

Self-sufficiency State of Poverty in Ohio

employment seniors nutrition assistance families howsehold income poverty line foster care education costs addiction Medicaid expansion child care



Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies

Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies

Philip E. Cole, J.D., Executive Director Kathryn A. Clausen, Communications Director Josh Summer, Development Director 50 West Broad Street, Suite 1616 Columbus, OH 43215 phone: 614-224-8500 fax: 614-224-2587 www.oacaa.org

The Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies (OACAA) exists to support, unify, and strengthen the Community Action Network in Ohio. Serving the needs of low-income families and individuals, Ohio's forty-eight Community Action Agencies provide resources and opportunities to alleviate poverty and help all Ohioans become fully self-sufficient. Each independent nonprofit agency is locally controlled and provides services unique to their communities so that low-income households can overcome their unique barriers. Agencies take a wholistic approach to not only assist with the emergency needs of today but to build a foundation for long-term success tomorrow. Our network employs 6,500 people who administer over \$450 million and serve over 700,000 Ohioans annually. Our 50-year history of helping people and changing lives not only seeks solutions to strengthen families but also communities.

Thoughtwell

Lynnette Cook, Ph.D., Executive Director Megan Johanson, Ph.D., Director of Research and Data Services Becky Zwickl, Assistant Director, Quality Assurance Jacob Cunliffe, Senior Research Associate Marc Rostan, Senior Research Associate Genna Auteri, Research Associate Bruce Jones, Research Associate

399 E. Main Street, Suite 100 Columbus, Ohio 43215 phone: 614-224-5917 www.thoughtwell.org

Thoughtwell is a nonprofit research center that strengthens Ohio communities through data, information, and knowledge. Thoughtwell is a partnership of the City of Columbus, United Way of Central Ohio, The Ohio State University, and the Franklin County Commissioners. Thoughtwell is also the Columbus partner in the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership.

Editorial Partners

Leah D. Hackleman-Good, Ph.D. Editorial.Partners 740.654.1260 Information design for research, education, and business



This report is supported in whole or in part through a grant from the Ohio Development Services Agency (ODSA). However, the information contained in the report does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of ODSA.

Letter from the Executive Director

Nearly 307,000 Ohio families including over 1.6 million individuals are experiencing poverty today. The Community Action Network continues to develop innovative solutions which can help every Ohioan reach their fullest potential and become self-sufficient. To be effective, it is imperative that we understand the systems and processes that have created obstacles preventing some from achieving self-reliance. One effective way to do that is to research and analyze credible data, which we do in this report.

The State of Poverty in Ohio report, now in its 25th year of production, aims to shed light on trends across our state which may be preventing low-income Ohioans from breaking out of poverty. By bringing attention to economic, social, environmental, geographic area considerations, and policies that may get in the way, we as a society, a network, and a partner can work together to develop viable solutions which can have a real and lasting impact for Ohioans.

As in previous years, we begin the 2017 State of Poverty report by defining poverty. We compare the outdated Federal Poverty Level (FPL) guidelines with the Self-Sufficiency Standard to illustrate the realistic income necessary for self-reliance based on varying family compositions and areas. The map on page six illustrates the change in the percentage of poverty, for better or worse, in Ohio.

New data analyzing Ohio's 2015 Medicaid Expansion is also now available and included in this report. Though we believe it is still too early to determine the long-term impacts for newly eligible families, over 700,000 Ohioans have already benefited from the expansion allowing Ohio to record the lowest ever rate of uninsured non-senior adults at 14.1%.

The rising costs of childcare and education have continued to have a major impact on families—an impact that is significantly greater to low-income Ohioans. A married couple living at the Federal Poverty Level, for instance, will exceed their income by more than 30% when adding childcare costs on top of housing, food, and transportation, not to mention other necessities like clothing and other needs. Although options like Title XX funding or centers that accept Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) provide an opportunity for families to access childcare, the benefits are not widely available in many communities. As a result, these families are forced to choose sub-standard daycare providers or must significantly reduce their available income. This makes it even more difficult for them to get ahead. And, over the past 14 years, tuition costs have increased nearly 30% while state support has decreased over 14% creating a wider gap between education and affordability, adding more debt, and creating fewer opportunities to secure higher paying jobs.

This report also highlights the economic impacts of the opioid epidemic in Ohio. Over 2,300 people died from opioids in 2016 making Ohio the second most impacted state in America. Families of those who died are impacted not only emotionally but also financially—especially if the person was a primary income earner.

In addition to the highlighted trends, it is our hope the data tables included in this report will provide you valuable information about poverty across all areas in the state. We encourage you to get involved, ask questions, and take a seat at the table to discuss solutions that will help people and change lives throughout Ohio.

Sincerely,

1/45 6

Philip E. Cole *Executive Director Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies*

Defining Poverty

decrease in people below the Federal Poverty Level since 2011...

See Tables 8 and 9, p. 20

Poverty has multiple definitions, many of which counter the preconceived notion of what it is like to live in poverty in the United States. The most frequently used measure of poverty, the **Federal Poverty Level (FPL)**, provides a threshold based on family size and draws a line that puts families and individuals in poverty, or above poverty. However, the FPL does not tell the full story of poverty.

Often people fall below the poverty level for brief periods of time which may not be reflected in FPL numbers. Someone who is in poverty every month over the course of three years is said to be in **chronic poverty**—what many people think of when they hear "poverty." However, **episodic poverty**, defined as being in poverty for at least two consecutive months in a three year period, is far more prevalent than chronic or annual poverty (32% instead of close to 16% annual and 3.5% chronic poverty with the most recent estimates), and can also make it difficult to secure basic needs like shelter and food.

The **Federal Poverty Measure (FPM)** and **Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM)** are two other ways of looking at poverty. The FPM provides a threshold based on the minimum food budget—three times that amount is the FPM. The SPM, on the other hand, includes not only food, but also clothing, housing, and utilities in its measures.

...but this statistic doesn't tell the full story.

The above graph provides a visual representation of a family whose income might indicate episodic poverty, with the blue line representing the family's income and the black line showing the federal poverty level. Although the family maintains an income mostly above the FPL, at times it falls beneath the line. When income falls beneath the line for at least two months in a row, as it does on the far right of the graph, that family is experiencing episodic poverty.

State of Poverty 2017

Defining Poverty

See Tables 1 and 2, p. 16



Defining Poverty

The self-sufficiency standard takes into account costs including...

food utilities housing clothing



The **Self-Sufficiency Standard** considers not only the base level needs and how much money is required to cover those needs but also considers how much a family needs to earn in order to be free from any type of public assistance. Since certain costs, like housing, vary greatly by geography, the self-sufficiency standard takes location into consideration. Family size is also used to create the standard and accounts for things like the higher cost of child care for an infant versus for a preschooler.

Self-sufficiency standards for Ohio vary widely by county; in Noble County a single adult raising one preschool-age child would need to earn \$27,461 annually to be self-sufficient. In Warren County, that same adult would need to earn 63% more - \$44,818 - to make ends meet. Counties that surround Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland have the highest annual self-sufficiency wages whereas counties in southeast and northwest Ohio have far lower wages. The higher self-sufficiency standards by county are due to increased costs in areas like housing (rent or mortgage), child care, and transportation.

Another way of looking at poverty is to consider **asset poverty**, or the percentage of people who would be forced into poverty if they encountered an expensive emergency situation. Asset poverty is defined as having assets (including both liquid - like cash - and non-liquid - like a house) that are worth less than three months' living expenses at the FPL. A person or household may also be **liquid asset poor** if they would have to sell something, like a house or a car, to cover three months' worth of living expenses in an emergency.

Many Ohioans are at risk of encountering the **benefits cliff**, or a sudden drop off in public benefits, due to an income increase that shifts their income above the allowable maximum for certain benefits. For example, a family might qualify for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, sometimes called food stamps). However, when the main wage earner receives a \$1 an hour raise, the family no longer qualifies. In this instance the family may have a harder time securing food than they did when receiving SNAP benefits, leaving families in a precarious situation when considering increased earning potential.

> Use the Self-Sufficiency Calculator to determine income needed to meet the basic needs of a particular family type in a specific county in Ohio: www.oacaa.org/self-sufficiency-calculator/

Defining Poverty

See Table 4, p.17

See Tables 5-7, p. 18-19

Poverty in Ohio

Change in the percentage of the population below 200% of the federal poverty level, 2000-2016



As noted in the Defining Poverty section, there are many different ways of looking at poverty. This map looks at the absolute change in the percentage of people who are below 200% FPL, or earn up to two times the FPL. Most counties in Ohio have seen an increase in people below 200% FPL in the last 16 years (2000 to 2016). Of the five counties that have seen a decrease in poverty at 200% FPL, four have a poverty rate above the state average at 100% FPL, indicating that they are still experiencing substantial poverty.

Medicaid expansion has, of course, increased the number of Ohioans who have access to healthcare; more than 700,000 Ohioans are newly enrolled and the uninsured rate for low-income, non-senior adults has dropped from 33% in 2010 to 14% in 2015.

The Ohio Department of Medicaid surveyed recipients who were newly eligible for Medicaid following Medicaid expansion, which increased the income eligibility cap in Ohio. Survey respondents reported having an easier time continuing to work if already employed and an easier time looking for work if not employed. In addition, 55.8% of surveyed Medicaid enrollees reported having medical debt before enrolling in Medicaid; after enrollment, only 30.8% of survey respondents reported having medical debt.

of employed workers said expansion made it easier to continue working

52.1%

"Gives me the ability to seek employment without worrying about my health."

Medicaid Expansion

74.8%

said expansion made it easier to look for work

"I am finally getting everything that was wrong with me fixed so that I can go back to work. It's a great help."

See Table 25, p.51

Data note: Medicaid in Ohio currently covers nearly half of Ohio's prescriptions for the main opioid addiction medication

Child Care

Married

parents

who live at the

poverty

of their income on

child care

center-based

line

spend

with two children

133%

100%

80%

60%

40%

20%

Child care

Higher education's tuition costs have been steadily increasing over the last two decades. This increase in tuition comes despite the fact that tuition was frozen for part of that time. As tuition increases, students are increasingly burdened by high cost, high interest student loans. Colleges and universities in Ohio are offering much less need-based aid than they offered just 10 years ago, and the state is offering less financial support.

As tuition costs rise there have also been increases in the number of administrators per student. Administrators may work in financial aid, student affairs, career planning, and other areas that are integral to retaining and attracting students. However, the increase in administrators may also contribute to increased college costs.

Additionally, there are more part-time faculty in Ohio schools; there are two parttime faculty members for every one full-time faculty, a 16% increase in 10 years.



Child care costs can be overwhelming on their own but, combined with the expenses of other basic needs, can far exceed a family's income. The graph to the left assumes a family spends 30% of their income on housing, 13% on food, 17% on transportation, and a whopping 73% on child care—which is easily the most expensive item in a household's budget. A married couple living at the FPL would far exceed their income, spending a total of 133% of their earnings on just housing, food, transportation, and child care.

Single parents, who are also at the FPL, seeking center-based child care for two children can expect to pay 83% of their income on child care.

There are some support options available to make child care more affordable in the form of Title XX funding, which may be offered to families based on need either for free or for a fee. However, there are not always enough centers available that accept Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC); statewide, only 72% of centers accept PFCC (Table 24, p. 48-50).

Income

Food

Housing



See Table 25, p.51

Education and Debt

See Table 25, p.51

Opioid Crisis

Ohio has been hit particularly hard by the opioid epidemic. In just one year the number of unintentional drug overdoses increased by nearly 33%, from 3,050 in 2015 to 4,050 in 2016. Of those drug overdoses, 6 out of every 10 were caused by Fentanyl and related opioids. **The percentage of overdose deaths due to opioids (compared to other drugs) has also increased in the last five years, from 3.9% to 58.2%.** Ohio currently has the second highest rate of drug overdose deaths, 39.1 per 100,000 residents (West Virginia is first).

Opioids make up the largest proportion of Ohio's overdose deaths



Six Ohioan Die even FROM RESULTING IN

billion

See Table 23, p. 47

Opioid Crisis



lost lifetime earnings

See Table 25, p.51

Data note: The graphic shows only deaths from *opioid* overdoses. In 2016, 4,050 Ohioans died from overdoses of any drug, approximately 11 per day.

