We Need to Save Child Care Before It’s Too Late

The coronavirus pandemic has struck a severe blow to the already inadequate child care system in the United States. As of August, approximately 214,000 child care workers—one fifth of the pre-pandemic level—are still out of a job. More than four fifths of child care providers report that if they don’t receive additional public assistance they expect to close permanently. As result, 13 percent of parents say that they were forced to reduce hours or quit their jobs, on average losing a full day of work a week. The lack of child care has become one of the key factors holding back the U.S recovery.

Even before COVID-19, more than four out of five parents of young children reported that finding quality, affordable child care in their area was a serious problem. This is because child care is neither widely accessible nor affordable. Millions of American families live in “child care deserts,” in which the demand for child care far exceeds the supply. The average family that uses child care spends about one fourth of their income to pay for it. In some states, a single-earner family earning median income would need to spend more than half of their earnings to care for a single infant. In 30 states and Washington, D.C., the average cost of center-based infant care costs more than average in-state college tuition.

Child care is expensive in the United States because, unlike in other developed countries, it is not seen as a public good, despite extensive research showing that it has substantial public benefits. The U.S. federal government spends less than half as much on child care as a share of its gross domestic product as the average of other nations in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). In some of those countries, free child care is widely accessible; in others, fees are means-tested and on average amount to only about 15 percent of average earnings.

The fact that American parents are forced to bear a much larger portion of the costs means that access to child care highly depends on a family’s economic status. Whereas universal, publicly-funded primary and secondary school education is progressive—reducing inequality—the lack of accessible and affordable child care is regressive, exacerbating it. Although some families below the poverty line can take advantage of the federally-funded Head Start program and other government subsidies, many others cannot—preventing them from working and maximizing earning potential. Middle-income families can also be hurt, not earning enough to pay full price for child care or little enough to qualify for assistance.

Extensive research shows that child care has substantial economic benefits to children, parents and the economy. Children who receive quality child care are healthier, more likely to graduate high school and have higher lifetime incomes. Parents who have access to affordable child care can remain in the workforce and earn needed income. Conversely, those who leave the workforce—disproportionately mothers—can suffer depressed earnings throughout their careers; this is a major source of the gender wage gap, with the median woman earning 82 percent of what the median man earns. Furthermore, affordable child care increases overall labor force participation, an essential prerequisite for economic growth. Economists at the Minneapolis Federal Reserve found that investments in child care are “the most efficient means to boost the productivity of the workforce 15 to 20 years down the road.”

America’s failure to contain the coronavirus will put extraordinary pressure on child care providers, which have suffered from sharply reduced enrollments due to fear of contagion as well as significantly higher costs for personal protective equipment and other safety measures. While Congress has passed coronavirus relief measures that help some child care providers, many others are unable to access it. In an industry with razor-thin margins, many providers will face bankruptcy without additional federal assistance. That would leave millions of American parents and children without the child care they need and risk long-term damage to the U.S. economy.
KEY POINTS

- More than four out of five (83 percent) parents of young children reported that finding quality, affordable child care in their area was a serious problem.

- More than 50 percent of American families with young children live in “child care deserts,” areas in which the demand for licensed child care far outpaces the local supply.

- Over 12 million young children were in some kind of child care before the pandemic, 62 percent of whom were in center-based care.

- American families that use child care spend an average of 23 percent of their net income on it.

- The average cost of child care for families with two children (infant and 4-year-old) exceeds the average cost of rent in every state.

- Depending on the state, care for one infant costs between almost one quarter (23 percent) and more than three quarters (77 percent) of median U.S. family income.

- In many states, parents spend more on child care than they would on a college education. For example, the average annual cost of center-based infant care exceeds average annual in-state public college tuition in 30 states and Washington, D.C.

- Since 2000, the cost of child care has increased almost twice as fast as inflation.

- Child care workers earned a median hourly wage of only $11.65 in 2019, approximately $24,000 per year.

- High child care costs force parents who otherwise would work to forego as much as $35 billion in income, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

- Investments in child care are “the most efficient means to boost the productivity of the workforce 15 to 20 years down the road,” according to economists at the Minneapolis Federal Reserve.

- Every dollar spent on early care and education could yield a societal benefit of more than eight dollars, according to a 2015 report by the Council of Economic Advisers.

- More than 370,000 child care workers lost their jobs in the first months of the coronavirus recession. Employment in August 2020 remained about 20 percent below its recent peak.

- More than 80 percent of child care providers surveyed say that they won’t survive without government assistance.

- The child care system needs an estimated $9.6 billion a month in public aid in order to avoid the economic destabilization that could result from permanent closures of child care providers.
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A SHORTAGE OF AFFORDABLE CHILD CARE

Even before COVID-19, the United States had been facing a child care crisis

Even before the current pandemic, child care was inaccessible or unaffordable for millions of American families. Fifteen million (67 percent) young children have all available parents in the workforce—including 4.5 million children of single mothers.1 But at the same time, four out of five parents of young children report that finding quality, affordable child care in their area was a serious problem.2 In 2016, nearly 2 million parents of young children had to make career sacrifices because of problems with child care.3

More than half of American families with children live in “child care deserts”

In 2018, more than 50 percent of American families with young children lived in areas where the demand for licensed child care far outpaced the local supply.4 These communities, which have been called “child care deserts,” have more than three children under the age of five for every one licensed child care slot.5 In some of these areas, there are no child care centers at all.

