Analysis of Proposed Changes to SNAP Eligibility and Benefit Determination in the 2013 Farm Bill and Comparison of Cardiometabolic Health Status for SNAP Participants and Low-Income Nonparticipants

Final Report

August 2, 2013

Joshua Leftin
Allison Dodd
Kai Filion
Rebecca Wang
Andrew Gothro
Karen Cunnyngham

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Analysis of Proposed Changes to SNAP Eligibility and Benefit Determination in the 2013 Farm Bill and Comparison of Cardiometabolic Health Status for SNAP Participants and Low-Income Nonparticipants

Final Report

August 2, 2013

Joshua Leftin
Allison Dodd
Kai Filion
Rebecca Wang
Andrew Gothro
Karen Cunnyngham

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

CONTENTS

TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Congress has begun deliberations to reauthorize the U.S. Farm Bill, which governs federal agriculture and nutrition policies and programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). A primary concern in the current reauthorization debate is the escalating trend in federal spending on SNAP. SNAP eligibility and benefit determination policies have come under particular scrutiny. Proposals in both the House and Senate contain policy changes intended to reduce federal spending. A large share of the downward adjustment would result from proposed revisions to rules regarding (1) when receipt of Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) benefits could confer use of the SNAP Heating and Cooling Standard Utility Allowance (HCSUA) and (2) categorical eligibility for SNAP conferred through non-cash TANF-funded programs. An alternate approach that has been suggested in the House is to convert SNAP and other nutrition programs to a state block grant program based on FY 2008 federal funding levels.

The Health Impact Project, a collaboration of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts, is conducting a health impact assessment (HIA) intended to inform congressional consideration of changes to SNAP included as part of the 2013 Farm Bill reauthorization. Their analysis focuses on changes to SNAP as proposed by the Senate (S. 3240) and the House (H.R. 1947).[1] To support the Health Impact Project's HIA, Mathematica Policy Research:

- Used two microsimulation models to estimate the effects of the proposed Farm Bill changes on people who are eligible for SNAP and participating in SNAP

- Used SNAP program data to estimate the potential effects of converting SNAP to a state block grant program

- Used 2003 to 2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data to develop a baseline cardiometabolic health profile of SNAP participants and to compare health indicators for SNAP participants with those of nonparticipants at different income levels

The two microsimulation models we used were developed for and are frequently used by the USDA Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) to estimate the effects of proposed changes on people who are eligible for and participating in SNAP. The first model is based on a sample of FY 2011 SNAP administrative data and simulates changes to the participating SNAP caseload. The second model is based on 2009 data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and incorporates data from the Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC); this model simulates both SNAP eligibility and participation changes.

We found the vast majority of participants would not face eligibility or benefit changes under the potential LIHEAP policy change. A simulated 1.1 percent of participating individuals and 1.5 percent of participating households would receive lower SNAP benefits, but would continue to participate in the program. In addition, a small fraction of individuals and households (less than 0.1 percent of each group) would receive lower benefits and choose not to participate. The simulation reduced total SNAP benefits by less than 0.5 percent.

---

[1] Similar changes have been proposed in subsequent bills, including S. 954 and H.R. 1947.

Simulating both the LIHEAP *and* non-cash categorical eligibility policy changes, we estimated that 13.3 percent of participating households and 11.8 percent of participating individuals would lose eligibility; 1.4 percent of households and 1.1 percent of individuals would face a reduction in benefits but still participate; and a small proportion (0.2 percent of households and 0.1 percent of individuals) would remain eligible but would no longer participate.

Using the MATH SIPP+ model, we prepared a set of supplemental estimates. First, with the baseline, we estimated average gross income and benefits by subgroup. Then, we estimated (1) average percentage loss in gross income plus SNAP benefit for households losing benefits or eligibility under the three policy change simulations; (2) average benefit loss for households with net income below the federal poverty level who became ineligible under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation; and (3) reasons for eligibility loss for households who became ineligible under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation. We found that average monthly household gross income and benefits in the baseline were $743 and $280, respectively. We estimated that affected households would lose 6.7 percent of their baseline gross income plus SNAP benefits under the LIHEAP policy change and 38.1 percent under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change. Households with net income at or below poverty losing eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change would lose an average of $271 in monthly SNAP benefits. About 2.0 million households under this policy change would fail only the asset test. An additional 561,000 would fail an income test and about 90,000 would fail both tests.

We used FNS SNAP program data on the number of participating households, participating individuals, and SNAP benefit amounts by month and state to estimate the potential effects of converting SNAP to a block grant program that reverts total benefits to 2008 levels. We estimated that if this block grant were implemented in FY 2012, total SNAP benefits would have been 53.6 percent lower than they were in FY 2012. As a result, if the number of participating households in each state were to stay constant, average SNAP monthly household benefits would decrease by $149. Alternatively, if average benefits were to stay at FY 2012 levels, the number of participating households would have to fall by nearly 12 million.

We used 2003 to 2008 NHANES data to develop a baseline cardiometabolic health profile of SNAP participants and to compare health indicators for SNAP participants with those of nonparticipants at different income levels. We found that SNAP participants showed a range of negative health indicators, including obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and risk factors for metabolic syndrome. For example, most SNAP participants (82.8 percent) had at least one risk factor for metabolic syndrome, and 43.6 percent had at least three of the five risk factors. Moreover, SNAP participants fared worse than nonparticipants on many of the health indicators. At all income levels, SNAP participants had a significantly higher prevalence of obesity among school-age children and adults than nonparticipants. Compared to higher-income nonparticipants, SNAP participants also had a greater prevalence of diabetes, stroke, and congestive heart failure.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) provides millions of low-income individuals in the United States with the means to purchase food for a nutritious diet. SNAP benefits also reduce the need to make economic tradeoffs between buying enough food and meeting other needs such as access to health care. Consequently, changes to SNAP eligibility and benefit determination rules may both directly and indirectly affect the health of low-income individuals. Congress has begun deliberations to reauthorize the U.S. Farm Bill, which governs federal agriculture and nutrition policies and programs, including SNAP. A primary concern in the current reauthorization debate is the escalating trend in federal spending on SNAP, and the procedures used to determine SNAP eligibility have come under particular scrutiny.

The Health Impact Project, a collaboration of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts, is conducting a health impact assessment (HIA) intended to inform congressional consideration of changes to SNAP included as part of the 2013 Farm Bill reauthorization. Their analysis focuses on changes to SNAP as proposed by the Senate (S. 3240) and the House (H.R. 1947).[2] To support the Health Impact Project's HIA, Mathematica Policy Research used two microsimulation models to estimate the effects of the proposed House and Senate versions of the bill on people who are eligible for SNAP and on those participating in SNAP. Additionally, Mathematica used SNAP program data provided by FNS to estimate the potential effects of converting SNAP to a state block grant based on FY 2008 federal funding levels. Under the block grant, proposed in H.R. 5652, a fixed combined funding level would be established for SNAP and other nutrition programs. Lastly, to provide baseline health data for the HIA, Mathematica used 2003 to 2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data, the most recent data available with information on SNAP participation, to develop a baseline cardiometabolic health

---

[2] Similar changes have been proposed in subsequent bills, including S. 954 and H.R. 1947.

profile of SNAP participants. We then compared health indicators for SNAP participants with those of nonparticipants at different income levels.

In the remainder of this introductory chapter, we provide some background on SNAP and explain the changes proposed in the House and Senate bills. In Chapter II, we describe the methodology used for the estimates presented in this report, and in Chapters III through V, we present and discuss the findings. Chapter III focuses on findings from the microsimulation models, Chapter IV on findings on the block grant proposal from SNAP program data, and Chapter V on findings from the NHANES-based cardiometabolic profile. Detailed tables with comprehensive results from the microsimulation analysis are provided in Appendices A through H, from the block grant analysis in Appendix I, and from the cardiometabolic health profile in Appendix J.

A. Background on SNAP

SNAP, administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), is the largest domestic food and nutrition assistance program in the United States. In an average month in fiscal year (FY) 2011, SNAP provided benefits to 44.7 million individuals in more than 21.1 million households, more than double the caseload in FY 2003.[3] In an average month, households received a total of $71.8 billion in SNAP benefits.

SNAP households. Under SNAP eligibility rules, members of a dwelling unit who purchase and prepare food together are usually required to apply for SNAP as a unit. Throughout this report, we refer to this group of individuals as a "SNAP household" or simply a "household." SNAP households often comprise all members of a dwelling unit, but occasionally a dwelling unit will form two or more SNAP households. A SNAP household, as defined in this report, is the group of individuals who would theoretically need to apply for SNAP together and is not necessarily eligible for or participating in SNAP.

---

[3] Strayer et al. 2012.

SNAP income tests. Under federal SNAP eligibility rules, most households must meet two income eligibility standards: a gross income threshold and a net income threshold. Gross income includes most cash income and excludes most non-cash income or in-kind benefits. Households without elderly or disabled members must have gross income at or below 130 percent of federal poverty guidelines. Households with an elderly or disabled member do not face a gross income test.

Most households must have net income at or below 100 percent of federal poverty guidelines to be eligible for SNAP. Net income is determined by subtracting allowed deductions from gross income. Allowed deductions include a standard deduction (which varies by household size and geographic location) and deductions for earned income, dependent care costs, medical expenses (for households with elderly or disabled individuals), child support payments, and shelter costs in excess of 50 percent of a household's countable income after all other potential deductions are subtracted from gross income. The excess shelter expense deduction is based on total shelter expenses, including rent and utilities. State agencies establish a set of Standard Utility Allowances (SUA), which are dollar amounts that may be used in place of actual utility costs to calculate total shelter expenses. SUAs may vary by the type of utility expenses incurred by a household and, in some states, by household size or geographic location. Most, although not all, states have separate SUAs for households with heating and cooling expenses—the Heating and Cooling SUA (HCSUA)—and a lower SUA for households that do not have direct heating and cooling expenses—the Lower Utility Allowance (LUA). Households that receive any assistance through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) may claim the HCSUA even if they have do not have direct heating and cooling expenses.

SNAP asset test. Under federal eligibility rules, households must also meet an asset eligibility standard. Federal asset rules in FY 2012 stipulate that countable assets must be at or below $2,000 for households without any elderly or disabled members or at or below $3,250 for households with such members. Countable assets include cash, resources easily converted to cash (such as money in

checking or savings accounts, savings certificates, stocks and bonds, and lump-sum payments), and some nonliquid resources. However, some types of property are not counted toward the asset limit, including retirement and education savings accounts, family homes, tools of a trade, or business property used to earn income. States are allowed to establish their own policies regarding which, if any, of a SNAP household's vehicles count toward the asset limit. In FY 2012, twenty-seven states excluded all vehicles from the asset test and the remaining states excluded some or most vehicles.

Categorical eligibility. Certain households are categorically eligible for SNAP and therefore not subject to the federal income and asset limits. SNAP households that have long been categorically eligible for SNAP include those in which all members are authorized to receive means-tested cash assistance from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or General Assistance (GA)—known as pure public assistance (pure PA) households. Over the last 10 years, categorical eligibility has been expanded to additional SNAP households through state broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE) and narrow categorical eligibility (NCE) policies.

States can confer BBCE for SNAP through programs that provide a TANF or state Maintenance of Effort (MOE)-funded non-cash benefit—sometimes as simple as a brochure on assistance programs—to a large number of households. States have flexibility in setting the criteria for receiving the TANF/MOE-funded non-cash benefit, but most apply only a gross income eligibility limit (between 130 and 200 percent of SNAP poverty guidelines) and do not apply an asset test. The number of states (including the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands) implementing BBCE policies has expanded rapidly in recent years, rising from 29 states in FY 2009 to 41 by the end of FY 2012.

States can confer NCE through non-cash TANF/MOE-funded benefits or services provided to a small targeted group of households that, in most cases, formerly received or were diverted from

TANF cash benefits. Examples of these services include post-TANF job counseling, diversionary assistance, kinship care, child care, or transportation assistance.

State categorical eligibility policies simplify and streamline the application and eligibility determination processes because they usually eliminate certain verification requirements, such as the need to document an applicant household's assets. BBCE policies also expand eligibility in states that use them to eliminate the SNAP asset test, raise the gross income limit, or eliminate the net income test for most households. In these states, some households eligible under state categorical eligibility policies would fail at least one of the federal asset or income eligibility tests.

SNAP benefits. Whether a household meets SNAP federal eligibility rules or is eligible through state categorical eligibility rules, its SNAP benefit amount is based on the maximum SNAP benefit for its size and location, the household's net monthly income, and the benefit reduction rate. Historically, the maximum benefit has been based on 100 percent of the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) for a family of four in June of the previous year, although that percentage temporarily increased under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The TFP is a healthful and minimal-cost diet, with the cost adjusted for household size and composition.[4] SNAP benefits are calculated by subtracting 30 percent of a household's net income from the maximum benefit amount to which it is entitled. This benefit reduction rate is based on the assumption that participant households spend about 30 percent of their net cash income on food. In this report, if a SNAP household meets eligibility requirements but would not be eligible to receive a calculated benefit greater than $0, we consider the household as ineligible for SNAP.

B. Proposed 2013 Farm Bill

Funding levels for SNAP are established in the Farm Bill, which reauthorizes federal agriculture and nutrition programs every five years. Both the House and Senate proposals contain policy

---

[4] Carlson et al. 2007

changes intended to reduce federal spending. A large share of the downward adjustment would result from proposed revisions to rules regarding (1) cases for which receipt of LIHEAP benefits could confer use of the SNAP HCSUA and (2) non-cash categorical eligibility. Both bills (S. 3240 and H.R. 6083) propose a minimum LIHEAP amount of $10 in order for receipt of that benefit to confer use of the HCSUA.[5] Under current SNAP rules, the receipt of any LIHEAP amount allows SNAP households to claim an HCSUA, which can lower their net income and thus raise their SNAP benefit. Fifteen states currently provide a nominal LIHEAP benefit of $1 to $5 per year to low-income residents, with the goal of increasing SNAP benefits for some residents.[6]

In addition, the House bill proposes to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility. The proposed change would not affect households categorically eligible through pure PA but would restrict eligibility for SNAP households that qualify through BBCE or NCE; such households would no longer be eligible if they fail a federal income or asset test.

A separate bill, H.R. 5652, proposes converting SNAP and other nutrition programs to a state block grant program based on their FY 2008 federal funding levels.

---

[5] The more-recent House bill, H.R. 1947, proposes a minimum LIHEAP amount of $20 in order for receipt of that benefit to confer use of the HCSUA.

[6] For more information on the LIHEAP, see http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/programs/liheap.

II. METHODOLOGY

We used microsimulation models to estimate the effects of the proposed House and Senate versions of the 2013 Farm Bill on individuals who are eligible for SNAP and individuals participating in SNAP, and we used SNAP program data from FNS to estimate the potential effects of converting SNAP to a state block grant program. In addition, we used 2003 to 2008 NHANES data to develop a baseline cardiometabolic health profile for SNAP participants and nonparticipants. In this chapter, we summarize our approach to the microsimulation analysis, including a description of the models and the methodology used to simulate policy changes. We then describe our approaches to the block grant and NHANES analyses.

A. Microsimulation Analysis Approach

To conduct this analysis, we employed two microsimulation models developed for and frequently used by FNS. Both microsimulation models are composed of an underlying database, a set of parameters, and simulation techniques. The database is constructed from a nationally representative sample of households, and the set of parameters and simulation techniques apply the rules of a government program—in this case, SNAP—to each household to determine its eligibility for, participation in, and benefit amount for that program. Given that the modeling technique operates on individual households as opposed to aggregate data, the model is able to apply a set of rules to each household under baseline and alternative scenarios to estimate effects of proposed changes. In other words, the model acts as an electronic caseworker to simulate the effect of policy changes on the caseload. By changing the parameters and program rules simulated, an analyst can evaluate whether a change to program rules will have a relatively small or large effect on SNAP caseloads and costs.

1. The Microsimulation Models

The two models we used are the Quality Control (QC) Minimodel, based on the SNAP QC database and the MATH SIPP+ model, based on data from the Survey of Income and Program

Participation (SIPP) and incorporating data from the Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC). The QC Minimodel generates estimates based on a sample of actual participants while the MATH SIPP+ database simulates both SNAP eligibility and participation.

a.   SNAP QC Datafile and Minimodel

The SNAP QC datafile is an edited version of the raw datafile of monthly case reviews conducted by state SNAP agencies to assess the accuracy of eligibility determinations and benefit calculations for each state's SNAP caseload. The datafile includes information on income, expenses, deductions, benefit amounts, and disability status for SNAP households as well as demographic information such as age, gender, and citizenship status for individuals. It also includes sufficient information to identify LIHEAP recipients and categorically eligible households. The file produces the most reliable estimate of participation in SNAP because the data are a random sample of actual (rather than reported or simulated) SNAP households.

The FY 2011 file, the most recent version available at the time this research was conducted, includes a sample size of just over 51,000 SNAP households. The file is weighted to match the number of SNAP individuals, households, and total benefits by state and month in FY 2011 (October 2010 through September 2011), excluding benefits received in response to a disaster or in error.

The 2011 QC Minimodel used in this report is a microsimulation model based on the FY 2011 SNAP QC datafile. The "baseline" version of the model simulates 2011 SNAP eligibility and benefit determination rules and produces estimates of the 2011 SNAP participant population. To simulate the effect of restrictive policy changes (also called "reforms") on SNAP eligibility and benefit amounts, we adjust the model's policy parameter values—such as gross and net income thresholds, maximum and minimum benefit amounts, and state SNAP policies such as BBCE rules and SUA amounts—and the model code as necessary and then recompute eligibility status and benefit

amounts for each SNAP household. The model results estimate the effect of proposed policy changes to SNAP on the FY 2011 caseload in an average month in FY 2011.

Given that state SUA amounts tend to change each year and that they are central to two of the policy reforms evaluated in this report, we updated the SUA amounts in the 2011 QC Minimodel to those used in FY 2012, deflated to FY 2011 dollar amounts. To do so, we identified households with a utility amount on the file equal to one of its state's SUAs in FY 2011 and replaced the utility amount with the comparable deflated FY 2012 SUA amount.[7] The deflation ensures that the real value of the SUAs is consistent with other dollar amounts in the FY 2011 SNAP QC datafile. We calculated a deflation factor of 0.976 by using the average nonseasonally adjusted Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) values for FY 2012 (October 2011 to September 2012) and FY 2011 (October 2010 to September 2011). For more information about the SNAP QC datafile and QC Minimodel, see Leftin et al. 2012.

b. MATH SIPP+ Model

The MATH SIPP+ model is based on data from the 2009 SIPP panel and incorporates data from the 2009 and 2010 CPS ASECs. The model contains detailed information on household income, assets, and expenses needed to determine SNAP eligibility and benefit amounts. To develop the estimates in this report, we use a revised 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ national model. The model uses August 2009 SIPP data and 2012 SNAP policy parameters, deflated to August 2009, to simulate SNAP eligibility and participation in FY 2012. The model estimates in this report are expressed in 2012 dollars.

Smith and Wang (2012) document the original 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ model. The revised model incorporates several updates to the original model, including:

---

[7] The FY 2012 state SUA values were provided by FNS and are available upon request.

- **Updated factors used to deflate FY 2012 dollar parameter values to August 2009.** We deflate SNAP parameter values from FY 2012 to August 2009 by using updated factors of 0.944 (based on the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers [CPI-U] for all items) for all nonvehicle parameters and 0.847 (based on the CPI-U for used cars and trucks) for vehicles.

- **Updated HCSUA values for FY 2012.**

- **Simulated use of the HCSUA by SNAP households reporting energy assistance but no utility expenses.**

- **Simulated receipt of nominal LIHEAP benefits that confer the HCSUA in 14 states.** In Table II.1, we present a description of the LIHEAP rules we used in our simulation.

- **Updated BBCE rules for Pennsylvania.** In Table II.2, we display the BBCE rules that we modeled.

- **Recalibrated SNAP participant selection using FY 2011 SNAP QC data.** We use an algorithm that selects participants to match as closely as possible the number and characteristics of SNAP households, participants, and their benefits based on FY 2011 SNAP QC data.

A major advantage of the MATH SIPP+ model is the data it contains on household asset holdings, one of the determinants of SNAP eligibility. However, the Census Bureau imputes asset information for almost 20 percent of simulated SNAP participants in the model. In the majority of these cases, households reported having an asset type, but did not report the asset value. In a smaller number of cases, households did not report whether they have a particular asset type. In these latter cases, the Census Bureau may impute either positive (greater than $0) or zero asset values.

We conducted an analysis of imputed asset amounts for FNS and found that low-income households with imputed assets are more likely to have assets over the federal SNAP asset limit than those without imputed assets. In addition, the mean values of most asset types are greater for households with positive imputed assets (with values greater than $0) than for households without. The differences between reported and imputed asset amounts may be due in part to differences between individuals who report asset values and those who report asset ownership but not values. For instance, it may be that households who report having financial assets but are unable to report the asset value are more likely to have higher asset values than households who are able to report

asset values. It may also be the case, however, that the Census Bureau asset imputation has a slight upward bias for some low-income households. The Census Bureau imputes assets by substituting unreported data from one household with reported data drawn from a "donor" household with the same combination of characteristics. For low-income households, one of these characteristics is a four-month total income of $8,000 or less. This dollar amount does not vary by household size.

For small households, this group likely includes households with incomes twice the amount of the SNAP income limits, whose asset holdings may differ from those with lower incomes. Despite this, based on the research we conducted for FNS, we believe the imputation procedures used are reasonable and appear to produce at most a small upward bias in estimates of participating SNAP households with financial assets above the federal limit. This possible small upward bias may result in a slight overestimation of the number of SNAP households that would lose eligibility in the absence of categorical eligibility.

While the QC Minimodel generates estimates based on a sample of actual participants, the MATH SIPP+ database simulates both SNAP eligibility and participation. Nonparticipants may be ineligible for SNAP, or they may be simulated as eligible and choosing not to participate. In the simulated reforms, the decision to participate is based in part on the size of the potential benefit amount. Despite the availability of a state model to simulate reforms at the state level, the national model produces more precise estimates at the national level. Therefore, we used the national model for this report and do not report results from the MATH SIPP+ model at the state level.

2. The Policy Change Simulations

Using the QC Minimodel and MATH SIPP+ model, we simulated existing SNAP policies (the baseline simulation) and the policy changes proposed in the House and Senate bills (the policy change simulations). Comparing the results of the policy change simulations to the baseline simulation provides estimates of the effect of the proposed policies on the SNAP eligible and participant populations. All simulation results are presented in Chapter III.

a.   Baseline Simulation

In section A of Chapter III, we present baseline estimates from the QC Minimodel and MATH SIPP+ model. These profiles are estimates of current SNAP recipients and, in the case of the MATH SIPP+ model, individuals eligible for SNAP, including benefit levels and demographic information. The estimates provide the "before" picture for the proposed SNAP policy changes. Baseline estimates from the QC Minimodel represent characteristics of the SNAP caseload in an average month in FY 2011 while baseline estimates from the MATH SIPP+ model represent characteristics of simulated participants in 2009 if they were subject to FY 2012 SNAP rules. The data are calibrated to FY 2011 SNAP QC program participant totals for households, individuals, and benefits by state and month, with dollar amounts (for example, benefits, income, and assets) expressed in 2012 dollars.

Our estimates include poverty indexes as defined by Foster, Greer, and Thorbecke (1984). The *headcount index* is the proportion of households with gross income at or below the poverty guideline and can be used to measure the incidence of poverty among SNAP households. A household's *poverty gap* is the difference between the poverty guideline and the household's gross income, divided by the poverty guideline, with the poverty gap of households with income above the poverty guideline set to zero. The *poverty gap index* is the sum of all households' poverty gaps divided by the total number of households. This measure is an indicator of the depth of poverty in a population. The *poverty gap squared index* measures the severity of poverty. The higher the squared poverty gap index, the more unequal the income distribution is among households below the poverty line.

Children who receive SNAP benefits may be directly certified for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). In addition, children who do not receive SNAP benefits but live in a dwelling unit with a child who does receive SNAP benefits also may be directly certified. Children are eligible for free lunch if their household's gross income is at or below 130 percent of the federal poverty guideline and eligible for reduced-price lunch if their household's gross income is greater than

130 percent of the federal poverty guideline but at or below 185 percent of the federal poverty guideline. We estimate the number of school-age children in participating households with gross income at or under 185 percent of the poverty guideline as well as the number of nonparticipating school-age children living with participating children. The QC Minimodel underestimates the latter group because it contains limited data on nonparticipants.

b.   LIHEAP Policy Change Simulations

Under current law, SNAP applicants who receive any assistance through LIHEAP may claim the HCSUA, effectively decreasing their net income and making them more likely to be eligible or qualify for larger benefits. Both the House and Senate bills assessed in this report propose setting a minimum LIHEAP amount of $10 to qualify for the HCSUA. As a result, SNAP households that receive a small LIHEAP benefit may not qualify for an SUA or may qualify only for a lower SUA. These households may then be eligible for a lower SNAP benefit or even lose eligibility for SNAP. In this report, we assess the effect of this proposed policy change by looking at the following groups:

- **SNAP households still participating with the same benefit.** These households were not affected by the policy change simulation. Eligibility status and benefit amounts remain the same.

- **SNAP households no longer eligible.** These households were eligible for SNAP in the baseline but are no longer eligible under the policy change simulation.

- **SNAP households still participating with lower benefit.** These households were eligible for SNAP in the baseline and are still eligible and participate under the policy change simulation, but for a smaller benefit. We also calculate the average monthly benefit loss per SNAP household in this group.

- **SNAP households that are newly not participating (MATH SIPP+ model only).** These households participated in the baseline and are still eligible under the policy change simulation, but with a lower benefit amount, and therefore chose not to participate.

In the QC Minimodel, we identified households as receiving a nominal LIHEAP benefit if they met all of the following criteria:

1. The household was coded in the FY 2011 SNAP QC file as receiving an HCSUA because it received a LIHEAP benefit.

2. The household is in one of the 11 states with a nominal LIHEAP program in place during FY 2011 that did not require the recipient household to live in public or subsidized housing.[8]

3. The household satisfies the state requirements for receipt of a nominal LIHEAP benefit (that is, some states provide this benefit only to households that pay rent).

4. The most recent certification or recertification for the household took place after the state's passage of its nominal LIHEAP rule.

If a household meets all the above criteria, we assumed that it received a nominal LIHEAP benefit. To simulate the loss of the HCSUA for these households, we set their deductible utility expenses to $0 and redetermined their eligibility status and benefit amounts.

We likely overestimate the effect of this policy change because the QC data do not include information on receipt of energy assistance, making it impossible to determine whether the LIHEAP assistance was nominal or based on actual heating and cooling expenses. The implicit assumption in our simulation is that, in states that conferred nominal LIHEAP assistance, all LIHEAP assistance was nominal. We also may overestimate the effect of losing an HCSUA conferred through receipt of the nominal LIHEAP benefit because, rather than allowing certain households to use the LUA or simply a telephone allowance, we set the SUA to zero.

Unlike the case of the QC Minimodel, the MATH SIPP+ model does not include an indicator of SUA receipt or an indicator of households receiving an HCSUA because of the receipt of LIHEAP benefits. Therefore, we simulated receipt of the HCSUA for households (1) with positive utility expenses, (2) that receive energy assistance, or (3) that live in one of the 14 states using nominal LIHEAP benefits to confer the HCSUA and met the state-specific criteria in Table II.1. In 7 states, households must be participating in SNAP to receive the LIHEAP-conferred HCSUA. In

---

[8] Three states (Maine, New York, and Vermont) grant nominal LIHEAP benefits only to households in public or subsidized housing. Because we are unable to identify such households in the QC Minimodel, we did not include these states in the reform. We are able to identify such households in the MATH SIPP+ model, and so include them in reform.

these states, eligibility is first determined without receipt of the nominal LIHEAP benefit (and thus the HCSUA); then, if eligible for SNAP, the household's benefit is recalculated with receipt of the nominal LIHEAP benefit (and the HCSUA). The other 7 states include receipt of the nominal LIHEAP (and the HCSUA) when determining eligibility and benefits for SNAP applicants.

As with the QC Minimodel, we simulate the loss of the HCSUA for households simulated as receiving it through a nominal LIHEAP benefit by setting their deductible utility expenses to $0 and redetermining their eligibility status and benefit amount. In addition, with the MATH SIPP+ model, we predict which households will choose not to participate in SNAP because of a decreased benefit amount, allowing us to estimate the number of households that remain eligible but no longer participate. Again as with the QC Minimodel, we may overestimate the effect of losing an HCSUA conferred through receipt of the nominal LIHEAP benefit because, rather than allowing certain households to use the LUA or simply a telephone allowance, we set the SUA to zero.

We have not assessed the accuracy of reported energy assistance in the MATH SIPP+ model. We also did not calibrate model participants to estimated LIHEAP receipt in the SNAP QC data or another data source. Nevertheless, we believe that the MATH SIPP+ model results are more reliable because of the additional overestimation in the QC Minimodel of the effect of the policy change. Results for both models are presented in the appendix tables by household size and composition, locality, region, income level, and employment status, although the types of characteristics presented differ in a few cases based on the varying data available in the models. Some state-level results for the QC Minimodel are also presented.

c. Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Change Simulations

Legislation in the House (H.R. 6083 and subsequent legislation) proposed to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility. As with the LIHEAP policy change simulation, we estimate the effect of the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation by using both the QC Minimodel and the MATH SIPP+ model. In the QC Minimodel, we identify SNAP participants who would lose

eligibility if BBCE and NCE rules are eliminated. We do so by requiring all non-pure PA SNAP households to satisfy federal income requirements.

The QC Minimodel does not include information about a household's assets unless the assets are countable under SNAP rules. Recognizing that the assets of categorically eligible households generally are not countable, we cannot identify households that are asset-ineligible under the policy change. We expect the number of income-eligible but asset-ineligible households to be small; however, our estimates of the number of people who lose eligibility with this policy change simulation should be seen as a lower bound.

In the MATH SIPP+ model, we simulate BBCE for households that meet the state criteria in place as of May 2012. Therefore, relative to the QC Minimodel where BBCE rules reflect those in place during a household's FY 2011 sample month, the BBCE rules differed in three states (Michigan, Nebraska, and Pennsylvania). In Table 2, we show the complete set of state rules that we modeled. Similarly to the simulation conducted in the QC Minimodel, we simulate the removal of BBCE by requiring non-pure PA households to meet the federal SNAP income and asset requirements. Unlike in the QC Minimodel, we are unable to identify households in the baseline that were eligible because of NCE policies. However, we are able to identify households that lose eligibility because they no longer pass the asset test.

We believe that the MATH SIPP+ model estimates for this policy change simulation are more accurate than those generated with the QC Minimodel because the MATH SIPP+ model contains information on household assets.

We estimate the number of households and individuals unaffected by this change as well as the number that lose eligibility nationally and by subgroup (for example, household size and composition). Given that SNAP benefits are unchanged for those who remain eligible under this policy change simulation, we do not include table columns for individuals still participating with lower benefits.

d.   Combined Policy Change Simulation

The House bill proposes to implement both the LIHEAP and non-cash categorical eligibility policy changes. To estimate the bill's effect, we ran a third simulation using both models. For a couple of reasons, the effect of the combined policy change is not simply the sum of the effects of the two separate policy changes. First, some households may lose eligibility independently under both policy changes and should not be double-counted when determining the impact of the combined policy change. Second, some households that did not lose eligibility under either policy change may lose eligibility if both are implemented in tandem, an outcome that would occur in certain cases when a non-cash categorically eligible household's net income increases as a result of the LIHEAP policy change. If the household's net income remains low enough to maintain eligibility under its state BBCE policy but newly surpasses the federal net income requirements, the household would lose eligibility under the categorical eligibility policy change.

e.   Additional MATH SIPP+ Model Estimates

In addition to providing simulation results from the two microsimulation models on the numbers of individuals and households affected by the policy changes by demographic and economic characteristic, we prepared the following supplemental estimates using the MATH SIPP+ model:

- **Average gross income and benefits for participating SNAP households and individuals in the baseline.** We tabulated average gross income and benefits for many of the same groups as those presented in the simulation results tables, but added panels for households containing a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under 5; participating nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5; households by net income as a percentage of the poverty guideline; and households by deductible expenses as a percentage of gross income. The same groups were included in the other supplemental tabulations, described below.

- **Percentage loss of income plus SNAP benefit by participating SNAP households affected by the policy change simulations.** To calculate percentage loss of income plus SNAP benefit, we first summed baseline monthly gross income and SNAP benefit and averaged the sum over all households (by characteristic) losing benefits or eligibility under the policy change simulation. Then, for those losing benefits or eligibility, we subtracted average monthly benefit loss (by characteristic) from this average baseline sum, and divided by the average baseline sum.

- **Participating SNAP households with net income at or below the federal poverty level losing eligibility under the simulation to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility and average dollar benefit loss.** Because no households lose eligibility under the MATH SIPP+ LIHEAP policy change simulation, we only present results for the BBCE policy change simulation in this table set.

- **Participating SNAP households losing eligibility under the simulation to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility by reason for eligibility loss.** Reasons for eligibility loss include failing only an income test, only the asset test, or both income and asset tests. Again, because no households lose eligibility under the MATH SIPP+ LIHEAP policy change simulation, we only present results for the BBCE policy change simulation in this table set.

We provide approximate 90-percent confidence intervals for the estimates based on the policy change simulations. The confidence intervals were constructed using standard errors produced from the Census-reported replicate weights on the SIPP. We only present estimates for subgroups derived from sufficient sample sizes to provide reliable estimates.

B. State Block Grant Analysis Approach

We used SNAP program operations administrative data for FY 2008 and FY 2012 to estimate the effect on SNAP participation and benefits of converting SNAP to a state block grant program. Although H.R. 5652 includes other nutrition programs in addition to SNAP, we made the simplifying assumption that states would preserve existing nutrition programs at the same proportional level of funding. Under this assumption, we estimated the effects by state of SNAP funding reverting to FY 2008 levels.

We estimated the drop in total SNAP benefits by subtracting state FY 2012 benefit totals from state FY 2008 benefit totals. We estimated the drop in the number of participating households if average benefits remained at FY 2012 levels while total benefits decreased to FY 2008 levels as follows. We first divided annual FY 2008 benefit totals by 12 and then divided the resulting average monthly FY 2008 benefit totals by FY 2012 average monthly benefit amounts. This gave us the average monthly number of households that could be served with FY 2008 total benefits at FY 2012 average benefit, which we compared to the actual number of participating households in FY 2012.

We similarly estimated the drop in average benefits if the number of participating households remained at FY 2012 levels while total benefits decreased to FY 2008 levels. This time we divided average monthly FY 2008 benefit totals by FY 2012 average monthly numbers of participating households. We compared the results, the average monthly household benefits if the number of FY 2012 households were served with FY 2008 total benefits, to FY 2012 average benefits.

C. Cardiometabolic Analysis Approach

We used publicly available 2003–2008 NHANES data to generate tables that can be used to assess the cardiometabolic health profile of SNAP participants.[9] Results are presented in Chapter V. The 2003–2008 NHANES data were the most recently available with information on SNAP participation. While some of the health data were available from the 2009–2010 survey, the SNAP participation data were not yet available. The 2001–2002 NHANES data could not be used for our analysis because of survey administration issues that resulted in too few people being asked about SNAP participation; therefore, fully food-secure households are over-represented in the sample (CDC 2013a).

NHANES is an ongoing national survey that collects interview data at home and physical examination data at a mobile examination center (MEC). Each year, NHANES selects a nationally representative sample of the noninstitutionalized U.S. population by using a complex, stratified, multistage probability cluster sampling design (Flegal et al. 2012). Low-income persons, persons age 12 to 19 and 60 and older, pregnant women, African Americans, and Mexican Americans were oversampled in NHANES 2003–2008. Several changes were made to the sampling approach in NHANES 2007–2008. All Hispanics were oversampled, not just Mexican Americans. The oversampling of pregnant women and adolescents was discontinued to allow for the oversampling of Hispanics. In addition, for each race/ethnic group, the sampling age domains of 12 to 15 and 16

---

[9] NHANES asked respondents about the "Food Stamp Program." The name of the program is now SNAP.

to 19 were combined, and those age 40 to 59 were broken into two 10-year age categories, leading to an increase in the number of those age 40 or older and a decrease in adolescents, compared to previous survey years (CDC 2013b). NHANES is considered the gold standard for measuring obesity in the United States because it measures participants' height and weight by using standardized techniques and equipment and therefore avoids the potential inaccuracies of self-reported height and weight information. NHANES data are released in two-year cycles.

Questions were asked regarding household participation in SNAP as part of the food security component of the interview. We created four "income" categories: (1) SNAP participants, identified as respondents who self-reported that they or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months; (2) income-eligible nonparticipants, defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below; (3) lower income, defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0; and (4) higher income, defined as a PIR above 2.0. We also report results for all respondents, regardless of whether their SNAP participation or PIR information was known. We did not account for potential endogenous selection into SNAP participation or systematic underreporting of SNAP participation status (Kreider et al. 2012).

Our analysis population consisted of nonpregnant individuals. Prevalence estimates were broken down by sex and age. For children, we used the age at examination because weight status for children is affected by a child's age in months. The age groups for children were (1) 2 through 19 years, representing all children, (2) 6 through 19 years, representing school-age children, (3) 2 through 5 years, representing preschool-age children, (4) 6 through 11 years, representing elementary school–age children, and (5) 12 through 19 years, representing middle and high school students. For adults, we used the age at interview because (1) weight status measures for adults are not age-dependent and (2) not all respondents had examinations and some of our analysis measures relied solely on information from the interview. Adult estimates were presented for ages 20 through 39, 40 through 59, and 60 and older. To create age-adjusted values, we adjusted these age groups by the

direct method to the 2000 U.S. Census population. We present the unadjusted and age-adjusted prevalence estimates for all adults age 20 and older.

We used SAS 9.1 to generate the analysis file and SUDAAN Release 10.0.0 (Windows Individual User SAS-Callable version) to generate all the estimates. We conducted two-tailed t-tests to determine whether there were statistically significant differences among the four "income" categories. We considered differences statistically significant at a P<0.05 level, with a Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment for multiple comparisons (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995). We calculated six-year weights (2003–2008) for the analyses by using the appropriate 2003–2004, 2005–2006, and 2007–2008 weights (CDC 2013c). For each measure, we determined the type of weights by the analysis population. In the table descriptions below, we note the definition for each measure and the weights:

Table J.1. Prevalence of high BMI among U.S. children, 2003–2008. The population for Table J.1 was all nonpregnant children age 2 through 19 years with a valid body mass index (BMI) measure from the MEC examination. We generated prevalence estimates by using MEC weights, the weights for respondents who received an examination as part of the survey. We classified the weight status of participants by using the BMI variable provided in NHANES. BMI is calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared and rounded to the nearest tenth. We compared the BMI to the 2000 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) age- and sex-specific growth charts to determine the BMI-for-age percentile (Kuczmarski et al. 2000). We calculated three weight categories: (1) BMI≥97th percentile of the CDC growth charts;[10] (2) BMI≥95th percentile of

---

[10] The need to track and study the heaviest children has become widely accepted in recent years. In 2007, an expert committee disseminated treatment recommendations that called for and included a higher cutoff point to identify severe obesity among children (Barlow et al. 2007). The committee used a high cutoff point at the 99th percentile, but the technical report that accompanied the 2000 CDC growth charts noted that the data were insufficient to estimate percentiles accurately above the 97th percentile and that extrapolation beyond this range should be done with caution (Kuczmarski et al. 2002).

the CDC growth charts, the typical definition used for obesity among children; and (3) BMI≥85th percentile of the CDC growth charts, the typical definition used to capture overweight and obese children.

Table J.2. Prevalence of weight status among U.S. adults, 2003–2008. The population was all nonpregnant adults age 20 and older who had a valid BMI measure from the MEC examination. We generated prevalence estimates by using the MEC weights. To examine weight status, we used the BMI value provided in the NHANES files. Following current recommendations, we created four weight status categories: (1) underweight, defined as a BMI of less than 18.5; (2) normal weight, defined as a BMI of 18.5 to 24.9; (3) overweight, defined as a BMI of 25.0 to 29.9; and (4) obese, defined as a BMI of 30.0 or higher (CDC 2013d; Flegal et al. 2012; Expert Panel 1998).

Table J.3. Prevalence of diabetes among U.S. adults, 2003–2008. The initial population was all nonpregnant adults age 20 and older who were in the morning fasting sample. Some participants, who were chosen at random by using a specified sampling fraction based on the protocol for a particular component, were selected to give a fasting blood sample on the morning of their MEC examination (CDC 2013e). We included in the estimates only morning fasting sample participants with valid glucose and glycohemoglobin measures who had answered the interview question regarding diagnosed diabetes. We generated the prevalence estimates by using the morning fasting weights. A respondent was considered to have diagnosed diabetes if he or she self-reported in the interview that a doctor or health professional told him or her that he or she had diabetes. Among those who did not report diabetes, we tested to see if they met the criteria for undiagnosed diabetes or pre-diabetes. Undiagnosed diabetes was defined as a fasting glucose level of 126 mg/dl or higher or an HbA1c level of 6.5 percent or higher (CDC 2013f). Pre-diabetes was defined as a fasting glucose level lower than 126 mg/dl but greater than or equal to 100 mg/dl or an HbA1c level lower than 6.5 percent but greater than or equal to 5.7 percent (CDC 2013f).

Table J.4. Prevalence of cardiovascular disease among U.S. adults, 2003–2008. The initial population was all nonpregnant adults age 20 and older who completed an interview. In NHANES, respondents were asked separate questions to determine if they ever had any of the following cardiovascular conditions: (1) stroke; (2) coronary heart disease; (3) heart attack; (4) congestive heart failure; and/or (5) angina. Only people who answered the relevant question were included in that measure's analysis sample. A respondent was considered to have had the cardiovascular condition if he or she self-reported yes when asked. We generated prevalence estimates by using interview weights.

Table J.5. Prevalence of risk factors associated with metabolic syndrome among U.S. adults, 2003–2008. The initial population was all nonpregnant adults age 20 and older. The analysis population and weights varied by measure. For each individual risk factor, the analysis population was adults with a valid measurement. For the metabolic syndrome estimate and the "at least one risk factor for metabolic syndrome" estimate, the analysis population was adults with a valid measurement for all five risk factors. We generated the prevalence estimates for the metabolic syndrome and the "at least one risk factor" measures by using the morning fasting weights. For the individual risk factor measures, a respondent was classified as having the risk factor if he or she met the specified numeric levels or reported being on medication to treat the condition (Alberti et al. 2009).

For the elevated waist circumference measure, the analysis population was adults with a valid waist measurement from the MEC examination. We generated prevalence estimates of elevated waist circumference by using MEC weights. A respondent was considered to have an elevated waist circumference if it was greater than 102 cm for men or 88 cm for women.

For the triglycerides measure, the analysis population was adults in the morning fasting sample with a triglyceride value. We generated the estimates of the prevalence of elevated triglycerides by using morning fasting weights. We defined elevated triglycerides as a triglyceride level of 150 mg/dL

or higher or a response of yes when the respondent was asked in the interview if he or she were currently taking cholesterol medication prescribed by a doctor or health care professional. It was not clear from the survey whether the respondent had been told to take cholesterol medication for high triglycerides or reduced HDL-C. Therefore, for each cholesterol measure, we assumed that the cholesterol medication was applicable to that issue. As a result, a person who reported being on cholesterol medication would be classified with high triglycerides and reduced HDL-C.

For the HDL measure, the analysis population was adults with a valid HDL measurement from the MEC examination. We generated prevalence estimates for this measure by using MEC weights. Reduced HDL-C was defined as a direct HDL cholesterol level of lower than 40 mg/dL for men or 50 mg/dL for women or a response of yes when a respondent was asked if he or she were currently taking cholesterol medication prescribed by a doctor or health care professional.

For the blood pressure measure, the analysis population was adults with at least one valid blood pressure measurement from the MEC examination. Up to three blood pressure measurements were averaged together for respondents with more than one valid measurement. We generated prevalence estimates for the measure by using MEC weights. Elevated blood pressure was defined as either a systolic blood pressure reading of 130 mm Hg or higher or a diastolic blood pressure reading of 85 mm Hg or higher or a response of yes when a respondent was asked if he or she were currently taking medication for blood pressure or hypertension prescribed by a doctor or health care professional.

For the glucose measure, the analysis population was adults in the morning fasting sample with a fasting glucose value. We generated the estimates of the prevalence of elevated fasting glucose by using morning fasting weights. Elevated fasting glucose was defined as a glucose plasma level of 100 mg/dL or higher or a response of yes when a respondent was asked if he or she were currently taking insulin or diabetic pills to lower blood sugar.

Table II.1. Eligibility Rules for Households Receiving Nominal LIHEAP Benefits ($1 to $9) Conferring SNAP HCSUA, FY 2012

States with Nominal LIHEAP[a]	Implementation Date	Requirements for SNAP Households Receiving LIHEAP Nominal Benefit	Whether Nominal LIHEAP Affects Eligibility or Only Benefit Amounts[b]
Connecticut	7/1/2009	Must not be receiving HCSUA; must have rent or mortgage expenses	Only benefits
Delaware	10/1/2009[c]	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Only benefits
District of Columbia	4/1/2011	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Only benefits
Maine	Late 1990s	Must not be receiving HCSUA; must be living in public or subsidized housing and meet general LIHEAP requirements: gross income <= 150% of poverty guideline, or <= 170% of poverty guideline if any elderly or disabled, or child <= age 2 in the unit	Only benefits
Massachusetts	6/1/2007	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Only benefits
Michigan	10/1/2009	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Eligibility and benefits
New Jersey	12/1/2009	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Eligibility and benefits
New York	10/1/2008	Must not be receiving HCSUA; must be living in public or subsidized housing and must have rent or mortgage expenses	Eligibility and benefits
Oregon	10/1/2008	Must not be receiving HCSUA; SNAP benefit must be less than the maximum benefit; shelter deduction must be less than the maximum deduction (for units without elderly or disabled) and must have rent or mortgage expenses	Only benefits
Pennsylvania	9/10/2010	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Eligibility and benefits
Rhode Island	11/1/2008	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Eligibility and benefits
Vermont	10/1/2010	Must not be receiving HCSUA; must be living in public or subsidized housing	Only benefits
Washington	2/1/2009	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Eligibility and benefits
Wisconsin	4/1/2009	Must not be receiving HCSUA	Eligibility and benefits

Source: Information on eligibility for state nominal LIHEAP payments is based on email or telephone contacts with state SNAP policy and/or LIHEAP program staff.

