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For more than 40 years, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has served as the foundation of America’s national nutrition safety net. It is the nation’s first line of defense against hunger and offers a powerful tool to improve nutrition among low-income people. In fiscal year 2011, SNAP served nearly 45 million people, about one in seven Americans.

Over the course of four decades, researchers and analysts—inside government and out—have built a substantial body of evidence that SNAP makes an important difference in the lives of low-income people.

- **It touches the lives of millions of people who need help to put food on the table.** Unlike most other assistance programs, SNAP is available to nearly anyone who qualifies with little income and few resources. Program rules do not limit benefits to families with children or the elderly or the unemployed. Nationwide standards for eligibility and benefits create a national nutrition safety net for low-income families and individuals wherever they live.

- **It supports those whose wages are too low to lift them out of poverty.** SNAP is an important work support: 75 percent of the people who receive benefits for a year or less—and about 40 percent overall—live in households with earnings. The Census Bureau indicates that SNAP would lift 3.9 million Americans—including 1.7 million children—out of poverty in 2010 if its benefits were included in the official measures of income and poverty.

- **It raises food expenditures and improves nutrient availability.** Participants in SNAP spend more on food than they would in the absence of the program. Providing benefits that can be spent only on food raises food expenditures more than an equal amount of cash. In addition, there is evidence that program participation can increase the availability of some nutrients in the home food supply. Recent studies have shown that the nutrient intake of low-income people differs little from higher-income people—a sharp contrast from 40 years ago.

- **It responds to changing economic conditions.** The program automatically expands to meet increased need when the economy is in recession and contracts when the economy is growing, making sure that food gets to people who need it. SNAP benefits automatically flow to communities, States, or regions of the country that face rising unemployment or poverty, providing a boost for local economies. When the economy strengthens, SNAP participation declines.

- **It delivers benefits with a high degree of integrity.** The program effectively delivers benefits only to households that need them: more than 98 percent of all participating households are eligible for SNAP benefits. In fiscal year 2010, the program achieved the highest level of overall payment accuracy in its history: the national overpayment error rate—the percentage of SNAP benefit dollars issued in excess of the amounts for which households are eligible—fell to 3.05 percent; the underpayment error rate was less than 1.00 percent. Trafficking is the sale of SNAP benefits for cash, a practice that diverts benefits away from their intended purpose of helping low-income families access a nutritious diet. The extent of trafficking is also low, about one cent of every dollar issued.

- **It provides flexibility to States while ensuring the protection of a national safety net.** The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (2008 Farm Bill) continued the commitment to a national nutrition safety net and gave States a substantial new opportunity to streamline complex rules. In addition, States may also use SNAP’s waiver procedures to test changes to a variety of program rules.

As the time for reauthorization of SNAP again approaches, it is useful to take stock of its accomplishments, identify those features that have contributed to its success, and look for new opportunities to strengthen operations to achieve program goals more fully. To that end, this is a summary of past research on program operations and outcomes.
How SNAP Works

SNAP alleviates hunger and improves nutrition by increasing the food purchasing power of low-income households, enabling them to obtain a more nutritious diet by preparing food at home.

The program is available to nearly anyone with little income and few resources who qualifies. Program rules do not limit benefits to a specific group of people, such as the elderly, families with children, or the unemployed. As a result, the program serves a wide range of low-income persons, about half of whom are children.

**KEY FACT:**

SNAP benefits, provided monthly via an electronic debit card, are available to most households with gross income less than 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines.

Nationwide standards for eligibility and benefits create a national safety net for low-income households. Generally SNAP households must have monthly gross income less than 130 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines ($2,422 for a family of four in fiscal year 2012), monthly net income less than 100 percent of the poverty guidelines, and assets of less than $2,000. Households with elderly (age 60 and older) and disabled members are exempt from the gross income limit and must have assets less than $3,250. Categorical eligibility exempts households from the income and asset tests if all members receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), State General Assistance, or Supplemental Security Income (SSI). Broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE), a State option, may extend the exemption from the asset and income tests to additional families receiving a TANF-funded benefit or service. Eligible households must also meet some nonfinancial criteria, including citizenship and work requirements. Almost all households that reside in States with BBCE would be eligible for SNAP under standard program rules.

National standards for application filing and processing also bolster the safety net. SNAP has standard procedures for application filing, interviews, verification of applicant information, and application processing that provide strong procedural protections for applicants and participants.

The program allows several deductions from income, to provide a better measure of disposable income available to purchase food and to encourage work. The deductions include a standard available to all households; an earned income deduction available to working households; a shelter deduction for those with high shelter expenses; and dependent care, medical, and child support deductions for some with particular expenses. These deductions are subtracted from gross income to determine net income.

SNAP benefits are based on the Thrifty Food Plan, a minimal cost food plan that reflects current nutrition standards and guidance, the nutrient content and cost of food, and consumption patterns of low-income households. Maximum allotments vary by household size. In fiscal year 2012, the maximum allotment for a family of four is $668 per month, including the benefit increase contained in The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act).

Maximum allotments are reduced by 30 percent of a household’s net income. SNAP benefits are designed to be a supplement to food purchases made with the household’s own income. As a result, benefits can vary across households of the same gross income and size.

Participating households receive monthly benefit allotments in the form of electronic debit cards (also known as EBT, or electronic benefit transfer). SNAP benefits are limited to the purchase of food items for use at home as well as seeds and plants to produce food. Alcohol and tobacco cannot be purchased with SNAP benefits. Many States use a single EBT card for SNAP and a variety of cash benefit programs. The cash benefits can be accessed through most ATMs, but SNAP benefits cannot be withdrawn as cash.

SNAP benefits are used at supermarkets, large and small grocery stores, convenience and specialty stores, and farmers markets. Benefits can be exchanged only at authorized food retailers. Nationwide, there were about 230,000 authorized retailers at the end of fiscal year 2011.

Benefits are 100 percent Federally funded, whereas administrative costs are shared between States and the Federal government. Although broad policy guidance is provided through USDA’s Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), day-to-day administration is carried out by States or counties. States are responsible for the certification of households and issuance of benefits. FNS is responsible for the authorization and oversight of food retailers.

The program monitors performance through a national system of quality control and a set of participation indicators. The quality control system measures the accuracy of eligibility decisions and benefit determinations against program rules for a representative sample of cases. Other performance measures include the proportion of eligible households who receive benefits and the percentage of applications processed within required timelines.
Why SNAP Is Important

SNAP participation grows when the economy is weak, helping families put food on the table. As the number of unemployed persons and families living in poverty grew in the last few years, so did SNAP participation. When the economy improves, SNAP participation will decline. The face of SNAP has changed during the recent economic downturn as more newly unemployed or underemployed people rely on SNAP to feed their families. Although SNAP largely serves a vulnerable population—children, elderly, and individuals with disabilities—it is available to most individuals with low incomes who meet the eligibility criteria. At the end of fiscal year 2011, SNAP was serving about one in seven Americans.

