



**NATIONAL  
WOMEN'S  
LAW CENTER**  
Justice for Her. Justice for All.

**JANUARY 2024 | ISSUE BRIEF**

# The Continuing Need for Gender, Racial, and Disability Justice in the Rental System

**By Talia Grossman, Sarah Hassmer, and Sarah Javaid**

The United States has a long history of discrimination—racism, sexism (including transphobia and homophobia), and ableism—in housing and in the broader U.S. economy that causes women, women of color, disabled people, and LGBTQIA+ people to disproportionately face economic insecurity and struggle to afford basic necessities, like housing. Policies today still fail to address these deep structural inequities so all people can meet their basic needs.

An expansive explanation of the historically discriminatory housing policies can be found in a 2022 National Women’s Law Center (NWLC) report, in collaboration with Insight Center and Groundwork Collaborative, *The Roots of Discriminatory Housing Policy: Moving Toward Gender Justice in Our Economy*.<sup>1</sup> This issue brief updates and expands on renter data presented in the 2022 report and describes policy changes needed to create a more equitable housing system for women of color, disabled people, and LGBTQIA+ people.

## METHODOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

The data cited throughout this brief comes from multiple sources, including the U.S. Census Bureau, data from other federal agencies, numerous surveys, as well as analyses of these and other data conducted by other individuals and organizations. Within these multiple data sources, moreover, there are a wide range of terms used to refer to people of different racial or ethnic groups. In this brief, the “AANHPI” race category includes those who identified themselves as Asian American, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander. The “Black” race category includes those who identified themselves as Black or African American. The “Latina” category includes women of any race who identified themselves to be of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

Please refer to each individual source note for more information on racial and ethnic categories.

- **Area Median Income (AMI):** The median family income in the metropolitan or nonmetropolitan area
- **Extremely Low-Income (ELI):** Households with income at or below the Poverty Guideline or 30 percent of area median income, whichever is higher
- **Very Low-Income (VLI):** Households with income between extremely low income and 50 percent of area median income
- **Low-Income (LI):** Households with income between 51 percent and 80 percent of area median income
- **Middle-Income (MI):** Households with income between 81 percent and 100 percent of area median income
- **Above Median Income:** Households with income above 100 percent of area median income
- **Gender justice:** This brief recognizes that we will not achieve gender justice by focusing solely on discrimination against women, but rather, by also addressing broader gender injustices that include discrimination against LGBTQIA+ people and forms of discrimination that intersect with gender injustices, including racism, ableism, xenophobia, and more.

## WOMEN AND WOMEN OF COLOR RENTERS WERE MORE LIKELY TO HAVE EXTREMELY LOW INCOMES COMPARED TO MEN AND WHITE, NON-HISPANIC MEN.

Women of color disproportionately make up the low-paid workforce, representing nearly two-thirds (64.1%) of the workforce in the 40 lowest paying jobs but less than half of the workforce overall.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the racist and sexist wage gap robs women of color of tens of thousands of dollars each year. Women working full time, year-round are typically paid just 84 cents for every dollar men are paid.<sup>3</sup> For women overall, the \$9,954 loss in median earnings every year<sup>4</sup> equates to nearly eight months of rent.<sup>5</sup> For some women of color this loss is much greater. For example, Latinas lose \$30,450 annually to the wage gap,<sup>6</sup> or almost 23 months of rent coverage every year.<sup>7</sup> For some women of color, wage disparities add up to more than \$1 million in lost income over their careers.<sup>8</sup> This vast financial loss contributes to a greater share of women, particularly women of color, living as extremely low-income renters.




**Over four in 10 Black, non-Hispanic women, Native women, Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) women, and Latinas were extremely low-income renters in 2021.**

### Among single adults living alone in 2021:

- Women of every race were more likely than white, non-Hispanic men (25.9%) to be extremely low-income renters.<sup>9</sup>
- Nearly half of Native women (47.0%) and Latina (46.9%) renters had extremely low incomes, and they were both nearly two times more likely than white, non-Hispanic men to be extremely low-income.
- Black, non-Hispanic women (44.1%) and AANHPI women (40.2%) were also very likely to be extremely low-income renters.

**FIGURE 1**

**Income Distribution of Single Renters Living Alone by Selected Demographics (2021)**



Source: See appendix Table A for table format of graph. Data were limited to heads of households living alone. National Women's Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

## Among single renters raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own in 2021:

- Women (44.6%) were nearly two times more likely than men (23.1%) to be extremely low-income renters.<sup>10</sup>
- Women of every race were nearly or more than twice as likely as white, non-Hispanic men (20.3%) to have extremely low incomes. Over half of Native women (52.9%) and nearly half of Black, non-Hispanic women (48.4%) were extremely low-income renters. Over four in 10 Latina renters (46.0%) had extremely low incomes.



Source: See appendix Table B for table format of graph. Data were limited to heads of households raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on 2021 ACS microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

A greater share of single women raising a child on their own had extremely low incomes than single women living alone. In contrast, a smaller share of men raising a child on their own had extremely low incomes than single men living alone. This is in part due to a sexist trend that economically penalizes mothers and financially benefits fathers—women experience a wage decrease after having children while men experience a wage increase,<sup>11</sup> increasing the maternal wage gap. Single mothers working full time, year-round are typically paid 67 cents for every dollar paid to single fathers.<sup>12</sup> This wage decrease is often worse for low-income women, who experience the greatest wage penalty for raising children, increasing their existing financial struggle.<sup>13</sup> The motherhood penalty results in increased economic and housing insecurity for women raising children alone and decreased economic and housing insecurity for men raising children alone.



Improving job quality and mitigating employment discrimination, including by raising the minimum wage<sup>14</sup> and addressing wage gaps,<sup>15</sup> along with bolstering rental assistance, would help address these income disparities that have a harmful impact on women’s budgets, particularly when it comes to housing.

## WOMEN OF EVERY RACE WERE MORE LIKELY THAN WHITE, NON-HISPANIC MEN RENTERS TO SPEND OVER 50% OF THEIR INCOME ON HOUSING COSTS.

Renters spending more than 30% of their pre-tax income on housing are defined as cost-burdened and those spending more than 50% as severely cost-burdened.

The gender inequities in our employment systems, the lack of a thriving wage, and the shortage of homes affordable to families with the lowest incomes mean that rent takes up a huge chunk of women's budgets. In order to afford a modest, two-bedroom apartment at fair market rent without being cost-burdened (spending more than 30% of their income on rent), a full-time worker in the United States needs to make \$28.58 per hour (\$23.57 for a modest one-bedroom).<sup>16</sup> Women, unfortunately, are overrepresented among poorly paid workers, including those being paid the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour.<sup>17</sup> A full-time, minimum-wage worker can afford a one-bedroom rental home at fair market value in only 7% of counties across the United States (excluding Puerto Rico) without being cost burdened—all located in states where the minimum wage is higher than the federal minimum wage.<sup>18</sup>

According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, “the average minimum wage worker” would have to work 86 hours per week to afford a one-bedroom rental home or 104 hours per week (2.6 full-time jobs) to afford a two-bedroom rental home at the fair market rate without being cost-burdened.<sup>19</sup> This forces women to make the impossible choice between a solid balance of sleep and daily activities or working an exorbitant amount of hours to not be cost-burdened. This seems untenable for anyone, but it is even worse for single people with caregiving responsibilities, who are disproportionately women.


