Reliance on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Continued to Rise Post-Recession

Through the Great Recession officially ended in June 2009,1 the effects of a weak economy continue to ripple through the nation. High unemployment and poverty persist,2 and in 2010, nearly one in four Americans struggled to afford sufficient food.3 Amidst this enduring economic back-drop, participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP (formerly known as food stamps), continued to rise. This brief uses data from the 2007, 2009, and 2010 American Community Survey to provide an up-to-date look at changes in SNAP receipt over the course of the recession, with particular attention to differences in receipt by place type (rural, suburban, central city locations) and family structure.4

Increases During the Recession

In December 2010, 44 million people received SNAP benefits.5 This compares with 27.3 million in November 2007 (one month pre-recession) and 35.9 million in July 2009 (one month post-recession).6 As might be expected, SNAP receipt increased in all place types both during the 2007-2010 and 2009-2010 periods (see Figure 1), rising 4.2 percentage points since 2007 and 1.6 percentage points since 2009. Receipt was highest in rural areas until 2010, when central city residents caught up through a large increase in receipt (2.1 percentage points between 2009 and 2010). Suburban rates remain substantially lower than in other place types both pre- and post-recession.

Key Findings

- Receipt of SNAP continued to rise in 2010, increasing 4 percentage points since the recession began in 2007, and 1.6 percentage points since 2009.
- By 2010, nearly 12 percent of households reported receiving SNAP benefits. Receipt is even higher in rural places and central cities, approaching 15 percent in both places.
- Reliance on SNAP was still very high among single parents in 2010, rising 10 percentage points nationally since the recession began. In 2010, 42 percent of single mothers relied on SNAP; in rural places, the rate is as high as one in two.

Critical Support for Families in Need

Households that received SNAP benefits in 2010 had a median household income of $17,912, compared with the national median of $50,046.7 This is despite the fact that 76 percent of families receiving SNAP had at least one employed member.8 According to the U.S. Food and Nutrition Service, the average household’s monthly benefit was just $289.61 in 2010,9 totaling $3,475.32 per year. As such, it is no surprise that over one-third of the households that received SNAP still reported food insecurity.10 Although SNAP access is widespread,11 it is clear that the program alone does not reach all those in need and that imposing stricter limits on SNAP allocations may move more households into food insecurity.

Receipt of benefits is even more widespread among certain groups in need, suggesting that SNAP does reasonably well reaching its target populations. For example, more than one in five households with a disabled member relied on SNAP in 2010 (21.4 percent), with estimates reaching 38.1 percent in some places.12 In addition, while 11.9 percent of households...
Table 1. Households with Children Receiving SNAP in last 12 Months, by Family Type (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Places</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Central City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Households</td>
<td>Change Since 2007</td>
<td>Change Since 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couples with Children</td>
<td>1,645,604</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>350,095</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>554,905</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1,100,865</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>639,738</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Fathers</td>
<td>343,636</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Total</td>
<td>115,967</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>180,701</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>229,133</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>178,857</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold and shaded typeface indicates statistically significant change (p<0.05). Includes ONLY families with children. Change columns indicate percentage point changes.

Policy Implications

In a context of high poverty and unemployment, SNAP is one of the most responsive federal programs, providing immediate benefits and helping millions of families to put food on the table. Despite its efficiency, however, SNAP is at risk for deep budget cuts. There is an effort to include SNAP cuts in the deficit reduction plan currently being developed by the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction (that is, the “supercommittee”). On October 17, the Senate and House Agriculture committees recommended that the supercommittee reauthorize the Farm Bill with a $23 billion reduction in funding. Because SNAP is included in the Farm Bill, this spending cut could include a significant portion of SNAP funding. While it is unclear how many families would experience a reduction in (or loss of) SNAP benefits under this plan, this brief makes it evident that the economy has not recovered enough to begin cutting SNAP funds. While budget cuts are imminent, legislators should carefully consider the effects on America’s most vulnerable families when reducing funding for such important programs.

Data

This analysis is based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates from the 2007, 2009, and 2010 American Community Survey. For more details, please refer to the U.S. Census Bureau. Estimates here were produced by aggregating information from detailed tables available on American FactFinder. These estimates are meant to give perspective on SNAP use, but because they are based on survey data, one should use caution when comparing across categories, as the margins of error may place seemingly disparate estimates within reasonable sampling error. All differences highlighted in this brief are statistically significant (p<0.05).
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