

ALICE IN INDIANA: A FINANCIAL HARDSHIP STUDY

LIVE UNITED

2020 INDIANA REPORT



Indiana United Ways



United Way
of Central Indiana

ALICE IN THE TIME OF COVID-19



The release of this ALICE Report for Indiana comes during an unprecedented crisis – the COVID-19 pandemic. While our world changed significantly in March 2020 with the impact of a global dual health and economic crisis, ALICE remains central to the story. The pandemic has exposed exactly the issues of economic fragility and widespread hardship that United For ALICE and the ALICE data work to reveal.

That exposure makes the ALICE data and analysis more important than ever. The ALICE Report for Indiana presents the latest ALICE data available – a point-in-time snapshot of economic conditions across the state in 2018. By showing how many Indiana households were already struggling, that snapshot provides the backstory for why the COVID-19 crisis is so damaging. The ALICE data is especially important now to help stakeholders identify the most vulnerable in their communities, and direct programming and resources to assist them throughout the pandemic and the recovery that follows. And as Indiana moves forward, this data can be used to estimate the impact of the crisis over time, providing an important baseline for changes to come.

This crisis is fast-moving and quickly evolving. To stay abreast of the impact of COVID-19 on ALICE households and their communities, visit our website at UnitedForALICE.org/COVID19 for updates

THE UNITED WAYS OF INDIANA

Decatur County United Fund
Jackson County United Way
Jefferson County United Way
Jennings County United Way
Lake Area United Way
Metro United Way
Montgomery United Fund For You
Shelby County United Fund
Starke United Fund
Steuben County United Way
United Way for Clinton County
United Way of Adams County
United Way of Allen County
United Way of Bartholomew County
United Way of Cass County
United Way of Central Indiana
United Way of Danville Area
United Way of Daviess County
United Way of DeKalb County

United Way of Delaware, Randolph & Henry Counties
United Way of Elkhart & LaGrange Counties
United Way of Fayette County
United Way of Franklin County
United Way of Fulton County
United Way of Gibson County
United Way of Grant County
United Way of Greater Cincinnati
United Way of Greater Lafayette
United Way of Howard & Tipton Counties
United Way of Huntington County
United Way of Jay County
United Way of Johnson County
United Way of Knox County
United Way of Kosciusko County
United Way of LaPorte County
United Way of Madison County

United Way of Marshall County
United Way of Miami County
United Way of Monroe County
United Way of Noble County
United Way of Perry County
United Way of Pike County
United Way of Porter County
United Way of Posey County
United Way of Scott County
United Way of South Central Indiana
United Way of Southwestern Indiana
United Way of St. Joseph County
United Way of the Wabash Valley
United Way of Wells County
United Way of Whitewater Valley
United Way of Whitley County
Wabash County United Fund
White County United Way

Learn more about ALICE in Indiana: www.iuw.org

Indiana State Partners



Indiana United Ways



United Way
of Central Indiana

Acknowledgements

Indiana United Ways and United Way of Central Indiana thank our sponsors, partners, and community stakeholders throughout the state for their support and commitment to this 2020 ALICE Report for Indiana. It is our hope that this Report will help raise awareness of the 37% of households in the state who live in poverty or who are **ALICE** – **A**sset Limited, **I**ncome **C**onstrained, **E**mployed. Our goal is to inform and inspire policy and action to improve the lives of ALICE families.

To learn more about how you can get involved in advocating and creating change for ALICE in Indiana, contact: Kathryn Habecker, M.P.A., M.A., at kathryn.habecker@iuw.org

To access the ALICE data and resources for Indiana, go to UnitedForALICE.org/Indiana



ALICE RESEARCH

ALICE Reports provide high-quality, research-based information to foster a better understanding of who is struggling in our communities. To produce the ALICE Report for Indiana, our team of researchers collaborated with a Research Advisory Committee composed of experts from across the state. In addition, every two years, United For ALICE undertakes a full review of the ALICE Methodology, in which Research Advisory Committee members from each of our partner states participate. This collaborative model ensures each Report presents unbiased data that is replicable, easily updated on a regular basis, and sensitive to local context.

Learn more about the ALICE Team on our website at UnitedForALICE.org/ALICE-team

Director and Lead Researcher: Stephanie Hoopes, Ph.D.

Research Support Team:

Andrew Abrahamson; Ashley Anglin, Ph.D.; Catherine Connelly, D.M.H.; Max Holdsworth, M.A.; Dan Treglia, Ph.D.

ALICE Research Advisory Committee for Indiana

Priyanka Brunese, Ph.D.

Purdue University

Tiara Dungy

*Lilly Family School of Philanthropy,
Indiana University*

Jessica Fraser, M.A.

Indiana Institute for Working Families

Kirsten Grønbjerg, Ph.D.

*University O'Neill School of Public
and Environmental Affairs*

Chelsea Haring-Cozzi, Ph.D.

*Coalition for Homelessness Intervention
& Prevention*

Rachel Lane, M.B.A.

Family and Social Services Administration

Waldo Mikels-Carrasco, M.A.

Michiana Health Information Network

Lucinda Nord

Indiana Library Federation

Matt Nowlin, M.U.R.P.

*The Polis Center, Indiana University-Purdue
University Indianapolis*


Maude Toussaint-Comeau, Ph.D.

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago

ALICE: A GRASSROOTS MOVEMENT

This body of research provides a framework, language, and tools to measure and understand the struggles of a population called **ALICE** – an acronym for **A**sset **L**imited, **I**ncome **C**onstrained, **E**mployed. ALICE represents the growing number of households in our communities that do not earn enough to afford basic necessities. Partnering with United Ways, nonprofits, academic institutions, corporations, and other state organizations, this research initiative provides data to stimulate meaningful discussion, attract new partners, and ultimately inform strategies for positive change.

Based on the overwhelming success of this research in identifying and articulating the needs of this vulnerable population, this work has grown from a pilot in Morris County, New Jersey to 21 states and more than 648 United Ways. Together, United for ALICE partners can evaluate current initiatives and discover innovative approaches to improve life for ALICE and the wider community. To access Reports from all states, visit UnitedForALICE.org



NATIONAL ALICE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The following companies are major funders and supporters of this work:

**Aetna Foundation ■ Allergan ■ Alliant Energy ■ AT&T ■ Atlantic Health System ■ Atlantic Union Bank
Compare.com ■ Deloitte ■ Entergy ■ Johnson & Johnson ■ JLL ■ Key Bank ■ RWJBarnabas Health
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation ■ Thrivent Financial Foundation ■ UPS ■ U.S. Venture**

WHAT'S NEW IN ALICE RESEARCH

Every two years, United For ALICE undertakes a full review of the ALICE Methodology to ensure that the ALICE measures are transparent, replicable, and current in order to accurately reflect how much income families need to live and work in the modern economy. In 2019, more than 40 external experts – drawn from the Research Advisory Committees across our United For ALICE partner states – participated in the review process. A full description of the Methodology and sources is available at UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology

This Report includes the following improvements:

More local variation: The ALICE budgets for housing, food, transportation, health care, and taxes incorporate more local data. For housing, we differentiate counties within Metropolitan Statistical Areas using American Community Survey gross rent estimates. For food, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Thrifty Food Plan is adjusted at the county level using Feeding America's cost-of-meal data. For transportation, auto insurance is added to new miles-traveled data (discussed in the next paragraph) to reflect different driving costs by state. For health care, out-of-pocket costs are provided by census region. And taxes now systematically include local income tax, using data from the Tax Foundation.

Better reflection of household composition: Transportation and health care budgets now better reflect costs for different household members. The transportation budget for driving a car uses the Federal Highway Administration's miles-traveled data, sorted by age and gender, and AAA's cost-per-mile for a small or medium-sized car. The health care budget reflects employer-sponsored health insurance (the most common form in 2018, when it covered 49% of Americans¹), using the employee's contribution, plus out-of-pocket expenditures by age and income, from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Medical Expenditure Panel Survey.

More variations by household size: The median household size in the U.S. is three people for households headed by a person under age 65 and two people for households headed by seniors (65+).² Reflecting this reality, the Household Survival Budgets are presented in new variations, including a Senior Survival Budget. The website provides data to create budgets for households with any combination of adults and children. The ALICE Threshold has also been adjusted to incorporate the most common modern household compositions. These new budget variations are included in the County Profile and Household Budget pages on UnitedForALICE.org/Indiana

New ALICE measures:

- The **Senior Survival Budget** more accurately represents household costs for people age 65 and over. Housing and technology remain constant; however, some costs are lower – transportation, food, and health insurance premiums (due to Medicare) – while others are higher, especially out-of-pocket health costs. Because over 90% of seniors have at least one chronic condition, the Senior Survival Budget includes the additional cost of treating the average of the five most common chronic diseases.
- The **ALICE Essentials Index** is a standardized measure of the change over time in the costs of essential household goods and services, calculated for both urban and rural areas. It can be used as a companion to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' (BLS) Consumer Price Index, which covers all goods and services that families at all income levels buy regularly.

Data Notes: The data are estimates; some are geographic averages, others are one- or five-year averages depending on population size. Change-over-time ranges start with 2007, before the Great Recession, then measure change every two years from 2010 to 2018. County-level data remains the primary focus, as state averages mask significant differences between counties. For example, the share of households below the ALICE Threshold in Indiana ranges from 21% in Hamilton County to 47% in Crawford and Monroe counties. Many percentages are rounded to whole numbers, sometimes resulting in percentages totaling 99% or 101%.

The methodological improvements included in this Report have been applied to previous years to allow for accurate year-over-year comparisons. This means that some numbers and percentages at the state and county level will not match those reported in previous ALICE Reports for Indiana.


TABLE OF CONTENTS

Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed	1
Who Is ALICE?	3
Trends: Household Demographics	5
The Cost of Living in Indiana	6
The ALICE Household Budgets	6
The ALICE Essentials Index	8
Trends: Cost of Living	9
The Changing Landscape of Work in Indiana	11
The New Labor Force	13
ALICE Jobs: Maintaining the Economy	15
Trends: The Landscape of Work	17
Next Steps: Data for Action	19
Identifying Gaps	19
Understanding ALICE: Health, Education, and Social Factors	21
The Benefits of Moving Toward Equity in Indiana	22
Endnotes	27
Figure 12	36

ASSET LIMITED, INCOME CONSTRAINED, EMPLOYED

From 2010 to 2018, Indiana showed steady economic improvements according to traditional measures. Unemployment in the state and across the U.S. fell to historic lows, GDP grew, and wages rose slightly. Yet in 2018, eight years after the end of the Great Recession, 37% of Indiana's 2,592,262 households still struggled to make ends meet. And while 13% of these households were living below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), another 24% – almost twice as many – were **ALICE** households: **A**sset **L**imited, **I**ncome **C**onstrained, **E**mloyed. These households earned above the FPL, but not enough to afford basic household necessities.

This Report provides new data and tools that explain the persistent level of hardship faced by ALICE households, revealing aspects of the Indiana economy not tracked by traditional economic measures. The Report highlights three critical trends:



The Report highlights three critical trends:

- **The cost of living is increasing for ALICE households.** From 2007 to 2018, the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and technology) increased faster than the cost of other goods and services. The ALICE Essentials Index, a new tool that measures change over time in the cost of essentials, increased at an average rate of 3.4% annually nationwide over the past decade, while the official rate of inflation was 1.8%.
- **Worker vulnerability is increasing while wages stagnate in ALICE jobs.** By 2018, a near-record-low number of people were reported to be unemployed. However, that low unemployment concealed three trends that expose ALICE workers to greater risk: growth in the number of low-wage jobs, minimal increases in wages, and more fluctuations in job hours, schedules, and benefits that make it harder to budget and plan. These trends were clear in 2018: A record number of Indiana workers – 59% – were paid by the hour, and 66% percent of the state's jobs paid less than \$20 per hour.
- **The number of ALICE households has increased in Indiana** as a result of rising costs and stagnant wages. There are more ALICE households than households in poverty, and the number of ALICE households is increasing at a faster rate. The FPL, with its minimal and uniform national estimate of the cost of living, far underestimates the number of households that cannot afford to live and work in the modern economy. In Indiana, the percentage of households that were ALICE rose from 16% in 2007 to 24% in 2018, while the percentage of poverty-level households remained relatively flat, increasing slightly from 12% to 13% during that time period.

This Report provides critical measures that assess Indiana's economy from four perspectives: They track financial hardship over time and across demographic groups; quantify the basic cost of living in Indiana; assess job trends; and identify gaps in assistance and community resources. These measures also debunk assumptions and stereotypes about low-income workers and families. ALICE households are as diverse as the general population, composed of people of all ages, genders, races, and ethnicities, living in rural, urban, and suburban areas.

The Report concludes with an analysis of the economic benefits if all households had income above the ALICE Threshold. Not only would there be a significant positive impact on families and their communities, but the state economy would also benefit. In fact, the added value to the Indiana GDP would be approximately \$57.5 billion.

This Report and its measures are tools to help stakeholders ask the right questions, reduce vulnerabilities, remove obstacles to advancement, identify gaps in community resources, build a stronger workforce, and implement programs and policies that help put financial stability within reach for ALICE households. With the magnitude of financial hardship revealed, these actions can help move all households toward a more equitable economy, and ensure that no one is left behind in harder times.

GLOSSARY

ALICE is an acronym that stands for **A**sset **L**imited, **I**ncome **C**onstrained, **E**mployed – households with income above the Federal Poverty Level but below the basic cost of living. A household consists of all the people who occupy a housing unit. In this Report, households do not include those living in group quarters such as a dorm, nursing home, or prison.

The **Household Survival Budget** estimates the actual bare-minimum costs of basic necessities (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan) in Indiana, adjusted for different counties and household types.

The **Senior Survival Budget** incorporates specific cost estimates for seniors for food, transportation, and health care, reflecting key differences in household expenses by age.

The **Household Stability Budget** calculates the costs of supporting and sustaining an economically viable household over time, including a contingency for savings.

The **ALICE Threshold** is the average income that a household needs to afford the basic necessities defined by the Household Survival Budget for each county in Indiana. Households **Below the ALICE Threshold** include both ALICE and poverty-level households.

The **ALICE Essentials Index** is a measure of the average change over time in the costs of the essential goods and services that households need to live and work in the modern economy – housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a smartphone plans

ALICE ONLINE

Visit UnitedForALICE.org for more details about ALICE, including:



Interactive Maps

Data at the state, county, municipal, ZIP code, and congressional district levels



Research Advisory Committee

Learn about the members and role of this critical group



Additional Reports

Explore The ALICE Essentials Index and The Consequences of Insufficient Household Income



Demographic Data

Information about ALICE households by age, race/ethnicity, and household type



Data Spreadsheet

Download the ALICE data



Jobs Graphs

Details about where ALICE works



County Profiles

Detailed data about ALICE households in each county



Methodology

Overview of the sources and calculations used in the ALICE research



More about United For ALICE


See our partners, press coverage, learning communities, etc.

WHO IS ALICE?

With income above the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) but below a basic survival threshold – defined as the ALICE Threshold – ALICE households earn too much to qualify as “poor” but are still unable to make ends meet. They often work as cashiers, nursing assistants, office clerks, servers, laborers, and security guards. These types of jobs are vital to keeping Indiana’s economy running smoothly, but they do not provide adequate wages to cover the basics of housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and technology for these ALICE workers and their families.

The number of Indiana households living in poverty rose from 12% in 2007 to 14% in 2010, and then held steady through 2016 before decreasing slightly to 13% in 2018. The total number of households in the state increased 5%, from 2,462,278 in 2007 to 2,592,262 households in 2018. Yet the number of ALICE households in Indiana increased significantly more (52%), with their share of households rising from 16% in 2007 to 24% in 2018. Overall, the percentage of households living below the ALICE Threshold (ALICE and poverty-level households combined), rose from 28% in 2007 to 37% in 2018 (Figure 1).


Figure 1.
Households by Income, Indiana, 2007-2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2007-2018; American Community Survey, 2007-2018

ALICE households live in every county in Indiana – urban, suburban, and rural – and they include people of all genders, ages, and races/ethnicities, across all household types. Figure 2 shows that in 2018, the largest numbers of households below the ALICE Threshold were in the largest demographic groups in Indiana. White households accounted for 82% of total households in 2018, and 33% of White households earned below the ALICE threshold. Two other large groups with a high proportion of households below the ALICE Threshold are households headed by someone in their prime working years (ages 25-64) and single or cohabiting households (without children or seniors). Among families with children – another of the state’s biggest groups – married-parent families were the largest subgroup and accounted for 29% of families with children living below the ALICE Threshold.