Additionally, the gap in the supply of housing affordable and available to families with the lowest incomes has persisted for decades, and there is not a single state in the country with enough deeply affordable homes to meet demand.<sup>20</sup> In Nevada, for example, there are only 17 affordable and available rental units available for every 100 extremely low-income households.<sup>21</sup> Years of federal disinvestment from affordable housing programs have severely constrained both the supply of affordable housing and the quality of existing affordable housing stock.<sup>22</sup> The supply gap for accessible housing for people with disabilities is far worse.<sup>23</sup> Gender and racial income disparities, and the insufficient supply of affordable housing, thus make single women, particularly women of color, who are renting more likely than white, non-Hispanic men who are renting to be cost-burdened or severely cost-burdened.

### Among single adults living alone in 2021:

- Women were more likely than men to be severely cost-burdened renters.<sup>24</sup>
- Women of every race were more likely than white, non-Hispanic men (32.0%) to be severely cost-burdened.
- Women of color were especially likely to be severely cost-burdened. Over two in five Latinas (45.6%), Black, non-Hispanic women (43.1%), Native women (40.4%), and AANHPI women (40.3%) renters were severely cost-burdened in 2021. Black, non-Hispanic women and Latinas were also more likely than white, non-Hispanic women (39.3%) to be severely cost-burdened renters.

**FIGURE 3**

**Share of Single Renters Living Alone Who Were Severely Cost-Burdened by Selected Demographics (2021)**



Source: See appendix Table C for table format of graph. Data were limited to heads of households living alone. National Women's Law Center calculations based on 2021 ACS IPUMS-USA.

**Among single adults raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own in 2021:**


- Women (46.3%) were more likely than men (30.3%) to be severely cost-burdened renters in 2021.<sup>25</sup>
- Women of every race were more likely than white, non-Hispanic men (27.2%) to be severely cost-burdened renters. Nearly half of Latinas (48.9%), AANHPI women (48.3%), Black, non-Hispanic women (47.3%), and Native women (47.3%) renters were severely cost-burdened in 2021. Latinas, AANHPI women, and Black, non-Hispanic women were also more likely than white, non-Hispanic women (43.0%) to be severely cost-burdened.

**Nearly 50% of single Black, non-Hispanic women, AANHPI women, Native women, and Latinas who were raising at least one child on their own were severely cost-burdened renters in 2021.**



**FIGURE 4**

**Share of Single Renters Raising at Least One Child Under the Age of 18 on Their Own Who Were Severely Cost-Burdened by Selected Demographics (2021)**



Source: See appendix Table C for table format of graph. Data were limited to heads of households raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own. National Women's Law Center calculations based on 2021 ACS IPUMS-USA.

Families raising children have higher living expenses, forcing many single women raising children on their own to choose among basic necessities and driving them further into being severely cost-burdened by rent. The cost of child care alone is an incredibly burdensome, often reaching or exceeding the price of in-state college tuition,<sup>26</sup> and is out of reach for many. Without reliable and affordable child care, women are disadvantaged in consistently participating in the workforce. One in five women (20.2%) reported that at some point between August 23 and September 6, 2023, children in their household were unable to attend child care due to it being closed, unavailable, unaffordable, or because they were concerned about their child's safety.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, among the women who did not have child care, nearly seven in 10 women (69%) experienced an economic impact, such as taking unpaid leave, cutting their work hours, leaving their jobs, losing their jobs, or not being able to look for a job.<sup>28</sup>




**Significant investments in rental and child care assistance, as well as nutrition, health care, and other basic needs, are needed to ensure women and families have what they need to not just survive, but thrive.**

## BLACK, NON-HISPANIC WOMEN AND LATINAS WERE MORE LIKELY THAN WHITE, NON-HISPANIC MEN TO BE BEHIND ON THEIR RENT PAYMENTS THROUGHOUT THE PANDEMIC.

Women of color, as well as women overall, disproportionately experienced housing insecurity prior to the COVID-19 pandemic due to sexist and racist policies.<sup>29</sup> Throughout the pandemic, Black, non-Hispanic and Latina women were often more likely than white, non-Hispanic men and women to be behind on

their rent payments. COVID relief programs including the Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) helped millions of people stay in their homes. Yet, well into 2023, the share of Black, non-Hispanic women and Latinas who were behind on their rent continued to remain high.

**FIGURE 5**  
Share of Renters Who Were Behind on Their Rent Payments by Selected Demographics (2020–2023)



See appendix Table D for table format of graph. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020-2023 Household Pulse Survey,” Census.gov, <https://www.census.gov/data/experimental-data-products/household-pulse-survey.html>.<sup>30</sup>





### Across much of 2021–2023:

- In 45 states and the District of Columbia, a greater share of women compared to men were behind on their rent (Appendix Table E).<sup>31</sup>
- In 44 states (all states for which complete data is available), a greater share of women of color compared to white, non-Hispanic men were behind on their rent. The share of women behind on their rent and the disparities between women of color and white, non-Hispanic men and women varied greatly by state. For example, in Wisconsin, 33.0% of Black, non-Hispanic women who rent were behind on their payments compared to 7.6% of white, non-Hispanic women and 7.4% of white, non-Hispanic men. In New York, 28.3% of Latinas, 10.5% of white, non-Hispanic women, and 9.9% of white, non-Hispanic men were behind on their rent payments (Appendix Table F).
- In nine states and the District of Columbia (out of 27 states and the District of Columbia for which complete data is available), a greater share of LGBT people compared to non-LGBT people were behind on their rent. This share varied greatly by state. For example, in Missouri, 17.6% of LGBT renters were behind on their rent compared to 11.4% of non-LGBT renters. In Washington, 9.0% of LGBT and 10.1% of non-LGBT renters were behind on their rent (Appendix Table G).
- In 48 states and the District of Columbia (all states for which complete data is available), a greater share of disabled women compared to nondisabled men were behind on their rent (Appendix Table H).

