

US Household (HH) Income by Class

US Household (HH) Income by Class												Classification		
US Population in 2014								The Lower Class*						
318,600,000								% HH Pop.				22%		
US Median Income in 2014								% HH Inc.				6%		
\$54,000		...in 2017 \$		\$57,000		...in 2018 \$		The Middle Class*						
67% of Median Income in 2014								% HH Pop.				65%		
\$36,000		...in 2017 \$		\$38,000		...in 2018 \$		% HH Inc.				59%		
200% of Median Income in 2014								The Upper Class*						
\$108,000		...in 2017 \$		\$113,000		...in 2018 \$		% HH Pop.				13%		
								% HH Inc.				35%		
Census Data Distribution of Household Income, 2014												Classification		
HH Income	Number of HH (1000)	Percent	Percentile	Mean Income	Mean number of earners	Mean size of HH	Population (est.)	Aggregate mean income (AMI) (billions)	Percent of agg. income	Mean income per day	% HH Pop.	% HH Inc.	Group AMI (Billions)	
Total	124,587	100.00%	-	\$75,738	1.28	2.54	318,600,000	\$9,436	100.00%	\$207.50				
Under \$5,000	4571	3.67%	0	\$1,080	0.20	1.91	8,833,502	\$5	0.05%	\$2.96	The Lower Class			
\$5,000 to \$9,999	4320	3.47%	3.67th	\$7,936	0.34	1.78	7,780,223	\$34	0.36%	\$21.74	22%	6%	\$565	
\$10,000 to \$14,999	6766	5.43%	7.14th	\$12,317	0.39	1.71	11,706,213	\$83	0.88%	\$33.75				
\$15,000 to \$19,999	6779	5.44%	12.57th	\$17,338	0.54	1.90	13,031,894	\$118	1.25%	\$47.50				
\$20,000 to \$24,999	6865	5.51%	18.01th	\$22,162	0.73	2.07	14,378,024	\$152	1.61%	\$60.72				
\$25,000 to \$29,999	6363	5.11%	23.52th	\$27,101	0.82	2.19	14,099,196	\$172	1.83%	\$74.25				
\$30,000 to \$34,999	6232	5.00%	28.63th	\$32,058	0.94	2.27	14,313,361	\$200	2.12%	\$87.83	The Middle Class			
\$35,000 to \$39,999	5857	4.70%	33.63th	\$37,061	1.04	2.31	13,689,119	\$217	2.30%	\$101.54	65%	59%	\$5,610	
\$40,000 to \$44,999	5430	4.36%	38.33th	\$41,979	1.15	2.40	13,185,584	\$228	2.42%	\$115.01				
\$45,000 to \$49,999	5060	4.06%	42.69th	\$47,207	1.24	2.52	12,901,475	\$239	2.53%	\$129.33				
\$50,000 to \$54,999	5084	4.08%	46.75th	\$51,986	1.32	2.54	13,065,546	\$264	2.80%	\$142.43				
\$55,000 to \$59,999	4220	3.39%	50.83th	\$57,065	1.41	2.56	10,930,518	\$241	2.55%	\$156.34				
\$60,000 to \$64,999	4477	3.59%	54.22th	\$62,016	1.46	2.64	11,958,572	\$278	2.94%	\$169.91				
\$65,000 to \$69,999	3709	2.98%	57.81th	\$67,081	1.51	2.67	10,019,739	\$249	2.64%	\$183.78				
\$70,000 to \$74,999	3737	3.00%	60.79th	\$72,050	1.57	2.73	10,322,242	\$269	2.85%	\$197.40				
\$75,000 to \$79,999	3484	2.80%	63.79th	\$77,023	1.60	2.79	9,834,916	\$268	2.84%	\$211.02				
\$80,000 to \$84,999	3142	2.52%	66.58th	\$81,966	1.63	2.79	8,869,491	\$258	2.73%	\$224.56				