[a]California implemented nominal LIHEAP payments starting 1/1/2013. As part of Montana's regular LIHEAP program, those living in subsidized housing with utilities included in rent who apply for and meet the regular LIHEAP income and asset requirements receive a $50 payment issued every five years. This is not considered "nominal" LIHEAP.

[b]In states where nominal LIHEAP affects SNAP eligibility and benefit amounts, the state includes the projected LIHEAP benefit (and thus includes the HCSUA) when determining eligibility and benefits for SNAP applicants. In states where nominal LIHEAP only affects SNAP benefit amounts, eligibility for SNAP is first determined without the LIHEAP benefit (and thus without the HCSUA); then, if the household is eligible for SNAP, the benefit is recalculated assuming the household receives the LIHEAP benefit (and thus the HCSUA).

[c]In Delaware, no LIHEAP payments were made until 10/1/2010 (FY 2011).

Table II.2. State Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility Rules, FY 2012 SNAP

State	Households Eligible Under BBCE Rules
Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Maryland, Nevada, North Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin	Households with gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty
Montana, North Dakota	Households with gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty and net income at or below 100 percent of poverty
Arizona, Connecticut, Maine, New Jersey, Oregon	All households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty
Vermont	Households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty and net income at or below 100 percent of poverty.
Minnesota, New Mexico	Households with gross income at or below 165 percent of poverty
Iowa	Households with gross income at or below 160 percent of poverty
Mississippi	Households with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Alabama, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, South Carolina, West Virginia	Households with (1) an elderly or disabled member and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Georgia	Households (1) in which all members are elderly or disabled and with gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Rhode Island	Households with (1) an elderly or disabled member and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty
California, Oklahoma	Households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty and (1) an elderly or disabled member or (2) gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Colorado, Louisiana	Households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty and (1) an elderly or disabled member and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Massachusetts	Households with (1) an elderly or disabled member or a child under age 19 and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty and net income at or below 100 percent of poverty
New Hampshire	Households with a child under age 22 and a relative of the child present with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty
New York	Households with (1) an elderly or disabled member or dependent care expenses and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Idaho	Households with countable assets at or below $5,000, net income at or below 100 percent of poverty, and (1) an elderly or disabled member and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Michigan	Households with countable assets at or below $5,000 and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty
Nebraska	Households with financial assets at or below $25,000, net income at or below 100 percent of poverty, and (1) an elderly or disabled member or (2) gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty
Pennsylvania (effective 6/1/2012)	Households with (1) an elderly or disabled member, countable assets less than or equal to $9,000, and gross income at or below 200 percent of poverty or (2) countable assets less than or equal to $5,500 and gross income at or below 160 percent of poverty
Texas	Households with countable assets under $5,000 and gross income below 165 percent of poverty

Note: States not listed did not have a BBCE policy in FY 2012.

III. FINDINGS FROM SNAP MICROSIMULATION ANALYSES

In this chapter, we first describe the characteristics of the SNAP eligible and SNAP participating populations under existing program rules (Section A). We then examine the effects on those populations of the three proposed SNAP policy changes, focusing on the characteristics of households that lose eligibility or SNAP benefits as a result of the proposed policy changes (Section B). Finally, we describe findings from the set of supplemental estimates described in Chapter II, again focusing on the characteristics of SNAP participants losing eligibility or SNAP benefits as a result of the proposed policy changes (Section C).

A. Descriptive Analysis of SNAP Eligible and Participant Populations

We used the revised 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ model to examine the characteristics of the SNAP eligible and participant populations in an average month in FY 2012 and the 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 SUA amounts to examine the characteristics of SNAP participants in an average month in FY 2011. In Appendix A, we present detailed tables with the QC Minimodel results and, in Appendix B, the MATH SIPP+ results.

1. 2012 SNAP Eligibility Estimates

An estimated 67.8 million individuals in 33.0 million SNAP households were eligible for SNAP in an average month in FY 2012 (Table III.1). The majority of individuals simulated to be eligible were either children under age 18 (37.4 percent), elderly individuals (age 60 or older) (18.1 percent), or disabled nonelderly individuals (7.1 percent). Among eligible households, 38.1 percent included a child, 31.5 percent included an elderly individual, and 13.2 percent included a disabled nonelderly individual. A substantial proportion of eligible households with children included just one adult—17.2 percent of all eligible households were headed by a single adult, and 15.4 percent were headed by a single female adult.

Income is an important determinant of SNAP eligibility. Among eligible SNAP households, 21.9 percent had gross income over 130 percent of the poverty guideline. However, 58.4 percent of

eligible SNAP households had gross income at or below the poverty guideline, and 26.0 percent had income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline. In addition, 86.3 percent of eligible individuals lived in households with net income at or below the poverty guideline. Among eligible SNAP households, 38.4 percent received income from earnings, 33.7 percent received Social Security income, 14.1 percent received SSI, and 4.8 percent received TANF. Half of eligible SNAP households had monthly gross income of $1,001 or more.

Assets holdings are another important determinant of SNAP eligibility. Among eligible SNAP households, 82.1 percent had assets, and 45.3 percent had assets countable under federal SNAP rules. Notably, 15.2 percent of all eligible households had countable assets greater than the federal asset limits, indicating that they were categorically eligible and not subject to the federal asset test. In contrast, 24.1 percent had assets under $1,000.

Eligible households qualified for an average household benefit of $201 (Table III.2). The estimated average potential benefit for eligible households with children was $354; for elderly individuals, it was $86; and for disabled nonelderly individuals, it was $158. The average potential benefit for households with children was much higher than the overall household average in part because such households tend to have larger-than-average household sizes. Nearly a quarter (23.6 percent) of SNAP households was eligible to receive only the minimum SNAP benefit (for household sizes of one or two individuals) or less (Table III.1). An additional 16.9 percent were eligible for a benefit up to $100, and 27.2 percent were eligible for a benefit between $101 and $200. The remaining 32.2 percent were eligible for a benefit in excess of $200.

Using the poverty indexes described in Section II.C.a, we examined the incidence, depth, and severity of poverty of households eligible for SNAP. We estimated a headcount index of 58.2 and a poverty gap index of 47.4 for the simulated SNAP eligible population. The findings indicate that over half of the eligible SNAP population was in poverty, and, on average, eligible households' gross

income was under half of the poverty guideline. The estimated squared poverty gap for the SNAP-eligible caseload was 22.5.

We used the methodology described in Nord (2006) to estimate the food security status of eligible SNAP households. Given that data on household food security were collected eight months after collection of the SIPP data that provide the base for the MATH SIPP+ model, we could estimate food security status only for the 87 percent of households still in the SIPP panel when the food security questions were asked. Among those for whom we were able to estimate food security status, 79.6 percent of households and 78.2 percent of individuals were food secure in FY 2012 (Table III.3). However, food security was slightly less prevalent among children and disabled nonelderly individuals. We estimate that only 75.3 percent of all eligible children and 69.0 percent of disabled nonelderly individuals were food secure. Furthermore, 9.2 percent of children and 13.1 percent of disabled nonelderly individuals were very food insecure. On the other hand, elderly individuals had higher-than-average rates of food security, at a rate of 88.8 percent. The estimated 2.7 million eligible individuals who had ever served in the military also had higher-than-average rates of food security (84.3 percent).

2.   SNAP Participation Estimates

Using the MATH SIPP+ model, we estimate that 43.2 million individuals in 20.1 million SNAP households participated in SNAP (Table III.4).[11] Just over half of the estimated participants were either children (42.4 percent) or elderly individuals (9.2 percent). While the percentage of participants who were children was slightly higher than the corresponding percentage for all eligible individuals, the percentage that was elderly was half the corresponding percentage for all eligible individuals. Almost one-quarter (23.2 percent) of participating households included children and

---

[11] Although the updated 2012 Baseline of the MATH SIPP+ model simulates FY 2012 eligibility rules, participants are calibrated to match FY 2011 SNAP QC data, the most recent data available when the model was developed.

were headed by a single adult. As with eligible households, the vast majority of such households were female-headed households (20.9 percent of all participating households).

The QC Minimodel produces similar estimates. According to that model, an estimated 44.1 million individuals in 20.8 million SNAP households participated in SNAP in an average month in FY 2011.[12] Among SNAP participants, 45.1 percent were children, and 8.5 percent were elderly. Among participating households, 26.3 percent included children and were headed by a single adult, most of who were female.

Relative to all those eligible for SNAP, a higher percentage of SNAP participants lived in poverty. According to estimates from the MATH SIPP+ model, 83.5 percent of SNAP participants had gross income at or below the poverty guideline, and 42.1 percent had gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline. Nearly all participants (97.6 percent) lived in households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty. The QC Minimodel estimates similar rates of poverty: 83.4 percent of SNAP participants had gross income at or below the poverty guideline, and 42.6 percent had gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline.

Compared to all eligible SNAP households, participating households were more likely to have received income from TANF and SSI, and were less likely to have received income from earnings or Social Security. Among participating households in the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 6.4 percent received TANF and 18.5 percent received SSI (Table III.4). The QC Minimodel estimates were similar although slightly higher: 7.6 percent of participants received TANF and 20.2 percent received SSI. According to estimates from the MATH SIPP+ model, 32.8 percent of participating households had earnings and 21.6 percent received Social Security benefits. The corresponding estimates from the QC Minimodel were 30.5 percent and 22.4 percent, respectively).

---

[12] The QC Minimodel numbers presented here differ slightly from published numbers in the FY 2011 Characteristics report because we use a baseline that simulates FY 2012, rather than FY 2011, SUA values. See Chapter II for more details.

In addition, a much smaller percentage of participating households than all eligible households had gross monthly income over $1,000 (29.3 and 27.8 percent of participating households in the MATH SIPP+ model and the QC Minimodel, respectively).

In addition to the national profiles of SNAP participants, we prepared state tabulations of participants, using the QC Minimodel (Table III.5). The three states with the highest percentage of households with gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline were California (67.6 percent), the District of Columbia (61.0 percent), and Guam (59.5 percent). The states with the lowest percentage of households in this poverty range were Massachusetts (29.3 percent), New Hampshire (25.5 percent), and Vermont (22.6 percent), all of which are New England states. As for households in poverty (gross income at or below the poverty guideline), the state with the highest percentage of households in poverty was again California (93.8 percent). The state with the second-highest poverty rate was Mississippi (90.6 percent), followed by the District of Columbia (90.4 percent). Maine, Wisconsin, and Vermont, had the lowest percentage of households with income at or below the poverty guideline, at 71.9, 68.7, and 59.1 percent, respectively. Vermont, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin had the highest average incomes at $1,080, $977, and $969, respectively, while the three states with the lowest average household income were the District of Columbia ($505), California ($578), and Tennessee ($615).

In the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 76.9 percent of participating households had assets (Table III.4). However, only 36.9 percent of participating households had any assets countable under SNAP rules, and less than one percent had countable vehicle assets. Over half of participating households with countable assets (21.3 percent of all participating households) had countable assets at or below $1,000 while 11.2 percent of all participating households had countable asset holdings that exceeded the federal asset limit.

The average benefit among participating SNAP households estimated from the MATH SIPP+ model, $280, was higher than the average benefit among all eligible households (Table III.6). The

same was true for average benefits among participating households with children ($419), households with elderly individuals ($166) and households with disabled nonelderly individuals ($186). Fewer than 5 percent of participating households received the minimum benefit or less, a much lower percentage than among eligible households (Table III.4).

Examining the poverty indexes using the QC Minimodel, we found a headcount index of 83.4 and a poverty gap index of 45.6 for participating households (Table III.6). The estimated squared poverty gap index is 20.8. All three indexes are higher in the MATH SIPP+ model (83.5, 52.2, and 27.3, respectively).

The food security patterns for SNAP participants in the MATH SIPP+ model are generally consistent with those for individuals eligible for SNAP. Overall, 75.2 percent of the SNAP participants for whom we were able to estimate food security were food secure, 15.3 percent were food insecure, and 9.5 percent were very food insecure (Table III.7). As with the eligible population, food security varied by subgroup and was less prevalent among children (73.5 percent) and disabled nonelderly individuals (70.7 percent) and more prevalent among elderly individuals (84.8 percent) and individuals who have ever served in the military (78.0 percent). Moreover, we found that the percentage of very food insecure participants was roughly the same as for eligible individuals for all four subgroups.

According to the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 12.1 million participating school-age children (age 5 through 17) lived in households with gross income at or below 185 percent of the poverty guideline and thus could be directly certified for free or reduced-price lunch through the NSLP (Table III.8). Estimates from the QC Minimodel indicate that 13.1 million school-age children could be directly certified for free or reduced-price lunch. In both models, almost 100 percent of participating school-age children qualified for free or reduced-price lunch. In the MATH SIPP+ model, an additional 550,000 nonparticipating school-age children are estimated to have lived in households with gross income at or below 185 percent of the poverty guideline and

thus also could be directly certified for free or reduced-price lunch. The corresponding total in the QC Minimodel, which has less information than the MATH SIPP+ model on nonparticipating household members, is 333,000.

B. Policy Change Simulation Results and Analyses

We used the revised 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ model and the 2011 QC Minimodel to conduct the policy simulations described in Section II.A.2. The simulations are:

- Remove the HCSUA for individuals receiving a LIHEAP benefit of less than $10
- Eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility
- Implement both policy changes simultaneously

The Senate version of the 2013 Farm Bill includes only the LIHEAP policy change while the House version includes both the LIHEAP and non-cash categorical eligibility changes.

In this section, we first summarize the overall effects of each policy simulation and then describe the effects by key subgroup. As discussed in Section II.A.2, even though both microsimulation models offer advantages and disadvantages, we believe that, for all three policy simulations, the estimates from the revised 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ model are more accurate than those from the 2011 QC Minimodel. Therefore, we advise researchers and policymakers to primarily use the MATH SIPP+ model estimates.

1. Summary Results

In Tables III.9 and III.10, we show the estimated effects of the policy change simulations on SNAP eligibility, participation, and benefits among households and individuals. The MATH SIPP+ model estimates are presented in Table III.9 and the QC Minimodel estimates in Table III.10.

a. LIHEAP Policy Change Simulation

As discussed in Section II.A.2.b, we likely overestimate the effect of the LIHEAP policy change in both microsimulation models because of data limitations. However, we believe that the

overestimation is greater in the QC Minimodel. However, the QC Minimodel estimates can provide an upper-bound estimate of the effect of the policy change on current SNAP participants.

Based on the MATH SIPP+ model results, the vast majority of participants would not face eligibility or benefit changes under the potential LIHEAP policy change. A simulated 1.1 percent of participating individuals and 1.5 percent of participating households would receive lower SNAP benefits but would continue to participate in the program. In addition, a small fraction (less than 0.1 percent) would receive lower benefits and choose not to participate. Even though participants could potentially lose eligibility under the LIHEAP policy change in the seven states that do not require SNAP eligibility in the absence of a LIHEAP benefit as a condition for the LIHEAP benefit, no individuals become newly ineligible under the simulated LIHEAP policy change. The simulation reduced total SNAP benefits by less than 0.5 percent.

The QC Minimodel simulation predicts that a higher proportion of SNAP participants would receive lower benefits under the LIHEAP policy change (8.2 percent of individuals and 7.9 percent of households)[13] and that a small percentage would lose eligibility (0.1 percent). In the QC Minimodel simulation, total benefits would fall by 2.4 percent.

b. Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Change Simulation

As described in Section II.A.2.c., we believe that the MATH SIPP+ model's estimates for the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change are more accurate than those generated with the QC Minimodel because the MATH SIPP+ model contains information on household assets.

The elimination of non-cash categorical eligibility would make some households ineligible for SNAP but would not affect benefit amounts for households that remain eligible. When simulating the policy change in the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 13.3 percent of participating

---

[13] In the QC Minimodel, we assume that all eligible households participate, including households with reduced benefits.

households and 11.8 percent of participating individuals become ineligible. The households losing eligibility received a disproportionately low percentage of the benefits (10.8 percent) in the baseline, indicating that they have higher net incomes than households that would remain eligible.

The QC Minimodel, which uses FY 2011 BBCE rules, simulates that only 3.3 percent of participating households and 3.6 percent of participating individuals would become income ineligible under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change. As noted, the QC Minimodel simulation does not include households that would become asset-ineligible if non-cash categorical eligibility were eliminated.

c. Combined Policy Change Simulation

As mentioned in Section II.C.d, the effect of the combined policy change is not simply the sum of the effects of the two separate changes for two reasons. First, some households may lose eligibility independently under both policy simulations and should not be double-counted when determining the impact of the combined simulations. Second, households not losing eligibility under either policy change may lose eligibility if both policies are implemented in tandem. However, under the combined policy change simulation, most households remaining eligible but with lower benefits were affected by the LIHEAP portion of the simulation but not by the non-cash categorical eligibility portion, and most households losing eligibility were affected by the non-cash categorical eligibility portion of the simulation.

Simulating both the LIHEAP *and* non-cash categorical eligibility policy changes in the MATH SIPP+ model, we estimate that 13.3 percent of participating households and 11.8 percent of participating individuals would lose eligibility, 1.4 percent of households and 1.1 percent of individuals would still participate but face a reduction in benefits, and a small proportion (0.2 percent of households and 0.1 percent of individuals) would remain eligible but would no longer participate. Estimates of households and individuals losing eligibility are smaller in the QC Minimodel than in the MATH SIPP+ model because the QC Minimodel underestimates the effect

of the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change. On the other hand, estimates of households and individuals remaining eligible but losing benefits are larger in the QC Minimodel than in the MATH SIPP+ model because the QC Minimodel likely overestimates the impact of the LIHEAP policy change. On the balance, fewer households and individuals are affected by the combined policy change simulation in the QC Minimodel than in the MATH SIPP+ model.

2.   Detailed Analyses of Results by Subgroup

A comprehensive collection of tables are available in Appendices C and D, respectively, for the QC Minimodel and MATH SIPP+ model estimates.

a.   LIHEAP Policy Change Simulation

Simulating the LIHEAP policy change in the MATH SIPP+ model, we estimate that approximately 489,000 individuals (1.1 percent of individuals in the baseline) and 294,000 households (1.5 percent of households in the baseline) would continue to participate under the LIHEAP reform but would lose an average of $67 per month in SNAP benefits (Table III.11).

Among individuals continuing to participate with lower benefits, an estimated 31.5 percent are children under age 18, 18.3 percent are elderly individuals age 60 or older, and 5.1 percent are current or former members of the military (Table III.12). All of those losing benefits under the policy change simulation have net income at or below the poverty guideline.

Among households continuing to participate with lower benefits, an estimated 31.6 percent include children, 28.9 include elderly individuals, and 32.4 percent include disabled nonelderly individuals. Of these subgroups, households with elderly individuals face the highest average benefit loss ($76), and households with children incur the smallest average benefit loss ($60). The majority of affected households with children (21.3 percent of all households) are headed by a single female adult.

Most households simulated to continue participating with lower benefits have no countable assets and low, but positive levels of income. Over three-quarters (78.4 percent) have no countable

assets, and the majority of those with countable assets (14.6 percent of households continuing to participate with lower benefits) have countable assets of $1,000 or less. About 13.7 percent have positive gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline, and 75.6 percent have income between 50 and 100 percent of the poverty guideline. The most common sources of income for this group are SSI (in 43.1 percent of households), followed by Social Security (in 37.9 percent of households) and earnings (in 22.4 percent of households). About 6.2 percent receive income from TANF. The headcount index, poverty gap index, and squared poverty gap index of households losing benefits but continuing to participate would be 89.3, 21.6, and 4.7, respectively.

Of households with known food security status among those estimated to continue participating with lower benefits under the policy change, most (70.8 percent) are food secure, but sizeable minorities are either food insecure (19.3 percent) or very food insecure (9.9 percent) (Table III.13). However, these households, particularly very food insecure households, would face smaller benefit losses. Food secure households losing benefits would face an estimated $70 benefit loss on average, food insecure households would lose an estimated $68 on average, and very food insecure households would lose an estimated $52 on average.

In addition to estimating higher overall effects from the LIHEAP policy change simulation than in the MATH SIPP+ model, the QC Minimodel produces different subgroup effects. Among households that would continue to participate with lower benefits, a higher proportion includes children (49.4 percent), and a lower proportion includes elderly individuals (18.7 percent) or disabled nonelderly individuals (28.6 percent) (Table III.11). As compared with the MATH SIPP+ model, the QC Minimodel simulates more still-participating/lower-benefit households having income from earnings (38.4 percent) or TANF (11.4 percent) and fewer having income from SSI (25.6 percent) or Social Security (30.2 percent). The estimated average benefit loss for households still participating but with lower benefits is higher in the QC Minimodel ($84) than in the MATH SIPP+ model ($67).

b.   Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Change Simulation

In the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 5.1 million participating individuals (11.8 percent of individuals in the baseline) in 2.7 million participating households (13.3 percent of households in the baseline) would lose eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation (Tables III.14 and III.15).

Of the individuals estimated to lose eligibility, 28.4 percent are children, 17.2 percent are elderly individuals, 5.1 percent were once or are current members of the military, and most (83.2 percent) have net income at or below the poverty guideline (Table III.15).

The proportions of households affected by the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation with children and with elderly individuals are similar to those of households affected by the LIHEAP simulation. Under the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation, an estimated 30.3 percent of households losing eligibility include children, and 28.8 include elderly individuals. Only 11.9 percent of affected households include disabled nonelderly individuals probably because many households with disabled individuals receive SSI and therefore may be categorically eligible through the receipt of cash assistance. We estimate that approximately one-quarter of the affected households with children (7.8 percent of all households) includes only a single female adult. This proportion is lower under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation than under the LIHEAP policy change simulation probably because some single-adult households with children are categorically eligible through the receipt of cash TANF.

Given that households may lose eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change by failing an income test *or* the asset test, affected households would not necessarily have both high income and high asset amounts. For example, we estimate that over 60 percent of participating households that would lose eligibility under the reform have gross incomes at or below the poverty guideline; over half of those households have gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline. About 20.5 percent have income between 131 and 185 percent of the poverty

guideline, and a small proportion of simulated affected households (2.4 percent) have gross income at or above 186 percent of the poverty guideline. The sources of income for households with positive gross income that would lose eligibility tend to be earnings (in 35.6 percent of these households) or Social Security (in 28.7 percent of these households). The estimated headcount index for households affected by the reform is 62.1, the poverty gap index is 62.4, and the squared poverty gap index is 38.9.

Asset amounts vary among participating households that would lose eligibility under the reform, but they are often high. Under the MATH SIPP+ model simulation, approximately 67.5 percent of those losing eligibility have countable assets in excess of $3,250, the federal asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members. An additional 11.2 percent have countable assets greater than $2,000, the asset limit for households without elderly or disabled members. The majority of the remaining households have no countable assets (12.8 percent of households losing eligibility).

Of households with known food security status among those participants estimated to lose eligibility under the policy change simulation, a vast majority (87.4 percent) are food secure, representing a higher proportion than those continuing to participate with lower benefits under the LIHEAP policy change simulation (70.8 percent) (Table III.13). Under the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation, 8.3 percent of those losing eligibility are estimated to be food insecure, and 4.2 percent would be very food insecure.

The estimated impact of the simulation was much lower in the QC Minimodel. As such, characteristics of those who lose eligibility differ from those in the MATH SIPP+ model. For example, an estimated 53.7 percent of participating households losing eligibility in the QC Minimodel include children as opposed to only 30.3 percent of affected households in the MATH SIPP+ model. Meanwhile, only 17.6 percent of affected households include elderly individuals versus 28.8 in the MATH SIPP+ model. As was the case for affected households under the

LIHEAP policy change simulation, more affected households under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy simulation in the QC Minimodel have earnings, and fewer have SSI or TANF. Most affected households in the QC Minimodel have gross income over 130 percent of poverty. A smaller proportion (about 10.6 percent) has gross income between 100 and 130 percent of the poverty guideline. Most of these households would likely lose eligibility for failure to meet the federal net income test. A very small proportion of households (0.2 percent) has gross income between 50 and 100 percent of poverty. These are rare instances in the SNAP QC data where the households are eligible through BBCE and have reported asset data. Because countable assets reported on the file exceed the federal asset limits, these households would become ineligible for failure to pass the asset test.

c.   Combined Policy Change Simulation

Under the combined LIHEAP and non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation, some previously participating households would lose benefits but continue to participate while others would lose eligibility.

In the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 468,000 participating individuals (1.1 percent of individuals in the baseline) in 279,000 households (1.4 percent) would lose benefits but continue to participate under the combined simulation (Tables III.16 and III.17). These totals are slightly lower than the total number of those remaining eligible but losing benefits under the LIHEAP simulation by itself (489,000 individuals and 294,000 households; Tables III.11 and III.12). The reason is that, under the combined simulation, some households that would lose benefits under the LIHEAP simulation instead lose eligibility entirely through the elimination of non-cash categorical eligibility. An estimated 5.1 million participating individuals (11.8 percent of individuals in the baseline) in 2.7 million participating households (13.3 percent) would lose eligibility (Tables III.16 and III.17), the same number losing eligibility as under the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation by itself.

Given that the estimated effect of the combined simulation is similar to that of the LIHEAP simulation for households continuing to participate with lower benefits and the same as that of the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation for households losing eligibility, the demographic and economic subgroup characteristics of these households are similar to those under each separate simulation. For example, under the combined simulation, an estimated 32.7 percent of households losing benefits but still participating include children (Table III.16) versus 31.6 percent under the LIHEAP simulation (Table III.11). Estimated average benefit losses for these households would be approximately $60 under both the LIHEAP and combined simulations. Similarly, under both the combined simulation and non-cash categorical eligibility simulation by itself, 30.3 percent of households losing eligibility include children.

Under the combined simulation, the proportions of households with elderly individuals among those losing benefits but remaining eligible and becoming newly ineligible are 27.7 and 28.8 percent, respectively. While 34.1 percent of households continuing to participate with lower benefits include disabled nonelderly individuals, only 11.9 percent of households losing eligibility include such individuals.

Of the individuals who would continue to participate with lower benefits under the MATH SIPP+ model simulation, an estimated 32.6 percent are children, 17.5 percent are elderly individuals (Table III.17), 5.4 percent were or are currently in the military, and all have net income at or below the poverty guideline. Of the individuals losing eligibility, an estimated 28.4 percent are children, 17.2 percent are elderly individuals, 5.1 percent were or are currently in the military, and most (83.2 percent) have net income at or below the poverty guideline. The households with net income over the poverty guideline lose eligibility because they do not pass the federal net income test and, possibly, the asset test.

As would be the case under the LIHEAP simulation, most households that would lose benefits but continue to participate under the combined simulation (77.3 percent) have gross income

between 51 and 100 percent of the poverty guideline. On average, these households lose an estimated $68 in SNAP benefits. The 12.7 percent of such participants with gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline face smaller benefit losses than households with gross income above the poverty guideline. The more common income sources for households losing benefits under the simulation are SSI and Social Security (45.3 and 37.3 percent, respectively). In addition, an estimated 21.2 percent have earnings, and 6.5 percent have TANF income. The headcount index, poverty gap index, and squared poverty gap index for the group of households continuing to participate with lower benefits under the combined simulation are approximately 89.9, 20.5, and 4.2, respectively.

As in the LIHEAP simulation by itself, most households that lose benefits but continue to participate under the combined simulation have zero countable assets. However, even though a small portion of these households under the LIHEAP simulation has asset amounts greater than $2,000, no households has asset amounts above $2,000 when the simulation is conducted in tandem with the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation. The reason is that such households lose eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility portion of the simulation.

The characteristics of households losing eligibility under the combined simulation in the MATH SIPP+ model are identical to those losing eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation. Approximately 30.3 percent of these households include children, 28.8 include elderly individuals, and 11.9 include disabled nonelderly individuals. Over 60 percent have gross incomes at or below 100 percent of the poverty guideline, about 35.6 percent have earnings, and very few have income from SSI or TANF. About 11.2 percent have assets between $2,000 and $3,250, and an additional 67.5 percent have asset amounts that exceed $3,250. Households losing eligibility are about 17 percentage points less likely to be food insecure or very food insecure than households that remain eligible and continue to participate, though with lower benefits (Table III.13).

Under the combined simulation in the MATH SIPP+ model, an estimated 1.2 million children age 5 to 17 who reside in households with income at or below 185 percent of the poverty guideline would lose eligibility for SNAP and thus the ability to be directly certified for free or reduced-price lunch under the NSLP (Table (III.18). This estimate is much smaller in the QC Minimodel (465,000) because the model underestimates the effect of the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation. The remaining 11.1 million school-age children in the MATH SIPP+ model and 12.7 million school-age children in the QC Minimodel would remain eligible and continue to participate in SNAP, thus retaining the ability to be directly certified for the NSLP. When restricting to school-age children residing in households with income at or below 130 percent of the poverty guideline and thus eligible for direct certification for *free* lunch, the MATH SIPP+ model simulation estimates that 1.0 million school-age children would lose SNAP eligibility, while the QC Minimodel estimates that 72,000 school-age children would lose SNAP eligibility.

As was the case under the two previous simulations, the QC Minimodel results differed from the MATH SIPP+ model results in other ways under the combined simulation. In general, as compared to the MATH SIPP+ model, a greater number of affected households in the QC Minimodel include children and fewer include elderly individuals (Table III.16). These households generally have higher gross income and more frequently have earnings or TANF but less frequently have income from Social Security or SSI. As such, the headcount index for this group of households in the QC Minimodel is smaller than in the MATH SIPP+ model, and fewer affected individuals in the QC Minimodel have net income under the poverty guideline (Table III.17). However, the poverty gap and squared poverty gap indexes vary in relation to those estimated with the MATH SIPP+ model by whether the household loses benefits but continues to participate or loses eligibility, as do the proportions with disabled nonelderly individuals for these two groups.

C. Analyses of SNAP Baseline and Policy Change Simulation Supplemental Estimates

We used the revised 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ model to provide supplemental estimates based on the policy change simulations described in Section B. In Section C.1, we describe the additional baseline estimates; in C.2, we assess the extent of the share of income plus SNAP benefits that households might lose as a result of each policy change; in C.3, we describe estimated average benefit losses from the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change for households with net income below poverty; and in C.4, we examine reasons for eligibility loss from the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change.

The full set of results for these supplemental estimates can be found in Appendices E through H. Approximate 90-percent confidence intervals for each set of estimates discussed in Sections C.2, C.3, and C.4 may also be found in the appendices. Note that we only report results derived from sufficient sample sizes to provide reliable estimates.

1. Additional Baseline Estimates

We tabulated average gross income and benefits for many of the same groups of SNAP participants presented in the tables discussed in Section A. Additional groups include households containing a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5; nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5; households by net income as a percentage of the poverty guideline; and households by deductible expenses as a percentage of gross income.

a. Average Gross Income

We estimate that average monthly gross income among all participating SNAP households in 2012 was $743 (Table III.19). Households with children, elderly individuals, or disabled nonelderly individuals all had higher-than-average gross incomes ($896, $863, and $1,016, respectively). However, among households with children, those with single adults tended to have substantially lower income amounts than those with multiple adults. Among SNAP household composition

groups, child-only households and those with no children had the lowest average monthly gross income ($562 and $615, respectively).

Approximately 37.6 percent of participating SNAP households contained a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5. Less than half of these households, comprising 15.7 percent of all SNAP households, had income from earnings; the average monthly gross income of these households was $1,052. Households with nondisabled adults age 18-49, no children under age 5, and no earnings (22.0 percent of all SNAP households) had a much smaller average gross income ($365).

Households with earnings, cash TANF, SSI, or Social Security income all tended to have higher gross income than other SNAP households. Among these households, those with earnings had the highest average gross income ($1,120), followed by those with Social Security ($1,040), TANF ($957), and SSI ($953). These groups of households are not mutually exclusive.

Among households with positive gross income, those with deductible expenses tended to have higher gross incomes than those without expenses. For example, households with shelter expenses equal to 1 to 30 percent of gross income (23.2 percent of all SNAP households) had an average gross income of $977 and households with shelter expenses between 31 to 50 percent of gross income (13.1 percent of all SNAP households) had an average gross income of $1,085. In contrast, those without shelter expenses but positive gross income (15.3 percent of all households) had an average gross income of $338. Households without deductible medical expenses (83.1 percent of all SNAP households) had an average gross income of $702.

Individuals living in participating SNAP households had an average household gross income of $915 (Table III.20). Children lived in households with an average gross income of $1,015, nonelderly adults lived in households with an average gross income of $830, and elderly adults lived in households with an average gross income of $897. Disabled nonelderly individuals had an average household gross income of $1,093, higher than for the other subgroups described above. Household

gross income varied slightly by race and ethnicity. American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo individuals, Hispanic individuals, and African-American, non-Hispanic individuals had above average gross incomes, while Asian individuals or Pacific Islanders and white, non-Hispanic individuals had slightly below average gross incomes. We estimated that food secure individuals had an average household gross income of $918 while food insecure individuals had an average of $874 and very food insecure individuals had an average of $1,001. Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5 and in households with earnings had a higher-than-average household gross income ($1,064).

b.   Average SNAP Benefits

As discussed in Section A, we estimated that the average household SNAP benefit for participants in FY 2012 was $280, and that it was higher for households with children than for households with elderly individuals and those with disabled individuals. SNAP households containing a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 in households with both earnings and no children under age 5 had an average benefit of $296 (Table III.19). It was slightly higher ($311) for households with nondisabled adults age 18 to 49, no children under age 5, and no earnings. Households with earnings and those with cash TANF had higher-than-average SNAP benefits ($326 and $361, respectively), while those with SSI or Social Security had lower-than-average SNAP benefits ($175 and $169, respectively), likely because their household sizes were smaller.

Among households with shelter expenses, the average benefit tended to increase with the size of the expense relative to gross income. For example, households with shelter expenses equal to 1 to 30 percent of gross income had an estimated average benefit of $192, while those with shelter expenses of 51 percent or more of gross income had an average benefit of $328. Similarly, households with medical expenses equal to 11 percent or more of gross income had a higher average benefit ($192) than those with medical expenses equal to 1 to 10 percent of gross income ($154).

The estimated average household SNAP benefit for individuals in participating SNAP households was $391 (Table III.20). Children had higher average household SNAP benefits ($492) than nonelderly adults ($343), elderly adults ($175), and disabled nonelderly adults ($198). Among race and ethnicity groupings, Hispanic individuals have the highest average household benefit ($450). Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5 had lower-than-average household benefits ($332).

2. Percentage Loss in Income Plus SNAP Benefit Due to Policy Changes

One way to measure the extent to which households are affected by a SNAP policy change is to calculate the estimated SNAP benefit loss as a percentage of gross income plus SNAP benefit. Households and individuals with higher percentage losses in income plus SNAP benefits may encounter greater difficulties than other households if the policy change were enacted.

a. Percentage Loss in Income Plus SNAP Benefit Under LIHEAP Policy Change

We estimate that about 304,000 SNAP households would become eligible for lower benefits under the LIHEAP policy change. All of these households would remain eligible for SNAP. While we estimate that 10,000 of these households would choose to no longer participate, our analysis includes only benefits lost through the policy change, not benefits forgone by households choosing not to participate. We found that the average monthly household SNAP benefit loss as a percentage of gross income plus baseline SNAP benefit would be 6.7 percent (Table III.21). We found that the average percentage loss of income plus SNAP benefit was highest for households with elderly individuals (7.8 percent), SSI (7.8 percent), disabled nonelderly individuals (7.4 percent), or Social Security (7.4 percent). Subgroups with lower-than-average percentage loss included those with children (4.8 percent), with earnings (4.8 percent), or containing a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49, no children under age 5, and earnings (4.8 percent). Households with no countable assets were estimated to lose 6.9 percent of their gross income plus SNAP benefit.

The model predicted that 499,000 individuals live in households that would be eligible for lower benefits under the LIHEAP policy change (Table III.22), approximately 10,000 of which would elect not to participate. Individuals estimated to have the highest percentage loss in income plus SNAP benefit include elderly adults (7.5 percent), disabled nonelderly adults (7.4 percent), and food insecure individuals (6.3 percent). Those with the lowest estimated percentage loss include children (4.3 percent), Hispanic individuals (4.5 percent), and very food insecure individuals (4.8 percent).

b.   Percentage Loss in Income Plus SNAP Benefit Under Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Change

Under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change, we estimated that 2.7 million households would lose eligibility and thus 38.1 percent of their baseline gross income plus SNAP benefit on average (Table III.23). Among the 810,000 households with children losing eligibility, the average estimated percentage loss was 37.3 percent. Among the 771,000 elderly households losing eligibility, average percentage loss was lower but still sizeable (26.0 percent). The relatively small number of households with disabled nonelderly individuals (318,000 households) would lose an average of 11.7 percent of income plus SNAP benefit. Percentage loss was higher for households headed by an individual with a Bachelor's degree or higher (53.4 percent) and lower for those headed by an individual without a high school degree (32.6 percent) or only a high school degree or GED (26.6 percent).

The 419,000 households containing a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 with no children under age 5 and no earnings would lose nearly three quarters of their income plus SNAP benefit (74.9 percent), indicating that their baseline income levels were quite low compared to their baseline SNAP benefits. In contrast, households containing these adults, with no children under age 5, and with earnings would lose a much lower percentage (17.8 percent) of their income plus SNAP benefit.

As is intuitive, we found that households with lower levels of baseline gross and net income would lose a higher percentage of their gross income plus SNAP benefit than other households when they become ineligible for SNAP. For example, those with gross income at or below 50 percent of the poverty guideline would lose an average of 80.8 percent of their gross income plus SNAP benefit, while those with gross income between 131 and 200 percent of poverty would lose only 4.0 percent. Likewise, households with net income at or below 50 percent of poverty would lose 53.2 percent of their income plus SNAP benefit, while those with net income over 100 percent of poverty would lose only 1.4 percent.

Households with no shelter expenses and no deductible medical expenses tended to lose more of their income plus SNAP benefit under the policy change (47.9 percent and 42.7 percent, respectively) than those with such expenses. While households with shelter expenses amounting to 1 to 50 percent of their gross income would lose, on average, less than 15 percent of their gross income plus SNAP benefit, those with very high shelter expenses (51 percent or more of their gross income) would lose about 47.4 percent of their gross income plus SNAP benefit.

The approximately 5.1 million participating SNAP individuals losing eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation lose an average of 37.3 percent of their gross income plus SNAP benefit (Table III.24). Nonelderly adults (41.6 percent) lose a higher percentage than children (36.0 percent), elderly adults (25.9 percent), and disabled nonelderly adults (10.5 percent). Among race and ethnicity groupings, Asian individuals or Pacific Islanders and white, non-Hispanics tend to lose the highest proportion (43.0 percent and 41.4 percent, respectively) and African-American, non-Hispanic individuals lose the lowest (18.3 percent). Individuals in food secure households appear to lose a higher proportion of their gross income plus SNAP benefit than those in food insecure and very food insecure households.

c. Percentage Loss in Income Plus SNAP Benefit Under Combined Policy Change

Under the combined LIHEAP and non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation, some previously participating households would lose benefits but remain eligible while others would lose eligibility. As described in Section B, an estimated 5.1 million participating individuals in 2.7 million participating households would lose eligibility, the same number losing eligibility as under the non-cash categorical eligibility simulation by itself. For reasons discussed in Section B, the numbers of participating households (289,000) and individuals (478,000) still eligible with lower benefits, including those that might choose not to participate, are slightly lower than the total numbers of those remaining eligible but losing benefits under the LIHEAP simulation by itself. Because findings do not differ substantially from the sum of those under the two policy changes conducted separately, we do not describe the results here. However, they can be found in Appendix tables F.7 through F.9.

3. Average Benefit Losses Under Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Change for Households with Net Income Below Poverty

In this subsection, we describe average benefit loss by characteristic for SNAP participants who have baseline net income at or below the federal poverty level and lose eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation. Because no households would become ineligible under the MATH SIPP+ LIHEAP policy change simulation, the number losing eligibility under the combined policy change would be the same as that under the policy change by itself. Therefore, we provide results only for the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation.

Of the 2.7 million households losing eligibility under the simulation (Table III.23), about 2.2 million (or 82.5 percent) had net income at or below the federal poverty guideline (Table III.25), making them net income eligible under federal SNAP rules. These households included 4.2 million individuals (Table III.26). Among those with net income at or below the federal poverty guideline,

average household monthly benefit loss would be $271 for participating households and $355 for participating individuals.

Of those losing eligibility and with net income at or below the federal poverty guideline, households with children would lose an average of $396 in SNAP benefits when they become ineligible (Table III.25). On average, households with elderly individuals would lose $215 and those with disabled nonelderly individuals would lose $258. Among households with children, those that contained multiple adults faced higher average benefit losses ($475) than those with a single adult ($306).

Households containing nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 with earnings and no children under age 5 would lose an average of $265. However, losses would jump to an average $400 if there was a school-age child (age 5 to 17) in the household. Similarly, households containing nondisabled adults age 18 to 49, no children under age 5, and no earnings would face average losses of $305, but if these households included a school-age child, average benefit losses were $464.

Households with lower levels of gross and net income incurred larger benefit losses. For example, households with gross income between 0 and 50 percent of poverty would lose an average of $321 per month, those with gross income between 51 and 100 percent of poverty would lose $289, and those with gross income between 101 percent to 130 percent of poverty and 131 to 200 percent of poverty would lose an average of $173 and $139, respectively. A similar pattern occurs with net income, where households with net income of 0 to 50 percent of poverty would lose $292 on average, and those with net income between 51 and 100 percent of poverty would lose $163.

As is the case with percentage loss of income plus SNAP benefit, households with no shelter expenses and those with shelter expenses equaling 51 percent or more of gross income appeared to incur higher average benefit losses than those with shelter expenses between 1 to 50 percent of gross income. Households with no deductible medical expenses would face higher average benefit losses ($286) than those with such expenses.

At the individual level, we found that average household benefit loss would be highest for children ($451) than for other age groups (Table III.26); nonelderly adults would face household benefit losses of $339 on average and elderly adults would lose $227 in monthly household benefits. Disabled nonelderly individuals would encounter lower-than-average household benefit losses of $272. We estimate that food secure households would lose $370 in average household benefits, food insecure households would lose $297, and very food insecure households would lose $333.

4.   Reasons for Eligibility Loss Under Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Change

As discussed in Chapter I, households eligible through BBCE are not subject to federal SNAP income and asset requirements. Under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation, these households become ineligible for SNAP if they fail a federal income test, the asset test, or both. In this subsection, we describe characteristics of participants losing eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change by reason for eligibility loss.

Of the 2.7 million households losing eligibility under the non-cash categorical eligibility policy change simulation, we estimate that approximately 2.0 million would fail only the asset test, 561,000 would fail only an income test, and the remaining 90,000 would fail both (Table III.27). Among the 4.2 million participating individuals who would lose eligibility, a vast majority (3.9 million) would fail only the asset test, approximately 1.0 million would fail only an income test, and 172,000 would fail both an asset and income test (Table III.28).

Most households that would become ineligible under the simulation do not include children (Table III.27). Only 32.0 percent of households failing only the asset test, 25.3 percent of those failing only an income test, and 22.6 percent of those failing both types of tests include children. The proportion of households containing elderly individuals does not vary widely by type of test failed. On the other hand, households with disabled nonelderly individuals more frequently failed an income test than the asset test; 38.1 percent of households failing only an income test contain a nonelderly disabled individual, compared to only 3.8 percent of households failing only an asset test.

Approximately 29.2 percent of households failing both an income and asset test contain a nonelderly disabled individual.

Households that failed only the asset test are more likely to be headed by white, non-Hispanic individuals and by individuals with a Bachelor's degree or higher than those that failed only an income test. About 80.5 percent of households that failed only the asset test have a white, non-Hispanic household head, versus 54.5 percent of households that failed only an income test. Additionally, while 33.0 percent of households that failed only the asset test are headed by individuals with a Bachelor's degree or higher, only 7.2 percent of households that failed only an income test and 5.4 percent of households that failed both an income and the asset test are headed by such individuals.

As would be expected, households that failed only the asset test had lower gross and net incomes than those that failed an income test (Table III.27). While 82.0 percent of households that failed only the asset test have gross income at or below the poverty level, no households that failed an income test, by definition, have gross income under 100 percent of poverty. These households often have gross income over 130 percent of poverty, both among households that only failed an income test (75.7 percent) and among those that failed both an income and asset test (88.6 percent).

Notably, 5.4 percent of households that remained income-eligible but failed the asset test had gross income over 130 percent of poverty. These households have elderly or disabled members and so did not face federal gross income requirements, but had deductions high enough to bring their net income at or below 100 percent of poverty.

Also, as one would expect, households that failed only an income test more commonly have various types of countable income than households that failed only an asset test, including earnings (46.0 percent versus 32.8 percent), Social Security (51.4 percent versus 21.1 percent), and SSI (15.6 percent versus 0.4 percent).

Most households that failed only the asset test have high shelter expenses relative to gross income (for example, 61.3 percent have expenses greater than 50 percent of gross income), while most households that failed only the income test had lower shelter expenses (7.5 percent have no shelter expenses and 56.5 have shelter expenses equal to 1 to 30 percent of gross income). Similarly, 13.4 percent of households that failed both an income and asset test have no shelter expenses and 57.5 percent have expenses equal to 1 to 30 percent of gross income. Likewise, households that failed only the asset test were more likely to have medical expenses of 11 percent or more of gross income than households that failed only an income test (18.3 percent and 2.3 percent, respectively).

At the individual level, the proportion of SNAP participants who are children does not vary much by reason for eligibility loss. We estimate that about 28.8 percent of individuals who failed only the asset test, 27.2 percent who failed only an income test, and 27.9 percent of those who failed both tests are children (Table III.28). We found that a higher percentage of individuals who failed both an income and asset test than of those failing only an income or asset test are elderly (26.3 percent, versus 15.9 percent and 17.2 percent, respectively).

Individuals losing eligibility because they failed only the asset test are less often nonelderly disabled than those who failed an income test. However, a higher proportion of individuals who failed only the asset test (24.2 percent) are nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5 compared with the proportion of individuals who failed both an income and asset test (15.0 percent).