**This behind-on-rent data makes clear that we need both emergency and long-term rental assistance to address short-term financial shocks and longer-term affordability challenges.**



## EVICTION, AND EVEN THE THREAT OF EVICTION, HAS SEVERE REPERCUSSIONS FOR WOMEN OF COLOR.

Being behind on rent (having “rent arrears”) increases the threat of eviction. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, many eviction cases on this basis were for arrears that amounted to less than \$1,500, often less than one month’s rent.<sup>32</sup>

Before the pandemic, millions of people across the United States faced eviction. Between 2007 and 2016, on average, 7.6 million individuals faced the threat of eviction and 3.9 million lived in a home that faced an eviction judgment.<sup>33</sup> Black women have been disproportionately likely to experience eviction, due to racist and sexist policies by landlords<sup>34</sup> and pay inequities that make it harder to afford rent.<sup>35</sup> In 17 of the 36 states with available data prior to the pandemic, Black women renters received eviction filings at double the rate (or higher) of white renters.<sup>36</sup>

Facing an eviction can unleash a cascade of consequences. An eviction filing, even if it does not end in an eviction itself, appears on background checks landlords use when considering rental applications.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately, these screenings often contain false, outdated, or misleading information; therefore, the fact that the tenant was never actually evicted may not make it to the landlord.<sup>38</sup> Additionally, tenant screenings do not indicate the reasons for the eviction—which may have no bearing on a future tenancy,<sup>39</sup> especially when the eviction can be a pretext for other forms of discrimination. The inability to find safe, accessible,

and affordable housing due to a previous eviction filing can also affect the ability to find or keep a job. Without adequate shelter in a location of their choosing, a person may not have access to proper hygienic care, transportation, or child care, which are all barriers to employment. Furthermore, unstable housing due to an eviction filing can lead to health consequences for women and their families due to several factors, including that their housing may provide an unsafe or unhealthy environment, they may not have a safe place to store medication, or they may be unable to access public transportation needed to attend medical appointments.<sup>40</sup> All of these factors continue the cycle of poverty and demonstrate the critical need for tenant protections.

People facing homelessness experience the same struggles as those with unstable housing, but much more heightened. People experiencing unsheltered homelessness are at risk of falling ill or dying from severe temperatures—heat stroke when it is too hot and hypothermia when it is too cold. Women and LGBTQIA+ people are much more likely to experience violence in shelters or on the streets.<sup>41</sup> Additionally, people are more likely to get a severe infection, such as COVID-19 or Toxic Shock Syndrome, due to unsanitary and crowded conditions. Menstruation products are incredibly expensive, forcing people who menstruate to reuse products or use toilet paper from public restrooms.<sup>42</sup>



**To reduce evictions, we need to increase tenant protections at the federal, state, and local levels. Laws to expunge or seal eviction filings can help eliminate challenges associated with credit reporting and background checks. Additionally, the right to legal assistance during an eviction proceeding can lessen the chance of women and LGBTQIA+ people experiencing homelessness due to not knowing their rights.**

## THIS DATA SUGGESTS THE NEED FOR DEEP POLICY CHANGES TO ENSURE RENTAL HOUSING IS EQUITABLE FOR ALL.

Given the long history of discriminatory housing policies in the United States, addressing gender, racial, and disability inequities in housing requires centering gender justice, including centering the needs of women of color, LGBTQIA+ people, and disabled women. The discriminatory roots of housing policy in this country run deep. Consequently, untangling these roots to create a liberated society in which every single person can have a safe, accessible, and affordable home in the neighborhood of their choosing will require significant effort and public investments, both short- and long-term.

### 1. WE NEED DEEP, LONG-TERM PUBLIC INVESTMENTS IN HOUSING AND OTHER ECONOMIC SUPPORTS.

The end of the Civil Rights movement led to a shift away from public investments in housing,<sup>43</sup> which still impacts people today, as only one in four eligible households receive assistance and eligible families are often on waitlists for years.<sup>44</sup> As the country shifted away from public investments, the private real estate market significantly increased in power and failed to meet the needs of low-income renters.<sup>45</sup> The private market has not built or maintained housing affordable enough for the lowest-income renters, and indeed cannot do so, on its own. Only the federal government can provide the large-scale, sustained investments needed to help solve the affordable housing crisis. **Congress must change course and increase public investments in housing to allow for permanent and systemic change for renters.** While we advocate for federal investments, states and localities can help address local needs.

COVID-19 relief funds, which were greatly effective in mitigating the eviction crisis during the pandemic, offer some lessons for Congress going forward. Across two COVID-19 relief packages, Congress created the Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) to

prevent evictions through direct financial assistance. Through the ERAP, Congress appropriated over \$46 billion in funding distributed to states, U.S. territories, local governments, and Native American Tribes (or Tribally Designated Housing Entities). These funds were then directly distributed as cash assistance to renters and landlords for housing-related expenses like rent and utilities. As of June 2023, more than 12.3 million households received assistance, with more than 60% of funds going to communities of color and more than 66% to households headed by women.<sup>46</sup>

While these funds were greatly effective, they were only temporary and are almost depleted, despite continued need. The price of rent and other basic needs, such as food, continues to rise, while the wage growth for poorly paid workers has slowed and gender and racial wage disparities persist. We need to both strengthen job quality and mitigate employment discrimination, including through raising minimum wages and achieving equal pay, and make systemic housing investments so housing is affordable for all.

Raising revenues through a more equitable tax code can support critical and much needed housing investments described below, along with other public investments that would increase the economic security of women of color, LGBTQIA+ people, and disabled women, such as child care, paid family leave and medical leave, aging and disability care, nutrition, and health care.

**The federal government, as well as states and localities, need to provide the deep housing investments required to ensure permanent system change.**

Examples include the following:

- **Create a permanent Emergency Rental Assistance Program**, which would provide short-term cash assistance to families struggling financially. A tragic life event, like a sudden job loss or health emergency,

can cause a family to experience sudden financial instability, fall behind on rent payments, and face the threat of eviction even when they owe less than a month's rent. Emergency cash assistance would provide the family with the necessary funds to stay housed during a short-term crisis and avoid the costly, destructive, and long-term effects of an eviction.<sup>47</sup>

- **Congress should create a pathway to universal rental assistance** that ensures that every eligible family receives the assistance they need to afford rent. By increasing investments in rental assistance, eligible families will no longer have to worry about untenable choices between paying for rent, food, health care, or other basic necessities. Universal rental assistance is part of the solution to reducing the number of people who are behind on their rent payments and those who are cost-burdened.
- **Create or improve refundable renters tax credits that would benefit low- to middle-income families**, which would help households that cannot receive a Housing Choice Voucher, either because of the long waitlists or because of strict income limits.<sup>48</sup> Unlike a tax deduction, which only reduces taxes owed, a refundable renters tax credit would allow families with little to no tax liability to receive the credit as a refund.<sup>49</sup> Some states and Washington, D.C., have pursued these credits, and more states should consider doing so. Additionally, Congress should create a federal refundable renters tax credit so that all eligible renters can benefit.
- **Make robust public investments targeted toward increasing the supply of accessible and affordable housing**, which would allow more families to find housing they can afford, without being cost-burdened. The Housing Trust Fund (HTF), for example, builds, rehabilitates, preserves, and operates rental housing for people with extremely low incomes.<sup>50</sup> While HTF allocations have grown since the first \$174 million allocation to states in 2016,<sup>51</sup> much greater investments are needed to address the vast supply gaps in accessible and affordable housing.

