In the past 10 years, the County’s Welfare to Work program has provided more than 113,000 aid recipients with job-readiness and vocational training, and work experience placements, moving tens of thousands of county residents into the ranks of income earners. Rachel is one of them. With the loss of her employment in 2012, Rachel sought assistance from the County’s Transitional Assistance Department (TAD). Introduced to the Welfare to Work program, Rachel volunteered to participate in the Subsidized Work Experience Program. She was offered a paid on-the-job training position with the County Department of Behavioral Health (DBH). “Luckily, I was placed with a great team who was supportive and encouraging. They believed in me when I didn’t believe in myself,” Rachel said. Since accepting her first entry-level position, Rachel has promoted to Staff Trainer. “The collaboration between TAD and DBH has created a pathway out of poverty for me and my family,” Rachel said. “To go from not knowing how I was going to pay my rent or take care of my children, to being secure in my finances and a homeowner is incredible.” While the Welfare to Work program clearly benefits individuals, its impacts are felt countywide as it increases the number of income earners and reduces the number of those receiving public assistance.

Success Story

Section Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Living Compared to the National Average</th>
<th>28% Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$63,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Living in Poverty</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of All Residents Living in Poverty</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year Change in Residents with Low Food Security</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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County Posts Robust Median Income Growth in 2018

Cost of living is low in San Bernardino County compared to its Southern California neighbors, but it is 28% higher than the national average. As a result, real income growth is important to ensure residents have sufficient income to thrive in San Bernardino County and afford rising expenses. This indicator tracks the change in inflation-adjusted median household income for San Bernardino County compared to the state and nation.¹ Median household income and cost of living are presented for San Bernardino County and compared to selected peer markets. The cost of living index compares the prices of housing, consumer goods, and services in San Bernardino County relative to the national average.

How is San Bernardino County Doing?

Real median household income has rebounded in the last four years:
• In 2018, median household income in San Bernardino County was $63,857. This is a 16% increase since the 10-year low in 2014, and it outpaces inflation.
• San Bernardino County’s median income surpassed that of the nation, but remains lower than the state.
• Both California and the United State’s median household incomes have reached pre-recession levels. San Bernardino County has yet to reach that milestone.

San Bernardino County has the lowest cost of living in Southern California, but the highest among selected peer markets outside of California:
• With 100.0 being average, San Bernardino County measured 128.1 in 2018, or 28.1% more expensive than the national average.
• Regions with relatively high income and low cost of living provide residents with the most discretionary income. Among peer markets compared, Phoenix residents have the most advantageous ratio of income to cost of living, followed by San Bernardino County. Los Angeles County residents have the least favorable ratio, with a high cost of living and low median household income.

¹ All income data in this indicator are inflation-adjusted to 2018 dollars, such that $1,000 earned in 2009, for example, has the same buying power as $1,170 in 2018. "Real" refers to income adjusted for inflation.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates, Table B19013; Sperling’s Best Places, 2018
INCOME INEQUALITY

County’s Income Inequality is Low Compared to Peers

Income inequality, or the gap between the rich and the poor, has been increasing in the United States since the 1980s and is higher than most industrialized countries. High income inequality is associated with poorer public health, reduced socioeconomic mobility, and reduced feelings of well-being among those at the low end of the income distribution. This indicator measures the level of income inequality among households in San Bernardino County using the Gini Index.

How is San Bernardino County Doing?
There is less income inequality in San Bernardino County than the state and nation:
- In 2018, San Bernardino County’s Gini Index score was 0.44, compared to 0.49 in California and 0.48 nationwide.
- Among the 40 California counties with populations of 65,000 or more, San Bernardino County has less income inequality than all but four counties.
- In comparison to selected peer and neighboring counties, San Bernardino County has the least income inequality.

Gini Index of Income Inequality
County Comparison, 2018

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates (Table B19083)

Gini Index Scale
Gini Index results range between zero (0) and one (1). A value of zero indicates complete equality, where all households have equal income. A value of one indicates complete inequality, where only one household has any income.

Russell Sage Foundation. (2016). What we know about income inequality and social mobility in the United States (www.russellsage.org)
Family Poverty Continues to Decline

Poverty can have negative health impacts for both children and adults. For children, growing up in an impoverished household increases their risk for lower cognitive abilities, lower school achievement, and poorer development. Tracking poverty can assist with targeting interventions to mitigate these negative impacts. The poverty rate is also an important tool to determine eligibility for health and human services and programs, including health and supplemental food programs, which can lessen the negative impacts of poverty. This indicator provides detailed information about the percentage and makeup of San Bernardino County families that are living in poverty. A family is defined as a group of two or more people related by birth, marriage, or adoption residing in the same housing unit.