Table III.1. Individuals and Households Eligible for SNAP

	Eligible
Number of Eligible Individuals (000s)	67,825
Children (under age 18) (percent)	37.4
Elderly adults (age 60+) (percent)	18.1
Disabled nonelderly adults (percent)	7.1
In households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty (percent)	86.3
Number of Eligible Households (000s)	33,047
SNAP household composition (percent)	
With children	38.1
Single adult	17.2
Female adult	15.4
With elderly individuals	31.5
With disabled nonelderly individuals	13.2
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty Guideline (percent)	
At or below 100 percent	58.4
0 to 50 percent	26.0
51 to 100 percent	32.4
Over 100 percent	41.6
101 to 130 percent	19.7
131 percent of higher	21.9
Countable Income Source (percent)	
Earnings	38.4
TANF (cash)	4.8
SSI	14.1
Social Security	33.7
Gross Countable Income (percent)	
No income	10.7
$1 to $1,000	39.3
$1,001 or more	50.1
Benefit Amount (percent)	
Minimum benefit or less	23.6
Greater than the minimum to $100	16.9
$101 to $200	27.3
$201 or more	32.2
SNAP Households with Assets (percent)	82.1
Countable under SNAP rules	45.3
Financial assets	55.7
Countable under SNAP rules	44.9
Vehicle assets	60.3
Countable under SNAP rules	0.9
Amount of Countable Assets (percent)	
None	54.7
$1 to $1,000	24.1
$1,001 or more	21.2
Countable assets greater than the federal asset limit	15.2

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table III.2. Average Benefits and Poverty Indexes for Eligible SNAP Households

	Average Value for Eligible SNAP Households
Potential Benefit ($)	201
Households with children	354
Households with elderly individuals	86
Households with disabled nonelderly individuals	158
Poverty Indexes	
Headcount	58.4
Poverty gap	47.2
Poverty gap squared	22.2

Source:　　Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table III.3. Food Security of Eligible SNAP Households and Individuals

	Total[a] (000s)	Food Secure	Food Insecure	Very Food Insecure
Total SNAP Households	28,737	79.6	12.6	7.8
Total Individuals	58,897	78.2	13.5	8.3
Children (under age 18)	21,958	75.3	15.4	9.2
Elderly adults (age 60+)	11,036	88.8	7.7	3.5
Disabled nonelderly individuals	7,503	69.0	17.9	13.1
Individuals ever in the military	2,659	84.3	9.5	6.2

Source:　　Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. Therefore, this table includes only households that were still present in Wave 6.

Table III.4. Participating Individuals and Households

	Participants	
	MATH SIPP+ Model	QC Minimodel
Number of Eligible Individuals (000s)	43,246	44,146
Children (under age 18) (percent)	42.4	45.1
Elderly adults (age 60+) (percent)	9.2	8.5
Disabled nonelderly adults (percent)	8.8	n.a.
In households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty (percent)	97.6	--
Number of Eligible Households (000s)	20,145	20,802
SNAP household composition (percent)		
With children	45.5	47.1
Single adult	23.2	26.3
Female adult	20.9	24.5
With elderly individuals	17.9	16.5
With disabled nonelderly individuals	17.2	20.2
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty Guideline (percent)		
At or below 100 percent	83.5	83.4
0 to 50 percent	42.1	42.6
51 to 100 percent	41.4	40.7
Over 100 percent	16.5	16.6
101 to 130 percent	11.8	11.9
131 percent of higher	4.8	4.7
Countable Income Source (percent)		
Earnings	32.8	30.5
TANF (cash)	6.4	7.6
SSI	18.5	20.2
Social Security	21.6	22.4
Gross Countable Income (percent)		
No income	17.4	20.0
$1 to $1,000	53.4	52.2
$1,001 or more	29.3	27.8
Benefit Amount (percent)		
Minimum benefit or less	4.9	4.3
Greater than the minimum to $100	12.7	10.2
$101 to $200	37.0	41.6
$201 or more	45.3	43.8
SNAP Households with Assets (percent)	76.9	n.a.
Countable under SNAP rules	36.9	n.a.
Financial assets	48.0	n.a.
Countable under SNAP rules	36.6	n.a.
Vehicle assets	55.1	n.a.
Countable under SNAP rules	0.9	n.a.
Amount of Countable Assets (percent)		
None	63.1	n.a.
$1 to $1,000	21.3	n.a.
$1,001 or more	15.6	n.a.
Countable assets greater than the federal asset limit	11.2	n.a.

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

n.a. = Not applicable.

-- = Not available.

Table III.5. Participating SNAP Households in Poverty and Average Household Gross Income, by State

State	Households with Gross Income under Poverty Guideline (percent)			Average Household Gross Income ($)
	All	0–50 Percent of Poverty	51–100 Percent of Poverty	
Alabama	87.8	44.0	43.8	683
Alaska	84.9	47.7	37.2	928
Arizona	80.4	46.2	34.2	763
Arkansas	88.5	42.4	46.1	722
California	93.8	67.6	26.2	578
Colorado	86.0	46.4	39.6	708
Connecticut	76.8	37.3	39.5	789
Delaware	76.6	41.4	35.2	828
District of Columbia	90.4	61.0	29.3	505
Florida	85.1	43.9	41.2	645
Georgia	86.9	46.4	40.4	679
Guam	84.8	59.5	25.3	727
Hawaii	90.0	43.5	46.5	783
Idaho	83.8	41.8	42.0	784
Illinois	88.4	46.3	42.1	644
Indiana	86.5	42.7	43.8	719
Iowa	81.4	39.5	41.8	809
Kansas	85.4	41.6	43.8	734
Kentucky	90.0	43.1	47.0	670
Louisiana	88.0	42.0	46.1	717
Maine	71.9	29.0	42.9	906
Maryland	80.9	42.1	38.9	783
Massachusetts	76.7	29.3	47.3	875
Michigan	76.5	35.4	41.1	831
Minnesota	82.1	40.5	41.6	766
Mississippi	90.6	41.6	49.0	700
Missouri	85.3	41.1	44.2	716
Montana	80.0	39.2	40.8	776
Nebraska	84.0	34.9	49.1	813
Nevada	80.6	44.0	36.6	760
New Hampshire	72.0	25.5	46.6	977
New Jersey	79.9	35.8	44.1	843
New Mexico	86.2	43.9	42.3	767
New York	79.1	29.1	50.0	854
North Carolina	81.1	44.5	36.6	755
North Dakota	73.0	32.3	40.7	915
Ohio	83.9	41.8	42.1	713
Oklahoma	88.4	42.8	45.6	706
Oregon	75.3	39.9	35.4	790
Pennsylvania	78.6	32.3	46.4	872
Rhode Island	75.8	30.8	45.0	844
South Carolina	87.5	50.0	37.5	635
South Dakota	81.7	36.4	45.3	835
Tennessee	87.8	49.1	38.7	615
Texas	80.5	44.1	36.3	815
Utah	85.0	40.4	44.6	831
Vermont	59.1	22.6	36.4	1,080
Virgin Islands	85.0	56.6	28.4	686
Virginia	86.9	44.3	42.6	679
Washington	78.4	39.8	38.6	809
West Virginia	86.8	30.8	56.0	792
Wisconsin	68.7	30.4	38.4	969
Wyoming	86.4	38.2	48.2	785

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table III.6. Average Benefits and Poverty Indexes for Participating SNAP Households

	Average Value for Participating SNAP Households	
	MATH SIPP + Model	QC Minimodel
Benefit ($)	280	280
Households with children	419	412
Households with elderly individuals	166	143
Households with disabled nonelderly individuals	186	218
Poverty Indexes		
Headcount	83.5	83.4
Poverty gap	52.3	45.6
Poverty gap squared	27.3	20.8

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table III.7. Food Security of Participating SNAP Households and Individuals

	Total[a] (000s)	Food Secure	Food Insecure	Very Food Insecure
Total SNAP Households	17,216	76.0	14.8	9.2
Total Individuals	36,980	75.2	15.3	9.5
Children (under age 18)	15,674	73.5	16.4	10.1
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,527	84.8	10.6	4.7
Disabled nonelderly individuals	5,969	70.7	17.5	11.8
Individuals ever in the military	1,075	78.0	11.9	10.1

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. Therefore, this table includes only households that were still present in Wave 6.

Table III.8. School-Age Children in SNAP Households Able to Directly Certify for National School Lunch Program

	MATH SIPP + Model		QC Minimodel	
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Number (000s)	Column Percent
Participating School-Age Children (age 5-17)	12,128	100.0	13,146	100.0
In households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	12,117	99.9	13,135	99.9
Nonparticipating School-Age Children in Households with Participating Children	660	100.0	333	100.0
In households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	550	83.3	333	99.9

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table III.9. Estimated Changes in SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under the Three Policy Simulations, MATH SIPP+ Model

	Baseline Number Participating (000s)	Percentage of Baseline Participants Still Eligible After the Simulation and			Percentage of Baseline Participants No Longer Eligible After Simulation
		Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	
LIHEAP Simulation					
Total households	20,145	98.5	1.5	0.1	n.a
Total individuals	43,246	98.8	1.1	0.0	n.a.
Total benefits in baseline ($)	5,637,439	98.9	1.1	0.0	n.a.
Benefits retained ($)	5,616,200	98.9	0.7	n.a.	n.a.
Benefits lost ($)	21,239	n.a.	0.4	0.0	n.a.
Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Simulation					
Total households	20,145	86.7	n.a.	n.a.	13.3
Total individuals	43,246	88.2	n.a.	n.a.	11.8
Total benefits after simulation ($)	5,637,439	89.2	n.a.	n.a.	10.8
Benefits retained ($)	5,026,898	89.2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Benefits lost ($)	610,541	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	10.8
Combined Simulation					
Total households	20,145	85.2	1.4	0.2	13.3
Total individuals	43,246	87.1	1.1	0.1	11.8
Total benefits after simulation ($)	5,637,439	88.1	1.0	0.0	10.8
Benefits retained ($)	5,005,342	88.1	0.7	n.a.	n.a.
Benefits lost ($)	632,097	n.a.	0.3	0.0	10.8

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.10. Estimated Changes in SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under the Three Policy Simulations, QC Minimodel

| | Baseline Number Participating (000s) | Percentage of Baseline Participants No Longer Eligible After Simulation | | Percentage of Baseline Participants No Longer Eligible After Simulation |
		Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
LIHEAP Simulation				
Total households	20,802	92.0	7.9	0.1
Total individuals	44,146	91.7	8.2	0.1
Total benefits in baseline ($)	5,818,058	92.2	7.8	0.0
Benefits retained ($)	5,678,147	92.2	5.4	n.a.
Benefits lost ($)	139,911	n.a.	2.4	0.0
Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Simulation				
Total households	20,802	96.7	n.a.	3.3
Total individuals	44,146	96.4	n.a.	3.6
Total benefits after simulation ($)	5,818,058	99.1	n.a.	0.9
Benefits retained ($)	5,766,155	99.1	n.a.	n.a.
Benefits lost ($)	51,903	n.a.	n.a.	0.9
Combined Simulation				
Total households	20,802	89.0	7.3	3.7
Total individuals	44,146	88.7	7.5	3.9
Total benefits after simulation ($)	5,818,058	91.5	7.5	1.0
Benefits retained ($)	5,630,511	91.5	5.3	n.a.
Benefits lost ($)	187,547	n.a.	2.3	1.0

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.11. Households Losing SNAP Benefits but Continuing to Participate Under LIHEAP Policy Simulation by Demographic and Economic Characteristic

	MATH SIPP+ Model		QC Minimodel
	Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit		Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit
	Number or Percent	Average Benefit Loss ($)	
Number of Households (000s)	294	67	1,651
SNAP Household Composition (percent)			
With children	31.6	60	49.4
Single adult	23.4	68	28.8
Female adult	21.3	67	27.0
With elderly individuals	28.9	76	18.7
With disabled nonelderly individuals	32.4	69	28.6
Countable Income Source (percent)			
Earnings	22.4	61	38.4
TANF (cash)	6.2	63	11.1
SSI	43.1	70	25.6
Social Security	37.9	76	30.2
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty Guideline (percent)			
0 to 50 percent	13.7	39	19.5
51 to 100 percent	75.6	68	54.9
101 to 130 percent	9.6	100	18.1
131 to 185 percent	0.0	0	7.3
186 percent or higher	1.1	59	0.2
Poverty Indexes			
Headcount (value)	89.3	n.a.	74.4
Poverty gap (value)	21.6	n.a.	33.8
Squared poverty gap (value)	4.7	n.a.	11.4
Amount of Countable Assets (percent)			
None	78.4	67	n.a.
$1 to $1,000	14.6	70	n.a.
$1,001 to $2,000	2.2	29	n.a.
$2,001 to $3,250[a]	0.9	34	n.a.
$3,251 or more	3.9	86	n.a.

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

[a]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.12. Individuals Losing SNAP Benefits but Continuing to Participate Under LIHEAP Policy Simulation by Demographic and Economic Characteristic

	Individuals in Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
	MATH SIPP+ Model	QC Minimodel
Number of Individuals (000s)	489	3,624
Age (percent)		
Children (under age 18)	31.5	44.3
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	9.0	14.2
School age children (age 5 to 17)	22.4	30.1
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	50.3	46.3
Elderly adults (age 60+)	18.3	9.4
Individuals Ever in the Military (percent)	5.1	n.a.
Individuals in Households with Net Income at or Below 100 Percent of Poverty Guideline (percent)	100.0	n.a.

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.13. Households Losing SNAP Benefits but Continuing to Participate and Households Previously Participating but No Longer Eligible Under the Three Policy Change Simulations by Food Security Status

	MATH SIPP+ Model		
	Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit		Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible
	Number or Percent	Average Benefit Loss ($)	
Number of Households with Known Food Security Status Under LIHEAP Simulation (000s)[a]	253	n.a.	n.a.
Food secure (percent)	70.8	70	n.a.
Food insecure (percent)	19.3	68	n.a.
Very food insecure (percent)	9.9	52	n.a.
Number of Households with Known Food Security Status Under Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Simulation (000s)[a]	n.a.	n.a.	2,249
Food secure (percent)	n.a.	n.a.	87.4
Food insecure (percent)	n.a.	n.a.	8.3
Very food insecure (percent)	n.a.	n.a.	4.2
Number of Households with Known Food Security Status Under Combined Simulation (000s)[a]	241	n.a.	2,249
Food secure (percent)	70.7	68	87.4
Food insecure (percent)	19.0	71	8.3
Very food insecure (percent)	10.4	52	4.2

Source:　　　Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. Therefore, this table includes only households that were still present in Wave 6.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.14. Households Previously Participating but No Longer Eligible Under Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Simulation by Demographic and Economic Characteristic

	Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible	
	MATH SIPP+ Model	QC Minimodel
Number of Households (000s)	2,676	686
SNAP Household Composition (percent)		
With children	30.3	53.7
Single adult	10.2	29.6
Female adult	7.8	26.8
With elderly individuals	28.8	17.6
With disabled nonelderly individuals	11.9	13.5
Countable Income Source (percent)		
Earnings	35.6	68.3
TANF (cash)	0.5	0.1
SSI	4.0	1.5
Social Security	28.7	29.8
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty Guideline (percent)		
0 to 50 percent	37.9	0.0
51 to 100 percent	24.2	0.2
101 to 130 percent	15.0	10.6
131 to 185 percent	20.5	80.1
186 percent or higher	2.4	9.0
Poverty Indexes		
Headcount (value)	62.1	0.3
Poverty gap (value)	62.4	40.6
Squared poverty gap (value)	38.9	16.5
Amount of Countable Assets (percent)		
None	12.8	n.a.
$1 to $1,000	7.4	n.a.
$1,001 to $2,000	1.1	n.a.
$2,001 to $3,250[a]	11.2	n.a.
$3,251 or more	67.5	n.a.

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

[a]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.15. Individuals Previously Participating and No Longer Eligible Under Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Simulation by Demographic and Economic Characteristic

	Individuals in Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible	
	MATH SIPP+ Model	QC Minimodel
Number of Individuals (000s)	5,086	1,591
Age (percent)		
Children (under age 18)	28.4	41.4
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	8.4	13.3
School age children (age 5 to 17)	20.1	28.0
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	54.4	48.8
Elderly adults (age 60+)	17.2	9.8
Individuals Ever in the Military (percent)	5.1	n.a.
Individuals in Households with Net Income at or Below 100 Percent of Poverty Guideline	83.2	n.a.

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.16. Households Losing SNAP Benefits but Continuing to Participate and Households Previously Participating but No Longer Eligible Under Combined LIHEAP and Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Simulation, by Demographic and Economic Characteristic

	MATH SIPP+ Model			QC Minimodel		
	Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit		Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible	Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit		Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible
	Number or Percent	Average Benefit Loss ($)		Number or Percent	Average Benefit Loss ($)	
Number of Households (000s)	279	67	2,676	1,523	86	760
SNAP Household Composition (percent)						
With children	32.7	60	30.3	48.5	81	50.5
Single adult	24.1	68	10.2	28.6	80	27.9
Female adult	21.9	67	7.8	26.8	80	25.4
With elderly individuals	27.7	72	28.8	19.1	99	21.3
With disabled nonelderly individuals	34.1	69	11.9	29.9	104	15.8
Countable Income Source (percent)						
Earnings	21.2	64	35.6	35.3	81	63.0
TANF (cash)	6.5	63	0.5	12.1	76	0.2
SSI	45.3	70	4.0	27.5	106	1.8
Social Security	37.3	73	28.7	30.8	99	34.9
Gross Income as a Percent of Poverty Guideline (percent)						
0 to 50 percent	12.7	41	37.9	21.2	57	0.0
51 to 100 percent	77.3	68	24.2	59.5	97	0.2
101 to 130 percent	8.9	95	15.0	17.9	87	13.9
131 to 185 percent	0.0	0	20.5	1.4	90	77.4
186 percent or higher	1.2	59	2.4	0.0	0	8.4
Poverty Indexes						
Headcount (value)	89.9	n.a.	62.1	80.7	n.a.	0.2
Poverty gap (value)	20.5	n.a.	62.4	33.8	n.a.	40.6
Squared poverty gap (value)	4.2	n.a.	38.9	11.4	n.a.	16.5
Amount of Countable Assets (percent)						
None	82.4	67	12.8	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
$1 to $1,000	15.3	70	7.4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
$1,001 to $2,000	2.3	29	1.1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
$2,001 to $3,250[a]	0.0	0	11.2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
$3,251 or more	0.0	0	67.5	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source:　　　Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

n.a. = Not applicable.

Table III.17. Individuals Losing SNAP Benefits but Continuing to Participate and Individuals Previously Participating but No Longer Eligible Under Combined LIHEAP and Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Simulation, by Demographic and Economic Characteristic

	MATH SIPP+ Model		QC Minimodel	
	Individuals in Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Individuals in Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible	Individuals in Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Individuals in Households Previously Participating, No Longer Eligible
Number of Individuals (000s)	468	5,086	3,291	1,715
Age (percent)				
Children (under age 18)	32.6	28.4	44.3	40.3
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	9.5	8.4	14.2	12.8
School age children (age 5 to 17)	23.1	20.1	30.1	27.5
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	49.9	54.4	46.1	47.9
Elderly adults (age 60+)	17.5	17.2	9.6	11.9
Individuals Ever in the Military (percent)	5.4	5.1	n.a.	n.a.
Individuals in Households with Net Income at or Below 100 Percent of Poverty Guideline	100.0	83.2	99.3	37.1

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011.

n.a. = Not applicable

Table III.18. Participating School-Age Children in Still-Eligible and Newly Ineligible Households After Combined LIHEAP and Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility Policy Simulation

	MATH SIPP + Model		QC Minimodel	
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Number (000s)	Column Percent
School-Age Children (age 5-17) Participating in Baseline	12,128	100.0	13,146	100.0
In households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	12,117	99.9	13,135	99.9
In households with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	11,905	98.2	12,675	96.4
Still-Eligible and Participating School-Age Children	11,108	91.6	12,675	96.4
In households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	11,108	91.6	12,673	96.4
In households with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	11,049	91.1	12,604	95.9
School-Age Children in No Longer Eligible or No Longer Participating SNAP Households	1,342	100.0[a]	474	100.0[a]
In households with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	1,221	91.0	465	98.1
In households with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline (able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)	1,042	77.7	72	15.1

Sources: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model and 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: The number of children in the last panel includes those in households that were simulated as eligible nonparticipants in the baseline.

[a]Percentage of children in no longer eligible or no longer participating SNAP households.

Table III.19. Participating SNAP Households by Characteristic, Average Income, and Average Benefit

	Households	Average ($)	
	Number or Percent	Gross Income	SNAP Benefit
Number of Households (000s)	20,145	743	280
SNAP Household Composition			
With children	45.5	896	419
Single adult	23.2	747	400
Multiple adults	17.0	1,206	499
Child only	5.3	562	244
No children	54.5	615	164
With elderly individuals	17.9	863	166
With disabled nonelderly individuals	17.2	1,016	186
SNAP Household Contains a Nondisabled Adult Age 18 to 49 and No Children Under age 5	37.6	651	305
With earnings	15.7	1,052	296
Without earnings	22.0	365	311
Countable Income Source			
Earnings	32.8	1,120	326
TANF (cash)	6.4	957	361
SSI	18.5	953	175
Social Security	21.6	1,040	169
Veterans' benefits	0.7	792	237
Shelter Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a]			
No expense	15.3	338	270
1 to 30 percent	23.2	977	192
31 to 50 percent	13.1	1,085	246
51 percent or more	39.5	816	328
Deductible Medical Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a, b]			
No expense	83.1	702	301
1 to 10 percent	9.2	1,026	154
11 percent or more	7.2	913	192

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table III.20. Participating Individuals by Characteristic, Average Income, and Average Benefit

	Individuals	Average ($)	
	Number or Percent	Gross Income	SNAP Benefit
Number of Individuals (000s)	43,246	915	391
Age			
Children (under age 18)	42.4	1,015	492
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	48.3	830	343
Elderly adults (age 60+)	9.2	897	175
Disabled Nonelderly Individuals	8.8	1,093	198
Race/Ethnicity			
White, non-Hispanic	47.0	879	363
African-American, non-Hispanic	22.6	932	390
Hispanic	23.7	962	450
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.4	863	394
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	4.3	988	378
Food Security Status			
Food secure	64.3	918	386
Food insecure	13.1	874	402
Very food insecure	8.1	1,001	391
Unknown[a]	14.5	889	402
Nondisabled Adults Age 18 to 49 Not Living with Children Under Age 5	21.4	715	332
With earnings	7.1	1,064	294

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table III.21. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Characteristic

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Number of Households	304	6.7
SNAP Household Composition		
With children	93	4.8
With No children	211	7.6
With elderly individuals	88	7.8
With disabled nonelderly individuals	98	7.4
SNAP Household Contains a Nondisabled Adult Age 18 to 49 and No Children Under Age 5	89	5.5
With earnings	44	4.8
Countable Income Source		
Earnings	67	4.8
SSI	129	7.8
Social Security	114	7.4
Households with No Countable Assets	237	6.9

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

Table III.22. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating Individuals Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Characteristic

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Number of Individuals (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Number of Individuals	499	5.7
Age		
Children (under age 18)	154	4.3
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	253	6.0
Elderly adults (age 60+)	92	7.5
Disabled Nonelderly Individuals	98	7.4
Race/Ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	222	5.8
African-American, non-Hispanic	152	5.9
Hispanic	86	4.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	*
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	21	*
Food Security Status		
Food secure	313	5.5
Food insecure	79	6.3
Very food insecure	47	4.8
Unknown[b]	60	7.3
Nondisabled Adults Age 18 to 49 Not Living with Children Under Age 5	106	5.0
With earnings	46	4.7

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table III.23. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Characteristic

	No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Number of Households	2,676	38.1
SNAP Household Composition		
With children	810	37.3
With elderly individuals	771	26.0
With disabled nonelderly individuals	318	11.7
Educational Attainment of SNAP Household Head		
Less than high school or GED	254	32.6
High school or GED	719	26.6
Associate degree or some college	918	37.4
Bachelor's degree or higher	714	53.4
Unknown or not in universe	71	29.9
SNAP Household Contains a Nondisabled Adult Age 18 to 49 and No Children Under Age 5	924	43.7
With earnings	504	17.8
Without earnings	419	74.9
Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty Guideline		
0 to 50 percent	1,013	80.8
51 to 100 percent	647	22.3
101 to 130 percent	401	7.9
131 to 200 percent	614	4.0
Baseline Net Income as a Percentage of Poverty Guideline		
0 to 50 percent	1,845	53.2
51 to 100 percent	362	8.4
101 percent or higher	469	1.4
Shelter Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a]		
No expense	245	47.9
1 to 30 percent	629	11.4
31 to 50 percent	307	14.6
51 percent or more	1,349	47.4
Deductible Medical Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a,b]		
No expense	1,979	42.7
1 to 10 percent	263	7.5
11 percent or more	395	29.2

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table III.24. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating Individuals Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Characteristic

	No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Individuals (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Number of Individuals	5,086	37.3
Age		
Children (under age 18)	1,445	36.0
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	2,765	41.6
Elderly adults (age 60+)	876	25.9
Disabled Nonelderly Individuals	405	10.5
Race/Ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	3,648	41.4
African-American, non-Hispanic	540	18.3
Hispanic	463	23.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	253	43.0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	183	38.3
Food Security Status		
Food secure	3,750	39.0
Food insecure	339	33.5
Very food insecure	190	27.1
Unknown[a]	807	33.5

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table III.25. Participating SNAP Households with Net Income at or Below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Characteristic

	Households Losing Eligibility	Average Benefit Lost ($)
	Number or Percent	
Number of Households with Net Income at or Below the Federal Poverty Level (000s)	2,207	271
SNAP Household Composition		
With children	33.2	396
Single adult	10.3	306
Multiple adults	19.1	475
Child only	3.9	242
With elderly individuals	26.8	215
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3.8	258
SNAP Household Contains a Nondisabled Adult Age 18 to 49 and No Children Under Age 5	37.6	284
With earnings	19.6	265
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	8.2	400
Without earnings	18.0	305
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	5.5	464
Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty Guideline		
0 to 50 percent	45.9	321
51 to 100 percent	29.3	289
101 percent to 130 percent	12.2	173
131 to 200 percent	12.6	139
Net Income as a Percentage of Poverty Guideline		
0 to 50 percent	83.6	292
51 to 100 percent	16.4	163
Shelter Expenses as a percentage of Gross Income[a]		
No expense	9.3	256
1 to 30 percent	14.3	214
31 to 50 percent	10.4	212
51 percent or more	59.5	293
Deductible Medical Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a,b]		
No expense	77.0	286
1 to 10 percent	4.5	203
11 percent or more	16.8	217

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table III.26. Participating Individuals with Net Income at or Below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Characteristic

	Individuals Losing Eligibility	Average Benefit Lost ($)
	Number or Percent	
Number of Individuals with Net Income at or Below the Federal Poverty Level (000s)	4,232	355
Age		
Children (under age 18)	29.5	451
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	54.8	339
Elderly adults (age 60+)	15.7	227
Disabled Nonelderly Individuals	2.1	272
Food Security Status		
Food secure	74.0	370
Food insecure	6.4	297
Very food insecure	3.4	333
Unknown[a]	16.3	312

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table III.27. Participating SNAP Households Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Characteristic

	Households Failing Only an Income Test	Households Failing Only the Asset Test	Households Failing Income and Asset Tests
	Number or Percent	Number or Percent	Number or Percent
Number of Households (000s)	561	2,024	90
SNAP Household Composition			
With children	25.3	32.0	22.6
No children	74.7	68.0	77.4
With elderly individuals	25.3	29.3	40.8
With disabled nonelderly individuals	38.1	3.8	29.2
Race/Ethnicity of SNAP Household Head			
White, non-Hispanic	54.5	80.5	67.7
African-American, non-Hispanic	23.6	5.4	16.5
Hispanic	15.0	6.2	3.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.1	5.4	8.5
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	3.8	2.5	4.3
Educational Attainment of SNAP Household Head			
Less than high school or GED	14.7	8.1	8.5
High school or GED	43.9	21.0	52.7
Associate degree or some college	34.2	34.4	33.4
Bachelor's degree or higher	7.2	33.0	5.4
Unknown or not in universe	0.0	3.5	0.0
Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty Guideline			
0 to 50 percent	0.0	50.0	0.0
51 to 100 percent	0.0	32.0	0.0
101 to 130 percent	24.3	12.6	11.4
131 to 200 percent	75.7	5.4	88.6
201 percent or higher	0.0	0.0	0.0
Net Income as a Percentage of Poverty Guideline			
0 to 50 percent	5.4	89.1	11.0
51 to 100 percent	24.1	10.9	8.0
101 percent or higher	70.5	0.0	81.0
Countable Income Source			
Earnings	46.0	32.8	34.1
SSI	15.6	0.4	11.5
Social Security	51.4	21.1	56.5
Shelter Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a]			
No expense	7.5	9.4	13.4
1 to 30 percent	56.5	12.9	57.5
31 to 50 percent	19.0	9.2	16.3
51 percent or more	17.0	61.3	12.8
Deductible Medical Expenses as a Percentage of Gross Income[a,b]			
No expense	72.7	75.1	56.1
1 to 10 percent	25.0	4.7	29.8
11 percent or more	2.3	18.3	14.1

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table III.28. Participating Individuals Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Characteristic

	Individuals Failing Only an Income Test	Individuals Failing Only the Asset Test	Individuals Failing Income and Asset Tests
	Number or Percent	Number or Percent	Number or Percent
Number of Individuals (000s)	1,037	3,877	172
Age			
Children (under age 18)	27.2	28.8	27.9
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	56.9	54.1	45.8
Elderly adults (age 60+)	15.9	17.2	26.3
Disabled Nonelderly Individuals	27.8	2.1	20.1
Nondisabled Adults Age 18 to 49 Not Living with Children Under Age 5	22.7	24.2	15.0
With earnings	16.7	7.8	13.9

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

IV. FINDINGS FROM STATE BLOCK GRANT ANALYSIS

In this chapter, we describe the estimated impacts of converting SNAP to a state block grant program using SNAP program operations administrative data for FY 2008 and FY 2012. Our approach is limited by the unavailability of details about how states would implement the block grant, including how block grant funds would be distributed among SNAP and other nutrition programs. We made the simplifying assumption that states would preserve existing nutrition programs at the same proportional level of funding. Under this assumption, we estimated the effects by state of SNAP funding reverting to FY 2008 levels.

We found that total annual SNAP benefits under the block grant would drop by about $40 billion, a 53.6 percent decline from total FY 2012 benefits (Table IV.1). The decrease by state would range from $25.4 million in Wyoming to $4.1 billion (10.2 percent of the total nationwide decrease) in California. Under our simplifying assumption, the highest percentage decreases would occur in Florida (68.2 percent), Idaho (67.7 percent), Nevada (67.7 percent), Wisconsin (63.2 percent), and Rhode Island (62.8 percent). These states had the highest percentage increases in SNAP benefits from FY 2008 to FY 2012. The lowest percentage decreases would be in Louisiana (33.8 percent), North Dakota (34.6 percent), West Virginia (39.2 percent), Arkansas (41.2 percent), and Kentucky (42.9 percent).

Next, we estimated the change in the number of participating households that would be necessary for average benefits to remain at FY 2012 levels (Table IV.1). That is, we assumed that fewer households would be eligible under the block grant but that those who remain eligible would not face changes in benefit amounts. Under this assumption, we found that the number of participating households would decline by nearly 12 million.[14] The decrease in participating

---

[14] As shown in Appendix Table I.2, total participating households would decrease from approximately 22.3 million to 10.4 million.

households would reach 1 million or more in Florida (1.2 million) and California (1.0 million), and would exceed 800,000 in New York (870,000) and Texas (815,000). The states with the smallest decreases in SNAP households are the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Wyoming. Each of these states or territories would face decreases between 5,900 and 7,400 households.

Finally, we estimated the change in average benefits that would be necessary for the number of participating households to remain at FY 2012 levels (Table IV.1). That is, we assumed that the same number of SNAP households would be allowed to participate under the block grant but that average benefits would be reduced. We found that benefits would decrease on average by $149, and that average losses would be highest in Guam ($311), Hawaii ($253), Virgin Islands ($236), Idaho ($203), and Alaska ($202). Among other states in the contiguous U.S., losses would be highest in California ($192), Utah ($187), and Colorado ($183). Average benefit decreases would be lowest in North Dakota ($96), West Virginia ($100), and Louisiana ($103).

Table IV.1. Number and Percentage of Benefits Lost Relative to FY 2012 if Benefits Reverted to FY 2008 Levels and Potential Change in Participating Households or Average Household Benefit, by State

	Total Benefits ($000s)		Difference (FY 2008 - FY 2012)		Change in Participating Households if Average Benefits Remain at FY 2012 Levels	Change in Average Benefits if Participating Households Remain at FY 2012 Levels
	FY 2008	FY 2012	Total ($000s)	Percent		
All	34,608,397	74,619,461	-40,011,063	-53.6	-11,973,375	-149.3
Alabama	663,901	1,390,012	-726,111	-52.2	-215,090	-147.0
Alaska	94,262	186,325	-92,063	-49.4	-18,752	-202.2
Arizona	772,440	1,706,601	-934,161	-54.7	-265,430	-160.5
Arkansas	431,548	733,397	-301,849	-41.2	-90,585	-114.3
California	2,995,180	7,090,221	-4,095,042	-57.8	-1,027,620	-191.8
Colorado	325,104	808,505	-483,401	-59.8	-131,959	-182.5
Connecticut	284,829	696,671	-411,841	-59.1	-129,946	-156.1
Delaware	86,181	226,577	-140,396	-62.0	-43,104	-168.2
District of Columbia	112,325	233,303	-120,978	-51.9	-41,343	-126.4
Florida	1,778,642	5,592,221	-3,813,579	-68.2	-1,245,104	-174.1
Georgia	1,276,750	3,119,436	-1,842,686	-59.1	-519,525	-174.6
Guam	60,125	113,416	-53,291	-47.0	-6,708	-311.1
Hawaii	184,612	453,331	-268,719	-59.3	-52,433	-253.2
Idaho	116,568	361,230	-244,662	-67.7	-68,065	-202.9
Illinois	1,718,280	3,128,689	-1,410,409	-45.1	-412,165	-128.6
Indiana	772,883	1,444,410	-671,527	-46.5	-186,625	-139.4
Iowa	305,655	593,444	-287,788	-48.5	-92,490	-125.7
Kansas	211,265	457,479	-246,214	-53.8	-77,093	-143.2
Kentucky	742,038	1,298,611	-556,574	-42.9	-172,611	-115.2
Louisiana	1,025,182	1,549,559	-524,376	-33.8	-143,034	-103.4
Maine	196,265	376,753	-180,488	-47.9	-62,829	-114.7
Maryland	432,044	1,104,338	-672,294	-60.9	-219,476	-155.4
Massachusetts	586,587	1,369,998	-783,410	-57.2	-274,382	-136.1
Michigan	1,506,032	2,980,302	-1,474,270	-49.5	-457,395	-132.9
Minnesota	329,569	749,536	-419,967	-56.0	-148,336	-132.2
Mississippi	496,848	980,028	-483,180	-49.3	-146,189	-135.8
Missouri	810,472	1,462,076	-651,605	-44.6	-196,821	-123.0
Montana	94,225	193,011	-98,786	-51.2	-30,191	-139.6
Nebraska	140,753	258,675	-117,922	-45.6	-35,132	-127.5
Nevada	169,714	525,319	-355,604	-67.7	-114,501	-175.2

Table IV.1 *(continued)*

	Total Benefits ($000s)		Difference (FY 2008 - FY 2012)		Change in Average Benefits if Participating Households Remain at FY 2012 Levels	Change in Average Benefits if Participating Households Remain at FY 2012 Levels
	FY 2008	FY 2012	Total ($000s)	Percent		
New Hampshire	71,404	166,473	-95,069	-57.1	-32,182	-140.6
New Jersey	532,945	1,321,102	-788,157	-59.7	-242,303	-161.7
New Mexico	269,189	674,067	-404,878	-60.1	-116,238	-174.3
New York	2,572,843	5,444,102	-2,871,259	-52.7	-870,280	-145.0
North Carolina	1,104,400	2,430,133	-1,325,733	-54.6	-428,285	-140.7
North Dakota	59,267	90,678	-31,411	-34.6	-9,446	-96.0
Ohio	1,494,661	3,006,931	-1,512,270	-50.3	-439,475	-144.2
Oklahoma	491,363	947,200	-455,837	-48.1	-134,581	-135.8
Oregon	542,197	1,253,656	-711,459	-56.8	-253,867	-132.5
Pennsylvania	1,386,964	2,772,898	-1,385,934	-50.0	-434,416	-132.9
Rhode Island	107,719	289,246	-181,526	-62.8	-59,797	-158.8
South Carolina	706,792	1,371,335	-664,543	-48.5	-198,920	-134.9
South Dakota	78,001	165,489	-87,488	-52.9	-23,849	-161.6
Tennessee	1,114,791	2,089,053	-974,262	-46.6	-299,041	-126.6
Texas	3,068,233	6,006,735	-2,938,502	-48.9	-815,182	-147.0
Utah	150,961	404,542	-253,582	-62.7	-70,992	-186.6
Vermont	62,169	141,256	-79,086	-56.0	-27,630	-133.5
Virginia	610,022	1,403,721	-793,699	-56.5	-248,743	-150.3
Virgin Islands	22,856	52,786	-29,930	-56.7	-5,987	-236.2
Washington	680,799	1,684,648	-1,003,849	-59.6	-345,737	-144.2
West Virginia	304,123	500,403	-196,280	-39.2	-64,343	-99.7
Wisconsin	430,028	1,167,767	-737,739	-63.2	-252,050	-154.1
Wyoming	26,390	51,770	-25,380	-49.0	-7,328	-141.5

Source: USDA National Data Bank (Data as of May 10, 2013).

V. FINDINGS FROM NHANES ANALYSIS

In this section, we present a baseline cardiometabolic health profile for SNAP participants using 2003 to 2008 NHANES data. We then compare the prevalence of the health indicators from the baseline profile with that of individuals not participating in SNAP.

A. Health Profile of SNAP Participants

SNAP participants in the 2003 to 2008 NHANES data show a range of negative health indicators, including childhood obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and risk factors for metabolic syndrome.

Weight. Among children age 2 to 19 in households reporting SNAP benefit receipt, an estimated 21.9 percent were obese, and an additional 14.7 percent were overweight (Tables J.1a through J.1c).[15] Weight issues in children receiving SNAP benefits were similar across genders and were concentrated in children over age 5. Among school-age children participating in SNAP, 24.8 percent were obese and an additional 15.8 percent were overweight. Weight indicators were considerably worse for adults. Among adults receiving SNAP benefits, 42.3 percent were obese and 27.8 percent were overweight (Tables J.2a through J.2e). Women participating in SNAP were much more likely to be obese than men, 49.5 percent compared with 31.9 percent. Obesity among adult SNAP participants was most prevalent among individuals in their 40s and 50s, affecting 53.5 percent of women and 32.2 percent of men.

Diabetes. Among adult SNAP participants, 15.4 percent had diabetes, either formally diagnosed or undiagnosed as evidenced by blood glucose or HbA1c levels consistent with diabetes (Tables J.3a through J.3d). The prevalence of diabetes was similar across genders for all adult SNAP

---

[15] Children were considered obese if their BMI was equal to or greater than the 95th percentile of the 2000 CDC Growth Charts. They were considered overweight if their BMI was equal to or greater than the 85th percentile but less than the 95th percentile of the 2000 CDC Growth Charts.

recipients, with women having a slightly higher prevalence than men through their 50s. Among SNAP participants age 60 or over, men had a higher prevalence of diabetes, affecting 41.7 percent of men and 31.8 percent of women. Many more adult SNAP participants were assessed to suffer from prediabetes, a risk factor for developing full diabetes, including 45.2 percent of men and 29.3 percent of women.

Cardiovascular disease. The most common type of cardiovascular disease reported by SNAP participants was stroke; 5.3 percent of participants reported having experienced one (Tables J.4a through J.4e). The rates were much higher for elderly participants, with 16.4 percent of men and 15.1 percent of women age 60 or older reporting that they had experienced a stroke. Heart attack was the second most common type of cardiovascular disease; 4.9 percent of participants reported having experienced one, including 22.2 percent of men and 11.8 percent of women age 60 or over. Among elderly SNAP participants, 11.4 percent reported having suffered from congestive heart failure, 10.8 percent reported ever having coronary disease, and 8.0 percent reported having experienced angina.

Risk factors for metabolic syndrome. We included five risk factors for metabolic syndrome in the NHANES analysis tables, as assessed during the survey medical examination. The most common risk factor among SNAP participants was elevated waist circumference, experienced by 57.1 percent of all adult participants (Tables J.5a through J.5g). Elevated waist circumference was much more common among adult women than men (71.8 versus 35.8 percent), and elderly participants (72.3 percent). Among adult SNAP participants, 38.1 percent had elevated triglycerides, a risk factor for heart disease. Nearly 47 percent had reduced HDL-C levels, another cardiovascular risk factor because HDL-C is considered the "good cholesterol." Women (50.6 percent) were more likely than men (41.4 percent) to have reduced HDL-C levels. By contrast, men were more likely than women to show elevated blood pressure during the NHANES examination, 40.2 to 36.2 percent. High blood pressure was much more common among adults age 60 and over, affecting

79.0 percent of men and 87.9 percent of women. Men were also more likely than women to show elevated fasting glucose, a risk factor for diabetes (52.9 percent compared to 39.9 percent). The prevalence of elevated fasting glucose was greater in elderly SNAP recipients, affecting 75.8 percent of men and 62.1 percent of women age 60 and over.

Most SNAP participants (82.8 percent) had at least one risk factor, and 43.6 percent had at least three of the five risk factors, which indicates metabolic syndrome. Metabolic risk was particularly widespread among elderly participants, with 98.9 percent having at least one factor and 74.8 percent having at least three.

B. Comparative Health Indicators

SNAP participants fared worse than nonparticipants on many of the health indicators described above. In the NHANES analysis, we compared SNAP participants to individuals who reported not participating in the program during the 12 months before the survey. As described in Chapter 2, we divided nonparticipants into eligible, lower-income, and higher-income nonparticipants. Unless otherwise noted, all differences reported between SNAP participants and nonparticipants are statistically significant.

Weight. School-age children in households receiving SNAP benefits were more likely to be obese than children in any other group. One quarter of school-age SNAP participants were obese, compared with 19.1 percent of eligible nonparticipants, 18.2 percent of lower income nonparticipants, and 15.0 percent of higher income nonparticipants (Tables J.1a through J.1c). The prevalence of obesity among school-age girls receiving SNAP benefits was significantly higher than both lower- and higher-income nonparticipants, while the prevalence of obesity among school-age boys receiving SNAP benefits was only significantly higher than the higher income nonparticipants. Children receiving SNAP were more likely than higher-income nonparticipants to be overweight or obese; again, this is particularly the case with girls (37.2 percent compared with 28.5 percent).

Weight disparities between groups were present with adults surveyed as well. The prevalence of obesity among adults receiving SNAP benefits was 42.3 percent, more than any of the nonparticipant groups—33.7 percent for lower income non participants, 32.7 percent for higher income nonparticipants, and 30.0 percent for eligible nonparticipants (Tables J.2a through J.2e). This pattern was largely driven by women, who had a significantly higher prevalence of obesity compared to all other income groups for nearly every age group. The prevalence of obesity among men was similar to the prevalence of obesity among the lower income and higher income groups for all age groups.

Diabetes. SNAP recipients were more likely to have diabetes (diagnosed or undiagnosed) than higher-income nonparticipants (15.6 compared with 9.3 percent, Tables J.3a through J.3d). Among women, SNAP participants closely resembled lower-income nonparticipants—both groups had a much higher prevalence of diabetes than either eligible or higher-income nonparticipants. A similar trend held for men, but with fewer statistically significant differences among groups (though men in their 40s and 50s receiving SNAP were more likely than their higher-income peers to have diabetes, 22.4 versus 10.1 percent). In the prevalence of prediabetes, there were no statistically significant differences between SNAP participants and other groups.

Cardiovascular disease. SNAP participants had a greater prevalence than higher-income individuals of both stroke (5.3 compared with 2.2 percent) and congestive heart failure (3.4 versus 1.9 percent, Tables J.4a through J.4e). SNAP recipients, as well as eligible nonparticipants and lower-income nonparticipants, all had higher reported prevalence of heart attacks than did higher-income nonparticipants. The difference appeared to be driven primarily by adults age 60 and over, particularly among women (11.8 percent for SNAP participants compared with 4.7 percent for higher-income nonparticipants).

There were few statistically significant differences in the prevalence of having had coronary heart disease, a heart attack, or angina. Many estimates did not meet statistical reliability standards

because so few respondents, particularly under the age of 60, had experienced a cardiovascular event.

Metabolic syndrome risk factors. SNAP participants showed differences compared with nonparticipants on most metabolic syndrome risk factors. Adults receiving SNAP benefits, particularly those in their 20s and 30s, were more likely to have an elevated waist circumference than all nonparticipant groups (49.9 percent compared with 38.9 percent for lower-income nonparticipants, the next highest group, among individuals in their twenties and thirties, Tables J.5a through J.5g). The same held for women in their 20s and 30s. Female SNAP participants in their 40s and 50s were more likely to have an elevated waist circumference than eligible nonparticipants and higher-income nonparticipants. By contrast, male SNAP recipients were less likely than higher-income nonparticipants to have an elevated waist circumference, a difference apparently driven by men in their 40s and 50s (40.6 percent compared with 52.4 percent). SNAP participants were more likely to have reduced HDL-C levels compared with nonparticipants at all income levels, a difference apparently driven by women in their 20s and 30s (51.0 percent compared with 39.1 percent for eligible nonparticipants, the next highest group). There were no statistically significant differences among men or among women in other age groups.

SNAP participants were more likely than other groups to have elevated blood pressure. SNAP participants in their 20s and 30s, and those age 60 and over, showed a greater prevalence of elevated blood pressure compared with other groups. This difference was concentrated in female SNAP participants. Women in their 20s and 30s receiving SNAP benefits were more likely that high-income individuals to have elevated blood pressure (13.9 to 5.7 percent), while women age 60 and over receiving SNAP benefits were more likely to have elevated blood pressure than both lower- and higher-income individuals (87.9 compared with 78.3 and 76.5 percent). Female SNAP participants in their 20s and 30s were more likely to have high blood pressure than higher-income nonparticipants (13.9 to 5.7 percent), while elderly women receiving SNAP benefits were more likely

than lower- and higher-income nonparticipants to have elevated blood pressure (87.9 percent versus 78.3 and 76.5 percent). In the final metabolic syndrome risk factor, female SNAP recipients were more likely than higher-income nonparticipants to have elevated fasting glucose. No other groups were statistically different from SNAP recipients.

Women in their 20s and 30s who were receiving SNAP benefits were more likely to meet at least one risk factor for metabolic syndrome compared with higher-income nonparticipants (77.5 percent compared with 63.4 percent). Female SNAP recipients were more likely to have at least three criteria for metabolic syndrome compared with higher-income nonparticipants (46.6 percent compared with 35.4 percent).

