Three Perspectives, One America

No matter where they live, Americans share many values in divided times
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The Pew Charitable Trusts has long supported arts and culture in the Philadelphia region. The Philadelphia Art Museum, framed here by the Swann Memorial Fountain on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, received its first grant from Pew in 1954 and continues to receive funding today. As part of its commitment to Philadelphia, the Pew Center for Arts & Heritage was established in 2005. It has awarded nearly $135 million to more than 1,700 grant recipients with a stated mission of investing “in ambitious, imaginative, and catalytic work that showcases the region’s cultural vitality and enhances public life.”
The Pew Charitable Trusts is a public charity driven by the power of knowledge to solve today’s most challenging problems. Working with partners and donors, Pew conducts fact-based research and rigorous analysis to improve public policy, inform the public, and invigorate civic life.

Pew is the sole beneficiary of seven individual charitable funds established between 1948 and 1979 by two sons and two daughters of Sun Oil Co. founder Joseph N. Pew and his wife, Mary Anderson Pew.
Different, but the Same

The need for unity has been a central theme and driving principle of the American story. That’s why our Founding Fathers embraced the motto *E pluribus unum*: Out of many, one. But the agricultural nation that the Founders created has given way to an expansive and diverse country with a wide range of political, economic, and cultural points of view—and a natural tension between the core democratic beliefs and shared history that unite us and the regional differences that sometimes divide us. We are, in other words, different but the same. Or as Martin Luther King Jr. noted in 1963, “Unity has never meant uniformity.”

If you read or listen to the news these days, it can be easy to miss much of the unity and see only the disagreements among Americans. Last year, the Pew Research Center wanted to delve deeper and see how much of the nation’s division was rooted in partisanship and how much actually played out in communities. Analysts at the center surveyed the attitudes of people living in cities, suburbs, and rural areas, and found gaps in political views and in demographics. But the survey also found that Americans have much in common, with residents of all three areas reporting regular communication with neighbors, a sense of attachment to where they live, and the importance of family connections. They also share concerns, such as worries about the influence of drugs in their communities.

Urban, suburban, and rural Americans also share the view that they’re misunderstood by people who live in different places: The study found that a solid majority of rural residents—58 percent—say the values of those in urban areas are different from theirs, while 53 percent of urbanites say the same about Americans in rural areas. In our cover story, we traveled to Milwaukee to see how these trends are playing out in that city, its suburbs, and the farms and small towns beyond. Joel Kuehnhold, a farmer who lives north of Milwaukee, may have summed up our nation best when he said, “I think we share a lot of the same values, but sometimes you have to scratch the surface to find them.”

In this issue of *Trust*, we also continue to look beneath the surface of our common challenges by exploring the opioid epidemic, which affects Americans no matter where they live. More than 130 people a day died from an opioid overdose in 2017, and today more than 2 million Americans suffer from opioid use disorder—a chronic, debilitating condition.

Evidence-based research tells us that the most effective therapy for this disorder is medication-assisted treatment. And although residents of urban and rural communities both benefit when medication-assisted treatment is available, they lack access to it for very different reasons. In urban areas, such as the Kensington section of Philadelphia, there are often too few treatment facilities and providers for the number of people seeking help. In rural communities, distance and lack of public transportation can make seeking treatment difficult. In this issue, we examine the impact of the opioid crisis, the benefits of medication-assisted treatment, and the different challenges people face trying to obtain it—depending on where they live.

Where you live also can have an impact on your access to high-speed internet service—which has become nearly as essential as electricity in modern life. The Federal Communications Commission reports that more than 21 million Americans are on the wrong side of the digital divide. Although many of these people live in rural areas where the expansion of towers and cables is costly, at least 2 percent of those lacking service are in cities. Cost is a factor for some; in May, the Pew Research Center reported that 44 percent of adults in households with incomes below $30,000 don’t have broadband. Whether it’s the expense or an incomplete infrastructure keeping them from connecting to high-speed service, these millions of Americans all lack the same access to job searches, schooling, and medical technology that connected citizens have.
Federal policymakers don’t have exact data on where the connections are missing, which makes it difficult for them to direct resources to meet the needs. Pew is working to help learn more about where service is needed and has found stories of innovation in many states, including Maine and Indiana, where local leaders are striving to get their residents connected. We’re sharing some of those successes with you in this issue.

*Urban, suburban, and rural Americans share the view that they’re misunderstood by people who live in different places.*

The opioid crisis and digital divide were far in the future in 1784, when Benjamin Franklin warned in a letter to a friend about the danger of becoming a nation “weakened by internal contentions and divisions.” There has always been disagreement in a thriving democratic society as it grapples with change. But a successful republic also never loses sight of what unites its citizens, for that is the basis of what best serves the public good. This goal of a more perfect union continues to inspire Americans and animates the work of Pew to help address the problems of today—and tomorrow.

Rebecca W. Rimel, President and CEO
A meteor shoots through the night sky above Price Lake in North Carolina, just off the Blue Ridge Parkway. Although the 469-mile road—through America’s longest linear park, bisecting Virginia and North Carolina—offers abundant scenic vistas, it is marred by serious rough patches. It’s not alone: Aging infrastructure and inadequate annual maintenance funding have left over half of the National Park Service’s 75,000-plus assets in need of repairs totaling nearly $12 billion. Pew is working with partners to seek increased, dedicated funding to relieve the maintenance backlog.
U.S. Caribbean Fishing Policies to Recognize Differences Among Islands

BY JOHN BRILEY

For all that Caribbean islands have in common—tropical weather and ocean-based economies, for example—each also differs from its neighbors, often in significant ways. On April 23, the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, which sets fishing policy for U.S. waters in the region, took a big step toward recognizing those differences while protecting the ocean, marine species, and all that both provide to the islands’ people and culture.

The council unanimously approved island-based fishery management plans that will guide rules for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands that are tailored to the biodiversity, customs, and other characteristics of each island and its inhabitants, known as island-based fishery management plans. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

NOTEWORTHY

Blue tang fish swim among coral off the coast of Puerto Rico. Marine life around the U.S. territory as well as the three U.S. Virgin Islands—St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John—will now receive protections based on the biodiversity, customs, and characteristics of each island and its inhabitants, known as island-based fishery management plans. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

The plans cover Puerto Rico, St. Croix, St. Thomas,
and St. John, all of which had been previously managed as one unit—an approach that didn’t account for differences in culture, fishing practices, or the marine environment across the communities. Now, for example, each of the plans might call for a different catch limit for the same species, allowing higher numbers where the fish is more culturally important and/or more abundant.

Pew supports these plans because they mark a critical step toward a more comprehensive, ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management, which considers interactions among flora and fauna within an ecosystem instead of just a single species or issue. The plans will help the ocean and the people who rely on it by balancing human needs with sustainable management of the region’s diverse ecosystems. Pew advocates for ecosystem-based fishery management throughout U.S. waters.

Most importantly, the plans will expand the umbrella of protections offered by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, our nation’s primary fishing law, to 18 fish species, including mahi-mahi, that until now had no catch limits or other protections.

In addition, they will require fishery managers to safeguard the role that parrotfish and surgeonfish play in maintaining healthy coral reefs. These keystone species, which are commercially trapped and spear-fished in the Caribbean, feed on algae that would otherwise smother reefs and clear the way for new coral growth by chewing off tiny bits of coral skeleton and excreting it as sand. One parrotfish can create up to 200 pounds of sand each year. Catch limits will be lowered in St. Croix and St. Thomas, while the extraction of the largest parrotfishes will be prohibited in waters off all three islands.

The council vote also advances the protection of fish spawning habitats. Some species return to the same spots to spawn for generations; safeguarding these places can boost healthy fish populations and improve the recovery chances for species in decline.

Some current rules remain in place, such as a prohibition on harvesting all coral species under federal jurisdiction or engaging in activities that can damage corals, such as anchoring or using certain kinds of fishing gear. Corals are often harvested to feed demand in the aquarium industry.

“This is great news for Caribbean marine life and people there who depend on healthy ocean ecosystems,” says Holly Binns, who leads Pew’s fisheries work in the region. “This new system is a testament to how well our fishery management system works in addressing diverse needs, protecting marine resources, and bolstering coastal economies.”

With the April vote, the Caribbean council is shaping a better future for the region’s people and ecosystems, a forward-looking approach that should pay dividends far into the future.

In Memoriam: Robert G. Williams, 1934–2019

During his tenure on The Pew Charitable Trusts’ board of directors from 1996 until 2016, Robert G. Williams, a banker by profession, brought a steady hand to board governance, particularly as chair of Pew’s compensation and audit committees. His service to Pew spanned periods of global financial challenges, including the dot-com bubble of the late 1990s and the Great Recession of the 2000s, and he is remembered for the professional expertise and thoughtful advice he provided during those times. Mr. Williams passed away on April 26, 2019, in Charleston, South Carolina.

“Bob was a knowledgeable and dedicated steward of Pew’s mission and resources for many years.”

—Rebecca W. Rimel, president and CEO, The Pew Charitable Trusts

Mr. Williams, who was born in Mimico, Canada, near Toronto, received a Bachelor of Science degree from Babson Institute (now Babson College) in 1956 and graduate-level management training from Harvard Business School and the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. He was chairman of the Markel Corp. of Norristown, Pennsylvania, for 12 years, and had previously spent 24 years working at Girard Bank in a variety of positions, ranging from security analyst to vice chairman and director. He also served on numerous for-profit and nonprofit boards in the Philadelphia area, and was a member of the U.S. Army from 1956 to 1958.

Mr. Williams is survived by his wife of 61 years, Rosalind; three daughters; nine grandchildren; and two great-grandchildren.

“Bob was a knowledgeable and dedicated steward of Pew’s mission and resources for many years,” said Rebecca W. Rimel, president and CEO of Pew. “He provided stability and wise counsel during times of change, and he was a person of deep conviction and sound judgment. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to work alongside him in service to the Trusts and its commitment to the public good. Pew’s staff joins me in offering their condolences to Mr. Williams’ family.”

Following his retirement in 2016 from Pew’s board of directors, Mr. Williams was named director emeritus. He had also served on the board of the Glenmede Trust Co. for 25 years, including as chairman, before retiring in 2018.

—Keith Lindblom
Over the past decade, the widespread adoption of electronic health records (EHRs)—digital health information that can be shared among doctors’ offices, hospitals, and other medical facilities—has improved the overall quality and safety of patient care. During the recent measles outbreak, for example, New York University’s Langone Health Network installed alerts in its EHR system to notify doctors and nurses when patients were living in a known outbreak area. The alerts, based on the patient’s ZIP code, helped identify those who might have been exposed to the virus.

Despite their many pluses, however, a recent Pew study shows that challenges remain with systems’ usability and design, and these shortcomings can inadvertently contribute to medical errors. For example, EHRs can display critical data in confusing ways or make it difficult for some users to view colleagues’ notes and other information needed to deliver safe care. Unclear system menus and settings can also lead to treatment mistakes and delays.

These problems are of particular concern for pediatric patients, who often need drug dosages adjusted by their weight or age. Pew’s health information technology project, which strives to improve safety for all patients, worked with three hospital systems to analyze 9,000 pediatric safety events from a five-year period in order to explore how EHR usability can affect the care of children. The study, published in November, found that poor usability contributed to medication errors in more than 3,200 of the incidents reviewed. Almost 1 in 5 of these mistakes affected a child’s care.

In one case, a patient received double the appropriate dose of acetaminophen because the child’s weight was mistakenly entered in pounds when the EHR was configured to record weight in kilograms. In another, an organ-transplant patient ran out of medicine used to prevent organ rejection because of a physician’s confusion with the EHR’s prescription-refill settings. Such real-world views of how these systems can misfire will help health IT administrators and policymakers understand where problems lie, the first critical step to fixing them.

