

SECTION V
RESOURCES

WORKS CITED

- ¹U.S. Census Bureau, 2005 American Community Survey. *2005 American Community Survey Data Profile Highlights*. Note that the ACS universe is limited to the household population and excludes the population living in institutions, college dormitories, and other group quarters. For more information about the difference between Census-reported estimates please see the Appendix. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from http://factfinder.census.gov/jsp/saff/SAFFInfo.jsp?_pagelid=gn10_select_state.
- ²U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. *State Personal Income 2005*. March 2006. Table 1: Per Capita Income, Personal Income, and Population, by State and Region, 2004 – 2005. Note that 2005 estimates are preliminary. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time.
- ³U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2004 to 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. Three-Year-Average Household Income by State: 2003 – 2005. The three-year-average median is the sum of three inflation-adjusted single-year medians divided by 3. Estimates for Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia were not available at press time. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/income/income05/statemh3.html>. The national estimate is from *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2005*. Available at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2006pubs/p60-231.pdf>.
- ⁴U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Regional and State Employment and Unemployment: December 2006*. Table 3: Civilian Labor Force and Unemployment by State and Selected Area, Seasonally Adjusted.
- ⁵U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2004 to 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. *Percentage of People in Poverty by State Using 2- and 3-Year Averages: 2003 to 2005*. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/poverty05/table8.html>.
- ⁶U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Table POV46: Poverty Status by State: 2005, Below 100% and 125% of Poverty – All Ages (weighted person count). Poverty in the United States is measured by comparing family income with one of 48 poverty thresholds - the dollar amounts used to determine who is poor. The poverty thresholds vary by size of family and the ages of the members. See the Appendix for further explanation. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time. Accessed on January 28, 2007 from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032006/pov/new46_100125_01.htm.
- ⁷U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Table POV46: Poverty Status by State: 2005, Below 135% and 150% of Poverty – All Ages (weighted person count). Poverty in the United States is measured by comparing family income with one of 48 poverty thresholds - the dollar amounts used to determine who is poor. The poverty thresholds vary by size of family and the ages of the members. See the Appendix for further explanation. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032006/pov/new46_135150_01.htm.
- ⁸U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Table POV46: Poverty Status by State: 2005, Below 185% and 200% of Poverty – All Ages (weighted person count). Poverty in the United States is measured by comparing family income with one of 48 poverty thresholds - the dollar amounts used to determine who is poor. The poverty thresholds vary by size of family and the ages of the members. See the Appendix for further explanation. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032006/pov/new46_185200_01.htm.
- ⁹U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Table POV46: Poverty Status by State: 2005, Below 100% and 125% of Poverty – People Under 18 Years of Age (weighted person count). Poverty in the United States is measured by comparing family income with one of 48 poverty thresholds - the dollar amounts used to determine who is poor. The poverty thresholds vary by size of family and the ages of the members. See the Appendix for further explanation. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time. Accessed on December 28, 2006 from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032006/pov/new46_100125_03.htm.
- ¹⁰U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Table POV46: Poverty Status by State: 2005, Below 100% and 125% of Poverty – People 65 Years and Over (weighted person count). (B) Is defined by the Census to mean the percentage has been suppressed because it is statistically unreliable. Percentages are not shown when the denominator is less than 75 thousand. Poverty in the United States is measured by comparing family income with one of 48 poverty thresholds - the dollar amounts used to determine who is poor. The poverty thresholds vary by size of family and the ages of the members. See the Appendix for further explanation. Estimates for Puerto Rico were not available at press time. Accessed on December 28, 2006 from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032006/pov/new46_100125_06.htm.
- ¹¹Nord, Mark, M. Andrews, and S. Carlson. November 2006. *Household Food Security in the United States, 2005*. ERR-29, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Available at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/err29>. Note that the term food insecurity with hunger has been replaced with very low food security with the release of this report, although its meaning has not. This change is the result of an assessment of the USDA's food security measurement by the National Research Council which is available free of charge at <http://nap.edu/catalog/11578.html>.
- ¹²Nord, Mark, M. Andrews, and S. Carlson. October 2005. *Household Food Security in the United States, 2004*. ERR-11, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Available at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/err11>.

¹³U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Food Stamp Program: Number of Persons Participating*. Data as of December 22, 2006. Note that October 2005 data include disaster assistance for Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. The national total includes participation from Guam and the Virgin Islands. Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas receive Nutrition Assistance Grants which provide benefits analogous to the Food Stamp Program. FY 2006 data are preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/foodstamp.htm>.

¹⁴U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Food Stamp Program: Average Monthly Participation (Persons)*. Data as of November 24, 2006. The number of persons participating is reported monthly. Annual averages are the sums divided by twelve. The national total includes participation from Guam and the Virgin Islands. Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas receive Nutrition Assistance Grants which provide benefits analogous to the Food Stamp Program. FY 2006 data are preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on December 28, 2006 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/foodstamp.htm>.

¹⁵U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Food Stamp Program: Average Monthly Benefit per Person*. Data as of November 24, 2006. Annual averages are total benefits divided by total annual participation. The national total includes participation from Guam and the Virgin Islands. Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas receive Nutrition Assistance Grants which provide benefits analogous to the Food Stamp Program. FY 2006 data are preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on December 28, 2006 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/foodstamp.htm>.

¹⁶U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Food Stamp Program: Average Monthly Benefit per Household*. Data as of November 24, 2006. Annual averages are total benefits divided by total annual household participation. The national total includes participation from Guam and the Virgin Islands. Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas receive Nutrition Assistance Grants which provide benefits analogous to the Food Stamp Program. FY 2006 data are preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on December 28, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/foodstamp.htm>.

¹⁷Cunningham, Karen E., L.A. Castner, A.L. Schirm. October 2006. *Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2004*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Available at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/Participation/reaching2004.pdf>.

¹⁸U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. November 2006. *The Business Case for Increasing Food Stamp Participation*. Table: Potential Increases in People Served, Total Benefits, and Economic Activity if All States Served an Additional Five Percent of Eligibles in Fiscal Year 2004. Note that the number of eligibles used to calculate economic activity is different than the methodology used in the USDA report *Reaching Those in Need*. Available at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/outreach/business-case.htm>.

¹⁹Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Totals include the Federal costs for benefits, the Federal share of State program administrative costs, and other Federal costs. These "other" costs include processing of EBT redemptions, studies and surveys, computer support systems, etc. Because these other Federal costs are not for state-level activity they only impact the national total. The national total also reflects costs from Guam and the Virgin Islands. In addition, the data includes automated system generated estimates to fill in the gaps for any missing state data and all FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision.

²⁰Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Deliveries include entitlement and bonus purchases. The national total includes participation in Guam and the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 deliveries and values are preliminary and subject to revision.

²¹Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Final TEFAP funding is provided through Public Law 110-5 at \$140 million for food (full funding) and \$50 million for TEFAP storage and distribution costs (\$60 million is currently authorized for TEFAP storage and distribution grants under Public Law 107-171). States have the option of transferring a portion of their food grants to help cover a portion of the storage and distribution costs associated with TEFAP and "bonus" commodities and are reflected in the allocated totals for each state. For a preliminary account of FY 2007 state TEFAP allocations, please see Appendix.

²²Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by each State Distributing Agency responsible for administering the TEFAP program. Each state was asked to provide a copy of their current TEFAP distribution plan, from which the household income eligibility level was derived. For Puerto Rico, household eligibility is determined by a Maximum Annual Gross Income Limit as opposed to a percentage of the Federal Poverty Guideline. Contact information for these State Distribution Agencies can be found in the Appendix.

²³U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Commodity Supplemental Food Program: Total Participation*. Data as of November 24, 2006. If a state operated for less than a full year, its annual average does not include non-operating months. Consequently, the sum of the States exceeds the total for most years. In FY 2005, Louisiana participation is an eight-month average; there was no activity in September due to Hurricane Katrina. In FY 2006, Louisiana's participation gradually rose from under 6,000 in the initial month to 62,000 during the final two months. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on December 28, 2006 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/csf.htm>.

²⁴Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Deliveries and values include entitlement and bonus purchases. The national total includes participation from American Samoa, the Red Lake Tribal Organization in Minnesota, and the Oglala Sioux Tribal Organization in South Dakota. Total Federal Spending amounts include emergency supplemental appropriations for Louisiana,

Mississippi, and Texas for Hurricane Katrina. FY 2006 deliveries and values are preliminary and subject to revision.

²⁵U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance. *TANF: Total Number of Recipients, FY 2004*. Data as of March 14, 2006. The national total also reflects participation in Guam and the Virgin Islands. Accessed on December 29, 2006 from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/caseload/2004/recipient04tanf.htm>.