VI. CONCLUSION

In this analysis, we assess the effects of two proposed changes to SNAP eligibility and benefit policies as proposed in the nutrition title of the 2013 Farm Bill by the Senate (S. 3240) and House (H.R. 6083). We also examined the possible effects on SNAP households and benefits of converting SNAP to a state block grant program, as proposed in H.R. 5652. Finally, we used NHANES data to develop a baseline cardiometabolic health profile of SNAP participants and to compare health indicators for SNAP participants with those of nonparticipants at different income levels. The purpose of these analyses is to bring objective, rigorous, evidence-based nonpartisan research to the Health Impact Project.

The Health Impact Project incorporated these findings into their HIA research processes and draft reports. The intent of an HIA is to provide an objective analysis of the potential health risks and benefits of policy proposals, and to provide information regarding the risks and benefits identified to a wide range of stakeholders, including policymakers, policy implementers, and the general public.

Although this study addresses many of the important questions currently before Congress on the effects on SNAP of the proposed Farm Bill changes, there are several opportunities for further research. For example, while the 2011 QC Minimodel used for this analysis is the most recent version of the model currently available, the 2012 QC Minimodel, based on FY 2012 administrative data, will be available this fall. Likewise, an updated MATH SIPP+ model, based on 2011 data from the SIPP and CPS, will also be available this fall. These new versions of the models could be used to update the estimates presented in this report. The model baselines could be further updated to simulate FY 2013 rules.

Additionally, we could expand SNAP policy change simulations to include new options being considered. For example, recent legislation proposed in the House (H.R. 1947) would raise the

minimum LIHEAP amount from $10 to $20 in order for receipt of that benefit to confer use of the HCSUA. We could simulate this change and compare results to those from H.R. 6083.

As discussed in the text, our estimates of the potential effects of converting SNAP into a state block grant program relied on some assumptions about funding levels and how the block grant would be implemented. For example, although H.R. 5652 includes other nutrition programs in addition to SNAP, we made the simplifying assumption that states would preserve existing nutrition programs at the same proportional level of funding. We also assumed that if SNAP funding reverted to FY 2008 levels, either the average SNAP benefit or the number of participating SNAP households would remain the same in each state. If more information becomes available on how states would implement the block grant, we may be able to use a microsimulation model to fine-tune our estimates and estimate the effects on subgroups of households.

REFERENCES

Alberti, K., R. Eckel, S. Grundy, P. Zimmet, J. Cleeman, K. Donato, J. Fruchart, W. James, C. Loria, S. Smith, Jr., International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, American Heart Association, World Heart Federation, International Atherosclerosis Society, and International Association for the Study of Obesity. "Harmonizing the Metabolic Syndrome: A Joint Interim Statement of the International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity.*" Circulation*, vol. 120, no.16, 2009, pp. S1640-1645.

Barlow, S., and the Expert Committee. "Expert Committee Recommendations Regarding the Prevention, Assessment, and Treatment of Child and Adolescent Overweight and Obesity: Summary Report." *Pediatrics,* vol. 120, no. 4, 2007, pp. S164-S192.

Benjamini, Y., and Y. Hochberg. "Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing." Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B, vol. 57, 1995, pp. 289-300.

Carlson, A., M. Lino, W. Juan, K. Hanson, and P. Basiotis. *Thrifty Food Plan, 2006*. CNPP-19. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion, 2007.

CDC. "National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2001–2002 Data Documentation, Codebook, and Frequencies, Food Security (FSQ_B)." November 2004. Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/nhanes2001-2002/FSQ_B.htm]. Accessed January 25, 2013a.

CDC. "NHANES 2007-2008 Public Data General Release File Documentation." Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/nhanes2007-2008/generaldoc_e.htm]. Accessed January 25, 2013b.

CDC. "Task 2: When and How to Construct Weights When Combining Survey Cycles." Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/tutorials/NHANES/SurveyDesign/Weighting/Task2.htm]. Accessed January 25, 2013c.

CDC. "Defining Overweight and Obesity." Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/adult/defining.html]. Accessed January 9, 2013d.

CDC. "Key Concepts About Weighting in NHANES." Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/tutorials/nhanes/SurveyDesign/Weighting/OverviewKey.htm]. Accessed January 25, 2013e.

CDC. "2011 National Diabetes Fact Sheet: Data Sources, Methods, and References for Estimates of Diabetes and Prediabetes." Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/pubs/references11.htm]. Accessed January 25, 2013f.

Expert Panel on the Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Overweight in Adults. "Clinical Guidelines on the Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Overweight and Obesity in Adults: Executive Summary: Expert Panel on the Identification, Evaluation, and Treatment of Overweight in Adults." *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, vol. 68, no. 4, 1998, pp. 899–917.

Flegal, K. M., M. D. Carroll, C. L. Ogden, and L. R. Curtin. "Prevalence and Trends in Obesity Among U.S. Adults, 1999–2010." *Journal of the American Medical Association,* vol. 307, no. 5, 2012, pp. 491-497.

Foster, James, Joel Greer, and Erik Thorbecke. "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures." *Econometrica*, vol. 52, no. 3, May 1984, pp. 761-765.

Kreider, Brent, John V. Pepper, Craig Gundersen, and Dean Jolliffe. "Identifying the Effects of SNAP (Food Stamps) on Child Health Outcomes When Participation Is Endogenous and Misreported." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 107, no. 499, September 2012, pp. 958-974.

Kuczmarski, R., C. Ogden, S. Guo, et al. "2000 CDC Growth Charts for the United States: Methods and Development." *Vital Health Statistics*, vol. 246, 2002, pp. 1-190.

Kuczmarski, R. J., C. L. Ogden, L. M. Grummer-Strawn, K. M. Flegal, S. S. Guo, R. Wei, Z. Mei, L. R. Curtin, A. F. Roche, and C. L. Johnson. "2000 CDC Growth Charts: United States." *Advance Data*, vol. 214, 2000, pp. 1-27.

Leftin, Joshua, Esa Eslami, Katherine Bencio, Kai Filion, and Daisy Ewell. "Technical Documentation for the Fiscal Year 2011 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Quality Control Database and the QC Minimodel." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, August 2012.

Nord, Mark. "Survey of Income and Program Participation: 2001 Wave 8 Food Security Data File Technical Documentation and User Notes." 2006. Available at [http://www.ers.usda.gov/datafiles/Food_Security_in_the_United_States/Current_Population_Survey/2001_December/notes1201.pdf]. Accessed November 13, 2012.

Smith, Joel, and Rebecca Wang. "2012 Technical Working Paper: Creation of the 2012 Baseline of the 2009 MATH SIPP+ Microsimulation Model and Database." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, March 2012.

Strayer, Mark, Esa Eslami, and Joshua Leftin. "Characteristics of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Households: Fiscal Year 2011." Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, November 2012.

APPENDIX A

QC MINIMODEL BASELINE TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table A.1. Individuals in Participating SNAP Households by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Individuals in Participating SNAP Households	
	Number (000s)	Column Percent
Total participating individuals in SNAP households	44,146	100.0
Age		
Children (under age 18)	19,926	45.1
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,780	15.4
School age children (age 5 to 17)	13,146	29.8
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	20,451	46.3
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,769	8.5
Gender		
Male	19,211	43.5
Female	24,935	56.5
Citizenship		
Citizen	42,384	96.0
Eligible noncitizen	1,761	4.0
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	2,334	n.a.
Locality		
Metropolitan	34,822	78.9
Micropolitan	5,340	12.1
Rural	3,442	7.8
Not identified	542	1.2
SNAP Region		
Northeast	4,737	10.7
Mid-Atlantic	4,583	10.4
Southeast	10,743	24.3
Midwest	7,626	17.3
Southwest	6,305	14.3
Mountain Plains	2,808	6.4
West	7,344	16.6

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to participate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table A.2. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Demographic Characteristic

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,802	100.0	5,818,058	100.0	280
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	14,242	68.5	2,656,276	45.7	187
3 to 4 members	4,977	23.9	2,154,688	37.0	433
5 or more members	1,582	7.6	1,007,094	17.3	636
Age of SNAP household head					
Child (under age 18)	1,296	6.2	409,507	7.0	316
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	16,193	77.8	4,949,114	85.1	306
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	3,313	15.9	459,437	7.9	139
Gender of SNAP household head					
Male	6,686	32.1	1,452,251	25.0	217
Female	14,116	67.9	4,365,808	75.0	309
SNAP household composition					
With children	9,793	47.1	4,030,357	69.3	412
Single adult	5,477	26.3	2,159,049	37.1	394
Male adult	373	1.8	133,451	2.3	358
Female adult	5,104	24.5	2,025,597	34.8	397
Multiple adults	3,026	14.5	1,463,725	25.2	484
Married head	1,873	9.0	903,416	15.5	482
Other multiple-adult household	1,153	5.5	560,309	9.6	486
Child only	1,290	6.2	407,583	7.0	316
No children	11,009	52.9	1,787,702	30.7	162
With elderly individuals	3,425	16.5	489,927	8.4	143
With disabled nonelderly individuals	4,198	20.2	916,914	15.8	218
With eligible noncitizens	1,214	5.8	406,369	7.0	335

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

A.4

Table A.3. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Locality and Region

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,802	100.0	5,818,058	100.0	280
Locality					
Metropolitan	16,522	79.4	4,655,480	80.0	282
Micropolitan	2,406	11.6	666,596	11.5	277
Rural	1,556	7.5	428,970	7.4	276
Not identified	317	1.5	67,012	1.2	211
SNAP Region					
Northeast	2,526	12.1	664,856	11.4	263
Mid-Atlantic	2,204	10.6	582,639	10.0	264
Southeast	5,159	24.8	1,413,756	24.3	274
Midwest	3,640	17.5	1,000,779	17.2	275
Southwest	2,631	12.6	779,055	13.4	296
Mountain Plains	1,258	6.0	354,339	6.1	282
West	3,385	16.3	1,022,634	17.6	302

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table A.4. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Income and Benefit Level

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,802	100.0	5,818,058	100.0	280
Countable income source					
Earnings	6,350	30.5	2,085,769	35.8	328
TANF (cash)	1,591	7.6	678,583	11.7	427
SSI	4,194	20.2	898,490	15.4	214
Social Security	4,660	22.4	748,338	12.9	161
Veterans' benefits	165	0.8	27,074	0.5	164
Gross countable income					
No income	4,151	20.0	1,213,141	20.9	292
$1 to $500	3,261	15.7	1,116,166	19.2	342
$501 to $1,000	7,607	36.6	1,894,835	32.6	249
$1,001 or more	5,783	27.8	1,593,916	27.4	276
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline					
0 to 50 percent	8,870	42.6	3,216,854	55.3	363
51 to 100 percent	8,472	40.7	2,105,651	36.2	249
101 to 130 percent	2,473	11.9	415,917	7.1	168
131 to 185 percent	903	4.3	76,985	1.3	85
186 percent or higher	83	0.4	2,651	0.0	32
Benefit Amount					
Minimum benefit or less	902	4.3	14,413	0.2	16
Greater than the minimum to $100	2,132	10.2	136,043	2.3	64
$101 to $199	3,485	16.8	529,177	9.1	152
$200 (one-person maximum benefit)	5,171	24.9	1,034,245	17.8	200
$201 to $300	1,586	7.6	402,447	6.9	254
$301 to $400	3,139	15.1	1,116,738	19.2	356
$401 to $500	1,124	5.4	507,602	8.7	452
$501 to $600	1,605	7.7	854,902	14.7	533
$601 or more	1,658	8.0	1,222,491	21.0	737

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table A.5. Average Benefit, Income, and Poverty Rate of Participating SNAP Households

	Average Value for Participating SNAP Households
SNAP benefit ($)	280
Gross income among households with positive income ($)	930
Amount of income type among households with income type ($)	
Earnings	1,022
TANF (cash)	396
SSI	554
Social Security	760
Veterans' benefits	485
Poverty indexes	
Headcount	83.4
Poverty gap	45.6
Poverty gap squared	20.8

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table A.6. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Work Status

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,802	100.0	5,818,058	100.0	280
SNAP household members registered for work					
None	15,074	72.5	4,002,903	68.8	266
At least one	5,728	27.5	1,815,155	31.2	317
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	130	0.6	40,661	0.7	312
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	1,194	5.7	378,896	6.5	317
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program					
None	16,177	77.8	4,320,571	74.3	267
At least one	4,625	22.2	1,497,488	25.7	324
SNAP household members with earned income					
None	15,293	73.5	4,004,715	68.8	262
One	5,204	25.0	1,703,531	29.3	327
Two or more	305	1.5	109,812	1.9	360
Type of employment[a]					
Active military	5	0.0	2,170	0.0	452
Farm-related	13	0.1	5,125	0.1	401
Other	5,151	24.8	1,702,117	29.3	330
Gross countable income among SNAP households with earned income					
$1 to $500	1,000	4.8	314,316	5.4	314
$501 to $1,000	1,770	8.5	638,364	11.0	361
$1,001 or more	3,580	17.2	1,133,090	19.5	316

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table A.7. Children Receiving SNAP or in Households with Children Receiving SNAP (Able to Directly Certify for National School Lunch Program)

	Number Participating (000s)	Number Ineligible in SNAP Household (000s)
Total individuals in households with children	31,601	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	19,926	351
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,780	18
School age children (age 5 to 17)	13,146	333
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)*	31,565	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	19,905	351
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,770	18
School age children (age 5 to 17)	13,135	333
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free lunch)*	30,363	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	19,233	348
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,558	18
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,675	330
Individuals in households with children with gross income above 130 percent and at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for reduced-price lunch)*	1,202	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	672	3
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	212	0
School age children (age 5 to 17)	460	3

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table A.8. Average SNAP Household Size, Income, and Benefits by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Average SNAP Household Size Number	Average SNAP Household Income Dollars	Average SNAP Household Benefit Dollars
All	20,802	2.1	744	280
Alabama	377	2.3	683	294
Alaska	35	2.5	928	412
Arizona	456	2.3	763	292
Arkansas	205	2.3	722	282
California	1,603	2.3	578	336
Colorado	197	2.3	708	311
Connecticut	201	1.8	789	256
Delaware	61	2.2	828	276
District of Columbia	76	1.8	505	251
Florida	1,659	1.9	645	257
Georgia	781	2.3	679	306
Guam	12	3.2	727	681
Hawaii	79	2.0	783	428
Idaho	95	2.4	784	308
Illinois	852	2.1	644	288
Indiana	374	2.3	719	302
Iowa	171	2.2	809	266
Kansas	136	2.2	734	268
Kentucky	374	2.2	670	270
Louisiana	381	2.3	717	291
Maine	126	2.0	906	242
Maryland	324	2.0	783	252
Massachusetts	443	1.8	875	233
Michigan	964	2.0	831	264
Minnesota	243	2.0	766	238
Mississippi	269	2.3	700	278
Missouri	427	2.2	716	273
Montana	56	2.2	776	275
Nebraska	75	2.3	813	280
Nevada	154	2.1	760	260
New Hampshire	53	2.1	977	245
New Jersey	367	2.0	843	272
New Mexico	177	2.3	767	290
New York	1,573	1.9	854	276
North Carolina	724	2.2	755	264
North Dakota	27	2.2	915	273
Ohio	837	2.1	713	285
Oklahoma	267	2.3	706	289
Oregon	416	1.8	790	229
Pennsylvania	812	2.1	872	266
Rhode Island	85	1.8	844	254
South Carolina	385	2.2	635	280
South Dakota	43	2.3	835	312
Tennessee	590	2.1	615	275
Texas	1,601	2.5	815	301
Utah	110	2.5	831	299
Vermont	45	2.0	1,080	237
Virgin Islands	9	2.4	686	431
Virginia	398	2.1	679	268
Washington	535	1.9	809	242
West Virginia	156	2.1	792	246
Wisconsin	369	2.2	969	248
Wyoming	15	2.4	785	288

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table A.9. SNAP Households by Gross Income as Percent of Poverty and State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Percentage of Households with Income in Poverty Range				
		0-50 Percent	51-100 Percent	101-130 Percent	131-185 Percent	186+ Percent
All	20,802	42.6	40.7	11.9	4.3	0.4
Alabama	377	44.0	43.8	11.8	0.4	0.0
Alaska	35	47.7	37.2	14.5	0.6	0.0
Arizona	456	46.2	34.2	13.6	6.1	0.0
Arkansas	205	42.4	46.1	10.9	0.5	0.1
California	1,603	67.6	26.2	5.6	0.5	0.1
Colorado	197	46.4	39.6	12.5	1.1	0.4
Connecticut	201	37.3	39.5	12.6	9.9	0.6
Delaware	61	41.4	35.2	14.2	8.1	1.1
District of Columbia	76	61.0	29.3	5.4	3.9	0.3
Florida	1,659	43.9	41.2	11.1	3.7	0.2
Georgia	781	46.4	40.4	11.4	1.7	0.0
Guam	12	59.5	25.3	10.1	5.1	0.0
Hawaii	79	43.5	46.5	8.1	1.9	0.0
Idaho	95	41.8	42.0	15.5	0.7	0.0
Illinois	852	46.3	42.1	9.8	1.9	0.0
Indiana	374	42.7	43.8	12.8	0.7	0.0
Iowa	171	39.5	41.8	13.7	4.8	0.2
Kansas	136	41.6	43.8	13.8	0.8	0.0
Kentucky	374	43.1	47.0	9.5	0.3	0.1
Louisiana	381	42.0	46.1	10.8	1.2	0.0
Maine	126	29.0	42.9	17.6	10.4	0.1
Maryland	324	42.1	38.9	10.5	7.4	1.2
Massachusetts	443	29.3	47.3	15.0	7.2	1.1
Michigan	964	35.4	41.1	13.1	9.3	1.1
Minnesota	243	40.5	41.6	12.3	4.9	0.7
Mississippi	269	41.6	49.0	9.1	0.3	0.0
Missouri	427	41.1	44.2	13.7	1.0	0.0
Montana	56	39.2	40.8	15.2	4.4	0.4
Nebraska	75	34.9	49.1	15.8	0.2	0.0
Nevada	154	44.0	36.6	12.2	6.8	0.4
New Hampshire	53	25.5	46.6	17.2	10.3	0.5
New Jersey	367	35.8	44.1	12.5	6.9	0.7
New Mexico	177	43.9	42.3	10.6	3.2	0.0
New York	1,573	29.1	50.0	14.3	5.7	0.9
North Carolina	724	44.5	36.6	11.2	6.8	0.9
North Dakota	27	32.3	40.7	15.8	10.5	0.8
Ohio	837	41.8	42.1	11.8	4.0	0.2
Oklahoma	267	42.8	45.6	11.1	0.5	0.0
Oregon	416	39.9	35.4	13.6	10.1	1.0
Pennsylvania	812	32.3	46.4	13.8	6.9	0.6
Rhode Island	85	30.8	45.0	13.3	10.0	0.9
South Carolina	385	50.0	37.5	12.0	0.5	0.0
South Dakota	43	36.4	45.3	15.5	2.7	0.1
Tennessee	590	49.1	38.7	11.1	1.1	0.0
Texas	1,601	44.1	36.3	12.7	6.3	0.5
Utah	110	40.4	44.6	13.5	1.4	0.1
Vermont	45	22.6	36.4	22.9	16.0	2.1
Virgin Islands	9	56.6	28.4	12.1	2.5	0.3
Virginia	398	44.3	42.6	12.4	0.6	0.1
Washington	535	39.8	38.6	13.0	7.7	0.9
West Virginia	156	30.8	56.0	11.9	1.3	0.0
Wisconsin	369	30.4	38.4	16.7	13.8	0.7
Wyoming	15	38.2	48.2	12.8	0.8	0.0

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX B

MATH SIPP+ BASELINE TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.1. Individuals in Eligible and Participating SNAP Households by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Individuals in Eligible Households		Individuals in Participating Households	
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Number (000s)	Column Percent
Total individuals in SNAP households	67,825	100.0	43,246	100.0
Age				
Children (under age 18)	25,398	37.4	18,345	42.4
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	8,112	12.0	6,217	14.4
School age children (age 5 to 17)	17,286	25.5	12,128	28.0
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	30,131	44.4	20,908	48.3
Elderly adults (age 60+)	12,297	18.1	3,992	9.2
Gender				
Male	29,843	44.0	19,089	44.1
Female	37,982	56.0	24,156	55.9
Disabled nonelderly individuals	4,805	7.1	3,818	8.8
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	33,899	50.0	20,324	47.0
African-American, non-Hispanic	13,006	19.2	9,762	22.6
Hispanic	16,363	24.1	10,261	23.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,729	2.5	1,043	2.4
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	2,829	4.2	1,856	4.3
Citizenship				
Citizen	63,263	93.3	41,177	95.2
Eligible noncitizen	4,562	6.7	2,069	4.8
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	4,448	n.a.	2,688	n.a.
Locality				
Metropolitan	51,154	75.4	33,190	76.7
Not metropolitan	14,106	20.8	8,553	19.8
Not identified	2,565	3.8	1,503	3.5
SNAP Region				
Northeast	7,423	10.9	4,691	10.8
Mid-Atlantic	6,784	10.0	4,130	9.5
Southeast	16,955	25.0	10,564	24.4
Midwest	11,052	16.3	7,410	17.1
Southwest	9,372	13.8	5,570	12.9
Mountain Plains	3,928	5.8	2,808	6.5
West	12,312	18.2	8,073	18.7
Individuals in households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty	58,550	86.3	42,222	97.6

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to participate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of eligible or participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table B.2a. Eligible SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Demographic Characteristic

	Eligible SNAP Households		Potential SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	33,047	100.0	6,658,567	100.0	201
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	24,192	73.2	2,957,311	44.4	122
3 to 4 members	6,340	19.2	2,355,239	35.4	371
5 or more members	2,515	7.6	1,346,017	20.2	535
Age of SNAP household head					
Child (under age 18)	1,621	4.9	308,416	4.6	190
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	21,446	64.9	5,536,295	83.1	258
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	9,980	30.2	813,856	12.2	82
Gender of SNAP household head					
Male	12,181	36.9	2,232,603	33.5	183
Female	20,866	63.1	4,425,963	66.5	212
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head					
White, non-Hispanic	18,724	56.7	3,292,000	49.4	176
African-American, non-Hispanic	6,264	19.0	1,357,165	20.4	217
Hispanic	6,135	18.6	1,590,100	23.9	259
Asian or Pacific Islander	874	2.6	185,010	2.8	212
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	1,050	3.2	234,292	3.5	223
SNAP household composition					
With children	12,599	38.1	4,455,678	66.9	354
Single adult	5,684	17.2	1,980,761	29.7	348
Male adult	595	1.8	191,787	2.9	322
Female adult	5,089	15.4	1,788,974	26.9	352
Multiple adults	5,333	16.1	2,183,907	32.8	409
Married head	4,001	12.1	1,655,740	24.9	414
Other multiple-adult household	1,332	4.0	528,168	7.9	397
Child only	1,582	4.8	291,010	4.4	184
No children	20,448	61.9	2,202,889	33.1	108
With elderly individuals	10,406	31.5	899,208	13.5	86
With disabled nonelderly individuals	4,377	13.2	690,339	10.4	158
With eligible noncitizens	3,060	9.3	873,699	13.1	285
Educational attainment of SNAP household head					
Less than high school or GED	5,945	18.0	1,330,591	20.0	224
High school or GED	11,909	36.0	2,263,539	34.0	190
Associate degree or some college	10,215	30.9	2,085,818	31.3	204
Bachelors degree or higher	3,655	11.1	749,229	11.3	205
Unknown or not in universe	1,322	4.0	229,390	3.4	174

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.2b. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Demographic Characteristic

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,145	100.0	5,637,439	100.0	280
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	13,747	68.2	2,506,886	44.5	182
3 to 4 members	4,777	23.7	2,082,581	36.9	436
5 or more members	1,621	8.0	1,047,972	18.6	646
Age of SNAP household head					
Child (under age 18)	1,102	5.5	275,533	4.9	250
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	15,623	77.6	4,821,001	85.5	309
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	3,420	17.0	540,905	9.6	158
Gender of SNAP household head					
Male	7,329	36.4	1,842,582	32.7	251
Female	12,816	63.6	3,794,858	67.3	296
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head					
White, non-Hispanic	10,645	52.8	2,797,940	49.6	263
African-American, non-Hispanic	4,446	22.1	1,230,701	21.8	277
Hispanic	3,777	18.8	1,263,831	22.4	335
Asian or Pacific Islander	543	2.7	149,849	2.7	276
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	734	3.6	195,118	3.5	266
SNAP household composition					
With children	9,166	45.5	3,837,963	68.1	419
Single adult	4,671	23.2	1,867,245	33.1	400
Male adult	465	2.3	177,122	3.1	381
Female adult	4,206	20.9	1,690,123	30.0	402
Multiple adults	3,423	17.0	1,708,871	30.3	499
Married head	2,443	12.1	1,256,429	22.3	514
Other multiple-adult household	980	4.9	452,441	8.0	462
Child only	1,072	5.3	261,847	4.6	244
No children	10,979	54.5	1,799,476	31.9	164
With elderly individuals	3,596	17.9	598,414	10.6	166
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,455	17.2	643,777	11.4	186
With eligible noncitizens	1,419	7.0	559,601	9.9	394
Educational attainment of SNAP household head					
Less than high school or GED	3,596	17.9	1,114,853	19.8	310
High school or GED	6,944	34.5	1,885,481	33.4	272
Associate degree or some college	6,439	32.0	1,805,492	32.0	280
Bachelors degree or higher	2,269	11.3	626,258	11.1	276
Unknown or not in universe	896	4.5	205,355	3.6	229

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.3a. Eligible SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Locality and region

	Eligible SNAP Households		Potential SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	33,047	100.0	6,658,567	100.0	201
Locality					
Metropolitan	25,091	75.9	5,116,103	76.8	204
Not metropolitan	6,606	20.0	1,306,270	19.6	198
Not identified	1,349	4.1	236,194	3.5	175
SNAP Region					
Northeast	4,001	12.1	724,337	10.9	181
Mid-Atlantic	3,498	10.6	611,126	9.2	175
Southeast	8,606	26.0	1,570,067	23.6	182
Midwest	5,333	16.1	1,085,006	16.3	203
Southwest	3,951	12.0	890,425	13.4	225
Mountain Plains	1,950	5.9	439,198	6.6	225
West	5,709	17.3	1,338,409	20.1	234

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.3b. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Locality and Region

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,145	100.0	5,637,439	100.0	280
Locality					
Metropolitan	15,616	77.5	4,355,993	77.3	279
Not metropolitan	3,760	18.7	1,083,888	19.2	288
Not identified	769	3.8	197,559	3.5	257
SNAP Region					
Northeast	2,481	12.3	609,775	10.8	246
Mid-Atlantic	1,988	9.9	518,444	9.2	261
Southeast	4,957	24.6	1,352,729	24.0	273
Midwest	3,356	16.7	956,102	17.0	285
Southwest	2,321	11.5	712,691	12.6	307
Mountain Plains	1,370	6.8	380,505	6.7	278
West	3,672	18.2	1,107,193	19.6	302

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.4a. Eligible SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Income and Benefit Level

	Eligible SNAP Households		Potential SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	33,047	100.0	6,658,567	100.0	201
Countable income source					
Earnings	12,682	38.4	2,921,474	43.9	230
TANF (cash)	1,582	4.8	482,597	7.2	305
SSI	4,656	14.1	715,859	10.8	154
Social Security	11,126	33.7	991,029	14.9	89
Veterans' benefits	364	1.1	39,561	0.6	109
Gross countable income					
No income	3,529	10.7	1,161,781	17.4	329
$1 to $500	3,780	11.4	1,275,907	19.2	338
$501 to $1,000	9,194	27.8	1,754,082	26.3	191
$1,001 or more	16,545	50.1	2,466,797	37.0	149
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline					
0 to 50 percent	8,606	26.0	3,244,298	48.7	377
51 to 100 percent	10,708	32.4	2,305,065	34.6	215
101 to 130 percent	6,508	19.7	759,711	11.4	117
131 to 185 percent	6,055	18.3	299,572	4.5	49
186 percent or higher	1,171	3.5	49,921	0.7	43
Benefit amount					
Minimum benefit or less	7,787	23.6	123,668	1.9	16
Greater than the minimum to $100	5,599	16.9	307,902	4.6	55
$101 to $199	4,404	13.3	653,372	9.8	148
$200 (one-person maximum benefit)	4,619	14.0	924,366	13.9	200
$201 to $300	2,241	6.8	558,316	8.4	249
$301 to $400	3,764	11.4	1,340,865	20.1	356
$401 to $500	1,158	3.5	518,645	7.8	448
$501 to $600	1,690	5.1	903,035	13.6	534
$601 or more	1,787	5.4	1,328,399	20.0	743
SNAP households eligible for a zero benefit[a]	818	2.5	0	0.0	0

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These households pass the requisite SNAP asset and income tests, but have income high enough that they do not qualify for a positive benefit. They also do not receive a minimum benefit because the household includes more than two individuals. They are not included in the total number of eligible households or in any other estimates in this table.

Table B.4b. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Income and Benefit Level

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,145	100.0	5,637,439	100.0	280
Countable income source					
Earnings	6,602	32.8	2,152,614	38.2	326
TANF (cash)	1,285	6.4	464,329	8.2	361
SSI	3,718	18.5	651,539	11.6	175
Social Security	4,359	21.6	735,984	13.1	169
Veterans' benefits	132	0.7	31,429	0.6	237
Gross countable income					
No income	3,504	17.4	1,148,333	20.4	328
$1 to $500	3,695	18.3	1,245,869	22.1	337
$501 to $1,000	7,048	35.0	1,628,557	28.9	231
$1,001 or more	5,898	29.3	1,614,680	28.6	274
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline					
0 to 50 percent	8,476	42.1	3,183,589	56.5	376
51 to 100 percent	8,340	41.4	1,967,140	34.9	236
101 to 130 percent	2,371	11.8	385,629	6.8	163
131 to 185 percent	789	3.9	80,539	1.4	102
186 percent or higher	168	0.8	20,542	0.4	122
Benefit amount					
Minimum benefit or less	992	4.9	15,751	0.3	16
Greater than the minimum to $100	2,560	12.7	153,705	2.7	60
$101 to $199	2,917	14.5	437,449	7.8	150
$200 (one-person maximum benefit)	4,546	22.6	909,695	16.1	200
$201 to $300	1,578	7.8	398,462	7.1	253
$301 to $400	3,267	16.2	1,165,189	20.7	357
$401 to $500	985	4.9	442,132	7.8	449
$501 to $600	1,605	8.0	856,693	15.2	534
$601 or more	1,695	8.4	1,258,365	22.3	742

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.5. Average Benefit, Income, Assets, and Poverty Rate of Eligible and Participating SNAP Households

	Average Value for SNAP Households	
	Eligible	Participating
SNAP benefit ($)	201	280
Gross income among households with positive income ($)	1,416	1,071
Amount of income type among households with income type ($)		
Earnings	1,500	1,140
TANF (cash)	442	440
SSI	595	598
Social Security	1,032	854
Veterans' benefits	527	434
Amount of countable assets amoung households with asset type ($)		
Financial assets	18,231	17,265
Vehicle assets	4,801	4,657
Amount of home equity among households with home equity ($)	130,874	122,980
Poverty indexes		
Headcount	58.4	83.5
Poverty gap	47.2	52.2
Poverty gap squared	22.2	27.3

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.6. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Work Status

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,145	100.0	5,637,439	100.0	280
SNAP household members with earned income					
None	14,320	71.1	3,669,195	65.1	256
One	5,482	27.2	1,822,289	32.3	332
Two or more	343	1.7	145,955	2.6	426
Type of employment[a]					
Active military	11	0.1	5,733	0.1	518
Farm-related	148	0.7	61,486	1.1	415
Other	7,753	38.5	2,625,364	46.6	339
Gross countable income among SNAP households with earned income					
$1 to $500	948	4.7	323,855	5.7	342
$501 to $1,000	1,650	8.2	569,256	10.1	345
$1,001 or more	3,227	16.0	1,075,133	19.1	333

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table B.7. SNAP Households and Children (Able to Directly Certify for National School Lunch Program)

	Number Participating (000s)	Number of Nonparticipating Children in Household (000s)
Total individuals in households with children	30,045	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	18,345	757
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,217	96
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,128	660
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)*	30,019	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	18,327	624
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,210	74
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,117	550
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free lunch)*	29,542	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	18,063	592
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,158	68
School age children (age 5 to 17)	11,905	524
Individuals in households with children with gross income above 130 percent and at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for reduced-price lunch)*	477	n.a.
Children (under age 18)	264	32
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	52	6
School age children (age 5 to 17)	212	26

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.8a. Eligible SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Household Size and Composition

	Eligible SNAP Households		Potential SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	33,047	100.0	6,658,567	100.0	201
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	24,192	73.2	2,957,311	44.4	122
with elderly members	9,990	30.2	773,121	11.6	77
with disabled nonelderly members	3,319	10.0	310,078	4.7	93
with no elderly or disabled nonelderly members	11,035	33.4	1,886,273	28.3	171
3 to 4 members	6,340	19.2	2,355,239	35.4	371
with elderly members	355	1.1	95,455	1.4	269
with disabled nonelderly members	742	2.2	216,188	3.2	291
with no elderly or disabled nonelderly members	5,306	16.1	2,055,371	30.9	387
5 or more members	2,515	7.6	1,346,017	20.2	535
with elderly members	61	0.2	30,633	0.5	504
with disabled nonelderly members	316	1.0	164,073	2.5	519
with no elderly or disabled nonelderly members	2,149	6.5	1,156,406	17.4	538

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.8b. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Household Size and Composition

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,145	100.0	5,637,439	100.0	280
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	13,747	68.2	2,506,886	44.5	182
with elderly members	3,367	16.7	505,264	9.0	150
with disabled nonelderly members	2,552	12.7	286,724	5.1	112
with no elderly or disabled nonelderly members	7,906	39.2	1,724,679	30.6	218
3 to 4 members	4,777	23.7	2,082,581	36.9	436
with elderly members	197	1.0	73,560	1.3	373
with disabled nonelderly members	634	3.1	205,689	3.6	324
with no elderly or disabled nonelderly members	3,996	19.8	1,814,516	32.2	454
5 or more members	1,621	8.0	1,047,972	18.6	646
with elderly members	32	0.2	19,589	0.3	611
with disabled nonelderly members	269	1.3	151,363	2.7	563
with no elderly or disabled nonelderly members	1,328	6.6	880,450	15.6	663

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table B.9a. Eligible SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Asset Holdings

	Eligible SNAP Households		Potential SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	33,047	100.0	6,658,567	100.0	201
SNAP households with assets	27,119	82.1	5,251,361	78.9	194
Countable under SNAP rules	14,959	45.3	2,696,265	40.5	180
Financial assets	18,424	55.7	3,290,798	49.4	179
Countable under SNAP rules	14,844	44.9	2,669,418	40.1	180
Vehicle assets	19,923	60.3	4,162,259	62.5	209
Countable under SNAP rules	309	0.9	72,074	1.1	234
Home Equity	13,500	40.9	2,267,962	34.1	168
Amount of countable assets					
None	18,088	54.7	3,962,302	59.5	219
$1 to $1,000	7,975	24.1	1,562,995	23.5	196
$1,001 to $2,000	1,639	5.0	310,540	4.7	190
$2,001 to $3,250[a]	1,056	3.2	162,833	2.4	154
$3,251 or more	4,290	13.0	659,897	9.9	154
Countable assets > federal asset limit	5,020	15.2	796,335	12.0	159

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table B.9b. Participating SNAP Households, Total Benefits, and Average Benefit, by Asset Holdings

	Participating SNAP Households		SNAP Household Benefits		
	Number (000s)	Column Percent	Total ($000s)	Column Percent	Average ($)
Total SNAP households	20,145	100.0	5,637,439	100.0	280
SNAP households with assets	15,491	76.9	4,328,121	76.8	279
Countable under SNAP rules	7,435	36.9	2,114,150	37.5	284
Financial assets	9,667	48.0	2,627,104	46.6	272
Countable under SNAP rules	7,371	36.6	2,093,764	37.1	284
Vehicle assets	11,102	55.1	3,385,822	60.1	305
Countable under SNAP rules	176	0.9	59,640	1.1	338
Home Equity	6,951	34.5	1,815,078	32.2	261
Amount of countable assets					
None	12,710	63.1	3,523,289	62.5	277
$1 to $1,000	4,295	21.3	1,258,076	22.3	293
$1,001 to $2,000	788	3.9	231,129	4.1	293
$2,001 to $3,250[a]	506	2.5	123,787	2.2	245
$3,251 or more	1,845	9.2	501,158	8.9	272
Countable assets > federal asset limit	2,262	11.2	613,737	10.9	271

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table B.10a. Eligible SNAP Households and Individuals by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, Region, and Food Security

| | | Food Secure | | Food Insecure or Very Food Insecure | | | | |
| | | | | | Food Insecure | | Very Food Insecure | |
	Total[a] (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Total (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
Total SNAP households	28,737	22,870	79.6	5,867	3,626	12.6	2,241	7.8
Households by locality								
Metropolitan	21,868	17,249	78.9	4,618	2,882	13.2	1,736	7.9
Not metropolitan	5,725	4,700	82.1	1,024	602	10.5	422	7.4
Not identified	1,145	920	80.4	225	142	12.4	83	7.2
Households by SNAP region								
Northeast	3,401	2,910	85.6	491	324	9.5	167	4.9
Mid-Atlantic	3,063	2,460	80.3	604	425	13.9	178	5.8
Southeast	7,645	6,192	81.0	1,454	868	11.3	586	7.7
Midwest	4,621	3,683	79.7	938	503	10.9	435	9.4
Southwest	3,531	2,671	75.6	860	549	15.5	312	8.8
Mountain Plains	1,641	1,327	80.8	314	181	11.0	133	8.1
West	4,833	3,627	75.0	1,206	777	16.1	429	8.9
Total individuals	58,897	46,055	78.2	12,843	7,972	13.5	4,871	8.3
Individuals by age								
Children (under age 18)	21,958	16,544	75.3	5,414	3,388	15.4	2,026	9.2
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,932	5,272	76.1	1,660	1,083	15.6	577	8.3
School age children (age 5 to 17)	15,027	11,273	75.0	3,754	2,304	15.3	1,450	9.6
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	25,903	19,710	76.1	6,193	3,730	14.4	2,463	9.5
Elderly adults (age 60+)	11,036	9,800	88.8	1,235	854	7.7	381	3.5
Disabled nonelderly individuals	7,503	5,174	69.0	2,329	1,346	17.9	983	13.1
Individuals ever in the military	2,659	2,242	84.3	418	251	9.5	166	6.2

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. Therefore, this table only includes households that were still present in Wave 6.

Table B.10b. Participating SNAP Households and Individuals by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, Region, and Food Security

| | Total[a] (000s) | Food Secure | | Food Insecure or Very Food Insecure | | | | |
| | | Number (000s) | Row Percent | Total (000s) | Food Insecure | | Very Food Insecure | |
					Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
Total SNAP households	17,216	13,085	76.0	4,131	2,554	14.8	1,577	9.2
Households by locality								
Metropolitan	13,358	10,075	75.4	3,283	2,055	15.4	1,228	9.2
Not metropolitan	3,203	2,511	78.4	692	395	12.3	297	9.3
Not identified	655	499	76.2	156	103	15.7	53	8.1
Households by SNAP region								
Northeast	2,086	1,737	83.2	350	236	11.3	114	5.5
Mid-Atlantic	1,701	1,316	77.3	386	261	15.4	124	7.3
Southeast	4,350	3,320	76.3	1,030	634	14.6	396	9.1
Midwest	2,905	2,233	76.9	672	356	12.2	316	10.9
Southwest	1,994	1,428	71.6	566	345	17.3	221	11.1
Mountain Plains	1,111	840	75.6	271	163	14.7	108	9.7
West	3,068	2,213	72.1	856	558	18.2	298	9.7
Total individuals	36,980	27,810	75.2	9,171	5,662	15.3	3,508	9.5
Individuals by age								
Children (under age 18)	15,674	11,523	73.5	4,151	2,575	16.4	1,576	10.1
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	5,251	3,879	73.9	1,372	861	16.4	511	9.7
School age children (age 5 to 17)	10,423	7,644	73.3	2,779	1,714	16.4	1,065	10.2
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	17,780	13,298	74.8	4,482	2,713	15.3	1,768	9.9
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,527	2,989	84.8	538	373	10.6	164	4.7
Disabled nonelderly individuals	5,969	4,221	70.7	1,748	1,044	17.5	705	11.8
Individuals ever in the military	1,075	838	78.0	237	128	11.9	109	10.1

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. Therefore, this table only includes households that were still present in Wave 6.