\$85,000 to \$89,999	2750	2.21%	69.11th	\$87,101	1.77	2.90	8,068,987	\$240	2.54%	\$238.63				
\$90,000 to \$94,999	2665	2.14%	71.31th	\$92,033	1.82	2.96	7,981,366	\$245	2.60%	\$252.15				
\$95,000 to \$99,999	2339	1.88%	73.45th	\$97,161	1.81	2.97	7,028,700	\$227	2.41%	\$266.19				
\$100,000 to \$104,999	2679	2.15%	75.33th	\$101,921	1.79	3.01	8,158,823	\$273	2.89%	\$279.24				
\$105,000 to \$109,999	2070	1.66%	77.48th	\$107,187	1.88	3.01	6,304,130	\$222	2.35%	\$293.66				
\$110,000 to \$114,999	1922	1.54%	79.14th	\$112,069	1.93	3.12	6,067,311	\$215	2.28%	\$307.04				
\$115,000 to \$119,999	1623	1.30%	80.68th	\$117,133	1.98	3.14	5,156,280	\$190	2.01%	\$320.91				
\$120,000 to \$124,999	1863	1.50%	81.99th	\$122,127	1.93	3.09	5,824,513	\$228	2.41%	\$334.59				
\$125,000 to \$129,999	1452	1.17%	83.48th	\$127,166	1.99	3.12	4,583,630	\$185	1.96%	\$348.40				
\$130,000 to \$134,999	1512	1.21%	84.65th	\$131,863	2.00	3.18	4,864,825	\$199	2.11%	\$361.27				
\$135,000 to \$139,999	1219	0.98%	85.86th	\$137,284	1.98	3.11	3,835,769	\$167	1.77%	\$376.12				
\$140,000 to \$144,999	1290	1.04%	86.84th	\$142,199	1.97	3.03	3,954,765	\$183	1.94%	\$389.59				
\$145,000 to \$149,999	1024	0.82%	87.87th	\$147,130	2.01	3.11	3,222,172	\$151	1.60%	\$403.10				
\$150,000 to \$154,999	1146	0.92%	88.70th	\$151,940	1.85	3.12	3,617,658	\$174	1.85%	\$416.27				
\$155,000 to \$159,999	848	0.68%	89.62th	\$157,177	2.08	3.15	2,702,681	\$133	1.41%	\$430.62	The Upper Class			
\$160,000 to \$164,999	875	0.70%	90.30th	\$162,019	2.02	3.13	2,771,027	\$142	1.50%	\$443.89	13%	35%	\$3,261	
\$165,000 to \$169,999	786	0.63%	91.00th	\$167,101	2.1	3.16	2,513,032	\$131	1.39%	\$457.81				
\$170,000 to \$174,999	717	0.58%	91.63th	\$172,169	2.17	3.21	2,328,694	\$123	1.31%	\$471.70				
\$175,000 to \$179,999	607	0.49%	92.21th	\$177,187	2.19	3.28	2,014,424	\$108	1.14%	\$485.44				
\$180,000 to \$184,999	619	0.50%	92.69th	\$182,055	2.03	3.19	1,997,881	\$113	1.19%	\$498.78				
\$185,000 to \$189,999	556	0.45%	93.19th	\$187,299	2.03	3.20	1,800,168	\$104	1.10%	\$513.15				
\$190,000 to \$194,999	485	0.39%	93.64th	\$192,241	2.19	3.29	1,614,455	\$93	0.99%	\$526.69				
\$195,000 to \$199,999	436	0.35%	94.03th	\$197,211	2.23	3.27	1,442,522	\$86	0.91%	\$540.30				
\$200,000 to \$249,999	3249	2.61%	94.38th	\$220,267	2.08	3.24	10,650,820	\$716	7.58%	\$603.47				
\$250,000 and over	3757	3.02%	96.98th	\$402,476		2.94	11,175,754	\$1,512	16.02%	\$1,102.67				
Own It Economics Calculations:							Check Totals:	318,600,000	\$9,436	100.00%	100%	100%	\$9,436	
							Adjustment Factors:	1.011785170	0.8817					

