allocations people with disabilities remain disproportionately poor so the allocations are not adequate to fill the shortfall of market income allocations.

In 2014, 3.2 million children received direct OASDI benefits as surviving dependents or as dependents of a retiree or disabled worker; moreover, another 3.2 million children benefited from OASDI indirectly.243 Thus, 9% of all U.S. children under the age of 18 are Social Security beneficiaries, representing 11% of all Social Security beneficiaries.244 Average monthly OASDI benefits for children are about $548, with 43% of qualifying children receiving the highest average amount of $821 on behalf of deceased workers, 15% receiving $621 on average on behalf of retired workers, and 42% receiving only $335 on behalf of disabled workers.245

About 67% of these “indirect child beneficiaries live in multigenerational families consisting of three or more generations or in” households comprised of only grandparents and grandchildren.246 From 2001 to 2014, the number of children living in intergenerational families rose from 8% to 11% across all racial and ethnic groups.247 Consistent with this pattern, the number of multigenerational households has increased 70% since 1990, due to an aging population, stagnant wages, increasing unemployment and underemployment, increased immigration, diversity, and rising housing costs.248 249

---

236. See infra Table 5.
237. See infra Table 5.
238. See infra Table 5.
239. See infra Table 5.
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241. See infra Table 5.
242. Compare Table 3 supra, with Table 5 infra.
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million people, or 19% of the U.S. population” lived in multi-generational households, including 26.9 million in three-generation households.  

As a result of these multi-generational households children are directly and indirectly lifted out of poverty with OASDI and SSI. Without these benefits about 1.5 to 1.625 million more children would live in poverty,250 and the overall child poverty rate would increase by about 20% up to 23–24%.251 White children are by far the largest group of children receiving antipoverty OASDI and SSI benefits.252 More than 700,000 White children were lifted out of poverty by these benefits, reducing the poverty rate for White children from 14.7% to 12.8% (by 1.9% or about 13% of the pre-allocation poverty rate).253 More than 600,000 Black and Hispanic children, evenly distributed between the two groups, would be added to the ranks of children living in poverty without these benefits under the OPM.254 As a result, Black and Hispanic children received poverty rate reductions of 3% and 1.7%, reducing their OPM rates down to 37.9% and 32.8%, respectively. 255 Nevertheless, these extremely high OPM rates for children of color are 250–300% of the OPM rates for White children after only accounting for market income, OASDI, and SSI benefits.256 Thus, while these benefits are reaching children, the reach is discriminatory based upon race and ethnic origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop. 257</th>
<th>% of No. in Poverty</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Poverty w/OASDI &amp; SSI 259</th>
<th>Pop. in Poverty Post Mrkt Income, OASDI &amp; SSI 260</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---


250. See infra Table 5.


256. 32.8% OPM for Hispanic children /12.8% OPM for White Children = 256% and 37.9% OPM for Black children /12.8% OPM for White Children = 296%. Id. (click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “After Market Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”).

257. Reproduces data from Table 3, OPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.

259. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income,” “Social Security,” “Supplemental Security Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; and (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total Pop. 262</th>
<th>% of No. in Poverty Post Mrkt Income 263</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Poverty w/OASDI &amp; SSI 264</th>
<th>Pop. in Poverty Post Mrkt Income, OASDI &amp; SSI 265</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>17.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac Islander</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>13.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>7.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

258. Reproduces data from Table 3, OPM-2014, supra, at col. 7.

261. The number lifted out of poverty (24.057M) over the total OPM population (315.804M) equals 7.62%.

262. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.

263. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 7.

264. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income,” “Social Security,” “Supplemental Security Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; and (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).


266. The number lifted out of poverty (24.735M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals 7.82%.
### Multi-Racial Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>1.8</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>.295</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>.912</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>15.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sex Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>49.0</th>
<th>45.0</th>
<th>10.855</th>
<th>43.9</th>
<th>20.971</th>
<th>45.6</th>
<th>13.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>13.880</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>25.054</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>23.4</th>
<th>23.5</th>
<th>1.625</th>
<th>6.6</th>
<th>15.023</th>
<th>32.6</th>
<th>20.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>7.783</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.130</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>15.327</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.872</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.609</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>6.330</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disability Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>23.4</th>
<th>23.5</th>
<th>1.625</th>
<th>6.6</th>
<th>15.023</th>
<th>32.6</th>
<th>20.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>7.783</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.130</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>15.327</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.872</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.609</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>6.330</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OASDI Benefits Details

The Social Security Administration provides OASDI monthly benefits to qualified retired and disabled workers and their dependents and survivors. Eligibility and benefit amounts are determined by workers’ lifetime wages and corresponding contributions to Social Security through payroll or earnings taxes. Social Security benefits are not means-tested, but they are reduced for individuals below full retirement age with earned income above certain thresholds and are subject to federal income tax for higher income individuals.

Social Security taxes are regressive, although benefits tend to be progressive.

A person contributes to and qualifies for Social Security through payroll taxes or self-employment taxes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) or Self-Employment Contributions Act (SECA). Employers match employee contributions of 6.2%, while self-employed workers pay both the employer and employee contributions on the maximum yearly amount of earnings, which is $127,200 for 2017.

Average annual benefits for retired workers using January 2017 monthly averages were $16,320; $14,052 for disabled workers; and $15,600 for nondisabled surviving spouses. Average annual family benefits similarly computed were $32,340 for widowed spouses and two children; $23,952 for disabled workers, their spouses, and children; and $27,120 for retired couples.

While these benefits are modest compared to average annual worker wages of about $48,000, they are by far the most significant and long-term resource presently distributed by the government in the United States.

---

270. Lipman, supra note 269.
273. Id.
274. Id.
Workers become qualified for OASDI benefits through quarterly credits. A quarterly credit is earned with Social Security covered earnings of $1,300 (in 2017) or up to four quarterly credits a year for at least $5,200 of covered earnings. To be fully insured, workers need the greater of (1) six quarters; or (2) a number of quarters equal to the number of years from age 21 to the first of: attaining age 62, becoming disabled, or dying. If a worker dies before she qualifies as “fully insured,” benefits will be paid to certain survivors if the worker was “currently insured.” Workers are “currently insured” if they have earned six quarterly credits in the 13 quarters ending with death. Survivor benefits are paid to a worker’s children and to a surviving spouse who takes care of the deceased’s children who are under age 16 or disabled and receiving Social Security benefits.

A worker receives disability benefits only if she is “fully insured” and has “recent work activity.” Recent work activity for a non-blind individual who is age 31 or older means she has earned at least 20 quarterly credits during the 40-calendar quarter period ending with the first quarter of disability. If she becomes disabled before age 31, the number of quarterly credits is basically the greater of (1) six or (2) one-half of the calendar quarters from age 21 until she became disabled. Workers for whom blindness is their disability qualify for benefits if they are fully insured regardless of recent work activity. If individuals do not qualify for these benefits, SSI is a back-up benefit that is needs-based.

c. SSI Details. While Social Security is described as an earned or “entitlement” benefit, SSI is a needs-based program for individuals who are disabled or for senior citizens with limited income and resources (at or below $2,000 for individuals, $3,000 for couples). SSI fills the needs-based income gap for senior citizens and people with disabilities who do not meet the worker’s credit requirements described above for OASDI. SSI lifted about 2.5 million individuals out of poverty, after market income, in 2014. While these individuals are included in the tables and demographic discussion above, this subsection will describe the requirements for and the mechanics of SSI.

---

276. See Quarter of Coverage, SOC. SECURITY ADMIN., https://www.ssa.gov/oact/cola/QC.html (last visited Nov. 18, 2017) (also describing how this dollar amount is computed and indexed for inflation annually).
277. SSA Fact Sheet 2017, supra note 272.
278. SSA STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, supra note 230, at 11 (determining that the number of quarters a non-disabled worker living past age sixty-two needs is forty quarters (one for each of the forty years from age twenty-one to attaining age sixty-two)).
279. Id.
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282. Id. at 12.
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288. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income” and “Social Security”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Official Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income,” “Social Security,” and “Supplemental Security Income”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; and (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).
SSI is paid to individuals who are disabled, blind, or at least 65 years old and have limited income and resources. In 2014, over eight million individuals received federal SSI payments, including about two million who were aged 65 or older, 1.3 million of whom were children, and over seven million who were disabled. In most states, SSI beneficiaries also qualify for Medicaid and may also be eligible for food assistance. The monthly benefit is up to $735 for individuals in their own household and $1,103 for an eligible couple. These amounts are reduced based upon other cash income and in-kind resources provided to the beneficiary for food and shelter, not including government assistance. As a result, average monthly benefits for December 2014 were $517 (or about $6,200 annualized), aggregating to about $51.6 billion. Some states provide a supplemental cash benefit, which averaged about $142 per month, or an additional $1,700 per year. Median monthly SSI benefits from 2009 to 2012 were $698, or about $8,400 per year. About four percent of the OPM and SPM population universes participated in SSI from 2009 to 2012, with the average monthly participation rates ranging below this rate at about three percent. During the same period, the length of coverage for all SSI recipients was as follows: 35.6% received SSI benefits for 1 to 12 months; 14.3% received benefits for 13 to 24 months; 11.9% received benefits for 25

289. Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Overview, SOC. SECURITY ADMIN., https://www.ssa.gov/ssi/text-over-ussi.htm (last visited Nov. 18, 2017) (individuals must be U.S. citizens or nationals, or in one of certain categories of legal residents). Individuals must also be a resident of one of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, or the Northern Mariana Islands, and not confined to a hospital or prison. Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Eligibility Requirements, SOC. SECURITY ADMIN., https://www.ssa.gov/ssi/text-eligibility-ussi.htm (last visited Nov. 18, 2017).


292. Supplemental Security Income (SSI) General Information, SOC. SECURITY ADMIN., https://www.ssa.gov/ssi/text-general-ussi.htm (last visited Nov. 20, 2017). For examples of how the monthly SSI benefit is computed, see Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Income, SOC. SECURITY ADMIN., https://www.ssa.gov/ssi/text-income-ussi.htm (last visited Nov. 20, 2017). Your total income is reduced by income that is not counted to determine your countable income. *Id.* The SSI federal benefit rate is reduced by the countable income to determine the amount of the SSI federal benefit. *Id.* As an example, suppose that your earned income was $317 per month. *Id.* To determine your countable income, subtract $20 (excluded income) and $65 (excluded earned income) from your earned income and divide that amount in half \[\frac{($317 - $20 - $65)}{2} = $116\]. *Id.* Then, to determine your SSI federal benefit, subtract your countable income from your SSI federal benefit rate ($735 - $116 = $619). *Id.*

293. Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Resources, SOC. SECURITY ADMIN., https://www.ssa.gov/ssi/text-resources-ussi.htm (last visited Nov. 20, 2017). Certain resources are disregarded for SSI eligibility purposes including, but not limited to, the house that applicant lives in, household goods, personal effects, life insurance and burial funds of $1,500 or less, and one car if used for transportation by the applicant or a member of the applicant’s household. *Id.*


295. SSA 2014 REPORT, supra note 294, at 16, 26; SSA FAST FACTS, supra note 290, at 25.


297. *Id.* at 4.
to 36 months; and 38.2% received benefits for between 37 and 48 months. Not surprisingly, this pattern of participation was consistent with Medicaid usage during the same period.

3. Unemployment Insurance and Veterans’ Benefits

We lived in a farmhouse. My dad lost his job from Picture Perfect. He got laid off and we got kicked out of there. We moved here. It’s not very big. We didn’t have enough room, so we had to put stuff in storage, and we lost it all because we couldn’t pay it. [Roger, age 14.]

a. Details of Unemployment Insurance Benefits. Unemployment Insurance (UE) benefits are designed to provide a safety net for regularly employed individuals who are involuntarily unemployed but “who are able and willing to accept suitable employment” opportunities. UE covers employees in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and all U.S. Virgin Islands. Agricultural workers are covered on farms that employ ten or more employees on at least one day in 20 weeks of the year or with quarterly payrolls of at least $20,000. Domestic employees are eligible for UE if they have reported wages of at least $1,000 per quarter from an employer.