Most child care deserts are in low- and middle-income communities—particularly many predominantly Latino neighborhoods—and across rural America, according to researchers at the University of Minnesota and the Center for American Progress.6 Middle-income communities, defined as areas where typical household incomes for a family of four with two children are above the federal poverty line ($25,926) but below 185 percent of the federal poverty line ($47,964), are most likely to be child care deserts, showing the lowest levels of local child care capacity relative to demand.7

High-income neighborhoods have the most child care capacity relative to local demand due to the ability of wealthier parents to pay full price. Child care in low-income neighborhoods likely is supported by the federal child care subsidy program, the Head Start program, and publically provided pre-K, allowing for higher capacity relative to demand than in middle-income neighborhoods.8 However, capacity in low-income areas is not sufficient because many families that qualify for subsidized programs do not receive assistance due to severe underfunding; only about one in ten children eligible for subsidized early care and education receive it.9

Child care is more expensive than college tuition in many states

Early care and education (ECE) includes settings in which children between birth and eight years old are cared for and taught by people other than their parents or primary caregivers with whom they live.10 In the United States, parents spend about $42 billion annually on ECE.11 Sixty-two percent (7.8 million) of young children in child care are in center-based care.12 Center-based care (i.e., day care center, preschool or pre-K), on average, tends to be of higher quality than care provided in home-based or informal arrangements, but it is more expensive.

Parents in the United States that have children in child care spend on average 23 percent of their net income to pay for it.13 In many states parents spend more on child care than they would on a
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college education. The average annual cost of center-based infant care exceeds average annual in-state public college tuition in 30 states and Washington, D.C., the average annual cost for toddlers (ages 2 to 3) exceeds tuition in 28 states and Washington, D.C., and the average annual cost for 4-year-olds exceeds tuition in 18 states and Washington, D.C.\textsuperscript{14} Parents who need child care from infancy through 4 years old in these states face higher costs for care than if their child were enrolling in a 4-year public institution. Whereas parents have 18 years to plan and save for college, they do not have that luxury of time to plan for child care, and they are in the lowest earning years of their careers.

Bearing this expense is particularly difficult or impossible for low-income families. The cost of center-based infant care in all states is well above the recommendation by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that families with low incomes pay no more than 7 percent of household income for child care.\textsuperscript{15} The patchwork of federal subsidies and municipally provided programs are not enough to make child care affordable for many low-income families.

Middle-income parents, as well as parents in the lower end of the high-income range, are often even more constrained, as they do not qualify for as much government assistance but still do not earn enough to afford care. Depending on the state, care for one infant costs between almost one quarter (23 percent) and more than three quarters (77 percent) of median family income for middle-income parents.\textsuperscript{16} For a single mother making median income, infant care costs between 29 and 94 percent of her income.\textsuperscript{17}

Child care costs are often the number one expense for families across incomes. The average cost of child care for families with two children (infant and 4-year-old) exceeds the average cost of rent in every state for which data is available, and it exceeds the average mortgage in 39 states and Washington, D.C.\textsuperscript{18} For example, average annual center-based care for two children in Maine is $25,480, while average annualized rent is $9,696 and the average annualized mortgage is $16,284.\textsuperscript{19} A mother in Iowa, where infant care costs an average of $10,743 a year, said in February 2020 that care for her 6-month-old daughter—costing more than her family’s mortgage—would have put her family “on a rice and beans diet, and made it absolutely impossible to save as a young family.”\textsuperscript{20}

\textit{The rising cost of child care has far outpaced inflation}

Sky-high child care prices today reflect two decades of cost increases outpacing the growth in the cost of living across the United States. Between 2000 and 2020, the cost of day care and preschool rose nearly twice as much as inflation.\textsuperscript{21} Meanwhile, average hourly wages for most U.S. workers have been stagnant for decades—today’s real average wage has about the same purchasing power it did 40 years ago.\textsuperscript{22}
There are three widely agreed-upon principal drivers of the high costs of child care: high labor costs, strict staff-to-child ratio requirements that push these costs higher and real estate costs, particularly in urban and suburban settings.

In 2019, child care workers earned a median hourly wage of only $11.65, approximately $24,000 annually. These are near-poverty wages—close to 130 percent of the federal poverty line for a single parent with one child and only slightly above 180 percent of the federal poverty line for a single person.

Nevertheless, employee compensation is the largest expense for center-based child care providers because, relative to primary and secondary schools, they must maintain a low ratio of children to caregivers, which often is mandated by law.

The ratios depend on age and are lowest for infants, but vary by state. Lower ratio requirements mean a higher cost of care. For example, in Massachusetts, where one caregiver is required for every three infants, the average annual cost of infant care is $20,880. On the other hand, Louisiana requires one caregiver for every six infants, and the average annual cost of infant care is $8,580. Ratio requirements also depend on labor standards and safety considerations for the children, which vary by location. Research consistently proves that lower ratios result in higher-quality care—increasing ratios to cut costs is not the answer.

Because of these necessary standards, center-based child care providers cannot cut staff without cutting enrollment and losing revenue (see Appendix: “Direct Spending by the Child Care Industry in Other Sectors”). Many other types of businesses cut costs by outsourcing services or entire jobs along the production chain; child care is a direct service that cannot be outsourced or replaced by technology.

Real estate costs also drive up the cost of care. States with high real estate costs (e.g., Massachusetts and California) generally have the most expensive child care, both in absolute dollars and as a share of median income. Within states, there are significant differences in real estate costs—and therefore child care expenses—between urban, suburban and rural areas.
Most states require child care facilities to have sufficient indoor and outdoor space. Studies show that the quality, including the size, of the physical environment of early child care centers is related to children’s development.\textsuperscript{26} Crowding has been shown to be associated with increased risk of developing respiratory infections and higher risk of injury.\textsuperscript{27} For these reasons, child care providers cannot cut costs in areas with high rents by reducing the size of their facilities.