## 2. WE NEED SYSTEMIC POLICY CHANGES AT EVERY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT.

Robust investments must be paired with systemic policy changes to provide an equitable housing system. We need to correct the extreme power imbalance between tenants and landlords. Tenant protections critically counter the decades of women of color facing higher eviction rates.

Examples of policy changes that better protect tenants include the following:

- Various **“Tenant Bills of Rights”** enacted in a number of states and local jurisdictions in the last 10 years include laws with affordability provisions, protections against displacement, and the right to healthy and accessible housing.<sup>52</sup> In January 2023, the Biden administration released a Blueprint for a Renters Bill of Rights that contains important proposals to increase renter protections,<sup>53</sup> but more work is needed to address the deep power imbalances between tenants and landlords.
- **The Fair Housing Act (FHA) should prohibit housing discrimination based on classifications such as source of income (SOI), and Congress should increase federal funding for fair housing enforcement.**<sup>54</sup> The FHA does not explicitly protect against SOI discrimination. States and localities that do not have anti-SOI discrimination allow landlords to have the ability to deny housing to prospective tenants using government subsidies to pay for rent, which is often used as a proxy for illegal discrimination that often disproportionately harms people of color, LGBTQIA+ people, and women with disabilities.<sup>55</sup> One fair housing test in Memphis and Shelby County found significant SOI discrimination—84.4% of tests had discrimination based on the testers source of income.<sup>56</sup> SOI discrimination often has discriminatory impacts based on sex, race, and disability in violation of the FHA, but insufficient fair housing enforcement funding makes it

impossible to counter. Without federal protection, the patchwork of laws fails to cover everyone, no matter where they live.

- **Tenants should have the right to counsel in eviction proceedings.**<sup>57</sup> On average, only 3% of tenants are represented by legal counsel, compared to 81% of landlords.<sup>58</sup> Legal aid organizations that provide legal assistance to people with low-income are often unable to help due to the large demand and the small number of staff.<sup>59</sup> When tenants have access to counsel, their odds of eviction are greatly diminished.<sup>60</sup>
- **Barriers to housing must be removed for people who have experienced an eviction filing.** Even if someone has not been evicted by court judgment but has received a filing of eviction, the filing alone can reduce their chances of housing in the future because

it often stays on their record.<sup>61</sup> Landlords often use sexist and racist policies to evict women of color for no legal reason, but the attempted eviction can still show up on a record, making it extremely difficult to find housing later.<sup>62</sup> Laws to expungement or sealing eviction filings will minimize this problem leading to greater housing access after an eviction filing.

**The evidence shows that women of color, LGBTQIA+ people, and disabled women struggle to afford rent because of decades, if not centuries, of discriminatory housing and economic policies. Only significant public investments and sweeping policy changes at every level of government can ensure that all women and LGBTQIA+ people can afford rent and enjoy safe, accessible housing in the neighborhood of their choice without sacrificing food, child care, health care, and other necessities.**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank May Amoyaw, Melissa Boteach, Kathryn Domina, Amy Matsui, Shengwei Sun, Hilary Woodward, and the rest of the NWLC Campaigns and Communications Team for their review and dissemination of this issue brief. The authors would also like to thank Andres de la Roche for design and accessibility and Kim Johnson at the National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) for her review of this issue brief. Finally, the authors thank American University students Dani DiPietro, Kristy Garcia, Ryan Golden, Ethan Taylor, and Shannon Vyvihal, who conducted the initial cost-burden data analysis for NWLC based on analysis and code provided by the Research team at NLIHC.

# APPENDIX

**TABLE A** Income Distribution of Single Renters Living Alone (2021)

	EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME	VERY LOW-INCOME	LOW-INCOME	MIDDLE INCOME	ABOVE MEDIAN INCOME
<b>Men overall</b>	29.1%	16.4%	20.1%	9.8%	24.6%
<b>Women overall</b>	38.0%	19.1%	19.1%	8.2%	15.7%
<b>White, non-Hispanic men</b>	25.9%	16.1%	20.3%	10.3%	27.4%
<b>White, non-Hispanic women</b>	33.7%	20.1%	20.0%	8.6%	17.6%
<b>Black, non-Hispanic women</b>	44.1%	18.0%	19.0%	7.6%	11.2%
<b>Native women</b>	47.0%	18.1%	18.6%	5.8%	10.6%
<b>AANHPI women</b>	40.2%	11.0%	15.5%	8.5%	24.9%
<b>Latinas</b>	46.9%	18.1%	16.2%	6.9%	11.8%

Source: Data were limited to heads of households living alone. National Women's Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

**Income Distribution of Single Renters Raising at Least One Child Under the Age of 18 on Their Own (2021)**

	EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME	VERY LOW-INCOME	LOW-INCOME	MIDDLE INCOME	ABOVE MEDIAN INCOME
<b>Men overall</b>	23.1%	18.1%	24.5%	11.8%	22.6%
<b>Women overall</b>	44.6%	20.7%	19.8%	6.2%	8.7%
<b>White, non-Hispanic men</b>	20.3%	14.4%	25.2%	13.7%	26.5%
<b>White, non-Hispanic women</b>	39.5%	19.9%	21.9%	7.6%	11.2%
<b>Black, non-Hispanic women</b>	48.4%	21.6%	18.5%	5.2%	6.3%
<b>Native women</b>	52.9%	12.4%	14.3%	6.3%	14.1%
<b>AANHPI women</b>	35.6%	19.3%	25.5%	4.8%	14.8%
<b>Latinas</b>	46.0%	21.2%	18.8%	5.7%	8.2%

Source: Data were limited to heads of households raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own. National Women's Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

# APPENDIX

**TABLE C** Share of Renters Who Were Severely Cost Burdened (2021)

	SINGLE ADULTS	SINGLE ADULTS RAISING AT LEAST ONE CHILD UNDER THE AGE OF 18 ON THEIR OWN
<b>White, non-Hispanic men</b>	32.0%	27.2%
<b>White, non-Hispanic women</b>	39.3%	43.0%
<b>Black, non-Hispanic women</b>	43.1%	47.3%
<b>AANHPI women</b>	40.3%	48.3%
<b>Native women</b>	40.4%	47.3%
<b>Latinas</b>	45.6%	48.9%
<b>Women overall</b>	40.9%	46.3%

Source: Data were limited to heads of households living alone. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.

