



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250-0100

*file
Food
Stamp*

Melanne Verveer
Deputy Chief of Staff
to the First Lady

Dear Melanne:

Thought you'd be interested in this information on the effects of block-granting the Food Stamp Program on States. We released it today to a wide variety of press -- especially targeted States.

I've also tried to reach you to discuss the UN Conference on Women and how important it is for Agriculture and nutrition to be represented when these programs affect so many millions of women worldwide.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ellen", written over a horizontal line.

Ellen Haas
Under Secretary for Food,
Nutrition and Consumer Services

**EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS:
STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS**

July 11, 1995

Food and Consumer Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

BLOCK GRANTS AND THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The Food Stamp Program has a long, successful history of getting food to the people who need it. Not just another welfare program, it provides essential nutrition assistance to protect the health and well-being of low-income children, working families, and elderly. Half of all food stamp participants are children, over a quarter of all participants live in households where someone is working, about seven percent are elderly, and virtually all have income well below the poverty line. The Food Stamp Program -- together with the National School Lunch Program and WIC -- anchors the Nation's nutritional safety net.

Nonetheless, a variety of proposals have been put forward to replace the Food Stamp Program with a block grant. Most of these proposals would eliminate all existing benefit and eligibility standards, allow States to determine who should be served, permit States to provide assistance in virtually any form, including cash, and limit Federal funding, often by freezing the amount available to States in future years. The Food Stamp Flexibility Act of 1995 (S. 843), for example, would limit each State to the amount of food stamp funds it received in 1994 (or the average over 1992-1994, whichever is higher). Over the five years between 1996 and 2000, this approach would cut program spending by over \$20 billion (Table 1).

Replacing the Food Stamp Program with a block grant -- especially one funded far below current services -- would have serious consequences for the health and well-being of the Nation's families and children. Throughout its history, the Food Stamp Program has produced significant and measurable nutrition outcomes among the children and families who participate in it. The program works because of its uniform national nutrition, eligibility, and benefit standards and because the funding structure ensures that the program can expand to meet the increased need created by economic recession. A block grant would eliminate both of these protections, leaving children, working families, and the elderly vulnerable to shifts in the economy and changing State priorities.

A block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net. It would reduce nutrition benefits, limit the Food Stamp Program's future growth during times of economic downturn, and sever the link between food stamps and nutrition. It would result in the unraveling of the national nutrition framework that has successfully narrowed the gap between the diets of low-income and other families.

- o A block grant eliminates the critical link to basic nutrition standards. Food stamp benefits are now linked to the Thrifty Food Plan, the least costly of USDA's food plans. This ensures that low-income families and individuals have the resources needed to purchase an adequate and nutritious diet at minimal cost. Under a block grant, States would no longer be required to provide benefits that could be used only to purchase food, nor would they be required to provide a benefit that is adequate to purchase a nutritious diet.

- o The current food stamp benefit is linked directly to food purchases. Because a block grant enables or permits States to cash-out the Food Stamp Program, the link between benefits and nutrition would no longer exist. Cash-out weakens the link between food stamp benefits and consumption of a healthy diet.
- o The gap between the diets of low-income and all other families narrowed after expansion of the Food Stamp Program and the introduction of WIC. Eliminating the link between food stamp benefits and nutrition jeopardizes 30 years of health and nutrition accomplishments.
- o The private sector will not be able to step into the gap in the national nutritional safety net created by a food stamp block grant, especially in times of economic recession. The size of the anticipated food stamp reductions are far larger than private charities could absorb. For example, in 1992, Second Harvest, the largest charitable hunger relief organization in the United States, distributed 769 million pounds of food with an estimated value of about \$360 million.¹ The reduction in food stamps in the first year alone under S. 843 is expected to be about \$1.7 billion; by fiscal year 2000, the reduction is over \$6 billion. These reductions are 4 to 17 times larger than the largest current effort in the private sector.

A block grant would eliminate the economic responsiveness of the Food Stamp Program. Historically, the Food Stamp Program has automatically expanded to meet increased need when the economy is in recession and contracted when the economy is growing, making sure that food gets to people who need it. Food stamp benefits automatically flow to communities, States or regions that face rising unemployment or poverty. The effect is to cushion some of the harsher effects of economic recession and provide a stimulus to weakening economies.

It is not possible for a food stamp block grant to respond to economic or demographic changes in this way. While the number of people eligible for and in need of assistance will grow as the economy weakens, unemployment rises, or poverty increases, federal funding would no longer automatically increase in response to the rising need. States would have to decide whether to cut benefits, tighten eligibility, or dedicate their own revenues to the Food Stamp Program. The demand for assistance to help children, working families, and the elderly would be greatest at precisely the time when State economies are weakest.

¹ The amount of food distributed is reported in Second Harvest's 1993 National Research Study. In 1994, USDA distributed 276 million pounds of food through the Emergency Food Assistance Program with an estimated value of \$129 million, an average of 46.6 cents per pound. If the food distributed by Second Harvest has a comparable value, 769 million pounds is worth approximately \$358 million.

- o Between 1990 and 1994, the number of food stamp participants increased by more than one-third. The Food Stamp Program expanded automatically to meet the rising need. But there are now clear signs that the pattern of recession-driven growth has ended; in every month since August, the number of participants this year is less than the number a year ago. Nearly a million fewer people relied on food stamps in April 1995 than a year earlier. The reduction in participation translates into savings of about \$325 million over the months since last August.
- o The importance of the loss of an automatic adjustment in the Food Stamp Program can be illustrated best by looking back to the period between 1989 and 1994 when the U.S. economy fell into recession and subsequently recovered. What would have happened if a block grant had been enacted in 1989, with initial funding set with the formulas included in S. 843? By 1994, benefits would have fallen more than \$12 billion short of actual need, a reduction of 50 percent (Table 2). Over the course of five years, the shortfall would have exceeded \$43 billion.

Funding reductions of this size could have required dramatic reductions in the number of people served by the Food Stamp Program (Table 3). *For the Nation as a whole, the Food Stamp Program would have been able to serve 16.8 million fewer recipients -- half of them children -- a reduction of 61 percent.*

A block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards. The elements of a healthy, nutritious diet do not vary across the country. National standards protect low-income families and their children, no matter where they live. Moreover, ensuring that these families and their children get the food they need is a national responsibility which warrants the attention and policy guidance of the Congress.