SNAP helps prevent food insecurity. The number of households experiencing food insecurity, or difficulty getting enough food because of a lack of resources, was at record high levels in 2008 to 2010. Although the continued high levels of food insecurity are cause for concern, the fact that the numbers did not increase between 2008 and 2010, despite a significant increase in the poverty rate and number of unemployed persons, underscores the important role of SNAP in helping to prevent food insecurity.

SNAP lifts millions of people out of poverty. The Census Bureau has reported that 46.2 million people—15.1 percent of all those in the United States—lived in poverty in 2010. SNAP benefits have a powerful anti-poverty effect that is not reflected in the Nation’s official poverty statistics. The Census Bureau indicates that SNAP would lift 3.9 million Americans—including 1.7 million children—out of poverty if its benefits were included in the official measures of income and poverty. Another study found that the antipoverty effectiveness of SNAP accelerated over the decade, with about 2 million people lifted out of poverty each year through 2003, but that figure more than doubled to 4.5 million in 2009 because of the deep recession and the benefit increase in the Recovery Act.

SNAP provides a fiscal boost to the economy during an economic downturn. In addition to helping families during these tough economic times, SNAP has an added benefit of serving as an economic multiplier—meaning it puts critical dollars back into local economies. Every $1 in new benefits generates up to $1.80 in economic activity. Every time a family uses SNAP benefits to put healthy food on the table, it benefits the store and the employees where the purchase was made, the truck driver who delivered the food, the warehouses that stored it, the plant that processed it, and the farmer who produced the food. Each $1 billion increase in SNAP benefits is estimated to create or maintain 18,000 full-time equivalent jobs, including 3,000 farm jobs.

Sources:

KEY FACT:
SNAP automatically responds to changes in the economy and plays a key role in supporting families during tough economic times.
Overview of SNAP Participation

The pattern of participation in SNAP over the last 35 years has closely followed the pattern of poverty and the economic cycle in the United States.

- SNAP participation declined slowly from 1983 to 1989, mostly because of a strong economy. It increased sharply from 1990 through 1994, driven by a slowing economy, Medicaid expansion, and changes increasing SNAP access.
- After reaching 28.0 million in March 1994, participation declined steadily, reaching a low of 16.9 million in July 2000 in response to a strong economy, restrictions on the eligibility of noncitizens, time limits for nonelderly childless adults, and a lower participation rate among eligible people.
- Participation began rising in 2001 as unemployment and poverty increased. At the same time, eligibility was restored for many noncitizens, vehicle rules were improved, States had options to simplify their reporting requirements, and FNS encouraged improved access to program benefits.
- Participation has continued to grow during the economic downturn during the period 2008 through 2010. As the number of unemployed or underemployed persons and persons in poverty grew, so did SNAP participation, reaching 45 million in fiscal year 2011.

Sources:
FNS Program Operations data, Census Bureau (poverty), Bureau of Labor Statistics (unemployment)
Prevalence of Food Insecurity

Households are considered food insecure when their lack of financial resources does not allow them to fully meet their basic food needs at all times. Food insecurity has been measured since 1995 using the Food Security Supplement to the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey. Established income and food assistance programs help to provide a safety net for many low-income families.

A record high number of American households experienced food insecurity in 2008 through 2010. During calendar year 2010, 14.5 percent of all American households were food insecure, including 5.4 percent who experienced very low food security. The percentage of households in the United States experiencing food insecurity jumped to 14.6 percent in 2008 and 14.7 percent in 2009. These three years have had the highest recorded levels of food insecurity since measurement began in 1995. Rates of food insecurity were substantially higher among households with children headed by single parents and among Black and Hispanic households. Food insecurity was more common in large cities and in the South and West.

Children were food insecure at times during the year in 3.9 million households, or 9.8 percent of households with children. Although children are usually shielded from disrupted eating patterns and reduced food intake, children along with adults experienced instances of very low food security in 386,000 households (1.0 percent of households with children) in 2010.

Source:

.Key Fact:
With the severe economic downturn, food insecurity rose to record high levels in 2008 and remained essentially unchanged in 2009 and 2010.

1 “Very low food security” means that at times during the year, the food intake of household members was reduced and their normal eating patterns were disrupted because the household lacked money and other resources for food.
Characteristics of SNAP Participants

Nearly half of SNAP participants are children.
Forty-seven percent of all participants are less than 18 years old, and about half of all households include at least one child. Households with children receive 71 percent of all SNAP benefits. About 56 percent of the households with children are single parent families.

Many SNAP participants are elderly or disabled.
Eight percent of all participants are age 60 or older, 73 percent of whom live alone. About 16 percent of all households include an elderly member, and about 20 percent include a disabled member.

Many participants work.
About 30 percent of all households have earnings from a job; about 41 percent of all participants live in a household with earnings.

Few participants rely on cash welfare.
About 8 percent receive cash TANF and 21 percent receive SSI.

Nearly 40 percent of SNAP households receive the maximum allotment because they have little or no income. Nearly 20 percent of households have no gross income; another 19 percent have no net income.

About 4 percent of SNAP participants are noncitizens. All are legal immigrants admitted for permanent residence such as legal permanent resident aliens and refugees. Another 3 percent are naturalized citizens.

Source:
Many participating households are or have been part of the labor force: 30 percent have earnings, 21 percent receive Social Security, and 7 percent receive Unemployment Insurance and/or Workers Compensation.

Participating households receive cash from a variety of unearned sources that help them make ends meet: 21 percent receive SSI, 8 percent receive TANF, 10 percent receive child support, and 4 percent receive General Assistance.

Households with earned income now represent a larger portion of the total SNAP caseload than in the past. Over the past 10 years the percentage of households with earned income has increased from 27 percent to 30 percent, whereas the share of households with unearned income has declined from 79 percent to 60 percent.

**Source:**

**KEY FACT:**
Earnings from employment are the most common single source of income for SNAP households.

**Sources of SNAP Household Income: FY 2010**

*Other unearned income includes alimony, foster care payments, and dividend and interest payments. Other government cash benefits include Black Lung Benefits, Railroad Retirement payments, and USDA payments to farmers.*
SNAP households have little cash income. In fiscal year 2010, more than 43 percent of SNAP households had gross incomes at or below 50 percent of the poverty level (including 20 percent with no gross income), and only 15 percent had gross income above the poverty level.

SNAP makes a real impact on poverty. The value of SNAP benefits, when added to cash income, moved 13 percent of participating households above the poverty guideline in 2010. SNAP benefits had an even greater impact on the poorest households, moving 16 percent above 50 percent of the poverty guideline. On average, one-fourth of a SNAP household’s monthly income came from SNAP.

**KEY FACT:**

If SNAP benefits were counted as income, 13 percent of households would move above the poverty guidelines.

SNAP benefits have a powerful anti-poverty effect that is not reflected in the Nation’s official poverty statistics. The Census Bureau has developed a Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) that uses a different calculation of income to measure poverty. The SPM adds to cash income the value of near-cash benefits, including SNAP and other assistance programs, and then subtracts taxes, work-related expenses, childcare expenses, out-of-pocket medical expenses, and child support payments. Including SNAP benefits in the calculation reduced the SPM-based poverty rate by 1.9 percentage points from 17.7 percent to 15.8 percent in 2009. In 2010, the Census Bureau indicates that SNAP would lift 3.9 million Americans—including 1.7 million children—out of poverty if its benefits were included in the official measures of income and poverty.

SNAP plays an important role in improving the welfare of children in low-income households. Participation in the program significantly reduces the depth and severity of child poverty. When SNAP was added to cash income in 2007, the percentage of working families with children below 50 percent of poverty dropped from 20 percent to 4 percent. The percentage of families with children at or above the Federal poverty guidelines increased from 26 to 45 percent when SNAP was added to cash income. Another study focusing on three States found that SNAP reduced child poverty by 3.4 to 5.1 percentage points in 2008.

Sources:


Some households are not able to use the full value of deductions available to them. Because net income cannot be less than zero, households with total deductions greater than their gross income can only claim a portion of the deductions available to them. In fiscal year 2010, about 20 percent of all participating households had zero gross income and received the maximum benefit without taking any deductions. Another 20 percent had sufficient deductions to offset their gross income and raise their benefit to the maximum.

Source:
Changes in Characteristics of SNAP Participants

Over the past 20 years, earnings have replaced cash welfare as the most common income source among SNAP households. Earnings or earned income is defined as wages, salaries, or self-employment income. The percentage of households with cash welfare (formerly Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC], now known as TANF) fell from 42 to 8 percent between fiscal years 1990 and 2010, whereas the percentage with earnings rose from 19 to 30 percent.

The proportion of SNAP households with no income has nearly tripled over the past 20 years. The percentage of households with zero gross income has grown from 7 percent in fiscal year 1990 to 20 percent in fiscal year 2010. Similarly, the percentage of households with zero net income, after all applicable deductions, has doubled from 19 percent to 38 percent during the same time period.

Source:

### Table: Changes in Characteristics of SNAP Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Households with Earnings (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph: SNAP Households Receiving TANF Versus Earnings

- **Households with AFDC/TANF Income**
- **Households with Earnings**

The graph shows a decline in the proportion of households receiving TANF over time, from 50% in 1990 to 0% in 2010, while the proportion of households with earnings has increased from 0% in 1990 to nearly 40% in 2010.
Half of all new SNAP participants received benefits for 10 months or less in the mid 2000s, up from 8 months in the early 2000s. Single parent families and elderly individuals tended to stay in the program longer than did working poor individuals, childless adults without disabilities, and noncitizens. Seventy-four percent of new participants left the program within two years. This is an increase from 71 percent in the early 1990s.

Participants who stay on SNAP for longer periods of time account for a high proportion of the caseload in any single month. Half of SNAP participants in May 2004 were on the program for seven years. This is a sizable increase from May 2001, when the median length of participation was four years. A decade before, the median time spent on SNAP was more than eight years.

The elderly, disabled adults, and single parents and their children account for a larger proportion of long-term SNAP participants. Married parents and their children, able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs), and the working poor account for a smaller share. For example, elderly participants account for 5 percent of the caseload that has received SNAP for one year or less, but 15 percent of the caseload that has received SNAP for seven years or more. The working poor (individuals in households with earnings) account for 75 percent of the caseload that has received SNAP for one year or less, but 39 percent of the long-term SNAP participants.

More than half of SNAP participants who stopped receiving benefits returned within two years, and those who had longer prior periods of participation were more likely to return than were those who previously received benefits for a short time.

SNAP serves substantially more individuals over the course of a year than is implied by the monthly average number of participants. About 40 percent more individuals participated over the course of a year than participated in an average month, resulting in a turnover rate of 1.4 in the mid 2000s. The turnover rate was 1.3 in the early 1990s and 1.5 in the early 2000s.

Sources:


Most families who participate in nutrition assistance programs do not enroll in every one. Among all people that participate in at least one of four major Federal nutrition assistance programs (SNAP, free or reduced-price school lunch and breakfast, and WIC\(^2\)), only 6 percent live in families that receive all four, and 42 percent live in families that receive only one.

**KEY FACT:**

- About 42 percent of the people that receive benefits from the four largest FNS nutrition assistance programs participate in only one program.

**Forty-three percent of the participants in nutrition assistance programs receive SNAP.** Thirteen percent receive only SNAP, 19 percent receive only school meals (lunch or breakfast), and 10 percent receive only WIC.

One-third of children that participate in school lunch also receive SNAP benefits. Virtually all children that receive a free or reduced-price school breakfast also receive free or reduced-price school lunch. Children living in households that receive SNAP benefits are automatically eligible for free school meals through the direct certification process.

**Source:**

---

\(^2\) Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC).
One important measure of a program’s performance is its ability to reach its target population, as indicated by the fraction of people eligible for benefits that actually participate.

After falling to a low of 54 percent in 2001 and 2002, SNAP’s participation rate among eligible people has increased in recent years, reaching 72 percent in fiscal year 2009. Economic changes, increased outreach to low-income households, simplification of reporting requirements, a trend toward more categorical eligibility, less restrictive vehicular asset rules, and the restoration of eligibility to many legal noncitizens all contributed to this expansion.

The program provided 91 percent of the total benefits possible, an indication that benefits reach those most in need.

Although only 31 percent of eligible persons with incomes above 100 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines participated, 89 percent with incomes below poverty participated.

Source:
Children have the highest SNAP participation rate among all demographic subgroups. At 92 percent, the participation rate of children was 20 percentage points higher than the overall participation rate of 72 percent in fiscal year 2009. Individuals in households with children participate at a significantly higher rate than do individuals who live in households without children.

**KEY FACT:**

Historically, children have the highest SNAP participation rate and elderly have the lowest.

The vast majority (96 percent) of individuals who live in a household that receives TANF benefits participate in SNAP. In addition, SSI recipients have a 72 percent participation rate, whereas individuals who receive Social Security have only a 50 percent participation rate. Individuals who live in household with earnings participate at a rate of 60 percent.

For most groups of participants, participation rates increase as benefits increase; and, overall, participants receive higher benefits than would eligible nonparticipants. Households with earnings are eligible for a lower benefit, on average, and thus participate at a lower rate than the overall participation rate. But many eligible nonparticipants forgo a substantial benefit. Nearly 58 percent of all eligible nonparticipants would qualify for a monthly benefit of more than $100, and nearly 35 percent would qualify for more than $200.

**Source:**

SNAP participation rates vary widely among States. In fiscal year 2009, participation rates among all eligible persons ranged from a low of 53 percent in California to a high of 100 percent in Maine.

Some States have had consistently high and low rates relative to other States. From 2007 to 2009, Iowa, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia had significantly higher participation rates than rates in two-thirds of the States, whereas California, New Jersey, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming had significantly lower rates than rates in two-thirds of the States.

At 60 percent, the participation rate for the working poor (households with earned income) was lower than the rate for all eligibles in fiscal year 2009. The participation rate for the working poor was significantly lower than the rate for all eligible persons in 35 States. In no State was the rate for the working poor significantly higher than the rate for all eligible people.

Source:
Reasons for Not Participating in SNAP

There are many potential reasons why people eligible for benefits may not apply. Five of the most common reasons cited in the research literature include lack of information about eligibility, a sense that benefits are not needed, dissatisfaction with the size of the benefit, the complexity of the application process, or the stigma attached to participation.

Most nonparticipation in SNAP does not stem from a lack of basic awareness of the program. Nearly all eligible nonparticipants (96 percent) know of the program, two-thirds know where to go to apply for benefits, and half have previously received SNAP as adults.

Lack of information about their eligibility is a more important reason for nonparticipation. Less than half of all apparently eligible nonparticipants think that they are eligible.

Most (69 percent) nonparticipants would apply for SNAP benefits if they knew that they were eligible. Nevertheless, 27 percent would not apply even if they knew they were eligible. The vast majority (91 percent) of these households who would not apply most often cite a desire for personal independence as their reason.

Among the elderly, low benefits are a major reason for not participating. Because low-income elderly are relatively better off than are the nonelderly, they tend to qualify for lower benefits. Moreover, food insecurity rates are lower among the elderly, indicating less need. Finally, the Elderly Nutrition Program’s group and home delivered meals appear to substitute for SNAP benefits rather than complement them.

Sources:
Combined Application Projects

Combined Application Projects (CAPs) were introduced as a means of improving access to SNAP for SSI recipients through streamlined procedures for providing SNAP benefits. Federal law provides that recipients of SSI who live alone or in households in which every member receives means-tested benefits are categorically eligible for SNAP. Potential CAP participants are identified either at intake, during recertification for SSI, or through a data match between SNAP and SSI administrative records. SSI data on income and household composition are used for eligibility determination and no face-to-face interviews are required.

At the end of fiscal year 2011, 18 States had implemented CAP demonstrations and additional States have submitted applications or expressed interest in implementing CAPs. States may choose to provide a standard benefit that varies by shelter costs or a variable benefit that is calculated using two or more standard shelter expenses. CAP procedures simplify enrollment and reporting for households and case management for State agencies.

CAPs are successful at increasing SNAP participation among SSI recipients. In CAP States, the percentage of one-person SSI cases participating in SNAP increased by 48 percent, whereas the percentage in non-CAP States remained relatively flat. The increase in participation among one-person SSI recipients in CAP States was much greater than the overall increase in SNAP participation in the CAP States during this same time period.

Source:
Reducing Food Insecurity

Federal and community food assistance programs are important resources for low-income households. The level of food insecurity has remained steady during the last three years, despite a significant increase in the rate of poverty in the United States, underscoring the important role of Federal nutrition assistance programs in helping to prevent food insecurity. During the month before the December 2010 food security survey was administrated, approximately 41 percent of food-insecure households and 42 percent of households with very low food security received SNAP.

Households turn to SNAP when they are more severely food insecure. The prevalence of very low food security among households increases from around 8 percent one year prior to entering SNAP to nearly 20 percent in the four to six months prior to entry. Within a few months of entering SNAP, the prevalence of very low food security declines to around 12 percent. Another study has found that SNAP receipt reduces the likelihood of being food insecure by roughly 30 percent and reduces the likelihood of being very food insecure by 20 percent.

Evidence suggests that the increase in SNAP benefits provided by the Recovery Act contributed to the ability of SNAP participants to increase their food expenditures and improve food security. A recent study indicates that food expenditures by low-income households increased by more than 5 percent and food security improved by more than 2 percent between 2008 and 2009. These changes were considerably larger than changes for households with incomes above the SNAP eligibility range.

Sources:


SNAP participants received a monthly benefit of about $134, on average, per person in fiscal year 2010. SNAP benefit amounts are based on the Thrifty Food Plan (TFP), a nutritious, minimal cost food plan that reflects current nutrition standards and guidance. Families with no net income receive the maximum allotment, the full cost of the TFP. Most SNAP households have income and receive a benefit equal to the difference between the maximum allotment and 30 percent of their net income. The maximum benefit for a family of four in fiscal year 2012 is $668, or less than $1.90 per person per meal. The minimum benefit, available only to one- and two-person households, is $16 in fiscal year 2012.

On average, low-income people in the United States consume amounts of most vitamins and minerals that meet or exceed established nutrition standards. However, usual intake of several key nutrients is lower than recommended for a substantial number of individuals. One study reports, for example, that 93 percent of SNAP participants had adequate intakes of iron, but only 80 percent had adequate intakes of zinc and 61 percent had adequate intakes of vitamin C.

More than half (52 percent) of all SNAP households experienced food insecurity during 2010; about 20 percent experienced very low food security. The relationship between program participation and food security is complex. The program is intended to reduce hunger by increasing household purchasing power. But households with the greatest difficulty meeting their food needs may be more likely to seek help than others.

More than half (54 percent) of food pantry users report SNAP participation in the last month. About 58 percent of emergency kitchen users report SNAP participation in the same timeframe.

Sources:

### Adequacy of SNAP Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of SNAP Households</th>
<th>Minimum Benefit</th>
<th>&lt; 25% of Maximum</th>
<th>25–50% of Maximum</th>
<th>51–75% of Maximum</th>
<th>76–99% of Maximum</th>
<th>Maximum Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FACT:**
Forty percent of SNAP households receive the maximum benefit for their household size.
SNAP households spend about a quarter of their income on food. About 22 percent of income is spent on food at home and 2 percent on food away from home. In contrast, SNAP households spend about 43 percent of their income on housing.

**KEY FACT:**

With an additional dollar of SNAP benefits, households would spend approximately 14 to 47 cents more on food.

SNAP benefits increase household food expenditures and the increase is greater than what would occur with an equal benefit in cash. The most reliable estimates indicate that each additional dollar in SNAP benefits generates 14 to 47 cents of new spending on food. In contrast, an additional dollar of cash generates 5 to 13 cents more food spending. Another study found that for each additional dollar of cash, an additional 7 to 8 cents is spent on food at home and an additional 2 to 3 cents for food away from home. This is less than the additional amount allocated to housing and transportation but more than that spent on apparel or health.

Vegetables, fruits, grain products, meat, and meat alternatives account for most of the money value of food used by SNAP households. These groups account for nearly three-quarters of the money value of food used at home. Lower-cost red meats (7.8 percent) and milk and yogurt (7.6 percent) account for the largest shares of food at home.

**Sources:**


The diets of all Americans fall far short of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. The overall average score on the Healthy Eating Index-2005 (HEI-2005) was 58 out of a possible 100 in 1999–2004. SNAP participants scored slightly lower, with an overall score of 52, versus 56 for income eligible nonparticipants and higher-income nonparticipants. All groups had very low intakes of whole grains, dark green and orange vegetables, and legumes. All groups had high intakes of saturated fat, and too many discretionary calories came from solid fats, alcoholic beverages, and added sugars.

Increasing the amount SNAP participants can spend on food improves diet quality, but the improvement is very small. Most increases in the diet-quality measures are statistically significant, but nearly all increases associated with a 10 percent increase in food expenditures are less than 3 percent, and many are less than 1 percent. A 10 percent increase in spending on food increases a household’s HEI-2005 score by approximately 0.30 percent. A 10 percent increase in food spending for SNAP participants correlates to increased intake of fruits and vegetables, high-fat dairy and milk products, and whole grains—including grains that are more nutrient dense.

Sources:

The Healthy Eating Index (HEI) is a measure of diet quality that can be used to assess compliance with the U.S. Dietary Guidelines for Americans and monitor changes in dietary patterns nationwide. Originally developed in 1995, the HEI was revised after the release of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans in 2005 (HEI-2005).
**Food Choice**

Across broadly defined food categories, there is little difference in the food choices made by low-income and higher-income families. However, families at the high end of the income distribution spend more than twice as much on food at home as those at the low end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Annual Food-at-Home Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal and bakery products</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meats, poultry, fish, eggs</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits and vegetables</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other food at home</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All food at home</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of food at home</td>
<td>$3,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within food categories, SNAP participants do make some less healthful food choices, as compared to higher-income nonparticipants. For example, SNAP participants were slightly more likely to consume foods recommended for occasional consumption and somewhat less likely to consume foods recommended for frequent consumption. However, more than half of all foods consumed by all Americans are foods that should be consumed only occasionally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNAP Participants’ Food Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Less Likely to Consume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole grains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-fat milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar-free soda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods suggested for selective or frequent consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SNAP participants were somewhat less likely to consume fruits or vegetables than other Americans. There were more differences among adults than among children.

Most SNAP participants have adequate usual intakes for most vitamins, minerals, and macronutrients. The exceptions are for Vitamin C, Vitamin A, magnesium, and Vitamin E. However, for the last two, most higher-income individuals also fail to meet the adequate usual intake level.

**Sources:**


Hunger, Obesity, and SNAP Participation

Obesity is a nationwide problem that affects all segments of our population. According to the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), the prevalence of overweight and obesity among all persons age 20 to 74 has increased by 20 percentage points over the past three decades, from a rate of 48 percent in the 1970s to 68 percent in the mid 2000s. Between 1988–1994 and 2007–2008, the prevalence of obese adults has increased across all income and education levels.

Factors such as diet, physical inactivity, genetics, and environment contribute to overweight and obesity. Though low-income people are more vulnerable to obesity risk factors, including sometimes limited access to healthful and affordable foods, limited opportunities for physical activity, and high levels of stress, most obese adults are not low income.

Some observers have pointed to the paradox that hunger persists when a growing number of Americans are overweight and have suggested a possible link between the two. Families who run short on food may tend to eat more when they can because they are unsure when they will have sufficient food again. Because many studies indicate that binge eating can result in weight gain, overeating when food is plentiful may result in gradual gains over time. Because SNAP eligibility is related to poverty, researchers have been interested in how this “hunger-obesity paradox” plays out in the context of SNAP participation.

Existing research provides no consistent evidence of an association—and no evidence of a causal relationship—between SNAP participation and overweight or obesity. The potential effects of food assistance on obesity are tangled with the effects of poverty and socioeconomic status. Because poverty is highly correlated with SNAP participation and with obesity, independent effects are hard to determine. However, the most recent NHANES data from 2005–2008 show little difference between the overweight and obesity rates of those below 100 percent of the poverty level and those at higher levels of income.

Recent studies have found that SNAP participation does not increase either Body Mass Index (BMI) or the likelihood of being overweight or obese for the majority of SNAP participants—children, nonelderly men, and the elderly. For some subgroups, SNAP participation has a negative association with the probability of being overweight. Nonelderly adult women, who account for 28 percent of the SNAP caseload, are the only group of participants for whom multiple studies show a correlation between SNAP participation and elevated BMI and obesity.

New research on program participation and obesity should explore ways program participation can encourage and promote healthy behaviors. Additional research is needed to understand the pathways through which SNAP participation can help prevent obesity and to determine which policy changes may be needed.

Sources:


KEY FACT:

There is little evidence of a connection between SNAP participation and obesity.
SNAP Nutrition Education

The goal of SNAP Nutrition Education (SNAP-Ed) is to improve the likelihood that persons eligible for SNAP benefits will make healthy food choices within a limited budget and choose physically active lifestyles consistent with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans and MyPlate.

SNAP-Ed projects target a variety of audiences in diverse settings. The program is designed for families and individuals at any stage in the life span that are eligible for SNAP. Key nutrition objectives across audiences include the following:

- Make half your plate fruits and vegetables; eat whole grains, and switch to fat-free or low-fat milk products.
- Increase physical activity and reduce time spent in sedentary behaviors as part of a healthy lifestyle.
- Maintain appropriate calorie balance during each stage of life—childhood, adolescence, adulthood, pregnancy, breastfeeding, and older age.

Sources:


KEY FACT:

All 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands currently operate SNAP-Ed programs.

SNAP-Ed has grown dramatically over the past decade with increased concern about diet-related diseases. The number of State agencies with approved SNAP-Ed Plans increased from 7 in fiscal year 1992 to 52 in fiscal year 2011.

Federal funds approved for SNAP-Ed have grown from $661,000 in fiscal year 1992 to nearly $380 million in fiscal year 2010. The passage of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 caps Federal funding of SNAP-Ed at $375 million in fiscal year 2011 and then indexes it to inflation in future years.

FNS encourages coordinated and collaborative nutrition education that is integrated across programs and the country. Nearly 100 organizations, in partnership with State agencies, provide SNAP-Ed through hundreds of projects.
SNAP Work Requirements

Most SNAP participants in fiscal year 2010 (60 percent) were not expected to work because of their age or disability. Nearly 47 percent of SNAP participants are children, another 8 percent are elderly, and about 6 percent are nonelderly adults receiving SSI disability payments. About 53 percent of the nonelderly, non-disabled adult SNAP participants were either working full- or part-time, living with another employed adult, or subject to a meaningful work requirement (e.g., through receipt of TANF or unemployment benefits). Together these groups account for 81 percent of all SNAP participants in fiscal year 2010.

Some SNAP participants are required to register for employment and comply with SNAP work requirements as a condition of eligibility. States reported 6.7 million new work registrants among the new SNAP participants in fiscal year 2010. SNAP work requirements include participating in an Employment and Training (E&T) program if referred, not voluntarily quitting or reducing work hours, and accepting an offer of employment.

States are required to establish a SNAP E&T program to help SNAP participants find work or gain the skills, training, and experience needed to obtain employment. In fiscal year 2010, States served 852,859 SNAP participants through E&T programs. Many persons subject to work registration are also subject to time limited participation in SNAP. Able-bodied Adults without Dependents (ABAWDs) are limited to 3 months of SNAP benefits within a 36-month period unless they meet specific work expectations, such as working 20 hours per week or participating in a work program. SNAP E&T programs can help ABAWDs meet these work expectations through workfare and work experience.

ABAWDs account for only 10 percent of all participants in 2010. Many live in areas that have high unemployment or insufficient jobs and so do not face the three-month time limit. The Recovery Act suspended the three-month time limit on receipt of SNAP benefits for non-disabled adults without children from April 2009 through September 2010.

The Federal government provided States $122 million in direct grants and another $157 million to match State costs to operate E&T in 2010. The Federal government also matched $54 million in State funds spent to reimburse E&T participants for dependent care, transportation, and other expenses.

Sources:
SNAP Quality Control Data, Fiscal Year 2010.
SNAP Interaction with TANF

Most SNAP households do not receive TANF. The proportion of the SNAP caseload receiving TANF declined steadily from 37 percent in fiscal year 1996 to 8 percent in fiscal year 2010. Nationally uniform SNAP benefit level rules help mitigate State-to-State variation in TANF benefit levels.

SNAP policy options allow States to better coordinate the administration of SNAP and TANF:

- Many States have adopted a single application for all public assistance programs, including TANF and SNAP.
- SNAP eligibility has historically been linked to TANF cash assistance through categorical eligibility.
- At least 21 States have adopted transitional SNAP to help families leaving TANF keep their SNAP benefits.

KEY FACT:

Since welfare reform in 1996, fewer SNAP households receive TANF benefits each year.

Sources:


Percentage of SNAP Households Receiving TANF
SNAP Modernization

Over the years, many States have reorganized and modernized administrative processes and functions in response to increasing caseloads, budget constraints, and State legislative initiatives. These initiatives fundamentally change the ways SNAP agencies and staff process applications, manage caseloads, and interact with clients.

Because SNAP serves a vulnerable population with critical and immediate needs, it is designed with national standards for client rights and customer service. The most effective modernization efforts have focused on increasing access, improving customer service, and enhancing administrative efficiency consistent with those standards and existing statutory requirements.

Implementing Policy Changes

- Nearly all States have implemented policy options that have simplified or reduced the reporting requirements for SNAP clients.
- Most States received waivers of the Federal requirement to conduct face-to-face interviews with clients at initial certification or recertification.

Restructuring Administrative Functions

- Most States have implemented some type of organizational changes that simplify processes and improve access to SNAP. More than half of all States have out-stationed workers at convenient sites other than the local SNAP agency office. All States now offer a combined application that allows customers to apply for several benefit programs at one time through one form. A few States have made modifications that allow workers to telecommute from home or to telework or “port” work from one area of the state to another.
- Most States have established contractual relationships with commercial businesses to help restructure their administrative functions.

Expanding Applications of Technology

- Nationally, more than half the States have implemented or are planning to implement call centers, although functions of these centers vary widely by State.
- Most States have implemented or plan to implement online application and benefits tools.
- Several States use technology to reduce the use of paper in case files.
- Several States implemented data-sharing systems that use technology to electronically exchange customer data and documentation with one or more agencies.
- Some States have updated or are in the process of updating their management information systems from mainframe systems to web-based systems.

Partnering with Commercial Businesses and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)

- Most states have established relationships with partner organizations, typically to conduct outreach and provide information about SNAP, to serve as supplemental access points, to provide application assistance, or to conduct follow-up activities with customers who need additional assistance.

Source:
SNAP has statutory deadlines for application processing. States must issue benefits to eligible destitute households within 7 days (expedited service); other eligible households are entitled to benefits within 30 days.

**KEY FACT:**

In recent years, rising caseloads and declining resources are challenging States’ abilities to process all applications in a timely manner.

SNAP began routinely tracking application processing timeliness using quality control data in fiscal year 2003. Twenty-one States processed 90 percent or more of their cases on time in fiscal year 2010. The number of States processing SNAP applications on time has declined over time with rising caseloads and frozen or declining State resources. The average timeliness rate in fiscal year 2010 was 86 percent, compared to an average timeliness rate of 91 percent in 2004.

FNS is working with the States to improve timeliness by requiring Corrective Action Plans and encouraging business process reengineering and certain policy options.

*Source:*

SNAP Quality Control Data, Fiscal Years 2003 and 2010.
Neither overpayments nor underpayments had much effect on overall household purchasing power. Most overpayments to eligible households are small relative to household income and official poverty standards. As a result, most SNAP households are poor and remain poor even when overpaid.

Sources:
SNAP Quality Control Data, Fiscal Years 1981 through 2010.

KEY FACT:
SNAP payment error rates have declined over time, reaching a record low of 3.81 percent in fiscal year 2010.

SNAP Payment Accuracy

SNAP payment accuracy rates have improved for four years in a row, culminating in a combined payment error rate of 3.81 percent in fiscal year 2010, the lowest in program history. This is a combined error rate equal to the sum of overpayments (3.05 percent) and underpayments (0.75 percent). The net cost of erroneous payments to the Federal government (overpayments minus underpayments) is slightly less than 3 percent. The record low error rate has been achieved during a time of rising State caseloads. In the past 10 years, the error rate has declined by 56 percent although SNAP participation has grown by 134 percent.

Almost all (98 percent) households receiving SNAP were eligible for some benefit. Thus, the problem of erroneous payments is not so much one of determining eligibility but rather one of finely targeting benefits to the complicated and changing circumstances of low-income households.

SNAP Payment Error Rates

![SNAP Payment Error Rates Graph](image-url)
The Extent of SNAP Trafficking

Trafficking is the sale of SNAP benefits for cash, a practice that diverts benefits away from their intended purpose of helping low-income families access a nutritious diet. To combat trafficking, the Food and Nutrition Service conducts undercover investigations of authorized food stores and uses powerful EBT-based tools to identify and sanction traffickers.

KEY FACT:

About one cent of every SNAP benefit dollar is trafficked.

Since 1993 when the estimate was first generated, the SNAP trafficking rate has decreased substantially. The most recent analysis from 2006 to 2008 indicates that trafficking diverted one cent of each benefit dollar, or about $330 million annually. While the dollar value of trafficked benefits increased during this timeframe, this reflects, in part, the substantial growth in SNAP participation since 2005. Between 2002–2005 and 2006–2008, annualized redemptions increased by 28 percent (from $25.1 billion to $32.1 billion) and annualized benefits trafficked increased by almost 37 percent (from $241 million to $330 million).

Stores that redeem the majority of SNAP benefits continue to have the lowest trafficking rates. The vast majority of supermarkets, 99.5 percent, do not knowingly traffic SNAP benefits. Supermarkets, super stores, and large grocers—where rates of trafficking are very low—redeem slightly more than 87 percent of all benefits. Small grocers and convenience stores—which have higher rates of trafficking, from 13 to 16 percent—redeem about 6 percent of benefits.

Source:


Average Annual Value of SNAP Benefits Trafficked* ($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Value ($ in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2008</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1998</td>
<td>$660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fiscal year 2011, the total cost of administering SNAP was $6.9 billion. These costs were shared between the Federal government ($3.4 billion) and State governments ($3.5 billion). Sixty-five percent of those costs were for certification. Total administrative costs as a percentage of total program costs are negatively correlated with the SNAP caseload, tending to rise as the SNAP caseload falls and to fall as the caseload increases.

The average monthly administrative cost per case tends to be lower when caseloads are increasing and higher when caseloads decline because costs such as office space leases and equipment are fixed and workforce adjustments lag behind caseload changes.

Source: FNS Program Operations data.

Beginning in 1998, legislation required that some States pay a total of $197 million in administrative costs before the Federal government starts reimbursing 50 percent of these States’ administrative expenses.
State SNAP Policy Options

SNAP policy options provide States with flexibility to simplify the eligibility process and their program operations, improve coordination with other programs such as TANF or Medicaid, and encourage participation among target groups such as working families. All States have implemented at least a few policy options.

Some policy options are widely implemented by most States. Since the 2002 Farm Bill, most States have chosen to expand their simplified reporting systems to include households with earned income. Now most households are required to report changes in income between certification and scheduled reporting periods only when countable income rises above 130 percent of the poverty level. Using a mandatory Standard Utility Allowance (SUA) and aligning the definitions of income and resources with TANF and Medicaid policy are two other widely implemented options. Most States have also chosen to waive the requirement for a face-to-face interview at certification or recertification. Households are interviewed by telephone instead.

With rising caseloads, many States have implemented broad-based categorical eligibility to simplify SNAP administration. By the beginning of fiscal year 2012, 43 States had adopted BBCE. In these States, households that receive a TANF-funded noncash service are categorically eligible for SNAP. Although many States have raised the gross income and resource limits, these policies have not substantially expanded eligibility. Almost all (97 percent) SNAP recipients in States that have adopted BBCE are also eligible under the standard rules limiting income. States elect to implement BBCE to simplify the administration of SNAP by no longer verifying resources. States have the broad authority to place limits to prevent households that receive large lump sum payments such as lottery winnings—and so do not need assistance—from receiving SNAP.

The least popular policy options are child support disqualification and simplified determination of deductions. States say they do not choose some options because they believe they would complicate program rules, affect only a few participants, or result in little or no benefit to participants. Data are limited on the effect of policy options on program administration, operations, costs, error rates, and participant satisfaction.

Sources:


### Common Policy Options, November 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Option</th>
<th>States Implementing Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Simplified Reporting</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Standard Utility Allowance</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver of Face-to-Face Interview</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified Definition of Income</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified Definition of Resources</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Applications</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT)

On June 17, 2009, EBT became the sole method of SNAP issuance and the only way for participants to buy eligible food using SNAP benefits. In accordance with the 2008 Farm Bill, food stamp paper coupons were de-obligated. All States have efficiently delivered SNAP benefits using EBT cards with personal identification numbers since June 2004. Some States use multiprogram EBT cards to issue benefits for additional programs such as TANF, Child Care, and WIC.

EBT has revolutionized the way that FNS combats fraud in the program. FNS continues to grow its Anti-fraud Locator using the EBT Retailer Transactions (ALERT) application, which monitors and tracks electronic retail transactions and identifies potentially high-risk retailers based on patterns in transaction data commonly associated with trafficking. This information is used to better target investigations. Increasingly, retailers are being sanctioned based on EBT transaction data.

Sources:


KEY FACT:
EBT is the sole method for participants to buy food using SNAP benefits.
Nationwide, there were over 231,000 stores authorized to accept and redeem SNAP benefits at the close of fiscal year 2011. To qualify as an authorized SNAP retailer, the store must either (1) stock and sell food for home preparation and consumption in all four categories of staple foods—namely, breads/cereals, dairy products, fruits/vegetables, and meat/fish/poultry (two must include perishable foods)—or (2) obtain more than 50 percent of gross total sales from the sale of one or more staple food categories.

Virtually all authorized stores meet the program’s criteria for eligibility, indicating that the authorization process works well in screening out ineligible stores. An annual review of a nationally representative sample of stores found that 99 percent were eligible in fiscal year 2009.

The majority of authorized stores are supermarkets and super stores; small, medium, and large groceries; and convenience stores. In fiscal year 2010, 17 percent of all authorized stores were supermarkets or super stores, 15 percent were grocery stores, and 36 percent were convenience stores. Most other authorized firms were specialty food stores or combination markets.

Sources:

Most SNAP benefits are redeemed at supermarkets and super stores. In fiscal year 2010, 83 percent of benefits were redeemed in supermarkets or super stores, 6 percent were redeemed at grocery stores, and 4 percent were redeemed at convenience stores.

The type of store at which SNAP participants buy food is important because store type often determines the cost and selection of foods available. Supermarkets supply, on average, a wider variety of high quality food at lower cost.

About one-third of low-income households usually shop for food within a mile of where they live. Another third shop at stores that are between one and four miles away. Many participants, however, do not shop at the store nearest to them. For those who do not usually shop in their own neighborhoods, the most common reasons they do not are high prices (47 percent) and a lack of nearby stores (51 percent).

Distances to the nearest store are greater and access to supermarkets is more difficult for rural households. The reported average distance to a participant’s most-used store ranges from 2.5 miles in urban areas to 14.4 miles in rural areas. An earlier study found that the share of redemptions in supermarkets varied from 80 percent in suburban areas to 64 percent in central cities to 53 percent in rural areas. Approximately 96 percent of SNAP households, however, shop at a supermarket or superstore at some time during the month.

The new SNAP Retailer Locator finds stores that welcome SNAP benefits. The SNAP Retailer Locator (www.snapretailerlocator.com/) is an easy-to-use web-based search application in which participants can enter a street address, city, and State or a zip code and a map of the closest authorized stores will appear. The application also delivers a list of the names, addresses, and distances to each retailer.

Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Retailers/Redemptions</th>
<th>Retailers</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets/ Super Stores</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Stores</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Stores</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Services</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Stores</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FACT:
In fiscal year 2010, 83 percent of SNAP benefits were redeemed in supermarkets or super stores.
SNAP benefits are used to buy food for home consumption and only from authorized food stores. The vast majority of benefits are redeemed at supermarkets and super stores. Purchases at supermarkets and supercenters account for nearly two-thirds of all transactions and more than 80 percent of all redemptions. About 40 percent of households redeem benefits only in supermarkets and supercenters. Only 4 percent of all households never shop in a supermarket, but they tend to receive relatively small benefits.

**SNAP participants shop frequently, making about 10 SNAP purchases per month with an average transaction of about $30.** About 80 percent of benefits are spent within two weeks of issuance, regardless of amount, and more than 97 percent are spent by the end of the month. The average EBT balance carried over to the next month is slightly more than $8.

Households redeem SNAP benefits at many (four on average) different stores. About 25 percent of SNAP households redeem benefits at six or more stores, whereas 16 percent redeem benefits at only one store. Following the benefit increase in the Recovery Act, households shopped at more stores and became less exclusive in the types of stores they used. The average number of stores in which benefits were redeemed increased from 3.8 to 4.4, and the percentage of households redeeming in six or more stores increased from 23 percent to 30 percent.

Most SNAP households augment their food purchases by using cash. About 75 percent of SNAP participants use some of their own money, in addition to SNAP benefits, to purchase food. Most participants report that they often use careful shopping practices—comparing prices across stores, looking for store specials, and stocking up on bargains—to stretch their food buying resources.

**SNAP benefits are almost always redeemed in places in or near participants’ home States.** Although allowable, out-of-state redemptions are relatively rare. Only 4 percent of all SNAP households redeemed any benefits outside their State of residence. These transactions accounted for fewer than 2 percent of all transactions.

For most households, **SNAP benefits cannot be used in restaurants.** Restaurant meals are available only to the elderly, disabled, and or homeless in the few States that elect to operate a meals program; less than 0.1 percent of SNAP benefits are redeemed at restaurants. On average, these participants made only one restaurant purchase each month, with a total value of less than $9.50. Virtually all (99.8 percent) households that used their SNAP benefits in a restaurant also redeemed benefits in a supermarket, grocery store, or other retailer.

**SNAP benefits cannot be converted into cash and are not used in casinos or on cruise ships.** There are no authorized casinos or cruise ships, and SNAP benefits cannot be withdrawn as cash from ATMs.

Sources:


SNAP in Farmers Markets

At the end of fiscal year 2010, a total of 1,611, or 26 percent of, farmers markets were authorized to accept SNAP benefits. SNAP authorized farmers markets represented about 0.7 percent of the total number of authorized retailers, and farmers market SNAP redemptions accounted for 0.01 percent of total SNAP redemptions in 2010. However, these numbers represent a 263 and 49 percent increase, respectively, from the previous five fiscal years, and trends indicate that these numbers will continue to rise.

In general, SNAP farmers market outreach efforts have focused on identifying and eliminating barriers to participation. Technological barriers are one of the impediments to increased farmers market participation in SNAP because farmers markets typically lack electricity and telephone lines to operate government-provided EBT equipment. To assist farmers markets, FNS supports scrip projects that allow a market to obtain one FNS authorization to accept SNAP benefits for all eligible vendors at the market using a single point-of-sale (POS) terminal. The scrip (paper, tokens, or receipts) is purchased at the centrally located POS terminal with SNAP benefits and is exchanged for eligible food products at the market. Many markets also use this process for credit and debit card customers.

The informal and transitory nature of many farmers markets makes it difficult for them to accept SNAP benefits without government support. As a result, FNS conducted a cost benefit analysis to assess the feasibility of equipping all farmers markets nationwide with wireless EBT POS equipment. This analysis focuses on requiring centralized operation of a single EBT terminal to issue scrip. The goal for this analysis was to demonstrate better stewardship of Federal funds by appropriating market time and money more efficiently and centralizing processing and accounting functions. The report concluded that the cost to equip all farmers markets with wireless EBT point-of-sale equipment is $4 million.

Source:

KEY FACT:
Between FY 2006 and FY 2010 there was a 263 percent increase in the number of authorized farmers markets and a 49 percent increase in SNAP redemptions at farmers markets.
The Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (D-SNAP) operates under special eligibility and issuance rules. States must submit a formal request for the operation of the D-SNAP in areas affected by a disaster.

- Benefits are provided to existing SNAP households who qualify for replacement or supplemental benefits and to non-SNAP households temporarily eligible under D-SNAP rules because of their disaster-related expenses. State certification staff determines eligibility.

- The monthly income eligibility limit is the poverty level plus the standard deduction and excess shelter cap—$2,151 for a family of three in fiscal year 2012.

- Take-home income plus liquid assets (e.g., checking or savings accounts), less nonreimbursed disaster-related expenses during the disaster benefit period, must be less than or equal to the eligibility limit. Eligible households receive the equivalent of one month’s maximum benefit for their household size.

- Households that experienced ongoing loss of income because of the disaster may be eligible to apply for and receive SNAP benefits under regular program rules after the disaster benefit period has ended.

FNS provides other emergency food assistance to disaster victims by providing food commodities to shelters, congregate feeding sites, and pertinent local relief organizations such as the Red Cross and Salvation Army and by distributing food packages directly to households.

Source:

KEY FACT:

The amount of D-SNAP benefits issued depends on the number and magnitude of disasters during the year. The spike in 2006 is the result of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the Gulf Coast.
Looking Forward

The current authorization of SNAP, provided through the 2008 Farm Bill, ends on September 30, 2012.

FNS looks forward to working with Congress, State agencies, and advocates to reauthorize SNAP through the upcoming Farm Bill. Our goal is to continue improving access to the program, easing the administrative burden for States, improving oversight and monitoring of program operations, and providing SNAP benefits to millions of Americans.

For More Information

Office of Research and Analysis
USDA Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302
(703) 305-2134

www.fns.usda.gov/ora

Many of the reports and studies referenced in this document can be found at http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/Published/SNAP/SNAP.htm