APPENDIX C

QC MINIMODEL POLICY CHANGE SIMULATION TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table C.1a. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)		Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
Total households	19,140	1,651	11
SNAP household size			
1 to 2 members	13,138	1,103	1
3 to 4 members	4,557	412	8
5 or more members	1,445	136	2
Age of SNAP household head			
Child (under age 18)	1,228	68	0
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	14,896	1,286	11
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	3,016	297	0
Gender of SNAP household head			
Male	6,241	442	3
Female	12,899	1,209	8
SNAP household composition			
With children	8,967	816	9
Single adult	5,000	475	2
Male adult	343	30	0
Female adult	4,657	445	2
Multiple adults	2,744	274	8
Married head	1,719	150	4
Other multiple-adult household	1,025	125	4
Child only	1,224	67	0
No children	10,173	835	2
With elderly individuals	3,116	309	1
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,723	473	2
With eligible noncitizens	1,128	86	0
Locality			
Metropolitan	15,115	1,396	10
Micropolitan	2,271	134	1
Rural	1,464	93	0
Not identified	289	28	0
SNAP region			
Northeast	2,249	271	5
Mid-Atlantic	1,738	463	2
Southeast	5,159	0	0
Midwest	3,015	623	3
Southwest	2,631	0	0
Mountain Plains	1,258	0	0
West	3,090	294	2

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.1b. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Income Sources and Amounts and Work Status

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)		Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
Total households	19,140	1,651	11
Countable income source			
Earnings	5,710	634	7
TANF (cash)	1,407	184	0
SSI	3,771	423	0
Social Security	4,159	498	3
Veterans' benefits	152	13	0
Gross countable income			
No income	4,151	0	0
$1 to $500	3,052	209	0
$501 to $1,000	6,802	805	0
$1,001 or more	5,135	637	11
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline			
0 to 50 percent	8,548	323	0
51 to 100 percent	7,566	906	0
101 to 130 percent	2,174	299	1
131 to 185 percent	773	121	9
186 percent or higher	80	3	1
SNAP household members registered for work			
None	13,812	1,254	8
At least one	5,328	397	4
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	104	26	0
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	1,019	175	1
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program			
None	14,686	1,480	11
At least one	4,454	170	0
Type of employment[a]			
Active military	5	0	0
Farm-related	13	0	0
Other	4,601	543	6

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table C.2. Individual SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Individuals in Still Eligible Households (000s)		Number of Individuals in No Longer Eligible Households (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
Total individuals	40,485	3,624	37
Age			
Children (under age 18)	18,305	1,605	16
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,263	515	2
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,043	1,090	13
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	18,751	1,680	20
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,429	339	1
Gender			
Male	17,670	1,526	15
Female	22,815	2,098	22
Citizenship			
Citizen	38,860	3,486	37
Eligible noncitizen	1,624	138	0
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	2,213	134	0
Locality			
Metropolitan	31,709	3,078	34
Micropolitan	5,027	310	3
Rural	3,245	197	0
Not identified	503	39	0
SNAP region			
Northeast	4,198	523	16
Mid-Atlantic	3,524	1,054	5
Southeast	10,743	0	0
Midwest	6,208	1,409	9
Southwest	6,305	0	0
Mountain Plains	2,808	0	0
West	6,700	638	6

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to participate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table C.3a. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

| | SNAP Household Benefits | | | |
| | Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s) | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | Total Benefit Loss for Newly Ineligible Households ($000s) |
		Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	
Total benefits	5,363,600	314,547	84	704
SNAP household size				
1 to 2 members	2,448,242	113,808	85	42
3 to 4 members	1,989,187	130,759	83	514
5 or more members	926,170	69,981	80	148
Age of SNAP household head				
Child (under age 18)	388,908	15,801	71	0
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	4,562,516	280,160	82	682
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	412,175	18,586	96	22
Gender of SNAP household head				
Male	1,353,113	62,245	83	259
Female	4,010,486	252,302	85	445
SNAP household composition				
With children	3,713,425	250,725	80	610
Single adult	1,985,598	135,181	80	122
Male adult	123,365	7,689	80	0
Female adult	1,862,234	127,492	80	122
Multiple adults	1,340,474	100,073	83	488
Married head	836,602	54,706	79	221
Other multiple-adult household	503,872	45,367	87	267
Child only	387,353	15,472	71	0
No children	1,650,175	63,822	88	94
With elderly individuals	439,724	20,580	96	62
With disabled nonelderly individuals	800,481	67,892	102	152
With eligible noncitizens	378,100	21,081	84	0
Locality				
Metropolitan	4,263,682	273,043	85	649
Micropolitan	632,426	23,162	82	54
Rural	405,540	15,408	87	0
Not identified	61,952	2,935	77	0
SNAP region				
Northeast	594,497	42,566	101	411
Mid-Atlantic	446,141	97,866	83	133
Southeast	1,413,756	0	0	0
Midwest	830,246	116,518	87	110
Southwest	779,055	0	0	0
Mountain Plains	354,339	0	0	0
West	945,565	57,597	66	50

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.3b. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Income Sources and Amounts and Work Status

| | SNAP Household Benefits | | | |
| | | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | Total Benefit Loss for Newly Ineligible Households ($000s) |
	Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s)	Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	
Total benefits	5,363,600	314,547	84	704
Countable income source				
Earnings	1,890,997	144,417	79	430
TANF (cash)	598,750	65,792	76	15
SSI	793,016	60,919	105	7
Social Security	654,225	45,722	97	165
Veterans' benefits	25,310	731	80	24
Gross countable income				
No income	1,213,141	0	0	0
$1 to $500	1,046,664	59,794	46	0
$501 to $1,000	1,689,013	130,181	94	0
$1,001 or more	1,414,781	124,573	85	704
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	3,073,062	125,514	57	0
51 to 100 percent	1,864,195	154,019	97	0
101 to 130 percent	362,704	27,892	85	49
131 to 185 percent	61,309	7,002	67	613
186 percent or higher	2,330	121	59	42
SNAP household members registered for work				
None	3,688,371	206,424	86	434
At least one	1,675,229	108,123	79	270
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	33,158	5,465	77	17
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	324,924	41,027	74	84
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program				
None	3,932,727	261,644	85	665
At least one	1,430,873	52,903	80	39
Type of employment[a]				
Active military	2,170	0	0	0
Farm-related	5,125	0	0	0
Other	1,535,701	123,419	78	391

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table C.4a. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)	Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
Total households	20,116	686
SNAP household size		
1 to 2 members	13,789	454
3 to 4 members	4,795	183
5 or more members	1,532	50
Age of SNAP household head		
Child (under age 18)	1,280	15
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	15,636	557
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	3,199	114
Gender of SNAP household head		
Male	6,502	184
Female	13,614	503
SNAP household composition		
With children	9,424	369
Single adult	5,274	203
Male adult	354	19
Female adult	4,919	184
Multiple adults	2,875	151
Married head	1,766	107
Other multiple-adult household	1,109	44
Child only	1,275	15
No children	10,691	318
With elderly individuals	3,305	121
With disabled nonelderly individuals	4,105	93
With eligible noncitizens	1,175	39
Locality		
Metropolitan	15,991	531
Micropolitan	2,302	104
Rural	1,517	39
Not identified	305	12
SNAP region		
Northeast	2,442	84
Mid-Atlantic	2,110	93
Southeast	5,049	110
Midwest	3,474	167
Southwest	2,536	95
Mountain Plains	1,245	13
West	3,260	125

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.4b. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts and Work Status

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)	Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
Total households	20,116	686
Countable income source		
Earnings	5,881	468
TANF (cash)	1,590	1
SSI	4,184	10
Social Security	4,456	204
Veterans' benefits	155	9
Gross countable income		
No income	4,151	0
$1 to $500	3,261	0
$501 to $1,000	7,606	0
$1,001 or more	5,097	686
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	8,870	0
51 to 100 percent	8,470	1
101 to 130 percent	2,401	73
131 to 185 percent	354	550
186 percent or higher	21	62
SNAP household members registered for work		
None	14,526	547
At least one	5,589	139
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	105	26
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	1,139	55
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program		
None	15,569	607
At least one	4,546	79
Type of employment[a]		
Active military	5	0
Farm-related	12	0
Other	4,735	416

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table C.5. Individual SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Individuals in Still Eligible Households (000s)	Number of Individuals in No Longer Eligible Households (000s)
Total individuals	42,555	1,591
Age		
Children (under age 18)	19,267	658
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,567	212
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,700	446
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	19,674	776
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,613	157
Gender		
Male	18,535	675
Female	24,019	916
Citizenship		
Citizen	40,851	1,532
Eligible noncitizen	1,703	59
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	2,301	46
Locality		
Metropolitan	33,580	1,242
Micropolitan	5,100	240
Rural	3,347	95
Not identified	527	15
SNAP region		
Northeast	4,535	202
Mid-Atlantic	4,360	224
Southeast	10,490	253
Midwest	7,275	351
Southwest	6,069	236
Mountain Plains	2,774	34
West	7,052	292

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to participate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table C.6a. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Benefits for SNAP Households ($000s)	
	Still Participating	Total Benefit Loss for Newly Ineligible Households
Total benefits	5,766,155	51,903
SNAP household size		
1 to 2 members	2,637,768	18,508
3 to 4 members	2,129,998	24,690
5 or more members	998,389	8,705
Age of SNAP household head		
Child (under age 18)	408,513	994
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	4,900,098	49,016
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	457,544	1,893
Gender of SNAP household head		
Male	1,444,177	8,074
Female	4,321,978	43,830
SNAP household composition		
With children	3,986,298	44,058
Single adult	2,136,519	22,530
Male adult	131,933	1,519
Female adult	2,004,586	21,011
Multiple adults	1,443,190	20,535
Married head	888,759	14,657
Other multiple-adult household	554,431	5,878
Child only	406,589	994
No children	1,779,857	7,845
With elderly individuals	487,831	2,096
With disabled nonelderly individuals	914,261	2,653
With eligible noncitizens	403,398	2,971
Locality		
Metropolitan	4,614,175	41,304
Micropolitan	659,354	7,242
Rural	425,960	3,010
Not identified	66,666	347
SNAP region		
Northeast	657,528	7,328
Mid-Atlantic	574,544	8,094
Southeast	1,405,709	8,047
Midwest	991,268	9,511
Southwest	770,796	8,259
Mountain Plains	353,184	1,155
West	1,013,126	9,509

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.6b. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts and Work Status

	Benefits for SNAP Households ($000s)	
	Still Participating	Total Benefit Loss for Newly Ineligible Households
Total benefits	5,766,155	51,903
Countable income source		
Earnings	2,038,821	46,949
TANF (cash)	678,479	104
SSI	897,609	881
Social Security	743,098	5,240
Veterans' benefits	26,849	225
Gross countable income		
No income	1,213,141	0
$1 to $500	1,116,166	0
$501 to $1,000	1,894,731	105
$1,001 or more	1,542,117	51,799
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	3,216,753	101
51 to 100 percent	2,105,146	505
101 to 130 percent	412,163	3,753
131 to 185 percent	31,038	45,947
186 percent or higher	1,055	1,596
SNAP household members registered for work		
None	3,963,197	39,706
At least one	1,802,958	12,197
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	38,543	2,117
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	373,646	5,250
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program		
None	4,275,014	45,557
At least one	1,491,141	6,346
Type of employment[a]		
Active military	2,170	0
Farm-related	5,078	47
Other	1,659,280	42,837

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table C.7a. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)		Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
Total households	18,519	1,523	760
SNAP household size			
1 to 2 members	12,695	1,031	516
3 to 4 members	4,417	370	190
5 or more members	1,407	121	54
Age of SNAP household head			
Child (under age 18)	1,214	67	15
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	14,426	1,173	593
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	2,879	283	152
Gender of SNAP household head			
Male	6,057	419	210
Female	12,462	1,104	551
SNAP household composition			
With children	8,670	739	384
Single adult	4,829	436	212
Male adult	327	27	19
Female adult	4,502	409	193
Multiple adults	2,632	237	156
Married head	1,637	126	109
Other multiple-adult household	995	111	48
Child only	1,210	66	15
No children	9,849	784	376
With elderly individuals	2,973	291	162
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,622	455	120
With eligible noncitizens	1,091	83	40
Locality			
Metropolitan	14,636	1,293	593
Micropolitan	2,174	120	112
Rural	1,429	85	42
Not identified	280	24	14
SNAP region			
Northeast	2,172	253	101
Mid-Atlantic	1,657	433	114
Southeast	5,049	0	110
Midwest	2,883	566	192
Southwest	2,536	0	95
Mountain Plains	1,245	0	13
West	2,978	271	136

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.7b. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts and Work Status

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)		Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
Total households	18,519	1,523	760
Countable income source			
Earnings	5,334	538	479
TANF (cash)	1,406	184	1
SSI	3,762	419	14
Social Security	3,925	469	265
Veterans' benefits	142	11	11
Gross countable income			
No income	4,151	0	0
$1 to $500	3,052	209	0
$501 to $1,000	6,801	805	0
$1,001 or more	4,514	508	760
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline			
0 to 50 percent	8,547	323	0
51 to 100 percent	7,564	906	1
101 to 130 percent	2,095	273	106
131 to 185 percent	293	22	589
186 percent or higher	19	0	64
SNAP household members registered for work			
None	13,290	1,166	618
At least one	5,229	356	143
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	88	17	26
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	985	154	55
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program			
None	14,137	1,362	678
At least one	4,382	160	83
Type of employment[a]			
Active military	5	0	0
Farm-related	12	0	0
Other	4,271	455	425

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table C.8a. Individual SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality and Region

	Number of Individuals in Still Eligible Households (000s)		Number of Individuals in No Longer Eligible Households (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	
Total individuals	39,139	3,291	1,715
Age			
Children (under age 18)	17,778	1,457	691
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,093	468	220
School age children (age 5 to 17)	11,685	989	471
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	18,112	1,518	821
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,249	317	204
Gender			
Male	17,105	1,375	731
Female	22,035	1,917	984
Citizenship			
Citizen	37,571	3,157	1,656
Eligible noncitizen	1,568	134	59
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	2,171	130	47
Locality			
Metropolitan	30,669	2,805	1,347
Micropolitan	4,817	271	252
Rural	3,163	181	99
Not identified	491	34	17
SNAP region			
Northeast	4,022	482	233
Mid-Atlantic	3,351	974	258
Southeast	10,490	0	253
Midwest	5,973	1,262	390
Southwest	6,069	0	236
Mountain Plains	2,774	0	34
West	6,460	573	311
Individuals in households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty[b]	38,433	3,267	637

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to particpate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

[b]Because net income is not used in their benefit determinations, about 513 thousand households participating through the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) or SSI Combined Application Projects (SSI-CAPs) are excluded from these totals.

Table C.8b. Children Receiving SNAP or in Households with Children Receiving SNAP (Able to Directly Certify for National School Lunch Program) Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility

	Number Still Eligible and Participating (000s)	Number Ineligible in Still-Participating SNAP Household (000s)	Number in Newly Ineligible SNAP Households (000s)
Total individuals in households with children	30,375	n.a.	1,283
Children (under age 18)	19,235	348	694
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,560	18	220
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,675	330	474
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)*	30,371	n.a.	1,245
Children (under age 18)	19,233	348	675
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,560	18	210
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,673	330	465
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free lunch)*	30,211	n.a.	159
Children (under age 18)	19,144	348	89
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,540	18	18
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,604	330	72
Individuals in households with children with gross income above 130 percent and at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for reduced-price lunch)*	160	n.a.	1,086
Children (under age 18)	89	0	586
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	20	0	192
School age children (age 5 to 17)	69	0	394

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.9a. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	SNAP Household Benefits			
	Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s)	Still Participating with Lower Benefit		Total Benefit Loss for Newly Ineligible Households ($000s)
		Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	
Total benefits	5,322,503	308,008	86	56,292
SNAP household size				
1 to 2 members	2,433,299	112,002	87	20,891
3 to 4 members	1,969,782	127,839	84	25,843
5 or more members	919,422	68,166	82	9,557
Age of SNAP household head				
Child (under age 18)	387,961	15,780	72	994
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	4,524,620	273,885	84	52,075
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	409,922	18,343	99	3,223
Gender of SNAP household head				
Male	1,346,008	61,581	84	9,367
Female	3,976,495	246,427	87	46,926
SNAP household composition				
With children	3,678,884	245,143	81	46,228
Single adult	1,967,516	132,860	80	23,669
Male adult	122,267	7,521	78	1,559
Female adult	1,845,249	125,339	80	22,110
Multiple adults	1,324,962	96,832	86	21,565
Married head	825,161	52,831	83	14,960
Other multiple-adult household	499,801	44,001	89	6,605
Child only	386,405	15,451	72	994
No children	1,643,619	62,866	91	10,064
With elderly individuals	437,319	20,231	99	3,721
With disabled nonelderly individuals	797,811	67,186	104	4,656
With eligible noncitizens	375,441	20,908	85	2,997
Locality				
Metropolitan	4,231,136	267,756	86	45,140
Micropolitan	626,282	22,395	85	7,662
Rural	403,337	14,983	89	3,072
Not identified	61,748	2,874	82	418
SNAP region				
Northeast	588,387	41,728	103	8,690
Mid-Atlantic	440,373	96,374	84	9,384
Southeast	1,405,709	0	0	8,047
Midwest	825,802	113,673	90	10,629
Southwest	770,796	0	0	8,259
Mountain Plains	353,184	0	0	1,155
West	938,252	56,233	67	10,128

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.9b. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts and Work Status

	SNAP Household Benefits			
		Still Participating with Lower Benefit		Total Benefit Loss for Newly Ineligible Households ($000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s)	Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	
Total benefits	5,322,503	308,008	86	56,292
Countable income source				
Earnings	1,855,134	138,727	81	48,223
TANF (cash)	598,646	65,792	76	118
SSI	792,229	60,495	106	1,404
Social Security	648,649	45,016	99	8,160
Veterans' benefits	25,103	671	83	354
Gross countable income				
No income	1,213,141	0	0	0
$1 to $500	1,046,664	59,794	46	0
$501 to $1,000	1,688,908	130,181	94	105
$1,001 or more	1,373,789	118,033	90	56,188
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	3,072,961	125,514	57	101
51 to 100 percent	1,863,690	154,019	97	505
101 to 130 percent	359,369	26,896	87	6,066
131 to 185 percent	25,507	1,579	90	47,945
186 percent or higher	976	0	0	1,675
SNAP household members registered for work				
None	3,655,076	201,933	88	43,571
At least one	1,667,427	106,075	81	12,722
At least one working full-time (40+ hours per week)	32,014	5,036	88	2,122
None working full-time, but at least one working part-time (1-39 hours per week)	322,033	40,032	75	5,300
SNAP household members participating in employment and training program				
None	3,896,939	255,740	87	49,580
At least one	1,425,563	52,268	81	6,712
Type of employment[a]				
Active military	2,170	0	0	0
Farm-related	5,078	0	0	47
Other	1,503,210	118,055	81	44,038

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Note: Individuals identified as working part-time, full-time, or having an active military, farm-related or other occupation must have earnings or be self employed.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

Table C.10. Average SNAP Household Income and Benefits Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Average SNAP Household Size Number	Average SNAP Household Income Dollars	Average SNAP Household Benefit Dollars
All	20,791	2.1	743	273
Alabama	377	2.3	683	294
Alaska	35	2.5	928	412
Arizona	456	2.3	763	292
Arkansas	205	2.3	722	282
California	1,603	2.3	578	336
Colorado	197	2.3	708	311
Connecticut	200	1.8	783	222
Delaware	61	2.2	826	267
District of Columbia	76	1.8	505	250
Florida	1,659	1.9	645	257
Georgia	781	2.3	679	306
Guam	12	3.2	727	681
Hawaii	79	2.0	783	428
Idaho	95	2.4	784	308
Illinois	852	2.1	644	288
Indiana	374	2.3	719	302
Iowa	171	2.2	809	266
Kansas	136	2.2	734	268
Kentucky	374	2.2	670	270
Louisiana	381	2.3	717	291
Maine	126	2.0	906	242
Maryland	324	2.0	783	252
Massachusetts	439	1.8	859	197
Michigan	964	2.0	829	227
Minnesota	243	2.0	766	238
Mississippi	269	2.3	700	278
Missouri	427	2.2	716	273
Montana	56	2.2	776	275
Nebraska	75	2.3	813	280
Nevada	154	2.1	760	260
New Hampshire	53	2.1	977	245
New Jersey	366	2.0	839	229
New Mexico	177	2.3	767	290
New York	1,573	1.9	854	276
North Carolina	724	2.2	755	264
North Dakota	27	2.2	915	273
Ohio	837	2.1	713	285
Oklahoma	267	2.3	706	289
Oregon	416	1.8	790	220
Pennsylvania	811	2.1	870	239
Rhode Island	84	1.8	840	205
South Carolina	385	2.2	635	280
South Dakota	43	2.3	835	312
Tennessee	590	2.1	615	275
Texas	1,601	2.5	815	301
Utah	110	2.5	831	299
Vermont	45	2.0	1,080	237
Virgin Islands	9	2.4	686	431
Virginia	398	2.1	679	268
Washington	534	1.9	802	214
West Virginia	156	2.1	792	246
Wisconsin	367	2.2	961	199
Wyoming	15	2.4	785	288

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.11. Average SNAP Household Income and Benefits Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Average SNAP Household Size Number	Average SNAP Household Income Dollars	Average SNAP Household Benefit Dollars
All	20,116	2.1	702	287
Alabama	377	2.3	683	294
Alaska	35	2.5	928	412
Arizona	428	2.3	688	306
Arkansas	205	2.3	722	282
California	1,599	2.3	575	337
Colorado	197	2.3	704	312
Connecticut	190	1.8	728	266
Delaware	56	2.2	718	293
District of Columbia	73	1.8	469	258
Florida	1,616	1.8	612	261
Georgia	771	2.3	667	309
Guam	12	3.2	644	698
Hawaii	78	2.0	755	429
Idaho	95	2.4	784	308
Illinois	841	2.1	630	292
Indiana	374	2.3	719	302
Iowa	166	2.1	767	273
Kansas	136	2.2	734	269
Kentucky	374	2.2	670	270
Louisiana	381	2.3	715	291
Maine	115	1.9	796	256
Maryland	300	2.0	665	263
Massachusetts	418	1.8	794	241
Michigan	886	2.0	740	282
Minnesota	231	2.0	698	247
Mississippi	269	2.3	700	278
Missouri	425	2.2	712	273
Montana	54	2.2	737	281
Nebraska	75	2.3	813	280
Nevada	143	2.1	678	275
New Hampshire	50	2.0	877	252
New Jersey	349	2.0	794	282
New Mexico	173	2.3	739	294
New York	1,549	1.9	836	279
North Carolina	669	2.1	651	281
North Dakota	25	2.2	817	284
Ohio	816	2.1	689	291
Oklahoma	267	2.3	705	289
Oregon	376	1.8	661	247
Pennsylvania	770	2.1	811	276
Rhode Island	80	1.8	778	264
South Carolina	383	2.2	630	282
South Dakota	43	2.3	823	313
Tennessee	589	2.1	614	275
Texas	1,511	2.5	742	314
Utah	110	2.5	820	301
Vermont	40	1.9	927	255
Virgin Islands	9	2.5	662	441
Virginia	398	2.1	678	268
Washington	494	1.9	699	256
West Virginia	154	2.1	780	249
Wisconsin	325	2.1	823	272
Wyoming	15	2.4	785	288

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.12. Average SNAP Household Income and Benefits Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Average SNAP Household Size Number	Average SNAP Household Income Dollars	Average SNAP Household Benefit Dollars
All	20,042	2.1	699	281
Alabama	377	2.3	683	294
Alaska	35	2.5	928	412
Arizona	428	2.3	688	306
Arkansas	205	2.3	722	282
California	1,599	2.3	575	337
Colorado	197	2.3	704	312
Connecticut	185	1.8	711	236
Delaware	55	2.2	716	286
District of Columbia	73	1.8	467	257
Florida	1,616	1.8	612	261
Georgia	771	2.3	667	309
Guam	12	3.2	644	698
Hawaii	78	2.0	755	429
Idaho	95	2.4	784	308
Illinois	841	2.1	630	292
Indiana	374	2.3	719	302
Iowa	166	2.1	767	273
Kansas	136	2.2	734	269
Kentucky	374	2.2	670	270
Louisiana	381	2.3	715	291
Maine	115	1.9	796	256
Maryland	300	2.0	665	263
Massachusetts	409	1.8	772	207
Michigan	871	2.0	726	247
Minnesota	231	2.0	698	247
Mississippi	269	2.3	700	278
Missouri	425	2.2	712	273
Montana	54	2.2	737	281
Nebraska	75	2.3	813	280
Nevada	143	2.1	678	275
New Hampshire	50	2.0	877	252
New Jersey	342	2.1	777	242
New Mexico	173	2.3	739	294
New York	1,549	1.9	836	279
North Carolina	669	2.1	651	281
North Dakota	25	2.2	817	284
Ohio	816	2.1	689	291
Oklahoma	267	2.3	705	289
Oregon	374	1.8	657	238
Pennsylvania	758	2.1	798	252
Rhode Island	77	1.8	743	220
South Carolina	383	2.2	630	282
South Dakota	43	2.3	823	313
Tennessee	589	2.1	614	275
Texas	1,511	2.5	742	314
Utah	110	2.5	820	301
Vermont	40	1.9	927	255
Virgin Islands	9	2.5	662	441
Virginia	398	2.1	678	268
Washington	486	1.9	685	230
West Virginia	154	2.1	780	249
Wisconsin	315	2.1	806	225
Wyoming	15	2.4	785	288

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.13. Gross Income as Percent of Poverty Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Percentage of Households with Income in Poverty Range				
		0-50 Percent	51-100 Percent	101-130 Percent	131-185 Percent	186+ Percent
All	20,791	42.7	40.7	11.9	4.3	0.4
Alabama	377	44.0	43.8	11.8	0.4	0.0
Alaska	35	47.7	37.2	14.5	0.6	0.0
Arizona	456	46.2	34.2	13.6	6.1	0.0
Arkansas	205	42.4	46.1	10.9	0.5	0.1
California	1,603	67.6	26.2	5.6	0.5	0.1
Colorado	197	46.4	39.6	12.5	1.1	0.4
Connecticut	200	37.5	39.7	12.7	9.8	0.4
Delaware	61	41.4	35.2	14.2	8.0	1.1
District of Columbia	76	61.0	29.3	5.4	3.9	0.3
Florida	1,659	43.9	41.2	11.1	3.7	0.2
Georgia	781	46.4	40.4	11.4	1.7	0.0
Guam	12	59.5	25.3	10.1	5.1	0.0
Hawaii	79	43.5	46.5	8.1	1.9	0.0
Idaho	95	41.8	42.0	15.5	0.7	0.0
Illinois	852	46.3	42.1	9.8	1.9	0.0
Indiana	374	42.7	43.8	12.8	0.7	0.0
Iowa	171	39.5	41.8	13.7	4.8	0.2
Kansas	136	41.6	43.8	13.8	0.8	0.0
Kentucky	374	43.1	47.0	9.5	0.3	0.1
Louisiana	381	42.0	46.1	10.8	1.2	0.0
Maine	126	29.0	42.9	17.6	10.4	0.1
Maryland	324	42.1	38.9	10.5	7.4	1.2
Massachusetts	439	29.6	47.8	15.2	6.4	1.1
Michigan	964	35.4	41.2	13.1	9.2	1.1
Minnesota	243	40.5	41.6	12.3	4.9	0.7
Mississippi	269	41.6	49.0	9.1	0.3	0.0
Missouri	427	41.1	44.2	13.7	1.0	0.0
Montana	56	39.2	40.8	15.2	4.4	0.4
Nebraska	75	34.9	49.1	15.8	0.2	0.0
Nevada	154	44.0	36.6	12.2	6.8	0.4
New Hampshire	53	25.5	46.6	17.2	10.3	0.5
New Jersey	366	35.9	44.2	12.6	6.8	0.5
New Mexico	177	43.9	42.3	10.6	3.2	0.0
New York	1,573	29.1	50.0	14.3	5.7	0.9
North Carolina	724	44.5	36.6	11.2	6.8	0.9
North Dakota	27	32.3	40.7	15.8	10.5	0.8
Ohio	837	41.8	42.1	11.8	4.0	0.2
Oklahoma	267	42.8	45.6	11.1	0.5	0.0
Oregon	416	39.9	35.4	13.6	10.1	1.0
Pennsylvania	811	32.3	46.4	13.8	6.8	0.6
Rhode Island	84	30.8	45.2	13.3	9.8	0.8
South Carolina	385	50.0	37.5	12.0	0.5	0.0
South Dakota	43	36.4	45.3	15.5	2.7	0.1
Tennessee	590	49.1	38.7	11.1	1.1	0.0
Texas	1,601	44.1	36.3	12.7	6.3	0.5
Utah	110	40.4	44.6	13.5	1.4	0.1
Vermont	45	22.6	36.4	22.9	16.0	2.1
Virgin Islands	9	56.6	28.4	12.1	2.5	0.3
Virginia	398	44.3	42.6	12.4	0.6	0.1
Washington	534	40.0	38.7	13.0	7.5	0.9
West Virginia	156	30.8	56.0	11.9	1.3	0.0
Wisconsin	367	30.5	38.6	16.7	13.5	0.7
Wyoming	15	38.2	48.2	12.8	0.8	0.0

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.14. Gross Income as Percent of Poverty Under Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Percentage of Households with Income in Poverty Range				
		0-50 Percent	51-100 Percent	101-130 Percent	131-185 Percent	186+ Percent
All	20,116	44.1	42.1	11.9	1.8	0.1
Alabama	377	44.0	43.8	11.8	0.4	0.0
Alaska	35	47.7	37.2	14.5	0.6	0.0
Arizona	428	49.1	36.4	13.9	0.7	0.0
Arkansas	205	42.4	46.1	10.9	0.5	0.1
California	1,599	67.8	26.2	5.5	0.4	0.0
Colorado	197	46.6	39.8	12.2	1.0	0.4
Connecticut	190	39.4	41.7	13.2	5.1	0.5
Delaware	56	45.4	38.6	14.6	1.4	0.1
District of Columbia	73	63.1	30.3	5.5	0.9	0.2
Florida	1,616	45.1	42.3	11.2	1.5	0.0
Georgia	771	47.0	40.9	11.1	1.0	0.0
Guam	12	62.6	26.7	10.7	0.0	0.0
Hawaii	78	44.2	47.2	8.2	0.4	0.0
Idaho	95	41.8	42.1	15.4	0.7	0.0
Illinois	841	46.9	42.6	9.3	1.2	0.0
Indiana	374	42.7	43.8	12.8	0.7	0.0
Iowa	166	40.8	43.2	13.8	2.1	0.1
Kansas	136	41.6	43.8	13.8	0.7	0.0
Kentucky	374	43.1	47.0	9.5	0.3	0.1
Louisiana	381	42.0	46.1	10.8	1.1	0.0
Maine	115	31.6	46.7	18.5	3.2	0.0
Maryland	300	45.4	42.0	11.0	1.6	0.1
Massachusetts	418	31.1	50.1	15.6	2.8	0.4
Michigan	886	38.5	44.8	13.7	2.8	0.2
Minnesota	231	42.6	43.8	12.3	1.3	0.1
Mississippi	269	41.6	49.0	9.1	0.3	0.0
Missouri	425	41.3	44.4	13.7	0.6	0.0
Montana	54	40.5	42.2	15.3	1.9	0.1
Nebraska	75	34.9	49.1	15.8	0.2	0.0
Nevada	143	47.3	39.3	12.0	1.2	0.1
New Hampshire	50	27.3	49.9	18.0	4.5	0.4
New Jersey	349	37.6	46.3	13.1	2.7	0.4
New Mexico	173	44.9	43.3	10.8	1.0	0.0
New York	1,549	29.6	50.8	14.5	4.5	0.5
North Carolina	669	48.2	39.6	10.9	1.2	0.1
North Dakota	25	35.0	44.1	17.1	3.6	0.2
Ohio	816	42.9	43.2	11.4	2.4	0.1
Oklahoma	267	42.9	45.7	11.0	0.4	0.0
Oregon	376	44.2	39.2	14.1	2.5	0.0
Pennsylvania	770	34.0	48.9	13.9	3.1	0.1
Rhode Island	80	32.7	47.9	14.0	4.6	0.7
South Carolina	383	50.3	37.7	11.5	0.5	0.0
South Dakota	43	36.7	45.6	15.6	2.0	0.1
Tennessee	589	49.2	38.8	11.1	1.0	0.0
Texas	1,511	46.8	38.4	12.9	1.9	0.0
Utah	110	40.7	44.9	13.6	0.8	0.0
Vermont	40	25.5	41.0	25.2	7.2	1.1
Virgin Islands	9	58.1	29.1	12.0	0.9	0.0
Virginia	398	44.4	42.6	12.4	0.5	0.1
Washington	494	43.2	41.8	13.0	1.9	0.1
West Virginia	154	31.3	56.8	10.8	1.2	0.0
Wisconsin	325	34.4	43.6	18.0	4.0	0.0
Wyoming	15	38.2	48.2	12.8	0.8	0.0

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.15. Gross Income as Percent of Poverty Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility, by State

State	SNAP Households Number (000s)	Percentage of Households with Income in Poverty Range				
		0-50 Percent	51-100 Percent	101-130 Percent	131-185 Percent	186+ Percent
All	20,042	44.3	42.3	11.8	1.6	0.1
Alabama	377	44.0	43.8	11.8	0.4	0.0
Alaska	35	47.7	37.2	14.5	0.6	0.0
Arizona	428	49.1	36.4	13.9	0.7	0.0
Arkansas	205	42.4	46.1	10.9	0.5	0.1
California	1,599	67.8	26.2	5.5	0.4	0.0
Colorado	197	46.6	39.8	12.2	1.0	0.4
Connecticut	185	40.4	42.9	12.5	3.9	0.3
Delaware	55	45.5	38.7	14.5	1.2	0.1
District of Columbia	73	63.2	30.4	5.5	0.7	0.2
Florida	1,616	45.1	42.3	11.2	1.5	0.0
Georgia	771	47.0	40.9	11.1	1.0	0.0
Guam	12	62.6	26.7	10.7	0.0	0.0
Hawaii	78	44.2	47.2	8.2	0.4	0.0
Idaho	95	41.8	42.1	15.4	0.7	0.0
Illinois	841	46.9	42.6	9.3	1.2	0.0
Indiana	374	42.7	43.8	12.8	0.7	0.0
Iowa	166	40.8	43.2	13.8	2.1	0.1
Kansas	136	41.6	43.8	13.8	0.7	0.0
Kentucky	374	43.1	47.0	9.5	0.3	0.1
Louisiana	381	42.0	46.1	10.8	1.1	0.0
Maine	115	31.6	46.7	18.5	3.2	0.0
Maryland	300	45.4	42.0	11.0	1.6	0.1
Massachusetts	409	31.8	51.3	14.8	1.8	0.3
Michigan	871	39.2	45.5	13.2	1.9	0.2
Minnesota	231	42.6	43.8	12.3	1.3	0.1
Mississippi	269	41.6	49.0	9.1	0.3	0.0
Missouri	425	41.3	44.4	13.7	0.6	0.0
Montana	54	40.5	42.2	15.3	1.9	0.1
Nebraska	75	34.9	49.1	15.8	0.2	0.0
Nevada	143	47.3	39.3	12.0	1.2	0.1
New Hampshire	50	27.3	49.9	18.0	4.5	0.4
New Jersey	342	38.4	47.2	12.7	1.4	0.2
New Mexico	173	44.9	43.3	10.8	1.0	0.0
New York	1,549	29.6	50.8	14.5	4.5	0.5
North Carolina	669	48.2	39.6	10.9	1.2	0.1
North Dakota	25	35.0	44.1	17.1	3.6	0.2
Ohio	816	42.9	43.2	11.4	2.4	0.1
Oklahoma	267	42.9	45.7	11.0	0.4	0.0
Oregon	374	44.4	39.4	13.9	2.2	0.0
Pennsylvania	758	34.6	49.7	13.1	2.5	0.1
Rhode Island	77	33.9	49.7	13.8	2.5	0.1
South Carolina	383	50.3	37.7	11.5	0.5	0.0
South Dakota	43	36.7	45.6	15.6	2.0	0.1
Tennessee	589	49.2	38.8	11.1	1.0	0.0
Texas	1,511	46.8	38.4	12.9	1.9	0.0
Utah	110	40.7	44.9	13.6	0.8	0.0
Vermont	40	25.5	41.0	25.2	7.2	1.1
Virgin Islands	9	58.1	29.1	12.0	0.9	0.0
Virginia	398	44.4	42.6	12.4	0.5	0.1
Washington	486	43.9	42.5	12.2	1.2	0.1
West Virginia	154	31.3	56.8	10.8	1.2	0.0
Wisconsin	315	35.6	45.0	17.4	2.1	0.0
Wyoming	15	38.2	48.2	12.8	0.8	0.0

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

Table C.16. Poverty Indexes for Still Participating and No Longer Eligible Households Under All Three SNAP Policy Simulations

	Average Value for Households Still Participating with Same Benefit	Average Value for Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Average Value for Newly Ineligible Households
Poverty indexes under simulation to eliminate SUA conferred through LIHEAP benefit of less than $10			
Headcount	84.2	74.4	0.0
Poverty gap	56.3	33.8	0.0
Poverty gap squared	31.7	11.4	0.0
Poverty indexes under simulation to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility			
Headcount	86.2	n.a	0.3
Poverty gap	54.7	n.a	40.6
Poverty gap squared	29.9	n.a	16.5
Poverty indexes under combined simulation to eliminate SUA conferred through LIHEAP benefit of less than $10 and simulation to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility			
Headcount	87.0	80.7	0.2
Poverty gap	56.3	33.8	40.6
Poverty gap squared	31.7	11.4	16.5

Source: 2011 QC Minimodel with FY 2012 Standard Utility Allowances deflated to FY 2011 dollars.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX D

MATH SIPP+ POLICY CHANGE SIMULATION TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table D.1a. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristic

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	
Total households	19,841	294	10	12,902	0
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	13,504	233	10	10,445	0
3 to 4 members	4,724	53	0	1,563	0
5 or more members	1,614	7	0	894	0
Age of SNAP household head					
Child (under age 18)	1,099	3	0	519	0
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	15,408	208	7	5,823	0
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	3,334	82	3	6,560	0
Gender of SNAP household head					
Male	7,211	108	10	4,852	0
Female	12,630	186	0	8,050	0
Race/ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	10,499	140	6	8,079	0
African-American, non-Hispanic	4,355	87	4	1,818	0
Hispanic	3,740	37	0	2,357	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	525	18	0	331	0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	722	12	0	316	0
SNAP household composition					
With children	9,074	93	0	3,432	0
Single adult	4,603	69	0	1,013	0
Male adult	459	6	0	130	0
Female adult	4,144	63	0	882	0
Multiple adults	3,402	21	0	1,910	0
Married head	2,437	6	0	1,558	0
Other multiple-adult household	965	14	0	352	0
Child only	1,069	3	0	509	0
No children	10,768	201	10	9,470	0
With elderly individuals	3,509	85	3	6,809	0
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,358	95	2	922	0
With eligible noncitizens	1,406	13	0	1,641	0
Educational attainment of SNAP household head					
Less than high school or GED	3,518	77	2	2,349	0
High school or GED	6,814	127	3	4,965	0
Associate degree or some college	6,363	70	5	3,777	0
Bachelors degree or higher	2,253	17	0	1,386	0
Unknown or not in universe	893	3	0	425	0

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.1b. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Income Sources and Amounts, Employment Type, and Asset Amounts

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	
Total households	19,841	294	10	12,902	0
Countable income source					
Earnings	6,535	66	2	6,079	0
TANF (cash)	1,267	18	0	297	0
SSI	3,589	127	2	939	0
Social Security	4,245	111	3	6,767	0
Veterans' benefits	121	9	2	232	0
Gross countable income					
No income	3,504	0	0	25	0
$1 to $500	3,671	24	0	85	0
$501 to $1,000	6,842	198	7	2,146	0
$1,001 or more	5,824	71	3	10,646	0
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline					
0 to 50 percent	8,436	40	0	129	0
51 to 100 percent	8,112	222	5	2,368	0
101 to 130 percent	2,339	28	5	4,137	0
131 to 185 percent	789	0	0	5,265	0
186 percent or higher	165	3	0	1,003	0
Type of employment[a]					
Active military	11	0	0	43	0
Farm-related	148	0	0	51	0
Other	7,677	74	2	5,621	0
Amount of countable assets					
None	12,473	230	7	5,377	0
$1 to $1,000	4,249	43	3	3,680	0
$1,001 to $2,000	782	6	0	850	0
$2,001 to $3,250[b]	503	3	0	550	0
$3,251 or more	1,834	12	0	2,444	0

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table D.1c. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Locality and Region

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	
Total households	19,841	294	10	12,902	0
Locality					
Metropolitan	15,370	235	10	9,476	0
Not metropolitan	3,738	22	0	2,846	0
Not identified	733	36	0	580	0
SNAP region					
Northeast	2,336	140	5	1,519	0
Mid-Atlantic	1,901	84	3	1,510	0
Southeast	4,957	0	0	3,649	0
Midwest	3,311	44	2	1,977	0
Southwest	2,321	0	0	1,629	0
Mountain Plains	1,370	0	0	580	0
West	3,646	25	0	2,037	0
Food security status					
Food secure	12,901	179	5	9,785	0
Food insecure	2,505	49	0	1,072	0
Very food insecure	1,552	25	0	664	0
Unknown[a]	2,883	41	5	1,381	0

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6.

Table D.2. Individual SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Individuals in Still Eligible Households (000s)				Number of Individuals in No Longer Eligible Households (000s)
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	
Total individuals	42,747	489	10	24,579	0
Age					
Children (under age 18)	18,191	154	0	7,053	0
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,173	44	0	1,895	0
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,018	110	0	5,158	0
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	20,656	246	7	9,222	0
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,900	89	3	8,304	0
Gender					
Male	18,874	205	10	10,753	0
Female	23,872	284	0	13,826	0
Race/ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	20,101	217	6	13,575	0
African-American, non-Hispanic	9,611	148	4	3,243	0
Hispanic	10,175	86	0	6,101	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,025	18	0	686	0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	1,835	21	0	974	0
Citizenship					
Citizen	40,690	476	10	22,086	0
Eligible noncitizen	2,056	13	0	2,493	0
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	2,682	6	0	1,760	0
Locality					
Metropolitan	32,768	412	10	17,964	0
Not Metropolitan	8,527	26	0	5,553	0
Not identified	1,452	51	0	1,062	0
SNAP region					
Northeast	4,462	224	5	2,731	0
Mid-Atlantic	3,959	167	3	2,654	0
Southeast	10,564	0	0	6,391	0
Midwest	7,341	67	2	3,642	0
Southwest	5,570	0	0	3,802	0
Mountain Plains	2,808	0	0	1,120	0
West	8,042	30	0	4,239	0
Individuals ever in the military	1,302	25	2	1,775	0
Individuals in households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty	41,722	489	10	16,328	0

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to participate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table D.3a. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristic

| | Benefits for Still Eligible Households | | | | |
| | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | | | |
	Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s)	Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	Newly Not Participating ($000s)	Still Not Participating ($000s)
Total benefits	5,574,624	41,576	67	421	1,019,297
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	2,471,643	17,111	71	421	449,266
3 to 4 members	2,059,922	19,898	52	0	272,657
5 or more members	1,043,060	4,567	47	0	297,374
Age of SNAP household head					
Child (under age 18)	275,397	53	24	0	32,883
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	4,769,001	37,467	64	373	714,146
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	530,226	4,056	76	48	272,268
Gender of SNAP household head					
Male	1,822,187	11,459	68	421	389,840
Female	3,752,437	30,117	66	0	629,456
Race/ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	2,768,357	19,091	68	330	493,275
African-American, non-Hispanic	1,213,154	11,224	66	91	126,038
Hispanic	1,252,998	8,872	53	0	325,649
Asian or Pacific Islander	147,987	280	90	0	35,161
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	192,128	2,109	71	0	39,174
SNAP household composition					
With children	3,802,567	29,835	60	0	616,769
Single adult	1,842,041	20,517	68	0	113,240
Male adult	175,443	1,161	85	0	14,664
Female adult	1,666,598	19,356	67	0	98,576
Multiple adults	1,698,814	9,264	38	0	474,365
Married head	1,253,123	3,109	31	0	398,639
Other multiple-adult household	445,692	6,154	41	0	75,726
Child only	261,712	53	24	0	29,163
No children	1,772,057	11,741	70	421	402,528
With elderly individuals	587,037	4,587	76	48	300,112
With disabled nonelderly individuals	630,645	6,183	69	61	46,424
With eligible noncitizens	555,999	2,882	57	0	313,219
Educational attainment of SNAP household head					
Less than high school or GED	1,101,051	7,722	76	30	215,542
High school or GED	1,856,463	20,007	66	282	376,953
Associate degree or some college	1,788,643	11,947	60	109	279,797
Bachelors degree or higher	623,247	1,847	70	0	122,971
Unknown or not in universe	205,219	53	24	0	24,035

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.3b. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Income Sources and Amounts, Employment Type, and Asset Amounts

| | Benefits for Still Eligible Households | | | | |
| | Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s) | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | Newly Not Participating ($000s) | Still Not Participating ($000s) |
		Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)		
Total benefits	5,574,624	41,576	67	421	1,019,297
Countable income source					
Earnings	2,127,818	20,545	61	30	767,923
TANF (cash)	459,474	3,711	63	0	18,190
SSI	636,464	5,827	70	61	64,110
Social Security	718,377	8,818	76	48	254,392
Veterans' benefits	29,869	601	68	61	8,133
Gross countable income					
No income	1,148,333	0	0	0	13,447
$1 to $500	1,236,098	9,002	32	0	30,038
$501 to $1,000	1,599,282	14,621	69	139	124,895
$1,001 or more	1,590,911	17,952	74	282	850,917
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline					
0 to 50 percent	3,165,660	16,376	39	0	60,558
51 to 100 percent	1,928,002	23,309	68	109	336,527
101 to 130 percent	380,532	1,432	100	312	373,831
131 to 185 percent	80,539	0	0	0	219,002
186 percent or higher	19,891	458	59	0	29,379
Type of employment[a]					
Active military	5,733	0	0	0	7,556
Farm-related	61,486	0	0	0	4,526
Other	2,597,619	22,849	63	30	739,099
Amount of countable assets					
None	3,474,040	32,859	67	139	438,041
$1 to $1,000	1,248,334	6,171	70	282	304,186
$1,001 to $2,000	230,836	103	29	0	79,366
$2,001 to $3,250[b]	123,262	431	34	0	39,046
$3,251 or more	498,152	2,012	86	0	158,658

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table D.3c. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Locality and Region

| | | Benefits for Still Eligible Households | | | |
| | Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s) | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | Newly Not Participating ($000s) | Still Not Participating ($000s) |
		Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)		
Total benefits	5,574,624	41,576	67	421	1,019,297
Locality					
Metropolitan	4,301,931	37,495	64	421	759,254
Not metropolitan	1,081,206	1,048	73	0	221,514
Not identified	191,488	3,033	84	0	38,529
SNAP region					
Northeast	583,194	14,682	80	109	113,790
Mid-Atlantic	494,298	19,143	53	282	92,027
Southeast	1,352,729	0	0	0	217,337
Midwest	948,095	5,262	57	30	128,579
Southwest	712,691	0	0	0	177,734
Mountain Plains	380,505	0	0	0	58,693
West	1,103,112	2,489	62	0	231,137
Food security status					
Food secure	3,573,339	24,739	70	109	747,337
Food insecure	727,446	6,276	68	0	101,457
Very food insecure	437,991	4,986	52	0	59,033
Unknown[a]	835,848	5,575	63	312	111,470

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6.

Table D.4a. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)			Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating	All	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total households	23,763	17,469	6,293	9,284	2,676	6,609
SNAP household size						
1 to 2 members	16,580	11,691	4,889	7,612	2,056	5,557
3 to 4 members	5,135	4,285	849	1,205	492	714
5 or more members	2,048	1,493	555	467	128	339
Age of SNAP household head						
Child (under age 18)	1,407	1,014	393	215	88	126
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	16,811	13,769	3,042	4,634	1,854	2,780
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	5,544	2,686	2,858	4,435	734	3,702
Gender of SNAP household head						
Male	8,454	6,192	2,262	3,727	1,137	2,590
Female	15,309	11,278	4,031	5,557	1,538	4,019
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	12,040	8,648	3,393	6,684	1,997	4,687
African-American, non-Hispanic	5,261	4,189	1,072	1,002	256	746
Hispanic	5,038	3,565	1,473	1,097	213	884
Asian or Pacific Islander	578	409	168	297	134	163
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	846	659	187	205	76	129
SNAP household composition						
With children	10,422	8,357	2,065	2,177	810	1,367
Single adult	4,999	4,398	601	685	273	412
Male adult	471	401	70	124	64	60
Female adult	4,528	3,997	531	560	209	351
Multiple adults	4,053	2,972	1,081	1,280	451	829
Married head	2,947	2,072	874	1,055	371	684
Other multiple-adult household	1,106	900	207	226	80	146
Child only	1,370	987	383	212	85	126
No children	13,341	9,113	4,228	7,107	1,866	5,241
With elderly individuals	5,795	2,825	2,969	4,611	771	3,840
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,698	3,137	561	680	318	362
With eligible noncitizens	2,394	1,299	1,095	666	120	546
Educational attainment of SNAP household head						
Less than high school or GED	4,808	3,343	1,465	1,137	254	884
High school or GED	8,589	6,225	2,364	3,320	719	2,601
Associate degree or some college	7,190	5,521	1,669	3,026	918	2,108
Bachelors degree or higher	2,029	1,555	474	1,626	714	912
Unknown or not in universe	1,146	826	320	175	71	105

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.4b. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts, Employment Type, and Asset Amounts

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)			Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating	All	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total households	23,763	17,469	6,293	9,284	2,676	6,609
Countable income source						
Earnings	8,843	5,650	3,193	3,839	952	2,886
TANF (cash)	1,534	1,271	263	48	14	34
SSI	4,370	3,611	760	286	107	179
Social Security	6,544	3,592	2,952	4,582	767	3,815
Veterans' benefits	230	126	104	134	7	128
Gross countable income						
No income	3,335	3,310	25	194	194	0
$1 to $500	2,976	2,929	47	804	766	38
$501 to $1,000	8,470	6,551	1,919	723	497	227
$1,001 or more	8,982	4,679	4,302	7,563	1,219	6,344
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline						
0 to 50 percent	7,549	7,463	86	1,056	1,013	43
51 to 100 percent	9,833	7,693	2,141	875	647	228
101 to 130 percent	4,991	1,970	3,021	1,516	401	1,115
131 to 185 percent	1,019	241	778	5,036	549	4,487
186 percent or higher	370	103	268	800	65	735
Type of employment[a]						
Active military	12	7	5	42	4	38
Farm-related	134	108	25	65	40	25
Other	9,219	6,433	2,786	4,154	1,319	2,835
Amount of countable assets						
None	15,850	12,367	3,483	2,237	343	1,895
$1 to $1,000	6,137	4,098	2,039	1,838	197	1,641
$1,001 to $2,000	1,218	759	459	421	29	391
$2,001 to $3,250[b]	429	205	224	628	301	327
$3,251 or more	129	40	89	4,161	1,805	2,355
$3,251 to $5,000	49	25	24	487	182	305
$5,001 to $10,000	32	10	22	865	338	526
$10,000 or more	48	6	43	2,808	1,285	1,523

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table D.4c. Household-Level Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Locality and Region

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)			Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating	All	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total households	23,763	17,469	6,293	9,284	2,676	6,609
Locality						
Metropolitan	18,063	13,530	4,533	7,029	2,085	4,943
Not metropolitan	4,855	3,323	1,532	1,751	438	1,314
Not identified	845	617	228	504	152	352
SNAP region						
Northeast	2,655	1,999	656	1,345	482	863
Mid-Atlantic	2,437	1,764	672	1,061	223	838
Southeast	5,951	4,375	1,577	2,654	582	2,072
Midwest	3,707	2,911	796	1,626	445	1,181
Southwest	3,181	2,166	1,015	770	155	615
Mountain Plains	1,693	1,231	461	257	138	119
West	4,138	3,022	1,116	1,570	650	921
Food security status						
Food secure	15,729	11,119	4,611	7,140	1,966	5,174
Food insecure	3,021	2,366	655	605	188	417
Very food insecure	1,884	1,482	402	356	95	261
Unknown[a]	3,128	2,502	626	1,182	427	756

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6.

