

---

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Autumn Arnold  
California Food Policy Advocates

**FROM:** Karen Cunnyngnam

**DATE:** December 9, 2002

**SUBJECT:** Modeling the Impact of Eliminating SSI Cash-out in California (**8852-007**)

---

Social Security Income/State Supplemental Payment (SSI/SSP) recipients in California are ineligible for the Food Stamp Program (FSP) under what is known as the SSI cash-out policy. When this policy was originally implemented, SSI/SSP recipients in California received an additional \$10 as part of their SSI/SSP grant in lieu of FSP eligibility under the assumption that most would not be eligible for more than the minimum FSP benefit. Current concerns about this policy are that the SSI/SSP grant no longer includes a discreet \$10 amount for food purchases, the real purchasing power of the \$10 bonus has declined over the past 30 years, and some SSI recipients might qualify for substantially more than \$10 in food stamp benefits if they were eligible for the FSP. On the other hand, some SSI recipients and their family members might be worse off if the SSI cash-out policy were eliminated.

This short study uses a computer microsimulation model to estimate the impact of ending the SSI cash-out policy. We found that restoring FSP eligibility to SSI recipients would likely result in a net increase in food stamp participants in California, but a net decrease in total food stamp benefits. The individuals most likely to benefit are SSI recipients who could apply for food stamps by themselves or with other SSI recipients. This group has a relatively high average FSP gross income, so qualifies for relatively small benefits. The individuals most likely to lose are those living in families with both current food stamp recipients and SSI recipients who would not qualify to apply for food stamps separately. The reduction in benefits for these current recipients would be greater than the benefits gained by the newly eligible SSI/SSP recipients forming their own units, hence the net reduction in benefits.

This memo discusses the research questions addressed by the study, the data and methodology used, and the results. Appendix A goes into greater detail on the methodology, and Appendix B describes the standard output tables of our microsimulation model.

### **Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to estimate the impact of ending the California SSI cash-out policy, that is, extending eligibility for the FSP to all California SSI/SSP recipients. The study estimates the net change in food stamp eligibles, participants, and benefits under an end to SSI cash-out, the number

**MEMO TO:** Autumn Arnold  
**FROM:** Karen Cunyningham  
**DATE:** December 9, 2002  
**PAGE:** 2

and characteristics of households gaining or losing benefits, and the magnitude of the benefit change for each group. These estimates are produced for two simulations. The first simulation assumes that newly eligible SSI recipients will participate in the FSP at rates currently seen in the FSP-eligible population. The second simulation models 100 percent participation by all newly eligible FSP units. The study also examines the characteristics of the population under baselaw and both reforms.

Those likely to gain from restored FSP eligibility are elderly or disabled individuals who are living only with other SSI recipients, with little or no income beyond SSI, and with high out-of-pocket medical or shelter expenses. These individuals, currently ineligible for the FSP, would be eligible for more than the minimum food stamp benefit because of high deductions. Those likely to be worse off if SSI cash-out were eliminated are families with both SSI recipients and SSI non-recipients who are currently receiving food stamps. If the SSI recipients join current food stamp units instead of forming their own unit, the additional income that must be counted when determining eligibility may cause these units to become ineligible or to see a substantial reduction in food stamp benefits.<sup>1</sup>

## **Data and Methodology**

We combined data from the 1998 – 2001 March Current Population Surveys (CPS) to create a California 2000 MATH CPS model. The model was calibrated to match California administrative data for food stamp participants and SSI/SSP recipients and simulates the FSP and SSI programs in California in April 2000. Using this model, we ran the following simulations:

- Plan 001: This baseline plan simulates the FSP and SSI program as they existed in California in 2000.
- Plan 002: This plan simulates ending SSI cash-out in California; that is, extending FSP eligibility to SSI recipients.
- Plan 004: This plan, which also simulates ending SSI cash-out, models 100 percent participation by newly eligible FSP units.

In addition, we produced tabulations using a subset of the 2000 and 2001 FSPQC databases to further examine shelter expenses and the excess shelter expense deduction taken by FSP participants in California. We created these databases from FSP Quality Control data collected by the states. Using the FSPQC databases, we produced the following tables:

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the CPS data do not contain all the information necessary to determine which households would be permitted to form multiple food stamp units, we impute food stamp unit formation based on the methodology described in Appendix A.

**MEMO TO:** Autumn Arnold  
**FROM:** Karen Cunnyngham  
**DATE:** December 9, 2002  
**PAGE:** 3

- Table 1: Average Calculated Shelter Deduction and Reported Shelter Expense Among Units by State and SSI Receipt
- Table 2: Average Calculated Shelter Deduction and Reported Shelter Expense Among Units with a Positive Shelter Deduction by State
- Table 3: Total FSP Units without SSI and Number and Percentage of FSP Units without SSI with a Shelter Deduction, by State
- Table 4: Unweighted Counts of FSP Units, Units Receiving a Shelter Deduction, and Units Receiving a Medical Deduction by State
- Table 5: Selected Characteristics of Individuals by State, Poverty Level, and Food Stamp Receipt

For more information on the MATH CPS model and the FSPQC database, please see Appendix A. For descriptions of the standard MATH CPS tables, please see Appendix B.

## **Results**

The results of our simulations show that extending FSP eligibility to SSI recipients in California would result in a net decrease in total food stamp benefits. We estimate that ending SSI cash-out would result in a -12.4 percent (+/- 3.0 percent) net change in total benefits (Plan 002, Table 1).

If every SSI recipient who became newly eligible were to participate in the FSP, we estimate that total FSP benefits would still decrease by 4.2 percent (+/- 3.5 percent) (Plan 004, Table 1). In reality, 100 percent participation would only occur if no additional actions were required by SSI recipients in order to receive FSP benefits. If separate applications and income verifications were necessary, some individuals eligible for low FSP benefits would choose not to participate. Even an automated enrollment system that greatly reduced application requirements is unlikely to result in 100 percent participation. This simulation does show, however, that the amount of potential food stamp benefits that could be gained by newly eligible SSI recipients is less than the amount that would likely be lost by those who would become ineligible or see a reduction in benefits. This is primarily because the newly eligible FSP participants, on average, qualify for very low food stamp benefits.

**Gainers and Losers.** While Plan 002 results in a net loss in total benefits, there are both “gainers” and “losers” (Plan 002, Table 7). The losers include individuals who no longer participate and individuals who continue to participate with lower benefits. Approximately 5.7 percent of the baselaw participants no longer participate under the reform. The average per-capita benefit of these individuals is \$47, and together they receive 4.3 percent of total baselaw benefits. Another 10.2 percent of baselaw participants continue to participate with lower benefits. The average per-capita benefit of these individuals drops from \$88 to \$22. This reduction equals 10.8 percent of total baselaw benefits.

**MEMO TO:** Autumn Arnold  
**FROM:** Karen Cunnyngham  
**DATE:** December 9, 2002  
**PAGE:** 4

The gainers are individuals who are newly eligible and participate under the reform. These individuals, equivalent to 10.6 percent of baselaw individuals, receive an average per-capita benefit of \$16. Their new participation increases total benefits by 2.6 percent of baselaw benefits. The net result of this reform, then, is a 4.9 percent increase in participants and, as noted before, a 12.4 percent decrease in benefits. The average per-capita benefit drops from \$63 under baselaw to \$53 under this reform.