**TABLE D** Share of Renters Who Were Behind on Their Rent Payments (2020–2023)

		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC MEN	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC WOMEN	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC WOMEN	LATINAS
<b>2020</b>	Aug. 19–31	10.2%	11.3%	24.2%	15.7%
	Sept. 30 – Oct. 12	10.7%	11.8%	24.7%	19.3%
	Oct. 28 – Nov. 9	13.4%	14.1%	30.4%	18.3%
<b>2021</b>	Jan. 6–18	11.6%	12.3%	32.2%	29.4%
	March 3–15	12.3%	11.1%	26.6%	21.5%
	May 12–24	9.1%	9.0%	23.1%	17.6%
	July 21 – Aug. 2	8.7%	10.7%	26.4%	20.0%
	Sept. 29 – Oct. 11	8.6%	14.0%	27.1%	20.6%
	Dec. 1–13	8.6%	10.5%	30.9%	19.6%
<b>2022</b>	March 2–14	9.5%	10.9%	23.8%	16.6%
	June 29 – July 11	9.6%	10.0%	28.1%	21.1%
	Nov 2–14	6.2%	9.9%	25.5%	18.3%
<b>2023</b>	April 26 – May 8	5.2%	10.1%	21.2%	17.3%

Source: National Women’s Law Center calculations based on U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020–2023 Household Pulse Survey,” Census.gov, <https://www.census.gov/data/experimental-data-products/household-pulse-survey.html>.

# APPENDIX

**TABLE E**

Share of Men and Women Who Were Behind on Their Rent Payments by State  
(January 6, 2021 – September 4, 2023)

STATE	ALL MEN	ALL WOMEN
United States	13.9%	15.6%
Alabama	17.0%	21.8%
Alaska	12.3%	15.2%
Arizona	10.0%	11.4%
Arkansas	14.9%	17.3%
California	14.0%	13.2%
Colorado	9.1%	10.4%
Connecticut	16.9%	16.1%
Delaware	15.1%	17.1%
District of Columbia	12.5%	14.1%
Florida	15.2%	17.6%
Georgia	16.5%	19.7%
Hawaii	13.4%	12.7%
Idaho	7.6%	8.9%
Illinois	14.6%	18.1%
Indiana	13.3%	16.3%
Iowa	13.4%	13.4%
Kansas	9.3%	11.2%
Kentucky	13.9%	14.9%
Louisiana	17.3%	21.4%
Maine	11.5%	10.4%
Maryland	16.1%	19.3%
Massachusetts	12.5%	13.3%
Michigan	13.1%	15.8%
Minnesota	10.1%	13.0%
Mississippi	20.7%	23.0%

STATE	ALL MEN	ALL WOMEN
Missouri	12.0%	13.5%
Montana	6.8%	11.4%
Nebraska	9.7%	12.0%
Nevada	13.1%	13.1%
New Hampshire	12.0%	10.5%
New Jersey	17.6%	18.6%
New Mexico	15.0%	15.2%
New York	19.7%	21.3%
North Carolina	12.6%	15.5%
North Dakota	10.7%	10.4%
Ohio	12.0%	14.8%
Oklahoma	11.1%	16.3%
Oregon	9.7%	11.2%
Pennsylvania	14.5%	17.0%
Rhode Island	14.9%	15.4%
South Carolina	18.9%	19.3%
South Dakota	11.2%	13.6%
Tennessee	12.2%	15.2%
Texas	14.6%	15.5%
Utah	7.0%	9.3%
Vermont	9.8%	10.0%
Virginia	10.9%	12.8%
Washington	9.9%	11.6%
West Virginia	14.1%	18.0%
Wisconsin	9.5%	11.3%
Wyoming	11.7%	14.1%

Source: National Women’s Law Center calculations based on weeks 22–61 of the U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020–2023 Household Pulse Survey. “Weeks” is the term used by the Census Bureau to define separate data collections in all phases, but “weeks” may be shorter or longer than a seven-day period.



# APPENDIX

**TABLE F**

**Share Who Were Behind on Their Rent Payments by State and Selected Demographics (January 6, 2021 – September 4, 2023)**

State	White, non-Hispanic Men	White, non-Hispanic Women	Women of Color Overall*	Black, non-Hispanic Women	Latinas
<b>United States</b>	8.9%	10.5%	20.6%	25.5%	17.8%
<b>Alabama</b>	11.0%	16.4%	27.6%	27.8%	-
<b>Alaska</b>	9.7%	10.1%	20.7%	-	-
<b>Arizona</b>	5.6%	9.0%	13.8%	-	13.2%
<b>Arkansas</b>	13.0%	14.2%	23.1%	26.0%	-
<b>California</b>	8.1%	8.4%	15.6%	25.4%	14.5%
<b>Colorado</b>	6.1%	8.1%	14.9%	-	14.5%
<b>Connecticut</b>	9.9%	10.5%	21.7%	23.3%	22.3%
<b>Delaware</b>	-	11.0%	22.2%	24.4%	-
<b>District of Columbia</b>	2.4%	1.7%	22.0%	26.8%	-
<b>Florida</b>	8.7%	12.6%	21.5%	26.7%	17.2%
<b>Georgia</b>	11.6%	12.8%	24.0%	25.3%	19.2%
<b>Hawaii</b>	-	6.7%	14.7%	-	-
<b>Idaho</b>	6.6%	7.6%	14.2%	-	-
<b>Illinois</b>	7.4%	10.7%	24.9%	28.9%	21.5%
<b>Indiana</b>	10.9%	14.3%	20.5%	21.6%	-
<b>Iowa</b>	11.1%	11.4%	22.1%	-	-
<b>Kansas</b>	7.5%	9.7%	15.0%	-	-
<b>Kentucky</b>	11.9%	14.2%	17.4%	18.4%	-
<b>Louisiana</b>	11.5%	13.2%	28.3%	29.6%	-
<b>Maine</b>	9.7%	10.7%	-	-	-
<b>Maryland</b>	9.6%	11.8%	23.7%	24.3%	18.9%
<b>Massachusetts</b>	8.0%	9.0%	20.1%	25.0%	22.0%
<b>Michigan</b>	8.6%	10.3%	24.7%	26.0%	-
<b>Minnesota</b>	6.8%	9.2%	22.4%	28.2%	-
<b>Mississippi</b>	16.7%	15.9%	27.9%	28.7%	-