Pew’s health information technology team has recommended steps that federal officials and health care organizations can take to reduce EHR-related safety risks for children and adults alike. “Improved testing of these tools and more public data to evaluate their performance would help hospitals and health IT developers detect and correct problems before patients are harmed,” says Ben Moscovitch, the project’s director.

—Demetra Aposporos
People in Emerging Economies See Pros and Cons to Mobile Phones

Pew Research Center surveys conducted in 11 emerging and developing countries across four global regions find that the vast majority of adults in these countries own or have access to a mobile phone of some kind, and not simply basic devices: A median of 53 percent across these nations now have access to a phone capable of accessing the internet and running apps.

And with access to the devices has come wide use of social media. Across the surveyed countries, a median of 64 percent of adults use at least one of seven social media sites or messaging apps.

In fact, smartphones and social media have melded so thoroughly that for many they go hand in hand. A median of 91 percent of smartphone users in these countries also use social media, while a median of 81 percent of social media users say they own or share a smartphone. (The median is the middle number in a list of figures sorted in ascending or descending order. In a survey of 11 countries, the median result is the sixth figure on a list of country-level findings ranked in order.)

The center interviewed 28,122 adults last September in Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia; South Africa and Kenya; India, Vietnam, and the Philippines; and Tunisia, Jordan, and Lebanon. The researchers sought middle-income emerging economies with a variety of regional, political, economic, social, cultural, population size, and geographic conditions as part of the center’s expanding exploration of online connectivity in emerging economies.

“The rapid advancement of the mobile-social package invites people to think about the role of these devices in their lives and to look around and see how they might be affecting their societies,” says Lee Rainie, director of the center’s internet and technology research.

“On the positive side, people in these nations say they reap personal benefits from the spread of mobile phones, including the capacity to stay in touch with far-flung family and friends and obtain news about important issues. Yet, fewer say mobile phones and social media are bringing the same level of benefit to their societies, and a key flashpoint of their concern is the impact of mobile connectivity on children.”

Some 79 percent of adults in these countries said people should be very concerned about children being exposed to harmful or immoral content when using mobile phones, and a median of 63 percent said mobile phones have had a bad influence on children in their country. They also expressed mixed opinions about the impact of increased connectivity on physical health and morality.

—Daniel LeDuc

### Mobile phones viewed as having a more positive personal, societal impact than social media in 11 emerging economies

Percent of adults who say _____ have mostly been a good/bad thing...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For me personally</th>
<th>For society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAD THING</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOOD THING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>63%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of adult mobile phone users who say their phone is something that...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ties them down</th>
<th>Frees them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Makes them waste time</th>
<th>Helps them save time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>They don’t always need</th>
<th>They couldn’t live without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pew Research Center
Three Views of One America

Americans’ perspectives vary by whether they live in cities, suburbs, or rural areas. But they also have much in common.

By Steve Hendrix
Photography by Nima Taradji for The Pew Charitable Trusts
In this age of discord, it is one of the key questions before the country. As protest politics, Twitterized incivility, and 24-hour televised bickering tug at the fabric of the nation, the straining seams are to be found here, between the urban, suburban, and rural areas where Americans live day to day. Along these lines, the ongoing shifts in the country’s demographic plates—with a population growing more numerous, diverse, and older—are playing out in different ways.

After the contentious 2016 elections, analysts at the Pew Research Center set out to learn how much of the cacophony was the political noise of cable news and social media, and how much was being felt by people where they live.

“We know there are real divisions, but we wanted to know how much of that is rooted in partisanship and how much in communities,” says Kim Parker, the center’s director of social trends and head of the team that compiled the report, “What Unites and Divides Urban, Suburban and Rural Communities.”

The nationally representative survey of 6,251 adults was conducted online over two weeks in 2018 using Pew’s American Trends Panel. The results showed widening gaps on some hot-button social issues and disparities in economic prospects, but also deep similarities in how people in cities, suburbs, and rural areas view their reliance on family and neighbors and the sense of attachment they feel to their communities.

Cities like Milwaukee, where about 46 percent of residents are white, are on the leading edge of racial and ethnic change. Immigrants and migrants from other parts of the country are flowing to city neighborhoods and to faster-growing suburbs. Many newcomers also are arriving from rural areas, where the departure of young people seeking better jobs has led to smaller growth and lower economic hopes. Cities and suburbs have swelled by 13 percent and 16 percent, respectively, since 2000, while rural populations grew just 3 percent, according to the center’s analysis of census data for the report.

In some ways, the shifts may have fostered a sense of division among people who live in different communities, with roughly two-thirds or more of people in cities and rural areas feeling misunderstood by people in other types of communities. According to the center’s survey, 58 percent of rural residents say city dwellers don’t share their values; 53 percent of urbanites also see a rural-urban divide on values.

“I’ve had people ask me, ‘Aren’t you afraid to live in the city? Why would you choose that? How could you send your kids to city schools?’” says Barb Scotty, 55, a longtime Milwaukee resident who lives in a century-old house within walking distance of her job at a community redevelopment nonprofit. “I feel like we truly live in a bubble sometimes.”
Almost 200 miles north, in a barnyard filled with the babble of chickens and the grunts of pigs, Joel Kuehnhold recalls a suburban visitor who marveled at how much time he spent chatting with drop-by neighbors. She was amazed at a dynamic that he considers fundamental to life in a place where the nearest health care is a 40-minute ambulance ride away. “I think we share a lot of the same values, but sometimes you have to scratch the surface to find them,” he says.

Pew analysts did find some similarities among residents across communities, with inhabitants of all three reporting regular communication with neighbors, a sense of attachment to where they live, and the importance of family connections. They have many of the same concerns. Drug addiction is a worry for many, with 50 percent of urbanites and 46 percent of rural dwellers citing it as a major local problem.

“There are real differences in these communities, particularly when it comes to views on controversial social issues,” Parker says. “But when it comes to how people live their day-to-day lives, their values are really very similar.”

It was with that mix in mind that Linda Edelstein, 56, addressed her Rotary meeting in Elm Grove. Edelstein, who runs the Milwaukee Youth Symphony Orchestra in a converted Schlitz Brewing Co. warehouse, has roots in the city where she spent her childhood and deep ties in Waukesha County, where she moved after college and has lived for 25 years. Like most of the Rotarians who gather each Friday morning, Edelstein is upbeat, energetic, and ready to see the best in her fellow Green Bay Packers fans, wherever in Wisconsin they live. Unlike urban and rural residents, a majority of suburbanites say people from other areas have a positive view of suburbanites.

Edelstein put the question directly to her club. “Are we more united or divided,” she asked. “Let’s see a show of hands.”

Many in urban, suburban, and rural areas are longtime residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have lived in local community for 11+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would move if given the chance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pew Research Center

Most Americans like where they live. The Pew survey found that only a quarter of rural residents would move if given a chance, and roughly a third of suburban and urban people say the same. Rural folk are the most rooted, with about half (47 percent) living in or near the places where they grew up. But substantial shares in all three communities have lived where they live for more than a decade. And for many, family connections are a key; more Americans point to family ties than to any other reason for staying in a community or coming back after an absence.
Barb Scotty chose Milwaukee for a professional internship 30 years ago in part because her Aunt Kathy lived there. She grew up and went to college in Champaign, Illinois, but now can’t imagine leaving the big city life that she and her husband, Brian, built here and that is the only one her two kids have ever known. Her aunt has passed away. But her Uncle Bill is a frequent dinner guest, and on a recent spring night he joined them and their son Ben for roast pork and craft beer.

“The only move I could think of making would be to another neighborhood in Milwaukee,” Scotty says.

Like 7 in 10 urbanites around the country, Scotty says living in a racially and ethnically diverse community is important to her. Her neighborhood, Historic Concordia, is largely white. But her workdays are a kaleidoscopic mix of races, ethnicities, and economic classes.

Walking to lunch from her nonprofit office—where the director and a majority of the staff are African-American—she headed down a street lined with cut-rate phone stores and Latino day care. “Immigrants and Refugees Welcome” read a banner over Central United Methodist Church.

One of Scotty’s favorite spots is Daddy’s, a soul-food buffet that draws cornbread and greens seekers of all races from around the city. “It’s kind of a melting pot,” Scotty says, nursing an iced tea. “It’s like the Jewish deli of North Avenue.”

A friendly chatterer, Scotty has befriended the black couple—Angela and Bennie Smith—who opened the restaurant in 2014 with $5,000 in savings and $10,000 in low-interest incubator financing. Judging by the lunchtime line, the work has paid off.

“This is the right place for us,” says Angela Smith, 47, over the crunch of fried chicken and the crooning of Sam Cooke.

Smith has lived in Milwaukee since she moved with her family from Chicago and still has two brothers and a sister here. Her part of the city, historically black Bronzeville, is shifting as younger white residents move in. But she likes the changes—“We’re getting more variety of people and shops”—and reports knowing almost all her immediate neighbors.

That’s not so common in cities overall, where the center’s survey found that only 24 percent of residents say they know all or most of their neighbors, compared with 28 percent in suburbs and 4 in 10 in rural areas.

Top: Angela Smith and her husband, Bennie, own Daddy’s Soul Food & Grille, a popular buffet in a racially and ethnically diverse neighborhood in Milwaukee.

Middle: Pigs and chicken feed at Lonely Oak Farm.

Bottom: Gary Larsen lives in Wisconsin Rapids, a rural area that’s a three-hour drive from Milwaukee. The town has seen a decline in the number of farming and paper mill jobs—and in the number of employed adults ages 25-54. But Larsen and his wife, Paddy, say they can’t imagine living anywhere else.
Folks outside of cities are also more trusting of their neighbors, with about 6 in 10 residents of suburbs and rural areas saying they have a neighbor they would trust with a key to their house; 48 percent of urbanites say that, including Smith.

“This is Milwaukee,” Smith says. “You lock your doors.”

Still, her restaurant experience has helped her connect with Wisconsinites of all types, including those from suburbs and farms.

“If they see Angela from Milwaukee, they just think inner-city gun violence,” she says. “If they see Angela the business operator, that’s when we relate. Running a business is hard no matter where you live.”

Smith and Scotty are both part of another common urban pattern: feeling good about their kids’ future job prospects. That’s in part because most of their children are in or bound for college and partly because cities and suburbs are outstripping rural areas on some economic measures. The average earnings per worker in urban areas was $49,515 in 2016, according to the Pew report, followed by $46,081 in the suburbs and $35,171 in rural areas, although these figures don’t account for differences in housing and other costs.

While most Americans worry about making ends meet—majorities in all three community types say they don’t currently have enough income to live the lives they want—optimism about the future is higher in the cities and suburbs, especially among those with a college degree.

Smith feels like her children’s prospects are brighter than her own were as a young person. Two of her daughters live and work in Milwaukee and a third is about to start at Boston’s Emerson College with plans to become a journalist. Smith doesn’t know if she’ll come back home after but knows she’ll have choices. “I think the sky is the limit for her,” she says.

Among adults who say they don’t currently have enough income to live the life they want, about half of those with at least a bachelor’s degree think they eventually will, whether they are in cities (53 percent), rural areas (53 percent), or suburbs (58 percent). But for those without a degree, optimism drops off, especially in rural areas where only about a third of people who are currently dissatisfied with their financial situation say they expect to be better off in the future (compared with 46 percent of suburbanites and 44 percent in urban areas).

Three hours’ drive north of Milwaukee, Gary Larsen knows how much more difficult it has become to make a living, with or without a degree, in the heart of rural Wisconsin. Many of his friends from high school have decided against taking over their family dairy operations as farming becomes more concentrated in large landholdings. And the once-robust string of paper mills along the Wisconsin River has shrunk.