Opioid Crisis

The opioid epidemic has taken the United States by storm, and it has disproportionately impacted Ohioans. Eleven Ohioans die every day from drug overdoses, and over half of those overdoses (six) are from opioids. Families are impacted not only emotionally but also financially. Because many of those who are dying each year are between the ages of 20 and 30, \$5.3 billion in projected lifetime earnings—\$3.1 billion from opioids alone—are lost, leaving loved ones to make up the financial resources to care for their families.

Like poverty, opioids do not discriminate; they have certainly taken their toll on low-, middle-, and upper-income households. Its impacts, however, can be devastating to low-income households who are less likely to have access to resources and treatment. This epidemic has affected family dynamics, mental and physical health, economics, and social services—including the foster care system. In fact, if Ohio maintains its current pace, the number of children in foster care are expected to reach 20,000 by 2020.

Half of all children in Ohio's foster care system have parents who struggle with drug usage, and according to a 2015 Public Children Services Association of Ohio (PCSAO) survey, 28% of those cases are opioid-specific. Children entering the foster system also have more complex needs than other children. Trauma-induced behavior challenges, drug-addicted births, lack of treatment options, longer wait times, insurance coverage limits, and much more have contributed to strain on foster care causing longer stays in temporary custody and fewer specially trained placement options.

Although the data surrounding opioids are alarming, private nonprofit and government entities are coming together to develop solutions. Community Action Agencies across Ohio, in many cases, have been at the lead of the opioid crisis in their communities. Agencies have partnered with others in their service areas to develop solutions ranging from intense wrap-around case management services to housing solutions for families in recovery. Programs like PCSAO's Ohio START (Sobriety Treatment And Reducing Trauma), which is modeled from a program created in Cuyahoga County and implemented successfully in Kentucky, are also beginning to make an impact for families to overcome addiction.

Investing in solutions like intensive case management has been shown to save money in the long-term. As Ohioans, we must come together with innovative programs and be prepared to meet new challenges in full force to make a positive impact for our neighbors and our communities.

See Table 25, p. 51

The foster care system has been particularly stressed by increases in drug overdoses. According to data from the Public Children Services Association of Ohio (PCSAO), the number of children in foster care has steadily increased since 2010, from 12,300 to 15,000. That number is expected to continue increasing, particularly since half of all children coming into the foster care system have drug-using parents. As a result of the increased strain on the foster care system, there has been a substantial increase in foster care placement costs. The state recently allocated an additional \$15 million to foster care placement funds to meet some of this need, though PCSAO estimates that costs have increased by as much as \$45 million in the last year alone.

Haf

of all children in Ohio's foster care system have parents who struggle with

State of Poverty 2017

Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies

Opioid Crisis

See Table 25, p.51

List of Tables

Defining Poverty

Table 1. Federal poverty level thresholds by household size and number	
of related children, in dollars, 2016	16
Table 2. Comparison between the Official and Supplemental Poverty Measures	16
Table 3. Chronic and episodic poverty rates, United States, 2005–2007	
and 2009–2011	17
Table 4. Items included in the Self-Sufficiency Standard, Ohio	17
Table 5. Monthly expenses and self-sufficiency wages, sample counties, 2015	18
Table 6. Asset poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2002–2011	19
Table 7. Liquid asset poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2006–2011	19

Poverty in Ohio

Table 8. Poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2011-2016	20
Table 9. Change in poverty, Ohio, 2011-2016	20
Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need,	
Ohio counties	21
Table 11. Change in 200% FPL, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2016	39
Table 12. Child poverty by age group, Ohio, 2016	42
Table 13. Child food insecurity, Ohio and the United States, 2015	42
Table 14. Income to poverty ratio by age group, Ohio, 2016	43
Table 15. Poverty by race/ethnicity, Ohio, 2016	43
Table 16. Poverty by race/ethnicity and age, Ohio, 2016	44
Table 17. Poverty by family type, Ohio, 2016	44
Table 18. Poverty by race/ethnicity of householder and family type, Ohio, 2016	45
Table 19. Poverty by employment type, Ohio, 2016	45

Table 20. Poverty by wage-earners, we Table 21. Poverty by educational attai Table 22. Seniors living in poverty by s Table 23. Drug overdose deaths, Ohio Table 24. Publicly Funded Child Care (

Sources

Table 25. Source information.....

ork experience, and family type, Ohio, 2016	.46
inment, Ohio, 2016	.46
sex, Ohio, 2016	.47
o, 2012-2016	. 47
(PFCC) status. Ohio counties	.48

ا C

Defining Poverty

Table 1. Federal poverty level thresholds by household size and number of children, 2016

Household size	Number of related children under age 18							
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
One person, under age	\$12,486							
65								
Age 65 and over	\$11,511							
Two people, under age	\$16,072	\$16,543						
65								
Age 65 and over	\$14,507	\$16,480						
Three people	\$18,774	\$19,318	\$19,337					
Four people	\$24,755	\$25,160	\$24,339	\$24,424				
Five people	\$29,854	\$30,288	\$29,360	\$28,643	\$28,205			
Six people	\$34,337	\$34,473	\$33,763	\$33,082	\$32,070	\$31,470		
Seven people	\$39,509	\$39,756	\$38,905	\$38,313	\$37,208	\$35,920	\$34,507	
Eight people	\$44,188	\$44,578	\$43,776	\$43,072	\$42,075	\$40,809	\$39,491	\$39,156
Nine people or more	\$53,155	\$53,413	\$52,702	\$52,106	\$51,127	\$49,779	\$48,561	\$48,259

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

- The U.S. Census Bureau calculates the federal poverty level (FPL) thresholds and estimates annually for the previous year, based on number of adults and number of related children under 18
- The FPL is based on the cash resources shared by related individuals in a household

Table 2. Comparison between the Official and Supplemental Poverty Measures

	Official Poverty Measure	Supplemental Poverty Measure
Measurement Units	Families and unrelated individuals	All related individuals who live at the same address and any co-resident
		unrelated children who are cared for by the family (such as foster chil-
		dren) and any co-habiters and their relatives
Poverty Threshold	3 times the cost of a minimum food diet	Mean of the 30th and 36th percentile of expenditures on food, clothing,
		shelter, and utilities of consumer units with exactly 2 children, multiplied
		by 1.2
Threshold Adjust-	Vary by family size, composition, and age of	Geographic adjustments for differences in housing costs by tenure and
ments	householder	a
		3-parameter equivalence scale for family size and composition
Updating Thresh-	Consumer Price Index	5-year moving average of expenditures on food, clothing, shelter, and
olds		utilities
Resource Measure	Gross pre-tax cash income	Sum of cash income; plus noncash benefits that families can use to
		meet their food, clothing, shelter, and utilities needs; plus tax credits;
		minus taxes, work expenses, out-of-pocket medical expenses, and child
		support paid to another household

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

- The official measure does not account for differences in housing costs in different parts of the country
- The supplemental measure considers government assistance and necessary expenses to establish a more accurate amount of resources available

Table 3. Chronic and episodic poverty rates, United States, 2005–2007 and 2009–2011 2005-2007 2009-2011 Percentage of population in poverty every month in a 36-month period (chronic poverty rate) 3.0% 3.5% 27.1% 31.6% Percentage of population in poverty for at least 2 consecutive months in a 36-month period (episodic

poverty rate)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation Notes: Monthly poverty thresholds were calculated by multiplying the base-year annual poverty thresholds by an inflation factor relevant to the reference month and then dividing the calculated annual threshold by 12. Study was based on three-year longitudinal panels of noninstitutionalized civilians participating for 36 consecutive months.

- deeper understanding of the duration of poverty
- unlike the overall annual poverty rate

Table 4. Items included in the Self-Sufficiency Standard, Ohio

HousingYes: Rent, utilities, and property taxesNo: Cable, internet, or telephone services (telephoneChild careYes: Full-time family day care for infants, full-timeChild carechildrenNo: After school programs for teenagers, extraFoodYes: GroceriesNo: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or aldFransporta-publiciontransportation when adequate (assuming only on No: Non-essential travel or vacationsHealth careYes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, transportationFaxesYes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively)Ves: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	Cost	What is included in each budget item
Housing No: Cable, internet, or telephone services (telephold care Child care Yes: Full-time family day care for infants, full-time family day care family day care family day care for infants, full-time family day care for infants, full-time family day care family day care fa	levele e	Yes: Rent, utilities, and property taxes
Yes: Full-time family day care for infants, full-time Child care children No: After school programs for teenagers, extrated Food Yes: Groceries No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or all Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance, public tion transporta- public No: Non-essential travel or vacations Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credi No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no Miscella- items, and telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	Housing	No: Cable, internet, or telephone services (telep
Child care children No: After school programs for teenagers, extra Yes: Groceries No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or ald Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance, Irransporta- public ion transportation when adequate (assuming only in No: Non-essential travel or vacations Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees or transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving		Yes: Full-time family day care for infants, full-tin
No: After school programs for teenagers, extra Food Yes: Groceries No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or ald Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance, public transporta- public No: Non-essential travel or vacations Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credi No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees or transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, n viscella- items, and telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	Child care	children
Yes: Groceries No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or ald Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance, public ion transportation when adequate (assuming only transportation transportation transportation transportation transportation transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, in tems, and Mo: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving		No: After school programs for teenagers, extra
No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or ald Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance, public ion transportaion when adequate (assuming only involve) Health care Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no Miscella- telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	- and	Yes: Groceries
Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance, Irransporta- public ion transportation when adequate (assuming only involve) No: Non-essential travel or vacations Health care Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, not telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving	-000	No: Take-out, fast-food, restaurant meals, or ald
Transporta- public ion transportation when adequate (assuming only No: Non-essential travel or vacations Health care Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Faxes Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit transportation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, not telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving		Yes: car ownership cost (per adult)—insurance,
transportation when adequate (assuming only No: Non-essential travel or vacations Health care Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Faxes Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit transportation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, not telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving	Fransporta-	public
No: Non-essential travel or vacations Health care Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	ion	transportation when adequate (assuming only
Health care Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Faxes Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit in the savings account, gym memberships, and tax credit in the savings account, gym memberships, and transportation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Ves: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving		No: Non-essential travel or vacations
No: Health savings account, gym memberships, Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credi No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no neous telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	Joalth caro	Yes: Employer-sponsored health insurance and
Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credit No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, no Noiscella- items, and telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin		No: Health savings account, gym memberships,
No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, not items, and telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, saving		Yes: Federal and state income tax and tax credi
transportation costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, n Miscella- items, and telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	Taxos	No: Itemized deductions, tax preparation fees of
costs, respectively) Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, n Miscella- items, and neous telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	laxes	transportation
Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, n Miscella- neous telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin		costs, respectively)
Miscella- items, and neous telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin		Yes: Clothing, shoes, paper products, diapers, n
neous telephone service No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	Viscella-	items, and
No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin	neous	telephone service
		No: Recreation, entertainment, pets, gifts, savin

Source: University of Washington, Center for Women's Welfare, Self-Sufficiency Standard for Ohio

- any additional public or private assistance

Appendix

Using a monthly poverty threshold as opposed to an annual one allows for a The episodic poverty rate (31.6%) in 2009-2011 was twice as high as the U.S.'s official annual poverty rate in 2011 (15.9%, see Table 8 on page 20) Episodic poverty rates capture the many people who filter in and out of poverty,

phone service is included under miscellaneous costs)

me center care for preschoolers, and before and after school care for school-age

acurricular activities, babysitting when not at work

coholic beverages

gasoline (including gasoline taxes), oil, registration, repairs, monthly payments-or

commuting to and from work and day care plus a weekly shopping trip)

out-of-pocket costs

individual health insurance

its, payroll taxes, and state and local sales taxes

or other taxes (property taxes and gasoline taxes are included under housing and

onprescription medicines, cleaning products, household items, personal hygiene

ngs, emergencies, debt repayment (including student loans), or education

 The Self-Sufficiency Standard is a measure that identifies the minimum amount of income a given household needs to adequately meet basic needs without receiving

It only provides the minimum to meet daily needs and does not include any allowance for savings, college tuition, debt payments, or emergencies See 2015 self-sufficiency brief for details on Noble and Warren Counties: http:// oacaa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/OH15_SSS_Brief_120815.pdf

Defining Poverty, continued

Table 5. Monthly expenses and self-sufficiency wages, sample counties, 2015

	Coshocton County (low)	Tuscarawas County (middle)	Warren County (high)
Monthly expenses			
	¢C24	¢C 42	¢050
Housing	\$634	\$643	\$958
Child Care	\$491	\$716	\$1,014
Food	\$696	\$782	\$812
Transportation	\$482	\$482	\$535
Health Care	\$473	\$475	\$462
Miscellaneous	\$278	\$310	\$378
Taxes	\$352	\$487	\$793
Self-sufficiency wages			
Hourly wage per working	\$8.30	\$9.88	\$13.31
adult			
Monthly household income	\$2,923	\$3,478	\$4,685
Annual household income	\$35,078	\$41,730	\$56,220
Minimum wage and poverty			
threshold (for comparison)			
2017 Ohio Minimum Wage	\$8.15	\$8.15	\$8.15
(hourly)			
2017 federal poverty level	\$24,339	\$24,339	\$24,339
threshold (annual)			

Sources: University of Washington, Center for Women's Welfare, Self-Sufficiency Standard for Ohio; Ohio Department of Commerce; U.S. Census Bureau

Notes: Figures represent the monthly expenses and self-sufficiency wages for a family of two adults and two school-age children. These are not average or median amounts earned, but the amount needed to be self-sufficient for a family of four. Coshocton, Tuscarawas, and Warren Counties were chosen because they represent the low end (least expensive self-sufficiency wage), the middle (closest to the median of the self-sufficiency wages of all 88 counties), and high end (most expensive self-sufficiency wage) for that family type. Taxes were calculated as total tax burden minus tax credits (i.e., the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit, and the Child Tax Credit).

