State Trends in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Eligibility and Participation Among Elderly Individuals

Final Report

Contractor and Cooperator Report No. 64
November 2010

By Karen Cunnyngham, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Abstract

Elderly adults (ages 60 or older) participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly the Food Stamp Program, at lower rates than other eligible people. This report provides State information on the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants and eligibles and elderly participation rates that can be used both in assessing the success of past efforts and when considering additional efforts to increase elderly SNAP participation. The report is based on analyses from a Survey of Income and Program Participation-based microsimulation model, SNAP Quality Control data files, the Current Population Survey, and other data. The report finds that the estimated elderly SNAP participation rate increased steadily from 25 percent in fiscal year (FY) 2002 to 34 percent in FY 2006. The highest elderly participation rates were found in Hawaii, Florida, Maine, New York, and Oregon. The States with the largest elderly participation rate increases were Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, and Washington.

This study was conducted by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., under a cooperative research agreement with USDA's Economic Research Service (ERS) Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Program (FANRP): agreement number 59-5000-8-0099 (ERS project representative: John Kirlin). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of ERS or USDA.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Cooperative Agreement Number:
59-5000-8-0099

Mathematica Reference Number:
06520

Submitted to:
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Economic Research Service
1800 M St., NW, Rm. N2176
Washington, DC 20036-5831
Project Officer: John Kirlin

Submitted by:
Mathematica Policy Research
600 Maryland Avenue, SW
Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024-2512
Telephone: (202) 484-9220
Facsimile: (202) 863-1763
Project Director: Karen Cunnyngham

State Trends in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Eligibility and Participation Among Elderly Individuals

Final Report

Karen Cunnyngham

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

Disclaimer: This study was conducted by Mathematica Policy Research under Cooperative Agreement Number 59-5000-8-0099 with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Economic Research Service (ERS). Mathematica was responsible for reviewing the report. The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily those of ERS or USDA.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was conducted under a cooperative research contract with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Economic Research Service (ERS) Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Program (FANRP). The author would like to extend her gratitude to the many people who contributed to this research. In particular, I would like to thank John A. Kirlin, the ERS project officer, for his guidance and support throughout the project. I also received valuable input on methodology and presentation from Christine Kissmer, the project liaison from the USDA's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS).

Many people at Mathematica Policy Research made meaningful contributions to this research. Bruce Schechter and Kathy Bencio provided computer programming support, with assistance from Joel Smith and Daisy Ewell. Laura Castner reviewed the state estimates of elderly SNAP participation rates. Jackie Kauff reviewed a draft of this report as well as additional documents prepared in the course of this project, and Ronette Briefel reviewed the final report. Carole Trippe also reviewed portions of this report, Josh Leftin assisted with project management, Molly and Jim Cameron edited the report, and Donna Dorsey, Alfreda Holmes, and Lisa Walls were responsible for its production.

Finally, valuable feedback and suggestions also were received from Dottie Rosenbaum, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and Elaine Waxman, Feeding America.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY xi

I INTRODUCTION 1

A. SNAP Participation Among Elderly Individuals 1

B. Efforts to Increase SNAP Participation Among Elderly Individuals 3

C. Additional Existing Research on SNAP Participation and Eligibility 5

D. Research Objectives 7

II METHODOLOGY 9

A. Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants 11

B. SNAP Eligibility Rates and Characteristics of Elderly Eligible Individuals 12

C. SNAP Participation Rates 14

III FINDINGS 19

A. Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants 21

1. Trends in National Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants 21
2. Trends in State Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants 22
3. Elderly SNAP Participants by Type of Eligibility 25
4. Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants 29

B. Characteristics of Elderly Eligible Individuals 38

1. Elderly Percentage of Eligible Population 39
2. Characteristics of the Elderly Eligible Population 39
3. Characteristics of the Low-Income SNAP-Ineligible Elderly Population 51

C. Estimates of State Elderly SNAP Eligibility Rates 55

1. Eligibility Rates for All Low-Income Elderly Individuals 55
2. Eligibility Rates for Subgroups of Low-Income Elderly Individuals 57

III *(continued)*

D. Estimates of State Elderly SNAP Participation Rates 59

1. Trend in National Elderly SNAP Participation Rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006 60
2. Trends in State Elderly SNAP Participation Rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006 61
3. Comparisons of State Elderly Participation Rates Across States and to National Rates 64
4. Trends in the Number of Elderly Eligibles and Participants from FY 2002 to FY 2006 66
5. Effect of Changes in Numbers of Eligibles and Participants on Participation Rates 68
6. Changes Between Consecutive Years in State Elderly Participation Rates and Number of Elderly Eligibles and Participants 69

IV SUMMARY 73

REFERENCES 75

APPENDIX A: TABLES SHOWING CHARACTERISTICS OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN SNAP, FISCAL YEARS 2000 TO 2007

APPENDIX B: TABLES SHOWING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR SNAP, FISCAL YEAR 2009

APPENDIX C: TABLES SHOWING NUMBER OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS BELOW 200 PERCENT OF POVERTY, NUMBER ELIGIBLE FOR SNAP, AND SNAP ELIGIBILITY RATES BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 2009

APPENDIX D: TABLES SHOWING ELDERLY SNAP PARTICIPATION RATES, RANKS, AND NUMBER OF ELDERLY PARTICIPANTS AND ELIGIBLES BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 2002 THROUGH 2006

TABLES

II.1. State SSI Supplements Simulated in the MATH SIPP+ Model 13

II.2. State Policies Regarding Expanded Categorical Eligibility and Vehicle Assets Simulated in the 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ Model 15

III.1. Estimated National Average Monthly Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants, by Year 22

III.2. Change in Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation, FY 2000 Through FY 2007 23

III.3. Change in Estimated Percentage of SNAP Participants Age 60 or Older by State, FY 2000 to 2007 24

III.4. Percentage of Elderly Participants Eligible Through an SSI CAP and Percentage Receiving a Standard Medical Deduction, by State and Year 26

III.5. Estimated Percentage of Elderly Non-SSI CAP SNAP Participants Who Would Fail the SNAP Net Income Test But Are Categorically Eligible, by State, Average FY 2000 – 2007 27

III.6. National Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants, FY 2000 through FY 2007 29

III.7. Percentage of Elderly Participants in One-Person SNAP Household, in Poverty, and Percentage with SSI in Poverty, by State, Average FY 2000 – 2007 30

III.8. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Households with SSI and Social Security Income and Average SSI and Social Security Amounts Among Elderly Households with Income Type, by State, FY 2007 31

III.9. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Households with Shelter and Medical Deductions and Average Shelter Deduction Among Elderly SNAP Households with a Shelter Deduction, by State, FY 2007 32

III.10. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Households Receiving the Minimum Benefit or Less and Receiving the Maximum Benefit and Average Benefit for Elderly SNAP Households, by State, FY 2007 33

III.11. Estimated Number of SNAP-Eligible Individuals and the Percentage Elderly, by State, FY 2009 40

III.12. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in One-Person SNAP Households, in Poverty, and with Medicaid, by State, FY 2009 41

III.13. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Households with SSI and Social Security Income and Average SSI and Social Security Amounts Among SNAP Households with Income Type, by State, FY 2009 44

III.14. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Households with Assets, with Shelter and Medical Deductions, and in Public Housing and Average Shelter Deduction Among Elderly Eligible SNAP Households with a Shelter Deduction, by State, FY 2009 46

III.15. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Households Qualifying for the Minimum Benefit or Less and Qualifying for the Maximum Benefit and Average Benefit for Elderly Eligible SNAP Households, by State, FY 2009 49

III.16. Elderly Percentage of Low-Income SNAP-Ineligible Individuals, FY 2009 51

III.17. Estimated Percentage of Elderly Ineligibles in One-Person SNAP Household, in Poverty, and with Countable Assets by State, FY 2009 53

III.18. Percentage of Elderly Ineligibles in SNAP Households with Medicaid, SSI, Social Security, and Excess Shelter Expenses by State, FY 2009 54

III.19. Estimated Number and SNAP Eligibility Rate of Elderly Individuals with Income below 200 Percent of Poverty, by State, 2009 56

III.20. Estimated Number and SNAP Eligibility Rate of Elderly Individuals with SSI or in One-Person SNAP Households with Income below 200 Percent of Poverty, by State, 2009 58

III.21. National SNAP Participation Rates for Eligible Elderly Individuals and for All Eligible Individuals, FY 2002 to FY 2006 60

III.22. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates by State, FY 2002 to FY 2006 62

III.23. Trends in Estimated State Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, FY 2002 to FY 2006 63

III.24. Comparisons of Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, FY 2002 to FY 2006 65

III.25. Change in Estimated Number of Elderly SNAP Eligibles and Participants and Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, FY 2002 to FY 2006 67

III.26. Direction of Change in Estimated Number of Elderly SNAP Eligibles and Participants and Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, by Year, FY 2002 to FY 2006 71

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly the Food Stamp Program, helps low-income households achieve a healthy diet through benefits redeemable for food. Historically, elderly adults (age 60 or older) have participated in SNAP at lower rates than other eligible people. Policymakers concerned about unmet nutrition needs among elderly adults have taken steps to reduce barriers to participation and increase elderly SNAP participation levels. The research described in this report, conducted by Mathematica under a Cooperative Agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Economic Research Service (ERS), provides policymakers, researchers, and advocates with detailed information on the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants and eligibles and on elderly SNAP eligibility and participation rates across states and over time. These data can be of use both in assessing the success of past efforts and when considering additional efforts to increase elderly SNAP participation.

In fiscal year (FY) 2008, a monthly average of 27.8 million people living in 12.5 million households received SNAP benefits, with an average monthly household benefit of $222. Nine percent of SNAP participants were elderly. The number of elderly SNAP participants, like the number of nonelderly participants, has increased steadily since 2001, reaching a monthly average of 2.5 million in FY 2008. However, although an estimated 67 percent of all eligible individuals participated in SNAP in FY 2008, the estimated elderly SNAP participation rate was just 35 percent.

The research presented here provides a rich source of data on elderly individuals' eligibility for and participation in SNAP. Specifically, we used SNAP Quality Control (QC) data to tabulate characteristics of elderly SNAP participants for FY 2000 through FY 2007 by state, and a Survey of Income and Program Participation-based microsimulation model to tabulate characteristics of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP in FY 2009 by state. We used the same microsimulation model to estimate elderly eligibility rates by characteristics and state. Finally, we used Current Population Survey; SNAP QC; and other administrative, survey, and program data to estimate state SNAP participation rates for elderly individuals for FY 2002 through FY 2006. We used these estimates to examine the following research questions:

- What are the economic and demographic characteristics of elderly SNAP participants? Do the characteristics vary by state and year?
- What are the characteristics of elderly individuals who are eligible for SNAP? Do the characteristics vary by state? Do they differ from the characteristics of elderly participants and ineligible low-income elderly individuals?
- What percentage of the low-income elderly population is eligible for SNAP? Do SNAP eligibility rates vary across states?
- Do elderly SNAP participation rates vary across states and years? Do most states have a similar elderly participation rate trend? Are differences in rates between states or changes in rates between years due to differences in the number of eligibles or participants?
- What are the likely effects on SNAP eligibility, participation, and benefit levels of SSI CAPs and other state options and demonstration projects designed to increase elderly individuals' eligibility for and participation in SNAP?

We found that the average monthly number of elderly SNAP participants increased by almost 40 percent from FY 2000 to FY 2007. In most states, elderly participation fluctuated over time, but

generally increased from the earlier years of the study period to the later ones. While three states saw a decline in the number of elderly participants (Alabama, Colorado, and Hawaii), and others only a minimal increase (e.g., Montana and Arkansas), six experienced an increase in elderly participation of 100 percent or more (Delaware, Massachusetts, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, and Texas). The percentage of SNAP participants that was elderly varied by state, from 5 percent or less in California, Alaska, and Utah to 16 percent or more in New York, Florida, and Hawaii.

Nationally, on average from FY 2000 to FY 2007, 72 percent of elderly SNAP participants were in one-person SNAP households, 84 percent were in poverty, 58 percent were in households where someone received Supplemental Security Income (SSI), 67 percent qualified for an excess shelter expense deduction, 21 percent received the minimum SNAP benefit, and 12 percent received the maximum benefit. While some elderly participant characteristics, such as the percentage in one-person SNAP households, remained relatively constant over time, others trended up or down during the study period. For instance, the percentage with a shelter deduction increased from 59 percent in the early years to 72 percent in FY 2007, and the percentage receiving the minimum benefit, while fluctuating somewhat, decreased from 27 percent in FY 2001 to 17 percent in FY 2007. Elderly SNAP participant characteristics also varied by state. For example, FY 2000 to FY 2007 average poverty rates among elderly participants varied from lows of 57 and 60 percent in Alaska and Wisconsin, respectively, to highs of 92 percent in both Hawaii and Mississippi. In addition, the percentage in FY 2007 with a shelter deduction ranged from 42 percent in Mississippi and 46 percent in Texas and Alaska to 93 percent in Vermont and Maine and 94 percent in Illinois.

An estimated 53 million individuals were eligible for SNAP in FY 2009, 16 percent of whom were age 60 or over. The average household benefit for which eligible elderly individuals qualified was $102. Among eligible elderly individuals nationally in FY 2009, 59 percent were in one-person SNAP households, 42 percent were in poverty, 17 percent were in households where someone received SSI, 56 percent qualified for an excess shelter expense deduction, 37 percent qualified for the minimum SNAP benefit, and 14 percent qualified for the maximum benefit. As with the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants, those of elderly SNAP eligibles varied by state. For example, poverty rates among elderly eligibles ranged from 26 percent in Delaware and 28 percent in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin to 64 percent in the District of Columbia and 65 percent in Hawaii and Mississippi. In all states but Alaska, the poverty rate among eligibles was considerably higher than among participants. In FY 2009, 28 percent of elderly eligibles qualified for a shelter deduction in South Carolina, the lowest percentage among states, while 94 percent qualified for shelter deduction in North Dakota, the highest percentage. In three-quarters of the states, the percentage of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction was lower than that of elderly participants.

In FY 2009, more than 16 million elderly individuals had income under 200 percent of poverty and an estimated 8.5 million, or 53 percent, were eligible for SNAP. State low-income elderly SNAP eligibility rates varied widely. Thirteen states had eligibility rates of 64 percent or more and 13 states had elderly eligibility rates of 36 percent or less.