Larsen, who moved to the town of Wisconsin Rapids when he was boy, didn’t finish college—“My four years in the Navy were my degree”—but started work as a cable installer in 1986. Almost 34 years later, long after cable morphed into fiber optics and internet services, he’s close to retiring as a manager. His wife, Paddy, an art teacher in two rural schools in different parts of surrounding Wood County, has a master’s degree. Their daughter also has a degree in art and is a new mother living on a nearby farm. Their son, who didn’t go to college, lives at home and works at a McDonald’s.

“He seems content with that,” Larsen says, driving past one of the closed paper mills that once provided both union scale and middle-management jobs. Unlike suburbs and cities where the number of employed adults ages 25-54 has risen since 2000, rural areas saw a decline, Pew found.

The Larsens live on a creek only a few hundred yards from his 84-year-old mother. As retirement approaches, he and his wife are looking to build a new house, but—like about 40 percent of rural folks interested in moving—they want to stay in their rural setting. Suburbanites who would like to move are similarly inclined to remain in a suburb, while 28 percent of city people would choose a rural area and about 4 in 10 would head for the suburbs.

The Larsens, as much as they love traveling abroad and visiting siblings scattered between Atlanta and Sacramento, California, have no interest in leaving an area rich in natural beauty and family connections.
“The best thing about taking a trip is getting back home again,” Larsen says.

One of their friends is Joel Kuehnhold. On a recent visit to his Lonely Oak Farm, he showed them how a small grower makes it in the changing agricultural economy: The two new litters of pigs he will raise for local restaurants, the 8 acres of vegetable plots to supply his weekly delivery subscribers, the tables set in the barnyard for a seasonal farm brunch scheduled for the next morning. Kuehnhold’s mother, Karen, who lives on the next farm along County Road S, was unpacking coolers on her return from one of their two Saturday farmers markets. Sheep grazed in the pasture.

“‘It’s a three-ring circus,’” says Kuehnhold, whose family has been farming in the county since the 1880s and who is one of 26 percent of rural residents who have always lived where they grew up. “I don’t really want to be this varied, but it’s the only way to keep it going. Every time you see one of those farm auctions, it’s heartbreaking.”

Many of the people who are leaving the farms and small towns of rural areas are heading to the suburbs, site of the country’s fastest growth and some of its most pronounced demographic shifts: The proportion of people 65 and older in suburbs has climbed roughly 40 percent since 2000, compared with 26 percent in cities and 22 percent in rural areas. And suburban areas have experienced the country’s largest increase in people living in poverty since 2000, 51 percent.

Even Waukesha County, one of Wisconsin’s wealthiest jurisdictions, has pockets of food insecurity. Karen Tredwell, a lifelong resident, runs the county Food Pantry, a converted warehouse in a light industrial area. About 5,000 clients a month come for groceries, diapers, and sanitary products, many of them Latino agricultural workers and other immigrants and refugees.

“At one time we counted 17 different languages here,” says Tredwell, as some of her 300 volunteers sorted donated produce and boxed goods around her. Some were preparing boxes nutritionally tailored to older clients, a twice-a-month program they are increasing to once a week.

Tredwell, who has devoted much of her career to building up the Food Pantry, has lived outside the county only while at the university in Madison an hour west. Her fellow suburbanites are generous with their donations and time, she says. County officials recently routed a bus line near the food bank to aide her clients.

---

**About one-in-five adults have always lived in or near the community where they grew up**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent saying they…</th>
<th>Do not live in/near the community where they grew up</th>
<th>Live in/near the community where they grew up</th>
<th>Always lived there</th>
<th>Have lived elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pew Research Center
But in recent years, as politics in Wisconsin and nationally have turned more contentious, some residents have expressed resentment toward her foreign-born clients. The percentage of people who told the Pew researchers that living in a diverse community was important to them is lower in suburbs (59 percent) than in cities (70 percent), and Tredwell says that split is evident in her area.

“There are people in our county who ask us, ‘Why are these people here at all?’” she says.

Among her reliable supporters, though, are local Rotarians. When members of the Elmbrook chapter arrived for their Friday morning meeting, they found a flyer on each table promoting an upcoming food drive for the pantry.

The club is at the center of civic life in the bustling county. Brookfield Mayor Steve Ponto, a member, says his city of 39,000 is having a baby boom even as Wisconsin’s overall birthrate is at a 40-year low. The county is planning a new elementary school, and developers are adding apartments and condos to the makeover of an aging mall.

“People are coming here to start families,” Ponto says. “We’re working to keep up.”

Most of his constituents welcome the changes, he says. When a new mosque was proposed in Brookfield a few years ago, some neighbors complained but most were welcoming.

“The highest polarization tends to be between urban and rural areas,” says Pew’s Parker. “The suburbs tend to balance the two.”

The Rotary meeting’s agenda was a roll call of support for a growing county: a planned Boy Scout outing to a rifle range, a $50,000 fundraiser for local grants, interviews with candidates for need-based scholarships. The meeting opened with a prayer beseeching members “to engage and work with the world and the people around us” and ended with a presentation on the history of discrimination against the Irish in Milwaukee, the immigrants and refugees of an earlier age.

And Edelstein’s poll? Of nearly 90 attendees, only 10 raised their hands to say there are more differences than similarities among those who live in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The rest see more similarities.

Edelstein wasn’t surprised. The positivity of her fellow suburbanites is one reason she has no plans to leave her cul-de-sac of tidy houses and wide lawns.

“It’s home,” she says. “And I need my green grass.”

Steve Hendrix is a staff writer for The Washington Post.

Linda Edelstein, the executive director of the Milwaukee Youth Symphony Orchestra, has ties to both the city of Milwaukee—where she grew up—and to Waukesha County, where she lives now. The past president of the Elmbrook Rotary Club found, when she asked her fellow club members, that the vast majority of them say there are more similarities than differences among urbanites, suburbanites, and people who live in rural areas.
Beneath the raised tracks of Philadelphia's El train lies Kensington Avenue, home to Prevention Point, a clinic working to expand access to medication-assisted treatment for people with opioid use disorder. However, the facility's director—like the staff of other clinics—has found that getting patients access to care is not always easy.
OUT of REACH

THE OPIOID CRISIS AFFECTS THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS IN BIG CITIES AND SMALL TOWNS. MEDICATION-ASSISTED TREATMENT IS A PROVEN WAY TO HELP THEM. BUT THERE ARE OBSTACLES TO GETTING IT NO MATTER WHERE PEOPLE LIVE.

BY TOM INFIELD
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Michaela Dargan, 58, a longtime heroin user, meets with Dr. David Barclay, Prevention Point Philadelphia’s director, to discuss her care. Barclay asks Dargan how she is feeling on MAT, which combines prescription medication with behavioral therapy. “I feel better every week,” she says.

The clamor of loud talking in the hallway dies down only a little as Dr. David Barclay closes his office door at his Philadelphia clinic and sits down to talk with a patient, a slim woman of 58 with freshly painted red nails.

Michaela Dargan, a heroin user since “I don’t remember when,” had dressed up for her appointment. “I wanted to look nice,” she says. Recently homeless, she’s been living temporarily with her daughter. On this May day, she’s been able to stay away from heroin for two weeks.

The doctor has questions, which he asks in a gentle tone: How had she coped at the funeral of a niece who died from an overdose? How is she feeling on the 8 milligrams of the treatment drug buprenorphine that he had prescribed twice a day to block withdrawal sickness and curb opioid cravings? Was she following through with the counseling he had ordered?

Dargan’s answers are all positive. But she’s concerned about having to go to Baltimore soon to deal with a troublesome family matter. Would the doctor give her a two-week supply of medication? Barclay replies, yes, “if you have another good week like this.”

As medical director of Prevention Point Philadelphia, a clinic located in the city’s deeply impoverished Kensington neighborhood, Barclay is working to break down barriers to medication-assisted treatment (MAT)—which combines U.S. Food and Drug Administration-approved medication with behavioral therapy—for opioid use disorder. The U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration says this “whole-patient” approach sustains long-term recovery for people who have developed the disorder. But medication-assisted treatment is not always available to those who need it—not in big cities overwhelmed with opioid misuse, not in rural areas where the problem may be just as real but where services are few and far between.

In Philadelphia, 1,116 people died in 2018 from overdoses, many caused by fentanyl, a cheap and dangerous heroin substitute that has nearly swept real heroin off the streets. Around the country, nearly 48,000 people died from opioid overdoses in 2017—about 130 people a day. Deaths were attributed to the use of prescription pain relievers, including oxycodone and hydrocodone, as well as the illicit use of drugs like heroin and fentanyl. Opioid misuse has become a national crisis, affecting all economic and social classes.

In Barclay’s view, medication-assisted treatment works for heroin users, among the poorest of the poor, whom he sees at the Kensington clinic. And it works for the patients he treats at his private family practice in central Philadelphia, some of them college students or recent college graduates who became dependent on pain relievers initially prescribed for surgery or sports injuries.

At his clinic desk, next to the eye chart and physician’s scale, Barclay has a photocopy of his letter to the editor...
IN PHILADELPHIA, 1,116 PEOPLE DIED IN 2018 FROM OVERDOSES, MANY CAUSED BY FENTANYL, A CHEAP AND DANGEROUS HEROIN SUBSTITUTE THAT HAS NEARLY SWEPT REAL HEROIN OFF THE STREETS.

Pew’s substance use prevention and treatment initiative has been working to increase access to MAT. “Medication-assisted treatment is the best way to care for opioid use disorder because it ultimately saves lives,” says Beth Connolly, who directs the Pew initiative. “It helps individuals adhere to treatment longer, reduces illicit drug use and infectious disease transmission, and decreases overdose deaths better than either medications or behavioral therapies alone.”

But barriers to this treatment remain rooted in many places, both in heavily populated urban areas and in more rural sections of the nation.

As director of New Jersey’s Department of Human Services from 2015 to 2018, Connolly oversaw the fight against opioid deaths in the nation’s most densely populated state—one that, nonetheless, still has large rural areas, including the blueberry farmlands, pine woods, and marshes of inland southern counties.

“In urban areas, services might seem more available, but the number of people seeking those services often outweighs the capacity,” she says. “In addition, high rents and other overhead may make it cost-prohibitive for provider agencies, since Medicaid and private insurance reimbursements tend to be low.”

“In rural areas, by contrast, the population is geographically dispersed and the lack of public transportation can make it difficult, if not impossible, for people who need treatment to access it,” Connolly says. “There’s also a general lack of treatment providers in rural areas.”

People wait to see Dr. Barclay at Prevention Point. The clinic focuses on delivering MAT to those with opioid use disorder in an intensive outpatient program.
IN RURAL AREAS, THE LACK OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CAN MAKE IT DIFFICULT, IF NOT IMPOSSIBLE, FOR PEOPLE WHO NEED TREATMENT TO ACCESS IT.
But cost and proximity aren’t the only obstacles. Social stigma plays a role in hindering treatment access—stigma felt not just by people with substance use disorders, but also by doctors.

“One of the big barriers to medically-assisted treatment is getting providers to deliver this service,” Barclay says. “In all honesty, a lot of physicians don’t want this kind of patient in their office. There’s a bias that the patients are going to somehow not behave like the rest of the folks who are there.”

Patients themselves say that medical offices often won’t accept their Medicaid coverage or other insurance—or can’t be bothered with the hassles of obtaining the pre-authorizations for coverage. One of Barclay’s patients in Philadelphia, Michael Weidner, says that when he was ready to seek treatment for his addiction to opioids, he struggled to find a doctor. Eight or nine months elapsed before a social agency caseworker pointed him to Prevention Point.

“Some places didn’t take my insurance because I’m Medicare-Medicaid,” he says. “Or the wait was three months. Or the cash doctors—the fee was $200 every month, and that was after the hit of $300 or $400 for the first visit. A lot of paperwork went with it.”

In rural areas, the distances that individuals may have to travel to gain access to a treatment center is only one obstacle. Another may be the long waiting period when they get there.