²⁶U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Family Assistance. *TANF: Total Number of Recipients, FY 2005*. Data as of May 11, 2006. The national total also reflects participation in Guam and the Virgin Islands. Accessed on December 29, 2006 from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/caseload/2005/recipient05tanf.htm>.

²⁷Calculated by America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network.

²⁸Rowe, Gretchen, and J. Versteeg. April 2005. *The Welfare Rules Databook: State TANF Policies as of July 2003*. Table II.A.4: Maximum Monthly Benefit for a Family of Three with No Income, July 2003. The Urban Institute. Maximum benefits are calculated assuming that the unit contains one adult and two children who are not subject to a family cap, has no special needs, pays for shelter, and lives in the most populated area of the state. The national average only includes one amount per state (the policy affecting the largest percent of the caseloads). Available at http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411183_WRD_2003.pdf.

²⁹U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *National School Lunch Program: Total Participation*. Data as of December 22, 2006. Participation data are nine-month averages; summer months are excluded. Participation is based on average daily meals divided by an attendance factor of 0.927. The national total includes participation in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense activity represents children of armed forces personnel attending schools overseas. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/slfypart.htm>.

³⁰Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. The national total includes participation in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense activity represents children of armed forces personnel attending schools overseas. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to change.

³¹U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *School Breakfast Program: Total Participation*. Data as of December 22, 2006. Participation data are nine-month averages; summer months are excluded. Participation is based on average daily meals divided by an attendance factor of 0.927. The national total includes participation in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense activity represents children of armed forces personnel attending schools overseas. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 24, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/sbfypart.htm>.

³²Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. The national total includes participation in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense activity represents children of armed forces personnel attending schools overseas. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision.

³³U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Summer Food Service Program: Average Daily Attendance*. Data as of December 22, 2006. Average daily attendance is reported for July only, the peak month of national program activity. Unlike participation data in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, average daily attendance is not adjusted for absenteeism. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 25, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/sffypart.htm>.

³⁴U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. June 22, 2005. Accessed on January 25, 2007 from http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/summer/states/Simplified_Summer.html.

³⁵Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. The national total includes participation in the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision.

³⁶U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *WIC Program: Total Participation*. Data as of December 22, 2006. Participation data are 12-month averages. The state totals for Arizona, Colorado, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming include participation administered by an authorized local agency, such as an Indian Tribal Organization. The national total includes participation in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 25, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/wifypart.htm>.

³⁷Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. The national total includes participation in Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense activity represents children of armed forces personnel attending schools overseas. Unlike the program participation data, the state totals for Arizona, Colorado, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming do not include participation administered by an authorized local agency, such as an Indian Tribal Organization. Total Federal spending on WIC includes food costs as well as nutrition services and administration. The national total includes participation in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision.

³⁸U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *WIC Program: Average Monthly Benefit per Person*. Data as of December 22, 2006. The average monthly benefit equals total annual food cost divided by average

monthly participation, divided by twelve. Farmers Market benefits are not included. The state averages for Arizona, Colorado, Maine, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming include participation administered by an authorized local agency, such as an Indian Tribal Organization. The national total includes participation in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 27, 2006 from [http://www.fns.usda.gov/pdf/wifyavgfd\\$.htm](http://www.fns.usda.gov/pdf/wifyavgfd$.htm).

³⁹U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. *Child and Adult Care Food Program: Average Daily Attendance*. Data as of December 22, 2006. Average daily attendance data are reported on a quarterly basis only. Annual averages are divided by four. Unlike participation data in the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, average daily attendance is not adjusted for absenteeism. The national total also reflects participation in Guam and the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision. Accessed on January 27, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/ccfypart.htm>.

⁴⁰Data provided upon request to America's Second Harvest by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. The national total includes participation in Guam and the Virgin Islands. FY 2006 data is preliminary and subject to revision.

⁴¹U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplement. Table H105: *Health Insurance Coverage Status and Type of Coverage by State and Age for All People: 2005*. August 29, 2006. (B) Is defined by the Census to mean the percentage has been suppressed because it is statistically unreliable. Percentages are not shown when the denominator is less than 75 thousand. Accessed on January 27, 2007 from http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032006/health/h05_000.htm.

⁴²U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division. *Minimum Wage Laws in the States – January 1, 2007*. Minimum wage and overtime premium pay standards applicable to nonsupervisory, nonfarm, private sector employment under state and federal laws (January 1, 2007). Like the Federal wage and hour law, State law often exempts particular occupations or industries from the minimum labor standard generally applied to covered employment. Accessed on January 28, 2007 from <http://www.dol.gov/esa/minwage/america.htm>.

⁴³State EITC Online Resource Center. *50 State Resource Map*. Accessed on February 20, 2007 from <http://www.stateeitc.org/map/index.asp>.

⁴⁴Federation of Tax Administrators. *State Sales Tax Rates*. Data as of January 1, 2006. The Federation of Tax Administrators is a nonprofit organization composed of the tax and revenue departments of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and New York City. Its mission is to improve the standards and methods of tax administration. Available at <http://www.taxadmin.org/fta/rate/sales.html>.

⁴⁵U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. *Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program: Number of Assisted Households, by Type of LIHEAP Assistance, as Reported by States, Fiscal Year 2003*. Accessed on January 29, 2007 from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/liheap/data/assisted_households.html.

⁴⁶Cohen, Rhoda, M. Kim, and J. Ohls. March 2006. *Hunger in America 2006*. America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network. Estimates provided reflect emergency food providers, including food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters, and the clients they serve. Note that many other types of provider organizations and programs served by food banks are not described in this study, including congregate meal sites for seniors, after-school programs, and summer camps. For more information on *Hunger in America 2006* please visit www.hungerinamerica.org.

⁴⁷America's Second Harvest – The Nation's Food Bank Network. *2005 Network Activity Report* is an internal publication of America's Second Harvest – The Nation's Food Bank Network. Source of FY 2006 poundage data from Receipts and Distribution questionnaire. Note that *Allocation of Functional Expenses* is calculated using cash expenses only and does not account for the value of food. Member data was the most current at time of press and may have changed since. For the most recent data, please contact your local Network Member.

⁴⁸Cohen, Rhoda, M. Kim, and J. Ohls. *Hunger in America 2006*. March 2006. *Hunger in America 2006*. America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network. Estimates for participating Network Members printed with permission. "n/a" means "not available". Estimates provided reflect emergency food providers, including food pantries, soup kitchens, and emergency shelters, and the clients they serve. Note that many other types of provider organizations and programs served by food banks are not described in this study, including congregate meal sites for seniors, after-school programs, and summer camps. For a detailed report on each participating Network Member's findings please contact that Member directly. For more information on *Hunger in America 2006* please visit www.hungerinamerica.org.

⁴⁹U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Unemployment Rates for States: Annual Average Rankings Year 2005*. Data as of March 1, 2006. Accessed on February 14, 2007 from <http://www.bls.gov/lau/lastrk05.htm>.

⁵⁰U.S. Department of Commerce, *Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau. United States Census 2000*. Summary File 4. PCT142. Poverty Status in 1999 by Sex by Age [59] – Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined.

⁵¹Nord, Mark, M. Andrews, and S. Carlson. October 2004. *Household Food Security in the United States, 2003*. FANRR42, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Available at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr42>

Poverty Thresholds vs. Poverty Guidelines

Poverty thresholds are used for calculating all official poverty population statistics, including figures on the number of Americans in poverty each year. They are updated each year by the Census Bureau. Poverty thresholds since 1980 and weighted average poverty thresholds since 1959 are available on the Census Bureau's web site. For poverty thresholds before 1980, contact the Census Bureau at (301)763-2422. For an example of how the Census Bureau applies the thresholds to a family's income to determine its poverty status, see "How the Census Bureau Measures Poverty" on the Census Bureau's web site.

The poverty guidelines are a simplified version of the federal poverty thresholds used for administrative purposes — for instance, determining financial eligibility for certain federal programs. They are issued each year in the *Federal Register* by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Key differences between the poverty thresholds and the poverty guidelines are summarized in the table below. For more information, see the discussion of poverty thresholds and poverty guidelines on the Institute for Research on Poverty's web site.