When all newly eligible SSI recipients participate in the FSP, participation increases by 31.8 percent over baselaw (Plan 004). The average per-capita benefit of new participants is \$18 and the over-all per-capita benefit drops to \$46 (Plan 004, Table 7).

Characteristics of Food Stamp Units. The characteristics of the food stamp population changed under these reforms. The number of participating units with children fell by 4.0 percent from baselaw, while the number of units with elderly or disabled rose by over 300 percent (Plan 002, Table 3). As a result, the percentage of participating food stamp units that contain children fell from 77.3 percent of all units to 68.7 percent and the percentage of units containing elderly or disabled rose from 7.3 percent to 28.8 percent. This suggests that ending the SSI cash-out policy would have the effect of moving some food stamp benefits from units with children to units containing elderly or disabled.

Along with a drop in the number of participating units with children came a 19.9 percent drop in participating units receiving TANF, resulting in a fall in the percentage of units receiving TANF from 57.1 percent to 42.3 percent (Plan 002, Table 4). The percentage of units in which every member received TANF, SSI or GA (the “pure public assistance” units), however, rose from 50.4 percent in baselaw to 56.0 percent under Plan 002.

The average monthly gross income rose from \$711 under baselaw to \$807 under Plan 002, and the average monthly net income rose from \$462 to \$566. This means that the units that would become newly eligible tend to have higher incomes than those that would become ineligible, thus raising the overall average incomes. Average total deductions for participating units fell slightly from \$288 under baselaw to \$272 under Plan 002 (Plan 002, Table 5). While the percentage of units receiving a medical deduction increased slightly from 1.2 percent in baselaw to 2.0 percent under Plan 002, the average medical deduction among units receiving a medical deduction fell from \$75 to \$60. The percentage of units receiving a shelter deduction fell from 60.4 percent in baselaw to 52.5 percent under Plan 002 and the average shelter deduction among units receiving a shelter deduction rose very slightly from \$159 to \$161.

Shelter and Medical Deductions. California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA) had theorized that SSI recipients applying for food stamps would have relatively large shelter and medical deductions to offset their SSI benefits and thus would be eligible for substantially more than \$10 in food stamp benefits. When the results of the simulations indicated this was not the case, CFPA asked us to do some tabulations on shelter and medical deductions using the FSPQC database.

**MEMO TO:** Autumn Arnold  
**FROM:** Karen Cunyningham  
**DATE:** December 9, 2002  
**PAGE:** 5

Because so few food stamp units receive a medical deduction, we are unable to tabulate the characteristics of those units. We suspect that the reason so few food stamp units receive a medical deduction is that many food stamp participants, particularly those receiving SSI, are eligible for Medicaid. Few elderly or disabled food stamp participants, then, have the out-of-pocket medical expenses over \$35 necessary to qualify for a medical deduction.

Because of the high cost of housing in California, CFPA expected shelter expenses among California food stamp recipients to be relatively high. However, when we compared the average shelter deduction of food stamp units in California with that of other food stamp units, we found that California food stamp units have an average shelter deduction of \$77 compared to \$110 for non-SSI, non-California units (Table 1). Among food stamp units with a shelter deduction, units in California have one of the lowest average shelter deductions in the country (Table 2). California also has a slightly lower than average percentage of food stamp units that receive a shelter deduction (Table 3). We suspect one reason units in California have a relatively low average shelter deduction is that they have relatively low heating costs compared to colder states.

Another reason for the lower than expected shelter expenses among food stamp units compared to other low income families is the prevalence of public housing and other rent subsidies for this population. We conducted a tabulation using CPS data to compare receipt of public housing, rent subsidies, and energy assistance among low-income households compared with food stamp households. Table 5 shows that among individuals living in households with gross income less than 200 percent of poverty, individuals who live in households that report food stamp receipt are much more likely to live in public housing, have a rent subsidy, or have no cash rent than those in households not reporting food stamp receipt. These individuals are also much more likely to receive energy assistance.

These tabulations confirm that, despite California's high housing costs, the average SSI recipient would be unlikely to receive a shelter deduction high enough to lift their benefits well above the minimum benefit of \$10. While some SSI recipients would receive significantly more benefits, the average benefit would nevertheless remain in the \$10 to \$20 range.

Please call us with any questions on these results or if you would like any further analysis.

cc: C. Trippe  
L. Castner  
S. Cody

R. Rosso  
B. Schechter  
J. Ohls

M. Morris

TABLE 1  
 SUMMARY COMPARISONS OF IMPACTS ON FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Weighted

Plan No.	Eligibles				Participants				Benefits	
	Units	% Chg	Persons	% Chg	Units	% Chg	Persons	% Chg	Dollars	% Chg
Baselaw	1,624,596	NA	4,252,488	NA	651,604	NA	1,743,817	NA	109,792,321	NA
Plan 002	2,041,831	25.68 (2.65)	4,809,272	13.09 (1.74)	703,987	8.04 (3.03)	1,829,982	4.94 (2.90)	96,154,311	-12.42 (3.03)

Unweighted

Plan No.	Eligibles				Participants				Benefits	
	Units	Chg	Persons	Chg	Units	Chg	Persons	Chg	Dollars	Chg
Baselaw	1,627	NA	4,337	NA	629	NA	1,669	NA	102,685	NA
Plan 002	1,863	236	4,647	310	659	30	1,716	47	97,965	-4720

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout

TABLE 2  
 DISTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE AND PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS  
 BY GROSS INCOME RELATIVE TO POVERTY AND UNIT SIZE

BASELAW

ELIGIBLES

Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	140,391	68,375	36,672	18,867	9,763	5,065	279,133	17.2%	62,623,298
1-50%	59,233	93,969	46,961	39,550	29,961	18,142	287,816	17.7%	76,581,882
51-100%	124,099	134,490	121,679	90,223	70,433	33,608	574,532	35.4%	98,892,058
101-130%	168,536	62,464	60,696	69,851	31,666	20,621	413,834	25.5%	26,580,299
131+	27,808	38,429	0	2,058	421	565	69,281	4.3%	1,597,987
Total Units	520,067	397,727	266,008	220,549	142,244	78,001	1,624,596	100.0%	266,275,524
Total Persons	520,067	795,454	798,024	882,196	711,220	545,527	4,252,488		
% of Total Units	32.0	24.5	16.4	13.6	8.8	4.8	100.0%		

PARTICIPANTS

Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	48,122	5,040	8,555	1,594	0	576	63,887	9.8%	11,222,319
1-50%	32,161	52,979	28,345	24,059	19,653	13,959	171,156	26.3%	45,425,565
51-100%	100,166	70,916	71,221	45,087	39,693	14,115	341,198	52.4%	50,472,218
101-130%	12,574	7,429	2,726	6,632	6,546	5,292	41,199	6.3%	2,261,172
131+	8,919	23,305	0	1,375	0	565	34,164	5.2%	411,047
Total Units	201,942	159,669	110,847	78,747	65,892	34,507	651,604	100.0%	109,792,321
Total Persons	201,942	319,338	332,541	314,988	329,460	245,548	1,743,817		
% of Total Units	31.0	24.5	17.0	12.1	10.1	5.3	100.0%		

TABLE 2  
 DISTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE AND PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS  
 BY GROSS INCOME RELATIVE TO POVERTY AND UNIT SIZE