- o National standards work. Under the current program rules, over 80 percent of all food stamp benefits go to families with children. Virtually all benefits go to households with income below the poverty line, and nearly 60 percent go to those with income less than half the poverty line.
- o Yet, a block grant would permit each of the 50 States to establish their own standards. There could be 50 vastly different State programs using 50 different eligibility standards and offering 50 different nutrition benefits. These changes may reverse the program's effectiveness in assuring low-income families access to the resources they need to meet their basic nutritional needs.
- o Where States have this flexibility now, we have seen enormous variability. A single parent with two children can qualify for \$120 a month in AFDC if she lives in Mississippi but \$680 if she lives in Connecticut. The uniform national standards of the Food Stamp Program help smooth out these inequities among States.

A block grant could ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income. This effect occurs in two ways. First, a block grant like that proposed in S. 843 would reduce the amount of federal support for the Food Stamp Program. Second, a block grant would enable States to move away from food stamp coupons and electronic benefit transfer -- each with a direct link to food purchases -- and provide assistance in cash. There is ample evidence that when people have less money, or when the same level of assistance is provided as cash rather than targeted assistance, retail food spending will fall. Reductions in food spending then spread throughout the economy, reducing farm income and potentially raising farm program costs. Of these, the conversion of coupons to cash is by far the more serious.

- o A substantial body of research indicates that food spending would fall by about 20 to 45 cents for every dollar in reduced food stamp benefits. Thus, the nearly \$20 billion reduction in food stamps achieved in S. 843 by freezing the program at its 1994 level over the next five years would reduce retail food spending by \$4 to 9 billion between 1996 and 2000.
- o More importantly, total food spending will also fall if the remaining food assistance is provided in the less targeted form of cash rather than coupons or electronic benefits. The Department's rigorous evaluation of the effects of cash-out in four sites around the country shows that expenditures on food would fall, perhaps by as much as 15 to 30 cents for every dollar of food stamps converted to cash. Thus, reducing food stamp benefits by \$20 billion over five years and converting the remaining benefits to cash would reduce retail food spending between 1996 and 2000 by \$17 to 34 billion more than the benefit reduction alone.
- o *The combined effect of reducing food stamp benefits and converting them to cash is a \$21 billion to \$43 billion reduction in food spending over the next five years.*
- o Reductions in food spending then spread throughout the economy, reducing farm income and potentially raising farm program costs. Reducing food stamp benefits by \$20 billion and converting to a block grant could reduce gross farm income by about \$5 billion to \$10 billion over the next five years. The biggest losses in gross farm income would be felt among beef (\$3 billion), vegetables (\$1 billion), pork (\$1 billion), and dairy (\$1 billion) producers. Some of these income losses for some agricultural producers would be moderated by existing farm price and income support programs. Total farm program costs could increase by about \$1 billion to \$2 billion.
- o A food stamp block grant could ultimately reduce employment in farm production by 13,000 to 26,000 jobs and farm output by \$1 billion to \$2 billion per year. Food processing and distribution sectors could lose between 50,000 and 100,000 jobs and between \$4 billion and \$8 billion per year in output. The economic effects would be felt most heavily in rural America.

Table 1 -- The Effects of a Block Grant on Food Stamp Program Expenditures
(Dollars in millions)

	Fiscal Year					Total
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	
Anticipated Spending:	26,120	27,347	28,521	29,677	30,846	142,511
Block Grant Amount:	24,434	24,434	24,434	24,434	24,434	122,168
Difference	-1,686	-2,914	-4,087	-5,244	-6,412	-20,343
Percent Difference	-6.5	-10.7	-14.3%	-17.7%	-20.8%	-14.3%

Note: The block grant amount in each year is equal to the higher of the 1994 level or the average from 1992-1994. Sums of columns may not equal totals due to rounding.

**Table 2 -- Historical Illustration of the Effects of a Block Grant During an Economic Recession
(Dollars in millions)**

	Fiscal Year					Total
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	
Actual Spending:	15,491	18,769	22,462	23,653	24,490	104,866
Block Grant Amount:	12,258	12,258	12,258	12,258	12,258	61,289
Difference	-3,233	-6,511	-10,204	-11,395	-12,233	-43,576
Percent Difference	-20.9	-34.7%	-45.4%	-48.2%	-49.9%	-41.6%

Note: The block grant amount in each year is equal to the higher of the 1988 level or the average from 1986-1988. Sums of columns may not equal totals due to rounding.

**Table 3 -- Historical Illustration of the Effects of a Block Grant During an Economic Recession:
Impacts on States in Fiscal Year 1994
(Dollars in millions)**

State	Level of Food Stamp Funding		Difference		Reduction in:	
	1994 Actual	Estimated Block Grant	Total	Percent	Participants (000s)	Children (000s)
Alabama	\$487	\$288	- \$199	- 41	- 307	- 140
Alaska	60	32	- 29	- 48	- 29	- 17
Arizona	437	166	- 271	- 62	- 364	- 199
Arkansas	226	137	- 89	- 39	- 162	- 68
California	2,641	806	-1,835	- 70	- 2,401	- 1,580
Colorado	236	134	- 103	- 44	- 150	- 74
Connecticut	169	59	- 109	- 65	- 163	- 85
Delaware	52	20	- 32	- 61	- 40	- 23
District of Columbia	94	40	- 54	- 58	- 59	- 32
Florida	1,405	439	- 966	- 69	- 1,126	- 568
Georgia	744	310	- 434	- 58	- 575	- 279
Guam	24	16	- 7	- 31	- 6	- 4
Hawaii	163	90	- 73	- 45	- 63	- 29
Idaho	62	42	- 20	- 33	- 42	- 20
Illinois	1,119	778	- 342	- 31	- 522	- 231
Indiana	441	218	- 223	- 51	- 344	- 168
Iowa	153	115	- 38	- 25	- 83	- 35
Kansas	153	82	- 71	- 47	- 114	- 53
Kentucky	443	331	- 111	- 25	- 229	- 86
Louisiana	682	486	- 196	- 29	- 328	- 142
Maine	116	56	- 60	- 52	- 89	- 36
Maryland	371	184	- 187	- 50	- 230	- 119
Massachusetts	356	167	- 189	- 53	- 259	- 120
Michigan	894	543	- 351	- 39	- 503	- 246
Minnesota	257	133	- 124	- 48	- 185	- 88
Mississippi	417	320	- 97	- 23	- 207	- 84
Missouri	509	255	- 254	- 50	- 375	- 169
Montana	62	40	- 22	- 36	- 36	- 15
Nebraska	85	55	- 30	- 35	- 58	- 27
Nevada	94	29	- 65	- 69	- 75	- 40
New Hampshire	48	12	- 36	- 75	- 53	- 26
New Jersey	539	261	- 278	- 52	- 324	- 157
New Mexico	208	106	- 102	- 49	- 153	- 76
New York	2,081	1,039	- 1,042	- 50	- 1,223	- 459
North Carolina	524	241	- 283	- 54	- 431	- 195
North Dakota	38	22	- 15	- 41	- 26	- 11