Figure 2.
Household Types by Income, Largest Groups, Indiana, 2018




Note: Categories shown in figure are overlapping.

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Another way to examine the data is to look at the proportion of each group that is below the ALICE Threshold. Overall, 37% of households in Indiana had income below the ALICE Threshold in 2018. But many smaller groups had a disproportionately high percentage of families below the ALICE Threshold, including Hispanic and Black households, young households (headed by someone under age 25), and single-female-headed households with children (Figure 3).

Figure 3.
Select Household Groups by Income, Indiana, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

TRENDS: HOUSEHOLD DEMOGRAPHICS

A growing number of households live on the edge of the ALICE Threshold. For these households, even a small increase in the cost of housing or a decrease in work hours can mean the difference between being financially stable and being ALICE — or between being ALICE and falling into poverty. **In Indiana, 275,093 households (11%) were on the cusp of the ALICE Threshold in 2018**, with earnings just above or below it.³ This matters not only for families, but also for the Indiana economy: Small increases in regular bills like rent, food, or gasoline; a decrease in wages or hours worked; or an unexpected emergency, such as a factory closing or a natural disaster, could destabilize a large number of households.

Indiana is becoming more diverse. Each of the state's racial and ethnic groups expanded between 2010 and 2018; but the trajectories for population growth and financial hardship among these groups differed. The largest group, White households, is aging, divided between urban and rural areas, and showed the slowest overall growth, increasing by 2%. White households also experienced a 6% decrease in the number of households below the ALICE Threshold.

All other racial/ethnic groups tend to be younger, are more likely to live in urban areas, and experienced larger increases in both total population and number of households below the ALICE Threshold between 2010 and 2018. Black households increased by 10%, and the number of Black households below the ALICE Threshold increased by 9%. Hispanic households increased by 28%, and the number of Hispanic households below the ALICE Threshold increased by 16%. And the smallest group, Asian households, increased by 45%, while the number of Asian households below the ALICE Threshold increased by 44%.

Most of Indiana's population growth, particularly among non-White groups, occurred in metropolitan areas, especially the Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson metro area — including Boone, Hamilton, Hancock, and Hendricks counties. In contrast, counties with mid-sized communities and rural areas saw a decline in population. More than one-third of Indiana's rural counties, which are largely White, lost population in 2018.⁴

Indiana's household structure continues to change. Married-parent families with children are no longer the most common household type. In 2018, single or cohabiting adults under age 65 with no children under age 18 made up the largest proportion of households in Indiana (47%), as well as the largest share of households below the ALICE Threshold (44%). Nationally, the number of cohabiting adults, in particular, more than doubled between 1996 and 2017, and these partners tend to have higher levels of education and be more racially diverse today than cohabiting adults 20 years ago.⁵

Baby boomers and millennials, the two largest population bubbles, are getting older. This natural aging of the population is increasing the number of seniors as more baby boomers pass the age of 65; boomers are now between the ages of 55 and 73. By 2030, one in five Hoosiers will be a senior citizen. There are three trends among seniors: First, the White population in Indiana will continue to account for an increasing share of the senior population. Second, having lived through a decade of financial challenges since the Great Recession, more Indiana seniors will become ALICE. And third, seniors make up a larger portion of households in rural areas, where they will continue to face additional challenges in access to transportation, health care, and caregiving.⁶ A 2020 report on the best and worst place for seniors to live ranked Indiana 33rd out of 50 states, with high scores for affordability, but low scores in access to health care providers, social involvement, and other quality-of-life factors.⁷

As millennials, the other population bubble, get older, the proportion of both college-age students and families with children is declining due to several factors: Millennials have passed traditional college age, are having fewer children, and are waiting longer than previous generations to start a family.⁸

Inequality in income and wealth will continue to rise as wage growth and job stability in high-wage jobs greatly outpace wage growth and stability at the lower end. Nationwide, from the late 1940s to the early 1970s, incomes across the income distribution grew at nearly the same pace. Then, beginning in the 1970s, income disparities began to widen: The average income for the top 1% increased over five times more than that of the middle 60% and over three times more than that of the bottom fifth, from 1979 to 2016.⁹ The gap in wealth (savings and assets) is even greater. Unable to save, ALICE families do not have the means to build assets, let alone catch up to those who already have assets, (especially those who have been building assets for generations). ALICE families also face more barriers that, when compounded, create an even bigger wealth gap. These include issues like lower pay for women, racial/ethnic discrimination in homeownership, and student loan debt.¹⁰

THE COST OF LIVING IN INDIANA

Traditional economic measures systematically underestimate the actual cost of basic needs and their rate of increase over time, concealing important aspects of the local and national economy. To better capture the reality of how much income households need to live and work in the modern economy in each county in Indiana, this Report includes the **ALICE Household Budgets**. In addition, the Report presents the **ALICE Essentials Index**, a standardized national measure that captures change over time in the cost of household essentials that ALICE households purchase. Together, these tools provide a more accurate estimate of the cost of living and a clearer way to track change over time.

THE ALICE HOUSEHOLD BUDGETS

United For ALICE provides three basic budgets for all counties in Indiana. Each budget can be calculated for various household types.

- The **ALICE Household Survival Budget** is an estimate of the minimal total cost of household essentials — housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and technology, plus taxes and a miscellaneous contingency fund equal to 10% of the budget. It does not include savings, auto repairs, cable service, travel, laundry costs, or amenities such as holiday gifts or dinner at a restaurant that many families take for granted.
- The **Senior Survival Budget**, new to this Report, adjusts the Household Survival Budget to reflect the fact that seniors have lower food costs than younger adults, travel fewer miles for work and family responsibilities, and have increasing health needs and out-of-pocket health care expenses.
- For comparison to a more sustainable budget, the **ALICE Household Stability Budget** estimates the higher costs of maintaining a viable household over time, and it is the only ALICE budget to include a savings category, equal to 10% of the budget.

The actual cost of household basics in every county in Indiana is well above the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) for all household sizes and types (Figure 4). For a single adult, the FPL was \$12,140 per year in 2018, but the average Household Survival Budget in Indiana was \$21,228 per year.¹¹ The average Senior Survival Budget totaled \$24,024 per year, primarily due to increased health costs. (Despite having Medicare, seniors have greater out-of-pocket health care costs, largely due to increased spending on chronic health issues like heart disease and diabetes.) And all budgets were significantly lower than the Household Stability Budget, which reached \$41,748 per year for a single adult.


The gaps are even larger for families. The FPL for a four-person family was \$25,100 in 2018, while the Household Survival Budget for a family with two adults, an infant, and a four-year-old was \$60,756.¹²

The hourly wages needed to support these budgets were \$10.61 for the single adult Survival Budget; \$12.01 for the Senior Survival Budget; and \$30.38 for one worker or \$15.19 each for two workers for the Survival Budget for a family of four. To put these budgets in perspective, the median hourly wage for cashiers, one of the top five most common occupations in Indiana, was \$9.68 per hour in 2018, or \$19,360 if full time, year-round — not enough to support any of the ALICE budgets.

Public assistance programs are based on the FPL, but the FPL is not enough for a household to cover even its most minimal costs, as shown by the comparison to the Household Survival Budget in Figure 4. This means that assistance programs serve far fewer households than actually need assistance, even in a strong economy.

To see the details of each ALICE budget for different household types, visit UnitedForALICE.org/Indiana

Figure 4.
Budget Comparison, Indiana, 2018



Note: The FPL is a total; there is no breakdown of how that amount is allocated by budget category.


Sources: AAA, 2018; Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018—Consumer Expenditure Surveys; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018—Occupational Employment Statistics; Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2019; Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2019—Medicare - Chronic Conditions; Child Care Aware of America, 2018; Federal Highway Administration, 2017; Fowler, 2019; Gundersen, Dewey, Kato, Crumbaugh, and Strayer, 2019; Internal Revenue Service, 2020; Scarboro, 2018; The Zebra, 2018; U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2018—Official USDA Food Plans; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2018—Fair Market Rents; Walczak, 2019. For more details, see the Methodology Overview at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/Methodology)

THE ALICE ESSENTIALS INDEX

Based on items in the Household Survival Budget, the ALICE Essentials Index measures the change over time in the costs of household essentials – a much narrower definition than the more common rate of inflation based on the BLS Consumer Price Index (CPI). While the CPI covers a large group of goods and services that urban consumers buy regularly (housing, food and beverages, transportation, medical care, apparel, recreation, education, and communication services), the ALICE Essentials Index includes only essential household items (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a smartphone plan). The ALICE Essentials Index is also calculated for both urban and rural areas, while the CPI only tracks inflation based on a select number of metropolitan (urban) counties.¹³

Across the country, the ALICE Essentials Index has increased faster than the CPI over the last decade (Figure 5). From 2007 to 2018, the average annual rate of increase was 3.3% in urban areas and 3.4% in rural areas, while the CPI increased by 1.8%.¹⁴ This difference is primarily due to the fact that the costs of basics, especially housing and health care, have increased, while the costs of other items – notably manufactured goods, from apparel to cars – have remained relatively flat. And while basic household goods were 18% to 22% more expensive in urban areas than in rural areas, those costs increased at nearly the same rate in both areas during this period.

Figure 5.
Consumer Price Index and ALICE Essentials Index, United States, 2007-2018



Sources: ALICE Essentials Index, 2007-2018; Bureau of Labor Statistics—Consumer Price Index, 2007-2018. For more information, visit [UnitedForALICE.org/Essentials-Index](https://www.unitedforalice.org/essentials-index)

The difference between these two cost-of-living measures is more than an academic question. The CPI is used to measure inflation and monitor monetary policy. It also determines the rate at which a wide range of government program levels and benefits are increased, including Social Security, veterans’ and Federal Civil Service retirees’ benefits, government assistance programs, the FPL, income tax brackets, and tax credits like the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC).¹⁵ But the ALICE Essentials Index shows that from 2007 to 2018, the CPI considerably underestimated the increase in the cost of living across the country.

TRENDS: COST OF LIVING

The cost of living for ALICE is growing significantly in both urban and rural areas, often driven by the cost of housing. In Indiana, rising costs in urban areas — such as the Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson metro area — are due to population growth and increasing demand for low-cost rental units (especially among millennials and seniors). And while the overall cost of living in rural America is lower than in metro areas, expenses — especially housing — are rising at similar rates in both areas. A recent national report calculated that renters who earn Indiana’s minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour would have to work 71 hours a week to afford a modest one-bedroom apartment at fair market rate. Adding to the affordable housing crisis, more than 30,000 renter households are evicted statewide each year. Nationwide, households that are severely rent burdened (with rent accounting for more than 50% of their income) are projected to grow by at least 11%, to 13.1 million households, by 2025.¹⁶

Commuting times will continue to increase, as will demand for alternative transportation options. High housing costs and urban sprawl push workers farther from their jobs and increase commute times, which has a negative impact on health, job retention, and productivity. These pressures — along with the cost of owning and maintaining a car, which is essential to live and work in most parts of Indiana — will increase demand for both traditional and new public transportation options (e.g., trains and buses, rideshares, and self-driving vehicles).¹⁷

The child care industry will face new challenges, and so will parents. As the number of families with children starts to decrease (it fell 5% in Indiana from 2010 to 2018), it will be harder for child care centers to stay in business, making child care more difficult to find and more expensive, especially in less populated areas. Fifty-five percent of Indiana residents live in a child care desert, defined as having no child care providers at all, or so few options that there are three times as many children for each available licensed child care slot. Shortages are even more pronounced in rural areas, where 72% of families have limited access to licensed child care centers.¹⁸ With more than two-thirds of mothers with young children in Indiana in the labor force, the need for affordable, quality child care already exists. Since single-parent families are more likely to be below the ALICE Threshold, they will experience the most significant financial hardship in accessing and affording quality child care. According to Child Care Aware, single parents in Indiana pay, on average, 52% of their income for center-based infant child care. Compounding this issue is the fact that low-paid child care workers are ALICE as well (with a median hourly wage of \$9.75 in Indiana).¹⁹ The overall trend, then, is toward fewer families with children but more who are struggling.

“ In 2018, compared to other age groups in Indiana, households headed by adults under the age of 25 were more likely to be below the ALICE Threshold, and they often struggled to put food on the table. ”

Food insecurity is increasing among young adults and seniors. In 2018, compared to other age groups in Indiana, households headed by adults under the age of 25 were more likely to be below the ALICE Threshold, and they often struggled to put food on the table. For example, reports consistently find higher rates of food insecurity among college students. There is also growing food insecurity at the other end of the age spectrum, with a projected 8 million food-insecure seniors nationwide by 2050. Compared to other seniors, food-insecure seniors are more than twice as likely to have depression, 91% more likely to have asthma, 66% more likely to have had a heart attack, and 57% more likely to have congestive heart failure. Public benefits help but do not eliminate the need for emergency assistance measures, such as food pantries.²⁰

College students across the country are facing greater challenges in meeting living expenses, despite the fact that increasing numbers of students are working full or part time. Students often rely on multiple sources of financial support, including financial aid, student loans, and assistance from parents or other family members, to cover their living expenses. Yet even with these types of financial help, many students need to work while in school; in particular, more than two-thirds of students enrolled in community colleges work full or part time.²¹ In a recent financial wellness survey, 56% of students report paying for college using money from their current employment, and 31% of students pay for college with credit cards, leading to accumulation of increased debt.²² Working long hours to earn more income comes at a price, as it can interfere with academic performance and ultimately the likelihood of obtaining a degree.²³ Students report that two of the major obstacles to academic success are juggling work with school and other responsibilities and difficulty meeting expenses.²⁴ For more information, see the 2019 United For ALICE Report, *The Consequences of Insufficient Household Income*.

Gaps in health based on demographic, environmental, and socioeconomic factors will continue to grow. Volatility in health insurance availability and coverage, increasing out-of-pocket costs – even for those with employer-sponsored programs – and shortages of health care providers (especially in rural areas) make it harder for many families to get the health care they need.²⁵ On a range of measures, including avoidable hospital use and cost, and the disparity in care between high- and low-income patients, Indiana ranked 37th out of 50 states in the Commonwealth Fund’s 2018 survey of state health systems.²⁶ These disparities will grow with new but expensive advances in medicine, compounded exposure to environmental hazards and public health crises for many low-income households, and a persistent context of discrimination and institutionalized racism in Indiana and across the country.²⁷

Natural and human-made disasters will continue to impact ALICE households disproportionately. In 2018, many counties in Indiana saw the worst flooding in decades. In addition to heavy rains and severe thunderstorms, a recent report found that tornado activity is expanding east beyond Tornado Alley to Indiana and neighboring states.²⁸ Across Indiana, the increasing impact of disasters – from floods and wildfires to pandemics – is felt most acutely by ALICE households and their surrounding communities. With minimal job security and little to no savings, ALICE families feel the impact of an economic disruption almost immediately, as hourly paid workers suffer lost wages right away. ALICE households are more vulnerable during natural disasters, as they often live in communities with fewer resources, and their housing is more susceptible to flooding, fire, and other hazards. With no financial cushion, ALICE workers struggle to repair damage, recover from illness, and pay ongoing bills. At the same time, ALICE workers are essential to disaster recovery efforts in both infrastructure repair and health care, and they are often forced to choose between caring for their families and ensuring community recovery. All of these costs are added to the increased risk of physical harm ALICE families face if they cannot afford to flee an oncoming natural disaster or take necessary precautions during a public health crisis.²⁹

Financial instability will mean additional costs for ALICE households. The costs of financial instability are cumulative and intensify over time. Skimping on essentials, from food to health care, leads to greater long-term problems (see United For ALICE’s 2019 Report *The Consequences of Insufficient Household Income*). Failure to pay bills on time leads to fees, penalties, and low credit scores, which in turn increase interest rates, insurance rates, and costs for other financial transactions (from check-cashing fees to payday cards).³⁰ Unexpected expenses can intensify these impacts. In 2017, only 62% of Indiana households had set aside any money in the prior 12 months that could be used for unexpected expenses or emergencies such as illness or the loss of a job. Though this was well above the national rate of 42%, it still left more than one third of Hoosiers without any financial cushion. And without enough income to cover current and unexpected expenses, ALICE households cannot save for future expenses like education, retirement, or a down payment on a house.³¹

THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF WORK IN INDIANA

ALICE workers play an essential role in Indiana’s economy but have not benefited from many of the state’s recent economic gains — a reality that is not captured by traditional economic measures. This section breaks down labor force data in new ways, and in so doing highlights the challenges ALICE workers face: the declining power of wages to keep up with the cost of living, greater dependence on hourly wages, more than one-third of adults out of the labor force, and increased economic risk for workers.