State	White, non-Hispanic Men	White, non-Hispanic Women	Women of Color Overall*	Black, non-Hispanic Women	Latinas
<b>Missouri</b>	9.5%	10.3%	21.3%	23.3%	-
<b>Montana</b>	6.2%	9.1%	22.9%	-	-
<b>Nebraska</b>	7.8%	9.3%	20.8%	-	-
<b>Nevada</b>	8.1%	8.8%	16.3%	21.5%	14.6%
<b>New Hampshire</b>	11.4%	9.6%	-	-	-
<b>New Jersey</b>	10.9%	11.6%	22.9%	25.1%	22.3%
<b>New Mexico</b>	8.4%	9.9%	18.1%	-	16.1%
<b>New York</b>	9.9%	10.5%	28.5%	33.1%	28.3%
<b>North Carolina</b>	7.8%	10.3%	21.6%	23.6%	-
<b>North Dakota</b>	8.3%	8.6%	-	-	-
<b>Ohio</b>	9.1%	11.5%	22.0%	23.2%	-
<b>Oklahoma</b>	9.2%	14.1%	19.9%	20.6%	-
<b>Oregon</b>	8.1%	9.7%	15.2%	-	15.2%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	9.4%	11.7%	27.3%	29.2%	24.4%
<b>Rhode Island</b>	11.8%	11.0%	23.4%	-	23.7%
<b>South Carolina</b>	15.2%	13.9%	25.5%	28.0%	-
<b>South Dakota</b>	8.3%	9.6%	26.8%	-	-
<b>Tennessee</b>	9.8%	11.6%	21.7%	23.3%	-
<b>Texas</b>	9.3%	10.1%	18.7%	20.7%	18.2%
<b>Utah</b>	5.3%	6.6%	17.2%	-	15.8%
<b>Vermont</b>	8.6%	9.4%	-	-	-
<b>Virginia</b>	6.9%	8.4%	17.4%	19.1%	13.8%
<b>Washington</b>	7.4%	8.7%	16.6%	25.6%	15.8%
<b>West Virginia</b>	13.4%	17.3%	23.9%	-	-
<b>Wisconsin</b>	7.4%	7.6%	22.8%	33.0%	-
<b>Wyoming</b>	10.9%	12.7%	-	-	-

\*Women of color includes all women except white, non-Hispanic women.

“-” indicate insufficient state data for reliable estimates.

“Weeks” is the term used by the Census Bureau to define separate data collections in all phases, but “weeks” may be shorter or longer than a seven-day period.

Source: National Women’s Law Center calculations based on weeks 22–61 of the U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020–2023 Household Pulse Survey.

# APPENDIX

**TABLE G**

Share of LGBT and Non-LGBT People Who Were Behind on Their Rent Payments by State (July 21, 2021 – September 4, 2023)

STATE	LGBT PEOPLE	NON-LGBT PEOPLE
<b>United States</b>	13.0%	14.2%
<b>Alabama</b>	-	17.9%
<b>Alaska</b>	-	12.3%
<b>Arizona</b>	8.5%	10.4%
<b>Arkansas</b>	-	16.6%
<b>California</b>	12.6%	13.0%
<b>Colorado</b>	9.1%	8.6%
<b>Connecticut</b>	13.8%	16.2%
<b>Delaware</b>	-	16.6%
<b>District of Columbia</b>	11.6%	13.9%
<b>Florida</b>	17.0%	15.6%
<b>Georgia</b>	14.9%	17.3%
<b>Hawaii</b>	-	12.3%
<b>Idaho</b>	-	8.1%
<b>Illinois</b>	11.2%	16.5%
<b>Indiana</b>	-	14.0%
<b>Iowa</b>	11.4%	12.7%
<b>Kansas</b>	-	9.7%
<b>Kentucky</b>	-	15.1%
<b>Louisiana</b>	-	18.8%
<b>Maine</b>	-	9.8%
<b>Maryland</b>	19.8%	17.0%
<b>Massachusetts</b>	10.5%	12.5%
<b>Michigan</b>	10.9%	14.7%
<b>Minnesota</b>	11.5%	11.7%
<b>Mississippi</b>	-	20.6%

STATE	LGBT PEOPLE	NON-LGBT PEOPLE
<b>Missouri</b>	17.6%	11.4%
<b>Montana</b>	-	8.9%
<b>Nebraska</b>	-	10.5%
<b>Nevada</b>	11.3%	11.9%
<b>New Hampshire</b>	-	9.7%
<b>New Jersey</b>	16.5%	17.7%
<b>New Mexico</b>	-	15.3%
<b>New York</b>	17.7%	20.2%
<b>North Carolina</b>	-	13.5%
<b>North Dakota</b>	-	10.1%
<b>Ohio</b>	11.5%	12.7%
<b>Oklahoma</b>	13.8%	13.3%
<b>Oregon</b>	10.0%	9.4%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	13.1%	15.5%
<b>Rhode Island</b>	-	14.8%
<b>South Carolina</b>	-	17.3%
<b>South Dakota</b>	-	10.9%
<b>Tennessee</b>	16.1%	13.4%
<b>Texas</b>	12.3%	14.2%
<b>Utah</b>	10.0%	7.3%
<b>Vermont</b>	-	9.6%
<b>Virginia</b>	10.7%	11.2%
<b>Washington</b>	9.0%	10.1%
<b>West Virginia</b>	-	14.8%
<b>Wisconsin</b>	12.7%	9.9%
<b>Wyoming</b>	-	12.7%

“-” indicate insufficient state data for reliable estimates.

“Weeks” is the term used by the Census Bureau to define separate data collections in all phases, but “weeks” may be shorter or longer than a seven-day period.

Source: National Women’s Law Center calculations based on weeks 34–61 of the U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020–2023 Household Pulse Survey.”

# APPENDIX

**TABLE H**

Share of Women With Disabilities and Nondisabled Men Who Were Behind on Their Rent Payments by State (April 14, 2021 – September 4, 2023)

STATE	WOMEN WITH DISABILITIES	MEN WITHOUT DISABILITIES
United States	20.5%	12.0%
Alabama	27.8%	13.3%
Alaska	21.7%	10.0%
Arizona	16.9%	7.7%
Arkansas	20.7%	15.0%
California	17.8%	12.7%
Colorado	16.7%	6.3%
Connecticut	25.9%	16.1%
Delaware	20.6%	13.2%
District of Columbia	16.7%	12.3%
Florida	22.3%	13.0%
Georgia	24.7%	13.5%
Hawaii	-	11.1%
Idaho	11.2%	4.8%
Illinois	24.2%	12.0%
Indiana	18.7%	11.3%
Iowa	17.9%	10.4%
Kansas	17.4%	6.5%
Kentucky	19.1%	12.3%
Louisiana	28.9%	13.3%
Maine	15.1%	10.1%
Maryland	24.0%	15.1%
Massachusetts	17.7%	11.0%
Michigan	18.9%	10.9%
Minnesota	15.9%	8.0%
Mississippi	28.8%	17.6%

STATE	WOMEN WITH DISABILITIES	MEN WITHOUT DISABILITIES
Missouri	19.0%	8.8%
Montana	20.8%	5.4%
Nebraska	16.9%	7.5%
Nevada	14.2%	10.7%
New Hampshire	16.0%	10.6%
New Jersey	22.9%	16.3%
New Mexico	20.3%	11.7%
New York	29.3%	17.5%
North Carolina	15.8%	10.8%
North Dakota	-	10.1%
Ohio	19.6%	9.9%
Oklahoma	22.3%	8.4%
Oregon	16.5%	8.2%
Pennsylvania	23.7%	12.2%
Rhode Island	21.4%	12.9%
South Carolina	25.4%	15.90%
South Dakota	16.5%	11.9%
Tennessee	18.9%	10.3%
Texas	20.8%	13.0%
Utah	15.2%	5.6%
Vermont	-	7.0%
Virginia	18.1%	9.0%
Washington	16.1%	7.9%
West Virginia	23.7%	10.9%
Wisconsin	14.5%	7.7%
Wyoming	17.1%	10.1%

“-” indicate insufficient state data for reliable estimates.