State	Level of Food Stamp Funding		Difference		Reduction in:	
	1994 Actual	Estimated Block Grant	Total	Percent	Participants (000s)	Children (000s)
Ohio	1,152	769	- 383	- 33	- 603	- 259
Oklahoma	324	181	- 143	- 44	- 223	- 102
Oregon	259	154	- 106	- 41	- 162	- 71
Pennsylvania	1,083	596	- 487	- 45	- 686	- 319
Rhode Island	82	36	- 45	- 56	- 60	- 30
South Carolina	321	182	- 139	- 43	- 237	- 112
South Dakota	45	34	- 11	- 25	- 21	- 9
Tennessee	627	315	- 312	- 50	- 473	- 201
Texas	2,463	1,059	- 1,404	- 57	- 1,845	- 936
Utah	103	61	- 42	- 41	- 72	- 37
Vermont	48	20	- 29	- 60	- 46	- 20
Virginia	489	217	- 272	- 56	- 375	- 174
Virgin Islands	25	20	- 6	- 22	- 9	- 6
Washington	421	195	- 226	- 54	- 284	- 127
West Virginia	268	170	- 97	- 36	- 149	- 75
Wisconsin	252	172	- 80	- 32	- 155	- 74
Wyoming	30	20	- 10	- 34	- 17	- 8
Total	24,490	12,258	-12,233	- 50	- 16,754	- 8,259

Notes: Total includes other Federal program costs and outlying territories not shown in the table.
Individual cells may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Each State's block grant amount is equal to the higher of the State's 1988 Food Stamp funding or the average from 1986-1988.

The participation impacts assume that States cope with the loss of funds by lowering the food stamp income eligibility limits to eliminate participants with relatively high incomes.

STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS

ALABAMA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Alabama would have lost 41% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$287 million versus the \$487 million the State actually received); 310,000 fewer Alabama residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 56%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Alabama's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, ALABAMA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Alabama would have lost \$100 or \$125 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Alabama would have lost \$200 or \$225 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Alabama absorbs about 10% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Alabama would absorb 36% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN ALABAMA:

During 1994, Alabama served about 550,000 people through the Food Stamp Program – about 13% of the State's population – compared to 200,000 through AFDC.

- Among Alabama families receiving Food Stamps, nearly one-third were working poor, another one-third were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. Only 20% of the food stamp families in Alabama received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 – a time when Food Stamp participation in Alabama increased by 20% as the State and national economies worsened – Alabama received \$2.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 85% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

ALASKA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Alaska would have lost 48% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$32 million versus the \$60 million the State actually received); 29,000 fewer Alaska residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 64%. *More than half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Alaska's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, ALASKA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Alaska would have lost \$15 or \$35 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Alaska would have lost \$30 or \$60 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Alaska absorbs about 40% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Alaska would absorb 80% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN ALASKA:

During 1994, Alaska served 45,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 8% of the State's population -- compared to 45,000 through AFDC.

- Among Alaska families receiving Food Stamps, nearly one-quarter were working poor, another one-tenth were elderly or disabled, and about 70% contained children. Almost 70% of the food stamp families in Alaska received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Alaska increased by 82% as the State and national economies worsened -- Alaska received \$480 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 47% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

ARIZONA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Arizona would have lost 62% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$166 million versus the \$437 million the State actually received); 365,000 fewer Arizona residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 71%. *More than half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Arizona's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, ARIZONA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Arizona would have lost \$170 or \$195 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Arizona would have lost \$370 or \$405 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Arizona absorbs about 19% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Arizona would absorb 57% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN ARIZONA:

During 1994, Arizona served 510,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 13% of the State's population -- compared to 315,000 through AFDC.

- Among Arizona families receiving Food Stamps, one-quarter were working poor, nearly one-fifth were elderly or disabled, and about 70% contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in Arizona received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Arizona increased by 61% as the State and national economies worsened -- Arizona received \$2.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 68% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

ARKANSAS: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Arkansas would have lost 39% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$137 million versus the \$226 million the State actually received); 161,000 fewer Arkansas residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 57%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Arkansas's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, ARKANSAS WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Arkansas would have lost \$30 or \$50 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Arkansas would have lost \$70 or \$95 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Arkansas absorbs about 10% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Arkansas would absorb 41% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN ARKANSAS:

During 1994, Arkansas served 285,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 12% of the State's population -- compared to 110,000 through AFDC.

- Among Arkansas families receiving Food Stamps, about one-quarter were working poor, another 40% were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. Less than 25% of the food stamp families in Arkansas received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Arkansas increased by 20% as the State and national economies worsened -- Arkansas received \$1.3 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 79% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

CALIFORNIA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, California would have lost 70% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$806 million versus the \$2.6 billion the State actually received); 2.4 million fewer California residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 76%. *About two-thirds of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If California's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, CALIFORNIA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, California would have lost \$1.5 or \$1.9 billion (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, California would have lost \$3 or \$3.6 billion.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, California absorbs about 38% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, California would absorb 77% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN CALIFORNIA:

During 1994, California served 3.1 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 10% of the State's population -- compared to 4 million through AFDC.

- Among California families receiving Food Stamps, about 15% were working poor, another 2% were elderly or disabled, and about 85% contained children. About 60% of the food stamp families in California received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in California increased by 61% as the State and national economies worsened -- California received \$25 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 37% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

COLORADO: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Colorado would have lost 44% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$134 million versus the \$236 million the State actually received); 150,000 fewer Colorado residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 56%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Colorado's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, COLORADO WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Colorado would have lost \$55 or \$80 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Colorado would have lost \$105 or \$145 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Colorado absorbs about 26% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Colorado would absorb 58% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN COLORADO:

During 1994, Colorado served 270,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 135,000 through AFDC.

- Among Colorado families receiving Food Stamps, about 30% were working poor, more than one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in Colorado received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Colorado increased by 21% as the State and national economies worsened -- Colorado received \$1.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 67% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

CONNECTICUT: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Connecticut would have lost 65% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$59 million versus the \$169 million the State actually received); 163,000 fewer Connecticut residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 73%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Connecticut's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, CONNECTICUT WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Connecticut would have lost \$110 or \$140 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Connecticut would have lost \$210 or \$245 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Connecticut absorbs about 40% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Connecticut would absorb 81% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN CONNECTICUT:

During 1994, Connecticut served 225,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 200,000 through AFDC.

- Among Connecticut families receiving Food Stamps, about 10% were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. More than one-half of the food stamp families in Connecticut received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Connecticut increased by 67% as the State and national economies worsened -- Connecticut received \$1.7 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 40% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

D.C.: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, D.C. would have lost 58% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$40 million versus the \$94 million the State actually received); 59,000 fewer D.C. residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 65%. *More than half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If D.C.'s population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, D.C. WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, D.C. would have lost \$40 or \$45 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, D.C. would have lost \$80 or \$90 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, D.C. absorbs about 32% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, D.C. would absorb 64% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN D.C.:

During 1994, D.C. served 90,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 16% of the District's population -- compared to 110,000 through AFDC.