**The U.S. government spends far less on child care than other developed countries**

The United States significantly lags behind other industrialized countries in public investment in early care and education (ECE), spending less than half the average of what other industrialized countries spend as a share of gross domestic product (GDP)—0.3 percent compared to the OECD average of 0.7 percent. The United States spends approximately 3 to 6 times less than France, New Zealand and the Nordic countries on ECE as a share of GDP. Those countries invest more than one percent of GDP on ECE.\textsuperscript{28} As a result, the United States ranks third from the bottom of the 37 OECD countries (see Appendix: “U.S. Public Investment in Children Lags behind Other OECD Countries”).\textsuperscript{29} Furthermore, U.S. federal spending on ECE is projected to decline in real dollars and relative to GDP over the next decade.\textsuperscript{30}

In the United States, ECE is funded through financing from a wide range of resources. The public sector—federal, state and local governments—covers 46 percent of the cost of ECE while private and philanthropic entities cover about 2 percent of costs, leaving families to shoulder the remaining 52 percent.\textsuperscript{31} This is in contrast to K-12 education, which is available to all children free of cost as a public good. As a result, public funding for K-12 education has progressive effects that lessen inequality, whereas insufficient funding for early care and education has regressive effects and exacerbates inequality.

Some U.S. states and cities (e.g., Oklahoma, Georgia, Washington, D.C. and New York City) have implemented universal ECE programs that do not require out-of-pocket costs to parents as well as other countries (e.g., Belgium, France and South Korea).\textsuperscript{32} Generally in most countries where parent fees are charged, they are means-tested, representing around 15 percent of household income on average, so the poorest and largest families pay less.\textsuperscript{33} In contrast, families in the United States pay an average of 23 percent of their net income on child care.\textsuperscript{34}

**ECONOMIC EFFECTS**

**The vast majority of child care providers are sole proprietors**

Over 12 million (59 percent) children age 5 and younger and not enrolled in kindergarten were in some kind of non-parental care before the pandemic.\textsuperscript{35} The child care industry in the United States is a network of 617,000 establishments, the core of which consists of just over 77,000 employer firms (13 percent of the total) with paid employees, while the other 540,000 establishments (87 percent) are home-based and mostly operated by a sole proprietor with no employees.\textsuperscript{36} Most of these employer firms are traditional child care centers that collectively serve an estimated 80 percent of children enrolled in organized care and employ 64 percent of child care workers.\textsuperscript{37}
Larger child care providers serve most of the market—and their share is growing

In recent years, an increasing share of child care services have been provided by employer firms, and the number of employer providers has been rising while the number of non-employer providers has been declining. Home-based care tends to be a less expensive option for parents, and the decline in non-employer providers reduces its availability. In 2019, parents of young children in any type of care other than center-based who reported difficulty finding child care most often cited the cost of care as the primary reason for difficulty. Additionally, the mix of employer providers and non-employer providers varies across states. Home-based care plays a larger role in rural states, producing an above-average share of regional industry revenue. In states along the East Coast, home-based care contributes a very low share of total industry revenue.

In 2017, an average employer firm kept 13 workers on payroll, each of whom earned just $20,886 on average in annual compensation. Very low wages contribute to high turnover rates among child care workers, meaning centers must devote more resources to training new employees and children must build new relationships with a shifting roster of teachers. The owners of non-employer child care providers operate on thinner margins—typically 1 percent—than employer providers do and only receive as salary the net profit from operating their business. Consequently, a typical non-employer child care provider earned $12,563 on average annually in 2017.

The child care industry’s spending spills over to other sectors of the economy

The child care industry produced over $50 billion in total revenue in 2017, with employer firms accounting for 83 percent of the revenue ($42 billion). However, as in any sector of the economy, the value of the child care industry is more than the sum of its parts—that is, the value the industry adds to the economy is more than its revenue. Child care industry spending spills over to other sectors through consumer spending by child care workers, as well as purchases of goods and services by child care providers to support the direct operations of their facilities.

As a result, the amount of direct earnings received by workers and owners providing child care services is the largest predictor of the child care sector’s overall direct economic impact within a state. Over half of the industry’s revenue is used to compensate employees and sole proprietors of child care businesses: 45 percent ($22.8 billion) of revenue compensates employees of center-based providers while the earnings of sole proprietors operating child care businesses make up an estimated 14 percent ($6.8 billion) of revenue (see Appendix: “Direct Spending by the Child Care Industry in Other Sectors”).

Purchases of goods and services by child care establishments are the second-largest source of child care industry spending after employee and owner compensation, amounting to one-third of total industry revenue ($16.7 billion) in 2017. Spending is spread across major industry sectors, with real estate and manufactured goods being the two biggest beneficiaries receiving $7.2 billion and $4.9 billion, respectively. The distribution of purchases varies across states depending on the prices of goods and services, and especially real estate costs.
Affordable child care raises labor force participation

The future growth of the U.S. economy depends in part on increasing the labor force participation rate—the share of the working-age population that is employed or looking for a job. From the mid-1960s through 2000, the U.S. labor force participation rate rose significantly, partly as a result of millions of women entering the workforce—mainly women with young children. Women’s labor force participation in the United States plateaued around its 2000 peak until the Great Recession when it declined slightly and settled at a lower plateau until February 2020. During this two-decade period of stagnation, women’s labor force participation has also increasingly lagged behind other industrialized countries—a phenomenon largely explained by more-favorable family policies in other OECD countries and higher public spending on child care.

An important lever for increasing labor force participation is to make it easier for parents to work—particularly women, who shoulder a disproportionate share of child care duties. Research on the 1980s surge in women’s labor force participation found that the availability of no-cost child care was associated with higher labor force participation among married women with young children. However, it also predicted that, as the availability of informal no-cost care declined with women increasingly joining the workforce, higher child care costs would negatively affect maternal labor force decisions and slow growth in participation.