PLAN 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout

ELIGIBLES									
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	107,061	53,407	32,242	11,950	9,763	5,065	219,488	10.7%	50,457,184
1-50%	55,041	74,340	45,121	22,845	34,248	18,142	249,737	12.2%	66,252,446
51-100%	113,951	127,279	133,319	87,800	74,286	40,421	577,056	28.3%	95,965,397
101-130%	523,295	82,953	85,129	65,213	32,389	25,179	814,158	39.9%	37,116,849
131+	48,263	127,698	0	4,445	421	565	181,392	8.9%	3,213,870
Total Units	847,611	465,677	295,811	192,253	151,107	89,372	2,041,831	100.0%	253,005,746
Total Persons	847,611	931,354	887,433	769,012	755,535	618,327	4,809,272		
% of Total Units	41.5	22.8	14.5	9.4	7.4	4.4	100.0%		
PARTICIPANTS									
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	32,532	5,040	8,555	1,594	0	576	48,297	6.9%	9,242,389
1-50%	32,741	37,222	26,505	13,712	17,023	13,959	141,162	20.1%	36,521,738
51-100%	93,385	48,683	73,202	41,626	45,560	15,853	318,309	45.2%	44,870,961
101-130%	72,778	19,532	24,473	6,632	7,687	7,383	138,485	19.7%	4,872,476
131+	15,862	39,932	0	1,375	0	565	57,734	8.2%	646,747
Total Units	247,298	150,409	132,735	64,939	70,270	38,336	703,987	100.0%	96,154,311
Total Persons	247,298	300,818	398,205	259,756	351,350	272,555	1,829,982		
% of Total Units	35.1	21.4	18.9	9.2	10.0	5.4	100.0%		



TABLE 3  
 CHARACTERISTICS OF ELIGIBLE FOOD STAMP UNITS

Characteristic	BASELAW	PLAN 002
Units with:		
Earners	775,826	775,906
% Chg from Baselow		0.0
% Of Total Units	47.8	38.0
Elderly	250,591	602,857
% Chg from Baselow		140.6
% Of Total Units	15.4	29.5
Elderly or Disabled	301,797	902,768
% Chg from Baselow		199.1
% Of Total Units	18.6	44.2
Children	1,098,627	1,064,159
% Chg from Baselow		-3.1
% Of Total Units	67.6	52.1
Children 5 to 17	896,892	867,891
% Chg from Baselow		-3.2
% Of Total Units	55.2	42.5
Zero net income	420,187	351,470
% Chg from Baselow		-16.4
% Of Total Units	25.9	17.2
Minimum benefit	222,989	618,754
% Chg from Baselow		177.5
% Of Total Units	13.7	30.3
Average Income Amounts (\$):		
Avg Monthly Gross Income	749	815
% Chg from Baselow		8.9
Avg Monthly Net Income	459	533
% Chg from Baselow		16.0
Total Units	1,624,596	2,041,831
% Chg from Baselow		25.7
Total Benefits (\$)	266,275,524	253,005,746
% Chg from Baselow		-5.0

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout

TABLE 3  
 CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS

Characteristic	BASELAW	PLAN 002
Units with:		
Earners	241,389	231,403
% Chg from Baselow		-4.1
% Of Total Units	37.0	32.9
Elderly	26,691	76,421
% Chg from Baselow		186.3
% Of Total Units	4.1	10.9
Elderly or Disabled	47,702	202,964
% Chg from Baselow		325.5
% Of Total Units	7.3	28.8
Children	503,703	483,480
% Chg from Baselow		-4.0
% Of Total Units	77.3	68.7
Children 5 to 17	393,702	376,043
% Chg from Baselow		-4.5
% Of Total Units	60.4	53.4
Zero net income	115,151	87,514
% Chg from Baselow		-24.0
% Of Total Units	17.7	12.4
Minimum benefit	58,703	146,008
% Chg from Baselow		148.7
% Of Total Units	9.0	20.7
Average Income Amounts (\$):		
Avg Monthly Gross Income	711	807
% Chg from Baselow		13.4
Avg Monthly Net Income	462	566
% Chg from Baselow		22.4
Total Units	651,604	703,987
% Chg from Baselow		8.0
Total Benefits (\$)	109,792,321	96,154,311
% Chg from Baselow		-12.4

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout

TABLE 4  
 WELFARE STATUS OF ELIGIBLE UNITS

Welfare Status	BASELAW	PLAN 002
Units with:		
No AFDC, SSI, or GA	1,200,088	1,093,395
% Chg from Baselaw		-8.9
% Of Total Units	73.9	53.5
Only AFDC	372,408	298,285
% Chg from Baselaw		-19.9
% Of Total Units	22.9	14.6
Only GA	50,996	30,213
% Chg from Baselaw		-40.8
% Of Total Units	3.1	1.5
Only SSI	0	531,647
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	26.0
Only AFDC and GA	1,104	1,104
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.1	0.1
Only AFDC and SSI	0	54,915
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	2.7
Only GA and SSI	0	32,272
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	1.6
AFDC, SSI, and GA	0	0
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	0.0
Total Units	1,624,596	2,041,831
% Chg from Baselaw		25.7
% Of Total Units	100.0	100.0
Units with:		
Any AFDC	373,512	354,304
% Chg from Baselaw		-5.1
% Of Total Units	23.0	17.4
Any GA	52,100	63,589
% Chg from Baselaw		22.1
% Of Total Units	3.2	3.1
Any SSI	0	618,834
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	30.3
Pure PA*	345,647	798,327
% Chg from Baselaw		131.0
% Of Total Units	21.3	39.1

BASELAW: \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout  
 \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

TABLE 4  
 WELFARE STATUS OF PARTICIPATING UNITS

Welfare Status	BASELAW	PLAN 002
Units with:		
No AFDC, SSI, or GA	258,574	236,525
% Chg from Baselaw		-8.5
% Of Total Units	39.7	33.6
Only AFDC	371,787	297,664
% Chg from Baselaw		-19.9
% Of Total Units	57.1	42.3
Only GA	20,139	10,104
% Chg from Baselaw		-49.8
% Of Total Units	3.1	1.4
Only SSI	0	92,552
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	13.1
Only AFDC and GA	1,104	1,104
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.2	0.2
Only AFDC and SSI	0	54,915
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	7.8
Only GA and SSI	0	11,123
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	1.6
AFDC, SSI, and GA	0	0
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	0.0
Total Units	651,604	703,987
% Chg from Baselaw		8.0
% Of Total Units	100.0	100.0
Units with:		
Any AFDC	372,891	353,683
% Chg from Baselaw		-5.2
% Of Total Units	57.2	50.2
Any GA	21,243	22,331
% Chg from Baselaw		5.1
% Of Total Units	3.3	3.2
Any SSI	0	158,590
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	22.5
Pure PA*	328,133	394,194
% Chg from Baselaw		20.1
% Of Total Units	50.4	56.0

BASELAW: \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout  
 \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

TABLE 5  
 DEDUCTIONS OF ELIGIBLE FOOD STAMP UNITS

	BASELAW		PLAN 002	
	All Units	Units with Deduction	All Units	Units with Deduction
Avg Standard	134.0	134.0	134.0	134.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	0.0	0.0
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0
Avg Earnings	91.9	192.4	70.8	186.2
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-23.0	-3.2
% Units with Deduct		47.8		38.0
Avg Medical	8.2	163.5	8.6	131.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	4.9	-19.9
% Units with Deduct		5.0		6.5
Avg Dependent Care	5.2	111.2	4.2	113.2
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-19.4	1.8
% Units with Deduct		4.6		3.7
Avg Shelter	128.9	192.2	118.9	200.1
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-7.7	4.1
% Units with Deduct		67.0		59.4
Avg Total	368.1	368.1	336.4	336.4
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-8.6	-8.6
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0

NOTE: For valid baselow/reform comparisons, use the same value of the parameter DEDTYPE for baselow and reform simulations. See notes below to determine the DEDTYPE value used in each simulation.