When a longtime opioid user makes the hard decision to get help, that help should be immediate, says Amanda Leese, regional director of Safe Return, a re-entry program operated by Volunteers of America for ex-offenders in New Jersey.

“Imagine being years in an addiction, and you finally agree to get help, and you walk into an office, and someone tells you that you have to wait five days,” Leese says.

Her Safe Return colleague Ja’Net Dingle, program director at the Sewell, New Jersey, office, 60 miles outside Philadelphia, adds, “Saying ‘wait’ may sound like ‘no,’ and the user won’t come back.”

When a patient finally gets in the door, the first step in treatment may be detoxification. To get a South Jersey person seeking help into immediate detox, Safe Return sometimes resorts to driving him or her to northern New Jersey and Bergen New Bridge Medical Center, 102 miles from Sewell. This happens often enough that New Jersey Transit Police have been recruited to help as drivers.

But once in treatment, patients say medication helps greatly. Dave Murri, who lives amid rural surroundings in Vineland, New Jersey, says medication-assisted treatment is working for him, so far.

A former construction contractor, Murri says he lost his business and landed in jail on drug charges after getting hooked on opioid medication for lumbar pain in his back. He was buying large quantities of Percocet, spending “sometimes $400 to $500 a day.” He switched to heroin, he says, because it was “a lot cheaper, probably $30 to $40 a day.”

The last time he used opioids, Murri says, was Aug. 1, 2018, the day he went into the Gloucester County Correctional Facility for a parole violation. Just before he was released in December, he was given a naltrexone shot to help him remain clean while he looked for a treatment program.

But finding a program isn’t easy if you don’t have the money for the doctor every month, he says. It took Volunteers of America to help him locate a doctor.

That doctor is in Northfield, New Jersey, 30 miles from Murri’s home, near Atlantic City. He has to go there only every other Tuesday. But he holds a job and has to “leave work two hours early every time.”

Murri says he is determined to make treatment work. The buprenorphine the doctor gives him “takes a good hour and a half to kick in,” he says. His normal

Dave Murri, a former construction contractor from Vineland, New Jersey, became addicted to the opioid medication used to treat his lumbar pain. After moving on to the much cheaper heroin, Murri lost his business and wound up in jail. There, he was given a naltrexone shot before his release. Determined to remain drug-free, Murri says that MAT is working for him.
Trust

fatalities declined by 8 percent last year. Benitez thinks that the widening availability of MAT, combined with the emergency overdose medication naloxone, often known by its commercial name, Narcan, is making a difference. (See related story on Page 34.)

Prevention Point operates a mobile clinic—a specially equipped van—to get out of Kensington and take help to neighborhoods all over the city. From the van, staff members directly invite users to accept treatment. Staffers can provide users with on-the-spot initial access to medication and then direct them to the clinic.

Meeting the van was how Michaela Dargan was introduced to Prevention Point—and to Barclay. “I was on the street, actually homeless, and I was walking down the street, and the truck was there,” she says. “I was sick, and they said that they would make sure I had Suboxone [a trade name for buprenorphine] that day.”

Her thinking, she remembers, was to just take the one dose of medication to get through the day. “I wasn’t going to be in no program. I didn’t want to stop or nothing. I just wanted to get well.”

But a Prevention Point staffer kept after her, she says. She knows him just as Andrew, and she says of him: “Andrew is relentless. I was going to die out there, but he got me hooked up with treatment.”

“I feel better and better every week,” she says, “and I’m going to try and make it.”

Tom Infield is a longtime Philadelphia journalist.
As the internet becomes increasingly intertwined with daily life, millions of Americans, from rural areas to inner cities, still lack access to high-speed broadband service. But states are finding ways to make new connections.
From the comfort of their homes to the nearest coffee shop, Americans expect—and rely—on internet access being available almost wherever they go.

But the Federal Communications Commission estimates that more than 21 million people in the United States don’t have that connection. That includes nearly 3 in 10 people—27 percent—who live in such rural places as the outreaches of Maine and the fertile fields of Indiana, as well as 2 percent of those living in cities.

Research shows that 40 percent of schools lack broadband, as do 60 percent of health care facilities outside metropolitan areas.

And those estimates are on the low side. Other research, including analysis from Microsoft, suggests that the number of Americans without broadband—that’s internet access with download speeds of at least 25 megabytes per second (Mbps) and upload speeds of at least 3 Mbps—could be over 163 million.

And at a time when broadband access has become increasingly essential, any community without fast, reliable internet is condemned “to a long, dark death,” says Peggy Schaffer, executive director of Maine’s ConnectME Authority, which is working to extend service in the state.

Think about it, Schaffer says. Without broadband, “Kids can’t do homework. Older people have to drive off our islands to talk to a doctor. Boats delivering live lobsters from the ocean that can’t ‘talk’ in real time to their customers lose a competitive edge in the supply chain. Before long, young families, older citizens, and jobs leave. New employers don’t come in.”

Cost is one obstacle to extending broadband internet to everyone who wants it. The companies providing the services need adequate returns to justify their investment in the necessary fiber, towers, and cables. And at the other end of the supply-demand equation, many low-income Americans lack access because they cannot afford the monthly bills that come with connecting a computer to high-speed internet.

The Pew Research Center reported in May that 44 percent of adults in households with incomes below $30,000 don’t have broadband. This disparity in access is also seen in what researchers call the “homework gap”—the differences between school-age children who have access to high-speed internet at home and those who don’t. A 2015 center report found that 35 percent of lower-income households with children in school didn’t have a broadband connection at home.

“Without broadband, kids are left behind,” says Schaffer.

Even with the wide discrepancy in estimates on the extent of the digital divide, state leaders are seeing the need for more access in many communities and working to make connections.

“States have employed a range of policies and practices to achieve the ‘last mile’ of high-speed connection—the link to homes, schools, businesses, and others who still need access,” says Kathryn de Wit, who manages Pew’s broadband research initiative. “It has spurred creativity at the state and local level, as well as in the private sector, in Maine and across the country.”
Policymakers in rural and urban states alike are creating new approaches, including building partnerships between public and private entities and using grants from foundations to bring broadband to more sparsely populated places.

Small providers “pop up in places large internet companies don’t serve,” says Shirley Bloomfield, CEO of NTCA-The Rural Broadband Association, a membership organization of nearly 850 small providers in 45 states. “Hometown phone companies expanding into this market offer broadband to as few as a hundred neighbors.”

The experience in Maine shows that it takes a lot of effort—and persistence—to close the last mile of connection.

“Building momentum toward a community-based broadband solution is like building a political campaign,” says Mark Ouellette, president of Axiom, a small internet provider with 10 employees in Machias, Maine, not far from the Canadian border. “Three rules help us gauge progress. First: You need local champions to rally support. With their help we can discuss the community’s goals, do surveys, and hold meetings that explain options. My second rule mirrors a Lady Gaga song: There are a hundred million reasons to walk away; you need one good reason to stay. There’s always some resistance. It can be overcome with a good set of goals aimed at revitalizing the community. The third rule: Resist talking about cost till your champions and goals are in place.”

He says that approach helped get high-speed internet to Cranberry Isles, off Maine’s coast near Bar Harbor. “Broadband now enables better fire and police service, induced more families to remain on the islands, and increased tourism there. Tourists stay longer when they can work online and use email,” Ouellette says. “High-speed internet in Cranberry Isles costs subscribers $69 a month for an upload speed of 25 Mbps and helps the community maintain its way of life. One seasonal resident told me it’s faster, cheaper service than he has in Brooklyn.”

In Indiana, large-scale farmers have paid to bring broadband to their farms—often with help from seed manufacturers and data management companies that, like the farmers, rely on high-speed internet for modern, precision agriculture.

Farmers can get a cellphone warning late at night that a fence was breached and from bed know exactly where, and how many cattle to round up. Internet data also tells the temperature inside livestock barns, and how much water and feed is being consumed in each, such that the farmer can diagnose illness before symptoms show and disease spreads,” says Justin Schneider, who directs state government relations for the Indiana Farm Bureau. And he notes, “These efficiencies ultimately benefit the consumer by lowering costs.”

But Indiana has plenty of small and midsize farming operations that can’t afford to pay for bringing in high-speed internet themselves. They could be getting help soon from $100 million that state leaders set aside this year to help jump-start installation of fiber-optic cable in rural Indiana.

A Purdue University agriculture economist analyzed the costs and benefits of broadband installation within the service territories of seven electric cooperatives and extrapolated the findings to the entire state. The economist’s report, which helped spur the new funding, said:

“Every dollar invested in broadband returns nearly 4 dollars to the economy. It’s unusual to see returns that significant. The finding of a 4:1 return validates the opportunity that could be created by full broadband deployment in Indiana, where 93,000 people within just the seven electric cooperative areas are without it.”

Other states are trying to be equally inventive.

In 2010, North Carolina’s Golden LEAF Foundation, created by the state Legislature and funded from the national settlement with cigarette makers, distributed $24 million that, along with federal funds and assistance from a nonprofit internet provider, paid for 2,600 miles of fiber cable to link 83 of the state’s 100 counties. Access points connect public schools, state universities, community colleges, and some public libraries. That, says Jeffrey Sural, director of North Carolina’s Broadband Infrastructure Office, gives “all state students equal footing as far as internet is concerned.”

North Carolina also employs teams of technical advisers in specific regions to work with local leaders and help them get service. The teams have sample ordinances that towns can use for legal issues, such as hanging wireless equipment on municipal water towers and other tools for local officials to seek and evaluate bids from internet providers. But expansion often comes down to how much will providing service cost and who will pay for it. And, as Sural notes, “Cable is labor intensive and not cheap.”

Even as states try to expand access, their efforts underline one key tool in solving the connectivity gap.

“What policymakers need is a comprehensive overview of what’s been tried and what’s been successful, so they can continue to learn from one another,” says de Wit.

Pew’s broadband research initiative is aiming to do just that. The initiative—launched in 2018—is working to identify promising state practices that address gaps in connectivity. Early indications from the research suggest that most states have begun to address broadband access: Some are creating a state task force, others are collecting data about connectivity, and still others are allocating funding for expansion efforts. But the research also shows that these efforts vary from state to state, with communities tailoring approaches to fit their unique needs.

The enthusiasm for these expansion efforts, says Pew’s de Wit, shows that policymakers understand the promise of high-speed, reliable internet access.

“We all have a stake in building communities that will thrive in the future. In today’s economy, making high-speed internet more available will give more Americans new opportunities.”

Joyce Winslow is a Washington-based writer.
Most Americans take supplements; FDA should know something about them

BY ALLAN COUKELL

Most American adults take at least one dietary supplement daily—products that include vitamins, herbs, botanicals, or amino acids, among other ingredients. But not all of them are safe. Between 2004 and 2013, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) received more than 15,000 reports of health problems linked to supplements, including 339 deaths and nearly 4,000 hospitalizations. These figures likely represent only a small fraction of the harm caused by unsafe supplements.

So it came as welcome news in February when, a few weeks before revealing his plans to leave his post, FDA Commissioner Scott Gottlieb announced the agency’s intention to strengthen its oversight of supplements. The announcement described the most significant changes in 25 years to the agency’s approach to supplements, including the creation of a new tool to quickly notify the public about safety concerns with products or ingredients; an update to the system for manufacturers to submit notifications of new ingredients; the establishment of a public-private partnership to evaluate the safety of botanical ingredients; and the continuation of enforcement actions against unlawful claims and ingredients.

Dr. Gottlieb also announced that the agency will engage in a public dialogue about potentially updating the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act (DSHEA), the 1994 law that governs FDA’s authority over supplements. Specifically, he described the possibility of an amendment instituting a product listing requirement, under which manufacturers would have to share with FDA certain information about each of their products.

Building on this statement, President Donald Trump’s fiscal year 2020 budget request includes a legislative proposal that would require all products marketed as dietary supplements to be listed with FDA. This would enable the agency to know what products are being sold, and thereby be able to act more effectively against unsafe supplements. The proposal is one of the strongest signals the administration can send on its support for product listing.