How is San Bernardino County Doing?
The percentage of families living in poverty continues to decline:
• The percentage of families living in poverty declined from 12.8% in 2017 to 11.7% in 2018.
• San Bernardino County’s rate of family poverty is higher than the state and national averages and is the highest among the counties compared, except for Miami-Dade (13.2%).
• At 23.4% in 2018, families whose head of household does not have a high school diploma had the highest rate of poverty.
• Among San Bernardino County cities with 65,000 or more residents, the highest rate of family poverty was in the City of San Bernardino (20.1%), while Chino Hills had the lowest rate (4.1%).

Families with younger children have a higher incidence of poverty:
• Female-headed households, where there is no husband living in the house, have the highest poverty rate at 26.7%. For those female-headed households with children under 18 years of age, the poverty rate increases considerably (35.3%).
• Married-couple families (with or without children) have a lower poverty rate (7.1%). For those married-couple families with children under 18 years of age, the rate increases to 9.4%.

Families with younger children have a higher incidence of poverty:
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Poverty rates vary by race and ethnicity:
- Black families have the highest rate of poverty (16.0%), while White families have the lowest rate (7.5%).
- For Latino families, 14.8% are living in poverty.

**Percentage of Families Living in Poverty by Race/Ethnicity of Householder**
San Bernardino County, 2018

- White: 7.5%
- Asian: 8.7%
- Other: 12.1%
- Latino: 14.8%
- Black: 16.0%

**Poverty Level by Family Structure and Ages of Children**
San Bernardino County, 2018

- All families (with and without children): 11.7%
- With Related Children under 18 Years: 7.1%
- With Related Children under 5 Years Only: 9.4%
- Married Couple: 16.5%
- Female-Headed Household (No Husband Present): 26.7%

Note: Percentages based on race/ethnicity of householder. Asian includes Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. White is non-Hispanic. Latino is of any race. Other includes Native American alone, some other race alone, or two or more races.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 1-Year Estimates (https://data.census.gov/cedsci/)

**Low-income Family Eligibility for Free or Reduced-Price School Meals**

A growing number of children are eligible to receive free or reduced-price school meals:
- In 2017/18, 71.7% of K-12 public school students lived in families with incomes low enough to qualify for free or reduced-price school meals, up two percentage points from 69.7% in 2016/17.
- A child is eligible if his or her family’s income is below 185% of the poverty level (e.g., $46,435 for a family of four in 2018).

**Children Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price School Meals**
San Bernardino County and California, 2009-2018

- California: 2008/09: 52.0%, 2009/10: 54.0%, 2010/11: 56.0%, 2011/12: 58.0%, 2012/13: 59.0%, 2013/14: 60.1%, 2014/15: 61.0%, 2015/16: 62.0%, 2016/17: 63.0%, 2017/18: 64.5%

Source: California Department of Education, DataQuest (http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/)
Overall Poverty Declines for Fourth Year in a Row

In addition to impacting an individual’s health and educational attainment, poverty also affects their burden upon and contribution to the community. The poverty rate is an important tool to determine eligibility for health and human services and programs, including health insurance and supplemental food programs, which can lessen the negative impacts of poverty. Tracking poverty can also assist with targeting interventions. This indicator tracks the percentage of the population in San Bernardino County living in poverty by select demographics including age, gender and employment.

**How is San Bernardino County Doing?**

Overall poverty rates in San Bernardino County continue to decline:
- The percentage of the population living in poverty decreased from 16.2% in 2017 to 14.9% in 2018.
- This is a drop of more than two percentage points over the past 10 years, when 17.0% of the population lived in poverty.
- San Bernardino County’s rate of poverty is higher than state and national averages and is the highest among counties compared, except for Miami-Dade (16.0% living in poverty).

Over the past 10 years, poverty rates declined all age groups except seniors:
- In 2018, 21.4% of children in San Bernardino County were living in poverty, down from 23.8% in 2009.
- The percentage of adults living in poverty also decreased during this same period, from 14.8% in 2009 to 12.7% in 2018.
- However, poverty among seniors ages 65 and older increased, rising from 9.1% in 2009 to 11.3% in 2018.

Women are more likely to live in poverty than men:
- In 2018, 16.0% of females in San Bernardino County were living in poverty.
- This is more than two percentage points higher than the proportion of the male population living in poverty (13.7%).

The working poor population has declined somewhat:
- In 2018, 6.3% of the civilian labor force ages 16 and older who were employed were living in poverty. This is down from 2009 when 7.5% of the employed population in the labor force was living in poverty.
- The poverty rate for the unemployed population in the labor force decreased slightly, from 26.5% in 2009 to 26.1% in 2018.

**2018 Income Thresholds for Poverty Determination**

For an individual, the annual income to be considered in poverty is less than $12,140. For two people with no children, the poverty threshold is an annual income of $16,460.

**Percentage of Population Living in Poverty, by Age**
San Bernardino County, 2009-2018

**Percentage of Civilian Labor Force Ages 16 and Older Living in Poverty**
San Bernardino County, 2009-2018

**2019 INCOME**
Food and Income Support Caseloads Continue to Decline

Public income support and food subsidies provide a critical safety net to those living in or at risk of poverty. These supports can work against the negative pressures of poverty, including the stress and strained family relationships that can result from the challenges of paying for basic needs. To assess the demand for these services, this indicator measures caseloads of two core public assistance programs, CalWORKs and CalFresh.

How is San Bernardino County Doing?
CalWORKs and CalFresh caseloads continued to decline in 2019:
• After peaking in 2016, CalFresh caseloads fell for the third consecutive year, dropping from 178,986 cases in 2016 to 150,863 cases in 2019.
• This represents a decrease of 16% from 2016 to 2019.
• CalWORKs caseloads have also continued to decline, dropping 28% in five years, from 49,731 cases in 2015 to 35,757 cases in 2019.
• While San Bernardino County is home to 4.8% of California’s households, 7.7% of the 1.29 million California households receiving cash public assistance or CalFresh reside in San Bernardino County.
• Most CalWORKs recipients are children (82%) and just under half of CalFresh recipients are children (48%).
• Veterans make up only 1% of CalFresh recipients and even fewer (less than one-half of a percent) of CalWORKs recipients.
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Food insecurity is not having consistent access to enough food for an active, healthy life. It reflects both the quantity and quality of food in a household, as people may decide to go without food or purchase less expensive, and also less healthy, food. Food insecurity can also cause increased stress, requiring families to choose between food and other essentials such as housing, utilities, transportation and medical care. People who are food insecure are disproportionately affected by diet-sensitive chronic diseases such as diabetes and high blood pressure, and according to research, food insecurity is also linked to many adverse effects to overall health. For children, research shows an association between food insecurity and delayed development in young children; risk of chronic illnesses like asthma and anemia; and behavioral problems like hyperactivity, anxiety and aggression in school-age children. This indicator reports data from the national annual food security survey, including both low food security (reduced quality, variety or desirability of diet) and very low food security (food intake is reduced and normal eating patterns are disrupted because the household lacks money and other resources for food).

How is San Bernardino County Doing?
Food insecurity in the Riverside-San Bernardino metro area is improving:

- Five years ago, with nearly 18% of its population experiencing food insecurity, Riverside-San Bernardino had a greater proportion of residents who were food insecure than California (13.7%) and the United States (15.4%).
- However, food insecurity is steadily improving in Riverside-San Bernardino, dropping 46% between 2014 and 2018, from 17.8% of the population experiencing food insecurity in 2014 to 9.6% in 2018.
- In contrast, a greater proportion of both California and United States residents were food insecure in 2018, at 10.3% and 11.5%, respectively.

Residents Experiencing Low and Very Low Food Security, 2014-2018
Riverside-San Bernardino, California and United States

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture 2018 Food Security Survey, households with very low food insecurity reported experiencing the following conditions (national data):

- 98% reported having worried that their food would run out before they got money to buy more.
- 97% reported that the food they bought just did not last, and they did not have money to get more.
- 96% reported that they could not afford to eat balanced meals.
- 97% reported that an adult had cut the size of meals or skipped meals because there was not enough money for food; 90% reported that this had occurred in 3 or more months.
- 69% of respondents reported that they had been hungry but did not eat because they could not afford enough food.
- 32% reported that an adult did not eat for a whole day because there was not enough money for food; 25% reported that this had occurred in 3 or more months.