“Weeks” is the term used by the Census Bureau to define separate data collections in all phases, but “weeks” may be shorter or longer than a seven-day period.

Source: National Women’s Law Center calculations based on weeks 28–61 of the U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020–2023 Household Pulse Survey.

# ENDNOTES

- 1 Sammi Aibinder, Andrea Flynn, Richelle Gernan, Sarah Hassmer, and Rakeen Mabud, “The Roots of Discriminatory Housing Policy: Moving Toward Gender Justice in Our Economy” (National Women’s Law Center, Insight Center, and The Groundwork Collaborative, August 2, 2022), <https://nwlc.org/resource/the-roots-of-discriminatory-housing-policy-moving-towards-gender-justice-in-our-economy/>.
- 2 Jasmine Tucker and Julie Vogtman, “Hard Work Is Not Enough: Women in Low-Paid Jobs,” (National Women’s Law Center, July 2023). <https://nwlc.org/resource/when-hard-work-is-not-enough-women-in-low-paid-jobs/>
- 3 Brooke LePage and Jasmine Tucker, “A Window Into the Wage Gap: What’s Behind It and How to Close It,” (National Women’s Law Center, January 2023), <https://nwlc.org/resource/wage-gap-explainer/>, 1.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 NWLC calculations using the median rent in the United State of \$1,300 and an annual wage loss of \$9,954. <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP1Y2022.DPO4?q=DPO4:+SELECTED+HOUSING+CHARACTERISTICS&moe=false>. The American Community Survey asks respondents for the monthly rent of their house, apartment, or mobile home.
- 6 Sarah Javaid, “Because of the Wage Gap, Latinas Stand to Lose More Than \$1.2 Million Over a 40-Year Career,” (National Women’s Law Center, September 2023). <https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/2023-Latina-EPD-9.27.23v3.pdf>.
- 7 NWLC calculations using the median rent in the United State of \$1,300.
- 8 Javaid, “Because of the Wage Gap, Latinas Stand to Lose More Than \$1.2 Million Over a 40-Year Career.”
- 9 Data were limited to heads of households living alone. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS) microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.
- 10 Data were limited to heads of households raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on 2021 ACS microdata, <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>. Respondents self-identify their sex as either male or female and self-identify their race and whether they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.
- 11 Wei-hsin Yu and Yuko Hara, “Motherhood penalties and Fatherhood Premiums: Effects of Parenthood on Earnings Growth Within and Across Firms,” (Demography, 2021). <https://read.dukeupress.edu/demography/article/58/1/247/167586/Motherhood-Penalties-and-Fatherhood-Premiums>
- 12 NWLC calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS), accessed through Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Ronald Goeken, Jose Pacas, Megan Schouweiler and Matthew Sobek, Integrated Public Use Microdata Series USA (IPUMS USA): Version 12.0 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2023), <https://doi.org/10.18128/DO10.V12.0>.
- 13 Michelle J. Budig, “The Fatherhood Bonus and The Motherhood Penalty: Parenthood and the Gender Gap in Pay,” (Third Way, September 2, 2014). <https://www.thirdway.org/report/the-fatherhood-bonus-and-the-motherhood-penalty-parenthood-and-the-gender-gap-in-pay>.
- 14 Tucker and Vogtman, “Hard Work Is Not Enough: Women in Low-Paid Jobs.”
- 15 Brooke LePage and Sarah Javaid, “The Wage Gap Robs Mothers of What They’re Owed,” (National Women’s Law Center, August 2023), <https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Moms-EPD-8.7.23v1.pdf>, 5; Brooke LePage and Jasmine Tucker, “A Window Into the Wage Gap: What’s Behind It and How to Close It,” (National Women’s Law Center, January 2023), <https://nwlc.org/resource/wage-gap-explainer/>, 5.
- 16 Andrew Aurand, Mackenzie Pish, Ikra Rafi, and Diane Yentel, “Out of Reach: The High Cost of Housing” (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2023), <https://nlihc.org/oor>, 1.
- 17 Tucker and Vogtman, “Hard Work Is Not Enough: Women in Low-Paid Jobs.”
- 18 Aurand, Pish, Rafi, and Yentel, “Out of Reach,” 3.
- 19 Ibid., 3. The National Low Income Housing Coalition calculates “the national average number of hours a full-time worker earning minimum wage must work to afford the” Federal Market Rate (FMR) “by taking into account the prevailing minimum wage at the county level (or New England FMR area) and finding the weighted average of hours needed in all counties, weighting counties by their number of renter households. Accordingly, that average reflects higher state and county minimum wages, but not higher minimum wages associated with sub-county jurisdictions.” Ibid.
- 20 Andrew Aurand, Dan Emmanuel, Emma Foley, Matt Clarke, Ikra Rafi, and Diane Yentel, “The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes” (National Low Income Housing Coalition, March 2023), <https://nlihc.org/gap>.
- 21 Ibid. 3.
- 22 Aibinder, Flynn, Gernan, Hassmer, and Rakeen Mabud., “The Roots of Discriminatory Housing Policy: Moving Toward Gender Justice in Our Economy,” 24.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Data were limited to heads of households living alone. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS), accessed through Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Sophia Foster, Ronald Goeken, Jose Pacas, Megan Schouweiler and Matthew Sobek, Integrated Public Use Microdata Series USA (IPUMS USA): Version 11.0 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.18128/DO10.V11.0>.
- 25 Data were limited to heads of households raising at least one child under the age of 18 on their own. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on 2021 American Community Survey (ACS), accessed through Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Sophia Foster, Ronald Goeken, Jose Pacas, Megan Schouweiler and Matthew Sobek, Integrated Public Use Microdata Series USA (IPUMS USA): Version 11.0 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.18128/DO10.V11.0>.
- 26 Baylee Patel, “The U.S. States Where Childcare Costs More Than College Tuition,” (NetCredit, August 31, 2023). <https://www.netcredit.com/blog/cost-of-child-care-by-state/>.
- 27 Sarah Javaid, “High Shares of Women with Children Under 12 Lack Access to Child Care as the Child Care Funding Cliff Approaches” (National Women’s Law Center, September 26, 2023), <https://nwlc.org/high-shares-of-women-with-children-under-12-lack-access-to-child-care-as-the-child-care-funding-cliff-approaches/>. This data is not just in regard to single women, but rather women who responded to the survey. The data is at the household level, meaning all children in the household and are not necessarily their children.
- 28 Ibid.