BASELAW: Check the baselow simulation output file to determine the DEDTYPE value that was used.

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout  
 Deductions tabulations use the entitled deduction amounts (DEDTYPE = 2).

TABLE 5  
 DEDUCTIONS OF PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS

	BASELAW		PLAN 002	
	All Units	Units with Deduction	All Units	Units with Deduction
Avg Standard	134.0	134.0	134.0	134.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	0.0	0.0
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0
Avg Earnings	52.7	142.3	47.5	144.4
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-9.9	1.5
% Units with Deduct		37.0		32.9
Avg Medical	0.9	74.8	1.2	60.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	35.8	-19.8
% Units with Deduct		1.2		2.0
Avg Dependent Care	5.0	118.7	4.5	120.1
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-10.1	1.2
% Units with Deduct		4.2		3.7
Avg Shelter	95.8	158.6	84.6	161.2
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-11.6	1.6
% Units with Deduct		60.4		52.5
Avg Total	288.3	288.3	271.8	271.8
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-5.7	-5.7
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0

NOTE: For valid baselow/reform comparisons, use the same value of the parameter DEDTYPE for baselow and reform simulations. See notes below to determine the DEDTYPE value used in each simulation.

BASELAW: Check the baselow simulation output file to determine the DEDTYPE value that was used.

Plan 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout  
 Deductions tabulations use the entitled deduction amounts (DEDTYPE = 2).

TABLE 7  
 ANALYSIS OF UNIT COMPOSITION CHANGES  
 PLAN 002: Eliminate SSI Cashout

	Participants	Average Per-Capita Benefit In Baselaw	Average Per-Capita Benefit In Reform	Average Change In Per-Capita Benefit	Total Change in Benefits	
					Dollars	% of Total Baselaw Benefits
Baselaw Participant, No Change In Per-Capita-Benefits	1,466,198	60.99	60.99	0.00	0	0.00
Baselaw Participant, No Longer Participating	99,359	46.94	0.00	-46.94	-4,663,513	-4.25
Baselaw Participant, Decrease In Per-Capita-Benefits	178,260	88.08	21.54	-66.53	-11,860,221	-10.80
Baselaw Participant, Increase In Per-Capita-Benefits	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Baselaw Non-Participant, Participating Under Reform	185,524	0.00	15.55	15.55	2,885,725	2.63

TABLE 1  
 SUMMARY COMPARISONS OF IMPACTS ON FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Weighted

Plan No.	Eligibles				Participants				Benefits	
	Units	% Chg	Persons	% Chg	Units	% Chg	Persons	% Chg	Dollars	% Chg
Baselaw	1,624,596	NA	4,252,488	NA	651,604	NA	1,743,817	NA	109,792,321	NA
Plan 004	2,041,831	25.68 (2.65)	4,809,272	13.09 (1.74)	1,094,699	68.00 (7.54)	2,298,189	31.79 (4.52)	105,210,591	-4.17 (3.53)

Unweighted

Plan No.	Eligibles				Participants				Benefits	
	Units	Chg	Persons	Chg	Units	Chg	Persons	Chg	Dollars	Chg
Baselaw	1,627	NA	4,337	NA	629	NA	1,669	NA	102,685	NA
Plan 004	1,863	236	4,647	310	886	257	1,990	321	102,978	293

Plan 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part



TABLE 2  
 DISTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE AND PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS  
 BY GROSS INCOME RELATIVE TO POVERTY AND UNIT SIZE

BASELAW

ELIGIBLES

Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	140,391	68,375	36,672	18,867	9,763	5,065	279,133	17.2%	62,623,298
1-50%	59,233	93,969	46,961	39,550	29,961	18,142	287,816	17.7%	76,581,882
51-100%	124,099	134,490	121,679	90,223	70,433	33,608	574,532	35.4%	98,892,058
101-130%	168,536	62,464	60,696	69,851	31,666	20,621	413,834	25.5%	26,580,299
131+	27,808	38,429	0	2,058	421	565	69,281	4.3%	1,597,987
Total Units	520,067	397,727	266,008	220,549	142,244	78,001	1,624,596	100.0%	266,275,524
Total Persons	520,067	795,454	798,024	882,196	711,220	545,527	4,252,488		
% of Total Units	32.0	24.5	16.4	13.6	8.8	4.8	100.0%		

PARTICIPANTS

Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	48,122	5,040	8,555	1,594	0	576	63,887	9.8%	11,222,319
1-50%	32,161	52,979	28,345	24,059	19,653	13,959	171,156	26.3%	45,425,565
51-100%	100,166	70,916	71,221	45,087	39,693	14,115	341,198	52.4%	50,472,218
101-130%	12,574	7,429	2,726	6,632	6,546	5,292	41,199	6.3%	2,261,172
131+	8,919	23,305	0	1,375	0	565	34,164	5.2%	411,047
Total Units	201,942	159,669	110,847	78,747	65,892	34,507	651,604	100.0%	109,792,321
Total Persons	201,942	319,338	332,541	314,988	329,460	245,548	1,743,817		
% of Total Units	31.0	24.5	17.0	12.1	10.1	5.3	100.0%		

TABLE 2  
 DISTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE AND PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS  
 BY GROSS INCOME RELATIVE TO POVERTY AND UNIT SIZE

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part

ELIGIBLES									
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	107,061	53,407	32,242	11,950	9,763	5,065	219,488	10.7%	50,457,184
1-50%	55,041	74,340	45,121	22,845	34,248	18,142	249,737	12.2%	66,252,446
51-100%	113,951	127,279	133,319	87,800	74,286	40,421	577,056	28.3%	95,965,397
101-130%	523,295	82,953	85,129	65,213	32,389	25,179	814,158	39.9%	37,116,849
131+	48,263	127,698	0	4,445	421	565	181,392	8.9%	3,213,870
Total Units	847,611	465,677	295,811	192,253	151,107	89,372	2,041,831	100.0%	253,005,746
Total Persons	847,611	931,354	887,433	769,012	755,535	618,327	4,809,272		
% of Total Units	41.5	22.8	14.5	9.4	7.4	4.4	100.0%		

  

PARTICIPANTS									
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty	Number of Units by Unit Size						Total Units	% of Total Units	Total Benefits (dollars)
	1	2	3	4	5	6+			
<= 0.0	32,532	5,040	8,555	1,594	0	576	48,297	4.4%	9,242,389
1-50%	32,741	37,222	26,505	13,712	17,023	13,959	141,162	12.9%	36,521,738
51-100%	93,385	49,289	73,202	41,626	46,261	15,853	319,616	29.2%	45,039,918
101-130%	373,583	20,446	24,473	6,632	7,687	7,383	440,204	40.2%	12,696,089
131+	30,377	113,103	0	1,375	0	565	145,420	13.3%	1,710,457
Total Units	562,618	225,100	132,735	64,939	70,971	38,336	1,094,699	100.0%	105,210,591
Total Persons	562,618	450,200	398,205	259,756	354,855	272,555	2,298,189		
% of Total Units	51.4	20.6	12.1	5.9	6.5	3.5	100.0%		