Nationally, the estimated elderly SNAP participation rate—the percentage of eligible elderly individuals participating in the program—increased steadily, from 25 percent in FY 2002 to 34 percent in FY 2006. Although there was variation across states and between consecutive years, the change in elderly participation rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006 was also positive in every state. Hawaii's elderly participation rate was higher than that of every other state in all five years, and Florida, Maine, New York, and Oregon had participation rates significantly higher than two-thirds of the states in all five years.

I. INTRODUCTION

Historically, elderly adults (age 60 or older) have participated in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly the Food Stamp Program, at lower rates than the general population. Policymakers concerned about unmet nutrition needs among such individuals have taken steps to reduce barriers to participation and increase elderly SNAP participation levels. The research described in this report, conducted by Mathematica Policy Research under a Cooperative Agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Economic Research Service (ERS), provides policymakers, researchers, and advocates with detailed information on the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants and eligibles and on elderly SNAP eligibility and participation rates across states and over time. Specifically, we tabulated state characteristics of elderly SNAP participants for fiscal year (FY) 2000 through FY 2007 and elderly individuals eligible for SNAP in FY 2009. We also estimated state elderly SNAP eligibility rates for FY 2009 and state SNAP participation rates for elderly individuals for FY 2002 through FY 2006.[1] The data presented in this report can be of use both in assessing the success of past efforts and when considering additional efforts to increase elderly SNAP participation.

In the remainder of this chapter, we provide some background information on elderly SNAP participation, efforts to increase elderly participation, existing research on SNAP participation and eligibility, and the objectives of the reported research.

A. SNAP Participation Among Elderly Individuals

SNAP, the largest food and nutrition assistance program administered by USDA's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), helps low-income households achieve a healthy diet through benefits redeemable for food. In FY 2008, a monthly average of 27.8 million people living in 12.5 million

[1] The different time periods examined reflect differences in the data available at the time this research was conducted. See Chapter II (Methodology) for more information.

SNAP households received SNAP benefits, with an average monthly household benefit of $222 (Wolkwitz and Trippe 2009).[2,3] Nine percent of SNAP participants were elderly, and 19 percent of participating SNAP households included at least one elderly member.

The percentage of participating individuals that was elderly in FY 2008 varied by state, from 18 percent in New York to 5 percent in Delaware and 2 percent in California. (California's low elderly percentage is due to the ineligibility of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) recipients in that state.) Participating SNAP households with elderly members received an average monthly SNAP benefit of $94. This smaller average benefit for elderly SNAP households relative to all SNAP households reflects the smaller average size (1.3 members versus 2.2) of the former and their slightly higher average gross income ($762 versus $701 for all SNAP households).

The total number of SNAP participants has been increasing steadily since 2001. The number of elderly SNAP participants has followed the same trend, increasing by more than 60 percent, from 1.6 million in FY 2001 to 2.5 million in FY 2008 (Wolkwitz and Trippe 2009).

In FY 2007, the overall SNAP participation rate—the percentage of eligible individuals participating in the program—was 66 percent (Leftin and Wolkwitz 2009). Participation rates varied across states, from more than 90 percent in Maine and Missouri to under 50 percent in California and Wyoming (Cunnyngham and Castner 2009).[4] Although an average of 2.5 million elderly adults received SNAP benefits each month in FY 2008, this population participates in SNAP at a lower

---

[2] The participant estimates presented in Wolkwitz and Trippe (2009) and cited in this paragraph do not include ineligible individuals who received benefits in error or individuals who received only disaster SNAP benefits.

[3] After Wolkwitz and Trippe (2009) was published, Missouri determined that it mistakenly over-reported the number of individuals participating in SNAP for FY 2003 through FY 2009, with the reporting error gradually increasing over time. Revised participant estimates will be published in Leftin et al, forthcoming.

[4] Revised participation rate estimates incorporating corrected Missouri participant data had not been derived by the time the Cunnyngham and Castner report was published. The corrected 2007 Missouri participation rate is likely to be in the low 80s. Missouri's corrected numbers were not received in time to be incorporated in this report. However, the effect of Missouri's reporting error on the number of *elderly* SNAP participants in FY 2007 and prior years is likely to be small, as is the likely effect on elderly participation rate estimates presented later in this report.

rate than do all eligible people. In FY 2007, the SNAP participation rate among elderly individuals was only 35 percent, versus 73 percent for nonelderly individuals (Leftin 2010).

Some policymakers and advocates have been concerned about the low rate of elderly participation in SNAP for several reasons. First, some evidence suggests that receipt of SNAP benefits increases both household food expenditures and overall financial well-being (LeBlanc et al. 2006). Second, although rates of food security are higher among households with a member over age 65 (92 percent in 2008) than among all households (85 percent), 3 percent of households with an older member had very low food security in 2008 (Nord et al. 2009). In these households, the food intake of at least one member was reduced because the household lacked sufficient resources. Further evidence of possible unmet need comes from waiting lists for other food assistance programs, such as Meals-on-Wheels (Salmon and Bridges 2005). Finally, Lee and Frongillo (2001) found that food-insecure elderly people had a poorer nutritional and health status than food-secure elderly people. Given the potentially positive effect of SNAP benefits on the health and well-being of elderly participants, many policymakers are interested in increasing elderly SNAP participation.

B. Efforts to Increase SNAP Participation Among Elderly Individuals

Researchers have identified several factors that contribute to the low rate of SNAP participation by elderly individuals (Maryns 2008). Among these is a perception held by some that the SNAP application process, including income and expense verification, is too burdensome. Elderly individuals also may have inaccurate information about eligibility requirements and the level of benefits for which they are likely to qualify.

Federal and state policymakers have undertaken a variety of efforts to address these deterrents, including the implementation of programs intended to facilitate elderly participation. An example is SSI Combined Application Projects (CAPs), which are state projects that streamline the application process for certain elderly individuals who also are receiving SSI. These partnerships between FNS and the Social Security Administration (SSA) use standard deduction or benefit amounts, require a

minimal amount of income and asset verification beyond that required for the SSI program, and often do not require a visit to the local SNAP office. By June 2009, 15 states had implemented CAPs and another 4 states had projects that were either approved but not yet implemented or pending approval (USDA 2009). Boussy et al. (2000) found that in South Carolina, one of the first states to implement an SSI CAP, SNAP participation rates among eligible SSI recipients increased during the first several years of the project.

Other examples of initiatives intended to facilitate elderly participation are the Standard Medical Deduction, Simplified Application, and Simplified Elderly Reporting demonstration projects that some states have implemented or plan to implement. The Standard Medical Deduction demonstrations simplify the application process by applying a standard medical deduction for SNAP households with an elderly or disabled member who incurs monthly medical expenses of more than $35. In 2009, seven states—Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, and Wyoming—operated Standard Medical Deduction demonstrations. The Elderly/Disabled Simplified Application demonstrations reduce the burden of applying for SNAP benefits for qualifying SNAP households by waiving face-to-face interviews and some income verification requirements. In 2009, three states—Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina—operated Simplified Application demonstrations. Finally, the Simplified Elderly Reporting demonstrations aim to increase SNAP participation and reduce the administrative burden on the state agency by reducing the income reporting requirements for qualifying participating SNAP households.

Between 2002 and 2004, USDA funded county-wide demonstration projects in six states to test several additional methods designed to increase SNAP participation among eligible elderly individuals. The methods included simplifying the application process, increasing elderly individuals' understanding of SNAP, assisting with the application process, and providing commodities rather than standard SNAP benefits. Cody and Ohls (2005) found that most of the demonstration projects increased participation among the target populations.

Another strategy used to encourage elderly SNAP participation is increased outreach. FNS awards outreach grants in an effort to increase program participation among eligible households. The USDA (2008) prepared a report describing the 16 outreach projects that resulted from the nearly $2 million the agency awarded in 2004 and 2005. The report describes the projects' goals and strategies and includes grantees' self-evaluations of their project performances. Altogether, the grantees report prescreening more than 18,000 households and facilitating the submission of 12,000 SNAP applications, 7,000 of which were known to have been approved. By November 2007, 23 states had implemented formal outreach programs intended to increase participation in SNAP and other states were operating informal programs (USDA 2007).

In 2009, FNS awarded a new set of outreach grants to six states, three of which are targeting outreach to the elderly. Two of the states—Ohio and Michigan—are making extensive use of community partners to provide SNAP application assistance at sites frequented by seniors. The third—Pennsylvania—is conducting data matching to identify seniors not enrolled in SNAP but enrolled in other assistance programs that have similar eligibility criteria (and thus imply eligibility for SNAP). A local nonprofit organization will conduct targeted outreach to this group and provide application assistance through its call center. This state also will apply waivers of face-to-face interviews and some income and expense verification requirements. The outreach strategies are being formally evaluated.

C. Additional Existing Research on SNAP Participation and Eligibility

In addition to the research already cited, many other recent reports have examined SNAP participation and eligibility. Mabli et al. (2009) examined the factors associated with the increase in SNAP participation between 2000 and 2006 and found that program outreach and policies that expand eligibility or reduce reporting requirements all increased the number of SNAP participants. Klerman and Danielson (2009) examined the extent to which changes in the economic climate and SNAP and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) policies affected SNAP caseload

trends from 1990 to 2004. Their research indicates that, among households not receiving TANF or SSI, both the economy and SNAP policies affected SNAP participation. The effect on households that received TANF or SSI is less clear. Ratcliffe et al. (2008) used data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and data on state SNAP, TANF, minimum wage, and Earned Income Tax Credit policies to examine the effect of policies on program participation. They found that expanded categorical eligibility, vehicle exemption policies, and longer certification periods increased SNAP participation, while fingerprinting requirements lowered participation. Cody et al. (2007) examined variations across states in SNAP participation rates and found that demographic and policy differences between states explain some, but not all, of the differences in participation rates.

Other researchers specifically examined elderly individuals' low participation in SNAP. Wu (2009) used data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics and other sources to examine the causes of low elderly SNAP participation rates and the implications for elderly well-being. She found that the lower average benefit for which elderly eligibles qualify, lack of information about SNAP eligibility, and a preference for other types of nutrition assistance, such as congregate dining, are all factors in the low elderly SNAP participation rates. Wu also determined that low SNAP participation, on average, did not negatively affect elderly nutritional well-being.

Gabor et al. (2002) used focus groups to gather data from elderly individuals in Washington State on their views of SNAP. Among the reasons given for nonparticipation were the stigma associated with receiving assistance, the belief that the benefits would be too low to be worth the effort, and an application process perceived as overly complicated and intrusive. Wilde and Dagata (2002) found similar participation barriers among older individuals, as well as difficulties with transportation and the use of electronic benefit transfer cards. Using the Health and Retirement Study, Haider et al. (2003) found that measurement error, or inaccurate identification by researchers

of individuals eligible for SNAP, does not explain elderly individuals' estimated low rates of participation in SNAP and that participation rates vary among age cohorts.

D. Research Objectives

The research presented in this report supplements existing research by providing a rich source of data on elderly individuals' eligibility for and participation in SNAP. Combined with information on federal and state efforts to increase elderly SNAP participation and data on economic and demographic changes that affect states' elderly populations, this research can increase policymakers' understanding of the factors that influence elderly individuals' SNAP participation decisions.

The questions that guided this research are:

- What are the economic and demographic characteristics of elderly SNAP participants? Do the characteristics vary by state and year?
- What are the characteristics of elderly individuals who are eligible for SNAP? Do the characteristics vary by state? Do they differ from the characteristics of elderly participants and ineligible low-income elderly individuals?
- What percentage of the low-income elderly population is eligible for SNAP? Do SNAP eligibility rates vary across states?
- Do elderly SNAP participation rates vary across states and years? Do most states have a similar elderly participation rate trend? Are differences in rates between states or changes in rates between years due to differences in the number of eligibles or participants?
- What are the likely effects on SNAP eligibility, participation, and benefit levels of SSI CAPs and other state options and demonstration projects designed to increase elderly individuals' eligibility for and participation in SNAP?

In the remainder of this report, we describe the methodology used to address these research questions (Chapter II) and present and summarize the findings (Chapters III and IV, respectively). Detailed tables with additional data are available in the appendices.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

II. METHODOLOGY

We used SNAP Quality Control (QC) (formerly known as FSPQC) data to tabulate characteristics of elderly SNAP participants for FY 2000 through FY 2007 by state, and the 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH® SIPP+ model to tabulate characteristics of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP in FY 2009 by state. We also used the MATH SIPP+ model to estimate eligibility rates by characteristics and state. Finally, we used Current Population Survey (CPS); SNAP QC; and other administrative, survey, and program data to estimate state SNAP participation rates for elderly individuals for FY 2002 through FY 2006. We chose to use data from different time periods so we could use the most recent data available when the research was conducted. We discuss this in more detail in the sections below.

To be eligible for SNAP under the standard federal rules, most elderly SNAP households—those with at least one elderly member—must have no more than $3,000 in countable assets and have net income under 100 percent of the federal poverty guideline.[5] Pure public assistance households—those in which every member receives income from SSI, TANF, or General Assistance—are categorically eligible for SNAP, meaning that they are not subject to the asset or income tests. Some states have extended categorical eligibility to additional low-income households, exempting them from the federal SNAP asset test and, in some cases, the net income test. While two states (Maine and Maryland) have restricted the categorical eligibility expansion to households with children, others do not include demographic constraints. By the beginning of FY 2009, 13 states had enacted expanded categorical eligibility policies to exempt all or almost all households from the federal SNAP asset test.

[5] Throughout this report, "SNAP household" refers to those members of a dwelling unit who purchase and prepare food together and thus would be required to apply for SNAP as a unit. SNAP households often comprise all members of a dwelling unit, but occasionally a dwelling unit will form two or more SNAP households. A SNAP household, as defined in this report, is not necessarily eligible for or participating in SNAP.

Under federal rules, countable assets include the value of most financial assets and some vehicles. Beginning in FY 2009, tax-preferred retirement and education savings were excluded from countable assets. States have the flexibility to align the rules by which vehicle assets are counted when determining SNAP eligibility to those in place for a state TANF-funded program as long as the alternate program rules are more generous than the federal rules. If a state chooses this option, the new vehicle rules apply to all SNAP applicants. By FY 2009, all states had implemented more generous policies that excluded some or all vehicle assets from countable assets.