Key Differences Between Thresholds and Guidelines

	POVERTY THRESHOLDS	POVERTY GUIDELINES
Issuing Agency	Census Bureau	Department of Health and Human Services
Purpose/Use	Statistical — calculating the number of people in poverty	Administrative — determining financial eligibility for certain programs
Characteristics by Which They Vary	Detailed (48-cell) matrix of thresholds varies by family size, number of children, and, for 1- & 2-person units, whether or not elderly. Weighted average thresholds vary by family size and, for 1- & 2-person units, whether or not elderly. There is no geographic variation; the same figures are used for all 50 states and D.C.	Guidelines vary by family size. In addition, there is one set of figures for the 48 contiguous states and D.C.; one set for Alaska; and one set for Hawaii.
Timing of Annual Update	The Census Bureau issues preliminary poverty thresholds in January and final poverty thresholds in August of the year after the year for which poverty is measured. The poverty thresholds are adjusted to the price level of the year for which poverty is measured. For example, the poverty thresholds for calendar year 2002 were issued in 2003 (preliminary in January, final in September), were used to measure poverty for calendar year 2002, and reflect the price level of calendar year 2002.	HHS issues poverty guidelines in February of each year. Some programs make them effective on date of publication, others at a later date. For example, the 2003 poverty guidelines were issued in February 2003, calculated from the calendar year 2001 thresholds issued in September 2002, updated to reflect the price level of calendar year 2002. Therefore the 2003 poverty guidelines are approximately equal to the poverty thresholds for 2002 (for most family sizes).
How Updated or Calculated	The <i>48-cell matrix</i> is updated each year from the 1978 threshold matrix using the CPI-U. The <i>preliminary weighted average thresholds</i> are updated from the previous year's final weighted average thresholds using the CPI-U. The final <i>weighted average thresholds</i> are calculated from the current year's 48-cell matrix using family weighting figures from the Current Population Survey's Annual Social and Economic Supplement.	Guidelines are updated from the latest published (final) weighted average poverty thresholds using the CPI-U. (Figures are rounded, and differences between adjacent-family-size figures are equalized.)
Rounding	Rounded to the nearest dollar	Rounded to various multiples of \$10 — may end only in zero

2006 HHS Poverty Guidelines

PERSONS IN FAMILY OR HOUSEHOLD	48 CONTIGUOUS STATES AND D.C.	ALASKA	HAWAII
1	\$ 9,800	\$12,250	\$11,270
2	13,200	16,500	15,180
3	16,600	20,750	19,090
4	20,000	25,000	23,000
5	23,400	29,250	26,910
6	26,800	33,500	30,820
7	30,200	37,750	34,730
8	33,600	42,000	38,640
For each additional person, add	3,400	4,250	3,910

SOURCE: *Federal Register*, Vol. 71, No. 15, January 24, 2006, pp. 3848-3849

2007 HHS Poverty Guidelines

PERSONS IN FAMILY OR HOUSEHOLD	48 CONTIGUOUS STATES AND D.C.	ALASKA	HAWAII
1	\$10,210	\$12,770	\$11,750
2	13,690	17,120	15,750
3	17,170	21,470	19,750
4	20,650	25,820	23,750
5	24,130	30,170	27,750
6	27,610	34,520	31,750
7	31,090	38,870	35,750
8	34,570	43,220	39,750
For each additional person, add	3,480	4,350	4,000

SOURCE: *Federal Register*, Vol. 72, No. 15, January 24, 2007, pp. 3147-3148

The separate poverty guidelines for Alaska and Hawaii reflect Office of Economic Opportunity administrative practice beginning in the 1966-1970 period. Note that the poverty thresholds — the original version of the poverty measure — have never had separate figures for Alaska and Hawaii. The poverty guidelines are not defined for Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Palau. In cases in which a Federal program using the poverty guidelines serves any of those jurisdictions, the Federal office which administers the program is responsible for deciding whether to use the contiguous-states-and-D.C. guidelines for those jurisdictions or to follow some other procedure.

The poverty guidelines apply to both aged and non-aged units. The guidelines have never had an aged/non-aged distinction; only the Census Bureau (statistical) poverty thresholds have separate figures for aged and non-aged one-person and two-person units.

Programs using the guidelines (or percentage multiples of the guidelines — for instance, 125 percent or 185 percent of the guidelines) in determining eligibility include Head Start, the Food Stamp Program, the National School Lunch Program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program. Note that in general, cash public assistance programs (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and Supplemental Security Income) do NOT use the poverty guidelines in determining eligibility. The Earned Income Tax Credit program also does NOT use the poverty guidelines to determine eligibility. For a more detailed list of programs that do and don’t use the guidelines, see the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).

The poverty guidelines (unlike the poverty thresholds) are designated by the year in which they are issued. For instance, the guidelines issued in January 2007 are designated the 2007 poverty guidelines. However, the 2007 HHS poverty guidelines only reflect price changes through calendar year 2006; accordingly, they are approximately equal to the Census Bureau poverty thresholds for calendar year 2006. (The 2006 thresholds are expected to be issued in final form in August 2007; a preliminary version of the 2006 thresholds is now available from the Census Bureau.)

The computations for the 2007 poverty guidelines are available.

The poverty guidelines may be formally referenced as “the poverty guidelines updated periodically in the Federal Register by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services under the authority of 42 U.S.C. 9902(2).”

Poverty Thresholds 2005

Poverty Thresholds for 2005 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

SIZE OF FAMILY UNIT	NONE	ONE	TWO
One person (unrelated individual)			
Under 65 years	10,160		
65 years and over	9,367		
Two persons			
Householder under 65 years	13,078	13,461	
Householder 65 years and over	11,805	13,410	
Three persons	15,277	15,720	158,735
Four persons	20,144	20,474	19,806
Five persons	24,293	24,646	23,891
Six persons	27,941	28,052	27,474
Seven persons	32,150	32,350	31,658
Eight persons	35,957	36,274	35,621
Nine persons or more	43,254	43,463	42,885

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division

The above was accessed on February 16, 2007 from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh05.html>.

Poverty Thresholds 2006

Poverty Thresholds for 2006 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

SIZE OF FAMILY UNIT	NONE	ONE	TWO
One person (unrelated individual)			
Under 65 years	10,488		
65 years and over	9,669		
Two persons			
Householder under 65 years	13,500	13,896	
Householder 65 years and over	12,186	13,843	
Three persons	15,769	16,227	16,242
Four persons	20,794	21,134	20,444
Five persons	25,076	25,441	24,662
Six persons	28,842	28,957	28,361
Seven persons	33,187	33,394	32,680
Eight persons	37,117	37,444	36,770
Nine persons or more	44,649	44,865	44,269

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division

The above was accessed on February 16, 2007 from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html>.

	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN	EIGHT OR MORE
	19,874					
	23,307	22,951				
	26,920	26,096	25,608			
	31,176	30,277	29,229	28,079		
	35,049	34,237	33,207	32,135	31,862	
	42,400	41,603	40,507	39,515	39,270	37,757

	THREE	FOUR	FIVE	SIX	SEVEN	EIGHT OR MORE
	20,516					
	24,059	23,691				
	27,788	26,938	26,434			
	32,182	31,254	30,172	28,985		
	36,180	35,342	34,278	33,171	32,890	
	43,768	42,945	41,813	40,790	40,536	38,975

Differences between the *Income and Poverty* Estimates from the American Community Survey and the Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey

AUGUST 29, 2006

The American Community Survey (ACS) is currently the largest household survey in the United States. The ACS is part of the 2010 Decennial Census Program and will eliminate the need for a long-form sample questionnaire. The ACS offers broad, comprehensive information on social, economic, and housing data and is designed to provide this information at many levels of geography, particularly for local communities. With full implementation in 2005, the ACS is now producing annual estimates for geographic areas with populations of 65,000 or more. Beginning in 2008, the ACS will release data for geographic areas with populations between 20,000 and 64,999 using data collected over the three-year period 2005 to 2007. Beginning in 2010, the ACS will use five-year averages to provide estimates for all areas down to census tracts/block groups.

Because of its detailed questionnaire and its experienced interviewing staff, the Current Population Survey (CPS) Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) is a high quality source of information used to produce the official annual estimate of poverty, and estimates of a number of other socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, including income, health insurance coverage, school enrollment, marital status, and family structure. The following chart summarizes the key differences between the ACS and CPS:

	AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY	CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY
Principal Purpose	Part of the 2010 Decennial Program, providing annual (or multi-year average) estimates of selected social, economic, and housing characteristics of the population for many geographic areas and subpopulations.	Produce specific socioeconomic and demographic estimates for the United States, and estimates for states for selected characteristics and subpopulations. Provide timely estimates of income and health insurance, as well as official poverty estimates.
Geography	Nation, states, and cities and counties of 65,000 or more. Eventually, areas as small as census tracts using multi-year averages.	Nation, regions, and states for selected characteristics.
Sample Size	About 3 million addresses per year. Data are collected from about one-twelfth of the sample each month.	Annual sample size is about 100,000 addresses.
Data Collection Method	Mail, telephone, and personal-visit interviews for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. (The Puerto Rico Community Survey began collecting data in 2005.) About half the responses are obtained by mail. The ACS is a mandatory survey.	Telephone and personal-visit interviews for the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The CPS is a voluntary survey.
Residency Status	The ACS includes a person at the address where they are at the time of the survey if they have been there, or will be there, more than 2 months, whether or not they have a "usual residence elsewhere."	The CPS sample unit's householder (one of the people in whose name the unit is rented or owned) must consider the unit to be their place of usual residence (where they spend most of the time during the year) to be counted as an occupied unit, which is traditional in most censuses and housing surveys. If a family has more than one home, the interviewer has to determine if the sample unit is their usual residence.