TABLE 3  
 CHARACTERISTICS OF ELIGIBLE FOOD STAMP UNITS

Characteristic	BASELAW	PLAN 004
Units with:		
Earners	775,826	775,906
% Chg from Baselow		0.0
% Of Total Units	47.8	38.0
Elderly	250,591	602,857
% Chg from Baselow		140.6
% Of Total Units	15.4	29.5
Elderly or Disabled	301,797	902,768
% Chg from Baselow		199.1
% Of Total Units	18.6	44.2
Children	1,098,627	1,064,159
% Chg from Baselow		-3.1
% Of Total Units	67.6	52.1
Children 5 to 17	896,892	867,891
% Chg from Baselow		-3.2
% Of Total Units	55.2	42.5
Zero net income	420,187	351,470
% Chg from Baselow		-16.4
% Of Total Units	25.9	17.2
Minimum benefit	222,989	618,754
% Chg from Baselow		177.5
% Of Total Units	13.7	30.3
Average Income Amounts (\$):		
Avg Monthly Gross Income	749	815
% Chg from Baselow		8.9
Avg Monthly Net Income	459	533
% Chg from Baselow		16.0
Total Units	1,624,596	2,041,831
% Chg from Baselow		25.7
Total Benefits (\$)	266,275,524	253,005,746
% Chg from Baselow		-5.0

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part

TABLE 3  
 CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS

Characteristic	BASELAW	PLAN 004
Units with:		
Earners	241,389	256,163
% Chg from Baselow		6.1
% Of Total Units	37.0	23.4
Elderly	26,691	367,343
% Chg from Baselow		1276.3
% Of Total Units	4.1	33.6
Elderly or Disabled	47,702	593,676
% Chg from Baselow		1144.6
% Of Total Units	7.3	54.2
Children	503,703	486,315
% Chg from Baselow		-3.5
% Of Total Units	77.3	44.4
Children 5 to 17	393,702	378,878
% Chg from Baselow		-3.8
% Of Total Units	60.4	34.6
Zero net income	115,151	103,114
% Chg from Baselow		-10.5
% Of Total Units	17.7	9.4
Minimum benefit	58,703	457,488
% Chg from Baselow		679.3
% Of Total Units	9.0	41.8
Average Income Amounts (\$):		
Avg Monthly Gross Income	711	818
% Chg from Baselow		15.0
Avg Monthly Net Income	462	574
% Chg from Baselow		24.2
Total Units	651,604	1,094,699
% Chg from Baselow		68.0
Total Benefits (\$)	109,792,321	105,210,591
% Chg from Baselow		-4.2

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part

TABLE 4  
 WELFARE STATUS OF ELIGIBLE UNITS

Welfare Status	BASELAW	PLAN 004
Units with:		
No AFDC, SSI, or GA	1,200,088	1,093,395
% Chg from Baselaw		-8.9
% Of Total Units	73.9	53.5
Only AFDC	372,408	298,285
% Chg from Baselaw		-19.9
% Of Total Units	22.9	14.6
Only GA	50,996	30,213
% Chg from Baselaw		-40.8
% Of Total Units	3.1	1.5
Only SSI	0	531,647
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	26.0
Only AFDC and GA	1,104	1,104
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.1	0.1
Only AFDC and SSI	0	54,915
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	2.7
Only GA and SSI	0	32,272
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	1.6
AFDC, SSI, and GA	0	0
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	0.0
Total Units	1,624,596	2,041,831
% Chg from Baselaw		25.7
% Of Total Units	100.0	100.0
Units with:		
Any AFDC	373,512	354,304
% Chg from Baselaw		-5.1
% Of Total Units	23.0	17.4
Any GA	52,100	63,589
% Chg from Baselaw		22.1
% Of Total Units	3.2	3.1
Any SSI	0	618,834
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	30.3
Pure PA*	345,647	798,327
% Chg from Baselaw		131.0
% Of Total Units	21.3	39.1

BASELAW: \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part  
 \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

TABLE 4  
 WELFARE STATUS OF PARTICIPATING UNITS

Welfare Status	BASELAW	PLAN 004
Units with:		
No AFDC, SSI, or GA	258,574	236,525
% Chg from Baselaw		-8.5
% Of Total Units	39.7	21.6
Only AFDC	371,787	297,664
% Chg from Baselaw		-19.9
% Of Total Units	57.1	27.2
Only GA	20,139	10,104
% Chg from Baselaw		-49.8
% Of Total Units	3.1	0.9
Only SSI	0	469,893
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	42.9
Only AFDC and GA	1,104	1,104
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.2	0.1
Only AFDC and SSI	0	54,915
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	5.0
Only GA and SSI	0	24,494
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	2.2
AFDC, SSI, and GA	0	0
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	0.0
Total Units	651,604	1,094,699
% Chg from Baselaw		68.0
% Of Total Units	100.0	100.0
Units with:		
Any AFDC	372,891	353,683
% Chg from Baselaw		-5.2
% Of Total Units	57.2	32.3
Any GA	21,243	35,702
% Chg from Baselaw		68.1
% Of Total Units	3.3	3.3
Any SSI	0	549,302
% Chg from Baselaw		0.0
% Of Total Units	0.0	50.2
Pure PA*	328,133	782,685
% Chg from Baselaw		138.5
% Of Total Units	50.4	71.5

BASELAW: \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part  
 \* Pure PA means all persons in the unit receive AFDC, SSI, and/or GA (PUREPA = 3)

TABLE 5  
 DEDUCTIONS OF ELIGIBLE FOOD STAMP UNITS

	BASELAW		PLAN 004	
	All Units	Units with Deduction	All Units	Units with Deduction
Avg Standard	134.0	134.0	134.0	134.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	0.0	0.0
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0
Avg Earnings	91.9	192.4	70.8	186.2
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-23.0	-3.2
% Units with Deduct		47.8		38.0
Avg Medical	8.2	163.5	8.6	131.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	4.9	-19.9
% Units with Deduct		5.0		6.5
Avg Dependent Care	5.2	111.2	4.2	113.2
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-19.4	1.8
% Units with Deduct		4.6		3.7
Avg Shelter	128.9	192.2	118.9	200.1
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-7.7	4.1
% Units with Deduct		67.0		59.4
Avg Total	368.1	368.1	336.4	336.4
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-8.6	-8.6
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0

NOTE: For valid baselow/reform comparisons, use the same value of the parameter DEDTYPE for baselow and reform simulations. See notes below to determine the DEDTYPE value used in each simulation.

BASELAW: Check the baselow simulation output file to determine the DEDTYPE value that was used.

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part  
 Deductions tabulations use the entitled deduction amounts (DEDTYPE = 2).