References

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Income Distribution to \$250,000 or More for Households*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-hinc/hinc-06.2014.html>

US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Selected Characteristics of Households, by Total Money Income in 2014*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/cps-hinc/hinc-01.2014.html>

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics consumer price index, prices in 2018 are 6.45% higher than prices in 2014. Official Data Foundation/Alioth LLC. (2018). *CPI Inflation Calculator*. Retrieved from <http://www.in2013dollars.com/2014-dollars-in-2018>

Renwick, T. *Examining the Middle Class in the United States Using the Lens of the Supplemental Poverty Measure* (2014, September 30) Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2014/demo/SEHSD-WP2014-30.pdf>

Distribution of Household Income (2014) Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2015/demo/distribution-of-household-income--2014.html>

Credit Suisse Research Institute *Thought Leadership from Credit Suisse Research and the world's foremost experts* (2015, October) Retrieved from <http://publications.credit-suisse.com/tasks/render/file/index.cfm?fileid=C26E3824-E868-56E0-CCA04D4BB9B9ADD5>

* Based on 2017 surveys, from Gallup and others, finding that 62-70% of Americans self-identify as being in the middle class. 50% of those persons in one survey were found to have incomes between \$50K and \$125K in 2017. Our classification begins with the Pew Research Institute standard of middle class being from 67% to 200% of median income. This gives \$36K to \$108K in 2014. Then, we extend the range to \$30K to \$155K in 2014 dollars to capture 65% of the 2014 population. In 2018 dollars (using a 106.4% net change in the CPI as the basis for the change in buying power), this is a range of \$32K to \$165K.

Newport, F. *Middle-Class Identification in U.S. at Pre-Recession Levels* (2017, June 21) Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/212660/middle-class-identification-pre-recession-levels.aspx>

Martin, E. *70% of Americans consider themselves middle class—but only 50% are* (2017, June 30) Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/06/30/70-percent-of-americans-consider-themselves-middle-class-but-only-50-percent-are.html>

Northwestern Mutual *70% of Americans Identify as Middle Class Despite a Prolonged Decline in Middle-Income Households in the US* (2017, June 21) Retrieved from <https://news.northwesternmutual.com/2017-06-21-70-of-americans-identify-as-middle-class-despite-a-prolonged-decline-in-middle-income-households-in-the-us>

Carbon Calculations

	Number	Units	Notes
Global Population, 2018	7,633	million persons	
Population (middle/high income adults), 2018	763	million persons	See Appendix Table "Population."
Total Need, Atmospheric CO2e Reduction	2,580	Gt CO2e	See Greenhouse Gases Calculations Table.
Legacy (1850 to 2020)	1,135	Gt CO2e	44%
Future (2020 to 2050)	1,445	Gt CO2e	56%
Fragile-Frost (2020-2050)			See calculations below based on article referenced below.
Responsibility			
Per capita	3,380	t CO2e/person	
Per capita annually, 2020-2050	113	t CO2e/person/year	
Per capita annually, 2020-2050, Legacy part	50	t CO2e/person/year	44%
Per capita annually, 2020-2050, Future part	63	t CO2e/person/year	56%
Unit Cost to Repair			
Best deals (2018)	5	\$/t CO2e	e.g. Mammoth Steppe strategy in Drawdown, planting trees, etc. This is for low hanging fruit, but long term cost will average much higher.
Typical	12	\$/t CO2e	
Drawdown estimate	30	\$/t CO2e	Drawdown Plausible Scenario is at about \$29.6/Gt, however this may include government spending.
Total Cost to Repair	31	\$ trillion	Assuming \$12/t
For legacy (pre 2020)	14	\$ trillion	
For future (post 2020)	17	\$ trillion	
Total Annual (2020-2050) Cost	1.03	\$ trillion/year	
Per capita population total cost	40,561	\$/person	
For legacy	17,844	\$/person	
For future	22,717	\$/person	
Per capita total annual cost, 2020-2050	1,352	\$/person/year	
For legacy annual, 2020-2050	595	\$/person/year	
For future annual, 2020-2050	757	\$/person/year	