- The Self-Sufficiency Standard calculates the full costs of basic needs without help from public subsidies or informal assistance
- The measure takes into account an area's cost of living to determine the minimum • amount of income needed to meet basic needs
- A family of two adults and two school-age children in Ohio needs an annual household income of at least 144% FPL to be self-sufficient (Coshocton)
- The hourly minimum wage in Ohio provides annual wages near self-sufficiency • for Ohio counties on the low end of the cost range, but for counties with a higher cost of living, the minimum wage is not high enough for a family to maintain selfsufficiency

Defining Poverty, continued

Table 6. Asset poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2002–2011

	2002	2004	2006	2009	2010	2011
Ohio	22.0%	24.2%	21.9%	27.3%	26.3%	23.7%
United States	25.2%	22.4%	22.4%	27.1%	26.0%	25.4%

Source: Corporation for Enterprise Development, Assets & Opportunity Scorecard; data was not collected every year

- crisis (i.e. medical emergency, job loss, etc.)
- to cover three months' living expenses at the FPL threshold

Table 7. Liquid asset poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2006–2011

	2006	2009	2010	2011
Ohio	39.5%	43.6%	43.2%	44.7%
United States	41.4%	43.1%	43.9%	43.5%

Source: Corporation for Enterprise Development, Assets & Opportunity Scorecard; data was not collected every year

- accounts, government bonds)
- poverty for three months

Appendix

Asset poverty is a measure of the financial cushion needed to withstand a financial • One out of every four households in Ohio does not have enough combined assets

Liquid assets are those which can be easily exchanged for cash (e.g., gold, savings

• Four out of every ten Ohio households lack the liquid assets needed to stay out of

Defining Poverty, continued

Table 8. Poverty rates, Ohio and the United States, 2011-2016

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Ohio	16.4%	16.3%	16.0%	15.8%	14.8%	14.6%
United States	15.9%	15.9%	15.8%	15.5%	14.7%	14.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

Both Ohio and U.S. poverty rates have decreased since 2011; the gap between the Ohio and U.S. poverty rates is 0.6%

Table 9. Change in poverty, Ohio, 2011-2016

	2011	2016	Change 2011-2016	% Change 2011- 2016
Population for whom poverty status is determined	11,234,071	11,287,401	53,330	0.5%
Persons below the poverty level	1,845,800	1,645,382	-200,418	-10.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

Ohio's population is growing and fewer people (200,418) are in poverty in 2016 than were in poverty in 2011

Poverty in Ohio

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties

		Ohio	Adams	Allen	Ashland	Ashtabula
Pop	pulation and population change	44 64 4 272	27.007	400 740	52 (52	00.224
1	Total population, 2016	11,614,373	27,907	103,742	53,652	98,231
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	20.6%	3.6%	18.9%	4.3%	10.4%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	69,549	-615	-2,197	391	-2,849
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	0.6%	-2.2%	-2.1%	0.7%	-2.8%
Indi	ividual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	1,639,636	5,543	15,101	6,235	17,202
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	14.5%	20.2%	15.5%	12.2%	18.2%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	20.5%	29.6%	21.9%	17.4%	26.5%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.1%	10.9%	7.3%	6.8%	9.5%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	11.2%	23.5%	13.0%	15.4%	17.8%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	31.0%	Ν	35.7%	Ν	31.8%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	15.1%	Ν	10.7%	Ν	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	24.9%	Ν	28.1%	12.1%	43.4%
Fan	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	306,876	1,390	3,022	1,499	3,548
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	10.5%	18.7%	11.6%	10.8%	14.2%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	6.0%	17.3%	6.4%	11.2%	10.6%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	41.1%	60.3%	43.0%	41.6%	49.5%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	6.7%	10.4%	7.0%	6.2%	10.7%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	31.7%	51.8%	37.2%	35.0%	42.8%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$52,357	\$38,302	\$47,924	\$50,612	\$43,668
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	5.4%	8.1%	3.2%	11.0%	7.3%
	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth,					
4	1980-2012	38.1%	34.1%	38.5%	23.7%	33.3%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	21.9%	27.5%	22.2%	23.4%	24.8%
	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food					
5	assistance, 2015	7.2%	4.7%	5.3%	5.1%	4.5%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	36.1%	56.5%	41.6%	40.4%	54.4%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	12.4%	18.8%	11.2%	7.4%	17.7%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	25.7%	37.7%	26.4%	19.7%	32.4%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	5.6%	12.7%	9.1%	11.1%	11.0%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.9%	7.5%	5.0%	5.0%	6.0%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	8.6%	24.8%	11.0%	5.4%	14.8%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened 2016	42.0%	46.1%	47.4%	31.6%	47.1%
2	Percentage of owners cost-hurdened 2016	20.2%	22.1%	17.4%	20.1%	20.9%
Sourc	es: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Inco ty Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Ga	me and Poverty Es p; (6) Ohio Depart	stimates (SAIPL	E); (3) U.S. Cen ation; (7) Ohio	sus Bureau, A Department	merican Com
Famil Local	y Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicai Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency. State first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3) Ohio number	d Expenditures an	d Eligibles Rep	port; (9) U.S. Bi	ureau of Labo	or Statistics,
	unty, numbers and percentages represent 2012, 2016 ACS five year estimates. For	county poverty ra	tos by raco la	thnicity and	family type is	lata aro cup

ers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and fa pressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Athens	Auglaize	Belmont	Brown	Butler
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	66,186	45,894	68,673	43,759	377,537
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	10.8%	4.1%	7.1%	3.5%	18.1%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	1,084	82	-1,382	-902	7,338
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	1.7%	0.2%	-2.0%	-2.0%	2.0%
Ind	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	16,044	4,165	10,135	7,196	45,165
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	28.8%	9.2%	15.7%	16.7%	12.4%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	24.5%	11.5%	21.5%	24.3%	15.8%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	12.1%	6.9%	8.6%	9.7%	5.6%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	29.4%	8.5%	14.3%	16.4%	11.1%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	51.4%	Ν	29.6%	Ν	27.0%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	49.7%	Ν	Ν	Ν	15.1%
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	42.5%	17.6%	Ν	Ν	30.9%
Fan	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	2,146	789	1,831	1,527	8,558
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	17.7%	6.3%	10.3%	12.7%	9.2%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	11.5%	3.9%	6.0%	7.0%	5.3%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	59.3%	35.7%	50.9%	52.9%	41.8%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	17.4%	3.9%	6.7%	8.2%	6.7%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	50.9%	27.8%	34.5%	38.1%	28.3%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$38,131	\$59,543	\$45,661	\$51,504	\$63,094
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	8.4%	11.3%	13.7%	7.2%	5.4%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	38.7%	22.7%	23.7%	25.2%	39.8%
5	Child food insecurity rate. 2015	26.8%	18.3%	23.0%	22.9%	19.8%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	5.9%	5.9%	7.1%	4.8%	7.7%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	46.5%	31.1%	44.2%	51.8%	35.4%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	14.1%	6.2%	11.4%	12.5%	8.7%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	23.8%	15.8%	24.8%	29.8%	23.8%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	7.6%	5.5%	8.5%	10.2%	7.8%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	6.2%	3.7%	7.4%	5.7%	4.4%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	14.7%	4.7%	9.5%	12.3%	5.0%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	51.5%	32.6%	36.4%	36.1%	43.7%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	20.6%	17.1%	14.3%	21.9%	19.6%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and oth

		Carroll	Champaign	Clark	Clermont	Clinton
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	27,669	38,747	134,786	203,022	41,902
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	3.8%	6.9%	15.8%	6.2%	6.6%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-1,225	-1,126	-2,968	4,456	-10
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-4.2%	-2.8%	-2.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Indiv	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	3,475	4,194	20,643	21,281	5,426
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	12.8%	11.1%	15.7%	10.6%	13.4%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	18.9%	16.0%	22.4%	12.9%	19.2%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	7.8%	4.6%	7.7%	6.9%	7.1%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	13.8%	10.7%	15.5%	10.1%	14.7%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	Ν	18.0%	31.9%	25.1%	26.4%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	N	11.0%	3.3%	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	Ν	24.3%	30.9%	17.8%	16.1%
Fam	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	766	837	4,549	3,921	1,321
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	9.8%	7.8%	12.8%	7.3%	12.1%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	9.1%	7.7%	9.0%	5.4%	7.6%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	57.7%	29.6%	43.8%	33.8%	52.0%
Othe	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	5.3%	4.9%	8.3%	4.5%	6.9%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	35.3%	29.7%	39.0%	25.7%	36.2%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$48,616	\$56,203	\$47,410	\$61,203	\$53,234
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	8.9%	5.0%	4.8%	9.1%	7.3%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980–2012	35.7%	36.3%	42.3%	37.2%	36.6%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	24.0%	21.6%	23.8%	19.3%	23.5%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food	4.1%	6.3%	5.0%	8.1%	5.9%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	46.8%	38.1%	40.2%	36.6%	42.5%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits. 2016	9.6%	9.2%	15.8%	6.7%	13.8%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid. 2017	22.7%	21.4%	32.1%	19.7%	27.3%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	11.6%	6.9%	8.5%	7.3%	8.6%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	6.8%	4.5%	5.2%	4.4%	5.8%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	9.5%	9.4%	9.4%	4.0%	15.3%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened. 2016	33.0%	37.9%	47.3%	42.1%	39.4%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	17.6%	18.4%	18.3%	19.7%	21.0%
Sourc muni Famil Local Note all co press coho	ess: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Inc. ty Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Go y Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medica Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency. s: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio number unty numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For sed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter rt of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in -level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual	orme and Pove ap; (6) Ohio De id Expenditure ers and perce county pover "N." For (4), pr the bottom c birth data fro	rty Estimates (SAIF epartment of Educes and Eligibles Rep ntages represent 'ty rates by race, robabilities are be quintile of the nat om the U.S. Censi	E; (3) U.S. Ce. ation; (7) Ohio bort; (9) U.S. E 2016 ACS or ethnicity, and ased on the c ional income is Bureau. Ec	nsus Bureau, Arr o Department o Bureau of Labor he-year estimat I family type, da current family i distribution at or (6) data inclu	nerican Com f Job and r Statistics, tes, whereas ata are sup- ncome of a t hat time. ide annlica-

Appendix

er measures of economic need	, Ohio counties,	continued
------------------------------	------------------	-----------

