BUDGETARY AND SPENDING IMPLICATIONS OF A FOOD STAMP OUTREACH PROGRAM

Prepared for:

The Oregon Center for Public Policy
P.O. Box 7
Silverton, Oregon 97381
(503) 873-1201
(503) 873-1947 fax
info@ocpp.org

Submitted by:

ECONorthwest
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1460
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-6060
(503) 222-1504 fax

BUDGETARY AND SPENDING IMPLICATIONS OF A FOOD STAMP OUTREACH PROGRAM

Introduction

The Food Stamp Program provides a basic safety net for nearly a quarter million poor and near-poor Oregonians. The federal government authorized the current program in 1977 with the goal of alleviating hunger and malnutrition by subsidizing the food expenditures of low-income households. While the program is available to households with gross incomes of up to 130 percent of poverty, national program data indicate that 91 percent of program participants have incomes below the poverty level. The federal government pays for 100 percent of benefits, and the federal and state governments share equally the costs of administration.

As with all social insurance programs, the number of people participating in the Food Stamp Program is less than the number of people who are eligible. Reasons for non-participation are varied and include lack of information about the program, access barriers, a low expected benefit, and a lack of desire for benefits. To better ensure that eligible households are aware of the program, Congress authorized states and other entities to conduct outreach programs through the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988[1]. The federal government reimburses the states for 50 percent of their approved outreach expenditures. Oregon has not initiated such a program.

The Oregon Center for Public Policy (OCPP) asked ECONorthwest to review the budgetary and economic implications of an outreach program. OCPP believes there is need to remove the barriers that limit participation by the low-income working poor, rural poor, elderly, disabled, homeless, and non-English-speaking populations who have traditionally been underrepresented in enrollment figures. Moreover, OCPP is concerned that as more families with children exit, avoid, or are diverted from the cash assistance program (i.e., Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program), some of those who remain in poverty will fail to enroll in the Food Stamp Program.

Through an analysis of data from federal and state agencies and a review of the academic literature, ECONorthwest has found that about 80 percent of Oregonians eligible for food stamps participated in the program in 1994. Experts project, however, the percentage will decline because of lower participation in related cash assistance programs. In 1997, non-participating Oregonians left an estimated $30 million in food stamp benefits uncollected. Participation is disproportionately low among elderly, working-poor, rural, homeless, and non-English-speaking populations.

With respect to the feasibility and cost of an outreach program, we have found the following:

- Interim data from outreach demonstrations designed to increase participation among such populations suggest program cost-effectiveness is feasible but requires careful planning. We estimate a small and well-designed outreach effort could increase food stamp receipt by up to $3.5 million;

[1] For the current rules governing the outreach program, see *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 7, Volume 4, Part 272.5.

- The state's share of an outreach program's total cost, including benefits, is unlikely to exceed 30 percent and could be less than 10 percent. Put differently, a state expenditure of $0.3 million would attract between $0.7 million and $3.8 million in federally-funded benefits and administrative-matching funds;

- In addition to providing direct food assistance, each $1.0 million of new federal food stamp spending would support up to 22 jobs in Oregon, principally in the retail trade and service sectors.

The following sections outline recent trends in food stamp participation, key reasons some people do not participate, and estimates of the budgetary and economic effects of a hypothetical outreach program.

Participation in the Food Stamp Program

In an average month during 1997, 248,995 Oregonians received food stamps. The average monthly benefit in 1997 was $69.28 per person, yielding monthly benefit expenditures of $17.2 million and total annual spending of $207.0 million. The vast majority of Oregon's food stamp households contain either a child, an elderly person, or a disabled person. As with all social policy programs, not all of the individuals or households eligible to receive food stamps participated in the program. A recent study by Mathematica Policy Research estimates that in 1994 approximately 80 percent of Oregonians eligible for food stamps actually received benefits[2]. Assuming this is the case and that the rates stayed constant between 1994 and 1997, the number of Oregonians eligible but not participating in the Food Stamp Program equaled 62,239 in an average month of 1997 (see Table 1)[3]. Moreover, the estimates imply an additional $31.5 million in federally-funded benefits would have been issued in 1997 if every eligible Oregonian had participated.

[2] See Schirm, Allen L. August 1998. *Reaching Those in Need: How Effective is the Food Stamp Program?* Mathematica Policy Research Inc. under contract to USDA. Washington, DC.

[3] Such an assumption is reasonable given the relative stability in Oregon's food stamp caseload during 1994-1997.

Table 1: Estimated Number of Food Stamp Eligibles and Participants in Oregon

	Participants 1997	Calculated Eligibles(1)	Difference
Average Monthly Individuals	248,955	311,194	62,239
Annual Benefits	206,979,512	238,444,934	31,465,422

Source: ECONorthwest and Oregon Department of Human Resources
(1) ECONorthwest calculated the number of eligible individuals by dividing the 1997 participation total by Mathematica's estimated participation rate for Oregon (80%). To estimate annual benefits, we assumed non-participants would be eligible for a benefit equal to $42.13 per month, which is 59% ofthe average benefit for FSP participants.

Reasons for Non-Participation

Several recent studies have focused on the characteristics of non-participants and the reasons for their non-participation[4]. The previously cited Mathematica study reports participation rates by demographic group and finds that children and their parents are the most likely to participate, while elderly individuals are the least likely to participate (see Table 2). Nearly all eligible single adults with children receive food stamps primarily because such individuals are made aware of the program through their participation in cash assistance programs. Individuals without children, including the elderly, tend to participate less, in part, because the size of their households makes them eligible for smaller benefits.

[4] See, for example, USDA, *Nonparticipation and Problems of Access in the Food Stamp Program: A Review of the Literature,* US Department of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Service, Washington, DC, February 1996.

Table 2: US Participation Rates for Individuals, by Selected Demographic Characteristics, August 1995

Elderly	31.1
Living Alone	38.8
Living with Others	21.2
Children	85.3
Under age 5	94.7
Age 5-17	81.0
Adults Ages 18 to 59	71.1
Household Composition	
Single Adults w/Children	96.4
Two or More Adults w/Children	59.7
Households without Children	45.4
Race/Ethnicity of Head	
White Non-Hispanic	66.4
Black Non-Hispanic	86.0
Hispanic	54.0
Other	83.9
Gender	
Male	71.1
Female	70.7
Total	70.9

Source: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

The USDA and General Accounting Office (GAO) have summarized the reasons for non-participation nationally and identified three common factors that are likely to apply to Oregon as well[5]:

- Insufficient or incorrect information about the program. Working-poor families with children often do not know about their eligibility for food stamps given that many such families are not eligible for cash assistance. Lack of accurate of program information is also prevalent among illiterate and non-English-speaking individuals. GAO estimated that 36.8 percent of non-participants failed to receive benefits because of insufficient information.

- Problems of program access and administrative difficulties with the application process. Participation rates are often lower among rural and elderly populations

[5] See US General Accounting Office, *Food Stamp Program: A Demographic Analysis of Participation and Nonparticipation,* Washington , DC. January 1990 and USDA, *Nonparticipation and Problems of Access in the Food Stamp Program: A Review of the Literature,* US Department of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Service, Washington, DC, February 1996.

because of physical access and transportation barriers. GAO estimated 25 percent of non-participants failed to received benefits because of real or perceived access problems.

- Small size of the benefit or lack of desire for benefits. As an individual's or household's income rises the potential food stamp benefit declines. At some point, program eligibles decide the small amount of the benefit is worth less than the cost of applying. Other people forgo benefits regardless of the amount because of personal objections to income transfer programs and/or the stigma associated with receiving transfer payments or using food stamps. GAO estimated 38.2 percent of non-participants did not receive benefits because they did not want them.

Although participation rates among single parents and their children have been high historically, the recent declines in cash assistance caseloads suggest they may fall in the future. Recent Congressional testimony reports that, in Indiana, the state's welfare reforms have reduced food stamp participation without a corresponding reduction in the number potentially-eligible families[6]. In short, some families that leave or avoid the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF) and remain in poverty fail to apply for food stamp benefits. The relative stability of Oregon's food stamp caseload during 1993-1997 would suggest this has not been the case here, although the state has not conducted a formal study of changes in food stamp participation as a result of welfare reform.

Illustrative Federal and State Costs of a Food Stamp Outreach Program

Before a state implements a food stamp outreach program, administrators should know something about its potential cost-effectiveness. At a minimum, benefits paid to individuals should exceed (by some factor) the administrative cost of the outreach effort. Since the passage of the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, states have been eligible for 50 percent federal cost reimbursement on activities related to food stamp client outreach[7]. A few states, including Washington State, have implemented such programs, but none has evaluated program outcomes. In 1993, USDA awarded 16 grants to non-profit organizations throughout the country to demonstrate effective methods to overcome barriers to food stamp participation. The projects varied in their methods and target populations with some focusing on specific type of client (for example, native Americans) and others addressing a range of clients (for example, working-poor, homeless, and elderly individuals).

The interim evaluation of the projects represents the only attempt to date to measure the cost-effectiveness of outreach efforts. Each demonstration site reported the total amount spent on outreach, as well as statistics on the outcomes of each person contacted through their effort (see Table 3). The findings indicate cost-effectiveness varies considerably across sites. New York City's program, which sought to increase participation among the working-poor, elderly and disabled populations, claims they enrolled 1,844 individuals on a total budget of $80,604 (that is, $44 per enrollee). On the

[6] See Chris Hamilton, *What Makes Caseloads Grow or Shrink in the Food Stamp Program?,* Abt Associates, Washington, DC, April, 23, 1998.

[7] For the current rules governing the outreach program, see *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 7, Volume 4, Part 272.5.

other hand, project coordinators in Independence, Wisconsin, who targeted homeless, elderly, and low-income working people, reported only 111 enrollees following its $147,000 investment (that is, $1,324 per enrollee). A member of the evaluation team said that a number of the non-profits performed poorly because they had strained relations with their state counterparts and that program effectiveness would likely be higher in projects originated by state agencies. Moreover, the evaluator notes that the findings should be interpreted with caution because the figures were self-reported.

Table 3: Clients Reached by Food Stamp Demonstration Projects and Subsequent Outcome

	Grant Amount	Persons Contacted by Project	Persons Referred to FSP	Persons who Applied to FSP	Persons Accepted by FSP	Cost per Person Accepted*
Independence, WI	147,000	538	360	no data	111	1,324
Bloomfield, NY	199,962	4,015	942	365	171	1,169
Los Angeles, CA	200,000	5,275	730	417	232	862
Boston, MA	200,000	1,788	718	505	232	862
Morristown, TN	99,938	1,807	1,072	no data	217	461
Jackson, TN	50,000	323	198	no data	155	323
Seattle, WA	157,216	1,276	916	899	545	288
Greenville, MS	150,000	4,861	2,404	no data	882	170
Wash, DC	72,658	2,521	926	558	450	161
Richmond, VA	69,524	8,769	614	512	452	154
Honolulu	48,892	1,681	509	509	430	114
Denver, CO	99,937	2,326	1,636	no data	1,068	94
New York City, NY	80,604	3,750	2,781	2,256	1,824	44
Syracuse, NY	46,310	364	180	165	no data	no data
Barre, VT	44,986	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Phoenix, AZ	98,000	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data

Source: USDA, *Food Stamp Program Client Enrollment Assistance Demonstration Projects: Interim Evaluation Report*
* ECONorthwest calculated cost per client enrolled.

We used the findings to construct some illustrative federal and state cost estimates of an Oregon-initiated outreach effort. We calculated high, middle, and low scenario to incorporate the range of cost-per-enrollee outcomes reported in the USDA study[8]. The study failed to measure two important statistics on the enrollees: the average monthly benefit and the average duration of food stamp participation. Based on analyses of

[8] The high scenario assumes a cost per enrollee of $131, which is the average cost programs in Denver, Honolulu, Richmond, and Washington DC. The middle scenario assumes a cost per enrollee of $310, which is the average cost of programs in Greenville, Seattle, Jackson, Morristown. The low scenario assumes a cost per enrollee of $1,054, which is the average cost of programs in Boston, Los Angeles, Bloomfield, and Independence.

program dynamics and benefit eligibility of non-participants, we assumed an average monthly benefit of $56.77 per person and an average receipt of 13.6 months[9]

The state and federal governments would fund the hypothetical program at $600,000 annually, which is comparable to the size of Washington State's outreach program in recent years. Given the assumptions outlined above, we calculate that such an expenditure could generate between 569 and 4,593 additional food stamp participants, who would receive between $0.4 million and $3.5 million in food stamp benefits (see Table 4). In each scenario, the federal government would finance a significant majority of the program. We assumed no increase in federal or state spending associated with *on-going* administrative activities because such spending does not rise with small, incremental changes in the caseload.

Table 4: Illustrative Budgetary and Participation Effects of a Food Stamp Outreach Program

	High Enrollment	Moderate Enrollment	Low Enrollment
Expenditures on Outreach	600,000	600,000	600,000
Estimated Individuals Enrolled	4,593	1,933	569
Average Monthly Benefit	56.77	56.77	56.77
Average Number of Months Participating	13.6	13.6	13.6
Total Benefits Issued	3,545,741	1,492,278	439,319
Federal Cost	3,845,741	1,792,278	739,319
State Cost	300,000	300,000	300,000
Effective Federal Match Rate	93%	86%	71%

Source: ECONorthwest

Clearly the long-term operation of such a program would be justified only if its outcomes fell between the moderate- and high-enrollment scenarios. To achieve such outcomes, state administrators would have to plan carefully in advance, select reliable community-based partners, and draw from the lessons learned from the demonstration

[9] Mathematica estimates that a typical non-participating eligible person would receive benefits equal to 59 percent of the average benefit paid to a typical participant. In February 1998, the average US food stamp participant received $71.41 per month, so the average non-participant would receive $42.13 (or, $71.41 multiplied by .59). For these scenarios, we have assumed an average benefit would fall between these two amounts at $56.77 per person. This implicitly assumes that outreach specialists would enroll individuals who, on average, are in greater need of assistance than a typical non-participant.

ECONorthwest derived the participation duration assumption (13.6 months) from a recently-released study on the dynamics of Food Stamp Program participation. See , USDA, *The Dynamics of Food Stamp Program Participation in the Early 1990s.* April 1998. Table II.19 of the study reports that 48.9 percent of new program entrants experience only one spell of program participation while 51.1 percent experience mulitiple spells. Furthermore, Table II.8 shows a median spell length of nine months for all individuals. Therefore, ECONorthwest assumed 48.9 percent of entrants would participate for nine months and 51.1 percent of entrants would participate for 18 months (that is, two spells each lasting nine months).

sites. The interim report noted several patterns that were associated with sites that had high rates of enrollment[10]:

- Outreach workers identified potential clients using lists of people receiving public benefits other than food stamps (for example, the Oregon Health Plan, Supplemental Security Income, Employment Related Day Care);

- Outreach workers hand-delivered the application to the food stamp office for selected clients who had disabilities or poor access to transportation;

- Outreach workers assisted clients to meet with food stamp eligibility workers at the non-profit agency;

- State welfare agencies assigned eligibility workers to community agencies where they could meet clients. Staff assisted clients with their applications and returned to the state office to determine eligibility. The "outstationing" arrangements required a waiver of certain program regulations.

Other than procedural factors, the study noted that sites with high-enrollment rates employed outreach workers who were skilled in communication and who adjusted their approach depending on the target population.

Spending Impacts of an Outreach Effort

In addition to providing direct food assistance to low-income individuals, a food stamp outreach effort would generate a modest economic stimulus to local economies. When an individual or household spends their food stamp benefits, they generate economic activity, which directly supports the local employment base (for example, the employment of grocery clerks and food wholesalers). In addition, food stamp spending produces some indirect effects (for example, the employment of workers who make cans for food producers). Finally, the direct and indirect increases in employment and income enhance a community's purchasing power, thereby inducing further consumption- and investment-driven stimulus (for example, employment created from the purchases made by a grocery clerk).

The economic modeling framework that best captures these direct, indirect, and induced effects is called input-output modeling. We used an input-output model called IMPLAN (Impact Analysis for Planning) to translate how spending by additional food stamp recipients would affect the economy. The model incorporates survey data on spending patterns by low-income families and calculates how each dollar they spend flows through the Oregon economy.

We had to characterize the nature of food stamp spending before we could estimate its effect on different economic sectors. While program participants must spend food stamps on a restricted list of food items, the stamps have the effect of "freeing up" cash that a low-income individual otherwise would have spent on food. Consequently, the Food Stamp Program increases not only spending on food but also on a variety of other items, like housing, transportation, health care, and child care. For the purposes of this

[10] See USDA, *Food Stamp Program Client Assistance Demonstration Projects: Interim Evaluation Report,* pp. 44-47.

estimate, we assumed that 25 percent of new food stamp benefits would directly generate food expenditures while the remainder, through substitution for cash, would be spent on the full range of items purchased by low-income families[11].

Given this assumption, we used IMPLAN to model the program's spending impacts. We estimated the impact of each additional $1.0 million in food stamp spending, so decision makers could assess the effects of a variety of outreach outcomes. The model calculated that the spending would support about 22 full-year, full-time equivalent jobs in Oregon at an average wage of $21,830 (see Table 5). Somewhat more than half of those jobs were estimated as the direct effects of food stamp spending. More than 75 percent of the jobs would be in the retail and wholesale trade and services sectors, which explains the below-average annual wages. It's important to note that these local effects come at the expense of federal taxpayers who would finance the program.

Table 5: Spending Impacts per Million Dollars of Food Stamp Expenditures in Oregon

	Jobs (Person/Years)	Average Annual Wage ($)
Direct Effects		
Retail and Wholesale Trade	6.2	18,989
Services	4.3	24,071
Other Sectors	1.7	28,669
Total	12.2	22,129
Indirect Effects		
Retail and Wholesale Trade	0.2	30,435
Services	0.2	14,667
Other Sectors	1.3	22,692
Total	1.7	22,659
Induced Effects		
Retail and Wholesale Trade	3.5	18,448
Services	3.1	20,350
Other Sectors	1.9	27,782
Total	8.5	21,228
Total Effects		
Retail and Wholesale Trade	9.9	19,064
Services	7.6	22,334
Other Sectors	4.9	26,637
Total	22.4	21,830

Source: ECONorthwest

[11] We derived the "25-percent assumption" from analyses of state and local programs that "cashed-out" their food stamp benefits. See Fraker et. al., *The Effect of Food Stamp Cashout on Food Expenditures: An Assessment of the Findings from Four Demonstrations.* Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. Washington DC. December 1994. The authors analyzed the effects on food expenditures of four demonstrations where states and localities provided cash in lieu of food stamps. They estimated a reduction in food expenditures of between 20 and 25 cents per dollar of benefits cashed out.

Job creation through increased spending would not be the only *economic* effect associated with higher participation. For example, food stamp receipt may induce people to work less, by increasing their non-wage income. One study, which focused only on single mothers, found the Food Stamp Program in total reduces the labor supply of its working-age participants by about 9 percent, or about four hours per month[12]. The study's findings are somewhat outdated, however, because newly-enacted requirements in welfare programs make it difficult for participants to voluntarily reduce the number of hours they work.

Conclusions

National estimates show that about 70 percent of the people who are eligible for food stamps participate in the program. Participation is disproportionately low among the elderly, adults without children, homeless, rural, disabled, and non-English-speaking populations. Moreover, the recent declines in TANF rolls suggest that participation among eligible single adults with children may fall in the future.

Despite significant federal subsidies, states and localities have made only limited efforts to improve program access to non-participating populations. An interim evaluation of 16 projects designed to demonstrate effective food stamp outreach methods suggests that achieving cost-effectiveness is feasible but by no means automatic. A well-designed and targeted program could extend benefits to individuals who are unaware of their eligibility or unable to apply because of transportation or access barriers. In addition to the direct food assistance provided to food stamp participants, the resulting expenditures by new enrollees would provide a modest economic stimulus to their local economies.

[12] For the population examined in the study, the 9 percent reduction equaled a reduction of 4 hours of work per month.

Appendix A: Detailed Output of IMPLAN Model and Food Stamp Spending by County in 1997

Economic Impacts Per Million Dollars of Food Stamp Expenditures in Oregon

(1997 dollars)

DIRECT IMPACTS

Sector	Total Output	Business Income	Personal Income	Jobs (person/ yrs)	Average Annual Wage
Agric, forestry, and fisheries	$10,200	$200	$1,400	0.2	$8,750
Mining	$0	$0	$0	0.0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	0.0	$0
Manufacturing	$106,500	$16,900	$16,700	0.5	$34,792
Transp, comm, and utilities	$32,100	$8,800	$9,200	0.3	$35,385
Retail and wholesale trade	$198,300	$25,300	$118,300	6.2	$18,989
Finance, insurance, real estate	$134,600	$58,000	$15,200	0.7	$22,353
Services	$239,500	$25,700	$102,300	4.3	$24,071
Government	$20,600	$3,900	$7,100	0.2	$47,333
Total	$741,800	$138,800	$270,200	12.2	$22,129

INDIRECT EFFECTS

Sector	Total Output	Business Income	Personal Income	Jobs (person/ yrs)	Average Annual Wage
Agric, forestry, and fisheries	$24,600	$4,500	$2,200	0.3	$6,471
Mining	$100	$0	$0	0.0	$0
Construction	$17,300	$2,100	$7,700	0.3	$27,500
Manufacturing	$26,500	$1,600	$2,900	0.1	$36,250
Transp, comm, and utilities	$22,000	$6,400	$5,400	0.1	$41,538
Retail and wholesale trade	$11,100	$1,500	$7,000	0.2	$30,435
Finance, insurance, real estate	$39,300	$16,100	$6,900	0.4	$16,429
Services	$7,600	$1,100	$2,200	0.2	$14,667
Government	$9,200	$1,700	$4,900	0.1	$49,000
Total	$157,700	$35,000	$39,200	1.7	$22,659

INDUCED EFFECTS

Sector	Total Output	Business Income	Personal Income	Jobs (person/ yrs)	Average Annual Wage
Agric, forestry, and fisheries	$9,500	$1,400	$1,000	0.1	$7,143
Mining	$100	$0	$0	0.0	$0
Construction	$12,600	$1,500	$5,600	0.2	$26,667
Manufacturing	$42,900	$3,900	$7,000	0.2	$41,176
Transp, comm, and utilities	$37,000	$10,200	$9,700	0.2	$40,417
Retail and wholesale trade	$106,300	$12,200	$64,200	3.5	$18,448
Finance, insurance, real estate	$140,500	$55,600	$21,400	0.9	$22,766
Services	$157,700	$16,200	$63,900	3.1	$20,350
Government	$16,600	$3,400	$7,000	0.2	$46,667
Total	$523,200	$104,400	$179,800	8.5	$21,228

TOTAL EFFECTS

Sector	Total Output	Business Income	Personal Income	Jobs (person/ yrs)	Average Annual Wage
Agric, forestry, and fisheries	$44,300	$6,100	$4,600	0.6	$7,188
Mining	$200	$0	$0	0.0	$0
Construction	$29,900	$3,600	$13,300	0.5	$27,143
Manufacturing	$175,900	$22,400	$26,600	0.7	$36,438
Transp, comm, and utilities	$91,100	$25,400	$24,300	0.6	$38,571
Retail and wholesale trade	$315,700	$39,000	$189,500	9.9	$19,064
Finance, insurance, real estate	$314,400	$129,700	$43,500	2.0	$21,324
Services	$404,800	$43,000	$168,400	7.5	$22,334
Government	$46,400	$9,000	$19,000	0.4	$47,500
Total	$1,422,700	$278,200	$489,200	22.4	$21,830

VALUE OF FOOD STAMP COUPONS ISSUED IN 1997, BY COUNTY

Location	Jan-97	Feb-97	Mar-97	Apr-97	May-97	Jun-97	Jul-97	Aug-97	Sep-97	Oct-97	Nov-97	Dec-97	1997 Total
Baker County	149,660	140,128	136,077	123,655	123,960	118,609	118,741	112,097	107,220	105,511	105,587	106,016	**1,447,261**
Benton County	244,732	247,057	233,299	225,402	221,988	207,900	200,128	199,463	202,890	224,268	224,218	229,868	**2,661,213**
Clackamas County	734,081	714,559	713,469	653,989	651,323	619,620	607,712	630,550	638,654	663,719	628,834	661,946	**7,918,456**
Clatsop County	251,029	252,203	242,097	222,478	213,042	204,988	201,302	187,883	186,861	209,681	218,427	218,181	**2,608,172**
Columbia County	171,184	167,672	166,607	161,740	149,583	141,216	140,439	141,894	144,628	151,736	150,149	158,068	**1,844,916**
Coos County	638,445	607,653	606,000	567,498	554,806	528,108	522,525	518,733	516,991	548,654	553,384	566,544	**6,729,341**
Crook County	126,168	128,024	125,463	116,060	108,625	107,006	109,842	102,862	102,167	103,720	104,173	112,332	**1,346,442**
Curry County	155,695	151,125	141,680	138,159	125,218	111,531	110,378	105,600	105,310	112,085	113,495	128,002	**1,498,278**
Deschutes County	523,846	541,215	536,643	507,848	474,905	454,066	447,802	429,135	434,815	459,875	474,519	506,665	**5,791,334**
Douglas County	787,889	761,828	757,975	713,076	694,712	658,950	654,231	641,501	639,877	687,961	675,694	712,965	**8,386,659**
Gilliam, Morrow, Wheeler	6,671	6,155	6,171	6,545	6,060	5,628	4,846	4,024	3,929	5,180	5,574	5,042	**65,825**
Grant County	57,339	60,238	59,358	55,529	55,893	47,353	46,126	44,664	43,076	47,124	48,089	53,018	**617,807**
Harney County	53,127	54,472	49,880	47,148	46,245	40,582	36,604	40,712	40,444	43,572	41,834	44,461	**539,081**
Hood River County	86,250	86,031	88,606	80,348	74,106	74,684	68,381	65,153	67,125	66,522	65,612	71,353	**894,171**
Jackson County	1,244,613	1,267,965	1,231,099	1,174,714	1,123,514	1,058,008	1,079,486	1,064,600	1,059,953	1,094,596	1,036,986	1,071,312	**13,506,846**
Jefferson County	154,060	152,250	154,401	137,925	135,234	130,803	126,233	121,736	122,988	125,011	127,927	136,701	**1,625,269**
Josephine County	972,075	971,349	934,748	878,454	834,569	789,570	794,327	767,533	783,163	818,504	799,735	820,017	**10,164,044**
Klamath County	579,660	591,638	576,804	534,809	517,685	497,691	489,354	479,585	481,140	501,812	498,489	535,412	**6,284,079**
Lake County	50,304	50,002	47,044	44,248	42,200	42,111	42,595	38,546	40,639	44,990	46,541	52,030	**541,250**
Lane County	2,428,887	2,414,493	2,278,005	2,119,736	2,041,639	1,962,228	1,908,023	1,854,415	1,848,725	2,129,635	2,051,979	2,114,827	**25,152,592**
Lincoln County	365,167	359,296	343,414	328,322	314,266	306,472	302,393	300,710	306,074	323,878	329,130	343,815	**3,922,937**
Linn County	684,534	684,832	660,961	627,432	608,128	586,863	566,338	552,833	549,936	585,976	579,114	592,009	**7,278,956**
Malheur County	234,178	241,463	248,525	239,729	238,625	235,453	254,093	245,552	232,075	223,258	212,915	218,229	**2,824,095**
Marion County	1,851,745	1,803,376	1,783,220	1,707,251	1,670,300	1,624,376	1,625,396	1,564,463	1,560,492	1,667,295	1,659,446	1,761,384	**20,278,744**
Multnomah County	4,242,916	4,212,265	4,088,483	3,861,369	3,754,636	3,615,872	3,611,317	3,539,899	3,455,412	3,622,475	3,625,061	3,644,360	**45,274,065**
Polk County	208,225	207,132	200,132	193,013	185,380	177,509	184,298	188,239	184,980	202,516	204,709	213,742	**2,349,875**
Tillamook County	131,683	134,660	133,632	128,982	121,950	116,769	116,779	114,127	112,254	114,939	118,704	126,906	**1,471,385**
Umatilla County	551,665	552,204	540,016	499,570	483,519	452,115	448,264	440,112	434,518	459,210	458,480	494,728	**5,814,401**
Union County	168,330	169,204	169,546	157,168	152,925	140,977	141,511	136,445	119,675	133,990	133,127	136,760	**1,759,658**
Wallowa County	34,974	37,244	37,464	36,910	31,889	30,371	28,283	26,798	27,056	29,760	33,753	33,863	**388,365**
Wasco and Sherman Counties	164,323	165,677	158,916	140,686	134,266	134,291	124,248	119,311	120,294	121,394	119,218	127,366	**1,629,990**
Washington County	901,075	895,927	921,346	850,754	833,913	811,235	818,887	803,949	791,404	842,290	789,696	852,564	**10,113,040**
Yamhill County	404,146	396,706	393,947	371,756	353,057	300,654	304,738	302,782	325,228	369,044	346,702	382,205	**4,250,965**
OREGON TOTAL	19,358,676	19,226,043	18,765,028	17,652,303	17,078,161	16,333,609	16,235,620	15,885,906	15,789,993	16,840,181	16,581,301	17,232,691	**206,979,512**

Source: Oregon Department of Human Resources

Comparison of Number of Food Stamp Recipients and Persons in Poverty by Oregon County, 1993

County	People of All Ages in Poverty in 1993	Total Persons Receiving Food Stamps, May 1993	Food Stamp Caseload as a Percentage of Persons in Poverty
Baker	2,530	1,961	77.5
Benton	7,817	3,709	47.4
Clackamas	24,049	12,225	50.8
Clatsop	4,906	3,325	67.8
Columbia	3,653	2,781	76.1
Coos	10,710	8,606	80.4
Crook	1,759	1,298	73.8
Curry	2,926	2,172	74.2
Deschutes	9,712	6,623	68.2
Douglas	15,442	11,639	75.4
Gilliam/Morrow/Wheeler	914	158	17.3
Grant	984	768	78.0
Harney	919	712	77.5
Hood River	2,930	1,872	63.9
Jackson	23,391	17,403	74.4
Jefferson	2,732	2,111	77.3
Josephine	13,356	10,985	82.2
Klamath	10,466	8,014	76.6
Lake	972	683	70.3
Lane	44,779	33,071	73.9
Lincoln	6,403	4,575	71.5
Linn	14,148	12,009	84.9
Malheur	5,909	4,480	75.8
Marion	36,842	27,048	73.4
Multnomah	92,002	65,509	71.2
Polk	6,708	3,448	51.4
Tillamook	2,971	1,850	62.3
Umatilla	10,698	8,798	82.2
Union	3,485	2,618	75.1
Wallowa	901	496	55.0
Wasco/Sherman	3,254	2,222	68.3
Washington	29,477	15,903	54.0
Yamhill	8,976	6,046	67.4
Total	406,721	285,118	70.1

Source: US Census Bureaus and Oregon Deparment of Human Resources