UE benefits are not means-tested but rather require a certain amount of time or earnings in covered employment. UE benefits are based upon employment during a “base period.” In most states, the base period is the first four quarters of the last five completed calendar quarters preceding an individual’s UE benefits claim. The amount of an individual’s UE benefits depends upon past wages, with minimum and maximum limits; a typical benefit might be 50% of the highest quarter of base period wages subject to a maximum and minimum. Typically, there is a one-week waiting period after unemployment begins before benefits can start, and 13 states provide additional amounts for certain dependents. In all but eight jurisdictions, there is a maximum duration of 26 weeks of benefits in a benefit year. However, during periods of high unemployment (e.g., the Great Recession), benefits are often extended for another 13 weeks. In 2013, UE benefits averaged about $310 weekly for approximately 17 weeks for total individual benefits of about $5,300 per year, aggregating almost $39 billion.

b. Details of Veterans’ Benefits. Veterans’ Benefits (VBs) are paid to “veterans who are disabled by injury or disease incurred in or aggravated during active military service.” Benefits depend upon the
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degree of the disability or functions lost. Veterans who have at least a 30 percent service-connected
disability are entitled to an additional” amount for qualifying dependents. Veterans who are discharged
under other than honorable conditions generally are not eligible for benefits. Benefits for service-
connected disabilities are not means-tested. About 4.25 million veterans received a disability pension in
2014, including about 3.95 million with a service-related disability. These veterans received monthly
benefits ranging “from $133 a month for a 10 percent disability to $2,907 a month for a total disability,” or
about $1,600 and $35,000 annually, respectively.

Monthly benefits are also paid “to wartime veterans with limited income and resources who are
totally and permanently disabled” due to reasons other than military service. About 300,000 individuals
qualified for these VBs in 2014, receiving amounts ranging from $1,072 monthly (about $13,000 annually)
for qualifying individuals without any dependents to up to $2,198 monthly (about $26,000 annually) for
veterans with one dependent and in need of attendance and aid.

c. Demographic Distribution for Unemployment Insurance Benefits & Veterans’ Benefits. Consistent
with the distribution of market income and OASDI and SSI benefits, UE and VBs disproportionately lift
individuals who are White out of poverty, after accounting for market income and OASDI and SSI benefits.
Of the 1.1 million individuals lifted out of poverty by UE and VBs, more than 550,000 are White. While
Whites represent 62% of the OPM and SPM population universes, they only represent approximately 40%
of the poverty population post-market, OASDI, and SSI resource allocations, and approximately 50% of
the individuals who are lifted out of poverty by VBs and UE benefits. Correspondingly, Hispanic, Black,
Asian, Pacific Islanders, and Native American individuals were disproportionately not lifted out of poverty
by VBs and UE benefits. UE benefits are derived from wages, which are disproportionately higher for
Whites as compared to people of color.

Similarly, men, working-age individuals, and senior citizens are disproportionately lifted out of
poverty by UE and VBs as compared to women and children. This finding is consistent with the facts
that UE benefits are derivative from wages recently earned and that working-age, White men statistically
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317 See id. (listing requirements to qualify, none of which relate to financial means).
318 Id. at 6.
319 Id. at 73.
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321 Id. at 6, 73.
322 See infra Table 6 (showing demographics of individuals lifted out of poverty with UE and VBs under
the OPM and SPM). Under the SPM, approximately 948,000 individuals would drop into poverty without
unemployment benefits. See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 5, 9 (estimating that there were approximately 316,168,000
in the United States in 2014, and that without UE benefits the poverty rate would increase by about 0.3%, or from
15.3% to 15.6%) (0.3% x 316,168,000 = 948,504). The U.S. Census Bureau does not provide any information as to
whether VBs have a statistically significant effect on the poverty rate. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9.
323 See infra Table 6.
324 See infra Table 6.
325 SSA STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, supra note 230, at 66 (describing how UE benefits are based upon
wages recently earned).
326 See infra Table 6 (showing demographics of individuals lifted out of poverty with UE and VB under
the OPM and SPM).
receive higher wages than women. As such, their derivative benefits should be correspondingly higher. This finding is also consistent with the fact that VBs are dependent upon military service and disability. Therefore, older men who are more likely to have served in the armed services and suffer a disability are more likely to be lifted out of poverty with VBs than other demographic categories. Consistent with these targeted benefits, people with disabilities (who represent about 14% of the poor after accounting for market income and OASDI and SSI benefits) represent about 23% of those who are lifted out of poverty by UE and VB benefits. Nevertheless, even after these targeted benefits, people with disabilities suffer approximately a 21% poverty rate and represent approximately 14% of all people living in poverty, even though they constitute less than 10% of the OPM and SPM population universes.

Table 6: Antipoverty Relief of 2014 Market Income, OASDI, SSI, VBs, and UE Benefits Under the OPM and SPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>% of No. in Poverty Post Mrkt, OASDI &amp; SSI</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Poverty w/UE &amp; VBs</th>
<th>Pop. in Poverty Post Mrkt, OASDI, SSI, UE &amp; VBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>47.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>19.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>13.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>10.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>2.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>20.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>26.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


329. See infra Table 6.

330. See infra Table 6.

331. Reproduces data from Table 3, OPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.

332. Reproduces data from Table 5, OPM-2014, supra, at col. 7.


335. The number lifted out of poverty (1.099M) over the total OPM population (315.804M) equals .35%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0–17</th>
<th>18–64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>0–17</th>
<th>18–64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.701</td>
<td>26.723</td>
<td>4.603</td>
<td>6.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>% of No. in Poverty Post Mrkt, OASDI &amp; SSI</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Poverty w/UE &amp; VBs</th>
<th>Pop. in Poverty Post Mrkt, OASDI, SSI, UE &amp; VBs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>44.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total (millions)</td>
<td>% of Total (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total (millions)</td>
<td>% of Total (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total (millions)</td>
<td>% of Total (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF)

336. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
337. Reproduces data from Table 5, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 7.
340. The number lifted out of poverty (1.115M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals .35%.
Grades is my only way out of here. If my grades are not good, I know I can’t go to universities, like my dream is to go. I know if my grades are not good, I can’t play football like I want to. If I don’t succeed doing what I have to do in school and making good grades, I will fail. I’m going to live this life, life of shelter and going through hard times, can’t feed my kids, trying to figure out where I’m going to lay my head every night. [Jonny, age 13.]341

TANF replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) in 1996 under President Clinton’s bipartisan effort to address political focus on “welfare dependency.”342 As a consequence of these efforts, TANF is a shorter-term program than historical social benefits programs, and recipients must meet work participation requirements.343 However, this is not the first time that work has been required for welfare or basic subsistence benefits.344 From 1935 through the mid-1960s, welfare recipients were predominately white women who were not required to work. 345 However, “[a]bout the same time that significant numbers of people of color became AFDC recipients . . . Congress enacted the first work requirement for AFDC recipients” with the 1967 Work Incentive Program.346 Members of Congress stated

341. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
342. See Gene Falk, Cong. Res. Serv. R44668, The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant: A Legislative History (2016), https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44668.pdf. “TANF jurisdictions use federal TANF funds to provide income support to low-income families with children, as well as to provide a wide range of services . . . designed to accomplish the program’s four” statutory goals. What We Do, U.S. Dep’t Health & Hum. Servs., Off. Fam. Assistance, http://acf.hhs.gov/ofa/about/what-we-do (last reviewed Dec. 20, 2016). The statutory goals are to

1. provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; 2. end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage; 3. prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies; and 4. encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

While TANF jurisdictions must meet certain work participation and cost sharing requirements, they have considerable flexibility with TANF funds to implement programs that best serve their distinct communities.

Id.
343. Policy Basics: An Introduction to TANF, Ctr. on Budget & Pol’y Priorities 4, https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/7-22-10tanf2.pdf (updated June 15, 2015) (describing the general 60-month limit and work sanctions and requirements under TANF; “For a state to meet the federal work rates, half of the families receiving TANF assistance must be engaged in a work activity for at least 30 hours a week (20 hours a week for single parents with young children). States also must have 90 percent of two-parent families engaged in work, generally for 35 hours per week.”); see Vicki Lens, Work Sanctions Under Welfare Reform: Are They Helping Women Achieve Self-Sufficiency?, 13 Duke J. Gender L. & Pol’y 255, 258–259 (2006) (describing the work requirements under TANF and noting the decrease in cash benefits and increase in employment and job training demands); see also Marie A. Failinger, A Truly Good Work: Turning to Restorative Justice for Answers to the Welfare-to-Work Dilemma, 15 Geo. J. on Poverty L. & Pol’y 209 (2008) (demonstrating that work has long been an inherent, but unrealistic, requirement in welfare, even though that the requirement undermines welfare, and proposing using restorative justice theory to resolve the challenge rather than trying to undermine the puritanical work requirement).
344. See Julie A. Nice, Welfare Servitude, 1 Geo. J. on Fighting Poverty 340, 342 (1994) (describing historical work requirements for welfare recipients and commenting that “welfare amounts have never fully met recipients’ economic needs, many recipients have worked to supplement their meager benefits”).
345. Id.
346. Id.
that the work was required “to help each AFDC recipient ‘acquire a sense of dignity, self-worth, and confidence which will flow from being recognized as a wage-earning member of society.’”

TANF cash assistance is modest with median monthly benefits per recipient between 2009 and 2012 of only $321, or less than $4,000 per year. TANF benefits are generally restricted by federal law to a period of no more than 60 cumulative months for any adult in the household. From 2009 to 2012, almost 63% of TANF recipients participated for between 1 and 12 months, with less than 10% participating for more than 36 months. Average monthly participation rates were about one percent in 2012. TANF’s annual $16 billion federal block grant is delivered to states, territories, the District of Columbia, and federally recognized Native American tribes.

In 2016, there were only just under 2.7 million recipients of TANF nationwide, about 2 million of whom were children. Thus, nearly 75% of TANF recipients are children. Most of the TANF adult recipients are single mothers. Families who receive TANF assistance typically have one child, who most often is in pre-school. In 2013, “38.1% of families receiving TANF were composed of children in families cared for by an adult who is ineligible for benefits, or “child-only” families. The most common “child-only” cases are families with (1) a disabled parent receiving SSI; (2) an ineligible, immigrant parent; and (3) children being cared for by a relative who is not their parent. California had the biggest caseload of any state, with about 40% of the beneficiaries.

The largest ethnic group of TANF cash assistance children were Hispanic. In 2013, 36.3% of TANF children were Hispanic, 29.9% were African American, and 25.8% were non-Hispanic White. “The growth in Hispanic children as a percent of all TANF assistance children is due entirely to their population growth—not an increase in the rate at which Hispanic children receive TANF.” In 2014, TANF cash assistance, or traditional “welfare,” lifted just over 630,000 individuals out of poverty after considering all other cash income under the OPM and SPM. Consistent with the 2013 data, 2014 TANF

---

347. Id. (quoting N.Y. State Dep’t of Soc. Servs. v. Dublino, 413 U.S. 405, 410 (1973)).
348. IRVING & LOVELESS, supra note 296, at 13.
350. IRVING & LOVELESS, supra note 296, at 4.
351. Id.
352. What We Do, supra note 342.
355. Id. at 10.
356. Id.
357. Id. at 1.
358. Id.
359. Id. at 15 (the sum of the percentages for the columns that include “Child-Only” data for California equals about 40%).
360. Id. at 5.
361. Id.
362. Id. at Summary.
363. See infra Table 7 (showing OPM and SPM demographic data for TANF). If TANF were not available under the SPM (assuming no behavioral changes) about 630,000 individuals, mostly children would drop into poverty in 2014. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9 (estimating that the poverty rate would increase by 0.2% under the SPM if
beneficiaries lifted out of poverty were disproportionately Hispanic and children. In excess of 70,000 Hispanic children were lifted out of poverty by TANF benefits. Similarly, about 66,000 people with disabilities were lifted out of poverty by TANF. TANF’s modest benefits, among other reasons, leave poverty rates for people with disabilities and children in excess of 20%. Moreover, Hispanic children suffer a poverty rate in excess of 30% even though they disproportionately benefit from TANF’s modest financial resources. By comparison, White children had a poverty rate of approximately 10% under the SPM after accounting for 41,000 White children being lifted out of poverty by TANF benefits. Less than 30,000 Black children were lifted out of poverty by TANF benefits; yet after accounting for TANF, Black children suffer a poverty rate of greater than 35%.

TANF benefits were removed entirely from the measurement). This increase in the poverty rate applied to the population universe of 316,168,000 would result in just over 630,000 individuals suffering poverty.

364. See infra Table 7.


366. See infra Table 7.

367. See infra Table 7 (setting forth the post-TANF poverty rate of children and people with disabilities at 21.1% and 21.8%, respectively, under the OPM and 19.8% and 20.3%, respectively, under the SPM).