- Among D.C. families receiving Food Stamps, about 5% were working poor, more than one-fifth were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. More than one-half of the food stamp families in D.C. received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in D.C. increased by 46% as the State and national economies worsened -- D.C. received \$740 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 49% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

DELAWARE: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Delaware would have lost 61% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$20 million versus the \$52 million the State actually received); 40,000 fewer Delaware residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 68%. *More than half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Delaware's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, DELAWARE WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Delaware would have lost \$5 or \$15 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Delaware would have lost \$25 or \$40 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Delaware absorbs about 28% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Delaware would absorb 56% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN DELAWARE:

During 1994, Delaware served 60,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 8% of the State's population -- compared to 40,000 through AFDC.

- Among Delaware families receiving Food Stamps, nearly one-quarter were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and about 65% contained children. Only 40% of the food stamp families in Delaware received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Delaware increased by 78% as the State and national economies worsened -- Delaware received \$320 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 65% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

FLORIDA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Florida would have lost 69% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$439 million versus the \$1.4 billion the State actually received); 1.1 million fewer Florida residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 76%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Florida's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, FLORIDA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Florida would have lost \$445 or \$535 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Florida would have lost \$1.2 or \$1.3 billion.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Florida absorbs about 24% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Florida would absorb 53% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN FLORIDA:

During 1994, Florida served 1.5 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 11% of the State's population -- compared to 940,000 through AFDC.

- Among Florida families receiving Food Stamps, about one-quarter were working poor, about one-third were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in Florida received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Florida increased by 89% as the State and national economies worsened -- Florida received \$7.8 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 72% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

GEORGIA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Georgia would have lost 58% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$310 million versus the \$744 million the State actually received); 575,000 fewer Georgia residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 69%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Georgia's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, GEORGIA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Georgia would have lost \$165 or \$240 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Georgia would have lost \$445 or \$540 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Georgia absorbs about 19% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Georgia would absorb 50% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN GEORGIA:

During 1994, Georgia served 830,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 12% of the State's population -- compared to 540,000 through AFDC.

- Among Georgia families receiving Food Stamps, one-fifth were working poor, about one-third were elderly or disabled, and almost two-thirds contained children. Only 40% of the food stamp families in Georgia received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Georgia increased by 55% as the State and national economies worsened -- Georgia received \$4.5 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 68% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

HAWAII: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Hawaii would have lost 45% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$90 million versus the \$163 million the State actually received); 63,000 fewer Hawaii residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 55%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Hawaii's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, HAWAII WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Hawaii would have lost \$55 or \$65 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Hawaii would have lost \$105 or \$120 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Hawaii absorbs about 33% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Hawaii would absorb 65% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN HAWAII:

During 1994, Hawaii served 115,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 10% of the State's population -- compared to 65,000 through AFDC.

- Among Hawaii families receiving Food Stamps, about 15% were working poor, about one-third were elderly or disabled, and half contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in Hawaii received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Hawaii increased by 49% as the State and national economies worsened -- Hawaii received \$985 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 62% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

IDAHO: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Idaho would have lost 33% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$42 million versus the \$62 million the State actually received); 42,000 fewer Idaho residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 52%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Idaho's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, IDAHO WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Idaho would have lost \$5 or \$20 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Idaho would have lost \$15 or \$30 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Idaho absorbs about 16% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Idaho would absorb 54% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN IDAHO:

During 1994, Idaho served 80,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 30,000 through AFDC.

- Among Idaho families receiving Food Stamps, over a third were working poor, more than one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and two-thirds contained children. Only one-quarter of the food stamp families in Idaho received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Idaho increased by 39% as the State and national economies worsened -- Idaho received \$390 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 69% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

ILLINOIS: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Illinois would have lost 31% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$778 million versus the \$1.2 billion the State actually received); 520,000 fewer Illinois residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 44%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Illinois' population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, ILLINOIS WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Illinois would have lost \$210 or \$290 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Illinois would have lost \$320 or \$410 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Illinois absorbs about 30% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Illinois would absorb 59% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN ILLINOIS:

During 1994, Illinois served 1.2 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 10% of the State's population -- compared to 935,000 through AFDC.

- Among Illinois families receiving Food Stamps, over 10% were working poor, almost 30% were elderly or disabled, and over half contained children. Only about 40% of the food stamp families in Illinois received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Illinois increased by 17% as the State and national economies worsened -- Illinois received \$7.7 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 67% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

INDIANA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Indiana would have lost 51% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$218 million versus the \$441 million the State actually received); 344,000 fewer Indiana residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 67%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Indiana's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, INDIANA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Indiana would have lost \$120 or \$155 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Indiana would have lost \$275 or \$315 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Indiana absorbs about 19% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Indiana would absorb 51% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN INDIANA:

During 1994, Indiana served 520,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 9% of the State's population -- compared to 280,000 through AFDC.

- Among Indiana families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-third were working poor, almost one quarter were elderly or disabled, and two-thirds contained children. Only 35% of the food stamp families in Indiana received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Indiana increased by 67% as the State and national economies worsened -- Indiana received \$2.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 69% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

IOWA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Iowa would have lost 25% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$115 million versus the \$153 million the State actually received); 83,000 fewer Iowa residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 42%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Iowa's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, IOWA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Iowa would have lost \$35 or \$45 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Iowa would have lost \$50 or \$55 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Iowa absorbs about 24% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Iowa would absorb 64% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN IOWA:

During 1994, Iowa served 195,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 125,000 through AFDC.

- Among Iowa families receiving Food Stamps, over a quarter were working poor, more than one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and nearly two-thirds contained children. Only about 40% of the food stamp families in Iowa received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Iowa increased by 15% as the State and national economies worsened -- Iowa received \$1.3 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 55% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

KANSAS: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Kansas would have lost 47% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$82 million versus the \$153 million the State actually received); 114,000 fewer Kansas residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 60%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Kansas's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, KANSAS WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Kansas would have lost \$60 million in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Kansas would have lost \$105 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Kansas absorbs about 25% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Kansas would absorb 63% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN KANSAS:

During 1994, Kansas served 190,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 8% of the State's population -- compared to 110,000 through AFDC.