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Columbi- ana	Coshocton	Craw- ford	Cuyahoga	Darke
Pop	pulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	103,685	36,602	42,083	1,249,352	51,778
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	6.0%	4.2%	4.5%	40.3%	3.8%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-3,553	-307	-1,220	-20,543	-888
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-3.3%	-0.8%	-2.8%	-1.6%	-1.7%
Ind	ividual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	17,130	4,581	5,753	223,636	5,438
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	17.2%	12.7%	13.9%	18.3%	10.7%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	26.5%	20.7%	22.1%	26.4%	14.8%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.5%	7.4%	11.0%	10.9%	5.0%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	15.0%	13.7%	15.0%	10.1%	11.7%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	45.8%	Ν	Ν	33.3%	N
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	Ν	13.3%	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	26.0%	Ν	7.8%	30.4%	23.1%
Fan	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	3,355	888	1,299	43,523	1,282
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	11.7%	9.0%	11.4%	14.3%	9.0%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	6.5%	8.8%	8.2%	7.0%	8.3%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	51.3%	45.6%	51.2%	44.7%	38.8%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	7.3%	5.1%	7.4%	8.9%	4.6%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	37.6%	39.8%	38.9%	36.8%	34.6%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$46,873	\$45,777	\$44,336	\$46,703	\$52,771
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	6.5%	3.5%	7.9%	3.9%	12.3%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980–2012	29.9%	40.3%	34.5%	39.9%	23.3%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	23.5%	24.1%	24.4%	21.2%	21.2%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food assistance. 2015	5.6%	2.2%	4.4%	7.0%	4.5%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12 free or reduced-price lunch. 2016	47.5%	50.6%	49.2%	36.3%	36.6%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits 2016	14.7%	16.5%	13.7%	17.1%	6.2%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid 2017	27.9%	30.7%	29.6%	31.0%	19.6%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance 2016	9.8%	12.9%	8.3%	8.2%	7.7%
9	Linemployment rate 2016	6.6%	7.0%	6.0%	5.4%	4.1%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP henefits 2016	13.7%	14.6%	11.8%	11 3%	8.1%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened 2016	35.7%	36.3%	39.3%	46.9%	40.1%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	15.9%	17.3%	18.4%	23.9%	17.2%
0				/ .	20.070	

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Defiance	Delaware	Erie	Fairfield	Fayette
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	38,158	196,463	75,107	152,597	28,676
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	13.4%	14.1%	16.6%	13.3%	7.2%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-871	17,937	-1,557	5,269	-232
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-2.2%	10.0%	-2.0%	3.6%	-0.8%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	3,876	9,083	9,171	14,445	4,489
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	10.4%	4.7%	12.5%	9.7%	16.0%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	15.1%	4.7%	20.1%	13.0%	23.0%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	5.3%	4.8%	6.3%	6.1%	7.0%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	12.7%	4.5%	9.7%	9.9%	16.9%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	28.4%	10.8%	26.9%	11.1%	27.6%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	1.3%	Ν	9.4%	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	18.1%	12.1%	37.7%	17.0%	47.1%
Farr	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	1,066	1,632	1,935	2,963	1,143
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	10.0%	3.2%	9.6%	7.4%	14.6%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	8.2%	1.7%	4.0%	3.6%	8.8%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	47.3%	18.7%	43.5%	33.0%	50.0%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	5.6%	2.2%	5.6%	4.1%	9.2%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	33.0%	12.9%	31.5%	26.9%	40.0%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$52,210	\$102,990	\$51,354	\$65,198	\$44,257
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	11.8%	7.5%	5.8%	6.0%	2.5%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980–	27.1%	27.4%	37.3%	34.6%	51.3%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	20.6%	14.4%	21.0%	18.8%	24.6%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	4.7%	9.5%	6.7%	7.1%	5.7%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	40.2%	12.8%	33.5%	33.8%	51.7%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	N/A	2.8%	11.8%	10.3%	15.2%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	21.6%	8.6%	23.5%	22.4%	33.0%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	9.1%	4.1%	8.2%	6.6%	10.1%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.8%	3.5%	5.5%	4.2%	4.4%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	9.0%	2.5%	9.3%	7.9%	16.8%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	40.3%	38.7%	40.1%	46.6%	44.6%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	17.7%	21.0%	19.2%	19.6%	21.2%
Source munity Famil Local Notes all co press cohoi State tions	Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com- munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency. Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are sup- pressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applica- tions at traditional schools only. For (7) Defiance and Paulding did not report individual figures for SNAP benefits and were not included.					

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Franklin	Fulton	Gallia	Geauga	Greene
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	1,264,518	42,514	30,015	94,060	164,765
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	35.4%	10.8%	6.6%	4.4%	16.0%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	84,497	47	-987	665	1,170
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	7.2%	0.1%	-3.2%	0.7%	0.7%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	205,476	3,719	5,995	5,451	18,975
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	16.6%	8.9%	20.6%	5.8%	12.1%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	23.9%	11.7%	29.8%	8.3%	14.5%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.6%	6.8%	14.0%	4.8%	6.0%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	11.2%	9.3%	20.7%	6.5%	11.4%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	30.8%	Ν	38.9%	25.8%	27.2%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	15.3%	Ν	Ν	5.2%	11.1%
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	28.6%	24.7%	Ν	9.0%	17.0%
Farr	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	35,828	925	1,286	1,216	3,698
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	12.5%	7.9%	16.1%	4.6%	8.8%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	7.5%	6.7%	16.9%	2.8%	6.0%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	41.0%	36.5%	62.4%	31.4%	43.1%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	8.3%	4.5%	7.0%	2.5%	6.3%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	34.4%	27.0%	42.3%	21.1%	26.6%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$56,090	\$56,504	\$42,074	\$77,938	\$62,751
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	3.6%	11.4%	6.3%	10.0%	4.8%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	41.8%	22.9%	37.7%	18.9%	38.8%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	20.4%	18.9%	24.9%	17.6%	20.3%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	6.7%	8.3%	4.2%	6.2%	8.1%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	36.5%	32.9%	54.9%	17.7%	31.6%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	13.5%	7.1%	22.3%	3.1%	6.8%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	27.9%	17.6%	35.3%	9.0%	18.2%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	10.2%	5.2%	12.1%	10.7%	6.4%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.0%	4.6%	6.7%	4.4%	4.3%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	7.5%	6.1%	16.4%	3.3%	5.0%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	43.8%	37.8%	35.2%	38.8%	41.6%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	21.5%	17.9%	19.3%	21.6%	18.0%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com*sources.* (1) Sources (2) Sources (2) Construction (2) C

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Guernsey	Hamilton	Hancock	Hardin	Harrison		
Рор	ulation and population change							
1	Total population, 2016	39,063	809,099	75,872	31,474	15,307		
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	5.5%	33.9%	10.6%	5.0%	5.1%		
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-799	8,478	810	-341	-493		
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-2.0%	1.1%	1.1%	-1.1%	-3.1%		
Indi	vidual poverty rates							
2	Population in poverty, 2016	7,161	126,002	7,385	3,906	2,521		
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	18.6%	16.0%	10.0%	13.3%	16.8%		
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	25.4%	23.2%	13.1%	17.2%	23.9%		
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.6%	9.2%	4.6%	7.6%	11.1%		
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	18.7%	10.9%	12.1%	15.1%	18.0%		
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	Ν	34.4%	24.5%	Ν	Ν		
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	11.9%	17.2%	Ν	Ν		
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	Ν	28.4%	28.8%	Ν	Ν		
Fam	nily poverty rates							
3	Families in poverty, 2016	1,697	25,746	1,840	899	543		
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	16.4%	13.2%	9.2%	11.7%	12.5%		
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	11.5%	5.2%	4.8%	14.8%	9.4%		
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	62.5%	46.5%	55.1%	29.2%	57.3%		
Oth	er measures of economic need							
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	8.8%	9.0%	6.3%	6.7%	7.8%		
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	41.6%	34.5%	30.8%	36.8%	37.4%		
2	Median household income, 2016	\$43,519	\$53,344	\$56,406	\$46,969	\$44,274		
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	9.5%	3.7%	13.2%	8.4%	8.3%		
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	31.4%	43.6%	25.7%	27.4%	21.7%		
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	26.6%	21.1%	20.2%	23.6%	25.1%		
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	4.5%	7.4%	5.9%	3.8%	5.5%		
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	52.2%	37.5%	31.4%	45.8%	36.1%		
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	13.7%	13.2%	7.6%	10.0%	14.8%		
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	31.7%	28.8%	19.4%	22.4%	28.1%		
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	9.7%	8.3%	7.1%	10.6%	10.3%		
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	7.0%	4.3%	3.6%	5.0%	7.5%		
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	16.1%	5.2%	7.5%	10.7%	14.7%		
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	46.8%	46.3%	36.6%	35.8%	34.6%		
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	17.8%	22.7%	17.8%	17.5%	17.5%		
Source munite Famil Local Notes all co press cohoi State	Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com- munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency. Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are sup- pressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau, For (6) data include apolica-							
tions	tions at traditional schools only.							

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Henry	Highland	Hocking	Holmes	Huron
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	27,629	43,029	28,340	43,936	58,439
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	10.0%	4.9%	3.6%	2.3%	9.6%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-598	-403	-1,141	1,145	-956
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-2.1%	-0.9%	-3.9%	2.7%	-1.6%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	2,258	8,410	4,054	5,041	7,043
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	8.3%	19.8%	14.5%	11.7%	12.2%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	11.3%	28.4%	22.4%	16.4%	17.9%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	5.5%	10.3%	8.7%	11.6%	7.3%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	9.0%	20.4%	16.5%	12.6%	12.1%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	25.0%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	20.9%	Ν	Ν	Ν	21.1%
Fan	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	562	1,792	1,006	1,003	1,593
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	7.1%	16.1%	12.6%	9.9%	10.3%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	4.9%	13.9%	9.9%	12.2%	5.0%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	38.6%	54.2%	42.4%	40.0%	44.6%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	4.4%	8.8%	8.0%	4.4%	6.5%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	26.1%	43.6%	39.3%	35.6%	34.9%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$57,752	\$44,729	\$47,799	\$58,783	\$51,278
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	12.2%	14.1%	7.6%	10.0%	7.2%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	12.2%	30.4%	39.1%	17.9%	29.3%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	20.3%	25.8%	23.8%	19.9%	22.3%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	7.7%	3.1%	5.7%	1.4%	5.6%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	34.8%	47.8%	63.9%	34.3%	44.7%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	5.5%	15.5%	N/A	3.0%	12.4%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	15.7%	33.3%	34.0%	10.1%	26.2%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	6.4%	11.3%	10.7%	40.7%	9.3%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	5.3%	6.3%	5.4%	3.5%	6.5%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	5.9%	17.6%	16.9%	4.4%	11.4%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	32.1%	47.2%	35.0%	27.9%	40.1%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	17.8%	22.7%	21.7%	17.8%	19.6%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Comsources. (1) 0.5. Census baread, robation Estimates, (2) 0.5. Census baread, similar Area income and rovery Estimates (SAFE), (3) 0.5. Census baread, American con-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and oth

		Jackson	Jefferson	Knox	Lake	Lawrence
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	32,505	66,704	60,814	228,614	60,872
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	3.9%	9.6%	4.7%	11.1%	5.3%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-645	-2,177	-471	-1,189	-1,509
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-1.9%	-3.2%	-0.8%	-0.5%	-2.4%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	5,780	10,469	7,294	19,364	10,771
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	18.1%	16.3%	12.7%	8.6%	17.9%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	27.2%	24.0%	17.5%	12.5%	26.5%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	10.6%	8.9%	9.4%	6.5%	12.1%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	22.0%	14.9%	15.1%	7.3%	17.9%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	Ν	37.7%	28.1%	27.1%	36.4%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	Ν	8.2%	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	Ν	57.2%	24.7%	18.8%	10.3%
Fam	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	1,401	2,238	1,771	3,563	2,180
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	16.4%	12.5%	11.6%	5.7%	14.1%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	15.7%	7.9%	6.3%	3.7%	8.4%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	54.1%	50.9%	56.5%	27.7%	54.6%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	11.7%	8.7%	7.0%	4.1%	7.0%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	46.2%	38.6%	34.3%	23.5%	40.2%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$45,168	\$43,558	\$53,375	\$61,946	\$42,132
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	11.9%	6.6%	9.4%	10.0%	5.7%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	37.1%	34.7%	20.6%	27.5%	35.1%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	27.9%	25.2%	22.7%	18.0%	23.2%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	5.0%	5.5%	6.1%	7.7%	5.6%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	49.8%	57.6%	39.8%	27.3%	51.2%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	18.7%	19.6%	9.1%	7.1%	19.1%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid. 2017	36.8%	32.1%	23.1%	15.9%	34.9%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	9.8%	8.1%	10.9%	6.7%	9.2%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	7.8%	8.3%	4.5%	4.8%	6.4%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	20.6%	16.2%	8.8%	4.1%	20.5%
. इ २	Percentage of renters cost-burdened 2016	40.2%	39.8%	44 7%	42.0%	42.3%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	20.1%	16.4%	21.1%	20.7%	19.8%
			10.470	21.170	20.770	19.070
Sourc munit Famil Local	res: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Incom ty Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; y Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid , Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Develooment Services Agency.	e and Poverty E: (6) Ohio Depart Expenditures an	stimates (SAIPE, ment of Educa d Eligibles Repo); (3) U.S. Cens tion; (7) Ohio I ort; (9) U.S. Bu	us Bureau, Ai Department c reau of Labo	merican Com of Job and r Statistics,