Table 7: Antipoverty Relief of 2014 Market Income, OASDI, SSI, VBs, UE, and TANF Benefits Under the OPM and SPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>% of No. in Pov. Post Mrkt, OASDI, SSI, UE &amp; VBs</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Pov. w/TANF</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post Mrkt, OASDI, SSI, UE, VBs &amp; TANF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (in millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

371. Reproduces data from Table 3, OPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
372. Reproduces data from Table 6, OPM-2014, supra, at col. 7.
375. The number lifted out of poverty (.369M) over the total OPM population (315.804M) equals .12%. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.(^{376})</th>
<th>% of No. in Pov. Post Mrkt, OASDI SSI, UE &amp; VBs(^{377})</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Pov. w/TANF(^{378})</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post Mkt. Inc., OASDI, SSI, UE, VBs &amp; TANF(^{379})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Total (millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(.367)</td>
<td>44.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Food Security

I think there’s a lot of people in America that need help with food because they’re poor or they’re either homeless or they’re both. We need food for our family. I’m hitting my growth spurt, and I’m really hungry. My favorite food is Chinese. I’m craving that right now. You know what makes me mad? We can’t afford it. [Brittany, age nine.]\(^{381}\)

There are six people in our family. But only five sit down to dinner. That’s because my

\(^{376}\) Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
\(^{377}\) Reproduces data from Table 6, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 7.


\(^{380}\) The number lifted out of poverty (.367M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals .12%.

\(^{381}\) Poor Kids, supra note 2.
mom doesn’t eat. She wants to make sure we have enough food. [Vanessa, age six.] 382
We were homeless. My mom. My big sister and me. We slept in the car . . . We went to IHOP and we only got one pancake and we shared it. That was our breakfast . . . When I was tired of sitting in the car, I would talk to my mom. She would always say a prayer so we could have a better life. We should buy kids good food when they are homeless. We should help them out. [Jasmine, age seven.] 383
The OPM only includes in its analysis a family unit’s pre-tax cash resources as described above. Therefore, among other in-kind resources, critical food security resources are not included in the OPM. The more current SPM does include in a household unit’s resources in-kind benefits such as food security subsidies, like Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), school lunches, and WIC. 384

a. SNAP. SNAP, formerly called Food Stamps, is a means-tested program that provides qualifying beneficiaries with the opportunity to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet. 385 The program is modest and provides qualifying households with about $255 per month in food-value equivalents, which is an average of $126 per person, per month, or about $1.40 per person, per meal. 386 Under federal rules, SNAP eligibility is not automatic and depends upon many dispositive factors. 387

SNAP is a limited-means, income- and asset-tested resource primarily targeted for children, people with disabilities, and working individuals. 388 Undocumented immigrants, individuals on strike, and legally present immigrants who have been in the country for less than five years are ineligible for SNAP benefits. 389 Unemployed, childless adults who are not disabled may only receive SNAP for three months every three years unless this restriction is waived due to extreme unemployment. 390

SNAP rules require satisfying three means-focused tests. 391 First, an eligible household’s gross monthly income must be at or below 130% of the poverty guideline. 393 In federal fiscal year 2018, a family of three has a 130% poverty guideline of $2,213 a month or $26,600 per year. 394 Gross income for this

382. Marian Wright Edelman, The Hungry Child (Apr. 16, 2014), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/marian-wright-edelman/the-hungry-child_b_4791364.html (noting that “physical health and brain development depend on access to nutritious food, especially in the earliest years of life” and that federal food security programs are critical to fill this void, but that too many states do not have year-long programs so that children go hungry during school breaks).

383. Id.


385. Id.


387. Id. at 1.

388. See id. at 1–4.

389. Id. at 3 n.6.

390. Id. at 2.

391. Id. at 1. “Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands participate in SNAP but are subject to somewhat different eligibility, benefit, and deduction levels. Puerto Rico does not participate in the regular program but instead receives a block grant for nutrition assistance.” Id. at 1 n.2.

392. “A ‘household’ for SNAP consists of individuals who live in the same residence and who purchase and prepare food together.” Id. at 1 n.1.

393. Id. at 1.

394. Id.
purpose includes all cash income from all sources including Social Security, unemployment income, child support, and wages or self-employment income. Households with an elderly or disabled member that receives SSI or TANF are not subject to the gross income test. Second, net income, or gross income less allowable deductions, must be at or below the poverty guideline. Finally, household assets must be at or below $2,250 or, for households with an elderly or disabled member, $3,500 or less. SNAP benefits are tied to the cost of the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan, and SNAP expects that households spend 30% of their net income on food. Allowable deductions include a standard deduction, a 20% earnings deduction, a dependent care deduction, a child support deduction, a medical expenses deduction, and an excess shelter deduction. The example below demonstrates how these deductions are determined and how this formula is calculated.

**Example:** Consider a single parent, earning minimum wage with two children and dependent care costs of $67 and shelter costs of $881 per month. A full-time minimum wage worker’s gross monthly income at $7.25 per hour is $1,256. The statutory SNAP standard deduction for a three-person family is $160, the earnings deduction is 20% of $1,256 or $251, and the child care deduction is $67. Thus, $1,256 - ($160 + $251 + $67) = $778 countable income. The shelter deduction is determined by dividing the countable income by two or $778 / 2 = $389, and subtracting that figure from the monthly shelter cost, or $881 - $389 = $492. Countable income is reduced by this excess of $492 as follows: $778 - $492 = $286. Thirty percent of the net income is $86. Therefore, the SNAP benefit is the maximum benefit for a family of three of $504 reduced by $86 for $418 monthly SNAP benefit.

To determine the amount of a household’s SNAP benefits for purposes of the SPM, the Census Bureau asks survey respondents if anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the previous calendar year as well as the face value of benefits received during the relevant period. From this information the Census Bureau determines the annual household amount and prorates it for SPM units within each household. This reverse engineered amount is included as an in-kind benefit resource for the unit.

* National School Lunch Program.

Nutrition Club is a bag of food that you get every Friday and you have to make last the whole weekend. They announce in class that you have to go down for Nutrition Club if you’re in it. You have to go to the office and you have to sign your name in for it. And then

---

395. *Id.* at 2.
396. *Id.* at 1 n.3.
397. *Id.* at 1.
398. *Id.* at 2.
399. *Id.* at 3.
400. The standard SNAP deduction varies based upon household size, but is $160 in 2018 for one to three person households and “$170, $199, and $228 for households with four, five, and six or more members, respectively.” *Id.* at 4 n.10. These amounts are higher in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. *Id.* at 3. Amounts are adjusted for inflation and can be found at *Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) Information—Old, S.D.A. FOOD & NUTRITION SERV.* (last published Sept. 28, 2017), www.fns.usda.gov/snap/government/cola.htm.
402. *Id.* at 5 (providing the numbers used in this example).
404. *Id.*
you go put it in your locker, and then you go back to class. Poor people get Nutrition Club because they can’t afford to get other food. [Brittany, age nine, 405]

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has been providing funding and food for school children for more than 70 years. 406 Congress formalized the school lunch program through the National School Lunch Act in 1946 and has since subsidized more than 224 billion school lunches. 407 About 7.1 million children participated in the National School Lunch Program from 1946 to 1947. 408 In 2012, more than 31.6 million children received their lunch and snacks daily through the National School Lunch Program at an aggregate national annual cost of $11.6 billion. 409

About 100,000 public and nonprofit private schools and residential child care institutions participate in the school lunch and snack programs. 410 Participating schools get cash subsidies and USDA food for qualifying meals and snacks. 411 Schools must offer free or reduced-price lunches to eligible children through the National School Lunch Program. 412 Children from households with incomes at or below 130% of the poverty guidelines are eligible for free meals. 413 Children whose households have incomes “between 130 percent and 185 percent of the Federal poverty level are eligible for reduced-price meals. Schools may not charge children more than 40 cents for a reduced price lunch.” 414 “Children from families with incomes over 185 percent of poverty pay a full price, though their meals are still subsidized to some extent.” 415 Afterschool snacks are free to all in the afterschool care program if “at least 50 percent of the enrolled children are eligible for free or reduced price meals.” 416 In all other cases, free snack policies must follow the same general guidelines as the lunch program. 417

The Census Bureau survey asks how many children in the household “usually” eat a school-provided lunch and if a child receives subsidized school lunches, then the Census Bureau assumes that the child received the lunches every day during the school year. 418 The Census Bureau acknowledges that this may overestimate the benefits received by a household, but it does not have sufficient data to better fine-

405. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
408. NSLP Fact Sheet, supra note 406.
409. School Nutrition Programs, supra note 407.
411. NSLP Fact Sheet, supra note 406.
412. Id.
413. Id.
414. Id.
417. Id.
tune the amount of in-kind benefits received by each household.\textsuperscript{419} The value of the lunches is determined from the cost to the administrators of the program, the USDA Food and Nutrition Service.\textsuperscript{420} While the Census Bureau’s separate Survey of Income and Program Participation asks for information regarding the number of subsidized school breakfasts children receive, no value for these meals is included in household resources to date.\textsuperscript{421} The amount of school lunch and snacks estimated for the 2009 calendar year was $4.6 billion for all families.\textsuperscript{422}

c. \textbf{Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Program (WIC)}.

I think it would be difficult for the baby to grow up here because we don’t have a lot of money. . . . We don’t have the money to buy diapers for it and food for it. And the good part is that my mom is happy, like, my family’s happy. I don’t really care if I’m happy or not. I just care if my family’s happy. [Brittany, age nine.]\textsuperscript{423}

WIC is one of the United States’ most successful and cost-effective nutrition intervention programs.\textsuperscript{424} Since 1974, WIC has saved lives and improved the health and well-being of nutritionally at-risk women, infants, and children.\textsuperscript{425} Extensive research shows that WIC participation leads to “healthier infants, more nutritious diets and better health care for children, and subsequently to higher academic achievement for students.”\textsuperscript{426} The program targets low-income, nutritionally-at-risk pregnant, postpartum, and breastfeeding moms, infants, and children up to five years old.\textsuperscript{427} WIC provides supplemental nutritious foods as well as counseling, screening, and referrals.\textsuperscript{428} While funded through federal grants, “WIC is administered by 90 State agencies, with services provided at a variety of clinic locations including, but not limited to, county health departments, hospitals, schools, and Indian Health Service facilities.”\textsuperscript{429} The program is available in all 50 states, 34 Indian Tribal Organizations, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.\textsuperscript{430}

\textsuperscript{419} Id.
\textsuperscript{420} Id.
\textsuperscript{421} Id.
\textsuperscript{422} Id.
\textsuperscript{423} Poor Kids, supra note 2.
\textsuperscript{425} Id.
\textsuperscript{426} Steven Carlson & Zoë Neuberger, WIC Works: Addressing the Nutrition and Health Needs of Low-Income Families for 40 Years, CTR. ON BUDGET & POL’Y PRIORITIES 1 (Mar. 29, 2017), https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/5-4-15fa.pdf. The provision of infant formula through WIC has caused some concern that the program lowers breastfeeding rates. Id. at 13 (“In general, despite WIC’s strong policy and operational emphasis on promoting breastfeeding, mothers participating in WIC have been less likely than non-participating mothers to breastfeed their infants. . . . There are indications that the difference between breastfeeding rates among all women and WIC participants has narrowed.”).
\textsuperscript{428} Id.
\textsuperscript{430} Id.
Approximately 7.7 million people participated in WIC in 2016; of this group, “approximately 3.98 million were children, 1.88 million were infants, and 1.84 million were women.”431 WIC provided an average monthly value of $61.24 in food per participant in 2016.432 “The average monthly cost to the federal government, however, was much lower—$42.70 per participant—due to the infant formula discounts . . . .”433 The WIC Program is designed to supplement participants’ diets with specific nutrients through infant cereal, baby foods, iron-fortified adult cereal, fruits and vegetables, juice, eggs, milk, cheese, yogurt, soy-based beverages, tofu, peanut butter, whole wheat bread, and other whole-grain options.434 “For infants of women who do not fully breastfeed, WIC provides iron-fortified infant formula.”435

To be eligible for WIC, participants must be a qualifying pregnant mother, infant, or child and have an income between between 100% and 185% of the poverty guidelines or be eligible to receive SNAP, Medicaid, TANF, or certain other state-administered programs.436 Participants must also reside in the state in which they apply and be seen by a health professional to determine if the individual has a nutrition risk.437 “Nutrition risk” means that an individual has one or more medical-based or dietary-based conditions including anemia, being underweight, poor prior pregnancy outcomes, or unhealthy diet.438

Most WIC “participants receive paper checks or vouchers to purchase food, while a few [states] distribute food through centralized warehouses or deliver the foods to participants’ homes.”439 All WIC state agencies must implement WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT) no later than October 1, 2020.440 “EBT uses a magnetic strip or smart card, similar to a credit card, that participants use in the check-out lane to redeem their food benefits.”441

The Census Bureau includes WIC in a household’s resources if the household indicates affirmatively that they received WIC during the previous year.442 Barring receipt of conflicting information, the Census Bureau assumes that the household received WIC for the entire year.443 All children less than five years old are assumed to receive WIC if anyone in the household reports receiving the benefit.444 If the household has a child one year of age or younger, then the mother is also assumed to receive WIC benefits.445 If there is no child in the household, the Census Bureau assumes that the WIC recipient is


433. Id.
434. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program, supra note 429.
435. Id.

437. Id.
438. Id.
439. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program, supra note 429.
440. Id.
441. Id.
442. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 17.
443. Id.
444. Id.
445. Id.
The Census Bureau acknowledges that this approach may overestimate WIC benefits. The WIC benefit included as an in-kind resource is valued using program cost information from the Department of Agriculture.

d. Demographics of Food Security Antipoverty Programs.