Net income is calculated by subtracting certain deductions from gross income. Every SNAP household is allowed a standard deduction, the amount of which is based on the household's geographic location and size. (In FY 2009, the standard deduction for SNAP households with one to three members was $144 in the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia, $203 in Hawaii, and $245 in Alaska.) In addition, SNAP households may deduct shelter costs that exceed 50 percent of their countable income after subtracting all other deductions. Elderly SNAP households are not subject to a cap on this deduction. (In FY 2009, the excess shelter expense deduction for SNAP households without elderly or disabled members was capped at $446 in the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia, $601 in Hawaii, and $713 in Alaska.) SNAP households with elderly or disabled members also may deduct out-of-pocket medical expenses incurred by those members in excess of $35 per month. Finally, they may deduct 20 percent of SNAP household earnings; the cost of dependent care incurred while other household members work, seek employment, or attend school; and legally obligated child support expenses. SNAP benefit amounts are calculated by subtracting 30 percent of SNAP household net income from the maximum benefit, as determined by SNAP household size.

Eligible one- and two-person SNAP households are guaranteed a minimum benefit. For decades, including most of the period covered by this research, the minimum benefit for small SNAP households was $10. The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 increased the

minimum benefit to 8 percent of the maximum benefit for a one-person household beginning in FY 2009. Accordingly, the minimum benefit was $14 for the first half of FY 2009 and then increased to $16 as of April 2009 with the passage of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA). Although 18 percent of SNAP households with elderly members received the minimum benefit in 2008 (Wolkwitz and Trippe 2009), elderly SNAP households with significant shelter, medical, or other deductible expenses can qualify for benefits substantially larger than the minimum benefit.

We used SNAP eligibility and benefit determination rules to simulate SNAP eligibility in both the CPS-based eligibility files and the MATH SIPP+ model. The SNAP QC data files provide information on SNAP households eligible for benefits based on the SNAP rules described above.

The data and methodology used in the research are described briefly below. In each section, we provide references to documents with more details on methodology.

A. Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants

We used SNAP QC databases for FY 2000 through FY 2007 to tabulate economic and demographic characteristics of elderly SNAP participants over time and by state. These databases, which are representative at the state level, contain detailed demographic, economic, and SNAP eligibility information for an annual sample of more than 45,000 SNAP households. More recent files, such as the 2008 SNAP QC data file described in Wolkwitz and Ewell (2009), were not available when the research presented here was conducted.

Five of the data files—for FY 2000 through FY 2004—differ slightly from the published SNAP QC data files for those years. Two weighting methodology updates were implemented for this research to make these consistent with the most recent data files. First, the published data files for FY 2000 through FY 2002 are weighted to match unadjusted administrative control totals. The files used for this research instead are weighted to match administrative control totals adjusted to remove SNAP households receiving disaster assistance benefits and ineligible SNAP households that

received benefits in error. Benefit totals also were adjusted for benefits over- or under-issued to eligible SNAP households. Second, the published data files for FY 2000 through FY 2004 are weighted to match administrative totals for SNAP households only, whereas the data files used for this research are weighted to match administrative control totals for individuals and benefits as well as SNAP households.

Technical documentation for the FY 2007 SNAP QC data file (Wolkwitz and Ewell 2008) and earlier SNAP QC data files is available at http://hostm142.mathematica-mpr.com/fns/download.htm.

B. SNAP Eligibility Rates and Characteristics of Elderly Eligible Individuals

We used the 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model to tabulate economic and demographic characteristics of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP and estimate SNAP eligibility rates—the percentage of the low-income elderly population eligible for SNAP. The MATH SIPP+ is a microsimulation model with two components: an underlying database and a series of computer programs. The database consists of individual household records that contain detailed information about household income, assets, expenses, and demographics. The computer programs, acting as "electronic caseworkers," apply SNAP eligiblity rules to each household in the database to determine whether it would be eligible for the program and, if so, the benefit to which it would be entitled. The eligibility rules simulated include determining which members of a household or dwelling unit would be required to apply for SNAP as a unit, or "SNAP household." The model also predicts which eligible SNAP households would participate in SNAP. The predicted participant population is calibrated to match participant totals and characteristics from the SNAP QC data file.

The MATH SIPP+ model is based on data from both the SIPP and the CPS Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC). The SIPP was chosen to serve as the model's underlying database because it contains the data on household income, assets, and expenses needed to determine SNAP eligiblity and benefit amounts. The SIPP sample is relatively small, however, and is not

representative at the state level. To overcome these weaknesses, the MATH SIPP+ model also incorporates CPS ASEC data. While the CPS ASEC does not contain information on assets and expenses, it provides a larger sample than the SIPP and is representative at the state level. The CPS data are used to reweight the SIPP data in such a way that the MATH SIPP+ model can be used for state-level simulations. In brief, each SNAP household in the underlying SIPP database is assigned a set of state weights—one for each state—derived from the original SIPP weight and based on state demographic and economic household characteristics from the CPS ASEC. Through these state weights, the MATH SIPP+ model uses data on all SNAP households in the sample, regardless of their state of residence, to simulate SNAP eligibility in each state.

The 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model uses September 2005 SIPP data, 2005 and 2006 CPS ASEC data, and FY 2008 SNAP QC data. The model simulates SNAP in FY 2009[6] and SSI and TANF participation and benefits in 2005. The state SSI supplements simulated are listed in Table II.1. The SNAP simulation incorporates the SNAP policy changes included in ARRA and the

Table II.1. State SSI Supplements Simulated in the MATH SIPP+ Model

State	Individual	Couple	State	Individual	Couple
Alaska	362	528	New Jersey	31	25
California	226	553	New York	87	104
Colorado	25	339	Oklahoma	48	96
Connecticut	168	277	Oregon	2	0
Idaho	52	20	Pennsylvania	27	44
Maine	10	15	Rhode Island	57	109
Massachusetts	129	202	South Dakota	15	15
Michigan	14	28	Utah	0	5
Minnesota	61	91	Vermont	52	99
Nebraska	9	5	Wisconsin	84	132
Nevada	36	74	Wyoming	10	26
New Hampshire	27	21			

Source: State Assistance Programs for SSI Recipients, January 2005.

[6] All 2009 parameters expressed in dollar amounts are deflated to 2005 dollars using a ratio derived from CPI-U data.

state asset and categorical eligibility policies summarized in Table II.2. We chose to use the 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model rather than an earlier version of the model (the 2006 Baseline of the 2002 MATH SIPP+ model) to take advantage of more recent data and enhanced model development methodologies. The creation of the 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model is described in Smith (2010).

C. SNAP Participation Rates

We estimated state SNAP participation rates for elderly individuals for FY 2002 through FY 2006 employing the data and methodology used to estimate state participation rates for all eligible individuals and eligible working poor, as published in "Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2006" (Cunnyngham et al. 2008). More recent files, such as the 2007 eligibility file developed for "Reaching Those in Need: State Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Rates in 2007" (Cunnyngham and Castner 2009) were not available when the research presented here was conducted.

The small area estimation methodology used to estimate state SNAP participation rates draws on data from the SNAP QC System, the CPS ASEC, the decennial census, and administrative records. It uses a shrinkage estimator to average direct sample estimates of elderly SNAP participation rates with predictions from a regression model.

We used a small area estimation methodology to overcome the small sample sizes available in the CPS for most states. Direct state participation rate estimates based on small sample sizes are imprecise and result in large confidence intervals. The shrinkage estimator uses data for all states, several time periods, and multiple data sources, substantially improving the precision of our participation rate estimates.

Direct Sample Estimates. To obtain direct sample participation rate estimates, we used SNAP QC data files to estimate the number of elderly SNAP *participants* in an average month of each fiscal

Table II.2. State Policies Regarding Expanded Categorical Eligibility and Vehicle Assets Simulated in the 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ Model

	SNAP Households Exempt from Asset Test[a]	Vehicles Excluded from Asset Test	SNAP Households With Higher Gross Income Limit[a]	SNAP Households Exempt from Net Income Test[a]
Alabama		All		
Alaska		Most		
Arizona	Almost All	All	Almost All	Almost All
Arkansas		Some		
California		All		
Colorado		All		
Connecticut		All		
Delaware	All	-	All	All
District of Columbia		All		
Florida		Some		
Georgia	All	-		All
Hawaii		All		
Idaho		Most		
Illinois		Some		
Indiana		All		
Iowa		Some		
Kansas		All		
Kentucky		All		
Louisiana		All		
Maine	Some	Some	Some	Some
Maryland	Some	All	Some	Some
Massachusetts	All	-		
Michigan	All	-	All	All
Minnesota	Higher Limit for Most	Most		All
Mississippi		All		
Missouri		All		
Montana		All		
Nebraska		Some		
Nevada		Some		
New Hampshire		Most		
New Jersey		All		
New Mexico		All		
New York	All	-		All
North Carolina		Most		
North Dakota	All	-	All	
Ohio		All		
Oklahoma		Most		
Oregon	Almost All	All	Almost All	Almost All
Pennsylvania	All	-		All
Rhode Island		Some		
South Carolina	All	-	All	All
South Dakota		Some		
Tennessee		All		
Texas	Higher Limit for Most	Federal Rules	Some	
Utah		All		
Vermont	Almost All	Some	Almost All	Almost All
Virginia		All		
Washington	All	-	All	All
West Virginia		All		
Wisconsin	All	-	All	All
Wyoming		Some		

Source: Smith (2010).

[a] By federal rule, states are not permitted to extend categorical eligibility to a very small number of SNAP households, including those with members who intentionally violate program rules. However, since these households are not identified in the SIPP, the MATH SIPP+ model does not simulate this rule.

year and CPS-based SNAP eligibility files to estimate the number of elderly individuals *eligible* for SNAP in an average month of each fiscal year.

The SNAP QC databases are edited versions of the data files generated by SNAP's QC System. Three of the files we used differ slightly from the published SNAP QC data files. As described in Section II.A, we revised data files for FY 2002 through FY 2004 to be methodologically consistent with the more recent files.

The CPS-based eligibility files were developed to produce the denominators of the participation rates presented in "Trends in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Rates: 2000 to 2006" (Wolkwitz 2008). Like the SNAP QC data files we used, these annual files are produced with a consistent methodology, allowing us to examine trends in SNAP eligibility levels and participation rates over time.

To ensure consistency between the participant estimates (the participation rate numerator) and the eligibles estimates (the participation rate denominator), certain SNAP households were removed from the SNAP QC data file. Specifically, the CPS does not contain the information needed to identify SNAP households that would fail the SNAP income tests but are eligible through certain state categorical eligibility rules; for this reason, such households were dropped from the participation rate numerators. Just over one percent of eligible participants was removed from the FY 2006 participant estimates.

Regression Predictions. To develop the regression predictions, we evaluated a large number of potential regression models. To create these models, we drew on a pool of predictors previously developed and used to estimate state SNAP participation rates for all eligible individuals and eligible working poor, and to estimate state numbers of children income eligible for WIC. We chose the regression model that seemed to possess the strongest predictive ability based on an examination of functions of the regression residuals, such as mean squared error. We also checked for and found no strong evidence of correctable model bias, or a persistent tendency to under- or over-predict the

number of elderly eligibles for certain types of states categorized by, for example, region or racial/ethnic composition. The model included the following predictors (in addition to an intercept):

- The percentage of the population receiving SNAP benefits each year, according to program operations data from FNS and population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau
- The percentage of the population age 65 and over receiving SSI each year, according to SSA and population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau
- The percentage of the population age 65 and over at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level in 1999, according to Census 2000
- The percentage of families with related children under age 5 at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty level in 1999, according to Census 2000
- The median household income in 1999, according to Census 2000
- The percentage of the population over age 25 with a high school degree or higher in 1999, according to Census 2000
- The percentage of the employed civilian population 16 years and over that was self-employed in 1999, according to Census 2000
- The percentage of the population that was foreign-born and naturalized in 1999, according to Census 2000

Shrinkage Estimation Methodology. After obtaining the direct sample estimates and the regression predictions, we used shrinkage estimation methods to combine them. The empirical Bayes shrinkage estimator jointly derived estimates of participation rates for elderly eligibles and all eligibles for all five years for the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It took into account the inter-year correlations in sampling and model errors, the correlation between estimates of elderly eligibles and all eligibles, and the correlation between estimates of elderly and all participants. We used the estimated participation rates to derive estimates of the numbers of elderly eligibles and all eligibles. After deriving the shrinkage estimates, we tested for statistically significant differences in numbers of eligibles and rates across states and over time.

The national FY 2002 through FY 2004 estimates for elderly individuals differ slightly from estimates published in Leftin and Wolkwitz (2009) because we used revised SNAP QC data files for those years. The state estimates for all individuals jointly derived with the elderly state estimates for

this research differ slightly from those published in Cunnyngham and Castner (2009) because we chose to use a different regression model for the estimates presented here—one with better predictive ability for the elderly estimates—and because we jointly estimated participation rates for five years, rather than the three used for the Cunnyngham and Castner estimates, as well as for elderly individuals and all individuals, rather than working poor individuals and all individuals.

Because of the differences in estimated participation rates for all individuals, we limit our discussion in this report to the elderly state participation rate estimates. We present estimated national participation rates for elderly individuals and all individuals for comparison purposes, but these estimates are not intended to supplant the estimates published in Leftin and Wolkwitz (2009).

The direct sample estimates, regression predictions, and other data used to derive the shrinkage participation rate estimates are available on request. More details on the methodology and data used to estimate state SNAP participation rates can be found in these three documents:

1. Cunnyngham et al. (2009) describes the shrinkage estimation methodology and is available at http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/nutrition/empbayes04-06rpt.pdf.
2. Wolkwitz (2008) contains an appendix that describes the methodology used to develop the CPS-based eligibility and SNAP QC-based participant files from which the direct sample estimates were derived. This document is available at http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/PDFs/fsptrends00-06.pdf.
3. Wolkwitz and Ewell (2007) and similar reports provide technical documentation for SNAP QC data files and are available at http://hostm142.mathematica-mpr.com/fns/download.htm.

III. FINDINGS

In this chapter, we present and discuss the findings, including characteristics of elderly SNAP participants for FY 2000 through FY 2007, characteristics of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP in FY 2009, SNAP eligibility rates for elderly individuals for FY 2009, and SNAP participation rates for elderly individuals for FY 2002 through FY 2006. We also mention some apparent connections between state policies or characteristics and elderly SNAP eligibility and participation. However, a rigorous analysis of the correlation between various policy, economic, and demographic factors and state elderly participation and eligibility rates and characteristics of elderly eligibles and participants was beyond the scope of this research.