That prediction has proven to be accurate. Recent research reveals that maternal labor force participation rises when affordable child care is available—as much as 5 to 10 percentage points when the care is available at no cost. When low maternal employment is driven by a lack of affordable child care, universal preschool can encourage more mothers to work, and where universal preschool has increased maternal employment, effects have been found to persist for several years. In a study of Washington, D.C.’s universal, full-day preschool program, maternal labor force participation rose by 15 percent.
Research by the Economic Policy Institute shows the double benefit of increasing family well-being as well as spurring economic growth when child care is made affordable. They find that capping child care expenditures at 10 percent of family income could increase overall women’s labor force participation enough to boost GDP by roughly $210 billion (1.2 percent).\(^{49}\)

A lack of affordable child care depresses the labor force participation of low-income workers. Parents with low incomes are less likely to be able to afford child care, even with federal subsidies. They also are less likely to have flexible workplaces, more likely to have fluctuating or “on-call” schedules and more likely to live in child care deserts. Researchers at the Urban Institute note that for families with limited resources, nontraditional hours, inflexible work policies and fluctuating work schedules can all limit child care options.\(^{50}\)

Furthermore, mothers with young children who live in child care deserts tend to participate in the labor force at a rate about three percentage points lower than those in areas with adequate child care supply.\(^{51}\) Higher child care subsidy expenditures increase employment and labor force participation for women with young children, which boosts family incomes—and consequently, children’s quality of life—and helps to reduce inequality.\(^{52}\)

\textbf{A lack of affordable child care can restrict parents’ earning potential}

When parents are unable to work or unable to work full time, they lose the opportunity to earn additional income.\(^{53}\) Researchers at the Economic Policy Institute estimate that parents forego around $30 billion to $35 billion in income because of high child care costs.\(^{54}\) As a result of fewer parents working, federal and state and local governments lose approximately $4.2 billion in tax revenue per year.\(^{55}\)

Parents who temporarily leave the workforce to care for their children earn substantially less throughout their careers. Even taking a year or two off negatively impacts a parent’s long-term career prospects, as each year out of work can cost more than three times a parent’s initial annual salary over the course of their careers.\(^{56}\) This loss can be even higher for lower-income parents—those least likely to be able to afford child care.\(^{57}\) Reduced lifetime earnings and wage growth from a few missed years of work can also reduce a parent’s retirement assets—including Social Security.\(^{58}\)

Taking a hiatus from the labor force poses a higher cost for women. Mothers are hit by the “mommy penalty”—when women’s earnings drop after the birth of their first child and never recover—under the assumption that the woman will be the primary caretaker, whether or not this is actually the case. This is a primary cause of the gender wage gap—the fact that the median woman earns only 82 percent of what her male counterpart earns. This is not true for new fathers, who often receive a “daddy bonus,” whereby men experience a bump in pay when they have children—fathers also earn roughly 20 percent more than men with no children do.\(^{59}\)

Most single working parents cannot afford to leave the labor force, and it is becoming increasingly difficult even for families with two working parents.\(^{60}\) As renowned Cornell University labor economist Francine Blau notes, “Even if [child care] is eating up half of a parent’s income, the family may need the other half so much that they just have to keep working.”\(^{61}\)
Parents of color pay a high price for a lack of affordable child care

Latino families are more likely to live in child care deserts and Black parents are more likely to work (and thus require child care), but earn on average 40 percent less than their non-Hispanic white peers—making child care more unaffordable.\(^6^2\) Black and multiracial parents also are twice as likely as non-Hispanic white parents to experience job disruptions (quitting, not taking a job or significantly changing their job) due to problems with child care.\(^6^3\)

In part because child care is so scarce and expensive, parents’ debt can increase significantly in the year after a child’s birth—this is particularly true for Black parents.\(^6^4\) Parents who can send their child to day care are better able to hold a consistent job and succeed professionally, increasing their ability to pay their debts and pursue continuing education and professional development. Thus, the absence of affordable child care exacerbates inequality by severely inhibiting low-income, Black and Latino parents from attaining promotions and higher salaries.

High child care costs lead to lower birth rates, thereby suppressing economic growth

The number of babies born in the United States hit a 30-year low in 2019, continuing a five-year decline that includes falling birth rates for women in their 20s and early 30s (prime child-rearing age).\(^6^5\) Research has shown the causal effect of child care costs on fertility decisions, and surveys of young adults reveal child care costs are keeping some of them from having the number of children they want—expensive child care was the top factor that nearly two thirds of young adults cited as the reason they have or expect to have fewer children than they considered ideal in a \textit{New York Times} survey.\(^6^6\)

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the U.S. fertility rate has been below replacement since 1971 and “consistently below replacement since 2007.”\(^6^7\) A fertility rate below replacement means an aging population that will face economic and social repercussions, including depressed GDP and insolvency in Social Security, the number-one antipoverty program in the United States.\(^6^8\) Population growth is necessary for sustained economic growth, but the coronavirus pandemic could further depress fertility rates as would-be parents put off child-rearing amid heightened economic insecurity and uncertainty. The assurance of affordable and available child care to young adults is important to get population growth back on track and power the economy.

Unpaid child care work is undervalued but important to the economy

Household and child-rearing responsibilities disproportionately fall on mothers in families with two full-time working parents and as a result, mothers’ employment is more dependent on child care availability than fathers’ employment.\(^6^9\) Among families seeking child care so a parent can work, mothers are significantly more likely to be employed if their family finds child care.\(^7^0\) In 2018, mothers were 40 percent more likely to say that they had felt a negative impact of child care issues on their careers than fathers, and in 2016, 94 percent of parents involuntarily working part time because of child care issues were women.\(^7^1\)

When formal child care is not a viable option, mothers drop out of the labor force to care for the child or find other informal care options (e.g., relatives). In 2019, over 4 million young children were being cared for by a relative.\(^7^2\) Current tools for measuring the economy do not measure
such unpaid jobs in the informal economy, consequently overlooking the value of housework and child-rearing.\(^73\) As a significant proportion of child care work is informal, its true value is not captured in discussions of national wealth and economic progress. A recent analysis valuing unpaid work at the United States’ low minimum wage of $7.25 an hour estimates that the value of women’s unpaid work in the home—largely child care—amounts to $1.5 trillion a year.\(^74\)

**BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN**

*Child care greatly increases children’s well-being*

Children who participate in high-quality programs perform better in school and are healthier. For example, children who participate in the Head Start program, which serves children under age 5 in families with incomes at or below the federal poverty line, have better cognitive development and social skills, more positive relationships with their parents, teachers and peers, as well as better math, literacy and language skills than similar peers who didn’t participate in Head Start.\(^75\) Parents with children enrolled in certain Head Start programs are also more engaged in their children’s learning in school and at home—an important contributor to school readiness and social-emotional development.\(^76\)

Head Start provides a safe and reliable environment for young disadvantaged children, which has lifetime effects. Findings from studies on the effectiveness of Head Start vary because of the difficulties of measuring a national program implemented at local levels. While some research shows that the gains in school-readiness from Head Start may fade in the short term, other studies find that in the long term Head Start participants have lower incarceration rates and higher graduation rates. Additional research finds while factors like curriculum, teacher education and class size may not be significantly correlated with positive outcomes, the number of hours children spend per week in the program are correlated with such results.\(^77\)

The benefits of child care are particularly strong for children most likely to not receive it. Without a high-quality early childhood intervention, an at-risk child is 40 percent more likely to become a teen parent, 25 percent more likely to drop out of school, 50 percent more likely to be placed in special education, 70 percent more likely to be arrested for a violent crime and 60 percent more likely to never attend college.\(^78\) Participation in high-quality child care can reduce crime, increase incomes and enable higher intergenerational mobility.

*Early investments in children have high per-dollar returns*

There is a significant body of economic research demonstrating that investments in early education pay off across children’s lifetimes, especially when those investments are targeted towards disadvantaged children. A 2019 Harvard study found that direct investments in the health and education of low-income children yield the highest returns.\(^79\) Economists at the Minneapolis Federal Reserve have shown that investments prior to kindergarten are “the most efficient means to boost the productivity of the workforce 15 to 20 years down the road.”\(^80\) Their cost-benefit analyses of multiple early education interventions showed annual rates of return, adjusted for inflation, ranging between 7 percent to over 20 percent, or $3 to $17 per dollar invested.\(^81\)
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Economists Arthur Rolnick and Rob Grunewald estimated rates of return of 16 percent—12 percent for society at large and 4 percent for the children involved—for the widely-studied Perry Preschool Program in the 1960s, which served disadvantaged children living in poverty and assessed to be at risk for school failure.\(^\text{82}\) A 2015 analysis by the President’s Council of Economic Advisers noted that research suggests a societal benefit of $8.60 for every dollar spent on ECE, “about half of which comes from increased earnings for children when they grow up.”\(^\text{83}\)

Research by Nobel laureate James Heckman and economist Dimitriy Masterov found that early interventions for disadvantaged children promote high school graduation and college attendance, reduce crime, help prevent teenage births, reduce the need for special education and lower the share of students forced to repeat a grade. “Very early interventions also appear to raise IQ, especially for girls.”\(^\text{84}\)

In another study, researchers at National Institutes of Health evaluated the effectiveness of the Chicago Public Schools’ federally funded Child-Parent Centers (CPCs), established in 1967.\(^\text{85}\) The 2011 cost-benefit analysis of CPC attendees found that the greatest benefits were realized among those who joined the earliest. Researchers calculated the benefits to the children participating in the program, including increased future earnings, and to society, including higher tax revenues, as well as savings in education costs from non-repeated school years. They showed that “Children enrolled in preschool CPC received net benefits at age 26 totaling $83,708 per participant in 2007 dollars, compared with children who did not take part in the CPC program. When projected over a lifetime, economic benefits of the program, both to participants and society at large, amounted to nearly $11 for [each] dollar spent, which corresponds to an 18 percent annual rate of return on the original investment.”\(^\text{86}\)

THE PANDEMIC PUTS CHILD CARE CENTERS AT RISK

Child care providers face plummeting revenues and skyrocketing costs

As the pandemic continues and children and parents stay home, child care providers, reliant on tuition, are bringing in lower revenues while facing higher costs.\(^\text{87}\) More than four in five programs are serving fewer children than prior to the pandemic, with enrollment down by 67 percent on average.\(^\text{88}\) At the same time, over 90 percent of child care programs report increased costs from cleaning supplies, 76 percent for personal protective equipment and 23 percent for necessary facility changes.\(^\text{89}\) To ensure safety, even though many providers are serving fewer children, they need more staff per child and therefore must increase their hiring. In an industry with razor-thin margins—the Minneapolis Federal Reserve notes that they are typically less than 1 percent—these additional costs can easily drive child care providers out of business.\(^\text{90}\)

Providers have been forced to lay off employees or close altogether

Approximately half of child care programs have been closed at some point during the pandemic, according to surveys conducted by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), spanning child care centers and home-based single-proprietor providers.\(^\text{91}\) In the peak of the pandemic lockdowns in mid-April, the NAEYC estimates that over 100,000 child care providers closed their doors—and those that remained open operated at a severely reduced
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capacity. This figure encompasses center-based and home-based providers, which includes group-home centers but mostly single-proprietor providers; half of child care centers and 27 percent of home-based providers reported being completely closed in April. As of July, nearly one in five centers and one in ten home-based providers remain closed. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that over 370,000 child care jobs were lost in the first two months of the coronavirus pandemic (this figure only applies to jobs at child care centers with employees), and we have yet to recover 214,000 child care jobs as of August. More than half of center-based programs had staff file for full or partial unemployment, and another 20 percent reported that staff members had found new jobs. The NAEYC said, “Some programs, rather than facing limited enrollment now, indicated an intent to reopen by the end of the summer, but permanent closures have begun as the relief that programs have received so far begins to run out.”