There’s good days and bad days. Sometimes when we have cereal, we don’t have milk. We have to eat it dry. Sometimes we don’t have cereal and we have milk. It’s often, like, switch and swap. Sometimes, like, when I switch the channel and there’s a cooking show on, I get a little more hungry and I want to vanish into the screen and start eating the food. [Tyler, age twelve.] 

Almost 5.5 million individuals were lifted out of poverty by in-kind access to food in 2014, after accounting for all cash income, but none of the additional expenses, under the SPM. Children are disproportionately lifted out of poverty by food security programs, although the statistics also show that the data for children is generally also consistent with the relative, post-OPM cash income poverty population percentages. Consistent with program goals of providing resources to food insecure children, more than 2.5 million children were lifted out of poverty in 2014 by access to food. Thirty percent of children lifted out of poverty by food security were White, 36% were Hispanic, and 24% were Black, while their pre-food security SPM poverty shares were 26.7%, 39%, and 24.7%, respectively. Thus, poor White children were...
disproportionately lifted out of poverty with food security benefits. Childhood pre-food security poverty numbers, rates, and shares broken into demographics are as follows:

Table 8: Child Poverty Demographics After 2014 Market Income, OASDI, SSI, VBs, UE and TANF Benefits Under the OPM and SPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014&lt;sup&gt;454&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number (in millions)</th>
<th>% of Number in Poverty</th>
<th>Poverty Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014&lt;sup&gt;455&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number (in millions)</th>
<th>% of Number in Poverty</th>
<th>Poverty Rate (%) for Group—Before In-Kind Food</th>
<th>Poverty Rate (%)—After In-Kind Food (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.3 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26.7 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>29.3 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dramatic decrease in childhood poverty rates through food security programs is striking. Food security programs decrease childhood poverty rates for children of color by more than 15%. Nevertheless, these benefits disproportionately lift White children out of poverty reducing their poverty rate by almost 20%.<sup>456</sup>

---

454. *Id.* These numbers are derived from the OPM 2014 (click the “Calculate 2014 Official Poverty Measure” button). The total number of poor children (0–17) in the OPM 2014 is 15.540 million, including 4.679 million White children (30.1%), 5.745 million Hispanic children (37.0), and 3.782 million Black children (24.3%). The *Poverty Calculator* does not break-down the remaining 1.334 million (8.58%) poor children among the remaining classifications as Asian, Multi-Racial, Native American or Pacific Islander.


456. The decreases in poverty rates of 5%/31.7% = 15.8% decrease for Hispanic children and 5.8%/35.1% = 16.5% for Black children exceed 15%. However, the decrease in poverty rate of 2%/10.3% = 19.4% for White children.
Table 9: Antipoverty Relief of 2014 Market Income, OASDI, SSI, VBs, UE, TANF, and In-Kind Food Security Benefits Under the SPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>% of No. in Pov. Post All Cash Income</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Pov. w/ SNAP, WIC, Lunches</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post After All Cash &amp; In-kind Food Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total (in millions)</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5.405</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>1.948</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>3.040</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>2.556</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Shelter Matters

I’m embarrassed because I’m poor and because I live in a shelter. It makes me feel like I just wish I never lived here. [Jasmine, age nine.]462

457. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
461. The number lifted out of poverty (5.405M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals 1.71%.
462. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
In addition to food security benefits, shelter benefits such as housing and utility subsidies, as described below, are included as resources for comparing household resources to the relevant threshold under the SPM, but not under the OPM.\footnote{463}  

a. Housing Subsidies.  

When you live in a shelter, you have to obey by the rules and do your chores. And if you don’t, you get a write-up. And if you get over eight write-ups or—or you get put out. [Jasmine, age nine.]\footnote{464}  

While the federal government currently subsidizes home ownership through $121 billion in annual tax expenditures for home mortgage interest and property tax deductions and capital gain exclusions, federal tax expenditures do not include any tax deduction for renters.\footnote{465} The government does provide about $41 billion, or less than a third of the homeownership subsidy, in subsidies for affordable rental assistance for low-income households.\footnote{466} Because of limited funding, less than 5.1 million low-income households receive subsidized housing.\footnote{467} However, more than ten million low-income households, or 68% of low-income households, suffer unsubsidized housing costs that are greater than 50% of their income, putting them at risk of homelessness.\footnote{468} As a result, on a single night in January 2015, almost 600,000 people in the United States suffered sustained homelessness, more than 20% of whom were children (128,000) and 16% of whom were adults with disabilities (96,000).\footnote{469} During the 2015–2016 school year, over one million public school children lived on the street, in shelters, doubled up with other families, or in hotels or motels.\footnote{470}
Federal rental subsidies make housing affordable and reduce homelessness and daily instability.\textsuperscript{471} However, the current demand for housing subsidies far surpasses the supply.\textsuperscript{472} “Children in homeless families that receive housing vouchers change schools less often and are 42\% less likely to be separated from their families and placed into foster care. Their families are also 20\% less likely to be food insecure and 34\% less likely to experience domestic violence.”\textsuperscript{473} Children in households that use housing subsidies to move to safer neighborhoods are more likely to attend college, earn more as adults, and are less likely to become single parents.\textsuperscript{474} In addition, housing subsidies produce savings in health care, child welfare, corrections, and other areas that reduce government spending.\textsuperscript{475}

Federal rental subsidies are targeted to low-income families with children, senior citizens, people with disabilities, and veterans.\textsuperscript{476} Federal rental assistance is generally means-tested and encompasses USDA Rural Rental Assistance and many Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) administered programs, including Public Housing, Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance, Supportive Housing for the Elderly, Supportive Housing for People with Disabilities, Rent Supplement, Rental Assistance Program, McKinney-Vento Permanent Supportive Housing, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.\textsuperscript{477} Of the more than five million households assisted in 2016, more than 2.2 million received Housing Choice Vouchers, 1 million received public housing, 1.2 million received Section 8 project-based assistance, 265,000 received USDA subsidies, and 154,000 received elderly and disabled targeted subsidies.\textsuperscript{478}

Eligibility for housing subsidies is determined by government public housing authorities based on household size and annual gross income.\textsuperscript{479} The federal government limits housing subsidies to U.S. citizens and specified categories of non-citizens who have eligible immigration status.\textsuperscript{480} Individuals evicted from public housing “for drug-related criminal activity are ineligible for assistance for at least three years from the date of the eviction.”\textsuperscript{481} Qualifying household income levels generally may not exceed a certain percent (e.g., 80\%) of the median income for area.\textsuperscript{482}

Households are expected to spend about 30\% of their monthly adjusted income on housing and utilities.\textsuperscript{483} The HUD contribution formula is the greater of one-third of “adjusted household income” or ten

\textsuperscript{471}Id.
\textsuperscript{472}Housing Choice Vouchers Fact Sheet, U.S. DEP’T HOUSING & URB. DEV., http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=topics/housing_choice_voucher_program_section_8 (last visited Nov. 26, 2017) (“Since the demand for housing assistance often exceeds the limited resources available to HUD and the local housing agencies, [long waiting periods are common.”).
\textsuperscript{473}Vouchers Fact Sheet, supra note 467.
\textsuperscript{474}Id.
\textsuperscript{476}United States Fact Sheet: Federal Rental Assistance, supra note 466.
\textsuperscript{477}Id.
\textsuperscript{478}Id.
\textsuperscript{480}Chapter 5: Eligibility and Denial of Assistance, supra note 479, at 5-3.
\textsuperscript{481}Id. at 5-1.
\textsuperscript{482}United States Fact Sheet: Federal Rental Assistance, supra note 466.
\textsuperscript{483}Housing Choice Vouchers Fact Sheet, supra note 472.
percent of “gross income.” HUD regulations define “adjusted household income” as cash income, excluding income from student financial aid, employment of children, and earnings in excess of $480 for each full-time adult student minus deductions for dependents, elderly, and disabled household members, child care, and medical expenses.

Households self-identify on surveys as receiving housing assistance. The Census Bureau includes the value of housing subsidies in household income. The value of the subsidy is estimated as the excess of the “market rent” over any tenant payment. “Market rent” is estimated using statistical matching with HUD data. Tenant payments are estimated from household income and HUD program rules. However, the housing benefits included as income are limited to the proportion of the relevant poverty threshold allocated to housing costs. Therefore, the housing subsidy included in income under the SPM is capped at the relevant threshold household housing costs, less any amount of tenant payments. For example, assume that the poverty threshold amount for housing for a household unit is $1,500 per month, the monthly housing subsidy is $1,000 and corresponding tenant costs are $700 because the actual housing costs are $1,700. The in-kind housing benefit included under this approach for the SPM would be the $1,500 housing threshold costs less the actual $700 housing costs, or $800 per month for the number of months received.

b. The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP).

It’s tough because my mom and dad are poor. My dad just lost his job. That’s kind of hard for us. One day, I started getting in the shower and it was cold. I put—I put the hot on all the way and no cold, and it was freezing. It felt like shoving your face in a bunch of snow. It was freezing! The hot water shut off because we didn’t pay the bill in time. It was overdue. [Brittany, age nine.]

LIHEAP is an energy assistance program that attempts to keep low-income families “safe and healthy” through initiatives that subsidize certain utility costs. The program is federally funded to assist in managing costs associated with energy bills, weatherization, and energy-related minor home repairs. The government’s goal through LIHEAP is to “reduce the risk of health and safety problems that arise from unsafe heating and cooling practices.” LIHEAP operates throughout all fifty states, the District of

484. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 18.
485. Id. at 18 n.23.
486. Id. at 18.
487. Id.
488. Id.
489. Id.
490. Id.
491. Id.
492. Id.
493. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
496. Id.
Columbia, Native American tribes or tribal organizations, and the U.S. territories.\textsuperscript{497}

Income eligibility criteria for LIHEAP may not be set lower than 110\% or higher than 150\% of the poverty guideline, “except where 60\% of state median income is higher.”\textsuperscript{498} “Under the law, LIHEAP grantees have the flexibility of serving households having at least one member who also receives assistance” under TANF, SSI, SNAP or VBs.\textsuperscript{499} LIHEAP grantees may add additional eligibility criteria “such as passing an assets test, residence in non-subsidized housing; or receipt of a utility disconnection notice.”\textsuperscript{500} LIHEAP’s fiscal year 2010 budget was about $5.3 billion assisting more than eight million households with average assistance amounts of $391 for heating, $293 for cooling, $434 for winter crisis, and $316 for summer crisis amounts.\textsuperscript{501}

The Census Bureau includes LIHEAP subsidies as in-kind benefits under the SPM.\textsuperscript{502} The survey asks for information on energy assistance for the entire year, capturing assistance for regular benefits and one or more crisis or emergency benefits.\textsuperscript{503} LIHEAP benefits are often made directly to utility companies, so households may have difficulty determining the precise amount of LIHEAP benefits received during the year.\textsuperscript{504}

\textbf{c. Demographics of Housing and LIHEAP Antipoverty Subsidies.}

My first year here, me and my mom got evicted. I felt shattered. That was the home that I had for my whole life and I grew up there. I didn’t know what was going to happen next. That period of not knowing wasn’t something that I felt comfortable with. I felt this inkling in me that I would never want my children or anyone else to experience this. [Omarina Cabrera, high school sophomore.]\textsuperscript{505}

Sometimes, when I watch people who, like, walk into their house when we’re driving. I wish that sometimes, like, I had a house like those people. [Jasmine, age nine.]\textsuperscript{506}

More than three million people were lifted out of poverty by approximately $42 billion in housing and utility subsidies under the SPM in 2014, after accounting for all cash income and in-kind food security benefits.\textsuperscript{507} Low-income families with children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities are specifically

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{499} Id.
\textsuperscript{500} Id.
\textsuperscript{502} SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 17.
\textsuperscript{503} Id.
\textsuperscript{504} Id.
\textsuperscript{505} Mary Robertson, Omarina’s Story, FRONTLINE (PBS television broadcast July 15, 2014), http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/film/omarinas-story/transcript/.
\textsuperscript{506} Poor Kids, supra note 2.
\textsuperscript{507} See infra Table 10 with demographic data regarding before and after statistics for housing and utility benefits. The Census Bureau determined that if housing subsidies were eliminated in 2014 under the SPM about 2.8 million individuals would drop into poverty or about 0.9\% of the 316,168,000 people in the SPM population universe. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9. In addition, if the LIHEAP program were terminated, assuming no behavioral changes, about 316,000 more individuals would suffer poverty. Id.
\end{flushleft}
targeted by these benefits, as described above. Consistent with this targeting, women, children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities were disproportionately lifted out of poverty by 2014 housing and energy benefits. All races and ethnic groups, other than Whites and Hispanics, were disproportionately lifted out of poverty by housing and energy benefits, after accounting for all cash-OPM resources plus in-kind food security benefits. After accounting for these resources, the poverty rate for all Whites was only 7.2%, and the lowest of all demographic groups was a 6.1% poverty rate for White senior citizens. In sharp contrast, all people of color, other than multi-racial individuals, suffered poverty rates in excess of the overall rate of 11.4%, ranging from a high rate of 25.4% for Hispanic children and 24.1% for Black children to a low rate of 10.1% and 12.3% for multi-racial and Asian individuals, respectively. Whites, men, working-age, multi-racial individuals, and senior citizens all had poverty rates under the overall poverty rate of 11.4%.