Adoption Rate (average, 2020-2050), estimate	33%		Assumption (comparables: global smart phone usage, 2018: 36%; Facebook 2017: 2.2 billion)
Per capita population gross income (GDP)	62,000	\$/person/year	Assuming \$31,000/person, \$62,000/household (PPP)
Share of gross income, annual, For legacy (L3), annual, estimated adoption rate	6.6%		
For future (L4), annual, estimated adoption rate	2.9%		
	3.7%		

Abbreviations Defined

\$ = 2018 US dollars
t = metric ton or tonne
Gt CO₂e = Greenhouse gas equivalent
PPP = purchasing power parity

References

Credit Suisse Research Institute *Thought Leadership from Credit Suisse Research and the world's foremost experts*, p. 115 (2015, October) Retrieved from

<http://publications.credit-suisse.com/tasks/render/file/index.cfm?fileid=C26E3824-E868-56E0-CCA04D4BB9B9ADD5>

Hawken, Paul. Drawdown. Penguin Putnam Inc. (2017)

The following stats were reviewed to assess virality of a movement. When something makes people feel better and brings a higher quality to their lives, billions of people spending hundreds of dollars is not an issue.

Statista. (n.d.). *Number of smartphone users worldwide from 2014 to 2020 (in billions)*. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/330695/number-of-smartphone-users-worldwide/>

Statista (n.d.). *Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 2nd quarter 2018 (in millions)* Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/>

Weston, Phoebe *Thawing permafrost turns Arctic from carbon sink into carbon emitter, study finds* (2019, October 22) Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/melting-permafrost-arctic-carbon-emissions-study-a9166321.html>

Participants Global Population

	Amount	Units	Notes
Global Population, 2018	7,633	million persons	
Low income or dependants	6,870	million persons	90% [1]
Population (middle/high income adults)	763	million persons	10% [1]
Low income adults	4,885	million persons	64% (74% minus 10%) [2]
Percentage of adults in the world population	14%		

Assumptions

Approximately 10% of all persons globally are adults in middle/high income ("middle income" is defined as PPP equivalent of \$50K or more USD 2015) in 2018.

References

1. Credit Suisse Research Institute *Thought Leadership from Credit Suisse Research and the world's foremost experts*, p. 115 (2015, October) Retrieved from

<http://publications.credit-suisse.com/tasks/render/file/index.cfm?fileid=C26E3824-E868-56E0-CCA04D4BB9B9ADD5>

2. "Globally, about 26 percent of the world is under 15 years of age," so about 74% are adults.

As of 2017, in Africa, it is 41%, while in the rest of the world it ranges from 16% in Europe and 19% in North America, to 23 to 25% in Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and Oceania.

Statista *Proportion of selected age groups of world population in 2017, by region (n.d.)* Retrieved from

<https://www.statista.com/statistics/265759/world-population-by-age-and-region/>

Greenhouse Gasses Calculations

Year (CE)	RFL CO ₂ e Gt Emissions	CO ₂ e Gt Emissions Business as Usual	Global Population (millions)	Notes
1850	2,230	2,230	1,200	See Footnotes 1-4 below for notes.
2018	3,290	3,290	7,633	Today
2020	3,365	3,370		Start of Drawdown scenarios, See Footnote 5.
2030	2,990	3,850	8,500	See Footnotes 6-8 below for the three previous cell notes.
2040	2,610	4,330		
2050	2,230	4,810	9,700	End of Drawdown scenarios
Add'l CO₂e Gt 2020-2050	-1,135	1,440		
CO₂e Increase Since 1850	-	2,580		
CO₂e Gt Sequestered with Plan	2,580	-		
Average Annual Rate of CO₂e Sequestration Gt per year by population	86	-		

Assumptions

Legacy anthropogenic methane estimated to be 40 Gt CO₂e up to 1850.

Anthropogenic methane added 1850 to 2018 estimated to be 60 Gt CO₂e based on 2016 atmospheric readings and 1850 estimate.