- 29 Talia Grossman, “The Horrifying History of Sexist Housing Policies You Might Not Know About.” National Women’s Law Center, August 22, 2023, <https://nwlc.org/the-horrifying-history-of-sexist-housing-policies-you-might-not-know-about/>.
- 30 NWLC’s other Household Pulse Analyses can be found at <https://nwlc.org/resource/nwlc-analysis-of-u-s-census-bureau-covid-19-household-pulse-surveys/>.
- 31 A population with a greater share does not necessarily mean that population is more likely than another to be behind on their rent. Some states show similar shares of those behind on rent at the first decimal place. Comparisons were made with at least two decimal places while tables include only one decimal place for the purposes of this brief. National Women’s Law Center calculations based on U.S. Census Bureau, “Measuring Household Experiences During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic, 2020-2023 Household Pulse Survey,” Census.gov, <https://www.census.gov/data/experimental-data-products/household-pulse-survey.html>.
- 32 Emily Badger, “Many Renters Who Face Eviction Owe Less Than \$600,” The New York Times, December 12, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/12/upshot/eviction-prevention-solutions-government.html>.
- 33 Nick Graetz, Carl Gershenson, Peter Hepburn, and Matthew Desmond, “Who is Evicted in America,” Eviction Lab, October 3, 2023, <https://evictionlab.org/who-is-evicted-in-america/>.
- 34 Sophie Beiers, Sandra Park, and Linda Morris, “Clearing the Record: How Eviction Sealing Laws Can Advance Housing Access for Women of Color,” ACLU, January 10, 2020, <https://www.aclu.org/news/racial-justice/clearing-the-record-how-eviction-sealing-laws-can-advance-housing-access-for-women-of-color>.
- 35 Sandra Park and John Pollock, “Tenants’ Right to Counsel is Critical to Fight Mass Evictions and Advance Race Equity During the Pandemic and Beyond,” ACLU, January 21, 2021, <https://www.aclu.org/news/racial-justice/tenants-right-to-counsel-is-critical-to-fight-mass-evictions-and-advance-race-equity-during-the-pandemic-and-beyond>.
- 36 Beiers, Park, and Morris, “Clearing the Record.”
- 37 Nada Hussein, Tori Bourret, and Sarah Gallagher, “Eviction Record Sealing and Expungement Kit” (National Low Income Housing Coalition, April 20, 2023), <https://nlihc.org/resource/nlihc-releases-toolkit-eviction-record-sealing-and-expungement-protections>, 4.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 Melissa Boteach, Amy Matsui, and Sarah Hassmer, “NWLC Comments to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development on Disparate Impact” (National Women’s Law Center, October 21, 2019), <https://nwlc.org/resource/nwlc-comments-to-the-u-s-department-of-housing-and-urban-development-on-disparate-impact/>.
- 41 National Low Income Housing Coalition, “Chart Book: Housing and Health Problems are Intertwined. So Are Their Solutions” (June 29, 2022), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/housing-and-health-problems-are-intertwined-so-are-their-solutions>.
- 42 Talia Grossman, “Why Housing Is a Gender Justice Issue,” National Women’s Law Center, April 28, 2023, <https://nwlc.org/why-housing-is-a-gender-justice-issue/>.
- 43 Aibinder, Flynn, Gernan, Hassmer, and Rakeen Mabud., “The Roots of Discriminatory Housing Policy: Moving Toward Gender Justice in Our Economy,” 13.
- 44 Eric Gartland, “Funding Limitations Create Widespread Unmet Need for Rental Assistance, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, February 15, 2022, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/funding-limitations-create-widespread-unmet-need-for-rental-assistance>.
- 45 Aibinder, Flynn, Gernan, Hassmer, and Rakeen Mabud., “The Roots of Discriminatory Housing Policy: Moving Toward Gender Justice in Our Economy,” 13.
- 46 U.S. Department of the Treasury, “Emergency Rental Assistance Program,” accessed November 2023, <https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/coronavirus/assistance-for-state-local-and-tribal-governments/emergency-rental-assistance-program>.
- 47 Aurand, Emmanuel, Foley, Clarke, Rafi, and Yentel, “The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes,” 12.
- 48 Daniel Teles and Christopher Davis, “Tax Credits for Renters Could Increase Racial and Economic Equity,” Urban Institute, December 9, 2020, <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/tax-credits-renters-could-increase-racial-and-economic-equity>.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 National Low Income Housing Coalition, “National Housing Trust Fund,” Accessed, November 2023, <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund>.
- 51 National Housing Trust Fund, “State Allocations for 2016” (National Low Income Housing Coalition, May 4, 2016), [https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/NHTF\\_StateAllocations\\_2016.pdf](https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/NHTF_StateAllocations_2016.pdf).
- 52 Aibinder, Flynn, Gernan, Hassmer, and Mabud, “The Roots of Discriminatory Housing Policy,” 33.
- 53 Domestic Policy Council and National Economic Council, “The White House Blueprint for a Renters Bill of Rights” (The White House, January 2023), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/White-House-Blueprint-for-a-Renters-Bill-of-Rights.pdf>.
- 54 Nada Hussein and Sarah Gallagher, “The State of Statewide Tenant Protections” (National Low Income Housing Coalition, May 2023), <https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/state-statewide-tenant-protections.pdf>, 3.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Corey Montag, Simeon Spencer, Jason Bailey, Morgan Williams, Justin Monteiro, Lindsay Augustine, and Camille Brown, “The Bad Housing Blues: Discrimination in the Housing Choice Voucher Program in Memphis, TN” (Legal Defense Fund and National Fair Housing Alliance, 2022), <https://nationalfairhousing.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/LDF-NFHA-HCV-Memphis-2-web.pdf>.
- 57 Ibid., 2.
- 58 Liel Sterling and Maria Roumiantseva, New Report Illustrates How Right to Counsel Prevents Evictions and their Discriminatory Impacts on Communities, ACLU, May 11, 2022, <https://www.aclu.org/news/womens-rights/new-report-illustrates-how-right-to-counsel-prevents-evictions-and-their-discriminatory-impacts-on-communities>.
- 59 Hussein, Bourret, and Gallagher, “Eviction Record Sealing and Expungement Toolkit,” 3.
- 60 Hussein and Gallagher, “The State of Statewide Tenant Protections,” 2.
- 61 Beiers, Park, and Morris, “Clearing the Record.”
- 62 Ibid.