Enactment of the proposal would be a hugely beneficial change for FDA. Right now, the agency doesn’t even know how many products are being sold:

Dr. Gottlieb’s announcement cited a range between “more than 50,000—and possibly as many as 80,000 or even more.”

A product listing requirement would provide a comprehensive picture of what products are on the market and would enable FDA to direct its resources and expertise toward supplements with greater potential to harm consumers. It would also give retailers a mechanism to ensure that the supplements they sell are known to FDA and subject to the agency’s oversight.

Mandatory product listing would also enhance FDA’s ability to respond effectively to emerging safety concerns. If the agency learned that an ingredient was dangerous, it could easily identify all listed supplements that contain it and take actions such as warning consumers or mandating a recall.

When DSHEA was enacted a quarter century ago about 4,000 supplements were on the market; now there may be 20 times that many. Supplements have ballooned into a $40 billion industry, but FDA has no mechanism to know what retailers are selling.

Acting commissioner Ned Sharpless, along with agency staff, should continue the conversation that Dr. Gottlieb began around amending DSHEA, giving priority to mandatory product listing. And Congress should pass legislation to give FDA the authority to collect basic information about each item on the market, such as its name, ingredients, and label. Americans look to FDA to ensure the safety of these products. It must have the tools it needs.

Allan Coukell is senior director of health programs at The Pew Charitable Trusts. A version of this article first appeared online in The Hill on March 29, 2019.
After more than a decade surveying trends in the world’s religions, the Pew Research Center this year took the measure of religion in a novel way. Pew researchers asked over 30,000 adults in 27 countries if religion plays a “more important role or a less important role” than it did 20 years ago. It then asked respondents who said religion played a “more important role,” “less important role,” or “no change” how they felt about its perceived waning or waxing status in their country. An additional question asked how important religion is in respondents’ own lives.

“This is the first time we asked it this way,” says Jacob Poushter, the center’s associate director for global attitudes research.

Overall, a median of 37 percent across the 27 nations polled sees religion playing a less important role than it did 20 years ago, while 27 percent say its role today is more important. At the same time, significantly more favor an increased role for religion in their countries (39 percent) than the 13 percent who oppose it. Twenty-two percent favored no change.

Medians never tell the whole story, of course. The survey, released in April, saw religion declining in stature in North America and Europe, popular in parts of Africa and Asia, and split elsewhere. Such omnidirectional findings “show just how difficult it is to draw global-level conclusions about religiosity,” says Stephen Schneck, recently retired director of the Institute for Policy Research and Catholic Studies at the Catholic University of America.

Likewise, says Schneck, the widely different perceptions of religion within certain regions and continents—even in neighboring countries such as Argentina and Brazil—reveal “just how much religion’s stature is culturally dependent.”

Titled “A Changing World,” the survey also asked respondents their views on diversity, gender equality, and the state of the family. “We wanted to track how people are responding to changes in their society,” Poushter explains. “Basically we were asking, ‘Is your country changing faster than you’re comfortable with?’”

Responses to the first three questions were clear and relatively consistent. Around 7 in 10 respondents report their countries are becoming more diverse and say gender equality has increased over the past 20 years. Roughly 6 in 10 across the countries surveyed say that family ties have weakened.

Religion, on the other hand “was the most complex question of the four,” says Poushter.

North American and European respondents were especially likely to see religion playing a diminished role. That’s the view of 58 percent of Americans, 64 percent of Canadians, and a median of 52 percent in Western Europe.

Broadly, older adults and those who describe themselves as religious are more likely to favor a greater role for religion. In the United States, 61 percent of adults over age 50 favor a greater role, while just 39 percent of those 18 to 29 agree.

Adults in the Asia-Pacific region are markedly split, meanwhile, on the role religion plays in their societies. Eighty-three percent of Indonesians—the highest response in the survey—say it plays a greater role today, and 58 percent of Filipinos and 54 percent of Indians agree.

Those positive views don’t hold for other parts of the Pacific, however. Sixty-three percent of Australians say religion is less important nowadays, even as 56 percent of Japanese say they see no change in its status, while South Koreans are roughly divided. There, 37 percent of respondents report a diminished role, 25 percent see an increase, and 34 percent report no change in the role of religion.

“What we see [in some developed nations] is a polarized view of religion, with one side viewing it as a repository of moral values that ought to be tapped, and the other side seeing it as conservative and repressive,” observes David Voas, professor and chair of social science at University College, London, and a leading sociologist of religion.

Yet even as religion loses stature in developed nations, Voas notes that religious identity “is becoming very important as a social divide as a result of large-scale immigration” and as a code word, oftentimes, for
ethnic “otherness.” This phenomenon, he says, makes some trends difficult to decipher.

When half of Swedes say, for example, that they oppose any enhanced role for religion, “is it a populist reaction to the country’s very large number of Muslim refugees?” and fear of an enhanced role for Shariah, Voas asks. “Or is it that people in Sweden take a broad view of identity, and that one’s religion should not matter?”

(The survey saw a correlation between those unwelcoming of diversity and those who want less immigration, says Poushter, although this finding was not included in the report.)

Religious identity and practice tends to run high, meanwhile, across the sub-Saharan African countries surveyed, where 60 percent of Kenyans see a growing role for religion. So do 65 percent of adults in Nigeria, with 88 percent of its Muslim population favoring a more important role for religion. Sixty-one percent of Nigerian Christians agree. Notably, 96 percent of Nigerians and 93 percent of Kenyans say religion is very important in their lives.

In South America, however, two of the continent’s largest nations diverge sharply. Fifty-one percent of Brazilian adults see religion playing a more important role today, whereas only 27 percent of their next-door neighbors in Argentina agree.

Voas and Schneck say they wished the survey question on religion’s importance had asked respondents to clarify if they were describing its place in their personal lives or in society’s.

It was “left up to the respondent” to decide what the question means, explains Poushter, but notes the survey separately asked respondents to rate religion’s importance in their own lives. When correlated, he says, the data show that respondents describing themselves as religious are much likelier to welcome a greater role for religion.

In Australia, for instance, 69 percent of those who say religion is very important in their lives favor a larger role for religion in society, compared with just 25 percent of those who say religion is less important to them personally.

Respondents were interviewed over telephone in more economically advanced countries, says Poushter, and the rest “face-to-face in their homes.”

“In the past, even secular people saw religion at a minimum as a benign force, one that makes people honest and trustworthy and well behaved,” says Voas. “But now there’s a feeling around the world that religion might bring more conflict than peace. And closer to home it’s sometimes associated with policy positions we just don’t like. So it’s become more controversial.

“Then, as an overlay, there’s the fact that ethnically religious minority groups are moving into [formerly homogeneous] Western countries, and people are seeing religion as a highly salient social division.

“So you can take the view that religion and race should not be important—that it’s private, and everyone is equal and should be celebrated. No need to get exercised about our differences. Or you can take the view that our national identities are being undermined by ‘these people’ coming in, and that’s a bad thing.

“So for all these reasons religion is not simple,” says Voas. “It has different aspects and ways it can be seen as a positive or negative force.”

David O’Reilly is the former religion reporter for The Philadelphia Inquirer.
New Naloxone Laws Seek to Prevent Opioid Overdoses

BY CHRISTINE VESTAL

It’s increasingly likely that someone you know has the opioid overdose rescue drug naloxone in their pocket or medicine cabinet. In fact, a new mobile app, NaloxoFind, will tell you whether anyone nearby is carrying the lifesaving drug.

In the past five years, at least 46 states and the District of Columbia enacted so-called good Samaritan laws, allowing private citizens to administer the overdose-reversal medication without legal liability. And all but four states—Connecticut, Idaho, Nebraska, and Oregon—have called on pharmacies to provide the easy-to-administer medication to anyone who wants it without a prescription, according to the Network for Public Health Law.

But a handful of states are going even further by requiring doctors to give or at least offer a prescription for the overdose rescue drug to patients taking high doses of opioid painkillers.

New naloxone co-prescribing laws in Arizona, California, Florida, Ohio, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia and Washington state also call on doctors to discuss the dangers of overdose with these high-risk patients. Tennessee lawmakers this year passed a similar bill, which is awaiting the governor’s signature.

Patients are free to decide whether to fill the naloxone prescription. But pain doctors who endorse
the initiative say that even if patients don’t fill their prescriptions for naloxone, the offer of a rescue drug underscores the dangers of long-term opioid use and creates a “teachable moment.”

“By offering a naloxone prescription to a patient, the physician is saying, ‘I’m so concerned this medication might kill you that you need an antidote in the house, so a family member can rescue you.’ That gets their attention,” said Andrew Kolodny, co-director of the Opioid Policy Research Collaborative at Brandeis University and director of Physicians for Responsible Opioid Prescribing, an organization that promotes safe painkiller prescribing.

Legal experts say these new laws—which have been endorsed by the federal government as well as the medical community—are likely to spread.

Last April, U.S. Surgeon General Jerome Adams recommended widespread use of naloxone, and since then, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has called on physicians to co-prescribe naloxone to patients taking relatively high doses of opioid painkillers and to educate patients on the risk of overdose.

In 2016, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a bill, the Co-Prescribing to Reduce Opioid Overdoses Act, that ultimately was included in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016. Although never funded, it would have provided $5 million in federal grants to support co-prescribing naloxone.

In addition, an advisory committee to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration voted in December to recommend that all physicians co-prescribe naloxone for patients on high doses of opioid pain medications.

People taking more than the equivalent of 50 mg of morphine a day are more than twice as likely to overdose compared with those taking lower doses, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Even physicians, who typically object to government-mandated medical rules, have signed on to the initiative. Following the surgeon general’s directive last year, the American Medical Association announced that it also recommended widespread use of naloxone, and since then, the FDA has called on physicians to co-prescribe naloxone for patients on high doses of naloxone would be needed if all states required physicians to co-prescribe naloxone.

From 1999 to 2017, nearly 218,000 people died in the United States from overdoses related to prescription opioids. (See related story on Page 18.) And in more than 40 percent of those deaths, bystanders were present, yet naloxone was rarely administered by a layperson, the CDC reported based on medical examiner reports.

Ensuring that naloxone gets into the hands of people who are most likely to witness an overdose, namely, the family and friends of people taking long-term, high doses of pain medications, could change that, Kolodny said.

Most often sold as a nasal spray known as Narcan, naloxone was approved by the FDA in 1971. Local drugstores in 2017 sold about 800,000 doses of naloxone to individuals who wanted to be prepared if someone close to them lost consciousness and a drug overdose was suspected.

And thousands of doses have been given away free to anyone who signs up for a quick training session at local health departments, community health centers and harm reduction centers.

Police and fire departments, emergency medical services, schools, harm reduction centers and other nonprofits receive the drug at no cost from manufacturers and purchase additional supplies as needed. The federal government also offers grants to purchase naloxone.

But most naloxone doses go to hospitals, nursing homes, health management organizations, community clinics, prisons and universities, which purchased roughly 5 million units of the drug in 2017, according to market research data analyzed by the FDA.

Requiring all doctors to prescribe naloxone to everyone who takes prolonged high-dose opioid medications would sharply increase the number of naloxone doses in the hands of bystanders and potentially inflate the cost of U.S. health care substantially, some critics have said.

Mary Ellen McCann, a member of the FDA advisory board and associate professor of anesthesia at Harvard Medical School, voted against the co-prescribing proposal. She described co-prescribing as “an expensive way to saturate the population with naloxone,” according to news reports from Reuters and other media outlets.

“I’m concerned about a person going in with a broken arm and ending up with $30 of a codeine product and a [naloxone] autoinjector at $4,000-plus,” she said.

Rather than purchasing an autoinjector, people can choose to buy the much less expensive nasal spray.