Population Universe	The 2005 ACS includes only the <i>household</i> population. This universe includes both the civilian and military population in households and excludes the <i>group quarters</i> population. The group quarters population consists of the institutionalized (such as people in correctional institutions or nursing homes) and the noninstitutionalized (most of whom are in college dormitories). The ACS began a group quarters data collection effort in 2006. The weighting is controlled to population estimates as of July 1 (e.g., July 1, 2003 for the 2003 ACS).	The CPS includes the <i>civilian non-institutionalized</i> population. This universe includes civilians in households, people in noninstitutional group quarters (other than military barracks) and military in households living off post or with their families on post (as long as at least one household member is a civilian adult). The universe excludes other military in households and in group quarters (barracks), and people living in institutions. The weighting is controlled to population estimates as of March 1 (e.g., March 1, 2004 for the 2004 CPS ASEC).
Time Period Covered	ACS collects data continuously throughout the year and the reference period for select questions (like income and the number of weeks worked) is the 12-month period prior to the response month. Therefore, people responding in January of 2005 reported income for January to December of 2004. People responding in December of 2005 reported income from December 2004 through November 2005. This yields a total time span covered by responses of 23 months. The survey's 12-month estimates are centered on December 15, 2004.	Monthly interviews conducted from February to April 2006 ask about calendar year 2005 income. The survey's 12-month estimates are centered on July 1, 2005.
Length and Detail of Questions	Using a series of eight questions, the ACS asks about money income, plus one type of noncash benefit (food stamps) during the previous 12 months.	CPS asks a series of questions about more than 50 sources of income, including questions about the amount of several noncash benefits such as food stamps and employment-related health insurance, during the previous calendar year.
Inflation Adjustment	All dollar values for income are adjusted to latest calendar year of estimates using the Consumer Price Index for the date collected versus the average for the year.	None.

The above was accessed on February 19, 2007 from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/factsheet.html>.

Trends in the Prevalence of Household–Level Food Insecurity Rates by State, 2003 – 2005 (average)¹¹, 2002 – 2004 (average)¹², 2001 – 2003 (average)⁵¹, 2000 – 2002 (average)¹¹

Food Insecure Households

(low and very low food security, formerly with and without hunger)

STATE	AVERAGE RATE, 2003 - 2005	AVERAGE RATE, 2002 - 2004	AVERAGE RATE, 2001 – 2003	AVERAGE RATE, 2000 - 2002
US TOTAL	11.4	11.4	11.0	10.8
AK	12.2	11.7	11.5	11.8
AL	12.3	12.2	12.5	12.5
AR	14.7	14.8	15.5	14.6
AZ	12.2	12.7	12.3	12.5
CA	11.7	12.4	12.2	11.7
CO	12.0	11.3	9.7	9.2
CT	8.2	8.6	8.0	7.6
DC	11.4	10.2	9.0	9.3
DE	6.6	6.8	6.7	6.8
FL	9.4	10.8	11.7	11.8
GA	12.4	12.3	12.9	12.9
HI	7.8	8.5	9.9	11.9
IA	10.9	10.2	9.5	9.1
ID	14.1	14.6	13.7	13.7
IL	9.1	9.0	7.9	8.6
IN	11.1	10.1	9.9	8.9
KS	12.3	12.3	11.7	11.7
KY	12.8	12.2	11.2	10.8
LA	12.8	11.8	12.3	13.1
MA	7.8	7.1	6.2	6.4
MD	9.4	8.6	7.7	8.2
ME	12.3	9.8	9.2	9.0
MI	11.5	11.3	10.1	9.2
MN	7.7	7.2	7.1	7.1
MO	11.7	11.3	10.4	9.9

Food Insecure Households

(low and very low food security, formerly with and without hunger)

STATE	AVERAGE RATE, 2003 - 2005	AVERAGE RATE, 2002 - 2004	AVERAGE RATE, 2001 - 2003	AVERAGE RATE, 2000 - 2002
MS	16.5	15.8	14.9	14.8
MT	11.2	12.2	12.5	12.8
NC	13.2	13.8	13.7	12.3
ND	6.4	6.3	6.9	8.1
NE	10.3	10.7	10.4	10.7
NH	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.7
NJ	8.1	8.5	8.6	8.5
NM	16.8	15.8	14.8	14.3
NV	8.4	8.5	9.2	9.3
NY	10.4	10.5	10.0	9.4
OH	12.6	11.4	10.9	9.8
OK	14.6	15.2	14.1	14.3
OR	11.9	11.9	12.9	13.7
PA	9.8	10.2	9.5	9.4
PR	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RI	12.4	12.1	11.1	10.1
SC	15.5	14.8	13.5	12.3
SD	9.5	9.2	8.9	8.0
TN	13.0	11.5	10.9	11.3
TX	16.0	16.4	14.9	14.8
UT	14.5	14.8	14.6	15.2
VA	8.4	8.5	8.4	7.3
VT	9.5	9.0	8.9	9.0
WA	11.2	12.0	11.6	12.3
WI	9.5	9.0	9.0	8.1
WV	8.9	8.8	8.9	9.4
WY	11.1	11.0	10.1	10.7

TEFAP FY 2007 Food and Storage & Distribution Grants (PRELIMINARY)²¹

STATE	FY 2007 ENTITLEMENT GRANT	FY 2007 ADMINISTRATIVE GRANT	FY 2007 ENTITLEMENT FUNDS AVAILABLE TO CONVERT TO ADMIN FUNDS
AK	\$294,127	\$113,433	\$22,916
AL	\$2,021,908	\$779,768	\$157,529
AR	\$1,365,251	\$526,522	\$106,368
AZ	\$2,591,552	\$999,457	\$201,911
CA	\$15,577,443	\$6,007,590	\$1,213,655
CO	\$1,794,365	\$692,014	\$139,801
CT	\$1,177,717	\$454,198	\$91,757
DC	\$316,172	\$121,935	\$24,633
DE	\$259,910	\$100,237	\$20,250
FL	\$6,097,439	\$2,351,536	\$475,058
GA	\$3,907,951	\$1,507,139	\$304,473
HI	\$362,226	\$139,696	\$28,221
IA	\$1,032,078	\$398,031	\$80,410
ID	\$468,015	\$180,495	\$36,464
IL	\$5,179,208	\$1,997,412	\$403,518
IN	\$2,621,026	\$1,010,824	\$204,207
KS	\$1,101,674	\$424,871	\$85,833
KY	\$2,118,755	\$817,118	\$165,074
LA	\$2,057,043	\$793,319	\$160,266
MA	\$2,426,507	\$935,806	\$189,052
MD	\$1,900,636	\$732,998	\$148,080
ME	\$543,538	\$209,621	\$42,348
MI	\$4,752,200	\$1,832,732	\$370,249
MN	\$1,535,343	\$592,120	\$119,620
MO	\$2,282,828	\$880,395	\$177,858
MS	\$1,735,806	\$669,430	\$135,238
MT	\$395,344	\$152,468	\$30,802

ENTITLEMENT FUNDS CONVERTED TO ADMIN FUNDS	ENTITLEMENT FUNDS USED FOR ENTITLEMENT PURCHASES	TOTAL FY 2007 ENTITLEMENT FUNDS	TOTAL FY 2007 ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS
\$22,916	\$0	\$294,127	\$136,349
\$0	\$157,529	\$2,179,437	\$779,768
\$106,368	\$0	\$1,365,251	\$632,890
\$201,911	\$0	\$2,591,552	\$1,201,368
\$1,213,655	\$0	\$15,577,443	\$7,221,245
\$139,801	\$0	\$1,794,365	\$831,815
\$0	\$91,757	\$1,269,474	\$454,198
\$24,633	\$0	\$316,172	\$146,568
\$20,250	\$0	\$259,910	\$120,487
\$100,000	\$375,058	\$6,472,497	\$2,451,536
\$150,000	\$154,473	\$4,062,424	\$1,657,139
\$7,055	\$21,166	\$383,392	\$146,751
\$50,000	\$30,410	\$1,062,488	\$448,031
\$36,464	\$0	\$468,015	\$216,959
\$0	\$403,518	\$5,582,726	\$1,997,412
\$0	\$204,207	\$2,825,233	\$1,010,824
\$85,833	\$0	\$1,101,674	\$510,704
\$165,074	\$0	\$2,118,755	\$982,192
\$160,266	\$0	\$2,057,043	\$953,585
\$189,052	\$0	\$2,426,507	\$1,124,858
\$48,080	\$10,000	\$2,000,636	\$781,078
\$42,348	\$0	\$543,538	\$251,969
\$247,249	\$123,000	\$4,875,200	\$2,079,981
\$119,620	\$0	\$1,535,343	\$711,740
\$177,858	\$0	\$2,282,828	\$1,058,253
\$0	\$135,238	\$1,871,044	\$669,430
\$30,802	\$0	\$395,344	\$183,270