Table 10: Antipoverty Relief of 2014 Market Income, OASDI, SSI, VBs, UE, TANF and In-Kind Food Security Benefits Under the SPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Number in Lifted Out of Pov. w/Housing &amp; Utils.</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post Cash Income, Food Security, Housing &amp; Utils.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

508. See discussion regarding housing and utility subsidies supra Parts II.B.6.a–b.
509. See discussion supra Parts II.B.6.a–b; infra Table 10 with demographic data regarding before and after statistics for housing and utility benefits.
510. See infra Table 10.
513. See infra Table 10 with demographic data regarding before and after statistics for housing and utility benefits.
516. Id. (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income,” “Social Security,” “Supplemental Security Income,” “Unemployment Compensation,” “Welfare (TANF),” “Veteran’s Benefits,” “Food Stamps (SNAP),” “Free/Subsidized School Lunch,” “Women, Infants, & Children (WIC),” “Housing Subsidies (e.g. Section 8),” “Home Energy Subsidies (e.g. LIHEAP)”; Step 2: No boxes checked; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income,” “Social Security,” “Supplemental Security Income,” “Unemployment Compensation,” “Welfare (TANF),” “Veteran’s Benefits,” “Food Stamps (SNAP),” “Free/Subsidized School Lunch,” “Women, Infants, & Children (WIC)”; Step 2: No boxes checked; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page.
7. Taxes

If I could change anything, it would be being poor. I really don’t want to be poor because then you can’t get—because then how can you pay your rent? How can you get food? How can you get a roof over your head if you’re going to be poor? [Kaylie, age ten.] 519

Taxes are a nondiscretionary expense included in measuring poverty under the SPM. 520 However, under federal and most state income tax systems, low-income working families receive refundable tax credits that offset their income tax liability and, in certain cases, even subsidize their earned income. 521 While the OPM does not include any tax expenses or tax subsidies in its computations, the SPM includes in its analysis federal, state, and local income taxes; Social Security payroll taxes (FICA); and any federal and state tax credits. 522 Under the SPM, certain federal refundable tax credits, including the Earned Income

(WIC), “Housing Subsidies (e.g. Section 8),” “Home Energy Subsidies (e.g. LIHEAP); Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”).

514. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
515. Reproduces data from Table 9, supra, at col. 7.
518. The number lifted out of poverty (3.035M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals .96%.
519. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
520. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 18.
Tax Credit (EITC) and the Child Tax Credit (CTC), are separately stated as a source of income.523 The SPM federal, state, and local tax expenses and subsidies allocated to each household unit are not based upon actual resources received and expenses incurred. In lieu of asking for actual data from the households surveyed, the Census Bureau relies on simulated tax calculators that use microdata from the IRS Statistics of Income tax return files to estimate the tax costs and subsidies for each household.524

a. Federal Income Taxes. In 1967, households with income equal to the poverty threshold suffered a 12% federal income and payroll tax rate, pushing millions of those households into poverty.525 Federal income and payroll taxes effectively increased the poverty rate by 3.2%.526 Households with children were taxed into poverty at an even higher rate of 3.9%.527 As a result of favorable tax credits for working families with children and other family- and work-friendly tax provisions, the federal tax rate for a married couple with two children and income at the poverty threshold “has gone from 10 percent in 1967 to -16 percent in 2012.”528 But the tax system continues to tax low-income childless households at about 11%, pushing those families near poverty thresholds into poverty.529 Thus, these low-income, childless households are taxed into poverty.

Because of progressive income tax rates, including the effect of the EITC and CTC, and record income inequality, recent estimates indicate that about 44% of Americans pay no federal individual income tax.530 However, these individuals who pay no federal income tax do pay many other taxes including, but not limited to, state and local sales, excise (e.g., gas, tire, and utility taxes), payroll, and real and personal property taxes.531 Under the 2014 SPM, federal income taxes, excluding the benefits of the EITC and CTC, pushed 1.6 million people into poverty increasing the overall poverty rate by 0.5%.532 These individuals were disproportionately working-age. Thus, the poverty rate for individuals 18–64 years of age was increased by 0.6% or about 1.2 million individuals; for individuals under 18 the increase was 0.3%, or more than 200,000 individuals; and for seniors aged 65 and older, the increase was only 0.1%, or about 50,000 individuals.533 This is consistent with the noted change in federal income tax laws that are designed not to push working families with children into poverty, but rather are designed to lift them out of poverty.534 Nevertheless,

523. See id.
524. Id.
526. Id.
527. Id.
528. Id. at 17.
529. Id.
531. Williams, supra note 530.
532. The Census Bureau has indicated that without any federal income taxes, about 1.6 million individuals would no longer suffer poverty, assuming everything else remained the same. SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9 (setting forth that the poverty rate would decrease by about 0.5% (with margin of error of +/- .3%) if federal income taxes were eliminated from the analysis; assuming a population universe of 316,168,000, this is the equivalent of about 1.6 million individuals).
533. Id.
534. See Furman, supra note 525.
consistent with family-focused tax subsidies, households without a child living with them consistently continue to be taxed into poverty.

b. State Income Taxes. State income taxes, net of any state income tax credits, are even less likely to push individuals into poverty than federal income taxes. About 400,000 individuals are pushed into poverty by state income taxes, increasing the poverty rate by about .1%.535 These individuals are disproportionately male, working age, people of color including about 142,000 Hispanics (poverty rate increase of 0.3%); 130,000 Whites (poverty rate increase of 0.1%); 81,000 Blacks (poverty rate increase of 0.2%); 40,000 Asians (poverty rate increase of 0.2%); and 3,000 Pacific Islanders (poverty rate increase of 0.3%).536 This is consistent with the fact that about twenty-nine states plus Washington D.C. have state EITCs that build on the antipoverty benefits of the federal EITC.537 While twenty-four of these state EITCs are refundable, similar to the federal EITC, six states, including Delaware, Hawaii, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia, have non-refundable EITCs.538 Washington has a refundable EITC, but with no state income tax, it has not been funded to date.539 In addition, there are eight states without any state income tax on wages, including Alaska, Florida, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming.540 Thus, almost 70%, or thirty-four states plus the District of Columbia, either don’t impose an income tax, offset the income tax, or even subsidize low-income wage earners.541

c. Federal Payroll Taxes. About 60% of those who pay no federal income tax work and, therefore, pay federal payroll taxes.542 The other 40% are generally non-working senior citizens whose income is too low to owe federal income taxes.543 Of those who work, two-thirds have payroll tax liabilities that exceed their refundable income tax credits, like the EITC and CTC.544 Therefore, only about 9% of households have their federal payroll tax liabilities offset by these tax credits and about 75% of all Americans pay federal taxes.545

535. *Poverty Calculator, supra* note 194 (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all expenses, except “State Taxes”; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page). The result labeled “Difference” is the increase in the 2014 SPM due to state income taxes assuming no behavioral changes. While overall poverty share percentages generally remain the same, the poverty share percentages for males, Whites, and working-age individuals increase, and, correspondingly, the poverty share percentages of females, children and seniors decrease.

536. *Id.*


538. *Id.* The states with refundable EITCs include California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, Wisconsin, Vermont, and the District of Columbia. *Id.*

539. *Id.*


541. *Id.; see also Policy Basics: State Earned Income Tax Credits, supra* note 537.


543. *Id.*

544. *Id.*

545. *Id.*
In 2014, without considering any offset with federal EITC and CTC, federal payroll taxes pushed about 5.1 million individuals into poverty, increasing the SPM by 1.6%.546 The impact of these taxes is disproportionately felt by Hispanic working families, increasing the SPM poverty rate for Hispanic children and working-age adults by 4.0% and 3.9%, respectively.547 Federal FICA and Medicare payroll taxes impose an effective tax rate of 15.3% on wages and self-employment income.548 While employees pay 7.65% and employers match the 7.65% rate (self-employed individuals must pay the entire 15.3% rate), economists find that workers bear the entire tax burden irrespective of who pays it directly.549 Notably, Congress designed the EITC, among other reasons, to offset the payroll tax burden for working poor families.550 In 2014, the EITC and CTC offset not only the federal income and payroll tax burdens, but also the minimal state tax burden and effectively lifted millions of families out of poverty even after these federal and state tax costs.551

d. Earned Income Tax and Child Tax Credits. The EITC and CTC have been described as the most successful antipoverty programs for children, not only encouraging work in single-mother households, but also creating jobs in EITC-participating communities.552 Recent research suggests these credits benefit virtually every stage of participants’ lives, including improved health in infants and mothers, better K–12 school performance, higher college enrollment, and increased work effort, earnings, and tax payments in adulthood.553

The EITC is a federal income tax credit for low- to moderate-income workers, which offsets federal payroll and income taxes.554 The CTC is also targeted to low- and moderate-income working families to offset the cost of raising children.555 The credit is up to $1,000 per eligible child (under age seventeen at

---

546. The Census Bureau has determined that if federal payroll taxes were eliminated, about 5.1 million individuals would not suffer poverty under the SPM in 2014. See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9 (determining that the poverty rate would drop by 1.6% from 15.3% down to 13.7% in 2014).

547. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all expenses, except “Federal Payroll Tax”; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page). Poverty share percentages go up for Hispanic children (0.5%) and Hispanic working-age individuals (1.0%) as well as males (0.5%), Asians (0.1%), and Pacific Islanders (0.1%); correspondingly, poverty share percentages go down for Whites (0.6%) and Blacks (0.9%) as well as seniors (1.3%).

548. SSA Statistical Supplement, supra note 230.

549. See Lipman, supra note 521 (explaining that economists find that workers bear the burden of payroll taxes).

550. Id.

551. See infra Table 12.

552. See Lipman, supra note 521.


555. I.R.C. § 24; see also Chart Book: The Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit, supra note 553.
the end of the year) and is phased out for higher-income families.\textsuperscript{556} Similar to the EITC, the CTC is refundable, but at a rate of 15\% for earned income in excess of $3,000.\textsuperscript{557} Therefore, both the CTC and the EITC require work as well as the filing of an income tax return.\textsuperscript{558} Families that do not work at all during the calendar year will not receive any refundable CTC nor EITC.\textsuperscript{559} In 2018, the EITC amounts and phase-out ranges are as follows:\textsuperscript{560}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: 2018 EITC Amounts and Phase-Out Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To demonstrate the antipoverty relief of the EITC and CTC, assume that Congress had repealed the EITC and CTC for 2014 and there were no taxpayer behavioral effects in response to these reductions in tax benefits. Poverty measures under the SPM would increase as described below.