TABLE 5  
 DEDUCTIONS OF PARTICIPATING FOOD STAMP UNITS

	BASELAW		PLAN 004	
	All Units	Units with Deduction	All Units	Units with Deduction
Avg Standard	134.0	134.0	134.0	134.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	0.0	0.0
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0
Avg Earnings	52.7	142.3	32.1	137.2
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-39.1	-3.6
% Units with Deduct		37.0		23.4
Avg Medical	0.9	74.8	4.3	81.3
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	390.2	8.7
% Units with Deduct		1.2		5.2
Avg Dependent Care	5.0	118.7	3.0	120.0
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-40.7	1.1
% Units with Deduct		4.2		2.5
Avg Shelter	95.8	158.6	92.2	180.9
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-3.7	14.1
% Units with Deduct		60.4		51.0
Avg Total	288.3	288.3	265.5	265.5
% Chg from Baselow	NA	NA	-7.9	-7.9
% Units with Deduct		100.0		100.0

NOTE: For valid baselow/reform comparisons, use the same value of the parameter DEDTYPE for baselow and reform simulations. See notes below to determine the DEDTYPE value used in each simulation.

BASELAW: Check the baselow simulation output file to determine the DEDTYPE value that was used.

PLAN 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part  
 Deductions tabulations use the entitled deduction amounts (DEDTYPE = 2).

<<## END OF FSTAMP



TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF UNIT COMPOSITION CHANGES

Plan 004: CCAP004: Elim SSI Cashout, All newly elig part

	Participants	Average Per-Capita Benefit In Baselaw	Average Per-Capita Benefit In Reform	Average Change In Per-Capita Benefit	Total Change in Benefits	
					Dollars	% of Total Baselaw Benefits
Baselaw Participant, No Change In Per-Capita-Benefits	1,466,198	60.99	60.99	0.00	0	0.00
Baselaw Participant, No Longer Participating	95,641	45.24	0.00	-45.24	-4,326,620	-3.94
Baselaw Participant, Decrease In Per-Capita-Benefits	181,978	88.13	21.66	-66.47	-12,096,648	-11.02
Baselaw Participant, Increase In Per-Capita-Benefits	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00
Baselaw Non-Participant, Participating Under Reform	650,013	0.00	18.22	18.22	11,841,538	10.79

TABLE 1

AVERAGE CALCULATED SHELTER DEDUCTION AND REPORTED SHELTER EXPENSE AMONG UNITS BY STATE AND SSI RECEIPT, CY  
2000

	Average Calculated Shelter Deduction			Average Reported Shelter Expense			Total Deductions		
	All	Received SSI		All	Received SSI		All	Received SSI	
		No	Yes		No	Yes		No	Yes
All States	113	106	127	312	297	346	301	312	275
Not CA	116	110	127	317	301	346	304	320	275
CA	77	77	NA	267	267	NA	264	264	NA

Sources: FY 2000 and 2001 FSPQC datafiles.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE CALCULATED SHELTER DEDUCTION AND REPORTED SHELTER EXPENSE AMONG UNITS  
WITH A POSITIVE SHELTER DEDUCTION BY STATE, CY 2000

State	Average Calculated Shelter Deduction	State	Average Reported Shelter Expense
All	189	All	427
Virgin Islands	105	Virgin Islands	241
Mississippi	119	Mississippi	301
South Carolina	129	Guam	317
Kentucky	141	Kentucky	331
<b>California</b>	<b>144</b>	South Carolina	334
Virginia	147	District of Columbia	341
District of Columbia	148	Texas	357
Iowa	149	Wyoming	357
Tennessee	150	Tennessee	358
Oklahoma	154	Oklahoma	360
Idaho	155	Alabama	365
Texas	157	<b>California</b>	<b>366</b>
Arkansas	158	Arkansas	366
New Mexico	158	Virginia	368
Guam	158	Missouri	370
Louisiana	161	Louisiana	371
Alabama	162	New Mexico	373
Kansas	163	West Virginia	373
Nebraska	163	Iowa	380
Missouri	164	Pennsylvania	380
Pennsylvania	164	North Carolina	381
Wyoming	164	Kansas	382
North Carolina	165	Georgia	383
Indiana	166	Arizona	383
Ohio	166	Maryland	387
Georgia	167	Indiana	388
Montana	170	Ohio	392
West Virginia	170	Montana	395
Washington	171	North Dakota	398
Arizona	174	Idaho	400
North Dakota	174	Illinois	403
Hawaii	177	Nebraska	406
Oregon	179	Hawaii	408
Delaware	180	Washington	411
Colorado	183	Delaware	415
Illinois	183	Oregon	416
Florida	185	Florida	421
Utah	186	Minnesota	421
Maryland	187	Colorado	430
Wisconsin	187	South Dakota	431
Rhode Island	193	Rhode Island	450
South Dakota	194	Utah	454
Nevada	199	Nevada	455
Minnesota	200	Wisconsin	463
Michigan	206	New Jersey	475
Vermont	208	Michigan	481
Maine	218	Maine	483
Connecticut	221	Connecticut	492
Massachusetts	227	Massachusetts	512
Alaska	228	Vermont	519
New Jersey	228	New Hampshire	547
New Hampshire	235	Alaska	548
New York	312	New York	634

Sources: FY 2000 and 2001 FSPQC datafiles.

TABLE 3

## TOTAL FSP UNITS WITHOUT SSI AND NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF FSP UNITS WITHOUT SSI WITH A SHELTER DEDUCTION, BY STATE, CY 2000

State	Total Units without SSI		Units without SSI with Shelter Deduction	
	Number (000s)		Number (000s)	Percent of State Total
All	4,992		2,924	58.6
District of Columbia	27		10	37.0
Virgin Islands	5		2	40.0
South Carolina	80		35	43.8
Mississippi	65		29	44.6
Alaska	11		5	45.5
Hawaii	40		19	47.5
Tennessee	140		69	49.3
Georgia	154		77	50.0
Idaho	16		8	50.0
New Mexico	47		24	51.1
Louisiana	124		64	51.6
Virginia	91		47	51.6
Texas	369		192	52.0
Kentucky	94		49	52.1
Rhode Island	23		12	52.2
Oklahoma	70		37	52.9
<b>California</b>	<b>653</b>		<b>346</b>	<b>53.0</b>
Ohio	155		83	53.5
Arkansas	65		35	53.8
Delaware	9		5	55.6
Wisconsin	54		30	55.6
Oregon	88		49	55.7
North Carolina	139		78	56.1
Guam	7		4	57.1
Iowa	35		20	57.1
Kansas	35		20	57.1
Wyoming	7		4	57.1
Indiana	87		50	57.5
Illinois	232		134	57.8
West Virginia	57		33	57.9
Alabama	100		58	58.0
Arizona	74		45	60.8
Utah	23		14	60.9
Florida	250		155	62.0
Maryland	66		41	62.1
Washington	93		58	62.4
Pennsylvania	234		147	62.8
Missouri	124		78	62.9
Connecticut	57		36	63.2
Minnesota	61		39	63.9
Colorado	43		28	65.1
Nebraska	23		15	65.2
Michigan	176		115	65.3
Maine	32		21	65.6
New Jersey	97		64	66.0
South Dakota	12		8	66.7
Massachusetts	65		44	67.7
Nevada	19		13	68.4
North Dakota	10		7	70.0
Vermont	14		10	71.4
Montana	18		13	72.2
New York	410		336	82.0
New Hampshire	12		10	83.3

Sources: FY 2000 and 2001 FSPQC datafiles.