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

ner measures of ec	conomic need, Ohio	counties, <i>continued</i>
--------------------	--------------------	----------------------------

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Licking	Logan	Lorain	Lucas	Madison
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	172,198	45,165	306,365	432,488	43,419
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	9.1%	6.5%	21.6%	30.6%	11.2%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	4,957	-441	4,450	-7,114	354
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	3.0%	-1.0%	1.5%	-1.6%	0.8%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	19,680	5,420	36,828	83,600	4,576
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	11.7%	12.2%	12.4%	19.8%	11.8%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	17.1%	17.5%	17.9%	27.9%	16.0%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	6.0%	7.2%	7.4%	9.8%	6.5%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	12.0%	13.0%	10.1%	13.8%	9.9%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	14.9%	26.3%	36.5%	39.6%	44.9%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	5.3%	Ν	29.9%	24.0%	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	20.3%	35.1%	25.4%	30.8%	2.2%
Fan	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	4,138	1,322	8,245	17,027	793
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	9.2%	10.2%	10.4%	16.1%	7.7%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	6.7%	9.5%	6.2%	9.7%	4.6%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	43.0%	45.2%	43.6%	48.9%	40.6%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	5.5%	7.3%	6.3%	9.8%	5.2%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	29.3%	32.4%	30.1%	39.6%	27.1%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$58,902	\$53,760	\$54,951	\$45,251	\$60,039
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	6.7%	6.5%	5.0%	4.4%	9.7%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	33.5%	30.9%	38.4%	44.4%	35.5%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	20.9%	21.4%	20.9%	22.9%	19.3%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	7.1%	7.1%	7.3%	6.2%	7.9%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	37.1%	43.6%	30.8%	36.6%	34.2%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	10.4%	11.5%	11.9%	18.0%	8.8%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	23.0%	22.2%	23.3%	33.6%	19.0%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	8.2%	10.6%	6.9%	8.5%	8.4%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.3%	4.2%	5.9%	5.1%	3.8%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	7.1%	10.4%	7.4%	10.5%	9.7%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	44.9%	38.1%	47.0%	46.9%	31.9%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	19.1%	18.9%	19.5%	21.2%	20.4%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Mahon-	Marian	Madina	Maiga	Максак
		ing	Warton	weama	weigs	wercer
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	230,008	65,096	177,221	23,125	40,909
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	23.8%	11.7%	6.0%	3.4%	4.5%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-7,284	-1,451	3,758	-574	93
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-3.1%	-2.2%	2.2%	-2.4%	0.2%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	41,625	8,673	11,394	4,815	3,308
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	18.7%	14.8%	6.5%	21.1%	8.2%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	27.2%	22.7%	8.1%	28.2%	10.3%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.6%	7.5%	4.9%	11.7%	5.8%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	11.9%	16.5%	6.0%	22.4%	7.7%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	41.4%	41.7%	32.7%	Ν	Ν
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	16.8%	Ν	11.9%	Ν	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	38.3%	34.1%	10.6%	Ν	24.9%
Fam	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	8,309	2,117	2,212	1,161	643
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	13.8%	12.9%	4.6%	18.4%	5.6%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	7.4%	10.3%	3.2%	14.6%	3.5%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	51.8%	47.8%	28.1%	56.5%	43.6%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	8.0%	7.5%	2.6%	9.1%	2.9%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	38.5%	39.7%	18.8%	44.2%	25.0%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$42,839	\$44,783	\$73,148	\$39,070	\$57,577
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	6.0%	6.0%	11.3%	10.0%	12.2%
	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980–					
4	2012	33.8%	39.1%	29.4%	25.0%	19.4%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	23.8%	24.4%	17.4%	27.2%	17.4%
_	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as-	6.00/	5.00/	0.004	4.604	7 50/
5	sistance, 2015	6.0%	5.9%	8.9%	4.6%	7.5%
6	Percentage of public school students K-12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	40.1%	42.4%	20.9%	43.9%	24.6%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	18.0%	15.4%	5.1%	21.8%	4.7%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	33.0%	31.4%	12.3%	36.4%	13.6%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	7.8%	8.3%	5.9%	10.9%	5.6%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	6.3%	5.0%	4.3%	8.3%	3.2%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	11.9%	13.3%	4.0%	19.5%	4.6%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	46.0%	46.4%	39.2%	40.5%	36.3%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	19.6%	17.7%	19.6%	20.1%	15.2%
C		a and Daviert - Ca	time at the CAUDE), (2) [] C. Cana	Duran Ar	
Famil Famil Local Notes	es. (1) 0.5. Censos Bareau, Population Estimates, (2) 0.5. Censos Bareau, sinali Area Incom y Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; y Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid i Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency. s: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers upty, numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For co	(6) Ohio Departr Expenditures and and percentage	nent of Educa l Eligibles Repu s represent 2	(3) 0.3. Ceris tion; (7) Ohio I prt; (9) U.S. Bu 2016 ACS one	US BUTEOU, AN Department of reau of Labor -year estimat	<i>conconstant conf</i> <i>fob and</i> <i>Statistics,</i> es, whereas
nress	ed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N	" For (4) probab	ilities are has	sed on the cu	rrent family ir	come of a

tions at traditional schools only.

Appendix

cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applica-

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Miami	Monroe	Montgom- erv	Morgan	Morrow
Pop	pulation and population change			0.5		
1	Total population, 2016	104,679	14,210	531,239	14,804	35,036
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	7.5%	2.9%	28.5%	8.2%	4.1%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	1,844	-509	-3,643	-282	135
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	1.8%	-3.5%	-0.7%	-1.9%	0.4%
Ind	ividual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	9,860	2,130	93,949	2,714	4,214
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	9.5%	15.2%	18.2%	18.7%	12.2%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	13.3%	22.4%	27.2%	27.6%	19.4%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	6.8%	8.2%	8.9%	11.9%	6.8%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	10.4%	18.9%	13.0%	19.5%	11.2%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	23.2%	Ν	34.1%	Ν	N
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	1.7%	Ν	12.8%	Ν	N
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	22.6%	Ν	36.5%	Ν	N
Fan	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	2,246	567	19,321	646	673
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	8.2%	13.3%	14.4%	15.7%	7.2%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	5.8%	13.3%	8.8%	15.4%	5.8%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	41.9%	46.1%	48.0%	54.4%	32.3%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	4.4%	9.4%	8.6%	9.2%	5.4%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	29.1%	40.3%	38.2%	44.6%	28.6%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$59,591	\$44,062	\$47,239	\$40,680	\$52,953
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	4.4%	16.4%	3.5%	7.0%	8.3%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980–2012	30.2%	29.1%	40.9%	28.1%	25.0%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	21.2%	29.7%	22.9%	26.1%	20.8%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	5.9%	4.2%	6.0%	6.8%	8.1%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	34.0%	58.7%	38.0%	55.1%	40.1%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	6.8%	13.1%	13.0%	15.3%	9.2%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	19.5%	25.6%	28.9%	30.6%	24.8%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	7.9%	10.3%	9.1%	11.1%	8.9%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.3%	11.1%	4.8%	8.1%	4.9%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	6.3%	12.7%	7.2%	20.8%	10.2%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	39.2%	37.2%	46.5%	41.3%	39.9%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	18.3%	14.8%	21.7%	20.4%	19.5%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap: (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

Musk-

		ingum	Noble	Ottawa	Paulding	Perry
Рор	ulation and population change	0				
1	Total population, 2016	86,068	14,294	40,636	18,865	35,927
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	8.5%	4.9%	7.7%	7.9%	3.4%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-173	-406	-755	-533	-280
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-0.2%	-2.8%	-1.8%	-2.7%	-0.8%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	12,435	1,744	4,160	2,004	6,029
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	14.8%	15.1%	10.4%	10.7%	17.0%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	22.7%	18.1%	15.0%	15.4%	23.9%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.2%	8.9%	5.2%	6.9%	11.7%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	16.4%	12.0%	10.4%	10.5%	20.3%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	25.9%	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	19.4%	Ν	19.3%	14.1%	Ν
Farr	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	3,057	274	812	441	1,587
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	13.5%	8.5%	6.9%	8.2%	15.8%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	9.0%	14.0%	4.3%	5.5%	10.4%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	44.6%	28.1%	44.9%	47.8%	57.9%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	8.0%	3.1%	4.9%	5.4%	9.3%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	40.0%	35.1%	27.6%	32.9%	43.0%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$44,871	\$48,836	\$56,569	\$51,020	\$47,543
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	6.3%	18.4%	11.2%	14.6%	8.3%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth,	22.004	16 204	10 704	14 604	21 /0/
4	1980-2012	55.970	10.570	10.7 %	14.0%	51.470
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	25.1%	24.9%	21.5%	20.2%	24.9%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as-	5 3%	4.2%	6.7%	5 9%	5.0%
J	sistance, 2015	5.570	4.270	0.770	5.570	5.070
6	Percentage of public school students K-12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	40.0%	50.7%	36.9%	38.9%	39.2%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	19.5%	8.5%	7.5%	N/A	18.0%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	34.0%	20.8%	17.9%	22.0%	31.4%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	8.8%	7.2%	7.0%	8.0%	9.7%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	6.0%	8.6%	6.4%	4.6%	6.2%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	15.0%	12.0%	5.7%	12.2%	18.0%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	44.7%	29.9%	40.0%	31.1%	42.8%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	19.1%	18.4%	18.8%	17.6%	19.8%
Souro muni Fami Local	res: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Incorr ty Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap, ly Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.	ie and Poverty E : (6) Ohio Depar Expenditures ar	stimates (SAIP. tment of Educe ad Eligibles Rep	E); (3) U.S. Cei ation; (7) Ohio port; (9) U.S. E	nsus Bureau, Ar Department o Bureau of Labor	merican Com- f Job and ^r Statistics,
Note all co press coho State tions	s: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers unty numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For co sed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N rt of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in th -level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual bi at traditional schools only. For (7) Defiance and Paulding did not report individual figu	and percentag ounty poverty ra "For (4), proba be bottom quint rth data from th ures for SNAP b	es represent ates by race, e abilities are ba tile of the nati ne U.S. Censu enefits and w	2016 ACS or ethnicity, and ised on the c onal income s Bureau. Fo ere not inclu	ne-year estimat family type, da urrent family in distribution at r (6) data inclu ded.	tes, whereas ata are sup- ncome of a that time. ide applica-