More than 80 percent of child care providers say they won’t survive without more help

The child care sector could be decimated without additional public support. The NAEYC survey reported that less than one in five programs (only 18 percent) expect to survive past July 2021 without further public assistance and if the virus is not contained. In April, the Center for Law and Social Policy, National Women’s Law Center and economist Aaron Sojourner estimated that the child care system needs at least $9.6 billion a month in public aid in order to avoid permanent closures and the resulting economic destabilization.

Continued child care closures could hinder a significant amount of U.S. economic activity. As Catherine White from the National Women’s Law Center notes, “Child care providers employ millions of caregivers across the U.S. and support tens of millions of families to go to work.” In Europe, which has experienced fewer coronavirus cases than the United States, closures are estimated to stall nearly 10 percent of economic activity.
Many parents are forced to work less because of the reduced availability of child care

From the start of the pandemic, parents—particularly those with young children—have endured massive disruptions to their work lives. Lockdowns, work-from-home orders and school and day care closures have forced parents to care for their children full time without their usual support networks. Whether working from home, unemployed and searching for work or working essential jobs outside of the home, they must balance the demands of full-time caregiving with the demands of full-time work, all while in the midst of a global pandemic.

A Northeastern University poll found that 13 percent of parents were forced to cut their hours or quit their jobs due to a lack of child care, with parents on average losing a full day of work per week.\textsuperscript{102} With schools closed, parents have had to become teachers, juggling their children’s online learning (or otherwise resorting to complete home-schooling) with their own virtual meetings and work responsibilities. Summer break may have been a brief reprieve from teaching, but the new school year is already here with no end to the pandemic in sight. Parents of younger children have also moved in with their own parents to get extra help, but not everyone is so fortunate to have that option.\textsuperscript{103}

Essential workers have had to scramble to come up with make-shift solutions of their own. Some child care providers remained open for children of essential workers, but rising costs and declining enrollment may force them to further raise prices, putting care too far out of reach for some parents right when they need it the most. This is especially prescient for parents of color, who have less access to the flexibility of telework and are overrepresented in essential jobs.\textsuperscript{104} The patchwork of partial solutions thus far is unsustainable—a mother in Washington, D.C. told the director of her child care program, “My baby has gone from my sister’s house for one week because I have to work, to my grandmother’s house. Next week, I’m not quite sure where I’ll put her, you know, but I have to get to work.”\textsuperscript{105}

The pandemic’s impact on child care could roll back decades of women’s economic progress

Women have borne an outsized share of the burden caused by school and day care closures, but are also more likely to become unemployed during the pandemic. Approximately 60 percent of the jobs lost in the first wave of pandemic-induced layoffs were held by women.\textsuperscript{106} Without reliable and affordable child care, mothers will not be able to go back to work—but they cannot pay for child care without the income made from going back to work. The cyclicity of the child care crisis is already forcing women to drop out of the workforce, and at a time when women had just passed the milestone of comprising more than half of the U.S. workforce right before the pandemic began.\textsuperscript{107} In April, for the first time since 1986, women’s labor force participation dipped below 55 percent.\textsuperscript{108}

Women who do not drop out of the workforce altogether can still have their careers eroded by child care responsibilities when they make career decisions based on family conflicts (e.g. spending more time at home caring for children, choosing a job based on flexibility or commute times, etc.). As Betsey Stevenson, economist and former member of the Council of Economic Advisers to President Obama, explains, “Those trade-offs end up giving them less opportunity, fewer opportunities for promotions or raises. That’s why you see much bigger gender gaps for women by age 50 than you saw at age 30.”\textsuperscript{109} Losing child care infrastructure could roll back the
gains of an entire generation of working women by keeping them out of the workforce or forcing them to make career sacrifices.\textsuperscript{110}

Women are impacted on the other side of the child care equation as well. The child care sector, of which women comprise over 90 percent and Black women are overrepresented, has experienced 50 percent growth in the last two decades, even growing through two recessions.\textsuperscript{111} But much of this growth has been slashed by the coronavirus pandemic; more than a third of child care jobs were lost at the height of the crisis, impacting Black and Latino women the most.\textsuperscript{112}

As of August, the child care sector has yet to recover nearly 60 percent of its job losses since the start of the pandemic.\textsuperscript{113} Many of these women have children themselves and relied on the center where they worked for care of their own child. Furthermore, child care positions often pay wages well below that of other occupations. In 2019, child care workers earned a median hourly wage of $11.65, substantially below the median hourly wage for all occupations of $19.14.\textsuperscript{114} Since employee compensation is the largest expense for providers, cutting wages or hours or otherwise furloughing workers is the only option for some providers to survive.

As Catherine White of the National Women’s Law Center explains, “Women are impacted no matter where you look. You have families who have lost their jobs or lost their income, and they’re thinking about going back to work without money to pay for child care. And then on the other side you have child care providers who are facing rising costs, they’re serving fewer children and having less revenue coming in. So they have to charge more, and parents can’t pay and providers can’t charge less.”\textsuperscript{115}

**STEPS FORWARD**

*Initial pandemic legislation extended paid family leave benefits to working parents*

As a stopgap measure, many working parents have responded to the lack of child care by leaning on paid leave provisions outlined in the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, passed on March 18.\textsuperscript{116} However, many workers are not eligible for this leave in the first place (essential health care professionals, employees at businesses with more than 500 employees, etc.) and many have burned through the emergency time allotted. Employers are beginning to lose patience with their employees, particularly mothers, resulting in forced resignations and firings.\textsuperscript{117} In some cases, employers are even preventing mothers who are pushed out from collecting unemployment.\textsuperscript{118} These pressures can impact the economic well-being of parents and children for decades to come.

*The CARES Act increased funding to many child care providers*

The CARES Act, passed on March 27, granted $3.5 billion in Child Care and Development Block Grants (CCDBG), which provide funding to states for child care subsidies to low-income families.\textsuperscript{119} It also included $750 million to help Head Start better respond to the needs of families during the coronavirus crisis.\textsuperscript{120}
Data show that states are using emergency CCDBG funds as a lifeline to improve affordability of care and increase provider compensation by continuing to pay providers who accept subsidies, funding programs providing care for children of essential workers and mitigating tuition losses. According to a survey by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), one-third of child care programs have received increased payments through the subsidy system overall.