With a steadily rising GDP and low unemployment, Indiana appeared to have a robust economic profile in 2018, with only 3% of adults actively looking but unable to find work. The state’s central location at the “Crossroads of America” continued to draw companies from the transportation and warehousing industry, while tech companies have migrated to Indianapolis for its affordability — with both industries bringing new jobs to the state. Manufacturing continued to be a leading industry for Indiana in 2018, yet the industry has been declining and is expected to shrink further over the next few years, leading to more job losses. Sectors that are expected to have the strongest job growth include health care, professional and business services, construction, and leisure.³²


While Indiana realized overall economic gains since the end of the Great Recession as a result of job growth and reduced unemployment, not all Hoosiers benefited. Low-wage jobs increased faster than medium- and high-wage jobs, leaving many households struggling to make ends meet.

Figure 6 illustrates the following trends in wages compared to the cost of living in Indiana from 2007 to 2018:

- Low-wage jobs (dark-blue line) are defined as those paying less than the wage needed for two workers to afford the family Household Survival Budget (which includes costs for two adults, an infant, and a four-year-old). In 2007, this was less than \$10.56 per hour; by 2018, the wage required had increased to \$15.19 per hour. From 2007 to 2018, the number of low-wage jobs increased by 106% and accounted for 30% of jobs in Indiana in 2018. This shows that even with two earners working full time, it is not only possible, but common for households to fall below the ALICE Threshold.
- Medium-wage jobs (medium-blue line) allow two workers to afford a family Household Survival Budget. In 2007, these were jobs that paid between \$10.56 and \$21.11 per hour per worker; by 2018, wages needed for these jobs were between \$15.19 and \$30.38 per hour per worker. The number of medium-wage jobs decreased dramatically during the Great Recession (39%), and have slowly rebounded, so that by 2018, there were only 8% fewer medium-wage jobs than in 2007.
- High-wage jobs (light-blue line) allow one worker to afford a family Household Survival Budget. In 2007, the wage required was \$21.11 per hour or more; by 2018, the wage required had increased to \$30.38 per hour. The number of high-wage jobs decreased dramatically, by 29% during that period.³³

“Low-wage jobs increased faster than medium- and high-wage jobs, leaving many households struggling to make ends meet.”

Figure 6.
Number of Jobs by Wage Level, Indiana, 2007-2018




Note: Wage levels are defined by their relation to the Household Survival Budget. Dark blue = Job cannot support family Household Survival Budget with two earners. Medium blue = Job supports family Household Survival Budget with two earners. Light blue = Job supports family Household Survival Budget with one earner.

Sources: ALICE Household Survival Budget, 2007-2018; Bureau of Labor Statistics, Labor Force Statistics, 2007-2018—Occupational Employment Statistics

THE NEW LABOR FORCE

A 2018 overview of the labor status of Indiana's 5,299,339 working-age adults (people age 16 and over) shows that 64% of adults were in the labor force (blue bars in Figure 7), yet more than half of them were workers who were paid hourly. In addition, 37% of adults were outside the labor force (gold bars).³⁴

Figure 7.
Labor Status, Population Age 16 and Over, Indiana, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total Indiana workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year. Many percentages are rounded to whole numbers, sometimes resulting in percentages totaling 99% or 101%.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Though the majority of adults in Indiana were working in 2018 and most households had at least one worker, only 24% of working-age adults had the security of a full-time job with a salary. The rest were paid hourly and/or worked part time.³⁵

Hourly Work and the Gig Economy

Employers' increasing reliance on hourly workers is typically associated with freelance "gig economy" jobs (like rideshare driving or on-demand delivery), but even traditional jobs are now more likely to be paid by the hour, especially in retail, health care, food service, and construction.³⁶ These workers are more likely to have fluctuations in income, with frequent schedule changes and variation in the number of hours available for work each week/month. They are also less likely to receive benefits, such as health insurance, paid time off, family leave, or retirement benefits, especially if they work fewer than 30 hours per week at a single job.³⁷

Hourly workers are more likely to have multiple sources of income. Traditional measures of employment have focused on the number of jobs held by a worker; for example, BLS estimates that only 5% of workers held two or more jobs in 2018.³⁸ However, in the modern economy, where many workers have their own small business, are consultants, or are contingent, temporary, freelance, or contract workers, a worker may have many sources of income that are not necessarily considered a “job.” In 2019, nearly half (45%) of working adults reported having a side gig outside of their primary job.³⁹

In comparison with hourly workers, salaried workers are paid an annual amount at regular pay periods, and usually receive benefits. Nationally, employers spent an average of 31% of compensation on benefits in 2018; not providing these represents significant savings to the employer. As a result, even traditional jobs are morphing as employers shift the financial risk of changes in supply and demand to employees.⁴⁰ While this is true throughout the economy, it is especially concentrated in lower-wage positions – the jobs most accessible to ALICE.

Who is Out of the Labor Force?

Of adults 16 years and older in Indiana, 16% were out of the labor force in 2018 because they were retired and another 21% were out of the labor force for other reasons (gold bars in Figure 7). This totals 37% of adults outside the labor force – a number that has remained relatively consistent since 2010.⁴¹

Many of those out of the labor force had stopped looking for work for a variety of reasons, such as scheduling, transportation, or child care issues. They were not included in the state’s low unemployment rate, which only counts adults actively looking for work. In the 2018 economy, those out of the labor force had proven to be a large reserve of potential workers able to be drawn back into the labor force with only slightly higher wages – in effect, keeping wages low. In previous periods of low unemployment, employers have had to offer much higher wages to attract workers back into the labor force or away from other businesses.⁴²

One of the largest groups of adults traditionally out of the labor force is retirees (age 65 and over and not working). In Indiana in 2018, they accounted for 16% of the population over age 16 – an unusually high percentage, in part due to the baby boomer generation aging into retirement. This number does not include the increasing number of seniors who are still working; in 2018, 22% of seniors in Indiana were still in the labor force.⁴³

Those under 65 and not working accounted for another 21% of the population over age 16, and they were out of the labor force for a variety of reasons, the two most common being:

- **School:** Nationally, 77% of high school students and 52% of college students did not work in 2018. At these rates, non-working students in Indiana would account for approximately one-third (34%) of the state’s working-age adults out of the workforce.⁴⁴
- **Health:** Adults with one or more health issues – an illness or disability that makes it difficult to get to work, perform some job functions, or work long hours – accounted for one-quarter of those out of the labor force in Indiana in 2018.⁴⁵

The remainder of adults were out of the labor force for other reasons, including family caregiving responsibilities or limited access to transportation or child care.⁴⁶ For women 25 to 54 years old, the most common reason for not working in 2018 was in-home responsibilities – caring for children, but also, as the population of Indiana ages, caring for an aging parent or a family member with a disability or chronic health issue.⁴⁷

ALICE JOBS: MAINTAINING THE ECONOMY

While national conversations about work often focus on the economic importance of the “innovation” sector and its high-paying jobs, the reality is that the smooth functioning of the national and Indiana economies relies on a much larger number of occupations that build and repair the infrastructure and educate and care for the past, current, and future workforce. The workers in these jobs are described as “Maintainers” by technology scholars Lee Vinsel and Andrew Russell, and they are primarily ALICE.⁴⁸ To better understand where ALICE works, we elaborate on Vinsel and Russell’s concept by breaking down all occupations in Indiana into two occupational categories, each with two job types: the lower-paying Maintainer occupations, composed of Infrastructor and Nurturer jobs; and the higher-paying Innovator occupations, composed of Adaptor and Inventor jobs.

DEFINITIONS

Maintainer Occupations:

Infrastructors build and maintain the physical economy (construction, maintenance, management, administration, manufacturing, agriculture, mining, transportation, retail).

Nurturers care for and educate the workforce (health and education, food service, arts, tourism, hospitality).

Innovator Occupations:


Adaptors implement existing tools or processes in new ways, responding to opportunities and changing circumstances (managers, industrial and organizational psychologists, analysts, designers, technicians, and even policymakers).

Inventors devise new processes, appliances, machines, or ideas. Before World War II, most inventors were independent entrepreneurs. Today, they are most likely engineers and scientists working in research & development, and, in some cases, higher education.

The largest employment sectors in Indiana are Maintainer occupations. The single largest industry in 2018, with 598,300 employees, was trade, transportation, and utilities, which is comprised of Infrastructor jobs. The second largest, also comprised of Infrastructor jobs, was manufacturing, with 542,900 employees. Education and health services, mainly comprised of Nurturer jobs, followed, with 478,400 employees. Each of these industries have large shares of ALICE workers.⁴⁹ There are far fewer jobs in Innovator occupations (Adaptors and Inventors).

When stacked together, Indiana’s occupations form a pyramid that reveals the critical role of Maintainer jobs – the jobs most accessible to ALICE – in the state economy (Figure 8). The majority of Maintainer jobs (67% of Infrastructor jobs and 63% of Nurturer jobs) pay less than \$20 per hour – a wage that, if full time, year-round, provides a maximum annual salary of less than \$40,000, which is \$20,756 less than the family Household Survival Budget of \$60,756. By comparison, almost all Adaptor and Inventor occupations pay more than \$20 per hour.


Figure 8.
Occupations by Wage and Type, Indiana, 2018



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Labor Force Statistics, 2018—Occupational Employment Statistics

The precarious nature of ALICE workers' jobs is reinforced by the powerful relationship between low wages and the high risk of jobs becoming automated (defined as having a greater than 50% chance of being replaced by technology in the next decade). Jobs that pay less than \$20 per hour are more likely to be replaced by technology compared to higher-paying jobs. This is especially true for Maintainer occupations, where most jobs pay less than \$20 per hour and 87% of these low-paying jobs are at a high risk of automation. By comparison, only 36% of Maintainer jobs that pay more than \$20 per hour are at that level of risk (Figure 9).

Figure 9.
Occupations by Type and Risk of Automation, Indiana, 2018



Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2018—Occupational Employment Statistics; Frey & Osborne, 2013

There are also differences in salary and risk of automation based on the type of Maintainer job. Among Infrastructor jobs, 95% of jobs that pay less than \$20 per hour are at risk of automation, compared to 54% of those that pay more than \$20 per hour. Among Nurturer jobs, the discrepancy is even greater: 67% of jobs that pay less than \$20 per hour are at risk of automation compared with 2% of those that pay more than \$20 per hour.⁵⁰ Education level also impacts risk of automation; jobs that require only a high school diploma are more than 200% more likely to be at risk of automation compared to jobs that require a bachelor’s degree.⁵¹

TRENDS: THE LANDSCAPE OF WORK

Economic growth will be led by the non-traditional work and small businesses of the gig economy. As much as 94% of U.S. net employment growth in the last decade has come from alternative or contingent labor, according to a National Bureau of Economic Research report.⁵² With an increasing number of workers who are contractors, work in small businesses, or rely on a combination of side gigs, the number of people experiencing gaps in income and going without benefits will also rise. Millennials are leading the way in this trend, with 48% nationally saying they earn income on the side (i.e., in addition to what they consider their primary employment), compared to 28% of baby boomers.⁵³ Since 2012, Indianapolis began to see a rise in the number of gig workers, largely because of gig-economy apps like Uber, DoorDash, and Airbnb, leading to more freelance jobs than ever before. While some workers are drawn to the flexibility, these arrangements are more volatile than traditional jobs. Freelancers bear the brunt of changes in demand, the price of materials, and transportation costs, as well as impacts related to cyberattacks, natural and human-made disasters, and economic downturns.⁵⁴

The rise of automation will require a workforce with more digital skills. Rather than being replaced outright, many jobs, across all job types, will require an increasing ability to incorporate new technologies, work with data, and make data-based decisions.⁵⁵ ALICE workers will need to gain new skills rapidly, and that will require more on-the-job training, more flexibility to change career paths, and different kinds of education providers.⁵⁶ The benefits of increased technology will include improved connectivity for small businesses in rural areas, accuracy in work such as pharmaceutical pill dispensing, and reduced risk of injury for workers such as warehouse packers and long-distance drivers.⁵⁷

The number of low-wage jobs will continue to increase, despite automation. Even though most jobs will change and evolve, a large portion will remain low-wage. For example, the wages in many Maintainer jobs are so low that it would be more expensive to automate them. Other low-wage jobs in areas like education and health care require employees to be on-site and are difficult to fully automate (although these workers will still have to learn to work with technology). From 2016 to 2026, the occupation projected to have the largest number of new jobs in Indiana is food preparation and serving workers; the median wage for these jobs in 2018 was \$9.05 per hour, which was not enough to support the single-adult or family Survival Budgets. Of the state's top 20 growth occupations, 60% will pay less than \$15 per hour, 37% will not require any formal educational credential at all, and 30% will require only a high school diploma.⁵⁸

Students will continue to be a significant part of the labor force. As more families face financial hardship and the cost of college continues to rise, more students will have to work while in school. Nationally, 20% of high school students, 41% of full-time college students, and 82% of part-time college students had a job in 2017.⁵⁹ What's more, despite many students being employed, 45% of college students who completed the largest annual survey of basic college needs reported having experienced food insecurity in the previous month, and 56% had experienced housing insecurity in the prior year.⁶⁰ And even with more students working, student debt will continue to increase as more students from lower-income families attend college and costs continue to rise. In Indiana, 57% of college students who graduated in 2018 were in debt with an average loan of \$29,064, an 8% increase from 2010.⁶¹

NEXT STEPS: DATA FOR ACTION

The ALICE data highlights significant problems in the Indiana economy in 2018: stagnant wages, a rising cost of living, and 37% of the state's households unable to afford even the most basic budget. However, this data can also be used to generate solutions to these problems that help ALICE households and create equity across communities. The measures of cost of living, financial hardship, and changes in the labor force presented in this Report can help stakeholders ask the right questions and make data-driven decisions. This data can help policymakers and community organizations identify gaps in community resources, and it can guide businesses in finding additional ways to assist their workforce and increase productivity — both in times of economic growth and in periods of economic recovery.

This section of the Report maps the 2018 ALICE data, showing gaps in resources to help direct assistance and fill immediate needs. When analyzed in relation to broader data on health, education, and social factors, these maps help focus solutions on underlying causes of hardship, and they also highlight areas of success.

IDENTIFYING GAPS

ALICE households often live in areas with limited community resources, making it even more difficult to make ends meet. The lack of some resources has immediate and direct costs. For example, without public transportation or nearby publicly funded preschools, ALICE families pay more for transportation and child care. Other costs, such as the consequences of limited access to health care providers, open space, or libraries, accumulate over time.

With the ALICE data tools, stakeholders can map where ALICE lives along with the location of community resources — such as public libraries or disaster-relief services — to identify gaps by town, ZIP code, or county (Figure 10). This data can help stakeholders answer targeted questions, including the following:


Do ALICE households have access to libraries?

Access to public libraries is especially important for ALICE families because libraries provide information on social services and job opportunities, free internet and computer access, and a range of free programs, community meetings, and even 3-D printers. After a natural disaster, libraries serve as second responders, providing electricity, internet access, charging stations, heat or air conditioning, and current information on recovery efforts.⁶² In lower-income communities, the library can provide a safe and inclusive place for individuals and families. A 2019 Gallup Poll found that lower-income households (earning less than \$40,000 per year) visit the library more frequently than average- and higher-income households.⁶³

There are 435 libraries across Indiana's 92 counties, shown in gold dots in Figure 10 (and in an interactive feature on UnitedForALICE.org/Indiana).⁶⁴ This data can help stakeholders identify where there are gaps in needed services (such as in areas with a high percentage of ALICE households but few or no libraries) and what type of intervention might be most helpful. For example, areas with a small population but a high percentage of ALICE households may benefit more from mobile library services than a new brick-and-mortar building, or library services (like free computers) could be offered in other public buildings.

Figure 10.

Library Locations and Households Below ALICE Threshold, Indiana, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018; The Institute of Museum and Library Services, 2019

Are the needs of ALICE households met after a natural disaster?

Mapping where ALICE households live in relation to the impact of natural disasters, such as floods, hurricanes, or wildfires, can help first and second responders meet critical needs. Disasters directly threaten the homes of ALICE families since more affordable housing is often located in vulnerable areas. The jobs where ALICE works are also more at risk, since low-wage and hourly paid jobs are more likely to be interrupted or lost. In addition, ALICE households have few or no savings for an emergency to begin with, and their communities often have fewer resources to assist households.⁶⁵

Knowing where ALICE households live can help federal, state, and local governments target preparation, response, and assistance for natural disasters, and help companies plan where to deploy their workforce and support. Because ALICE households and communities do not have the same resources as their wealthier counterparts, namely insurance or savings, they will need more assistance over a longer period of time to recover. Strategies will vary by rural or urban context, the quality of the housing stock, and the age composition of the community (with the young and the elderly more dependent on care).⁶⁶

UNDERSTANDING ALICE: HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SOCIAL FACTORS

In most contexts, having a low income is associated with lower levels of education, higher rates of unemployment, and poorer health.⁶⁷ Communities that have been able to disrupt that association can provide important insights on how to change environments or policy to support ALICE households. By tracking where ALICE lives with other indicators, it is possible to identify counties that have overcome a challenge or bucked a trend. Stakeholders can then learn from these examples and adapt those solutions to their own areas.

Tracking relationships between ALICE households and other variables at the county level – in areas such as technology or health – can also help stakeholders ask important questions and target resources where they can have the greatest impact. To see interactive maps of socioeconomic indicators in Indiana, visit our website: UnitedForALICE.org/Indiana

Here are two possible questions:

Is internet access related to income?

Access to digital technology has exploded over the last three decades: By 2017, 91% of U.S. adults owned a computing device and 81% had a broadband internet subscription. In Indiana, only 78% of households had access to the internet at home in 2018.⁶⁸ Technology has also become more important for work, community participation, and, crucially, disaster response and recovery.

But access to technology still varies by income and geography. For many families, that lack of access translates directly to reduced job opportunities, educational opportunities, health care access, and financial tools. For example, low-income adults are more likely to use their phones to search and apply for jobs; nationally, 32% of smartphone users with income below \$30,000 have applied for a job on their phone, compared with 7% of smartphone users with income above \$75,000. Although smartphone technology is constantly improving, many tasks are still more difficult to complete on the small screen of a smartphone as opposed to a computer (e.g., word processing, filling out applications, editing spreadsheets), and many websites still do not have a mobile version, making navigation time-consuming and difficult, or sometimes impossible. Households without internet access are also at greater risk of being undercounted in the 2020 Census, when they may need government programs and services the most.⁶⁹

“ In Indiana, only 78% of households had access to the internet at home in 2018. ”

This high usage of smartphones for a critical task indicates that many low-income households have limited access to the internet at home. In Indiana, 36% of households with income below the ALICE Threshold do not have an internet subscription, compared with only 11% for households above the ALICE Threshold. Rates also vary widely by location: The counties with the lowest access rates and lowest income are in rural areas, where as many as 43% of households below the ALICE Threshold do not have an internet subscription.⁷⁰ Two-thirds of rural small businesses in the state also report that poor connectivity negatively impacts their bottom line, and that improving access would lead to increased sales and the creation of new jobs.⁷¹ Identifying these gaps can help businesses and government provide more resources to libraries, establish training centers, or target low-cost internet plans.⁷²

Are drug overdoses driven by income?

Indiana, like many states across the country, has experienced an increase in drug overdose deaths, largely due to an increase in deaths from opioid use. In the last two decades, more than 15,000 people in Indiana died from drug overdoses, with nearly two thirds (63%) involving an opioid.⁷³

Several national studies have suggested that counties with the worst economic prospects have the highest rates of substance use disorders and drug-overdose related hospitalizations and deaths. Yet that relationship varies across states, as people of all incomes, geographies, ages, and races/ethnicities suffer from substance use disorders.⁷⁴ In Indiana, overdose deaths have been reported in both urban and rural counties, but rural counties have experienced higher incidences, particularly Fayette, Scott, and Wayne counties. In 2018, while some of the highest numbers of overdose deaths occurred in counties that also had a high percentage of households below the ALICE Threshold, overall there was not a significant relationship between income (defined by the percentage of households below the ALICE Threshold) and drug overdose deaths across Indiana's counties.⁷⁵

“ The impact of addiction and substance use disorders on families often means a decline in their financial position, causing many families to become or remain ALICE. ”

Understanding which communities have been hardest hit by substance use disorders can help planners and stakeholders see the complex ways in which addiction and financial hardship interact. Although economic standing is not always a risk factor for drug addiction in Indiana, the consequences of addiction hit low-income families harder. The impact of addiction and substance use disorders on families often means a decline in their financial position, causing many families to become or remain ALICE. A family's income may be reduced if addiction reduces an adult's ability to work, and these families often have substantial health care costs. For example, addiction treatment ranges from \$1,176 to \$6,552 per month nationally. And lower-income families may not have access to such treatment programs, which only prolongs and compounds the outcomes of addiction. Substance use disorders take a toll on the stability of families and marriages, on parenting, and on the physical and mental health of family members.⁷⁶ Finally, the opioid crisis has had a significant impact on the Indiana economy, costing the state an estimated \$3.1 billion in 2019.⁷⁷ For all of these reasons, there can be huge value for community stakeholders in mapping where ALICE lives with drug overdose deaths to identify communities that have the greatest need but the fewest resources to address addiction-related problems.⁷⁸

THE BENEFITS OF MOVING TOWARD EQUITY IN INDIANA

The strength of the Indiana economy is inextricably tied to the financial stability of its residents. The more people participate in a state's economy, the stronger it will be. In 2018, when the national economy was often described as "strong," the reality was that nearly a million households — more than one-third of all households in the state — struggled to support themselves. If all households earned enough to meet their basic needs, not only would each family's hardship be eased, but the Indiana economy would also benefit substantially. This is true in times of economic growth, and it becomes even more important during a period of crisis and recovery.

To better understand the extent to which financial hardship is a drain on a state's economy, this section provides an estimate of the benefits of raising the income of all households to the ALICE Threshold. While lifting family income would be an enormous undertaking, the statewide benefits of doing so make a compelling case for pointing both policy and investment toward that goal.

Based on 2018 data, the economic benefit to Indiana of bringing all households to the ALICE Threshold would be approximately \$57.5 billion, meaning that the state GDP would grow by 16%, which is approximately the size of Indiana's durable goods manufacturing industry (Figure 11). This is based on three categories of economic enhancement:

Earnings: Indiana's 2018 GDP reflected earnings of \$17.4 billion by the state's households below the ALICE Threshold. Bringing all households to the ALICE Threshold would have a two-fold impact:

- **Additional earnings:** \$21.1 billion statewide.
- **Multiplier effect:** Studies show that almost all additional wages earned by low-wage workers are put back into the economy through increased consumer spending, which in turn spurs business growth.⁷⁹ Building on economic calculations used by Moody's Analytics, this estimate assumes an economic multiplier of 1.2, meaning that a \$1 increase in compensation to low-wage workers leads to a \$1.20 increase in economic activity. In Indiana this increased economic activity would be valued at \$25.3 billion.⁸⁰

Tax revenue: Indiana's 2018 GDP reflected tax revenue of \$726 million from the state's households below the ALICE Threshold. Bringing all households to the ALICE Threshold would have a two-fold impact:


- **Additional tax revenue:** With additional earnings, there would also be additional taxes paid and reduced usage of tax credits such as EITC for low-income earners, totaling an additional \$795 million in tax revenue for Indiana.
- **Multiplier effect:** Additional state tax revenue gives state and local governments the opportunity to make investments that matter most to the well-being of residents and businesses – from tax cuts for small businesses to improvements in infrastructure, including health care and education – that can yield a high return on investment. Based on work by the Congressional Budget Office and Moody's Analytics, the estimated multiplier is 1.44, which would mean an added \$1.1 billion in economic activity in Indiana.⁸¹

Community spending: Indiana's 2018 GDP reflected community spending of \$20 billion on assistance to the state's households below the ALICE Threshold.⁸² When all households can meet their basic needs, this spending can be reallocated to projects and programs that help families and communities thrive, not just survive:

- **Indirect benefits:** Added value to the state GDP would come in the form of indirect benefits associated with increased financial stability. These benefits include improved health (and reduced health care expenditures), reduced crime and homelessness, and greater community engagement. Figure 11 uses the very conservative estimate of an added \$9.2 billion (or 2.5% of the state GDP, which is the estimated cost of childhood poverty alone).⁸³ This is still far short of the total indirect benefits of bringing all households to the ALICE Threshold, as it does not include benefits for adults or the direct impact of redeploying private and nonprofit spending currently used to alleviate poverty.⁸⁴

Figure 11.

Economic Benefits of Raising All Households to the ALICE Threshold, Indiana, 2018







Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018; Internal Revenue Service—1040, 2018; Internal Revenue Service—EITC, 2018; Internal Revenue Service—FICA, 2019; National Association of State Budget Officers, 2019; Office of Management and Budget, 2019; Tax Foundation, 2018 and 2019; U.S. Department of Agriculture—SNAP, 2019; Urban Institute. 2018

Benefits for Households and Local Communities

In addition to the economic benefits to the state if all households had income above the ALICE Threshold, there would be a significant number of positive changes for families and their communities. Our 2019 companion Report, *The Consequences of Insufficient Household Income*, outlines the tough choices ALICE and poverty-level families make when they do not have enough income to afford basic necessities, and how those decisions affect their broader communities. By contrast, Figure 12 outlines the improvements that all Indiana families and their communities would experience if policies were implemented that moved all households above the ALICE Threshold.⁸⁵

Figure 12.
The Benefits of Sufficient Income

If households have sufficient income for...	Impact on ALICE	Impact on the Community
 Safe, Affordable Housing	Improved health through safer environments and decreased stress, improved educational performance and outcomes for children, greater stability for household members, a means to build wealth for homeowners	Less traffic, lower health care costs, better maintained housing stock, lower crime rates, less spending on homelessness/social services
 Quality Child Care and Education	Improved academic performance, higher lifetime earnings, higher graduation rates, improved job stability/access for parents, better health	Decreased racial/ethnic and socioeconomic performance gaps, decreased income disparities, high return on investment (especially for early childhood education)
 Adequate Food	Decreased food insecurity, improved health (especially for children and seniors), decreased likelihood of developmental delays and behavioral problems in school	Lower health care costs, improved workplace productivity, less spending on emergency food services
 Reliable Transportation	Improved access to job opportunities, school and child care, health care, retail markets, social services, and support systems (friends, family, faith communities)	Fewer high-emissions vehicles on the road, more diverse labor market, decreased income disparities
 Quality Health Care	Better mental and physical health (including increased life expectancy), improved access to preventative care, fewer missed days of work/school, decreased need for emergency services	Decreased health care spending, fewer communicable diseases, improved workplace productivity, decreased wealth-health gap
 Reliable Technology	Improved access to job opportunities, expanded access to health information and tele-health services, increased job and academic performance	Decreased “digital divide” in access to technology by income, increased opportunities for civic participation
 Savings	Ability to withstand emergencies without impacting long-term financial stability and greater asset accumulation over time (e.g., interest on savings; ability to invest in education, property, or finance a secure retirement)	Greater charitable contributions; less spending on emergency health, food, and senior services

Note: For sources, see Figure 12: Sources, following the Endnotes for this Report

In addition to the benefits listed above, greater financial stability and having basic needs met can reduce the anxiety that comes from struggling to survive, or not having a cushion for emergencies, and it also leaves more time to spend with loved ones and to give back to the community – all of which contribute to happiness and improved life satisfaction.⁸⁶

Having money saves money: Having enough income means that households can build their credit scores and avoid late fees, predatory lending, and higher interest rates.⁸⁷ That, in turn, means that ALICE families have more resources to use to reduce risks (e.g., by purchasing insurance), stay healthy (e.g., by getting preventative health care), or save and invest in education or assets that could grow over time (e.g., buying a home or opening a small business). Instead of a downward cycle of accumulating fees, debt, and stress, families can have an upward cycle of savings and health that makes them even better able to be engaged in their communities and, in turn, enjoy a reasonable quality of life.

For communities, this leads to greater economic activity, greater tax revenue, lower levels of crime, and fewer demands on the social safety net, allowing more investment in vital infrastructure, schools, and health care.⁸⁸ Strengthening communities by strengthening ALICE families means a higher quality of life for all.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Kaiser Family Foundation. (n.d.). Health Insurance Coverage of the Total Population. Retrieved from <https://www.kff.org/other/state-indicator/total-population/>
- 2 American Community Survey. (2018). *1-year estimates*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- 3 Households on the cusp are defined as those with income in the Census income bracket above and below the ALICE Threshold. Income brackets begin with Less Than \$10,000/Year; they increase in \$5,000 intervals from \$10,000 to \$50,000/Year; then they extend to \$50,000-\$60,000/Year, \$60,000-\$75,000/Year, \$75,000-\$100,000/Year, \$100,000-\$125,000/Year, and \$125,000-\$150,000/Year.
- 4 American Community Survey. (2018). *1-year and 5-year estimates*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- Indiana University. (2019, April 18). Indiana sees stronger population growth in 2018, according to IU Kelley School analysis. *News at IU Bloomington*. Retrieved from <https://news.iu.edu/stories/2019/04/iub/releases/18-indiana-sees-stronger-population-growth-census.html>
- Kinghorn, M. (2012). Indiana's Population Projections, 2010 to 2050. *Indiana Business Review*, Spring 2012. <https://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/ibr/2012/spring/pdfs/article1.pdf>
- 5 Gurrentz, B. (2019, April 12). *Cohabitation over the last 20 years: Measuring and understanding the changing demographics of unmarried partners, 1996-2017*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/working-papers/2019/demo/SEHSD-WP2019-10.html>
- 6 AARP Public Policy Institute and the National Alliance for Caregiving. (2015, June). *Caregiving in the U.S.* National Alliance for Caregiving. Retrieved from http://www.caregiving.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2015_CaregivingintheUS_Final-Report-June-4_WEB.pdf
- Hartman, R. M., & Weierbach, F. M. (2013, February). *Elder health in rural America*. National Rural Health Association. Retrieved from <https://www.ruralhealthweb.org/getattachment/Advocate/Policy-Documents/ElderHealthinRuralAmericaFeb2013.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US>
- Schaeffer, K. (2019, July 30). *The most common age among whites in U.S. is 58 – more than double that of racial and ethnic minorities*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/30/most-common-age-among-us-racial-ethnic-groups/>
- Kinghorn, M. (2012). Indiana's Population Projections, 2010 to 2050. *Indiana Business Review*, Spring 2012. <https://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/ibr/2012/spring/pdfs/article1.pdf>
- 7 *2020 senior living report: Senior living in Indiana*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.caring.com/senior-living/indiana>
- 8 Rubenstein, E. S. (2017). *How millennials are slowing U.S. population growth and enhancing sustainability*. Negative Population Growth. Retrieved from <https://npg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/MillennialsEnhancingSustainability-FP-2017.pdf>
- Strange, R. (2018). Indiana's elderly population expected to climb sharply. *InContext*, 19(4). Retrieved from <http://www.incontext.indiana.edu/2018/july-aug/article2.asp>
- Vespa, J. (2018, March 13). *The U.S. joins other countries with large aging populations*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2018/03/graying-america.html>
- 9 Desilver, D. (2018, August 7). *For most U.S. workers, real wages have barely budged in decades*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/08/07/for-most-us-workers-real-wages-have-barely-budged-for-decades/>
- Economic Policy Institute. (2020). *The unequal states of America: Income inequality in the United States*. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/multimedia/unequal-states-of-america/>
- Stone, C., Trisi, D., Sherman, A., & Taylor, R. (2019, August 21). *A guide to statistics on historical trends in income inequality*. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Retrieved from https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/a-guide-to-statistics-on-historical-trends-in-income-inequality#_ftnref1
- 10 Clemens, A. (2019, October 24). *GDP 2.0: Measuring who prospers when the U.S. economy grows*. Washington Center for Equitable Growth. Retrieved from <https://equitablegrowth.org/gdp-2-0-measuring-who-prospers-when-the-u-s-economy-grows/>
- Urban Institute. (2017, October 5). *Nine charts about wealth inequality in America (updated)*. Retrieved from <http://apps.urban.org/features/wealth-inequality-charts/>
- 11 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). 2018 poverty guidelines. Retrieved from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/2018-poverty-guidelines>
- 12 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). 2018 poverty guidelines. Retrieved from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/2018-poverty-guidelines>
- Child Care Aware of America. (2018). The US and the high cost of child care: A review of prices and proposed solutions for a broken system [County-Level Child Care Costs: Indiana]. Retrieved August 20, 2019 from <https://usa.childcareaware.org/advocacy-public-policy/resources/research/costofcare/>
- 13 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019, April 25). Consumer Price Index frequently asked questions. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/cpi/questions-and-answers.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). The Consumer Price Index. In *Handbook of Methods*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/pdf/cpihom.pdf>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). *Consumer Price Index historical tables for U.S. city average*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/regions/mid-atlantic/data/consumerpriceindexhistorical_us_table.htm
- 14 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). CPI inflation calculator. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