Table D.5. Individual SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Individuals in Still Eligible Households (000s)			Number of Individuals in No Longer Eligible Households (000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating	All	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total individuals	50,616	38,160	12,456	17,209	5,086	12,123
Age						
Children (under age 18)	21,186	16,900	4,286	4,212	1,445	2,767
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,990	5,792	1,198	1,122	425	697
School age children (age 5 to 17)	14,196	11,108	3,088	3,090	1,020	2,070
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	22,876	18,143	4,733	7,255	2,765	4,490
Elderly adults (age 60+)	6,555	3,117	3,438	5,742	876	4,867
Gender						
Male	22,014	16,675	5,339	7,829	2,414	5,415
Female	28,602	21,484	7,118	9,380	2,672	6,708
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	22,507	16,676	5,831	11,391	3,648	7,743
African-American, non-Hispanic	11,085	9,223	1,862	1,921	540	1,381
Hispanic	13,640	9,798	3,842	2,722	463	2,259
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,126	790	336	602	253	350
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	2,258	1,673	585	572	183	389
Citizenship						
Citizen	46,996	36,242	10,754	16,268	4,935	11,333
Eligible noncitizen	3,621	1,918	1,703	941	151	790
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	3,659	2,424	1,235	789	264	525
Locality						
Metropolitan	38,229	29,307	8,922	12,925	3,883	9,042
Not metropolitan	10,804	7,686	3,118	3,302	867	2,435
Not identified	1,583	1,166	417	982	337	645
SNAP region						
Northeast	4,849	3,745	1,104	2,574	946	1,628
Mid-Atlantic	4,793	3,638	1,155	1,991	492	1,499
Southeast	12,438	9,549	2,890	4,516	1,015	3,501
Midwest	8,163	6,571	1,592	2,890	839	2,050
Southwest	7,604	5,251	2,352	1,769	319	1,450
Mountain Plains	3,459	2,581	878	469	227	242
West	9,311	6,825	2,486	3,001	1,248	1,753
Individuals ever in the military	1,618	1,070	549	1,486	259	1,227
Individuals in households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty	50,060	37,990	12,070	8,490	4,232	4,258

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to participate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table D.6a. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic

	Benefits for Still-Eligible Households ($000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating
Total benefits	5,727,607	5,026,898	700,709
SNAP household size			
1 to 2 members	2,427,604	2,152,077	275,528
3 to 4 members	2,084,127	1,894,264	189,863
5 or more members	1,215,875	980,557	235,318
Age of SNAP household head			
Child (under age 18)	280,755	253,227	27,527
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	4,869,434	4,352,921	516,513
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	577,418	420,749	156,669
Gender of SNAP household head			
Male	1,834,133	1,582,847	251,286
Female	3,893,474	3,444,051	449,423
Race/ethnicity			
White, non-Hispanic	2,601,036	2,313,177	287,859
African-American, non-Hispanic	1,293,935	1,196,538	97,396
Hispanic	1,489,222	1,223,147	266,075
Asian or Pacific Islander	135,015	113,078	21,937
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	208,399	180,958	27,441
SNAP household composition			
With children	4,010,724	3,541,115	469,609
Single adult	1,889,934	1,795,980	93,954
Male adult	171,762	158,723	13,039
Female adult	1,718,172	1,637,257	80,915
Multiple adults	1,855,794	1,503,947	351,847
Married head	1,380,305	1,086,019	294,286
Other multiple-adult household	475,489	417,927	57,562
Child only	264,996	241,188	23,808
No children	1,716,883	1,485,783	231,100
With elderly individuals	643,262	468,231	175,031
With disabled nonelderly individuals	647,373	614,055	33,318
With eligible noncitizens	782,361	520,403	261,958
Educational attainment of SNAP household head			
Less than high school or GED	1,244,677	1,058,769	185,908
High school or GED	2,026,548	1,760,917	265,631
Associate degree or some college	1,759,414	1,585,133	174,281
Bachelors degree or higher	487,191	431,407	55,784
Unknown or not in universe	209,777	190,672	19,106

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.6b. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts, Employment Type, and Asset Amounts

	Benefits for Still-Eligible Households ($000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating
Total benefits	5,727,607	5,026,898	700,709
Countable income source			
Earnings	2,462,449	1,913,236	549,214
TANF (cash)	477,135	459,951	17,184
SSI	696,637	641,503	55,134
Social Security	788,879	639,313	149,566
Veterans' benefits	34,769	30,161	4,608
Gross countable income			
No income	1,105,059	1,091,611	13,447
$1 to $500	1,027,681	1,010,676	17,005
$501 to $1,000	1,612,290	1,508,455	103,835
$1,001 or more	1,982,577	1,416,156	566,421
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline			
0 to 50 percent	2,901,378	2,858,733	42,645
51 to 100 percent	2,082,298	1,780,188	302,110
101 to 130 percent	637,433	333,736	303,697
131 to 185 percent	77,212	36,492	40,720
186 percent or higher	29,286	17,749	11,537
Type of employment[a]			
Active military	4,885	4,061	823
Farm-related	48,754	46,339	2,415
Other	2,783,233	2,257,815	525,418
Amount of countable assets			
None	3,881,048	3,505,767	375,281
$1 to $1,000	1,479,500	1,242,884	236,617
$1,001 to $2,000	295,281	227,947	67,334
$2,001 to $3,250[b]	62,361	45,059	17,302
$3,251 or more	9,416	5,241	4,175

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table D.6c. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Locality and Region

	Benefits for Still-Eligible Households ($000s)		
	All	Still Participating	Still Not Participating
Total benefits	5,727,607	5,026,898	700,709
Locality			
Metropolitan	4,400,439	3,884,435	516,004
Not metropolitan	1,150,129	987,036	163,093
Not identified	177,038	155,427	21,612
SNAP region			
Northeast	562,708	495,945	66,764
Mid-Atlantic	529,570	473,400	56,171
Southeast	1,386,380	1,243,705	142,675
Midwest	930,953	850,301	80,651
Southwest	833,567	687,493	146,074
Mountain Plains	393,947	348,197	45,750
West	1,090,482	927,858	162,624
Food security status			
Food secure	3,656,250	3,152,012	504,238
Food insecure	771,469	700,918	70,551
Very food insecure	473,183	424,933	48,250
Unknown[a]	826,705	749,036	77,669

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6.

Table D.7a. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)	
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total households	17,163	279	27	6,271	2,676	6,631
SNAP household size						
1 to 2 members	11,446	219	27	4,866	2,056	5,579
3 to 4 members	4,232	53	0	849	492	714
5 or more members	1,486	7	0	555	128	339
Age of SNAP household head						
Child (under age 18)	1,008	3	3	393	88	126
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	13,547	201	21	3,037	1,854	2,786
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	2,608	75	3	2,841	734	3,719
Gender of SNAP household head						
Male	6,072	104	16	2,252	1,137	2,600
Female	11,091	176	11	4,019	1,538	4,031
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	8,498	129	20	3,373	1,997	4,706
African-American, non-Hispanic	4,101	84	4	1,072	256	746
Hispanic	3,525	37	3	1,470	213	887
Asian or Pacific Islander	392	18	0	168	134	163
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	647	11	0	187	76	129
SNAP household composition						
With children	8,263	91	3	2,065	810	1,367
Single adult	4,331	67	0	601	273	412
Male adult	395	6	0	70	64	60
Female adult	3,936	61	0	531	209	351
Multiple adults	2,951	21	0	1,081	451	829
Married head	2,066	6	0	874	371	684
Other multiple-adult household	885	14	0	207	80	146
Child only	981	3	3	383	85	126
No children	8,900	188	24	4,206	1,866	5,264
With elderly individuals	2,745	77	3	2,952	771	3,857
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,036	95	6	555	318	367
With eligible noncitizens	1,288	11	0	1,092	120	549
Educational attainment of SNAP household head						
Less than high school or GED	3,267	74	2	1,465	254	884
High school or GED	6,093	121	11	2,348	719	2,617
Associate degree or some college	5,443	66	11	1,663	918	2,114
Bachelors degree or higher	1,540	15	0	474	714	912
Unknown or not in universe	820	3	3	320	71	105

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.7b. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts, Employment Type, and Asset Amounts

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)	
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total households	17,163	279	27	6,271	2,676	6,631
Countable income source						
Earnings	5,580	59	10	3,190	952	2,890
TANF (cash)	1,253	18	0	263	14	34
SSI	3,478	127	6	760	107	179
Social Security	3,481	104	7	2,938	767	3,828
Veterans' benefits	114	9	2	104	7	128
Gross countable income						
No income	3,306	0	4	25	194	0
$1 to $500	2,908	21	0	47	766	38
$501 to $1,000	6,346	192	14	1,919	497	227
$1,001 or more	4,604	67	9	4,280	1,219	6,367
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline						
0 to 50 percent	7,424	35	4	86	1,013	43
51 to 100 percent	7,465	216	12	2,141	647	228
101 to 130 percent	1,935	25	11	3,020	401	1,117
131 to 185 percent	241	0	0	757	549	4,508
186 percent or higher	99	3	0	268	65	735
Type of employment[a]						
Active military	7	0	0	5	4	38
Farm-related	108	0	0	25	40	25
Other	6,358	67	8	2,783	1,319	2,838
Amount of countable assets						
None	12,113	230	24	3,472	343	1,905
$1 to $1,000	4,052	43	3	2,026	197	1,653
$1,001 to $2,000	752	6	0	459	29	391
$2,001 to $3,250[b]	205	0	0	224	301	327
$3,251 or more	40	0	0	89	1,805	2,355

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table D.7c. SNAP Household Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Locality and Region

	Number of Households Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Households No Longer Eligible (000s)	
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total households	17,163	279	27	6,271	2,676	6,631
Locality						
Metropolitan	13,288	226	16	4,519	2,085	4,957
Not metropolitan	3,291	20	11	1,524	438	1,322
Not identified	584	33	0	228	152	352
SNAP region						
Northeast	1,860	134	5	648	482	871
Mid-Atlantic	1,679	82	3	663	223	847
Southeast	4,363	0	12	1,577	582	2,072
Midwest	2,867	43	2	790	445	1,187
Southwest	2,166	0	0	1,015	155	615
Mountain Plains	1,231	0	0	461	138	119
West	2,997	20	5	1,116	650	921
Food security status						
Food secure	10,934	171	14	4,594	1,966	5,190
Food insecure	2,320	46	0	649	188	424
Very food insecure	1,457	25	0	402	95	261
Unknown[a]	2,451	38	13	626	427	756

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6.

Table D.8a. Individual SNAP Eligibility and Participation Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic, Locality, and Region

	Number of Individuals Still Eligible (000s)				Number of Individuals No Longer Eligible (000s)	
	Still Participating with Same Benefit	Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Newly Not Participating	Still Not Participating	Previously Participating	Previously Not Participating
Total individuals	37,663	468	29	12,434	5,086	12,145
Age						
Children (under age 18)	16,745	152	3	4,286	1,445	2,767
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	5,745	44	3	1,198	425	697
School age children (age 5 to 17)	11,000	108	0	3,088	1,020	2,070
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	17,887	233	23	4,727	2,765	4,495
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,032	82	3	3,421	876	4,883
Gender						
Male	16,458	199	18	5,329	2,414	5,425
Female	21,205	268	11	7,105	2,672	6,721
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	16,451	203	22	5,812	3,648	7,763
African-American, non-Hispanic	9,077	142	4	1,862	540	1,381
Hispanic	9,709	86	3	3,839	463	2,263
Asian or Pacific Islander	772	18	0	336	253	350
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	1,654	19	0	585	183	389
Citizenship						
Citizen	35,757	457	29	10,734	4,935	11,352
Eligible noncitizen	1,907	11	0	1,700	151	793
Ineligible noncitizens affiliated with SNAP household[a]	2,415	6	3	1,235	264	525
Locality						
Metropolitan	28,892	397	18	8,908	3,883	9,056
Not metropolitan	7,652	23	11	3,109	867	2,444
Not identified	1,119	48	0	417	337	645
SNAP Region						
Northeast	3,524	215	5	1,096	946	1,635
Mid-Atlantic	3,471	164	3	1,146	492	1,508
Southeast	9,537	0	12	2,890	1,015	3,501
Midwest	6,503	66	2	1,586	839	2,056
Southwest	5,251	0	0	2,352	319	1,450
Mountain Plains	2,581	0	0	878	227	242
West	6,796	23	6	2,486	1,248	1,753
Individuals ever in the military	1,042	25	2	542	259	1,234
Individuals in households with net income at or below 100 percent of poverty	37,493	468	29	12,048	4,232	4,281

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These ineligible noncitizens are considered to be part of the SNAP household even though they are not eligible to particpate. Consequently, their income and assets are considered in the household's eligibility and benefit determination. They are not included in the total number of participating individuals or in any other estimate in this table.

Table D.8b. Children Receiving SNAP or in Households with Children Receiving SNAP (Able to Directly Certify for National School Lunch Program) Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility

	Number Still Eligible and Participating (000s)	Number of Nonparticipating Children in Household (000s)	Number no Longer Eligible or Not Participating (000s)
Total individuals in households with children	27,381	363	3,059
Children (under age 18)	16,897	363	1,842
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	5,789	24	500
School age children (age 5 to 17)	11,108	339	1,342
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free or reduced-price lunch)*	27,378	363	2,902
Children (under age 18)	16,895	363	1,693
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	5,787	24	473
School age children (age 5 to 17)	11,108	339	1,221
	27,271	363	2,500
Individuals in households with children with gross income at or below 130 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for free lunch)*			
Children (under age 18)	16,830	363	1,462
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	5,781	24	420
School age children (age 5 to 17)	11,049	339	1,042
Individuals in households with children with gross income above 130 percent and at or below 185 percent of poverty guideline *(able to certify for reduced-price lunch)*	107	0	402
Children (under age 18)	65	0	231
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	5	0	52
School age children (age 5 to 17)	59	0	179

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.9a. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristic

| | | Benefits for Still Eligible Households | | | |
| | | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | | |
	Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s)	Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	Newly Not Participating ($000s)	Still Not Participating ($000s)
Total benefits	4,966,210	39,133	67	1,825	698,474
SNAP household size					
1 to 2 members	2,118,960	14,668	71	1,825	273,963
3 to 4 members	1,871,605	19,898	52	0	189,863
5 or more members	975,644	4,567	47	0	234,647
Age of SNAP household head					
Child (under age 18)	252,999	53	24	93	27,527
Nonelderly adult (age 18 to 59)	4,301,373	35,973	65	1,684	515,257
Elderly adult (age 60 and over)	411,838	3,106	72	48	155,689
Gender of SNAP household head					
Male	1,562,549	10,802	67	1,393	250,912
Female	3,403,661	28,330	66	432	447,562
Race/ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	2,284,584	17,523	68	1,641	286,721
African-American, non-Hispanic	1,179,858	10,688	64	91	96,971
Hispanic	1,212,220	8,872	53	93	265,404
Asian or Pacific Islander	111,215	280	90	0	21,937
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	178,332	1,769	75	0	27,441
SNAP household composition					
With children	3,506,071	29,476	60	93	468,663
Single adult	1,771,222	20,159	68	0	93,679
Male adult	157,044	1,161	85	0	13,039
Female adult	1,614,178	18,997	67	0	80,640
Multiple adults	1,493,890	9,264	38	0	351,176
Married head	1,082,712	3,109	31	0	293,614
Other multiple-adult household	411,177	6,154	41	0	57,562
Child only	240,960	53	24	93	23,808
No children	1,460,138	9,657	70	1,731	229,811
With elderly individuals	458,622	3,637	72	48	174,050
With disabled nonelderly individuals	600,651	6,183	69	334	33,073
With eligible noncitizens	517,392	2,300	64	0	261,028
Educational attainment of SNAP household head					
Less than high school or GED	1,045,834	7,186	75	30	185,711
High school or GED	1,731,899	19,471	65	1,385	264,172
Associate degree or some college	1,569,047	11,157	61	317	173,701
Bachelors degree or higher	428,987	1,265	76	0	55,784
Unknown or not in universe	190,443	53	24	93	19,106

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

Table D.9b. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Income Sources and Amounts, Employment Type, and Asset Amounts

| | Benefits for Still Eligible Households | | | | |
| | | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | | |
	Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s)	Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)	Newly Not Participating ($000s)	Still Not Participating ($000s)
Total benefits	4,966,210	39,133	67	1,825	698,474
Countable income source					
Earnings	1,889,821	19,070	64	331	548,196
TANF (cash)	455,096	3,711	63	0	17,106
SSI	626,156	5,827	70	334	54,923
Social Security	623,201	7,868	73	320	148,667
Veterans' benefits	28,601	601	68	61	4,608
Gross countable income					
No income	1,090,781	0	0	831	13,447
$1 to $500	1,001,845	8,083	36	0	17,005
$501 to $1,000	1,480,503	13,512	68	505	103,286
$1,001 or more	1,393,080	17,538	71	490	564,735
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline					
0 to 50 percent	2,841,359	15,099	41	831	42,495
51 to 100 percent	1,742,292	22,219	68	475	300,792
101 to 130 percent	328,969	1,357	95	519	303,403
131 to 185 percent	36,492	0	0	0	40,246
186 percent or higher	17,098	458	59	0	11,537
Type of employment[a]					
Active military	4,061	0	0	0	823
Farm-related	46,339	0	0	0	2,415
Other	2,231,544	21,375	66	237	524,401
Amount of countable assets					
None	3,455,114	32,859	67	1,543	374,114
$1 to $1,000	1,233,141	6,171	70	282	235,594
$1,001 to $2,000	227,654	103	29	0	67,289
$2,001 to $3,250[b]	45,059	0	0	0	17,302
$3,251 or more	5,241	0	0	0	4,175

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]SNAP household contains at least one member with type of employment. Because SNAP households may contain more than one employed member, categories are not mutually exclusive.

[b]Beginning in FY 2012, the SNAP asset limit for households with elderly or disabled members was $3,250.

Table D.9c. Benefits for Eligible and Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Locality and Region

| | | Benefits for Still Eligible Households | | | |
| | Still Participating with Same Benefit ($000s) | Still Participating with Lower Benefit | | Newly Not Participating ($000s) | Still Not Participating ($000s) |
		Total ($000s)	Average Benefit Loss For Those Still Participating ($)		
Total benefits	4,966,210	39,133	67	1,825	698,474
Locality					
Metropolitan	3,832,414	35,560	64	835	514,931
Not metropolitan	983,903	614	75	990	162,037
Not identified	149,893	2,958	79	0	21,506
SNAP region					
Northeast	470,767	14,072	78	109	65,797
Mid-Atlantic	449,844	18,561	53	282	55,413
Southeast	1,242,536	0	0	1,169	142,675
Midwest	842,469	5,167	56	30	80,219
Southwest	687,493	0	0	0	146,074
Mountain Plains	348,197	0	0	0	45,750
West	924,904	1,333	69	235	162,545
Food security status					
Food secure	3,115,524	23,695	68	617	502,761
Food insecure	692,342	5,335	71	0	70,085
Very food insecure	418,639	4,986	52	0	48,148
Unknown[a]	739,705	5,117	65	1,208	77,480

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Food security questions were asked in the Wave 6 Topical Module. This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6.

Table D.10. Poverty Indexes for Still Participating and No Longer Eligible Households Under All Three SNAP Policy Reforms

	Average Value for Households Still Participating with Same Benefit	Average Value for Households Still Participating with Lower Benefit	Average Value for Newly Ineligible Households
Poverty indexes under simulation to eliminate SUA conferred through LIHEAP benefit of less than $10			
Headcount	83.4	89.3	n.a.
Poverty gap	52.7	21.6	n.a.
Poverty gap squared	27.8	4.7	n.a.
Poverty indexes under simulation to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility			
Headcount	86.8	n.a.	62.1
Poverty gap	51.1	n.a.	62.4
Poverty gap squared	26.1	n.a.	38.9
Poverty indexes under combined simulation to eliminate SUA conferred through LIHEAP benefit of less than $10 and simulation to eliminate non-cash categorical eligibility			
Headcount	86.7	89.9	62.1
Poverty gap	51.7	20.5	62.4
Poverty gap squared	26.7	4.2	38.9

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX E

SUPPLEMENTAL MATH SIPP+ BASELINE TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table E.1. Participating SNAP Households, Average Income, and Average Benefit, by Demographic Characteristics

	Households		Average ($)	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Gross Income	SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	20,145	100.0	743	280
SNAP household composition				
With children	9,166	45.5	896	419
Single adult	4,671	23.2	747	400
Male adult	465	2.3	698	381
Female adult	4,206	20.9	752	402
Multiple adults	3,423	17.0	1,206	499
Married head	2,443	12.1	1,214	514
Other multiple-adult household	980	4.9	1,186	462
Child only	1,072	5.3	562	244
No children	10,979	54.5	615	164
With elderly individuals	3,596	17.9	863	166
With disabled nonelderly individuals	3,455	17.2	1,016	186
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head				
White, non-Hispanic	10,645	52.8	728	263
African-American, non-Hispanic	4,446	22.1	731	277
Hispanic	3,777	18.8	802	335
Asian or Pacific Islander	543	2.7	727	276
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	734	3.6	744	266
Educational attainment of SNAP household head				
Less than high school or GED	3,596	17.9	755	310
High school or GED	6,944	34.5	775	272
Associate degree or some college	6,439	32.0	787	280
Bachelors degree or higher	2,269	11.3	566	276
Unknown or not in universe	896	4.5	584	229
Food security status				
Food secure	13,085	65.0	747	276
Food insecure	2,554	12.7	735	289
Very food insecure	1,577	7.8	777	282
Unknown[a]	2,929	14.5	716	288
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	7,585	37.6	651	305
With earnings	3,162	15.7	1,052	296
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	1,596	7.9	1,262	406
Without earnings	4,422	22.0	365	311
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	1,801	8.9	586	457

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table E.2. Participating SNAP Households, Average Income, and Average Benefit, by Economic Characteristics

	Households		Average ($)	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Gross Income	SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	20,145	100.0	743	280
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	8,476	42.1	201	376
51 to 100 percent	8,340	41.4	971	236
101 to 130 percent	2,371	11.8	1,475	163
131 to 200 percent	876	4.4	1,686	100
201 percent or higher	81	0.4	2,378	165
Gross countable income				
No income	3,504	17.4	0	328
$1 to $500	3,695	18.3	206	337
$501 to $1,000	7,048	35.0	752	231
$1,001 to $1,500	3,612	17.9	1,220	261
$1,501 or more	2,287	11.4	1,971	294
Net income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	15,556	77.2	566	324
51 to 100 percent	4,051	20.1	1,291	142
101 percent or higher	538	2.7	1,749	30
Countable income source				
Earnings	6,602	32.8	1,120	326
TANF (cash)	1,285	6.4	957	361
SSI	3,718	18.5	953	175
Social Security	4,359	21.6	1,040	169
Veterans' benefits	132	0.7	792	237
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]				
No expense	3,081	15.3	338	270
1 to 30 percent	4,681	23.2	977	192
31 to 50 percent	2,646	13.1	1,085	246
51 percent or more	7,952	39.5	816	328
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]				
No expense	19,588	97.2	732	276
1 to 15 percent	281	1.4	1,389	379
16 percent or more	233	1.2	1,037	473
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a, b]				
No expense	16,738	83.1	702	301
1 to 10 percent	1,855	9.2	1,026	154
11 percent or more	1,444	7.2	913	192

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table E.3. Participating Individuals, Average Income, and Average Benefit, by Demographic Characteristics

	Individuals		Average ($)	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Gross Income	SNAP Benefit
Total participating individuals	43,246	100.0	915	391
Age				
Children (under age 18)	18,345	42.4	1,015	492
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	6,217	14.4	934	472
School age children (age 5 to 17)	12,128	28.0	1,057	503
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	20,908	48.3	830	343
Elderly adults (age 60+)	3,992	9.2	897	175
Disabled nonelderly individuals	3,818	8.8	1,093	198
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	20,324	47.0	879	363
African-American, non-Hispanic	9,762	22.6	932	390
Hispanic	10,261	23.7	962	450
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,043	2.4	863	394
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	1,856	4.3	988	378
Food security status				
Food secure	27,810	64.3	918	386
Food insecure	5,662	13.1	874	402
Very food insecure	3,508	8.1	1,001	391
Unknown[a]	6,265	14.5	889	402
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children				
under age 5	9,256	21.4	715	332
With earnings	3,062	7.1	1,064	294

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX F

MATH SIPP+ TABLES SHOWING PERCENTAGE LOSS IN INCOME PLUS SNAP BENEFIT FROM POLICY CHANGES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table F.1. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristics

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	304	6.7
SNAP household composition		
With children	93	4.8
Single adult	69	5.7
Male adult	6	*
Female adult	63	5.5
Multiple adults	21	*
Married head	6	*
Other multiple-adult household	14	*
Child only	3	*
No children	211	7.6
With elderly individuals	88	7.8
With disabled nonelderly individuals	98	7.4
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head		
White, non-Hispanic	146	6.6
African-American, non-Hispanic	91	6.9
Hispanic	37	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	*
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	12	*
Educational attainment of SNAP household head		
Less than high school or GED	78	7.5
High school or GED	130	6.6
Associate degree or some college	76	6.3
Bachelors degree or higher	17	*
Unknown or not in universe	3	*
Food security status		
Food secure	184	6.7
Food insecure	49	6.9
Very food insecure	25	*
Unknown[b]	46	7.4
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	89	5.5
With earnings	44	4.8
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	29	*
Without earnings	45	*
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	27	*

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.1a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit for Households Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	6.2	7.3
SNAP household composition		
With children	3.9	5.8
Single adult	4.7	6.7
Male adult	*	*
Female adult	4.5	6.6
Multiple adults	*	*
Married head	*	*
Other multiple-adult household	*	*
Child only	*	*
No children	7.0	8.1
With elderly individuals	7.0	8.5
With disabled nonelderly individuals	6.5	8.3
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head		
White, non-Hispanic	5.9	7.3
African-American, non-Hispanic	6.1	7.7
Hispanic	*	*
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	*	*
Educational attainment of SNAP household head		
Less than high school or GED	6.2	8.8
High school or GED	5.6	7.7
Associate degree or some college	5.1	7.4
Bachelors degree or higher	*	*
Unknown or not in universe	*	*
Food security status		
Food secure	5.8	7.6
Food insecure	5.7	8.1
Very food insecure	*	*
Unknown[b]	6.0	8.8
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5		
With earnings	3.3	6.2
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	*	*
Without earnings	*	*

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.2. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Economic Characteristics

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	304	6.7
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	40	*
51 to 100 percent	227	7.0
101 to 130 percent	33	*
131 to 200 percent	3	*
201 percent or higher	0	n.a.
Gross countable income		
No income	0	n.a.
$1 to $500	24	*
$501 to $1,000	205	7.6
$1,001 to $1,500	71	5.3
$1,501 or more	3	*
Baseline net income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	268	7.2
51 to 100 percent	35	*
101 percent or higher	0	n.a.
Countable income source		
Earnings	67	4.8
TANF (cash)	18	*
SSI	129	7.8
Social Security	114	7.4
Veterans' benefits	11	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]		
No expense	236	6.6
1 to 30 percent	12	*
31 to 50 percent	28	*
51 percent or more	28	*
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]		
No expense	301	6.8
1 to 15 percent	0	n.a.
16 percent or more	2	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[b, c]		
No expense	231	6.3
1 to 10 percent	49	8.2
11 percent or more	24	*

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[c]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.2a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Economic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit for Households Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	6.2	7.3
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	*	*
51 to 100 percent	6.4	7.6
101 to 130 percent	*	*
131 to 200 percent	*	*
201 percent or higher	n.a.	n.a.
Gross countable income		
No income	n.a.	n.a.
$1 to $500	*	*
$501 to $1,000	7.1	8.2
$1,001 to $1,500	3.9	6.6
$1,501 or more	*	*
Baseline net income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	6.5	7.8
51 to 100 percent	*	*
101 percent or higher	n.a.	n.a.
Countable income source		
Earnings	3.7	5.9
TANF (cash)	*	*
SSI	7.2	8.5
Social Security	6.6	8.2
Veterans' benefits	*	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]		
No expense	5.9	7.3
1 to 30 percent	*	*
31 to 50 percent	*	*
51 percent or more	*	*
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]		
No expense	6.2	7.4
1 to 15 percent	n.a.	n.a.
16 percent or more	*	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[b, c]		
No expense	5.6	7.0
1 to 10 percent	7.3	9.1
11 percent or more	*	*

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[c]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.3. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating Individuals Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristics

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Number of Individuals (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating individuals	499	5.7
Age		
Children (under age 18)	154	4.3
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	44	*
School age children (age 5 to 17)	110	4.3
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	253	6.0
Elderly adults (age 60+)	92	7.5
Disabled nonelderly individuals	98	7.4
Race/ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	222	5.8
African-American, non-Hispanic	152	5.9
Hispanic	86	4.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	*
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	21	*
Food security status		
Food secure	313	5.5
Food insecure	79	6.3
Very food insecure	47	4.8
Unknown[b]	60	7.3
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	106	5.0
With earnings	46	4.7

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.3a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Individuals Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit for Individuals Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating individuals	5.0	6.5
Age		
Children (under age 18)	3.5	5.2
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	*	*
School age children (age 5 to 17)	3.3	5.3
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	5.1	6.9
Elderly adults (age 60+)	6.6	8.4
Disabled nonelderly individuals	6.5	8.3
Race/ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	4.9	6.6
African-American, non-Hispanic	4.9	6.9
Hispanic	2.7	6.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	*	*
Food security status		
Food secure	4.4	6.5
Food insecure	4.8	7.8
Very food insecure	3.5	6.1
Unknown[b]	6.1	8.5
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	3.8	6.3
With earnings	3.1	6.3

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.4. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	2,676	38.1
SNAP household composition		
With children	810	37.3
Single adult	273	33.2
Male adult	64	*
Female adult	209	30.0
Multiple adults	451	39.6
Married head	371	42.6
Other multiple-adult household	80	26.1
Child only	85	38.5
No children	1,866	38.4
With elderly individuals	771	26.0
With disabled nonelderly individuals	318	11.7
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head		
White, non-Hispanic	1,997	41.3
African-American, non-Hispanic	256	24.1
Hispanic	213	25.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	134	39.6
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	76	32.3
Educational attainment of SNAP household head		
Less than high school or GED	254	32.6
High school or GED	719	26.6
Associate degree or some college	918	37.4
Bachelors degree or higher	714	53.4
Unknown or not in universe	71	29.9
Food security status		
Food secure	1,966	39.2
Food insecure	188	36.8
Very food insecure	95	32.7
Unknown[a]	427	34.8
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	924	43.7
With earnings	504	17.8
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	192	23.5
Without earnings	419	74.9
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	124	67.6

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.4a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit for Households No Longer Eligible	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	35.6	40.5
SNAP household composition		
With children	33.7	41.0
Single adult	25.5	40.9
Male adult	*	*
Female adult	22.2	37.9
Multiple adults	35.0	44.3
Married head	37.1	48.0
Other multiple-adult household	20.1	32.2
Child only	26.5	50.4
No children	35.3	41.6
With elderly individuals	22.5	29.5
With disabled nonelderly individuals	6.7	16.7
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head		
White, non-Hispanic	38.6	44.1
African-American, non-Hispanic	16.7	31.5
Hispanic	17.8	33.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	29.2	50.0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	18.8	45.9
Educational attainment of SNAP household head		
Less than high school or GED	24.3	41.0
High school or GED	22.5	30.7
Associate degree or some college	32.5	42.2
Bachelors degree or higher	49.0	57.8
Unknown or not in universe	17.7	42.1
Food security status		
Food secure	36.3	42.1
Food insecure	26.7	46.9
Very food insecure	19.8	45.5
Unknown[a]	28.9	40.6
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5		
With earnings	15.3	20.3
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	19.0	28.0
Without earnings	69.9	79.9
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	57.6	77.6

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.5. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Economic Characteristics

	No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	2,676	38.1
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	1,013	80.8
51 to 100 percent	647	22.3
101 to 130 percent	401	7.9
131 to 200 percent	614	4.0
201 percent or higher	0	n.a.
Gross countable income		
No income	194	100.0
$1 to $500	766	78.3
$501 to $1,000	497	23.5
$1,001 to $1,500	671	10.6
$1,501 or more	548	7.0
Baseline net income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	1,845	53.2
51 to 100 percent	362	8.4
101 percent or higher	469	1.4
Countable income source		
Earnings	952	21.1
TANF (cash)	14	*
SSI	107	3.9
Social Security	767	10.6
Veterans' benefits	7	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]		
No expense	245	47.9
1 to 30 percent	629	11.4
31 to 50 percent	307	14.6
51 percent or more	1,349	47.4
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]		
No expense	2,628	38.3
1 to 15 percent	27	*
16 percent or more	21	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a,b]		
No expense	1,979	42.7
1 to 10 percent	263	7.5
11 percent or more	395	29.2

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.5a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit for Households No Longer Eligible	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	35.6	40.5
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	78.3	83.2
51 to 100 percent	21.5	23.2
101 to 130 percent	6.9	9.0
131 to 200 percent	3.5	4.5
201 percent or higher	n.a.	n.a.
Gross countable income		
No income	100.0	100.0
$1 to $500	75.5	81.0
$501 to $1,000	21.8	25.1
$1,001 to $1,500	9.4	11.9
$1,501 or more	6.0	7.9
Baseline net income as a percentage of poverty guideline		
0 to 50 percent	50.5	56.0
51 to 100 percent	7.2	9.7
101 percent or higher	1.2	1.5
Countable income source		
Earnings	19.0	23.2
TANF (cash)	*	*
SSI	2.0	5.7
Social Security	9.3	12.0
Veterans' benefits	*	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]		
No expense	59.2	75.4
1 to 30 percent	9.3	13.5
31 to 50 percent	10.7	18.5
51 percent or more	44.3	50.5
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]		
No expense	35.8	40.8
1 to 15 percent	*	*
16 percent or more	*	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a,b]		
No expense	41.0	46.6
1 to 10 percent	5.6	9.4
11 percent or more	24.7	33.7

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.6. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating Individuals Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Individuals (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating individuals	5,086	37.3
Age		
Children (under age 18)	1,445	36.0
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	425	35.1
School age children (age 5 to 17)	1,020	36.4
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	2,765	41.6
Elderly adults (age 60+)	876	25.9
Disabled nonelderly individuals	405	10.5
Race/ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	3,648	41.4
African-American, non-Hispanic	540	18.3
Hispanic	463	23.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	253	43.0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	183	38.3
Food security status		
Food secure	3,750	39.0
Food insecure	339	33.5
Very food insecure	190	27.1
Unknown[a]	807	33.5
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	1,199	43.6
With earnings	499	17.3

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table F.6a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Individuals Under Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10, by Demographic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit for Individuals No Longer Eligible	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating individuals	35.0	39.6
Age		
Children (under age 18)	32.3	39.8
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	28.9	41.3
School age children (age 5 to 17)	32.1	40.7
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	38.3	44.9
Elderly adults (age 60+)	22.5	29.4
Disabled nonelderly individuals	6.4	14.6
Race/ethnicity		
White, non-Hispanic	38.9	43.9
African-American, non-Hispanic	13.3	23.3
Hispanic	16.7	30.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	33.0	53.1
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	27.3	49.3
Food security status		
Food secure	36.4	41.6
Food insecure	24.5	42.4
Very food insecure	16.9	37.2
Unknown[a]	28.1	39.0
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	38.9	48.2
With earnings	15.1	19.5

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table F.7. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]		No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	289	6.7	2,676	38.1
SNAP household composition				
With children	91	4.8	810	37.3
Single adult	67	5.7	273	33.2
Male adult	6	*	64	*
Female adult	61	5.5	209	30.0
Multiple adults	21	*	451	39.6
Married head	6	*	371	42.6
Other multiple-adult household	14	*	80	26.1
Child only	3	*	85	38.5
No children	198	7.6	1,866	38.4
With elderly individuals	80	7.6	771	26.0
With disabled nonelderly individuals	98	7.4	318	11.7
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head				
White, non-Hispanic	135	6.6	1,997	41.3
African-American, non-Hispanic	88	6.8	256	24.1
Hispanic	37	*	213	25.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	*	134	39.6
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	11	*	76	32.3
Educational attainment of SNAP household head				
Less than high school or GED	75	7.4	254	32.6
High school or GED	124	6.5	719	26.6
Associate degree or some college	71	6.3	918	37.4
Bachelors degree or higher	15	*	714	53.4
Unknown or not in universe	3	*	71	29.9
Food security status				
Food secure	176	6.6	1,966	39.2
Food insecure	46	7.1	188	36.8
Very food insecure	25	*	95	32.7
Unknown[b]	43	7.6	427	34.8
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	84	5.6	924	43.7
With earnings	40	*	504	17.8
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	29	*	192	23.5
Without earnings	43	*	419	74.9
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	25	*	124	67.6

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.7a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit			
	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]		No Longer Eligible	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	6.1	7.3	35.6	40.5
SNAP household composition				
With children	3.8	5.8	33.7	41.0
Single adult	4.6	6.7	25.5	40.9
Male adult	*	*	*	*
Female adult	4.4	6.5	22.2	37.9
Multiple adults	*	*	35.0	44.3
Married head	*	*	37.1	48.0
Other multiple-adult household	*	*	20.1	32.2
Child only	*	*	26.5	50.4
No children	7.0	8.2	35.3	41.6
With elderly individuals	6.8	8.4	22.5	29.5
With disabled nonelderly individuals	6.5	8.3	6.7	16.7
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head				
White, non-Hispanic	5.9	7.3	38.6	44.1
African-American, non-Hispanic	6.0	7.7	16.7	31.5
Hispanic	*	*	17.8	33.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	29.2	50.0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	*	*	18.8	45.9
Educational attainment of SNAP household head				
Less than high school or GED	6.0	8.7	24.3	41.0
High school or GED	5.5	7.6	22.5	30.7
Associate degree or some college	5.0	7.6	32.5	42.2
Bachelors degree or higher	*	*	49.0	57.8
Unknown or not in universe	*	*	17.7	42.1
Food security status				
Food secure	5.7	7.5	36.3	42.1
Food insecure	5.8	8.4	26.7	46.9
Very food insecure	*	*	19.8	45.5
Unknown[b]	6.1	9.1	28.9	40.6
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	4.3	6.8	39.4	48.0
With earnings	*	*	15.3	20.3
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	*	*	19.0	28.0
Without earnings	*	*	69.9	79.9
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	*	*	57.6	77.6

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.8. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Economic Characteristics

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]		No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit	Number of Households (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating SNAP households	289	6.7	2,676	38.1
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	35	*	1,013	80.8
51 to 100 percent	221	7.0	647	22.3
101 to 130 percent	29	*	401	7.9
131 to 200 percent	3	*	614	4.0
Gross countable income				
No income	0	n.a.	194	100.0
$1 to $500	21	*	766	78.3
$501 to $1,000	199	7.6	497	23.5
$1,001 to $1,500	66	5.0	671	10.6
$1,501 or more	3	*	548	7.0
Baseline net income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	254	7.2	1,845	53.2
51 to 100 percent	35	*	362	8.4
101 percent or higher	0	n.a.	469	1.4
Countable income source				
Earnings	61	4.9	952	21.1
TANF (cash)	18	*	14	*
SSI	129	7.8	107	3.9
Social Security	107	7.2	767	10.6
Veterans' benefits	11	*	7	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]				
No expense	221	6.5	245	47.9
1 to 30 percent	12	*	629	11.4
31 to 50 percent	28	*	307	14.6
51 percent or more	28	*	1,349	47.4
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]				
No expense	287	6.7	2,628	38.3
1 to 15 percent	0	n.a.	27	*
16 percent or more	2	*	21	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[b, c]				
No expense	221	6.3	1,979	42.7
1 to 10 percent	49	8.2	263	7.5
11 percent or more	19	*	395	29.2

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[c]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.8a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Households Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Economic Characteristics

| | Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit | | | |
| | Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a] | | No Longer Eligible | |
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	6.1	7.3	35.6	40.5
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	*	*	78.3	83.2
51 to 100 percent	6.3	7.6	21.5	23.2
101 to 130 percent	*	*	6.9	9.0
131 to 200 percent	*	*	3.5	4.5
Gross countable income				
No income	n.a.	n.a.	100.0	100.0
$1 to $500	*	*	75.5	81.0
$501 to $1,000	7.0	8.1	21.8	25.1
$1,001 to $1,500	3.7	6.3	9.4	11.9
$1,501 or more	*	*	6.0	7.9
Baseline net income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	6.5	7.9	50.5	56.0
51 to 100 percent	*	*	7.2	9.7
101 percent or higher	n.a.	n.a.	1.2	1.5
Countable income source				
Earnings	3.7	6.0	19.0	23.2
TANF (cash)	*	*	*	*
SSI	7.2	8.5	2.0	5.7
Social Security	6.4	8.0	9.3	12.0
Veterans' benefits	*	*	*	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]				
No expense	5.8	7.3	59.2	75.4
1 to 30 percent	*	*	9.3	13.5
31 to 50 percent	*	*	10.7	18.5
51 percent or more	*	*	44.3	50.5
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[b]				
No expense	6.1	7.3	35.8	40.8
1 to 15 percent	n.a.	n.a.	*	*
16 percent or more	*	*	*	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[b, c]				
No expense	5.5	7.0	41.0	46.6
1 to 10 percent	7.3	9.1	5.6	9.4
11 percent or more	*	*	24.7	33.7

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[c]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.9. Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating Individuals Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a]		No Longer Eligible	
	Number of Individuals (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit	Number of Individuals (000s)	Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit
Total participating individuals	478	5.7	5,086	37.3
Age				
Children (under age 18)	152	4.3	1,445	36.0
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	44	*	425	35.1
School age children (age 5 to 17)	108	4.2	1,020	36.4
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	240	6.0	2,765	41.6
Elderly adults (age 60+)	85	7.3	876	25.9
Disabled nonelderly individuals	98	7.4	405	10.5
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	209	5.7	3,648	41.4
African-American, non-Hispanic	146	5.7	540	18.3
Hispanic	86	4.5	463	23.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	18	*	253	43.0
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	19	*	183	38.3
Food security status				
Food secure	300	5.3	3,750	39.0
Food insecure	73	6.5	339	33.5
Very food insecure	47	4.8	190	27.1
Unknown[b]	57	7.4	807	33.5
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	101	5.0	1,199	43.6
With earnings	42	*	499	17.3

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table F.9a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit by Participating SNAP Individuals Under Combined Simulation to Eliminate SUA Conferred Through LIHEAP Benefit of Less Than $10 and Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorial Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

| | Percentage Loss of Income Plus SNAP Benefit | | | |
| | Still Eligible with Lower Benefit[a] | | No Longer Eligible | |
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating individuals	5.0	6.4	35.0	39.6
Age				
Children (under age 18)	3.5	5.1	32.3	39.8
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	*	*	28.9	41.3
School age children (age 5 to 17)	3.2	5.3	32.1	40.7
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	5.0	6.9	38.3	44.9
Elderly adults (age 60+)	6.4	8.2	22.5	29.4
Disabled nonelderly individuals	6.5	8.3	6.4	14.6
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	4.8	6.6	38.9	43.9
African-American, non-Hispanic	4.7	6.7	13.3	23.3
Hispanic	2.7	6.3	16.7	30.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	*	*	33.0	53.1
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	*	*	27.3	49.3
Food security status				
Food secure	4.3	6.3	36.4	41.6
Food insecure	4.8	8.1	24.5	42.4
Very food insecure	3.5	6.1	16.9	37.2
Unknown[b]	6.1	8.7	28.1	39.0
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	3.7	6.4	38.9	48.2
With earnings	*	*	15.1	19.5

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]These estimates include households that may choose not to participate because of lower benefits.

[b]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

APPENDIX G

**MATH SIPP+ TABLES SHOWING AVERAGE BENEFIT LOSSES FROM NON-CASH
CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY POLICY CHANGE**

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table G.1. Participating SNAP Households with Net Income at or below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Households Losing Eligibility		Average Benefit
	Number (000s)	Percent	Lost ($)
Participating SNAP households with net income at or below the federal poverty level	2,207	100.0	271
SNAP household composition			
With children	733	33.2	396
Single adult	227	10.3	306
Male adult	55	2.5	*
Female adult	173	7.8	297
Multiple adults	421	19.1	475
Married head	358	16.2	471
Other multiple-adult household	63	2.8	498
Child only	85	3.9	242
No children	1,473	66.8	208
With elderly individuals	592	26.8	215
With disabled nonelderly individuals	85	3.8	258
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head			
White, non-Hispanic	1,733	78.5	276
African-American, non-Hispanic	142	6.4	218
Hispanic	160	7.2	237
Asian or Pacific Islander	114	5.2	314
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	58	2.6	232
Educational attainment of SNAP household head			
Less than high school or GED	184	8.3	297
High school or GED	509	23.1	235
Associate degree or some college	757	34.3	282
Bachelors degree or higher	686	31.1	283
Unknown or not in universe	71	3.2	208
Food security status			
Food secure	1,628	73.8	276
Food insecure	141	6.4	248
Very food insecure	70	3.2	267
Unknown[a]	368	16.7	255
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	829	37.6	284
With earnings	432	19.6	265
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	182	8.2	400
Without earnings	396	18.0	305
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	122	5.5	464

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table G.1a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Participating SNAP Households with Net Income at or below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Households Losing Eligibility (000s)		Average Benefit Lost ($)	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Participating SNAP households with net income at or below the federal poverty level	2,011	2,403	258	283
SNAP household composition				
With children	648	819	372	419
Single adult	180	275	278	333
Male adult	24	86	*	*
Female adult	135	210	263	331
Multiple adults	346	495	443	508
Married head	285	431	436	507
Other multiple-adult household	39	87	415	581
Child only	50	121	193	291
No children	1,296	1,651	199	218
With elderly individuals	517	667	202	228
With disabled nonelderly individuals	51	118	189	327
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head				
White, non-Hispanic	1,563	1,903	263	290
African-American, non-Hispanic	98	186	176	260
Hispanic	114	206	197	276
Asian or Pacific Islander	75	153	270	357
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	34	81	185	279
Educational attainment of SNAP household head				
Less than high school or GED	139	229	255	340
High school or GED	423	595	213	258
Associate degree or some college	655	859	262	301
Bachelors degree or higher	564	807	262	305
Unknown or not in universe	41	100	164	252
Food security status				
Food secure	1,473	1,784	261	291
Food insecure	99	182	216	280
Very food insecure	37	102	219	316
Unknown[a]	309	428	231	279
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	701	957	261	308
With earnings	346	519	233	298
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	137	227	353	447
Without earnings	322	471	278	332
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	82	162	417	512

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table G.2. Participating SNAP Households with Net Income at or below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorial Eligibility, by Economic Characteristics

	Households Losing Eligibility		Average Benefit
	Number (000s)	Percent	Lost ($)
Participating SNAP households with net income at or below the federal poverty level	2,207	100.0	271
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline			
0 to 50 percent	1,013	45.9	321
51 to 100 percent	647	29.3	289
101 percent to 130 percent	268	12.2	173
131 to 200 percent	278	12.6	139
Gross countable income			
No income	194	8.8	293
$1 to $500	766	34.7	307
$501 to $1,000	497	22.5	242
$1,001 to $1,500	454	20.6	233
$1,501 or more	297	13.4	267
Net income as a percentage of poverty guideline			
0 to 50 percent	1,845	83.6	292
51 to 100 percent	362	16.4	163
Countable income source			
Earnings	836	37.9	278
TANF (cash)	8	0.4	*
SSI	14	0.6	*
Social Security	437	19.8	203
Veterans' benefits	4	0.2	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]			
No expense	206	9.3	256
1 to 30 percent	315	14.3	214
31 to 50 percent	229	10.4	212
51 percent or more	1,313	59.5	293
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]			
No expense	2,162	98.0	268
1 to 15 percent	24	1.1	*
16 percent or more	21	0.9	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a,b]			
No expense	1,699	77.0	286
1 to 10 percent	100	4.5	203
11 percent or more	370	16.8	217

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table G.2a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Participating SNAP Households with Net Income at or below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Households Losing Eligibility (000s)		Average Benefit Lost ($)	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Participating SNAP households with net income at or below the federal poverty level	2,011	2,403	258	283
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	903	1,123	302	340
51 to 100 percent	558	737	270	308
101 percent to 130 percent	214	323	152	195
131 to 200 percent	218	338	119	159
Gross countable income				
No income	142	245	264	322
$1 to $500	669	863	285	329
$501 to $1,000	413	580	221	263
$1,001 to $1,500	380	527	207	259
$1,501 or more	248	345	232	301
Net income as a percentage of poverty guideline				
0 to 50 percent	1,682	2,007	279	304
51 to 100 percent	291	433	139	188
Countable income source				
Earnings	734	937	257	299
TANF (cash)	2	15	*	*
SSI	4	24	*	*
Social Security	362	513	184	222
Veterans' benefits	-2	10	*	*
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]				
No expense	277	425	246	303
1 to 30 percent	227	402	190	237
31 to 50 percent	187	270	184	241
51 percent or more	1,195	1,430	278	309
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]				
No expense	1,965	2,359	256	280
1 to 15 percent	9	39	*	*
16 percent or more	7	35	*	*
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a,b]				
No expense	1,561	1,912	270	302
1 to 10 percent	65	135	161	245
11 percent or more	313	428	202	232

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

* Sample is too small to produce reliable estimates.