The CARES Act also included the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP), which assists small businesses through forgivable loans. The program provided at least $2.3 billion to approximately 39,000 child care providers across the country, helping many to stay afloat and enabling 460,000 child care workers to keep their jobs.

However, many programs were unable to access PPP benefits. While almost three-fourths of large child care centers had received PPP funds by July, only 29 percent of small centers and 17 percent of home-based programs had accessed PPP loans. The vast majority of child care providers, many of them one-person operations with limited resources, were not able to access PPP funds.

**The House passed additional support, but the legislation is stalled in the Senate**

On May 15, the House of Representatives passed the HEROES Act, which would provide an additional $7 billion for Child Care and Development Block Grants and $850 million to fund child and family care for essential workers. It also extends emergency family and medical leave through 2021, limits employer exemptions to paid sick leave, bolsters financial support to state and local governments and provides additional support for small businesses. Republican Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has failed to bring the HEROES Act up for a vote in the Senate.

In late July, the House passed two bills that would help support child care during the coronavirus crisis. The Child Care is Essential Act (H.R. 7027), introduced in the House by Representative Rosa DeLauro (D-CT), creates a $50 billion stabilization fund for child care providers within the Child Care and Development Block Grant. Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) introduced companion legislation (S.3874) in the Senate but no further action has been taken. The legislation responds to the nearly 500 national, state and local organizations that have called for an urgent investment of $50 billion to save the child care sector from collapse, and it has been applauded by experts and advocacy groups across the board.

The Child Care for Economic Recovery Act (H.R. 7327), introduced by Representative Nita Lowey (D-NY), adds $10 billion in emergency funding to the Child Care and Development Fund. In addition, it expands dependent care and payroll credits to support caregivers and child care providers affected by the pandemic.

**CONCLUSION**

Child care in the United States was inadequate, not easily accessible and unaffordable even before the coronavirus pandemic. The pandemic has dealt it a serious blow, and now child care
providers, parents and their children face a crisis. Providers face higher costs, declining enrollment and plummeting revenues—over four in five providers say that they’ll be forced to close permanently without additional aid. An estimated nearly $10 billion per month is needed to help child care providers safely provide care and prevent many others from being forced to shut down permanently. With state and local governments facing increased health care expenditures, declining revenues and requirements for balanced budgets, only the federal government can step in and stop these closures. Without assistance, the United States could lose 80 percent of its child care capacity, leading to even more economic pain and hardship down the road.

Without this critical infrastructure, it will be hard for parents to work and for the economy to fully recover. Moreover, a weaker child care system likely would exacerbate economic disparities because those who cannot afford it may be prevented from working and from reaching their full economic potential. Mothers’ careers have been disproportionately disrupted by school and day care closures, as they shoulder more caregiving responsibilities and have also been more likely to lose a job in the pandemic. As a result, the collapse of the child care industry could set back an entire generation of working women.

Public investments in early child care and education have been shown to more than pay for themselves. Early education interventions are estimated to have produced returns of $3 to $17 for every dollar invested, with lower crime and teenage birth rates, higher high school graduation and college attendance rates and higher lifetime earnings. Spending more now will benefit millions of lives as well as the federal budget’s bottom line.
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APPENDIX