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Pickaway	Pike	Portage	Preble	Putnam
Рор	ulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	57,565	28,160	161,921	41,247	34,056
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	7.4%	5.0%	10.3%	3.7%	7.7%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	1,604	-465	53	-770	-339
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	2.9%	-1.6%	0.0%	-1.8%	-1.0%
Indi	vidual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	6,905	5,660	20,743	4,494	2,796
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	13.2%	20.5%	13.5%	11.0%	8.3%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	17.8%	29.7%	15.0%	16.8%	9.5%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.5%	11.6%	5.4%	7.8%	5.4%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	12.1%	21.0%	13.0%	13.4%	7.0%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	37.9%	Ν	Ν
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	Ν	30.2%	Ν	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	1.6%	Ν	28.0%	Ν	17.8%
Farr	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	1,327	1,192	3,970	1,133	548
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	9.5%	16.2%	10.0%	9.8%	5.7%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	7.8%	10.1%	5.2%	7.8%	3.6%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	37.1%	36.9%	50.2%	42.7%	48.8%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	4.5%	8.8%	7.3%	5.8%	2.7%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	28.5%	44.8%	30.8%	32.8%	23.9%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$60,051	\$42,869	\$52,947	\$57,896	\$61,069
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	3.3%	4.4%	8.4%	10.6%	9.5%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	45.8%	38.6%	29.6%	29.2%	9.5%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	20.7%	27.5%	21.7%	21.5%	15.9%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	7.2%	4.1%	8.0%	5.4%	7.3%
6	Percentage of public school students K-12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	32.6%	63.0%	33.0%	41.4%	22.5%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	10.6%	24.7%	7.9%	9.7%	5.6%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	22.0%	40.5%	18.5%	23.6%	13.4%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	7.6%	11.6%	7.5%	8.8%	4.0%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.7%	7.4%	5.0%	4.7%	3.6%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	10.2%	25.8%	7.0%	8.6%	6.3%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	35.3%	46.7%	50.0%	40.5%	32.6%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	19.0%	21.0%	20.5%	21.0%	12.6%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Richland	Ross	Sandusky	Scioto	Seneca
Pop	pulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	121,107	77,000	59,330	76,088	55,353
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	14.1%	10.3%	15.4%	6.6%	10.1%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-1,955	-576	-1,261	-3,138	-1,081
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-1.6%	-0.7%	-2.1%	-4.0%	-1.9%
Ind	ividual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	17,904	13,224	6,750	16,051	6,782
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	15.8%	18.6%	11.6%	22.1%	12.9%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	22.1%	24.9%	16.2%	31.6%	17.7%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	7.4%	9.9%	7.8%	12.2%	6.3%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	14.3%	17.7%	11.5%	23.8%	14.0%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	37.5%	34.3%	34.3%	32.3%	59.6%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	5.5%	N	Ν	Ν	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	33.5%	18.1%	18.4%	33.3%	17.8%
Fan	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	3,694	2,724	1,663	3,371	1,649
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	12.0%	13.8%	10.4%	17.8%	11.5%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	9.6%	9.7%	3.9%	14.2%	6.2%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	46.2%	49.5%	45.0%	56.9%	54.1%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	7.6%	7.8%	5.8%	10.5%	7.2%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	38.7%	40.2%	31.8%	45.3%	33.3%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$44,835	\$47,507	\$52,452	\$39,245	\$49,546
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	5.3%	5.1%	10.4%	9.0%	7.5%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	36.1%	36.5%	30.6%	38.2%	33.2%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	24.1%	24.2%	20.8%	27.4%	23.1%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	5.5%	5.6%	5.4%	6.0%	7.2%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	48.8%	46.3%	41.5%	53.0%	44.7%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	14.9%	0.0%	8.4%	24.7%	11.1%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	28.1%	32.6%	21.8%	37.6%	22.2%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	10.0%	8.9%	6.9%	9.9%	6.8%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	5.5%	5.5%	4.7%	7.6%	4.8%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	11.6%	19.1%	7.4%	24.2%	7.9%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	43.7%	41.7%	40.6%	43.9%	37.7%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	19.9%	20.4%	17.8%	19.2%	15.7%
3 9 10 3 3 Source munit Famil Local	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016 Unemployment rate, 2016 Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016 Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016 Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016 es: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Incom ty Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; y Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.	10.0% 5.5% 11.6% 43.7% 19.9% e and Poverty Est (6) Ohio Departn Expenditures and	8.9% 5.5% 19.1% 41.7% 20.4% imates (SAIPL nent of Educc Eligibles Rep	6.9% 4.7% 7.4% 40.6% 17.8% [;; (3) U.S. Cens. (7) Ohio I ort; (9) U.S. Bui	9.9 7.6 24.2 43.9 19.2 Us Bureau Departmen reau of Lc	% % % % I, An nt of abor

tions at traditional schools only.

Appendix

pressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applica-

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

		Shelby	Stark	Summit	Trum- bull	Tuscarawas
Рор	pulation and population change					
1	Total population, 2016	48,623	373,612	540,300	201,825	92,420
1	Percentage minority population, 2016	6.9%	13.2%	22.3%	12.7%	5.4%
1	Population change, 2011-2016	-620	-653	-947	-7,090	-94
1	Percentage population change, 2011-2016	-1.3%	-0.2%	-0.2%	-3.4%	-0.1%
Ind	ividual poverty rates					
2	Population in poverty, 2016	4,490	48,072	72,687	34,839	11,525
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	9.4%	13.2%	13.7%	17.6%	12.7%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	12.1%	19.4%	19.7%	29.2%	16.6%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	6.9%	7.6%	6.9%	6.8%	8.0%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	8.9%	11.3%	10.1%	14.5%	12.6%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	27.8%	36.8%	32.9%	41.5%	51.9%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	Ν	7.5%	15.6%	26.2%	Ν
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	7.1%	26.7%	18.3%	31.2%	28.2%
Far	nily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	909	10,356	14,371	7,364	2,432
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	6.8%	10.4%	10.4%	13.3%	9.9%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	3.6%	6.4%	4.9%	7.4%	8.2%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	32.9%	45.8%	43.3%	55.8%	40.4%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	3.5%	6.0%	6.5%	8.4%	4.8%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	27.1%	32.5%	31.4%	36.9%	35.0%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$59,604	\$51,036	\$52,226	\$45,929	\$50,273
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	9.5%	5.0%	5.8%	6.3%	8.3%
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 2012	26.3%	37.6%	40.3%	34.2%	26.1%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	19.2%	22.0%	20.9%	25.0%	22.2%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	7.5%	6.6%	7.1%	5.3%	5.8%
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	36.2%	34.4%	28.0%	44.8%	43.1%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	6.9%	11.9%	13.7%	13.8%	11.0%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	17.9%	25.1%	25.4%	29.0%	22.8%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	5.7%	7.4%	7.9%	10.1%	11.0%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	4.1%	5.4%	5.0%	6.7%	5.7%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	9.0%	8.0%	6.9%	8.4%	8.5%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	31.4%	41.5%	45.3%	43.7%	39.3%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	16.4%	18.5%	20.1%	17.7%	18.4%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are sup-pressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

36

Poverty in Ohio, continued

		Union	Van Wert	Vinton	Warren	Washing-
Pop	ulation and population change					ton
<u> </u>	Total population 2016	55 457	28.362	12,921	227.063	60.610
1	Percentage minority population 2016	9.6%	6.0%	3.6%	13.1%	5.0%
1	Population change 2011-2016	2 331	-336	-480	11 283	-936
1	Percentage population change 2011-2016	4.4%	-1.2%	-3.6%	5.2%	-1 5%
Indi	vidual poverty rates		1.270	5.070	5.270	1.570
2	Population in poverty, 2016	3,194	2,489	2,661	11,823	8,100
2	Overall poverty rate, 2016	6.1%	8.9%	20.8%	5.4%	13.7%
2	Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	7.2%	13.1%	31.8%	6.1%	19.2%
3	Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	8.1%	6.6%	8.3%	4.0%	9.1%
3	White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	7.8%	11.4%	20.8%	5.2%	15.3%
3	Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	17.1%	N	N	12.8%	24.5%
3	Asian poverty rate, 2016	1.5%	N	N	4.2%	N
3	Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	2.3%	28.9%	N	5.6%	27.1%
Farr	ily poverty rates					
3	Families in poverty, 2016	760	657	572	2,345	1,791
3	Family poverty rate, 2016	5.5%	8.3%	16.9%	3.9%	10.8%
3	Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	4.2%	5.6%	16.6%	2.4%	10.7%
3	Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	27.9%	44.6%	47.4%	26.3%	49.8%
Oth	er measures of economic need					
3	Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	3.3%	5.8%	8.9%	2.5%	5.9%
3	Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	22.1%	34.3%	44.2%	15.9%	34.6%
2	Median household income, 2016	\$78,796	\$52,610	\$41,522	\$81,543	\$47,802
4	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	10.2%	4.7%	10.9%	9.6%	10.2%
	Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980–					
4	2012	34.7%	34.9%	25.5%	29.4%	30.9%
5	Child food insecurity rate, 2015	17.7%	20.4%	27.0%	16.1%	22.7%
5	Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as-	7.8%	4.3%	4.1%	9.8%	6.4%
5	sistance, 2015	7.070	1.570	1.170	5.670	0.170
6	Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	24.9%	41.8%	57.2%	17.3%	45.0%
7	Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	4.6%	7.8%	0.0%	3.4%	12.0%
8	Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	12.9%	19.6%	40.7%	12.1%	24.7%
3	Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	6.4%	8.2%	10.0%	5.1%	8.6%
9	Unemployment rate, 2016	3.8%	4.0%	7.0%	4.1%	6.9%
10	Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	6.2%	10.2%	26.8%	2.7%	11.4%
3	Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	36.2%	37.3%	43.6%	35.9%	40.3%
3	Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	23.6%	14.6%	20.8%	18.5%	15.4%
Souro muni Fami Local	ces: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Incom ty Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap ly Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.	ne and Poverty E. ; (6) Ohio Depart Expenditures an	stimates (SAIPE tment of Educc d Eligibles Rep	E); (3) U.S. Cen ation; (7) Ohio ort; (9) U.S. B	sus Bureau, , Department ureau of Lab	American Com of Job and or Statistics,
Note all co press coho State tions	s: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers ounty numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For co sed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N rt of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in th -level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual bi at traditional schools only.	and percentag punty poverty ra I." For (4), proba ne bottom quint irth data from th	es represent 2 ates by race, e bilities are ba ile of the nation ne U.S. Census	2016 ACS on thnicity, and sed on the cu onal income s Bureau. For	e-year estim family type, urrent family distribution ⁻ (6) data inc	ates, whereas data are sup- vincome of a at that time. lude applica-

Appendix

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 10. Population, poverty rates, and other measures of economic need, Ohio counties, continued

	Wayne	Williams	Wood	Wyando
Population and population change				
1 Total population, 2016	116,470	37,017	130,219	22118
1 Percentage minority population, 2016	6.4%	7.3%	11.7%	4.8%
1 Population change, 2011-2016	1,816	-569	2,951	-540
1 Percentage population change, 2011-2016	1.6%	-1.5%	2.3%	-2.4%
Individual poverty rates				
2 Population in poverty, 2016	13,372	3,496	14,060	1,881
2 Overall poverty rate, 2016	11.9%	9.7%	11.4%	8.6%
2 Child (under age 18) poverty rate, 2016	16.2%	14.3%	10.9%	11.3%
3 Senior (age 65 and older) poverty rate, 2016	5.6%	9.1%	4.9%	9.6%
3 White (non-Hispanic) poverty rate, 2016	12.0%	13.9%	12.6%	11.4%
3 Black/African American poverty rate, 2016	34.2%	Ν	37.08%	Ν
3 Asian poverty rate, 2016	6.4%	Ν	12.8%	Ν
3 Hispanic/Latino (of any race) poverty rate, 2016	28.7%	21.3%	20.8%	1.2%
Family poverty rates				
3 Families in poverty, 2016	2,879	932	2,152	408
3 Family poverty rate, 2016	9.5%	9.6%	6.9%	6.7%
3 Married couples with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	8.8%	8.5%	4.9%	6.0%
3 Single women with related children in their care, poverty rate, 2016	43.6%	46.6%	36.2%	28.1%
Other measures of economic need				
3 Percentage of population below 50% FPL, 2016	5.0%	6.7%	7.3%	4.2%
3 Percentage of population below 200% FPL, 2016	34.5%	38.7%	28.7%	32.0%
2 Median household income, 2016	\$53,605	\$50,770	\$60,347	\$55,590
4 Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth rose to the top fifth, 1980–2012	7.1%	9.4%	9.1%	11.8%
Probability a child raised in the bottom fifth stayed in the bottom fifth, 1980– 4 2012	25.2%	22.4%	26.8%	11.8%
5 Child food insecurity rate, 2015	20.8%	21.9%	18.1%	19.2%
Percentage of children who are both food insecure and ineligible for food as- sistance, 2015	3.5%	4.4%	8.1%	5.0%
6 Percentage of public school students K–12, free or reduced-price lunch, 2016	40.8%	41.3%	28.7%	32.5%
7 Percentage of population receiving SNAP benefits, 2016	8.6%	9.5%	5.1%	7.1%
8 Percentage of population who are enrolled in Medicaid, 2017	18.7%	22.4%	13.6%	17.9%
3 Percentage of population with no health insurance, 2016	13.0%	6.6%	5.7%	7.4%
9 Unemployment rate, 2016	3.9%	4.4%	4.1%	3.7%
10 Percentage of households receiving HEAP benefits, 2016	7.6%	6.3%	3.8%	7.8%
3 Percentage of renters cost-burdened, 2016	40.0%	43.8%	44.1%	33.0%
3 Percentage of owners cost-burdened, 2016	19.1%	18.3%	17.9%	16.5%

Sources: (1) U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates; (2) U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE); (3) U.S. Census Bureau, American Com-munity Survey (ACS); (4) Equality of Opportunity Project; (5) Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap; (6) Ohio Department of Education; (7) Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, Public Assistance Monthly Statistics; (8) Ohio Department of Medicaid, Medicaid Expenditures and Eligibles Report; (9) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics; (10) Ohio Development Services Agency.