While earlier and later dates defining the "pre-industrial" era are sometimes advocated by climate scientists, 1850 is used here.

Footnotes

1. 40 Added for methane.

Historical methane was relatively constant at around 680 PPB CH₄ up to 1730, at which point it began to climb. By 1850, the growth curve was still relatively linear and the level had reached 774 PPB CH₄. This table assumes the target for methane is the 1850 level although it is about 14% above the equilibrium level from 1730 and before.

Historical to 1730: 680 PPB CH₄ | 36.2 Gt CO₂e

Historical in 1850: 774 PPB CH₄ | 41.2 Gt CO₂e

January 2018: 1860 PPB CH₄ | 99.0 Gt CO₂e

Change 1730 to 1850: 94 PPB CH₄ | 5 Gt CO₂e

Change 1850 to 2018: 1086 PPB CH₄ | 57.8 Gt CO₂e

$(25 * 2.13 * [x \text{ PPB CH}_4] / 1000 = y \text{ CO}_2\text{e})$

See <http://www.methanelevels.org/> ~Nick Seigal

2. This sheet does not account for the possible releases of carbon dioxide from natural sinks that convert to emitters, such as fragile frost (permafrost), which as of 2019 became an emitter. This effect is already happening and will increase as the planet warms up. It will be more severe the less aggressive than the approach to Radicalizing you footprint is.

3. This figure is just for the beginning of industrialization, meaning moving from agrarian to factories. GDP rises, large family networks are no longer concentrated. ~Nick Seigal

4. The Industrial Revolution was the transition to new manufacturing processes in the period from about 1760 to sometime between 1820 and 1840.

There is some disagreement among climate scientists as to what year should be used as the "pre-industrial" benchmark.

"The invention of an efficient steam engine by James Watt in 1784 meant humans were able to effectively convert fossil fuels into energy, a process that releases carbon dioxide (CO₂) into the atmosphere. [Though coal was being burnt for industry before then too].

Previously, the period 1850-1900 has been used as the historical baseline, but this period includes some large volcanic eruptions and is after greenhouse gas concentrations had already started to rise. We suggest that the earlier period of 1720-1800 is a better choice for this baseline. This is because the major natural factors that also affect Earth's climate - the levels of solar and volcanic activity - were both at similar levels to today..."

<https://www.climate-lab-book.ac.uk/2017/defining-pre-industrial/>

However, the difference in ppm is small regardless of the choice of years. In 1560 it was about 280 ppm, by 1800 it was much the same at about 282 ppm, while in 1880 it had slowly and slightly climbed to about 290 ppm. However, 1880 marks an inflection point and thereafter CO₂ concentrations have grown exponentially.

See http://blogs.reading.ac.uk/climate-lab-book/files/2017/01/forcing_fig_simpler.png for a graph of the historical trends in sunspots, vulcanism, CO₂ and CH₄. ~Nick Seigal

5. CO₂ emissions in 2016 were 36 Gt. In late 2017, they were estimated to have grown by 2% or to about 37 Gt. At that rate, emissions in 2020 will have added about 75 Gt to the total in 2018. ~Nick Seigal

6. The amount sequestered is assumed to be equal in each decade, but it could ramp up in each decade as solutions come on line or scale up.

7. The annual emissions average assumed for 2020-2050 is 48 Gt, based on the book Drawdown, but it is likely that it will be higher in later decades than in earlier ones. ~Nick Seigal

8. <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/news/population/2015-report.html>

References

Hawken, Paul. *Drawdown: the most comprehensive plan ever proposed to reverse global warming*. New York: Penguin Books 2017

Global CH₄ Levels (n.d.)

<http://www.methanelevels.org/>

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2015, July 29). *World population projected to reach 9.7 billion by 2050*. Retrieved from

<http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/news/population/2015-report.html>

Hawkins, Ed. (2017, January 25). *Defining 'pre-industrial'*. Retrieved from

<https://www.climate-lab-book.ac.uk/2017/defining-pre-industrial/>

Climate Lab Book. (n.d.). *Solar variations, volcanic eruptions & atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration*. Retrieved from

http://blogs.reading.ac.uk/climate-lab-book/files/2017/01/forcing_fig_simpler.png

Plastics in Oceans Calculations

Plastics in Oceans				
Period	Total	Units	Rationale	
2020	210	Mt	2025 estimate minus estimated annual leakage of 8Mt per year [1]	
2025	250	Mt	Ocean Conservancy Estimate [2]	
2050	937	Mt	Study by McArthur Foundation as cited by Business Insider Article [3]	

Assumptions

8Mt plastic leaked to Oceans per year, 2006 to 2050.

References

1 Jambeck, J. (2015, February 12). *Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean*. Retrieved from https://www.iswa.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Calendar_2011_03_AMERICANA/Science-2015-Jambeck-768-71__2_.pdf (footnote 12)

2 Ocean Conservancy. (2015, September). *Stemming the Tide: Land-based strategies for a plastic-free ocean*. Retrieved from <https://oceanconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/full-report-stemming-the.pdf>

3 Harrington, R. (2016, January 26). *By 2050, the oceans could have more plastic than fish*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/plastic-in-ocean-outweighs-fish-evidence-report-2017-1>

Additional Information

Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2016, January 19). *The New Plastics Economy: Rethinking the future of plastics - download the infographics*. Retrieved from

Proportions of Plastics in Oceans, by Size, Estimate					
Geographic Segment	Total Plastic	Units	% of Seg.	% of Total	
GPGP Gyre	78.4 Kt		100%	0.04%	Great Pacific Garbage Patch
Megaplastics (>50 cm).	42.0 Kt		54%		e.g. fishing nets
Macroplastics (5-50 cm)	20.0 Kt		26%		e.g. crates
Mesoplastics (0.5-5 cm)	10.0 Kt		13%		e.g. bottle caps
Microplastics (0.05-0.5 cm)	6.4 Kt		8%		e.g. pea-sized bits or smaller
All 5 Gyres	392.0 Kt		100%	0.2%	Estimated at 5x GPGP
Megaplastics (>50 cm).	210.0 Kt		54%		e.g. fishing nets
Macroplastics (5-50 cm)	100.0 Kt		26%		e.g. crates
Mesoplastics (0.5-5 cm)	50.0 Kt		13%		e.g. bottle caps
Microplastics (0.05-0.5 cm)	32.0 Kt		8%		e.g. pea-sized bits or smaller
Outside Gyres	199,608.0 Kt		100%	99.8%	Including beaches
Macroplastics (5-50 cm)	109,674.7 Kt		55%		
Mesoplastics (0.5-5 cm)	54,837.4 Kt		27%		
Microplastics (0.05-0.5 cm)	35,095.9 Kt		18%		
Total	200,000.0 Kt		100%	100%	Average of estimate methods 1 and 2
Megaplastics (>50 cm).	210.0 Kt		0%		
Macroplastics (5-50 cm)	109,774.7 Kt		55%		
Mesoplastics (0.5-5 cm)	54,887.4 Kt		27%		
Microplastics (0.05-0.5 cm)	35,127.9 Kt		18%		

Assumptions:

Amount of plastic by weight in all 5 gyres is roughly 5 times (5x) that of the GPGP.

Size composition of ocean plastic resembles GPGP, except that only gyres contain significant amounts of megaplastic.

References

Lebreton, L. (2018, March 22). Evidence that the Great Pacific Garbage Patch is rapidly accumulating plastic. *Retrieved from* <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-018-22939-w>

Ocean Plastic Clean-Up Costs		
Geographic Segment	Number	Measurement
GPGP cost, big plastics	370	M \$
All 5 gyres, big plastics	1,850	M \$
All 5 gyres, all plastics	2,014	M \$
All ocean areas	3,775,069	M \$
All ocean areas, legacy	1,007,222	M \$
All ocean areas, future	2,767,847	M \$
Adult population	763	million persons
Amount per person	\$4,947.67	/person for lifetime
Total amount per year	\$164.92	/person/yr for 30 years

Total amount per year, 2020-2050 (Level 3)	\$120.92	/person/yr for 30 years
Total amount per year, legacy (Level 4)	\$44.00	/person/yr for 30 year
Total amount per month	\$13.75	/person/month for 30 years

Assumptions:

Costs for cleaning all areas of the ocean (and beaches) of all sizes of plastic particles will be equivalent to costs per pound of cleaning GPGP per OceanCleanup.org estimates. See Reference below at pg. 21.