State Distributing Agency Contacts for TEFAP

STATE	PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY	CONTACT	PHONE	EMAIL
	CONTACT			
AL	NSLP, SFSP, TEFAP	Donny Cooper	(334) 242-8237	dcooper@alsde.edu
AK	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Linda Coate	(907) 465-8710	linda_coate@eed.state.ak.us
AZ	TEFAP	Frances Rubio	(602) 542-6633	Frubio@azdes.gov
AR	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Lynn Jackson	(501) 371-1400	lynn.jackson@arkansas.gov
CA	TEFAP	H. Peter Wilson	(916) 229-3335	hpeter@efap.net
CO	TEFAP	Tamarah Shannon	(303) 866-5105	tamarah.shannon@state.co.us
CT	TEFAP	Susan A. Gajda	(860) 424-5429	Susan.Gajda@po.state.ct.us
DE	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, NSIP, TEFAP	Kevin J. Boyd	(302) 834-4512	kevin.boyd@state.de.us
DC	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Dr. Cynthia M. Bell	(202) 727-6436	cynthia.bell@dc.gov
DE	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, NSIP, TEFAP	Kevin J. Boyd	(302) 834-4512	kevin.boyd@state.de.us
FL	NSLP, TEFAP	Gloria Van Treese	(850) 487-6694	vantreg@doacs.state.fl.us
GA	TEFAP	Rajonia Roberts	(404) 463-2607	raroberts@dhr.state.ga.us
HI	TEFAP	Michael Hane	(808) 586-8696	michael.y.hane@hawaii.gov
IA	CSFP, NSIP, TEFAP	Kim M. Jones	(515) 281-5410	kjones4@dhs.state.ia.us
ID	TEFAP	Gene Sue Weppner	(208) 334-5656	weppnerg@idhw.state.id.us
IL	TEFAP	Brenda Hanbury	(217) 782-1317	DHSD60A3@dhs.state.il.us
IN	TEFAP, CSFP	Marsha McGraw	(317) 232-6997	mmcgraw@lg.in.gov
KS	NSIP, CI, TEFAP	Ron Hamilton	(785) 368-8126	rjh@srskansas.org
KY	TEFAP	Bill Wilson	(502) 573-0298	BillA.Wilson@ky.gov
LA	NSLP, CACFP, FSFP, TEFAP	Mike St. Romain	(225) 922-1255	Mike_S@LDAF.STATE.LA.US
MA	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, NSIP, TEFAP	Martha Herlihy	(781) 338-6473	MHERLIHY@DOE.MASS.EDU
MD	TEFAP	Rhonda Forman	(410) 767-7015	rforman2@dhr.state.md.us
ME	TEFAP	Randy Mrasz	(207) 287-7513	randy.mrasz@maine.gov
MI	TEFAP	Mary Ann Chartrand	(517) 373-4013	chartrandm@michigan.gov
MN	TEFAP	Ty Morris	(651) 431-3821	Ty.Morris@state.mn.us
MO	RCCI, SFSP, CIs, TEFAP	Gary Hilch	(573)751-4328	dfs.fdu@dss.mo.gov
MS	TEFAP	Jane Smith	(601) 359-4812	jesmith@mdhs.state.ms.us

State Distributing Agency Contacts for TEFAP

STATE	PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY	CONTACT	PHONE	EMAIL
	CONTACT			
MT	NSIP, CSFP, TEFAP	Forest Farris	(406) 447-4262	ffarris@mt.gov
NC	NSLP, SFSP, NSIP, CSFP, TEFAP	Gary W. Gay	(919) 575-4490	gary.gay@ncmail.net
ND	TEFAP	John Dasovick	(701) 328-2732	jdasovick@state.nd.us
NE	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Julia West	(402) 471-9291	Julia.West@hhss.ne.gov
NH	TEFAP	Robert Stowell	(603) 271-3606	robert.stowell@nh.gov
NJ	TEFAP	Edward Cier	(609) 777-4276	edward.cier@ag.state.nj.us
NM	NSLP, SFSP, CACFP, TEFAP	Paulina Raia	(505) 841-2625	pauline.raia@state.nm.us
NV	NSLP, CACFP, NSIP, TEFAP	Jenelle Gimlin	(775) 688-1160	jjimlin@purchasing.state.nv.us
NY	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, NSIP, TEFAP	Tom Osterhout	(518) 474-5122	Tom.osterhout@ogs.state.ny.us
OH	CSFP, TEFAP	Jean Barcus	(614) 466-4815	barcuj@odjfs.state.oh.us
OK	TEFAP	Paula Price	(405) 521-3581	paula.price@okdhs.org
OR	TEFAP	Cecilia Lyons	(503) 986-2065	cecilia.lyons@hcs.state.or.us
PA	NSLP, CACFD, SFSP, TEFAP, CSFP	Barry Shutt	(717) 787-2940	BShutt@state.pa.us
PR	TEFAP	Javier Pesante	(787) 289-7600	Jpesante@adset.gobierno.pr
RI	TEFAP	Gail Dunphy	(401) 462-6865	gdunphy@dhs.ri.gov
SC	TEFAP	Larry Young	(803) 898-7396	lyoung@dss.state.sc.us
SD	CSFP, TEFAP	Elaine Scott	(605) 773-4769	elaine.scott@state.sd.us
TN	NSLP, TEFAP, SFSP	Terry Minton	(615) 837-5162	Terry.Minton@state.tn.us
TX	CSFP, TEFAP	Sam Varela	(512) 420-2432	sam.varela@hhsc.state.tx.us
UT	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Luann Elliott	(801) 538-7513	luann.elliott@schools.utah.gov
VA	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Beth Beville	(804) 786-0532	Beth.Beville@vdacs.virginia.gov
VT	NSLP, CACFP, SFSP, TEFAP	Holly Peake	(802) 241-2582	holly.peake@ahs.state.vt.us
WA	CSFP, TEFAP	Kim Eads	(253) 593-2031	keads@ga.wa.gov
WI	TEFAP	Patti Herrick	(608) 267-9071	n/a
WV	NSLP, CACFP, TEFAP	Darrell Carter	(304) 558-0573	dcarter@ag.state.wv.us
WY	TEFAP	Alice Sullivan	(307) 777-6076	ASULLI@state.wy.us

Food Stamp Allotment

For Households in the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia 10/1/06 through 9/30/07. To get food stamps, households must meet certain tests, including resource and income tests. The amount of benefits the household gets is called an allotment. The net monthly income of the household is multiplied by .3, and the result is subtracted from the maximum allotment for the household size to find the household's allotment. This is because food stamp households are expected to spend about 30 percent of their resources on food.

PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLD	MAXIMUM MONTHLY ALLOTMENT
1	\$155
2	284
3	408
4	518
5	615
6	738
7	816
8	932
Each additional person	+117

BENEFIT COMPUTATION

Multiply net income by 30%...
(Round up)

Subtract 30% of net income
from the maximum allotment
for the household size...

EXAMPLE

\$556 net monthly income
x .3 = \$166.80 (round up to \$167)

\$518 maximum allotment for 4 - \$167
(30% of net income) = \$351, **Food
Stamp Allotment** for a full month

If a household applies after the first day of the month, benefits will be provided from the day the household applies.

The Food Stamp Program is available to all eligible households regardless of race, sex, religious creed, national origin, or political beliefs.

The above was accessed on February 19, 2007, from http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/applicant_recipients/fs_Res_Ben_Elig.htm.

Eligibility Requirements for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)

(a) Public or private nonprofit organizations that provide food and nutrition assistance to the needy through the distribution of food for home use or the preparation of meals. Please note the following:

- Organizations that distribute food for home use must determine the household's eligibility by applying income standards.
- Organizations that provide prepared meals are eligible to receive commodities if they can demonstrate that they serve predominately needy persons.

(b) Households that meet State eligibility criteria. Each State sets criteria for determining what households are eligible to receive food for home consumption. Income standards may, at the State's discretion, be met through participation in other existing Federal, State, or local food, health, or welfare programs for which eligibility is based on income. States can adjust the income criteria in order to ensure that assistance is provided only to those households most in need. However, recipients of prepared meals are considered to be needy and are not subject to a means test.