Notes: The first column identifies the source of the data by number. For (3), Ohio numbers and percentages represent 2016 ACS one-year estimates, whereas all county numbers and percentages represent 2012–2016 ACS five-year estimates. For county poverty rates by race, ethnicity, and family type, data are suppressed here if the denominator is less than 500 individuals, as indicated with the letter "N." For (4), probabilities are based on the current family income of a cohort of adults born between 1980 and 1982 whose family income 30 years ago was in the bottom quintile of the national income distribution at that time. State-level probability is derived by weighting county-level probabilities based on annual birth data from the U.S. Census Bureau. For (6) data include applications at traditional schools only.

Poverty in Ohio, continued

		2000				Change, 2000 to 2016		
Geography	Population	Population below 200% FPL,	Percent below 200% FPL	Population	Population below 200% FPL	Percent below 200% FPL	Raw change	Percent change at 200% FPL
Ohio	11,046,987	2,919,858	26.4%	11,267,500	3,750,345	33.3%	6.9%	25.9%
Adams	27,002	11,422	42.3%	27,657	14,318	51.8%	9.5%	22.4%
Allen	102,300	31,103	30.4%	100,683	37,449	37.2%	6.8%	22.3%
Ashland	50,238	13,315	26.5%	51,027	17,871	35.0%	8.5%	32.1%
Ashtabula	100,870	32,803	32.5%	95,570	40,943	42.8%	10.3%	31.7%
Athens	53,844	25,513	47.4%	55,368	28,173	50.9%	3.5%	7.4%
Auglaize	45,636	9,263	20.3%	45,200	12,553	27.8%	7.5%	36.8%
Belmont	66,997	24,728	36.9%	65,224	22,503	34.5%	-2.4%	-6.5%
Brown	41,684	13,185	31.6%	43,108	16,415	38.1%	6.4%	20.4%
Butler	321,387	68,274	21.2%	361,674	102,196	28.3%	7.0%	33.0%
Carroll	28,404	9,054	31.9%	27,717	9,771	35.3%	3.4%	10.6%
Champaign	38,096	8,940	23.5%	38,229	11,348	29.7%	6.2%	26.5%
Clark	141,106	37,904	26.9%	132,847	51,806	39.0%	12.1%	45.2%
Clermont	176,027	34,425	19.6%	199,067	51,099	25.7%	6.1%	31.3%
Clinton	39,397	9,878	25.1%	40,597	14,714	36.2%	11.2%	44.6%
Columbiana	108,138	35,283	32.6%	101,206	38,054	37.6%	5.0%	15.2%
Coshocton	36,240	11,579	32.0%	36,173	14,399	39.8%	7.9%	24.6%
Crawford	46,296	14,069	30.4%	41,775	16,242	38.9%	8.5%	27.9%
Cuyahoga	1,365,658	397,268	29.1%	1,232,253	453,299	36.8%	7.7%	26.5%
Darke	52,534	13,752	26.2%	51,361	17,749	34.6%	8.4%	32.0%
Defiance	38,723	7,573	19.6%	37,701	12,456	33.0%	13.5%	68.9%
Delaware	107,078	11,895	11.1%	186,236	23,989	12.9%	1.8%	16.0%
Erie	77,628	17,993	23.2%	74,772	23,568	31.5%	8.3%	36.0%
Fairfield	119,747	23,068	19.3%	147,210	39,527	26.9%	7.6%	39.4%
Fayette	27,822	8,122	29.2%	28,041	11,204	40.0%	10.8%	36.9%
Franklin	1,045,966	273,900	26.2%	1,203,356	414,175	34.4%	8.2%	31.4%
Fulton	41,597	8,384	20.2%	41,932	11,336	27.0%	6.9%	34.1%
Gallia	30,069	12,278	40.8%	29,549	12,502	42.3%	1.5%	3.6%
Geauga	89,980	14,404	16.0%	93,201	19,658	21.1%	5.1%	31.8%
Greene	140,103	29,478	21.0%	155,180	41,271	26.6%	5.6%	26.4%
Guernsey	40,179	16,658	41.5%	38,905	16,202	41.6%	0.2%	0.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau data 2000; U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2012-2016

Appendix

Table 11. Change in 200% Federal Poverty Level, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2016

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 11. Change in 200% Federal Poverty Level, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2016, continued

Poverty in Ohio, continued

	2000		2000 2016		Chang	ge, 2000 to 2016	200		2000	2000		2016		Change, 2000 to 2016			
Geography	Population	Population below 200% FPL,	Percent below 200% FPL	Population	Population below 200% FPL	Percent below 200% FPL	Raw change	Percent change at 200% FPL	Geography	Population	Population below 200% FPL,	Percent below 200% FPL	Population	Population below 200% FPL	Percent below 200% FPL	Raw change	Percent change at 200% FPL
Hamilton	826,628	214,755	26.0%	787,878	272,091	34.5%	8.6%	32.9%	Ottawa	40,239	7,919	19.7%	40,377	11,133	27.6%	7.9%	40.1%
Hancock	69,451	15,123	21.8%	73,352	22,603	30.8%	9.0%	41.5%	Paulding	20,156	5,234	26.0%	18,878	6,208	32.9%	6.9%	26.6%
Hardin	29,825	9,503	31.9%	29,273	10,766	36.8%	4.9%	15.4%	Perry	33,741	11,570	34.3%	35,496	15,278	43.0%	8.8%	25.5%
Harrison	15,551	5,772	37.1%	15,238	5,697	37.4%	0.3%	0.7%	Pickaway	46,174	12,065	26.1%	52,003	14,825	28.5%	2.4%	9.1%
Henry	28,649	6,254	21.8%	27,366	7,156	26.1%	4.3%	19.8%	Pike	27,226	11,211	41.2%	27,729	12,435	44.8%	3.7%	8.9%
Highland	40,286	13,362	33.2%	42,540	18,564	43.6%	10.5%	31.6%	Portage	144,317	34,149	23.7%	154,946	47,799	30.8%	7.2%	30.4%
Hocking	27,447	9,068	33.0%	27,997	11,001	39.3%	6.3%	18.9%	Preble	41,755	9,394	22.5%	40,909	13,404	32.8%	10.3%	45.6%
Holmes	37,953	15,195	40.0%	42,806	15,244	35.6%	-4.4%	-11.1%	Putnam	34,353	6,715	19.5%	33,813	8,079	23.9%	4.3%	22.2%
Huron	58,652	15,445	26.3%	57,994	20,227	34.9%	8.5%	32.4%	Richland	122,277	36,372	29.7%	113,957	44,067	38.7%	8.9%	30.0%
Jackson	32,103	12,532	39.0%	32,206	14,895	46.2%	7.2%	18.5%	Ross	67,870	21,422	31.6%	71,189	28,638	40.2%	8.7%	27.5%
Jefferson	71,820	25,103	35.0%	65,132	25,152	38.6%	3.7%	10.5%	Sandusky	60,823	14,556	23.9%	58,761	18,686	31.8%	7.9%	32.9%
Knox	50,963	15,027	29.5%	57,551	19,756	34.3%	4.8%	16.4%	Scioto	75,683	32,219	42.6%	73,304	33,219	45.3%	2.7%	6.4%
Lake	224,680	36,556	16.3%	226,093	53,208	23.5%	7.3%	44.6%	Seneca	57,264	16,102	28.1%	52,779	17,555	33.3%	5.1%	18.3%
Lawrence	61,639	25,968	42.1%	60,659	24,366	40.2%	-2.0%	-4.7%	Shelby	46,961	9,938	21.2%	48,224	13,050	27.1%	5.9%	27.9%
Licking	141,726	31,863	22.5%	165,642	48,503	29.3%	6.8%	30.2%	Stark	368,573	95,337	25.9%	365,197	118,868	32.5%	6.7%	25.8%
Logan	45,208	10,974	24.3%	44,763	14,520	32.4%	8.2%	33.6%	Summit	533,162	130,220	24.4%	532,511	167,385	31.4%	7.0%	28.7%
Lorain	275,784	64,023	23.2%	294,509	88,775	30.1%	6.9%	29.8%	Trumbull	220,572	62,432	28.3%	200,895	74,033	36.9%	8.5%	30.2%
Lucas	446,417	135,038	30.2%	424,631	167,957	39.6%	9.3%	30.8%	Tuscarawas	89,481	27,490	30.7%	91,235	31,918	35.0%	4.3%	13.9%
Madison	35,612	8,155	22.9%	38,280	10,381	27.1%	4.2%	18.4%	Union	38,511	6,359	16.5%	50,417	11,128	22.1%	5.6%	33.7%
Mahoning	250,542	77,925	31.1%	225,694	86,925	38.5%	7.4%	23.8%	Van Wert	29,168	6,853	23.5%	28,019	9,621	34.3%	10.8%	46.1%
Marion	61,415	16,780	27.3%	59,109	23,491	39.7%	12.4%	45.5%	Vinton	12,643	5,409	42.8%	13,019	5,750	44.2%	1.4%	3.2%
Medina	149,347	21,430	14.3%	173,981	32,729	18.8%	4.5%	31.1%	Warren	152,000	20,637	13.6%	215,347	34,211	15.9%	2.3%	17.0%
Meigs	22,768	10,189	44.8%	23,052	10,200	44.2%	-0.5%	-1.1%	Washington	61,383	20,328	33.1%	59,219	20,511	34.6%	1.5%	4.6%
Mercer	40,359	8,503	21.1%	40,300	10,074	25.0%	3.9%	18.6%	Wayne	108,474	27,855	25.7%	111,893	38,631	34.5%	8.8%	34.4%
Miami	97,256	21,045	21.6%	102,555	29,868	29.1%	7.5%	34.6%	Williams	37,996	9,157	24.1%	35,946	13,895	38.7%	14.6%	60.4%
Monroe	14,995	5,700	38.0%	14,245	5,735	40.3%	2.2%	5.9%	Wood	113,406	26,012	22.9%	122,376	35,169	28.7%	5.8%	25.3%
Montgomery	542,982	145,454	26.8%	516,898	197,203	38.2%	11.4%	42.4%	Wyandot	22,457	5,420	24.1%	21,981	7,036	32.0%	7.9%	32.6%
Morgan	14,614	6,315	43.2%	14,485	6,460	44.6%	1.4%	3.2%									
Morrow	31,172	8,119	26.0%	34,626	9,919	28.6%	2.6%	10.0%	Source: 115 Cor	sus Rureau data 2000). IIS CANSUS RUMAN	ı American Commu	nity Survey 2012 20	16			
Muskingum	81,903	26,560	32.4%	83,591	33,412	40.0%	7.5%	23.3%		545 DUICUU UULU 2000	, o.s. census bureau		ncy Jurvey, 2012-20	10			
Noble	11,829	4,236	35.8%	11,815	4,145	35.1%	-0.7%	-2.0%	Notes: The per	cent change is not th	e same figure repre	esented in the map	. The map shows th	ne raw change in pe	ercentage of people	e below 200%	of the Federa

Notes: The percent change is not the same figure represented in the map. The map shows the raw change in percentage of people below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level. For Wyandot, the raw change is 24.1% to 32.0%, or a 7.9% increase. Percent change shown in the table above represents the percent difference between two numbers and is calculated as: (2016 Data Minus 2010 Data)/2010 Data.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau data 2000; U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2012-2016

Appendix

Table 11. Change in 200% Federal Poverty Level, Ohio and counties, 2000 to 2016, continued

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 12. Child poverty by age group, Ohio, 2016

	Unde	r age 6	Ages	6 to 11	Ages ?	12 to 17	All children under 18		
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
Total	809,305		842,342		906,485		2,558,132		
In poverty	192,571	23.8%	182,589	21.7%	149,500	16.5%	524,660	20.5%	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- Younger children have consistently experienced higher rates of poverty than older children, and higher rates than adults
- The poverty rate for children under age 6 is 23.8% compared to 16.5% for middle and high school age kids in Ohio

Table 13. Child food insecurity, Ohio and the United States, 2015

	Population under age 18, 2015	Number of children experiencing food insecurity	Child food insecurity rate	Food insecure chil- dren likely eligible for any federal food assistance	Food insecure chil- dren likely ineligible for any federal food assistance
Ohio	2,629,808	575,020	21.9%	67.0%	33.0%
United States	73,284,916	13,118,000	17.9%	80.0%	20.0%

Source: Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap, 2017 report (data from 2015)

Notes: Food insecurity is defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as having limited or uncertain access to adequate food. Federal food assistance programs include: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), or food stamps; the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); the National School Lunch Program (NSLP); and various other federal child nutrition programs. The income eligibility criteria for federal food assistance varies by state and program. For instance, in Ohio the SNAP threshold is 130% FPL, while the threshold for other nutrion programs (such as WIC and NSLP) is 185% FPL. Nationally, the highest threshold for any federal food assistance varies by state and is either 185% or 200% FPL.