- 15 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019, April 25). Consumer Price Index frequently asked questions. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/cpi/questions-and-answers.htm>
- Ng, M., & Wessel, D. (2017, December 7). *The Hutchins Center explains: The chained CPI*. Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2017/12/07/the-hutchins-center-explains-the-chained-cpi/>
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2019, November 26). Compensation: Benefit rates. Retrieved from <https://www.benefits.va.gov/compensation/rates-index.asp#cola>
- 16 Charette, A., Herbert, C., Jakobovics, A., Marya, E. T., & McCue, D. T. (2015). *Projecting trends in severely cost-burdened renters: 2015–2025*. Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University. Retrieved from https://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/projecting_trends_in_severely_cost-burdened_renters_final.pdf
- Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University. (2014). Housing America's older adults: Meeting the needs of an aging population. Retrieved from http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/jchs-housing_americas_older_adults_2014_1.pdf
- National Low Income Housing Coalition. (2019). Out of Reach 2019. Retrieved from: <https://reports.nlihc.org/oor>
- Scally, C. P., & Gilbert, B. (2018, October 1). Rural communities need more affordable rental housing. *Urban Wire: Housing and Housing Finance, the blog of the Urban Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/rural-communities-need-more-affordable-rental-housing>
- 17 Duranton, G., & Puga, D. (2014). The growth of cities. In *Handbook of Economic Growth*, 2, 771-853. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444535405000057>
- Jiao, J., Miró, J., & McGrath, N. (2017, November 3). Why the "Uberization" of public transit is good for cities. *Houston Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.houstonchronicle.com/local/gray-matters/article/Why-the-Uberization-of-public-transit-is-good-12329605.php>
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (2012, October 25). How does transportation impact health? *Health Policy Snapshot Series*. Retrieved from <https://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2012/10/how-does-transportation-impact-health.html>
- Stiglic, M., Agatz, N., Savelsbergh, M., & Gradisar, M. (2018, February). Enhancing urban mobility: Integrating ride-sharing and public transit. *Computers and Operations Research*, 90(no. C), 12–21. Retrieved from <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3165324.3165603>
- van Ommeren, J., & Gutiérrez-i-Puigarnau, E. (2011, January 11). Are workers with a long commute less productive? An empirical analysis of absenteeism. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 41(1), 1–8. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166046210000633>
- 18 Malik, R., Hamm, K., Schochet, L., Novoa, C., Workman, S., & Jessen-Howard, S. (2018, December 6). *America's Child Care Deserts in 2018*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <https://childcaresdeserts.org/index.html?state=IN>
- 19 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Occupational employment statistics: May 2018 state occupational employment and wage estimates Indiana*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_in.htm
- Child Care Aware of America. (2018). The US and the high cost of child care: A review of prices and proposed solutions for a broken system [County-Level Child Care Costs: Indiana]. Retrieved August 20, 2019 from <https://usa.childcareaware.org/advocacy-public-policy/resources/research/costofcare/>
- Indiana Early Learning Advisory Committee (2017). *2017 annual report*. Retrieved from: <http://www.elacindiana.org/elacindiana/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/FINAL-2017-Annual-Report-1.pdf>
- Vespa, J., Lewis, J. M., & Kreider, R. M. (2013, August). *America's families and living arrangements: 2012: Population characteristics*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p20-570.pdf>
- 20 Broton, K. M., & Goldrick-Rab, S. (2017, December 7). Going without: An exploration of food and housing insecurity among undergraduates. *Educational Researcher*, 47(2), 121-133. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17741303>
- Feeding America. (2020). Senior hunger poses unique challenges. Retrieved from <https://www.feedingamerica.org/hunger-in-america/senior-hunger-facts>
- Worthington, J., & Mabli, J. (2017). *Emergency food pantry use among SNAP households with children*. Mathematica Policy Research. Retrieved from <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/emergency-food-pantry-use-among-snap-households-with-children>
- Ziliak, J. P., & Gunderson, C. (2019, May). *State of senior hunger in America in 2017*. Feeding America. Retrieved from https://www.feedingamerica.org/sites/default/files/2019-06/The%20State%20of%20Senior%20Hunger%20in%202017_F2.pdf
- Ziliak, J. P., & Gunderson, C. (2017, August). *The health consequences of senior hunger in the United states: Evidence from the 1999-2014 NHANES*. Feeding America. Retrieved from <https://www.feedingamerica.org/sites/default/files/research/senior-hunger-research/senior-health-consequences-2014.pdf>
- 21 Beer, A. & Bray, J. B. (2019). *The College-Work Balancing Act*. Washington, D.C. Association of Community College Trustees. Retrieved from: <https://www.acct.org/product/college-work-balancing-act-2019>
- 22 Klepfer, K. Cornett, C, Flethcher, C., & Webster, J. (2019). *Student Financial Wellness Survey: Fall 2018 Semester Results*. Trellis Company. Retrieved from <https://www.trelliscompany.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Fall-2018-SFWS-Report.pdf>
- 23 Beer, A. & Bray, J. B. (2019). *The College-Work Balancing Act*. Washington, D.C. Association of Community College Trustees. Retrieved from: <https://www.acct.org/product/college-work-balancing-act-2019>
- 24 Porter, S.R. & Umbach, P.D. (2019). *What challenges to success do community college students face?* Percontor, LLC. Retrieved from: https://www.risc.college/sites/default/files/2019-01/RISC_2019_report_natl.pdf
- 25 Association of American Medical Colleges. (2019, April). 2019 update: *The complexities of physician supply and demand: Projections from 2017-2032*. Retrieved from https://www.aamc.org/system/files/c/2/31-2019_update_-_the_complexities_of_physician_supply_and_demand_-_projections_from_2017-2032.pdf

- Farrell, D., & Greig, F. (2017, September). *Paying out-of-pocket: The healthcare spending of 2 million US families*. JPMorgan Chase Institute. Retrieved from <https://institute.jpmorganchase.com/content/dam/jpmc/jpmorgan-chase-and-co/institute/pdf/institute-healthcare.pdf>
- Inserro, A. (2018, August 9). Enrollment in high-deductible health plans continues to grow. *The American Journal of Managed Care*. Retrieved from <https://www.ajmc.com/newsroom/enrollment-in-highdeductible-health-plans-continues-to-grow>
- 26 Radley, D. C., McCarthy, D. & Hayes, S. L. (2018, May). *2018 scorecard on state health system performance*. The Commonwealth Fund. Retrieved from https://interactives.commonwealthfund.org/2018/state-scorecard/files/Radley_State_Scorecard_2018.pdf
- 27 Anderson, K. F. (2013, January 16). Diagnosing discrimination: Stress from perceived racism and the mental and physical health effects. *Sociological Inquiry*, 83(1). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2012.00433.x>
- NAACP. (2017, November). *Fumes across the fence-line*. Clean Air Task Force. Retrieved from http://www.catf.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CATF_Pub_FumesAcrossTheFenceLine.pdf
- Peter G. Peterson Foundation. (2019, March 19). *Why are Americans paying more for health care?* Retrieved from <https://www.pgpf.org/blog/2019/03/why-are-americans-paying-more-for-healthcare>
- Ross, T. (2013, August). *A disaster in the making addressing the vulnerability of low-income communities to extreme weather*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/LowIncomeResilience-3.pdf>
- 28 Gensini, V.A., & Brooks, H.E. (2018, October 2017). Spatial trends in United States tornado frequency. *npj, Climate and Atmospheric Science*,1(38). Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-018-0048-2>
- Saenz, E. (2019, May 8) Natural disasters on the rise, but is Indiana prepared to help hoosiers recover? *Indiana Environmental Reporter*. Retrieved from: <https://www.indianaenvironmentalreporter.org/posts/natural-disasters-are-on-the-rise-but-is-indiana-prepared-to-help-hoosiers-recover>
- 29 Boustan, L. P., Yanguas, M. L., Kahn, M., & Rhode, P. W. (2017, July 1). As the rich move away from disaster zones, the poor are left behind. *Grist*. Retrieved from <https://grist.org/article/as-the-rich-move-away-from-disaster-zones-the-poor-are-left-behind/>
- California Institute of Technology. (2018). *Scientific consensus: Earth's climate is warming*. Retrieved from <https://climate.nasa.gov/scientific-consensus/>
- Krause, E., & Reeves R. V. (2017, September 18). *Hurricanes hit the poor the hardest*. Brookings Institution. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/social-mobility-memos/2017/09/18/hurricanes-hit-the-poor-the-hardest/>
- Lavizzo-Mourey, R. (2015). *In it together – building a culture of health: 2015 president's message*. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.rwjf.org/en/library/annual-reports/presidents-message-2015.html>
- Mutter, J. C. (2015). *The disaster profiteers: How natural disasters make the rich richer and the poor even poorer*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Oxfam America. (2009). *Exposed: Social vulnerability and climate change in the U.S. Southeast*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/exposed-social-vulnerability-and-climate-change-in-the-us-southeast/>
- 30 Federal Reserve System. (2019, May). *Report on the Economic Well-Being of U.S. Households in 2018*. Retrieved from: <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/2018-report-economic-well-being-us-households-201905.pdf>
- 31 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (2018, October). Table E.2 rates of saving for unexpected expenses or emergencies by State, 2015-2017. In *FDIC National Survey of Unbanked and Underbanked Households, Appendix Tables*. Retrieved from <https://www.fdic.gov/householdsurvey/2017/2017appendix.pdf>
- Karlan, D., Ratan, A. L., & Zinman, J. (2014, March). Savings by and for the poor. *The Review of Income and Wealth*, 60(1), 36–78. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/roiw.12101>
- The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2015, October). *The role of emergency savings in family financial security: How do families cope with financial shocks?* Retrieved from https://www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2015/10/emergency-savings-report-1_artfinal.pdf
- 32 Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2018). *Total gross domestic product for IN*. Retrieved from <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/INNGSP>
- Brewer, R. (2018). Indiana's outlook for 2019. *Indiana Business Review*, 93(4). Retrieved from <http://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/ibr/2018/outlook/indiana.html>
- Vitner, M., Dougherty, C., & Honnold, M. (2019, August 2). *Midwestern states: 2019 midyear outlook*. Wells Fargo Securities Economics Group. Retrieved from <https://www.wellsfargo.com/com/insights/economics/>
- 33 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Occupational employment statistics: May 2018 state occupational employment and wage estimates Indiana*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_in.htm
- 34 American Community Survey. (2018). *1-year estimates*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). *States and selected areas: Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population, 1976 to 2018 annual averages*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/lau/staadata.txt>
- 35 Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2018). *Labor Force Participation Rate for Indiana*. Retrieved from <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/LBSSA18>
- Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2018). *Employed full time: Workers paid hourly rates: Wage and salary workers: 16 years and over*. Retrieved from <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/LEU0253126800A>
- 36 Goldren, L. (2016, December 5). *Still falling short on hours and pay*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/still-falling-short-on-hours-and-pay-part-time-work-becoming-new-normal/>

LinkedIn & Snagajob. (n.d.). *LinkedIn and Snagajob Survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.snag.co/employers/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/LIResearchDataforMedia.pdf>

37 Eisenberg, R. (2019, February 18). How well is the gig economy working for gig workers? *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/nextavenue/2019/02/18/how-well-is-the-gig-economy-working-for-gig-workers/#4255bb9b3f0a>

Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2018, November 13). The Rise and Nature of Alternative Work Arrangements in the United States, 1995–2015. *ILR Review*, 72(2), 382-416. Retrieved from <https://scholar.harvard.edu/lkatz/publications/rise-and-nature-alternative-work-arrangements-united-states-1995-2015>

Manyika, J., Lund, S., Bughin, J., Robinson, K., Mischke, J., & Mahajan, D. (2016, October). *Independent work: Choice, necessity, and the gig economy*. McKinsey Global Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.mckinsey.com/global-themes/employment-and-growth/independent-work-choice-necessity-and-the-gig-economy>

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2015, April 20). *Contingent workforce: Size, characteristics, earnings, and benefits*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/669766.pdf>

38 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019, January 18). *Multiple jobholders by selected characteristics*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat36.htm>

39 Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2019, May). *Report on the economic well-being of U.S. households in 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/2018-report-economic-well-being-us-households-201905.pdf>

Dixon, A. (2019, June 5). Survey: Nearly 1 in 3 side hustlers needs the income to stay afloat. *Bankrate*. Retrieved from <https://www.bankrate.com/personal-finance/side-hustles-survey-june-2019/>

Freelancers Union & Upwork. (2017). *Freelancing in America: 2017*. Retrieved from <https://s3.amazonaws.com/fuw-Prod-Storage/content/FreelancingInAmericaReport-2017.pdf>

Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2018, November 13). The Rise and Nature of Alternative Work Arrangements in the United States, 1995–2015. *ILR Review*, 72(2), 382-416. Retrieved from <https://scholar.harvard.edu/lkatz/publications/rise-and-nature-alternative-work-arrangements-united-states-1995-2015>

McFeely, S., & Pendell, R. (2018, August 16). What workplace leaders can learn from the real big economy. *Gallup*. Retrieved from <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/240929/workplace-leaders-learn-real-gig-economy.aspx>

40 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (December 2018). *Employer Costs for Employee Compensation*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/ecec_03192019.pdf

U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.). *Compliance assistance – Wages and the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)*. Retrieved from <https://www.dol.gov/whd/flsa/>

41 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Occupational employment statistics: May 2018 state occupational employment and wage estimates Indiana*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_in.htm

42 Bivins, J. (2018). *The fuzzy line between “employed” and “not in the labor force” and what it means for job creation strategies and the Federal Reserve*. *Economic Policy Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/the-fuzzy-line-between-unemployed-and-not-in-the-labor-force-and-what-it-means-for-job-creation-strategies-and-the-federal-reserve/>

Frazis, H. (2017, May). Employed workers leaving the labor force: An analysis of recent trends. *Monthly Labor Review*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.21916/mlr.2017.16>

43 American Community Survey. (2018). *1-year estimates*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2013, December). Labor force projections to 2022: the labor force participation rate continues to fall. *Monthly Labor Review*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2013/article/pdf/labor-force-projections-to-2022-the-labor-force-participation-rate-continues-to-fall.pdf>

Vespa, J. (2018, March 13). *The U.S. joins other countries with large aging populations*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2018/03/graying-america.html>

44 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019, April 25). College enrollment and work activity of high school graduates news release [press release]. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/hsgcec.htm>

45 American Community Survey. (2018). *1-year estimates*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2019, May). *Report on the economic well-being of U.S. households in 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/2018-report-economic-well-being-us-households-201905.pdf>

McAlpine, D. D., & Warner, L. (2004). *Barriers to employment among persons with mental illness: A review of the literature*. Center for Research on the Organization and Financing of Care for the Severely Mentally Ill, Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research, Rutgers, the State University. Retrieved from http://dri.uiuc.edu/research/p01-04c/final_technical_report_p01-04c.pdf

National Alliance on Mental Illness. (2014, July). *Road to recovery: Employment and mental illness*. Retrieved from <https://www.nami.org/about-nami/publications-reports/public-policy-reports/roadtorecovery.pdf>

46 da Costa, P. N. (2018, January 27). There’s a major hurdle to employment that many Americans don’t even think about – and it’s holding the economy back. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/lack-of-transport-is-a-major-obstacle-to-employment-for-americans-poor-2018-1>

Rall, J. (2015, May). *Getting to work: Effective state solutions to help people with transportation challenges access jobs*. National Conference of State Legislatures. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/Portals/1/Documents/transportation/Work_Job_Access_0515.pdf.pdf

Saldivia, G. (2018, September 20). Stuck in traffic? You’re not alone. New data show American commute times are longer. *NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2018/09/20/650061560/stuck-in-traffic-youre-not-alone-new-data-show-american-commute-times-are-longer>