Americans filled more than 190 million prescriptions for opioid painkillers in 2017, according to the CDC. If even a fraction of those patients were to fill a prescription for naloxone and give the drug to a designated family member or friend, the number of doses in the hands of average people would skyrocket.

An FDA advisory panel estimated that 48 million more doses of naloxone would be needed if all states required doctors to co-prescribe naloxone for patients on high doses of opioids.

Thom Duddy, vice president of corporate communications for Emergent Biosolutions, the maker of Narcan, said the company is prepared to meet that demand. Already, the company has seen a spike in sales in the states that have enacted co-prescribing laws, he said.

In California, for example, retail sales of the drug more than quadrupled in the first four weeks after the law took effect, according to company sales data.

A two-pack of Narcan costs $125; an off-label nasal spray that requires some assembly costs around $40; and an EpiPen-like dispenser sold as Evzio costs $4,100.

Christine Vestal is a staff writer for Stateline.
How Ken Lum Became an Artist—and What Motivates Him Most

“I have found that a focus on another always feeds back to a better self.”

Philadelphia visual artist Ken Lum, who works in a variety of media from painting and sculpture to photography, was selected as a Pew art fellow in 2018. His work has been included in major exhibitions such as the Sao Paulo Biennial, Documenta 11, the Whitney Biennial, and the Venice Biennale, and he is the chair of fine arts at the School of Design at the University of Pennsylvania. In an interview with the Pew Center for Arts & Heritage, he discussed his path to making contemporary art and the curiosity that continues to drive him.

How did you become an artist? Is there a particular experience that drove you to this choice?

It sounds romantic to say, but I think I always wanted to be an artist. As a child, I would draw endlessly, and I realized early on that I could draw with a facility other children my age could not. I looked at a lot of comic books and tried to invent my own superheroes and villains. Interestingly, the noted painter Kerry James Marshall did likewise. In high school, I was called upon to design the yearbook as well as large posters for sporting events. By undergraduate, I worked part time as an illustrator for the Vancouver Public Library. I also worked part time as a commercial sign painter for stores and cafes near where I lived. So I always engaged in some creative practice of illustrating or painting. I just did not know anything about contemporary art or the art world, thinking that art was basically graphic design or yeoman practices such as sign painting. At some point, I came upon contemporary art. It was purely happenstance but once I did, I never looked back. I knew I had to make the leap to becoming an artist.

What was your first work of art that really mattered to you?

Early on in high school, I made an elaborately drawn landscape of strange flora and fauna that I spent several weeks on. It was a project for art class. My art teacher at the time admonished me for what he felt was misbehaved art. He accused me of not following his guidelines. He described my drawing as just weird.

He said he was bothered that I would spend so much time and energy devoted to a drawing that depicted disturbing scenarios. What I drew included scenes of bloody battle, based on photographic images of war I had photocopied in the school library, but it also included scenes of fantastical creatures crying over lost life. I don’t know how good it really was but I know that I placed a lot of myself into the work, and I am sure that was palpable to the art teacher. His response shocked me, and I tepidly tried to defend myself. I remember thinking there was a power to art, which is perhaps why some people resist it.

What is your biggest motivator as an artist?

I think it is my disquiet in terms of being a part of any system, including the art system. I have always questioned everything, sometimes to a paralyzing fault. In that questioning, I wanted to know more about art, particularly art as defined and practiced in other places in the world. That led me to spend time in West Africa, the Caribbean, China (from the early 1990s onward), and the Middle East, working on various projects of a curatorial and writerly nature. That’s what continues to drive me—a deep curiosity to know more about art in the broadest and deepest sense possible.

What single ethical consideration most impacts the decisions you make as an artist?

I think the biggest single ethical consideration—that not only impacts the decisions I make as an artist, but is integral to the character of my art—relates to an empathy that generates a curiosity about someone else. I think it is important to imagine the reality of someone else. It helps to take away focus from the self. At the same time, I have found that a focus on another always feeds back to a better self.
I think the quality I admire most in another artist is the recognition that being an artist is a lifelong path. I think of Dan Graham, who continues to be a mentor to me since I first got into art. His life has not been easy, but he was always an artist. Being an artist is not just about the next season but a continuous endeavor.

“I remember thinking there was a power to art, which is perhaps why some people resist it.”

I don’t really work that way where I have a lot of past images of things or objects of sentiment nearby. Whenever I embark on a project, I print out a lot of images and texts constituting the discursive formation around the subject or theme of the project. These are all pinned up on a corkboard or simply put into computer folders on the ready for me to look and relook at. During my breaks, I do like to look up at images of my children and my wife. I do that a lot.

In reflecting back to the beginning of your career, what is the most useful advice you ever received?

Rather than the most useful advice I have ever received, may I respond by stating what is the most useful advice I can offer others, particularly young artists? Making the decision to be an artist is not easy, at least not for me. My mother worked in a sweatshop. My father was a troubled individual who would return home from time to time only to borrow money to feed his severe gambling addiction. By the time I was 10, I think we were evicted three times, including once for a building deemed structurally unsound. Yet, as I mentioned earlier, I liked the idea of art despite not knowing anything about the world of galleries and museums. I know how skewed the art system is in terms of issues of social class. But I would also say to those thinking of being an artist that if the feelings are deep and unshakable, then the only choice is to heed those feelings. There is no other choice.
Scientists Capture a Penguin’s-Eye View

Working on the Antarctic tundra, researchers are strapping cameras on the animals to learn about their diets and whether warming seas are changing what they eat.

How important are jellyfish to the diets of Adélie penguins in the Antarctic?

That’s the question Pew marine fellow Yan Ropert-Coudert, director of research at France’s Centre d’Études Biologiques de Chizé, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, is seeking to answer. Along with colleagues from the National Institute of Polar Research in Japan, he decided that the best way to know about the penguins’ diet was to watch them eat.

Typically, Adélie penguins rely on a diet of krill, a small, shrimplike animal. But a decline in krill and an increase in jellyfish in the Southern Ocean prompted the researchers to begin temporarily attaching miniature cameras to the penguins’ lower backs so they could review video of the flightless birds as they forage for food.

Antarctic krill play a central role in Southern Ocean food webs and support populations of penguins, fish, seals, and whales. But recent studies have shown that krill are sensitive to ocean warming and acidification and that their numbers may be in decline. Now, gelatinous organisms such as jellyfish, sea salp, and comb jellies have begun to predominate in some of the world’s marine ecosystems. While not as nutritious as krill, they are abundant and easy to catch. So over the past four years, Ropert-Coudert and his colleagues have been trying to determine whether the penguins have changed their feeding patterns to rely more heavily on these plentiful food sources.

This work is part of a larger research effort to use animal-borne cameras, a technique known as biologging, for clues on how top predators in marine ecosystems around the world are responding to changes in their environment—especially when it comes to the availability of food. As the oceans warm, scientists are concerned that changes to the food web, especially in areas such as Antarctica, may force these animals to modify their feeding patterns due to changes in their prey base. Such studies ultimately aim to define areas of ecological significance for marine predators, so these places may be considered for protections in the future.

So to answer the question—Is a shift in feeding patterns happening in the Southern Ocean?—the scientists capture video from the back of a live penguin, which, not surprisingly, isn’t easy to do. To start, the researchers must painstakingly secure about a dozen strips of tape, sticky side up, beneath a patch of feathers on the bird’s lower backs—looping the tape around the feathers to preserve the bird’s plumage. The scientists then wrap the tape around the camera to secure it in place.

Each camera weighs about 7 ounces—anything heavier would impede the birds—and can record video for four to six hours, depending on its battery type. Because this time frame often isn’t long enough to capture the entire feeding trip of Adélie penguins, researchers may only get a glimpse of their activity at sea. So they use their knowledge of penguin feeding activity to program the video to start when the bird will be roughly at its farthest point from the colony, where it typically engages in the bulk of its feeding. To do this, the scientists schedule cameras to start recording at a certain time; some may also be set to activate when the bird reaches a certain depth.

The research takes place during the chick-rearing period, with cameras deployed wherever there is a suitable nest—one where a member of the pair is about to head out to sea to feed. To retrieve the video, the scientists must recover the camera upon the penguin’s return and remove the tape from the bird’s feathers as carefully as they placed it. They then change the camera’s batteries and repeat the process, reusing the device on a new bird. “We follow the rhythm of the penguins,
and they just don’t stop!” Ropert-Coudert says. He and his team suspect that jellyfish and other gelatinous organisms may account for a more substantial portion of the penguins’ diets than once thought. Because these free-swimming animals leave little trace in a penguin’s excretions or stomach contents after digestion, researchers may have missed this source of food in their diets. Alternatively, penguins may increasingly be turning to this food source as gelatinous animals become more abundant and krill stocks decline. The cameras can help the scientists pin down what the animals are eating.

In his Pew marine fellowship, Ropert-Coudert is investigating, among other things, whether the complex gelatinous community in the Southern Ocean could serve as an alternative food source for krill-dependent species such as the Adélie penguins. So far, researchers have found that while jellyfish are a regular part of the penguins’ diet, there is no evidence that this food source is more important than it was before.

Polita Glynn directs the Pew fellows program in marine conservation.
Lessons for Governments From Amazon’s Headquarters Search

On large economic development deals, states and cities benefit from high-quality analysis and a broad perspective

BY JOSH GOODMAN AND MARK ROBYN

Amazon’s announcement in late 2017 that it was seeking a location for a second headquarters to house 50,000 highly paid workers set off a furor in governments across North America. More than 200 cities, regions, and states—from Los Angeles to Leominster, Massachusetts—vied to become the home of “HQ2.” Some promised billions in tax incentives. Others offered customized workforce training, such as a proposed Amazon Academy in Atlanta.

In November, Amazon announced that HQ2 would...
be split between Arlington, Virginia, and Queens, New York, with 5,000 additional jobs in Nashville, Tennessee. Then, in February, the company scrapped its plans for New York in response to skepticism from the City Council, key state legislators, and some community organizations.

In hindsight, governments’ pursuit of HQ2—and the scrutiny that followed—vividly illustrated the quandaries that governors, mayors, and economic development officials face as they seek large-scale economic development deals. Officials must decide which companies to court, what to offer, and how to structure any agreements. Wrong moves could mean hundreds of millions of dollars squandered, or missed opportunities to transform the local economy. Even when the company ends up thriving, it’s hard to be sure whether it would have expanded at the same pace—and in the same place—even without government aid.

If anything, the challenges are more acute for state legislators. When states pursue megadeals, they often include company- or project-specific incentives that require lawmakers’ approval. But legislators frequently have little time to review these deals, let alone seek meaningful analysis of their economic and fiscal impact. For instance, the incentives of up to $330 million that Mississippi approved for a tire plant in 2013 were so secret that most legislators weren’t even told the name of the company—Yokohama Tire Corp.—until the day they voted.

**Promising strategies for assessing proposed deals**

Solutions to these challenges are not simple or obvious. However, research by The Pew Charitable Trusts and others points to promising strategies to help ensure that governments’ pursuit of economic development projects is well-informed. The process should start with planning. Under a December 2018 law, Michigan is developing detailed guiding principles for when and how the state will pursue business-specific incentives, rather than making ad hoc decisions when companies come calling.

Governments also should have a plan for conducting independent analyses of specific proposals. For instance, a major incentive program in Arkansas allows legislative leaders to commission an outside cost-benefit analysis of proposed deals to inform decisions on whether to support incentive agreements.

When lawmakers vote on business-specific incentives, too often the only analysis they have comes from the companies seeking the help or the economic development agency that negotiated the deal. The HQ2 debate in New York, however, was informed by a thoughtful report from the City Council’s Finance Division. It pinpointed population growth as one of the most consequential results of the agreement to bring Amazon to Queens, noting that more people would be a mixed blessing. Higher tax revenue could be offset by challenges related to affordable housing and schools.