(c) Homeless people, including low-income senior citizens are eligible to participate in TEFAP. Homeless people can receive prepared meals served in a congregate setting without submitting an application. However, homeless people must meet State income eligibility requirements in order to receive TEFAP food that is not served in prepared meals.

The above was accessed on February 19, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fdd/eligibility/tefap-applicants.htm>.

Income Eligibility Guidelines for NSLP, SBP, Special Milk Program for Children, CACFP, and SFSP

INCOME ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES											
Effective from			July 1, 2006			to			June 30, 2007		
HOUSEHOLD SIZE	FEDERAL POVERTY GUIDELINES		REDUCED PRICE MEALS - 185 %				FREE MEALS - 130 %				
	ANNUAL	MONTHLY	TWICE PER MONTH	EVERY TWO WEEKS	WEEKLY	ANNUAL	MONTHLY	TWICE PER MONTH	EVERY TWO WEEKS	WEEKLY	WEEKLY
48 CONTIGUOUS STATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, GUAM, AND TERRITORIES											
1	9,800	1,511	756	668	349	12,740	1,062	531	450	245	
2	13,200	2,035	1,018	940	470	17,160	1,430	715	660	330	
3	16,600	2,560	1,280	1,182	591	21,580	1,799	900	830	415	
4	20,000	3,084	1,542	1,424	712	26,000	2,167	1,084	1,000	500	
5	23,400	3,608	1,804	1,665	833	30,420	2,535	1,268	1,170	585	
6	26,800	4,132	2,066	1,907	954	34,840	2,904	1,452	1,340	670	
7	30,200	4,656	2,328	2,149	1,075	38,260	3,272	1,636	1,510	755	
8	33,600	5,180	2,590	2,391	1,196	43,680	3,640	1,820	1,660	840	
For each add'l family member, add		3,400	525	263	242	4,420	369	185	170	85	
ALASKA											
1	12,250	1,899	945	872	436	15,925	1,328	664	613	307	
2	16,500	2,544	1,272	1,175	588	21,450	1,788	894	825	413	
3	20,750	3,199	1,600	1,477	739	26,975	2,248	1,124	1,038	519	
4	25,000	3,855	1,928	1,779	890	32,500	2,709	1,355	1,250	625	
5	29,250	4,510	2,255	2,082	1,041	38,025	3,169	1,585	1,463	732	
6	33,500	5,165	2,583	2,384	1,192	43,550	3,630	1,815	1,675	838	
7	37,750	5,820	2,910	2,687	1,344	49,075	4,090	2,045	1,868	944	
8	42,000	6,475	3,238	2,969	1,495	54,600	4,550	2,275	2,100	1,050	
For each add'l family member, add		4,250	656	328	303	5,525	461	231	213	107	
HAWAII											
1	11,270	1,738	869	802	401	14,651	1,221	611	564	282	
2	15,180	2,341	1,171	1,061	541	19,734	1,645	823	759	380	
3	19,080	2,944	1,472	1,359	680	24,817	2,069	1,035	965	478	
4	23,000	3,546	1,773	1,637	819	29,900	2,482	1,246	1,160	575	
5	26,910	4,149	2,075	1,915	958	34,983	2,916	1,458	1,346	673	
6	30,820	4,752	2,376	2,193	1,097	40,066	3,339	1,670	1,541	771	
7	34,730	5,355	2,678	2,472	1,236	45,149	3,763	1,882	1,737	869	
8	38,640	5,957	2,979	2,750	1,375	50,232	4,186	2,093	1,932	966	
For each add'l family member, add		3,910	603	302	279	5,063	424	212	156	98	

The above was accessed on February 19, 2007 from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/governance/notices/iegs/IEG06-07.pdf>.

The Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act (P.L. 104-210)

On October 1, 1996, President Clinton signed this act to encourage donation of food and grocery products to non-profit organizations for distribution to needy individuals. This law:

- Protects you from liability when you donate to a non-profit organization;
- Protects you from civil and criminal liability should the product donated in good faith later cause harm to the needy recipient;
- Standardizes donor liability exposure. You or your legal counsel no longer have to investigate liability laws in 50 states; and
- Sets a floor of "gross negligence" or intentional misconduct for persons who donate grocery products. According to the new law, gross negligence is defined as "voluntary and conscious conduct by a person with knowledge (at the time of conduct) that the conduct is likely to be harmful to the health or well-being of another person."

The text of the bill itself follows:

The Bill Emerson Food Donation Act ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT THE SECOND SESSION

Begun and held at the City of Washington on Wednesday, the third day of January, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-six.

AN ACT

To encourage the donation of food and grocery products to nonprofit organizations for distribution to needy individuals by giving the Model Good Samaritan Food Donation Act the full force and effect of law.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. CONVERSION TO PERMANENT LAW OF MODEL GOOD SAMARITAN FOOD DONATION ACT AND TRANSFER OF THAT ACT TO CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966.

- (a) Conversion to Permanent Law. -- Title IV of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 is amended --
1. by striking the title heading and sections 401 and 403 (42 U.S.C. 12671 and 12673); and
 2. in section 402 (42 U.S.C. 12672) --

(A) in the section heading, by striking "model" and inserting "bill emerson"

(B) in subsection (a), by striking "Good Samaritan" and inserting "Bill Emerson Good Samaritan:"

(C) in subsection (b)(7), to read as follows:

"(7) GROSS NEGLIGENCE. -- The term 'gross negligence' means voluntary and conscious conduct (including a failure to act) by a person who, at the time of the conduct, knew that the conduct was likely to be harmful to the health or well-being of another person.";

(D) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES FROM DONATED FOOD AND GROCERY PRODUCTS.

"(1) LIABILITY OF PERSON OR GLEANER. -- A person or gleaner shall not be subject to civil or criminal liability arising from the nature, age, packaging, or condition of apparently wholesome food or an apparently fit grocery product that the person or gleaner donates in good faith to a nonprofit organization for ultimate distribution to needy individuals.

"(2) LIABILITY OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION. -- A nonprofit organization shall not be subject to civil or criminal liability arising from the nature, age, packaging, or condition of apparently wholesome food or an apparently fit grocery product that the nonprofit organization received as a donation in good faith from a person or gleaner for ultimate distribution to needy individuals.

“(3) EXCEPTION. -- Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to an injury to or death of an ultimate user or recipient of the food or grocery product that results from an act or omission of the person, gleaner or nonprofit organization, as applicable, constituting gross negligence or intentional misconduct.”; and

(E) in subsection (f), by adding at the end the following: “Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede State or local health regulations.”.

(b) TRANSFER TO CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966. -- Section 402 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12762) (as amended by subsection (a)) --

1. is transferred from the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966;
2. is redesignated as section 22 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; and
3. is added at the end of such Act.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT. -- The table of contents for the National and Community Service Act of 1990 is amended by striking the items relating to title IV.

Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Strom Thurmond
President of the Senate Pro Tempore

Approved 10/01/96
William J. Clinton
President of the United States
P.L. 104-210

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Choices. Issue Brief No. 1, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network

Rural Hunger. Issue Brief No. 2, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network

Child Hunger. Issue Brief No. 3 America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network

Senior Hunger. Issue Brief No. 4, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network

Food Stamps. Issue Brief No. 5 America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network

Tools For Change. Issue Brief No. 6, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network

Food Banking: A Response to Hunger. Issue Brief No. 7, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2005).

Hurricane Disaster Response and Recovery. Issue Brief No. 8, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2005).

A Business Response to Hunger. Issue Brief No. 9, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2006).

The Face of Hunger. Issue Brief No. 10, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2006).

Hunger in America 2001. Cohen, Rhoda, M. Kim, and J. Ohls. Mathematica Policy Research (2001).

Hunger in America 2006. Cohen, Rhoda, M. Kim, and J. Ohls. Mathematica Policy Research (2006).

The Red Tape Divide State-by-State Review of Food Stamp Applications. Douglas O'Brien, Kimberly Prendergast, Eleanor Thompson, Marcus Fruchter and Halley Torres Aldeen, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2000).

State Government Responses to the Food Assistance Gap, 2000. Food Research and Action Center, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2000).

Katrina and Rita Aftermath: The Impact on Emergency Food Distribution and Clients. Douglas O'Brien, Halley Torres Aldeen, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2005).

The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) and the Charitable Food Assistance System: Partners in Nourishing America's Hungry. Research and Analysis Department, Government Relations and Public Policy Department, America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network (2007).