- Tyndall, J. (2015). *Waiting for the R train: Public transportation and employment*. Retrieved from Canadian Transportation Research Forum: <http://ctrf.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/CTRF2015TyndallTransportationPolicyPlanning.pdf>
- Watson, L., Frohlich, L., & Johnston, E. (2014, April). *Collateral damage: Scheduling challenges for workers in low-wage jobs and their consequences*. National Women's Law Center. Retrieved from https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/collateral_damage_scheduling_fact_sheet.pdf
- 47 Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2019, May). *Report on the economic well-being of U.S. households in 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/2018-report-economic-well-being-us-households-201905.pdf>
- Hipple, S. F. (2015). People who are not in the labor force: why aren't they working? *Beyond the Numbers: Employment & Unemployment*, 4(15). U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/btn/volume-4/pdf/people-who-are-not-in-the-labor-force-why-arent-they-working.pdf>
- McCarthy, N. (2017, August 21). Why millions of Americans stay out of the workforce. *Statista*. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/chart/10754/why-millions-of-americans-stay-out-of-the-workforce/>
- 48 Vinsel, L., & Russell, A. (2016, April 7). Hail the maintainers: Capitalism excels at innovation but is failing at maintenance, and for most lives it is maintenance that matters more. *Aeon*. Retrieved from <https://aeon.co/essays/innovation-is-overvalued-maintenance-often-matters-more>
- 49 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020, January 3). *Economy at a Glance: Indiana*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/eag/eag.in.htm>
- 50 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Occupational employment statistics: May 2018 state occupational employment and wage estimates Indiana*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes.in.htm>
- Frey, C., & Osborne, M. (2013, September 17). *The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation?* Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford. Retrieved from https://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/downloads/academic/The_Future_of_Employment.pdf
- 51 Muro, M., Maxim, R., & Whiton, J. (2019). *Automation and artificial intelligence: How machines are affecting people and places*. Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/2019.01_BrookingsMetro_Automation-AI_Report_Muro-Maxim-Whiton-FINAL-version.pdf
- 52 Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2018, November 13). The Rise and Nature of Alternative Work Arrangements in the United States, 1995–2015. *ILR Review*, 72(2), 382-416. Retrieved from <https://scholar.harvard.edu/lkatz/publications/rise-and-nature-alternative-work-arrangements-united-states-1995-2015>
- 53 Dixon, A. (2019, June 5). Survey: Nearly 1 in 3 side hustlers needs the income to stay afloat. *Bankrate*. Retrieved from <https://www.bankrate.com/personal-finance/side-hustles-survey-june-2019/>
- 54 Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2019, May). *Report on the economic well-being of U.S. households in 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/2018-report-economic-well-being-us-households-201905.pdf>
- Council, J. (2016, October 27). 'Gig' economy heats up in Indy. *Indiana Business Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.ibj.com/articles/61000-gig-economy-heats-up-in-indy>
- Dokko, J., Mumford, M., & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2015, December). *Workers and the Online Gig Economy*. The Hamilton Project. Retrieved from https://www.hamiltonproject.org/assets/files/workers_and_the_online_gig_economy.pdf
- Eden, P., & Gaggl, M. (2015, November). *On the welfare implications of automation*. World Bank Group. Retrieved from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2015/11/25380579/welfare-implications-automation>
- Freelancers Union & Upwork. (2017). *Freelancing in America: 2017*. Retrieved from <https://s3.amazonaws.com/fuwt-prod-storage/content/FreelancingInAmericaReport-2017.pdf>
- Katz, L. F., & Krueger, A. B. (2018, November 13). The Rise and Nature of Alternative Work Arrangements in the United States, 1995–2015. *ILR Review*, 72(2), 382-416. Retrieved from <https://scholar.harvard.edu/lkatz/publications/rise-and-nature-alternative-work-arrangements-united-states-1995-2015>
- Manyika, J., Lund, S., Bughin, J., Robinson, K., Mischke, J., & Mahajan, D. (2016, October). *Independent work: Choice, necessity, and the gig economy*. McKinsey Global Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.mckinsey.com/global-themes/employment-and-growth/independent-work-choice-necessity-and-the-gig-economy>
- Torpey, E., & Hogan, A. (2016, May). Working in a gig economy. *Career Outlook*. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/careeroutlook/2016/article/what-is-the-gig-economy.htm?view_full
- Tran, M., & Sokas, R. (2017, April). The gig economy and contingent work: An occupation health assessment. *Journal of Occupation and Environmental Medicine*, 59(4), e63-e66. Retrieved from https://journals.lww.com/joem/FullText/2017/04000/The_Gig_Economy_and_Contingent_Work_An.20.aspx
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2015, April 20). *Contingent workforce: Size, characteristics, earnings, and benefits*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/669766.pdf>
- 55 Manyika, J., Chui, M., Miremadi, M., Bughin, J., George, K., Wilimott, P., & Dewhurst, M. (2017). *A future that works: Automation, employment, and productivity*. McKinsey Global Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/Digital%20Disruption/Harnessing%20automation%20for%20a%20future%20that%20works/MGI-A-future-that-works-Executive-summary.ashx>
- 56 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2016, December). *Skills for a digital world. Policy brief on the future of work*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/Skills-for-a-Digital-World.pdf>
- World Economic Forum. (2017). *Technology and innovation for the future of production: Accelerating value creation* [white paper]. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_White_Paper_Technology_Innovation_Future_of_Production_2017.pdf
- 57 Bond, J. (2017, January). AGVs roll into a new role. *Modern Materials Handling*. Retrieved from https://www.mmh.com/article/agvs_roll_into_a_new_role/agvs

McKinsey Global Institute. (2017). *A future that works: Automation, employment and productivity*. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/McKinsey/Global%20Themes/Digital%20Disruption/Harnessing%20automation%20for%20a%20future%20that%20works/MGI-A-future-that-works_Full-report.ashx

U.S. Chamber of Commerce Technology Engagement Center. (2020). *Unlocking the digital potential of rural America*. Retrieved from https://americaninnovators.com/rural-report/#state_IN

58 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). *Occupational employment statistics: May 2018 state occupational employment and wage estimates Indiana*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_in.htm

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019). *Occupational outlook handbook*. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/>

Indiana Department of Workforce Development. (2018). *Occupational projections (long terms)*. Retrieved from http://hoosierdata.in.gov/dpage.asp?id=39&page_path=Occupational%20Data&path_id=23&menu_level=smenu4&panel_number=2

Muro, M., Maxim, R., Whiton, J., & Hathaway, I. (2019). *Automation and artificial intelligence: How machines are affecting people and places*. Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/2019_01_BrookingsMetro_Automation-AI_Report_Muro-Maxim-Whiton-FINAL-version.pdf

Vinsel, L., & Russell, A. (2016). Hail the maintainers: Capitalism excels at innovation but is failing at maintenance, and for most lives it is maintenance that matters more. *Aeon*. Retrieved from <https://aeon.co/essays/innovation-is-overvalued-maintenance-often-matters-more>

59 Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2019). *College enrollment and work activity of high school graduates news release* [Press release]. U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/hsgsec.htm>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). Table 503.20. Percentage of college students 16 to 24 years old who were employed, selected years, October 1970 through 2017. In *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_503.20.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). Table 503.10. Percentage of high school students age 16 and over who were employed, selected years, 1970 through 2017. In *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_503.10.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). Table 303.10. Total fall enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, selected years, 1947 through 2028. In *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_303.10.asp

60 Goldrick-Rab, S., Baker-Smith, C., Coca, V., Looker, E., & Williams, T. (2019). *College and university basic needs insecurity: A national #RealCollege survey report*. Retrieved from https://hope4college.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/HOPE_realcollege_National_report_digital.pdf

61 Project on Student Debt. (2018). *State by state data: Indiana*. The Institute for College Access and Success. Retrieved from https://ticas.org/posd/map-state-data#overlay=posd/state_data/2018/in

U.S. Department of Education. (2018). *Distribution of Federal Pell Grant program funds by institution*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/finaid/prof/resources/data/pell-institution.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *FY 2015 cohort default rates by state/territory*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/staterates.pdf>

62 Indiana Business Research Center. (2007). *The economic impact of libraries in Indiana*. Indiana University. Retrieved from https://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/studies/EconomicImpactOfLibraries_2007.pdf

Morgan, A., Dupuis, R., D'Alonzo, B., Johnson, A., Graves, A., Brooks, K., et al. (2016, November). Beyond books: Public libraries as partners for population health. *Health Affairs*, 35(11). Retrieved from <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/full/10.1377/hlthaff.2016.0724>

Rosa, K. (Ed.). (2015, April). *The state of America's libraries 2015 (American Libraries Digital Supplement)*. American Library Association. Retrieved from: http://www.ala.org/news/sites/ala.org/news/files/content/0415_StateAmlib_0.pdf

63 McCarthy, J. (2020, January 24). In U.S., library visits outpaced trips to movies in 2019. *Gallup*. Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/284009/library-visits-outpaced-trips-movies-2019.aspx>

64 The Institute of Museum and Library Services. (2019). *Public libraries survey*. Retrieved from <https://www.ims.gov/research-evaluation/data-collection/public-libraries-survey>

65 Krause, E. & Reeves, R. V. (2017, September 18). *Hurricanes hit the poor the hardest*. Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/social-mobility-memos/2017/09/18/hurricanes-hit-the-poor-the-hardest/>

NASA. (2018). Scientific consensus: Earth's climate is warming. Retrieved from <https://climate.nasa.gov/scientific-consensus/>

66 Oxfam America. (2009). *Exposed: Social vulnerability and climate change in the U.S. Southeast*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfamamerica.org/explore/research-publications/exposed-social-vulnerability-and-climate-change-in-the-us-southeast/>

67 Choi, L. (2009). Financial stress and its physical effects on individuals and communities. *Community Development Investment Review*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://www.frbsf.org/community-development/files/choi.pdf>

Hill, C. B. (2015, June 10). *Income inequality and higher education*. American Council on Education. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/Income-Inequality-and-Higher-Education.aspx>

Lynch, J., Smith, G. D., Harper, S., & Hillemeier, M. (2004). Is income inequality a determinant of population health? Part 2. U.S. national and regional trends in income inequality and age- and cause-specific mortality. *Milbank Quarterly*, 82(2), 355–400. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15225332>

- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2018, July 17). Barriers to work: Low-income, unemployed and dislocated workers. Retrieved from <https://www.ncsl.org/research/labor-and-employment/barriers-to-work-low-income-unemployed-and-dislocated-workers.aspx>
- Sum, A., Khatiwada, I., & Palma, S. (2010, February). *Labor underutilization problems of U.S. Workers across household income groups at the end of the Great Recession*. Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University. Retrieved from <http://www.uvm.edu/~fmgdoff/employment%20Jan.12.11/Labor%20utilization%20studies.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *A matter of equity: Preschool in America*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/early-learning/matter-equity-preschool-america.pdf>
- 68 American Community Survey. (2018). *5-year estimates* [Table S2801: Types of computers and internet subscriptions]. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- Anderson, M. (2017, March 22). *Digital divide persists even as lower-income Americans make gains in tech adoption*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/03/22/digital-divide-persists-even-as-lower-income-americans-make-gains-in-tech-adoption/>
- 69 American Community Survey. (2018). *Table S2801: Types of computers and internet subscriptions*. Retrieved from U.S. Census Bureau: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- Perrin, A. (2017, June 28). *10 facts about smartphones as the iPhone turns 10*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/06/28/10-facts-about-smartphones/>
- Perrin, A. (2017, May 19). *Digital gap between rural and nonrural America persists*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/19/digital-gap-between-rural-and-nonrural-america-persists/>
- Ryan, C. (2018, August). *Computer and internet use in the United States: 2016*. American Community Survey Reports. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2018/acs/ACS-39.pdf>
- 70 Data calculated by applying the ALICE Threshold income levels to internet data from the American Community Survey. (2018). *5-year estimates* [Table S2801: Types of computers and internet subscriptions]. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>
- 71 U.S. Chamber of Commerce Technology Engagement Center. (2020). *Unlocking the digital potential of rural America*. Retrieved from https://americaninnovators.com/rural-report/#state_IN
- 72 Becker, S., Crandall, M. D., Fisher, K. E., Kinney, B., Landry, C., & Rocha, A. (2010). *Opportunity for all: How the American public benefits from internet access at U.S. libraries*. Institute of Museum and Library Services. Retrieved from <https://staging.community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/report-becker-et-al.pdf>
- Horrigan, J. (2018, September 24). *Home internet access for low-income household helps people manage time, money, and family schedules*. Technology Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://techpolicyinstitute.org/2018/09/24/home-internet-access-for-low-income-household-helps-people-manage-time-money-and-family-schedules/>
- Horrigan, J. B. (2016, September 9). Library usage and engagement. In *Libraries 2016*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewinternet.org/2016/09/09/library-usage-and-engagement/>
- Smith, A. (2015, April 1). Usage and attitudes toward smartphones. In *U.S. Smartphone Use in 2015*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/01/chapter-two-usage-and-attitudes-toward-smartphones/#job%20seeking>
- 73 Indiana State Department of Health. (2019). *Drug overdose epidemic in Indiana: Behind the numbers*. Retrieved from: https://www.in.gov/isdh/files/85_Drug%20overdose%20Data%20Brief_2019.pdf
- 74 Dasgupta, N., Beletsky, L., & Ciccarone, D. (2018, February). Opioid crisis: No easy fix to its social and economic determinants. *AJPH Perspectives*, 108(2), 182–186. Retrieved from <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/pdf/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304187>
- Ghertner, R., & Groves, L. (2018, September). *The opioid crisis and economic opportunity: Geographic trends and economic opportunity*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Retrieved from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/259261/ASPEEconomicOpportunityOpioidCrisis.pdf>
- Oquendo, M. A., & Volkow, N. D. (2018, April 26). Suicide: A silent contributor to opioid-overdose deaths. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 378, 1567-1569. Retrieved from <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp1801417>
- Rossen, L. M., Bastian, B., Warner, M., Khan, D., & Chong, Y. (2019). *Drug poisoning mortality: United States, 1999–2017*. National Center for Health Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data-visualization/drug-poisoning-mortality/index.htm>
- Ruhm, C. J. (2018, January). *Deaths of despair or drug problems?* National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w24188.pdf>
- 75 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). Multiple cause of death, 1999-2017. National Center for Health Statistics. Retrieved from <https://wonder.cdc.gov/>
- Indiana State Department of Health. (2019). *Drug overdose epidemic in Indiana: Behind the numbers*. Retrieved from: https://www.in.gov/isdh/files/85_Drug%20overdose%20Data%20Brief_2019.pdf
- 76 Daley, D. C., Smith, E., Balogh, D., & Toscaloni, J. (2018). Forgotten but not gone: The impact of the opioid epidemic and other substance use disorders on families and children. *Commonwealth, A Journal of Pennsylvania Politics and Policy*, 20, (2–3). Retrieved from <https://tupjournals.temple.edu/index.php/commonwealth/article/view/189>
- National Institute on Drug Abuse. (2018). *Medications to treat opioid use disorder: How much does opioid treatment cost?* Retrieved from <https://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/research-reports/medications-to-treat-opioid-addiction/how-much-does-opioid-treatment-cost>
- Scholl, L., Seth, P., Kariisa, M., Wilson, N., & Baldwin, G. (2019). Drug and opioid-involved overdose deaths — United States, 2013–2017. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 67, 1419–1427. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/67/wr/mm675152e1.htm>

77 Brewer, R. (2018). Indiana's outlook for 2019/ *Indiana Business Review*, 93(4). Retrieved from <http://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/ibr/2018/outlook/indiana.html>

78 amfAR. (2018). *Opioid & health indicators database: Indiana opioid epidemic*. Retrieved from <https://opioid.amfar.org/IN>.

Florence, C. S., Zhou, C., Luo, F., & Xu, L. (2016, October). The economic burden of prescription opioid overdose, abuse, and dependence in the United States, 2013. *Medical Care*, 54(10), 901–906. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27623005>

Kneebone, E., & Allard, S. W. (2017, September 25). *A nation in overdose peril: Pinpointing the most impacted communities and the local gaps in care*. Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/pinpointing-opioid-in-most-impacted-communities/>

Krueger, A. B. (2017). Where have all the workers gone? An inquiry into the decline of the U.S. labor force participation rate (BPEA Conference Drafts, September 7–8, 2017). *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/1_krueger.pdf

79 Congressional Budget Office. (2019, July 8). *The effects on employment and family income of increasing the federal minimum wage*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/55410>

Cooper, D., & Hall, D. (2013, March 13). *Raising the federal minimum wage to \$10.10 would give working families, and the overall economy, a much-needed boost*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/bp357-federal-minimum-wage-increase/>

From Poverty to Opportunity: How a Fair Minimum Wage Will Help Working Families Succeed. Hearings before the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. (Testimony of Heather Boushey, *Understanding how raising the federal minimum wage affects income inequality and economic growth*). Retrieved from <https://www.help.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Boushey3.pdf>

Zandi, M. (2011, April 14). At last, the U.S. begins a serious fiscal debate. *Moody's Analytics*. Retrieved from <https://www.economy.com/dismal/analysis/free/198972>

80 Note: While there are increased costs to employers for paying higher wages – which may be passed on to consumers – these impacts primarily occur when wages are increased for jobs with wages well above the Household Survival Budget (See Congressional Budget Office, 2019).