- The child food insecurity rate in Ohio remains higher than the child food insecurity rate for the country as a whole
- Food insecure children in Ohio are also less likely to be eligible for federal food . assistance than children in the U.S. in general (33% compared to 20%)

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 14. Income to poverty ratio by age group, Ohio, 2016

	Under	age 6	Under	age 18	Ages 1	8 to 64	Age 65 a	and over	Total a	ll ages
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total	809,305		2,558,132		6,913,724		1,815,545		11,287,401	
Below 50% FPL	95,676	11.8%	252,721	9.9%	457,784	6.6%	45,930	2.5%	756,435	6.7%
Below 100% FPL	192,571	23.8%	524,660	20.5%	973,638	14.1%	147,084	8.1%	1,645,382	14.6%
Below 200% FPL	368,375	45.5%	952,958	37.3%	2,022,963	29.3%	504,153	27.8%	3,480,075	30.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- federal poverty level

Table 15. Poverty by race/ethnicity, Ohio, 2016

	White (non-H	lispanic)	Bla African-A	ck/ Merican	As	ian	Mixe	d race	Hispa Latino (rac	anic/ (of any :e)
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total	8,982,067		1,380,553		232,438		312,621		407,709	
In poverty	1,007,341	11.2%	427,746	31.0%	35,137	15.1%	85,234	27.3%	101,588	24.9%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- .

Appendix

• Seven out of every hundred Ohioans live in extreme poverty, at less than half the • One of every three Ohioans live below 200% of the federal poverty level

Black or African American residents have the highest poverty rate at 31.0% The poverty rate among Asian Ohioans is closest to non-Hispanic Whites, at 15.1%

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 16. Poverty by race/ethnicity and age, Ohio, 2016

Persons in poverty	Total	White (non- Hispanic)	Black/African- American	Asian	Mixed race	Hispanic/Latino (of any race)
All age groups	1,645,382	1,007,341	427,746	35,137	85,234	101,588
Under age 6	192,571	91,644	64,433	2,373	19,971	18,228
Under age 18	524,660	262,497	167,147	5,583	49,298	50,129
Ages 18 to 64	973,638	628,342	235,654	28,459	34,125	49,030
Age 65 and	147,084	116,502	24,945	1,095	1,811	2,429
older						
Poverty rates	%	%	%	%	%	%
All age groups	14.6%	11.2%	31.0%	15.1%	27.3%	24.9%
Under age 6	23.8%	16.1%	53.7%	14.2%	32.7%	35.5%
Under age 18	20.5%	14.3%	44.6%	11.1%	30.4%	33.2%
Ages 18 to 64	14.1%	11.4%	27.8%	17.5%	24.7%	20.8%
Age 65 and	8.1%	7.3%	15.8%	5.6%	14.3%	11.6%
older						

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- Among Asian Ohioans, adults age 18 to 64 have a higher poverty rate (17.5%) than children under age 18 (11.1%)
- Adults age 65 and older have the lowest poverty rate in every racial/ethnic group

Table 17. Poverty by family type, Ohio, 2016

	Married couples related children care	with no in their	Married couples with re- lated children in their care		Single men with related children in their care		Single women with related children in their care	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total	1,299,050		822,566		128,494		382,337	
In poverty	41,168	3.2%	49,047	6.0%	28,193	21.9%	157,206	41.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- As expected, married couples with no children have the lowest poverty rate of any family structure (3.2%)
- Single women with children under 18 have a poverty rate nearly twice that of single men with children under 18 (41.1% and 21.9% respectively)

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 18. Poverty by race/ethnicity of householder and family type, Ohio, 2016

-	••				
aı	mil	ies	in	pove	rtv

Families in poverty	Total	White (non- Hispanic)	Black/ African- American	Asian	Mixed race	His- panic/ Latino (of any race)
All families	306,876	187,913	86,590	4,863	10,289	19,419
Married couples with no related children in their	41,168	34,027	7,820	2,353	1,570	3,548
care						
Married couples with related children in their care	49,047	33,036	4,277	1,408	884	1,505
Single men with related children in their care	28,193	17,020	6,961	178	919	3,358
Single women with related children in their care	157,206	81,941	59,567	742	6,573	10,220
Poverty rates	%	%	%	%	%	%
All families	10.5%	7.7%	26.7%	9.2%	25.3%	23.9%
Married couples with no related children in their	3.2%	2.8%	5.8%	7.8%	12.3%	7.4%
care						
Married couples with related children in their care	6.0%	4.8%	14.2%	8.8%	8.3%	14.5%
Single men with related children in their care	21.9%	17.8%	33.3%	12.4%	35.0%	42.8%
Single women with related children in their care	41.1%	35.3%	50.1%	32.9%	58.5%	49.7%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

Table 19. Poverty by employment type, Ohio, 2016

	f ye	Worked full-time, year round		-time or part- ear	Unemployed		
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
Total persons age 16 and older	3,864,767		2,177,961		2,996,929		
In poverty	97,308	2.5%	413,434	19.0%	660,186	22.0%	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

Appendix

Poverty rates for Asian single mother households are the lowest at 32.9% (compared to other single woman with related children under 18 households) Mixed race families continue to have among the highest poverty rates, with the exception of married couples with related children in their care

The poverty rate among people employed part-time or part-year is over seven times higher than the poverty rate among people working full-time year round

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 20. Poverty by number of wage-earners, work experience, and family type, Ohio, 2016

	Total families	Families in poverty	Poverty rate
Married couple	2,121,616	90,215	4.3%
Both work, full or part time	1,177,687	16,884	1.4%
One spouse work	575,566	38,015	6.6%
Neither works	368,363	35,316	9.6%
Single male householder	221,513	35,960	16.2%
Works full time	129,499	6,659	5.1%
Works part time	42,220	12,635	29.9%
Does not work	49,794	16,666	33.5%
Single female householder	586,532	180,701	30.8%
Works full time	261,122	26,605	10.2%
Works part time	151,637	82,659	54.5%
Does not work	173,773	71,437	41.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

There are more single female householders in poverty than married couple families in poverty (180,701 compared to 90,215) although the number of overall married couple families is far higher than the total number of single female householders

Table 21. Poverty by educational attainment, Ohio, 2016

	No high school diploma or GED		High school diploma or GED		Some college or associate degree		Bachelor's degree or higher	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total persons age 25 and older	749,993		2,574,914		2,279,023		2,167,783	
In poverty	204,143	27.2%	348,208	13.5%	255,015	11.2%	82,128	3.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

- Poverty rates decrease as educational attainment increases •
- More than one quarter of Ohioans without a high school diploma or equivalency • live in poverty

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 22. Seniors living in poverty by sex, Ohio, 2016

	Female, 65 and older		Male, 65 a	nd older	Total, age 65 and older	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Total seniors	1,014,852		800,693		1,815,545	
In poverty	98,144	9.7%	48,940	6.1%	147,084	8.1%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 1-year estimates

for men of the same age

Table 23. Drug overdose deaths, Ohio, 2012-2016

	2012
Total overdose deaths	1,914
Percentage of deaths	
from Fentanyl and	3.9%
related drugs	

Source: Ohio Department of Health

- related drugs (3.9% to 58.2%)
- death

Appendix

The poverty rate for women age 65 and older is 3.6% higher than the poverty rate

2013	2014	2015	2016
2,110	2,531	3,050	4,050
4.0%	19.9%	37.9%	58.2%

In the last five years the number of total overdose deaths has drastically increased (1,914 to 4,050) as has the percentage of overdose deaths related to Fentanyl and

• The estimated lost lifetime earnings per person is \$1.3 million per opioid overdose

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 24. Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) status, Ohio Counties

Child care centers

Geography	Number with PFCC agreement	Total centers	Percentage with PFCC agreement	Geography
	2,949	4,111	71.7%	Guernsey
5	2	4	50.0%	Hamilton
	26	35	74.3%	Hancock
d	7	12	58.3%	Hardin
ula	17	33	51.5%	Harrison
	9	16	56.3%	Henry
e	7	13	53.8%	Highland
t	4	16	25.0%	Hocking
	2	7	28.6%	Holmes
	106	133	79.7%	Huron
	1	4	25.0%	Jackson
aign	12	14	85.7%	Jefferson
	22	31	71.0%	Knox
nt	36	58	62.1%	Lake
	9	13	69.2%	Lawrence
iana	17	33	51.5%	Licking
on	5	8	62.5%	Logan
rd	4	9	44.4%	Lorain
ga	428	530	80.8%	Lucas
5	6	9	66.7%	Madison
ce	7	12	58.3%	Mahoning
ire	55	96	57.3%	Marion
	7	12	58.3%	Medina
1	40	55	72.7%	Meigs
	3	6	50.0%	Mercer
in	490	670	73.1%	Miami
	6	15	40.0%	Monroe
1	3	6	50.0%	Montgomery
,a	16	29	55.2%	Morgan
ne	39	51	76.5%	Morrow

Source: Ohio Department of Job and Family Services; data received February 2018

Source: Ohio Department of Job and Family Services; data received February 2018

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Appendix

Table 24. Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) status, Ohio Counties, continued

Child care centers

Total centers	Percentage with PFCC agreement
8	50.0%
392	79.6%
22	68.2%
7	42.9%
1	0.0%
11	36.4%
7	42.9%
5	20.0%
3	0.0%
13	30.8%
6	50.0%
10	80.0%
13	69.2%
70	77.1%
16	56.3%
67	67.2%
13	53.8%
96	71.9%
172	81.4%
8	75.0%
84	77.4%
13	23.1%
45	62.2%
1	0.0%
8	50.0%
29	62.1%
2	0.0%
222	84.2%
1	0.0%
5	60.0%

Poverty in Ohio, continued

Table 24. Publicly Funded Child Care (PFCC) status, Ohio Counties, continued

	Child care centers				
Geography	Number with PFCC agreement	Total centers	Percentage with PFCC agreement		
Muskingum	12	22	54.5%		
Noble	1	2	50.0%		
Ottawa	7	13	53.8%		
Paulding	2	3	66.7%		
Perry	4	6	66.7%		
Pickaway	10	16	62.5%		
Pike	4	6	66.7%		
Portage	35	46	76.1%		
Preble	9	10	90.0%		
Putnam	8	11	72.7%		
Richland	23	30	76.7%		
Ross	10	15	66.7%		
Sandusky	10	17	58.8%		
Scioto	8	16	50.0%		
Seneca	8	12	66.7%		
Shelby	3	9	33.3%		
Stark	99	117	84.6%		
Summit	143	206	69.4%		
Trumbull	39	54	72.2%		
Tuscarawas	12	23	52.2%		
Union	6	12	50.0%		
Van Wert	3	5	60.0%		
Vinton	0	1	0.0%		
Warren	37	67	55.2%		
Washington	18	28	64.3%		
Wayne	20	34	58.8%		
Williams	3	9	33.3%		
Wood	25	37	67.6%		
Wyandot	0	4	0.0%		

Table 25. Sources for report content, by subject and page number

Page Number(s)	Brief Description
7	Medicaid expansion data
8	Childcare costs
9	College and administrative costs
10	Opioid statistics
11 & 2	Opioid deaths - lost lifetime earnings
12 & 13	Opioid and drug-use system impact
12 & 13	Foster care systems data

Source: Ohio Department of Job and Family Services; data received February 2018

Source Information

Data Source(s)

(1) The Ohio Dept of Medicaid, Ohio Medicaid Group VIII Assessment: A Report to the Ohio General Assembly, p. 2, 15, 41

(2) ChildCare Aware, usa.childcareaware.org, Retrieved Jan 2018

(3) Policy Matters Ohio, State support for higher education is still behind the curve, December 2015

(4) College Board, Trends in Higher Education, Retrieved January 2018

(5) Ohio Conference AAUP 2015 Ohio Higher Education Report

(6) Ohio Department of Health, 2016 Ohio Drug Overdose Data: General Findings

(7) Ohio Department of Health (number of deaths); Taking Measure of Ohio's Opioid Crisis, Oct 2017

(8) Akron Beacon Journal, Opioid crisis overwhelms, leads to record number of children removed from homes of drug-addicted parents, Dec 2017. (9) AP Report by NBC24, Voters tapped as Ohio opioid crisis stretches foster care, November 2017

(10) Above articles (8) and (9), citing data from Public Children Services Associa-tion of Ohio



Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies