

Lost Dollars, Empty Plates

The Impact of Food Stamp Participation on State and
Local Economies

Tia Shimada
November 2009



California Food Policy Advocates

California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA) is a statewide public policy and advocacy organization dedicated to improving the health and well being of low-income Californians by increasing their access to nutritious, affordable food.

Acknowledgments

CFPA's food stamp policy advocacy is supported by Kaiser Permanente Community Benefit Programs, The California Endowment, The California Wellness Foundation, and the Wallis Foundation. Their generous support is gratefully acknowledged.



436 14th Street
Suite 1220
Oakland, CA 94612
www.cfpa.net

Please direct inquiries about this report to Tia Shimada at 510.433.1122 ext. 109 or tia@cfpa.net.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Analysis | 3 |
| The Lost Dollars (Statewide Summary) | 3 |
| Actions to Improve Food Stamp Participation..... | 3 |
| County Data Tables | 5 |
| Methodology..... | 12 |
| Appendix A..... | 16 |
| Appendix B | 23 |
| Appendix C..... | 24 |
| References | 35 |

Introduction

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), California ranks at the bottom of the list for state food stamp participation¹. This disconcerting underutilization harms the state and local economies as well as low-income Californians. The following analysis examines the impact that increased participation in the Food Stamp Program would have on state, local, and household budgets. In times of economic hardship, such as the state's continuing recession, increasing food stamp participation is an excellent means of bolstering economic activity while supporting the growing number of Californians in need.

Food Stamp Program Overview

The Food Stamp Program, known federally as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), is the nation's largest nutrition assistance program. As a federal entitlement program, funding is available to provide all eligible applicants with food stamp benefits. The program provides benefits to supplement household food budgets when individuals or families cannot afford enough to eat. By providing access to a nutritious, affordable diet, food stamp benefits support productivity, promote health, and help prevent hunger.

Food stamp benefits are fully federally funded. The federal government also funds 50 percent of the program's administrative costs, with the state and counties contributing the remaining 35 and 15 percent, respectively.

Food Stamp Program participation has increased rapidly in California over the course of the recession. For example, between January and August of 2009, there was an average monthly increase of 13% in Food Stamp Program participation statewide. During the same monthly period in 2008, there was only an 8.5% increase. In even starker contrast, for the same period in 2007, there was less than a 3% increase. The most recent data from the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) show that almost 2.9 million Californians participate in the Food Stamp Program². This translates to more than \$420 million in monthly nutrition assistance benefits for eligible children, adults, and senior citizens³.

Impact on State and Local Economies

Food stamp benefits clearly support households by increasing their ability to purchase adequate amounts of nutritious food. But food stamp benefits do more than just help individual households. USDA has shown that every dollar in federal food stamp

expenditures generates \$1.84 in economic activity⁴. In addition to helping people put food on the table, food stamps exert a multiplier effect that stimulates the economy.

Impact on State and Local Budgets

The California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) asserts that food stamp benefits help "generate revenue for the state and local governments."⁵ Receiving federal food stamp benefits can allow households to redistribute income that would normally be allocated to purchasing food. A portion of this redistributed income can be spent on taxable goods, generating sales tax revenue for the state and counties. This revenue-generating effect occurs soon after food stamp benefits are issued, as eligible households are, by necessity, more likely to spend (rather than save) any additional income within weeks of its being received⁶.

Low Food Stamp Participation Means Lost Dollars for All

Low food stamp participation means less for all Californians – less nutrition assistance for eligible households, less economic activity, and less sales tax revenue for the state and local governments. These losses can be mitigated by eliminating unnecessary barriers to food stamp participation. This report describes key steps California should take in improving food stamp participation to recoup lost dollars and fill empty plates.

Analysis

The Lost Dollars

As detailed in the data tables that conclude this section of the report, if 100 percent^a of eligible individuals participated in the Food Stamp Program, California would receive an estimated **\$3.7 billion** in additional federal benefits each year. Those benefits would generate an additional **\$6.9 billion** in annual statewide economic activity.

| Statewide Snapshot | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Income-Eligible Non-Participants | 2.9 million |
| Lost Federal Dollars | \$3.7 billion |
| Lost Economic Activity | \$6.9 billion |
| Loss to State Budget | \$121 million |
| Loss to County Budgets | \$32 million |

By applying food stamp benefits to their household food costs, Food Stamp Program participants have more dollars to spend on taxable goods. Using methodology adopted from the California Legislative Analyst’s Office, CFPA calculates that these dollars would result in an additional **\$100 million** of sales tax revenue for the state general fund. Similarly, an additional **\$21 million** of sales tax revenue would be generated for the state’s non-general fund expenditures. Full Food Stamp Program participation would yield an additional **\$32 million** for county budgets through increased state and county sales tax revenue.

Actions to Improve Food Stamp Participation

California should work to increase Food Stamp Program participation among eligible individuals and families. Such an increase would not only lend support to low-income Californians in a time of great need, but would also bolster state and local economies. There are several steps that should be taken to improve participation in the Food Stamp Program across California. Four priority actions are described below.

Modified Categorical Eligibility – Removing the Asset Test

On July 1, 2009, all California counties were authorized to implement modified categorical eligibility for the Food Stamp Program, which removes the asset test for households with children. The removal of the asset test, enacted through legislation

^a Three states (Tennessee, Maine, and Missouri) approach 100% food stamp participation among eligible individuals. Fourteen states have participation rates at or above 75%.

Source: USDA, *Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2006*.
<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/SNAP/FILES/Participation/Reaching2006.pdf>

sponsored by CFPA in 2008, means that households with children do not have to exhaust all of their assets before obtaining nutrition assistance benefits. Allowing low-income families to retain some level of savings while also receiving much needed nutrition assistance helps those families weather financial hardships and ultimately escape the cycle of poverty.

Though implementation of modified categorical eligibility is not required until January 1, 2010, counties should implement this policy immediately and cease the collection of asset-related information from households with children. The state should extend the policy to include all households (not just those with children) living below 200% of the federal poverty guidelines. Once the asset test is eliminated for all food stamp applicants, the state should remove asset-related questions from food stamp application forms to help put the policy change into practice.

The Face-to-Face Interview Waiver

Recently, the California Department of Social Services informed California's county food stamp offices that a phone interview can be conducted in lieu of a face-to-face interview for all food stamp applicants and all continuing participants undergoing annual recertification. This long-awaited state decision gives counties the option to remove a significant barrier to food stamp participation by eliminating the need for food stamp applicants and continuing participants to visit county food stamp office for in-person interviews.

The face-to-face interview waiver does not increase incidents of fraud within the Food Stamp Program. Before allowing the waiver for *all* food stamp applicants and *all* continuing participants, USDA approved the waiver for specific subsets of these populations. Once USDA confirmed that the waiver did not increase incidents of fraud among these subsets, the option became all-inclusive.

All counties should embrace the option to waive the face-to-face interview in order to improve food stamp participation and the timeliness of processing food stamp applications. For more information about implementing the face-to-face waiver, please contact Evonne Silva at evonne@cfpa.net or 510.433.1122 ext 107.

Removing Finger-Imaging Requirements

California's finger-imaging requirement is a significant barrier to food stamp participation, but not a proven method of fraud prevention. The goal of California's finger imaging system is to deter multiple-aid fraud (i.e. receiving food stamp benefits from multiple counties or under multiple names). However, the California State

Auditor has twice reported that the benefits of the finger imaging system do not clearly outweigh the costs⁷. That is, there is no fiscal evidence that the amount of multi-aid fraud in California warrants the use of an extremely expensive statewide finger imaging system. However, there is evidence that finger-imaging negatively impacts food stamp participation⁸. USDA, or the California State Legislature, should remove the finger-imaging requirement from the Food Stamp Program.

Paperwork Reduction - Moving to Simplified Reporting

California is the only state that requires food stamp participants to report their income and household status every three months to maintain benefits. In contrast to quarterly reporting, simplified six month reporting decreases errors in processing cases, improves the continuity of participation, and alleviates administrative burdens on county food stamp offices.

Until very recently, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), through waivers approved by USDA, was allowed to operate the Food Stamp Program using a quarterly reporting system. In September 2009, USDA rejected the CDSS request to extend the current modified quarterly reporting waiver for an additional four years. USDA has given CDSS six months to develop a plan for converting to simplified reporting and 18 months to implement the plan once it is submitted and approved. California should immediately adopt simplified six month reporting to increase food stamp participation among eligible households and improve administrative efficiency.

County Data Tables

The following tables describe the impact of Food Stamp Program underutilization on California's state and local economies. As detailed in the Methodology section, these results incorporate the Program Access Index (PAI). The PAI is designed to indicate the degree to which low-income people are participating in the Food Stamp Program.

USDA calculates a state-specific PAI that is used as one measure to assess states' administration of the Food Stamp Program. The county-specific PAI used for the analysis detailed in this report was generated by CFPD using methodology adapted from USDA. The county-specific PAI serves as the basis of this analysis because it helps describe county-by-county variation in food stamp participation.

Please note that an adjunct set of tables, based on the USDA-generated statewide Food Stamp Program participation rate, is located in Appendix A. The methodology used to generate those tables can be found in Appendix B. A comparison of the tables in

Appendix A and results from the 2006 *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates* analysis, which was also based on the statewide participation rate, is located in Appendix C.

Table 1

Average monthly participation and estimated eligibility for the Food Stamp Program (*based on the 2007 Program Access Index*)

| County | Average Monthly Food Stamp Participation | Estimated Number of Income-Eligible Participants | Estimated Number Income-Eligible Non-Participants |
|------------------|--|--|---|
| Statewide | 2,030,918 | 4,932,180 | 2,901,262 |
| Alameda | 70,230 | 157,586 | 87,356 |
| Alpine | 89 | 219 | 130 |
| Amador | 1,254 | 3,996 | 2,742 |
| Butte | 18,602 | 43,029 | 24,427 |
| Calaveras | 1,943 | 5,422 | 3,478 |
| Colusa | 1,304 | 3,091 | 1,787 |
| Contra Costa | 33,357 | 95,183 | 61,826 |
| Del Norte | 3,909 | 5,566 | 1,656 |
| El Dorado | 4,366 | 15,903 | 11,537 |
| Fresno | 124,972 | 192,617 | 67,645 |
| Glenn | 2,251 | 4,895 | 2,644 |
| Humboldt | 10,196 | 20,625 | 10,429 |
| Imperial | 18,661 | 32,007 | 13,346 |
| Inyo | 970 | 2,246 | 1,276 |
| Kern | 80,486 | 156,193 | 75,707 |
| Kings | 13,718 | 25,460 | 11,742 |
| Lake | 5,387 | 9,682 | 4,295 |
| Lassen | 2,165 | 4,608 | 2,443 |
| Los Angeles | 620,402 | 1,577,564 | 957,162 |
| Madera | 14,695 | 23,772 | 9,077 |
| Marin | 4,388 | 17,555 | 13,167 |
| Mariposa | 815 | 2,642 | 1,827 |
| Mendocino | 7,209 | 10,854 | 3,645 |
| Merced | 31,105 | 50,701 | 19,596 |
| Modoc | 716 | 1,746 | 1,029 |
| Mono | 250 | 1,576 | 1,326 |
| Monterey | 18,620 | 61,647 | 43,027 |

Table 1

Average monthly participation and estimated eligibility for the Food Stamp Program (*based on the 2007 Program Access Index*)

| County | Average Monthly Food Stamp Participation | Estimated Number of Income-Eligible Participants | Estimated Number Income-Eligible Non-Participants |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| Napa | 2,738 | 14,560 | 11,822 |
| Nevada | 2,708 | 10,814 | 8,106 |
| Orange | 81,497 | 314,694 | 233,197 |
| Placer | 7,546 | 23,030 | 15,484 |
| Plumas | 695 | 2,296 | 1,601 |
| Riverside | 90,984 | 283,241 | 192,257 |
| Sacramento | 119,078 | 169,396 | 50,318 |
| San Benito | 3,296 | 7,996 | 4,700 |
| San Bernardino | 138,578 | 276,506 | 137,928 |
| San Diego | 74,758 | 362,513 | 287,755 |
| San Francisco | 30,169 | 61,176 | 31,007 |
| San Joaquin | 57,098 | 97,647 | 40,549 |
| San Luis Obispo | 8,181 | 33,440 | 25,259 |
| San Mateo | 8,649 | 46,784 | 38,136 |
| Santa Barbara | 18,533 | 62,848 | 44,315 |
| Santa Clara | 59,859 | 151,658 | 91,799 |
| Santa Cruz | 11,794 | 31,941 | 20,147 |
| Shasta | 13,785 | 24,714 | 10,929 |
| Sierra | 156 | 423 | 267 |
| Siskiyou | 3,807 | 7,830 | 4,023 |
| Solano | 20,863 | 36,477 | 15,614 |
| Sonoma | 13,728 | 44,875 | 31,147 |
| Stanislaus | 42,176 | 75,887 | 33,711 |
| Sutter | 6,390 | 11,427 | 5,037 |
| Tehama | 5,619 | 12,681 | 7,062 |
| Trinity | 1,046 | 2,397 | 1,351 |
| Tulare | 63,783 | 114,236 | 50,453 |
| Tuolumne | 2,989 | 7,468 | 4,479 |
| Ventura | 31,038 | 78,885 | 47,847 |
| Yolo | 9,527 | 27,783 | 18,257 |
| Yuba | 8,564 | 16,686 | 8,122 |

Table 2

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation and the resulting increase in economic activity, per year (*incorporating the 2007 Program Access Index*)

| County | Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Resulting Increase in Economic Activity |
|------------------|---|--|
| Statewide | \$3,735,766,228 | \$6,873,809,860 |
| Alameda | \$126,884,607 | \$233,467,677 |
| Alpine | \$174,677 | \$321,406 |
| Amador | \$4,064,518 | \$7,478,714 |
| Butte | \$32,782,493 | \$60,319,787 |
| Calaveras | \$4,974,076 | \$9,152,299 |
| Colusa | \$2,043,379 | \$3,759,817 |
| Contra Costa | \$83,554,925 | \$153,741,063 |
| Del Norte | \$2,306,739 | \$4,244,399 |
| El Dorado | \$16,247,764 | \$29,895,886 |
| Fresno | \$76,962,110 | \$141,610,282 |
| Glenn | \$3,150,800 | \$5,797,472 |
| Humboldt | \$15,344,166 | \$28,233,265 |
| Imperial | \$15,273,353 | \$28,102,970 |
| Inyo | \$1,879,802 | \$3,458,836 |
| Kern | \$86,204,070 | \$158,615,489 |
| Kings | \$14,509,522 | \$26,697,521 |
| Lake | \$5,932,895 | \$10,916,528 |
| Lassen | \$3,172,295 | \$5,837,022 |
| Los Angeles | \$1,324,896,441 | \$2,437,809,451 |
| Madera | \$10,741,516 | \$19,764,389 |
| Marin | \$23,427,959 | \$43,107,445 |
| Mariposa | \$2,576,879 | \$4,741,457 |
| Mendocino | \$5,870,039 | \$10,800,872 |
| Merced | \$22,156,779 | \$40,768,473 |
| Modoc | \$1,282,914 | \$2,360,561 |
| Mono | \$2,106,810 | \$3,876,530 |
| Monterey | \$54,927,280 | \$101,066,195 |
| Napa | \$16,075,747 | \$29,579,374 |

Table 2

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation and the resulting increase in economic activity, per year (*incorporating the 2007 Program Access Index*)

| County | Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Resulting Increase in Economic Activity |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Nevada | \$11,888,278 | \$21,874,432 |
| Orange | \$284,487,800 | \$523,457,552 |
| Placer | \$20,074,824 | \$36,937,675 |
| Plumas | \$2,045,225 | \$3,763,215 |
| Riverside | \$211,851,992 | \$389,807,664 |
| Sacramento | \$61,917,048 | \$113,927,368 |
| San Benito | \$6,165,398 | \$11,344,333 |
| San Bernardino | \$152,483,007 | \$280,568,732 |
| San Diego | \$342,373,404 | \$629,967,063 |
| San Francisco | \$61,963,723 | \$114,013,251 |
| San Joaquin | \$46,820,284 | \$86,149,323 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$36,739,133 | \$67,600,004 |
| San Mateo | \$54,145,999 | \$99,628,637 |
| Santa Barbara | \$58,735,137 | \$108,072,653 |
| Santa Clara | \$123,699,596 | \$227,607,256 |
| Santa Cruz | \$30,005,603 | \$55,210,309 |
| Shasta | \$15,055,846 | \$27,702,757 |
| Sierra | \$401,808 | \$739,327 |
| Siskiyou | \$5,374,593 | \$9,889,250 |
| Solano | \$21,223,605 | \$39,051,433 |
| Sonoma | \$48,181,986 | \$88,654,854 |
| Stanislaus | \$41,718,957 | \$76,762,880 |
| Sutter | \$6,032,273 | \$11,099,382 |
| Tehama | \$9,031,075 | \$16,617,178 |
| Trinity | \$1,755,278 | \$3,229,711 |
| Tulare | \$60,284,656 | \$110,923,767 |
| Tuolumne | \$6,127,501 | \$11,274,603 |
| Ventura | \$63,825,847 | \$117,439,559 |
| Yolo | \$24,024,718 | \$44,205,482 |
| Yuba | \$9,932,479 | \$18,275,761 |