**The benefits of thinking broadly**

Economic research also suggests that some policies or approaches can be much more cost-effective than the financial incentives found in typical deals. As Timothy Bartik, an economic development expert, has noted, financial incentives cost governments a dollar to provide a dollar of benefits. In contrast, he highlights evidence that offering high-quality business advice, technical consulting, or customized job training could provide a value to companies that significantly exceeds the direct cost to states or municipalities. These programs can have a particularly large impact when tailored to help small and medium-size businesses overcome barriers to growth, such as difficulties finding qualified workers or limited technical expertise.

Wrong moves could mean hundreds of millions of dollars squandered, or missed opportunities to transform the local economy. Even when the company ends up thriving, it’s hard to be sure whether it would have expanded at the same pace—and in the same place—even without government aid.

An economic development strategy that fosters growth for a variety of businesses and workers also has the advantage of ensuring that the economic fortunes of cities and states are less tied to the success or failure of individual large companies. By providing customized, targeted support to small and medium-size businesses and their workers, states can help create an environment for broad-based growth. Some companies will inevitably struggle in the face of competitive pressures, but this diversified approach can help the local economy be more flexible—and better equipped to adapt when conditions change.

---

Josh Goodman and Mark Robyn are senior officers with The Pew Charitable Trusts’ state fiscal health initiative.
Michael Bloomberg, founder of the global media and data company Bloomberg LP and also of Bloomberg Philanthropies, has long been committed to giving away his vast fortune to worthy causes. “The reality of great wealth is that you can’t spend it all and you can’t take it with you,” the three-term mayor of New York City wrote in his 1997 autobiography.

Bloomberg’s longtime focus on public health puts into practice the credo of his philanthropic vision, “ensuring better, longer lives for the greatest number of people.” To this end, he has supported successful measures focused primarily in low- and middle-income countries—where the need is great and resources are limited—to help reduce smoking around the world. He also has supported lifesaving maternal health care for women in Tanzania and worked to reduce road crash deaths in countries with high numbers of such fatalities.

His vision of a health-focused approach to policy has not been limited to his philanthropy. As mayor, Bloomberg made New York’s public places 100 percent smoke-free, prohibited restaurants from using trans fats, and increased the number of bike lanes throughout the city. He also has an impressive record of supporting health-related initiatives at his alma mater, Johns Hopkins University; in 2001, the institution changed the name of its public health school to the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health to recognize his many contributions and deep commitment to the field. Bloomberg is also the World Health Organization’s Global Ambassador for Noncommunicable Diseases.

Last November, he turned his efforts to a national health emergency: the opioid epidemic, which claims 130 lives a day. Bloomberg announced a $50 million investment to improve prevention and treatment programs. “We are experiencing a national crisis,” he said. “For the first time since World War I, life expectancy in the U.S. has declined over the past three years—and opioids are a big reason why. We cannot sit by and allow this alarming trend to continue—not when so many Americans are being killed in what should be the prime of their lives.”

The opioid initiative is partnering with the nonprofit implementation group, Vital Strategies, as well as Johns Hopkins University, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and The Pew Charitable Trusts to help states implement solutions that strengthen the prevention and treatment efforts with the highest potential to address the root causes of substance use disorders. Over the next three years, the foundation’s initiative will focus on up to 10 states affected by high rates of opioid use, with Pennsylvania being the first. Pennsylvania had the nation’s highest number of overdose deaths in 2017 with about 5,400 people losing their lives. The project is implementing evidence-based policies—such as the expanded use of medication-assisted treatment through emergency departments, prisons and jails, and community providers—and seeks to expand the availability of naloxone, a drug that, when administered in time, can reverse an opioid overdose.

This method—of helping states implement promising initiatives in communities of need, gathering data on the success of various strategies, and using the resulting information to propel change on a larger scale—is similar to Pew’s evidence-based approach on a range of issues, from criminal justice reform to retirement savings. Pew’s substance use prevention and treatment initiative, which focuses on opioid misuse, has been working to expand access to Food and Drug Administration-approved drugs that are used in medication-assisted treatment, the most effective therapy for opioid use disorder. Pew has also begun providing technical assistance in states, helping to systematically assess a state’s ability to treat people with opioid use disorder, identify gaps in its treatment systems, and explore how best to expand access to treatment for residents. With support from the Bloomberg Philanthropies, Pew’s technical assistance will ultimately be deployed in up to eight states. It is not the first time that Bloomberg has supported Pew;
previously, Bloomberg Philanthropies was one of the partners in the Global Ocean Legacy project, now the Pew Bertarelli Ocean Legacy project, which works to create great parks in the sea.

Pew’s approach is to back its initiatives with data, and to undertake and share meticulous research in the areas in which it works. For example, Pew’s substance use prevention and treatment project has published articles, based on information from government sources, scientists, and health journals, on the difficulty that rural residents face in accessing suitable treatment owing to a dearth of physicians in rural areas who are willing or able to provide medication-assisted treatment. Pew’s research suggests that increasing the number of these providers is one way to ensure expanded access to care for the country’s rural population.

Likewise, Bloomberg is committed to harnessing the power of data to assess opportunities, measure and evaluate progress, and improve an initiative’s impact, something that he learned at an early age. In his autobiography, he writes that his analytical approach to life—to “Listen, question, test, think…”—was honed during childhood visits to Boston’s Museum of Science, which taught him the value of intellectual honesty and scholarship.

“Pew was a logical partner for our opioids initiative because they are a leader in working with states to create evidence-based change, and back up everything they do with meticulous research,” says Kelly Henning, who oversees the public health program at the Bloomberg Philanthropies. “Pew’s technical assistance will help show how we can best ramp up treatment efforts in individual states to reach the most people and achieve the best outcomes.”

Bloomberg’s support for finding effective measures to fight opioid misuse has the potential to expand access to treatment for many who need it and create a road map for more effective action to combat substance use disorder throughout the country.

“Over many years, Michael Bloomberg has made enormous contributions to improving public health in the United States and around the world,” says Sally O’Brien, Pew’s senior vice president for philanthropic partnerships. “He is a leading example of how philanthropy can affect and improve the world today. We are grateful for the trust he has placed in our work and research, and proud to help support his data-driven vision that will save the lives of so many Americans.”

For more information about philanthropic partnerships at Pew, please contact senior vice president Sally O’Brien at 202-540-6525 or sobrien@pewtrusts.org.

Demetra Aposporos is the senior editor of Trust.
LESSONS LEARNED

Benchmarking Questions
Keep Surveys Accurate
How asking about your sleep, smoking, or yoga habits can help pollsters verify their findings

BY KRISTEN BIALIK

Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your life? Have you practiced yoga in the past year? On average, how many hours of sleep do you get in a day?

At face value, these questions are not directly related to the topics that the Pew Research Center is most committed to studying. Yet our researchers have been periodically asking questions like these for years. Why? These are examples of benchmarking questions, which the center uses as a check to ensure that our surveys are accurate.

Why and how we use benchmarking questions
Determining the accuracy of a survey requires some sort of objective standard against which the survey can be compared. In election polls and other measures of voting intent, the standard is the outcome of the election. But for surveys that don’t ask about elections or voting intent, researchers need to find another way to benchmark their findings. This is often done with the help of other surveys—usually large, expensive government surveys conducted with great attention to data quality.

Pew Research Center surveys occasionally include questions about economic, demographic, and lifestyle characteristics for which government statistics are available as a benchmark. This not only helps us check the accuracy of our findings, it also helps us study how surveys themselves can be better conducted.

Take, for example, a Pew Research Center study from last year that examined what low response rates—many potential respondents being contacted but far fewer of them participating—mean for the accuracy of telephone surveys. To help answer this question, the study compared the results of a telephone survey by the center with those of high-response benchmark surveys by the federal government to see what, if any, differences existed.

The report found that Pew Research Center surveys were closely aligned with federal surveys on key demographic and lifestyle benchmarks. Across 14 questions about personal traits, the average difference between the government estimate and the center’s telephone survey estimate was 3 percentage points. Differences on individual questions ranged from 0 to 8 points. The largest was on a measure asking...
Pew Research Center Surveys Align With Federal Surveys on Key Demographic Benchmarks
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The government found that 59 percent of people rated their health as very good or excellent, while the center’s telephone survey found 51 percent doing so.

The other 13 items were quite close to the benchmarks, most with differences of 3 percentage points or fewer, which was generally within the margin of error. These questions included measures of family income, employment status, household size, citizenship, health insurance, length of residence at current address, marital and parenthood status, smoking frequency, place of birth (among Hispanics), and having a driver’s license. In other words, on these measures, the low-response telephone survey provided results quite comparable to those of the high-response government survey used as a benchmark.

Overall, the report showed that bias introduced into surveys due to low response rates remains limited in scope. And, critically, telephone poll estimates for party affiliation, political ideology, and religious affiliation continue to track well with estimates from high-response-rate benchmark surveys.

However, as the center and other survey researchers have discussed extensively, telephone surveys continue to yield large biases on measures of civic and, to a lesser extent, political engagement. This discrepancy is probably because of nonresponse bias—in which the kinds of people agreeing to participate in surveys are systematically different from those who can’t be contacted or refuse to participate. As found in previous work, the people who answer surveys are likely to be the same people involved in community life—they are joiners, and participating in surveys is a kind of pro-social behavior related to other kinds of behaviors such as volunteering. Fortunately for pollsters, civic engagement is not strongly correlated with political attitudes or most other measures researchers study in surveys.

Caveats about benchmarks

Although large government surveys are generally considered to have high data quality, they’re not immune to some of the same problems every survey researcher faces. For example, while government surveys tend to have very high response rates (on the order of 60 percent or more) compared with opinion polls conducted by other organizations, the risk of nonresponse bias still exists.

Government surveys, while carefully developed and tested, are also still subject to measurement error, which can arise from the way in which questions are asked (such as what questions come immediately before a particular question, whether the survey was conducted on the phone or online, etc.). Pew Research Center questionnaires that include benchmarking questions do not replicate the exact context in which the original questions were asked, particularly because the center tends to focus on topics that are different from those in benchmark surveys. Benchmarks also are generally unavailable for questions about attitudes and behaviors that the government does not study.

All surveys can also face response bias issues, including social desirability bias, where respondents may modify answers to certain questions to present themselves more favorably. This is especially a risk when an interviewer asks sensitive questions: Respondents may, for example, overstate their voting frequency.

All of these factors can affect the comparability of seemingly identical questions asked on different surveys, including government surveys. That said, benchmarking questions continue to be a valuable tool for survey researchers checking and assessing accuracy. They are especially vital for the center’s studies on survey methodology.

Kristen Bialik is a former research assistant at the Pew Research Center.
The Pew Charitable Trusts applies a rigorous, analytical approach to **improve public policy**, **inform the public**, and **invigorate civic life**, as these recent accomplishments illustrate.

**IMPROVING PUBLIC POLICY**

Alberta expands protections for Canadian boreal forests

The Alberta government announced in March the designation of Kitaskino Nuwenéné Wildland Provincial Park, protecting another 400,015 acres of boreal forestland. The new park is the latest addition to a network totaling more than 11 million acres—the largest expanse of protected boreal in the world.

Located in northeastern Alberta, the region is home to caribou, wood bison, lynx, bears, and moose that thrive in numbers rarely seen farther south. Pew will continue to support partnerships with Indigenous communities and land use planning to protect 1 billion acres of Canada’s boreal forest by the end of 2022.
Council adopts management plan for chub mackerel

The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council adopted a new management plan in March for Atlantic chub mackerel that protects the key forage species throughout its U.S. Atlantic range. Chub mackerel is an emerging fishery along the U.S. East Coast, where the annual catch has recently spiked from under a million to more than 5 million pounds. Marlins, tunas, swordfish, and a variety of marine mammals and sharks depend on chub mackerel as food. Pew worked with fishery managers, scientists, and fishermen to develop the plan and engaged the public to generate tens of thousands of supportive comments.