Blinder, A., & Zandi, M. (2010, July 27). *How the Great Recession was brought to an end*. Retrieved from <https://www.economy.com/mark-zandi/documents/End-of-Great-Recession.pdf>

Congressional Budget Office. (2019, July 8). *The effects on employment and family income of increasing the federal minimum wage*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/55410>

Cooper, D., & Hall, D. (2013, March 13). *Raising the federal minimum wage to \$10.10 would give working families, and the overall economy, a much-needed boost*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/bp357-federal-minimum-wage-increase/>

Cooper, D., & Hall, D. (2012, August 14). *How raising the federal minimum wage would help working families and give the economy a boost*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/ib341-raising-federal-minimum-wage/>

Zandi, M. (2011, April 14). At last, the U.S. begins a serious fiscal debate. *Moody's Analytics*. Retrieved from <https://www.economy.com/dismal/analysis/free/198972>

Zandi, M. (2010, December 8). U.S. macro outlook: Compromise boosts stimulus. *Moody's Analytics*. Retrieved from <https://economy.com/dismal/analysis/free/195470>

81 Note: The tax calculations include only state taxes, not federal or local. The Congressional Budget Office estimates the impact of tax cuts targeted at lower- and middle-income people and achieved without borrowing as high as 1.5; Zandi estimates the multiplier for increased infrastructure spending at 1.44. This calculation uses the conservative estimate of 1.44.

Bolstering the economy: Helping American families by reauthorizing the Payroll Tax Cut and UI Benefits. Hearings before the U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee (2012) (Testimony of Mark M. Zandi). Retrieved from <https://www.economy.com/mark-zandi/documents/2012-02-07-JEC-Payroll-Tax.pdf>

Congressional Budget Office. (2014, November). *How CBO analyzes the effects of changes in federal fiscal policies on the economy*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/113th-congress-2013-2014/reports/49494-FiscalPolicies.pdf>

Duper, B., Karabarounis, M., Kudryak, M., & Saif Mehkari, M. (2019). *Regional Consumption Responses and the Aggregate Fiscal Multiplier*. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. Retrieved from <https://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/wp2018-04.pdf>

82 American Community Survey. (2018). *1-year estimates*. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>

National Association of State Budget Officers. (2019). *State expenditure report: Fiscal years 2017-2019*. Retrieved from <http://www.nasbo.org/mainsite/reports-data/state-expenditure-report>

Office of Management and Budget. (2017). *Analytical perspectives: Budget of the U.S. government: Fiscal year 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BUDGET-2018-PER/pdf/BUDGET-2018-PER.pdf>

Scarboro, M. (2018). *State individual income tax rates and brackets for 2018*. Tax Foundation. Retrieved from <https://taxfoundation.org/state-individual-income-tax-rates-brackets-2018/>

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). (n.d.). SNAP data tables [State level participation and benefits]. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-snap>

U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (2019). Aid to State & Local Governments. In *Fiscal Year 2018 Analytical Perspectives Budget of the U.S. Government*. Retrieved from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/browse/collectionGPO.action?collectionCode=BUDGET>

Walczak, J. (2019). *Local income taxes in 2019*. Tax Foundation. Retrieved from <https://taxfoundation.org/local-income-taxes-2019/>

Walczak, J., & Drenkard, S. (2018). *State and local sales tax rates 2018*. Tax Foundation. Retrieved from <https://taxfoundation.org/state-and-local-sales-tax-rates-2018/>

83 The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine analyzes the cost of childhood poverty and estimates that reversing it would add 5.4 percent to the state GDP. To be conservative, this analysis uses Holzer's estimate that childhood poverty costs 2.5 percent of GDP in related health and criminal justice expenses.

Holzer, H. J., Schanzenbach, D. W., Duncan, J. D., & Ludwig, J. (2007, January 24). *The economic costs of poverty in the United States: Subsequent effects of children growing up poor*. Center for American Progress. Retrieved from

https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2007/01/pdf/poverty_report.pdf

McLaughlin, M., & Rank, M. R. (2018). Estimating the economic cost of childhood poverty in the United States. *Social Work Research*, 42(2), 73–83. Retrieved from doi:10.1093/swr/svy007

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). Consequences of child poverty. In G. Duncan & S. Le Menestrel (Eds.), *A Roadmap to Reducing Child Poverty* (pp. 67–96). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/read/25246/chapter/5#89>

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. (2018). *Total gross domestic product for Indiana*. Retrieved from <https://research.stlouisfed.org/fred2/series/INNGSP>

84 Carroll, S. J., & Erkut, E. (2009). *The benefits to taxpayers from increases in students' educational attainment*. RAND Corporation. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG686.pdf

Coleman-Jensen, A., Rabbitt, M. P., Gregory, C. A., & Singh, A. (2019). *Household food security in the United States in 2018*. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Retrieved from <https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/94849/err-270.pdf?v=963.1>

Furman, J., & Ruffini, K. (2015, May 11). *Six examples of the long-term benefits of anti-poverty programs*. The White House, President Barack Obama Archives. Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2015/05/11/six-examples-long-term-benefits-anti-poverty-programs>

Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. (2020). *Social determinants of health*. Healthy People 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/social-determinants-of-health>

Virginia Commonwealth University, Center on Society and Health. (2015, February 13). *Education: It matters more to health than ever before*. Retrieved from <https://societyhealth.vcu.edu/work/the-projects/education-it-matters-more-to-health-than-ever-before.html>

Wolf, A., Aron, L., Dubay, L., Simon, S. M., Zimmerman, E., & Luk, K. X. (2015, April). *How are income and wealth linked to health and longevity?* Urban Institute and Center of Society and Health at Virginia Commonwealth University. Retrieved from

<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/49116/2000178-How-are-Income-and-Wealth-Linked-to-Health-and-Longevity.pdf>

85 Chapman, J. & Thompson, J. (2006). *The economic impact of local living wages*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/bp170/>

Reeves, R. V. (2015). *Two anti-poverty strategies*. Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/two-anti-poverty-strategies/>

86 Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010, September 21). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of America*, 107(38), 16489–16493. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107>

Jebb, A. T., Tay, L., Diener, E., & Shigehiro, O. (2018). Happiness, income satiation and turning points around the world. *Nature Human Behavior*, 2, 33–38. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-017-0277-0>

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Stress and health disparities: Contexts, mechanisms, and interventions among racial/ethnic minority and low-socioeconomic status populations*. APA Working Group on Stress and Health Disparities. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/pi/health-disparities/resources/stress-report.pdf>

87 Beard, M. P. (2010). *In-depth: Reaching the unbanked and underbanked*. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Retrieved from <https://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/central-banker/winter-2010/reaching-the-unbanked-and-underbanked>

Hahn, R. A., Barnett W. S., Knopf J. A., Truman B. I., Johnson R. L., Fielding J. E., et al. (2016). Early childhood education to promote health equity: A community guide systematic review. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice*, 22(5), E1-8. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26672406>

McKernan, S.-M., Ratcliffe, C., & Shanks, T. W. (2011). *Is poverty incompatible with asset accumulation?* Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/poverty-incompatible-asset-accumulation>

88 Amadeo, K. (2019, July). Consumer spending and its impact on the economy. *The Balance*. Retrieved from <https://www.thebalance.com/consumer-spending-definition-and-determinants-3305917>

Chapman, J., & Thompson, J. (2006). *The economic impact of local living wages*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/bp170/>

Office of Policy Development and Research. (2016, Summer). *Neighborhoods and violent crime. Evidence matters: Transforming knowledge into housing and community development policy*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Retrieved from <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/em/summer16/highlight2.html>

McKenzie, T. L., Moody, J. S., Carlson, J. A., Lopez, N. V., Elder, J. P. (2014). Neighborhood income matters: Disparities in community recreation facilities, amenities, and programs. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 31(4), 12-22. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4082954/>

FIGURE 12

HOUSING

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., & Katz, L. F. (2016, April). The effects of exposure to better neighborhoods on children: New evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment. *American Economic Review*, 106(4), 855-902. Retrieved from <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.20150572>

Cunningham, M. K. (2016, June 26). *Reduce poverty by improving housing stability*. Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/reduce-poverty-improving-housing-stability>

Enterprise Community Partners, Inc. (2014). *Impact of affordable housing on families and communities: A review of the evidence base*. Retrieved from <https://homeforallsmc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Impact-of-Affordable-Housing-on-Families-and-Communities.pdf>

Goodman, L. (2018, February 21). *Homeownership is still financially better than renting*. Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/homeownership-still-financially-better-renting>

Joint Center for Housing Studies. (2020). *The State of the Nation's Housing 2019 do not necessarily*. Harvard University. Retrieved from https://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/Harvard_JCHS_State_of_the_Nations_Housing_2019.pdf

Litman, T. (2015, March). *Analysis of Public Policies that Unintentionally Encourage and Subsidize Sprawl*. The New Climate Economy and the Victoria Transport Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://newclimateeconomy.report/workingpapers/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/04/public-policies-encourage-sprawl-nce-report.pdf>

Maqbool, N., Viveiros, J., & Ault, M. (2015, April). *The impacts of affordable housing on health: A research summary*. Center for Housing Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.rupco.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/The-Impacts-of-Affordable-Housing-on-Health-CenterforHousingPolicy-Maqbool.etal.pdf>

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2015, June 30). *Permanent supportive housing cost study map*. Retrieved from <https://endhomelessness.org/resource/permanent-supportive-housing-cost-study-map/>

Office of Development and Research. (2014). *How Housing Mobility Affects Education Outcomes for Low- Income Children*. *Evidence Matters*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Retrieved from <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/em/fall14/highlight2.html>

Rohe, W. M., & Lindblad, M. (2013, August). *Reexamining the social benefits of homeownership after the housing crisis*. Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University. Retrieved from <https://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/hbt1-04.pdf>

Sullivan, J. (2015, April 21). *How commute issues can dramatically impact employee retention*. TLNT. Retrieved from <https://www.tlnt.com/how-commute-issues-can-dramatically-impact-employee-retention/>

Taylor, L. (2018, June 7). *Housing and health: An overview of the literature*. *Health Affairs Health Policy Brief*. Retrieved from <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hpb20180313.396577/full/>

The Economist. (2018, June 7). *The stark relationship between income inequality and crime*. Retrieved from <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2018/06/07/the-stark-relationship-between-income-inequality-and-crime>

Wright, B., Li, G., Weller, M., & Vartanian, K. (2016, February). *Housing and health: Exploring the intersection between housing and health care*. Enterprise Community Partners and Center for Outcomes Research and Education. Retrieved from <https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/download?fid=5703&nid=4247>

United States Interagency Council on Homelessness. (2017). *Ending chronic homelessness in 2017*. Retrieved from https://www.usich.gov/resources/uploads/asset_library/Ending_Chronic_Homelessness_in_2017.pdf

CHILD CARE

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2019). *The graduation effect*. Retrieved from <http://impact.all4ed.org/>

American Psychological Association. (2019). *Education and socioeconomic status*. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/publications/education>

Auguste, B.G., Hancock, B., & Laboissiere, M. (2009). *The economic cost of the U.S. education gap*. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/social-sector/our-insights/the-economic-cost-of-the-us-education-gap>

Child Care Aware of America. (2019). *The US and the high cost of child care: An examination of a broken system*. Retrieved from <https://usa.childcareaware.org/advocacy-public-policy/resources/research/costofcare/>

Garcia, E. & Weiss, E. (2017, September 27). *Education inequalities at the school starting gate*. Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.epi.org/publication/education-inequalities-at-the-school-starting-gate/>

Garcia, J. L., Heckman, J. J., Leaf, D. E., & Prados, M. J. (2016, December). *The life-cycle benefits of an influential early childhood program*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w22993>

Virginia Commonwealth University, Center on Society and Health. (2015, February 13). *Why education matters to health: Exploring the causes*. Retrieved from <https://www.aecf.org/resources/overstressed-kids/>

FOOD

- Berkowitz, S. A., Basu, S., Meigs, J. B., & Selgman, H. K. (2018). Food insecurity and health care expenditures in the United States, 2011-2013. *Health Services Research*, 53(3), 1600-1602. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1475-6773.12730>
- Bhargava, V., & Lee, J. S. (2016). Food insecurity and health care utilization among older adults in the United States. *Journal of Nutrition in Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 35(3), 177-192. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27559853>
- Feeding America & Oxfam America. (2014). *From paycheck to pantry: Hunger in working America*. Retrieved from <https://www.feedingamerica.org/sites/default/files/research/hunger-in-working-america/from-paycheck-to-pantry.pdf>
- Food Research and Action Center. (2017). *The Impact of Poverty, Food Insecurity, and Poor Nutrition on Health and Well-Being*. Retrieved from <http://frac.org/wp-content/uploads/hunger-health-impact-poverty-food-insecurity-health-well-being.pdf>
- French, S.A., Tangney, C.C., Crane, M.M. et al. (2019). Nutrition quality of food purchases varies by household income: the SHoPPER study. *BMC Public Health*, 19(231), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6546-2>
- Johnson, A. D., & Markowitz, A. J. (2017, March 21). Association between household food insecurity in early childhood and children's kindergarten skills. *Child Development*, 89(2). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12764>
- Loopstra, R., & Lalor, D. (2017). *Financial insecurity, food insecurity, and disability: The profile of people receiving emergency food assistance from The Trussell Trust Foodbank Network in Britain*. The Trussell Trust. Retrieved from https://www.trusselltrust.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2017/06/UO_exec_summary_final_02_04_online.pdf
- McLaughlin, K. A. Green, J. G., Alegria, M., & Costello, E. J. (2012, December). Food insecurity and mental disorders in a national sample of U.S. adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 51(12), 1293-1303. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0890856712007265>
- RTI International. (2014). *Current and prospective scope of hunger and food security in America*. Retrieved from http://www.rti.org/sites/default/files/resources/full_hunger_report_final_07-24-14.pdf

TRANSPORTATION

- Beiler, M. O., & Mohammed, M. (2016). Exploring transportation equity: Development and application of a transportation justice framework. *Transportation research part D: transport and environment*, 47, 285-298. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2016.06.007>
- Dawkins, C., Jeon, J. S., & Pendall, R. (2015). Transportation access, rental vouchers, and neighborhood satisfaction: Evidence from the moving to opportunity experiment. *Housing Policy Debate*, 25(3), 497-530. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2014.986662>
- Institute for Transportation and Development Policy. (2019, May 23). The High Cost of Transportation in the United States. *Transportation Matters*. Retrieved from <https://www.itdp.org/2019/05/23/high-cost-transportation-united-states/>
- Martens, K. (2016). *Transport justice: Designing fair transportation systems*. New York: Routledge.
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (2012, October 25). *How does transportation impact health?* Retrieved from <https://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2012/10/how-does-transportation-impact-health.html>
- Sullivan, J. (2015, April 21). *How commute issues can dramatically impact employee retention*. TLNT. Retrieved from: <https://www.tlnt.com/how-commute-issues-can-dramatically-impact-employee-retention/>
- Young, L., Irvin, E., & Shankar, P. (2019, September). *Equity and Smart Mobility*. Institute for Sustainable Communities and the Center for Neighborhood Technology. Retrieved from <https://www.cnt.org/sites/default/files/publications/Equity-and-Smart-Mobility-Report.pdf>
- Zhao, F., & Gustafson, T. (2013, February). Transportation Needs of Disadvantaged Populations: Where, When, and How? *FTA Report No. 0030*. Federal Transit Administration. Retrieved from https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/FTA_Report_No._0030.pdf

HEALTH CARE

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). *Emergency department visits*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/emergency-department.htm>
- Claxton, G., Sawyer, B., & Cox, C. (2019, April 14). How affordability of health care varies by income among people with employer coverage. *Access & Affordability, Peterson-KFF Health System Tracker*. Retrieved from <https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/brief/how-affordability-of-health-care-varies-by-income-among-people-with-employer-coverage/>
- DeLia, D., & Lloyd, K. (2014, July). *Sources of variation in avoidable hospital use and cost across low-income communities in New Jersey*. Rutgers Center for State Health Policy. Retrieved from <http://www.cshp.rutgers.edu/downloads/10470.pdf>
- Dickman, S. L., Himmelstein, D. U., & Woolhandler, S. (2017). Inequality and the health-care system in the USA. *The Lancet*, 389(10077), 1431-1441.
- Golberstein E. (2015). The effects of income on mental health: evidence from the social security notch. *The Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics*, 18(1), 27-37. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4494112/>

McMorrow, S., Kenney, G. M., & Goin, D. (2014). Determinants of receipt of recommended preventive services: implications for the Affordable Care Act. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(12), 2392–2399. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301569>