Table G.3. Participating Individuals with Net Income at or below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Individuals Losing Eligibility		Average Benefit
	Number (000s)	Percent	Lost ($)
Participating individuals with net income at or below the federal poverty level	4,232	100.0	355
Age			
Children (under age 18)	1,247	29.5	451
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	368	8.7	440
School age children (age 5 to 17)	879	20.8	455
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	2,320	54.8	339
Elderly adults (age 60+)	665	15.7	227
Disabled nonelderly individuals	89	2.1	272
Race/ethnicity			
White, non-Hispanic	3,232	76.4	361
African-American, non-Hispanic	287	6.8	274
Hispanic	334	7.9	291
Asian or Pacific Islander	227	5.4	405
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	151	3.6	425
Food security status			
Food secure	3,130	74.0	370
Food insecure	269	6.4	297
Very food insecure	143	3.4	333
Unknown[a]	689	16.3	312
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	1,078	25.5	321
With earnings	428	10.1	257

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table G.3a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Participating SNAP Individuals with Net Income at or below the Federal Poverty Level Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Demographic Characteristics

	Individuals Losing Eligibility (000s)		Average Benefit Lost ($)	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Participating individuals with net income at or below the federal poverty level	3,879	4,585	337	372
Age				
Children (under age 18)	1,084	1,410	418	484
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	267	469	380	500
School age children (age 5 to 17)	702	1,056	422	489
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	2,020	2,619	321	358
Elderly adults (age 60+)	581	750	212	241
Disabled nonelderly individuals	54	125	199	345
Race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	2,924	3,540	341	382
African-American, non-Hispanic	192	383	223	324
Hispanic	237	431	230	351
Asian or Pacific Islander	145	310	336	475
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	105	198	327	524
Food security status				
Food secure	2,850	3,410	348	391
Food insecure	190	349	254	341
Very food insecure	82	204	272	395
Unknown[a]	566	812	278	345
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	899	1,257	296	346
With earnings	330	527	227	287

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

APPENDIX H

MATH SIPP+ TABLES SHOWING REASONS FOR ELIGIBILITY LOSS FROM NON-CASH CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY POLICY CHANGE

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table H.1. Participating SNAP Households Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Demographic Characteristics

	Households Failing Only an Income Test		Households Failing Only the Asset Test		Households Failing Income and Asset Tests	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent
Total participating SNAP households	561	100.0	2,024	100.0	90	100.0
SNAP household composition						
With children	142	25.3	647	32.0	20	22.6
Single adult	91	16.2	177	8.7	5	5.8
Male adult	18	3.3	45	2.2	0	0.0
Female adult	73	13.0	131	6.5	5	5.8
Multiple adults	51	9.1	385	19.0	15	16.8
Married head	29	5.2	329	16.2	13	14.6
Other multiple-adult household	22	3.9	56	2.8	2	2.2
Child only	0	0.0	85	4.2	0	0.0
No children	419	74.7	1,377	68.0	70	77.4
With elderly individuals	142	25.3	592	29.3	37	40.8
With disabled nonelderly individuals	214	38.1	78	3.8	26	29.2
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head						
White, non-Hispanic	306	54.5	1,630	80.5	61	67.7
African-American, non-Hispanic	132	23.6	109	5.4	15	16.5
Hispanic	84	15.0	126	6.2	3	3.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	17	3.1	109	5.4	8	8.5
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	22	3.8	50	2.5	4	4.3
Educational attainment of SNAP household head						
Less than high school or GED	83	14.7	163	8.1	8	8.5
High school or GED	246	43.9	426	21.0	47	52.7
Associate degree or some college	192	34.2	696	34.4	30	33.4
Bachelors degree or higher	41	7.2	669	33.0	5	5.4
Unknown or not in universe	0	0.0	71	3.5	0	0.0
Food security status						
Food secure	388	69.1	1,508	74.5	71	78.2
Food insecure	64	11.3	124	6.1	0	0.0
Very food insecure	31	5.5	59	2.9	5	6.0
Unknown[a]	79	14.1	334	16.5	14	15.8
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	197	35.0	703	34.7	24	26.4
With earnings	172	30.6	309	15.2	24	26.4
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	38	6.7	139	6.9	16	17.3
Without earnings	25	4.4	394	19.5	0	0.0
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	2	0.4	122	6.0	0	0.0

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table H.1a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Participating SNAP Households Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to EliminateBroad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Demographic Characteristics

	Households Failing Only an Income Test		Households Failing Only the Asset Test		Households Failing Income and Asset Tests	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	463	660	1,849	2,200	54	127
SNAP household composition						
With children	101	183	566	728	4	37
Single adult	58	124	134	220	-2	13
Male adult	3	34	16	75	n.a.	n.a.
Female adult	45	100	98	165	-2	13
Multiple adults	29	73	317	453	0	31
Married head	9	49	262	395	-2	28
Other multiple-adult household	8	36	34	78	-1	5
Child only	n.a.	n.a.	50	121	n.a.	n.a.
No children	338	500	1,225	1,530	37	103
With elderly individuals	105	179	517	667	16	58
With disabled nonelderly individuals	162	266	47	109	8	45
Race/ethnicity of SNAP household head						
White, non-Hispanic	247	364	1,472	1,789	31	91
African-American, non-Hispanic	89	175	74	144	4	26
Hispanic	48	120	83	168	-4	10
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	31	71	146	-3	18
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	6	37	30	70	-1	9
Educational attainment of SNAP household head						
Less than high school or GED	53	112	121	206	-1	17
High school or GED	190	302	346	505	22	73
Associate degree or some college	134	250	598	794	12	48
Bachelors degree or higher	14	67	560	778	-1	11
Unknown or not in universe	n.a.	n.a.	41	100	n.a.	n.a.
Food security status						
Food secure	307	468	1,363	1,653	45	96
Food insecure	37	91	85	163	n.a.	n.a.
Very food insecure	9	53	34	84	-5	16
Unknown[a]	49	109	277	390	-4	33
SNAP household contains a nondisabled adult age 18 to 49 and no children under age 5	136	257	602	804	5	43
With earnings	116	227	248	369	5	43
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	19	57	106	172	-1	32
Without earnings	10	40	321	468	n.a.	n.a.
With school-age children (age 5 to 17)	-1	6	82	162	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table H.2. Participating SNAP Households Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Economic Characteristics

	Households Failing Only an Income Test		Households Failing Only the Asset Test		Households Failing Income and Asset Tests	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent
Total participating SNAP households	561	100.0	2,024	100.0	90	100.0
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline						
0 to 50 percent	0	0.0	1,013	50.0	0	0.0
51 to 100 percent	0	0.0	647	32.0	0	0.0
101 to 130 percent	136	24.3	255	12.6	10	11.4
131 to 200 percent	425	75.7	109	5.4	80	88.6
Gross countable income						
No income	0	0.0	194	9.6	0	0.0
$1 to $500	0	0.0	766	37.8	0	0.0
$501 to $1,000	0	0.0	497	24.5	0	0.0
$1,001 to $1,500	269	47.9	374	18.5	29	32.1
$1,501 or more	293	52.1	194	9.6	61	67.9
Net income as a percentage of poverty guideline						
0 to 50 percent	30	5.4	1,805	89.1	10	11.0
51 to 100 percent	135	24.1	220	10.9	7	8.0
101 percent or higher	396	70.5	0	0.0	73	81.0
Countable income source						
Earnings	258	46.0	664	32.8	31	34.1
TANF (cash)	7	1.2	7	0.3	0	0.0
SSI	88	15.6	9	0.4	10	11.5
Social Security	288	51.4	428	21.1	51	56.5
Veterans' benefits	0	0.0	4	0.2	3	2.8
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]						
No expense	42	7.5	191	9.4	12	13.4
1 to 30 percent	317	56.5	261	12.9	52	57.5
31 to 50 percent	107	19.0	186	9.2	15	16.3
51 percent or more	95	17.0	1,242	61.3	12	12.8
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]						
No expense	548	97.7	1,994	98.5	85	94.8
1 to 15 percent	7	1.3	17	0.8	3	3.1
16 percent or more	5	1.0	13	0.7	2	2.1
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a,b]						
No expense	408	72.7	1,521	75.1	51	56.1
1 to 10 percent	141	25.0	96	4.7	27	29.8
11 percent or more	13	2.3	370	18.3	13	14.1

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table H.2a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Participating SNAP Households Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Economic Characteristics

	Households Failing Only an Income Test		Households Failing Only the Asset Test		Households Failing Income and Asset Tests	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating SNAP households	463	660	1,849	2,200	54	127
Gross income as a percentage of poverty guideline						
0 to 50 percent	n.a.	n.a.	903	1,123	n.a.	n.a.
51 to 100 percent	n.a.	n.a.	558	737	n.a.	n.a.
101 to 130 percent	99	173	202	307	-3	24
131 to 200 percent	346	504	83	136	49	110
201 percent or higher	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Gross countable income						
No income	n.a.	n.a.	142	245	n.a.	n.a.
$1 to $500	n.a.	n.a.	669	863	n.a.	n.a.
$501 to $1,000	n.a.	n.a.	413	580	n.a.	n.a.
$1,001 to $1,500	203	335	319	428	11	47
$1,501 or more	236	349	158	230	33	89
Net income as a percentage of poverty guideline						
0 to 50 percent	6	55	1,649	1,960	-5	25
51 to 100 percent	93	177	164	276	0	15
101 percent or higher	328	464	n.a.	n.a.	41	105
Countable income source						
Earnings	194	322	576	752	12	50
TANF (cash)	1	12	1	13	n.a.	n.a.
SSI	54	121	1	16	-3	24
Social Security	232	345	355	501	26	76
Veterans' benefits	n.a.	n.a.	-2	10	-2	7
Shelter expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]						
No expense	21	63	264	408	-6	30
1 to 30 percent	246	387	192	330	27	77
31 to 50 percent	69	145	147	224	2	27
51 percent or more	49	141	1,132	1,352	2	21
Dependent care expenses as a percentage of gross income[a]						
No expense	451	646	1,818	2,170	49	122
1 to 15 percent	1	14	4	30	-2	7
16 percent or more	0	10	1	26	-1	5
Deductible medical expenses as a percentage of gross income[a,b]						
No expense	335	481	1,400	1,717	21	80
1 to 10 percent	98	183	64	128	8	46
11 percent or more	3	22	313	428	2	23

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]Households with expenses but no gross income are excluded from this panel.

[b]Only SNAP households with elderly or disabled members can deduct medical expenses from SNAP countable income.

Table H.3. Participating Individuals Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Demographic Characteristics

	Individuals Failing Only an Income Test		Individuals Failing Only the Asset Test		Individuals Failing Income and Asset Tests	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent
Total participating individuals	1,037	1.0	3,877	1.0	172	1.0
Age						
Children (under age 18)	282	0.3	1,115	0.3	48	0.3
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	85	0.1	333	0.1	7	0.0
School age children (age 5 to 17)	197	0.2	782	0.2	41	0.2
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	590	0.6	2,097	0.5	79	0.5
Elderly adults (age 60+)	165	0.2	665	0.2	45	0.3
Disabled nonelderly individuals	288	0.3	82	0.0	35	0.2
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	489	0.5	3,047	0.8	112	0.7
African-American, non-Hispanic	290	0.3	211	0.1	39	0.2
Hispanic	202	0.2	255	0.1	5	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	20	0.0	222	0.1	12	0.1
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	37	0.0	141	0.0	4	0.0
Food security status						
Food secure	715	0.7	2,892	0.7	143	0.8
Food insecure	106	0.1	233	0.1	0	0.0
Very food insecure	71	0.1	114	0.0	5	0.0
Unknown[a]	146	0.1	638	0.2	23	0.1
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	235	0.2	938	0.2	26	0.1
With earnings	174	0.2	302	0.1	24	0.1

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

Table H.3a. Approximate 90-Percent Confidence Intervals for Participating SNAP Individuals Losing Eligibility Under Simulation to Eliminate Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility, by Reason for Eligibility Loss and Demographic Characteristics

	Households Failing Only an Income Test		Households Failing Only the Asset Test		Households Failing Income and Asset Tests	
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Total participating individuals	851	1,224	3,521	4,232	106	238
Age						
Children (under age 18)	169	395	964	1,266	9	87
Pre-school children (age 0 to 4)	48	122	229	437	-1	15
School age children (age 5 to 17)	112	282	633	931	9	73
Nonelderly adults (age 18 to 59)	430	751	1,822	2,371	39	118
Elderly adults (age 60+)	123	207	581	750	17	74
Disabled nonelderly individuals	200	377	50	115	9	61
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	380	598	2,746	3,349	59	165
African-American, non-Hispanic	199	381	127	295	3	76
Hispanic	107	297	171	340	-9	19
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	35	141	303	-3	27
American Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo	4	70	97	185	-1	9
Food security status						
Food secure	557	873	2,599	3,185	86	200
Food insecure	52	159	160	306	n.a.	n.a.
Very food insecure	22	119	61	167	-5	16
Unknown[a]	91	201	518	758	-13	60
Nondisabled adults age 18 to 49 not living with children under age 5	143	327	786	1,090	7	45
With earnings	117	230	231	373	6	42

Source: Revised 2012 Baseline of 2009 MATH SIPP+ Model.

[a]This row includes households that were no longer present in Wave 6 when food security questions were asked.

APPENDIX I

STATE BLOCK GRANT ANALYSIS TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table I.1. Number and Percent of Benefits Lost Relative to FY 2012 if Benefits Reverted to FY 2008 Levels and Potential Change in Participating Households or Average Household Benefit, by State

	Total Benefits ($000s)		Difference (FY 2008 - FY 2012)		Change in Participating Households if Average Benefits Remain at FY 2012 Levels	Change in Average Benefits if Participating Households Remain at FY 2012 Levels
	FY 2008	FY 2012	Total ($000s)	Percent		
All	34,608,397	74,619,461	-40,011,063	-53.6	-11,973,375	-149.3
Alabama	663,901	1,390,012	-726,111	-52.2	-215,090	-147.0
Alaska	94,262	186,325	-92,063	-49.4	-18,752	-202.2
Arizona	772,440	1,706,601	-934,161	-54.7	-265,430	-160.5
Arkansas	431,548	733,397	-301,849	-41.2	-90,585	-114.3
California	2,995,180	7,090,221	-4,095,042	-57.8	-1,027,620	-191.8
Colorado	325,104	808,505	-483,401	-59.8	-131,959	-182.5
Connecticut	284,829	696,671	-411,841	-59.1	-129,946	-156.1
Delaware	86,181	226,577	-140,396	-62.0	-43,104	-168.2
District of Columbia	112,325	233,303	-120,978	-51.9	-41,343	-126.4
Florida	1,778,642	5,592,221	-3,813,579	-68.2	-1,245,104	-174.1
Georgia	1,276,750	3,119,436	-1,842,686	-59.1	-519,525	-174.6
Guam	60,125	113,416	-53,291	-47.0	-6,708	-311.1
Hawaii	184,612	453,331	-268,719	-59.3	-52,433	-253.2
Idaho	116,568	361,230	-244,662	-67.7	-68,065	-202.9
Illinois	1,718,280	3,128,689	-1,410,409	-45.1	-412,165	-128.6
Indiana	772,883	1,444,410	-671,527	-46.5	-186,625	-139.4
Iowa	305,655	593,444	-287,788	-48.5	-92,490	-125.7
Kansas	211,265	457,479	-246,214	-53.8	-77,093	-143.2
Kentucky	742,038	1,298,611	-556,574	-42.9	-172,611	-115.2
Louisiana	1,025,182	1,549,559	-524,376	-33.8	-143,034	-103.4
Maine	196,265	376,753	-180,488	-47.9	-62,829	-114.7
Maryland	432,044	1,104,338	-672,294	-60.9	-219,476	-155.4
Massachusetts	586,587	1,369,998	-783,410	-57.2	-274,382	-136.1
Michigan	1,506,032	2,980,302	-1,474,270	-49.5	-457,395	-132.9
Minnesota	329,569	749,536	-419,967	-56.0	-148,336	-132.2
Mississippi	496,848	980,028	-483,180	-49.3	-146,189	-135.8
Missouri	810,472	1,462,076	-651,605	-44.6	-196,821	-123.0
Montana	94,225	193,011	-98,786	-51.2	-30,191	-139.6
Nebraska	140,753	258,675	-117,922	-45.6	-35,132	-127.5
Nevada	169,714	525,319	-355,604	-67.7	-114,501	-175.2

Table I.1 *(continued)*

	Total Benefits ($000s)		Difference (FY 2008 - FY 2012)		Change in Average Benefits if Participating Households Remain at FY 2012 Levels	Change in Average Benefits if Participating Households Remain at FY 2012 Levels
	FY 2008	FY 2012	Total ($000s)	Percent		
New Hampshire	71,404	166,473	-95,069	-57.1	-32,182	-140.6
New Jersey	532,945	1,321,102	-788,157	-59.7	-242,303	-161.7
New Mexico	269,189	674,067	-404,878	-60.1	-116,238	-174.3
New York	2,572,843	5,444,102	-2,871,259	-52.7	-870,280	-145.0
North Carolina	1,104,400	2,430,133	-1,325,733	-54.6	-428,285	-140.7
North Dakota	59,267	90,678	-31,411	-34.6	-9,446	-96.0
Ohio	1,494,661	3,006,931	-1,512,270	-50.3	-439,475	-144.2
Oklahoma	491,363	947,200	-455,837	-48.1	-134,581	-135.8
Oregon	542,197	1,253,656	-711,459	-56.8	-253,867	-132.5
Pennsylvania	1,386,964	2,772,898	-1,385,934	-50.0	-434,416	-132.9
Rhode Island	107,719	289,246	-181,526	-62.8	-59,797	-158.8
South Carolina	706,792	1,371,335	-664,543	-48.5	-198,920	-134.9
South Dakota	78,001	165,489	-87,488	-52.9	-23,849	-161.6
Tennessee	1,114,791	2,089,053	-974,262	-46.6	-299,041	-126.6
Texas	3,068,233	6,006,735	-2,938,502	-48.9	-815,182	-147.0
Utah	150,961	404,542	-253,582	-62.7	-70,992	-186.6
Vermont	62,169	141,256	-79,086	-56.0	-27,630	-133.5
Virginia	610,022	1,403,721	-793,699	-56.5	-248,743	-150.3
Virgin Islands	22,856	52,786	-29,930	-56.7	-5,987	-236.2
Washington	680,799	1,684,648	-1,003,849	-59.6	-345,737	-144.2
West Virginia	304,123	500,403	-196,280	-39.2	-64,343	-99.7
Wisconsin	430,028	1,167,767	-737,739	-63.2	-252,050	-154.1
Wyoming	26,390	51,770	-25,380	-49.0	-7,328	-141.5

Source: USDA National Data Bank (Data as of May 10, 2013).

I.4

Table I.2. Calculations to Derive Average Monthly Number of Households That Could Be Served With FY 2008 Total Benefits at FY 2012 Average Benefit and Change from FY 2012

	USDA National Data Bank			Average Monthly Number of Households That Could Be Served With FY 2008 Total Benefits at FY 2012 Average Benefit	Change from FY 2012 Average Monthly Number of Households
	FY 2008 Total Benefits	FY 2012 Average Monthly Household Benefit	FY 2012 Average Monthly Number of Households		
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) = (a/12) / (b)	(e) = (d) - (c)
All	34,608,397,238	278.48	22,329,713	10,356,338	-11,973,375
Alabama	663,901,057	281.33	411,745	196,655	-215,090
Alaska	94,262,437	409.13	37,952	19,200	-18,752
Arizona	772,440,411	293.29	484,906	219,476	-265,430
Arkansas	431,547,807	277.68	220,095	129,510	-90,585
California	2,995,179,522	332.08	1,779,241	751,621	-1,027,620
Colorado	325,104,191	305.27	220,707	88,748	-131,959
Connecticut	284,829,257	264.11	219,817	89,871	-129,946
Delaware	86,180,751	271.42	69,564	26,460	-43,104
District of Columbia	112,324,800	243.85	79,729	38,386	-41,343
Florida	1,778,641,937	255.24	1,825,813	580,709	-1,245,104
Georgia	1,276,750,098	295.57	879,493	359,968	-519,525
Guam	60,125,091	662.1	14,275	7,567	-6,708
Hawaii	184,612,461	427.08	88,455	36,022	-52,433
Idaho	116,567,714	299.54	100,495	32,430	-68,065
Illinois	1,718,280,001	285.17	914,287	502,122	-412,165
Indiana	772,883,186	299.86	401,415	214,790	-186,625
Iowa	305,655,259	259.3	190,721	98,231	-92,490
Kansas	211,265,341	266.15	143,242	66,149	-77,093
Kentucky	742,037,605	268.71	402,734	230,123	-172,611
Louisiana	1,025,182,241	305.5	422,680	279,646	-143,034
Maine	196,264,502	239.38	131,153	68,324	-62,829
Maryland	432,043,737	255.26	360,523	141,047	-219,476
Massachusetts	586,587,498	237.93	479,830	205,448	-274,382
Michigan	1,506,032,208	268.6	924,643	467,248	-457,395
Minnesota	329,569,307	235.94	264,739	116,403	-148,336
Mississippi	496,847,694	275.44	296,508	150,319	-146,189
Missouri	810,471,619	275.89	441,626	244,805	-196,821
Montana	94,225,210	272.67	58,988	28,797	-30,191
Nebraska	140,752,738	279.71	77,066	41,934	-35,132
Nevada	169,714,444	258.81	169,147	54,646	-114,501

Table I.2 *(continued)*

	USDA National Data Bank			Average Monthly Number of Households That Could Be Served With FY 2008 Total Benefits at FY 2012 Average Benefit	Change from FY 2012 Average Monthly Number of Households
	FY 2008 Total Benefits	FY 2012 Average Monthly Household Benefit	FY 2012 Average Monthly Number of Households		
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) = (a/12) / (b)	(e) = (d) - (c)
New Hampshire	71,404,026	246.17	56,354	24,172	-32,182
New Jersey	532,944,902	271.07	406,143	163,840	-242,303
New Mexico	269,188,961	290.26	193,522	77,284	-116,238
New York	2,572,842,848	274.94	1,650,099	779,819	-870,280
North Carolina	1,104,399,962	257.95	785,072	356,787	-428,285
North Dakota	59,266,579	277.11	27,269	17,823	-9,446
Ohio	1,494,661,229	286.76	873,828	434,353	-439,475
Oklahoma	491,362,648	282.26	279,649	145,068	-134,581
Oregon	542,197,277	233.54	447,338	193,471	-253,867
Pennsylvania	1,386,964,117	265.86	869,157	434,741	-434,416
Rhode Island	107,719,391	252.97	95,282	35,485	-59,797
South Carolina	706,792,219	278.39	410,491	211,571	-198,920
South Dakota	78,001,007	305.71	45,111	21,262	-23,849
Tennessee	1,114,791,337	271.5	641,211	342,170	-299,041
Texas	3,068,232,722	300.39	1,666,362	851,180	-815,182
Utah	150,960,595	297.67	113,254	42,262	-70,992
Vermont	62,169,303	238.53	49,350	21,720	-27,630
Virginia	610,021,737	265.9	439,924	191,181	-248,743
Virgin Islands	22,855,912	416.58	10,559	4,572	-5,987
Washington	680,799,184	241.96	580,211	234,474	-345,737
West Virginia	304,122,744	254.22	164,034	99,691	-64,343
Wisconsin	430,028,455	243.92	398,966	146,916	-252,050
Wyoming	26,389,959	288.64	14,947	7,619	-7,328

Source: USDA National Data Bank (Data as of May 10, 2013).

Table I.3. Calculations to Derive Average Monthly Household Benefit if Average Monthly Number of FY 2012 Households Were Served with FY 2008 Total Benefits and Change from FY 2012

	USDA National Data Bank			Average Monthly Household Benefit if Average Monthly Number of FY 2012 Households Were Served with FY 2008 Total Benefits	Change from FY 2012 Average Monthly Household Benefit
	FY 2008 Total Benefits	FY 2012 Average Monthly Number of Households	FY 2012 Average Monthly Household Benefit		
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) = (a/12) / (b)	(e) = (d) - (c)
All	34,608,397,238	22,329,713	278.48	129.2	-149.3
Alabama	663,901,057	411,745	281.33	134.4	-147.0
Alaska	94,262,437	37,952	409.13	207.0	-202.2
Arizona	772,440,411	484,906	293.29	132.7	-160.5
Arkansas	431,547,807	220,095	277.68	163.4	-114.3
California	2,995,179,522	1,779,241	332.08	140.3	-191.8
Colorado	325,104,191	220,707	305.27	122.8	-182.5
Connecticut	284,829,257	219,817	264.11	108.0	-156.1
Delaware	86,180,751	69,564	271.42	103.2	-168.2
District of Columbia	112,324,800	79,729	243.85	117.4	-126.4
Florida	1,778,641,937	1,825,813	255.24	81.2	-174.1
Georgia	1,276,750,098	879,493	295.57	121.0	-174.6
Guam	60,125,091	14,275	662.1	351.0	-311.1
Hawaii	184,612,461	88,455	427.08	173.9	-253.2
Idaho	116,567,714	100,495	299.54	96.7	-202.9
Illinois	1,718,280,001	914,287	285.17	156.6	-128.6
Indiana	772,883,186	401,415	299.86	160.4	-139.4
Iowa	305,655,259	190,721	259.3	133.6	-125.7
Kansas	211,265,341	143,242	266.15	122.9	-143.2
Kentucky	742,037,605	402,734	268.71	153.5	-115.2
Louisiana	1,025,182,241	422,680	305.5	202.1	-103.4
Maine	196,264,502	131,153	239.38	124.7	-114.7
Maryland	432,043,737	360,523	255.26	99.9	-155.4
Massachusetts	586,587,498	479,830	237.93	101.9	-136.1
Michigan	1,506,032,208	924,643	268.6	135.7	-132.9
Minnesota	329,569,307	264,739	235.94	103.7	-132.2
Mississippi	496,847,694	296,508	275.44	139.6	-135.8
Missouri	810,471,619	441,626	275.89	152.9	-123.0
Montana	94,225,210	58,988	272.67	133.1	-139.6
Nebraska	140,752,738	77,066	279.71	152.2	-127.5
Nevada	169,714,444	169,147	258.81	83.6	-175.2

Table I.3 *(continued)*

	USDA National Data Bank			Average Monthly Household Benefit if Average Monthly Number of FY 2012 Households Were Served with FY 2008 Total Benefits	Change from FY 2012 Average Monthly Household Benefit
	FY 2008 Total Benefits	FY 2012 Average Monthly Number of Households	FY 2012 Average Monthly Household Benefit		
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d) = (a/12) / (b)	(e) = (d) - (c)
New Hampshire	71,404,026	56,354	246.17	105.6	-140.6
New Jersey	532,944,902	406,143	271.07	109.4	-161.7
New Mexico	269,188,961	193,522	290.26	115.9	-174.3
New York	2,572,842,848	1,650,099	274.94	129.9	-145.0
North Carolina	1,104,399,962	785,072	257.95	117.2	-140.7
North Dakota	59,266,579	27,269	277.11	181.1	-96.0
Ohio	1,494,661,229	873,828	286.76	142.5	-144.2
Oklahoma	491,362,648	279,649	282.26	146.4	-135.8
Oregon	542,197,277	447,338	233.54	101.0	-132.5
Pennsylvania	1,386,964,117	869,157	265.86	133.0	-132.9
Rhode Island	107,719,391	95,282	252.97	94.2	-158.8
South Carolina	706,792,219	410,491	278.39	143.5	-134.9
South Dakota	78,001,007	45,111	305.71	144.1	-161.6
Tennessee	1,114,791,337	641,211	271.5	144.9	-126.6
Texas	3,068,232,722	1,666,362	300.39	153.4	-147.0
Utah	150,960,595	113,254	297.67	111.1	-186.6
Vermont	62,169,303	49,350	238.53	105.0	-133.5
Virginia	610,021,737	439,924	265.9	115.6	-150.3
Virgin Islands	22,855,912	10,559	416.58	180.4	-236.2
Washington	680,799,184	580,211	241.96	97.8	-144.2
West Virginia	304,122,744	164,034	254.22	154.5	-99.7
Wisconsin	430,028,455	398,966	243.92	89.8	-154.1
Wyoming	26,389,959	14,947	288.64	147.1	-141.5

APPENDIX J

NHANES ANALYSIS TABLES

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table J.1a Prevalence Among Children of BMI Greater than or Equal to the 97th Percentile of the CDC Growth Charts, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-Eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All Children															
2-19 years	11,417	11.49	0.59	2,927	15.50 [b,c]	0.95	2,397	13.74 [c]	1.22	1,446	12.11 [c,d]	1.00	4,136	9.15 [a,b,d]	0.76
6-19 years	8,793	12.46	0.68	2,048	17.89 [b,c]	1.24	1,854	14.61 [c]	1.53	1,135	13.86 [c,d]	1.18	3,355	9.73 [a,b,d]	0.84
2-5 years	2,624	7.86	0.61	879	9.47	1.17	543	10.32	1.29	311	6.22	1.60	781	6.60	0.95
6-11 years	3,293	12.40	0.71	913	18.39 [c]	1.73	619	16.31 [c]	2.13	431	13.53	1.71	1,215	8.28 [a,d]	1.04
12-19 years	5,500	12.49	0.79	1,135	17.40 [c]	1.60	1,235	13.49	1.95	704	14.13	1.78	2,140	10.71 [d]	1.11
Boys															
2-19 years	5,819	12.52	0.71	1,463	15.93 [c]	1.35	1,214	15.02 [c]	1.44	776	14.16 [c]	1.42	2,115	10.06 [a,b,d]	0.93
6-19 years	4,479	13.75	0.85	1,017	18.74 [c]	1.85	926	15.84	1.81	616	16.66 [c]	1.88	1,720	10.93 [b,d]	1.05
2-5 years	1,340	7.86	0.93	446	8.85	1.43	288	11.95	1.92	160	5.91 [#]	1.92 [#]	395	6.07	1.45
6-11 years	1,608	13.31	0.95	438	17.83	2.67	306	17.39	2.67	215	16.47	2.75	601	9.13	1.27
12-19 years	2,871	14.07	1.01	579	19.63	2.36	620	14.74	2.27	401	16.80	2.78	1,119	12.14	1.47
Girls															
2-19 years	5,598	10.39	0.64	1,464	15.06 [c]	1.18	1,183	12.38	1.49	670	9.68	1.40	2,021	8.17 [d]	0.86
6-19 years	4,314	11.07	0.72	1,031	17.04 [b,c]	1.31	928	13.32	1.86	519	10.58 [d]	1.49	1,635	8.42 [d]	0.90
2-5 years	1,284	7.85	0.88	433	10.08	1.86	255	8.42	2.04	151	6.60 [#]	2.45 [#]	386	7.13	1.43
6-11 years	1,685	11.45	0.91	475	18.93 [b,c]	2.14	313	15.07 [c]	2.65	216	10.48 [d]	1.93	614	7.35 [a,d]	1.25
12-19 years	2,629	10.80	0.90	556	15.10 [c]	1.85	615	12.27	2.30	303	10.66	2.20	1,021	9.14 [d]	1.05

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.1b Prevalence Among Children of BMI Greater than or Equal to the 95th Percentile of the CDC Growth Charts, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receiving SNAP			Income-Eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All Children															
2-19 years	11,417	16.46	0.75	2,927	21.88 [b,c]	1.23	2,397	17.74	1.35	1,446	16.45 [d]	1.23	4,136	14.03 [d]	0.97
6-19 years	8,793	17.78	0.85	2,048	24.76 [a,b,c]	1.36	1,854	19.06 [d]	1.68	1,135	18.22 [d]	1.56	3,355	14.97 [d]	1.08
2-5 years	2,624	11.51	0.78	879	14.65	1.57	543	12.52	1.60	311	10.47	2.20	781	9.89	1.25
6-11 years	3,293	17.76	0.94	913	24.04 [c]	1.77	619	19.79	2.29	431	19.11	2.43	1,215	13.98 [d]	1.42
12-19 years	5,500	17.79	1.01	1,135	25.48 [b,c]	1.75	1,235	18.57	2.15	704	17.49 [d]	1.99	2,140	15.63 [d]	1.38
Boys															
2-19 years	5,819	17.23	0.84	1,463	21.82 [c]	1.45	1,214	19.43	1.52	776	19.10	1.60	2,115	14.36 [d]	1.18
6-19 years	4,479	18.80	1.03	1,017	25.57 [c]	1.83	926	21.00	1.95	616	21.25	2.21	1,720	15.41 [d]	1.36
2-5 years	1,340	11.35	0.93	446	12.38	1.83	288	13.53	2.19	160	11.97	3.08	395	9.50	1.80
6-11 years	1,608	18.93	1.20	438	25.02	2.86	306	21.59	3.04	215	22.59	3.41	601	14.36	1.83
12-19 years	2,871	18.70	1.28	579	26.11 [c]	2.25	620	20.58	2.24	401	20.25	3.22	1,119	16.12 [d]	1.82
Girls															
2-19 years	5,598	15.63	0.87	1,464	21.94 [b,c]	1.74	1,183	15.94	1.75	670	13.31 [d]	1.79	2,021	13.68 [d]	1.13
6-19 years	4,314	16.69	0.98	1,031	23.94 [b,c]	1.85	928	17.04	2.16	519	14.67 [d]	2.11	1,635	14.48 [d]	1.22
2-5 years	1,284	11.68	1.17	433	16.91	2.53	255	11.34	2.60	151	8.64	2.53	386	10.28	1.73
6-11 years	1,685	16.53	1.17	475	23.08 [c]	2.28	313	17.73	2.55	216	15.50	2.65	614	13.57 [d]	1.67
12-19 years	2,629	16.82	1.21	556	24.83 [b,c]	2.62	615	16.63	2.98	303	13.91 [d]	2.60	1,021	15.10 [d]	1.45

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.1c Prevalence Among Children of BMI Greater than or Equal to the 85th Percentile of the CDC Growth Charts, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-Eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All Children															
2-19 years	11,417	31.76	0.91	2,927	36.55 [c]	1.24	2,397	33.43	1.42	1,446	31.78	1.98	4,136	29.35 [d]	1.32
6-19 years	8,793	34.08	1.01	2,048	40.57 [c]	1.52	1,854	34.89	1.69	1,135	34.39	2.20	3,355	31.62 [d]	1.37
2-5 years	2,624	23.06	1.21	879	26.45	1.89	543	27.66	2.48	311	22.98	2.98	781	19.36	2.09
6-11 years	3,293	33.89	1.41	913	38.56	2.29	619	34.10	2.48	431	35.34	3.53	1,215	30.88	2.12
12-19 years	5,500	34.23	1.17	1,135	42.58 [c]	2.02	1,235	35.41	2.03	704	33.62	2.72	2,140	32.11 [d]	1.63
Boys															
2-19 years	5,819	32.42	1.11	1,463	35.89	1.69	1,214	34.47	1.89	776	32.24	2.19	2,115	30.13	1.81
6-19 years	4,479	34.83	1.29	1,017	39.62	2.21	926	35.78	2.28	616	34.68	2.62	1,720	32.73	1.91
2-5 years	1,340	23.37	1.59	446	26.52	2.40	288	29.56	3.89	160	24.16	4.29	395	18.17	2.91
6-11 years	1,608	34.58	1.75	438	37.76	3.46	306	35.57	3.96	215	37.28	4.43	601	31.39	2.91
12-19 years	2,871	35.00	1.51	579	41.43	2.69	620	35.92	2.48	401	32.76	3.06	1,119	33.64	2.29
Girls															
2-19 years	5,598	31.06	1.04	1,464	37.21 [c]	1.58	1,183	32.34	1.86	670	31.23	2.96	2,021	28.53 [d]	1.47
6-19 years	4,314	33.29	1.17	1,031	41.51 [c]	1.92	928	33.98	2.31	519	34.05	3.28	1,635	30.40 [d]	1.59
2-5 years	1,284	22.74	1.36	433	26.38	2.67	255	25.45	3.57	151	21.56	4.50	386	20.56	2.14
6-11 years	1,685	33.16	1.80	475	39.33	2.55	313	32.41	2.97	216	33.32	4.34	614	30.34	2.63
12-19 years	2,629	33.39	1.41	556	43.77 [c]	2.54	615	34.92	2.89	303	34.74	4.36	1,021	30.45 [d]	1.89

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.2a Prevalence of Weight Status Among Adults, Age 20 and Over, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-Eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
Underweight	14,337	1.72	0.15	1,859	2.77 [c]	0.48	2,492	2.97 [c]	0.40	2,042	1.94	0.44	7,075	1.18 [a,d]	0.16
Normal Weight	14,337	31.19	0.63	1,859	27.17 [a]	1.50	2,492	33.83 [d]	1.40	2,042	32.17	1.24	7,075	31.04	0.84
Overweight	14,337	33.77	0.50	1,859	27.75 [a,c]	1.18	2,492	33.22 [d]	1.04	2,042	32.19	1.64	7,075	35.10 [d]	0.70
Obese	14,337	33.32	0.73	1,859	42.31 [a,b,c]	1.51	2,492	29.98 [d]	1.28	2,042	33.69 [d]	1.52	7,075	32.68 [d]	0.90
Men															
Underweight	7,220	1.20	0.18	800	2.04 [c]	0.50	1,227	2.50 [c]	0.54	1,029	1.39 [#]	0.53 [#]	3,738	0.61 [a,d]	0.13
Normal Weight	7,220	26.95	0.74	800	32.38 [c]	2.25	1,227	35.02 [c]	1.69	1,029	31.59 [c]	1.75	3,738	23.90 [a,b,d]	0.85
Overweight	7,220	39.92	0.77	800	33.65 [c]	2.00	1,227	37.93	1.38	1,029	34.37 [c]	1.82	3,738	42.10 [b,d]	0.96
Obese	7,220	31.93	0.96	800	31.93 [a]	1.92	1,227	24.55 [b,c,d]	1.60	1,029	32.65 [a]	1.79	3,738	33.39 [a]	1.18
Women															
Underweight	7,117	2.21	0.22	1,059	3.28	0.75	1,265	3.36	0.65	1,013	2.43	0.56	3,337	1.78	0.29
Normal Weight	7,117	35.25	0.94	1,059	23.58 [a,b,c]	1.58	1,265	32.82 [c,d]	1.75	1,013	32.70 [c,d]	1.88	3,337	38.48 [a,b,d]	1.24
Overweight	7,117	27.89	0.71	1,059	23.69	1.35	1,265	29.25	1.43	1,013	30.24	2.37	3,337	27.80	0.95
Obese	7,117	34.65	0.81	1,059	49.46 [a,b,c]	1.92	1,265	34.56 [d]	1.81	1,013	34.63 [d]	2.20	3,337	31.94 [d]	1.00

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.2b Prevalence of Weight Status Among Adults, Age 20 or Older (Age-Adjusted), 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-Eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
Underweight	14,337	1.74	0.15	1,859	2.65 [c]	0.39	2,492	2.95 [c]	0.41	2,042	2.10	0.53	7,075	1.25 [a,d]	0.17
Normal Weight	14,337	31.46	0.63	1,859	26.50 [a,b,c]	1.45	2,492	33.32 [d]	1.24	2,042	32.12 [d]	1.25	7,075	31.80 [d]	0.86
Overweight	14,337	33.67	0.52	1,859	28.40 [a,c]	1.09	2,492	33.76 [d]	1.07	2,042	31.26	1.75	7,075	34.96 [d]	0.71
Obese	14,337	33.13	0.72	1,859	42.44 [a,b,c]	1.52	2,492	29.98 [d]	1.21	2,042	34.52 [d]	1.70	7,075	31.99 [d]	0.89
Men															
Underweight	7,220	1.20	0.18	800	2.24 [c]	0.42	1,227	2.42 [c]	0.52	1,029	1.47 [#]	0.58 [#]	3,738	0.63 [a,d]	0.14
Normal Weight	7,220	27.01	0.72	800	31.58 [c]	2.13	1,227	33.56 [c]	1.60	1,029	31.82 [c]	1.81	3,738	24.57 [a,b,d]	0.87
Overweight	7,220	39.93	0.78	800	34.44 [c]	1.89	1,227	38.89	1.34	1,029	33.69 [c]	1.89	3,738	41.87 [b,d]	0.96
Obese	7,220	31.86	0.93	800	31.74 [a]	1.85	1,227	25.12 [b,c,d]	1.59	1,029	33.02 [a]	1.92	3,738	32.93 [a]	1.16
Women															
Underweight	7,117	2.29	0.22	1,059	3.01	0.64	1,265	3.45	0.69	1,013	2.71	0.69	3,337	1.92	0.32
Normal Weight	7,117	35.70	0.95	1,059	23.00 [a,b,c]	1.56	1,265	33.29 [c,d]	1.68	1,013	32.36 [c,d]	1.99	3,337	39.42 [a,b,d]	1.29
Overweight	7,117	27.58	0.70	1,059	24.42	1.38	1,265	28.98	1.41	1,013	28.87	2.51	3,337	27.65	0.94
Obese	7,117	34.43	0.83	1,059	49.57 [a,b,c]	1.97	1,265	34.28 [d]	1.79	1,013	36.06 [d]	2.54	3,337	31.01 [d]	1.01

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

J.7

Table J.2c Prevalence of Weight Status Among Adults, Age 20 to 39, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-Eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
Underweight	4,690	2.43	0.27	819	3.05	0.81	814	3.69	0.82	666	2.13	0.63	2,144	1.90	0.33
Normal Weight	4,690	38.27	0.93	819	29.26 a,b,c	1.96	814	42.52 d	2.43	666	36.43 d	2.12	2,144	39.35 d	1.42
Overweight	4,690	30.14	0.90	819	26.76	1.73	814	27.38	1.77	666	30.32	2.23	2,144	31.67	1.20
Obese	4,690	29.15	1.11	819	40.93 a,b,c	2.16	814	26.41 d	2.22	666	31.12 d	2.15	2,144	27.08 d	1.37
Men															
Underweight	2,445	1.58	0.33	360	##	##	424	3.04 #	0.98 #	355	##	##	1,168	0.96 #	0.30 #
Normal Weight	2,445	34.96	1.15	360	32.73 a	2.63	424	45.09 b,c,d	2.36	355	34.13 a	2.85	1,168	32.56 a	1.56
Overweight	2,445	35.96	1.14	360	33.65	2.63	424	31.21	2.05	355	34.02	3.20	1,168	38.32	1.63
Obese	2,445	27.50	1.34	360	32.00 a	2.57	424	20.67 b,c,d	2.19	355	30.35 a	2.87	1,168	28.16 a	1.84
Women															
Underweight	2,245	3.35	0.46	459	4.09 #	1.26 #	390	4.36	1.34 #	311	2.80	0.95 #	976	3.00	0.65
Normal Weight	2,245	41.82	1.42	459	26.74 a,b,c	2.48	390	39.87 d	3.56	311	38.91 d	3.50	976	47.24 d	2.17
Overweight	2,245	23.91	1.10	459	21.76	1.93	390	23.41	2.44	311	26.35	3.29	976	23.93	1.55
Obese	2,245	30.92	1.40	459	47.41 a,b,c	2.68	390	32.36 d	3.19	311	31.94 d	3.41	976	25.83 d	1.81