Scaled-down OceanCleanup.org approaches and other technological advances will allow near 100% cleanup of all parts of ocean and all particle sizes.

Size composition of ocean plastic resembles GPGP, except that only gyres contain significant amounts of megaplastic.

Amount of plastic by weight in all 5 gyres is roughly 5 times (5x) that of the GPGP.

References

Slat, B. (2014). *How the Oceans Can Clean Themselves—A Feasibility Study*. Retrieved from https://www.theoceancleanup.com/fileadmin/media-archive/Documents/TOC_Feasibility_study_executive_summary_V2_0.pdf

Poverty Calculations

Poverty						
	Period Cost	Units	Years	Total Cost	Units	Notes
Extreme Poverty, Cost to End [1] (Cost x Years = Total)	\$71.94	Billion Dollars per Year	10	\$719	Billion Dollars	Cost for ending extreme poverty (those living on less than \$1.25 US per day) in 2013.
Poverty, Cost to End [2] (Cost x Years = Total)	\$177.64	Billion Dollars per Year	10	\$1,776	Billion Dollars	In 2015, the poverty threshold was estimated to be those living on less than \$2.50 US per day.
Extreme Poverty, Cost per Person (Cost / Years = Total Cost per Person Per Year)	\$232.72	Dollars per Year	10	\$2,327	Dollars	
Poverty, Cost per Person (Cost / Years = Total per Person Per Year)	\$465.44	Dollars per Year	10	\$4,654	Dollars	
Poverty, Cost per Person, Per Month	\$38.79	Dollars per	10	\$4,654	Dollars	

Assumptions

The global poverty threshold often used is two times the threshold used for extreme poverty, thus the cost per person to eradicate poverty is estimated to be about twice the amount per person to eradicate extreme poverty. The UN estimates that 3 billion people lived in poverty (living on less than \$2.50 US per day) and 1.3 billion in extreme poverty (living on less than \$1.25 US per day) in 2014 [2]. Since there are a few more people in poverty, but not extreme poverty, than are in extreme poverty, in the table above, ending poverty is assumed to cost 2.3 (3.0/1.3) times the amount needed to end extreme poverty. We acknowledge that this does not address possible differences in the efficiency of dollars spent on eradication of extreme poverty versus poverty that is not as extreme. As always, we encourage feedback on these assumptions.

Figures shown in other sources (e.g. Drezner[3]) often show much larger costs for the elimination of extreme poverty, these typically include the current amount of foreign aid. The current analysis addresses the amount needed in addition to the current levels of foreign aid.

All figures adjusted to 2019 dollars. 2013 dollars are estimated as 1.09 2019 dollars. 2015 dollars are estimated as 1.07 2019 dollars. Based on <https://www.usinflationcalculator.com>.

References

- 1 OXFAM. (2013, January 18). *OXFAM Media Briefing*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2013-01-19/annual-income-richest-100-people-enough-end-global-poverty-four>
- 2 United Nations Development Programme. (2014). "Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience." *Human Development Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.dosomething.org/us/facts/11-facts-about-global-poverty>
- 3 Drezner, Daniel W. (2005, April 24). The End of Poverty': Brother, Can You Spare \$195 Billion?. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/24/books/review/the-end-of-poverty-brother-can-you-spare-195-billion.html>
- 4 Brookings Institute. (2016, January 20). The global poverty gap is falling. Billionaires could help close it. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2016/01/20/the-global-poverty-gap-is-falling-billionaires-could-help-close-it>