TABLE 4

UNWEIGHTED COUNTS OF FSP UNITS, UNITS RECEIVING A SHELTER DEDUCTION, AND UNITS  
RECEIVING A MEDICAL DEDUCTION BY STATE, CY 2000

	Total FSP Units	Units Receiving a Shelter Deduction	Units Receiving a Medical Deduction
All	46,693	27,022	2,231
Alabama	1,045	653	91
Alaska	269	132	3
Arizona	1,214	740	29
Arkansas	1,244	653	84
<b>California</b>	<b>899</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>3</b>
Colorado	976	610	50
Connecticut	920	577	7
Delaware	347	214	7
District of Columbia	701	278	10
Florida	1,183	790	20
Georgia	949	493	60
Hawaii	883	449	11
Idaho	468	227	17
Illinois	1,308	795	33
Indiana	1,036	595	111
Iowa	1,022	585	66
Kansas	1,002	606	64
Kentucky	1,013	472	77
Louisiana	1,037	588	89
Maine	795	544	40
Maryland	1,051	663	51
Massachusetts	917	610	9
Michigan	1,451	988	94
Minnesota	936	532	19
Mississippi	1,107	444	50
Missouri	1,017	647	97
Montana	470	324	36
Nebraska	874	569	41
Nevada	518	369	10
New Hampshire	351	264	25
New Jersey	1,130	751	26
New Mexico	1,322	652	25
New York	958	764	25
North Carolina	1,106	601	70
North Dakota	467	300	50
Ohio	1,033	552	85
Oklahoma	1,204	601	45
Oregon	1,005	549	79
Pennsylvania	997	600	33
Rhode Island	592	312	5
South Carolina	1,157	599	31
South Dakota	349	236	31
Tennessee	869	442	48
Texas	1,246	647	79
Utah	599	375	10
Vermont	360	251	16
Virginia	987	499	66
Washington	1,208	714	21
West Virginia	1,030	634	47
Wisconsin	1,144	604	95
Wyoming	312	156	20
Guam	323	184	8
Virgin Islands	294	113	12

Sources: FY 2000 and 2001 FSPQC datafiles.

TABLE 5

## SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS BY STATE, POVERTY LEVEL, AND FOOD STAMP RECEIPT, 2000

	United States								CA							
	All poverty levels				Gross income less than 200 percent of poverty level				All poverty levels				Gross income less than 200 percent of poverty level			
	Total		FSP		Total		FSP		Total		FSP		Total		FSP	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent
All	271,359	100.0	16,746	100.0	79,790	100.0	15,247	100.0	34,457	100.0	2,459	100.0	11,502	100.0	2,206	100.0
Housing																
Own	191,116	70.4	4,960	29.6	38,637	48.4	4,281	28.1	20,523	59.6	453	18.4	4,158	36.2	398	18.0
Rent	76,385	28.1	11,364	67.9	39,107	49.0	10,571	69.3	13,440	39.0	1,952	79.4	7,001	60.9	1,753	79.5
Public housing	7,276	2.7	3,094	18.5	6,238	7.8	3,025	19.8	669	1.9	212	8.6	576	5.0	204	9.2
Rent subsidy	3,230	1.2	1,653	9.9	2,855	3.6	1,572	10.3	757	2.2	403	16.4	645	5.6	370	16.8
No cash rent	3,858	1.4	423	2.5	2,047	2.6	395	2.6	493	1.4	54	2.2	343	3.0	54	2.4
Total with reduced housing costs	14,364	5.3	5,170	30.9	11,140	14.0	4,992	32.7	1,919	5.6	669	27.2	1,564	13.6	628	28.5
Energy assistance	5,890	2.2	3,369	20.1	5,295	6.6	3,232	21.2	486	1.4	212	8.6	430	3.7	212	9.6
Metro status																
In metro area	183,223	67.5	10,128	60.5	49,455	62.0	9,031	59.2	31,315	90.9	2,067	84.1	10,266	89.3	1,856	84.1
In central city	65,050	24.0	6,041	36.1	23,392	29.3	5,417	35.5	12,533	36.4	993	40.4	4,560	39.6	884	40.1
Other metro area	118,173	43.5	4,087	24.4	26,063	32.7	3,614	23.7	18,782	54.5	1,074	43.7	5,706	49.6	972	44.1
In non-metro area	50,503	18.6	3,997	23.9	18,378	23.0	3,784	24.8	404	1.2	82	3.3	218	1.9	61	2.8
Unknown	37,634	13.9	2,620	15.6	11,957	15.0	2,432	16.0	2,738	7.9	309	12.6	1,018	8.9	288	13.1
Gross income as a percentage of poverty																
Less than 200%	79,790	29.4	15,247	91.0	79,790	100.0	15,247	100.0	11,502	33.4	2,206	89.7	11,502	100.0	2,206	100.0
200% or more	191,569	70.6	1,499	9.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	22,954	66.6	254	10.3	0	0.0	0	0.0

## Notes:

Data in columns with header "FSP" include all individuals in households that report the receipt of food stamps by someone in the household. These counts, therefore, are different from counts of actual FSP participants.

Data in columns with header "Gross income less than 200 percent of poverty" include all individuals in families with family income less than 2.0 times the poverty cutoff for their family size.

Source: March 2001 CPS

## APPENDIX A

### METHODOLOGY

#### A. CREATION OF THE CALIFORNIA 2000 MATH CPS MODEL

In order to simulate ending SSI cash-out in California, we created the California 2000 MATH<sup>1</sup> CPS model. The model was calibrated to match California administrative data for food stamp participants and SSI/SSP recipients and simulates the FSP and SSI programs in California in April 2000.

To create a California dataset, we extracted California households from the 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 March CPS, taking into account the overlapping rotation groups in the CPS.<sup>2</sup> We aged the economic data on the 1998, 1999 and 2000 March CPS to 2000 values<sup>3</sup> and adjusted the weights on the file so that the weighted counts matched 2000 California control totals.

We modified existing computer programs to create the California 2000 MATH CPS model from the California dataset in the following steps:

##### 1. Initial Data Processing

In this step, the raw CPS datafile is edited, recoded and renamed so that it is readable by the MATH model. Then we create variables that classify families and individuals by certain characteristics needed to determine eligibility for the FSP and other assistance programs.

##### 2. Allocate Annual Income to Monthly Amounts, Impute Child-care Expenses

We convert the annual income reported on the March CPS to monthly amounts that can be used to calculate eligibility for the FSP and other assistance programs. This includes earnings, asset income, unemployment compensation, TANF, GA, and other unearned income.

Because the CPS does not collect information on child-care expenses, and since eligibility for the FSP is affected by the amount of child-care expense a family incurs, we impute these expenses.

---

<sup>1</sup> MATH stands for Micro Analysis of Transfers to Households.

<sup>2</sup> Each household in the CPS is interviewed once a month for four consecutive months one year, and then interviewed again for the corresponding four-month time period a year later. As a result of this design, fifty percent of the sampled households in any given year were also in the previous year's sample. To avoid duplicate households in our sample, we used the full sample from 2001 and the non-overlapping half of each of the other year's samples.

<sup>3</sup> The March CPS collects economic data for the prior year. For example, the 2001 March CPS has economic data for 2000.