Table 3

Estimated value of additional state and county sales tax revenue generated annually if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the 2007 Program Access Index*)

| County | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (General Fund) | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (non- General Fund) | Additional Sales Tax Revenue for Counties |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| Statewide | \$100,865,688 | \$21,013,685 | \$31,817,538 |
| Alameda | \$3,425,884 | \$713,726 | \$1,427,452 |
| Alpine | \$4,716 | \$983 | \$786 |
| Amador | \$109,742 | \$22,863 | \$27,435 |
| Butte | \$885,127 | \$184,402 | \$147,521 |
| Calaveras | \$134,300 | \$27,979 | \$22,383 |
| Colusa | \$55,171 | \$11,494 | \$9,195 |
| Contra Costa | \$2,255,983 | \$469,996 | \$751,994 |
| Del Norte | \$62,282 | \$12,975 | \$10,380 |
| El Dorado | \$438,690 | \$91,394 | \$73,115 |
| Fresno | \$2,077,977 | \$432,912 | \$597,418 |
| Glenn | \$85,072 | \$17,723 | \$14,179 |
| Humboldt | \$414,292 | \$86,311 | \$69,049 |
| Imperial | \$412,381 | \$85,913 | \$103,095 |
| Inyo | \$50,755 | \$10,574 | \$12,689 |
| Kern | \$2,327,510 | \$484,898 | \$387,918 |
| Kings | \$391,757 | \$81,616 | \$65,293 |
| Lake | \$160,188 | \$33,373 | \$26,698 |
| Lassen | \$85,652 | \$17,844 | \$14,275 |
| Los Angeles | \$35,772,204 | \$7,452,542 | \$14,905,085 |
| Madera | \$290,021 | \$60,421 | \$72,505 |
| Marin | \$632,555 | \$131,782 | \$184,495 |
| Mariposa | \$69,576 | \$14,495 | \$17,394 |
| Mendocino | \$158,491 | \$33,019 | \$26,415 |
| Merced | \$598,233 | \$124,632 | \$99,706 |
| Modoc | \$34,639 | \$7,216 | \$5,773 |
| Mono | \$56,884 | \$11,851 | \$9,481 |
| Monterey | \$1,483,037 | \$308,966 | \$247,173 |
| Napa | \$434,045 | \$90,426 | \$108,511 |
| Nevada | \$320,984 | \$66,872 | \$60,184 |

Table 3

Estimated value of additional state and county sales tax revenue generated annually if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the 2007 Program Access Index*)

| County | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (General Fund) | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (non- General Fund) | Additional Sales Tax Revenue for Counties |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| Orange | \$7,681,171 | \$1,600,244 | \$1,920,293 |
| Placer | \$542,020 | \$112,921 | \$90,337 |
| Plumas | \$55,221 | \$11,504 | \$9,204 |
| Riverside | \$5,720,004 | \$1,191,667 | \$1,430,001 |
| Sacramento | \$1,671,760 | \$348,283 | \$417,940 |
| San Benito | \$166,466 | \$34,680 | \$27,744 |
| San Bernardino | \$4,117,041 | \$857,717 | \$1,029,260 |
| San Diego | \$9,244,082 | \$1,925,850 | \$2,311,020 |
| San Francisco | \$1,673,021 | \$348,546 | \$627,383 |
| San Joaquin | \$1,264,148 | \$263,364 | \$316,037 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$991,957 | \$206,658 | \$165,326 |
| San Mateo | \$1,461,942 | \$304,571 | \$487,314 |
| Santa Barbara | \$1,585,849 | \$330,385 | \$396,462 |
| Santa Clara | \$3,339,889 | \$695,810 | \$1,113,296 |
| Santa Cruz | \$810,151 | \$168,782 | \$236,294 |
| Shasta | \$406,508 | \$84,689 | \$67,751 |
| Sierra | \$10,849 | \$2,260 | \$1,808 |
| Siskiyou | \$145,114 | \$30,232 | \$24,186 |
| Solano | \$573,037 | \$119,383 | \$107,444 |
| Sonoma | \$1,300,914 | \$271,024 | \$379,433 |
| Stanislaus | \$1,126,412 | \$234,669 | \$211,202 |
| Sutter | \$162,871 | \$33,932 | \$27,145 |
| Tehama | \$243,839 | \$50,800 | \$40,640 |
| Trinity | \$47,392 | \$9,873 | \$7,899 |
| Tulare | \$1,627,686 | \$339,101 | \$406,921 |
| Tuolumne | \$165,443 | \$34,467 | \$27,574 |
| Ventura | \$1,723,298 | \$359,020 | \$287,216 |
| Yolo | \$648,667 | \$135,139 | \$108,111 |
| Yuba | \$268,177 | \$55,870 | \$44,696 |

Methodology

The following is a description of the data sources and calculations used to complete the *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates* analysis. This methodology is organized according to the data tables found in the Analysis section above.

Table 1

Average Monthly Food Stamp Participation

Monthly Food Stamp Program participation data were obtained from the California Department of Social Services' DFA 256⁹ report for January-December 2007. Monthly participation was averaged across the calendar year to account for seasonal differences in food stamp participation.

Estimated Number of Income-Eligible Individuals & Income-Eligible Non-Participants

CFPA's 2007 County Program Access Index (PAI)¹⁰ analysis was used to identify the *estimated number of income-eligible individuals* and *estimated number of income-eligible non-participants*. The PAI is a county-level estimate of food stamp participation among income-eligible individuals. Individuals who are income-eligible for the Food Stamp Program may not meet all other eligibility criteria.

CFPA's PAI methodology is detailed in the report *Measuring County Food Stamp Performance 2007*¹¹. The formula used to calculate a county's PAI is as follows:

$$\text{PAI} = \text{Food Stamp Participants (not including Disaster Food Assistance recipients)} \div \text{Individuals Income-Eligible for Food Stamps}$$

Due to limitations in data available from the US Census Bureau, the income-eligible population is defined as those living below 125% of the federal poverty level, though actual income criteria for the Food Stamp Program are slightly higher (130% of the federal poverty level). Individuals participating in the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations and individuals receiving Supplemental Security Income are removed from the income-eligible population as those individuals are ineligible to receive food stamp benefits in California.

In previous iterations of the *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates* report, the USDA-generated statewide food stamp participation rate was used to estimate the number of eligible non-participants. At the county level, Food Stamp Program participation can vary widely; the statewide rate simply does not reflect the reality of food stamp participation

in many counties. Unfortunately, USDA does not calculate county-level participation rates. The PAI serves as the basis of this analysis because, unlike the statewide participation rate, it helps describe county-by-county variation.

Table 2

Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits

Calculating the value of additional federal food stamp benefits that would be received by Californians if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% requires an estimated value of average monthly benefits. The average benefit that current non-participants *would* receive may be significantly different than the average benefit current participants *do* receive. To account for the potential discrepancy, this analysis relied on a fiscal year 2009 estimate of the average monthly benefit for *eligible* households. Eligible households include both eligible participants and eligible non-participants. The estimate (\$262), calculated by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.,^b is lower than the actual, average household benefit (\$273) received by food stamp participants in California for fiscal year 2008¹². The \$262 estimate includes the 13.6% increase in federal food stamp benefits resulting from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

The average monthly benefit for eligible individuals was estimated from the average monthly benefit for eligible households using the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Estimated Household Benefit for Eligible Households} \div \text{Average Household Size} \\ & = \text{Estimated Monthly Benefit for Eligible Individuals} \end{aligned}$$

Average household size is a county-specific statistic calculated with data from the 2007 CDSS DFA 256 reports¹³ using the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Total Individuals Receiving Federal Food Stamp Benefits from January through} \\ & \text{December} \div \text{Total Number of Households Receiving Federal and/or State Food} \\ & \text{Stamp Benefits from January through December} = \text{Average Household Size} \end{aligned}$$

The value of *additional federal food stamp benefits* received by Californians if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% was estimated with the following calculation:

^b This estimate was calculated for an SSI Cash-Out analysis that will be released by CFPA and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. in December 2009.