Without EITC or CTC antipoverty benefits, the SPM would increase from 15.3\% to 18.6\%, pushing 10.587 million or 22\% more individuals into poverty.\textsuperscript{562} As designed, children are disproportionately lifted out of poverty by EITC and CTC benefits.\textsuperscript{563} More than one-half of those individuals pushed into poverty without these benefits, or 5.644 million, would be children.\textsuperscript{564} Thirty-three percent of these children would be White, 38\% would be Hispanic, and 21\% would be Black.\textsuperscript{565} While White children represent 52\% of the

\textsuperscript{556} I.R.C. § 24(a)–(b).
\textsuperscript{557} I.R.C. § 24(d).
\textsuperscript{558} See Lipman, supra note 521.
\textsuperscript{559} I.R.C. § 32(a)(1) (setting forth the EITC’s reliance on earned income, among other requirements).
\textsuperscript{562} See infra Table 12. The Census Bureau has determined that without the refundable portion of these credits (only the amount that results in a cash refund, not the amount that offsets federal income tax liabilities), about 9.8 million or 3.1\% of the SPM population universe would drop into poverty. See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9.
\textsuperscript{563} See infra Table 12.
\textsuperscript{564} Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: check all resources, except “Earned Income Tax Credit” and “Child Tax Credit”; Step 2: all Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page). The results labeled “Difference” are the 10.587 million individuals who are lifted out of poverty by the EITC and the CTC, including 5.644 million 0–17 year old children.
\textsuperscript{565} Out of the total of 5.644 million (M) children dropped into poverty 33\% or 1.877 million are White (1.877M/5.644M), 2.151 million or 38\% (2.151M/5.644M) are Hispanic, and 1.163 million or 21\% (1.163M/5.644M) are Black. See infra Table 12.
SPM population universe, they are only 31% of poor children without the EITC and CTC. Thus, they are disproportionately lifted out of poverty with EITC and CTC and other antipoverty benefits. Hispanic and Black children represent 24% and 14% of the SPM population universe of children, but 39% and 21% of poor kids without these benefits. Nevertheless, EITC and CTC antipoverty benefits significantly decrease the child poverty rate for all children by 7.6% from 24.3% down to 16.7%. The decrease in poverty rate is even greater at 8.5% for children age zero through five who are lifted out of poverty with the EITC and CTC at even greater numbers and percentages than older children. But the most dramatic effect is for children of color who suffer much higher poverty rates than their White counterparts. Hispanic and Black children enjoy poverty rate decreases from the EITC and CTC of over 11% from 38.8% and 37.3% to 26.9% and 26%, respectively. Without these tax credits, almost 3.8 million more children of color would live in poverty. This represents about 11% of all children of color in the SPM population universe.

Targeted working adults also experience a decrease in their SPM overall rate of 2.4%, with Hispanic and Black working-age adults enjoying poverty rate decreases of 5.4% and 3.6% down to 24% and 22%, respectively. While Whites represent 43% of the pre-EITC and -CTC poor working-aged individuals, only 37% are lifted out of poverty by these benefits as compared to 38% of Hispanics who represent 29% of this population universe. Blacks are 18% of the working-age poor population universe.

Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (Step 1: none; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (A) click “Recalculate”). There are 73.920 million children in the population universe including 38.201 million White children (52%), 18.105 million Hispanic children (24%) and 10.236 million Black children (14%).

Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: check all resources, except “Earned Income Tax Credit” and “Child Tax Credit”; Step 2: all Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page). The resulting “Prior Calculation” determines that there are 17.970 children (0–17 years old) living in poverty including 5.542 White children (31%), 7.023 Hispanic children (39%) and 3.820 Black children (21%) excluding all EITC and CTC benefits.

About 33% of all children lifted out of poverty with EITC and CTC benefits are White (1.877M/5.424M) although only 31% of all children who are poor without the EITC and CTC benefits are White (5.542M/17.97M). Id.

Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (Step 1: none; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; Click “Recalculate”). There are 73.920 million children in the population universe including 38.201 million White children (52%), 18.105 million Hispanic children (24%) and 10.236 million Black children (14%).

See infra Table 12.

See infra Table 12.

See infra Table 12.

See infra Table 12 (setting forth the drop into poverty without the EITC and CTC of over 11% from 38.8% to 26.9% for Hispanic, 26% for Black, and 24% for White children).

See infra Table 12 (setting forth the lifting out of poverty of 3.8 million children of color out of 35.719 million non-White children in the SPM population universe or about 11% 3.8M/35.719M = 11%).
and 18% are lifted out of poverty by these benefits.\textsuperscript{577} The explanation for this distortion is likely that the targeted Hispanic poor population is 39% children, as compared to the White poor population, which is 23% children.\textsuperscript{578} As described above, CTC and EITC antipoverty benefits increase with the number of children in the household.\textsuperscript{579}

People with disabilities do not see much antipoverty relief from the EITC and CTC, but this could be due to the reliance of these credits on work and children.\textsuperscript{580} Only 262,000 individuals with disabilities were lifted out of poverty by the EITC and CTC in 2014 under the SPM, decreasing the poverty rate by .8% from 23.5% to 22.7%.\textsuperscript{581} Senior citizens who generally do not qualify for the EITC without children experience very little relative antipoverty relief from these tax credits.\textsuperscript{582} One hundred and eight thousand senior citizens were lifted out of poverty with EITC and CTC benefits decreasing the poverty rate by only .3% from 14.7% to 14.4%.\textsuperscript{583} Thus, the targeting of benefits in the structure and design of the EITC and CTC to lower-income working families with one or more children is realized in the Census Bureau’s estimates of these benefits. However, these are estimates of the benefits and not necessarily the actual amount received by the household unit.

### Table 12: SPM 2014 Poverty Demographics Without EITC and CTC\textsuperscript{584}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>Increase in Pop (millions) / (% change)</th>
<th>Pov Share (%)</th>
<th>Pov. Rate (%) Before</th>
<th>Pov. Rate (%) After</th>
<th>Increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.587 / 22%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>3.689 / (1.5%)</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>4.010 / 1.6%</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.054 / .2%</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{577} See infra Table 12.  
\textsuperscript{578} See infra Table 12.  
\textsuperscript{579} See I.R.C. § 24(a) (dollar amount of the CTC is $1,000 per qualifying child); I.R.C. § 32(b) (EITC benefits increase based on the number of qualifying children, with benefits maxing out at 3 or more qualifying children).  
\textsuperscript{580} See infra Table 12.  
\textsuperscript{581} See infra Table 12.  
\textsuperscript{582} See infra Table 12.  
\textsuperscript{583} See infra Table 12.  
\textsuperscript{584} Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: check all resources, except “Earned Income Tax Credit” and “Child Tax Credit”; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).  
\textsuperscript{585} Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
Asian | 5.5 | 0.446 / (.3%) | 5.7 | 16.8 | 19.4 | 2.6
Multi-Racial | 1.8 | 0.262 / (.1%) | 1.8 | 13.7 | 18.2 | 4.5
Native | .8 | 0.089 / 0% | 1.0 | 19.3 | 22.9 | 3.6
Pac. Islander | .3 | 0.038 / (.1%) | .4 | 22.8 | 26.7 | 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Female | 51 | 5.651 / 0% | 53.5 | 16.0 | 19.5 | 3.5
| White | 31.4 | 1.927 | 22.4 | 11.4 | 13.3 | 1.9
| Hispanic | 8.8 | 2.108 | 15.9 | 26.2 | 33.8 | 7.6
| Black | 6.5 | 1.206 | 10.4 | 24.1 | 30.0 | 5.9
| Male | 49 | 4.937 / 0% | 46.5 | 14.5 | 17.7 | 3.2
| White | 30.4 | 1.762 | 19.3 | 10.0 | 11.8 | 1.8
| Hispanic | 8.8 | 1.901 | 14.9 | 24.6 | 31.4 | 6.8
| Black | 5.7 | .848 | 8.2 | 21.9 | 26.6 | 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0–17 | 23.3 | 5.644 / 5% | 30.5 | 16.7/18.5 | 24.3/27 | 7.6/8.5
| 18–64 | 62.1 | 4.836 / (.8%) | 58.0 | 15.0 | 17.4 | 2.4
| 65+ | 14.6 | .108 / (.2%) | 11.4 | 14.4 | 14.7 | 0.3

| Disability | 9.4 | .262 / (2.1%) | 11.8 | 22.7 | 23.5 | 0.8

---

e. Demographics of Net Tax Benefit Under the SPM. Considering federal and state income and federal payroll taxes, including the EITC and CTC, after all cash and in-kind resources, but before MOOP and worker and child care expenses, 3.232 million individuals were lifted out of poverty by these net benefits under the SPM in 2014.587 This net tax benefit decreased overall poverty by 1%.588 The individuals lifted out of poverty were disproportionately children, Hispanic, and female.589 Notably, as described above with respect to senior citizens and people with disabilities, it appears that these two demographics continue to be taxed into poverty primarily because they do not qualify for meaningful EITC and CTC benefits, without qualifying children.590 An enhanced childless EITC could mitigate this issue, although this would continue to make earned income a requirement for any benefits.591 Notably, 75% of those lifted out of poverty by the

---

586. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: check all resources, except “Earned Income Tax Credit” and “Child Tax Credit”; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).

587. See infra Table 13.
588. See infra Table 13.
589. See infra Table 13.
590. See I.R.C. § 24(a) (setting forth that the dollar amount of the CTC is $1,000 per qualifying child); I.R.C. § 32(b), (c)(1)(A) (setting forth that EITC benefits for “eligible individuals” are based on the number of qualifying children, with benefits maxing out at 3 or more qualifying children and disqualifying individuals over the age of 65 for the childless EITC).
591. EXEC. OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND U.S. TREAS. DEP’T, THE PRESIDENT’S PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT 2 (2014) (proposing an expansion to include 300,000 older workers age 65 or 66 and suggesting that even conservative economists believe “a more robust childless worker EITC could replicate successes” in encouraging work among single parents).
net tax benefits are children and more than 26% are working-age adults, indicating that senior citizens are actually pushed into poverty by net taxes. While the percentage of Blacks lifted out of poverty by the net tax benefit exceeded the percentage of Blacks in the overall population, it did not exceed the percentage of Blacks living in poverty after accounting for all SPM resources. Thus, this net tax benefit does not proportionately benefit Black Americans. This might be explained by the demographics of Black families versus Hispanic families with fewer children in each household.

After accounting for all cash and in-kind income in the SPM and the net tax benefit, the overall poverty rate is 10.4% with only 6.8% of Whites, 9.9% of males, and only 8.5% of senior citizens suffering from poverty. While Hispanics enjoy the net tax benefits disproportionately (predominately due to the EITC and CTC benefits), they suffer the highest overall poverty rate even after this benefit of 18% relative to 17.3% for Blacks and 15.7% for Pacific Islanders. The overall Hispanic poverty rate is more than 250% of the White poverty rate. When further deconstructed, the White child poverty rate at this point in the analysis is only 6.1% as compared to 19.4% and 19.8% for Hispanic and Black children, respectively, even after the antipoverty child-focused benefits of the EITC and CTC. Indeed, without the antipoverty benefits of the EITC and CTC, as described above, these rates would be more than 11% higher for Hispanic and Black children or about 40% as compared to about 15% for White children. Needless to say, these tax benefits are critical to these children, their families and communities, and our resource allocation system, but they are not sufficient to correct the overall misallocation of benefits.

Table 13: SPM 2014 Poverty Demographics After All Cash Income and In-Kind Resources, Less Net Taxes (Including Federal and State Income and Payroll Taxes and Tax benefits from CTCs and EITCs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>% of No. in Pov. Post Cash &amp; All In-Kind</th>
<th>Lifted Out of Pov. w/Net Taxes</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post Cash, All In-Kind &amp; Net Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.232</td>
<td>32.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

592. See infra Table 13 setting forth the number and demographics of individuals lifted out of poverty after accounting for all cash and in-kind income resources and all tax costs and benefits.
593. See infra Table 13.
594. See infra Table 13.
595. See infra Table 13.
596. See infra Table 13.
597. See infra Table 13 setting forth the number and demographics of individuals lifted out of poverty after accounting for all cash and in-kind income resources and all tax costs and benefits.
598. See infra Table 13.
599. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
600. Reproduces data from Table 10, supra, at col. 7.
601. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: “Federal Income Tax,” “Federal Payroll Tax,” “State Taxes”; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: “Market Income,” “Social Security,” “Supplemental Security Income,” “Unemployment Compensation, Welfare (TANF),” “Veteran’s Benefits,” “Food Stamps (SNAP),” “Free/Subsidized School Lunch,” “Women, Infants, & Children (WIC),” “Housing Subsidies (e.g. Section 8),” “Home Energy Subsidies (e.g. LIHEAP)”; Step 2: none; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).
603. The number lifted out of poverty (3.232M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals 1.02%.
8. Medical Out-of-Pocket Expenses (MOOP)

The bills here at the house is just too much for me to handle. And I seen a doctor last week for depression and she put me on some antidepressants and Xanax for my panic attacks. Right now, there doesn’t seem to be a way out. So my only options are to give up my house and move my stuff into storage and move into the motel room. [Barbara, mother of Tyler and Kaylie.]604

a. Accounting for Actual MOOP Expenses. MOOP expenses are not included in the OPM, despite evidence that they can cause a tremendous burden on low-income families and push countless Americans into poverty.605 Under the SPM, 9.1 million individuals, or 2.9% of the population universe, were pushed into poverty by MOOP in 2014 (assuming all other aspects of the SPM, other than child care and worker related expenses).606 This is greater than any other nondiscretionary expense included in the SPM.607 The Census Bureau has determined that without MOOP about 3.5% of the SPM population universe or almost 11.1 million would not suffer poverty.608 Studies indicate that MOOP expenses are the third most significant