### **3. Simulate SSI**

The model simulates SSI receipt rather than using SSI income reported in the March CPS. This is because receipt of SSI, like other forms of public assistance, is underreported in the March CPS. The SSI simulation is done in three steps. First, elderly or disabled individuals are assigned to an SSI unit. Because the CPS data does not contain income data for children under age 15, disabled children on SSI will most likely have their SSI income reported on the record of an adult in the household. Therefore, the model assigns to an SSI unit those children under age 15 who are living in a household with an adult who reports SSI income but did not miss work in the past year due a disability. The second step is to simulate SSI eligibility. Units are deemed eligible for SSI if they pass an asset test and an income test. SSI asset eligibility in the MATH CPS model is imputed because the March CPS data does not contain information on asset balances. Individuals meeting any of the following criteria are considered asset eligible for SSI:

- Individuals who report SSI in the CPS.
- Individuals in households that report TANF in the CPS.
- Individuals in households that report food stamps in the CPS.
- Individuals in households that are asset eligible based on an imputation using data from the 1997 MATH SIPP model.

In this step we also compute the benefits for all eligible SSI units. The final step in the SSI simulation is the selection of SSI participants from the pool of simulated eligible individuals. This is done using an algorithm that selects participants to match administrative data on the California SSI caseload in 2000.

### **4. Define TANF and GA Units, Impute Medical and Shelter Expenses**

We define Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and General Assistance (GA) units to ensure that reported income amounts from these programs are allocated to the correct individuals in the household.

We impute medical and shelter expenses because these expenses are not reported in the March CPS but are needed to compute net monthly income to determine eligibility for the FSP. Out-of-pocket medical expenses are imputed using an equation based on data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey. Shelter expenses are imputed using two equations estimated from the American Housing Survey. Both types of estimated expenses are calibrated so that the medical and shelter deductions of simulated FSP households more closely match FSP administrative data.

### **5. Simulate the Food Stamp Program**

In the simulation procedure, FSP eligibility guidelines that were in effect in California in April 2000 are applied to each household in the CPS. These guidelines include unit formation rules, asset limits, and income limits.



#### **a. Classify Individuals into food stamp units**

Individuals who customarily purchase and prepare food together form a food stamp unit. Elderly and disabled individuals are eligible to form their own unit, along with their spouse, provided they are unable to purchase and prepare food for themselves and the income of other household members does not exceed 165 percent of poverty. While the CPS defines the dwelling unit based on shared living quarters, it does not identify who purchases and prepares food together. As a result, we simulate the formation of food stamp units within each household. For most households, we simulate all household members to be in the same food stamp unit. For some households with certain compositions (e.g., households with elderly individuals, multiple family households, etc.) we may simulate two or more separate food stamp units. The probability that a household will form multiple units is based on observed rates for similar households from FSP administrative data.

Some groups of individuals are categorically ineligible for the FSP and so are excluded from the food stamp unit. These groups include SSI recipients, some full-time postsecondary students, and certain classes of noncitizens and nonelderly nondisabled childless adults made ineligible as a result of welfare reform.

#### **b. Determine Asset Eligibility**

A food stamp unit is eligible for FSP benefits if its countable assets are less than \$2,000. If the unit contains an elderly person, the asset limit is \$3,000. Since asset balances are not included in the CPS database, we use an equation to impute the probability that non-pure public assistance (PA) units will pass the asset test. Pure PA units (units in which every member receives AFDC/TANF, GA, or SSI) are automatically eligible for food stamps and are thus not affected by the asset test.

#### **c. Determine Income Eligibility**

Food stamp units must also meet income limits in order to be eligible for benefits. Non-pure PA food stamp units that do not contain elderly or disabled members must have a gross income below 130 percent of the monthly FSP net income guidelines. There is no gross income limit for units that contain elderly or disabled members. In addition, all non-pure PA food stamp units must have a net income below 100 percent of the FSP net income guidelines. Net income equals gross income minus deductions (standard, earned income, dependent care, medical, and excess shelter expense).

#### **d. Select Program Participants**

The final step in the food stamp simulation is the selection of units to participate in the FSP from the pool of units simulated to be eligible. This is done using an algorithm that selects participants in such a way that the simulated caseload matches selected characteristics of the actual FSP caseload in California in 2000.

### **B. CREATION OF A CALENDAR YEAR 2000 CALIFORNIA FSPQC DATABASE**

The FSPQC database is an edited version of the raw datafile of monthly case reviews conducted by state FSP agencies for quality control purposes. It contains detailed demographic,

economic, and FSP eligibility information for a nationally representative sample of FSP units and is well suited for tabulations of the characteristics of food stamp units. We performed tabulations on a subset of the FY 2000 and FY 2001 FSPQC databases that included FSP units in California that were reviewed in calendar year 2000.<sup>4</sup>

For information on how the FSPQC databases are created, please see the Technical Documentation for the Fiscal Year 2001 FSPQC Database and QC Minimodel at <http://host2.mathematica-mpr.com/fns/fnsqcdata/index.htm>.

---

<sup>4</sup> FY 2000 data includes the months October 1999 – September 2000, and FY 2001 data includes October 2000 – September 2001.

## APPENDIX B

### TABLE DESCRIPTIONS

#### **Table 1: Summary Comparison of Impacts on the Food Stamp Program (FSP)**

Table 1 shows the weighted and unweighted numbers of eligible FSP units and persons, numbers of participating FSP units and persons, and total benefits received by participating units under the baselaw and reform plans. It also displays the percent change and standard error (in parentheses) in eligibles, participants, and benefits relative to the baseline.

#### **Table 2: Distribution of Eligible and Participating Food Stamp Units by Gross Income Relative to Poverty and Unit Size**

Table 2 shows the number of eligible and participating FSP units and persons under the baselaw and reform plans by gross income as a percentage of poverty and FSP unit size.

#### **Table 3: Characteristics of Eligible and Participating Food Stamp Units**

Table 3 shows the number and percent of eligible and participating FSP units under the baselaw and reform plans for the following subgroups:

- FSP units with earners
- FSP units with elderly
- FSP units with elderly or disabled
- FSP units with children
- FSP units with children age 5 to 17
- FSP units with zero net income
- FSP units receiving the minimum benefit.

The table also displays the average gross and net monthly income under the baseline and reform plans.

#### **Table 4: Welfare Status of Eligible and Participating Food Stamp Units**

Table 4 shows the number and percent of eligible and participating FSP units under the baselaw and reform plans by receipt of TANF, SSI and GA benefits.

#### **Table 5: Deductions of Eligible and Participating Food Stamp Units**

Table 5 shows the average standard, earnings, medical, dependent care, excess shelter, and total deductions as well as the percentage of units with each deduction for eligible and participating FSP units under the baselaw and reform plans.

## **Tables 6a, 6b and 6c: Summary and Detailed Gainer/Loser Tables**

We have not attached the Table 6's. These standard output, household level, tables are not applicable when we simulate unit composition changes.<sup>1</sup> Table 7 provides the relevant gainer/loser information for these reforms.

### **Table 7: Analysis of Unit Composition Changes**

Table 7 is a participant-level table showing average per-capita benefits under the baselaw and reform plans by gainer/loser category.

---

<sup>1</sup> We use household to refer to everyone who occupies the same dwelling, and food stamp unit to refer to those individuals within the household who apply for food stamps together. Households can contain one or more food stamp units. Tables 1 through 5 are based on the food stamp unit. Tables 6a, 6b, and 6c are based on households, with all food stamp units being combined into one unit. Hence, "units gaining/losing" refers to households, "persons gaining/losing" refers to all individuals living in the household regardless of whether they are part of the food stamp unit, and "benefits gained/lost" refers to total benefits gained/lost by the household. Table 7 is based on individuals in food stamp units.