RECOMMENDED READINGS

USDA. Economic Research Service. *Household Food Security in the United States, 2005*. Mark Nord, M. Andrews, and S. Carlson. November 2006 provides data on household food security in the United States. In 2005, 35.128 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 22.7 million adults and 12.4 million children. In the 2005 report, the classification of “food insecurity with hunger” has been changed to “very low food security.”

USDA. Economic Research Service. *The Food Assistance Landscape FY 2006 Midyear Report*. EIB 6-3. September 2006 utilizes preliminary data from the Food and Nutrition Service to highlight trends in federal food assistance programs particularly the Food Stamp Program (FSP), Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), National School Lunch Program (NSLP), School Breakfast Program (SBP), and the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). During the first half of FY 2006 (October 2005-March 2006), total expenditures for the USDA's fifteen food assistance programs totaled \$27.7 billion, an increase of 7% over the first half of FY 2005. The Food Stamp Program, NSLP, WIC, CACFP, and the School Breakfast Program accounted for 96% of USDA's total expenditures for food assistance during the first half of FY 2006.

US Census Bureau. Carmen DeNavas-Walt, B. Proctor, and C. Lee. *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2005*. August 2006 provides data on income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States. In 2005, 37 million people in the United States were in poverty. Thirteen million children under the age of 18 were in poverty. Four million seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

USDA. Economic Research Service. Noel Blisard, H. Stewart. *How Low-Income Households Allocate Their Food Budget Relative to the Cost of the Thrifty Food Plan*. ERRN-20. August 2006 examines how low-income households allocate their food budget relative to the Thrifty Food Plan for food consumed at home by looking at total expenditures. When looking at food-at-home and food away from home data, this study found that low-income households' food expenditures averaged nearly 125% of the Thrifty Food Plan budget. For food-at-home, low-income households' expenditures averaged nearly 86% of the TFP benchmark. Although the typical low-income household spends about the same amount on food-at-home and food away from home as the overall Thrifty Food Plan benchmark, it does not allocate that money according to the food groups that make up the elements of the Thrifty Food Plan.

Princeton University. The Brookings Institution. *Opportunity in America*. Melissa S. Kearney. *Intergenerational Mobility for Women and Minorities in the United States Volume 16, No. 2*. Fall 2006 explores how class, race, and gender affect the economic mobility of women and minorities particularly Blacks in the United States. Historically, women and minorities have confronted obstacles to economic success that have negatively impacted their prospects for upward economic mobility. The transfer of economic status from parents to children is different among white and black families and from parents to sons and from parents to daughters. Although race and sex are not major determinants in deciding economic status as they were in the past, differences in race-based and gender-based labor market outcomes still carry on.

USDA. Economic Research Service. *Rural America At A Glance, 2006 Edition*. August 2006 features the most up-to-date economic and social conditions in rural areas of America. Findings reveal that the non-metro population in the United States has increased 2.2% from 2000 to 2005. This increase resulted from international migration and accounted for nearly a third of the growth in non-metro areas and for all of the growth in the Midwest. The increase in the population was primarily centered in non-metro counties near metro areas. The population in non-metro areas is aging. From 2000 to 2005, the non-metro population 40-59 years of age increased 8% while the population under 20 years of age fell by 5%.

USDA. Economic Research Service. Constance Newman. *The Income Volatility See-Saw, Implications for School Lunch*. ERRN-23. August 2006 examines the ways in which monthly changes in income affect low-income populations and its implications for other federal assistance programs such as the National School Lunch Program. Analysis reveals that the lower a household's income the more likely it is to experience shifts in monthly income. Before the new guidelines were put into effect that extended eligibility from one month to the school year, children in these households moved back and forth across the eligibility threshold for the National School Lunch Program. These changes in a family's income help to explain errors in certification in the National School Lunch Program. Examination of income volatility across income groups found that income changes among poorer families are double that of higher income families.

The Brookings Institution. Amy Liu, M. Fellowes, M. Mabanta. *Special Edition of the Katrina Index: A One-Year Review of Key Indicators of Recovery in Post-Storm New Orleans. August 2006* investigates the social and economic progress of recovery efforts in the New Orleans region one year after Hurricane Katrina. Specific highlights reveal that housing rehabilitation and demolition are on the rise. Public services and infrastructure have been slow to recover to pre-Katrina levels. The labor force in the New Orleans region is 30% smaller than one year ago. The unemployment rate remains higher than prior to the hurricane at 7.2%. Over \$100 billion in federal aid has been devoted to serving families and communities affected by Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. These findings reveal that although there has been progress, improvement still is needed in the areas of infrastructure, affordable housing, employment, and basic city services.

The Urban Institute. Gretchen Rowe and L. Giannarelli. *Getting On, Staying On, and Getting Off Welfare: The Complexity of State-by-State Policy Choices. July 2006* examines how state policy choices will be affected by changes in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). In February 2006, Congress reauthorized TANF as part of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005. Congress increased the work participation rate which is the percentage of a states' caseload that must participate in work activities. In addition, it also restructured the caseload credit that states receive. Consequently, these changes will make states place more of an emphasis on work participation in order to avoid penalties and will lead to the reexamination of their current welfare policies.

The Urban Institute. P. Winston, O. Golden, K. Finegold, K. Rueben, M. Turner, S. Zuckerman. *After Katrina, Federalism after Hurricane Katrina. How Can Social Programs Respond to a Major Disaster? June 2006* explores the effectiveness of housing assistance, income replacement, health care, and cash assistance programs during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. As the report details, these social programs were not designed to respond quickly to a crisis the magnitude of Katrina. Consequently, emergency response processes had to be implemented to respond to the needs of those affected by the storm. The authors found three main problems surrounding the response of these programs: 1) uncertainty about states' financial obligations, risks, and policy choices 2) uncertainty about who would be eligible for which programs and for how long and 3) poor communication by the federal authorities regarding federal response policies that delayed the response of states and local communities.

USDA. Office of Analysis, Nutrition and Evaluation. *An Analysis of Food Stamp Benefit Redemption Patterns. June 2006* investigates how participants in the Food Stamp Program utilize their benefits. The findings of this examination reveal that most Food Stamp households shop at more than one food store per month, make multiple and small purchases each month. The average amount of these purchases total \$25.50. In addition, Food Stamp benefits are used quickly and few benefits are available toward the end of the month.

Center for Science in the Public Interest. *School Foods Report Card, A State-by-State Evaluation of Policies for Foods and Beverages Sold through Vending Machines, School Stores, A La Carte, and Other Venues Outside of School Meals. June 2006* evaluates school policies for foods and beverages sold through vending machines, school stores, a la carte, and other venues. The results reveal that states' school nutrition policies regarding food sold outside of federally-subsidized meals are fragmented. More states have policies to address the sale of beverages particularly soda than food. Twenty-two states limit the sale of soft drinks in some grade levels. Only nine states out of that twenty limit the sale of soft drinks during meal periods or through the end of the last lunch period. Ten states have school food and or beverage nutrition standards that apply to the entire school day and the entire campus at all grade levels. Most states have school nutrition standards that solely apply to beverages and foods sold in the cafeteria during the meal period or that apply to foods and drinks sold through the end of the last lunch period. Among states that have strong nutrition standards, 82% do not have limits on sodium levels for food, 57% do not limit the sale of sports drinks, and 86% do not limit the sale of high-fat milks at any grade level.

USDA. Economic Research Service. Iris Pettigrew, J. Kuchak, L. Ghelfi. *Administrative Costs in the Child and Adult Care Food Program. Results of an Exploratory Study of the Reimbursement System for Sponsors of Family Child Care Homes. CCR-16. March 2006* examined 940 sponsors of family childcare homes and discovered that 80% of sponsors are private nonprofit organizations. Three-quarters of sponsors are multi-purpose organizations conducting other programs besides CACFP administration. Multi-purpose organizations may be at an advantage over sole-purpose CACFP administrators by having other sources of revenue to support their CACFP activities. The majority of the 940 sponsors studied have been in CACFP for over 6 years and are small organizations administering 200 or fewer homes. Three-quarters of these sponsors administer to homes that are classified as Tier 1. A large share of sponsors (56%) serve a mixture of urban, suburban, and rural areas with service areas that are multi-county. Three quarters of sponsors serve family daycare homes that receive services from other sponsors.

Food Research and Action Center. Shireen Cama, L. Parker, M. Levin, and C. FitzSimons. *School Wellness Policy and Practice: Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Students*. February 2006 analyzes how school wellness policies can benefit low-income students. Low-income students would particularly benefit from school wellness policies because schools can provide affordable meals and physical activity at a low cost.

Henry J. Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured. *The Uninsured: A Primer*. January 2006 examines the difficult choices that low-income working families encounter when they have to decide whether to pay for groceries or healthcare. Many families often go without health care in order to pay for groceries. In 2004, 46 million Americans under the age of 65 did not have health insurance coverage. The majority of the uninsured are low-income adult workers.