---

604. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
606. See infra Table 14.
608. See SPM 2014, supra note 35, at 9 (demonstrating that if MOOP were eliminated then the poverty rate would drop by about 3.5% and 11.1 million individuals, disproportionately senior citizens, would be lifted out of poverty).
cause of financial hardship and bankruptcy and the first cause of bankruptcy when indirect effects like a job loss due to poor health are considered.609

The Census Bureau collects data on MOOP expenses directly from households, including amounts paid for health insurance premiums, over-the-counter health-related products, and medical care, including prescription medicine, and payments for dental, health, and eye care.610 Researchers have concluded that the derived estimates from sample surveys for the larger population compare favorably with more detailed Census Bureau surveys.611 While MOOP expenses have been verified as generally accurate, some scholars have criticized the concept as not reflecting the goals of the poverty measurement.612

Scholars have argued that expected rather than actual MOOP spending should be incorporated into poverty thresholds.613 The argument for incorporating expected MOOP spending in poverty thresholds rather than actual MOOP is that some households under-consume medical services and have unmet medical needs because they simply cannot afford the costs.614 Discretionary available household resources necessarily become a cap to MOOP. This cap lends itself to including MOOP in poverty thresholds as a basic need, similar to food, clothing, shelter, and utilities.615 However, to the extent health insurance coverage is incorporated as a cost, it would similarly have to be included as an in-kind resource to the extent that the government is providing coverage, for example, through Medicaid or CHIP.616 The current SPM does not use this approach, although scholars continue to research, analyze, and discuss the issue and design and test alternative poverty measures using different approaches to incorporating medical expenses and insurance coverage.617

b. Demographics of the Push of MOOP into Poverty. Actual MOOP in 2014 pushed into poverty more than 9.1 million individuals, who were disproportionately senior citizens, people with disabilities, women, and people of color after accounting for all other SPM resources and expenses, other than child care and work related expenses.618 Interestingly, MOOP pushed White seniors from a low poverty rate of 6.2% up

610. Bridges & Gesumaria, supra note 607.
611. Id.
(discussing and presenting several different methodologies for determining MOOP expenses for SPM purposes); O’Hara & Doyle, supra note 609 (discussing the literature on incorporating medical out of pocket costs in measuring poverty).
614. Id. at 18–20 (2005); Jessica S. Banthin, Where Do We Stand in Measuring Medical Care Needs for Poverty Definitions? A Summary of Issues Raised in Recent Papers (Workshop on Experimental Poverty Measures, Nat’l Academy of Sciences, Wash., D.C., June 2004) (on file with author) (finding some consensus among poverty researchers that medical care needs should be based practically on actual MOOP expenditure data and should be included in poverty measures either based upon actual MOOP as an expense from unit resources or to include some measure of expected medical care needs in poverty thresholds).
616. Id.
617. Id.
618. See infra Table 14.
to a significantly higher poverty rate of 11.3%. Although, if actual MOOP expenses are paid from savings rather than current cash-flow resources this could overstate the rate of poverty under certain circumstances. Scholars have noted that MOOP expenses are sensitive to wealth—that is, those that have the ability to pay for these services are more likely to incur them. As a result, extremely high MOOP expenses might be more likely to be incurred by individuals who can afford them through savings; therefore, accounting for MOOP in this manner may overstate poverty rates, especially for White seniors.

**Table 14: SPM 2014 Poverty Demographics After All Cash and In-Kind Resources, Less Net Taxes and MOOP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop.</th>
<th>% of No. in Pov. Post All Income &amp; Net Taxes</th>
<th>Pushed into Pov. w/MOOP</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post All Income, Net Taxes, and MOOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(9.103)</td>
<td>42.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>(5.189)</td>
<td>18.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>(1.785)</td>
<td>11.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>(1.308)</td>
<td>8.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>(0.559)</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(0.173)</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>(3.991)</td>
<td>19.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>(5.112)</td>
<td>22.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

619. See infra Table 14.
620. Sanders Korenman & Dahlia Remler, *Rethinking Elder Poverty: Time for a Health Inclusive Poverty Measure?* 17–18 (Nat’l Bureau of Econ. Research, Working Paper No. 18900, 2013), http://www.nber.org/papers/w18900.pdf (arguing that health benefits as well as assets should be included in the analysis to better capture poverty among seniors especially given that MOOP almost doubles the poverty rate despite the enormous financial resources that are going to subsidize senior citizens).
621. Id.
622. Id.
623. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
624. Reproduces data from Table 13, supra, at col. 7.
627. The number pushed into poverty (9.103M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals 2.88%.
### Table 1: Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0–17</th>
<th>18–64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.779)</td>
<td>(4.804)</td>
<td>(2.520)</td>
<td>(1.845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19.5)</td>
<td>(52.8)</td>
<td>(27.7)</td>
<td>(20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.421</td>
<td>25.290</td>
<td>6.424</td>
<td>6.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Worker and Child Care Related Expenses**

My dad works at a factory and we drive him there every day. . . . The journey takes about two hours there and back. We have to go with our mom because the rules say that we couldn’t be left in the shelter by ourselves because we weren’t old enough. [Kaylie, age ten.]\(^{628}\)

a. **How Work and Child Care Expenses Are Determined.** Work itself generally costs a worker out-of-pocket expenses such as commuting, uniforms, and tools.\(^{629}\) The SPM includes these expenses as a reduction of household resources for work and child care expenses.\(^{630}\) Work-related expenses, other than child care costs, are calculated by subtracting 85% of the median of work-related expenses reported in the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) for all household workers.\(^{631}\) The Census Bureau survey includes a question that asks for the number of weeks worked for every working household member.\(^{632}\) This reported number is multiplied by the 85% median weekly work-related SIPP expenses for each person to derive the annual work-related expenses.\(^{633}\) Therefore, worker expenses are estimated based upon population median costs and the number of actual of weeks worked.

Actual child care expenses paid while parents are at work are also deducted from household resources before comparing the net household resources to the relevant poverty threshold.\(^{634}\) Aggregate household work-related expenses, including child care costs, are capped so that they do not exceed the earnings of the lower-earning parent in a household before the poverty threshold comparison.\(^{635}\) However, some scholars have suggested that, in cases where the lower-earning parent is in school or looking for work, a cap may not be appropriate.\(^{636}\)

b. **Demographics of Who Is Pushed into Poverty with Work and Child Care Expenses.**

I mean, I don’t even know if I can find a job when I get out of school or if it’ll ever get any better. I’ll have to find day care for Kaylie. I mean, she’s ten, but still. Her and Tyler—they’re brother and sister—they fight. I’ll come home and the one will be hanging from the ceiling fan and the other one will be God knows where! I’m scared. [Barbara, mother of Tyler and Kaylie.]\(^{637}\)

---

628. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
630. Id.
631. Id.
632. Id.
633. Id.
634. Id. at 18–19.
635. Id.
636. Id.
637. Poor Kids, supra note 2.
Almost 6.2 million people were pushed into poverty by work and child care expenses in 2014, after accounting for all cash and in-kind income as well as all other expenses under the SPM. These individuals were disproportionately Hispanic, Asian, and multi-racial relative to their share of the population universe as a percentage of the poverty share, accounting for all resources and expenses before worker and child care expenses. Not surprisingly, these costs seem to be disproportionately pushing men, children and working-age individuals into poverty as compared to senior citizens, who are likely not working or bearing child care costs. People with disabilities are not suffering these burdens relative to their percentage in the population universe, but this could be because they suffer from high unemployment rates and might not have the same child care cost burden.

Table 15: SPM 2014 Poverty Demographics After All Cash and In-Kind Resources, Less Net Taxes, MOOP, and Child Care and Work Related Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Total Pop. 642</th>
<th>% of No. in Pov. Post All Income, Net Taxes, &amp; MOOP 643</th>
<th>Pushed into Pov. w/Child Care &amp; Work-Related 644</th>
<th>Pop. in Pov. Post All Income, Net Taxes, MOOP, Child Care &amp; Work-Related 645</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(6.185)</td>
<td>(48.320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>(2.393)</td>
<td>(20.875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>(2.298)</td>
<td>(14.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>(0.902)</td>
<td>(8.914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>(0.403)</td>
<td>(2.908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td>(0.798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.477)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac. Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

638. See infra Table 15.
639. See supra Table 15.
640. See supra Table 15.
642. Reproduces data from Table 3, SPM-2014, supra, at col. 3.
643. Reproduces data from Table 14, supra, at col. 7.
644. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 ((A) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: 2014; (B) click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: “Federal Income Tax,” “Federal Payroll Tax,” “State Taxes,” “Child Support Paid,” “Medical Out-of-Pocket Expenses”; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; (C) then press “Compare the current poverty calculation to the calculation immediately prior to this one” at the top of the page).
645. Id. (click the “Recalculate” button after selecting the following “Step” boxes: Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”).
646. The number pushed into poverty (6.185M) over the total SPM population (316.168M) equals 1.96%.
### III. Conclusions

#### A. Who Is Poor in America: Demographics of Poverty

During my freshman year in high school, my parents didn’t have money to buy us new clothes. I wore ripped jeans, and my sneakers had holes in them. It was kind of embarrassing, but I still didn’t think I was poor. . . . I asked my mom to do the math, and she said right now my family makes thirty-thousand a year—according to the federal government we’re fifteen-thousand dollars below the poverty line. I mean . . . that kind of scares me. [Jairo Gomez, high school student.]

This Article has exposed the underlying mechanics of the OPM and SPM and tried to humanize the statistical data representing those who have not been allocated enough resources in the United States today. While the details set forth herein are complicated, dynamic, and at times opaque, trends and patterns have emerged from this review of how antipoverty resources are distributed. In concluding, the Article will present these trends and patterns through the details of the OPM and SPM.

#### 1. Teasing Out Trends and Patterns

**a. The Exclusion of Nine Million from the Poverty Measure.** The population universe included in the OPM and SPM notably excludes over nine million Americans who are likely disproportionately poor, male, and people of color. While perhaps understandable given the genesis of the poverty measure programs were to measure population employment and labor data, the exclusion of about 3% of the population is a fact that should be better understood by poverty law scholars, researchers, and the public at large as they evaluate annual poverty demographic data. Moreover, as Mollie Orshansky famously pronounced, the goal of gathering poverty data must be to do something about the plight of the individuals. Accordingly, if the United States is not gathering poverty data for these excluded populations, are we, as a society, not doing something about the potentially adverse circumstances of their plight? While the United States obviously does gather data about some of these excluded populations in various forms (e.g., the annual counting of

---


648. See discussion supra at Part II.A and accompanying notes (discussing the more than nine million individuals who are excluded from the population universe of poverty measures).


650. “There is no particular reason to count the poor unless you are going to do something about them.” Orshansky, supra note 6, at 37 (describing poverty as a subjective value judgment).
the homeless\textsuperscript{651} and reports on poverty regarding residents of Puerto Rico\textsuperscript{652} a more affirmative disclosure of their exclusion from the OPM and SPM and a transparent explanation as to why these populations are excluded would better inform readers of these measurements. Moreover, integrating these other supplemental reports in poverty analysis, advocacy, and reform is necessary to include, rather than exclude, these individuals who have effectively been erased from the SPM and OPM. These individuals are a part of our American community and story and the discrete erasure of them from the population for poverty measurements when exposed communicates a loud message that they do not matter. Nevertheless, their hardships cannot be erased because they are our neighbors, family members, and fellow Americans. We exclude them to our short-term and long-term peril.\textsuperscript{653} We must include their burdens and benefits in any U.S. poverty measurement, analysis, discourse, advocacy, and remedies.

\textit{b. The Differences Between the OPM and SPM.} As the SPM has matured and scholars and data experts become more and more familiar with the meaningful differences between the OPM and SPM, poverty law scholars, sociologists, and legal advocates should make proactive efforts to explain them. While retaining the OPM for comparative data and reflection purposes continues to make some sense, the SPM should be introduced and favorably distinguished whenever and wherever OPM statistics are used. Scholars and advocates should make and take the time to recount, describe, and explain not only the additional resources and expenses that are included, but also describe and distinguish the different household units and thresholds. This Article can serve as a resource for those discussions. Over time, the usefulness of the OPM will dissipate, and writers will no longer have to explain the randomness of how Orshansky’s meal plan became a steadfast and long-term poverty measurement. The SPM is a meaningful improvement in our data collection for remedying misallocation of resources.