Powell, A. (2016, February 22). The costs of inequality: Money = quality healthcare = longer life. *Harvard Gazette*. Retrieved from <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2016/02/money-quality-health-care-longer-life/>

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (2011, December 1). *Health care's blind side: The overlooked connection between social needs and good health: Summary of findings from a survey of America's physicians*. Retrieved from <http://www.rwjf.org/files/research/RWJPhysiciansSurveyExecutiveSummary.pdf>

Witters, D., & Liu, D. (2013, May 7). In U.S., poor health tied to big losses for all job types. *Gallup*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/162344/poor-health-tied-big-losses-jobtypes.aspx>

Woolf, S.H., Aron, L., Dubay, L., Simon, S.M., Zimmerman, E., & Luk, K.X. (2015, April). *How Are Income and Wealth Linked to Health and Longevity?* Urban Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/49116/2000178-How-are-Income-and-Wealth-Linked-to-Health-and-Longevity.pdf>

TECHNOLOGY

Anderson, M., & Perrin, A. (2018, October 26). *Nearly one-in-five teens can't always finish their homework because of the digital divide*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/10/26/nearly-one-in-five-teens-cant-always-finish-their-homework-because-of-the-digital-divide/>

Anderson, M. (2019, May 7). *Digital divide persists even as lower-income Americans make gains in tech adoption*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/03/22/digital-divide-persists-even-as-lower-income-americans-make-gains-in-tech-adoption/>

Children's Hospital of Los Angeles. (2019). *mHealth*. Retrieved from <https://www.himss.org/library/mhealth>

Office of Policy Development and Research. (2016). *Community development and the digital divide*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Retrieved from <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/em/fall16/highlight1.html>

Pew Research Center. (2019, June 12). *Mobile fact sheet*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/>

Rideout, V., & Katz, V. (2016, Winter). *Opportunity for all? Technology and learning in lower-income families. A report of the families and media project*. The Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop. Retrieved from http://joanganzcooneycenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/jgcc_opportunityforall.pdf

Smith, A. (2013, April 25). *Civic engagement in the digital age*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewinternet.org/2013/04/25/civic-engagement-in-the-digital-age/>

Smith, A. (2015, April 1). Usage and attitudes toward smartphones. In *U.S. Smartphone Use in 2015*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/01/chapter-two-usage-and-attitudes-toward-smartphones/#job%20seeking>

SAVINGS

Blank, R. M., & Barr, M. S. (Eds.). (2009). *Insufficient funds: Savings, assets, credit, and banking among low-income households*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Collins, J. M., & Gjertson, L. (2013). Emergency savings for low-income consumers. *Focus, 30*(1), 12-17. Retrieved from <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc301c.pdf>

Econsult Solutions, Inc. (ESI). (2018 – January 18). *ESI Examines the Impact of Insufficient Retirement Savings on Pennsylvania*. Pennsylvania Treasury. Retrieved from <https://patreasury.gov/pdf/Impact-Insufficient-Retirement-Savings.pdf>

Helm, S., Serido, J., Ahn, S.Y., Ligon, V., & Shim, S. (2019, November). Materialist values, financial and pro-environmental behaviors, and well-being. *Emerald Insight*. Retrieved from <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/YC-10-2018-0867/full/html>

Krieger, J, Carter, G., Burr, M., & Collins, J.M. (2017, January). *The Case for Reducing Poverty Among Seniors: Encouraging Savings for Retirement by People in Wisconsin: Projected Reductions in Wisconsin State Expenditures*. La Follette School of Public Affairs, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and AARP. Retrieved from <https://lafollette.wisc.edu/images/publications/otherpublications/AARP-The-Case-for-Reducing-Poverty-Among-Seniors.pdf>

Levins, N. (2016, April). *Why Cities Should Care about Family Financial Security*. Urban Institute; Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/features/why-cities-should-care-about-family-financial-security>

Mutchler, J., Li, Y., & Roldán, N.V. (2019). *Living Below the Line: Economic Insecurity and Older Americans, Insecurity in the States 2019*. Center for Social and Demographic Research on Aging at the University of Massachusetts Boston. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/demographyofaging/40/>

Poterba, J. M., & Venti, S. F. (2001). Preretirement cashouts and foregone retirement saving: Implications for 401(k) asset accumulation. In D. A. Wise (Ed.), *Themes in the Economics of Aging* (pp. 23-58). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/chapters/c10320>

Rhee, N. & Boivie, I. (2015, March). *The Continuing Retirement Savings Crisis*. National Institute on Retirement Savings. Retrieved from https://www.nirsonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/final_rsc_2015.pdf

Wang, L., & Graddy, E. (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 19*(1), 23. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226255124_Social_Capital_Volunteering_and_Charitable_Giving

UWCI Six County ALICE Report 2020

ALICE is a registered trademark of the United Way of Northern New Jersey.

© Copyright 2009–2020 United Way of Northern New Jersey. All rights reserved.

No further use, copying, dissemination, distribution, or publication is permitted without the express written permission of United Way of Northern New Jersey.

ALICE IN BOONE COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data

Population: 66,999 • **Number of Households:** 24,645

Median Household Income: \$81,145 (state average: \$55,746)

Unemployment Rate: 2.5% (state average: 4.4%)


ALICE Households: 22% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 6% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Boone County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Boone County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Boone County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$754	\$1,072
Child Care	\$-	\$1,341
Food	\$256	\$775
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$189	\$549
Taxes	\$298	\$770
Monthly Total	\$2,074	\$6,038
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$24,888	\$72,456
Hourly Wage*	\$12.44	\$36.23


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/methodology)

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Boone County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Boone County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Advance Town	175	46%
Center Township	7,768	44%
Clinton Township	409	21%
Harrison Township	260	18%
Jackson Township	1,102	33%
Jamestown Town	400	44%
Jefferson Township	551	17%
Lebanon City	6,783	49%
Marion Township	612	28%
Perry Township	442	30%
Sugar Creek Township	946	41%
Thorntown Town	589	51%
Washington Township	468	24%
Whitestown Town	1,431	16%
Whitestown Town	2,652	20%
Worth Township	1,310	23%
Zionsville Town	9,346	16%
Zionsville Town	9,346	16%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.

ALICE IN MARION COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data

Population: 954,670 • **Number of Households:** 373,634

Median Household Income: \$47,780 (state average: \$55,746)

Unemployment Rate: 6.2% (state average: 4.4%)


ALICE Households: 26% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 15% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Marion County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Marion County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Marion County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$659	\$938
Child Care	\$-	\$1,155
Food	\$247	\$748
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$175	\$505
Taxes	\$268	\$673
Monthly Total	\$1,926	\$5,550
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$23,112	\$66,600
Hourly Wage*	\$11.56	\$33.30


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/methodology)

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Marion County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Marion County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Beech Grove City	5,862	48%
Center Township	61,159	57%
Clermont Town	548	22%
Decatur Township	11,856	34%
Franklin Township	19,801	22%
Homecroft Town	261	15%
Indianapolis City (balance)	339,536	41%
Lawrence City	18,113	37%
Lawrence Township	49,757	41%
Meridian Hills Town	658	13%
Perry Township	44,308	41%
Pike Township	31,161	37%
Rocky Ripple Town	261	36%
Southport City	593	31%
Speedway Town	5,186	48%
Warren Park Town	869	64%
Warren Township	41,730	47%
Washington Township	58,651	36%
Wayne Township	50,610	49%
Williams Creek Town	136	6%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.

ALICE IN HAMILTON COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data


Population: 330,086 • **Number of Households:** 122,876
Median Household Income: \$100,209 (state average: \$55,746)
Unemployment Rate: 2.4% (state average: 4.4%)
ALICE Households: 17% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 4% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Hamilton County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Hamilton County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Hamilton County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$881	\$1,254
Child Care	\$-	\$1,542
Food	\$293	\$889
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$210	\$613
Taxes	\$346	\$911
Monthly Total	\$2,307	\$6,740
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$27,684	\$80,880
Hourly Wage*	\$13.84	\$40.44


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/methodology)

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Hamilton County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Hamilton County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Adams Township	2,171	40%
Arcadia Town	557	54%
Atlanta Town	299	35%
Carmel City	33,738	16%
Cicero Town	2,064	31%
Clay Township	35,605	18%
Delaware Township	14,975	24%
Fall Creek Township	20,006	12%
Fishers City	32,017	17%
Jackson Township	4,239	35%
Noblesville City	22,532	29%
Noblesville Township	21,216	30%
Sheridan Town	1,196	53%
Washington Township	14,870	22%
Wayne Township	3,022	28%
Westfield City	13,368	22%
White River Township	878	27%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.

ALICE IN HANCOCK COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data

Population: 76,351 • **Number of Households:** 28,215

Median Household Income: \$71,653 (state average: \$55,746)

Unemployment Rate: 3.0% (state average: 4.4%)


ALICE Households: 21% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 7% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Hancock County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Hancock County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Hancock County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$679	\$965
Child Care	\$-	\$1,186
Food	\$244	\$740
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$177	\$510
Taxes	\$271	\$679
Monthly Total	\$1,948	\$5,611
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$23,376	\$67,332
Hourly Wage*	\$11.69	\$33.67


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/methodology)

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Hancock County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Hancock County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Blue River Township	438	31%
Brandywine Township	952	24%
Brown Township	959	31%
Buck Creek Township	3,129	15%
Center Township	10,919	37%
Cumberland Town	2,073	26%
Fortville Town	1,793	23%
Green Township	632	25%
Greenfield City	8,965	41%
Jackson Township	798	14%
McCordsville Town	2,237	14%
New Palestine Town	852	29%
Shirley Town	320	44%
Spring Lake Town	110	41%
Sugar Creek Township	5,713	26%
Vernon Township	4,675	18%
Wilkinson Town	156	35%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.

ALICE IN HENDRICKS COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data


Population: 167,009 • **Number of Households:** 60,368
Median Household Income: \$80,582 (state average: \$55,746)
Unemployment Rate: 1.7% (state average: 4.4%)
ALICE Households: 18% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 6% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Hendricks County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Hendricks County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Hendricks County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$804	\$1,144
Child Care	\$-	\$1,249
Food	\$253	\$767
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$195	\$545
Taxes	\$313	\$760
Monthly Total	\$2,142	\$5,996
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$25,704	\$71,952
Hourly Wage*	\$12.85	\$35.98


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/methodology)

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Hendricks County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Hendricks County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Amo Town	158	35%
Avon Town	5,946	23%
Brown Township	3,971	14%
Brownsburg Town	9,332	31%
Center Township	4,639	31%
Clay Township	834	37%
Clayton Town	362	37%
Coatesville Town	209	51%
Danville Town	3,633	34%
Eel River Township	666	38%
Franklin Township	534	37%
Guilford Township	11,829	37%
Liberty Township	2,266	22%
Lincoln Township	11,913	30%
Lizton Town	199	48%
Marion Township	534	30%
Middle Township	2,398	26%
North Salem Town	223	63%
Pittsboro Town	1,157	26%
Plainfield Town	11,936	37%
Stilesville Town	130	56%
Union Township	725	33%
Washington Township	17,769	20%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.

ALICE IN MORGAN COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data

Population: 70,116 • **Number of Households:** 25,926

Median Household Income: \$68,338 (state average: \$55,746)

Unemployment Rate: 6.1% (state average: 4.4%)


ALICE Households: 22% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 10% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Morgan County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Morgan County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Morgan County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$619	\$880
Child Care	\$-	\$1,153
Food	\$259	\$786
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$172	\$504
Taxes	\$265	\$690
Monthly Total	\$1,892	\$5,544
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$22,704	\$66,528
Hourly Wage*	\$11.35	\$33.26


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at [UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology](https://www.unitedforalice.org/methodology)

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Morgan County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Morgan County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Adams Township	423	22%
Ashland Township	672	26%
Baker Township	301	9%
Brooklyn Town	566	34%
Brown Township	5,054	40%
Clay Township	1,600	34%
Green Township	1,198	22%
Gregg Township	1,029	23%
Harrison Township	568	18%
Jackson Township	1,406	25%
Jefferson Township	1,289	25%
Madison Township	3,672	25%
Martinsville City	4,349	47%
Monroe Township	1,839	25%
Monrovia Town	487	22%
Mooresville Town	3,779	43%
Morgantown Town	381	50%
Painted Hills CDP	238	7%
Paragon Town	219	61%
Ray Township	588	32%
Washington Township	6,287	39%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.

ALICE IN PUTNAM COUNTY

2018 Point-in-Time Data

Population: 37,559 • **Number of Households:** 13,439

Median Household Income: \$56,169 (state average: \$55,746)

Unemployment Rate: 4.2% (state average: 4.4%)


ALICE Households: 24% (state average: 24%) • **Households in Poverty:** 10% (state average: 13%)

Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

How has the number of ALICE households changed over time?

ALICE is an acronym for Asset Limited, Income Constrained, Employed – households that earn more than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living for the county (the ALICE Threshold). While conditions improved for some households from 2010 to 2018, many continued to struggle, especially as wages failed to keep pace with the cost of household essentials (housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, and a basic smartphone plan).

Households by Income, Putnam County, 2010 to 2018




Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2010-2018; American Community Survey, 2010-2018

What types of households are struggling?

In the past few decades, there have been major shifts in household composition. The share of American adults who have never been married is at a historic high, as is the number of senior households. There is also a growing number of people who live alone or with roommates, and an increasing share of grown children who live with their parents. Yet all types of households continue to struggle: ALICE and poverty-level households exist across all of these living arrangements.

Household Income by Household Type, Putnam County, 2018



Sources: ALICE Threshold, 2018; American Community Survey, 2018

Why do so many households struggle?

The cost of household basics outpaces wages...

The Household Survival Budget reflects the bare minimum cost to live and work in the modern economy and includes housing, child care, food, transportation, health care, technology (a smartphone plan), and taxes. It does not include savings for emergencies or future goals like college or retirement. In 2018, household costs were well above the Federal Poverty Level of \$12,140 for a single adult and \$25,100 for a family of four.

Household Survival Budget, Putnam County, 2018		
	SINGLE ADULT	2 ADULTS, 1 INFANT, 1 PRESCHOOLER
Monthly Costs		
Housing	\$535	\$697
Child Care	\$-	\$921
Food	\$224	\$677
Transportation	\$332	\$800
Health Care	\$190	\$656
Technology	\$55	\$75
Miscellaneous	\$156	\$431
Taxes	\$221	\$485
Monthly Total	\$1,713	\$4,742
ANNUAL TOTAL	\$20,556	\$56,904
Hourly Wage*	\$10.28	\$28.45


* Wage working full-time required to support this budget

For ALICE Survival Budget Sources, see the 2020 Methodology Overview available at UnitedForALICE.org/Methodology

..and the labor landscape is challenging for ALICE workers

A breakdown of the labor force shows a small portion of adults (16 years and older) who were unemployed and a large number who were working in 2018. However, a significant portion of full- and part-time workers were paid by the hour; these workers were more likely to have fluctuations in income and less likely to receive benefits. There was also a high number of workers outside of the labor force (people who are not employed and not looking for work), which helped keep wages low: When more workers are available, employers have less incentive to raise wages to attract employees.

Labor Status, Population 16 and Over, Putnam County, 2018



Note: Data for full- and part-time jobs is only available at the national level; these national rates (51% of full-time workers and 75% of part-time workers paid hourly) have been applied to the total county workforce to calculate the breakdown shown in this figure. Full-time represents a minimum of 35 hours per week at one or more jobs for 48 weeks per year.

Sources: American Community Survey, 2018; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, 2018

Putnam County, 2018		
Town	Total HH	% ALICE & Poverty
Bainbridge Town	316	42%
Clinton Township	666	43%
Cloverdale Town	786	33%
Cloverdale Township	1,446	27%
Fillmore Town	288	41%
Floyd Township	1,533	22%
Franklin Township	706	39%
Greencastle City	3,675	45%
Greencastle Township	4,812	40%
Heritage Lake CDP	1,254	25%
Jackson Township	282	50%
Jefferson Township	469	21%
Madison Township	377	12%
Marion Township	921	33%
Monroe Township	485	40%
Roachdale Town	385	48%
Russell Township	307	43%
Russellville Town	128	44%
Van Bibber Lake CDP	375	55%
Warren Township	414	18%
Washington Township	1,021	38%

Note: Municipal-level data is 1- and 5-year averages for Incorporated Places and County Subdivisions, which include Census Designated Places (CDP) and Census County Divisions (CCD). Totals do not match county-level numbers because some places cross county borders, geographies may overlap, data is not available for the smallest towns, and county-level data is often 1-year estimates.