Center on Hunger and Poverty. Bryan Hall, Larry J. Brown. *Food Security Among Older Adults in the United States*. 2005 focuses on how food insecurity and hunger affect older Americans differently than the general population. What makes the affect on seniors different is the impact that insufficient nutrition has on their physical and mental health. The effect of insufficient nutrition among seniors is made worse by physical impairments and poverty.

Review of Agricultural Economics. Volume 27, Number 3. Parke Wilde and M. Nord
The Effect of Food Stamps on Food Security: A Panel Data Approach. Fall 2005 assesses how constant unobserved factors may influence measured food security and Food Stamp Program participation.

Food Research and Action Center. Randy Rosso, M. Levin. *School Breakfast Scorecard: 2005*. December 2005 explores participation in the School Breakfast Program. The rise in participation is a result of many states passing legislation that mandates schools located in low-income areas to participate in the program, the availability of start-up and expansion funds from the federal government for schools, financial incentives that supplement the federal reimbursement rate, and local wellness policies. During the 2004-2005 school year, a total of 9.2 million children participated in the program, an increase from 8.7 million children from 2003-2004.

USDA. *Amber Waves. Where You Shop Matters Store Formats Drive Variation in Retail Food Prices*. November 2005 examines the differences in national prices by analyzing average prices for a variety of dairy products. Results reveal that food prices during 1998-2003 differed as much as 11% across geographic regions. Besides store formats, there are other factors that determine retail food prices. The cost of acquiring food from distributors, wholesalers, and other suppliers, labor and operating costs, competition, and consumer preferences all influence food prices. These factors contribute to different retail prices across regions. Food prices vary an average of 5% to 15% for an identical basket of groceries.

Food Research and Action Center. *Heat and Eat: Using Federal Nutrition Programs to Cushion the Shock of Skyrocketing Heating Bills*. November 2005 investigates the effect of high heating bills on low-income households and how federal nutrition programs can help ease the burden. Although the federal Low-income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) provides help to families with heating bills, it only helps 18% of all eligible families. The authors propose that the following five strategies will help low-income families during the winter—enrolling food stamp eligible households who are not participating, maximizing shelter deductions, including the utility deduction, making certain that families receiving LIHEAP and other forms of utility assistance are not counted as income, reducing unnecessary visits to food stamp offices, and increasing participation in child nutrition programs.

USDA. Economic Research Service. *Low-Skill Employment and the Changing Economy of Rural America*. ERRN 10. October 2005 appraises the decline in low-skill employment in rural areas. The non-metro low-skill job share fell from 44.4% to 42.2% from 1990 to 2000. The decline in low-skill employment is a result of a shift from occupations that require low-skills to occupations that require higher skills within industries and the movement of jobs from the goods sector to the services sector.

The Urban Institute. Gregory Acs, P. Loprest. *Who Are Low-Income Working Families?* September 2005 focuses on low-income working families with children. In a majority of low-income two parent families, about 83% of high-work low-income married-couple families have only one adult working full-time, full-year. There are several reasons why some families have only one adult working. Research has shown that unemployment during the year, poor health, and child care responsibilities are reasons why there may be only one adult working full-time, full-year. In some instances, full-time work cannot be found so part-time work is the only option available. In 2004, 2.7% of all workers were working part-time involuntarily and 19% of all part-time workers were involuntary.

Center for Housing Policy. Barbara J. Lipman. *New Century Housing. Volume 5, Issue 2. Something's Gotta Give: Working Families and the Cost of Housing.* April 2005 explores how high housing costs affect the quality of life for working families. The findings reveal that 13 million American families pay half or more of their income on housing. Four million of these families are working full-time jobs. The housing industry considers affordable housing costs to be no more than 28% to 32% of household income. Yet, millions of Americans often have to make difficult tradeoffs in order to have a place to live. As a result of the lack of affordable housing, many working families make tradeoffs that diminish their quality of life. By paying over half of their income on housing, the budgets of many families are stretched thin when it comes to meeting their food, utilities, and healthcare costs.

USDA. Amber Waves. Robert Gibbs. *Education as a Rural Development Strategy.* November 2005 examines the dilemma that rural policymakers are confronted in relation to education as a high-wage and high-skill development strategy. The issue is whether improvements in elementary schools and high schools can improve the income of rural workers and the economy of rural communities. Initial research conducted as to whether better schools contribute to increased earnings and income for rural workers and communities shows a positive relationship between the two. However, the disadvantage in improving schools is the loss of highly-educated young people to better job opportunities in metro areas.

USDA. Economic Research Service. Robert P. King, E. Leibtag, and Ajay S. Behl. *Supermarket Characteristics and Operating Costs in Low-Income Areas.* AERN-839. December 2004 is an examination of whether the operating costs of supermarkets that serve low-income shoppers are higher than stores that serve high-income shoppers. The findings show no support that it costs more to operate a supermarket that serves low-income shoppers--stores that have a high redemption rate of Food Stamps than a supermarket which serves high-income shoppers. What the analysis does show is the differences and similarities of supermarkets serving low-income and high-income shoppers.

School Nutrition Association. *2004 After School Snack Report.* July 2004 study's operational activities in after school snack programs. The School Nutrition Association, The National Dairy Council and the Child Nutrition Foundation conducted this study to gain further insight into after school snack program operations specifically examining number of snacks distributed, staffing, data collection, food storage, and types of snacks served.

USDA. Economic Research Service. *Low-Income Households' Expenditures on Fruits and Vegetables.* AERN-833. May 2004 examines how income constraints affect fruit and vegetables purchases among low-income households. The authors examine whether or not low-income households spend less for produce than other households and if an increase in their incomes would lead to the likelihood of purchasing more fruits and vegetables. Another issue that is examined is the purchasing habits of low and high income households. Unlike the average American household, low-income households have different food spending patterns. Among households with incomes at or below 130% of the federal poverty line, the average weekly expenditures of fruits and vegetables fell from \$4.02 in 1991 to \$3.59 in 2000. Although expenditures for fruits and vegetables declined the budget share of fruits and vegetables increased which implies that similar to the total population, low-income households spent less of their resources on other food items than on fruits and vegetables.

USDA. Economic Research Service. Current Issues in Economics of Food Markets. Ephraim S. Leibtag, P. Kaufman. *Exploring Food Purchase Behavior of Low-Income Households, How Do They Economize?* AIB N-747-07. June 2003 considers the food expenditures of U.S. households from different income levels by studying a 1998 sample of food store purchase data. Analysis reveals that low-income households spend less on food purchases. Low-income households spend less because they stretch their limited budget by economizing. These households economize by purchasing discounted food products from discount food stores, purchasing private-label (generic) products, purchasing food products in bulk, and purchasing food products that are lower in price and quality within a product class.

USDA. Economic Research Service. Jean C. Buzby, J. Guthrie. L. Kantor. *Evaluation of the USDA Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program.* Report to Congress. E-FAN N 03-006 April 2003 provides an evaluation of The Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program. This program was designed to promote fresh fruit and vegetable consumption among school children by providing free fresh and dried fruits and vegetables. The evaluation conducted by ERS focused on 7 key areas of the program--1) pilot management and implementation 2) perceived value and effects of the pilot 3) Data on food and beverage sales 4) Key factors in pilot implementation 5) Feasibility of continuing this or a similar program 6) Cost considerations and 7) Acceptability of the pilot to students and others. ERS findings revealed; that delivery of fruits and vegetables varied among schools, the pilot program agreement did not require nutrition education and promotion activities however it was encouraged, feedback overall regarding the pilot was positive,

the majority of children commented that the taste and appeal of the foods offered was the primary reason why they liked the program and chose the fruits and vegetables they consumed, flexibility in implementing the pilot program was key to the success of the program, 100 of the schools stated it would be possible to continue the pilot program if funding was available, the biggest challenge they had in administering the program was the 10% cap on non-food spending, and the majority of participants in the pilot program had a high appreciation of the program.

THE ALMANAC OF HUNGER AND POVERTY

— IN AMERICA —

2007

AMERICA'S SECOND HARVEST - THE NATION'S FOOD BANK
NETWORK'S COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE TO NATIONAL AND
STATE FACTS ON HUNGER AND POVERTY



America's Second Harvest—The Nation's Food Bank Network feeds America's hungry through a nationwide Network of Member food banks and engages our country in the fight to end hunger. www.secondharvest.org



Proud sponsors of *The Almanac of
Hunger and Poverty in America 2007*

ISSN 1936-6248

ISBN-13: 978-0-9788161-1-7

ISBN-10: 0-9788161-1-0