After working through the additional items included in the SPM presented above, the lack of soundness of the OPM as a poverty measure seems somewhat obvious from a comparison, as illustrated below in Tables 16–20. The OPM stops quite suddenly after accounting for pre-tax cash resources and thereby excludes meaningful in-kind and tax benefits that lift millions of Americans out of poverty each year. While the OPM accounts for the most significant income resources, that is, market income and OASDI benefits, the failure to include in-kind and net tax benefits distorts its results for the broad population that does not understand this shortfall.

The OPM also fails to include meaningful antipoverty resources and safety nets.\textsuperscript{654} For example, not including in-kind food security and EITC and CTC antipoverty benefits targeted to children overstates OPM rates for children across every demographic group.\textsuperscript{655} Similarly, not including MOOP in the OPM

\textsuperscript{651} Nat’l Alliance to End Homelessness, supra note 9.

\textsuperscript{652} Puerto Rico, supra note 65.


\textsuperscript{654} See Developing a Supplemental Poverty Measure, supra note 30 (discussing the development of the SPM in response to the inadequacies in the OPM); see also Nancy K. Cauthen & Sarah Fass, Measuring Poverty in the United States, Nat’l Ctr. for Child. Poverty (June 2008), http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_825.html (describing the inadequacies of the current OPM).

\textsuperscript{655} Bridges & Gesumaria, supra note 607.
understates the poverty rate for senior citizens across all demographics.\(^{656}\) Moreover, not including worker expenses and child care expenses understates poverty rates especially for working single parents and their families. The exclusion of these benefits and expenses distorts the analysis and undermines productive conversations, comparisons, and analysis for better resource allocation.

However, a strict numerical analysis is too benign for understanding the harsh reality of limited financial resources and uncovered expenses. When in-kind benefits are described above, the details demonstrate inherent and palpable challenges in these programs for families, including the paucity of relief and the high hurdles implemented to receive this limited relief. A healthy, free school lunch for hungry children or critical formula for a newborn should be status quo, not a benefit.\(^{657}\) Similarly, when MOOP expenses reduce income below the relevant poverty threshold but are paid from a senior citizen’s ample savings account, are we exaggerating elder poverty statistics?\(^{658}\) The statistics, stories, program details, and SPM and OPM mechanics are all necessary to better understand the problem of resource misallocation so that the United States can mitigate its debilitating societal burdens and costs. Simply put, there is no perfect measurement, definition, or remedy. But a better understanding of all available data, people, programs, problems, and possibilities will help us to better address the status quo and plan for a better tomorrow for all Americans.

2. **Race-Based Income and Wealth Inequality**

As the statistics below describe, market income, or work plus investment income other than capital gains, and OASDI derived from work provide enormous antipoverty relief for about 85%, or more than 268 million, Americans.\(^{659}\) Unemployment benefits and Veterans Benefits, also derived from labor, lift a relatively less significant number of Americans out of poverty each year.\(^{660}\) These market-income-derived benefits disproportionately lift White people out of poverty.\(^{661}\) In the categories of children, working-age, senior citizens, men, and women, White people disproportionately are allocated financial resources as compared to their percentage of the population.\(^{662}\) Relative to people of color, White individuals have lower poverty rates and are underrepresented in every category under both the OPM and SPM.\(^{663}\)

Under the OPM and SPM, White people represent about 62% of the population universe, but only 42–43% of those living in poverty.\(^{664}\) Comparatively, Hispanic and Black individuals represent 18% and 12% of the population universe, respectively, but 28–29% and 18–22% of the population of poor, respectively.\(^{665}\) Similarly, OPM and SPM poverty rates for Whites range from 8–12% while poverty rates for people of color range from 13% to over 37%.\(^{666}\)

A more deconstructed comparative analysis is even more disparate as between White children or

---

657. See supra Part II.B.5.
658. See supra Part II.B.8.
659. See infra Tables 16, 17; see also supra Tables 3, 5 (setting forth that approximately 244–245 million individuals (78%) are lifted out of poverty with market income and another 24 million (7%) are lifted out of poverty by OASDI/SSI), or approximately 268 million individuals (85%) combined.
660. See supra Table 6.
661. See infra Tables 16, 18.
662. See infra Tables 16, 18.
663. See infra Tables 17, 19.
664. See infra Tables 17, 19.
665. See infra Tables 17, 19.
666. See infra Tables 17, 19.
senior citizens and children or seniors of color.\textsuperscript{667} White children and White senior citizens are underrepresented in the poor population, while children of color and senior citizens of color are represented in the poor population several times their representation in the population universe.\textsuperscript{668} White children suffer poverty rates of 10–12%, while children of color suffer poverty rates of 26–37% even though they represent a smaller percentage of the population universe.\textsuperscript{669} Similarly, White senior citizens are underrepresented among the poor and suffer poverty rates from 8–12%.\textsuperscript{670} Senior citizens of color are overrepresented among the poor and suffer poverty rates from 18–28%.\textsuperscript{671} These statistics demonstrate that the United States has broad-based, deep income (and likely the accumulation of income, that is wealth) inequality based upon race and ethnic origin.\textsuperscript{672}

### Table 16: 2014 OPM Poverty Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014</th>
<th>With Market Income (%)\textsuperscript{673}</th>
<th>&amp; w/ OASDI &amp; SSI (%)\textsuperscript{674}</th>
<th>&amp; w/ UE &amp; Veteran’s Benefit (%)\textsuperscript{675}</th>
<th>&amp; w/ TANF (%)\textsuperscript{676}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{667} See infra Tables 17, 19.  
\textsuperscript{668} See infra Tables 17, 19.  
\textsuperscript{669} See infra Tables 17, 19.  
\textsuperscript{670} See infra Tables 17, 19.  
\textsuperscript{671} See infra Tables 17, 19.  
\textsuperscript{672} See infra Tables 17, 19.  
\textsuperscript{673} See supra note 198 and accompanying text.  
\textsuperscript{674} See supra note 260 and accompanying text.  
\textsuperscript{675} See supra note 334 and accompanying text.  
\textsuperscript{676} See supra note 374 and accompanying text.
### Table 17: 2014 OPM Poverty Rates & Shares as Compared to the Population Universe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Population (out of 315,804 million)</th>
<th>% Share of Pop. in Poverty</th>
<th>% Pov Share over % of Pop</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>_681</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>215.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>253.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

677. See supra note 196 and accompanying text.
679. That is, column 3 (% share of population in poverty) divided by column 2 (% of population).
680. Supra note 678.
681. The number in poverty in overall OPM population is 46.657 million. Id.
3. Work-Based Resources

The OPM and SPM numbers also make obvious that U.S. institutions value a strong work ethic. The welfare-to-work mandate has transformed social benefits into work-fare, but those who cannot work in the traditional marketplace (e.g., full-time) for one reason or another suffer poverty disproportionately. This group includes children and people with disabilities. Also potentially included in this group, but not included in either the OPM or SPM population universe, are people who are incarcerated, homeless, or residents living in institutions (such as nursing homes) or some students living in dormitories. Moreover, those who suffer lower average wages, including women and people of color, also suffer poverty disproportionately. Poverty cannot be resolved with standardized solutions of more work because inability to work is the problem, not the answer, although a living wage, together with additional affirmative remedies for wage discrimination, would help mitigate poverty for minimum wage workers and their families.

4. MOOP and Work and Child Care Expenses

Finally, as the SPM statistical analysis below demonstrates, the overall SPM poverty rate is reduced to 9.5% after accounting for all resources including antipoverty relief under the CTC and EITC. Taxes,
MOOP, child care, and related worker expenses increase the overall poverty rate to 15.3%. This analysis demonstrates that some Americans are being pushed into poverty by taxes and other necessary living expenses. The expansion of the childless EITC and an enhanced CTC could mitigate this burden. In addition, continued access to affordable health care as a result of the Affordable Care Act should mitigate some of the MOOP pushing individuals into poverty given that current health insurance coverage is at record highs. Further analysis of MOOP measurements will help health care policy stewards to better understand if the impact on senior citizens’ poverty rates is overstated or even understated. This data should also facilitate even better health care, including Medicaid and Medicare policies on a going-forward basis. Lastly, the financial burdens of worker and child care expenses push millions of families into poverty every year. If we value work and families, then this broad and deep hardship should be remedied through universal child care or meaningful tax subsidies. The high cost of child care and related worker expenses is a persistent problem well overdue for relief. Because the issue has trickled up to middle- and higher-income families, tax subsidies have been proposed. Accordingly, Congress may or may not include some relief in the near term. The SPM data highlights the breadth and depth of child care and related worker expenses as a problem and should help shape and inform relief.

688. See infra Table 18.
689. See infra Table 18.
692. Trump’s proposed tax plan “would also add a new deduction for child and dependent care expenses, and increase the earned income tax credit (EITC) for working parents who would not benefit from the deduction. Further, the plan would provide a new form of tax-favored savings account related to child and dependent care expenses, and expand the credit for employer-provided child care.” James R. Nunns et al., An Analysis of Donald Trump’s Revised Tax Plan, TAX POL’Y CTR. (Oct. 18, 2016), http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/analysis-donald-trumps-revised-tax-plan/full; but see H.R. 1, Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, 115th Congress (2017), https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1/text (providing increased child tax credits of $1,650 in the House Bill and $2,000 in the Senate Bill in lieu of increased child and dependent care credits, but as of December 11, 2017, the increased child tax credit amounts are not refundable (except to the extent the current law amount is indexed for inflation) so they will not significantly benefit lower-income families).
693. H.R. 1.
### Table 18: 2014 SPM Poverty Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014&lt;sup&gt;694&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>After Cash Income Items (%)&lt;sup&gt;695&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>After In-Kind Benefits (%)&lt;sup&gt;696&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>After Expenses (%)&lt;sup&gt;697&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>OASDI &amp; SSI</td>
<td>UE/VB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Rel</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac Islander</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

694. Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (check the indicated “Step” boxes, then the “Recalculate” button: Step 1: none; Step 2: none; Step 3: Supplemental Poverty Line; Step 4: 2014).

695. For “Market” column, see supra note 202 and accompanying text; for “OASDI & SSI” column, see supra note 265 and accompanying text; and for “UE/VB” column, see supra note 339 and accompanying text.

696. For “TANF” column, see supra note 379 and accompanying text; for “Food” column, see supra note 460 and accompanying text; and for “Shelter” column, see supra note 517 and accompanying text.

697. For the “CTC/ EITC” column, use the Poverty Calculator, supra note 194 (check the indicated “Step” boxes, then the “Recalculate” button: Step 1: all checked; Step 2: none checked; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”).

For the “Taxes” column, see supra note 602 and accompanying text; for the “MOOP” column, see supra note 626 and accompanying text; for the “Child Care/Work” column, see supra note 645 and accompanying text.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: 2014 SPM Poverty Rates & Shares as Compared to Population Universe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPM-2014</th>
<th>% of Population (out of 316.168 million)(^{698})</th>
<th>% Share of Pop. in Poverty(^{699})</th>
<th>% Pov. Share over % of Pop(^{700})</th>
<th>Poverty Rate(^{701})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-(^{702})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>165.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>177.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>150.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 0–17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>171.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 18–64</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 65+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>166.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>161.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–17</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–64</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{698}\) See supra note 200 and accompanying text.

\(^{699}\) Poverty Calculator, supra note 192 check the indicated “Step” boxes, then the “Recalculate” button:
Step 1: all; Step 2: all; Step 3: “Supplemental Poverty Line”; Step 4: “2014”; see also supra note 645 and accompanying text.

\(^{700}\) Column 3 (% share of population in poverty) over column 2 (% of population).

\(^{701}\) Supra note 699.

\(^{702}\) The number in poverty in overall SPM population is 48.32 million. Supra note 699.
5. The Beginning

I’m surprised by how things can change so fast. You can go from doing OK, not having to go hungry, to this, going hungry and having to pay all your bills and not being able to, on the verge of being homeless again. [Roger, age fourteen.]\textsuperscript{703}

This Article has exposed the mechanics, details, calculations, analysis, successes, failures, and humanity inherent in resource allocations and antipoverty programs and relief in America today. This exposure and analysis fill a void in existing poverty measurement scholarship and provide a foundation for future poverty research and remedies. Social justice advocates must understand the methods behind the measurements counting the poor to better understand and design solutions to their problems, so that society can better provide for the success of all Americans, including Roger, Tyler, Kaylie, Jasmine, Brittany, Jonny, Barbara, Vanessa, Dee Dee and Tom, and in turn, you and all of precious humanity.

\textsuperscript{703} Poor Kids, supra note 2. For an update on what happened to the children featured in the FRONTLINE documentary, please visit http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/whats-happened-to-brittany-jonny-and-kaylie/.