- Among Kansas families receiving Food Stamps, one-fourth were working poor, almost 30% were elderly or disabled, and 60% contained children. Only about one-third of the food stamp families in Kansas received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Kansas increased by 34% as the State and national economies worsened -- Kansas received \$1.16 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 61% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

KENTUCKY: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Kentucky would have lost 25% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$331 million versus the \$443 million the State actually received); 229,000 fewer Kentucky residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 44%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Kentucky's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, KENTUCKY WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Kentucky would have lost \$80 or \$130 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Kentucky would have lost \$105 or \$160 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Kentucky absorbs about 13% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Kentucky would absorb 43% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN KENTUCKY:

During 1994, Kentucky served 520,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 14% of the State's population -- compared to 295,000 through AFDC.

- Among Kentucky families receiving Food Stamps, one-fourth were working poor, more than one-third were elderly or disabled, and 60% contained children. Only about one-third of the food stamp families in Kentucky received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Kentucky increased by 14% as the State and national economies worsened -- Kentucky received \$2.9 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 71% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

LOUISIANA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Louisiana would have lost 29% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$486 million versus the \$682 million the State actually received); 328,000 fewer Louisiana residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 43%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Louisiana's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, LOUISIANA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Louisiana would have lost \$75 or \$145 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Louisiana would have lost \$125 or \$195 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Louisiana absorbs about 10% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Louisiana would absorb 39% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN LOUISIANA:

During 1994, Louisiana served 755,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 18% of the State's population -- compared to 380,000 through AFDC.

- Among Louisiana families receiving Food Stamps, almost 30% were working poor, about one-third were elderly or disabled, and nearly two-thirds contained children. Less than one-third of the food stamp families in Louisiana received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Louisiana increased by 4% as the State and national economies worsened -- Louisiana received \$4 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 80% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MAINE: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Maine would have lost 52% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$56 million versus the \$116 million the State actually received); 89,000 fewer Maine residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 65%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Maine's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MAINE WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Maine would have lost \$30 or \$35 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Maine would have lost \$70 or \$75 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Maine absorbs about 24% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Maine would absorb 64% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MAINE:

During 1994, Maine served 135,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 11% of the State's population — compared to 80,000 through AFDC.

- Among Maine families receiving Food Stamps, one-fifth were working poor, almost one-third were elderly or disabled, and over half contained children. Only about one-third of the food stamp families in Maine received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Maine increased by 45% as the State and national economies worsened — Maine received \$880 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 57% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MARYLAND: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Maryland would have lost 50% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$184 million versus the \$371 million the State actually received); 230,000 fewer Maryland residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 59%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Maryland's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MARYLAND WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Maryland would have lost \$125 or \$135 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Maryland would have lost \$245 or \$260 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Maryland absorbs about 29% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Maryland would absorb 58% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MARYLAND:

During 1994, Maryland served 390,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 8% of the State's population -- compared to 280,000 through AFDC.

- Among Maryland families receiving Food Stamps, over 10% were working poor, almost one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and over 60% contained children. Less than half of the food stamp families in Maryland received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Maryland increased by 53% as the State and national economies worsened -- Maryland received \$2.5 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 61% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MASSACHUSETTS: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Massachusetts would have lost 53% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$167 million versus the \$356 million the State actually received); 259,000 fewer Massachusetts residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 59%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Massachusetts' population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MASSACHUSETTS WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Massachusetts would have lost \$145 or \$215 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Massachusetts would have lost \$285 or \$370 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Massachusetts absorbs about 38% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Massachusetts would absorb 75% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MASSACHUSETTS:

During 1994, Massachusetts served 440,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 7% of the State's population — compared to 360,000 through AFDC.

- Among Massachusetts families receiving Food Stamps, more than 10% were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and almost two-thirds contained children. About half of the food stamp families in Massachusetts received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Massachusetts increased by 27% as the State and national economies worsened — Massachusetts received \$3.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 42% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MICHIGAN: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Michigan would have lost 39% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$543 million versus the \$894 million the State actually received); 503,000 fewer Michigan residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 49%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Michigan's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MICHIGAN WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Michigan would have lost \$135 or \$295 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Michigan would have lost \$295 or \$490 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Michigan absorbs about 29% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Michigan would absorb 67% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MICHIGAN:

During 1994, Michigan served 1 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 11% of the State's population -- compared to 760,000 through AFDC.

- Among Michigan families receiving Food Stamps, almost 20% were working poor, more than 20% were elderly or disabled, and 60% contained children. One-half of the food stamp families in Michigan received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Michigan increased by 12% as the State and national economies worsened -- Michigan received \$8 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 53% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MINNESOTA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Minnesota would have lost 48% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$133 million versus the \$257 million the State actually received); 185,000 fewer Minnesota residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 58%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Minnesota's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MINNESOTA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Minnesota would have lost \$90 or \$100 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Minnesota would have lost \$170 or \$185 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Minnesota absorbs about 33% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Minnesota would absorb 72% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MINNESOTA:

During 1994, Minnesota served 320,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 220,000 through AFDC.

- Among Minnesota families receiving Food Stamps, almost 20% were working poor, more than one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and almost two-thirds contained children. One-half of the food stamp families in Minnesota received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Minnesota increased by 21% as the State and national economies worsened -- Minnesota received \$2.4 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 49% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MISSISSIPPI: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Mississippi would have lost 23% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$320 million versus the \$417 million the State actually received); 207,000 fewer Mississippi residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 41%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Mississippi's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MISSISSIPPI WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Mississippi would have lost \$45 or \$85 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Mississippi would have lost \$55 or \$95 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Mississippi absorbs about 6% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Mississippi would absorb 29% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MISSISSIPPI:

During 1994, Mississippi served 510,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 19% of the State's population -- compared to 250,000 through AFDC.

- Among Mississippi families receiving Food Stamps, 30% were working poor, more than 40% were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. Only about one-quarter of the food stamp families in Mississippi received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Mississippi increased by 2% as the State and national economies worsened -- Mississippi received \$2.4 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 83% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MISSOURI: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Missouri would have lost 50% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$255 million versus the \$509 million the State actually received); 375,000 fewer Missouri residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 63%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Missouri's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MISSOURI WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Missouri would have lost \$100 or \$155 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Missouri would have lost \$250 or \$315 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Missouri absorbs about 20% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Missouri would absorb 51% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MISSOURI:

During 1994, Missouri served 595,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 11% of the State's population -- compared to 350,000 through AFDC.

- Among Missouri families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-quarter were working poor, nearly 30% were elderly or disabled, and nearly 60% contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in Missouri received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Missouri increased by 37% as the State and national economies worsened -- Missouri received \$3.1 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 70% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

MONTANA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Montana would have lost 36% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$40 million versus the \$62 million the State actually received); 36,000 fewer Montana residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 50%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Montana's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, MONTANA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Montana would have gained \$5 million or lost \$20 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Montana would have lost \$5 or \$35 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Montana absorbs about 18% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Montana would absorb 63% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN MONTANA:

During 1994, Montana served 70,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 8% of the State's population -- compared to 40,000 through AFDC.

- Among Montana families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-third were working poor, over one-fourth were elderly or disabled, and almost 60% contained children. About one-third of the food stamp families in Montana received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Montana increased by 26% as the State and national economies worsened -- Montana received \$460 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 59% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NEBRASKA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Nebraska would have lost 35% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$55 million versus the \$85 million the State actually received); 58,000 fewer Nebraska residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 52%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Nebraska's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NEBRASKA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Nebraska would have lost \$2 or \$25 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Nebraska would have lost \$15 or \$40 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Nebraska absorbs about 22% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Nebraska would absorb 59% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NEBRASKA:

During 1994, Nebraska served 110,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 7% of the State's population — compared to 55,000 through AFDC.

- Among Nebraska families receiving Food Stamps, more than one-third were working poor, 30% were elderly or disabled, and more than 60% contained children. Less than one-third of the food stamp families in Nebraska received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Nebraska increased by 17% as the State and national economies worsened — Nebraska received \$615 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 62% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NEVADA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Nevada would have lost 69% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$29 million versus the \$94 million the State actually received); 75,000 fewer Nevada residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 78%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Nevada's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NEVADA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Nevada would have lost \$25 or \$35 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Nevada would have lost \$70 or \$85 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Nevada absorbs about 28% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Nevada would absorb 57% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NEVADA:

During 1994, Nevada served 95,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 7% of the State's population — compared to 40,000 through AFDC.

- Among Nevada families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-quarter were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and more than 60% contained children. Less than 20% of the food stamp families in Nevada received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Nevada increased by 94% as the State and national economies worsened — Nevada received \$495 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 74% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, New Hampshire would have lost 75% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$12 million versus the \$48 million the State actually received); 53,000 fewer New Hampshire residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 86%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If New Hampshire's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NEW HAMPSHIRE WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, New Hampshire would have lost \$20 or \$30 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, New Hampshire would have lost \$45 or \$60 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, New Hampshire absorbs about 37% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, New Hampshire would absorb 73% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE:

During 1994, New Hampshire served 60,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 5% of the State's population -- compared to 35,000 through AFDC.

- Among New Hampshire families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-quarter were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and almost 60% contained children. Only about one-third of the food stamp families in New Hampshire received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in New Hampshire increased by 24% as the State and national economies worsened -- New Hampshire received \$345 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 58% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NEW JERSEY: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, New Jersey would have lost 52% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$261 million versus the \$539 million the State actually received); 324,000 fewer New Jersey residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 60%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If New Jersey's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NEW JERSEY WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, New Jersey would have lost \$160 or \$210 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, New Jersey would have lost \$340 or \$400 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, New Jersey absorbs about 20% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, New Jersey would absorb 40% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NEW JERSEY:

During 1994, New Jersey served 545,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 7% of the State's population — compared to 370,000 through AFDC.

- Among New Jersey families receiving Food Stamps, about 10% were working poor, more than one fourth were elderly or disabled, and 60% contained children. About half of the food stamp families in New Jersey received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in New Jersey increased by 43% as the State and national economies worsened — New Jersey received \$4 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 55% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NEW MEXICO: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, New Mexico would have lost 49% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$106 million versus the \$208 million the State actually received); 153,000 fewer New Mexico residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 63%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If New Mexico's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NEW MEXICO WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, New Mexico would have lost \$80 or \$100 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, New Mexico would have lost \$150 or \$175 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, New Mexico absorbs about 16% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, New Mexico would absorb 60% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NEW MEXICO:

During 1994, New Mexico served 245,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 15% of the State's population -- compared to 105,000 through AFDC.

- Among New Mexico families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-third were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and 70% contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in New Mexico received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in New Mexico increased by 55% as the State and national economies worsened -- New Mexico received \$1.3 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 67% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NEW YORK: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, New York would have lost 50% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$1 billion versus the \$2.1 billion the State actually received); 1.2 million fewer New York residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 57%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If New York's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NEW YORK WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, New York would have lost \$1.2 or \$1.4 billion (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, New York would have lost \$1.9 or \$2.2 billion.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, New York absorbs about 37% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, New York would absorb 74% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NEW YORK:

During 1994, New York served 2.2 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 12% of the State's population -- compared to 1.5 million through AFDC.

- Among New York families receiving Food Stamps, almost 10% were working poor, nearly one-third were elderly or disabled, and one-half contained children. Less than 40% of the food stamp families in New York received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in New York increased by 39% as the State and national economies worsened -- New York received \$17.4 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 47% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NORTH CAROLINA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, North Carolina would have lost 54% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$241 million versus the \$524 million the State actually received); 431,000 fewer North Carolina residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 69%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If North Carolina's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NORTH CAROLINA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, North Carolina would have lost \$135 or \$195 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, North Carolina would have lost \$315 or \$390 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, North Carolina absorbs about 17% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, North Carolina would absorb 49% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NORTH CAROLINA:

During 1994, North Carolina served 630,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 9% of the State's population -- compared to 500,000 through AFDC.

- Among North Carolina families receiving Food Stamps, about one-quarter were working poor, more than one-third were elderly or disabled, and 60% contained children. Less than 40% of the food stamp families in North Carolina received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in North Carolina increased by 50% as the State and national economies worsened -- North Carolina received \$3.5 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 64% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

NORTH DAKOTA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, North Dakota would have lost 41% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$22 million versus the \$38 million the State actually received); 26,000 fewer North Dakota residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 56%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If North Dakota's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, NORTH DAKOTA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, North Dakota would have gained \$1 million or lost \$15 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, North Dakota would have lost \$5 or \$20 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, North Dakota absorbs about 19% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, North Dakota would absorb 65% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN NORTH DAKOTA:

During 1994, North Dakota served 45,000 people through the Food Stamp Program – about 7% of the State's population – compared to 20,000 through AFDC.

- Among North Dakota families receiving Food Stamps, almost 40% were working poor, nearly 30% were elderly or disabled, and more than 60% contained children. Only one-quarter of the food stamp families in North Dakota received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 – a time when Food Stamp participation in North Dakota increased by 16% as the State and national economies worsened – North Dakota received \$280 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 61% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

OHIO: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Ohio would have lost 33% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$769 million versus the \$1.2 billion the State actually received); 603,000 fewer Ohio residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 48%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Ohio's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, OHIO WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Ohio would have lost \$350 or \$370 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Ohio would have lost \$525 or \$550 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Ohio absorbs about 21% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Ohio would absorb 54% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN OHIO:

During 1994, Ohio served 1.2 million people through the Food Stamp Program — about 11% of the State's population — compared to 900,000 through AFDC.

- Among Ohio families receiving Food Stamps, about one-fifth were working poor, 30% were elderly or disabled, and more than one-half contained children. Only about 40% of the food stamp families in Ohio received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Ohio increased by 14% as the State and national economies worsened — Ohio received \$8.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 62% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

OKLAHOMA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Oklahoma would have lost 44% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$181 million versus the \$324 million the State actually received); 223,000 fewer Oklahoma residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 59%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Oklahoma's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, OKLAHOMA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Oklahoma would have lost \$65 or \$100 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Oklahoma would have lost \$140 or \$185 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Oklahoma absorbs about 16% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Oklahoma would absorb 55% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN OKLAHOMA:

During 1994, Oklahoma served 375,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 12% of the State's population -- compared to 170,000 through AFDC.

- Among Oklahoma families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-quarter were working poor, almost one-third were elderly or disabled, and nearly 60% contained children. Less than one-third of the food stamp families in Oklahoma received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Oklahoma increased by 41% as the State and national economies worsened -- Oklahoma received \$2 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 66% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

OREGON: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Oregon would have lost 41% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$154 million versus the \$259 million the State actually received); 162,000 fewer Oregon residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 57%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Oregon's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, OREGON WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Oregon would have lost \$95 or \$100 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Oregon would have lost \$155 or \$160 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Oregon absorbs about 24% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Oregon would absorb 64% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN OREGON:

During 1994, Oregon served 285,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 9% of the State's population -- compared to 160,000 through AFDC.

- Among Oregon families receiving Food Stamps, more than one-quarter were working poor, about one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and more than one-half contained children. Less than one-third of the food stamp families in Oregon received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Oregon increased by 32% as the State and national economies worsened -- Oregon received \$1.8 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 61% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

PENNSYLVANIA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Pennsylvania would have lost 45% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$596 million versus the \$1.1 billion the State actually received); 686,000 fewer Pennsylvania residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 57%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Pennsylvania's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, PENNSYLVANIA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Pennsylvania would have lost \$285 or \$335 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Pennsylvania would have lost \$560 or \$625 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Pennsylvania absorbs about 29% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Pennsylvania would absorb 64% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN PENNSYLVANIA:

During 1994, Pennsylvania served 1.2 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 10% of the State's population -- compared to 715,000 through AFDC.

- Among Pennsylvania families receiving Food Stamps, almost 15% were working poor, one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and more than one-half contained children. About one-third of the food stamp families in Pennsylvania received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Pennsylvania increased by 27% as the State and national economies worsened -- Pennsylvania received \$7.5 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 62% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

RHODE ISLAND: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Rhode Island would have lost 56% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$36 million versus the \$82 million the State actually received); 60,000 fewer Rhode Island residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 64%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Rhode Island's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, RHODE ISLAND WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Rhode Island would have lost \$35 or \$40 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Rhode Island would have lost \$65 or \$80 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Rhode Island absorbs about 32% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Rhode Island would absorb 70% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN RHODE ISLAND:

During 1994, Rhode Island served 95,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 9% of the State's population — compared to 70,000 through AFDC.

- Among Rhode Island families receiving Food Stamps, less than 10% were working poor, one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and almost two-thirds contained children. Less than one-half of the food stamp families in Rhode Island received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Rhode Island increased by 46% as the State and national economies worsened — Rhode Island received \$700 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 48% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

SOUTH CAROLINA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, South Carolina would have lost 43% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$182 million versus the \$321 million the State actually received); 237,000 fewer South Carolina residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 61%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If South Carolina's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, SOUTH CAROLINA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, South Carolina would have lost \$40 or \$75 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, South Carolina would have lost \$120 or \$160 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, South Carolina absorbs about 12% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, South Carolina would absorb 40% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN SOUTH CAROLINA:

During 1994, South Carolina served 385,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 11% of the State's population -- compared to 215,000 through AFDC.

- Among South Carolina families receiving Food Stamps, more than one-quarter were working poor, one-third were elderly or disabled, and almost two-thirds contained children. Less than one-third of the food stamp families in South Carolina received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in South Carolina increased by 29% as the State and national economies worsened -- South Carolina received \$1.9 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 75% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

SOUTH DAKOTA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, South Dakota would have lost 25% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$34 million versus the \$45 million the State actually received); 21,000 fewer South Dakota residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 39%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If South Dakota's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, SOUTH DAKOTA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, South Dakota would have gained \$4 million or lost \$10 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, South Dakota would have gained \$2 million or lost \$15 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, South Dakota absorbs about 20% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, South Dakota would absorb 65% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN SOUTH DAKOTA:

During 1994, South Dakota served 55,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 25,000 through AFDC.

- Among South Dakota families receiving Food Stamps, more than 40% were working poor, more than one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and two-thirds contained children. Less than 30% of the food stamp families in South Dakota received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in South Dakota increased by 58% as the State and national economies worsened -- South Dakota received \$315 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 68% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

TENNESSEE: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Tennessee would have lost 50% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$315 million versus the \$627 million the State actually received); 473,000 fewer Tennessee residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 64%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Tennessee's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, TENNESSEE WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Tennessee would have lost \$140 or \$180 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Tennessee would have lost \$320 or \$375 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Tennessee absorbs about 13% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Tennessee would absorb 39% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN TENNESSEE:

During 1994, Tennessee served 735,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 14% of the State's population -- compared to 410,000 through AFDC.

- Among Tennessee families receiving Food Stamps, more than one-quarter were working poor, about one-third were elderly or disabled, and about 60% contained children. Only about one-fourth of the food stamp families in Tennessee received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Tennessee increased by 39% as the State and national economies worsened -- Tennessee received \$3.5 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 76% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

TEXAS: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Texas would have lost 57% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$1.1 billion versus the \$2.5 billion the State actually received); 1.8 million fewer Texas residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 68%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Texas's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, TEXAS WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Texas would have lost \$670 million or \$580 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Texas would have lost \$1.5 billion or \$1.6 billion.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Texas absorbs about 14% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Texas would absorb 39% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN TEXAS:

During 1994, Texas served 2.7 million people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 15% of the State's population -- compared to 1.1 million through AFDC.

- Among Texas families receiving Food Stamps, one-third were working poor, more than 20% were elderly or disabled, and two-thirds contained children. Only one-fourth of the food stamp families in Texas received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Texas increased by 45% as the State and national economies worsened -- Texas received \$12.2 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 84% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

UTAH: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Utah would have lost 41% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$61 million versus the \$103 million the State actually received); 72,000 fewer Utah residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 56%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Utah's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, UTAH WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Utah would have lost \$20 million or \$35 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Utah would have lost \$40 million or \$55 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Utah absorbs about 16% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Utah would absorb 63% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN UTAH:

During 1994, Utah served 130,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 60,000 through AFDC.

- Among Utah families receiving Food Stamps, almost one-third were working poor, more than 20% were elderly or disabled, and two-thirds contained children. Only about one-third of the food stamp families in Utah received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Utah increased by 28% as the State and national economies worsened -- Utah received \$800 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 59% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

VERMONT: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Vermont would have lost 60% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$20 million versus the \$48 million the State actually received); 46,000 fewer Vermont residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 72%. *About 40% of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Vermont's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, VERMONT WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Vermont would have gained \$10 million or lost \$20 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Vermont would have lost \$10 million or \$40 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Vermont absorbs about 32% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Vermont would absorb 79% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN VERMONT:

During 1994, Vermont served 65,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 11% of the State's population -- compared to 35,000 through AFDC.

- Among Vermont families receiving Food Stamps, more than 20% were working poor, more than one-third were elderly or disabled, and more than half contained children. Only one-third of the food stamp families in Vermont received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Vermont increased by 68% as the State and national economies worsened -- Vermont received \$390 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 48% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

VIRGINIA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Virginia would have lost 56% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$217 million versus the \$489 million the State actually received); 375,000 fewer Virginia residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 69%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Virginia's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, VIRGINIA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Virginia would have lost \$90 million or \$135 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Virginia would have lost \$255 million or \$310 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Virginia absorbs about 29% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Virginia would absorb 58% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN VIRGINIA:

During 1994, Virginia served 545,000 people through the Food Stamp Program — about 8% of the State's population — compared to 290,000 through AFDC.

- Among Virginia families receiving Food Stamps, more than a quarter were working poor, nearly 30% were elderly or disabled, and almost 60% contained children. Only a quarter of the food stamp families in Virginia received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 — a time when Food Stamp participation in Virginia increased by 58% as the State and national economies worsened — Virginia received \$2.7 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 75% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

WASHINGTON: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Washington would have lost 54% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$195 million versus the \$421 million the State actually received); 284,000 fewer Washington residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 61%. *Almost half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Washington's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, WASHINGTON WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Washington would have lost \$195 or \$230 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Washington would have lost \$365 or \$410 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Washington absorbs about 32% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Washington would absorb 71% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN WASHINGTON:

During 1994, Washington served 470,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 9% of the State's population -- compared to 390,000 through AFDC.

- Among Washington families receiving Food Stamps, slightly more than 15% were working poor, almost one-fourth were elderly or disabled, and more than 60% contained children. Less than one-half of the food stamp families in Washington received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Washington increased by 37% as the State and national economies worsened -- Washington received \$3.4 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 50% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

WEST VIRGINIA: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, West Virginia would have lost 36% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$170 million versus the \$268 million the State actually received); 149,000 fewer West Virginia residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 46%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If West Virginia's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, WEST VIRGINIA WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, West Virginia would have lost \$35 or \$70 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, West Virginia would have lost \$75 or \$115 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, West Virginia absorbs about 11% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, West Virginia would absorb 47% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN WEST VIRGINIA:

During 1994, West Virginia served 320,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 18% of the State's population -- compared to 145,000 through AFDC.

- Among West Virginia families receiving Food Stamps, more than 10% were working poor, almost one-quarter were elderly or disabled, and almost 90% contained children. Almost 80% of the food stamp families in West Virginia received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in West Virginia increased by 23% as the State and national economies worsened -- West Virginia received \$1.7 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 71% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

WISCONSIN: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Wisconsin would have lost 32% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$172 million versus the \$252 million the State actually received); 155,000 fewer Wisconsin residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 47%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Wisconsin's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, WISCONSIN WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Wisconsin would have lost \$30 or \$105 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Wisconsin would have lost \$55 or \$150 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Wisconsin absorbs about 28% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Wisconsin would absorb 71% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN WISCONSIN:

During 1994, Wisconsin served 330,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 295,000 through AFDC.

- Among Wisconsin families receiving Food Stamps, 20% were working poor, almost one-third were elderly or disabled, and almost two-thirds contained children. About one-half of the food stamp families in Wisconsin received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Wisconsin increased by 15% as the State and national economies worsened -- Wisconsin received \$2.6 billion in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 44% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.

WYOMING: EFFECTS OF BLOCK-GRANTING FOOD STAMPS

If the Food Stamp Program had been converted to a block grant in 1990, Wyoming would have lost 34% of its actual Federal funding by 1994 (\$20 million versus the \$30 million the State actually received); 17,000 fewer Wyoming residents could have been served with the available funding, a reduction of 50%. *About half of those losing eligibility would have been children.*

- Unlike the current Food Stamp Program, a block grant cannot automatically respond to changes in population or economic conditions. If Wyoming's population grows or its economy worsens, as occurred between 1990 and 1994, the State would have to either reduce benefits to needy families or spend State revenues on food assistance.

OVERALL EFFECTS OF A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT:

- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the national nutritional safety net.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate the program's economic responsiveness.
- A Food Stamp block grant would eliminate national eligibility and benefit standards.
- A Food Stamp block grant would ultimately mean less money available to support food purchases and farm income.

IF AFDC IS BLOCK-GRANTED, REGARDLESS OF FUNDING FORMULA, WYOMING WOULD BE WORSE OFF UNDER A FOOD STAMP BLOCK GRANT THAN UNDER THE CURRENT PROGRAM STRUCTURE:

- If the current Food Stamp Program structure had been maintained, and AFDC block-granted, in 1990, Wyoming would have lost \$1 or \$10 million (depending on the AFDC funding formula used) in Federal funding in 1994. But if Food Stamps were also block granted, Wyoming would have lost \$5 or \$15 million.
- A combined block grant shifts the costs of serving new cases to the State. Currently, Wyoming absorbs about 20% of the cost for each new AFDC/Food Stamp case. If AFDC is block-granted but the Food Stamp Program is kept as-is, Wyoming would absorb 58% of the cost; if both programs are block-granted the State would bear 100% of the additional cost.

CURRENT FOOD STAMP PROGRAM STATISTICS IN WYOMING:

During 1994, Wyoming served 35,000 people through the Food Stamp Program -- about 7% of the State's population -- compared to 20,000 through AFDC.

- Among Wyoming families receiving Food Stamps, more than one-third were working poor, 20% were elderly or disabled, and more than two-thirds contained children. Less than one-half of the food stamp families in Wyoming received AFDC.
- Between 1990 and 1994 -- a time when Food Stamp participation in Wyoming increased by 20% as the State and national economies worsened -- Wyoming received \$235 million in Federal funds for AFDC and Food Stamps; about 57% of that total was Food Stamp Program funding.