Income-Eligible Individuals Not Receiving Federal Food Stamp Benefits x
Average Monthly Benefit for Eligible Individuals x 12 = Additional Federal Food
Stamp Benefits Received Annually with 100% Participation

Resulting Increase in Economic Activity

According to the USDA, every federal dollar spent on food stamp program expenditures generates \$1.84 in economic activity by “shifting cash income previously spent on food to nonfood spending.”¹⁴ Using this premise, the *resulting increase in economic activity* generated from the receipt of additional federal food stamp benefits was estimated with the following formula:

Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits x \$1.84 = Increase in Economic Activity,
Per Year, if Food Stamp Participation Reached 100%

Table 3

Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (General Fund)

The California Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) reports that food stamp benefits positively impact the state economy by freeing up household dollars for food and non-food purchases, 45% of which will constitute taxable purchases¹⁵:

Research shows that low-income individuals generally are not able to save money because their resources are spent on meeting their daily needs, such as shelter, food, and transportation. Therefore, for every dollar in food coupons that a low-income family receives, an additional dollar is available for the consumption of food or other items. Research done at the University of California and elsewhere indicates that individuals with income low enough to be eligible for food stamps would, on average, spend about 45 percent of their income on goods for which they would pay sales tax. The state General Fund receives about 5 cents for every dollar that is spent on a taxable good. Local governments and special funds receive the remainder of the sales tax revenue (generally about 2.25 percent). Because additional food coupons would result in low-income families spending more of their other resources on taxable goods, the receipt of federal food coupons helps to generate revenue for the state and for local governments.

Updating the LAO premise to reflect current sales tax rates and uses, the state general fund receives 6% (\$0.06) of every dollar spent on taxable goods¹⁶. One and a quarter percent of each dollar spent on taxable goods is slated for non-general fund expenses. Applying the LAO premise, the following calculation was used to estimate *additional state sales tax revenue* that would be generated if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100%:

Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits x 45% x \$0.06 Sales Tax =
Additional State Sales Tax Revenue Generated Annually for the General
Fund

Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits x 45% x \$0.0125 Sales Tax =
Additional State Sales Tax Revenue Generated Annually for Non-General
Fund Expenditures

Additional Sales Tax Revenue for Counties

Because California counties receive 1% of state sales tax (\$0.01 of every dollar spent on taxable goods), the LAO premise can be applied to estimate the impact of federal food stamp benefits on county budgets. However, to fully account for the impact of federal food stamp benefits on local economies, county-specific sales tax rates must be included in any calculations. The following formula was used to estimate the *additional sales tax revenue for counties* that would be generated if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100%:

$$[(\text{County sales tax rate} - \text{state sales tax rate}) + .01] \times (\text{Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits} \times 45\%) = \text{Additional Sales Tax Revenue Generated Annually for the County}$$

County sales tax rates were taken from the April 2009 California Board of Equalization Publication 71¹⁷. These rates do not include and city-or district-specific taxes within each county.

Appendix A

The following tables describe the impact of Food Stamp Program underutilization on California's state and local economies. These tables are based on the USDA-generated **statewide Food Stamp Program participation rate** for California, not the county-specific PAI. The methodology used to generate these tables is detailed in Appendix B.

Table 4

Monthly participation and estimated eligibility for the Food Stamp Program (*based on the statewide participation rate of 50%*)

| County | Total Persons Eligible to Receive Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Total Eligible Persons Receiving Benefits | Total Eligible Persons NOT Receiving Benefits |
|------------------|---|---|---|
| Statewide | 5594372 | 2,797,186 | 2,797,186 |
| Alameda | 172464 | 86,232 | 86,232 |
| Alpine | 208 | 104 | 104 |
| Amador | 4090 | 2,045 | 2,045 |
| Butte | 44648 | 22,324 | 22,324 |
| Calaveras | 6466 | 3,233 | 3,233 |
| Colusa | 3126 | 1,563 | 1,563 |
| Contra Costa | 93946 | 46,973 | 46,973 |
| Del Norte | 9162 | 4,581 | 4,581 |
| El Dorado | 14122 | 7,061 | 7,061 |
| Fresno | 339874 | 169,937 | 169,937 |
| Glenn | 5572 | 2,786 | 2,786 |
| Humboldt | 23130 | 11,565 | 11,565 |
| Imperial | 48852 | 24,426 | 24,426 |
| Inyo | 2836 | 1,418 | 1,418 |
| Kern | 216542 | 108,271 | 108,271 |
| Kings | 34768 | 17,384 | 17,384 |
| Lake | 14882 | 7,441 | 7,441 |
| Lassen | 5138 | 2,569 | 2,569 |
| Los Angeles | 1540008 | 770,004 | 770,004 |
| Madera | 38088 | 19,044 | 19,044 |
| Marin | 12608 | 6,304 | 6,304 |
| Mariposa | 2274 | 1,137 | 1,137 |

Table 4

Monthly participation and estimated eligibility for the Food Stamp Program (*based on the statewide participation rate of 50%*)

| County | Total Persons Eligible to Receive Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Total Eligible Persons Receiving Benefits | Total Eligible Persons NOT Receiving Benefits |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Mendocino | 20,092 | 10,046 | 10,046 |
| Merced | 81,422 | 40,711 | 40,711 |
| Modoc | 1,900 | 950 | 950 |
| Mono | 912 | 456 | 456 |
| Monterey | 55,256 | 27,628 | 27,628 |
| Napa | 9,022 | 4,511 | 4,511 |
| Nevada | 8,728 | 4,364 | 4,364 |
| Orange | 243,894 | 121,947 | 121,947 |
| Placer | 24,410 | 12,205 | 12,205 |
| Plumas | 1,992 | 996 | 996 |
| Riverside | 323,954 | 161,977 | 161,977 |
| Sacramento | 310,694 | 155,347 | 155,347 |
| San Benito | 9,604 | 4,802 | 4,802 |
| San Bernardino | 469,324 | 234,662 | 234,662 |
| San Diego | 274,616 | 137,308 | 137,308 |
| San Francisco | 71,170 | 35,585 | 35,585 |
| San Joaquin | 146,138 | 73,069 | 73,069 |
| San Luis Obispo | 23,500 | 11,750 | 11,750 |
| San Mateo | 27,652 | 13,826 | 13,826 |
| Santa Barbara | 48,408 | 24,204 | 24,204 |
| Santa Clara | 151,858 | 75,929 | 75,929 |
| Santa Cruz | 32,666 | 16,333 | 16,333 |
| Shasta | 36,782 | 18,391 | 18,391 |
| Sierra | 354 | 177 | 177 |
| Siskiyou | 9,542 | 4,771 | 4,771 |
| Solano | 60,342 | 30,171 | 30,171 |
| Sonoma | 41,972 | 20,986 | 20,986 |
| Stanislaus | 122,282 | 61,141 | 61,141 |
| Sutter | 17,646 | 8,823 | 8,823 |
| Tehama | 14,468 | 7,234 | 7,234 |

Table 4

Monthly participation and estimated eligibility for the Food Stamp Program (*based on the statewide participation rate of 50%*)

| County | Total Persons Eligible to Receive Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Total Eligible Persons Receiving Benefits | Total Eligible Persons <i>NOT</i> Receiving Benefits |
|---------------|--|--|---|
| Trinity | 2,544 | 1,272 | 1,272 |
| Tulare | 170,050 | 85,025 | 85,025 |
| Tuolumne | 9,234 | 4,617 | 4,617 |
| Ventura | 92,458 | 46,229 | 46,229 |
| Yolo | 25,086 | 12,543 | 12,543 |
| Yuba | 21,596 | 10,798 | 10,798 |