J.8

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

a Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

b Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

c Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

d Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.2d Prevalence of Weight Status Among Adults, Age 40 to 59, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
Underweight	4,529	1.33	0.25	605	2.68	0.66	657	2.58 [#]	0.81 [#]	478	##	##	2,547	0.81	0.21
Normal Weight	4,529	26.63	0.95	605	25.41	2.19	657	26.67	1.97	478	29.54	2.39	2,547	26.63	1.20
Overweight	4,529	34.59	0.95	605	27.26 [a,c]	2.16	657	40.04 [b,d]	2.01	478	28.24 [a]	2.98	2,547	35.30 [d]	1.20
Obese	4,529	37.45	1.11	605	44.65 [a,c]	2.30	657	30.71 [c,d]	1.83	478	39.52	3.38	2,547	37.26 [a,d]	1.31
Men															
Underweight	2,239	0.95	0.22	261	2.34 [#]	0.91 [#]	325	##	##	235	##	##	1,300	0.40 [#]	0.14 [#]
Normal Weight	2,239	20.91	1.26	261	33.64 [a,c]	3.58	325	22.35 [d]	2.81	235	32.76 [c]	3.63	1,300	18.23 [b,d]	1.40
Overweight	2,239	42.37	1.43	261	31.79 [a,c]	3.26	325	48.94 [b,d]	2.89	235	29.97 [a,c]	3.79	1,300	44.05 [b,d]	1.80
Obese	2,239	35.76	1.52	261	32.23	3.31	325	26.78	3.35	235	35.42	3.92	1,300	37.32	1.78
Women															
Underweight	2,290	1.69	0.35	344	2.93 [#]	0.93 [#]	332	3.18 [#]	1.20 [#]	243	##	##	1,247	1.22 [#]	0.39 [#]
Normal Weight	2,290	32.12	1.39	344	19.54 [a,c]	2.07	332	30.64 [d]	2.64	243	26.52	3.62	1,247	35.08 [d]	1.69
Overweight	2,290	27.12	1.13	344	24.03	3.07	332	31.87	2.64	243	26.60	4.06	1,247	26.50	1.44
Obese	2,290	39.06	1.39	344	53.50 [a,c]	3.61	332	34.31 [d]	2.77	243	43.39	4.78	1,247	37.20 [d]	1.54

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.2e Prevalence of Weight Status Among Adults, Age 60 or Older, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
Underweight	5,118	1.22	0.13	435	1.91	0.54	1,021	2.26	0.57	898	##	##	2,384	0.84	0.20
Normal Weight	5,118	27.54	0.85	435	23.54	2.78	1,021	28.23	1.11	898	28.85	1.95	2,384	27.19	1.16
Overweight	5,118	38.21	0.85	435	33.05	3.49	1,021	34.60	1.66	898	37.74	1.74	2,384	40.04	1.17
Obese	5,118	33.02	0.69	435	41.50	3.33	1,021	34.92	1.83	898	32.32	2.14	2,384	31.93	1.07
Men															
Underweight	2,536	0.95	0.17	179	##	##	478	2.14 [#]	0.81 [#]	439	##	##	1,270	0.45 [#]	0.15 [#]
Normal Weight	2,536	23.20	1.03	179	26.31	4.14	478	31.84 [c]	2.31	439	26.39	2.44	1,270	21.07 [a]	1.33
Overweight	2,536	42.78	1.15	179	40.06	4.82	478	35.92 [c]	2.32	439	39.09	2.62	1,270	44.45 [a]	1.61
Obese	2,536	33.07	1.13	179	30.48	4.66	478	30.10	3.00	439	33.73	2.78	1,270	34.03	1.49
Women															
Underweight	2,582	1.43	0.19	256	##	##	543	2.32 [#]	0.84 [#]	459	##	##	1,114	1.21	0.30
Normal Weight	2,582	30.97	1.32	256	22.17 [c]	3.35	543	26.30 [c]	1.63	459	30.55	2.81	1,114	33.00 [a,d]	1.70
Overweight	2,582	34.61	1.36	256	29.58	4.04	543	33.89	2.63	459	36.80	2.40	1,114	35.86	1.94
Obese	2,582	32.99	1.13	256	46.95 [b,c]	4.10	543	37.49 [c]	2.69	459	31.35 [d]	2.58	1,114	29.93 [a,d]	1.57

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.3a Prevalence of Diagnosed or Undiagnosed Diabetes Among Adults, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	6,031	11.41	0.50	719	15.57 [c]	1.83	1,039	11.90 [b]	1.27	864	17.10 [a,c]	1.64	3,069	9.33 [b,d]	0.55
≥20 (age-adjusted)	6,031	11.18	0.48	719	18.99 [a,c]	2.03	1,039	11.25 [b,d]	1.15	864	16.66 [a,c]	1.56	3,069	9.24 [b,d]	0.57
20-39 years	1,905	2.99	0.37	312	4.51	1.16	312	2.98 [#]	0.91 [#]	277	4.50	0.72	908	2.26	0.53
40-59 years	1,917	11.25	0.86	228	24.44 [a,c]	3.77	280	11.18 [b,d]	1.65	222	21.77 [a,c]	3.71	1,096	8.40 [b,d]	0.91
≥60 years	2,209	25.08	1.11	179	35.05 [c]	3.80	447	25.53	2.70	365	29.27	2.79	1,065	22.54 [d]	1.28
Men															
≥20 years	3,047	11.90	0.65	307	13.97	1.89	515	13.09	1.71	431	17.75	2.53	1,632	10.50	0.80
≥20 (age-adjusted)	3,047	12.25	0.64	307	19.09 [c]	2.25	515	13.88	1.84	431	18.14 [c]	2.33	1,632	10.66 [b,d]	0.79
20-39 years	1,008	3.42	0.58	134	##	##	168	5.65	1.60	148	5.71 [#]	1.85 [#]	503	2.74	0.81
40-59 years	938	12.00	1.22	101	22.36 [c]	3.95	135	14.44	3.04	109	20.54	5.22	555	10.05 [d]	1.33
≥60 years	1,101	27.75	1.73	72	41.66	7.34	212	27.09	3.38	174	35.57	5.66	574	25.19	2.16
Women															
≥20 years	2,984	10.95	0.68	412	16.68 [c]	2.39	524	10.90 [b]	1.33	433	16.53 [a,c]	1.74	1,437	8.11 [b,d]	0.79
≥20 (age-adjusted)	2,984	10.25	0.63	412	19.29 [a,c]	2.67	524	8.84 [b,d]	1.01	433	15.65 [a,c]	1.87	1,437	7.82 [b,d]	0.77
20-39 years	897	2.53	0.53	178	5.75 [a]	1.55	144	0.00 [d]	0.00	129	##	##	405	##	##
40-59 years	979	10.54	1.16	127	25.94 [a,c]	4.89	145	8.39 [b,d]	1.94	113	22.93 [a,c]	4.05	541	6.75 [b,d]	1.18
≥60 years	1,108	23.00	1.35	107	31.80	4.99	235	24.68	3.51	191	25.28	3.30	491	20.04	1.67

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. A respondent was considered to have diagnosed diabetes if the respondent self-reported that a doctor or health professional told them that they had diabetes. Undiagnosed diabetes was defined as having a fasting glucose level of 126 mg/dl or higher or an HbA1c level of 6.5% or higher for respondents with values for both measures.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.3b Prevalence of Diagnosed Diabetes Among Adults, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receiving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	6,031	7.89	0.41	719	12.96 [c]	1.62	1,039	8.08	1.03	864	11.15 [c]	1.17	3,069	6.19 [b,d]	0.45
≥20 (age-adjusted)	6,031	7.72	0.39	719	15.73 [a,c]	1.67	1,039	7.71 [d]	0.93	864	11.00 [c]	1.16	3,069	6.10 [b,d]	0.45
20-39 years	1,905	1.84	0.26	312	3.49 [#]	1.09 [#]	312	##	##	277	2.42 [#]	0.88 [#]	908	1.45	0.37
40-59 years	1,917	8.27	0.71	228	21.38 [a,c]	3.58	280	8.71 [d]	1.46	222	15.46 [c]	2.85	1,096	5.79 [b,d]	0.74
≥60 years	2,209	16.91	0.88	179	27.61 [c]	3.02	447	17.24	2.17	365	18.55	2.39	1,065	14.57 [d]	1.12
Men															
≥20 years	3,047	7.45	0.47	307	12.34 [c]	1.86	515	8.15	1.31	431	9.22	1.74	1,632	6.35 [d]	0.56
≥20 (age-adjusted)	3,047	7.66	0.48	307	16.02 [c]	2.19	515	8.82	1.34	431	9.47	1.69	1,632	6.45 [d]	0.55
20-39 years	1,008	1.72	0.41	134	##	##	168	##	##	148	##	##	503	1.48 [#]	0.51 [#]
40-59 years	938	7.89	0.86	101	21.40 [c]	3.90	135	10.57	2.42	109	10.99 [#]	3.46 [#]	555	6.12 [d]	1.01
≥60 years	1,101	17.45	1.41	72	29.95	7.17	212	17.20	2.65	174	20.36	4.41	574	15.47	1.86
Women															
≥20 years	2,984	8.32	0.62	412	13.40 [c]	1.94	524	8.02 [b]	1.16	433	12.85 [a,c]	1.58	1,437	6.02 [b,d]	0.75
≥20 (age-adjusted)	2,984	7.81	0.57	412	15.65 [a,c]	2.09	524	6.65 [b,d]	0.95	433	12.62 [a,c]	1.74	1,437	5.77 [b,d]	0.70
20-39 years	897	1.97	0.47	178	3.99 [#]	1.41 [#]	144	0.00	0.00	129	##	##	405	##	##
40-59 years	979	8.62	1.08	127	21.36 [a,c]	4.26	145	7.13 [b,d]	1.91	113	19.67 [a,c]	3.78	541	5.45 [b,d]	1.10
≥60 years	1,108	16.49	1.03	107	26.47	4.21	235	17.26	3.00	191	17.41	2.71	491	13.73	1.49

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. A respondent was considered to have diagnosed diabetes if the respondent self-reported that a doctor or health professional told them that they had diabetes.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.3c Prevalence of Undiagnosed Diabetes Among Adults, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	6,031	3.52	0.26	719	2.60 [#]	0.82 [#]	1,039	3.82	0.52	864	5.95	0.96	3,069	3.14	0.31
≥20 (age-adjusted)	6,031	3.46	0.25	719	3.26 [#]	1.15 [#]	1,039	3.54	0.49	864	5.66	0.88	3,069	3.14	0.32
20-39 years	1,905	1.15	0.25	312	1.01 [#]	0.37 [#]	312	1.77 [#]	0.69 [#]	277	2.08 [#]	0.68 [#]	908	0.80 [#]	0.30 [#]
40-59 years	1,917	2.98	0.43	228	##	##	280	2.47	0.70	222	6.31	1.66	1,096	2.61	0.51
≥60 years	2,209	8.17	0.75	179	##	##	447	8.29	1.17	365	10.72	2.20	1,065	7.97	1.06
Men															
≥20 years	3,047	4.45	0.47	307	1.63 [# a,b,c]	0.64 [#]	515	4.94 [d]	0.98	431	8.53 [d]	1.79	1,632	4.15 [d]	0.56
≥20 (age-adjusted)	3,047	4.59	0.47	307	3.07 [#]	1.20 [#]	515	5.06	1.04	431	8.68	1.73	1,632	4.21	0.56
20-39 years	1,008	1.70	0.41	134	0.00 [a,b]	0.00	168	3.35 [# d]	1.21 [#]	148	4.04 [# d]	1.36 [#]	503	##	##
40-59 years	938	4.11	0.83	101	##	##	135	##	##	109	9.55 [#]	3.25 [#]	555	3.93	0.92
≥60 years	1,101	10.30	1.14	72	##	##	212	9.89	2.18	174	15.21	4.51	574	9.72	1.57
Women															
≥20 years	2,984	2.62	0.29	412	3.28 [#]	1.25 [#]	524	2.88	0.51	433	3.69	0.80	1,437	2.10	0.36
≥20 (age-adjusted)	2,984	2.44	0.28	412	##	##	524	2.19	0.34	433	3.04	0.71	1,437	2.05	0.37
20-39 years	897	0.56 [#]	0.22 [#]	178	1.77 [# a,b]	0.63 [#]	144	0.00 [d]	0.00	129	0.00 [d]	0.00	405	##	##
40-59 years	979	1.92	0.45	127	##	##	145	1.27 [#]	0.40 [#]	113	##	##	541	1.30 [#]	0.49 [#]
≥60 years	1,108	6.51	1.03	107	##	##	235	7.42	1.43	191	7.87	1.94	491	6.31	1.46

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. Undiagnosed diabetes was defined as having a fasting glucose level of 126 mg/dl or higher or an HbA1c level of 6.5% or higher for respondents with values for both measures.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.3d Prevalence of Prediabetes Among Adults, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	6,031	38.03	1.14	719	35.85	2.12	1,039	39.99	1.92	864	36.39	2.34	3,069	38.17	1.45
≥20 (age-adjusted)	6,031	37.64	1.07	719	36.83	2.18	1,039	40.05	2.05	864	35.50	2.54	3,069	37.35	1.35
20-39 years	1,905	26.62	1.29	312	32.10	2.96	312	29.62	2.65	277	28.28	3.12	908	25.02	1.56
40-59 years	1,917	42.68	1.85	228	39.76	3.29	280	46.53	4.19	222	35.33	4.68	1,096	42.93	2.13
≥60 years	2,209	48.41	1.20	179	40.21	4.22	447	47.53	2.77	365	48.13	2.82	1,065	49.50	1.58
Men															
≥20 years	3,047	44.04	1.46	307	45.17	3.77	515	44.94	2.50	431	39.35	3.12	1,632	44.57	1.87
≥20 (age-adjusted)	3,047	44.07	1.42	307	44.25	3.58	515	45.80	2.48	431	39.68	3.41	1,632	44.16	1.76
20-39 years	1,008	35.36	1.74	134	44.65	5.10	168	38.83	4.40	148	34.57	4.26	503	33.81	1.97
40-59 years	938	49.66	2.72	101	48.72	4.97	135	52.19	5.68	109	42.24	7.66	555	49.44	3.07
≥60 years	1,101	50.02	1.72	72	36.40	6.14	212	47.46	5.20	174	44.30	4.54	574	53.40	1.91
Women															
≥20 years	2,984	32.30	1.13	412	29.34	2.30	524	35.80	2.68	433	33.79	2.89	1,437	31.52	1.49
≥20 (age-adjusted)	2,984	31.12	1.06	412	31.14	2.36	524	34.18	2.68	433	30.98	2.92	1,437	30.03	1.41
20-39 years	897	17.11	1.42	178	22.73	3.31	144	19.31	2.89	129	21.57	4.01	405	14.80	1.87
40-59 years	979	36.07	2.05	127	33.28	3.25	145	41.70	5.00	113	28.82	5.17	541	36.43	2.65
≥60 years	1,108	47.15	1.73	107	42.08	4.95	235	47.56	3.64	191	50.55	4.75	491	45.82	2.25

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. Prediabetes was defined as having a fasting glucose level of 100 mg/dl or higher but lower than 126 mg/dl or an HbA1c level of 5.7% or higher but lower than 6.5% for respondents with values for both measures.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.4a Percentage of Adults Reporting Ever Having Experienced a Stroke, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	15,294	3.00	0.20	1,954	5.27 [c]	0.60	2,668	4.41 [c]	0.44	2,186	3.95 [c]	0.61	7,497	2.16 [a,b,d]	0.20
≥20 (age-adjusted)	15,294	2.95	0.18	1,954	6.80 [a,b,c]	0.71	2,668	4.13 [c,d]	0.37	2,186	3.14 [d]	0.46	7,497	2.19 [a,d]	0.20
20-39 years	4,954	0.46	0.11	850	1.53 [# b]	0.55 [#]	857	##	##	697	0.00 [c,d]	0.00	2,275	0.42 [# b]	0.15 [#]
40-59 years	4,738	2.00	0.26	635	6.99 [a,c]	1.18	685	3.06 [d]	0.72	510	##	##	2,647	1.30 [d]	0.26
≥60 years	5,602	8.71	0.57	469	15.54 [c]	2.01	1,126	12.41 [c]	1.15	979	10.78 [c]	1.60	2,575	6.67 [a,b,d]	0.68
Men															
≥20 years	7,697	2.47	0.18	851	4.43	1.14	1,306	3.07	0.47	1,090	2.81	0.54	3,967	2.00	0.22
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,697	2.60	0.16	851	6.39	1.47	1,306	3.41	0.47	1,090	2.54	0.45	3,967	2.10	0.22
20-39 years	2,600	0.33 [#]	0.13 [#]	375	##	##	448	##	##	372	0.00	0.00	1,250	##	##
40-59 years	2,345	1.55	0.25	282	6.07 [#]	2.11 [#]	336	##	##	250	##	##	1,348	1.14	0.30
≥60 years	2,752	8.18	0.57	194	16.44	3.79	522	12.80 [c]	1.71	468	9.04	1.82	1,369	6.62 [a]	0.71
Women															
≥20 years	7,597	3.50	0.30	1,103	5.86 [c]	0.81	1,362	5.52 [c]	0.68	1,096	4.96 [c]	0.90	3,530	2.34 [a,b,d]	0.32
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,597	3.26	0.27	1,103	7.15 [b,c]	1.01	1,362	4.80 [c]	0.61	1,096	3.59 [d]	0.70	3,530	2.29 [a,d]	0.30
20-39 years	2,354	0.61	0.17	475	2.03 [#]	0.73 [#]	409	##	##	325	0.00	0.00	1,025	##	##
40-59 years	2,393	2.43	0.39	353	7.68 [c]	1.63	349	4.99	1.27	260	##	##	1,299	1.46 [d]	0.39
≥60 years	2,850	9.12	0.84	275	15.07	3.09	604	12.20	1.71	511	11.92	2.08	1,206	6.71	1.07

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.4b Percentage of Adults Reporting Ever Having Experienced Coronary Heart Disease, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	15,245	3.56	0.20	1,946	2.87 [b]	0.47	2,659	3.85	0.36	2,178	4.79 [d]	0.45	7,481	3.34	0.27
≥20 (age-adjusted)	15,245	3.50	0.17	1,946	4.01	0.61	2,659	3.62	0.31	2,178	3.83	0.34	7,481	3.38	0.25
20-39 years	4,951	0.22 [#]	0.07 [#]	849	##	##	857	##	##	697	0.00	0.00	2,273	##	##
40-59 years	4,735	2.16	0.24	634	3.54	1.01	687	2.68	0.66	509	2.23 [#]	0.76 [#]	2,645	1.99	0.33
≥60 years	5,559	11.28	0.56	463	10.82	1.83	1,115	11.06	1.03	972	12.97	1.00	2,563	11.00	0.79
Men															
≥20 years	7,666	4.84	0.30	848	4.32	1.06	1,298	4.01	0.50	1,086	5.91	0.80	3,956	4.89	0.39
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,666	5.15	0.28	848	5.94	1.31	1,298	4.55	0.53	1,086	5.26	0.56	3,956	5.15	0.37
20-39 years	2,599	##	##	374	##	##	448	##	##	372	0.00	0.00	1,250	##	##
40-59 years	2,344	2.99	0.41	281	6.57 [#]	2.23 [#]	336	2.77 [#]	0.94 [#]	251	1.84 [#]	0.72 [#]	1,347	2.87	0.53
≥60 years	2,723	16.99	0.97	193	13.59	3.78	514	14.91	1.73	463	19.75	2.02	1,359	17.27	1.22
Women															
≥20 years	7,579	2.35	0.20	1,098	1.87 [a,b]	0.27	1,361	3.73 [c,d]	0.51	1,092	3.80 [c,d]	0.59	3,525	1.72 [a,b]	0.26
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,579	2.16	0.18	1,098	2.73	0.44	1,361	3.12	0.47	1,092	2.94	0.58	3,525	1.67	0.25
20-39 years	2,352	##	##	475	##	##	409	##	##	325	0.00	0.00	1,023	##	##
40-59 years	2,391	1.38	0.31	353	1.28 [#]	0.44 [#]	351	2.59 [#]	1.01 [#]	258	##	##	1,298	1.11 [#]	0.39 [#]
≥60 years	2,836	6.81	0.53	270	9.39	1.90	601	9.05	1.17	509	8.53	1.24	1,204	5.01	0.84

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment

Table J.4c Percentage of Adults Reporting Ever Having Experienced a Heart Attack, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	15,299	3.63	0.23	1,955	4.86 [c]	0.68	2,670	4.74 [c]	0.49	2,187	5.79 [c]	0.56	7,501	2.74 [a,b,d]	0.26
≥20 (age-adjusted)	15,299	3.56	0.20	1,955	6.50 [c]	0.83	2,670	4.44 [c]	0.42	2,187	4.77 [c]	0.53	7,501	2.75 [a,b,d]	0.23
20-39 years	4,952	0.32	0.09	850	##	##	856	##	##	697	0.00	0.00	2,274	##	##
40-59 years	4,744	2.55	0.26	636	7.30 [c]	1.29	688	3.32	0.82	511	3.53 [#]	1.09 [#]	2,649	1.82 [d]	0.34
≥60 years	5,603	10.73	0.58	469	15.35 [c]	2.15	1,126	13.10 [c]	1.05	979	14.92 [c]	1.24	2,578	8.39 [a,b,d]	0.70
Men															
≥20 years	7,699	4.51	0.34	852	6.24	1.25	1,306	5.57 [c]	0.49	1,092	6.84 [c]	0.74	3,968	3.63 [a,b]	0.39
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,699	4.75	0.30	852	8.93 [c]	1.58	1,306	6.20 [c]	0.54	1,092	6.28 [c]	0.63	3,968	3.80 [a,b,d]	0.35
20-39 years	2,599	0.39 [#]	0.14 [#]	375	##	##	447	##	##	372	0.00	0.00	1,250	##	##
40-59 years	2,349	3.02	0.43	283	9.30 [c]	2.31	337	4.34	1.15	251	3.78 [#]	1.36 [#]	1,350	2.21 [d]	0.51
≥60 years	2,751	15.01	0.82	194	22.20	4.30	522	18.53 [c]	1.43	469	21.03 [c]	1.74	1,368	12.27 [a,b]	0.95
Women															
≥20 years	7,600	2.80	0.23	1,103	3.89 [c]	0.52	1,364	4.06 [c]	0.74	1,095	4.86 [c]	0.80	3,533	1.81 [a,b,d]	0.25
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,600	2.58	0.21	1,103	5.04 [c]	0.69	1,364	3.33	0.58	1,095	3.75	0.75	3,533	1.73 [d]	0.25
20-39 years	2,353	##	##	475	##	##	409	##	##	325	0.00	0.00	1,024	##	##
40-59 years	2,395	2.10	0.30	353	5.79 [c]	1.18	351	##	##	260	##	##	1,299	1.42 [d]	0.42
≥60 years	2,852	7.38	0.76	275	11.84 [c]	2.49	604	10.24 [c]	1.53	510	10.89 [c]	1.73	1,210	4.69 [a,b,d]	0.93

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.4d Percentage of Adults Reporting Ever Having Experienced Congestive Heart Failure, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receiving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	15,265	2.56	0.15	1,951	3.44 [c]	0.41	2,656	3.28 [c]	0.33	2,179	3.91 [c]	0.45	7,494	1.92 [a,b,d]	0.23
≥20 (age-adjusted)	15,265	2.52	0.14	1,951	4.57 [a,b,c]	0.49	2,656	3.14 [c,d]	0.36	2,179	3.03 [d]	0.31	7,494	1.96 [a,d]	0.22
20-39 years	4,951	0.27 [#]	0.09 [#]	849	##	##	857	##	##	697	0.00	0.00	2,273	##	##
40-59 years	4,740	1.47	0.17	636	4.09 [c]	0.85	686	2.94	0.74	510	1.29 [#]	0.50 [#]	2,648	1.04 [d]	0.21
≥60 years	5,574	8.05	0.46	466	11.43	1.84	1,113	8.71	0.92	972	11.02	1.16	2,573	6.37	0.84
Men															
≥20 years	7,674	2.80	0.20	848	4.26	0.69	1,297	3.14	0.43	1,085	3.96	0.53	3,963	2.30	0.29
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,674	2.96	0.19	848	5.69 [c]	0.85	1,297	3.58	0.53	1,085	3.57	0.36	3,963	2.43 [d]	0.29
20-39 years	2,599	##	##	374	##	##	448	0.00	0.00	372	0.00	0.00	1,250	##	##
40-59 years	2,348	1.84	0.27	283	6.52 [c]	1.37	336	3.37 [#]	1.22 [#]	251	##	##	1,349	1.25 [d]	0.35
≥60 years	2,727	9.37	0.73	191	12.37	2.76	513	10.04	1.45	462	12.88	1.54	1,364	8.05	1.09
Women															
≥20 years	7,591	2.34	0.20	1,103	2.86 [c]	0.48	1,359	3.38 [c]	0.46	1,094	3.86 [c]	0.67	3,531	1.53 [a,b,d]	0.29
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,591	2.15	0.19	1,103	3.78 [c]	0.61	1,359	2.87	0.44	1,094	2.65	0.44	3,531	1.50 [d]	0.30
20-39 years	2,352	##	##	475	##	##	409	##	##	325	0.00	0.00	1,023	##	##
40-59 years	2,392	1.11	0.26	353	##	##	350	2.56 [#]	0.90 [#]	259	##	##	1,299	0.83 [#]	0.26 [#]
≥60 years	2,847	7.03	0.69	275	10.95	2.53	600	8.01	1.08	510	9.81	1.75	1,209	4.77	1.17

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.4e Percentage of Adults Reporting Ever Having Experienced Angina, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 years	15,270	2.61	0.21	1,948	3.18	0.65	2,664	3.29	0.48	2,181	4.08 [c]	0.38	7,490	2.07 [b]	0.22
≥20 (age-adjusted)	15,270	2.55	0.20	1,948	4.01	0.72	2,664	3.17	0.45	2,181	3.30 [c]	0.33	7,490	2.08 [b]	0.22
20-39 years	4,947	0.22 [#]	0.07 [#]	846	##	##	857	##	##	697	0.00	0.00	2,272	##	##
40-59 years	4,737	1.87	0.29	635	5.16	1.36	689	2.87	0.75	508	2.13 [#]	0.70 [#]	2,646	1.36	0.27
≥60 years	5,586	7.66	0.56	467	7.96	1.42	1,118	7.95	0.91	976	10.83	1.18	2,572	6.61	0.75
Men															
≥20 years	7,684	2.81	0.26	847	2.89 [#]	1.10 [#]	1,302	3.29	0.57	1,089	4.07	0.57	3,963	2.55	0.32
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,684	2.96	0.27	847	3.74 [#]	1.27 [#]	1,302	3.58	0.61	1,089	3.71	0.49	3,963	2.67	0.31
20-39 years	2,597	##	##	372	##	##	448	##	##	372	0.00	0.00	1,250	##	##
40-59 years	2,345	1.94	0.49	281	##	##	337	3.11 [#]	1.12 [#]	250	1.91 [#]	0.75 [#]	1,348	1.62	0.48
≥60 years	2,742	9.17	0.76	194	7.37 [#]	2.62 [#]	517	8.56	1.40	467	12.96	1.84	1,365	8.69	0.97
Women															
≥20 years	7,586	2.42	0.24	1,101	3.38 [c]	0.54	1,362	3.30	0.65	1,092	4.08 [c]	0.51	3,527	1.56 [b,d]	0.27
≥20 (age-adjusted)	7,586	2.23	0.22	1,101	4.17 [c]	0.64	1,362	2.83	0.54	1,092	3.06 [c]	0.48	3,527	1.50 [b,d]	0.26
20-39 years	2,350	##	##	474	##	##	409	##	##	325	0.00	0.00	1,022	##	##
40-59 years	2,392	1.80	0.36	354	5.35 [c]	1.07	352	2.65 [#]	0.93 [#]	258	##	##	1,298	1.10 [d]	0.33
≥60 years	2,844	6.47	0.67	273	8.26	1.93	601	7.63	1.27	509	9.45	1.40	1,207	4.62	0.97

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5a Percentage of Adults with at Least Three Risk Factors Associated with Metabolic Syndrome, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	5,618	39.54	1.09	650	43.63	2.32	951	39.79	2.55	805	43.58	2.36	2,903	38.21	1.16
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	5,618	39.07	0.92	650	48.95 [a,c]	1.73	951	39.60 [d]	2.01	805	41.76	2.39	2,903	37.35 [d]	1.06
20-39 y	1,793	19.21	1.22	287	29.46 [a,c]	3.61	291	14.62 [b,d]	2.63	260	25.12 [a]	2.80	867	17.30 [d]	1.43
40-59 y	1,801	44.30	1.52	210	53.67 [c]	3.29	255	48.48	4.09	204	42.49	4.66	1,045	42.75 [d]	1.88
≥60 y	2,024	64.69	1.89	153	74.76	3.92	405	68.15	2.38	341	69.09	2.87	991	63.00	2.44
Men															
≥20 y	2,875	40.11	1.17	282	39.50	3.63	483	36.79	3.28	405	41.18	3.09	1,561	40.89	1.36
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	2,875	40.58	1.01	282	45.28	3.23	483	39.67	2.77	405	41.26	2.99	1,561	40.63	1.34
20-39 y	958	20.52	1.52	127	25.74	5.03	158	15.56	3.31	137	25.94	3.95	486	20.53	2.01
40-59 y	897	46.94	1.77	95	53.24	4.80	128	53.37	5.90	105	40.73	5.79	533	45.94	2.19
≥60 y	1,020	64.75	2.43	60	65.93	9.02	197	58.95	3.68	163	68.33	3.53	542	66.53	3.13
Women															
≥20 y	2,743	38.99	1.55	368	46.60 [c]	2.90	468	42.42	3.11	400	45.71 [c]	3.21	1,342	35.37 [b,d]	1.81
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	2,743	37.54	1.36	368	51.20 [a,c]	2.28	468	38.71 [d]	2.53	400	42.19	3.50	1,342	33.83 [d]	1.63
20-39 y	835	17.77	1.60	160	32.30 [a,c]	4.56	133	13.57 [d]	3.32	123	24.26	4.27	381	13.49 [d]	2.09
40-59 y	904	41.74	2.15	115	53.98 [c]	3.72	127	43.99	5.23	99	44.25	6.44	512	39.53 [d]	2.63
≥60 y	1,004	64.65	2.39	93	79.08 [c]	4.34	208	73.29 [c]	3.77	178	69.57	3.91	449	59.51 [a,d]	3.06

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. The number of risk factors for metabolic syndrome was assessed only for respondents with values for all measures.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5b Percentage of Adults with at Least One Risk Factor Associated with Metabolic Syndrome, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	5,618	80.64	0.82	650	82.83	1.77	951	81.28	1.88	805	81.16	1.93	2,903	80.60	0.88
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	5,618	80.33	0.75	650	85.64 [c]	1.43	951	81.13	1.76	805	80.62	1.88	2,903	80.07 [d]	0.89
20-39 y	1,793	67.54	1.36	287	75.11	2.99	291	68.86	3.27	260	64.85	3.41	867	67.42	1.91
40-59 y	1,801	84.18	0.98	210	88.65	2.50	255	84.99	3.05	204	87.12	3.62	1,045	83.32	0.94
≥60 y	2,024	96.04	0.54	153	98.85	0.76	405	95.95	0.86	341	97.21	1.10	991	96.52	0.84
Men															
≥20 y	2,875	82.11	1.09	282	81.14	2.73	483	80.85	2.53	405	77.66	2.99	1,561	83.38	1.15
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	2,875	82.38	1.04	282	84.71	2.08	483	82.26	2.30	405	78.03	2.86	1,561	83.14	1.20
20-39 y	958	69.62	1.88	127	71.98	4.90	158	70.35	4.46	137	64.04	4.40	486	70.84	2.45
40-59 y	897	86.99	1.40	95	90.93	2.67	128	87.99	4.70	105	80.51	6.47	533	87.18	1.48
≥60 y	1,020	96.82	0.62	60	96.51	2.23	197	93.44	2.29	163	97.98	1.09	542	97.71	0.71
Women															
≥20 y	2,743	79.21	1.12	368	84.04	2.04	468	81.66	2.51	400	84.28	2.31	1,342	77.65	1.63
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	2,743	78.26	1.06	368	86.22 [c]	1.77	468	79.77	2.48	400	83.31	2.26	1,342	76.75 [d]	1.62
20-39 y	835	65.26	2.11	160	77.49 [c]	3.52	133	67.18	4.70	123	65.70	5.28	381	63.39 [d]	3.18
40-59 y	904	81.46	1.21	115	86.93	3.68	127	82.25	3.99	99	93.76 [c]	2.70	512	79.41 [b]	1.46
≥60 y	1,004	95.40	0.87	93	100.00 [a,c]	0.00	208	97.35 [d]	0.60	178	96.71	1.68	449	95.34 [d]	1.43

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. The number of risk factors for metabolic syndrome was assessed only for respondents with values for all measures.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5c Percentage of Adults with Elevated Waist Circumference, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	13,766	52.48	0.87	1,784	57.08 [a,c]	1.38	2,400	49.76 [d]	1.77	1,951	53.14	1.61	6,830	52.24 [d]	0.97
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	13,766	52.11	0.79	1,784	59.69 [a,b,c]	1.26	2,400	50.23 [d]	1.45	1,951	52.59 [d]	1.64	6,830	51.23 [d]	0.91
20-39 y	4,533	38.26	1.14	789	49.94 [a,b,c]	2.18	796	34.86 [d]	2.96	643	38.85 [d]	2.35	2,079	36.69 [d]	1.32
40-59 y	4,402	57.57	1.09	588	62.26	1.93	638	55.54	2.11	466	57.60	3.26	2,483	57.31	1.28
≥60 y	4,831	67.05	0.93	407	72.27	2.25	966	68.01	1.45	842	68.08	1.87	2,268	66.36	1.38
Men															
≥20 y	6,949	43.36	1.04	772	35.79 [c]	2.07	1,198	33.94 [b,c]	2.19	982	41.50 [a,c]	2.02	3,605	46.34 [a,b,d]	1.16
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,949	43.55	0.90	772	39.11 [c]	2.13	1,198	36.04 [c]	2.08	982	41.93	2.06	3,605	45.70 [a,d]	1.04
20-39 y	2,360	28.63	1.18	349	29.18 [a]	2.75	417	20.47 [b,c,d]	2.58	343	29.24 [a]	2.65	1,127	30.59 [a]	1.46
40-59 y	2,169	49.98	1.58	255	40.64 [c]	3.12	315	44.13	4.27	228	45.65	4.16	1,259	52.35 [d]	1.77
≥60 y	2,420	58.78	1.13	168	53.63	4.76	466	49.72 [c]	3.30	411	57.70	2.34	1,219	60.89 [a]	1.60
Women															
≥20 y	6,817	61.22	0.99	1,012	71.84 [a,b,c]	1.86	1,202	63.48 [d]	2.29	969	63.58 [d]	2.18	3,225	58.37 [d]	1.13
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,817	60.41	0.96	1,012	73.61 [a,b,c]	1.73	1,202	62.56 [c,d]	2.07	969	62.46 [c,d]	2.20	3,225	57.08 [a,b,d]	1.16
20-39 y	2,173	48.53	1.58	440	65.14 [a,b,c]	2.91	379	50.02 [d]	4.22	300	49.13 [d]	4.17	952	43.73 [d]	1.92
40-59 y	2,233	64.79	1.24	333	77.68 [a,c]	2.54	323	66.04 [d]	2.73	238	68.72	3.65	1,224	62.25 [d]	1.53
≥60 y	2,411	73.73	1.36	239	81.59 [c]	2.45	500	78.44 [c]	1.98	431	75.23	2.53	1,049	71.63 [a,d]	1.80

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. A respondent was considered to have an elevated waist circumference if it was greater than 102 cm for men or 88 cm for women.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5d Percentage of Adults with Elevated Triglycerides, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receiving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	6,004	38.66	0.84	714	38.08	2.21	1,036	39.56	2.33	857	40.98	2.24	3,061	38.23	1.14
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,004	38.22	0.74	714	41.44	1.91	1,036	38.96	2.22	857	39.96	2.27	3,061	37.54	1.05
20-39 y	1,899	23.99	1.30	310	27.11	3.05	313	23.27	3.21	273	25.97	2.93	908	22.99	1.79
40-59 y	1,909	41.80	1.19	226	47.52	3.66	278	42.66	3.99	221	43.54	4.00	1,093	41.13	1.61
≥60 y	2,196	56.84	1.37	178	56.21	4.11	445	59.89	2.56	363	58.16	3.28	1,060	56.68	1.74
Men															
≥20 y	3,042	43.46	1.05	306	41.95	3.29	515	43.09	3.75	427	43.00	2.89	1,635	43.88	1.37
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	3,042	43.66	1.01	306	43.96	3.06	515	44.22	3.68	427	43.26	3.07	1,635	43.39	1.36
20-39 y	1,005	30.02	1.75	133	33.26	4.88	168	33.26	4.75	145	30.58	4.22	505	28.42	2.21
40-59 y	938	49.21	2.00	101	53.82	5.72	135	47.69	5.93	109	44.65	5.62	555	49.73	2.52
≥60 y	1,099	58.09	1.62	72	46.46	7.93	212	57.43	4.22	173	62.73	5.12	575	58.85	2.36
Women															
≥20 y	2,962	34.05	1.21	408	35.36	2.31	521	36.56	2.16	430	39.20	2.92	1,426	32.31	1.58
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	2,962	32.75	1.05	408	39.03 [c]	1.87	521	33.29	1.77	430	36.95	3.15	1,426	31.31 [d]	1.41
20-39 y	894	17.42	1.64	177	22.54	3.91	145	12.28	2.51	128	21.05	4.18	403	16.63	2.47
40-59 y	971	34.71	1.94	125	42.87	3.93	143	38.28	4.14	112	42.49	6.59	538	32.47	2.46
≥60 y	1,097	55.85	1.85	106	61.09	4.65	233	61.26	3.38	190	55.27	3.98	485	54.61	2.18

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. Elevated triglycerides was defined as having a triglyceride level of 150 mg/dL or higher or responding "yes" when asked if they were currently taking cholesterol medicine that had been prescribed by a doctor or health care professional, among respondents who had a triglycerides measurement.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5e Percentage of Adults with Reduced HDL-C, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	13,731	39.03	0.77	1,784	46.80 [b,c]	1.92	2,401	42.00 [c]	1.44	1,956	38.04 [d]	1.70	6,783	37.37 [a,d]	0.85
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	13,731	38.74	0.74	1,784	47.88 [a,b,c]	1.90	2,401	41.95 [c,d]	1.33	1,956	37.26 [d]	1.82	6,783	36.83 [a,d]	0.86
20-39 y	4,405	31.40	1.07	784	44.70 [a,b,c]	2.49	768	34.72 [c,d]	2.28	630	28.97 [d]	2.20	2,003	27.92 [a,d]	1.34
40-59 y	4,364	39.64	1.16	582	46.94	2.89	637	44.40	2.51	461	39.08	3.78	2,458	38.33	1.17
≥60 y	4,962	49.87	0.71	418	54.84	3.77	996	50.40	2.09	865	48.55	2.06	2,322	49.69	1.11
Men															
≥20 y	6,941	37.81	0.97	779	41.38	2.97	1,180	38.35	1.60	988	34.69	2.19	3,598	37.83	1.10
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,941	37.90	0.94	779	42.78	3.00	1,180	39.33	1.52	988	34.86	2.20	3,598	37.57	1.12
20-39 y	2,301	28.82	1.29	346	36.09	3.46	400	30.43	2.57	341	25.22	3.08	1,093	27.65	1.74
40-59 y	2,153	39.87	1.48	256	47.45	4.06	308	45.01	3.35	226	37.10	4.54	1,252	39.02	1.45
≥60 y	2,487	50.25	1.14	177	46.75	6.06	472	45.47	3.10	421	47.77	2.96	1,253	52.23	1.77
Women															
≥20 y	6,790	40.20	1.12	1,005	50.62 [a,b,c]	1.85	1,221	45.04 [c,d]	1.95	968	41.07 [d]	2.25	3,185	36.89 [a,d]	1.34
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,790	39.69	1.11	1,005	51.23 [a,b,c]	1.83	1,221	44.13 [c,d]	1.90	968	39.73 [d]	2.53	3,185	36.13 [a,d]	1.31
20-39 y	2,104	34.18	1.60	438	51.01 [a,b,c]	2.88	368	39.14 [c,d]	3.62	289	33.12 [d]	3.23	910	28.23 [a,d]	1.86
40-59 y	2,211	39.42	1.54	326	46.56	3.06	329	43.87	3.23	235	40.95	5.15	1,206	37.64	1.84
≥60 y	2,475	49.56	1.02	241	59.10	4.56	524	53.09	2.60	444	49.07	2.60	1,069	47.23	1.43

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. Reduced HDL-C was defined as having a direct HDL cholesterol level of lower than 40 mg/dL for men or 50 mg/dL for women or responding "yes" when asked if they were currently taking cholesterol medicine that had been prescribed by a doctor or health care professional, among respondents who had a valid HDL measurement.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5f Percentage of Adults with Elevated Blood Pressure, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	13,822	40.77	0.69	1,798	37.87	1.21	2,409	40.29	1.83	1,959	43.62	1.55	6,838	40.61	0.79
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	13,822	39.91	0.62	1,798	45.13 [a,c]	1.29	2,409	39.88 [d]	1.35	1,959	40.94	1.43	6,838	39.35 [d]	0.70
20-39 y	4,465	15.11	0.69	779	18.80 [a]	1.54	776	12.89 [d]	1.33	636	15.73	1.75	2,048	15.09	0.93
40-59 y	4,358	43.88	1.12	590	48.52	2.05	628	45.02	2.48	455	45.24	2.98	2,459	42.99	1.20
≥60 y	4,999	75.97	0.98	429	84.79 [b,c]	2.30	1,005	77.86	1.67	868	77.19 [d]	1.83	2,331	75.06 [d]	1.37
Men															
≥20 y	7,004	42.48	0.84	784	40.22	1.94	1,196	39.64	2.44	989	42.48	1.83	3,623	43.44	1.00
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	7,004	42.91	0.79	784	47.02	2.07	1,196	42.92	2.19	989	42.11	1.73	3,623	43.15	0.99
20-39 y	2,346	21.71	0.98	347	25.47	2.65	410	17.94	2.15	340	21.42	2.45	1,123	23.01	1.54
40-59 y	2,167	46.40	1.49	259	50.11	3.26	311	50.37	3.87	225	43.39	3.65	1,255	45.68	1.68
≥60 y	2,491	73.58	1.33	178	78.96	4.73	475	73.73	2.46	424	75.50	2.59	1,245	73.57	1.83
Women															
≥20 y	6,818	39.12	0.76	1,014	36.21 [b]	1.62	1,213	40.83	2.17	970	44.64 [c,d]	1.97	3,215	37.63 [b]	1.01
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,818	36.60	0.62	1,014	43.47 [a,c]	1.45	1,213	36.46 [d]	1.59	970	39.38	1.88	3,215	34.97 [d]	0.78
20-39 y	2,119	7.94	0.67	432	13.90 [c]	1.65	366	7.47	1.59	296	9.53	1.97	925	5.74 [d]	0.76
40-59 y	2,191	41.45	1.42	331	47.35	2.54	317	40.21	3.28	230	46.94	3.99	1,204	40.27	1.62
≥60 y	2,508	77.87	1.12	251	87.88 [b,c]	2.13	530	80.05	2.40	444	78.34 [d]	2.42	1,086	76.50 [d]	1.62

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. Elevated blood pressure was defined as having either a systolic blood pressure reading of 130 mm Hg or higher or a diastolic blood pressure reading of 85 mm Hg or higher or responding "yes" when asked if they were currently taking medicine for blood pressure or hypertension that had been prescribed by a doctor or health care professional, among respondents who had at least one valid blood pressure measurement. Up to three blood pressure measurements were averaged together for respondents with more than one valid measurement.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

Table J.5g Percentage of Adults with Elevated Fasting Glucose, by Age, 2003-2008

	Total Persons			Currently Receiving SNAP			Income-eligible Nonparticipants			Lower Income Nonparticipants			Higher Income Nonparticipants		
	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE	N	%	SE
All															
≥20 y	6,048	44.24	1.35	722	45.22	1.84	1,043	45.62	2.30	864	48.26	2.89	3,079	42.90	1.60
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	6,048	43.70	1.25	722	49.09 [c]	1.76	1,043	45.11	2.29	864	46.78	2.91	3,079	42.05 [d]	1.49
20-39 y	1,914	26.74	1.39	313	32.44	2.81	314	28.98	3.15	277	30.01	3.35	914	24.91	1.74
40-59 y	1,921	48.57	1.92	229	55.96	3.01	281	50.10	4.15	222	49.44	5.25	1,098	46.83	2.28
≥60 y	2,213	64.92	1.52	180	66.56	4.11	448	64.70	2.79	365	71.23	2.90	1,067	63.70	1.90
Men															
≥20 y	3,056	51.68	1.53	307	52.93	3.63	516	53.01	2.68	431	52.16	3.84	1,640	51.30	1.87
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	3,056	52.07	1.44	307	57.62	3.24	516	54.48	2.54	431	52.50	3.68	1,640	51.08	1.77
20-39 y	1,014	35.20	1.72	134	41.07	4.94	169	41.18	4.58	148	37.38	4.14	508	33.41	2.03
40-59 y	939	57.02	2.44	101	63.96	4.66	135	60.40	5.63	109	54.13	7.88	556	55.63	2.83
≥60 y	1,103	72.98	1.52	72	75.77	5.37	212	67.73	3.02	174	75.76	3.77	576	74.02	1.95
Women															
≥20 y	2,992	37.15	1.43	415	39.87	2.47	527	39.42	2.99	433	44.83 [c]	3.11	1,439	34.15 [b]	1.69
≥20 y (age-adjusted)	2,992	35.62	1.33	415	43.38 [c]	2.42	527	36.11	2.64	433	41.36	3.32	1,439	32.59 [d]	1.64
20-39 y	900	17.54	1.57	179	26.06	3.46	145	15.44	3.11	129	22.15	4.94	406	15.00	2.10
40-59 y	982	40.57	2.02	128	50.20	3.82	146	41.36	4.98	113	45.02	5.56	542	38.03	2.52
≥60 y	1,110	58.61	2.19	108	62.07	5.09	236	63.05	4.37	191	68.36 [c]	3.63	491	53.97 [b]	2.83

Note: Respondents were identified as currently receiving SNAP benefits if the respondent or anyone in the household received SNAP benefits in the last 12 months. Income-eligible was defined as a poverty-income ratio (PIR) of 1.3 or below. Lower income was defined as a PIR greater than 1.3 but less than or equal to 2.0. Higher income was defined as a PIR above 2.0. Elevated fasting glucose was defined as having a glucose plasma level of 100 mg/dL or higher or responding "yes" when asked if they were currently taking insulin or diabetic pills to lower blood sugar, among respondents who had a fasting glucose measurement.

[#] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 30 percent but less than 40 percent).

[##] Does not meet standard of statistical reliability (relative standard error greater than or equal to 40 percent).

[a] Significantly different from income-eligible nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) adjustment.

[b] Significantly different from lower income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[c] Significantly different from higher income nonparticipants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

[d] Significantly different from SNAP participants at the 0.05 level, with BH adjustment.

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research

Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC