



U.S. Department of Agriculture



Study of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR)

Volume 2: Technical Appendix



Food and Nutrition Service

June 2016

Mention or display of companies or commercial products does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture over others not mentioned or shown.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.



United States Department of Agriculture

Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Policy Support

June 2016

Study of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) Volume 2: Technical Appendix

AUTHORS:

Nancy M. Pindus
Diane K. Levy
Jennifer Biess
Jasmine Simington
Carl Hedman
Urban Institute

Carol Hafford
Jodie Smylie
NORC at the University of Chicago

Submitted by:

Urban Institute
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
www.urban.org

Submitted to:

Office of Policy Support
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302-1500

Project Director:

Nancy M. Pindus

Project Officer:

Bob Dalrymple, Ph.D.

This study was conducted under Contract number AG-3198-D-11-0066 with the Food and Nutrition Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

This report is available on the Food and Nutrition Service website:
<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ops/research-and-analysis>

Suggested Citation:

Pindus, Nancy M., Carol Hafford, Diane K. Levy, Jennifer Biess, Jasmine Simington, Carl Hedman, and Jodie Smylie. 2016. "Study of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR): Final Report." Prepared by the Urban Institute for the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Services, June.

Contents

Contents	5
Appendix A. Analyses of FDPIR Case Record Review, Household Survey, and FNS Administrative Data	6
Appendix B. Case Record Review	55
B1. Case Record Review Procedures	55
B2. Abstraction Template	61
Appendix C. Participant Survey Instrument	62
Appendix D. Survey Technical Documentation	100
Appendix E. Qualitative Instruments	108
E1. Key Informant Interview Guide	108
E2. Observation Checklists	133
E3. Discussion Group Guide	137
E4. Discussion group participant information questionnaire	145
Appendix F. Program Staff Interview Respondents by Site	146
Appendix G. Discussion Group Participant Characteristics	147
Appendix H. National Sample Memo	149
Appendix I. FDPIR Participant Sampling Methodology	157
Appendix J. Final Memorandum on FDPIR and SNAP Eligibility Benefits in FY2002 and 2008 Using TRIM Analysis	159
Appendix K. Participant Survey Response Rate by ITO	210

Appendix A. Analyses of FDPIR Case Record Review, Household Survey, and FNS Administrative Data

Table 1a: Characteristics of FDPIR Households, Chapter 3

Table 1b: Sources of Income Among FDPIR Participant Households, Chapter 3

Table 1c: Characteristics of Zero Income FDPIR Households, Chapter 3

Table 1d: Liquid Assets of FDPIR Participant Households, Chapter 3

Table 1e: Sources of Income by Household Composition, Chapter 3

Table 1e_1: Amounts of Household Income by Source, Chapter 3

Table 1f: Characteristics of Wage and Non-Wage Earners in FDPIR Participant Households, Chapter 3

Table 1g: Postsecondary Students in FDPIR Participant Households, Chapter 3

Table 1h: Additional Requested Analyses for FDPIR Participant Households, Chapter 3

Table 2: Characteristics of FDPIR Households, Chapter 3

Table 3: Economic Characteristics of FDPIR Households, Chapter 3

Table 4: Health Status of FDPIR Households, Chapter 3

Table 5: FDPIR Contribution to Food Supply, Chapter 4

Table 6: Participant Access to FDPIR- Distribution and Delivery, Chapter 4

Table 7: Nutrition Education and Other Services, Chapter 7

Table 8: Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR, Chapter 8

Table 9: Food Preparation, Chapter 3

Table 10: Food Access and Cost-Non Subsidized Sources, Chapter 4

Table 11: Food Security Status of Households, Chapter 3

Table 12: FDPIR Referrals and Coordination with Other Food and Non-Food Programs, Chapter 6

Table 13: Participation in FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps, Chapter 5

Table 14: Food Distribution Program Nutrition Education: Funds Allocated Fiscal Years 2008 through 2015, Chapter 7

Table 1a. Characteristics of FDPIR Households- CRR				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Gender of household head (%)				
Female	62%	647	0	± 3.3%
Male	38%	406	0	± 3.3%
Age of household head				
Age distribution (%)				
<18	100%	1051	2	
<18	++	++		
18 - 24	4.9%	51	2	± 1.9%
25 - 34	10.2%	111	2	± 2.7%
35 - 44	15.9%	171	2	± 3.4%
45 - 59	30.1%	323	2	± 3.1%
60- 74	25.6%	264	2	± 3.5%
75+	13.1%	129	2	± 4.7%
Average age	53.7	1051	2	± 3.0
Median age	54	1051	2	± 3.4
Household composition*				
Households with children under age 18 (%)	31.3%	343	2	± 7.8%
Households with elderly adults, ages 60 and older (%)	41.6%	423	5	± 7.0%
Households with no children or elderly (%)	32.4%	341	3	± 4.1%
Households with children and elderly (%)	5.2%	57	6	± 2.1%
Average number of children under 18 in households	2.2	343	2	± 0.1
Average number of adults aged 18-59 in households	1.6	737	1	± 0.1
Average number of adults age 60 or older in households	1.1	423	5	± 0.0
Household size				
Number of household members (%)				
1	100%	1053	0	
1	47.9%	492	0	± 8.4%
2	20.4%	214	0	± 2.5%
3	12.6%	134	0	± 2.9%
4	9.8%	107	0	± 2.7%
5	4.4%	50	0	± 1.5%
6	2.0%	23	0	± 1.0%
7	1.6%	18	0	± 0.8%
8+	1.3%	15	0	± 0.7%
Average household size	2.2	1053	0	± 0.3%
Median household size	1	1053	0	± 0.2%
Marital status of household head (%)				
Married	21.0%	205	58	± 4.4%
Domestic partner	1.6%	16	58	± 1.0%
Single	77.4%	774	58	± 4.7%
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. *Suggested categories of interest. Totals do not add up to 100% because categories are not mutually exclusive. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				
When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown.				
Table 1a continued on next page				

Table 1a. Characteristics of FDPIR Households- CRR (cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Households by family relationship (%)				
Married	21.0%	204	58	± 4.4%
No children, no other adults	7.9%	72	59	± 2.5%
No children, with other adults	0.6%	5	59	± 0.5%
With children, no other adults	10.9%	110	59	± 3.2%
With children, with other adults	1.5%	17	59	± 1.0%
Not Married	79.0%	790	59	± 4.4%
No children, no other adults	50.7%	492	59	± 8.3%
No children, with other adults	5.8%	59	59	± 1.8%
With children, no other adults	19.1%	203	59	± 5.1%
With children, with other adults	3.5%	36	59	± 1.3%
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. *Suggested categories of interest. Totals do not add up to 100% because categories are not mutually exclusive. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown.				

Table 1b. Sources of Income Among FDPIR Participant Households- CRR				
(~ to Usher et al 1990, exhibit III-10)	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
% of Households with the following income sources				
Earned income				
Wages	26.3%	288	4	± 7.2%
Self employment	0.6%	6	7	± 0.5%
Unearned income				
Unemployment insurance	2.3%	26	0	± 1.0%
Social Security	36.3%	372	0	± 7.9%
Veteran's Benefits	1.3%	13	0	± 0.7%
Pensions	2.1%	21	0	± 0.9%
Workers' compensation	++	++		
Supplemental Security Income/Social Security Disability Income	31.4%	304	0	± 9.8%
General Assistance/Public Assistance	3.2%	35	0	± 2.6%
TANF	2.7%	28	0	± 2.0%
Child support	2.7%	31	0	± 1.3%
Alimony	++	++		
Foster care	0.5%	6	0	± 0.6%
Leases/royalties	1.0%	10	0	± 1.0%
Per capita payments	3.0%	36	0	± 3.2%
Tribal revenue sharing	0.6%	7	41	± 1.0%
Other	6.4%	35	424	± 5.9%
No source of income (zero income)	11.9%	131	0	± 6.4%
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown.				

Table 1c. Characteristics of Zero Income FDPIR Households- CRR				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
% of Households				
Gender				
Female-headed zero income household	36%	48	0	± 7.4%
Male-headed zero income household	64%	83	0	± 7.4%
Age distribution of household head				
<18	0.0%	0	0	
18 - 24	16.3%	20	0	± 8.0%
25 - 34	14.6%	20	0	± 6.6%
35 - 44	22.6%	28	0	± 7.4%
45 - 59	37.5%	52	0	± 9.9%
60- 74	8.1%	10	0	± 4.6%
75+	++	++		
Average age	42.1	131	0	± 2.3
Median age	42	131	0	± 3.6
Household size (~ to Usher et al 1990, exhibit III-1)				
Number of household members (%)	100%	131	0	
1	67.7%	87	0	± 11.9%
2	14.4%	20	0	± 5.2%
3	9.0%	13	0	± 6.6%
4	5.5%	7	0	± 5.8%
5	++	++		
6	++	++		
7	0.0%	0	0	± 0%
8	0.0%	0	0	± 0%
9	0.0%	0	0	± 0%
10+	0.0%	0	0	± 0%
Average household size	1.6	131	0	± 0.3
Median household size	1	131	0	± 0.4
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown.				

Table 1d. Liquid Assets of FDPIR Participant Households- CRR				
(~ to Usher et al 1990, exhibit III-12)	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
% of Households				
Cash on hand				
None	78.4%	738	121	± 5.2%
< \$50	15.2%	134	121	± 4.0%
\$50-199	6.1%	56	121	± 2.2%
\$200 or more	++	++		
Checking/savings account				
None	76.8%	710	122	± 6.5%
\$1-99	11.9%	115	122	± 4.3%
\$100-199	2.3%	20	122	± 0.9%
\$200 or more	9.0%	86	122	± 3.4%
CD/Bonds				
None	98.2%	907	128	± 2.1%
\$	1.8%	18	128	± 2.1%
Value of all assets				
None	65.4%	612	120	± 7.2%
\$1-49	14.3%	133	120	± 3.3%
\$50-99	5.5%	47	120	± 1.7%
\$100-199	4.2%	38	120	± 1.7%
\$200-299	3.3%	32	120	± 1.4%
\$300-499	2.6%	25	120	± 1.0%
\$500-1,000	3.4%	32	120	± 1.6%
More than \$1,000	1.4%	14	120	± 0.9%
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown.				

Table 1e. Sources of Income by Household Composition- CRR

(~ to Usher et al 1990, exhibit III-11 except that 1990 report focused on two generation households)

	Frequency	Percentage of Households with Given Sources of Income								Households with \$0 income
		Earnings	Social Security	SSI	SSDI	GA/PA	VA	TANF	Other	
Household composition										
Grandparents with adult children and grandchildren	51	50.3%	35.4%	23.5%	8.0%	5.0%	0.0%	6.7%	8.8%	1.9%
Grandparents and grandchildren (only)	50	23.3%	39.9%	20.5%	9.4%	1.4%	0.0%	15.2%	23.9%	4.2%
Parents with adult child(ren) age 18 or over	35	59.5%	19.7%	20.5%	4.1%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	24.1%	6.9%
Parents with child(ren) under age 18	87	74.1%	7.2%	11.1%	5.5%	1.5%	0.7%	1.0%	21.1%	1.3%
Single parent with children - over age 18	95	42.4%	35.4%	16.6%	4.5%	3.0%	0.9%	2.6%	10.1%	6.1%
Single parent with children - under age 18	126	59.5%	9.2%	17.8%	2.3%	0.6%	0.0%	3.7%	23.5%	10.0%
Adults without children (by age only, <=24)	650	11.6%	47.9%	33.2%	4.9%	4.3%	1.9%	0.0%	11.3%	14.4%
Couples	82	26.4%	59.0%	30.3%	4.0%	3.6%	5.6%	0.0%	10.4%	3.3%
Married	76	24.0%	61.3%	28.9%	4.3%	2.7%	6.1%	0.0%	11.2%	3.6%
Partners	6	54.9%	29.9%	47.5%	0.0%	15.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Single	568	9.3%	46.2%	33.7%	5.0%	4.3%	1.4%	0.0%	11.4%	16.1%
Elderly only (by age, >=60)	287	2.7%	80.6%	38.2%	2.5%	2.8%	2.3%	0.0%	11.6%	2.1%

Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted.

Table 1e. 1. Amounts of Household Income by Source- CRR

	Income Sources								Total Income
	Earnings	Social Security	SSI	SSDI	GA/PA	VA	TANF	Other	
All households									
Mean income	1,492.25	788.07	615.52	948.90	105.00	567.65	484.58	502.86	1,144.42
Median income	1,524.15	781.38	697.69	908.51	38.84	380.35	362.56	300.20	964.84
Standard error of mean	57.55	35.18	44.71	39.93	37.94	101.57	112.02	75.30	52.88
Mean income by number of household members									
1	634.85	708.49	513.76	884.38	87.26	657.81	-	273.74	778.30
2	1,093.59	884.50	725.69	1,046.56	108.97	452.28	328.33	430.25	1,062.99
3	1,431.66	976.73	801.18	877.25	-	n/a	303.81	790.77	1,396.75
4	1,682.44	911.94	787.53	1,015.83	261.12	n/a	353.00	642.50	1,586.03
5	2,055.59	1,000.90	799.75	n/a	-	n/a	356.67	457.96	2,038.42
6	2,058.30	865.70	1,227.13	-	-	-	521.48	756.15	2,245.65
7	2,725.70	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	858.90	2,307.03
8+	1,873.36	1,067.59	1,301.03	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,672.43	977.12	2,367.21

Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. Cells containing '-' indicate only one household reporting that income source.

Table 1f. Characteristics of Wage and Non-Wage Earners in FDPIR Participant Households- CRR				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Wage earners	25.9%	284	4	± 7.1%
1 wage earner household (%)	24.0%	264	4	± 6.2%
Average monthly income	1,450.00	264	4	± 141
Median monthly income	1,499.13	264	4	± 165
2 + wage earner household (%)	1.9%	20	4	± 1.4%
Average monthly income	2,481.57	20	4	± 227
Median monthly income	2,395.29	20	4	± 542
Female wage earners (%)	64.8%	198	4	± 6.3%
Average monthly income	1,404.23	198	4	± 134
Median monthly income	1,435.92	198	4	± 207
Male wage earners (%)	35.2%	110	3	± 6.3%
Average monthly income	1,454.51	110	3	± 175
Median monthly income	1,546.31	110	3	± 176
Non-wage earners				
Non-wage earner household (%)	74.1%	765	4	± 7.1%
Female (%)	54.1%	716	35	± 3.6%
Male (%)	45.9%	628	35	± 3.6%
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				

Table 1g. Postsecondary Students in FDPIR Participant Households- CRR				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Percent of FDPIR households with students receiving financial aid	0.7%	8	2	± 0.5%
Average financial aid amount for those receiving financial aid	5,133.89	10	1	± 2,147
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. The FDPIR form asks only if there are students in the household who receive financial aid. The form does not ask about students in households who do not receive financial aid. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				

Table 1h. Additional Requested Analyses for FDPIR Participant Households- CRR

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Households with elderly only (%)	28.9%	287	1	± 9.4%
Number of household members in households with elderly only (%)	100%	287	0	
1	85.1%	248	0	± 3.9%
2	14.9%	39	0	± 3.9%
Ages of all household members				
Age distribution (%)	100%	2386	6	
<18	30.6%	749	6	± 4.2%
0-5	6.8%	170	6	± 1.9%
6-11	10.1%	251	6	± 1.6%
12-17	13.6%	328	6	± 1.7%
18 - 24	9.4%	234	6	± 1.8%
25 - 34	8.8%	215	6	± 1.6%
35 - 44	10.4%	246	6	± 1.8%
45 - 59	19.4%	462	6	± 2.0%
60- 74	14.3%	325	6	± 3.4%
75+	7.1%	155	6	± 3.0%
Average age	37.0	2386	6	± 3.8
Median age	35	2386	6	± 6.6
Gender of all household members (%)				
Female	54%	1244	55	± 2.6%
Male	46%	1093	55	± 2.6%
Source: 2014 FDPIR Case Record Review.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				

Table 2. Characteristics of FDPIR Households - Survey

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Gender of household head				
	1.2% of total sample missing	849	10	
Female	34.2	295		±2.8%
Male	65.8	544		±2.8%
Age of household head				
Age distribution (%)	0.24% of total sample missing	849	2	
<18	++	++		
18 - 24	4.2	34		±1.7%
25 - 34	8.3	71		±1.9%
35 - 44	14.9	130		±3.3%
45 - 59	30.3	258		±3.1%
60- 75	28.1	235		±2.7%
75+	14.0	116		±4.6%
Average age	55.2	847	2	±2.5
Median age	55.0	847	2	±2.6
Household composition*				
Household distribution (%)	1.06% of total sample missing	849	9	
Households with children under age 18, no elderly (%)	24.1	212		±5.5%
Households with elderly adults, ages 60 and older, no children (%)	39.9	331		±7.6%
Households with no children or elderly (%)	28.2	231		±3.2%
Households with children and elderly (%)	7.9	66		±2.4%
Average number of children under 18 in households, among households with children under 18	2.3	278	9	±0.2
Average number of adults aged 18-59 in households, among households with adults aged 18-59	1.8	616	9	±0.1
Average number of adults age 60 or older in households, among households with adults 60 or older	1.2	397	9	±0.
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. *N's for each of the separate categories listed below. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused."				
<i>Table 2 Continued on next page</i>				

Table 2. Characteristics of FDPIR Households- Survey (Continued)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Household size (~ to Usher et al 1990, exhibit III-1)				
Number of household members (%)	0% of total sample missing	849	0	
1	35.1	288		±5.9%
2	25.3	216		±3.5%
3	15.2	131		±1.8%
4	10.1	91		±2.7%
5	6.3	56		±2.0%
6	3.5	31		±1.5%
7	2.0	15		±1.5%
8	1.4	11		±0.9%
9	0.7	6		±0.7%
10	++	++		
Average household size	2.6	849	0	±0.3
Median household size	1.6	849	0	±0.1
Marital status of household head (%)				
	0.59% of total sample missing	845	5	
Married	25.1	210		±3.1%
Divorced, separated or widowed	48.6	415		±4.7%
Single, never married	26.3	215		±3.5%
Households by family relationship (%)				
	1.77% of total sample missing	849	15	
Married, no children, no other adults	9.4	76		±2.3%
Married, with children, no other adults	8.1	69		±2.0%
Married, with other adults, no children	3.5	29		±0.8%
Married, with children and other adults	4.2	34		±1.1%
Single, no children, no other adults	34.1	274		±6.2%
Single, with children, no other adults	8.0	71		±2.5%
Single, with other adults, no children	21.1	179		±2.7%
Single, with children and other adults	11.7	102		±4.6%
Educational attainment of household head (%)				
Educational attainment distribution (%)	1.80% of total sample missing	832	15	
Less than high school	14.6	109		±6.9%
Some high school, no diploma	18.6	153		±2.4%
High school diploma	30.8	260		±4.3%
Technical school	5.5	48		±2.1%
Trade apprentice	1.5	13		±0.7%
Some college, no diploma	19.6	162		±3.8%
College degree	9.3	72		±2.4%
Graduate or professional studies after college	0.00	0		
Graduate degree	0.00	0		
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. *N's for each of the separate categories listed below. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				
Table 2 Continued on next page				

Table 2. Characteristics of FDPIR Households- Survey (Continued)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Educational attainment of most educated person in the household (%)				
Educational attainment distribution (%)	1.06% of total sample missing	849	9	
Less than high school	8.5	64		±5.3%
Some high school, no diploma	14.0	115		±2.9%
High school diploma	32.8	284		±4.6%
Technical school	5.4	48		±2.0%
Trade apprentice	1.8	15		±1.1%
Some college, no diploma	22.1	186		±4.4%
College degree	12.8	106		±2.3%
Graduate or professional studies after college	1.8	15		±0.6%
Graduate degree	0.8	7		±0.5%
Student status (%)				
		849 484 848*	see below	
Respondent is a student	4.2	38	13/1.53%	±1.9%
Other adult in household is a student	12.6	59	10/2.07%	±3.1%
Any adult in household is a student	9.8	85	12/1.42%	±2.4%
Location of residence (%)				
	1.30% of sample missing	849	11	
On reservation/pueblo/rancheria/Alaska native village/tribal service area	77.4	642		±10.0%
Off reservation in approved near-areas	22.6	196		±10.0%
Internet access (%)				
	0.59% of sample missing	848	5	
At least one person in household has internet access	40.7	348		±7.2%
No one in household has internet access	59.3	495		±7.2%
Own or lease vehicle (%)				
	1.18% of sample missing	848	10	
Household has one or more members who owns or leases vehicle(s)	69.0	586		±6.7%
No one in household owns or leases vehicle(s)	31.0	252		±6.7%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey				
<p>Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.</p> <p>*N's for each of the separate categories listed below.</p> <p>Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."</p>				

Table 3. Economic Characteristics of FDPIR Households- Survey

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Employment status of the household head (%)	6.9% of total sample missing	844	58	
Working full time	17.3	141		±4.6%
Working part time	9.0	78		±3.6%
Not working, retired	16.6	137		±2.7%
Not working, disabled	25.6	194		±5.4%
Not working, other	31.5	236		±6.6%
Hours worked				
	1.4% of total sample missing	219	3	
Average number of hours per week worked, among heads of households that worked	34.0			±2.1
Median number of hours per week worked, among heads of households that worked	38.3			±2.5
	1.9% of total sample missing	323	6	
Average number of hours per week worked, among persons in household who worked the most hours	35.8			±1.7
Median number of hours per week worked, among persons in household who worked the most hours	38.6			±2.5
Education and training activities of non-elderly and non-disabled household heads, among those not working				
	19.7% of sample missing	294	58	
In school	1.5	5		±1.4%
Job training	++	++		
TANF approved work activity	0.0			
Not working	85.2	196		±7.8%
Something else	13.0	34		±6.9%
Employment status of the most employed person in the household (%)	6.4% of total sample missing	848	54	
Working full time	28.4	230		±5.4%
Working part time	10.5	93		±3.5%
Not working, retired	16.6	138		±2.7%
Not working, disabled	23.2	176		±4.9%
Not working, other	21.2	157		±6.3%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.

*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply". Totals will not add up to 100%.

Table 3 continued on next page

Table 3. Economic Characteristics of FDPIR Households- Survey (Continued)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
	0.0% of total sample missing	849	0	
Household Unearned Income Sources				
Social Security				
% of households receiving SS	38.9	324		±7.1%
SSI				
% of households receiving SSI	29.2	224		±9.0%
TANF				
% of households receiving TANF	4.7	38		±3.1%
Unemployment Insurance				
% of households receiving unemployment insurance	1.4	12		±0.9%
Monthly housing payment amount				
LIHEAP	0.0% of total sample missing	849	0	
% of households receiving LIHEAP	8.6	62		±5.6%
Other	52.8	445.0		±6.7%
Housing tenure (%)				
	0.8% of total sample missing	849	7	
Owner	51.2	415		±10.9%
Renter	33.6	289		±8.2%
Other arrangement	15.2	138		±4.2%
Housing payment amount distribution (%)				
	1.6% of total sample missing	849	14	
\$0	36.4	281		±15.1%
\$1 to \$99	21.4	185		±9.3%
\$100 to \$199	12.1	104		±3.2%
\$200 to \$249	5.1	47		±1.6%
\$250 to \$299	2.5	23		±1.2%
\$300 to \$349	4.0	36		±2.0%
\$350 to \$399	3.5	30		±1.6%
\$400 to \$449	3.4	28		±1.2%
\$450 to \$499	1.9	17		±1.3%
\$500 to \$599	4.0	34		±1.7%
\$600 to \$699	1.9	17		±1.3%
\$700 to \$799	1.7	13		±0.7%
\$800 to \$999	1.3	11		±0.7%
\$1,000 to \$1,249	0.6	6		±0.5%
\$1,250 to \$1,499	++	++		
\$1,500 to \$1,999	++	++		
\$2,000 to \$2,499	0.0	0		
\$2,500 or more	0.0	0		
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. *Respondents instructed to "select all that apply". Totals will not add up to 100%.				
<i>Table 3 continued on next page</i>				

Table 3. Economic Characteristics of FDPIR Households- Survey (Continued)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Monthly utility payment amount				
Utility payment amount distribution (%)	3.9% of total sample missing	849	33	
Less than \$100	15.7	115		±5.7%
\$100 to \$199	19.1	144		±4.7%
\$200 to \$249	16.2	138		±2.6%
\$250 to \$299	12.6	105		±2.2%
\$300 to \$349	11.7	96		±2.5%
\$350 to \$399	5.5	53		±1.9%
\$400 to \$449	7.1	62		±2.5%
\$450 to \$499	3.4	29		±1.6%
\$500 or more	8.5	74		±3%
Monthly housing payment amount				
Utilities/services included in amount for those who pay utilities (%)*	2.8% of total sample missing	849	24	
Gas	53.5	455		±10.0%
Electricity	93.8	777		±2.1%
Water	66.1	536		±11.1%
Trash collection	43.6	377		±9.6%
Telephone	72.4	617		±11.6%
Other	13.3	117		±4.9%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				
*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply". Totals will not add up to 100%.				

Table 4. Health Status of FDPIR Households-Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Household receives medical services on the [reservation/pueblo/rancheria/Alaska native village/tribal service area] (%)	1.2% of total sample missing	849	10	
Yes	86.0	700		±6.1%
No	14.0	139		±6.1%
Sources of medical services among those who receive services (%)*	0.0% of total sample missing	700	0	
Tribal or IHS health center or clinic	90.1	629		±7.6%
Urban Indian Health Center	3.8	28		±2.2%
Tribally-managed or IHS hospital	43.9	306		±16.8%
Tribal or IHS mobile clinic or lab (van)	5.7	43		±2.6%
Home visits (by a physician or visiting nurse)	7.9	61		±2.2%
Traditional healers	17.6	110		±10.0%
Community health representatives	12.5	89		±4.6%
Wellness center	14.0	109		±6.6%
Emergency medical services	37.6	270		±9.7%
Tele-health services	4.3	34		±2.4%
County/local health center	8.6	68		±3.7%
County/local hospital	19.8	159		±8.1%
Private doctor's office	20.9	157		±7.1%
Managed care organization	3.8	28		±2.0%
Local public health department	10.8	80		±3.6%
Other	6.4	50		±3.1%
Anyone in the household covered by health insurance or some other kind of health care plan (%)	1.1% of total sample missing	849	9	
Yes	75.3	645		±5.4%
No	24.7	195		±5.4%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
<p>Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.</p> <p>*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.</p> <p>** Those who reported high blood pressure, diabetes, overweight, underweight, heart disease, cancer, liver disease, gastro-intestinal problems, or vitamin or mineral deficiencies or anemia were counted as having "one or more member experiencing health condition"; this analysis excludes those who noted "other health condition" as a health condition.</p>				
Table 4 continued on next page				

Table 4. Health Status of FDPIR Households Survey (cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Type of health insurance or care plans used, among households with health insurance or health care plan (%)*		645	see below	
Private health insurance	22.0	145	5/ 0.78%	±5.3%
Medicare	57.3	362	12/ 1.86%	±6.2%
Medicaid	52.1	318	16/ 2.48%	±6.7%
Military health care (TRICARE, VA, and others)	6.2	43	8/ 1.24%	±2.4%
State sponsored health plan	17.7	116	19/ 2.95%	±6.8%
Other government program	4.4	34	20/ 3.10%	±2.6%
Single service (e.g., dental, vision, prescriptions)	23.0	161	5/ 0.78%	±8.5%
No coverage of any type	2.1	14	29/ 4.50%	±1.2%
SCHIP – State Children’s Health Insurance Program	6.8	47	22/ 3.41%	±3.4%
Other	19.7	137	21/ 3.26%	±9.6%
Health conditions of household members (%)			see below	
High blood pressure	56.7	476	5/ 0.59%	±4.5%
Diabetes	39.4	332	3/ 0.35%	±2.4%
Overweight/obesity	34.9	311	3/ 0.35%	±6.4%
Underweight	4.1	40	5/ 0.59%	±1.6%
Heart disease	16.6	146	11/ 1.30%	±2.9%
Cancer	6.3	60	5/ 0.59%	±2.1%
Liver disease	3.1	27	11/ 1.30%	±1.1%
Gastro-intestinal problems (e.g., Irritable Bowel Syndrome, ulcers, lactose intolerance, diarrhea)	23.2	203	7/ 0.82%	±4.9%
Vitamin or mineral deficiencies or anemia	14.9	128	10/ 1.18%	±2.9%
Other health condition	22.7	190	31/ 3.65%	±6.5%
Households experiencing health condition (%)	5.2% of total sample missing	849	44	
Households with no members experiencing health condition**	22.6	173		±4.8%
Households with one or more members experiencing health condition**	77.4	632		±4.8%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
<p>Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.</p> <p>*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.</p> <p>** Those who reported high blood pressure, diabetes, overweight, underweight, heart disease, cancer, liver disease, gastro-intestinal problems, or vitamin or mineral deficiencies or anemia were counted as having "one or more member experiencing health condition"; this analysis excludes those who noted "other health condition" as a health condition.</p>				
<i>Table 4 continued on next page</i>				

Table 4. Health Status of FDPIR Households-Survey (cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Food restrictions due to allergies or special diets of household members (%)	0.7% of total sample missing	849	6	
Households with at least one member with food restriction due to allergy or special diet	27.1	244		±5.2%
Households without any food restrictions due to allergy or special diet	72.9	599		±5.2%
Type of food restriction, among households with allergies and/or special diets (%)			see below	
Low salt	54.1	126	17/ 6.97%	±9.3%
Low sugar	60.7	136	14/ 5.74%	±7.5%
Low fat	46.4	102	19/ 7.79%	±9.1%
Lactose intolerant	42.5	93	15/ 6.15%	±7.2%
Gluten intolerant	8.4	18	26/ 10.7%	±4.2%
High protein	18.4	39	27/ 11.1%	±7.1%
Food allergies	32.7	77	13/ 5.33%	±6.8%
Other				
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.

*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.

** Those who reported high blood pressure, diabetes, overweight, underweight, heart disease, cancer, liver disease, gastro-intestinal problems, or vitamin or mineral deficiencies or anemia were counted as having "one or more member experiencing health condition"; this analysis excludes those who noted "other health condition" as a health condition.

Table 5. FDPIR and Other Food Sources/Nutrition Program Contribution to Food Supply- Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Most important reason for seeking food assistance through FDPIR (%)	8.7% of total sample missing	849	74	
Loss of job	11.8	94		±2.2%
Loss of other source of income	15.5	120		±4.0%
Household became eligible for FDPIR	40.7	313		±6.7%
FDPIR was more convenient than other programs	13.4	98		±5.4%
FDPIR changed delivery options and became easier for household	1.4	13		±1.0%
Loss of other benefits	1.6	14		±0.8%
Established own household	3.9	28		±1.3%
Other	11.6	95		±5.4%
How did household learn about FDPIR (%)	4.1% of total sample missing	849	35	
Prior receipt of FDPIR foods by household	20.4	159		±8.3%
Word of mouth (i.e. family/friend)	59.6	487		±8.4%
Referral from tribal social service program	8.6	78		±2.8%
Tribal newsletter or brochure	2.9	27		±1.3%
Outreach by FDPIR staff	2.4	21		±1.0%
Referral from county social services	1.4	11		±1.1%
Other	8.1	66		±2.4%
FDPIR is only source of food for household or primary source of food (%)	4.9% of total sample missing	849	42	
Yes	37.7	291		±6.2%
No	62.3	516		±6.2%
Other sources of food for households when FDIPR is not the only or primary source of food (%)		558		
Other food programs	24.1	140	17/ 3.05%	±5.7%
Extended family or tribal community	19.5	104	17/ 3.05%	±5.4%
Grocery/supermarket/convenience store	94.5	512	14/ 2.51%	±2.6%
Traditional/native food sources (hunting, fishing, berry picking, ricing, gardening, farming)	31.3	173	15/ 2.69%	±5.4%
Food pantries or food banks	15.1	85	15/ 2.69%	±3.6%
Take-out or convenience stores	27.5	147	14/ 2.51%	±6.1%
Other	4.5	26	17/ 3.05%	±2.3%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused." *Respondents who answered 0% for FDPIR contribution to household food supply were counted as missing values due to misinterpretation of the question.				
<i>Table 5 continued on next page</i>				

Table 5. FDIPIR and Other Food Sources/Nutrition Program Contribution to Food Supply-Survey(cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Contribution to the household food supply (%)				
FDPIR*	10.2% of total sample missing	558	57	
1<20% of food supply	9.7	47		±3.6%
21<40% of food supply	21.2	107		±5.1%
41<60% of food supply	44.6	217		±5.6%
61<80% of food supply	16.7	88		±4.8%
81<100% of food supply	7.8	42		±3.9%
Other food programs	3.1% of total sample missing	558	17	
0% of food supply	75.9	401		±5.7%
1<20% of food supply	19.8	113		±4.3%
21<40% of food supply	3.4	22		±1.7%
41<60% of food supply	++	++		
61<80% of food supply	++	++		
81<100% of food supply	++	++		
Extended family or tribal community	3.1% of total sample missing	558	17	
0% of food supply	80.5	437		±5.4%
1<20% of food supply	14.3	74		±3.5%
21<40% of food supply	3.5	22		±1.9%
41<60% of food supply	1.3	5		±1.2%
61<80% of food supply	++	++		
81<100% of food supply	0.0	0		±0.0%
Grocery/supermarket/convenience store	2.5% of total sample missing	558	14	
0% of food supply	5.5	32		±2.6%
1<20% of food supply	26.8	149		±5.6%
21<40% of food supply	26.1	145		±4.1%
41<60% of food supply	28.6	146		±4.7%
61<80% of food supply	8.7	48		±2.4%
81<100% of food supply	4.4	24		±2.0%
Traditional/native food sources (hunting, fishing, berry picking, ricing, gardening, farming)	2.7% of total sample missing	558	15	
0% of food supply	68.7	370		±5.4%
1<20% of food supply	26.8	146		±4.5%
21<40% of food supply	3.4	21		±1.9%
41<60% of food supply	0.9	5		±0.8%
61<80% of food supply	0.2	1		±0.4%
81<100% of food supply	0.0	0		
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDIPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDIPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				
*Respondents who answered 0% for FDIPIR contribution to household food supply were counted as missing values due to misinterpretation of the question.				
Table 5 continued on next page				

Table 5. FDIPIR and Other Food Sources/Nutrition Program Contribution to Food Supply-Survey(cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Contribution to the household food supply (%) (cont.)				
Food pantries or food banks	2.7% of total sample missing	557	15	
0% of food supply	84.9	457		±3.6%
1<20% of food supply	14.4	81		±3.6%
21%<40% of food supply	++	++		
41<60% of food supply	++	++		
61<80% of food supply	0.0	0		
81<100% of food supply	0.0	0		
Take-out or convenience stores	2.5% of total sample missing	557	14	
0% of food supply	72.5	396		±6.1%
1<20% of food supply	25.7	136		±5.8%
21%<40% of food supply	1.7	10		±1.0%
41<60% of food supply	++	++		
61<80% of food supply	0.0	0		
81<100% of food supply	0.0	0		
Other	3.0% of total sample missing	558	17	
0% of food supply	95.5	515		±2.3%
1<20% of food supply	2.6	15		±1.5%
21%<40% of food supply	1.0	6		±0.9%
41<60% of food supply	++	++		
61<80% of food supply	0.0	0		
81<100% of food supply	++	++		
Household receiving benefits from or participating in other food programs (%)				
	0.5% of total sample missing	558	3	
Yes	23.4	140		±8.3%
No	76.6	415		±8.3%
Type of food program participated in, among households that participated in food programs (%)				
	0.7% of total sample missing	140	1	
Summer Feeding Program or the Summer Food Service Program	7.0	11		±5.3%
Elderly meals/feeding programs	15.9	23		±6.4%
Local food banks or pantries	29.7	41		±10.3%
Tribal Emergency Funds	7.6	11		±5.0%
Meals on Wheels	11.6	18		±6.4%
Other state, county, local programs, other tribal programs	23.0	29		±12.3%
WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program	13.3	18		±4.5%
Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program	6.1	9		±5.1%
Soup kitchens	0.0	0		
Other	41.1	60		±15.2%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDIPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDIPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." *Respondents who answered 0% for FDIPIR contribution to household food supply were counted as missing values due to misinterpretation of the question.				
<i>Table 5 continued on next page</i>				

Table 5. FDPIR and Other Food Sources/Nutrition Program Contribution to Food Supply-Survey(cont.)

<i>Sources of meals for household during past month (%)</i>				
Household received any meals that were prepared away from home	0.9 % of total sample missing	558	5	
Yes	57.2	314		±6.3%
No	42.8	239		±6.3%
How often household ate meals prepared away from home	1.3 % of total sample missing	314	4	
None	1.7	5		±1.4%
Some	89.9	279		±3.0%
About half	6.0	17		±2.3%
Most	2.4	9		±1.6%
Household received meals prepared by extended family or prepared by a community group	0.4 % of total sample missing	558	2	
Yes	42.4	229		±8.5%
No	57.6	327		±8.5%
How often household received meals prepared by extended family or prepared by a community group	1.3 % of total sample missing	229	3	
None	++	++		
Some	90.9	204		±3.1%
About half	4.2	10		±1.9%
Most	3.9	9		±2.3%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."
 *Respondents who answered 0% for FDPIR contribution to household food supply were counted as missing values due to misinterpretation of the question.

Table 6. Participant Access to FDPIR- Distribution and Delivery-Survey

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Miles traveled to apply for FDPIR (%)	2.48% of total sample missing	848	21	
< 5 miles	29.7	258		±8.4%
5-9 miles	14.1	121		±4.4%
10-24 miles	27.4	229		±6.7%
25-99 miles	28.4	215		±9.2%
100 or more miles	++	++		
Average number of miles traveled	18.8	827	21	±4.6
Median number of miles traveled	11.5	827	21	±3.7
Length of time traveled to apply for FDPIR (%)	2.59% of total sample missing	849	22	
< 10 minutes	19.3	174		±5.3%
11-29 minutes	43.9	369		±8.1%
30 minutes-59 minutes	24.3	197		±4.4%
1 hour - under 2 hours	10.8	75		±5.9%
2 or more hours	1.7	12		±1.5%
Average length of time traveled (minutes)	27.2	827	22	±5.9
Median length of time traveled (minutes)	18.8	827	22	±2.5
Means of transportation to FDPIR certification (%)	2.12% of total sample missing	849	18	
Own car or truck	63.7	536		±7.1%
Someone else drove	26.6	209		±7.2%
Walked	1.9	19		±1.3%
Public transportation	1.8	15		±1.3%
Taxi	0.0	0		
Other	6.0	52		±2.4%
Certification period (%)	3.42% of total sample missing	849	29	
1-2 months	8.3	71		±2.5%
3-5 months	19.2	157		±4.9%
6-11 months	34.2	279		±5.6%
Year or more	35.9	293		±5.5%
Other	2.4	20		±1.2%
Food package distribution/delivery method most often used by household (%)				
	2.59% of total sample missing	849	22	
Pickup at FDPIR site	84.6	689		±5.6%
Different warehouse location	2.6	20		±1.5%
Tailgate location	5.1	50		±3.8%
Home delivery	5.7	51		±2.5%
Other	2.0	17		±1.5%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				
Table 6 continued on next page				

Table 6. Participant Access to FDPIR- Distribution and Delivery-Survey (cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Miles traveled to pick up FDPIR food package (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	2.01% of total sample missing	797	16	
< 5 miles	32.4	265		±8.%
5-9 miles	15.2	121		±4.1%
10-24 miles	28.4	227		±7.3%
25-99 miles	23.5	166		±8.8%
100 or more miles	0.3	2		±.4%
Average number of miles traveled	16.1	781	16	±4.2
Median number of miles traveled	9.5	781	16	±3.1
Length of time to pick up FDPIR food package (excludes home delivery) %				
	1.50% of total sample missing	798	12	
< 10 minutes	22.8	195		±5.7%
11-29 minutes	45.6	364		±8.%
30 minutes-59 minutes	22.3	168		±4.6%
1 hour - under 2 hours	8.5	55		±6.4%
2 or more hours	++	++		
Average length of time traveled (minutes)	23.4	786	12	±5.7
Median length of time traveled (minutes)	18.2	786	12	±2.5
Means of transportation to pick up FDPIR food package (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	2.88% of total sample missing	798	23	
Own car or truck	65.9	523		±7.6%
Someone else drove	27.7	202		±7.4%
Walked	0.9	8		±.6%
Public transportation	1.2	8		±1.2%
Taxi	++	++		
Other	4.2	33		±2.%
Use of authorized representative to pick up food package (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	0.88% of total sample missing	798	7	
Yes	49.4	388		±7.6%
No	50.6	403		±7.6%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				
<i>Table 6 continued on next page</i>				

Table 6. Participant Access to FDPIR- Distribution and Delivery-Survey(cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Miles representative traveled to pick up FDPIR food package (excludes home delivery) (among households with authorized representative) (%)				
	2.32% of total sample missing	388	9	
< 5 miles	31.1	123		±7.7%
5-9 miles	14.8	58		±5.5%
10-24 miles	30.0	115		±12.3%
25-99 miles	23.9	82		±8.4%
100 or more miles	++	++		
Average number of miles traveled	16.5	379	9	±3.2
Median number of miles traveled	9.7	379	9	±3.7
Length of time traveled to pick up FDPIR food package (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	1.29% of total sample missing	387	5	
< 10 minutes	22.6	91		±5.5%
11-29 minutes	44.8	173		±5.9%
30 minutes-59 minutes	23.1	89		±4.5%
1 hour - under 2 hours	7.6	23		±5.3%
2 or more hours	1.9	6		±1.5%
Average length of time traveled (minutes)	27.3	382	5	±7.2
Median length of time traveled (minutes)	18.1	382	5	±2.2
Means of transportation for representative to pick up FDPIR food package (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	1.55% of total sample missing	388	6	
Own car or truck	84.2	320		±3.9%
Someone else drove	11.6	43		±3.2%
Walked	++	++		
Public transportation	0.0	0		
Taxi	0.0	0		
Other	3.5	17		±2.5%
Satisfaction with FDPIR pickup method (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	3.38% of total sample missing	798	27	
Yes	92.3	717		±2.9%
No	7.7	54		±2.9%
Travelling to the FDPIR site presents challenges or problems for household (excludes home delivery) (%)				
	2.88% of total sample missing	798	23	
Yes	21.1	158		±5.5%
Gas/travel cost	23.7	42		±10.7%
Difficult travel conditions in winter	23.7	36		±9.2%
Health conditions make travel difficult	11.2	21		±6.9%
Lack of car or other form of transportation	29.0	40		±13.7%
No	78.9	617		±5.5%
SAMPLE SIZE		849		
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				

Table 7. Nutrition Education and Other Services-Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Participation in nutrition education at FDPIR over last year (%)	0.6 % of total sample missing	849	5	
Yes	41.2	357		±5.2%
No	58.8	487		±5.2%
Reasons for not participating (%)*	12.7 % of total sample missing	487	62	
Not offered	28.6	114		±6.2%
Not interested	29.0	128		±6.7%
Not useful	4.8	23		±2.7%
No computer/internet access	6.7	30		±2.1%
Timing not good	10.0	47		±3.4%
Location inconvenient	4.8	21		±3.0%
No transportation	9.6	43		±2.4%
Other	23.1	96		±4.6%
Types of nutrition education received (%)*		849		
Newsletters	38.0	304	62/ 7.3%	±3.4%
Factsheets	28.5	233	61/ 7.2%	±5.6%
Recipes/cookbooks	74.0	597	46/ 5.4%	±3.6%
DVDs	2.3	20	64/ 7.5%	±1.2%
Calendars	57.9	475	48/ 5.7%	±10.7%
How to budget	11.9	100	59/ 6.9%	±3.4%
How to grocery shop	11.4	96	65/ 7.7%	±3.5%
Cooking demonstrations	15.5	117	59/ 6.9%	±5.9%
Baking demonstrations	9.8	73	61/ 7.2%	±4.4%
Demonstrations on how to preserve food	7.9	59	63/ 7.4%	±3.6%
Demonstrations on using traditional foods	8.4	63	65/ 7.7%	±3.4%
Tastings during FDP pick-up	15.3	117	63/ 7.4%	±5.4%
Nutrition classes	6.4	53	68/ 8.0%	±2.2%
Nutrition counseling	4.9	43	66/ 7.7%	±1.8%
'Pot luck' or similar types of gatherings	6.9	62	64/ 7.5%	±2.5%
Kid nutrition	5.1	44	68/ 8.0%	±2.3%
Mothers' groups	1.5	12	68/ 8.0%	±0.9%
Demonstrations on or participation in gardening	4.8	41	65/ 7.7%	±2.2%
Gardening education	4.7	40	63/ 7.4%	±2.1%
Health/nutrition fairs	7.5	64	67/ 7.9%	±2.6%
Other	1.7	16	70/ 8.2%	±1.3%
Changes made to cooking or eating due to activities and offerings (%)	11.0 % of total sample missing	702	77	
Yes	52.2	318		±4.1%
No	47.8	307		±4.1%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014-15 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. * Respondents selected all applicable response categories.				
<i>Table 7 continued on next page</i>				

Table 7. Nutrition Education and Other Services-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Types of changes made (%)	0.06% of total sample missing	318	2	
Changes made to cookbook	8.8	26		±2.9%
Used recipes offered	40.1	130		±6.8%
Eat healthier	12.8	38		±4.7%
Tried different cooking approaches	24.1	74		±9.1%
Reasons changes have not been made (%)	24.7 % of total sample missing	384	95	
Liked what they cook	32.6	95		±9.2%
Weren't interested in changing their activities	16.4	48		±5.1%
Lacked the spices or additional ingredients.	5.0	13		±4.0%
Participation in other program services [fitness and health classes, cooking classes, health fairs] (%)	3.3 % of total sample missing	849	28	
Yes	11.6	96		±2.5%
No	88.4	725		±2.5%
Changes in activity or health/fitness because services/activities (%)	4.2 % of total sample missing	96	4	
Yes	69.7	65		±10.6%
No	30.3	27		±10.6%
Types of changes made (%)	0.0% of total sample missing	65	0	
Ate healthier	37.5	26		±12.7%
Exercised more	48.6	29		±15.7%
Changes made to diet or health because of services/activities (%)	8.3 % of total sample missing	96	8	
Yes	68.3	60		±13.7%
No	31.7	28		±13.7%
Types of changes made (%)	0.0 % of total sample missing	60	0	
Eats healthier	21.4	14		±9.3%
Consumed less sweetened foods	13.8	9		±9.8%
Consumed smaller portions	45.5	26		±13.0%
Changes made to food preparation due to other program services (%)	6.3 % of total sample missing	96	6	
Yes	69.0	63		±13.5%
No	31.0	27		±13.5%
Types of changes made (%)	0.0% of total sample missing	63	0	
Fried food less often	26.0	16		±6.4%
Prepare food with less salt	10.3	7		±6.4%
Prepare food with less sugar	7.8	5		±6.7%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014-15 FDIPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDIPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.

* Respondents selected all applicable response categories.

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Food-related level of satisfaction (%)				
Variety	% 0.5 total sample missing	849	4	
Very satisfied	64.3	530		±5.5%
Somewhat satisfied	28.3	252		±5.0%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	3.0	26		±1.3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	3.4	28		±1.4%
Very dissatisfied	1.0	9		±0.6%
Freshness	1.8% total sample missing	849	15	
Very satisfied	60.4	491		±7.3%
Somewhat satisfied	29.6	254		±5.7%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	3.5	32		±1.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	5.4	47		±1.7%
Very dissatisfied	1.1	10		±0.6%
Quality	0.9% total sample missing	849	8	
Very satisfied	61.9	510		±6.8%
Somewhat satisfied	30.9	270		±5.0%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	3.5	28		±1.5%
Somewhat dissatisfied	3.0	25		±1.2%
Very dissatisfied	0.8	8		±0.5%
Nutritional value	1.1% total sample missing	849	9	
Very satisfied	65.8	541		±6.0%
Somewhat satisfied	27.0	236		±4.8%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	4.5	38		±1.5%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1.9	17		±1.0%
Very dissatisfied	0.9	8		±0.7%
Taste appeal	0.7% total sample missing	849	6	
Very satisfied	55.7	455		±8.3%
Somewhat satisfied	34.5	306		±6.9%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	5.3	45		±1.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	3.6	30		±1.5%
Very dissatisfied	0.8	7		±0.5%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				
*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.				
<i>Table 8 continued on next page</i>				

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Visual appeal	0.7% total sample missing	849	6	
Very satisfied	59.9	492		±7.4%
Somewhat satisfied	31.2	275		±6.2%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	6.0	52		±2.0%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2.0	15		±1.0%
Very dissatisfied	0.9	9		±0.6%
Overall satisfaction of food package	0.5% total sample missing	849	4	
Very satisfied	68.7	572		±5.7%
Somewhat satisfied	25.8	226		±5.1%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	2.8	22		±1.2%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1.7	17		±0.8%
Very dissatisfied	1.0	8		±0.8%
Foods liked most (%)	1.3% total sample missing	849	11	
All of it	10.4	88		±2.1%
The variety	5.0	42		±2.4%
Dairy				
Cheese	27.0	231		±4.6%
Butter	2.5	23		±1.1%
Milk	6.0	51		±2.0%
Fruits and Vegetables				
Fruit	29.5	242		±5.0%
Vegetables	24.0	204		±3.7%
Fresh fruits and vegetables	8.9	74		±2.3%
Fresh fruits	13.3	108		±3.1%
Fresh vegetables	10.0	86		±2.6%
Canned fruit	3.9	30		±1.3%
Canned vegetables	2.6	20		±1.2%
Juices	6.1	55		±1.7%
Meat	29.4	251		±3.7%
Canned meat	2.1	15		±1.6%
Fresh meat	1.5	11		±1.4%
Frozen meat	2.4	18		±1.7%
Roast	3.3	28		±1.0%
Ground beef	7.7	71		±2.9%
Chicken	6.6	58		±2.0%
Turkey	2.2	21		±1.2%
Beef	8.0	65		±2.3%
Canned beef	3.6	27		±1.4%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. *Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.

Table 8 continued on next page

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Foods liked most (%) (cont.)				
Starches				
Noodles	3.6	31		±1.7%
Flour	3.8	31		±1.5%
Potatoes	3.9	32		±1.7%
Cereal	5.0	37		±2.1%
Canned food	5.1	40		±2.4%
Foods liked least (%)				
Nothing	27.4	219		±5.2%
Dairy				
Canned milk	1.5	14		±1.1%
Powdered milk	1.9	16		±0.8%
Milk	7.4	65		±1.9%
Egg Mix	11.4	100		±3.1%
Cheese	1.6	15		±1.0%
Butter	1.7	14		±0.9%
Fruits and Vegetables				
Fruit	3.4	29		±1.8%
Vegetables	4.3	37		±2.0%
Fresh fruits and vegetables	4.3	32		±1.9%
Prunes	0.8	7		±0.7%
Beans	9.3	72		±3.3%
Juices	1.3	11		±0.8%
Soups	2.7	25		±1.2%
Cream of chicken/cream of mushroom	++	++		
Meat				
Canned meat	0.8	7		±0.6%
Canned beef	1.0	10		±0.6%
Ground beef	1.3	12		±0.8%
Beef	2.3	22		±1.1%
Roast	0.6	7		±0.5%
Chicken	2.9	27		±1.2%
Turkey	0.6	5		±0.5%
Ham	0.8	8		±0.7%
Crackers	1.4	14		±0.9%
Canned foods	9.6	80		±3.8%
Dried foods	3.2	27		±1.6%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				
*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.				
<i>Table 8 continued on next page</i>				

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Suggested foods to be added (%)				
Dairy				
Eggs	8.5	70		±3.5%
Milk	4.7	41		±1.5%
Cheese	2.8	21		±1.2%
Butter	2.1	19		±1.1%
Fruits and vegetables				
More fruit options	18.1	150		±4.0%
More vegetable options	16.5	135		±4.2%
More produce options	4.0	31		±1.4%
More fresh produce options	12.2	103		±3.6%
Bananas	3.4	26		±2.1%
Meat				
Lunchmeat	2.1	20		±1.2%
SPAM	3.0	25		±1.7%
Bison	2.5	19		±1.4%
Fish	7.9	66		±2.4%
Chicken	3.9	33		±1.2%
Pork	11.0	93		±2.8%
Turkey	0.9	6		±0.7%
Beef	5.5	43		±1.9%
Roast	2.2	19		±1.2%
More meat options generally	28.3	226		±4.5%
Starches				
Bread	5.0	48		±2.1%
Flour and dough	1.4	12		±0.8%
Cereal - more options	1.7	14		±0.8%
Brown rice	0.6	7		±0.7%
Coffee and tea	7.1	56		±2.7%
Sugar	8.0	72		±2.3%
Spices	7.3	62		±2.7%
Honey	1.5	13		±0.9%
Fats - butter, lard, oil	3.3	30		±1.7%
Diabetic-friendly options	0.6	5		±0.5%
Participant considers suggested foods cultural/traditional (%)	10.1% total sample missing	849	86	
Yes	33.6	273		±6.8%
No	66.4	490		±6.8%
Participant believes FDPIR meets food and nutrition needs (%)	2.2% total sample missing	819	19	
Yes	93.1	771		±2.3%
No	6.9	59		±2.3%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				
*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.				
Table 8 continued on next page				

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Ways FDPIR has met food and nutrition needs (%)	3.4% total sample missing	771	26	
The variety of foods offered	8.2	57		±4.6%
Availability of types of foods				
Availability of fruits and vegetables				
Fresh fruits and vegetables	5.3	40		±1.6%
Fresh fruits	3.0	24		±1.3%
Fresh vegetables	2.7	22		±1.3%
Fruits generally	13.9	106		±6.6%
Vegetables generally	17.1	131		±6.2%
Availability of meat and protein items				
Meat	8.3	64		±2.6%
Protein	2.0	15		±0.9%
Availability of milk and other dairy items	4.8	36		±2.2%
Availability of other items				
Bread	1.7	14		±1.0%
Juices	1.5	11		±1.1%
Availability of low-sodium options	2.5	18		±1.1%
Food meets basic nutritional needs (food pyramid)	11.6	79		±3.1%
Food is nutritious	13.1	84		±5.6%
Food keeps their family healthy	12.0	84		±4.4%
Foods are appropriate for someone with diabetes	1.8	12		±0.8%
Foods keep them from going hungry	6.6	52		±1.9%
Ways FDPIR has not met food and nutrition needs (%)	20.5% total sample missing	78	16	
Don't get enough food	36.0	22		±15.1%
Want more fresh produce	10.7	7		±7.9%
Want more of other items (e.g., more meats, more greens)	8.8	6		±6.9%
The food is not nutritious enough or does not meet their nutritional needs	10.3	7		±8.8%
The food is not appropriate for their dietary restrictions	10.2	6		±6.1%
The ordering/inventory process interferes with program's ability to provide foods that meet their needs	6.7	5		±7.2%
Application process	0.8% total sample missing	849	7	
Very satisfied	68.0	562		±5.9%
Somewhat satisfied	25.1	221		±5.9%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	2.7	22		±0.9%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2.7	23		±1.0%
Very dissatisfied	1.5	14		±0.8%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. *Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.				
Table 8 continued on next page				

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Recertification process	2.7% total sample missing	849	23	
Very satisfied	67.4	546		±7.2%
Somewhat satisfied	24.5	208		±6.1%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	3.2	28		±1.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	3.4	29		±1.3%
Very dissatisfied	1.6	15		±0.9%
Location of distribution site	1.1% total sample missing	849	9	
Very satisfied	69.2	576		±5.6%
Somewhat satisfied	23.0	199		±5.3%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	3.4	30		±1.3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2.9	24		±1.1%
Very dissatisfied	1.5	11		±1.0%
Attractiveness and atmosphere of distribution site	1.6% total sample missing	849	14	
Very satisfied	65.7	545		±6.7%
Somewhat satisfied	26.7	226		±5.5%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	4.3	37		±1.3%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2.5	20		±1.6%
Very dissatisfied	0.8	7		±0.5%
Features of distribution facility	1.1% total sample missing	849	9	
Very satisfied	63.7	538		±5.3%
Somewhat satisfied	25.0	213		±4.7%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	4.4	37		±1.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	4.9	36		±1.7%
Very dissatisfied	2.0	16		±1.2%
Frequency of distribution	1.1% total sample missing	849	9	
Very satisfied	65.4	545		±6.0%
Somewhat satisfied	25.6	221		±5.6%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	2.6	22		±1.0%
Somewhat dissatisfied	5.3	42		±1.2%
Very dissatisfied	1.1	10		±0.7%
Interaction with program staff	1.1% total sample missing	849	9	
Very satisfied	73.2	618		±6.2%
Somewhat satisfied	20.3	172		±4.3%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	2.4	20		±1.0%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2.2	16		±1.6%
Very dissatisfied	1.9	14		±1.6%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.

*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.

Table 8 continued on next page

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Nutrition and education offerings	8.6% total sample missing	849	73	
Very satisfied	48.5	368		±7.9%
Somewhat satisfied	28.7	231		±6.1%
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	12.9	100		±3.0%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6.5	50		±2.3%
Very dissatisfied	3.4	27		±1.3%
Changes made in FDPIR program have influenced participation (%)	4.4% total sample missing	849	37	
Yes	15.6	129		±2.9%
No	84.4	683		±2.9%
Changes made among those who noted changes (%)	3.1% total sample missing	129	4	
Added fresh fruits and vegetables	30.0	39		±6.8%
Added fresh meat and improved meat options	12.8	16		±5.8%
Added more variety of foods	14.0	19		±6.8%
Program improved the building or services available	9.5	11		±5.8%
Made changes to application process or income requirements	5.7	7		±5.0%
Overall the quality has improved	6.1	10		±4.3%
Took away popular food options	5.7	8		±4.6%
Influence on participation among those who noted changes (%)	13.2% total sample missing	129	17	
Liked program better after change	27.6	31		±9.0%
Changed cooking in response to change	6.7	8		±5.0%
The program had better food options	21.7	24		±8.3%
Did not impact participation	5.8	7		±4.0%
Comments to federal government about FDPIR program (%)	5.7% total sample missing	849	48	
They are satisfied with the program	56.6	458		±6.5%
Don't cut the program	11.4	78		±5.7%
People would go hungry without FDPIR	3.3	28		±1.4%
This program is very needed	6.0	51		±2.1%
Expand criteria to include more demographic groups (serve non-Natives)	1.3	11		±0.8%
Increase the income threshold	1.9	17		±1.0%
Provide more food options	3.0	27		±1.2%
Provide more meat	2.4	19		±1.6%
Provide spices	1.0	10		±1.0%
Provide more canned goods	0.6	5		±0.6%
Provide more traditional foods	++	++		
Provide more fresh foods	2.9	23		±1.2%
Improve the quality of the food	1.8	15		±0.9%
Increase amount of food given	7.5	63		±2.1%
Allow for pick up more than once per month	1.4	11		±0.8%
Could do better	1.8	13		±0.9%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.

*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.

Table 8 continued on next page

Table 8. Participant Satisfaction with FDPIR-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Comments to tribal leaders about FDPIR program (%)	6.5% total sample missing	849	55	
They are satisfied with the program	44.8	356		±8.9%
They would like more meat included in the package	1.6	11		±1.2%
They would like more variety of food items	1.5	12		±0.6%
Don't cut the program	11.1	81		±6.3%
Same as what they said for federal government	16.7	129		±4.7%
Improve the quality of the food	1.4	12		±0.8%
Increase the amount of food	3.5	30		±1.7%
Provide more fresh options	1.4	13		±0.9%
Provide more traditional foods	0.8	8		±0.7%
Allow for pick up more than once per month	++	++		
Provide more nutrition education	1.2	10		±0.9%
The program is needed	4.8	38		±1.5%
They should do more outreach for the program	1.2	11		±0.8%
Increase the income threshold	1.0	7		±0.6%
Improve transportation or support for transportation costs (e.g., gas vouchers)	0.7	7		±0.6%
Participant would recommend FDPIR program to family and friends (%)	1.6% total sample missing	849	14	
Yes	99.3	827		±0.6%
No	0.7	8		±0.6%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			

Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.

Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.

Table 9. Food Preparation-Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Who in household has major responsibility for preparing meals (%)	3.7% of total sample missing	849	31	
Respondent	77.6	631		±3.3%
Person other than respondent	22.4	187		±3.3%
Person feels adequately prepared to cook FDPIR foods (%)	1.1% of total sample missing	849	9	
Yes	98.3	827		±0.7%
No	1.7	13		±0.7%
Equipment or methods of food storage and preparation available in home (%)*	0.2% of total sample missing	849	2	
Gas/electric stove	93.4	803		±5.5%
Gas/electric oven	90.7	782		±6.7%
Wood stove	19.7	144		±13.6%
Microwave	91.4	787		±5.4%
Hotplate	15.2	131		±2.8%
Open fire	13.2	100		±7.5%
Refrigerator	97.8	832		±1.7%
Freezer	80.2	703		±9.4%
Root cellar	2.8	25		±1.1%
Ice house	++	++		
Food canning	13.5	114		±4.4%
Food drying/dehydrator	12.1	107		±5.3%
Other	6.9	57		±2.5%
Main source of water for preparing meals (%)	6.6% of total sample missing	849	56	
Public or private water system (includes city water)	76.2	590		±6.4%
Individual well	18.3	155		±5.2%
Spring	++	++		
Cistern	0.0	0		
Stream or lake	++	++		
Commercial bottled water	2.0	15		±1.6%
Other	2.7	27		±2.5%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
<p>Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.</p> <p>*Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Totals do not add up to 100%.</p>				

Table 10. Food Access and Cost- Non Subsidized Sources-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Distance of other food outlets/suppliers/sources other than FDPIR from household home				
Nearest food retail store that sells produce				
<i>Miles (%)</i>	2.1% of total sample missing	849	18	
< 5 miles	47.5	411		±11.0%
5-9 miles	18.5	162		±3.7%
10-24 miles	21.5	174		±3.6%
25-99 miles	12.3	83		±11.1%
100 or more miles	++	++		
<i>Average number of miles traveled</i>	10.2	831	18	±5.2%
<i>Median number of miles traveled</i>	4.7	831	18	±1.9%
<i>Length of time traveled (%)</i>	2.1 % of total sample missing	848	18	
< 10 minutes	36.2	309		±7.8%
11-29 minutes	43.3	37		±7.8%
30 minutes-59 minutes	14.6	108		±6.7%
1 hour - under 2 hours	5.3	32		±6.5%
2 or more hours	0.7	4		±0.7%
<i>Average length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	17.2	830	18	±6.7%
<i>Median length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	9.3	830	18	±1.9%
Nearest grocery store				
<i>Miles (%)</i>	1.6 % of total sample missing	849	14	
< 5 miles	46.6	405		±11.2%
5-9 miles	19.6	170		±3.4%
10-24 miles	21.6	174		±3.9%
25-99 miles	12.2	86		±10.0%
100 or more miles	0.0	0		±0.0%
<i>Average number of miles traveled</i>	9.6	835	14	±4.1%
<i>Median number of miles traveled</i>	4.7	835	14	±1.9%
<i>Length of time traveled (%)</i>	2.0 % of total sample missing	849	17	
< 10 minutes	35.2	302.00		±8.2%
11-29 minutes	45.1	387.00		±6.3%
30 minutes-59 minutes	15.0	112.00		±8.1%
1 hour - under 2 hours	4.4	28.00		±5.1%
2 or more hours	0.4	3.00		±0.4%
<i>Average length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	17.2	832	17	±5.6%
<i>Median length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	9.4	832	17	±2.0%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014-15 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused."				
<i>Table 10 continued on next page</i>				

Table 10. Food Access and Cost- Non Subsidized Sources-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Nearest convenience store				
<i>Miles (%)</i>	3.3 % of total sample missing	849	28	
< 5 miles	60.9	515		±12.0%
5-9 miles	17.9	155		±3.2%
10-24 miles	16.0	116		±7.0%
25-99 miles	5.2	35		±4.8%
100 or more miles	0.0	0		±0.0%
<i>Average number of miles traveled</i>	6.0	821	28	±2.5%
<i>Median number of miles traveled</i>	2.8	821	28	±1.0%
<i>Length of time traveled (%)</i>	3.5 % of total sample missing	849	30	
< 10 minutes	52.9	444		±10.8%
11-29 minutes	35.8	296		±4.4%
30 minutes-59 minutes	8.7	60		±6.7%
1 hour - under 2 hours	2.3	16		±1.9%
2 or more hours	++	++		
<i>Average length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	12.5	819	30	±3.8%
<i>Median length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	6.3	819	30	±2.1%
Nearest farmers market				
<i>Miles (%)</i>	35.0 % of total sample missing	849	297	
< 5 miles	37.3	212		±8.4%
5-9 miles	13.7	82		±3.9%
10-24 miles	28.2	163		±7.5%
25-99 miles	17.0	83		±8.5%
100 or more miles	3.8	12		±6.9%
<i>Average number of miles traveled</i>	17.8	552	297	±11.3%
<i>Median number of miles traveled</i>	7.9	552	297	±3.9%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014-15 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused."				
<i>Table 10 continued on next page</i>				

Table 10. Food Access and Cost- Non Subsidized Sources-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Nearest farmers market (continued)				
<i>Length of time traveled (%)</i>	34.7 % of total sample missing	847	294	
< 10 minutes	29.1	164		±7.6%
11-29 minutes	39.7	237		±8.7%
30 minutes-59 minutes	20.9	113		±3.6%
1 hour - under 2 hours	7.0	29		±6.5%
2 or more hours	3.2	10		±5.7%
<i>Average length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	24.6	553	294	±12.2%
<i>Median length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	14.6	553	294	±4.7%
Nearest warehouse/department/large big box store that sells groceries (e.g. Walmart, Costco, Sam's Club)				
<i>Miles (%)</i>	3.8 % of total sample missing	849	32	
< 5 miles	12.3	109		±5.8%
5-9 miles	12.2	106		±5.0%
10-24 miles	29.5	267		±9.9%
25-99 miles	40.2	303		±13.0%
100 or more miles	5.7	32		±5.4%
<i>Average number of miles traveled</i>	33.3	817	32	±12.3%
<i>Median number of miles traveled</i>	19.8	817	32	±9.4%
<i>Length of time traveled (%)</i>	3.2 % of total sample missing	848	27	
< 10 minutes	8.2	68		±4.6%
11-29 minutes	37.4	337		±12.1%
30 minutes-59 minutes	24.8	212		±4.6%
1 hour - under 2 hours	23.7	167		±11.5%
2 or more hours	5.9	37		±5.3%
<i>Average length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	41.7	821	27	±13.2%
<i>Median length of time traveled (minutes)</i>	26.8	821	27	±9.5%
Access to food sources during past year				
<i>Changes in access to food sources during past year (%)</i>	0.7 % of total sample missing	849	6	
Yes	7.6	70		±2.6%
No	92.4	773		±2.6%
<i>Types of changes among changes noted (%)</i>				
Grocery store had closed and/or moved to a new location	30.9	20		±11.2%
New grocery store opened	20.7	14		±14.9%
No longer qualified for FDPIR	10.3	8		±6.8%
Switched from FDPIR to SNAP	9.8	8		±8.3%
Food prices increased	7.7	5		±6.5%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014-15 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				
<i>Table 10 continued on next page</i>				

Table 10. Food Access and Cost- Non Subsidized Sources-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Cost of food & seasonal variations in expenses				
Average amount spent per month by household on food consumed inside and outside home	\$206.2	823	26	±20.6%
Are there seasons where household food expenses considerably less	3.3 % of total sample missing	849	28	
Yes	37.2	315		±5.7%
No	62.8	506		±5.7%
Top seasons where food expenses considerably less, among those reporting	7.3 % of total sample missing	315	23	
Spring	3.1	10		±1.7%
Summer	55.5	162		±8.0%
Fall	10.6	35		±4.9%
Winter	30.5	86		±6.9%
Reasons why household spends less	0.0 % of total sample missing	849	0	
Because they hunt	2.3	20		±1.3%
Because they fish	0.9	9		±1.0%
Because they grow food in a garden	7.4	67		±2.7%
Because children are in school	2.9	26		±1.2%
Because of summer/heat (eat less in summer)	5.3	47		±1.4%
Because it's difficult to travel in winter	3.8	32		±1.7%
Because fresh produce is cheaper	3.2	29		±1.6%
Because they work seasonally and have less money to spend	1.2	10		±0.9%
Because more money is spent on bills	++	++		
Are there seasons where household food expenses considerably more	7.9 % of total sample missing	849	67	
Yes	51.0	414		±7.7%
No	49.0	368		±7.7%
Top seasons where food expenses considerably more among those reporting	8.5 % of total sample missing	414	35	
Spring	2.2	8		±1.4%
Summer	30.6	114		±6.6%
Fall	14.3	56		±5.3%
Winter	53.5	204		±6.1%
Reasons why household spends more	0.0 % of total sample missing	849	0	
Because of the holidays	16.5	147		±4.7%
Because they have house guests	5.1	44		±1.9%
Because children are out of school	6.2	51		±2.6%
Because they eat more in the winter	3.0	27		±1.4%
Because they grill/BBQ in summer	1.4	12		±0.7%
Because fresh produce is more expensive	3.9	36		±1.6%
Because garden not in season	1.2	11		±0.8%
Because they are at home more in the winter	3.1	25		±1.8%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014-15 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				

Table 11. Food Security Status of Households-Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Food security				
Food that household bought didn't last, and didn't have money to get more (%)	0.9% of total sample missing	849	8	
Often true	25.0	210		±2.8%
Sometimes true	41.1	347		±4.7%
Never true	33.9	284		±5.2%
Couldn't afford to eat balanced, nutritious meals (%)	0.8% of total sample missing	849	7	
Often true	18.0	154		±2.9%
Sometimes true	38.8	320		±4.2%
Never true	43.2	368		±5.1%
Adults in household ever cut the size of meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food (%)	1.1% of total sample missing	849	9	
Yes	30.3	250		±3.0%
No	69.7	590		±3.0%
Frequency of cutting or skipping meals among households where adults cut size of meals or skipped meals (%)	2.73% of total sample missing	256	7	
Almost every month	44.9	111		±6.6%
Some months but not every month	42.1	106		±6.9%
Only 1 or 2 months	13.0	32		±2.8%
Respondent ever ate eat less than felt should because there wasn't enough money for food (%)	1.1% of total sample missing	849	9	
Yes	29.3	244		±3.7%
No	70.7	596		±3.7%
Respondent or other adults in household hungry but didn't eat because there wasn't enough money for food (%)	1.8% of total sample missing	849	15	
Yes	18.8	153		±3.0%
No	81.2	681		±3.0%
Food security status of households in past 12 months (%)*	1.3% of total sample missing	849	11	
Food secure	44.4	376		±4.4%
Low food security	34.1	285		±3.3%
Very low food security	21.5	177		±3.0%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
<p>Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "+" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.</p> <p>*Scale score calculating using USDA ERS' Guide to Calculating Food Security, adapted for the 6 question module (http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/FSGuide.pdf) . Responses with 2 or more missings in questions 1-6 above were coded as "missing" for the food security scale score; other missings coded as "No".</p>				

Table 12. FDPIR Referrals and Coordination with Other Food and Non-Food Programs-Survey				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Households ever been referred to other food programs by FDPIR staff (%)	1.25% of total sample missing	558	7	
Yes	13.6	77		±4.6%
No	86.4	474		±4.6%
Type of referred program among those referred (%)*	0% of total sample missing	77	0	
Head Start (CACFP)	11.8	10		±7.2%
School Breakfast Program	21.9	21		±14.7%
National School Lunch Program	27.1	23		±11.6%
Child and Adult Care Food Program	++	++		
Summer Feeding Program or the Summer Food Service Program	6.3	5		±5.5%
Elderly meals/feeding programs	34.3	24		±22.1%
Local food banks or pantries	14.7	13		±8.8%
Soup kitchens	0.0	0		
Tribal Emergency Funds	++	++		
Meals on Wheels	11.6	10		±8.2%
Other state, county, local programs, other tribal programs	++	++		
WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program	5.5	5		±4.6%
Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program	10.5	10		±9.9%
Other programs	9.2	8		±8.8%
Households ever been referred to other assistance services or programs by FDPIR staff (%)	1.30% of total sample missing	849	11	
Yes	3.5	32		±1.7%
No	96.5	806		±1.7%
Type of referred program among those referred (%)*		32		
Head Start	++	++		
Tribal TANF	++	++		
Emergency Assistance (not limited to food assistance)	41.3	11	7/ 21.9%	±19.4%
General Assistance	37.9	9	9/ 28.1%	±25.0%
Elder care	++	++		
Subsidized housing	++	++		
Child support	++	++		
Indian child welfare	++	++		
Vocational education	++	++		
Vocational rehabilitation	++	++		
Health and wellness	++	++		
Mental health	0.0	0	9/ 28.1%	
Domestic violence	0.0	0	9/ 28.1%	
Substance abuse	++	++		
Other	32.1	9	4/ 12.5%	±26.4%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused."				
* Respondents selected all applicable response categories.				
<i>Table 12 continued on next page</i>				

Table 12. FDPIR Referrals and Coordination with Other Food and Non-Food Programs-Survey(cont.)

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Interval
Referred programs co-located with FDPIR (%)	15.63% of total sample missing	32	5	
Yes	42.8	11		±21.1%
No	57.2	16		±21.1%
Among co-located, name of program (%)*	36.36% of total sample missing	11	4	
Head Start				
Tribal TANF				
Emergency Assistance	70.8	5	4/ 36.4%	±36.7%
General Assistance	++	++		
Elder care	++	++		
Subsidized housing	++	++		
Child support	++	++		
Indian child welfare	++	++		
Vocational education	++	++		
Vocational rehabilitation	++	++		
Health and wellness	++	++		
Mental health	++	++		
Domestic violence	++	++		
Substance abuse	++	++		
Other	++	++		
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused."				
* Respondents selected all applicable response categories.				

Table 13. Participation in FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps-Survey

	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Concurrent months of FDPIR participation, including current month (%)	2.6% of total sample missing	849	22	
0 months *	6.8	57		±2.8%
1 month	1.2	9		±.8%
1 to 3 month	3.3	25		±1.4%
4 to 6 months	4.8	41		±1.9%
7 to 9 months	4.0	36		±1.2%
10 to 12 months	15.9	140		±7.7%
13 months to 18 months	12.2	111		±4.7%
19-24 months	9.7	83		±2.5%
Over 24 months	37.1	290		±6.4%
Too long to remember*	4.8	35		±3.4%
Average number of months participated straight**	52.4	849	57	±11.4
Median number of months participated straight **	17.7	849	57	±5.3
Participant switching between FDPIR/SNAP in past 12 months				
Household who switched from FDPIR to SNAP in past 12 months (%)	3.8	34		±1.6%
Household who switched from SNAP to FDPIR in past 12 months (%)	1.9	18		±1.2%
Total households that switched between FDPIR and SNAP in the past 12 months (%)	5.2	48		±2.0%
Among all households that switched between FDPIR and SNAP in the past 12 months				
Average number months in FDPIR	6.8	46	2	±0.7
Average number months in SNAP	4.8	46	2	±0.7
Median number months in FDPIR	6.5	46	2	±0.7
Median number months in SNAP	4.3	46	2	±1.2
Households with neither FDPIR/SNAP for at least 1 month in past 12 months	2.2% of total sample missing	849	19	
Households with neither FDPIR/SNAP for at least 1 month in past 12 months (% distribution)	18.0	147		±3.3%
Average number months of non-participation in SNAP/FDPIR among those who had months with non-participation in both programs	6.3	147	0	±0.9
Median number months of non-participation in SNAP/FDPIR among those who had months with non-participation in both programs	5.7	147	0	±1.6%
Reasons for non-participation in past 12 months, among household that did not participate in either for at least one month during last 12 months***	11.7% of total sample missing	154	18	
Was not eligible	42.0	56		±10.6%
Did not apply in time	14.5	19		±9.6%
Was receiving food benefits through another household	++	++		
Had other sources of food	10.2	15		±7.3%
Did not live in the area	7.1	9		±3.7%
Other	27.3	39		±8.0%
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.				
* These households were participating in September 2013 (reference month) but may not have been participating in FDPIR at the time of the actual interview.				
**Respondents indicated they had participated in FDPIR for at least a year, but "too long to remember". These responses are excluded from the average and median analyses listed below, which suggests that the estimates below are conservative.				
***Respondents instructed to "select all that apply". Totals do not add up to 100%.				

<i>Table 13 continued on next page</i>				
Table 13. Participation in FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps-Survey(cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
Reasons for changes from FDPIR to SNAP in past 12 months among households who made switch**	8.8% of total sample missing	34	3	
Because the size and income resources of my household changed so I was now eligible for SNAP	43.5	14		±17.6%
Because I participate in the TANF program	++	++		
Because I prefer having a greater variety of food choices or options	76.4	23		±17.2%
Because the food in the store/supermarket is better quality than the USDA Foods	100.0	31		
Because I have less time to prepare and cook food, don't know how to cook, don't like to cook or don't have the time to cook, needed greater flexibility and can buy convenience and prepared foods	100.0	31		
Because I needed to buy specific foods for household members (e.g., dietary restrictions)	100.0	31		
In the summer I have more responsibility for feeding children not in school.	23.1	6		±13.6%
Because I have greater privacy obtaining food using the EBT card	21.5	6		±15.1%
Because I can use the EBT card at a convenience store or gas station	38.9	11		±23.4%
Because the store/market is closer to where I live than the distribution site	15.8	5		±12.4%
Because I was going away for a period of time and would be able to use SNAP benefits anywhere	18.6	6		±14.2%
Because I think I can get more food on SNAP benefits than FDPIR	43.0	13		±18.2%
Other reason	59.6	17		±12.9%
Reasons for changes from SNAP to FDPIR in past 12 months among households who made switch	11.1% of total sample missing	18	2	
Because it was easier to qualify for FDPIR	33.4	6		±24.6%
Because I receive a greater quantity of food through FDPIR	84.1	14		±11.9%
Because the quality of the USDA Foods is better	42.3	7		±30.9%
Because I wanted to stock up on canned and dried goods	42.1	7		±25.5%
Because I don't like the SNAP/food stamp certification process, because I don't like the way I am treated at the county office or similar problem	++	++		
Because the county office is too far away and difficult to get to	++	++		
Because the FDPIR pick-up/distribution site is closer than going to the store/market	++	++		
Because I don't know how to use/feel comfortable using an EBT card	++	++		
Because I feel that people in the store/market look down on me when I use the EBT card	++	++		
Other reason	45.7	8		±24.5%
SNAP benefits per month among FDPIR participants who received SNAP in past year, by household size				
1 person household	8.3% of total sample missing	12	1	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$167.3			±78.9
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$139.5			±78.1
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
<p>Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and "Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level.</p> <p>*Respondents indicated they had participated in FDPIR for at least a year, but "too long to remember". These responses are excluded from the average and median analyses listed below, which suggests that the estimates below are conservative.</p> <p>**Respondents instructed to "select all that apply". Totals do not add up to 100%.</p>				
<i>Table 13 continued on next page</i>				

Table 13. Participation in FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps-Survey(cont.)				
	Estimate	n	n missing	Confidence Intervals
SNAP benefits per month among FDPIR participants who received SNAP in past year, by household size (cont.)				
2 person household	7.7% of total sample missing	13	1	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$166.8			±57.3
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$167.4			±88.6
3 person household	22.2% of total sample missing	9	2	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$313.7			±106.2
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$273.7			
4 person household	11.1% of total sample missing	9	1	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$349.3			±75.4
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$324.6			
5 person household	0% of total sample missing	7	0	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$261.6			±196.
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$175.5			
6 person household	0% of total sample missing	5	0	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$381.9			±116.7
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$304.2			
7 person household	3.1% of total sample missing	++	0	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$467.0			
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$380.0			
8 person household	0% of total sample missing	++	0	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$700.0			
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$700.0			
9 person household	0% of total sample missing		0	
Average amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$250.0	++		
Median amount of SNAP benefit per month	\$250.0			
Member of household ever been disqualified from FDPIR (%)	3.1% of total sample missing	849	26	
Yes	5.2	45		±1.3%
No	94.8	778		±1.3%
Reasons why member disqualified, among households who have had member disqualified				
Over the income limit	62.0	29		±18.2%
Enrolled in SNAP Program	++	++		
SAMPLE SIZE	849			
Source: 2014 FDPIR participant survey.				
Notes: Estimates are weighted to be nationally representative of households participating in FDPIR. Sample sizes are unweighted. When findings cannot be presented due to small sample size (fewer than five unweighted observations), the symbol "++" is shown. Missing values includes "Don't know" and " Refused." The confidence interval is computed at the 95% level. *Respondents indicated they had participated in FDPIR for at least a year, but "too long to remember". These responses are excluded from the average and median analyses listed below, which suggests that the estimates below are conservative. **Respondents instructed to "select all that apply". Totals do not add up to 100%.				

Table 14. Food Distribution Program Nutrition Education: Funds allocated Fiscal Years 2008 through 2015-FNS Administrative Data

Name of Organization	Region	State	FY 2008 Award	FY 2009 Award	FY 2010 Award	FY 2011 Award	FY 2012 Award	FY 2013 Award	FY 2014 Award	FY 2015 Award
Grand Portage Reservation	Midwest	Minnesota				\$9,827				
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians for the Midwest Nutrition Advisory Committee	Midwest	Wisconsin		\$78,753	\$78,205		\$39,950	\$45,147	\$35,384	\$45,008
Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Midwest	Wisconsin						\$82,421	\$26,657	
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	Midwest	Minnesota	\$40,488	\$53,494	\$46,256	\$39,146	\$45,703		\$11,026	
Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa	Midwest	Minnesota						\$3,629		
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin (Individual Organization Award)	Midwest	Wisconsin		\$27,196	\$57,165	\$39,194	\$45,860	\$41,813	\$40,258	\$45,691
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin for the Midwest Nutrition Advisory Committee	Midwest	Wisconsin								\$78,765
Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe	Midwest	Minnesota							\$49,931	
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa for the Midwest Nutrition Advisory Committee	Midwest	Wisconsin				\$115,181	\$93,907	\$96,260	\$55,393	
White Earth Reservation Tribal Council for the Midwest Region Nutrition Advisory Committee	Midwest	Minnesota	\$39,600							
Chippewa Cree Tribe for of the Rocky's Boy's Mountain Reservation for the Mountain Plains Region Nutrition Advisory Committee	Mountain Plains	Montana						\$102,230		\$78,376
Chippewa Cree of the Rocky Boy's Reservation (Individual Organization Award)	Mountain Plains	Montana		\$72,902	\$68,643	\$22,034	\$85,805		\$38,118	
Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes	Mountain Plains	Montana	\$139,815	\$137,695	\$145,671	\$118,032	\$78,738	\$59,235	\$93,402	\$68,988

Source: FNS Administrative Data

Table 14 continued on next page

Table 14. Food Distribution Program Nutrition Education: Funds allocated Fiscal Years 2008 through 2015-FNS Administrative Data

Name of Organization	Region	State	FY 2008 Award	FY 2009 Award	FY 2010 Award	FY 2011 Award	FY 2012 Award	FY 2013 Award	FY 2014 Award	FY 2015 Award
Crow Creek Sioux	Mountain Plains	South Dakota	\$8,222							
Ft. Belknap Indian Community	Mountain Plains	Montana	\$213,849							\$168,910
Oglala Sioux Tribe for the Mountain Plains Nutrition Advisory Committee	Mountain Plains	South Dakota	\$168,470			\$145,328	\$95,768			
Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	Mountain Plains	Kansas	\$45,694	\$28,770						
Rosebud Sioux Tribe (Individual Organization Award)	Mountain Plains	South Dakota				\$83,674				
Rosebud Sioux Tribe for the Mountain Plains Nutrition Advisory Committee	Mountain Plains	South Dakota		\$123,389						
Spirit Lake Tribe	Mountain Plains	South Dakota							\$40,210	
Spirit Lake Tribe for the Mountain Plains Region Nutrition Advisory Committee	Mountain Plains	South Dakota								\$138,095
United Tribes of Kansas and Southeast Nebraska, Inc.	Mountain Plains	Kansas				\$2,164				
Seneca Nation of Indians	Northeast	New York							\$22,796	
Mississippi Band of Choctaw	Southeast	Mississippi				\$44,941			\$5,210	
Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma	Southwest	Oklahoma	\$14,174		\$17,693		\$41,786	\$88,345	\$85,107	\$69,573
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	Southwest	Oklahoma						\$9,831	\$23,230	\$34,113
Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council, Inc.	Southwest	New Mexico	\$20,800							
Seminole Nation of Oklahoma Food Distribution Program	Southwest	Oklahoma		\$16,712	\$9,911		\$17,749			
The Chickasaw Nation	Southwest	Oklahoma			\$116,661	\$109,435	\$115,021	\$144,484	\$30,591	
The Pueblo of Acoma Food Distribution Program	Southwest	New Mexico		\$5,162						

Source: FNS Administrative Data

Table 14 continued on next page

Table 14. Food Distribution Program Nutrition Education: Funds allocated Fiscal Years 2008 through 2015-FNS Administrative Data

Name of Organization	Region	State	FY 2008 Award	FY 2009 Award	FY 2010 Award	FY 2011 Award	FY 2012 Award	FY 2013 Award	FY 2014 Award	FY 2015 Award
Wichita and Affiliated Tribes	Southwest	Oklahoma								\$25,340
Zuni Tribe of the Zuni Indian Reservations	Southwest	New Mexico	\$46,518	\$52,618	\$45,361	\$29,225	\$18,489	\$27,784	\$22,182	\$23,592
Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	Western	Alaska		\$131,993	\$44,016		\$62,500		\$36,400	\$23,097
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	Western	Oregon							\$8,581	\$22,348
Lummi Indian Business Council	Western	Washington		\$50,228	\$84,538	\$119,290	\$79,931		\$135,017	\$99,297
Quechan Indian Tribe Food Distribution Department	Western	Arizona					\$10,812			
Quileute Tribal Council	Western	Washington							\$30,197	
Nevada State Food Distribution Program	Western	Nevada		\$38,040						
Sherwood Valley Food Program	Western	California	\$34,249	\$59,578	\$52,304	\$41,182	\$36,711	\$54,341	\$72,634	\$74,134
South Puget Intertribal Planning Agency	Western	Washington		\$40,509	\$61,144	\$60,645	\$41,108			
Yakama Nation	Western	Washington	\$18,945							
Totals Allocated through Application Approval Process			\$790,824	\$917,039	\$827,568	\$979,298	\$909,838	\$755,520	\$862,324	\$995,327

Source: FNS Administrative Data, 2015

Appendix B. Case Record Review

B1. Case Record Review Procedures

In order to obtain data on households' demographic characteristics, size, income, and other variables that form the basis of the national profile we collected administrative data from households' FDPIR applications or most recent recertification paperwork. We conducted this process, which we refer to as the case record review, between December 2013 and December 2014.

The nationally representative sample of case records served as the sample for participant interviews. We learned during the consultation and outreach process that the ITOs had differing requirements and procedures for accessing data for research purposes. We worked closely with each ITO to follow their protocols and pre-tested our procedures with information from a Tribe that was not part of the study. This appendix describes our methods for locating case records, procedures for extracting data, the data to be collected, staffing and training for case record reviews, and quality control for the case record reviews. Appendix H describes the methodology for sampling Tribes, and Appendix I describes the methodology for sampling participants within the selected Tribes.

Methods for Locating Case Records and Procedures for Extracting Data

The steps that were taken to collect consistent data from case record files for the sample of 849 households (we oversampled so that our beginning sample was 1,053) are described below.

Contact with Tribes/ITOs. As part of the outreach effort, NORC staff contacted the ITO by email and by phone to explain the data needs for the study. NORC held a teleconference with each ITO to discuss the approval process for obtaining the participant list and access to the case record data. We identified the specific data elements needed to develop the sample frame for the participant profile and survey. In addition, we asked about site-specific quality assurance procedures to gain a better understanding of the quality of the information recorded in the case records, how information was updated, and where the records were stored.

Negotiate access. We anticipated having to enter into Data Sharing Agreements with each ITO in order to obtain case record data through a secure means. Tribal IRB approvals, resolutions, and MOUs addressed the secure transfer of data for the case record review as well as Tribal ownership of the de-identified data once the study was completed.

Obtain list of FDPIR Participants. NORC contacted each ITO to obtain a count of participants for the reference month of September 2013. We requested a list of participants to develop the ITO-specific sampling frame (as described in Appendix I). The source of this information was the monthly Household Issuance Inventory from FNS' Automated Inventory System (AIS). The FNS Regional Office assisted by requesting that all Tribes/ITOs in the study sample print and securely store the list for the reference month as the AIS system deletes the data after a specific period of time.

Implement site specific sampling strategy. As noted above, for each ITO we developed a site specific sampling frame based on the list of participants for the reference month. The study team offered to provide detailed instructions and technical assistance for any ITO that wished to draw the sample. Only one ITO maintained electronic records with a centralized database and the ITO selected the sample using specifications provided by NORC. For all other ITOs, the samples were drawn in one of three ways: 1) in advance of the on-site visit as the Tribe had sent a list of participants through a secure means (8 Tribes); 2) with the frame size known in advance but the sample drawn on-site using the Household Issuance list from the paper case records (13); and 3) with the frame size determined and the sample drawn on-site from the Household Issuance list (2).

Obtain case record data. We conducted on-site visits with 22 ITOs to abstract the data. We had originally anticipated three scenarios for conducting the case record review: 1) through electronic data transfers; 2) on-site data abstractions; and 3) secure transfer of unredacted applications. As we learned more about the record-keeping system for each ITO in the sample we found that we would have to conduct 22 case record reviews on-site. As noted above, only one ITO maintained a centralized database. We did not use the third method proposed (i.e., secure shipment of unredacted applications).

- Scenario (1): Electronic data transfers for sites with electronic records. NORC consulted with the ITO to establish a secure method of data transfer and the format of the data. An in-person visit was held with the ITO to identify the variables necessary for the case record review and to examine the data for quality assurance so that it was ready for secure transfer and uploading to the master database.
- Scenario (2): On-site data abstraction by NORC staff. NORC arranged a site visit with each ITO upon OMB, tribal, and IRB approval. Twenty-two visits were conducted between December

2013 and December 2014 during months convenient for each ITO. The visits were 2-4 days in duration, depending on the volume of case records to abstract (i.e., 32 for most sites but 68 and 89 for the two largest programs). Case records were typically centralized at the FDPIR warehouse. Four ITOs had multiple warehouses across their tribal service area. In such cases, records were kept at separate warehouses and staff traveled from site to site. NORC staff trained in the data abstraction procedures conducted the case record reviews. Most visits involved a two-person team (one senior and one junior staff), although eight visits to smaller programs were conducted by one senior staff. Three staff conducted the case record review at the largest ITO and four staff did so with the second largest ITO that had seven distribution sites. Materials for the on-site case record review included NORC employee identification badge, a copy of the approval documents, the procedures manual, and a secure laptop. The case record review procedures assumed that all case records were in conformity with the record-keeping guidelines outlined in FNS Handbook 501.

Data abstraction was conducted manually by NORC staff using a pre-formatted Access database installed on a secure laptop computer. Staff did not have internet access while on-site at ITO offices. We conducted the case review in quiet space in the ITO warehouse during working hours (typically 8.00 AM to 4.30 PM). Members of the ITO staff were available to pull files and answer questions (e.g., to decipher handwriting on a form or to track down files). For quality control purposes, each staff entered the data independently. At the end of each day, the data were reviewed to ensure inter-rater reliability. At the end of the visit, all files were returned to the program staff. The Household Issuance List was also returned to the ITO.

Create case record database. Data abstracted from the ITO-specific case records were compiled into an Access database specifically created for the project and installed on secure laptop computers for use on-site. The database was de-identified to maintain privacy. All household names were removed. Dates of birth were converted to ages.

DATA COLLECTED

An electronic data abstraction form was created to collect information about FDPIR participants and household members for the reference month, as shown in Appendix B.2. We reviewed FDPIR application forms from multiple ITOs and modelled the data abstraction template on the content of the forms.

Staffing and Training for the Case Record Reviews

NORC staff conducted the data abstractions for the case-record review, including two senior staff and four junior research staff who were trained on the data security and abstraction procedures.

The NORC staff that conducted the case record review were also involved in developing the data abstraction procedures, the codebook, and the quality control process, as well as conducting the outreach with the ITOs and Tribal IRBs. Through this process, we established working relationships with the ITOs and FDPIR staff. Our interactions with each ITO were guided by communication protocols to ensure sensitivity to Tribal research regulations.

Following OMB approval, we held training for the on-site case record review at NORC's Bethesda, MD office. The training covered the programmatic, technical, and cultural aspects of the study, involving the following components: (1) Understanding the study purpose; (2) Knowledge of the FDPIR program including program purpose, eligibility requirements, application procedures, benefit computation, and variations in ITO implementation; (3) Review of sampling procedures; (4) Review of case record review procedures; (5) Simulation of the data abstraction process (using dummy case records); (6) Mock quality control review; (7) Cultural competency and Tribal-specific site protocols; and (8) Methods for integrating ITO staff capacity-building in all aspects of the process.

Quality Control for Case Record Reviews

NORC conducted inter-rater reliability checks to ensure quality control of the case records abstracted for each site. For the sites where only one staff conducted the case record review all records were double-checked and corrected if necessary. Independent review of the resulting datasets was conducted by a member of NORC's team who was not involved in the on-site data abstraction. The quality control review ensured that the dataset was complete, correct, and contained accurate information. Any discrepancies were reconciled by referring back to the case review records.

The Access database was programmed to incorporate the following checks to detect errors and ensure the integrity of FDPIR data:

- Range checks ensured that every variable abstracted contained only data within a limited domain of valid values for categorical (e.g., gender) and chronological variables (e.g., age, dollar amounts), as well as lower-upper bounds and error flags.
- Consistency checks verified that values from one data field on the case review record were consistent with values from another data field (e.g., employment status and earnings).

- Demographic consistency of the household. The consistency between the ages and genders of all household members was checked with a view to kinship relationships. Once the date of birth was entered, the database converted the date to age of the household member so that we did not retain this element of personally-identifiable information.
- Consistency of age and other individual characteristics checked that the age of each household member was consistent with personal characteristics such as marital status, relationship to the head of the household, income source, etc.
- Control totals. Income, resources, educational supports, and allowable deductions were summed to ensure that the control total equaled the sum of the individual numbers.

Typographical checks were conducted to guard against transposition of digits for numerical input (i.e., age, dollar amounts, addresses, etc.). The Access database used on-site was segmented by Tribe/ITO. The system generated a unique identifier for both the tribe and the participant. For quality control purposes, the database also recorded the initials of the data entry staff and a date/time stamp.

While conducting the case record review, we also collected contact information for the participant (head of household). Once staff completed the data entry and the inter-rater reliability check, we validated the dataset and then exported the data to an Excel file for safekeeping. Upon return to NORC offices, staff uploaded the Access data file to the master database on NORC's secure server, in a folder with restricted access. Staff then deleted the case record information from their laptop-specific databases. This file included all data elements on household characteristics, as shown in Exhibit B.1. The data compiled across all 23 ITOs was then used to FDPIR Program Participant Characteristics analysis file. A second file, stored on a secure server, contained the contact information of participants (and their authorized representatives) that was used for the FDPIR Participant Survey. We did not link the case record review dataset with the participant survey datasets for analysis; therefore unique identifiers were not created.

EXHIBIT B.1

Case Record Data Elements

Case Record Number (a Tribal-specific code followed by a 4-digit number -0001,-0002, etc.)

Information on Head of Household (used to contact participants for the survey)

- Tribe/ITO
- Name [last name for initial data entry purposes and then deleted once the data was uploaded to the secure server]
- Household size [1-16 persons]
- Length of certification period [1-24 months] (per FNS Handbook 501 (Rev. 2/2010))
- Telephone
- Address
- Directions to house [if available, used for Field Interviewer locating]

Information on each household member (including HOH)

- Personal identifier [ITO identifier with system-generated number]
- Name [first initial with last name for initial data entry purposes and then deleted once the data were validated onsite]
- Relationship to HOH [self, spouse/partner, son, daughter, grandchild, sibling, step or foster child, mother, father, niece, nephew, cousin, in-law, roomer/boarder, other, etc.]
- DOB [mm/dd/yyyy] [Recalculated to indicate Age]
- Gender (male, female, transgender)
- SNAP
 - Whether currently receiving SNAP (Y/N)
 - Whether recently applied for SNAP (Y/N)
 - Past participation in SNAP (if this is in the case record) (Y/N)
 - Whether respondent or anyone in household has ever been disqualified from SNAP(Y/N)
- Income (Earned and unearned)^{1 2}
 - Income source 1 and amount
 - Income source 2 and amount
 - Income source 3 and amount
 - Income source 4 and amount
 - *Total of earned income sources*
 - Self-employment income (Y/N)
 - Type of occupation
 - Primary source of income (Y/N)
 - Student status (Y/N)
 - Receipt of educational grants, scholarships, or loans (Y/N),
 - Amount and type
 - *Total of earned income sources*
- Resources
 - Cash
 - Checking/savings accounts
 - Stocks, bonds, certificate of deposit, other
 - *Total resources*

¹ Wages, social security, SSI, TANF, general/public assistance, foster care payments, unemployment or worker's compensation, child support, alimony, pensions, Veteran's benefits, per capita payments from gambling enterprises, work/training allowances, etc..

² Frequently Asked Questions on FDIPR Household Eligibility (Rev. 8/5/2010): Based on treaties and other legal documents (including court judgments), laws have been enacted to specify that certain funds are to be excluded as income and/or a resource in determining eligibility for any Federal or federally assisted means-tested program. This list is posted on the FDPIR website at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/fdd/programs/fdpir/fdpir_guidance.htm .

B2. Abstraction Template

[NAME]		[ITO #-001]		CASE NUMBER (system generated from AIS) [#]		[NEW/RECERTIFIED]																		
TRIBE/ITO		FDPIR IDENTIFIER		FDPIR PARTICIPANT		HOUSEHOLD SIZE CERTIFICATION STATUS																		
RELATIONSHIP TO FDPIR APPLICANT		AG E		FOOD STAMPS			INCOME (EARNED AND UNEARNED)						SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME			STUDENTS					RESOURCES			
		Receiv g?	Applie d?	Disquali fied?	Source 1: Income Type	Amount	Source 2: Income Type	Amount	Source 3: Income Type	Amount	Source 4: Income Type	Amount	Household Member Self- Employed	Type of Busine ss	Occupatio n	Primary Source of Income?	Student Receiving Financial Aid?	Amount of Loan/Gra nt	Time Period	Type of Paymen t	Amount Used for Tuition/F ees	Cash on Hand	Checking/ Savings Account	Stock/Bon ds/CDs/Ot her
		Y/N	Y/N	Y/N		Enter \$ amount		Enter \$ amount		Enter \$ amount		Enter \$ amount	Y/N			Y/N/NA	Y/N	Enter \$ amount			Enter \$ amount	Enter \$ amount	Enter \$ amount	Enter \$ amount
1	self															Y/N/NA								
2																Y/N/NA								
3																Y/N/NA								
4																Y/N/NA								
5																Y/N/NA								
6																Y/N/NA								
7																Y/N/NA								
8																Y/N/NA								
9																Y/N/NA								
10																Y/N/NA								
11																Y/N/NA								
12																Y/N/NA								
13																Y/N/NA								
14																Y/N/NA								
15																Y/N/NA								
16																Y/N/NA								

Relationship to FDPIR Applicant	Income	Self-Employment Income	Type of Student Aid
A Spouse	A Social Security	A Rental Property	A Pell Grant
B Partner	B SSI	B Roomers	B Student Loan
C Son	C TANF	C Boarders	C BIA
D Daughter	D General/Public Assistance	D Farming	D Scholarship
E Step-child	E Foster Care Payments	E Ranching	E Other:
F Foster-child	F Unemployment Insurance	F Own business	
G Mother	G Worker's Compensation	G Other:	
H Step-mother	H Child Support		
I Father	I Alimony		
J Step-father	J Pensions		
K Brother	K Veteran's Benefits		
L Sister	L Per capita payments		
M Grandmother	M Work/training allowances		
N Grandfather	N Other:		
O Aunt	O No income source		
P Uncle			
Q Cousin			
R Niece			
S Nephew			
T Mother-in-law			
U Father-in-law			
V Sister-in-law			
W Brother-in-law			
X Other-in-law			
Y Roomer/boarder			
Z Other non-relative			

Appendix C. Participant Survey Instrument

OMB Control Number: 0584-0583
Expiration Date 08/14/16

Introduction and Informed Consent

INTERVIEWER READ: “Hello, my name is [NAME OF INTERVIEWER] from NORC at the University of Chicago. [IF IN PERSON - SHOW NORC ID CARD.] I am [CALLING/CONTACTING YOU] about the Study of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations. Have you by any chance received our letter? It tells about the study and also mentions you will receive (CASH/GIFT CARD).

IF YES: Do you have any questions about the survey? May I tell you more about the survey?

IF NO: IN PERSON: Here is a copy of the letter and some information about the project. Should I leave the materials and come back or call at a later time or could I answer any questions you may have at this time?

IF NO: TELEPHONE: I can read the letter to you and also send you another copy and some additional materials in the mail.

PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT

As you may have learned from the [ADVANCE LETTER SENT/MATERIALS SHARED/TRIBAL LETTER/COMMUNITY PRESENTATION HELD], this survey is being done to help understand the food needs of American Indian and Alaska Native families. It is sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

Your participation is very important to the success of this survey. This survey is voluntary, which means that you don't have to take the survey if you don't want to, and you can decide not to answer any specific questions. You also may end the interview at any point. You will receive a [CASH GIFT/ GIFT CARD/VOUCHER] as a thank you for taking the survey. You will receive the [CASH GIFT/ GIFT CARD/VOUCHER] even if you decide to end the survey early. The interview will take about 45 minutes.

The survey will ask you about the members of your household, (FDPIR/NAME OF PROGRAM) contribution to your food supply, the distribution and delivery of the FDPIR food packages, your food access and costs, any nutrition and health related services available, switching between SNAP and FDPIR and your satisfaction with the FDPIR program.

INFORMED CONSENT CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE

3

The information you provide will be helpful to improve food services in your community and other communities in Indian Country. At the end of the study we will prepare a summary of all of the responses to the survey in a computer data file. The summary will include responses from people in many tribal communities. The summary is called a public use file. It will not contain any names or addresses or other information that could identify you or your tribe. The summary will be carefully protected. We will give it to the federal Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service. We are required to give it to them. Other researchers who are interested in the FDPIR program may use the public use file someday.

The (NAME OF TRIBE) may ask us to give back the responses from your community. If they do, we will give them a summary of responses in a computer file. That computer file will not have names or addresses. We will hide or take out any information that may identify you or anyone in your household, such as the number of persons who live there. This is done to protect your confidentiality. But there is always a slight chance that tribal officials or administrators will be able to identify people based on the responses. It is possible, but not likely. We are very careful about protecting your personal information.

If you have questions about your rights as a survey participant, please call the IRB Human Subjects Protection hotline, toll-free, at (866) 309-0542. You may also email fdpir-study@norc.org or visit www.norc.org.

Do I have your permission to begin the interview?

D IF YES, Let's begin. **GO TO SECTION "HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION"**

D IF NO, ASK:

Are there any questions I can answer for you?

What is the reason you prefer not doing the interview?

When is a good time to come back?

Date: / /

Time: :

AM/PM (circle)

MM/DD/YY

HH:MM

INFORMED CONSENT FOR USE OF PROXY

STEP 1. *If respondent declines to participate in the interview but requests that another person responds to the questions on his/her behalf, continue:*

Note: We anticipate that there will be instances where an elder wishes that another person (e.g., adult child, grandchild) speaks on his/her behalf about participation in the program.

FOR IN-PERSON INTERVIEW: I have chosen not to participate in the interview but would like [name of person] to answer the survey questions for me.

Request signature if the interview is conducted in person:

Respondent Name:

Signature:

FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW: You stated that “I have chosen not to participate in the interview but would like [name of person] to answer the survey questions for me.” Is this correct?

D IF **YES**, I will note your agreement and obtain informed consent from [name of person].
Respondent Name:

D IF **NO**, Thank you for your time. [Terminate interview.]

Date and time permission obtained:

Date: /_ / Time: _: AM/PM (circle)

Step 2. To consent the person who will respond on the respondents’ behalf:
[Name of respondent’s] has declined to participate in the interview and requests that you answer questions about [his/her] FDPIR participation. Would you be able to answer questions on his/her behalf?

IF YES, I will need to request your informed consent to answer the survey questions.

IF NO, Thank you for your time. [Terminate interview.]

As you may have learned from the [ADVANCE LETTER SENT/MATERIALS SHARED/TRIBAL LETTER/COMMUNITY PRESENTATION HELD], this survey is conducted to help understand the food needs of American Indian and Alaska Native families. It is sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service.

Your participation is very important to the success of this survey. This survey is voluntary, which means that you don’t have to participate and you can decide not to answer any specific questions.

You also may end the interview at any point. You will receive a [CASH GIFT/ GIFT CARD/VOUCHER] as a token of appreciation for participating in the survey. The interview will take about 45 minutes.

The information you provide will be kept private, and will not be shared with anyone except for research staff working on the study. This includes anything that can identify you such as the [respondent's] name, address, or telephone number. Everyone who works on this survey has signed a legal document stating they will not reveal any of his/her personal information and can be severely penalized if they do. A report that summarizes the findings will be shared with the tribe/native village at a later date. Names of individuals or tribes/native villages will not be used in the report. All information is aggregated at the national level. A report that summarizes the survey findings will be shared with the tribe/native village at a later date, but it will not include names of individuals or tribes/native villages.

The survey will ask about the members of [his/her] household, (FDPIR/name of program) contribution to [his/her] food supply, the distribution and delivery of the FDPIR food packages, [his/her] food access and costs, any nutrition and health related services available, switching between SNAP and FDPIR and [his/her] satisfaction with the FDPIR program.

The information you provide on [respondent's name behalf] will be helpful to improve food services in [his/her] community and other communities in Indian Country.

If you have questions about your rights as a survey participant, please call the IRB Human Subjects Protection hotline, toll-free, at (866) 309-0542. You may also email @norc.org or visit www.norc.org.

USE OF PROXY

(Name of Respondent) has given permission for you to act as a proxy for him/her and answer questions for the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations. The interview will take approximately 40 minutes). Remember you are answering the questions for (name of respondent) and not as you would answer them for yourself. I will remind you of that again during the interview. Do you have any questions? Is now a good time to start?

D IF YES, Let's begin. [Certain tribes may require written consent] Date and time permission obtained:

Date: /_ / Time: _: AM/PM (circle)

Name of Proxy:

Signature of Proxy

D IF NO, ASK:
Are there any questions I can answer for you?

When is a good time to do the interview?

Date: /_ / Time: _: AM/PM (circle)

If the respondent has requested that a translator be used to assist with the interview, continue:

USE OF TRANSLATOR

(Name of Respondent) has given permission for you to act as a proxy for him/her and answer questions for the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes). Remember you are answering the questions for (name of respondent) and not as you would answer them for yourself. I will remind you of that again during the interview. Do you have any questions? Is now a good time to start?

D IF YES, Let's begin. [Certain tribes may require written

consent] Date and time permission obtained:

Date: /_ / Time: _: AM/PM (circle)

Name of Translator:

Signature of Translator

D IF NO, ASK:

Are there any questions I can answer for you?

When is a good time to do the interview?

Date: /_ / Time: _: AM/PM (circle)

HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION

In this interview, I am going to ask you some questions about you and the people living with you, as well as your use of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, or FDPIR. First, we would like to ask you about the people living in your household.

1	<p>Please tell me the names of all persons who live in your household starting with you – the FDPIR applicant. Just tell me their first names. Let’s start with you. ONCE R IS FINISHED LISTING NAMES, ASK: ...Do you have a spouse living in the household? ...any children? ...any grandchildren? ...any relatives? ...anyone that is not related to you? ...anyone else that you have not mentioned? I have listed...(read names from grid)...Have I missed- ...any babies or small children? ...anyone who usually lives with you but is away now traveling, at school, or in the hospital? ...any lodgers, boarders, or persons you employ who live with you? ...anyone who is part of the household but is away on full-time active duty with the Armed Forces? ...anyone else staying with you?</p> <p>IF RESPONDENT SAYS ‘YES’ TO AN ANY OF THE CATEGORIES ADD THAT PERSON(S) TO THE LIST ON THE GRID.</p>
2	Now we would like to ask how each person is related to you. Let’s start with (name of first person), how is he/she related to you?
3	ASK OR VERIFY GENDER OF EACH PERSON LISTED.
4	How old were (you/person) on your/his/her last birthday?
5	FOR EACH PERSON 16 YEARS AND OLDER ASK: What is (your/person’s) current marital status. Is he/she married, never married, separated, widowed or divorced?
6	FOR EACH PERSON ASK: What is the highest year of education (you/person) has completed?
7	FOR EACH PERSON ASK: Are you/person currently a student?
8	FOR EACH PERSON OVER 18: Are you/person currently employed? IF YES: Are you/person (READ CATEGORIES ON CHART) CODE EMPLOYMENT STATUS FOR EACH PERSON. IF WORKING: How many hours per week do you/does person work?
9	Does anyone in the household receive Social Security, SSI, LIHEAP, TANF or unemployment benefits? IF YES: Who and what do they receive?
10	Does anyone in the household have access to the internet? IF YES: Who?
11	Does anyone in the household own or lease a vehicle? IF YES: Who

ASK QUESTIONS 9, 10, AND 11 ONCE
 QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 8 ARE ASKED
 FOR ENTIRE HOUSEHOLD. PLEASE
 MARK ANSWERS FOR EACH PERSON

Person #	1. Please tell me [your name/the name of the next person living in the household].	2. REL TO APPLICANT	3. GENDER	4. AGE	5. [IF 16 OR OLDER] What is your/this person's current marital status? CODE USING OPTIONS BELOW	6. What is the highest year of education (you/ person) has completed? CODE USING OPTIONS BELOW	7. Are you/ person currently a student? CODE Y OR N	8. [IF OVER 18] Are you/person currently employed? IF YES: Are you/person [READ CATEGORIES BELOW AND CODE]	8a. IF EMPLOYED: How many hours do you/does person work?	9. Does anyone in the household receive [READ BELOW AND ENTER CODES OR F FOR NONE]	10. Does anyone in the household have access to the internet? [YES/NO]	11. Does anyone in the household own or lease a vehicle? [YES/NO]
01		SELF										
02												
03												
04												
05												
06												
07												
08												
09												
10												
11												
12												
	Relationship to Applicant		Marital Status		Education		Employment Status		Other Benefits (Question 9)			
	a. Spouse b. Partner c. Son/Daughter d. Grandson/granddaughter e. Step-child f. Foster child g. Mother h. Step mother i. Foster mother j. Father k. Step-father l. Foster father	m. Brother/sister n. Grandparent o. Uncle p. Aunt q. Cousin r. Nephew/niece s. Father-in-law t. Mother-in-law u. Bro/sis-in-law v. Other-in-law w. Other non-relative	Married (M) Never married (NM) Separated (S) Divorced (D) Widowed (W)	a. Less than high school b. Some high school, no diploma c. High school diploma d. Technical school e. Trade apprentice f. Some college, no diploma g. College degree h. Graduate or professional studies after college i. Graduate degree j. Don't know k. Refused	l. Working full time m. Working part time n. Retired o. In school p. Cannot work – disabled q. Job training r. TANF approved work activity s. Not working t. Something else (SPECIFY)	a. SS b. LIHEAP c. TANF d. Unemployment Insurance e. SSI f. NONE						

Section A: Participant and Household Characteristics

This section of the interview will help us better understand the characteristics of FDPIR participants and their households. We'll begin by talking about where you live, what kind of resources you have in your home for preparing and storing food and who prepares food.

A1. First, do you live within or off the [RESERVATION/PUEBLO/RACHERIA/ALASKA NATIVE VILLAGE/TRIBAL SERVICE AREA]?

- ON/WITHIN 1
- OFF 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

A2. Which of the following equipment or methods of food storage and preparations do you use in your home?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- Gas/Electric stove 1
- Gas/electric oven 2
- Wood stove 3
- Microwave 4
- Hotplate 5
- Open fire 6
- Refrigerator 7
- Freezer 8
- Root cellar 9
- Ice house 10
- Food canning..... 11
- Food drying/dehydrator..... 12
- Other SPECIFY): 13
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

A3. Who in your household has the major responsibility for preparing meals?

REFER TO HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION, COLUMN 1, FOR PERSON #

PERSON #

A3a. Does [NAME OF PERSON/this person] feel adequately prepared to cook the food provided by FDPIR?

- Yes 1
- No..... 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

- A4. What is your main source of water for preparing meals? Is it...
- Public or private water system (includes city water) .. 1
 - Individual well 2
 - Spring 3
 - Cistern 4
 - Stream or lake 5
 - Commercial bottled water 6
 - Other (SPECIFY): 7
 - DON'T KNOW DK
 - REFUSED..... REF
- A5. Now I'd like to ask you some questions about the kinds of health care services and insurance coverage used by members of your household.
I am going to show you/read a list to you with the responses or you can add your own. Do you or your family receive any medical services on the [reservation/pueblo/Rancheria/Alaska native village/tribal service area]?
- Yes 1
 - No 2
 - DON'T KNOW DK
 - REFUSED..... REF
- IF A5 = YES, GO TO QUESTION A5A**
IF A5 = NO/DK/REF, GO TO QUESTION A6
- A5a. Please refer to Showcard A. What are the sources of these services?
MARK ALL THAT APPLY
- Tribal or IHS Health Center or Clinic 1
 - Urban Indian Health Center 2
 - Tribally-managed or IHS Hospital..... 3
 - Tribal or IHS Mobile Clinic or Lab (van) 4
 - Home visits (by a physician or visiting nurse) 5
 - Traditional Healers..... 6
 - Community Health Representative..... 7
 - Wellness Center 8
 - Emergency Medical Services..... 9
 - Tele-health services 10
 - County/Local Health Center..... 11
 - County/Local Hospital..... 12
 - Managed Care Organization 13
 - Private doctor's office 14
 - Local Public Health Department 15
 - Other (SPECIFY): 16
 - DON'T KNOW DK
 - REFUSED..... REF
- A6. The next questions are about the types of health care plans and what sources are available for medical care. Is anyone in the household covered by health insurance or some other kind of health care plan?
- Yes 1
 - No 2
 - DON'T KNOW DK
 - REFUSED..... REF
- IF A6 = YES, GO TO QUESTION A6a**
IF A6 = NO/DK/REF, GO TO QUESTION A7

A6a. Is anyone covered by:

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
1. Private Health Insurance	1	2	DK	REF
2. Medicare	1	2	DK	REF
3. Medicaid	1	2	DK	REF
4. Military Health Care (TRICARE, VA, and others)	1	2	DK	REF
5. State Sponsored Health Plan	1	2	DK	REF
6. Other Government Program	1	2	DK	REF
7. Single Service (E.G., dental, vision, prescriptions)	1	2	DK	REF
8. No coverage of any type	1	2	DK	REF
9. SCHIP – State Children’s Health Insurance Program	1	2	DK	REF
10. OTHER:	1	2	DK	REF

A7. I’m going to read you a list of common health problems. Does anyone in your household currently have any of the following health problems?

INTERVIEWER: IF ‘YES’ TO ANY CATEGORY (A8a THROUGH A8j) ASK FOLLOWING QUESTION AND ENTER

IN SPACE PROVIDED : How many household members experience (HEALTH PROBLEM)?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED	HOW MANY HH MEMBERS
A. High blood pressure	1	2	DK	REF	
B. Diabetes (sugar)	1	2	DK	REF	
C. Overweight/obesity	1	2	DK	REF	
D. Heart disease	1	2	DK	REF	
E. Cancer	1	2	DK	REF	
F. Underweight	1	2	DK	REF	
G. Liver disease	1	2	DK	REF	
H. Gastro-intestinal problems (e.g., Irritable Bowel Syndrome, ulcers, lactose intolerance, diarrhea)	1	2	DK	REF	
I. Vitamin or mineral deficiencies or anemia	1	2	DK	REF	
J. OTHER:	1	2	DK	REF	

A8. Are there food items you or anyone in your household cannot or should not eat? These could include foods that cause food allergies, and foods needed for special diets and the like.

- Yes 1
- No..... 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF A8 = YES, GO TO QUESTION A8a
IF A8 = NO/DK/REF, GO TO QUESTION A9

A8a. What are they...

INTERVIEWER: IF 'YES' TO ANY CATEGORY (A8aa THROUGH A8AH) ASK FOLLOWING QUESTION
AND ENTER # IN SPACE PROVIDED : How many household members have a (CATEGORY) diet?

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED	HOW MANY HH MEMBERS
A. Low salt	1	2	DK	REF	
B. Low sugar	1	2	DK	REF	
C. Low fat	1	2	DK	REF	
D. Lactose intolerant	1	2	DK	REF	
E. Gluten intolerant	1	2	DK	REF	
F. High protein	1	2	DK	REF	
G. Food allergies	1	2	DK	REF	
H. Other (SPECIFY):	1	2	DK	REF	

A9. Now we're going to change topics and talk about your housing and utility expenses. Can you tell me whether you are buying your home, own your home, renting, live rent-free or have some other arrangement?

- Own home..... 1
- Renting 2
- Other (SPECIFY): 3
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

A10. **HAND SHOWCARD B TO RESPONDENT**

Now I would like to ask about your rent or mortgage payments. Do not include utilities.

IN PERSON: Please look at this card and show me the amount you pay for your rent or mortgage each month. You can just give me the letter if you prefer.

BY PHONE: Please listen to the options and tell me the letter that corresponds to the amount you pay for your rent or mortgage.

- A. Less than \$100 1
- B. \$100 to \$199 2
- C. \$200 to \$249 3
- D. \$250 to \$299 4
- E. \$300 to \$349 5
- F. \$350 to \$399 6
- G. \$400 to \$449 7
- H. \$450 to \$499 8
- I. \$500 to \$599 9
- J. \$600 to \$699 10
- K. \$700 to \$799 11
- L. \$800 to \$999 12
- M. \$1,000 to \$1,249 13
- N. \$1,250 to \$1,499 14
- O. \$1,500 to \$1,999 15
- P. \$1,500 to \$1,999 16
- Q. \$2,500 or more 17
- R. No cash paid for rent/mortgage 18
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED REF

A11. Now I would like to ask you about the amount you pay for utilities each month. Please think about the total amount you pay for gas, electricity, water, trash collection and telephone.

IN PERSON: HAND/READ SHOWCARD C TO RESPONDENT. Please look at this card and tell me the amount you pay each month.

TELEPHONE: Please listen to the options and tell me the amount you pay each month.

- Less than \$100 1
- \$100 to \$199 2
- \$200 to \$249 3
- \$250 to \$299 4
- \$300 to \$349 5
- \$350 to \$399 6
- \$400 to \$449 7
- \$450 to \$499 8
- \$500 or more 9
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED REF

OMB Control Number: 0584-0583
Expiration Date 08/14/16

A11a. What utilities/services are included in that amount?
CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- Gas 1
- Electricity..... 2
- Water 3
- Trash collection 4
- Telephone 5
- Other (SPECIFY) 6
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

Section B: FDPIR Contribution to Food Supply

These next questions are about the food eaten in your household in the last 12 months, since (current month) of last year and whether you were able to afford the food you need.

I am going to read you three statements and would like to know if during the past 12 months, that would be from (month/year), if these were often true for your household, sometimes true, or never true for your household.

B1a. The first statement is, “The food that (I/we) bought just didn’t last, and (I/we) didn’t have money to get more.” Was that often, sometimes or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON’T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B1b. “(I/we) couldn’t afford to eat balanced, nutritious meals.” Was that often, sometimes or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

- OFTEN TRUE 1
- SOMETIMES TRUE 2
- NEVER TRUE 3
- DON’T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B1c. In the last 12 months, since last (CURRENT MONTH), did (you/you or other adults your household) *ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals* because there wasn’t enough money for food?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON’T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF B1C = YES/DON’T KNOW THEN CONTINUE TO B1C1 IF B1C = NO/REFUSED THEN SKIP TO B1D

B1c1. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

- Almost every month..... 1
- Some months but not every month..... 2
- Only 1 or 2 months..... 3
- DON’T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B1d. In the last 12 months, did you *ever eat less than you felt you should* because there wasn’t enough money for food?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON’T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B1e. In the last 12 months, were you/other adults in your household *ever hungry but didn't eat* because there wasn't enough money for food?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B2. How did you learn about FDPIR? (RECORD VERBATIM AND THEN CODE ANSWER BELOW)

- PRIOR RECEIPT OF FDPIR FOODS BY HOUSEHOLD 1
- WORD OF MOUTH (I.E. FAMILY, FRIEND) 2
- REFERRAL FROM TRIBAL SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAM (SPECIFY): 3
- TRIBAL NEWSLETTER OR BROCHURE 4
- OUTREACH BY FDPIR STAFF (SPECIFY): 5
- REFERRAL FROM COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICES 6
- OTHER (SPECIFY): 7
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B3. Is FDPIR the only or primary source of food for this household?

- Yes only source of food 1
- No there are other sources 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, SKIP TO SECTION C
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO B3A

B3a. I will read you a list] with some responses to choose from or you can add your own. Thinking of the other sources of food for this household, what percentage comes from:

FI INSTRUCTION: ADD PERCENTAGES TO CHECK THAT PERCENTAGES TOTAL 100%

SOURCE OF FOOD	PERCENT
FDPIR	%
Other food programs to include, for example, National School Lunch Program, WIC, Meals on Wheels	_____ %
Extended family or tribal community	%
Grocery/supermarket/convenience store	%
Traditional/native food sources (hunting, fishing, berry picking, ricing, gardening, farming)	%
Food pantries or food banks	%
Take-out or convenience stores	%
Other (SPECIFY):	_____ %

B4. Is anyone in your household receiving benefits from or participating in food programs other than FDIPIR?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO B4A.

IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO B5

B4a. I will show you a list/read you a list with some responses to choose from or you can add your own.

Examples would include (READ CATEGORIES BELOW AND HAND/READ RESPONDENT SHOWCARD D)

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

- Child and Adult Care Food Program..... 1
- Summer Feeding Program or the
Summer Food Service Program..... 2
- Elderly Meals/ Feeding Programs 3
- Local Food Banks or Pantries 4
- Tribal Emergency Funds 5
- Meals on Wheels..... 6
- Other state, county, local programs,
other tribal programs 7
- WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program..... 8
- Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program 9
- Soup Kitchens..... 10
- Other programs(SPECIFY): 11
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B5. Has anyone in your household been referred to other food programs by the FDPIR staff? I will show you a list/read you a list with some responses to choose from or you can add your own. Examples would include (READ CATEGORIES BELOW AND HAND/READ RESPONDENT SHOWCARD E).

- Head Start (CACFP)
- School Breakfast Program
- National School Lunch Program
- Child and Adult Care Food Program
- Summer Feeding Program or the Summer Food Service Program
- Elderly Meals/ Feeding Programs
- Local Food Banks or Pantries
- Tribal Emergency Funds
- Meals on Wheels
 - Other state, county, local programs, other tribal programs
- WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program
- Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program
- Soup Kitchens

YES..... 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW DK
 REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO B5A.

IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO B6

B5a. Which programs?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

Head Start (CACFP)..... 1
 School Breakfast Program..... 2
 National School Lunch Program..... 3
 Child and Adult Care Food Program..... 4
 Summer Feeding Program or the
 Summer Food Service Program..... 5
 Elderly Meals/ Feeding Programs 6
 Local Food Banks or Pantries 7
 Tribal Emergency Funds..... 8
 Meals on Wheels..... 9
 Other state, county, local programs,
 other tribal programs 10
 WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program..... 11
 Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program 12
 Soup Kitchens..... 13
 Other programs (SPECIFY): 14
 _____ 14
 DON'T KNOW DK
 REFUSED..... REF

B6. I am going to ask you about the sources of meals for your household. By meals I mean breakfast, lunch and dinner. During the past month did you or anyone in your household get any meals that were prepared away from home in places such as restaurants, fast food places, food stands, grocery stores, or from vending machines? *Do not include meals prepared by extended family or in a community setting.*

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO B6A.
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO B7

B6a. About how often did the household eat meals prepared by such places as restaurants, fast food places, food stands, grocery stores, or from vending machines? Would you say none, some, about half, or most?

- NONE..... 1
- SOME..... 2
- ABOUT HALF..... 3
- MOST..... 4
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

B7. During the past month did you or anyone in your household get any meals that were prepared outside your home by extended family or prepared by a community group?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO B7a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION C

B7a. How often did the household eat meals prepared outside your home by extended family or prepared by a community group? Would you say none, some, about half or most meals?

- NONE..... 1
- SOME..... 2
- ABOUT HALF..... 3
- MOST..... 4
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

C3a. Are you satisfied with this method?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF NO, GO TO C3b
IF YES/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO C4

C3b. What would you prefer?

C4. Thinking about **picking up your food packages**, approximately how many miles do you have to travel to pick up the food packages?

_____ MILES

C4a. About how long does it usually take to get there?

_____ HOURS MINUTES

C4b. What kind of transportation do you usually use? Is it your own car or truck, someone else drove you, you walked, took public transportation, taxi or some other way?

- OWN CAR OR TRUCK..... 1
- SOMEONE ELSE DROVE (SPECIFY):
_____..... 2
- WALKED 3
- PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION 4
- TAXI 5
- SOME OTHER WAY (SPECIFY):
_____..... 6
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

C5. Do you have an authorized representative pick up your food packages?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO C5a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO C6

C5a. Approximately how many miles does the representative travel to pick up the food packages?

_____ MILES

C5b. About how long does it usually take your representative to get there?

_____ HOURS MINUTES

C5c. What kind of transportation does he/she use? Is it their own car or truck, they walked, took public transportation, taxi or some other means of transportation?

- OWN CAR OR TRUCK..... 1
- SOMEONE ELSE DROVE (SPECIFY):
- _____ 2
- WALKED 3
- PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION 4
- TAXI 5
- SOME OTHER WAY (SPECIFY):
- _____ 6
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

C6. Does traveling to the FDPIR site present any challenges or problems for you?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO C6a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION D

C6a. Please describe why this is challenging.

Section D: Food Access and Cost – Non-subsidized Sources

We are also interested in finding out how easy or hard it is to obtain food in your area and about food costs.

D1. We are also interested in the distance of other food outlets/suppliers/sources than FDPIR from your home. Approximately how many miles is the nearest (CATEGORY) and what is the travel time to get there?

	MILES	HOURS/MINUTES	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
D1a. Nearest food retail store that sells produce		H: M:	DK	REF
D1b. Nearest grocery store		H: M:	DK	REF
D1c. Nearest convenience store		H: M:	DK	REF
D1d. Nearest farmers market		H: M:	DK	REF
D1e. Nearest warehouse/department/large big-box store that sells groceries (i.e. Walmart, Costco, Sam's Club)		H: M:	DK	REF

D2. Thinking about the past year, that would be from about <CURRENT MONTH> 2013, have there been any changes in your access to food sources. Examples of changes could be opening or closing of supermarkets, changes in food programs and the like.

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO D2a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO D3

D2a. What are these changes?

D3. On **average**, what does your household spend each month on food (including food consumed at home and food consumed outside the home)?

\$ PER MONTH

D3a. Are there seasons when your household spends considerably less on food expenses?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO D3b
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO D3d

D3b. Which seasons?

SEASON: _____ SEASON:
SEASON: _____ SEASON:

D3c. Why is that?

D3d. Are there seasons when your household spends considerably more on food expenses?

YES.....

. 1

NO

..... 2

DON'T KNOW

DK

REFUSED.....

REF

IF YES, GO TO D3e

IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, SKIP TO SECTION E

D3e. Which seasons?

SEASON:

SEASON:

SEASON:

SEASON:

D3f. Why is that?

Section E: Participation in FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps

The next few questions will be about whether your household has also participated in SNAP/Food Stamp program as well as FDPIR, if you have ever switched between the two programs, and your reasons for doing so.

E1. Counting this month, how many months straight have you received FDPIR benefits?
 MONTHS:

IF NUMBER OF MONTHS IS MORE THAN 12 MONTHS, SKIP TO QUESTION E7

E1a. Now we are going to ask you about your household's participating in food programs in the past twelve months. To start, I am going to fill out a chart for each of the past twelve months.

INTERVIEWER: IF AVAILABLE ENTER THE MONTHS OF PARTICIPATION INFORMATION FROM AUTOMATED INVENTORY SYSTEM (AIS) DATABASE IN THE CHART BELOW.

IF INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE, GATHER INFORMATION FROM RESPONDENT.

ON ROW 1 UNDER MONTH IN THE CHART BELOW ENTER THE NEXT MONTH FROM THE INTERVIEW. (FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU ARE CONDUCTING THE INTERVIEW IN MARCH – ENTER APRIL). CONTINUE TO FILL IN THE MONTHS. THE LAST MONTH, ON ROW 12, WILL BE THE CURRENT MONTH. THEN ENTER THE YEAR THAT CORRESPONDS TO EACH MONTH TO SHOW THE LAST YEAR UP UNTIL THE INTERVIEW. HAND/READ RESPONDENT SHOWCARD F.

ALL MONTH LINES NEED TO HAVE AN ENTRY IN ONE OF THE LAST THREE SHADED COLUMNS

ASK: Starting in [MONTH] of [YEAR], did you receive SNAP benefits, FDPIR, or neither?

INTERVIEWER: CHECK OFF APPROPRIATE BOX IN GREY AREA FOR THAT MONTH AND YEAR. GO TO NEXT ROW AND RE-ASK QUESTION FOR EACH MONTH UNTIL ALL ROWS ARE COMPLETED.

IF RESPONDENT RECEIVED BOTH TYPES OF BENEFITS IN THAT CALENDAR MONTH, CHECK OFF BENEFIT THAT THEY RECEIVED FOR THE MAJORITY OF THAT MONTH.

ROW	MONTH	YEAR	SNAP	FDPIR	NEITHER
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12		2014			

IF ALL MONTHS ARE FILLED IN FOR FDPIR AND/OR SNAP (NEITHER IS NOT SELECTED): SKIP TO QE4.

IF THERE ARE ANY MONTHS WHERE 'NEITHER' IS CHECKED OFF: SKIP TO QE3.

IF THE RESPONDENT DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION: CONTINUE BELOW.

E3. I see that you did not participate in either FDPIR or SNAP in [MONTHS/YEARS]. Can you tell me way? THIS MAY INVOLVE CONSECUTIVE OR NON-CONSECUTIVE MONTHS. ASK ABOUT ALL MONTHS AND LIST UNTIL ALL REASONS HAVE BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR.

RECORD VERBATIM AND CODE BELOW

- WAS NOT ELIGIBLE (INCOME RELATED REASON) 1
- DID NOT APPLY IN TIME 2
- WAS RECEIVING FOOD BENEFITS THROUGH ANOTHER HOUSEHOLD 3
- HAD OTHER SOURCES OF FOOD (PERSONAL, COMMUNITY) 4
- DID NOT LIVE IN THE AREA 5
- OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ 6
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED REF

E4. **INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT CHANGED FROM FDPIR TO SNAP IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, ASK FOLLOWING QUESTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO E5.**

I see that you **changed from FDPIR to SNAP/Food Stamps** in <MONTHS/YEARS>. I will show you a list/read you a list with some responses to choose from or you can add your own. What was the reason/were the reasons for changing from FDPIR to SNAP? HAND/READ RESPONDENT SHOWCARD G AND READ THE STATEMENTS ALOUD. MARK ALL THAT APPLY. CONTINUE GOING THROUGH THE LIST UNTIL ALL CHANGES HAVE BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
E4a. Because the size and income resources of my household changed so I was now eligible for SNAP	1	2	DK	REF
E4b. Because I participate in the TANF program	1	2	DK	REF
E4c. Because I prefer having a greater variety of food choices or options	1	2	DK	REF
E4d. Because the food in the store/supermarket is better quality than the USDA Foods	1	2	DK	REF
E4e. Because I have less time to prepare and cook food , don't know how to cook, don't like to cook or don't have the time to cook, needed greater flexibility and can buy convenience and prepared foods	1	2	DK	REF
E4f. Because I needed to buy specific foods for household members (e.g., dietary restrictions)	1	2	DK	REF
E4g. In the summer I have more responsibility for feeding children not in school.	1	2	DK	REF
E4h. Because I have greater privacy obtaining food using the EBT card	1	2	DK	REF

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
E4i. Because I can use the EBT card at a convenience store or gas station	1	2	DK	REF
E4j. Because the store/market is closer to where I live than the distribution site	1	2	DK	REF
E4k. Because I was going away for a period of time and would be able to use SNAP benefits anywhere	1	2	DK	REF
E4l. Because I think I can get more food on SNAP benefits than FDPIR	1	2	DK	REF
E4m. Because of another reason (SPECIFY):	1	2	DK	REF

E5. **INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT CHANGED FROM SNAP TO FDPIR IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, ASK FOLLOWING QUESTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO E6.**

I see that you **changed from SNAP/Food Stamps to FDPIR** in <MONTHS/YEARS>. I will show you a list/read you a list with some responses to choose from or you can add your own. What was the reason/were the reasons for changing from SNAP to FDPIR?

HAND/READ RESPONDENT SHOWCARD H AND READ THE STATEMENTS ALOUD. MARK ALL THAT APPLY. CONTINUE GOING THROUGH THE LIST UNTIL ALL CHANGES HAVE BEEN ACCOUNTED FOR.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
E5a. Because it is easier to qualify for FDPIR	1	2	DK	REF
E5b. Because I receive a greater quantity of food through FDPIR	1	2	DK	REF
E5c. Because the quality of the USDA Foods is better	1	2	DK	REF
E5d. Because I wanted to stock up on canned and dried goods	1	2	DK	REF
E5e. Because I don't like the SNAP/food stamp certification process, because I don't like the way I am treated at the county office or similar problem.	1	2	DK	REF
E5f. Because the county office is too far way and difficult to get to	1	2	DK	REF
E5g. Because the FDPIR pick-up/distribution site is closer than going to the store/market	1	2	DK	REF
E5h. Because I don't know how to use/feel comfortable using an EBT card	1	2	DK	REF
E5i. Because I feel that people in the store/market look down on me when I use the EBT card	1	2	DK	REF
E5j. Because of another reason (SPECIFY):	1	2	DK	REF

E6. **INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT REPORTED USING SNAP BENEFITS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, CONTINUE. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO E7.**

You said that your household received SNAP/Food Stamps during the last year. About how much was the amount received each month?

\$ PER MONTH

E7. Has any member of the household ever been disqualified from participation in the FDPIR program?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO E7a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, SKIP TO SECTION F

E7a. Please explain:

Section F: Nutrition Education and Other Services

The next few questions ask about nutrition education and other health related services.

F1. FDPIR offers nutrition education information and activities on-line and in person. Examples of these include distributing newsletters, factsheets, recipes, providing nutrition counseling, or holding cooking demonstrations and nutrition classes. Have you or anyone in your household used or taken part in any of these activities in the past year?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF NO, GO TO F1a
IF YES/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, SKIP TO F1b

F1a. Was this because they were not offered, no one was interested, considered to be not useful, no computer/internet access, timing not good, location inconvenient, no transportation or some other reason.

RECORD VERBATIM AND CODE BELOW

- NOT OFFERED..... 1
- NOT INTERESTED..... 2
- NOT USEFUL..... 3
- NO COMPUTER/INTERNET ACCESS..... 4
- TIMING NOT GOOD..... 5
- LOCATION INCONVENIENT..... 6
- NO TRANSPORTATION 7
- OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ 8
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

F1b. I am going to read you a list of items, please tell me if during the past year anyone in your household picked up any of the educational offerings or took part in any of the activities that included nutrition education . . .

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
A. Newsletters	1	2	DK	REF
B. Factsheets	1	2	DK	REF
C. Recipes/cookbooks	1	2	DK	REF
D. DVDs	1	2	DK	REF
E. Calendars	1	2	DK	REF
F. How to budget	1	2	DK	REF
G. How to grocery shop	1	2	DK	REF
H. Cooking demonstrations	1	2	DK	REF
I. Baking demonstrations	1	2	DK	REF
J. Demonstrations on how to preserve food	1	2	DK	REF
K. Demonstrations on using traditional foods	1	2	DK	REF
L. Tastings during FDP pick-up	1	2	DK	REF
M. Nutrition classes	1	2	DK	REF
N. Nutrition counseling	1	2	DK	REF
O. 'Pot luck' or similar types of gatherings	1	2	DK	REF
P. Kid nutrition	1	2	DK	REF
Q. Mothers' groups	1	2	DK	REF
R. Demonstrations on or participation in gardening	1	2	DK	REF
S. Gardening education	1	2	DK	REF
T. Health/nutrition fairs	1	2	DK	REF
U. Other (SPECIFY):	1	2	DK	REF
V. Other (SPECIFY):	1	2	DK	REF

IF F1b RESPONSES A THROUGH V ARE NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED SKIP TO F1e. IF ANY RESPONSES TO F1b A THROUGH V ARE YES, CONTINUE TO F1c.

F1c. You indicated someone in the household read or participated in the following FDPIR offerings [MENTION ALL CHECKED FROM F1b, A THROUGH V]. Have any changes been made to the household cooking or eating practices as a result of these programs, activities, or information?

YES..... 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW DK
 REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO F1d
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO F1e.

F1d. What changes have been made?

GO TO F2

F1e. Why not?

F2. Other program services offered by FDPIR alone or in coordination with other programs **are fitness and health classes, cooking classes, health fairs** and the like. Have you or anyone in your household taken part in such activities?

YES.....
..... 1
NO
.....
... 2
DON'T KNOW DK
REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO F2a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, SKIP TO F2i

F2a. Were there any changes in activity or health/fitness because of these services/activities?

YES.....
..... 1
NO
.....
... 2
DON'T KNOW DK
REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO F2b
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, SKIP TO F2c

F2b. What were the changes?

F2c. Were there any changes in diet and health because of these services/activities?

YES.....
..... 1
NO 2
DON'T KNOW DK
REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO Fd2
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO F2e

F2d. What were these changes?

GO TO F2f

F2e. Why not?

F2f. Were there any changes in food preparation because of these services/activities?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO F2g
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO F2h

F2g. What were these changes?

GO TO F3

F2h. Why not?

GO TO F3

F2i. Why not?

F3. Has FDPIR staff ever referred your household to other assistance services or programs like cash assistance or child support for example?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO F3a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION G

F3a. Which of the following programs has FDPIR staff ever referred your household to...

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
A. Head Start	1	2	DK	REF
B. Tribal TANF	1	2	DK	REF
C. Emergency Assistance	1	2	DK	REF
D. General Assistance	1	2	DK	REF
E. Elder Care	1	2	DK	REF
F. Subsidized housing	1	2	DK	REF
G. Child Support	1	2	DK	REF
H. Indian Child Welfare	1	2	DK	REF
I. Vocational education	1	2	DK	REF
J. Vocational rehabilitation	1	2	DK	REF
K. Health and wellness	1	2	DK	REF
L. Mental health	1	2	DK	REF
M. Domestic violence	1	2	DK	REF
N. Substance abuse	1	2	DK	REF
O. Something else (SPECIFY):	1	2	DK	REF

F3b. Are any of these programs or services provided in the same location as FDPIR?

YES..... 1
 NO 2
 DON'T KNOW DK
 REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO F3c
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION G

F3c. Which ones?

FI INSTRUCTIONS: FOR ANY RESPONSES ANSWERED AS 'NO/DK/REF' IN F3a, INDICATE 'NOT APPLICABLE' IN APPROPRIATE COLUMN.

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	DON'T KNOW	REFUSED
A. Head Start	1	2	NA	DK	REF
B. Tribal TANF	1	2	NA	DK	REF
C. Emergency Assistance	1	2	NA	DK	REF
D. General Assistance	1	2	NA	DK	REF
E. Elder Care	1	2	NA	DK	REF
F. Subsidized housing	1	2	NA	DK	REF
G. Child Support	1	2	NA	DK	REF
H. Indian Child Welfare	1	2	NA	DK	REF
I. Vocational education	1	2	NA	DK	REF
J. Vocational rehabilitation	1	2	NA	DK	REF
K. Health and wellness	1	2	NA	DK	REF
L. Mental health	1	2	NA	DK	REF
M. Domestic violence	1	2	NA	DK	REF
N. Substance abuse	1	2	NA	DK	REF
O. Something else (SPECIFY):	1	2	NA	DK	REF

Section G: Satisfaction with FDPIR

We are now going to talk about your satisfaction with FDPIR.

G1. What was your household’s **most important** reason for seeking food assistance through FDPIR? I will [show/read] you a list with some responses to choose from or you can add your own.

CHOOSE ONLY ONE

- Loss of job 1
- Loss of other source of income 2
- Household became eligible for FDPIR 3
- FDPIR was more convenient than other programs 4
- FDPIR changed its delivery options and it became easier for our household 5
- Loss of other benefits..... 6
- Established own household 7
- Other (SPECIFY):
_____ 8
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

- G2. FDPIR offers a variety of foods including vegetables, dry beans, juice, fruits, meats, ready to eat cereals, and miscellaneous items such as dry egg mix, cheese, crackers, noodles, peanut butter, milk and pasta to name a few. **IF RESPONDENT IS SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED, ASK WHY BELOW ITEM.**

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DON'T KNOW	REF
A. In terms of variety, how satisfied are you ...	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							
B. In terms of freshness, how satisfied are you...	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							
C. In terms of quality, how satisfied are you...	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							
D. In terms of nutritional value, how satisfied are you...	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							
E. In terms of taste appeal, how satisfied are you? FI PROBE: salty, sweet, sour, old, stale, greasy)	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							
F. In terms of visual appeal of packaging and food, how satisfied are you?	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							
G. What is your overall satisfaction with the FDPIR food package?	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: Why are you not satisfied?							

G2h. What do you like most?

G2i. What do you like least?

G2j. What foods would you like to see added?

G2k. Are any of these foods considered cultural/traditional foods?

YES..... 1
..... 1
NO
.....
... 2
DON'T KNOW DK
REFUSED..... REF

G3. Generally, do you, and members of your household, feel that the FDPIR programs meets your food and nutrition needs?

YES..... 1
NO
.....
... 2
DON'T KNOW DK
REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO G3a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION G3b

G3a. Could you tell me more about how it has met your food and nutrition needs?

GO TO G4

G3b. Could you tell me more how the program has not met your food and nutrition needs?

G4. Please tell me your **overall satisfaction** about the following aspects of your experiences with FDPIR. Are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied or not satisfied with the following aspects of FDPIR:

IF RESPONDENT IS SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED, ASK WHY BELOW ITEM.

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DON'T KNOW	REF
A. Application process. Are you...	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
B. Recertification process. Are you...	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
C. Location of the distribution site.	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
D. Attractiveness and atmosphere of the distribution site.	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
E. Features of the distribution facility. [IF NECESSARY: Sufficient parking, children's play area, help carrying FDPIR food package items to the car]	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
F. Frequency of distribution	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
G. Interaction with program staff.	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
H. Nutrition and education offerings	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							
I. Other program factors (SPECIFY):	1	2	3	4	5	DK	REF
IF SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISSATISFIED: What is the reason you are/were not satisfied?							

G5. Have there been any changes in FDPIR in the past three years that have influenced your participation in the program?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF YES, GO TO G5a
IF NO/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION G6

G5a. What changes?

G5b. How did the changes influence your participation?

G6. If you had the opportunity, what would you tell the Federal Government about the FDPIR program?

RECORD VERBATIM – PROBE FOR COMPLETENESS

- NOTHING/NO COMMENT 1
- REFUSED..... REF

G7. If you had the opportunity, what would you tell your tribal leaders about the FDPIR program?

RECORD VERBATIM – PROBE FOR COMPLETENESS

- NOTHING/NO COMMENT 1
- REFUSED..... REF

G8. Would you recommend the FDPIR program to other family and friends?

- YES..... 1
- NO 2
- DON'T KNOW DK
- REFUSED..... REF

IF NO, GO TO G8a
IF YES/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED, GO TO SECTION H

G8a. Why not?

RECORD VERBATIM

Appendix D. Survey Technical Documentation

As described in Appendix B, a sample of FDPIR participants was selected from a sample of Tribes. The case record reviews of the study participant sample provided the contact information needed to conduct the FDPIR Participant Survey. This section describes how we implemented that survey.

Methods for conducting individual surveys

The contact information obtained from the case record review for each Tribe provided the sample frame for the household survey. Households were contacted by the Field Interviewers to see if they were interested in participating in the survey. Advance letters with a USDA signature were sent to participants prior to the fielding, along with a brochure with Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). The brochure had a toll-free number for respondents to call if they had questions or wished to set up an appointment with the Field Interviewer. Each program was assigned a dedicated Field Interviewer for the data collection period. We first attempted to conduct the interview by telephone. Nearly 49 percent of the interviews were conducted by telephone. When this was not successful, the Field Interviewer conducted an in-person interview. Some Tribes and tribal IRBs requested that all interviews be conducted in person. Locating efforts were conducted as needed, using the information derived from the case record. For the households that agreed to participate, a 30-minute interview was conducted. On average, 32 interviews were conducted per program, with more in the largest programs. Nearly 49 percent of the interviews were conducted by telephone.

NORC hired 28 Tribal members to conduct the in-person participant survey. Field Interviewers also included NORC Tribal Interviewers who were Native American themselves, or had extensive experience conducting interviews in Indian Country. All Field Interviewers were trained and supported continuously by NORC's field management staff with experience in conducting interviews in Indian Country to ensure proper procedures were followed and that Field Interviewers received comprehensive support.

Incentives. Providing incentives is beneficial in gaining respondent cooperation, and demonstrates to respondents that we value their contributions. We provided a cash incentive of \$25 to each respondent. Based on our experience with past studies, the desired form of payment varies by Tribe and

is often informed by practical matters, such as the feasibility of using a gas voucher or gift card based on the proximity of gas stations and stores. We consulted with each ITO and Tribal IRBs to determine the most appropriate method of payment (e.g., cash, gas voucher, Walmart gift card, VISA gift card) and the consensus was that cash was preferred. Field Interviewers provided the incentive to the respondent at the end of in-person interviews and mailed the incentive to respondents who completed the interview by telephone. We worked closely with FNS to develop this incentive plan which met OMB's approval.

We also budgeted for a nominal site payment of \$100 for each ITO in the sample in order to defray operational costs associated with providing case records or automated data, drawing the sample, hosting the Field Interviewer, making space available for interviewing, etc. We are in the process of sending the payment to the Tribe with the guidance that the funds cannot be directly applied to FDPIR, but can be applied to a general fund and used to match Federal funds.

Telephone interviews. All sampled respondents received an advance letter describing the study which included a toll-free number to directly contact the NORC Field Interviewer assigned to their ITO. NORC provides each Field Interviewer with a dedicated toll-free number to accept calls from respondents. This allows respondents to reach the Field Interviewer directly from his or her own home or cell phone.

Since we anticipated that some respondents would not be comfortable conducting the interview in their home, we did establish protocols for conducting interviews in a private space in FDPIR program offices or by having a mobile telephone available for respondent's use at the warehouse. As all respondents agreed to having the interviews conducted either by phone or in their homes, we did not implement these options. FDPIR program staff had brochures with the FAQs available to distribute in offices, warehouses, and stores to remind potential respondents about the benefits of participating in the study and to build awareness and cooperation with respondents.

Contact attempts and locating. Interviewers recorded each attempt to contact a household. They varied their contact attempts to the selected households across the most probable times of contact. After making up to 5 contact attempts, the Field Interviewers shifted to more intensive and in-person locating efforts for hard-to-reach cases. Field Interviewers and the Field Manager discussed approaches to deal with households that were very hard to reach, while remaining culturally sensitive to the diverse communication styles across Tribes and respondents. During a successful initial contact at the respondent's dwelling, the Field Interviewers introduced themselves and the survey, gave the household member time to ask questions about the survey, and attempted to schedule or conduct an interview.

In-person interview. In ITOs that permitted a choice of phone or in-person interviews, when respondents preferred to have an in-person interview, as was the case with many elderly respondents, the Field Interviewer traveled to the respondent's home. In-person interviews were pre-arranged.

A limited number of interviews were conducted with the assistance of proxies or translators. The most common reasons for having a proxy or translator assist with an interview were when a sampled respondent was a minor child and could not consent to participate, when the respondent was not able to participate because of health concerns (i.e. difficulty hearing or speaking), or when a language other than English was the respondent's primary spoken language.³ When these circumstances were identified by the Field Interviewer, they first confirmed with their Field Manager that a proxy was appropriate for the circumstance. Once confirmed, the Field Interviewer conducted the interview with the proxy or translator present, instructing them to answer on behalf of the respondent or assist with answering as needed. The proxy or translator was also required to provide consent verbally or complete a written consent form, depending on the requirements of a particular Tribe, in addition to consent provided by the respondent.

Ongoing interaction with the ITO to facilitate cooperation. In addition to their interviewing responsibilities, each Field Interviewer served in the capacity of a "site liaison" in order to fully observe Tribal research protocols, build rapport with the FDPIR staff, and become a recognized presence in the community. As part of the on-site responsibilities, all Field Interviewers made an initial site visit to meet with the ITO/ Tribal leaders and FDPIR staff to kick-off the data collection and implement procedures for contacting participants in order to establish a positive working relationship.

In developing these procedures for data collection, we attempted to make the best use of variation in the food distribution process across Tribes and to cultivate an environment where the Field Interviewer would be a known and trusted presence in the community. We anticipated some of the logistical challenges that each site may present and worked proactively with each ITO to develop and implement site-specific solutions that facilitated cooperation and good will and which minimized the inconvenience or burdens of data collection.

Obtaining Informed Consent and Maintaining Confidentiality. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents prior to collecting any survey information. The consent statement was written in easy-to-understand language at the 6th-9th grade level (depending on Tribal IRB requirements) so that all respondents had the opportunity to fully understand their rights as survey participants prior to

³ FNS regulations allow for a minor child to be the program applicant to participate in FDPIR. The number of such cases in the survey is less than 5.

beginning the interview. The consent forms were based on best practices recommended by Tribal IRBs and researchers. Field Interviewers read the informed consent statement prior to the start of every interview and provided time for the respondent to ask questions. In addition, the informed consent statement was sent with the advance letter to respondents so that they had a written copy of the statement. The informed consent statement explained that the respondents had the right to refuse or end their participation at any time or decline to answer any question or section. It also addressed the risks and benefits of participation as well as confidentiality, privacy, data security and dissemination. Five Tribal IRBs stipulated that we obtain written informed consent from participants. Field Interviewers then mailed the signed forms via a secure carrier to NORC's central office for storage.

Pretesting the Instrument. A pre-test was conducted. The pretest helped us determine if the questionnaire, procedures, and materials worked as planned in a field setting. Pretesting exercises examined both the content of the surveys and the accuracy and usability of all instruments. We checked for problems associated with the formal aspects of the surveys (such as unclear item wording, missing response categories, incorrect skip logic) as well as other issues. The wording and the content of the survey were assessed to determine whether or not potential respondents understood the questions, had trouble answering the questions, or felt uncomfortable or embarrassed about answering the questions. The pre-test also determined the length of time for survey administration (estimated at 30 minutes), which was necessary to estimate the response burden for OMB clearance.

Pre-testing replicated the conditions of the actual fieldwork to the extent feasible. Six interviews were conducted (3 in-person and 3 telephone interviews). The method of contacting and selecting the pretest sites followed Tribal research protocols. Three tribes participated (they were not part of the sample). We were fortunate to have established relationships and contacts with many Tribal areas nationally that were good candidates for pre-testing, as well as a cohort of native interviewers currently on NORC staff to facilitate pretesting. The pretest respondents received an incentive of \$25 for their time and cooperation.

Field Interviewers from all sites were trained in a conference call for the pre-test. Respondent and interviewer feedback was very important. Upon completion of the pre-test fieldwork, a telephone debriefing session took place with the interviewers. Topics included an in-depth review of the questionnaire and all materials used to accomplish each task. The group was also asked if there were other job aids or materials that would assist in data collection for the main fielding effort. A pretest report was prepared and shared with FNS. Minor changes were made to the instrument.

Data collected

For the FDPIR Participant Survey, we used a Paper and Pencil Instrument (PAPI) that can be used for telephone and in-person administration with FDPIR participants. There are multiple known advantages for using this approach rather than using computer assisted interviewing techniques. PAPI generally yields the highest cooperation and lowest refusal rates and allows for longer, more complex interviews with high response quality. The survey asked 122 questions of each respondent.

The interview collected data that described the extent of participation in other nutrition assistance programs, access to food stores, access to facilities for storing and preparing food, perspectives on FDPIR customer service, and reasons for FDPIR participation and for switching between FDPIR and SNAP. The survey questions focused on information and qualitative perceptions that could not be obtained from case records. Although certain information about household members (relationship to head of household, age or date of birth, type of income sources) was available on the application form, we obtained additional demographic information during the in-person survey.

Staffing and training for conducting participant surveys

Staffing for the participant surveys included Field Interviewers and Field Management. There were 28 field Interviewers. Each site had an assigned interviewer (larger sites required up to three interviewers). The Field Management staff consisted of one Field Project Manager and two Field Managers. The main roles for these three Managers included oversight of the interviewing staff, training/coaching, troubleshooting and quality control. Each Field Manager was responsible for about 8-10 sites.

Trainings were conducted for the Field Managers and Field Interviewers prior to the start of data collection and additional training calls were scheduled as warranted during the field period.

Field Manager's Training. The Field Managers' training included a 12-hour home study/telephone training to cover all aspects of managing the field period. Also included was a Train-the-Trainer module. Field Managers served as the lead trainers for the Field Interviewer training. Materials developed included a Field Manager Manual, training agenda and manual, PowerPoint presentation, Home Study Guide, and site management materials.

Training topics addressed: Overview of the Project; Cultural Sensitivity; Working with Tribal Contacts; Project Tasks (sampling, site set-up, contacting respondents, preparing for site visits); Challenges and Solutions; Site Visits; Materials Review; Administrative and Communication Plans; Train-the-Trainer; Interview Modes: Telephone and In-Person; Production and Cost Goals; Challenges to Managing Production; and Quality Control.

We developed a manual for the Field Manager that addressed management, training, tracking and data collection topics. It also contained several job aids for quick reference when questions and issues arose.

Field Interviewers' Training. For field interviewers, we used a combination of 4 hours of self-study and 12 hours of group training by telephone (split over 2 days). The four-hour home study oriented Field Interviewers to the project, case management tools, and interviewer tasks. The group training focused on interactive sessions for gaining cooperation, questionnaire administration, and other higher-order interviewing skills. Each Field Interviewer received a Field Interviewer Manual and suite of materials to help them complete their interviewing tasks effectively and efficiently. The materials were user-friendly and professional in presentation. Interviewer materials included: informed consent forms; questionnaires; case face sheets to identify respondents to be interviewed; call record forms (to be attached to the face sheet); show cards (if necessary); respondent receipts for incentive payment; and other materials as deemed needed by the project.

Each Field Interviewer was required to complete a two-hour certification mock interview with his or her Field Manager. The certification mock session began with the Field Interviewer gaining cooperation and answering questions, the actual mock interview, and a review of their individual assignment. Field Interviewers must demonstrate the ability to administer the survey instruments, and an understanding of their responsibilities with respect to confidentiality. After passing the certification, they were ready to conduct interviews in the field. Trainees that did not pass the certification were given additional targeted retraining to address deficiencies and attempted to pass the certification a second time. Trainings were held on a rolling basis as tribal approval and record abstraction was received.

Quality control for survey data collection

Rigorous quality control is crucial to conducting superior survey research. NORC Field Management, Field Interviewers, and Central Office staff worked together to produce data of

consistent high quality. This multi-pronged effort included: 1) intensive project training for all personnel that may include a blend of in-person and/or home study or remote methods, and 2) questionnaire practice mock interviews or certifications that were required before Field Interviewers were permitted to work on the project.

After training, we used in-person training and group conference calls that emphasized:

- Expectations of Professional Interviewers
- Best Practices in Conducting an Interview
- Challenges Faced in the Field
- Project Specifications
- Commitment to Excellence in Data Quality and Data Security

Other important features of quality control included:

- Interview timings and responses
- Case validation through periodic re-interviews
- Encryption and security systems upgrades
- Field strategy communication between interviewers and management on a regular basis
- Field Interviewer and Field Manager opinions requested on project procedures and the questionnaire
- Positive recognition and feedback given for compliance to standards and expectations, as well as corrective actions
- Constant monitoring of Field Interviewer performance relative to NORC and project standards

NORC Field Managers were tasked with routine monitoring of field interviews and providing regular feedback to the interviewers. Weekly memoranda and job aids were circulated as needed to Field Interviewers for a sustained emphasis on training. The Field Managers had responsibility for meeting remotely with their Field Interviewers as a group at least once a week to provide coaching and reinforce project protocols. Online training material and exercises were available electronically for field staff to reference throughout the data collection period.

Quality controls included cost and production monitoring, tracking sample targets, and adjusting projections, staffing and strategies as needed throughout the scheduled data collection. NORC's standard validation protocol includes automatically selecting the first two completed cases as well as 10 percent of the remaining cases for re-reviews. NORC encourages regular communication between Field Managers and Field Interviewers in addition to the weekly calls. Weekly quality assurance information was shared regularly with the Field Managers about all interviewers from the validation process. Reports were issued weekly that showed, by interviewer: the number of completed interviews, the number and percent of those for which validation was attempted, the number and percent that passed validation, the number that failed validation, and the number attempted for which no final validation

result was obtained. This allowed for feedback from the Field Managers and assured validation of quality in a timely manner. This information formed the basis of the Weekly Reports delivered to FNS during the field period, which reported on the target number of surveys, number of completed responses, attempts to locate or contact, and responsiveness.

Ensuring quality work by interviewers begins with the selection of interviewers and continues throughout data collection. Most importantly, quality is ensured through ongoing evaluation of the interviewers' work and an effective feedback and remedial training processes. A toll-free hotline was established so that respondents could contact NORC directly with any questions or concerns. Evaluating the quality of work is important, but having a method for delivering feedback and corrective remedies is essential to ensuring continued high quality data collection. In order to provide quick feedback to the field on the quality and completeness of the PAPI questionnaires, each questionnaire underwent a scan edit by a trained edit clerk upon receipt. In this process, clerks reviewed the document for missing items, proper recording of responses, errors in skip patterns, legibility, and so forth. This feedback was recorded on a PAPI Scan Edit Form and e-mailed to the respective Field Manager on a daily basis. Field Managers relayed these findings to the Field Interviewers and conducted retraining as necessary.

NORC had a validation process in place. All cases were validated. There were no falsified interviews.

Appendix E. Qualitative Instruments

E1. Key Informant Interview Guide

OMB Control Number: 0584-0583
Expiration Date 08/14/16

Introduction

My name is _____ and I'm a researcher from the Urban Institute, a non-profit organization in Washington, DC that conducts policy research on a range social welfare and economic issues [substitute SSI or NORC as appropriate]. I'm here today because the Urban Institute, with its partners NORC at the University of Chicago and Support Services International (SSI), was awarded a contract from USDA's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) to conduct a national study of FDPIR and its participants. This study will provide an updated description of participants and programs, gain a better understanding of changes in FDPIR participation, and provide FNS with information needed to improve the program. Benefits of the study for FNS and Tribes include identifying the needs of participants and ways to make the program more beneficial to them. An additional benefit of the study is to provide knowledge that can be shared among Tribes and Indian Tribal Organizations (ITO).

The study will provide current, nationally representative information on FDPIR participants through case record reviews and interviews with a sample of participants in 24 FDPIR programs. Key topics for the case record review include household characteristics, employment, economic hardship, and FDPIR eligibility. Topics that will be covered in the survey are food storage and preparation, FDPIR contribution to the household's food supply, access to the FDPIR program and barriers to access, food costs, participation in FDPIR and other food assistance programs, nutrition education and other health-related services, and satisfaction with the program.

This study will also provide updated information on local program operations across the nation through program visits. Our visit to [name of tribe/ITO] is one of 17 such visits. At these visits, we are interviewing staff such as yourself, holding discussion groups with FDPIR participants and non-participants, and touring FDPIR facilities. In this interview, we will cover information, such as nutrition education activities, food distribution methods, factors affecting participation, and coordination between FDPIR and other programs and services.

Privacy Statement

[Site visitors: this must be reviewed with each respondent before proceeding—if required substitute the written informed consent form to be signed by each respondent]

Before beginning the interview, I (we) want to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. I (we) realize that you are busy and will try to be as brief as possible. We have many questions and are going to talk to many different people, so please do not feel as though we expect you to be able to answer every question. Your participation is voluntary, and you can decide not to answer any specific questions. You also may end the interview at any point. The interview should take about one hour. In addition, before we start, I want to let you know that although we will take notes during these interviews *[if taping, ask permission to tape]*, information is never repeated with the name of the respondent. Your privacy will be protected and the information collected will be reported without identifying any individual interviewee. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Respondent information

Name

Title

Contact Information

How do you refer to the Food Commodities program in this reservation/ Tribal Area?

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTION MODULES

MODULE A: INTERVIEWEE AND ORGANIZATION BACKGROUND

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather general program information and initiate a conversation about FDPIR activities and the area in which it operates. The background of the organization should be obtained once at the beginning of an interview with any single organization (e.g. FDPIR, Non-FDPIR program, Tribal Council, etc.). A brief background should be obtained from each individual interviewee for documentation purposes and to provide context for the pending conversation. Review background in advance and use this section to confirm information as well as to obtain additional detail. Questions specific to a particular organization are indicated in **bold.**]*

A1. Describe your position with this organization.

- a. Probe: How long have you held this role? What was your previous job/activity? What, if any, specific qualifications or certifications does the job require?

FDPIR staff:

A2. Describe the organizational structure of this FDPIR program (How many staff work on the program and what are their roles?). Has this structure changed over time and, if so, how has it changed?

A3. How many staff are employed? Do you use volunteers?

Non-FDPIR staff:

A4. What is the mission of your program? How would you describe its primary goal? What does it hope to achieve?

A5. Describe your program and how it operates?

A6. How is your organization funded?

Tribal Leader:

A7. How many terms have you served? What is your total number of years serving in this position?

A8. Have you served the Tribal government in other governmental positions besides your current position? (If YES): Could you tell us what those positions were and how many total years you have served?

MODULE B: PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS, TRENDS, AND ISSUES IN THE AREA

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about the socioeconomic conditions of the geography served by the FDPIR program. Questions are intended for **Managers/Directors of the FDPIR program, Managers of Non-FDPIR programs, and Tribal Leaders, as necessary. Questions can be further tailored using background secondary data gathered prior to the site visit.***]

Now we'd like to talk about the characteristics of the characteristics of the service area for your program and the area generally.

- B1. What is the service area for the program? What tribes does this include?
- B2. Will you please describe the geography of the reservation/tribal area/FDPIR service area:
- a. physical terrain, size,
 - b. climate,
 - c. urban/rural;
 - d. condition of roads;
 - e. other notable idiosyncrasies?
- B3. Please describe the people who live in this area.
- a. PROBE: AIAN, non-AIAN, Average age, Household composition and Size, Income, Residential location, Housing type.

[Note that some respondents may only know their site's tailgate areas. Be clear about what area is being described.]

Now we're going to shift to talking about reservation/tribal area/area generally.

- B4. Does the [reservation/tribal area] include shopping/ retail stores, education opportunities, and other important amenities, etc.?
- B5. Does the [reservation/tribal area] provide public transportation to these venues?
- B6. How does the reservation differ from the area surrounding it?
- a. Please similarly describe the geography of the [reservation/tribal area]:
 - i. physical terrain, size,
 - ii. climate,
 - iii. urban/rural;
 - iv. condition of roads;
 - v. other notable idiosyncrasies?

B7. We are interested in learning about economic conditions because it can affect the need for food assistance. What is your overall assessment of the economic conditions in the area? Employment and Private Industry?

- a. Probe: Has the recession affected employment, economic activity, and need for assistance (e.g., food, income, housing, etc.)? Please describe the changes over the past 3-4 years.)

B8. What are the major sources of employment in your area? Have any major industries emerged over the past 5 years, such as casinos, new industries?

- a. [If YES] How have these affected the region?

B9. Describe your perception of poverty in this area? Is this a general problem? Has this changed over time?

B10. Besides employment and poverty, are there major problems or challenges that many households face?

- a. Probe: Substance abuse, domestic violence, safety/crime, transportation, educational opportunities, lack of access to healthcare, health issues? Etc.

MODULE C: Food Program Participant Households and Household Food Choices

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about the households that participate in FDPIR and other service programs within its service area, as yet to be determined. Questions are intended for **Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program, Nutritionists or Health Education providers affiliated with FDPIR, should they be on staff, and Managers of Non-FDPIR programs, as necessary. Questions specific to a particular organization are indicated in bold.***]

Now, I would like to ask several questions about food program participant households and household food choices. Do you think you would be able to speak to this? [Note: do not always have to ask this question, but use your best judgment].

[IF NO, SKIP TO MODULE D.]

- C1. Data retrieved for this study, from FNS, indicates that this program serves approximately **[X]** households, right now. Can you confirm this? **[We will request updated numbers from FNS]**
- C2. Does the number of households vary much during the course of the year?
 - a. [IF YES]: In what way does it vary?
 - b. [IF YES]: Why?
- C3. Please describe the FDPIR client base.
 - a. Probe: Average age; Household composition and size; Average length of time in program; Employment status; Income; Residential location (on-off reservation/tribal area).
- C4. Have you noticed any changes in the demographics, (such age, gender, household composition) over time?
- C5. How would you describe participating households' food storage and preparation facilities?
- C6. Do any households lack food storage or preparation resources? If yes, about what proportion?
- C7. What portion of a participating household's food supply do you think comes from FDPIR, other food assistance programs, and other sources?
- C8. Are there other nutrition assistance programs available to individuals living on or near this reservation/tribal area?

C9. If so, are any of these programs provided by a Tribal agency on the [reservation/tribal area]? Are any provided by churches or other community groups? How big of a role do these programs play in ensuring adequate food supplies for low-income residents?

- a. Probe: What would food access in the community be like without these food assistance programs?

Nutritionist/ Health Educator:

C10. How would you describe participating households' interest in and knowledge about cooking?

C11. Generally, what proportion of participants has some type of health insurance? From what source(s)?

C12. Do FDPIR participants receive health services on the [reservation/tribal area]? If yes, from what source?

C13. Are there prevalent health issues related to diet, such as obesity or diabetes? If so, how does this factor into your programming? Are there other health issues among participants that you need to accommodate or address in your programming?

Non-FDPIR Program Staff:

C14. About what proportion of your clients receive food assistance? Of those how many participate in FDPIR?

MODULE D: ENROLLMENT AND CERTIFICATION

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about certification procedures and challenges and practices involved in this process. Questions are intended for **Managers/Directors of the FDPIR program, or staff within the FDPIR program, as necessary.**]*

- D1. Please describe the process for certifying individuals for participating in the FDPIR program?
- a. Probe: How do participants apply, what are the requirements for documentation, etc.?
- D2. Do you have a system to ensure that they are not participating in FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps during the same period)
- D3. What challenges exist in the enrollment and certification ***process***? Have you attempted to address these challenges in any way?
- D4. What proportion of FDPIR cases requires expedited service?
- D5. What proportion of initial certifications is conducted in the office, by fax, or at remote locations such as tailgate sites? If certifications are conducted in remote locations, describe the process and accommodations for clients.
- D6. How do you handle applicants who inquire about the program over the phone?
- D7. Do you use computers to screen households for eligibility, initiate an application, collect client information, validate information, and check against dual participation in SNAP/Food Stamps?

MODULE E: REASONS FOR CHANGE IN FDPIR PARTICIPATION

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about the changes in FDPIR participation. Questions are intended for **Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program, FDPIR food education staff, and Tribal Leaders, as necessary.***]

Now, I would like to ask several questions about changes in FDPIR participation over the past few years. Do you think you would be able to speak about this?

[IF NO, SKIP TO MODULE F.]

- E1. Besides receiving subsidized food, what are the three most important reasons you think people choose to sign up for FDPIR?
 - a. Interviewer probe with following categories if respondent needs prompting:
 - Access (e.g., easier access to food, long distance to shopping options)
 - Program eligibility requirements (e.g., less burdensome or restrictive than for other food assistance programs)
 - Quantity of food
 - Quality of food
 - Food choice
 - Program-related services (e.g., nutrition education, recipes, cooking classes, home delivery)
 - Access to, or coordination with, other programs
 - Positive perception of the program
 - Participant/household characteristics (i.e., age, household size, etc.)
- E2. What are the key reasons you think people who need food assistance do not sign up for FDPIR?
 - a. Interviewer probe for reasons in addition to those associated with SNAP/Food Stamps.
- E3. How has the program changed over the years? Has the change been positive or negative?

Has interest in the commodities program changed compared to SNAP? Why do you think these preferences have changed?
- E4. Are there seasonal jobs or per capita payments in this community that might affect the number of individuals that are eligible for FDPIR? Other seasonal changes in the economy?
 - a. Please describe.

E5. What other economic factors may have a significant influence on FDPIR participation?

E6. Are there barriers that affect participation in FDPIR?

- a. (If YES): How do these barriers affect participation? Do they pertain to any specific FDPIR policy or local operation? Do they pertain to a specific subgroup of eligible households?

[INTERVIEWER: Make sure to check participation data before the site visit and tailor the next question accordingly.]

E7. We've seen data that show the number of participants here (increased / decreased/ remained the same) from 2001 -2011 and that from 2011 to 2013 the trend was..... How would you explain these trends

- a. PROBE: What has happened in your Tribe that may have led to this increase/decline?
- b. For FDPIR programs with increasing participation: Based on what you know about FDPIR in other locations, what do you think might be different about the program here or the people it serves that might explain the growth?

MODULE F: PARTICIPANT SWITCHING BETWEEN FDPIR AND SNAP/Food Stamps

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about participants that switch between FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps. Questions refer to the period prior to the rule that went into effect September 26th, 2013. Record comments about the new rule separately. Questions are intended for **Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program**, or staff within the FDPIR program, as necessary.]*

- F1. What is your understanding of SNAP/Food Stamp eligibility requirements in your state?
- F2. About what proportion of FDPIR clients would you estimate are also eligible for SNAP/Food Stamp?
- F3. Do you think individuals on and near the [reservation/tribal service area] are aware of both programs and their eligibility requirements?
- F4. Are you aware of participants switching between FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps? (If yes), approximately what proportion of FDPIR participants also received SNAP/Food Stamps benefits in the last year? In the course of a year about how many months do these households participate in FDPIR? In SNAP/Food Stamps?
- F5. Do you see more switches to FDPIR or to SNAP/Food Stamps?
 - a. Why do you think that is? (ask only if not already answered earlier in interview)
- F6. Has this pattern changed in the past few years?
 - a. Why do you think that is?
- F7. Have preferences for food packages changed in comparison to SNAP/Food Stamps benefits or other nutrition assistance?
 - a. If so, what are the reasons for the change in preferences?
- F8. Do you know if participants who switch from FDPIR to SNAP/Food Stamps (and vice-versa) ever lose benefits from either program in the transition?

[Note: This refers to losing benefits, NOT reduced benefits: reasons might include income eligibility differences in states with categorical eligibility, not getting documents in on time, delays at SNAP offices, etc.]

MODULE G: ACCESS TO FOOD SOURCES

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: The goal of this section is to gather information about the ability of households in the area to easily access food sources, both retail, and FDPIR distribution sites in and around the FDPIR service area. Questions are intended for *Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program, Managers of Non-FDPIR programs, and Tribal Leaders, as necessary.*]

- G1. How accessible do you think grocery retailers are for those living on/in the [reservation/tribal service area]? For others in FDPIR service area (if applicable)?
- G2. Is access to grocery retailers a factor for participants in deciding between SNAP/Food Stamps and FDPIR?
- a. Probe: Distance/ Transit to distribution sites, certification offices, nearest food retail store that sells fresh produce, nearest full-service authorized SNAP retailer (supermarket), and nearest authorized SNAP retailer that is not a supermarket?
- G3. What means of transportation do your clients use to access FDPIR sites or other food retailers?
- a. Probe: Interested in knowing how they get to food retail stores and apply for benefits.
- G4. Is lack of transportation a problem for many people in going to grocery stores or FDPIR distribution sites?
- G5. [IF NOT ALREADY ANSWERED] Are there grocery stores in the area? Convenience stores? Farmers markets? Warehouse/department/large, big-box stores that sell groceries such as (such as Walmart, Target, Costco, Sam's Club)?
- G6. How far are they from residences of [reservation/tribal area] members?
- a. To what extent are they used by FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps participants?
- G7. Are prices reasonable / expensive?
- G8. Is the food selection limited or broad?
- G9. Are fresh foods (meats, vegetables, fruits) available?
- G10. Do people grow any food / raise animals for meat/hunt/fish for themselves or their household?

Warehouse Staff

- G11. Can participants pick up food at the warehouse and at distribution sites?
- G12. What proportion of participants use an authorized representative to pick up their food on a regular basis?
- G13. Approximately how far do most participants travel to pick up food?
- G14. What is the farthest anyone travels?
- G15. What percent of participants receive home delivery? [If not in site profile]
 - a. Who uses this service? (Elderly, disabled, parents with infants, families without transportation, etc.)
- G16. Are all the access sites available year round (regardless of weather)?
 - a. If NO, what happens to distribution when access is limited?
 - b. Are there things that could be done to increase year round access?
 - i. E.g., improve stock of delivery vehicles, etc.

MODULE H: NUTRITION EDUCATION ACTIVITIES AND IMPACT

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about nutrition education programs offered by the FDPIR program as well as other agencies and programs operating in the area. Questions are intended for either **Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program or FDPIR food education staff (where applicable) and Managers of Non-FDPIR programs.** Questions regarding staffing and funding are included in module I.]*

H1. What nutrition education or other health promotion programs does [FDPIR/ your organization] offer participants? Do you offer workshops, such as cooking, food-budget management? Health promotion or physical fitness activities? Items such as recipes, measuring cups, seeds, bottled water -- to promote healthy eating?

[IF NO PROGRAMS, SKIP TO MODULE L]

- a. Please describe.

H2. For each program described:

- a. About how often do you offer these programs / workshops?
- b. How long do these sessions typically go?
- c. How do you inform people about the programs?
- d. Where are the programs held?
- e. How many people usually participate in any given program / workshop?
- f. [If FDPIR] Are these programs only for FDPIR participants or open to others as well?

H3. Are there nutrition education programs for different age groups, such as children, teenagers, parents, or elderly, etc.?

H4. What kinds of information or literature about nutrition, gardening, food preparation, and the use of FDPIR foods are provided to participants? Where are these materials available (e.g., at the warehouse or food pick-up location, on the web, at other tribal programs, etc.)?

H5. How have changes in Nutrition Guidelines sponsored by USDA affected the commodities package? Have such changes been positive or negative?

- a. [IF RESPONDENT IS NOT FAMILIAR WITH GUIDELINES]: The 2010 nutrition guidelines included: increasing fruit and vegetable consumption, switching to reduced fat milk, eating more whole grains, eating a variety of proteins; and cutting back on solid fats, added sugars, and salt.

Impact

- H6. Approximately what proportion of FDPIR participants receives nutrition education?
- H7. How do you learn about the effect of the programs on clients? Do participants complete any type of program evaluation?
- H8. Are the programs valuable to participants? Do they have an impact on participants' practices, such as attitudes about diet, cooking, shopping, or exercise?
- H9. Which programs / workshops do you think are the most valuable? Why?
- H10. What kinds of feedback or responses have you gotten from clients?

MODULE I: NUTRITION EDUCATION STAFFING AND FUNDING

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about the funding staffing and funding sources of any nutrition education programs operating in the FDPIR service area. Questions are directed to **FDPIR program managers or nutrition educators of programs where such activities are offered***]

Staff

11. Who leads these programs / workshops? With what agencies or programs are these instructors affiliated?
PROBE: FDPIR staff? USDA Extension Staff? IHS staff? WIC Staff? Contract dietician? Tribal college staff? FDPIR Nutrition Education Grantee staff?
12. What are the qualifications of those who teach these classes?
 - a. Probe: program affiliation and education background, training, or certification.
13. Are any FDPIR nutrition staff that provide nutrition education/health information trained as dietitians? What training do the staff have?
14. Is there a need/interest in receiving nutrition education training for staff?
15. Have you arranged any nutrition education training for staff?
16. Have you explored any resources for such training?

Funding

17. How are the nutrition education services funded?
18. How much funding is spent on nutrition education?
19. How are “regular” nutrition education funds (FDPIR nutrition education administrative funding) spent?
110. Has this FDPIR program applied for an FDPIR competitive nutrition education grant (e.g. FDPNE) since that program began in 2008? Have you applied more than once, how many times?
 - a. If no, why hasn't your program applied?
 - b. If yes, was your program a part of a consortium/committee that applied for funds?
 - c. If yes, have you ever received a grant under that program; for what time period?
 - i. What activities were funded? How did the grant improve the programs?

ii. About what percent of funding for nutrition education activities came from the grant during that time period?

- l11. Are there nutrition education services you would like to see offered that aren't available at present?
- a. What? Why?

MODULE J: WAREHOUSE, FOOD PACKAGE COMPONENTS AND DECISIONS

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: The goal of this section is to gather information about the program's warehouse and which foods go into the package. Questions are intended for *Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program* or the *Warehouse Staff of the FDPIR program*, as necessary.]

- J1. Please describe your warehouse:
- Size
 - Food storage capacity (amount and food type – freezer, refrigeration, shelf space)
 - Vehicles available to transport food
- J2. Have there been any upgrades to the warehouse in the last year? Please describe the upgrades.
- J3. Are there changes to the facility you would like to see?
- What? Why?
- J4. Please describe the inventory management system:
- Manual / electronic inventory
 - USDA Foods ordering procedures
 - Frequency of ordering
- J5. Have there been changes to the general management practices of the warehouse in the last year? Please describe the changes.
- J6. Are there changes in management practices you would like to see?
- What? Why?
- J7. How do you decide what food items are ordered for the food package? Please describe the process of selecting the food items.
- J8. Are there seasonal preferences or other factors related to acceptability or household preferences that affect the order?
- J9. Are there other factors you consider in selecting the foods that are ordered?
- J10. Is there variation in the food items available over the course of a year?
- Please describe how the food items vary.
 - Why do they vary?

- J11. Does participant feedback influence what foods are made available? Do you solicit feedback from participants on what foods to offer?
- J12. What foods have participants mentioned they would like to see made available? Are any of these foods considered cultural/traditional foods?
- J13. Do participants make comments to you about the appearance of the labels on the food they receive?
- J14. Are there limitations in storage or distribution that affect the selection of foods, particularly for fresh, frozen, or refrigerated products? If so, what is needed to address these limitations?
- J15. Do you participate in the fresh produce program? [Note to interviewer: funded by Department of Defense; information will be in Site Profile, but ask to confirm.]
- a. *If YES:*
 - i. How long have you been participating?
 - ii. Has this program been popular with participants?
 - iii. What are the main products you get through the fresh produce program?
 - iv. Have there been any challenges in participating? (e.g., quality of products, variety of products, storage, etc.)
 - v. What items are most popular with participants?
 - b. If not participating in the fresh produce program, why not?

MODULE K: FOOD PACKAGE DISTRIBUTION

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: The goal of this section is to gather information about the food package distribution. Questions are intended for *Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program* or the *Warehouse Staff of the FDPIR program* as necessary.]

- K1. Earlier you said that your program offers [RECAP] as options for receiving food. [IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE]: What proportion of participants is served by each of these approaches?
- K2. [IF HOME DELIVERIES ARE AN AVAILABLE OPTION]: How many home deliveries are made to FDPIR participants each month?
- K3. How many distribution sites are there? How/why were these sites selected?
- K4. [If ITO serves more than one area or if program is state-operated] Please describe the process of operating the distribution program for two or more areas.
- a. Probe: What are the challenges and benefits?
- K5. Do the sites ever change depending upon the location of participants?
- K6. How are distributions scheduled?
- K7. If distributions are directly from warehouses, are there other satellite warehouses?
- a. IF YES: Do they have the same storage capacity?
- K8. Do satellite warehouses operate on the same schedule as the main warehouse? If not, how do they differ?
- K9. If tailgate distributions to remote sites are necessary, what are the reasons clients cannot access central warehouses? About how many miles do staff drive each month to distribute FDPIR food?
- K10. If tailgate distributions are used, do the vehicles have refrigeration and freezers?
- K11. Does the distribution method affect the composition of the package? If so, how (e.g., do you have to pre-pack food packages or limit variety?)?
- K12. In general, what, if any, other services are provided at the time of distribution to participants?
- K13. Are there aspects of the distribution system that affect participation?

K14. Are there aspects of food availability that affect participation?

MODULE L: COORDINATION AND OUTREACH BETWEEN FDPIR, OTHER PROGRAMS AND TRIBAL LEADERS

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: The goal of this section is to gather information about how FDPIR and other programs coordinate efforts and communicate with the public. Questions are intended for either Managers/ Directors of the FDPIR program or FDPIR food education staff (where applicable) and Managers of Non-FDPIR programs.]

Coordination

- L1. Do you coordinate with other programs or tribal colleges to offer services or programs, such as nutrition education, gardening or food preservation education, cooking, health promotion, fitness, or food-budget management?
- L2. What other local groups and leaders do you work with regularly in carrying out this work? Which ones are most important to you and why?
- L3. Do you coordinate any activities with other programs, such as combined applications, outreach or enrollment activities, education programs, transportation? Please describe.
- L4. Can you describe the partnership(s) with other programs?
 - a. Probe: How often do you talk with each other? Plan programs together? How long have you been working together? Do you refer clients to each other's programs? What is the quality of the partnership?
- L5. Which partnerships are most successful and which are most important to you? Why?
- L6. [IF NOT OBSERVED FROM SURROUNDINGS] Is FDPIR co-located with other assistance programs (e.g., TANF, Social Security, and housing assistance)?
 - a. [IF THEY HAVE MULTIPLE LOCATIONS]: Does this differ in between your other offices?
- L7. Is the program near other community services (e.g., senior citizens programs, schools, community or cultural centers)?
- L8. [If not Tribal Leader] Please describe your interaction with Tribal leaders in this area.
 - a. Probe: In what ways do they support you? Do Tribal leaders facilitate coordination between your program and other programs, or hinder it? Are there ways that Tribal leadership can better support your program?

Outreach

- L9. What types of outreach activities do you have to inform people who are not current FDPIR participants about the [FDPIR / other program] (e.g., flyers, applications at public agencies and community locations, web site, partnerships with community agencies)?
- L10. Which outreach method seems to be most successful? How do you gauge your outreach efforts and determine their success?
- L11. How else do you interact with and communicate your work to the general community? Other service providers? Tribal leaders?

MODULE M: TRIBAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND THE FDPIR PROGRAM

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to gather information about the tribal government's role in service provision and get a more macro-level perspective on social service provision in the tribal service area. Questions are intended for **Tribal Leaders or their designees** as necessary. Questions can be further tailored using background secondary data gathered prior to the site visit.]*

- M1. What social services are administered by the tribal government? For example, child and family services, healthcare programs, TANF, work rehabilitation programs, etc.
- M2. Describe the tribal government structure and how FDPIR is situated within it. Who has authority over its budget, administration, and decision-making?
- M3. Do agencies compete for limited resources? If yes, how does this affect their relationships?
- M4. Do social service agencies serving the residents of this reservation/tribal service area collaborate or combine efforts, such as through common computer systems, caseworkers serving multiple programs, sharing space, etc.?
 - a. If yes, does this collaboration include the FDPIR program? Please describe that.
- M5. How would you describe FDPIR in relation to other health and social services programs administered by your Tribe (e.g., in terms of size, importance to the tribe, importance to individual participants)?

MODULE N: SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES

[INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: *The goal of this section is to get information on successes and challenges faced by FDPIR programs. This module is meant to be asked in all interviews. These questions also serve as a wrap up to the interview.]*

N1. Overall, what do you think are the best aspects of the FDPIR program in terms of meeting people's food needs?

N2. What are the major challenges to the program's ability to serve participants?

N3. If you were able to implement one change that would increase the number of program participants, what would it be?

N4. If you were able to implement one change that would improve diet and nutrition of program participants, what would it be?

N5. What recommendations do you have, in general, for improving FDPIR?

N6. Are there other things about USDA Foods that we haven't talked about that you think are important to know?

E2. Observation Checklists

OMB Control Number: 0584-0583

Expiration Date 08/14/16

FDPIR Warehouses

Date of Site Visit	
Site Location (reservation/tribal area/county/city, state)	
Name(s) of Researchers	

Location (distance to Distribution Site(s))	
Schedule of operation (days, hours)	
Storage capacity (square footage of storage space)	Regular
	Refrigerated
	Freezer
Inventory management system	
Schedule of food receipt	
Observations on food ordering process	

FDPIR Distribution Sites

Date of Site Visit		
Site Location (reservation/tribal area/county/city, state)		
Name(s) of Researchers		
Locations (general description of locations)	Centralized	
	Decentralized (number of sites)	
Schedule of operation (days, hours)		
Storage capacity	Regular	
	Refrigerated	
	Freezer	
Transportation resources		
Delivery capacity	Number and type of vehicles	
	Regular	
	Refrigerated	
	Freezer	

Inventory management system	
Client Accommodations	
Loading Area	
Parking	
Waiting Area	
Children's Area	
Assistance (loading or carrying packages)	
Separate area for conducting nutrition education	
Related services	What (food demonstrations, nutrition information, well-being seminars, etc.)
	When
	Where
	Frequency

FDPIR Certification Office/Site

Date of Site Visit	
Site Location (reservation/tribal area/county/city, state)	
Name(s) of Researchers	

Location (general description, at warehouse &/or distribution site, distance to warehouse/ distribution site)	
Collocation with other programs	
Distance to residential and business area densities	
Schedule of operation (days, hours)	
Signage related to program participation	
Information about other food-support programs	
Facility e.g., sufficient space, waiting area, private space for eligibility interview	

E3. Discussion Group Guide

OMB Control Number: 0584-0583

Expiration Date 08/14/16

Introductory Script

Hello, my name is _____. I am from the [Urban Institute/ Support Services International], a nonprofit research organization located in Washington, DC. Thank you for taking the time to participate in this group discussion. [Introduce colleague—second site visitor.]

We're here today because the Urban Institute, on behalf of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), is studying the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations. The purpose of this study is to describe the population of people participating in the FDPIR program; explore trends in FDPIR participation; examine key aspects of FDPIR operations, and learn about participant satisfaction with the program.

We're especially interested in learning how people choose between different food assistance programs and what you think about the food and services you receive from FDPIR and other food programs. All of you are either current or former food program participants or could be eligible for FDPIR or SNAP/ Food Stamps, but are not enrolled. Some of you responded to an advertisement to participate for this discussion group, and for others, your tribe provided your contact information for inviting you to this discussion group.

The information we collect will be useful to the USDA, Congress, and tribes in understanding changes in FDPIR participation and ways that FDPIR and other food assistance programs can work together to meet the nutrition needs of those who live on reservations and/or tribal service areas.

I want to remind you that your participation in the group discussion is voluntary; we want to stress that your participation is not required in order to continue receiving benefits or to receive them at any point in the future. We very much appreciate your willingness to come today. This session will last approximately two hours. You will receive a \$25 gift as a token of our appreciation, even if you decide not to stay to participate in the discussion.

This is a discussion, not a survey, so you can feel free to talk amongst yourselves and respond to what others are saying. Please make sure to be respectful of other people's opinions.

Importantly, we ask everyone here today to respect people's privacy. What is said in the room should stay in the room. We would appreciate it if you didn't speak about what was said today outside of this room, but we can't enforce it. Be aware that what you say, others might repeat outside this room. Information from this discussion will be included in a report to USDA, but all information you give us, the researchers, will be kept entirely private. We will use only first names in today's discussion; we will not identify you even by first name in our records, and we

will not tell program staff what you said. The information that you tell us will not affect your relationship with the program and will not affect your benefits in any way.

We value the information you will share with us today and want to make sure we capture all of it. So we will be taping the session and [name of person] will be taking notes on a laptop computer. However, we destroy the tapes as soon as we have made complete notes of the meeting, and those notes will **not** use your names. Does anyone have an objection to taping this group? Also, as we said, we will not use your names in preparing any reports and will disguise your comments so that no one can identify who made specific comments. We will ask you to sign for your \$25 gift in order to account for our financial disbursements, but we pass on only a coded identifier, not your name, to our accounting department. Do you have any questions or concerns about what we plan to do? Again, your participation is voluntary and you may leave at any time during the course of the meeting.

PAUSE AND ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS

GETTING STARTED

Ok, we're just about ready to get started. Discussion groups like this may be new to many and perhaps all of you—so let me make a few general points about what to expect. As the facilitator, I just ask the questions and moderate the discussion. What's really important is for all of you to speak up and participate so that we can have a lively and informative discussion. This will be an informal discussion. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions we ask. We are interested in learning each of your opinions. We very much appreciate your input.

It is important that only one person speak at a time so that we can follow what each of you say. There may be times during the discussion when I need to interrupt--either to ask you to explain what you have just said more clearly, or to move on to the next question to keep us on schedule. Again, this happens just to make sure that everyone has a chance to answer each of the questions, and that we listen to what each person says. We're hoping that each of you will speak up, and tell us your thoughts and feelings. In the past, most people have told us they enjoy these discussion groups very much because it gives them a chance to share their experiences and hear about others' experiences. Your participation here is voluntary and you may refuse to answer any question if you wish.

We will talk for about two hours. There will be no formal breaks. Please feel free to get up at any time to stretch, go to the bathroom, or get something to eat or drink. At the conclusion there is a very brief information form to complete. Following the discussion (or at any point during the discussion should you decide to leave before its conclusion) we will distribute the \$25 gift and you will be asked to sign a receipt form.

Once again, we are very pleased to have you here today. Are there any questions before we get started?

Note to facilitator: When a question asks "how many," be sure to say the count out loud so that it is recorded on the tape.

If a discussion group participant chooses to leave at any point, they are entitled to the \$25 incentive gift. Have an assistant ensure they sign the receipt and complete the information form, then give them the incentive gift.

To start, ask, "Does everyone know each other? And then go around the room with first name introductions.

Discussion Group Guide

A. Program Participation, Household Characteristics, and Access to Food Assistance

- A1. How familiar are you with the nutrition assistance programs that are available in your area, including FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps?

MODERATOR: PROBE USING LIST OF NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, IF NECESSARY

- A2. How easy is it for you to get to the FDPIR office to apply or certify, or recertify? How easy is it for you to get to the nearest SNAP/Food Stamps office?

- A3. How easy is it for you to get to grocery stores or FDPIR distribution points?

PROBE: How far is the grocery store from your residence?

- A4. How many food stores on or near the [reservation/tribal service area] do you have to choose from and how often do you go to them?

- A5. How would you describe your households' facilities for storing and preparing food?

Probes: space for storage, including refrigeration, freezers, cooking appliances, etc.

- A6. How would you describe your health and the health of the other members of your household? Are there any dietary needs or restrictions?

B. Contribution to Food Supply

- B1. For those enrolled in FDPIR, do you get most of your food from the FDPIR package? Of all the food in your house, about what portion comes from FDPIR? Probe: All? Nearly all? About half? Less than half? Where else do you get food from?

MODERATOR: PROBE USING LIST OF NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, IF NECESSARY

- B2. Are there other nutrition assistance programs available near the [reservation/tribal service area]?

MODERATOR: PROBE USING LIST OF NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, IF NECESSARY

B3. Please describe them:

Probe: Are any of these programs provided by a Tribal agency on the [reservation/tribal service area]? How big of a role do they play in ensuring adequate food supplies for low-income residents?

C. Reasons for Participating in Food Programs

C1. For those of you who currently participate in FDPIR, why did you decide to enroll in that program?

PROBE:

Is food access a factor? / Distance to shopping options?

Program eligibility requirements?

Quantity of food?

Quality of food?

Food choice?

Program-related services (e.g., nutrition education, recipes, cooking classes, home delivery)?

Access to, or coordination with, other programs?

How the program is perceived?

Participant characteristics (i.e., age, household size, etc.)

C2. For those of you who do not currently participate in FDPIR,

C2a. Have you ever participated in FDPIR?

C2b. Why did you decide not to apply for FDPIR, or to leave FDPIR?

PROBE:

Quantity, quality, variety of food unsatisfactory

Better access to SNAP/Food Stamps

More benefits in SNAP/Food Stamps

1. Program eligibility requirements for FDPIR (e.g., more burdensome / restrictive than for other food assistance programs)

2. Lack of related services offered through FDPIR (e.g., nutrition education, recipes, cooking classes, home delivery)

3. Negative perception of the FDPIR program

4. Household characteristics (i.e., age, household size, etc.)

C3. For those of you who have ever participated in FDPIR, how does it compare to other food assistance programs you have participated in?

C4. Have you switched between FDPIR and SNAP/Food Stamps? And if so, why?

PROBE: Preference for types of food, availability of desired foods, variety of foods available, value of food provided by each program

C4a. How often have you switched between the two programs?

D. FDPIR Operations

D1. For those currently participating in FDPIR, how does the program contact you about services and programs, new opportunities and changes to the service? Could this be better?

D2. For those not participating in FDPIR, do you ever learn about the program through any form of public communication, such as public announcements, newsletters, web sites, advertisements, local radio? Are there any other forms of outreach that you can think of?

D3. For those currently participating in FDPIR, are any other types of programs or services conducted or made available in the same locations as FDPIR?

D4. For those of you who are participating in FDPIR, does the program make any nutrition or educational programs available? Do they provide literature or any other kind of information about preparing foods (FDPIR package or other), health tips, cooking techniques, etc.?

D4a. Has this information changed your eating habits? Why or why not?

D5. Are any other services provided at the same time the FDPIR food package is distributed?

D5a. [IF YES]: What are they?

E. Participant Satisfaction

E1. What parts of FDPIR do you think work well?

E2. What do you like best about FDPIR?

E3. Do you think the nutrition education activities and information sources are worthwhile? Why?

E4. What nutrition education or information would you like to receive?

- E5. How do you think FDPIR could be improved?
5. PROBE for changes to distribution process (i.e. facility, frequency), quality and types of food, interaction with program staff
- E6. If there was one thing about FDPIR that you could change or one thing they should focus more on or expand, what would it be?

Probes for Factors Affecting Program Selection/Participation:

Delivery Modes

FDPIR - warehouse pick-up, stores, remote delivery sites (e.g. tailgates), home delivery
Once per month, spread over month
SNAP - electronic transfer used at grocery stores; accessibility of stores accepting SNAP or Food Stamp benefits; spread over month

Co-location of programs/services

FDPIR - administrative office located near WIC, TANF, etc.; program certification offered at food pick-up sites; health/fitness or nutrition-related programming offered at food pick-up sites

Food

FDPIR – amount, type (staples, ‘regular,’ traditional), ease of preparation, labeling (generic v. commercial), degree of choice, unwanted products, fresh produce/meat, nutritious value
SNAP – amount, type, ease of prep, prices, choice, nutritious value

Eligibility

FDPIR / SNAP – criteria, ease/difficulty proving eligibility, frequency, residency (on res/near res/ineligible for FDPIR due to location), income variability over year, benefits cliff

Participant Characteristics

FDPIR / SNAP – age, HH size, cooking ability/interest, employment status, and receipt of TANF, Social Security, SSI, and WIC (might steer to one program over other)

Other Factors

Seasonal factors (winter > snow affects delivery/pick-up options OR increased lay-offs lead to participation increase; summer > out of town OR children home from school); proximity to nearest grocery / access to transportation; interactions with program staff (un/comfortable); word-of-mouth ‘news’ about programs; general perceptions of programs (e.g., food v. welfare)

List of Other Nutrition Assistance Programs:

- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)/Food Stamps
- WIC – Women, Infants, and Children
- Child & Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)
- School Lunch and Breakfast Programs (Free and Reduced Price Breakfast/Lunch)
- Summer Meals
- Elderly Nutrition Program
- The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP)
- Commodity Supplemental Food Program

E4. Discussion group participant information questionnaire

Please complete this questionnaire. The information will be used only to summarize participant information at this meeting. Please DO NOT write your name or address on this questionnaire.

Site: _____ Date: _____
Time: _____

1. I am:
 Male
 Female

2. My age is:
 18-25 years
 25-29 years
 30-39 years
 40-49 years
 50-59 years
 60 or above

3. Number of children (under age 18) living with me: _____

4. Total number of people living with me: _____

5. I am currently:
 Not employed
 Working less than 20 hours a week
 Working more than 20 hours a week

6. I currently participate in:
 Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR).
 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)/Food Stamps
 A nutrition assistance program other than FDPIR or SNAP/Food Stamps.
Program: _____
 No nutrition assistance programs

7. I currently reside:
 Within a [reservation/tribal service area].
Name of [reservation/tribal service area]: _____
 Outside of a [reservation/tribal service area]

8. My household owns 1 or more automobiles.
 Yes
 No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

Appendix F. Program Staff Interview Respondents by Site

EXHIBIT F

FDPIR Program Staff Interview Respondents

Tribe	FDPIR Director	Other FDPIR Staff	Other
Bad River	1	11	2
Cherokee	1	7	4
Chickasaw	1	5	2
Comanche	1	1	1
Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council	1	2	2
Flathead	1	5	2
Ft. Peck	1	1	4
Hoopla Valley	1	3	1
Lac Courte Oreilles	1	2	2
MS Band of Choctaw	1	5	2
Navajo	1	13	0
Oglala Sioux	1	13	0
Sault Ste. Marie	1	3	2
Sherwood Valley	1	4	3
Spokane	1	0	2
Standing Rock	1	4	2
Yakama	1	4	2
Total	17	83	33

Source: FDPIR program site visit interviews, 2014-2015.

Notes: Other includes Tribal leaders, program partners, other agency staff

Appendix G. Discussion Group Participant Characteristics

EXHIBIT G

Characteristics of FDPIR Discussion Group Participants

Characteristic of Discussion Group Participants	N
Total Number Discussion Group Participants	142
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	42
Female	100
<i>Age</i>	
18-25	11
25-29	7
30-39	20
40-49	31
50-59	31
60 or above	42
Average number of children in household	1.2
Average size of household	3.9
<i>Employment Status</i>	
Not working	33
Working less than 20 hours a week	9
Working more than 20 hours a week	98
<i>Food Assistance Program Participation</i>	
Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR)	109
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)/Food Stamps	17
A Nutrition Assistance Program other than FDPIR or SNAP	2
No Nutrition Assistance Programs	13

Characteristics of FDPIR Discussion Group Participants (cont'd)

Characteristic of Discussion Group Participants	N
<hr/> <i>Residence</i> <hr/>	
Within a reservation/tribal service area	134
Outside of a reservation/tribal service area	7
<hr/> <i>Household owns an automobile</i> <hr/>	
Yes	104
No	37

Source: FDPIR program site visit discussion groups, 2014-2015

Notes: Respondents who indicated "self" for question 4 were assigned "1."

Respondents who indicated "N/A" for question 3 were assigned "0."

Respondents who indicated "retired" for question 5 were assigned "0."

Respondents who indicated "1" and "2" for nutrition assistance programs were counted as missing.

Appendix H. National Sample Memo

Memorandum: Nationally Representative Sample of FDPIR Households

December 9, 2014⁴

TO: Bob Dalrymple, Food and Nutrition Service

FROM: Nancy Pindus and Doug Wissoker, Urban Institute
Carol Hafford and Steven Pedlow, NORC at the University of Chicago

RE: Study of the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations (FDPIR), Subtask 6
Contract AG-3198-D-11-0066 UI Project (08322-020)

This memorandum describes the plan for drawing a nationally representative sample of households for the FDPIR study. We begin with a review of the initial two-stage sampling plan and changes made to address the instances where selected tribes declined participation in the study. We then describe how samples were drawn for the case record review and survey in each study site. We conclude with a summary of the sampling outcome.

Sample Selection

The sample was chosen using a two-stage design. In the first stage, we sampled 26 Indian Tribal Organizations (ITOs) and State organizations with a probability proportionate to the number of households participating in the FDPIR program.⁵ We used monthly household participation data for FY 2011 to draw the sample.⁶ Of the 26 ITOs/State organizations, the largest 6 were included in the sample with certainty (Navajo Nation, Cherokee Nation, Choctaw Nation, Oglala Sioux, Chickasaw Nation, and Muscogee [Creek] Nation). These sites do not have identified replacements. The remaining

⁴ Updated with final numbers October 20, 2015

⁵ Since the household is the unit for program eligibility decisions, and case files are maintained by household, the sampling frame used is household units.

⁶ National Data Bank Version 8.2, Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, Participation Report (FNS 152), FY 2011.

sites were chosen using systematic random sampling, with probability proportionate to the number of participating households. We stratified, sorting the programs first on region, and then on whether individual participation between 2001 and 2011 fell by more than 25 percent, fell by less than 25 percent, or increased. We added this latter dimension to ensure that our sample matched the distribution of all participants in terms of location in growing or shrinking programs. Under this sampling plan, small programs are represented, but in proportion to their numbers of participants, rather than oversampled to ensure a target number of small ITOs. When we selected sites, we also selected a set of alternate sites that were “paired” with the sample sites as suitable replacements, should tribes decline to participate.

Only participants in the 104 programs with more than 33 participating households were eligible for the sample. This is large enough to have a high probability of achieving our original target number of interviews (29 households) per Tribe, but excludes 8 small programs with FDPIR participants, and provides coverage of 99.6 percent of the FDPIR population. The excluded programs represent less than 1 percent (0.4%) of the population. The cutoff for inclusion was chosen as the smallest number of households from which we were confident that we could obtain a sufficient number of interviews in each of the sampled areas.

The study sites are the basis of a nationally representative sample of FDPIR participating households. Our approach is designed to focus on the national estimates for all participants: there will be relatively little weighting for the sample of participants.

In the second stage, samples of participating households were then selected from administrative records in each of the 26 Tribal areas. FDPIR eligibility is by household unit, and case records are maintained by household. From the sampled households, information about all members of the household was abstracted from the case record to develop the profile of participants. We then contacted and interviewed the person (participant) who applied for FDPIR assistance (noted as the Head of Household on some forms) or his/her proxy.

Our plan called for obtaining case records and interviews for 29 households in all but the two largest Tribal areas. In each of the two largest programs (Cherokee and Navajo), which together represent 23 percent⁷ of the participants, we are working to obtain case records and interviews for 68 households (yielding approximately 17 percent of the sample interviews). The increased sample size in these two programs reduces the extent to which weighting will be needed to represent the entire population. A random sample of 1,050 households was to be selected. Anticipating a 95 percent

⁷ Based on average monthly number of participants in FY 2011 (Source: FNS National Data Bank Public Use Data File).

eligibility rate from the case records and an 80 percent response on the participant survey, this was expected to yield approximately 800 completed interviews.

SELECTING THE PARTICIPATING HOUSEHOLD SAMPLE

To select the sample of participating households, it was necessary to define the reference month and construct the sampling frame prior to implementing systematic random sampling.

Define reference month. The reference month defines the target population by identifying every household that received FDPIR commodities that month for each of the programs in the sample. In determining the reference month, we considered the amount of time needed for sample frame construction and anticipated timing of data collection.⁸ We also considered seasonal fluctuation in FDPIR participation in an effort to select a month that reflected typical program activity. The reference month selected was September 2013.⁹

Constructing the sampling frame. The sampling frame for each ITO consists of a list of all FDPIR participating households for the reference month. For tribes that operate the program on Indian reservation lands, low-income households are served without regard to race or ethnicity. For programs operating in approved areas near a reservation or in tribal jurisdiction service areas in the state of Oklahoma, only households with at least one member of a Federally-recognized tribe are eligible to participate in FDPIR. FNS instructed each of the ITOs in the sample to save a copy of their September 2013 participation list (i.e., the Household Issuance list from the Automated Inventory System which identifies the name of the applicant in alphabetical order and date of food pick-up).¹⁰ During the outreach calls with each participating ITO, NORC requested that each ITO report the number of households participating for the reference month in order to establish the frame size (N). NORC then arranged either to have ITOs send the list by secure mail or FTP or for NORC staff to obtain or construct the list of FDPIR program households for the reference month during the on-site case record review. NORC returned all lists that were sent in advance to the ITO. All lists that were consulted while on-site remained with the ITO.

⁸ To increase the probability of accurate contact information and availability for interviews, the reference month needed to be as close as possible to the onset of data collection. For this reason, the reference month was not selected until outreach to ITOs was under way.

⁹ On August 27, 2013 FNS issued a final rule amending the income deduction and resource eligibility requirements for FDPIR to simplify and improve administration, expand access to FDPIR, and promote conformity with SNAP eligibility requirements. This rule went into effect on September 26, 2013, so the study reference month essentially reflects participation prior to the rule change. Site visit interviews and updated participation data available from FNS will provide information on early responses to the rule change.

¹⁰ One ITO that maintains electronic records had this information available in a database.

ITO-specific systematic random sampling. NORC's sampling statistician created a master spreadsheet to implement sampling at each ITO. The spreadsheet contained the ITO name, state, sample number, status as a certainty ITO, intended sample size (n), frame list size (N), skip interval, random start, the number selected, and the date selected.

Once the frame size was established and the list obtained, systematic random sampling was implemented at each ITO. Using the site-specific list of participants for the designated reference month, NORC research staff who were conducting the case record review selected a systematic random sample of the required size. This sample was then reviewed by NORC's sampling statistician.

Systematic random sampling involves identification of a random start (r) and a sampling or skip interval (k). The interval was determined by dividing the number of participants on the list (N) and the second-stage sample size (n) (i.e., $k=N/n$). K is a constant interval between participants on the list. R is a random number between 1 and k. This guarantees that all participants have an equal chance of being selected. Using the constant interval (k), every k^{th} unit was selected (i.e., r, r+k, r+2k, etc.). The advantages of using systematic sampling over simple random sampling are that it is simple to understand, easy to implement, assures that the population is evenly sampled, and eliminates clustering. Using only whole numbers for k did result in extra selections being made (40 instead of 38, for example), but this simplified the procedure for on-site ITO implementation. Depending on the ITO, sampling proceeded in one of three ways:

1. When the frame size (N) and participating household list were obtained and known in advance, NORC staff implemented the systematic random sampling procedure and identified the participants in the sample prior to conducting the on-site visit. Knowing the sample in advance, ITO staff pulled the corresponding case record for each sample household and NORC abstracted the relevant data on-site. Samples for eight ITOs were drawn in this manner (i.e., Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, Cherokee Nation, Chickasaw Nation, Choctaw Nation, Muscogee (Creek) Nation, Navajo Nation,¹¹ Sac and Fox Nation, and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe).
2. When the frame size (N) was known in advance but the participating household list was *not* obtained in advance, NORC research staff identified a random start and interval prior to the on-site visit. Once on-site, participant names were numbered and selected from the Household Issuance list. ITO staff then pulled the corresponding case records for each household and NORC abstracted the relevant data. Samples for 14 ITOs were drawn in this manner (i.e., Bad

¹¹ In mid-October 2014, the Navajo Nation sent NORC the frame size and household lists for six of the seven warehouses (i.e., Leupp, Tuba City, TeecNosPos, Kirtland, Mexican Springs, Fort Defiance). The list for Crownpoint (with 590 households) was not included. As we knew the frame size in advance (4,624 households served overall) NORC implemented systematic random sampling using the six lists and completed the sampling process for the seventh warehouse while on-site in December 2014.

River Reservation, Comanche Nation, Eight Northern Pueblos Indian Council, Flathead Reservation, Fort Peck Reservation, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Lac Court Oreilles, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Sault Ste. Marie, Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Spokane Tribe of Indians, Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, and Yakama Indian Nation).

3. When both the frame size (N) and the participating household list were *not* obtained in advance, NORC research staff obtained the sample size and drew the sample from the list while on-site. NORC research staff implemented the systematic random sampling procedure and verified its accuracy with NORC's sampling statistician by phone and email. The sample for Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians was drawn in this manner.

NORC asked each ITO if they wished to participate in the sampling process; however the ITOs preferred that the research staff draw the sample. While on-site, some ITOs assisted NORC staff by pulling the case records; other ITOs allowed NORC direct access to the active, in-active and archived files.

Changes to the Sampling Plan

Twenty-six ITOs were selected for the study sample as described in the first section of this memo. The following changes were made to this original sampling plan:

- When the original sample was submitted to FNS in June 2012, FNS expressed concerns about the participation of one ITO due to some longstanding administrative issues. Since that site was a large site, although not a certainty site, it did not have a readily comparable replacement. Based on discussions with FNS and UI and NORC statisticians, the decision was made to drop this ITO from the sample and, rather than replace the site, increase the sample size in the remaining sites. This resulted in an approved sample of 25 sites.
- One tribe in the approved study sample, Tule River Tribe, declined participation in the study (December 2012). Using our replacement sample, the decision was made to replace Tule River Tribe with Lummi Nation.
- Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe declined to participate in the study (March 2014). Using our replacement list, the decision was made to replace Spirit Lake with Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska.

- Lummi Nation declined to participate in the study (March 2014). Since Lummi Nation was a replacement site (for Tule River Tribe), it was not replaced in the sample. This resulted in a sample of 24 sites.
- In consultation with FNS (March 2014), the decision was made to increase the sample size in each of the sites where case record review had not yet been completed (except the two largest sites, which would each have larger sample) from approximately 29 interviews to approximately 32 interviews to account for the possibility of additional tribes declining to participate and not being replaced by other tribes.
- Rosebud Sioux Tribe declined participation in the study (May 2014) and was not replaced.

In summary, of the 26 sites selected for the nationally representative sample, one was dropped based on the recommendation of FNS, and three tribes in the original sample (Tule River Tribe, Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe, and Rosebud Sioux Tribe) declined to participate. The replacement for Tule River Tribe (Lummi Nation) also declined to participate. Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe was replaced by the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska. The resulting sample consists of 23 tribes. The following section describes the sample in each of the 23 tribes, and Table 1 presents the nationally representative sample.

Outcome: Final Sample

Site-specific samples were drawn for each of the 23 tribes that consented to participate in the national study. Samples were drawn from December 2013-October 2014, immediately prior to conducting the on-site case record review. The integrity of each sample was maintained by strict adherence to the procedures described above. As shown in Table 1, the total frame size for the 23 tribes is 19,393. The final sample size is 1,053.

The six site-specific samples that were drawn from December 2013 – March 2014 include at least 38 participants. As three of the 26 tribes in the original sample declined to participate, the sample sizes were adjusted slightly over the subsequent months to compensate for the reduction in the overall sample. Thus, the sample size minimum increased slightly from 38 to 42 participants at the remaining 15 ITOs. For the two largest programs (Cherokee Nation and Navajo Nation), however, which together represent 23 percent of the FDPIR participants, 89 participants were selected for each sample.

For each participating ITO, we identified the service area, the dispersion of participating households across a geographic area (such as on the reservation only, in contiguous counties in a tribal

jurisdiction area), and the food distribution points. For example, some programs operate more than one warehouse [i.e., Cherokee Nation (5), Chickasaw Nation (3), Choctaw Nation (4), Navajo Nation (7), Oglala Sioux Tribe (2), Sac and Fox Nation (2)] with food distribution occurring at each warehouse. Many ITOs operate tailgate distributions at several remote locations within their service area (e.g., Fort Peck Reservation, Hoopa Valley Tribe, Navajo Nation, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Sherwood Valley, and Standing Rock Sioux Tribe). For these ITOs, participating households were dispersed over several distribution sites and were included in the sample.¹²

¹² Case records were centralized at one warehouse for the Oglala Sioux Tribe and distributed at multiple warehouses across ITOs in the study sample: Cherokee Nation; Choctaw Nation; Navajo Nation; Sac and Fox Nation. The Chickasaw Nation maintains electronic records with a centralized database.

EXHIBIT H

Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations Study Sample

FNS Region	Indian Tribal Organization	State	Frame Size (N)	Selected	ITO-specific systematic random sampling procedure		
			September 2013	(n)	1	2	3
Mountain Plains	Fort Peck Reservation	MT	255	43		•	
Mountain Plains	Flathead Reservation	MT	112	42		•	
Mountain Plains	Oglala Sioux Tribe ^a	SD	635	48		•	
Mountain Plains	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe	ND/SD	597	43	•		
Mountain Plains	Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska ^b	NE	181	45		•	
Midwest	Bad River Reservation	WI	99	37		•	
Midwest	Lac Courte Oreilles	WI	275	44		•	
Midwest	Sault Ste Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians	MI	487	45		•	
Southeast	Mississippi Band Of Choctaw Indian	MS	368	37			•
Southwest	Eight Northern Indian Pueblos Council	NM	804	43		•	
Southwest	Apache Tribe Of Oklahoma	OK	256	41	•		
Southwest	Cherokee Nation ^a	OK	3,918	89	•		
Southwest	Chickasaw Nation ^a	OK	1,408	42	•		
Southwest	Choctaw Nation ^a	OK	1,666	43	•		
Southwest	Comanche Nation	OK	398	43		•	
Southwest	Muscogee (Creek) Nation ^a	OK	1,222	38	•		
Southwest	Sac And Fox Tribe	OK	582	39	•		
Western	Hoopa Valley Reservation	CA	304	42		•	
Western	Navajo Nation ^a	AZ	4,624	89	•		•
Western	Spokane Tribe of Indians	WA	59	38		•	
Western	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	ID	314	45		•	
Western	Sherwood Valley Pomo Indians	CA	609	37		•	
Western	Yakama Indian Nation	WA	220	40		•	
Total			19,393	1,053			

Notes:

- ^a = Certainty tribe
- ^b = Replacement tribe

Procedure:

- 1 = Sample drawn in advance of on-site visit
- 2 = Frame size obtained in advance and sample drawn on-site
- 3 = Sample drawn on site

Appendix I. FDPIR Participant Sampling Methodology

This Appendix explains the procedures followed to create the sample of FDPIR participants for the case record review (described in Appendix B) and the participant survey (described in Appendix D).

The sample was chosen using a two-stage design. We describe the selection of Tribes for the first stage of the sample in Appendix H. In that stage, 26 Tribes were selected. Of the 26, one was dropped based on the recommendation of FNS, and three tribes in the original sample (Tule River Tribe, Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe, and Rosebud Sioux Tribe) declined to participate. The replacement for Tule River Tribe (Lummi Nation) also declined to participate. Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe was replaced by the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska. The resulting sample consists of 23 tribes.

In the second stage, samples of participating households were then selected from administrative records in each of the 23 Tribal areas. FDPIR eligibility is by household unit, and case records are maintained by household. From the sampled households, information about all members of the household was abstracted from the case record to develop the profile of participants. We then contacted and interviewed the person (participant) who applied for FDPIR assistance (noted as the Head of Household on some forms) or his/her proxy.

Our plan called for obtaining case records and interviews for 29 households in all but the two largest Tribal areas. In each of the two largest programs (Cherokee and Navajo), which together represent 23 percent¹³ of the total number of FDPIR participants, we obtained case records and attempted interviews for 89 households in each of these Tribal areas (yielding approximately 17 percent of the sample interviews). The increased sample size in these two programs reduces the extent to which weighting will be needed to represent the entire population. A random sample of 1,050 households was to be selected. Anticipating a 95 percent eligibility rate from the case records and an 80 percent response on the participant survey, this was expected to yield approximately 800 completed interviews. The final number of completed interviews was 849.

In order to account for the smaller number of programs in the sample (23 instead of 26 Tribes), we increased the number of sampled households in each program from our original plan. In all but the two

¹³ Based on average monthly number of participants in FY 2011 (Source: FNS National Data Bank Public Use Data File).

largest programs, we sampled 37 to 48 households. In each of the two largest programs, Cherokee Nation and Navajo Nation, we sampled 89 households.

With minor exceptions, the case record review sample and the household survey sample are identical. The exceptions are:

- One case was dropped from the CRR sample during analysis because it was later determined to be ineligible for the sample. Since the CRR and household samples are not linked, it was not possible to remove this case from the Household Survey sample. So, one ITO (Sherwood Valley) appears as CRR = 37 and HH = 38. The person participated in the program and was in the survey sample, but we don't know whether s/he was a respondent.
- Two cases were dropped prior to loading the HH sample because they were known to be deceased (Apache = 1 and La Courte Oreilles = 1) at the time of the CRR. They were kept in the CRR sample because they received benefits in September 2013.

The total sample size for the case record review was 1,053 households. The final household survey sample was 1,052 households.

Appendix J. Final Memorandum on FDPIR and SNAP Eligibility Benefits in FY2002 and 2008 Using TRIM Analysis

April 6, 2015

Submitted To:
Bob Dalrymple, Ph.D.
Senior Analyst
SNAP Research and Analysis Division
Office of Policy Support
Food and Nutrition Service
Food and Nutrition Service, USDA
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

Contract No. GS-23F-8198H
UI Project No. 08322-020-00

FDPIR and SNAP Eligibility and Benefits in FY 2002 and 2008¹⁴

Introduction

Most households eligible for food assistance through the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) are also eligible for benefits under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as the Food Stamp Program (FSP).¹⁵ However, households are not permitted to participate simultaneously in both programs and so must choose between them. Participation in FDPIR declined from 129,500 participating individuals in Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 to 86,000 participating individuals in FY 2007 and has ranged between 75,600 and 85,400 since then.¹⁶ At the same time that FDPIR participation decreased, national SNAP participation increased—from 18.2 million average monthly participants in FY 1999 to 26.3 million in FY 2007, with growth continuing during the recession and post-recession years until falling between 2013 and 2014.¹⁷

The purpose of this analysis is to investigate whether changes in FDPIR and SNAP eligibility and benefit amounts between 2002 and 2008 provided incentives for households eligible for FDPIR to shift to SNAP during this time period. This analysis is part of a larger study of FDPIR, intended to provide an updated profile of participants, program operations, and understanding of participant preferences. The analysis presented here will be used along with participant and program staff responses for a later period (2013-2014) to understand the program's evolution and key factors affecting eligibility and participant choices between FDPIR and SNAP.

We use the Transfer Income Model Version 3 (TRIM3) to model FDPIR and SNAP eligibility in 2002 and 2008 and investigate the extent to which American Indian/Alaskan Native (AIAN) households in likely FDPIR service areas were eligible for FDPIR only, SNAP only, or both programs. Most program eligibility rules can be readily modeled using the detailed income and demographic data available in the Current Population Survey Social and Economic Supplement (CPS-ASEC). Although the CPS-ASEC

¹⁴ Laura Wheaton, Paul Johnson, Martha Johnson, Jennifer Biess, and Nancy Pindus contributed to this report. We use methods based on those from Finegold et al. (2009) and our discussion of eligibility rules and methodology is adapted in large part from that report. The analysis has benefited greatly from suggestions and information provided to us by Bob Dalrymple (project officer), Dana Rasmussen, Barbara Lopez, and their colleagues at FNS.

¹⁵ This report uses the current program name, "SNAP," although the program was known as the "Food Stamp Program" during the years covered by the analysis.

¹⁶ Food Distribution Program Tables, National Level Summary Tables: Fiscal Years 1969-2014, USDA Food and Nutrition Service, accessed January 22, 2015. <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/food-distribution-program-tables>.

¹⁷ Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) National Level Annual Summary participation and Costs, 1969-2014, USDA Food And Nutrition Service, accessed January 22, 2015.

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-snap>.

asks about SNAP participation, FDPIR participation is not collected, and key information required to model the choice between SNAP and FDPIR is not collected in the CPS-ASEC or other general household surveys. Therefore, our estimates focus on the extent to which there were differences in the extent of overlap between SNAP and FDPIR eligibility in 2002 and 2008, regardless of a household's actual participation decision.

In addition to examining differences in FDPIR and SNAP eligibility overlap in 2002 and 2008, we compare the relative value of SNAP and FDPIR benefits among households that were eligible for both programs. Households that participate in SNAP receive an Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) card which can be used for food purchases. The value of the EBT declines as household income rises. In contrast, FDPIR provides an in-kind food package based on household size. Depending on a household's income, the SNAP EBT benefit may be bigger or smaller than the value of the FDPIR food package. Because the relative values of the two benefits may factor into a household's participation decision, we estimate the extent to which households eligible for both SNAP and FDPIR were eligible for higher benefits under SNAP in 2002 and 2008.

Our eligibility analysis finds that most households eligible for FDPIR or SNAP in 2002 and 2008 were eligible for both programs, and there was little change between 2002 and 2008 in the share of FDPIR-eligible households also eligible for SNAP. Over half of households that were eligible for both SNAP and FDPIR were eligible for higher benefits under SNAP, but the share of households eligible for higher benefits under SNAP decreased between 2002 and 2008.

Although we model most SNAP and FDPIR eligibility rules in considerable detail, SNAP vehicle rules, certain restrictions (such as disqualifications for drug felonies and program violations), and treatment of per-capita (lump-sum) income are not modeled. A number of states with FDPIR programs¹⁸ eliminated SNAP vehicle tests or increased SNAP vehicle exemptions between 2002 and 2008. Our results do not capture any increases in SNAP eligibility resulting from changes in vehicle policy. The time period covered by this study also coincides with a period in which many states were implementing administrative and policy changes making it easier to apply for and remain on SNAP. These changes may have decreased perceived disadvantages of SNAP relative to FDPIR among households eligible for both programs, causing some to switch to SNAP. However, any such effect is beyond the scope of this analysis.

The remainder of this memorandum is organized as follows. In section one, we discuss FDPIR and SNAP eligibility rules—focusing primarily on the rules in effect in FY 2002 and 2008, but noting major

¹⁸ When describing SNAP policies in states with FDPIR programs, we include two states (Indiana and Iowa) that did not have FDPIR programs in 2002 or 2008 but had residents covered by FDPIR programs in bordering states.

changes in policy since 2008.¹⁹ Section two describes the data and methodology used for the analysis. In section three, we present eligibility estimates for FDPIR and SNAP in FY 2002 and 2008—showing the extent to which AIAN households in likely FDPIR areas were eligible for both programs, FDPIR only, SNAP only, or neither program, and describing changes between the two years. Section four compares the benefit amount for households found eligible for both FDPIR and SNAP, and section five concludes with a discussion of the findings from this analysis.

I. Eligibility rules for FDPIR and SNAP

FDPIR eligibility includes criteria related to location and tribal affiliation while SNAP does not, but in other respects SNAP requirements are stricter—and more complicated—than those for FDPIR. Studies by Usher et al. (1990), GAO (1990), Davis et al. (2002), and Finegold et al. (2009) reported that Native Americans on and near reservations perceived that it was easier to enroll, and stay enrolled, in FDPIR than in SNAP. This section describes FDPIR and SNAP eligibility rules, with a focus on FY 2002 and 2008—the years included in the analysis. Changes since 2008 have reduced some of the differences in eligibility rules of the two programs and are noted. The eligibility rules are organized into locational and tribal eligibility for FDPIR, household income limits (for both programs), resource limits, and other eligibility rules in effect in 2002 and 2008.

LOCATIONAL AND TRIBAL ELIGIBILITY FOR FDPIR

To participate in FDPIR, applicant households must reside on a reservation that operates the program or live in an approved near area or in Oklahoma, where most reservation boundaries no longer exist. In 2002, twenty-four states had residents eligible for FDPIR (table 22b). Two of these states (Indiana and Iowa) did not have FDPIR agencies themselves, but had residents eligible through programs in a bordering state. Alaska did not participate in FDPIR in 2002 but did in 2008, bringing the total to twenty-five. Tribes may be approved to serve areas outside their reservation boundaries (near areas) that have concentrations of Native Americans. In these near areas, eligible households must include at least one enrolled member of a federally recognized American Indian tribe or Alaska Native Village. This person does not have to be enrolled in the specific tribe operating FDPIR in that service area. Among Native Americans living outside reservations, those in communities with populations of 10,000 or more cannot participate in FDPIR unless that community was already participating in the

¹⁹ In particular, FDPIR regulations issued in 2013 eliminated the FDPIR resource test, expanded the deduction for out-of-pocket medical expenses, and introduced a regional shelter/utility expense deduction (FNS 2013).

program when its population grew above 10,000 or has a waiver from the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS).

HOUSEHOLD INCOME LIMITS FOR FDPIR AND SNAP

In both FDPIR and SNAP, a household can be an individual living alone; an individual living with others, but purchasing food and preparing meals separately; or a group of people living, purchasing food, and preparing meals together. By this definition, there can be more than one household under the same roof. Spouses living together, however, cannot be in separate households, and children under age 18 (under 22 for SNAP) who live with their parents cannot file separately from their parents.

Table 22 compares the eligibility requirements of FDPIR and SNAP in 2002 and 2008. Households in which everyone receives assistance from TANF, SSI, or (in some states) General Assistance are categorically eligible for SNAP or FDPIR, without regard to income or asset limits. Otherwise, to qualify for SNAP under federal rules, households without any elderly or disabled persons must pass both a gross income test (130 percent of federal poverty guidelines) and a net income test (100 percent of federal poverty guidelines, after the standard deduction and other deductions are applied). Households with an elderly or disabled member are subject to the net income test only. As described below, the two programs differ somewhat in the deductions used to determine net income. FDPIR has no gross income test, which allows households to remain eligible for FDPIR at higher earnings levels than for SNAP. The FDPIR net income limit is set at 100 percent of federal poverty guidelines, the same level as the SNAP limit, plus an amount equal to the SNAP standard deduction.

Under SNAP, states have the option to assign automatic eligibility to households eligible to receive a TANF/Maintenance of Effort (MOE) funded service (such as an informational brochure). States adopting this broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE) have typically eliminated the asset and net income tests and some have increased the gross income limit up to as high as 200 percent of poverty. Of the 25 states with residents eligible for FDPIR, three (Michigan, North Dakota, and Oregon) had BBCE policies in effect in FY 2002, and five more (Arizona, Minnesota, New York, Washington, and Wisconsin) had implemented BBCE by FY 2008 (table 22b). Two of the five states implementing BBCE during this period (Arizona and Wisconsin) increased the gross income limit (Arizona to 185 percent of poverty, and Wisconsin to 200 percent) and all but one eliminated the assets test (Minnesota raised the asset limit to \$7,000) (Trippe and Gillooly 2010).²⁰

²⁰ The gross income limits for the three states with BBCE already in effect in 2002 are 200 percent of poverty for Michigan and 185 percent of poverty for Oregon. North Dakota does not impose a gross income limit but requires units eligible through BBCE to have net income less than 100 percent of the federal poverty guideline.

FDPIR and SNAP both include a standard deduction, as well as other deductions to income. The standard deduction is the same for the two programs, although it is implemented differently. The SNAP standard deduction is subtracted from gross income as part of the calculation of net income. In FDPIR, where households are not subject to a gross income test, the standard deduction amount is used in the calculation that determines net monthly income limits for the program. In FY 2002, the standard deduction was constant across household sizes in the continental US at \$134. In FY 2008, the standard deduction varied between \$134 and \$191, depending on household size, with a higher deduction for Alaska. Both programs include deductions for dependent care expenses, child support payments (the legally obligated amount), and work expenses (20 percent of earnings). In FY 2002 and 2008 the monthly dependent care deduction was capped at \$200 per child under age 2 and \$175 for older children. The caps were eliminated under the 2008 Farm Bill²¹, effective October 1, 2008.

Both programs allow some households to deduct out-of-pocket medical expenses, but do so in different ways. SNAP allows a deduction for out-of-pocket medical expenses of elderly and/or disabled members within a household that exceed \$35 dollars per month. Prior to 2013, FDPIR only allowed deductions for payments for Medicare Part B (\$96.40 per person in 2008) and Medicare Part D, the prescription drug benefit that began in 2006. Part D premiums vary widely, depending on the plan chosen, and may be covered by premium assistance benefits for low-income participants. In 2013, the FDPIR medical expense deduction was expanded to include other out-of-pocket medical expenses in excess of \$35 per month incurred by elderly and/or disabled household members.

In determining net income, SNAP households can deduct shelter expenses, including utility costs, that are above 50 percent of net income after other deductions have been applied. FDPIR had no shelter deduction in 2002 or 2008; a regional shelter/utility expense deduction was added to the program in 2013.²²

Some tribes draw on income from gaming, sale or leasing of resources such as timber and oil, or other economic enterprises to distribute monthly, quarterly, or annual per capita payments to their members. Federal regulations, based on language in statutes and treaties, exclude per capita payments from some of the nongaming revenue streams in determining eligibility for food assistance. Treatment of per capita payments that are not excluded varies by whether the payments are monthly or are received less frequently (e.g., quarterly or annually). Monthly per-capita payments are counted as unearned income by both FDPIR and SNAP. In 2002 and 2008, FDPIR treated per capita payments

²¹ Public Law 110-246.

²² Set by FNS, these are region-specific standard income deductions for monthly shelter and utility expenses. The regions are Northeast/Midwest; Southeast/Southwest; Mountain Plains; and West.

received on a less frequent than monthly basis as resources in the month received. The payments continued to be counted as resources in the following months until spent. On some reservations, large numbers of people lost FDPIR eligibility in the months in which payments were distributed. In 2013, FDPIR removed the resource test and so per-capita payments received less frequently than monthly are no longer counted. SNAP's policy regarding per capita payments is the same today as it was in 2002 and 2008. Recurring payments that occur on less than a monthly basis are annualized, with one twelfth of the annual amount counted as income in each month. This avoids disqualifying large numbers of participants from SNAP at the same time. However, annualized per capita payments may push some households that are otherwise close to the SNAP income limits above those limits in all months. Households close to the income limits, however, are eligible for relatively small benefit amounts, so there may be few such households actually participating in the SNAP program when they are eligible. If a household does not spend per capita income in the month received, it counts as a resource in following months until spent.

RESOURCES

Both SNAP and FDPIR had asset “resource” limits in effect in 2002 and 2008. The SNAP resource limit in 2002 was \$2,000, or \$3,000 if the household contained an elderly person (aged 60 or more). SNAP asset limits remained the same in 2008, except that households with a disabled member also became eligible for the higher \$3,000 limit. The 2008 Farm Bill indexed SNAP asset limits for inflation. As noted above, SNAP asset limits were eliminated or substantially increased under BBCE policies in three states with FDPIR programs in 2002 and eight states with FDPIR programs in 2008.

FDPIR asset limits differed somewhat from SNAP during this time period. One-person households and households without an elderly person (age 60 or older) were subject to a \$1,750 asset limit in both years. Households with two or more members that contained at least one elderly member were subject to a \$3,000 asset limit. Asset tests were eliminated from FDPIR in 2013.

In 2002 and 2008, FDPIR did not count vehicles as assets, whereas federal SNAP rules counted the market value of a vehicle above \$4,650 as a resource. However, states had the option to align their SNAP vehicle rules with the rules of TANF or other human services programs or to eliminate SNAP assets tests through BBCE. In 2002, seven of the twenty-four states with FDPIR programs used the standard SNAP federal vehicle rules when determining SNAP eligibility, seven excluded the value of all vehicles, six excluded the value of at least one (but not all) of the vehicles in the household, and four exempted more than \$4,650 of the vehicle value from resources (table 22b). By 2008, sixteen of the states with FDPIR programs exempted all vehicles when determining SNAP eligibility, seven exempted

at least one (but not all) vehicles, and two exempted more than \$4,650 of the vehicle value from resources.

OTHER ELIGIBILITY RULES

Since 1985, SNAP participants between the ages of 16 and 59 have been required to register for work, if they were not already working or in school. The 1996 welfare reform law, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA)²³, imposed more stringent requirements on a subset of those subject to work requirements. Able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs) are the only group whose access to SNAP benefits is subject to time limits. Under PRWORA, unemployed people between the ages of 18 and 49 who are not disabled, and live in households without children, may only receive benefits for three months in a thirty-six month period. (ABAWDs are eligible for full benefits in months when they are working at least twenty hours per week, and enrollment during those months does not count against the time limit).

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)²⁴, the 2009 stimulus bill, suspended the ABAWD restrictions until October 2010, but the restrictions were in effect in both FY 2002 and FY 2008. States have the option to request exemptions from federal ABAWD restrictions for areas based on high unemployment relative to the national average. States may request waivers for areas as small as cities, counties, or reservations, or as large as the entire state to suspend ABAWD restrictions. To receive the waiver, the state must show that the local unemployment rate has been at least 20 percent above the national unemployment rate for the two prior calendar years. They can also receive waivers based on a local unemployment rate of 10 percent or more. Seventeen states with FDPIR programs in 2002 and twenty-two in 2008 had SNAP ABAWD waivers covering SNAP recipients in at least some portion of their FDPIR service areas. In contrast to time limit restrictions for ABAWDs in SNAP, FDPIR does not require registration for work, and does not have any time limits on assistance.

PRWORA also included a lifetime ban on benefits from SNAP or TANF for people who have been convicted of drug-related felonies. States can opt out of the drug felony restrictions; as of February 2003, five of the states with FDPIR programs had opted out of the lifetime ban, nine had implemented a modified ban, and the remaining ten had retained the lifetime ban. By November 2007, nine of the states with FDPIR programs had opted out of the lifetime ban, 11 had implemented a modified ban, and five had retained the lifetime ban (table 22b). The federal ban does not apply to FDPIR, so persons

²³ Public Law 104-193.

²⁴ Public Law 111-5.

convicted of drug felonies may be eligible for program benefits if they meet other program requirements.

II. Data and methodology

The data for this analysis are the March 2003 and March 2009 CPS-ASEC, which provide detailed demographic information for a nationally representative sample of households at the time of the survey and data on income, benefit receipt, and work in the prior calendar year. The two years were selected because they reflected a range in FDPIR participation with 110,000 participating individuals in FY 2002, and 90,200 participating individuals in FY 2008. We selected FY 2008 rather than a later year because it preceded the SNAP changes introduced in response to the recession. We selected FY 2002 rather than an earlier year due to a change in the race question implemented with the March 2003 ASEC. Previously, respondents were only able to specify a single race. Effective with the March 2003 ASEC, they can report all races to which they belong. As a result, the number of persons identifying as AIAN increased from 3.5 million in the 2002 ASEC to 4.9 million in the 2003 ASEC. The 2009 CPS-ASEC uses the same race variable and values as the 2003 CPS-ASEC. Selecting analysis years with the same race codes is important so that comparison of the findings from the two years reflects a similarly defined group of people.

We modeled eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP based on the approach developed in Finegold et al. (2009) using the SNAP component of the Transfer Income Model, version 3 (TRIM3).^{25,26} The TRIM3 SNAP module divides CPS-ASEC households into potential SNAP filing units and then models eligibility on a month-by-month basis.²⁷ The model follows the same steps as would be followed by a caseworker: determining whether the members meet categorical eligibility requirements,²⁸ performing assets tests,

²⁵ Funding for the Urban Institute to develop and maintain TRIM3 is primarily from the Department of Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE). More information on TRIM3 is available at <http://trim.urban.org>. TRIM3 also corrects for the underreporting of participation in SNAP and other means-tested programs (Wheaton 2007). The SNAP and FDPIR eligibility estimates presented here incorporate the TRIM3 correction for underreporting of SSI and TANF. However, correction for underreporting of SNAP does not factor into this analysis, as the focus is on SNAP and FDPIR eligibility.

²⁶ Although based on Finegold et al., this study incorporates a slightly revised definition of the universe, and an enhanced SNAP simulation methodology incorporating BBCE, improvements to the imputation of shelter expenses for the excess shelter expense deduction, incorporation of standard utility allowances, use of fiscal year program rules rather than average weighted calendar year values, and tailoring of ABAWD exemptions to better reflect the exemptions facing AIAN households in each state.

²⁷ On-line documentation of the procedures for modeling SNAP is available at <http://trim.urban.org/documentation/foodstamps/main.html>.

²⁸ TRIM3 denies eligibility to SSI recipients in California (which cashes out SNAP benefits for SSI recipients) and to the following groups, unless certain exemptions are met: (1) students of higher education; (2) able-bodied adults

calculating income and deductions, determining income eligibility, and calculating the benefit amount. Units consisting entirely of SSI and TANF cash recipients are automatically eligible for SNAP. The estimates produced by the model include the simulated benefits, if any, for which that person would be eligible. TRIM3 does not simulate vehicle restrictions, ineligibility due to drug felonies or program violations, or treatment of lump-sum income due to a lack of data on these items in the CPS-ASEC. TRIM3 simulates SNAP certification periods and reporting requirements and transitional SNAP for TANF leavers. Urban Institute staff annually update the national and state program rules in the model according to SNAP policies in place during a particular year.

TRIM3 also provides the capacity to model “what-if” policy scenarios. The actual national and state rules can be reset to other values to model eligibility and participation under those alternative rules. For example, an alternative rules simulation might raise the SNAP gross income limit from 130 percent of federal poverty guidelines to 150 percent. The results of the simulation would tell us how many more people would receive benefits, and how much the total benefits paid out would change.

In performing this analysis, we first updated the 2002 and 2008 TRIM3 SNAP baseline to use the latest version of the simulation code and to include programming enhancements introduced in more recent years—notably, simulation of BBCE rules and improvements to the simulation of the excess shelter expense deduction, including enhanced imputation of shelter expenses and simulation of state standard utility allowances. In contrast to standard TRIM3 baselines, in which weighted calendar year values are used for dollar values that change during the year, we modeled fiscal year 2002 and 2008 program rules and maximum allotments on the calendar year 2002 and 2008 data. We selected fiscal year rules and allotments for the analysis for consistency with estimates of the value of the FDPIR benefit package, which are for the fiscal rather than calendar year. We also modified the parameter specifying the percentage of ABAWDs exempt from time limits due to residence in an area of high unemployment, so as to reflect the extent to which AIAN individuals reside in FDPIR areas with SNAP ABAWD waivers.²⁹

In order to simulate FDPIR eligibility, we changed the rules for the 2002 and 2008 SNAP simulation to those for FDPIR in the corresponding year. For example, we removed the gross income test for all households because FDPIR has no gross income test.

without dependent children (ABAWDs) who fail to meet work requirements; and (3) certain categories of non-citizens.

²⁹ Specifically, we reviewed waiver documents supplied to us by FNS to identify the counties and reservations in each state that were approved for the ABAWD waiver. We then estimated the percentage of American Indian and Alaskan Natives subject to ABAWD waivers by dividing the total AIAN population in FDPIR counties and reservations with ABAWD waivers by the total AIAN population in all FDPIR counties and reservations within the state.

SAMPLE FOR ANALYSIS

The CPS-ASEC lacks the data necessary to directly identify households living on reservations. Reservations are not identified in the CPS and counties with low populations are not identified due to confidentiality concerns. In less densely populated states (such as Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota), few counties are identified. In addition, although AIAN status is identified, membership in a particular tribe is not reported. Our methods therefore seek to approximate the AIAN population likely living in FDPIR areas. Because reservations are not identified, we cannot assign eligibility to households without AIAN members residing on reservations.

Geographically, our sample is limited to states with FDPIR programs and to two states (Iowa and Indiana) without FDPIR programs but with households eligible for FDPIR through agencies in neighboring states. Alaska did not have FDPIR in 2002 but had FDPIR in effect in 2008. In order for the 2002 and 2008 comparison to reflect a consistent universe, we remove Alaska from our primary estimates (results incorporating Alaska are included as appendix A). In each state, we exclude identified counties that do not contain reservations participating in FDPIR. We also exclude identified metropolitan areas (except those intersecting tribal land or that have a waiver from FNS). Our geographic identification is imprecise—it excludes counties without reservations that are served as “near areas” and have sufficient sample size to be identified in the CPS-ASEC. On the other hand, the sample includes counties that are not identifiable in the CPS-ASEC and do not include reservations or near areas.

Demographically, we require households in the analysis to include at least one native-born AIAN adult, alone or in combination with another race. We focus on nativity in order to avoid selecting immigrants who identify as AIAN (e.g., Indians from Central America) but are not likely members of eligible tribes in the United States. We require the native-born AIAN to be an adult to avoid including households of recent immigrants with children born in the United States.

Although we cannot directly identify the population meeting FDPIR reservation and tribal membership requirements, our methods should capture the majority of households meeting these criteria. In addition to our primary sample, we also define two alternative samples focused on narrower population groups—decreasing the chance of including ineligible households, but increasing the chance of excluding eligible households. Our second universe is like the first, except that we require the presence of a native-born AIAN adult who does not report belonging to an additional race. Our third universe is like the second, except that we require the household to report Indian Health Service coverage. We provide a variety of estimates because we do not seek to provide a point estimate for the

number of eligible FDPIR households, but instead to shed insight into relative changes in eligibility and benefits under FDPIR and SNAP in likely FDPIR-eligible households.

VALUE OF BENEFITS

Our analysis includes a comparison of the value of the SNAP and FDPIR benefit, for households eligible for both. For SNAP, the benefit begins with the maximum allotment, which varies by household size. It is based on the USDA Thrifty Food Plan, designed to meet nutritional goals at minimal cost. Households with no net income after subtracting the standard deduction and deductions for dependent care, court ordered child support paid to non-household members, medical expenses, and shelter costs receive the full benefit. Other households receive the maximum allotment minus 30 percent of net income. If the resulting amount is less than the minimum benefit, and the household has one or two people, the benefit is set at the minimum level.

FDPIR benefits are received as a monthly food package. Participants follow a monthly guide rate³⁰ and may select from over 70 products, including meats; fresh and canned fruits and vegetables; pastas, cereals, rice and other grains; canned soups; cheese, low-fat ultra high temperature milk, nonfat dry milk, and evaporated milk; flour and bakery mix; dried beans and dehydrated potatoes; bottled juices and dried fruit; peanut butter; and vegetable oil. The estimated retail value of the FDPIR package—\$78.44 per person in FY 2009—is obtained from Lovellette (2011). We adjust to FY 2002 and FY 2008 using an index based on the change in the per capita cost of the FDPIR food package (the average cost of the food package to the government, per recipient), producing estimates of \$55.16 in FY 2002 and \$80.55 in FY 2008.³¹

When comparing a household's potential SNAP and FDPIR benefit, we compare the SNAP benefit for which the household is eligible to the estimated FDPIR retail value derived from Lovellette. We also perform two alternative comparisons. We first decrease the FDPIR benefit by 10 percent in order to account for the possibility that the FDPIR benefit package, while allowing some choice, may be worth less to a household than the equivalent amount received in SNAP benefits, which can be applied to most food items.³² This adjustment was selected arbitrarily as we are not aware of any study upon which to

³⁰ Guide rates list food products by food type and indicate the amounts that can be included in the food package by household size. The list enables participants to see the choices and amounts in order to select their monthly food package.

³¹ To obtain the per capita food cost for each year, we divide the total food cost for the year by twelve and divide the result by the average monthly number of FDPIR participants. Data on food cost and FDPIR participants were obtained from the National Data Bank Version 8.2 Public use – U.S. Summary, Table 23: Food Donation Program—Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR), sent to us by Bob Dalrymple and Barbara Lopez of FNS.

³² SNAP benefits cannot be used to buy alcoholic beverages, foods that will be eaten in the store, and hot foods. Further information about eligible and ineligible foods is available at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/eligible-food-items>.

base this estimate. In the second comparison, we increase the FDPIR benefit by 10 percent to account for the possibility of higher food prices in remote areas (Lovellette’s retail estimate is based on national average price data). For example, a study of American Indian communities in Washington State (O’Connell et al. 2011) finds that the average cost of a Thrifty Food Plan market basket for the nearest off-reservation supermarket is 7 percent above the USDA reference cost.

III. Eligibility findings

Tables 23a through 23c summarize simulated average monthly eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP in 2002 and 2008 for the primary universe, the second universe (narrowed to households with persons whose race is AIAN-alone), and the third universe (further narrowed to households reporting Indian Health Service Coverage).

The primary universe consists of 921 unweighted households representing 702,000 households in 2002 and 883 unweighted households representing 749,000 weighted households in 2008. The second universe has 557 unweighted households in 2002 and 589 unweighted households in 2008, representing 356,000 and 436,000 weighted households respectively. The sample size for the third universe is quite small (258 unweighted households in 2002 and 310 unweighted households in 2008), representing 124,000 and 154,000 households respectively. Due to the smaller sample size, results for the third universe should be interpreted with caution.

FDPIR-eligible households comprised 31.5 percent of the primary universe in 2002, falling to 27.8 percent in 2008—a 3.6 percentage point (or 12 percent) reduction. These results are similar to those of Finegold et al. (2009), who found 30.4 percent of households eligible for FDPIR in 2005. FDPIR eligibility was slightly higher in the second universe, with 33.8 percent and 33.0 percent of households eligible in 2002 and 2008 respectively. FDPIR eligibility was highest in the third universe—with 43.3 percent of households eligible for FDPIR in 2002 and slightly more (44.6 percent) eligible in 2008.

Most households in the sample that were eligible for SNAP or FDPIR benefits met the eligibility requirements for both programs. Twenty-eight percent of households in the primary universe were eligible for both SNAP and FDPIR in 2002, compared to 25 percent in 2008, similar to the 26.5 percent found in Finegold et al. for 2005. The percentages were somewhat higher for the second universe (at 30 percent in 2002 and 29 percent in 2008) and higher still for the third universe (at 36 percent in 2002 and 40 percent in 2008).

Among all households in the primary universe, 1.7 percent were eligible for SNAP but not FDPIR in 2002, increasing to 4.1 percent in 2008.³³ Most of this increase was due to additional SNAP eligibility among FDPIR-ineligible households as a result of BBCE. If BBCE policies were held constant at their 2002 levels, just 2.2 percent of the primary universe would have been eligible for SNAP but not FDPIR in 2008 (appendix B). Results for the second universe and third universes also show an increase in the share eligible for SNAP but not FDPIR between 2002 and 2008, although fewer households fell into this category and the increase was not as large.

Households eligible for FDPIR but not SNAP accounted for 3.5 percent of the primary universe in 2002, dropping to 3.0 percent in 2008.³⁴ Shares were similar for the second universe (dropping from 4.0 in 2002 to 3.7 in 2008) and somewhat higher in the third universe (dropping from 7.4 percent in 2002 to 4.8 percent in 2002). ABAWD time-limits were a primary reason for a household eligible for FDPIR to be ineligible for SNAP. In our sensitivity run that removes ABAWD time-limits, just 1.3 percent of the households in the primary universe were eligible for FDPIR but not SNAP, and this share did not change between 2002 and 2008 (appendix C). In addition, the share of households in this category was below two percent (for the second universe) and three percent (for the third universe) for both 2002 and 2008.

If declining FDPIR enrollment between 2002 and 2008 were attributable to an increase in SNAP eligibility among the FDPIR-eligible population, we would expect to see a higher share of FDPIR eligible households eligible for SNAP in 2008. However, the rates were similar in the two years—with 89 percent of FDPIR-eligible households in the primary universe also eligible for SNAP and 88 to 89 percent eligible in the second universe (not shown). The third universe does show a small increase—from 83 percent in 2002 to 89 percent in 2008. However, this result should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size. Also, the results are sensitive to the extent to which ABAWDs were ineligible in the two years, and simulation of ABAWD time-limits relies heavily on imputation. In the sensitivity test where we exempt all ABAWDs from time limits, the share of FDPIR-eligible households that were eligible for SNAP in the third universe actually declined between 2002 and 2008 from 98 to 94 percent.

³³ The share estimated by Finegold et al. (0.9 percent) for 2005 is slightly lower than these estimates, likely due to the fact that the FSP estimates in that study did not include BBCE.

³⁴ Finegold et al. found that 3.8 percent of households fell in this category in 2005.

IV. Benefit comparison

The TRIM3 estimates in tables 24a through 24c compare the average monthly SNAP and FDPIR benefit for households that met the eligibility requirements for both programs, about a quarter of the primary universe shown in table 23a. As described in the methodology section, we compare a household's potential SNAP benefit to the estimated retail value of the FDPIR benefit package—on a per-person basis, \$55.16 and \$80.55 in 2002 and 2008 respectively, and include sensitivity tests that decrease and increase the FDPIR benefit value by 10 percent.

We find that a majority of households eligible for both FDPIR and SNAP were eligible for larger (or equal) benefits under SNAP than under FDPIR, for both years and all three universes. This finding is consistent with Finegold et al., who found that 53 percent of households in the primary universe were eligible for a higher SNAP benefit in 2005. We find that the percentage of jointly-eligible households eligible for a higher SNAP benefit fell between 2002 and 2008—from 65 percent to 51 percent in the primary universe, 66 to 52 percent in the second universe, and from 80 to 54 percent in the third universe.

The 2002 value for the third universe (showing that 80 percent of jointly eligible households were eligible for a higher benefit under SNAP), was substantially higher than for the first two universes, and also higher than the 2005 estimate from Finegold et al., who found that 58 percent of jointly eligible households in this universe qualified for a higher benefit under SNAP. Our result may be an anomaly attributable to small sample size—just 116 unweighted households in the third universe were eligible for both FDPIR and SNAP in 2002.

When we vary the estimated value of the FDPIR package up and down by 10 percent, we see the same approximate decline in the extent to which households were eligible for higher benefits under SNAP. For the primary universe, there was a 13.5 percentage point decline in the share of households eligible for a higher benefit under SNAP than FDPIR when the estimated retail value is used. If we decrease the estimated retail value by 10 percent to reflect the possibility that FDPIR is valued less than the same dollar amount of SNAP benefits, there was a 12.0 percentage point decline between the two years. Raising the estimated retail value by 10 percent (to reflect the possibility of higher costs in remote areas) produced a 13.1 percentage point decline in the share of households eligible for a higher SNAP than FDPIR benefit between 2002 and 2008.

Our findings regarding a downward shift in the share of households eligible for a higher benefit under SNAP than FDPIR between 2002 and 2008 is not surprising as the estimated value of the FDPIR package increased more between these two years than did the Thrifty Food Plan (the basis for the

maximum SNAP allotment). The FDPIR per capita food cost (which we use to index the estimated 2009 FDPIR retail value to 2002 and 2008) was 46 percent higher in 2008 than in 2002, whereas the Thrifty Food Plan was 26.5 percent higher in 2008 than in 2002. As the full report for this study will address, the variety of fresh fruits and vegetables and frozen meats available in FDPIR has been increasing over time, contributing to the higher increase in the FDPIR per capita food cost.

V. Discussion

The findings of this analysis provide little evidence to support the hypothesis that changes in FDPIR eligibility, or the relationship between FDPIR and SNAP eligibility and benefits, explain the reduction in FDPIR participation in the early 2000s. Our analysis focuses on two years—2002, in which there were 110,000 participating individuals in FDPIR, and 2008, in which 18 percent fewer (90,200 individuals) participated in FDPIR. Due to data limitations which prevent us from identifying tribal membership and residence on or near a reservation, we do not provide point estimates of FDPIR and SNAP eligibility for the potentially eligible FDPIR population, but instead focus on the extent of eligibility within three universes of AIAN households residing in areas possibly served by FDPIR. Our results for 2002 and 2008 are generally consistent with those found for 2005 in prior work on this topic by the Urban Institute (Finegold et al., 2009).

Although FDPIR participation decreased between 2002 and 2008, the size and direction of the change in FDPIR eligibility between these two years differs for the three universes examined for this analysis. Among the primary universe for the analysis, eligibility for FDPIR decreased by 3.6 percentage points (12 percent) between the two years; the second universe (restricted to households with at least one member reporting no other race than AIAN) showed a 0.8 percentage point decrease; and the third universe (further restricted to households with Indian Health Service Coverage) showed a 1.3 percentage point increase in FDPIR eligibility between 2002 and 2008. Based on the results for the primary universe, we cannot rule out the possibility that an overall decline in FDPIR eligibility contributed to the decline in FDPIR enrollment between these two years. However, the fact that there was little change in FDPIR eligibility among the second universe and an increase in eligibility among the third universe makes it appear unlikely that changes in overall FDPIR eligibility were a major contributing factor to the decline in FDPIR enrollment for this period.

Households eligible for both FDPIR and SNAP can only participate in one of these programs. If households eligible for FDPIR during this period were increasingly likely to be eligible for SNAP benefits, then some could have opted for SNAP instead of FDPIR—contributing to the decline in FDPIR

enrollment. However, our analysis finds little evidence of increased SNAP eligibility among FDPIR-eligible households. Rates were similar for the primary and second universe—with 88 to 89 percent of FDPIR-eligible households also eligible for SNAP in the two years. The third universe does show a small increase—from 83 percent in 2002 to 89 percent in 2008. However, this result should be interpreted with caution due to the smaller sample size and sensitivity to assumptions used to simulate ABAWD time-limits. In a sensitivity test where we exempted all ABAWDs from time limits, the share of FDPIR-eligible households that were eligible for SNAP in the third universe actually declined from 98 to 94 percent. The full report will add new qualitative information about the effects of changes since 2008, particularly those associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, that increased SNAP benefit levels and have since been discontinued, and rules changes in FDPIR that were implemented in September of 2013.

The final possible explanation for declining FDPIR enrollment explored in this analysis involves the relative value of SNAP and FDPIR benefits. If an increasing share of households during this time period was eligible for higher benefits under SNAP than under FDPIR, then households that might previously have participated in FDPIR might have chosen SNAP instead. We assign a value to the FDPIR package using a 2009 estimate from Lovellette (2011) adjusted to 2002 and 2008 dollars by the change in FDPIR per capita food costs. Due to uncertainties around this estimate, we include sensitivity tests that increase and decrease the resulting amount by 10 percent. Results of this analysis show a reduction between 2002 and 2008 in the share of households that were eligible for a higher benefit under SNAP than FDPIR, suggesting if anything, an increased incentive for FDPIR participation relative to SNAP between these two years. In the full report, we describe the increased variety of foods in the FDPIR food package and participant satisfaction with the foods offered.

Although the results described here incorporate most details regarding the calculation of SNAP and FDPIR eligibility and benefits, certain aspects (such as SNAP vehicle limits, disqualification for drug felony or program violation, and the effect of per capita payments) are not modeled due to data limitations. ABAWD time-limits are modeled, although imputation is involved—both to determine where an individual ABAWD is with respect to the time limit and also whether the ABAWD lives in an area in which the work requirement is waived. Given that ABAWD time-limits are a key reason for why a person may be eligible for FDPIR and not SNAP, we included a sensitivity analysis in which ABAWD time-limits are excluded. Although ABAWD time-limits are an important factor in explaining why a person might be eligible for FDPIR but not SNAP, ABAWDs represent a small share of the overall potentially eligible population, and so the assumptions around them had little effect on the overall results.

Although it could not be addressed in this analysis, it is possible that changes in state SNAP vehicle policy encouraged some households to switch from FDPIR to SNAP because the vehicle test no longer presented a barrier to SNAP participation. In 2002, seven of the states with FDPIR programs exempted the value of all vehicles when determining SNAP eligibility; by 2008, the number had increased to sixteen. Whereas in 2002, seven of the states with FDPIR programs continued to use the standard SNAP federal vehicle rules, by 2008 all had changed their policies. A study by Ratcliffe, McKernan, and Finegold (2008), using data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) for 1996 to 2003 found that more lenient vehicle asset policies led to increased SNAP participation, although an earlier study (Hanratty 2006) using the same data found no statistically significant effect. In a study of North Carolina's Vehicle Exclusion Limit Demonstration, Wemmerus and Gottlieb (1999) estimated that exempting one vehicle per household would have led to a 5.6 percent increase in eligible households in North Carolina and a 6.5 percent increase in eligible households nationally.³⁵ The increase in participation in the North Carolina demonstration site (2.2 percent) was smaller than the estimated increase in eligibility because not all eligible households choose to participate. Households participating in the NC demonstration due to the vehicle exemption tended to have higher earnings than traditional households, were disproportionately in rural areas, were larger, and more likely to have children. By not modeling the vehicle rules, our estimates may somewhat overestimate eligibility for SNAP among FDPIR-eligible households (in states and years for which vehicle limits were in effect) and do not capture any increase in SNAP eligibility resulting from the elimination or modification of these limits.

The decline in FDPIR participation between 2002 and 2008 coincided with a period of increased SNAP participation at the national level. Although SNAP caseloads have historically trended with the state of the economy, caseloads grew between 2003 and 2007 despite a falling unemployment rate during this period. Studies analyzing the growth of SNAP in the post-2000 period find that efforts taken to simplify the steps required to apply and recertify for SNAP (including greater use of on-line applications, call centers, and expanded certification periods), restoration of eligibility to most legal immigrants, and increased state adoption of simplified eligibility determination through BBCE and state waivers, contributed to this growth (Andrews and Smallwood 2012, Zedlewski, Waxman, and Gundersen 2012).³⁶ With the exception of the immigrant restoration, these policies vary by state.

³⁵ The North Carolina Demonstration Project was implemented in Wake and Orange Counties from November 1994 through September 1996. The exemption criteria were sufficient to essentially exempt one vehicle per FSP household.

³⁶ Although the eligibility analysis does capture differences in state certification periods and BBCE policies, it does not capture differences in the effect of these policies on participation. For example, a household might have been eligible for FSP prior to BBCE and under more stringent reporting requirements, but have chosen not to participate given the greater paperwork and time required to apply for and retain FSP eligibility.

Changes in state policies facilitating access and retention of SNAP benefits may therefore have removed some of the perceived disadvantages of SNAP for some households, providing a greater incentive for SNAP participation versus FDPIR than can be observed through eligibility analysis alone. Another factor that could not be addressed in this analysis is the extent to which individuals value the wider choice of products available with SNAP. The full report will include participant perceptions of choice and decisions to enroll in FDPIR or SNAP.

In conclusion, this analysis finds that, contrary to what might have been expected, other factors besides changes in relative eligibility (with respect to rules we are able to model) or changes in relative value of benefit must be behind the decline in FDPIR participation between 2002 and 2008. The participant survey and the FDPIR site visits are intended to bring to light other factors that influence participation decisions., and will be discussed in the full report of this study.

References

- Andrews, Margaret and David Smallwood. 2012. "What's Behind the Rise in SNAP Participation?" *Amber Waves*. March 04, 2014. Washington, D.C. USDA Economic Research Service. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2012-march/what%E2%80%99s-behind-the-rise-in-snap-participation.aspx#.VMaD502YYdV>
- Davis, Judith, Rita Hiwalker, Carol Ward, and Eric Dahlin. 2002. "How Have Welfare Reforms Affected Access to Food Assistance Programs Among Two High Needs Groups at Northern Cheyenne: Young Families and Families Depending on Seasonal Employment?" Tucson: Economic Research Service Small Grants Research Center, University of Arizona American Indian Studies Program.
- Finegold, Kenneth, Nancy Pindus, Diane Levy, Tess Tannehill, and Walter Hillabrant. "Tribal Food Assistance: Comparison of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)." Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, and Support Services International, Inc. November 2009.
- Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). 2008. "Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Resource Limits and Exclusions, and Extended Certification Periods." *Federal Register* 73 (120: 38155-38159).
- . 2009. *Food Stamp Program: State Options Report*, 8th edition. Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service.
- . 2013. "Rules and Regulations." *Federal Register* 78 (166: 52827-52832).
- Government Accountability Office. 1990. "Food assistance Programs: Recipient and Expert Views on Food Assistance at Four Indian Reservations." GAO/RCED-90-152. Washington, DC: U.S. GAO.
- Hanratty, Maria J. 2006. "Has the Food Stamp Program Become More Accessible? Impacts of Recent Changes in Reporting Requirements and Asset Eligibility Limits." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 25 (3): 603-21.
- Lovellette, Grant. 2011. "Estimated Retail Value of the Average FDPIR Food Package as Delivered in Fiscal Year 2009." USDA Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis.
- O'Connell, Meghan, Debra S. Buchwald, and Glen E. Duncan. 2011. "Food Access and Cost in American Indian Communities in Washington State." *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. Sept 2011; 111(9): 1375-1379.
- Ratcliffe, Caroline. Signe-Mary McKernan, and Kenneth Finegold. 2008. "Effects of Food Stamp and TANF Policies on Food Stamp Receipt." *Social Service Review*. (June): 291-334.
- Trippe, Carole and Jessica Gillooly. 2010. "Non-Cash Categorical Eligibility For SNAP: State Policies and the Number and Characteristics of SNAP Households Categorically Eligible Through Those Policies. Final Memo. Submitted to U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Usher, Charles L., David S. Shanklin, and Judith B. Wildfire. 1990. "Evaluation of the Food Distribution Program on Indian reservations." Alexandria, VA: Office of Analysis and Evaluation, FNS, USDA.
- Wemmerus, Nancy, and Bruce Gottlieb. 1999. "Relaxing the FSP Vehicle Asset Test: Findings from the North Carolina Demonstration." Report to the USDA, Food and Nutrition Service (contract no. FCS 53-3198-4-007). Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Wheaton, Laura. 2007. "Underreporting of Means-Tested Transfer Programs in the CPS and SIPP," 2007 *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Social Statistics Section* [CD-ROM], Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association: 3622-3629.
- Zedlewski, Sheila, Elaine Waxman, and Craig Gundersen. 2012. "SNAP's Role in the Great Recession and Beyond." Washington, D.C. Urban Institute and Feeding America. <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412613-SNAPs-Role-in-the-Great-Recession-and-Beyond.pdf>.

TRIM Analysis Tables: FDPIR and FSP Eligibility and Benefits in FY 2002 and 2008

Table 22: Food Stamp Program and FDPIR Eligibility Comparison

Table 22b: Broad-based Categorical Eligibility, Vehicle, and Drug Felony Policies for the Food Stamp Program

Table 23a: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP (excluding Alaska) – Universe 1

Table 23b: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP (excluding Alaska) – Universe 2

Table 23c: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP (excluding Alaska) – Universe 3

Table 24a: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP (excluding Alaska) – Universe 1

Table 24b: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP (excluding Alaska) – Universe 2

Table 24c: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP (excluding Alaska) – Universe 3

APPENDIX J-1: Results Including Alaska

Table 23a: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP (including Alaska) – Universe 1

Table 23b: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP (including Alaska) – Universe 2

Table 23c: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP (including Alaska) – Universe 3

Table 24a: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP (including Alaska) – Universe 1

Table 24b: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP (including Alaska) – Universe 2

Table 24c: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP (including Alaska) – Universe 3

APPENDIX J-2: Results if FSP BBCE Rules Were The Same As In 2002

Table 23a: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP – Universe 1

Table 23b: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP – Universe 2

Table 23c: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP – Universe 3

Table 24a: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP – Universe 1

Table 24b: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP – Universe 2

Table 24c: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP – Universe 3

APPENDIX J-3: Results if FSP ABAWD Time Limits Were Waived in 2002 and 2008

Table 23a: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP – Universe 1

Table 23b: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP – Universe 2

Table 23c: Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and FSP – Universe 3

Table 24a: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP – Universe 1

Table 24b: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP – Universe 2

Table 24c: Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison FDPIR and FSP – Universe 3

Table 22. SNAP and FDPIR Eligibility Comparison, Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 and FY 2008				
	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)		Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR)	
	FY 2002	FY 2008	FY 2002	FY 2008
Tribal membership	Not required		Not required if live on Indian reservation. Required for at least one member of household if live in approved area near reservation or in Oklahoma tribal jurisdictions	
Categorical eligibility	Household is eligible without regard to income or asset limits if everyone receives TANF, SSI, or General Assistance		Household is eligible without regard to income or asset limits if everyone receives TANF, SSI, or General Assistance	
Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility (State Option) ¹	3 states with FDPIR programs	8 states with FDPIR programs	Not applicable	
Gross income limit	130 percent of poverty for households without an elderly or disabled member		No limit	
Net income limit	100 percent of poverty		100 percent of poverty plus standard deduction for contiguous US	100 percent of poverty plus standard deduction for contiguous US and AK
Per capita payments	Monthly recurring payments counted as monthly income. Recurring payments received less frequently than monthly are "annualized" (spread evenly over the months of the year). Payments not spent in a month are counted as resources in following months. Some nongaming payments are excluded from eligibility determination.		Monthly recurring payments counted as monthly income. Recurring payments received less frequently counted as resources in the month received and in following months so long as held. ⁷ Some nongaming payments are excluded from eligibility determination.	
Standard deduction	\$134 for continental US	\$134 to \$191, depending on household size. (\$229 to \$239 in Alaska)	Amounts are the same as SNAP. Added to net income limit.	
Dependent care deduction	\$200 per child under 2 years of age and \$175 for all others		Same as for SNAP.	
Child support deduction	Unlimited if legally required	Unlimited if legally required	Unlimited if legally required	Unlimited if legally required
Earned income deduction	20% of earnings	20% of earnings	20% of earnings	20% of earnings
Medical expense deduction ³	Elderly or disabled only. Out-of-pocket medical expenses above \$35 per month	Elderly or disabled only. Out-of-pocket medical expenses above \$35 per month	Medicare Part B Medical Insurance Premium Deduction	Medicare Part B + any Medicare PartD
Excess shelter expense deduction ⁴	Costs above 50% of net income, after other deductions are applied.	Costs above 50% of net income, after other deductions are applied.	No deduction.	
Asset limits ⁵	\$2,000 per household (\$3,000 if anyone in the household is elderly).	\$2,000 per household (\$3,000 if anyone in the household is elderly or disabled).	\$1,750 per household (\$3,000 if the household has two or more members and at least one is 60+). Disabled do not qualify for higher limit.	
Vehicle rules ¹	Federal rule: vehicle value above \$4,650 counted as a resource. Alternative rules in effect in 17 states with FDPIR programs.	Federal rule: vehicle value above \$4,650 counted as a resource. Alternative rules in effect in all states with FDPIR programs.	Vehicles are not counted as a resource	
Drug felony disqualification ¹	Lifetime ban ²	Lifetime ban ²	No	
Work registration	Required if age 16-59 and not working or in secondary school	Required if age 16-59 and not working or in secondary school	No requirement	
ABAWD ⁶ time limits	ABAWD eligibility limited to 3 months in 36-month period if not working, subject to certain exemptions and waivers in areas of high unemployment. ²	ABAWD eligibility limited to 3 months in 36-month period if not working, subject to certain exemptions and waivers in areas of high unemployment. ²	No time limits	
Notes: ¹ See Table 22b for SNAP BBCE, vehicle, and drug felony detail. ² Policies with significant state or tribal variation. ³ On September 26, 2013, the FDPIR medical expense deduction was expanded to include other out-of-pocket medical expenses of elderly and/or disabled household members exceeding \$35 per month. ⁴ A regional shelter/utility expense deduction was added to FDPIR on September 26, 2013. ⁵ The FDPIR asset limit was eliminated on September 26, 2013. The 2008 Farm Bill indexed the SNAP asset limit for inflation. ⁶ Able Bodied Adults Without Dependents. ⁷ The FDPIR asset test was eliminated on September 26, 2013.				

**Table 22b. SNAP Broad-based Categorical Eligibility, Vehicle, and Drug Felony Policies,
Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 and FY 2008**

State with FDPIR Program	FY 2002			FY 2008		
	BBCE (Gross Income Limit)	Vehicle Policy	Drug Felony Policy ⁶	BBCE (Gross Income Limit)	Vehicle Policy	Drug Felony Policy ⁶
Alaska	Not Participating in FDPIR			No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Lifetime ban
Arizona	No	Standard	Lifetime ban	Yes (185)	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No change
California	No	Standard	Lifetime ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	Modified ban
Colorado	No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Modified ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No change
Idaho	No	Standard	Modified ban	No change	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	No change
Indiana ¹	No	Excludes all vehicles in the household ²	Lifetime ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No change
Iowa ¹	No	Standard	Modified ban	No change	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	No ban
Kansas	No	Excludes all vehicles in the household	Lifetime ban	No change	No change	No ban
Michigan	Yes (200)	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No ban	No change	No change	No change
Minnesota	No	Standard	Modified ban	Yes (130)	Excludes all vehicles in the household ³	No change
Mississippi	No	Standard	Lifetime ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No change
Montana	No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Lifetime ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	Modified ban
Nebraska	No	Exempts amount higher than standard ²	Lifetime ban	No change	Exempts amount higher than standard	Modified ban
Nevada	No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Modified ban	No change	No change	No change
New Mexico	No	Excludes all vehicles in the household ²	No ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No change

Table 22b. SNAP Broad-based Categorical Eligibility, Vehicle, and Drug Felony Policies, Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 and FY 2008

State with FDPIR Program	FY 2002			FY 2008		
	BBCE (Gross Income Limit)	Vehicle Policy	Drug Felony Policy ⁶	BBCE (Gross Income Limit)	Vehicle Policy	Drug Felony Policy ⁶
New York	No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household ²	No ban	Yes (130)	Excludes all vehicles in the household ⁴	No change
North Carolina	No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Modified ban	No change	No change	No change
North Dakota	Yes (no limit ⁷)	Excludes all vehicles in the household	Lifetime ban	No change	No change	Modified ban
Oklahoma	No	Exempts amount higher than standard ⁵	No ban	No change	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Modified ban
Oregon	Yes (185)	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No ban	No change	No change	No change
South Dakota	No	Excludes at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household	Lifetime ban	No change	No change	No change
Utah	No	Exempts amount higher than standard	Modified ban	No change	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No ban
Washington	No	Standard	Modified ban	Yes (130)	Excludes all vehicles in the household	No ban
Wisconsin	No	Excludes all vehicles in the household	Modified ban	Yes (200)	No change	No change
Wyoming	No	Exempts amount higher than standard	Lifetime ban	No change	No change	No ban

Notes: Gross Income Limits in parentheses apply both to units with children and to units with no children or elderly or disabled individuals. All BBCE states eliminated their asset tests except Minnesota, which increased its asset limit from \$2000 to \$7000 between 2002 and 2008.

1 Indiana and Iowa do not contain FDPIR agencies but have areas served by FDPIR agencies in a neighboring state.

2 Indiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, and New York had standard vehicle policies until January 2008.

3 Minnesota's vehicle policy was to exempt an amount higher than the standard until March 2008.

4 New York's vehicle policy changed in January 2008 to exclude all vehicles in the household.

5 Oklahoma's vehicle policy changed in September 2002 to exclude at least 1 but not all vehicles in the household.

6 The drug felony policies for FY 2002 reflects the policies in effect in February 2003, and for FY 2008 reflects the policies in effect in November 2007.

7 North Dakota's BBCE program does not have a gross income limit but requires units to pass the net income test.

Sources: BBCE policies are from the TRIM3 database, which draws primarily from Trippe and Gillooly (2010). States with FDPIR programs are identified through FDPIR Contacts (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/fdpir/fdpir-contacts>). Vehicle policies are from the USDA SNAP Policy Database (<http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/snap-policy-database.aspx>). Drug felony policies are from the USDA FNS Food Stamp Program State Options Reports, Second Edition (http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2-State_Options.pdf) and Seventh Edition (http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/7-State_Options.pdf).

**Table 23a. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDIPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Excluding Alaska¹)**

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDIPIR program
- Not in identified non-FDIPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	921 households			unweighted	883 households			unweighted	-38 households	
	weighted	701,954 households			weighted	749,426 households			weighted	47,472 households	
Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	27.9%	1.7%	29.6%	Yes	24.8%	4.1%	29.0%	Yes	-3.1%	2.4%	-0.7%
No	3.5%	66.8%	70.4%	No	3.0%	68.0%	71.0%	No	-0.5%	1.2%	0.7%
Total	31.5%	68.5%	100.0%	Total	27.8%	72.2%	100.0%	Total	-3.6%	3.6%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	2,533 persons			unweighted	2,348 persons			unweighted	-185 persons	
	weighted	1,821,508 persons			weighted	1,976,681 persons			weighted	155,173 persons	
Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	24.9%	1.1%	26.0%	Yes	21.9%	3.0%	24.9%	Yes	-3.0%	1.9%	-1.1%
No	2.8%	71.2%	74.0%	No	2.8%	72.3%	75.1%	No	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%
Total	27.7%	72.3%	100.0%	Total	24.7%	75.3%	100.0%	Total	-2.9%	2.9%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of the SNAP and FDIPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹ FDIPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002, and so is excluded from the comparison.

**Table 23b. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Excluding Alaska¹)**

Universe 2: Same as Universe 1 except qualifying person is American Indian/Alaska Native alone

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	557 households			unweighted	589 households			unweighted	32 households	
	weighted	355,777 households			weighted	436,150 households			weighted	80,373 households	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	29.8%	1.4%	31.2%	Yes	29.3%	3.5%	32.8%	Yes	-0.5%	2.1%	1.6%
No	4.0%	64.7%	68.8%	No	3.7%	63.5%	67.2%	No	-0.3%	-1.3%	-1.6%
Total	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%	Total	33.0%	67.0%	100.0%	Total	-0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	1,622 persons			unweighted	1,601 persons			unweighted	-21 persons	
	weighted	971,100 persons			weighted	1,193,625 persons			weighted	222,525 persons	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	29.6%	1.0%	30.7%	Yes	26.7%	3.3%	30.0%	Yes	-3.0%	2.3%	-0.7%
No	2.6%	66.7%	69.3%	No	3.4%	66.7%	70.0%	No	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Total	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%	Total	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%	Total	-2.3%	2.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002, and so is excluded from the comparison.

**Table 23c. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Excluding Alaska¹)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	258 households			unweighted	310 households			unweighted	52 households	
	weighted	124,320 households			weighted	154,432 households			weighted	30,112 households	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	36.0%	1.4%	37.3%	Yes	39.8%	2.5%	42.3%	Yes	3.8%	1.1%	4.9%
No	7.4%	55.3%	62.7%	No	4.8%	52.9%	57.7%	No	-2.6%	-2.4%	-4.9%
Total	43.3%	56.7%	100.0%	Total	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%	Total	1.3%	-1.3%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	783 persons			unweighted	848 persons			unweighted	65 persons	
	weighted	318,751 persons			weighted	413,001 persons			weighted	94,251 persons	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	36.5%	1.2%	37.7%	Yes	38.6%	2.3%	40.9%	Yes	2.2%	1.1%	3.2%
No	3.8%	58.6%	62.3%	No	4.9%	54.2%	59.1%	No	1.2%	-4.4%	-3.2%
Total	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%	Total	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%	Total	3.3%	-3.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002, and so is excluded from the comparison.

**Table 24a. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Excluding Alaska¹)**

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDPIR Program
- Not in identified non-FDPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

Sample Size:	2002			2008			Difference		
	unweighted			unweighted			unweighted		
		290 households			269 households		unweighted	-20 households	
	weighted	195,957 households		weighted	186,082 households		weighted	-9,874 households	
	unweighted	801 persons		unweighted	707 persons		unweighted	-94 persons	
	weighted	469,585 persons		weighted	449,064 persons		weighted	-20,520 persons	

	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	64.6%	67.7%	61.1%	51.1%	55.7%	47.9%	-13.5%	-12.0%	-13.1%
FDPIR > SNAP	35.4%	32.3%	38.9%	48.9%	44.3%	52.1%	13.5%	12.0%	13.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹ FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002, and so is excluded from the comparison.

**Appendix J-1: Table 23a. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Including Alaska¹)**

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDPIR Program
- Not in identified non-FDPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	921 households			unweighted	1,025 households			unweighted	104 households	
	weighted	701,954 households			weighted	780,038 households			weighted	78,085 households	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	27.9%	1.7%	29.6%	Yes	24.8%	4.0%	28.8%	Yes	-3.1%	2.3%	-0.8%
No	3.5%	66.8%	70.4%	No	2.9%	68.3%	71.2%	No	-0.6%	1.4%	0.8%
Total	31.5%	68.5%	100.0%	Total	27.8%	72.2%	100.0%	Total	-3.7%	3.7%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	2,533 persons			unweighted	2,660 persons			unweighted	127 persons	
	weighted	1,821,508 persons			weighted	2,047,955 persons			weighted	226,446 persons	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	24.9%	1.1%	26.0%	Yes	21.9%	2.9%	24.9%	Yes	-2.9%	1.8%	-1.2%
No	2.8%	71.2%	74.0%	No	2.8%	72.4%	75.1%	No	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%
Total	27.7%	72.3%	100.0%	Total	24.7%	75.3%	100.0%	Total	-3.0%	3.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002. Results for 2002 exclude Alaska.

**Appendix J-1: Table 23b. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Including Alaska¹)**

Universe 2: Same as Universe 1 except qualifying person is American Indian/Alaska Native alone

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	557 households			unweighted	692 households			unweighted	135 households	
	weighted	355,777 households			weighted	458,031 households			weighted	102,254 households	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	29.8%	1.4%	31.2%	Yes	29.2%	3.4%	32.6%	Yes	-0.6%	1.9%	1.3%
No	4.0%	64.7%	68.8%	No	3.6%	63.8%	67.4%	No	-0.4%	-0.9%	-1.3%
Total	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%	Total	32.8%	67.2%	100.0%	Total	-1.0%	1.0%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	1,622 persons			unweighted	1,825 persons			unweighted	203 persons	
	weighted	971,100 persons			weighted	1,245,113 persons			weighted	274,013 persons	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	29.6%	1.0%	30.7%	Yes	26.7%	3.2%	29.8%	Yes	-3.0%	2.1%	-0.8%
No	2.6%	66.7%	69.3%	No	3.3%	66.9%	70.2%	No	0.6%	0.2%	0.8%
Total	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%	Total	29.9%	70.1%	100.0%	Total	-2.3%	2.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002. Results for 2002 exclude Alaska.

**Appendix J-1: Table 23c. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Including Alaska¹)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	258 households			unweighted	371 households			unweighted	113 households	
	weighted	124,320 households			weighted	166,954 households			weighted	42,634 households	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	36.0%	1.4%	37.3%	Yes	38.5%	2.3%	40.8%	Yes	2.5%	0.9%	3.5%
No	7.4%	55.3%	62.7%	No	4.6%	54.6%	59.2%	No	-2.8%	-0.7%	-3.5%
Total	43.3%	56.7%	100.0%	Total	43.1%	56.9%	100.0%	Total	-0.3%	0.3%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	783 persons			unweighted	977 persons			unweighted	194 persons	
	weighted	318,751 persons			weighted	442,366 persons			weighted	123,615 persons	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	36.5%	1.2%	37.7%	Yes	37.9%	2.1%	40.0%	Yes	1.4%	0.9%	2.3%
No	3.8%	58.6%	62.3%	No	4.6%	55.4%	60.0%	No	0.9%	-3.2%	-2.3%
Total	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%	Total	42.5%	57.5%	100.0%	Total	2.3%	-2.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002. Results for 2002 exclude Alaska.

**Appendix J-1: Table 24a. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Including Alaska¹)**

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDPIR Program
- Not in identified non-FDPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

Sample Size:	2002			2008			Difference		
	unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted	
		290 households		304 households			14 households		
		195,957 households		193,618 households			-2,339 households		
		801 persons		776 persons			-24 persons		
		469,585 persons		465,437 persons			-4,148 persons		

	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	64.6%	67.7%	61.1%	51.3%	55.8%	48.3%	-13.3%	-11.9%	-12.8%
FDPIR > SNAP	35.4%	32.3%	38.9%	48.7%	44.2%	51.7%	13.3%	11.9%	12.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹ FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002. Results for 2002 exclude Alaska.

**Appendix J-1: Table 24c. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(Results Including Alaska¹)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

Sample Size:	2002			2008			Difference		
	unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted	
	116 households	44,719 households		159 households	64,276 households		43 households	19,556 households	
	371 persons	118,085 persons		436 persons	168,311 persons		65 persons	50,226 persons	
	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	79.9%	82.8%	77.7%	55.1%	61.9%	54.8%	-24.8%	-21.0%	-22.9%
FDPIR > SNAP	20.1%	17.2%	22.3%	44.9%	38.1%	45.2%	24.8%	21.0%	22.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.
¹ FDPIR was not in effect in Alaska in 2002. Results for 2002 exclude Alaska.

Appendix J-2: Table 23a. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If 2008 SNAP BBCE Rules Were The Same As in 2002)

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDPIR Program
- Not in identified non-FDPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)						
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>						
	unweighted	921 households			unweighted	883 households			unweighted	-38 households				
	weighted	701,954 households			weighted	749,426 households			weighted	47,472 households				
Eligible for SNAP	Eligible for FDPIR			Eligible for SNAP	Eligible for FDPIR			Eligible for SNAP	Eligible for FDPIR					
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total			
	Yes	27.9%	1.7%		29.6%	Yes	24.7%		2.2%	27.0%	Yes	-3.2%	0.5%	-2.7%
	No	3.5%	66.8%		70.4%	No	3.1%		69.9%	73.0%	No	-0.4%	3.1%	2.7%
	Total	31.5%	68.5%		100.0%	Total	27.8%		72.2%	100.0%	Total	-3.6%	3.6%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>						
	unweighted	2,533 persons			unweighted	2,348 persons			unweighted	-185 persons				
	weighted	1,821,508 persons			weighted	1,976,681 persons			weighted	155,173 persons				
Eligible for SNAP	Eligible for FDPIR			Eligible for SNAP	Eligible for FDPIR			Eligible for SNAP	Eligible for FDPIR					
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total			
	Yes	24.9%	1.1%		26.0%	Yes	21.8%		1.3%	23.2%	Yes	-3.1%	0.2%	-2.9%
	No	2.8%	71.2%		74.0%	No	2.9%		73.9%	76.8%	No	0.1%	2.7%	2.9%
	Total	27.7%	72.3%		100.0%	Total	24.7%		75.3%	100.0%	Total	-2.9%	2.9%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-2: Table 23b. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDIPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If 2008 SNAP BBCE Rules Were The Same As in 2002)**

Universe 2: Same as Universe 1 except qualifying person is American Indian/Alaska Native alone

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	557 households			unweighted	589 households			unweighted	32 households	
	weighted	355,777 households			weighted	436,150 households			weighted	80,373 households	
Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	29.8%	1.4%	31.2%	Yes	29.3%	1.5%	30.8%	Yes	-0.5%	0.0%	-0.5%
No	4.0%	64.7%	68.8%	No	3.7%	65.5%	69.2%	No	-0.3%	0.8%	0.5%
Total	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%	Total	33.0%	67.0%	100.0%	Total	-0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	1,622 persons			unweighted	1,601 persons			unweighted	-21 persons	
	weighted	971,100 persons			weighted	1,193,625 persons			weighted	222,525 persons	
Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR				Eligible for FDIPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	29.6%	1.0%	30.7%	Yes	26.7%	1.2%	27.8%	Yes	-3.0%	0.2%	-2.8%
No	2.6%	66.7%	69.3%	No	3.4%	68.8%	72.2%	No	0.7%	2.1%	2.8%
Total	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%	Total	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%	Total	-2.3%	2.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDIPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-2: Table 23c. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If 2008 SNAP BBCE Rules Were The Same As in 2002)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	258 households			unweighted	310 households			unweighted	52 households	
	weighted	124,320 households			weighted	154,432 households			weighted	30,112 households	
Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP			
	Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR		
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total
Yes	36.0%	1.4%	37.3%	Yes	39.8%	2.5%	42.3%	Yes	3.8%	1.1%	4.9%
No	7.4%	55.3%	62.7%	No	4.8%	52.9%	57.7%	No	-2.6%	-2.4%	-4.9%
Total	43.3%	56.7%	100.0%	Total	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%	Total	1.3%	-1.3%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	783 persons			unweighted	848 persons			unweighted	65 persons	
	weighted	318,751 persons			weighted	413,001 persons			weighted	94,251 persons	
Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP			
	Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR		
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total
Yes	36.5%	1.2%	37.7%	Yes	38.6%	2.3%	40.9%	Yes	2.2%	1.1%	3.2%
No	3.8%	58.6%	62.3%	No	4.9%	54.2%	59.1%	No	1.2%	-4.4%	-3.2%
Total	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%	Total	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%	Total	3.3%	-3.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-2: Table 24a. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If 2008 SNAP BBCE Rules Were The Same As in 2002)**

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDPIR Program
- Not in identified non-FDPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

Sample Size:	2002			2008			Difference		
	unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted	
	290 households	195,957 households		269 households	185,282 households		-21 households	-10,674 households	
	801 persons	469,585 persons		706 persons	447,465 persons		-95 persons	-22,120 persons	

	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	64.6%	67.7%	61.1%	51.3%	55.9%	48.1%	-13.3%	-11.8%	-12.9%
FDPIR > SNAP	35.4%	32.3%	38.9%	48.7%	44.1%	51.9%	13.3%	11.8%	12.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-2: Table 24b. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If 2008 SNAP BBCE Rules Were The Same As in 2002)**

Universe 2: Same as Universe 1 except qualifying person is American Indian/Alaska Native alone

	2002			2008			Difference		
	Sample Size:	unweighted	210 households	unweighted	212 households	unweighted	2 households	unweighted	2 households
	weighted	105,918 households	weighted	127,836 households	weighted	21,917 households	weighted	21,917 households	
	unweighted	636 persons	unweighted	576 persons	unweighted	-60 persons	unweighted	-60 persons	
	weighted	291,989 persons	weighted	324,035 persons	weighted	32,046 persons	weighted	32,046 persons	
	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	66.0%	70.1%	62.5%	51.9%	57.2%	50.5%	-14.1%	-12.9%	-12.1%
FDPIR > SNAP	34.0%	29.9%	37.5%	48.1%	42.8%	49.5%	14.1%	12.9%	12.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-2: Table 24c. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If 2008 SNAP BBCE Rules Were The Same As in 2002)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

	2002			2008			Difference		
	unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted		unweighted	weighted	
Sample Size:									
	unweighted	116 households		unweighted	146 households		unweighted	30 households	
	weighted	44,719 households		weighted	61,454 households		weighted	16,735 households	
	unweighted	371 persons		unweighted	406 persons		unweighted	35 persons	
	weighted	118,085 persons		weighted	160,442 persons		weighted	42,357 persons	
	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	79.9%	82.8%	77.7%	54.0%	61.1%	53.8%	-25.9%	-21.7%	-23.9%
FDPIR > SNAP	20.1%	17.2%	22.3%	46.0%	38.9%	46.2%	25.9%	21.7%	23.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-3: Table 23a. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If SNAP ABAWD Time-Limits Were Waived in 2002 and 2008)**

Universe 1: All households where at least one person meets the following criteria:

- In state with FDPIR Program
- Not in identified non-FDPIR county or city
- Native-born citizen at least 18 years of age
- American Indian or Alaska Native (alone or in combination with other races)

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	921 households			unweighted	883 households			unweighted	-38 households	
	weighted	701,954 households			weighted	749,426 households			weighted	47,472 households	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	30.1%	1.7%	31.8%	Yes	26.5%	4.2%	30.7%	Yes	-3.6%	2.5%	-1.2%
No	1.3%	66.8%	68.2%	No	1.3%	68.0%	69.3%	No	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%
Total	31.5%	68.5%	100.0%	Total	27.8%	72.2%	100.0%	Total	-3.6%	3.6%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	2,533 persons			unweighted	2,348 persons			unweighted	-185 persons	
	weighted	1,821,508 persons			weighted	1,976,681 persons			weighted	155,173 persons	
Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR			
Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total	Eligible for SNAP	Yes	No	Total
Yes	26.0%	1.1%	27.2%	Yes	23.0%	3.1%	26.0%	Yes	-3.0%	1.9%	-1.1%
No	1.6%	71.2%	72.8%	No	1.8%	72.2%	74.0%	No	0.1%	1.0%	1.1%
Total	27.7%	72.3%	100.0%	Total	24.7%	75.3%	100.0%	Total	-2.9%	2.9%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-3: Table 23b. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If SNAP ABAWD Time-Limits Were Waived in 2002 and 2008)**

Universe 2: Same as Universe 1 except qualifying person is American Indian/Alaska Native alone

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	557 households			unweighted	589 households			unweighted	32 households	
	weighted	355,777 households			weighted	436,150 households			weighted	80,373 households	
Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP			
	Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR		
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total
Yes	33.0%	1.4%	34.4%	Yes	31.2%	3.6%	34.7%	Yes	-1.8%	2.1%	0.3%
No	0.8%	64.7%	65.6%	No	1.8%	63.4%	65.3%	No	1.0%	-1.3%	-0.3%
Total	33.8%	66.2%	100.0%	Total	33.0%	67.0%	100.0%	Total	-0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	1,622 persons			unweighted	1,601 persons			unweighted	-21 persons	
	weighted	971,100 persons			weighted	1,193,625 persons			weighted	222,525 persons	
Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP			
	Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR		
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total
Yes	31.1%	1.0%	32.1%	Yes	27.5%	3.4%	30.8%	Yes	-3.6%	2.3%	-1.3%
No	1.2%	66.7%	67.9%	No	2.5%	66.6%	69.2%	No	1.4%	-0.1%	1.3%
Total	32.3%	67.7%	100.0%	Total	30.0%	70.0%	100.0%	Total	-2.3%	2.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-3: Table 23c. Simulated Average Monthly Eligibility for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If SNAP ABAWD Time-Limits Were Waived in 2002 and 2008)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

2002				2008				Difference (2008 compared to 2002)			
<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>				<u>Households</u>			
	unweighted	258 households			unweighted	310 households			unweighted	52 households	
	weighted	124,320 households			weighted	154,432 households			weighted	30,112 households	
Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP			
	Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR		
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total
Yes	42.4%	1.4%	43.8%	Yes	41.9%	2.6%	44.5%	Yes	-0.5%	1.2%	0.8%
No	0.9%	55.3%	56.2%	No	2.7%	52.8%	55.5%	No	1.7%	-2.5%	-0.8%
Total	43.3%	56.7%	100.0%	Total	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%	Total	1.3%	-1.3%	0.0%
<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>				<u>Persons</u>			
	unweighted	783 persons			unweighted	848 persons			unweighted	65 persons	
	weighted	318,751 persons			weighted	413,001 persons			weighted	94,251 persons	
Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP				Eligible for SNAP			
	Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR				Eligible for FDPIR		
	Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total		Yes	No	Total
Yes	39.3%	1.2%	40.5%	Yes	39.6%	2.4%	42.1%	Yes	0.4%	1.2%	1.6%
No	0.9%	58.6%	59.5%	No	3.9%	54.0%	57.9%	No	3.0%	-4.6%	-1.6%
Total	40.2%	59.8%	100.0%	Total	43.6%	56.4%	100.0%	Total	3.3%	-3.3%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-3: Table 24b. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If SNAP ABAWD Time-Limits Were Waived in 2002 and 2008)**

Universe 2: Same as Universe 1 except qualifying person is American Indian/Alaska Native alone

	2002			2008			Difference		
	Sample Size:	unweighted	217 households	unweighted	221 households	unweighted	4 households	weighted	18,638 households
	weighted	117,334 households	weighted	135,972 households	weighted				
	unweighted	643 persons	unweighted	586 persons	unweighted	-58 persons	weighted	28,766 persons	
	weighted	303,405 persons	weighted	332,171 persons	weighted				
	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	67.2%	71.3%	63.8%	53.3%	58.5%	52.8%	-13.9%	-12.8%	-11.0%
FDPIR > SNAP	32.8%	28.7%	36.2%	46.7%	41.5%	47.2%	13.9%	12.8%	11.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

**Appendix J-3: Table 24c. Simulated Average Monthly Benefit Comparison for FDPIR and SNAP, 2002 and 2008
(If SNAP ABAWD Time-Limits Were Waived in 2002 and 2008)**

Universe 3: Same as Universe 2 except qualifying person reports Indian Health Service coverage

	2002			2008			Difference		
	Sample Size:	unweighted	121 households	unweighted	152 households	unweighted	31 households	weighted	12,027 households
	weighted	52,700 households	weighted	64,727 households	weighted				
	unweighted	376 persons	unweighted	412 persons	unweighted	36 persons	weighted	37,650 persons	
	weighted	126,066 persons	weighted	163,716 persons	weighted				
	Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)			Assumed value of FDPIR monthly package (per person)		
	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61	\$80.55	\$72.50	\$88.61
SNAP >= FDPIR	80.9%	83.9%	78.7%	55.3%	62.3%	55.3%	-25.6%	-21.6%	-23.4%
FDPIR > SNAP	19.1%	16.1%	21.3%	44.7%	37.7%	44.7%	25.6%	21.6%	23.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: TRIM3 simulations of SNAP and FDPIR using data from the 2003 and 2009 CPS-ASEC.

Appendix K. Participant Survey Response Rate by ITO

EXHIBIT K

FDPIR Participant Survey Response Rates

Site	Response Rate
Muscogee Creek	84%
Apache	85%
Bad River	89%
Ms. Choctaw	86%
Sherwood Valley	89%
Spokane	95%
Sac and Fox	85%
Yakama	82%
Hoopla	80%
Flathead	76%
8 N. Pueblos	93%
Choctaw	95%
Lac Courte Oreilles	79%
Pine Ridge O Sioux	79%
Standing Rock	74%
Cherokee	85%
Shoshone Bannock	80%
Comanche	81%
Sault Ste. Marie	79%
Winnebago	77%
Chickasaw	81%
Fort Peck	69%
Navajo	79%
Total	83%