New protections for prepaid card users

Prepaid cards now have consumer protections similar to those for credit cards and debit cards, thanks to a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) rule that took effect on April 1. The CFPB made certain that consumers can rely on prepaid cards as budgeting tools by ensuring that these accounts are protected from overdraft penalty fees, hidden charges, and loss of funds due to malfeasance. In its final regulation, the CFPB heavily cited Pew’s research on prepaid cards and its recommendations to improve their safety.

Wyoming enacts community supervision reform

Governor Mark Gordon (R) in February signed a package of bills to reform Wyoming’s probation and parole systems. The legislation curtails supervision terms, expands mental health services, and establishes sanctions for rule violations. It’s projected to reduce the number of people who return to prison for violations and save $18 million by fiscal year 2024, allowing for continued reinvestment into community-based behavioral health treatment. Pew’s partner, the Council of State Governments Justice Center, provided data, research, and consultation at the request of state leaders.

Three states improve fiscal policy

- In April, Nebraska Governor Pete Ricketts (R) signed legislation that modified the state’s rainy day fund, which ensures the state saves when revenue growth exceeds normal levels. The law also creates a limit for how large the fund may grow, which prevents oversaving while still ensuring the state has enough in reserve to offset a recession. Pew provided research and best practices related to state rainy day funds. Gov. Ricketts also signed into law requirements for Nebraska to implement two fiscal best practices: a long-term budget that would project state revenue and expenditures several years into the future, and a budget stress test that analyzes the impacts of different economic scenarios, including recessions, on state taxes and government spending.
- Arizona Governor Doug Ducey (R) signed legislation in April that will increase the maximum size of the state’s rainy day fund. Over the past two years, Pew’s state fiscal health team has provided research to the state legislature and executive office related to best practices for reserve fund size. In February, the team presented an analysis of evidence-based savings targets before the state Senate’s appropriations committee and the governor’s office.
- Montana Governor Steve Bullock (D) in May signed a law that requires a range of fiscal analyses to assess the long-term fiscal health of the state’s budget, including general fund budget stress testing and long-term revenue and expenditure forecasting. Since 2017, Pew’s state fiscal health team has worked in coordination with the bill sponsor and the legislative fiscal director to provide technical guidance on how to manage volatility and ways to implement these types of fiscal studies.

‘Stand Up to Superbugs’ push for federal support to combat antibiotic resistance

In March, Pew conducted its eighth annual “Superbugs” Capitol Hill event, highlighting the human toll of antibiotic resistance and the urgent need for federal action to combat it. Forty scientists, physicians, farmers, and patient advocates representing 32 states visited 104 Senate and House offices, meeting directly with approximately 30 members of Congress. The advocates urged support for increased appropriations for stewardship and surveillance activities, as well as new economic incentives to address the critical shortage of antibiotics in development.
States evaluate economic development strategies

• In May, North Dakota Governor Doug Burgum (R) signed legislation that cemented a new addition to the state’s portfolio of manufacturing incentives by creating a new tax credit for the purchase of manufacturing equipment. This law includes several best practices identified by Pew, including a cap on the incentives to protect the state’s budget, and a sunset of the program after four years, ensuring that policymakers will evaluate the program in the future. This is the latest in a series of reforms to the state’s tax incentive practices recommended to the full legislature by an evaluation committee that Pew helped create in 2015.

• Kansas Governor Laura Kelly (D) approved a bill in May that creates a framework for regular review of the state’s economic development incentive programs. The Legislative Division of Post Audit will evaluate the effectiveness of each of the state’s economic development incentives at least once every three years. The evaluations will address key questions about the state’s incentives, such as how they affect business behavior, their impact on the state’s economy, and whether they are achieving their goals. Pew’s tax incentives team has worked with the bill sponsor, state Senator Julia Lynn (R), since 2017, and shared best practices with the legislature, offered guidance and language on an evaluation process, and testified on two different evaluation proposals.

States prioritize Results First evidence in policy decisions

• In February, New Mexico Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham (D) signed into law a measure that improves the state’s Accountability in Government Act by requiring evidence of program effectiveness in agency budget requests. The law creates statewide definitions for key terms—such as evidence-based, research-based, and program inventory—and requires collaboration between government branches to implement the new policies. Elements of the Pew-MacArthur Results First initiative, an evidence-based approach to policymaking, and the project’s research on best practices both informed the legislation.

• The biennial budget recommendations of Minnesota Governor Tim Walz (D), released in February, included 16 evidence-based changes, using the Results First approach and tools and informed by the project’s work with the Department of Management and Budget. These program funding proposals, totaling approximately $150 million, include continued or additional funding for interventions that have been proved to reduce criminal behavior, improve academic achievement, increase housing stability, and prevent substance use disorders and premature death.

• In March, Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant (R) signed legislation that broadens evidence definitions for greater flexibility and applicability, includes language around cost-effectiveness, and mandates the inventorying of programs in all agencies. The legislation came from recommendations from the Mississippi Joint Legislative Committee on Performance Evaluation and Expenditure Review (PEER); the Results First team has been working with PEER to promote evidence-based policies and practices since 2012.

• Montana Governor Steve Bullock (D) signed a bill in April directing the state’s Department of Public Health and Human Services to develop a strategic plan for child welfare prevention programs. The plan includes many Results First principles, such as conducting an inventory of existing programs, comparing programs with research, standardizing key terms, and advancing evidence-based programs where appropriate. The law, passed by the legislature with broad bipartisan support, was informed by the National Conference of State Legislatures’ legislative policy academy, a January event co-organized by Pew that included best practices in evidence-based policymaking.
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Who uses Twitter?

The Pew Research Center released a report in April that found that the 22 percent of American adults who use Twitter are representative of the broader population in certain ways, but not others. Twitter users are younger, more likely to identify as Democrats, more highly educated, and have higher incomes than U.S. adults overall. Twitter users differ from the broader population on some key social issues; they are somewhat more likely to say that immigrants strengthen rather than weaken the country and see evidence of racial and gender-based inequalities in society. On other subjects, the views of Twitter users are not dramatically different from those expressed by all U.S. adults. Individuals who are among the top 10 percent most active tweeters also differ from those who tweet rarely. Compared with other U.S. adults on Twitter, they are much more likely to be women and more likely to say they regularly tweet about politics.

Whether on cellphones or computers, the most prolific Twitter users among U.S. adults are likely to be women. (Stock

Teens in America today

In February, the Pew Research Center published a report that looks at the experiences of U.S. teens today, finding that 7 in 10 teens see anxiety and depression as major problems among their peers, whether they personally suffer from these conditions or not. Concern about mental health cuts across gender, racial, and socioeconomic lines, with roughly equal shares of teens across demographic groups saying it is a significant issue in their community. Fewer teens, though still substantial shares, voice concern over bullying, drug addiction, and alcohol consumption. More than 4 in 10 say these are major problems affecting people their age in the area where they live.

How Americans receive local news

The Pew Research Center released a study in March, with support from the Google News Initiative, examining the local news landscape across the U.S. Based on a survey of roughly 35,000 U.S. adults, the study found that nearly as many Americans today prefer to get their local news online as through a television set. The 41 percent of Americans who say they prefer getting their local news via TV and the 37 percent who prefer it online far outpace those who prefer a printed newspaper or the radio (13 percent and 8 percent, respectively). The vast majority of Americans who get news from local TV stations primarily do so from the television set (76 percent), not from the stations’ websites or social media accounts (22 percent). Radio is similarly tied to its traditional form. But 43 percent of daily newspaper consumers tend to get that news digitally, as do 49 percent of those who rely on community newsletters or listservs.
Groups experiencing discrimination

The Pew Research Center published a report in April finding that the public sees widespread discrimination against several racial, ethnic, and religious groups in the U.S. While there has been little change in most of these views over the past several years, the share of Americans saying Jews face discrimination in the U.S. has increased substantially since late 2016. Today, 64 percent of Americans say Jews face at least some discrimination, a 20 percentage-point increase from 2016; the share saying Jews face “a lot” of discrimination has nearly doubled, from 13 percent to 24 percent. Democrats remain more likely than Republicans to say there is discrimination against Jews, but the shift in these views is evident in both parties. The survey also finds majorities of Americans continue to say there is a lot or some discrimination against blacks, Hispanics, gays and lesbians, women, and particularly Muslims; 82 percent say Muslims face some discrimination, with 56 percent saying Muslims encounter a lot of discrimination—the highest among nine groups included in the survey.

Philly pensions stress tested

In April, Pew’s Philadelphia research initiative and public sector retirement systems team issued a policy brief documenting the results of a stress test of Philadelphia’s municipal pensions system, which is less than 50 percent funded and has liabilities of more than $6 billion. The analysis projected how the pension fund will fare over the next 20 years under various economic scenarios and found that changes made in the past few years have positioned the system to gradually move toward fiscal soundness, even if returns on investments turn out to be lower than projected. To discuss the stress test, the Philadelphia policy and research team convened over 35 government officials, public sector labor union leaders, municipal finance analysts, and other stakeholders in May.

Pew Fund grantees

The Pew Fund for Health and Human Services in March awarded $8.12 million in support of the Philadelphia region’s low-income children and their families. The funding will help 43 local nonprofit organizations serve more than 25,000 young people annually over three years by focusing on five core areas: supporting high-quality early education and child care; providing effective prevention and early intervention services to reduce behavioral and academic issues; increasing access to mental health services; expanding quality after-school programs; and helping parents secure and retain public benefits and services to strengthen household stability.

Exhibition about Muslim communities opens

“America to Zanzibar: Muslim Cultures Near and Far,” a Pew Center for Arts & Heritage-funded exhibition inviting families to learn about modern and historic Muslim communities, opened at Philadelphia’s Please Touch Museum on Feb. 2 and runs until Sept. 2. Visitors to the exhibit can experience immersive 3D environments of Middle Eastern architecture and mosques, view historic artifacts and newly commissioned artwork created by Philadelphia-based Muslim artists, and hear personal stories from local Muslim families.
Visitors stroll near a portrait of Abraham Lincoln by David Bowser on display in the exhibit “Civil War and Reconstruction: The Battle for Freedom and Equality” at the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia. AP Photo/Matt Rourke

National Constitution Center opens a new permanent exhibit

On May 9, “Civil War and Reconstruction: The Battle for Freedom and Equality” opened at the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia. The 3,000-square-foot exhibit, the first in America devoted to exploring the constitutional legacy of the Reconstruction Amendments, features over 100 artifacts, including original copies of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments; a fragment of the flag that Abraham Lincoln raised at Independence Hall in 1861; and a ballot box marked “colored” from Virginia’s first statewide election that allowed black men to vote in 1867. In March 2017, Pew supported the National Constitution Center’s development of the gallery with a grant of $500,000 over two years.
The U.S. government spends defense dollars in every state through purchases of military equipment, wages for service members and civilians, pension payments, health care services, and grants to states. But the size and mix of those investments vary substantially across the states, so changes in defense spending will affect them differently, and the impacts will depend on which programs and operations are increased or cut. Pew's fiscal federalism project analyzed defense spending state by state and found that in fiscal year 2017—the most recent year for which data is available—the federal government spent a total of $483 billion on defense in the states and the District of Columbia, or $1,484 per capita. At the state level, that ranged from $488 in Michigan to $6,275 in Virginia. The District of Columbia received the highest amount in the country at $9,033 per person.
### Types of Federal Defense Dollars are Distributed Differently Across the States

#### Percentage of Total Defense Spending by Category and State, Federal FY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Contracts</th>
<th>Retirement</th>
<th>Nonretirement</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Salaries and wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Contracts**
- **Retirement**
- **Nonretirement**
- **Grants**
- **Salaries and wages**
“The quality I admire most in another artist is the recognition that being an artist is a lifelong path.”

—Ken Lum
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