Table 5

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation and the resulting increase in economic activity, per year (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Resulting Increase in Economic Activity |
|------------------|---|--|
| Statewide | \$3,740,646,312 | \$6,882,789,214 |
| Alameda | \$130,387,968 | \$239,913,861 |
| Alpine | \$147,768 | \$271,893 |
| Amador | \$3,121,992 | \$5,744,465 |
| Butte | \$31,855,008 | \$58,613,215 |
| Calaveras | \$4,659,408 | \$8,573,311 |
| Colusa | \$1,694,616 | \$3,118,093 |
| Contra Costa | \$67,152,696 | \$123,560,961 |
| Del Norte | \$6,636,984 | \$12,212,051 |
| El Dorado | \$10,614,144 | \$19,530,025 |
| Fresno | \$208,437,768 | \$383,525,493 |
| Glenn | \$3,398,664 | \$6,253,542 |
| Humboldt | \$18,301,224 | \$33,674,252 |
| Imperial | \$28,503,504 | \$52,446,447 |
| Inyo | \$2,106,480 | \$3,875,923 |
| Kern | \$128,520,432 | \$236,477,595 |
| Kings | \$21,879,096 | \$40,257,537 |
| Lake | \$10,680,168 | \$19,651,509 |
| Lassen | \$3,492,984 | \$6,427,091 |
| Los Angeles | \$1,101,547,560 | \$2,026,847,510 |
| Madera | \$22,913,472 | \$42,160,788 |
| Marin | \$11,824,584 | \$21,757,235 |
| Mariposa | \$1,644,312 | \$3,025,534 |
| Mendocino | \$16,449,408 | \$30,266,911 |
| Merced | \$48,301,272 | \$88,874,340 |
| Modoc | \$1,223,016 | \$2,250,349 |
| Mono | \$826,872 | \$1,521,444 |
| Monterey | \$35,873,040 | \$66,006,394 |
| Napa | \$6,410,616 | \$11,795,533 |
| Nevada | \$6,552,096 | \$12,055,857 |
| Orange | \$158,067,744 | \$290,844,649 |

Table 5

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation and the resulting increase in economic activity, per year (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | Additional Federal Food Stamp Benefits | Resulting Increase in Economic Activity |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Placer | \$16,424,256 | \$30,220,631 |
| Plumas | \$1,320,480 | \$2,429,683 |
| Riverside | \$187,234,632 | \$344,511,723 |
| Sacramento | \$206,384,736 | \$379,747,914 |
| San Benito | \$6,344,592 | \$11,674,049 |
| San Bernardino | \$276,609,120 | \$508,960,781 |
| San Diego | \$171,354,288 | \$315,291,890 |
| San Francisco | \$72,208,248 | \$132,863,176 |
| San Joaquin | \$87,003,912 | \$160,087,198 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$18,027,696 | \$33,170,961 |
| San Mateo | \$20,420,280 | \$37,573,315 |
| Santa Barbara | \$32,590,704 | \$59,966,895 |
| Santa Clara | \$106,260,912 | \$195,520,078 |
| Santa Cruz | \$24,601,800 | \$45,267,312 |
| Shasta | \$26,648,544 | \$49,033,321 |
| Sierra | \$251,520 | \$462,797 |
| Siskiyou | \$6,294,288 | \$11,581,490 |
| Solano | \$44,701,392 | \$82,250,561 |
| Sonoma | \$33,445,872 | \$61,540,404 |
| Stanislaus | \$79,219,368 | \$145,763,637 |
| Sutter | \$10,611,000 | \$19,524,240 |
| Tehama | \$9,309,384 | \$17,129,267 |
| Trinity | \$1,757,496 | \$3,233,793 |
| Tulare | \$104,100,984 | \$191,545,811 |
| Tuolumne | \$6,699,864 | \$12,327,750 |
| Ventura | \$66,266,088 | \$121,929,602 |
| Yolo | \$16,880,136 | \$31,059,450 |
| Yuba | \$14,449,824 | \$26,587,676 |

Table 6

Estimated value of additional state and county sales tax revenue generated annually if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (General Fund) | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (non- General Fund) | Additional Sales Tax Revenue for Counties |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| Statewide | \$100,997,450 | \$21,041,136 | \$30,314,240 |
| Alameda | \$3,520,475 | \$733,432 | \$1,466,865 |
| Alpine | \$3,990 | \$831 | \$665 |
| Amador | \$84,294 | \$17,561 | \$21,073 |
| Butte | \$860,085 | \$179,184 | \$143,348 |
| Calaveras | \$125,804 | \$26,209 | \$20,967 |
| Colusa | \$45,755 | \$9,532 | \$7,626 |
| Contra Costa | \$1,813,123 | \$377,734 | \$604,374 |
| Del Norte | \$179,199 | \$37,333 | \$29,866 |
| El Dorado | \$286,582 | \$59,705 | \$47,764 |
| Fresno | \$5,627,820 | \$1,172,462 | \$1,617,998 |
| Glenn | \$91,764 | \$19,117 | \$15,294 |
| Humboldt | \$494,133 | \$102,944 | \$82,356 |
| Imperial | \$769,595 | \$160,332 | \$192,399 |
| Inyo | \$56,875 | \$11,849 | \$14,219 |
| Kern | \$3,470,052 | \$722,927 | \$578,342 |
| Kings | \$590,736 | \$123,070 | \$98,456 |
| Lake | \$288,365 | \$60,076 | \$48,061 |
| Lassen | \$94,311 | \$19,648 | \$15,718 |
| Los Angeles | \$29,741,784 | \$6,196,205 | \$12,392,410 |
| Madera | \$618,664 | \$128,888 | \$154,666 |
| Marin | \$319,264 | \$66,513 | \$93,119 |
| Mariposa | \$44,396 | \$9,249 | \$11,099 |
| Mendocino | \$444,134 | \$92,528 | \$74,022 |
| Merced | \$1,304,134 | \$271,695 | \$217,356 |
| Modoc | \$33,021 | \$6,879 | \$5,504 |
| Mono | \$22,326 | \$4,651 | \$3,721 |
| Monterey | \$968,572 | \$201,786 | \$161,429 |
| Napa | \$173,087 | \$36,060 | \$43,272 |
| Nevada | \$176,907 | \$36,856 | \$33,170 |

Table 6

Estimated value of additional state and county sales tax revenue generated annually if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (General Fund) | Additional State Sales Tax Revenue (non- General Fund) | Additional Sales Tax Revenue for Counties |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| Orange | \$4,267,829 | \$889,131 | \$1,066,957 |
| Placer | \$443,455 | \$92,386 | \$73,909 |
| Plumas | \$35,653 | \$7,428 | \$5,942 |
| Riverside | \$5,055,335 | \$1,053,195 | \$1,263,834 |
| Sacramento | \$5,572,388 | \$1,160,914 | \$1,393,097 |
| San Benito | \$171,304 | \$35,688 | \$28,551 |
| San Bernardino | \$7,468,446 | \$1,555,926 | \$1,867,112 |
| San Diego | \$4,626,566 | \$963,868 | \$1,156,641 |
| San Francisco | \$1,949,623 | \$406,171 | \$731,109 |
| San Joaquin | \$2,349,106 | \$489,397 | \$587,276 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$486,748 | \$101,406 | \$81,125 |
| San Mateo | \$551,348 | \$114,864 | \$183,783 |
| Santa Barbara | \$879,949 | \$183,323 | \$219,987 |
| Santa Clara | \$2,869,045 | \$597,718 | \$956,348 |
| Santa Cruz | \$664,249 | \$138,385 | \$193,739 |
| Shasta | \$719,511 | \$149,898 | \$119,918 |
| Sierra | \$6,791 | \$1,415 | \$1,132 |
| Siskiyou | \$169,946 | \$35,405 | \$28,324 |
| Solano | \$1,206,938 | \$251,445 | \$226,301 |
| Sonoma | \$903,039 | \$188,133 | \$263,386 |
| Stanislaus | \$2,138,923 | \$445,609 | \$401,048 |
| Sutter | \$286,497 | \$59,687 | \$47,750 |
| Tehama | \$251,353 | \$52,365 | \$41,892 |
| Trinity | \$47,452 | \$9,886 | \$7,909 |
| Tulare | \$2,810,727 | \$585,568 | \$702,682 |
| Tuolumne | \$180,896 | \$37,687 | \$30,149 |
| Ventura | \$1,789,184 | \$372,747 | \$298,197 |
| Yolo | \$455,764 | \$94,951 | \$75,961 |
| Yuba | \$390,145 | \$81,280 | \$65,024 |

Appendix B

The following is a description of the data sources and calculations used to complete the *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates* analysis using the statewide Food Stamp Program participation rate. The methodology is organized to reflect the data tables in Appendix A.

Table 4 **Eligible Persons Receiving and Not Receiving Benefits**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports that 50% of eligible Californians participate in the federal Food Stamp Program¹⁸. Consequently, the number of *eligible persons receiving benefits* is equal to the number of *eligible persons not receiving benefits*. Similarly, the total number of *persons eligible to receive federal food stamps* is twice the number of current participants.

The number of current participants was calculated using monthly Food Stamp Program participation data from the CDSS report DFA 256¹⁹. Rather than average monthly participation data over an entire year, June 2009 participation data were used for this calculation.

June 2009 Food Stamp Program participation data were the most recent monthly data available from CDSS prior to the start of this analysis. Averaging monthly participation data across an entire calendar year does account for seasonal differences in food stamp participation. However, the dramatic increase in monthly food stamp participation statewide, reported since early 2008²⁰, warranted use of the most recent participation data for this analysis.

Table 5
Please see methodology for Table 2.

Table 6
Please see methodology for Table 3.

Appendix C

The following tables compare results from CFPA's 2006 *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates* analysis to the results presented in this 2009 edition. The 2006 analysis did not incorporate the county Program Access Index. Therefore, this comparison only includes results based on the USDA's statewide food stamp participation rate for California. Please note, the analysis for this 2009 edition of *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates*, was conducted using USDA's most recently released California state participation rate of 50% (see Appendix A). The 2006 *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates* analysis used an older statewide participation rate (45%) released by USDA in 2003.

Table 7

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Statewide | \$2,300,000,000 | \$3,740,646,312 | 63% |
| Alameda | \$99,968,717 | \$130,387,968 | 30% |
| Alpine | \$106,985 | \$147,768 | 38% |
| Amador | \$1,604,121 | \$3,121,992 | 95% |
| Butte | \$24,479,049 | \$31,855,008 | 30% |
| Calaveras | \$2,413,619 | \$4,659,408 | 93% |
| Colusa | \$1,702,285 | \$1,694,616 | 0% |
| Contra Costa | \$42,473,429 | \$67,152,696 | 58% |
| Del Norte | \$5,480,759 | \$6,636,984 | 21% |
| El Dorado | \$5,909,628 | \$10,614,144 | 80% |
| Fresno | \$170,399,383 | \$208,437,768 | 22% |
| Glenn | \$3,376,764 | \$3,398,664 | 1% |
| Humboldt | \$15,605,942 | \$18,301,224 | 17% |
| Imperial | \$24,504,140 | \$28,503,504 | 16% |
| Inyo | \$1,355,025 | \$2,106,480 | 55% |
| Kern | \$111,591,839 | \$128,520,432 | 15% |
| Kings | \$19,605,123 | \$21,879,096 | 12% |
| Lake | \$7,878,987 | \$10,680,168 | 36% |
| Lassen | \$2,957,336 | \$3,492,984 | 18% |
| Los Angeles | \$948,066,231 | \$1,101,547,560 | 16% |
| Madera | \$20,503,213 | \$22,913,472 | 12% |
| Marin | \$6,014,244 | \$11,824,584 | 97% |
| Mariposa | \$1,179,520 | \$1,644,312 | 39% |

Table 7

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Mendocino | \$11,169,227 | \$16,449,408 | 47% |
| Merced | \$42,302,993 | \$48,301,272 | 14% |
| Modoc | \$1,074,243 | \$1,223,016 | 14% |
| Mono | \$382,568 | \$826,872 | 116% |
| Monterey | \$26,138,008 | \$35,873,040 | 37% |
| Napa | \$3,754,805 | \$6,410,616 | 71% |
| Nevada | \$3,240,835 | \$6,552,096 | 102% |
| Orange | \$114,084,545 | \$158,067,744 | 39% |
| Placer | \$7,861,656 | \$16,424,256 | 109% |
| Plumas | \$977,501 | \$1,320,480 | 35% |
| Riverside | \$116,127,775 | \$187,234,632 | 61% |
| Sacramento | \$158,826,507 | \$206,384,736 | 30% |
| San Benito | \$4,237,865 | \$6,344,592 | 50% |
| San Bernardino | \$201,640,712 | \$276,609,120 | 37% |
| San Diego | \$120,380,233 | \$171,354,288 | 42% |
| San Francisco | \$46,032,799 | \$72,208,248 | 57% |
| San Joaquin | \$76,456,952 | \$87,003,912 | 14% |
| San Luis Obispo | \$8,610,496 | \$18,027,696 | 109% |
| San Mateo | \$12,215,332 | \$20,420,280 | 67% |
| Santa Barbara | \$25,465,604 | \$32,590,704 | 28% |
| Santa Clara | \$80,930,527 | \$106,260,912 | 31% |
| Santa Cruz | \$14,847,582 | \$24,601,800 | 66% |
| Shasta | \$18,896,893 | \$26,648,544 | 41% |
| Sierra | \$239,267 | \$251,520 | 5% |
| Siskiyou | \$5,898,893 | \$6,294,288 | 7% |
| Solano | \$23,398,030 | \$44,701,392 | 91% |
| Sonoma | \$18,138,715 | \$33,445,872 | 84% |
| Stanislaus | \$55,958,696 | \$79,219,368 | 42% |
| Sutter | \$7,853,379 | \$10,611,000 | 35% |
| Tehama | \$7,600,791 | \$9,309,384 | 22% |
| Trinity | \$1,333,685 | \$1,757,496 | 32% |
| Tulare | \$84,935,787 | \$104,100,984 | 23% |
| Tuolumne | \$4,025,371 | \$6,699,864 | 66% |
| Ventura | \$38,002,013 | \$66,266,088 | 74% |
| Yolo | \$12,324,820 | \$16,880,136 | 37% |

Table 7

Estimated value of additional federal benefits received annually with 100% Food Stamp Program participation (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|--------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Yuba | \$11,567,961 | \$14,449,824 | 25% |

Table 8

Estimated value of additional economic activity, per year, if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Statewide | \$4,000,000,000 | \$6,882,789,214 | 72% |
| Alameda | \$183,942,440 | \$239,913,861 | 30% |
| Alpine | \$196,852 | \$271,893 | 38% |
| Amador | \$2,951,583 | \$5,744,465 | 95% |
| Butte | \$45,041,451 | \$58,613,215 | 30% |
| Calaveras | \$4,441,058 | \$8,573,311 | 93% |
| Colusa | \$3,132,205 | \$3,118,093 | 0% |
| Contra Costa | \$78,151,109 | \$123,560,961 | 58% |
| Del Norte | \$10,084,596 | \$12,212,051 | 21% |
| El Dorado | \$10,873,716 | \$19,530,025 | 80% |
| Fresno | \$313,534,864 | \$383,525,493 | 22% |
| Glenn | \$6,213,246 | \$6,253,542 | 1% |
| Humboldt | \$28,714,933 | \$33,674,252 | 17% |
| Imperial | \$45,087,618 | \$52,446,447 | 16% |
| Inyo | \$2,493,247 | \$3,875,923 | 55% |
| Kern | \$205,328,984 | \$236,477,595 | 15% |
| Kings | \$36,073,426 | \$40,257,537 | 12% |
| Lake | \$14,497,335 | \$19,651,509 | 36% |
| Lassen | \$5,441,498 | \$6,427,091 | 18% |
| Los Angeles | \$1,744,441,864 | \$2,026,847,510 | 16% |
| Madera | \$37,725,913 | \$42,160,788 | 12% |
| Marin | \$11,066,210 | \$21,757,235 | 97% |
| Mariposa | \$2,170,317 | \$3,025,534 | 39% |
| Mendocino | \$20,551,377 | \$30,266,911 | 47% |
| Merced | \$77,837,508 | \$88,874,340 | 14% |
| Modoc | \$1,976,607 | \$2,250,349 | 14% |
| Mono | \$703,925 | \$1,521,444 | 116% |
| Monterey | \$48,093,935 | \$66,006,394 | 37% |
| Napa | \$6,908,842 | \$11,795,533 | 71% |
| Nevada | \$5,963,136 | \$12,055,857 | 102% |
| Orange | \$209,915,563 | \$290,844,649 | 39% |
| Placer | \$14,465,447 | \$30,220,631 | 109% |
| Plumas | \$1,798,602 | \$2,429,683 | 35% |
| Riverside | \$213,675,106 | \$344,511,723 | 61% |

Table 8

Estimated value of additional economic activity, per year, if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Sacramento | \$292,240,772 | \$379,747,914 | 30% |
| San Benito | \$7,797,672 | \$11,674,049 | 50% |
| San Bernardino | \$371,018,909 | \$508,960,781 | 37% |
| San Diego | \$221,499,629 | \$315,291,890 | 42% |
| San Francisco | \$84,700,349 | \$132,863,176 | 57% |
| San Joaquin | \$140,680,792 | \$160,087,198 | 14% |
| San Luis Obispo | \$15,843,313 | \$33,170,961 | 109% |
| San Mateo | \$22,476,211 | \$37,573,315 | 67% |
| Santa Barbara | \$46,856,711 | \$59,966,895 | 28% |
| Santa Clara | \$148,912,170 | \$195,520,078 | 31% |
| Santa Cruz | \$27,319,550 | \$45,267,312 | 66% |
| Shasta | \$34,770,284 | \$49,033,321 | 41% |
| Sierra | \$440,251 | \$462,797 | 5% |
| Siskiyou | \$10,853,964 | \$11,581,490 | 7% |
| Solano | \$43,052,374 | \$82,250,561 | 91% |
| Sonoma | \$33,375,236 | \$61,540,404 | 84% |
| Stanislaus | \$102,964,001 | \$145,763,637 | 42% |
| Sutter | \$14,450,217 | \$19,524,240 | 35% |
| Tehama | \$13,985,455 | \$17,129,267 | 22% |
| Trinity | \$2,453,981 | \$3,233,793 | 32% |
| Tulare | \$156,281,847 | \$191,545,811 | 23% |
| Tuolumne | \$7,406,682 | \$12,327,750 | 66% |
| Ventura | \$69,923,705 | \$121,929,602 | 74% |
| Yolo | \$22,677,669 | \$31,059,450 | 37% |
| Yuba | \$21,285,049 | \$26,587,676 | 25% |

Table 9

Estimated value of additional state sales tax revenue generated annually for the general fund if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Statewide | \$52,000,000 | \$100,997,450 | 94% |
| Alameda | \$2,249,296 | \$3,520,475 | 57% |
| Alpine | \$2,407 | \$3,990 | 66% |
| Amador | \$36,093 | \$84,294 | 134% |
| Butte | \$550,779 | \$860,085 | 56% |
| Calaveras | \$54,306 | \$125,804 | 132% |
| Colusa | \$38,301 | \$45,755 | 19% |
| Contra Costa | \$955,652 | \$1,813,123 | 90% |
| Del Norte | \$123,317 | \$179,199 | 45% |
| El Dorado | \$132,967 | \$286,582 | 116% |
| Fresno | \$3,833,986 | \$5,627,820 | 47% |
| Glenn | \$75,977 | \$91,764 | 21% |
| Humboldt | \$351,134 | \$494,133 | 41% |
| Imperial | \$551,343 | \$769,595 | 40% |
| Inyo | \$30,488 | \$56,875 | 87% |
| Kern | \$2,510,816 | \$3,470,052 | 38% |
| Kings | \$441,115 | \$590,736 | 34% |
| Lake | \$177,277 | \$288,365 | 63% |
| Lassen | \$66,540 | \$94,311 | 42% |
| Los Angeles | \$21,331,490 | \$29,741,784 | 39% |
| Madera | \$461,322 | \$618,664 | 34% |
| Marin | \$135,320 | \$319,264 | 136% |
| Mariposa | \$26,539 | \$44,396 | 67% |
| Mendocino | \$251,308 | \$444,134 | 77% |
| Merced | \$951,817 | \$1,304,134 | 37% |
| Modoc | \$24,170 | \$33,021 | 37% |
| Mono | \$8,608 | \$22,326 | 159% |
| Monterey | \$588,105 | \$968,572 | 65% |
| Napa | \$84,483 | \$173,087 | 105% |
| Nevada | \$72,919 | \$176,907 | 143% |
| Orange | \$2,566,902 | \$4,267,829 | 66% |
| Placer | \$176,887 | \$443,455 | 151% |
| Plumas | \$21,994 | \$35,653 | 62% |

Table 9

Estimated value of additional state sales tax revenue generated annually for the general fund if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Riverside | \$2,612,875 | \$5,055,335 | 93% |
| Sacramento | \$3,573,596 | \$5,572,388 | 56% |
| San Benito | \$95,352 | \$171,304 | 80% |
| San Bernardino | \$4,536,916 | \$7,468,446 | 65% |
| San Diego | \$2,708,555 | \$4,626,566 | 71% |
| San Francisco | \$1,035,738 | \$1,949,623 | 88% |
| San Joaquin | \$1,720,281 | \$2,349,106 | 37% |
| San Luis Obispo | \$193,736 | \$486,748 | 151% |
| San Mateo | \$274,845 | \$551,348 | 101% |
| Santa Barbara | \$572,976 | \$879,949 | 54% |
| Santa Clara | \$1,820,937 | \$2,869,045 | 58% |
| Santa Cruz | \$334,071 | \$664,249 | 99% |
| Shasta | \$425,180 | \$719,511 | 69% |
| Sierra | \$5,384 | \$6,791 | 26% |
| Siskiyou | \$132,725 | \$169,946 | 28% |
| Solano | \$526,456 | \$1,206,938 | 129% |
| Sonoma | \$408,121 | \$903,039 | 121% |
| Stanislaus | \$1,259,071 | \$2,138,923 | 70% |
| Sutter | \$176,701 | \$286,497 | 62% |
| Tehama | \$171,018 | \$251,353 | 47% |
| Trinity | \$30,008 | \$47,452 | 58% |
| Tulare | \$1,911,055 | \$2,810,727 | 47% |
| Tuolumne | \$90,571 | \$180,896 | 100% |
| Ventura | \$855,045 | \$1,789,184 | 109% |
| Yolo | \$277,308 | \$455,764 | 64% |
| Yuba | \$260,279 | \$390,145 | 50% |

Table 10

Estimated value of additional state sales tax revenue generated annually for non-general fund expenditures if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Statewide | \$12,937,500 | \$21,041,136 | 63% |
| Alameda | \$562,324 | \$733,432 | 30% |
| Alpine | \$602 | \$831 | 38% |
| Amador | \$9,023 | \$17,561 | 95% |
| Butte | \$137,695 | \$179,184 | 30% |
| Calaveras | \$13,577 | \$26,209 | 93% |
| Colusa | \$9,575 | \$9,532 | 0% |
| Contra Costa | \$238,913 | \$377,734 | 58% |
| Del Norte | \$30,829 | \$37,333 | 21% |
| El Dorado | \$33,242 | \$59,705 | 80% |
| Fresno | \$958,497 | \$1,172,462 | 22% |
| Glenn | \$18,994 | \$19,117 | 1% |
| Humboldt | \$87,783 | \$102,944 | 17% |
| Imperial | \$137,836 | \$160,332 | 16% |
| Inyo | \$7,622 | \$11,849 | 55% |
| Kern | \$627,704 | \$722,927 | 15% |
| Kings | \$110,279 | \$123,070 | 12% |
| Lake | \$44,319 | \$60,076 | 36% |
| Lassen | \$16,635 | \$19,648 | 18% |
| Los Angeles | \$5,332,873 | \$6,196,205 | 16% |
| Madera | \$115,331 | \$128,888 | 12% |
| Marin | \$33,830 | \$66,513 | 97% |
| Mariposa | \$6,635 | \$9,249 | 39% |
| Mendocino | \$62,827 | \$92,528 | 47% |
| Merced | \$237,954 | \$271,695 | 14% |
| Modoc | \$6,043 | \$6,879 | 14% |
| Mono | \$2,152 | \$4,651 | 116% |
| Monterey | \$147,026 | \$201,786 | 37% |
| Napa | \$21,121 | \$36,060 | 71% |
| Nevada | \$18,230 | \$36,856 | 102% |
| Orange | \$641,726 | \$889,131 | 39% |
| Placer | \$44,222 | \$92,386 | 109% |
| Plumas | \$5,498 | \$7,428 | 35% |

Table 10

Estimated value of additional state sales tax revenue generated annually for non-general fund expenditures if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Riverside | \$653,219 | \$1,053,195 | 61% |
| Sacramento | \$893,399 | \$1,160,914 | 30% |
| San Benito | \$23,838 | \$35,688 | 50% |
| San Bernardino | \$1,134,229 | \$1,555,926 | 37% |
| San Diego | \$677,139 | \$963,868 | 42% |
| San Francisco | \$258,934 | \$406,171 | 57% |
| San Joaquin | \$430,070 | \$489,397 | 14% |
| San Luis Obispo | \$48,434 | \$101,406 | 109% |
| San Mateo | \$68,711 | \$114,864 | 67% |
| Santa Barbara | \$143,244 | \$183,323 | 28% |
| Santa Clara | \$455,234 | \$597,718 | 31% |
| Santa Cruz | \$83,518 | \$138,385 | 66% |
| Shasta | \$106,295 | \$149,898 | 41% |
| Sierra | \$1,346 | \$1,415 | 5% |
| Siskiyou | \$33,181 | \$35,405 | 7% |
| Solano | \$131,614 | \$251,445 | 91% |
| Sonoma | \$102,030 | \$188,133 | 84% |
| Stanislaus | \$314,768 | \$445,609 | 42% |
| Sutter | \$44,175 | \$59,687 | 35% |
| Tehama | \$42,754 | \$52,365 | 22% |
| Trinity | \$7,502 | \$9,886 | 32% |
| Tulare | \$477,764 | \$585,568 | 23% |
| Tuolumne | \$22,643 | \$37,687 | 66% |
| Ventura | \$213,761 | \$372,747 | 74% |
| Yolo | \$69,327 | \$94,951 | 37% |
| Yuba | \$65,070 | \$81,280 | 25% |