The number and characteristics of SNAP-eligible individuals in a state can be influenced by state and federal eligibility policies, household economic circumstances, and state demographics. *Differences* in state policies, economies, and demographics may lead to *differences* across states in SNAP eligibility rates and the characteristics of the eligible population. Similarly, *changes* in policies, economic circumstances, or demographics can lead to *changes* in the number and characteristics of the eligible population in a state. For example, the number of SNAP eligibles in a state will tend to increase if the state adopts rules that exclude additional vehicles from the SNAP asset test. The number of eligibles also will increase if poverty rates rise, which means that more SNAP applicants will pass the gross income test, or if shelter or medical costs rise, which means that SNAP applicants are more likely to pass the net income test. Differences across states, such as in poverty rates or shelter or medical costs, may lead to state differences in the size and composition of the SNAP eligible population. The presence and size of state SSI supplements can also affect the number of SNAP eligibles: a smaller percentage of SSI recipients are likely to be eligible for SNAP in states with generous SSI supplements than in states with no SSI supplement.

The number and characteristics of SNAP participants in a state are determined both by the number of eligible individuals and their participation decisions. Participation decisions can be

affected by outreach and education efforts, the application process, household perceptions of need, other programs that interact with SNAP, and SNAP benefit amounts. As with eligibles, changes in policies and practices, economic circumstances, or demographics can also lead to changes in the number and characteristics of the participant population in a state. For example, the number of SNAP eligibles who decide to participate in the program will tend to increase if a state increases outreach efforts or streamlines the application process through an SSI CAP, a Standard Medical Deduction, or other application process simplifications. An increase in the SNAP benefit amount for which an eligible SNAP household qualifies also will increase the likelihood that the SNAP household will choose to participate.[7] Changes in SNAP benefit amounts can be the result of a change in household economic circumstances or size, or in federal or state policies affecting the benefit calculation. Examples of federal policies that increased SNAP benefits are the 13.6 percent increase in maximum benefit amounts and the associated increase in the minimum benefit included in ARRA, effective April 2009.

Although relatively limited, states also have the ability to implement policies that affect benefit amounts. For instance, some states allow SNAP households whose heating costs are included in their rent to claim a higher Standard Utility Allowance (SUA) by conferring a small Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) benefit on them. A SNAP household that receives a LIHEAP benefit is eligible for a state's heating and cooling SUA, which is higher than the non-heating and cooling SUA.

We examine the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants by state and over time in Section III.A and the characteristics of the elderly SNAP-eligible population and the low-income SNAP-ineligible population by state in Section III.B.

[7] As mentioned in Chapter 2, throughout this report, "SNAP household" refers to a group of individuals who would be required to apply for SNAP as a unit. A SNAP household is not necessarily comprised of everyone in a dwelling unit nor is it necessarily eligible for or participating in SNAP.

Elderly SNAP participation rates—the percentage of the elderly eligible population participating in the program—are an important measure of how well the program is reaching its target population in each state. Elderly SNAP eligibility rates—the percentage of the low-income elderly population eligible for SNAP—also are an important tool for use in comparing SNAP eligibility and participation across states. We discuss state eligibility rates for the low-income elderly population and two subgroups (those with SSI and those in one-person SNAP households) in Section III.C. We discuss state elderly participation rates, the number of eligible individuals and participants, and differences in participation rates across states in Section III.D.

A. Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants

We used edited administrative data—SNAP QC data files—to examine the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants from FY 2000 through FY 2007. The participant tabulations presented here differ in two respects from tabulations presented in Wolkwitz and Leftin (2008) and earlier reports in the series on characteristics of SNAP participants. First, the research presented in this report relied on revised data files for FY 2000 through 2004, as described in the methodology chapter. Second, these tabulations exclude Guam and the Virgin Islands; our focus is on the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Detailed tabulations of the characteristics of elderly SNAP participants are presented in Appendix A.

1. Trends in National Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants

The average monthly number of elderly SNAP participants increased by almost 40 percent from FY 2000 to FY 2007 (Table III.1). After a slight initial drop, from 1.63 million in FY 2000 to 1.56 million in FY 2001, the average monthly number of elderly participants reached 2.26 million in FY 2007. At the same time, the average monthly number of all SNAP participants grew from 16.88 million in FY 2000 to 25.89 million in FY 2007, an increase of more than 50 percent. Much of the increase in overall participation occurred from FY 2002 through FY 2005, while the increase in elderly participation occurred primarily from FY 2003 through FY 2006. Because the increase in

total participation occurred earlier than that in elderly participation, the percentage of participants over age 60 dropped by almost 2 percentage points, from 10 percent in FY 2000 to 8 percent in FY 2002, before rising to 9 percent in FY 2006. Further, because total participation increased more than elderly participation during this time period, the percentage of elderly SNAP participants remained one percentage point lower in FY 2007 than in FY 2000.

Table III.1. Estimated National Average Monthly Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants, by Year

	SNAP Participants			Elderly SNAP Participants			Percentage Elderly (Standard Error)
	Number (000,000s)	Percent Change	Cumulative Change	Number (000,000s)	Percent Change	Cumulative Change	
FY 2000	16.88			1.63			10 (0.4)
FY 2001	16.81	-0.4	-0.4	1.56	-4.0	-4.0	9 (0.3)
FY 2002	18.57	10.5	10.0	1.57	0.9	-3.2	8 (0.2)
FY 2003	20.74	11.7	22.9	1.69	7.2	3.8	8 (0.1)
FY 2004	23.29	12.3	38.0	1.92	13.6	17.9	8 (0.1)
FY 2005	24.84	6.7	47.2	2.04	6.6	25.7	8 (0.1)
FY 2006	25.55	2.9	51.4	2.23	8.9	36.9	9 (0.1)
FY 2007	25.89	1.3	53.4	2.26	1.7	39.1	9 (0.1)

Source: Revised FY 2000–FY 2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–FY 2007 SNAP QC data files.

2. Trends in State Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants

In most states, elderly participation fluctuated over time but generally increased from the earlier years of the study period to the later ones (Table III.2). In two states (Georgia and Michigan), the number of elderly SNAP participants followed the national trend and increased or essentially held constant (change was less than one percentage point) each year from FY 2000 to FY 2007. In four other states (Delaware, Florida, Illinois, and Oregon), the number increased or held constant in every year except FY 2007. While two states saw a decline in the number of elderly participants from FY 2000 to FY 2007 (Alabama and Hawaii), and others only a minimal increase (e.g., Arkansas and Montana), six experienced an increase in elderly participation of more than 100 percent (Arizona, Delaware, Massachusetts, Oregon, Texas, and Washington).

Following the national trend, the percentage of the SNAP population that was elderly declined over the study period in a majority of states (Table III.3). In about a quarter of the states, however,

Table III.2. Change in Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation, FY 2000 Through FY 2007

	Change in Estimated Number of Elderly SNAP Participants							
	Percent Change	Direction of Change						
	FY 2000–2007	'00-01	'01-'02	'02-'03	'03-'04	'04-'05	'05-'06	'06-'07
United States	**39**	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Alabama	-19	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓
Alaska	25	↓	↑	↑	—	↓	↑	↑
Arizona	119	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑
Arkansas	3	↓	↓	↑	—	↑	↓	↑
California	44	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓
Colorado	4	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑
Connecticut	37	—	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Delaware	148	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓
District of Columbia	40	↓	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑
Florida	28	↑	↑	—	↑	↑	↑	↓
Georgia	16	—	—	—	—	↑	↑	↑
Hawaii	-5	↓	↑	↓	—	—	—	↓
Idaho	23	↓	—	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑
Illinois	56	↑	—	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓
Indiana	50	↓	—	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓
Iowa	38	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓
Kansas	7	↓	↓	—	—	↑	↑	↓
Kentucky	20	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	—	↓
Louisiana	34	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑
Maine	8	↓	↑	↑	—	—	↑	↑
Maryland	16	↓	—	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑
Massachusetts	139	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Michigan	53	—	↑	↑	—	↑	↑	↑
Minnesota	23	↓	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑
Mississippi	13	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑
Missouri	28	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓
Montana	2	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↓
Nebraska	18	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓
Nevada	98	↑	↑	↑	↑	—	↓	↑
New Hampshire	8	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓
New Jersey	16	↑	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑
New Mexico	13	↑	—	↓	↑	↓	—	↑
New York	28	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑
North Carolina	45	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↓
North Dakota	54	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Ohio	41	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↓
Oklahoma	10	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓
Oregon	106	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓
Pennsylvania	66	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Rhode Island	42	—	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑
South Carolina	33	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑
South Dakota	6	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↓
Tennessee	42	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	—	↑
Texas	104	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓
Utah	15	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓
Vermont	10	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↓
Virginia	23	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Washington	107	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	—	↑
West Virginia	23	↓	↑	↑	—	↑	↓	↑
Wisconsin	41	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Wyoming	33	↑	↓	↑	↓	↑	↓	↓

Sources: Revised FY 2000–FY 2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–FY 2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table III.3. Change in Estimated Percentage of SNAP Participants Age 60 or Older by State, FY 2000 to 2007

	Percentage Point Change in Percentage Elderly, FY 2000 to 2007	Percentage Elderly, FY 2007 (Standard error)
United States	**-1**	**9 (0.1)**
Alabama	-4	6 (0.4)
Alaska	-1	5 (0.7)
Arizona	0	6 (0.5)
Arkansas	-3	7 (0.5)
California	0	2 (0.3)
Colorado	-4	7 (0.5)
Connecticut	1	12 (0.7)
Delaware	1	6 (0.7)
District of Columbia	2	9 (0.8)
Florida	-1	16 (0.8)
Georgia	-3	7 (0.5)
Hawaii	3	16 (1.0)
Idaho	-2	7 (0.6)
Illinois	0	7 (0.5)
Indiana	-2	6 (0.5)
Iowa	-2	6 (0.6)
Kansas	-3	8 (0.6)
Kentucky	-2	8 (0.5)
Louisiana	0	8 (0.5)
Maine	-5	11 (0.7)
Maryland	-2	9 (0.6)
Massachusetts	2	12 (0.8)
Michigan	-2	7 (0.6)
Minnesota	-1	9 (0.7)
Mississippi	-3	8 (0.5)
Missouri	-3	6 (0.7)
Montana	-2	6 (0.7)
Nebraska	-2	8 (0.6)
Nevada	0	12 (0.8)
New Hampshire	-4	8 (0.9)
New Jersey	0	12 (0.7)
New Mexico	-1	6 (0.5)
New York	1	17 (1.0)
North Carolina	-3	10 (0.6)
North Dakota	0	10 (0.8)
Ohio	-2	7 (0.4)
Oklahoma	-4	7 (0.5)
Oregon	1	10 (0.7)
Pennsylvania	1	10 (0.7)
Rhode Island	3	11 (0.9)
South Carolina	-3	8 (0.5)
South Dakota	-2	7 (0.8)
Tennessee	-2	9 (0.6)
Texas	1	9 (0.5)
Utah	-2	5 (0.5)
Vermont	-1	12 (1.1)
Virginia	-3	11 (0.6)
Washington	1	10 (0.6)
West Virginia	1	9 (0.7)
Wisconsin	-3	7 (0.5)
Wyoming	2	7 (1.0)

Sources: Revised FY 2000 – FY 2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005 – FY 2007 SNAP QC data files.

the elderly percentage was higher in FY 2006 or FY 2007 than in any of the earlier years. The percentage of the SNAP population age 60 or over dropped by approximately four percentage points or more in Alabama, Colorado, Maine, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma while rising by three percentage points in Hawaii and Rhode Island. As with the number of elderly participants, the elderly percentage fluctuated over time at the state level more than at the national level.

In FY 2007, the state elderly percentage of SNAP participants ranged from 5 percent or less in California, Alaska, and Utah to 16 percent or more in New York, Florida, and Hawaii. California's low elderly percentage is likely due in large part to a state policy that makes SSI recipients ineligible for SNAP. In lieu of SNAP eligibility, SSI recipients receive an additional $10 as part of the state SSI supplement. Alaska's and Utah's low elderly percentages are likely due to the small elderly populations in those states (7 and 9 percent, respectively).[8] Conversely, the percentage of elderly Floridians is the largest among states and that of Hawaiians is among the largest (17 and 14 percent, respectively), contributing to those states' high elderly percentage among participants.

3. Elderly SNAP Participants by Type of Eligibility

As mentioned previously, households can qualify for SNAP in several ways. The majority of participants are eligible because they pass the federal income and asset tests (with state vehicle rules applied). Some participants are not subject to, and would not pass, the income and/or asset tests but are either pure public assistance SNAP households or eligible under their state's expanded categorical eligibility rules. An additional small number of elderly participants qualify for SNAP through SSI CAPs. States began implementing SSI CAPs in FY 2004; by FY 2007, 12 states had programs in place.

Table III.4 shows the states that had implemented an SSI CAP by 2007 and the annual percentage of each state's participant population that qualified for SNAP through the SSI CAP. The

[8] Tabulation by state of the percentage of the population age 65 years and older in the 2006–2008 American Community Survey 3-year estimates, using the Census Bureau's American FactFinder tool.

table also shows the three states with a standard medical deduction in FY 2007 and the percentage of each state's participant population that received one.

Table III.4. Percentage of Elderly Participants Eligible Through an SSI CAP and Percentage Receiving a Standard Medical Deduction, by State and Year

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants			
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
SSI CAP Participants				
United States	**10**	**11**	**10**	**13**
Florida		7	20	23
Kentucky				14
Louisiana				10
Massachusetts		5	3	9
Mississippi	43	35	34	44
New York	42	44	36	30
North Carolina		4	3	29
Pennsylvania				6
South Carolina	28	16	31	10
Texas	32	33	20	32
Virginia				2
Washington	32	28	33	33
Received Standard Medical Deduction				
United States				**1**
New Hampshire				31
Texas				14
Wyoming				20

Sources: Revised FY 2004 SNAP QC data file and FY 2005–FY 2007 SNAP QC data files.

From FY 2004 through FY 2006, 10 to 11 percent of elderly participants nationally were eligible through an SSI CAP. In FY 2007, when the number of states with an SSI CAP increased from 8 to 12 states, 13 percent of elderly SNAP participants were SSI CAP participants. In that year, Mississippi's SSI CAP enrolled a full 44 percent of the state's elderly SNAP participants. Two other states with relatively high percentages of SSI CAP participants among elderly participants—New York (30 percent) and Florida (23 percent)—had the highest percentages of elderly participants among all participants. In FY 2007, only one percent of elderly SNAP households nationally received a Standard Medical Deduction. In New Hampshire, however, almost one-third of that state's elderly participants received a Standard Medical Deduction.

Table III.5 shows the FY 2000 through FY 2007 average percentage of elderly non-SSI CAP participants that would have failed the federal SNAP income tests but were pure public assistance or

Table III.5. Estimated Percentage of Elderly Non-SSI CAP SNAP Participants Who Would Fail the SNAP Net Income Test but Are Categorically Eligible, by State, Average FY 2000 – 2007

	Elderly Non-SSI CAP Participants (Number in 000s)	Percentage Categorically Eligible		FY Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility Implemented
		Pure Public Assistance	Expanded Categorical Eligibility	
United States	**1,746**	**1**	**1**	
Alabama	33	1	1	After 2007
Alaska	2	5	0	None
Arizona	22	*	1	2007
Arkansas	23	*	0	None
California	27	*	1	After 2007
Colorado	17	7	0	None
Connecticut	20	1	*	After 2007
Delaware	3	1	6	2001
District of Columbia	6	0	1	After 2007
Florida	165	1	0	None
Georgia	59	1	1	After 2007
Hawaii	14	*	0	After 2007
Idaho	5	1	1	After 2007
Illinois	77	*	0	After 2007
Indiana	31	1	0	None
Iowa	11	1	*	None
Kansas	13	*	0	None
Kentucky	42	1	0	After 2007
Louisiana	41	1	0	None
Maine	16	1	*	2001
Maryland	24	*	*	2001
Massachusetts	32	1	1	2001
Michigan	66	1	5	2001
Minnesota	20	1	0	2006
Mississippi	24	1	0	None
Missouri	43	1	0	None
Montana	5	1	0	After 2007
Nebraska	8	*	0	None
Nevada	11	*	*	After 2007
New Hampshire	5	*	0	After 2007
New Jersey	43	*	0	After 2007
New Mexico	13	1	*	After 2007
New York	190	1	*	After 2007
North Carolina	61	1	1	After 2007
North Dakota	4	2	1	2001
Ohio	66	1	0	After 2007
Oklahoma	29	1	*	After 2007
Oregon	33	1	8	None
Pennsylvania	84	1	0	After 2007
Rhode Island	6	1	1	After 2007
South Carolina	31	*	*	2001
South Dakota	4	*	0	None
Tennessee	66	1	*	After 2007
Texas	126	1	3	2002
Utah	6	1	0	None
Vermont	5	1	0	After 2007
Virginia	46	*	0	None
Washington	28	*	1	2004
West Virginia	21	1	0	After 2007
Wisconsin	21	2	6	2004
Wyoming	1	*	0	None

Sources: Revised FY 2000–FY 2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–FY 2007 SNAP QC data files.

* Less than 0.5 percent.

qualified through state expanded categorical eligibility policies. (SNAP participants who qualified through an SSI CAP are excluded from this table because the SNAP QC data files do not contain the information necessary to determine whether these households would pass the federal net income test.) Table III.5 also indicates when each state implemented a broad-based categorical eligibility policy. (Note that many states had narrowly focused categorical eligibility policies in place before a broad-based policy was implemented.)

On average, from FY 2000 through FY 2007, only one percent of elderly participants would have failed the SNAP net income test but were eligible because they were in pure public assistance SNAP households, and another one percent would have failed the net income test but were eligible through state categorical eligibility rules. No elderly participants in the District of Columbia were eligible solely through their pure public assistance status and virtually none in another 17 states. The highest percentages of elderly participants eligible through their pure public assistance status were in Colorado and Alaska (seven and five percent, respectively.) The highest state percentages of elderly participants eligible solely through state categorical eligibility from FY 2000 through FY 2007 were in Oregon, Delaware, Wisconsin, and Michigan (eight, six, six, and five percent, respectively.) In half of the states during this time period, no elderly participants were eligible solely through state categorical eligibility rules, and in almost all other states, only one percent or less were.

Many, although not all, of the states in which elderly SNAP participation increased at a higher than average rate from FY 2000 to FY 2007 had either implemented an SSI CAP, expanded categorical eligibility such that at least one percent of elderly SNAP participants were eligible only through that expansion, or both. For example, five of the six states in which elderly participation increased by 100 percent or more (Delaware, Massachusetts, Washington, Oregon, and Texas) had streamlined the application process, expanded eligibility, or both. Conversely, many, although not all, states in which elderly SNAP participation decreased from FY 2000 to FY 2007, or increased at a lower than average rate, did not have an SSI CAP or expanded categorical eligibility policies.

4. Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants

Table III.6 presents estimates of the national percentages of elderly SNAP participants with selected economic and demographic characteristics for FY 2000 through FY 2007 and an eight-year average. Tables III.7 through III.10 show these same characteristics by state. Table III.7 presents eight-year averages; the other tables include dollar amounts, which are less meaningful when averaged, and so present data for one year—FY 2007. The following paragraphs discuss results from these tables.

Low-income elderly individuals in one-person SNAP households are of particular interest to policymakers. While some live with other people, the majority live alone. Because elderly individuals in one-person SNAP households generally do not share resources with other family members, their eligibility determination is usually relatively straightforward and they may be at higher risk for unmet nutrition needs. In addition, elderly one-person SNAP households are more likely than nonelderly one-person SNAP households to qualify for only a minimum benefit. Nationally, on average from FY2000 to FY 2007, 72 percent of elderly participants were in a one-person SNAP household.

Table III.6. National Characteristics of Elderly SNAP Participants, FY 2000 Through FY 2007

	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY Average
	Estimated Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants								
One person	72	74	73	72	71	71	72	73	72
In poverty	85	85	85	84	83	84	82	82	84
With SSI in poverty	95	95	95	94	94	96	95	95	95
With SSI	60	62	60	57	58	56	55	56	58
With Social Security	68	68	68	68	67	67	68	70	68
With medical deduction	14	13	14	16	15	15	15	13	14
With shelter deduction	59	59	60	70	70	69	71	72	67
Benefit of $10 or Less	27	29	28	21	17	15	17	17	21
Maximum benefit	9	9	11	9	14	13	15	15	12
	Estimated Average Dollar Amounts Among Elderly SNAP Households with Income or Deduction Type								
SSI	198	216	212	201	217	211	217	218	
Social Security	355	357	374	385	393	414	431	447	
Shelter deduction	214	225	251	214	255	254	286	308	
Benefit	61	60	66	72	86	87	91	90	

Sources: Revised FY 2000–FY 2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–FY 2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table III.7. Percentage of Elderly Participants in One-Person SNAP Household, in Poverty, and Percentage with SSI in Poverty, by State, Average FY 2000–2007

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Participants (Standard Error)		
	In One-Person SNAP Household	In Poverty	With SSI in Poverty
United States	**72 (0.4)**	**84 (0.2)**	**95 (0.2)**
Alabama	67 (1.5)	87 (1.1)	96 (0.8)
Alaska	55 (3.2)	57 (3.2)	48 (5.4)
Arizona	62 (1.9)	87 (1.2)	97 (0.8)
Arkansas	69 (1.3)	87 (0.9)	97 (0.6)
California	66 (3.6)	81 (2.7)	- [a]
Colorado	78 (1.4)	75 (1.4)	81 (1.9)
Connecticut	78 (1.3)	76 (1.3)	83 (1.5)
Delaware	76 (2.3)	76 (2.0)	94 (1.8)
District of Columbia	83 (1.7)	89 (1.2)	99 (0.6)
Florida	72 (1.0)	89 (0.6)	97 (0.5)
Georgia	72 (1.3)	84 (1.1)	96 (0.8)
Hawaii	68 (1.5)	92 (0.8)	98 (0.6)
Idaho	76 (2.0)	81 (1.5)	96 (1.2)
Illinois	73 (1.4)	82 (1.3)	90 (1.4)
Indiana	81 (1.3)	73 (1.3)	94 (1.1)
Iowa	76 (1.6)	79 (1.2)	95 (0.8)
Kansas	80 (1.4)	79 (1.1)	98 (0.6)
Kentucky	66 (1.3)	88 (0.9)	96 (0.6)
Louisiana	68 (1.5)	87 (1.1)	97 (0.7)
Maine	80 (1.2)	71 (1.4)	97 (0.7)
Maryland	72 (1.3)	87 (0.9)	96 (0.7)
Massachusetts	74 (1.5)	72 (1.5)	77 (1.7)
Michigan	77 (1.5)	73 (1.4)	93 (1.2)
Minnesota	75 (1.6)	85 (1.1)	92 (1.2)
Mississippi	74 (1.2)	92 (0.7)	98 (0.5)
Missouri	72 (2.0)	81 (1.5)	94 (1.4)
Montana	82 (1.8)	83 (1.6)	99 (0.4)
Nebraska	79 (1.5)	76 (1.4)	95 (0.9)
Nevada	79 (1.5)	84 (1.1)	97 (0.8)
New Hampshire	82 (2.1)	73 (2.0)	93 (2.3)
New Jersey	72 (1.3)	85 (0.9)	94 (0.9)
New Mexico	60 (1.5)	87 (0.9)	96 (0.7)
New York	73 (1.3)	87 (0.9)	96 (0.6)
North Carolina	73 (1.3)	80 (1.1)	95 (0.9)
North Dakota	76 (1.9)	72 (1.7)	93 (1.5)
Ohio	81 (1.2)	82 (1.0)	96 (0.7)
Oklahoma	75 (1.1)	88 (0.9)	97 (0.6)
Oregon	75 (1.6)	66 (1.5)	95 (1.1)
Pennsylvania	74 (1.4)	83 (1.0)	97 (0.7)
Rhode Island	80 (1.7)	84 (1.2)	96 (1.0)
South Carolina	73 (1.4)	88 (0.9)	98 (0.5)
South Dakota	71 (2.5)	78 (2.0)	96 (1.4)
Tennessee	69 (1.4)	79 (1.1)	95 (0.9)
Texas	65 (1.4)	89 (0.8)	97 (0.6)
Utah	76 (1.9)	87 (1.2)	97 (0.9)
Vermont	79 (2.1)	66 (2.0)	95 (1.3)
Virginia	75 (1.3)	86 (0.9)	97 (0.6)
Washington	71 (1.5)	87 (1.0)	97 (0.6)
West Virginia	67 (1.5)	85 (1.0)	97 (0.7)
Wisconsin	74 (1.5)	60 (1.6)	80 (1.9)
Wyoming	76 (3.1)	81 (2.4)	99 (0.9)

Source: FY 2007 SNAP QC data file.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table III.8. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Households with SSI and Social Security Income and Average SSI and Social Security Amounts Among Elderly Households with Income Type, by State, FY 2007

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Participants (Standard Error)				Estimated Average Amount[a] ($)	
	With SSI		With Social Security		SSI	Social Security
United States	**56**	**(0.8)**	**70**	**(0.8)**	**218**	**447**
Alabama	64	(4.4)	78	(3.7)	200	458
Alaska	32	(7.7)	76	(7.0)	123	557
Arizona	44	(4.8)	63	(4.5)	181	407
Arkansas	50	(4.1)	83	(3.0)	153	527
California	0[b]		58	(8.8)	0[b]	453
Colorado	49	(4.1)	66	(3.8)	196	431
Connecticut	52	(3.9)	59	(3.7)	225	393
Delaware	36	(6.1)	79	(5.1)	122	574
District of Columbia	47	(5.1)	68	(4.4)	169	402
Florida	60	(3.2)	59	(3.0)	269	365
Georgia	45	(3.7)	82	(2.9)	137	523
Hawaii	60	(3.5)	56	(3.8)	267	355
Idaho	48	(5.1)	80	(4.5)	120	511
Illinois	60	(4.3)	59	(4.0)	264	412
Indiana	38	(4.2)	83	(3.0)	126	585
Iowa	49	(5.2)	77	(4.6)	140	526
Kansas	43	(4.1)	78	(3.4)	153	517
Kentucky	66	(3.6)	73	(3.4)	227	440
Louisiana	60	(3.5)	77	(3.0)	192	433
Maine	29	(3.7)	91	(2.0)	81	649
Maryland	64	(3.7)	52	(4.0)	290	333
Massachusetts	76	(3.2)	55	(3.6)	392	345
Michigan	37	(4.4)	81	(3.4)	121	614
Minnesota	71	(3.7)	47	(4.1)	383	306
Mississippi	66	(3.2)	84	(2.5)	190	463
Missouri	43	(5.4)	85	(3.5)	134	636
Montana	41	(6.0)	79	(5.1)	136	503
Nebraska	40	(4.6)	73	(4.2)	150	496
Nevada	59	(3.7)	64	(3.7)	249	415
New Hampshire	36	(6.0)	87	(3.9)	101	654
New Jersey	60	(3.6)	62	(3.7)	269	392
New Mexico	53	(3.9)	74	(3.6)	198	504
New York	70	(3.2)	58	(3.4)	334	356
North Carolina	50	(3.8)	83	(2.8)	138	527
North Dakota	35	(4.5)	86	(2.7)	101	606
Ohio	52	(2.9)	73	(2.7)	200	472
Oklahoma	59	(4.1)	72	(3.7)	198	431
Oregon	33	(3.5)	84	(2.6)	106	660
Pennsylvania	63	(3.9)	72	(3.6)	259	439
Rhode Island	65	(4.4)	62	(5.1)	289	428
South Carolina	51	(4.0)	78	(3.3)	186	481
South Dakota	34	(5.7)	90	(3.6)	86	624
Tennessee	40	(3.8)	84	(2.9)	122	573
Texas	65	(3.2)	75	(2.9)	189	399
Utah	57	(5.5)	65	(5.3)	242	378
Vermont	43	(5.3)	85	(3.8)	132	589
Virginia	54	(3.8)	68	(3.3)	212	434
Washington	62	(3.9)	51	(4.0)	287	359
West Virginia	54	(4.1)	77	(3.4)	214	480
Wisconsin	33	(4.0)	77	(3.4)	163	619
Wyoming	46	(7.9)	88	(4.7)	107	558

Source: FY 2007 SNAP QC data file.

[a] Average amount among SNAP households with income type.