Public spending on child care: United States vs. other OECD countries

U.S. Public Investment in Children Lags behind Other OECD Countries

Public spending on early childhood education and care as a percentage of GDP, 2015 or latest year available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Public Spending on Early Childhood Education and Care as a Percentage of GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Average</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Average</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Child care is often more expensive than college tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Infant</th>
<th>Toddler</th>
<th>4-Year-Old</th>
<th>Single-Parent Median Income</th>
<th>Two-Parent Median Income</th>
<th>Public College Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama*</td>
<td>$7,280</td>
<td>$7,280</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$20,396</td>
<td>$80,350</td>
<td>$10,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$11,832</td>
<td>$11,287</td>
<td>$9,847</td>
<td>$36,196</td>
<td>$100,967</td>
<td>$7,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$10,822</td>
<td>$9,229</td>
<td>$8,724</td>
<td>$26,907</td>
<td>$80,533</td>
<td>$11,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$6,443</td>
<td>$6,152</td>
<td>$4,493</td>
<td>$21,535</td>
<td>$72,354</td>
<td>$8,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$16,452</td>
<td>$11,202</td>
<td>$11,202</td>
<td>$29,198</td>
<td>$93,850</td>
<td>$9,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
<td>$14,087</td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td>$31,504</td>
<td>$97,260</td>
<td>$11,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
<td>$15,548</td>
<td>$12,688</td>
<td>$31,569</td>
<td>$123,275</td>
<td>$12,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$11,371</td>
<td>$10,034</td>
<td>$9,054</td>
<td>$30,678</td>
<td>$101,096</td>
<td>$12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>$24,081</td>
<td>$23,017</td>
<td>$18,980</td>
<td>$25,670</td>
<td>$173,340</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$9,312</td>
<td>$8,356</td>
<td>$7,002</td>
<td>$26,826</td>
<td>$79,586</td>
<td>$8,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$8,729</td>
<td>$8,427</td>
<td>$6,987</td>
<td>$25,162</td>
<td>$84,215</td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$14,100</td>
<td>$12,996</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
<td>$34,599</td>
<td>$98,592</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$8,636</td>
<td>$8,249</td>
<td>$7,665</td>
<td>$23,460</td>
<td>$72,913</td>
<td>$7,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$13,762</td>
<td>$12,278</td>
<td>$10,432</td>
<td>$26,773</td>
<td>$98,037</td>
<td>$13,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$12,390</td>
<td>$12,230</td>
<td>$9,290</td>
<td>$23,620</td>
<td>$83,985</td>
<td>$9,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$10,743</td>
<td>$9,695</td>
<td>$8,856</td>
<td>$25,798</td>
<td>$90,788</td>
<td>$9,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$12,584</td>
<td>$10,296</td>
<td>$8,736</td>
<td>$26,179</td>
<td>$85,329</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$7,440</td>
<td>$7,440</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
<td>$20,684</td>
<td>$79,224</td>
<td>$10,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana*</td>
<td>$8,580</td>
<td>$9,060</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$20,408</td>
<td>$90,147</td>
<td>$9,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$14,248</td>
<td>$12,324</td>
<td>$11,232</td>
<td>$25,470</td>
<td>$86,324</td>
<td>$10,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$15,403</td>
<td>$12,067</td>
<td>$10,484</td>
<td>$39,010</td>
<td>$122,253</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$20,880</td>
<td>$19,269</td>
<td>$15,475</td>
<td>$30,203</td>
<td>$127,047</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$10,287</td>
<td>$9,713</td>
<td>$8,315</td>
<td>$23,239</td>
<td>$89,831</td>
<td>$13,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$16,120</td>
<td>$14,040</td>
<td>$12,428</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$105,309</td>
<td>$11,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi*</td>
<td>$5,760</td>
<td>$5,760</td>
<td>$5,280</td>
<td>$19,654</td>
<td>$75,630</td>
<td>$8,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$9,880</td>
<td>$8,716</td>
<td>$6,849</td>
<td>$24,725</td>
<td>$84,836</td>
<td>$8,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>81,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$12,272</td>
<td>$11,523</td>
<td>$11,148</td>
<td>$26,647</td>
<td>$88,935</td>
<td>$8,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$11,107</td>
<td>$10,238</td>
<td>$8,812</td>
<td>$29,427</td>
<td>$78,378</td>
<td>$7,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$13,044</td>
<td>$12,116</td>
<td>$10,603</td>
<td>$32,105</td>
<td>$108,389</td>
<td>$16,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey*</td>
<td>$15,600</td>
<td>$14,340</td>
<td>$12,660</td>
<td>$31,560</td>
<td>$123,806</td>
<td>$14,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$9,135</td>
<td>$8,934</td>
<td>$8,352</td>
<td>$22,209</td>
<td>$73,143</td>
<td>$7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$15,028</td>
<td>$14,144</td>
<td>$12,064</td>
<td>$27,955</td>
<td>$102,402</td>
<td>$8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$9,254</td>
<td>$8,387</td>
<td>$7,920</td>
<td>$24,130</td>
<td>$82,987</td>
<td>$7,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$9,182</td>
<td>$8,762</td>
<td>$8,349</td>
<td>$27,186</td>
<td>$98,424</td>
<td>$8,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$10,009</td>
<td>$9,006</td>
<td>$8,258</td>
<td>$22,853</td>
<td>$91,084</td>
<td>$10,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$8,940</td>
<td>$8,262</td>
<td>$6,762</td>
<td>$22,584</td>
<td>$76,234</td>
<td>$8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$13,518</td>
<td>$12,667</td>
<td>$10,102</td>
<td>$25,398</td>
<td>$85,863</td>
<td>$10,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania*</td>
<td>$11,560</td>
<td>$10,709</td>
<td>$9,540</td>
<td>$26,303</td>
<td>$97,308</td>
<td>$14,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island*</td>
<td>$10,955</td>
<td>$10,739</td>
<td>$9,793</td>
<td>$27,380</td>
<td>$102,759</td>
<td>$12,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina*</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$8,190</td>
<td>$22,818</td>
<td>$81,290</td>
<td>$12,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>$6,198</td>
<td>$25,586</td>
<td>$85,342</td>
<td>$8,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$9,017</td>
<td>$8,449</td>
<td>$7,486</td>
<td>$22,426</td>
<td>$78,413</td>
<td>$9,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas*</td>
<td>$9,864</td>
<td>$9,170</td>
<td>$8,294</td>
<td>$25,911</td>
<td>$84,909</td>
<td>$10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$10,002</td>
<td>$9,270</td>
<td>$7,714</td>
<td>$29,865</td>
<td>$83,424</td>
<td>$8,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$12,507</td>
<td>$12,084</td>
<td>$11,438</td>
<td>$26,874</td>
<td>$93,403</td>
<td>$16,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$14,560</td>
<td>$14,352</td>
<td>$11,544</td>
<td>$30,199</td>
<td>$106,567</td>
<td>$13,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$14,844</td>
<td>$12,852</td>
<td>$11,352</td>
<td>$28,561</td>
<td>$96,716</td>
<td>$9,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$8,029</td>
<td>$7,194</td>
<td>$6,934</td>
<td>$18,739</td>
<td>$75,793</td>
<td>$8,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$12,552</td>
<td>$11,816</td>
<td>$10,181</td>
<td>$26,189</td>
<td>$93,937</td>
<td>$9,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming*</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
<td>$8,320</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>$27,043</td>
<td>$89,780</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*State did not report prices in 2019; data reported from state’s most recent reporting
NR: Data not reported or available

**Employee compensation and real estate costs are the largest spending categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS Code</th>
<th>Industry Sector</th>
<th>Purchases ($ millions)</th>
<th>Share of Industry Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional and Technical Services</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Administrative and Waste Management Services</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Education Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other Services, Except Government</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Federal Government and Enterprises</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>State and Local Government and Enterprises</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Intermediate Purchases</td>
<td>16,737</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation of employees (wages &amp; salary earnings)</td>
<td>22,789</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxes on production and imports, less subsidies</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross operating surplus (including proprietor's earnings)</td>
<td>10,426</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Value Added</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,497</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Industry Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,235</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis Input-Output Accounts; Census Bureau.
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