Table 11

Estimated value of additional county sales tax revenue generated annually if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Statewide | \$21,000,000 | \$30,314,240 | 44% |
| Alameda | \$1,124,648 | \$1,466,865 | 30% |
| Alpine | \$481 | \$665 | 38% |
| Amador | \$7,219 | \$21,073 | 192% |
| Butte | \$110,156 | \$143,348 | 30% |
| Calaveras | \$10,861 | \$20,967 | 93% |
| Colusa | \$7,660 | \$7,626 | 0% |
| Contra Costa | \$382,261 | \$604,374 | 58% |
| Del Norte | \$24,663 | \$29,866 | 21% |
| El Dorado | \$26,593 | \$47,764 | 80% |
| Fresno | \$1,226,876 | \$1,617,998 | 32% |
| Glenn | \$15,195 | \$15,294 | 1% |
| Humboldt | \$70,227 | \$82,356 | 17% |
| Imperial | \$165,403 | \$192,399 | 16% |
| Inyo | \$9,146 | \$14,219 | 55% |
| Kern | \$502,163 | \$578,342 | 15% |
| Kings | \$88,223 | \$98,456 | 12% |
| Lake | \$35,455 | \$48,061 | 36% |
| Lassen | \$13,308 | \$15,718 | 18% |
| Los Angeles | \$8,532,596 | \$12,392,410 | 45% |
| Madera | \$138,397 | \$154,666 | 12% |
| Marin | \$27,064 | \$93,119 | 244% |
| Mariposa | \$5,308 | \$11,099 | 109% |
| Mendocino | \$50,262 | \$74,022 | 47% |
| Merced | \$190,363 | \$217,356 | 14% |
| Modoc | \$4,834 | \$5,504 | 14% |
| Mono | \$1,722 | \$3,721 | 116% |
| Monterey | \$117,621 | \$161,429 | 37% |
| Napa | \$25,345 | \$43,272 | 71% |
| Nevada | \$16,407 | \$33,170 | 102% |
| Orange | \$770,071 | \$1,066,957 | 39% |
| Placer | \$35,377 | \$73,909 | 109% |
| Plumas | \$4,399 | \$5,942 | 35% |
| Riverside | \$783,862 | \$1,263,834 | 61% |

Table 11

Estimated value of additional county sales tax revenue generated annually if Food Stamp Program participation reached 100% (*incorporating the statewide participation rate*)

| County | 2006 Analysis | 2009 Analysis | % Change |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Sacramento | \$1,072,079 | \$1,393,097 | 30% |
| San Benito | \$19,070 | \$28,551 | 50% |
| San Bernardino | \$1,361,075 | \$1,867,112 | 37% |
| San Diego | \$812,567 | \$1,156,641 | 42% |
| San Francisco | \$466,082 | \$731,109 | 57% |
| San Joaquin | \$516,084 | \$587,276 | 14% |
| San Luis Obispo | \$38,747 | \$81,125 | 109% |
| San Mateo | \$109,938 | \$183,783 | 67% |
| Santa Barbara | \$171,893 | \$219,987 | 28% |
| Santa Clara | \$728,375 | \$956,348 | 31% |
| Santa Cruz | \$116,925 | \$193,739 | 66% |
| Shasta | \$85,036 | \$119,918 | 41% |
| Sierra | \$1,077 | \$1,132 | 5% |
| Siskiyou | \$26,545 | \$28,324 | 7% |
| Solano | \$118,453 | \$226,301 | 91% |
| Sonoma | \$102,030 | \$263,386 | 158% |
| Stanislaus | \$283,291 | \$401,048 | 42% |
| Sutter | \$35,340 | \$47,750 | 35% |
| Tehama | \$34,204 | \$41,892 | 22% |
| Trinity | \$6,002 | \$7,909 | 32% |
| Tulare | \$382,211 | \$702,682 | 84% |
| Tuolumne | \$18,114 | \$30,149 | 66% |
| Ventura | \$171,009 | \$298,197 | 74% |
| Yolo | \$55,462 | \$75,961 | 37% |
| Yuba | \$52,056 | \$65,024 | 25% |

References

¹ Karen E. Cunnyngham, Laura A. Castner, and Allen L. Schirm, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service, *Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2006*, November 2008.

Available at:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/SNAP/FILES/Participation/Reaching2006.pdf>

USDA Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis, *Calculating the SNAP Program Access Index: A Step-by-Step Guide*, October 2009. Available at:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/published/snap/FILES/Other/pai2008.pdf>

² California Department of Social Services, *DFA 256 - Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report*, August 2009. Available at:

<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/PG352.htm>

³ California Department of Social Services, *DFA 256 - Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report*, August 2009. Available at:

<http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/PG352.htm>

⁴ Kenneth Hanson and Elise Golan, United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, *Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report Number 26-6, Effects of Changes in Food Stamp Expenditures Across the U.S. Economy*, August 2006. Available at:

<http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr26/fanrr26-6/fanrr26-6.pdf>

⁵ Legislative Analyst's Office, *Analysis of the 2004-05 Budget Bill- Food Stamps Program*, February 2004. Available at:

http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2004/health_ss/hss_20_foodstamps_anl04.htm

⁶ Mark Zandi, *Assessing the Macro Economic Impact of Fiscal Stimulus 2008*, Moody's Analytics, Inc., January 2008. Available at:

<http://www.economy.com/mark-zandi/documents/assising-the-impact-of-the-fiscal-stimulus.pdf>

⁷ The California State Auditor, *Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System: The State Must Weigh Factors Other Than Need and Cost-Effectiveness When Determining Future Funding for the System*, January 2003. Available at: <http://www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2001-015.pdf>

The California State Auditor, *Department of Social Services: For the CalWORKs and Food Stamp Programs, It Lacks Assessments of Cost-Effectiveness and Misses Opportunities to Improve Counties' Antifraud Efforts*, November 2009. Available at: <http://www.bsa.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2009-101.pdf>

⁸ Food Research and Action Center, *Access and Access Barriers to Getting Food Stamps: A Review of the Literature*, February 2008. Available at: <http://www.frac.org/pdf/FSPaccess.pdf>

⁹ California Department of Social Services, *DFA 256 - Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report*, January-December 2007. Available at: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/PG352.htm>

¹⁰ California Food Policy Advocates, *The County Food Stamp Program Access Index*. Available at: <http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/PAI.htm>

¹¹ Cathy Hsu and Pilar Abascal, California Food Policy Advocates, *Measuring County Food Stamp Performance 2007: Using the Program Access Index to Analyze California's 59 Counties*. April 2009. Available at: <http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/Measuring%20County%20Food%20Stamp%20Performance%202007.pdf>

¹² United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service, *SNAP Average Monthly Benefit per Household*, November 2009. Available at: [http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/19SNAPavg\\$HH.htm](http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/19SNAPavg$HH.htm)

¹³ California Department of Social Services, *DFA 256 - Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report*, January-December 2007. Available at: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/PG352.htm>

¹⁴ Kenneth Hanson and Elise Golan, United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, *Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report Number 26-6, Effects*

of *Changes in Food Stamp Expenditures Across the U.S. Economy*, August 2006. Available at: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr26/fanrr26-6/fanrr26-6.pdf>

¹⁵ Legislative Analyst's Office, *Analysis of the 2004-05 Budget Bill- Food Stamps Program*, February 2004. Available at: http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2004/health_ss/hss_20_foodstamps_anl04.htm

¹⁶ California State Board of Equalization, *Detailed Description of the Sales & Use Tax Rate*, 2009. Available at: <http://www.boe.ca.gov/news/sp111500att.htm>

¹⁷ California State Board of Equalization, *Publication 71- California City and County Sales and Use Tax Rates, April 1, 2009 Edition*. Available at: <http://www.boe.ca.gov/pdf/pub71.pdf>

¹⁸ Karen E. Cunyningham, Laura A. Castner, and Allen L. Schirm, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service, *Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2006*, November 2008. Available at: <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/SNAP/FILES/Participation/Reaching2006.pdf>

¹⁹ California Department of Social Services, *DFA 256 - Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report*, June 2009. Available at: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/PG352.htm>

²⁰ California Department of Social Services, Administrative Division, Data Systems and Survey Design Bureau, June 2009. Available at: <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/res/pdf/foodtrends/FS01.pdf>