[b] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table III.9. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Households with Shelter and Medical Deductions and Average Shelter Deduction Among Elderly SNAP Households with a Shelter Deduction, by State, FY 2007

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Participants (Standard Error)				Average Shelter Deduction[a] ($)
	With Medical Deduction		With Shelter Deduction		
United States	**13**	**(0.6)**	**72**	**(0.7)**	**308**
Alabama	20	(3.6)	82	(3.7)	176
Alaska	9	(4.1)	46	(7.6)	363
Arizona	9	(2.7)	83	(3.6)	285
Arkansas	12	(2.7)	65	(3.8)	142
California	10	(5.0)	76	(8.2)	365
Colorado	9	(2.4)	79	(3.3)	372
Connecticut	3	(1.2)	79	(3.2)	418
Delaware	8	(3.3)	74	(5.5)	372
District of Columbia	8	(2.8)	60	(4.9)	235
Florida	3	(1.1)	85	(2.3)	282
Georgia	15	(3.2)	89	(2.6)	273
Hawaii	5	(1.4)	57	(3.5)	194
Idaho	14	(3.6)	81	(4.3)	236
Illinois	6	(1.9)	94	(1.8)	285
Indiana	23	(3.7)	82	(3.1)	309
Iowa	16	(4.0)	79	(4.1)	251
Kansas	20	(3.4)	76	(3.9)	206
Kentucky	19	(2.9)	69	(3.6)	203
Louisiana	26	(3.6)	70	(3.2)	203
Maine	10	(2.6)	93	(2.1)	302
Maryland	8	(1.9)	71	(3.7)	248
Massachusetts	6	(1.9)	83	(2.9)	367
Michigan	23	(3.8)	84	(3.2)	484
Minnesota	2	(1.0)	70	(3.8)	216
Mississippi	8	(2.0)	42	(3.5)	201
Missouri	32	(5.5)	59	(6.1)	186
Montana	17	(4.4)	75	(5.4)	287
Nebraska	19	(3.8)	70	(4.5)	201
Nevada	11	(2.7)	84	(3.2)	303
New Hampshire	31	(5.7)	81	(4.7)	354
New Jersey	5	(1.8)	85	(2.9)	388
New Mexico	6	(1.8)	64	(4.2)	201
New York	12	(2.4)	61	(3.1)	560
North Carolina	17	(2.9)	57	(3.7)	232
North Dakota	41	(4.9)	83	(3.6)	421
Ohio	15	(1.9)	76	(2.5)	314
Oklahoma	5	(2.3)	62	(4.0)	153
Oregon	37	(3.9)	82	(3.6)	277
Pennsylvania	14	(3.1)	81	(3.3)	346
Rhode Island	9	(2.8)	85	(3.5)	452
South Carolina	15	(2.6)	61	(3.9)	191
South Dakota	29	(5.9)	83	(4.5)	421
Tennessee	13	(2.6)	74	(3.5)	193
Texas	14	(2.4)	46	(3.4)	255
Utah	6	(2.3)	68	(5.5)	263
Vermont	29	(5.3)	93	(2.8)	466
Virginia	9	(2.2)	68	(3.7)	213
Washington	10	(2.3)	92	(2.3)	220
West Virginia	11	(2.3)	67	(3.9)	184
Wisconsin	30	(4.1)	70	(3.9)	225
Wyoming	20	(6.3)	78	(6.6)	261

Source: FY 2007 SNAP QC data file.

[a] Average shelter deduction amount among SNAP households receiving a shelter deduction.

Table III.10. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Households Receiving the Minimum Benefit or Less and Receiving the Maximum Benefit and Average Benefit for Elderly SNAP Households, by State, FY 2007

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Participants (Standard Error)				Average Benefit ($)
	With Minimum Benefit or Less		With Maximum Benefit		
United States	**17**	**(0.6)**	**15**	**(0.6)**	**90**
Alabama	13	(3.0)	6	(2.0)	70
Alaska	39	(7.9)	10	(3.9)	170
Arizona	14	(3.1)	12	(3.1)	114
Arkansas	36	(4.0)	3	(1.1)	61
California	9	(5.3)	39	(8.9)	122
Colorado	31	(3.7)	11	(2.7)	86
Connecticut	17	(2.7)	19	(2.7)	102
Delaware	22	(5.2)	18	(4.8)	90
District of Columbia	22	(3.9)	13	(3.1)	78
Florida	11	(1.9)	10	(18)	92
Georgia	19	(3.3)	12	(2.4)	97
Hawaii	2	(0.8)	6	(1.6)	169
Idaho	25	(4.8)	6	(2.5)	75
Illinois	17	(3.4)	11	(2.6)	89
Indiana	18	(3.2)	9	(2.4)	79
Iowa	22	(4.0)	4	(2.4)	66
Kansas	27	(3.9)	5	(1.8)	61
Kentucky	13	(2.3)	6	(1.7)	78
Louisiana	11	(2.4)	9	(1.9)	82
Maine	24	(3.3)	4	(1.4)	70
Maryland	18	(2.7)	8	(2.0)	80
Massachusetts	21	(3.1)	10	(2.0)	76
Michigan	23	(4.2)	26	(4.0)	103
Minnesota	39	(4.2)	5	(1.9)	59
Mississippi	30	(3.1)	4	(1.1)	59
Missouri	31	(5.3)	3	(1.5)	58
Montana	24	(5.3)	10	(3.4)	81
Nebraska	35	(4.4)	6	(2.1)	62
Nevada	18	(3.1)	9	(2.1)	82
New Hampshire	24	(5.0)	12	(3.5)	67
New Jersey	12	(2.7)	20	(2.8)	112
New Mexico	20	(3.0)	5	(1.5)	78
New York	7	(1.4)	41	(3.4)	134
North Carolina	20	(3.1)	5	(1.6)	84
North Dakota	16	(3.7)	25	(3.7)	109
Ohio	23	(2.5)	12	(2.0)	79
Oklahoma	40	(3.6)	4	(1.6)	52
Oregon	30	(3.9)	8	(1.8)	70
Pennsylvania	12	(2.6)	14	(2.6)	98
Rhode Island	12	(2.8)	16	(3.5)	102
South Carolina	22	(3.1)	6	(1.8)	79
South Dakota	18	(4.5)	17	(4.4)	100
Tennessee	26	(3.5)	5	(1.6)	73
Texas	10	(1.9)	12	(2.3)	81
Utah	21	(4.2)	17	(4.0)	87
Vermont	16	(4.4)	27	(5.0)	103
Virginia	29	(3.3)	6	(1.5)	66
Washington	10	(2.3)	8	(2.2)	73
West Virginia	34	(3.7)	3	(1.2)	63
Wisconsin	53	(4.7)	5	(1.9)	54
Wyoming	20	(6.4)	4	(2.9)	73

Source: FY 2007 SNAP QC data file.

The national percentage of elderly participants in one-person SNAP households varied from 71 percent to 74 percent over time, with no clear trend. The percentage of elderly SNAP participants in one-person SNAP households also varied by state. The highest eight-year average percentage was in the District of Columbia (83 percent) and the lowest were in Alaska and New Mexico (55 and 60 percent, respectively). The high rate of one-person SNAP households among elderly participants in the District of Columbia may be due to the prevalence of people age 65 and older living alone in the District; that rate—50 percent—is higher than for any state.[9] Conversely, Alaska has one of the lowest rates of people age 65 and older living alone (33 percent).

Nationally, an average 84 percent of elderly SNAP participants were in poverty from FY 2000 through FY 2007. The national elderly SNAP participant poverty rate trended down over time, dropping from 85 percent in FY 2000 to 82 percent in FY 2007, although the change was not statistically significant. Average poverty rates among elderly participants were lowest in Alaska, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Vermont (57, 60, 66, and 66 percent, respectively) and highest in Mississippi and Hawaii (92 percent in both).[10] Wisconsin and Oregon have the highest percentages of elderly participants who would fail the SNAP net income test but are eligible through state expanded categorical eligibility rules, which may in part explain the relatively low poverty rate among those states' elderly SNAP participants. In addition, Alaska has the lowest poverty rate among all elderly (5 percent) and Mississippi the highest (16 percent), which likely contribute to those states' low and high poverty rates among elderly SNAP participants.[11]

---

[9] Tabulation by state of the percentage of the population age 65 years and older living alone in the 2006–2008 American Community Survey 3-Year estimates, using the Census Bureau's American FactFinder tool.

[10] Note that Alaska and Hawaii have higher poverty guidelines than do the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia (Wolkwitz and Ewell 2008).

[11] Tabulation by state of the percentage of the population age 65 years and older and in poverty in the 2006–2008 American Community Survey 3-Year estimates, using the Census Bureau's American FactFinder tool.

Average poverty rates were higher among elderly participants in SNAP households with SSI income than among all elderly participants, both nationally (95 percent, versus 84 percent) and in all states except Alaska. The average national SSI poverty rate held relatively constant over time but varied across states, from an average of 48 percent in Alaska to 99 percent in the District of Columbia, Montana, and Wyoming. The five states with the lowest average SSI poverty rates (Alaska, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Colorado, and Connecticut) had among the highest state SSI supplements.[12]

The difference between poverty rates within a state for all elderly participants and elderly participants with SSI also varied. In Alaska, the SSI poverty rate among elderly participants was 9 percentage points lower than the all elderly participant poverty rate. In other states, the SSI poverty rate was higher than the all elderly poverty rate, from 5 percentage points in Massachusetts, a state with one of the lowest SSI poverty rates, to 29 percentage points in Oregon and Vermont, both states having among the lowest all elderly poverty rates.

The national percentage of elderly participants in SNAP households in which someone received SSI income varied from 62 percent in FY 2001 to 55 percent in FY 2006, averaging 58 percent for FY 2000 to FY 2007. The percentage with SSI in FY 2007 varied widely across states, from one-third or less in Maine, Alaska, Wisconsin, and Oregon to two-thirds or more in Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, and Mississippi. (SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP in California, so no SNAP participants receive SSI in that state.) Alaska, Wisconsin, and Oregon also had the lowest elderly poverty rates and Mississippi one of the highest. Massachusetts, New York, and Mississippi all had streamlined the SNAP application process for SSI recipients through SSI CAPs, which may have contributed to those states' high percentages of SSI recipients among elderly SNAP participants.

[12] State SSI supplements are listed in Table II.1.

The national percentage of elderly participants in SNAP households with Social Security income fluctuated over time between 67 percent and 70 percent and averaged 68 percent for FY 2000 to FY 2007. Across states, the percentage with Social Security in FY 2007 varied from 47 percent in Minnesota to 91 percent in Maine.

The national average SSI benefit among elderly SNAP households receiving SSI rose from $198 in FY 2000 to $218 in FY 2007, and the average Social Security benefit among those receiving Social Security rose from $355 in FY 2000 to $447 in FY 2007. In FY 2007, the average SSI benefit varied across states, from less than $100 in Maine and South Dakota to more than $300 in New York, Massachusetts, and Minnesota. The average Social Security benefit varied from under $350 in Maryland, Massachusetts, and Minnesota to over $650 in New Hampshire and Oregon.

The national average percentage of elderly participants in SNAP households receiving a medical deduction ranged between 13 percent and 16 percent from FY 2000 to FY 2007. Across states, the percentage of elderly participants with a medical deduction in FY 2007 varied, from 2 percent in Minnesota to 41 percent in North Dakota. Minnesota had one of the highest percentages of elderly participants receiving SSI and thus likely also Medicaid, and North Dakota had one of the lowest. Medicaid often covers most medical expenses, including the Medicare Part B premium when applicable, which reduces out-of-pocket medical expenses.

The percentage of elderly participants in SNAP households receiving a shelter deduction rose from 59 percent in FY 2000 to 72 percent in FY 2007, a statistically significant increase of 13 percentage points. (To qualify for a shelter deduction, a SNAP household must have shelter costs greater than half of its income after all other deductions have been applied.) The state percentage with a shelter deduction in FY 2007 ranged from 42 percent in Mississippi and 46 percent in Texas and Alaska to 94 percent in Illinois and 93 percent in Vermont and Maine.

The national average shelter deduction among participating elderly SNAP households receiving such a deduction varied from $214 in FY 2000 to $308 in FY 2007. In FY 2007, the average shelter

deduction varied across states, from $142 in Arkansas to $560 in New York. States with higher average shelter deductions tended to have higher than average SUAs. For instance, Arkansas had one of the lowest SUAs, while New York had one of the highest.[13]

On average, 21 percent of elderly participants were in SNAP households that received the minimum benefit ($10 from FY 2000 through FY 2007) or less. The percentage of elderly participants in SNAP households receiving the minimum benefit fluctuated somewhat over time, but dropped from around 28 percent in the earlier years to 17 percent in the later years. It also varied by state; in FY 2007, percentages ranged from 2 percent in Hawaii to 53 percent in Wisconsin. Hawaii's rate was 5 percentage points lower than the rate in any other state; the next lowest percentages were 7 percent, in New York, and 9 percent, in California. Hawaii's low percentage is likely due in large part to its higher maximum benefit and hence higher overall benefits. Wisconsin's rate (53 percent) was 13 percentage points higher than the rate in any other state; the next highest percentages were 40 percent, in Oklahoma, and 39 percent, in Alaska and Minnesota. Wisconsin's high percentage may be due in part to the relatively high percentage of elderly participants eligible solely through state categorical eligibility.

From FY 2000 through FY 2007, the average percentage of elderly participants in households receiving the maximum benefit for their SNAP household size was 12 percent. The percentage fluctuated over time but rose from around 9 percent at the beginning of our study period to around 15 percent at the end. Across states, the percentage in households receiving the maximum benefit in FY 2007 varied from 5 percent or less in 14 states to 39 percent in California and 41 percent in New York.[14] Not surprisingly, New York and California also had among the lowest percentages of

[13] FY 2007 SUAs are listed in Table F.6 of Wolkwitz and Ewell (2008).

[14] The 14 states in which the percentage of elderly participants receiving the maximum benefit in FY 2007 was five percent or less were Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

elderly participants in households receiving the minimum benefit. Similarly, many of the states that had among the highest percentages of elderly participants receiving the minimum benefit also had among the lowest percentages receiving the maximum benefit.

The average monthly SNAP benefit for SNAP households containing elderly participants rose from $61 in FY 2000 to $90 in FY 2007 and varied across states, from $52 and $54 respectively in Oklahoma and Wisconsin, to $169 and $170, respectively in Hawaii and Alaska. The high average benefits in Hawaii and Alaska are likely due in part to the higher maximum benefits in those states. The next highest average benefits were in New York and California ($134 and $122, respectively), reflecting the high percentage of elderly participants in those states receiving the maximum benefit.

B. Characteristics of Elderly Eligible Individuals

We used the MATH SIPP+ model to estimate the characteristics of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP in FY 2009. (These estimates of eligibles include both SNAP participants and nonparticipants.) We also examined the characteristics of low-income elderly individuals ineligible for SNAP to see how they differ from the characteristics of elderly eligibles overall. Detailed tabulations of the characteristics of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP are presented in Appendix B.

The tabulations of elderly eligibles presented in this section are drawn from the same data source as the eligibility rate estimates presented in Section III.C and so can be compared directly. However, they differ in several ways from the estimates of elderly eligibles used to derive the participation rate estimates presented in III.D. First, the estimates discussed here are for FY 2009, while the participation rate denominator estimates are for FY 2002 through FY 2006 (the most recent data available when those estimates were derived). Several important programmatic changes affecting eligibility were enacted between these years, including provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and ARRA. Second, the participation rate denominator estimates are based on CPS data and were derived through a combination of microsimulation and small area estimation

methodologies. The estimates presented in this section, on the other hand, are from a complex microsimulation model that uses the SIPP as an underlying database. While the 2009 Baseline of the MATH SIPP+ model simulates only one point in time, the weighting methodology employed by the model allows tabulations of smaller subgroups than are possible with the CPS-based estimates, hence our use of this model to examine characteristics of elderly eligibles and state eligibility rates. Because of the differences between the elderly eligibles estimates presented in this section and Section III.C and those presented in III.D, they should not be compared directly.

Similarly, the eligibles estimates presented in this section and the participant estimates presented in III.A should not be combined to estimate subgroup SNAP participation rates for several reasons, including the different data sources and program changes between FY 2007 and FY 2009.

1. Elderly Percentage of Eligible Population

An estimated 53 million individuals were eligible for SNAP in FY 2009, 16 percent of whom were age 60 or over, compared to 9 percent of all SNAP participants in FY 2007 (Table III.11). As with the participant population in FY 2007, California, Utah, and Alaska had the lowest elderly percentages among SNAP eligibles in FY 2009 (7, 8, and 9 percent respectively). The highest elderly percentages among SNAP eligibles were in Pennsylvania and New York (28 and 25 percent, respectively). New York also had the highest elderly percentage among participants and, as mentioned previously, one of the highest percentages of SSI CAP participants among elderly participants. Pennsylvania had one of the largest elderly percentages among all state residents, similar to Florida and Hawaii, which along with New York, had among the highest elderly percentages among participants.

2. Characteristics of the Elderly Eligible Population

The next series of tables displays the state percentages of elderly individuals eligible for SNAP with the socioeconomic characteristics discussed for elderly SNAP participants in III.A, as well as the percentages with Medicaid, with countable assets, and living in public housing.

Table III.11. Estimated Number of SNAP-Eligible Individuals and the Percentage Elderly, by State, FY 2009

	All Eligible Individuals (000s)	Percentage Elderly (Standard Error)			All Eligible Individuals (000s)	Percentage Elderly (Standard Error)	
United States	**53,288**	**16**	**(0.8)**	Missouri	828	14	(0.8)
Alabama	888	14	(0.9)	Montana	145	14	(0.6)
Alaska	122	9	(0.5)	Nebraska	207	15	(0.9)
Arizona	1,754	16	(0.9)	Nevada	336	15	(1.0)
Arkansas	522	15	(0.9)	New Hampshire	101	21	(0.7)
California	5,176	7	(0.8)	New Jersey	846	17	(1.0)
Colorado	586	12	(0.9)	New Mexico	389	14	(1.2)
Connecticut	428	17	(0.8)	New York	4,287	25	(1.0)
Delaware	191	21	(0.4)	North Carolina	1,470	15	(0.9)
District of Columbia	113	15	(1.1)	North Dakota	131	20	(0.5)
Florida	2,436	18	(1.0)	Ohio	1,706	13	(0.6)
Georgia	1,966	21	(0.7)	Oklahoma	609	15	(0.8)
Hawaii	188	20	(0.8)	Oregon	988	18	(0.7)
Idaho	197	11	(0.7)	Pennsylvania	2,490	28	(0.7)
Illinois	1,705	13	(0.8)	Rhode Island	159	14	(0.8)
Indiana	959	12	(0.6)	South Carolina	1,271	21	(0.6)
Iowa	361	14	(0.8)	South Dakota	108	18	(0.9)
Kansas	354	14	(0.8)	Tennessee	1,074	15	(0.9)
Kentucky	799	14	(0.9)	Texas	6,004	12	(1.1)
Louisiana	894	15	(1.0)	Utah	271	8	(0.5)
Maine	265	13	(0.6)	Vermont	126	23	(0.6)
Maryland	900	12	(0.7)	Virginia	846	16	(0.7)
Massachusetts	949	20	(0.6)	Washington	1,467	19	(0.6)
Michigan	2,712	18	(0.6)	West Virginia	334	19	(1.0)
Minnesota	539	22	(0.7)	Wisconsin	1,363	20	(0.6)
Mississippi	665	15	(1.0)	Wyoming	58	16	(0.8)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Fifty-nine percent of eligible elderly individuals were in one-person SNAP households in FY 2009, compared to an average 72 percent of participants from FY 2000 to FY 2007 (Table III.12). The percentage of elderly eligibles in one-person SNAP households was highest in Connecticut and the District of Columbia (74 and 78 percent, respectively) and lowest in Arizona and South Carolina (50 and 51 percent, respectively). The District of Columbia also had the highest percentage among elderly participants. In all but two states—Alaska and California—the percentage of one-person SNAP households was lower among elderly eligibles in FY 2009 than the average percentage among elderly participants from FY 2000 to FY 2007.

Table III.12. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in One-Person SNAP Households, in Poverty, and with Medicaid, by State, FY 2009

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Eligibles (Standard Error)			
	In One-Person Households	In Poverty	With SSI in Poverty	With Medicaid
United States	**59 (1.1)**	**42 (1.0)**	**87 (1.7)**	**33 (1.0)**
Alabama	60 (1.6)	60 (1.5)	90 (1.8)	45 (1.5)
Alaska	68 (1.3)	55 (1.6)	73 (2.4)	32 (1.2)
Arizona	50 (1.3)	33 (1.1)	82 (4.5)	26 (1.0)
Arkansas	55 (1.6)	57 (1.5)	87 (2.2)	42 (1.5)
California	69 (2.7)	32 (2.5)	- [a]	32 (2.6)
Colorado	67 (1.7)	49 (1.5)	68 (3.4)	41 (1.6)
Connecticut	74 (1.4)	47 (1.6)	80 (2.8)	39 (1.4)
Delaware	56 (1.0)	26 (0.9)	83 (2.8)	22 (0.7)
District of Columbia	78 (1.7)	64 (1.3)	93 (2.4)	57 (1.8)
Florida	62 (1.6)	57 (1.4)	91 (1.5)	44 (1.7)
Georgia	56 (1.0)	30 (0.9)	85 (2.1)	27 (1.1)
Hawaii	55 (2.5)	65 (2.5)	95 (1.7)	43 (2.9)
Idaho	56 (1.5)	48 (1.4)	87 (2.7)	34 (1.6)
Illinois	67 (1.4)	56 (1.3)	92 (1.3)	43 (1.4)
Indiana	69 (1.7)	52 (1.3)	89 (2.3)	39 (1.3)
Iowa	59 (1.6)	55 (1.6)	90 (1.9)	34 (1.5)
Kansas	66 (1.4)	54 (1.5)	91 (1.7)	37 (1.5)
Kentucky	58 (1.9)	60 (1.7)	87 (2.2)	42 (1.6)
Louisiana	53 (1.7)	60 (1.5)	89 (2.1)	45 (1.9)
Maine	61 (1.6)	45 (1.6)	86 (2.5)	33 (1.3)
Maryland	62 (1.4)	59 (1.1)	92 (1.9)	45 (1.4)
Massachusetts	62 (1.3)	44 (1.2)	75 (3.1)	30 (1.0)
Michigan	56 (1.0)	28 (1.0)	81 (2.6)	19 (0.8)
Minnesota	62 (1.2)	30 (1.3)	82 (2.6)	24 (0.9)
Mississippi	55 (1.8)	65 (1.6)	89 (2.1)	47 (1.9)
Missouri	64 (1.4)	54 (1.4)	90 (1.9)	39 (1.4)
Montana	61 (1.8)	46 (1.8)	90 (2.4)	29 (1.5)
Nebraska	66 (1.6)	54 (1.7)	91 (1.8)	38 (1.6)
Nevada	61 (1.7)	56 (1.5)	91 (2.2)	45 (1.9)
New Hampshire	65 (1.5)	50 (1.5)	88 (2.9)	34 (1.7)
New Jersey	66 (1.6)	56 (1.4)	91 (1.6)	44 (1.5)
New Mexico	56 (2.7)	59 (1.9)	91 (2.2)	47 (2.5)
New York	58 (1.1)	35 (1.0)	86 (2.3)	29 (0.9)
North Carolina	63 (1.5)	61 (1.3)	92 (1.5)	46 (1.4)
North Dakota	60 (1.5)	37 (1.5)	90 (2.2)	21 (0.9)
Ohio	69 (1.3)	46 (1.4)	90 (1.7)	36 (1.2)
Oklahoma	61 (1.5)	56 (1.4)	90 (2.0)	41 (1.4)
Oregon	55 (1.1)	29 (1.0)	81 (3.9)	22 (0.7)
Pennsylvania	55 (0.9)	28 (1.0)	81 (2.5)	21 (0.7)
Rhode Island	71 (1.7)	52 (1.4)	88 (1.8)	43 (1.5)
South Carolina	51 (1.0)	36 (1.0)	86 (2.2)	27 (0.9)
South Dakota	63 (1.6)	48 (1.7)	88 (2.6)	34 (1.3)
Tennessee	59 (1.5)	58 (1.3)	89 (1.9)	44 (1.4)
Texas	54 (1.9)	44 (1.4)	86 (2.8)	42 (1.3)
Utah	56 (2.1)	51 (2.1)	89 (2.8)	33 (1.8)
Vermont	57 (1.2)	30 (1.1)	76 (3.2)	17 (0.8)
Virginia	62 (1.4)	56 (1.3)	90 (1.5)	44 (1.3)
Washington	57 (1.2)	28 (1.0)	82 (3.4)	20 (0.7)
West Virginia	53 (2.7)	56 (2.0)	83 (4.5)	38 (2.0)
Wisconsin	57 (1.1)	28 (1.0)	82 (3.7)	18 (0.7)
Wyoming	62 (1.7)	53 (1.7)	90 (2.2)	36 (1.7)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Nationally, 42 percent of elderly eligibles had income below the federal poverty level, half as high as the 84 percent average poverty rate among elderly participants from FY 2000 to FY 2007. In almost all states, the poverty rate among eligibles was also considerably lower than among participants. The exception was Alaska, where the elderly eligible and participant poverty rates were within a few percentage points of each other (55 and 57 percent, respectively). Poverty rates for elderly eligibles were lowest in Delaware (26 percent) and Michigan, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin (28 percent), states in which essentially all households are exempt from the SNAP asset and net income tests. These expanded categorical eligibility policies increase the number of eligible SNAP households with income above the poverty line and thus decrease the poverty rate among eligibles. Poverty rates for elderly eligibles were highest in Hawaii, Mississippi, and the District of Columbia (65, 65, and 64 percent, respectively). None of these states have expanded categorical eligibility to exempt non-pure public assistance SNAP households from the asset or net income tests.

The national poverty rate among elderly participants in SNAP households with SSI was 87 percent in FY 2009, lower than the average corresponding rate for elderly participants (95 percent), although the difference in participant and eligibles poverty rates was less pronounced among elderly SNAP households with SSI than among all elderly SNAP households. Poverty rates for elderly eligibles with SSI were lowest in Colorado, Alaska, and Massachusetts (68, 73, and 75 percent, respectively), all states with among the lowest SSI poverty rates among participants. Poverty rates for elderly eligibles with SSI were highest in Hawaii and the District of Columbia (95 and 93 percent, respectively), mirroring those states' high poverty rates for all elderly eligibles. As with elderly participants, poverty rates were higher among elderly eligibles with SSI than among all elderly eligibles, both nationally and in all states. The difference between elderly eligibles poverty rates within a state varied, from under 20 percentage points in Alaska and Colorado to 55 or more percentage points in Delaware and Georgia.

Nationally, 33 percent of elderly eligibles received Medicaid in FY 2009, with the percentage varying across states, from 17 percent in Vermont to 57 percent in the District of Columbia. Not surprisingly, the states with the lowest and highest poverty rates were among those with the lowest and highest percentage receipt of Medicaid, respectively.

The national percentage of elderly eligibles in SNAP households in which someone received SSI income in FY 2009 (17 percent) was almost half the percentage of elderly eligibles that received Medicaid and much lower than the corresponding 56 percent of participants in FY 2007 (Table III.13). In all states, the percentage of eligibles with SSI in FY 2009 was lower than the corresponding percentage of participants in FY 2007—in some cases substantially lower. In five states (New York, Washington, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota), the difference was more than 50 percentage points. The percentage of elderly eligibles with SSI was lowest in Delaware and Wisconsin (each 7 percent) and North Dakota and Oregon (each 8 percent), all states with expanded categorical eligibility policies and relatively low rates of poverty and Medicaid receipt among elderly eligibles. The percentage of elderly eligibles with SSI was highest in Kentucky, Mississippi, New Mexico, and New Jersey (33, 31, 30, and 30 percent, respectively). These states had a high elderly eligible poverty rate, a high percentage receiving Medicaid, or both.

The national percentage of elderly eligibles in SNAP households with income from Social Security in FY 2009 was 80 percent, slightly higher than the corresponding percentage of participants in FY 2007. The range between the highest state percentage (85 percent in Wisconsin) and the lowest (72 percent in Utah) was just under 14 percentage points, relatively small compared to other characteristics we examined.

Nationally, the FY 2009 average monthly Social Security income among eligible elderly SNAP households receiving Social Security income was $925. State averages ranged from $785 in the District of Columbia and Kentucky to $1,031 in Delaware and Georgia. The 10 states in which the

Table III.13. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Households with SSI and Social Security Income and Average SSI and Social Security Amounts Among SNAP Households with Income Type, by State, FY 2009

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Eligibles (Standard Error)		Estimated Average Amount[a] ($) (Standard Error)	
	With SSI	With Social Security	SSI	Social Security
United States	**17 (0.7)**	**80 (1.0)**	**429 (15)**	**925 (10)**
Alabama	28 (1.4)	79 (1.6)	378 (16)	807 (13)
Alaska	28 (1.1)	77 (1.1)	543 (20)	928 (14)
Arizona	9 (0.7)	82 (1.0)	464 (26)	988 (12)
Arkansas	27 (1.3)	77 (1.5)	411 (17)	815 (13)
California	- [b]	76 (2.5)	- [b]	955 (21)
Colorado	21 (1.3)	76 (1.3)	470 (22)	832 (13)
Connecticut	18 (1.1)	77 (1.3)	523 (23)	865 (13)
Delaware	7 (0.4)	85 (0.8)	401 (18)	1,031 (9)
District of Columbia	28 (1.6)	77 (1.6)	398 (23)	785 (12)
Florida	28 (1.6)	75 (1.5)	421 (18)	802 (14)
Georgia	13 (0.6)	84 (0.7)	426 (14)	1,031 (9)
Hawaii	23 (1.9)	72 (2.3)	452 (30)	873 (26)
Idaho	16 (1.1)	75 (1.6)	484 (23)	859 (15)
Illinois	26 (1.2)	76 (1.3)	422 (15)	812 (12)
Indiana	14 (0.8)	79 (1.5)	393 (21)	838 (12)
Iowa	16 (1.1)	75 (1.7)	463 (19)	808 (16)
Kansas	16 (1.0)	76 (1.5)	433 (21)	829 (13)
Kentucky	33 (1.6)	76 (1.8)	427 (18)	785 (14)
Louisiana	28 (1.4)	76 (1.6)	417 (16)	812 (13)
Maine	17 (1.3)	79 (1.7)	432 (22)	893 (13)
Maryland	24 (1.3)	75 (1.4)	434 (19)	817 (13)
Massachusetts	23 (1.0)	76 (1.2)	473 (21)	863 (11)
Michigan	9 (0.6)	85 (0.7)	426 (17)	1,004 (9)
Minnesota	14 (0.9)	83 (1.0)	440 (18)	1,000 (13)
Mississippi	31 (1.8)	78 (1.7)	383 (16)	795 (18)
Missouri	20 (1.1)	79 (1.5)	393 (17)	820 (12)
Montana	13 (1.0)	78 (1.5)	448 (25)	880 (16)
Nebraska	15 (1.0)	77 (1.6)	423 (20)	818 (14)
Nevada	19 (1.6)	75 (1.4)	455 (27)	814 (15)
New Hampshire	11 (1.0)	78 (1.4)	486 (24)	858 (15)
New Jersey	30 (1.4)	75 (1.4)	424 (17)	818 (15)
New Mexico	30 (2.4)	75 (2.1)	437 (30)	790 (19)
New York	19 (0.8)	81 (0.9)	453 (16)	991 (10)
North Carolina	25 (1.3)	77 (1.4)	392 (17)	792 (12)
North Dakota	8 (0.6)	81 (1.2)	400 (19)	926 (12)
Ohio	18 (1.0)	80 (1.4)	399 (17)	865 (12)
Oklahoma	21 (1.2)	78 (1.5)	413 (20)	818 (12)
Oregon	8 (0.5)	83 (0.8)	439 (22)	1,010 (10)
Pennsylvania	10 (0.6)	84 (0.7)	438 (16)	1,020 (10)
Rhode Island	29 (1.3)	78 (1.4)	407 (21)	835 (13)
South Carolina	11 (0.7)	84 (0.8)	397 (17)	1,003 (10)
South Dakota	17 (1.3)	79 (1.5)	417 (21)	871 (13)
Tennessee	24 (1.2)	77 (1.3)	411 (16)	815 (12)
Texas	23 (1.5)	80 (1.4)	427 (18)	909 (14)
Utah	18 (1.4)	72 (1.9)	443 (23)	848 (17)
Vermont	9 (0.6)	83 (1.0)	462 (22)	1,000 (10)
Virginia	27 (1.2)	75 (1.3)	424 (16)	823 (12)
Washington	10 (0.6)	84 (0.8)	434 (18)	1,025 (10)
West Virginia	24 (2.1)	75 (2.1)	457 (23)	811 (17)
Wisconsin	7 (0.4)	85 (0.8)	436 (21)	1,008 (10)
Wyoming	12 (1.1)	78 (1.8)	407 (27)	824 (14)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] Average amount among elderly eligible SNAP households with income type.
[b] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

average Social Security income among elderly eligible SNAP households was $1,000 or more also were the 10 states with the highest rates of Social Security receipt among the same group.[15]

Sixteen percent of elderly eligibles nationally were in units with countable assets in FY 2009 (Table III.14). The vast majority of elderly eligibles with countable assets had countable financial assets; only one-tenth of one percent had countable vehicle assets. In 11 states, no elderly eligibles had any countable assets, meaning those states had expanded categorical eligibility to eliminate the asset test for virtually all elderly applicants, or had implemented a higher asset limit.[16] In an additional four states (Arizona, Oregon, Texas, and Vermont), the percentage of elderly eligibles with countable assets was two percent or less. Conversely, in five states (Iowa, Montana, New Hampshire, Nebraska, and Wyoming), half or more of elderly eligibles had countable assets.

Nationally, 55 percent of elderly eligibles were in SNAP households that qualified for a medical deduction in FY 2009, more than three times the similar percentage of elderly participants in FY 2007. Similarly, in every state, a larger percentage of elderly eligibles qualified for a medical deduction in FY 2009 than did participants in FY 2007. The District of Columbia, which had the highest rate of Medicaid receipt among elderly eligibles, had the lowest percentage with a medical deduction—36 percent. This is likely because Medicaid often covers most medical expenses, including the Medicare Part B premium, when applicable. Mississippi, where 43 percent of elderly eligibles qualified for a medical deduction (along with most other states with a low medical deduction percentage), had among the highest rates of Medicaid receipt among elderly eligibles. Conversely, states with the largest medical deduction percentages, such as North Dakota, Vermont, and Wisconsin (68, 67, and 67 percent respectively), had among the lowest rates of Medicaid receipt.

---

[15] The 10 states in which the average Social Security income was $1,000 or more were Delaware, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

[16] The 11 states in which no elderly eligibles had any countable assets were Delaware, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Table III.14. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Households with Assets, with Shelter and Medical Deductions, and in Public Housing and Average Shelter Deduction Among Elderly Eligible SNAP Households with a Shelter Deduction, by State, FY 2009

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Eligibles (Standard Error)				Average Shelter Deduction[b] ($) (Standard Error)
	With Countable Assets[a]	With Medical Deduction	With Shelter Deduction	That Lived in Public Housing	
United States	**16 (0.6)**	**55 (1.4)**	**56 (1.3)**	**11 (0.5)**	**396 (11)**
Alabama	33 (1.5)	47 (1.8)	52 (1.8)	13 (0.8)	323 (16)
Alaska	45 (1.4)	54 (1.6)	71 (1.5)	13 (0.7)	346 (12)
Arizona	1 (0.3)	60 (1.5)	44 (1.7)	8 (0.5)	397 (13)
Arkansas	35 (1.7)	49 (1.8)	49 (1.5)	13 (0.8)	379 (16)
California	47 (2.5)	54 (2.4)	54 (3.2)	11 (1.5)	440 (31)
Colorado	42 (1.5)	49 (1.7)	80 (2.2)	15 (1.0)	372 (13)
Connecticut	48 (1.5)	50 (1.7)	90 (1.7)	17 (1.0)	567 (12)
Delaware	0	62 (1.2)	51 (1.2)	8 (0.4)	371 (11)
District of Columbia	31 (1.8)	37 (2.3)	53 (1.7)	24 (1.5)	333 (20)
Florida	36 (1.4)	48 (1.8)	40 (1.7)	13 (0.9)	423 (23)
Georgia	0	57 (1.4)	39 (1.2)	10 (0.5)	362 (11)
Hawaii	41 (2.4)	44 (2.3)	45 (2.5)	15 (1.4)	393 (24)
Idaho	46 (1.7)	55 (1.9)	74 (2.5)	10 (0.7)	385 (13)
Illinois	39 (1.4)	48 (1.8)	57 (1.8)	15 (0.9)	371 (16)
Indiana	45 (1.5)	51 (1.5)	83 (2.0)	14 (0.9)	363 (12)
Iowa	50 (1.7)	55 (1.8)	75 (2.0)	12 (0.8)	383 (13)
Kansas	48 (1.5)	51 (1.8)	66 (1.9)	15 (0.9)	386 (16)
Kentucky	34 (1.8)	50 (2.0)	52 (2.3)	12 (0.8)	328 (14)
Louisiana	32 (1.6)	47 (2.3)	59 (1.7)	12 (1.1)	341 (13)
Maine	46 (1.6)	55 (1.7)	90 (1.1)	12 (0.7)	517 (12)
Maryland	35 (1.5)	46 (1.8)	67 (1.9)	15 (0.9)	362 (13)
Massachusetts	0	60 (1.5)	88 (1.4)	12 (0.7)	511 (13)
Michigan	0	64 (1.2)	66 (1.4)	8 (0.4)	399 (11)
Minnesota	0	57 (1.5)	41 (1.5)	11 (0.6)	367 (16)
Mississippi	29 (1.7)	43 (2.1)	44 (1.9)	11 (0.8)	325 (20)
Missouri	42 (1.5)	51 (1.8)	49 (1.6)	13 (0.8)	367 (17)
Montana	53 (1.7)	57 (1.8)	89 (1.5)	11 (0.8)	434 (14)
Nebraska	50 (1.6)	52 (1.8)	66 (2.0)	15 (1.0)	375 (16)
Nevada	37 (1.4)	47 (2.0)	55 (2.2)	13 (0.8)	362 (17)
New Hampshire	53 (1.6)	54 (1.7)	89 (1.5)	14 (0.9)	475 (13)
New Jersey	38 (1.5)	46 (2.0)	74 (2.7)	15 (1.0)	370 (13)
New Mexico	32 (1.9)	46 (2.1)	57 (2.7)	12 (1.0)	367 (25)
New York	0	56 (1.3)	64 (1.4)	12 (0.6)	398 (10)
North Carolina	36 (1.5)	46 (1.7)	53 (1.5)	15 (0.9)	343 (15)
North Dakota	0	68 (1.4)	94 (0.6)	9 (0.6)	515 (13)
Ohio	45 (1.3)	53 (1.6)	89 (1.6)	13 (0.7)	452 (11)
Oklahoma	38 (1.4)	49 (1.7)	50 (1.6)	13 (0.8)	407 (16)
Oregon	1 (0.3)	63 (1.2)	48 (1.4)	9 (0.5)	407 (13)
Pennsylvania	0	64 (1.1)	57 (1.3)	8 (0.4)	388 (11)
Rhode Island	39 (1.4)	48 (1.7)	86 (2.3)	16 (0.9)	419 (11)
South Carolina	0	58 (1.3)	28 (0.9)	9 (0.4)	400 (17)
South Dakota	49 (1.6)	54 (1.8)	91 (1.1)	13 (0.8)	491 (11)
Tennessee	35 (1.4)	48 (1.8)	57 (1.7)	13 (0.8)	353 (13)
Texas	2 (0.4)	46 (1.8)	47 (1.8)	13 (0.8)	348 (22)
Utah	49 (1.8)	54 (2.6)	53 3.0	11 (0.9)	414 (24)
Vermont	2 (0.3)	67 (1.1)	86 (0.8)	8 (0.5)	518 (13)
Virginia	36 (1.4)	48 (1.6)	59 (1.5)	15 (0.8)	374 (14)
Washington	0	65 (1.1)	44 (1.3)	9 (0.5)	406 (14)
West Virginia	37 (2.1)	54 (2.1)	64 (2.9)	8 (0.6)	330 (13)
Wisconsin	0	67 (1.1)	40 (1.2)	9 (0.5)	404 (16)
Wyoming	50 (1.7)	53 (1.8)	59 (2.1)	13 (0.9)	367 (17)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] States with zero elderly eligibles with countable assets are those that have eliminated the asset test through categorical eligibility expansions.
[b] Average shelter deduction amount among SNAP households qualifying for a shelter deduction.

Nationally, 56 percent of elderly eligibles were in SNAP households that qualified for a shelter deduction in FY 2009, compared to 72 percent of elderly participants in FY 2007. In one-quarter of the states, the percentage of elderly eligibles who qualified for a shelter deduction was higher than the corresponding percentage of elderly participants; in all other states, the percentage of elderly eligibles with a shelter deduction was lower than that of elderly participants. The largest differential was in Georgia, where the eligible percentage was 50 percentage points higher than the participant percentage. In South Carolina, 28 percent of elderly eligibles qualified for a shelter deduction, the lowest percentage among states; in North Dakota, 94 percent qualified for shelter deduction, the largest percentage. Several states that had among the lowest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction, such as Florida, Hawaii, Mississippi, and South Carolina, were in relatively warm climates and had among the lowest SUAs. However, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin also had low percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction. Almost all of the states with high shelter deduction percentages were in relatively cold climates and had among the highest SUAs.

The average national shelter deduction among elderly eligible SNAP households qualifying for a shelter deduction in FY 2009 was $396. The average shelter deduction varied across states, from $323 in Alabama to $567 in Connecticut. Among states, the highest average shelter deductions generally corresponded with the highest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction, with the exceptions of California and Florida. Both of those states had lower than average percentages qualifying for a shelter deduction and higher than average shelter deductions among those who did qualify. Many, although not all, states with low average shelter deductions were in the south, including Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky.

Eleven percent of elderly eligibles lived in public housing nationally in FY 2009. The highest percentage—24 percent—was in the District of Columbia, which also had a lower than average percentage qualifying for a shelter deduction and one of the lowest average shelter deductions

among those who did qualify. The next highest percentages of public housing use were in Connecticut and Rhode Island (17 and 16 percent, respectively). These states, along with the District of Columbia, had relatively large percentages of eligible elderly living alone. Unlike the District of Columbia, Connecticut and Rhode Island both had relatively high percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction, and Connecticut had a relatively high average shelter deduction. In Michigan, West Virginia, Delaware, Vermont, Arizona, and Pennsylvania, 8 percent of the elderly eligibles lived in public housing, the lowest percentage among states. With the exception of West Virginia, these states also had relatively low rates of Medicaid receipt and relatively high rates of Social Security receipt and average Social Security amounts.

Nationally, 37 percent of elderly eligibles were in SNAP households that qualified for the minimum benefit or less in FY 2009, compared to 17 percent of elderly participants in FY 2007 (Table III.15). (In FY 2009, the minimum benefit was $16 for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia. In Alaska and Hawaii, the minimum benefit was $19 and $25, respectively.) As was the case for participants, Hawaii had the lowest percentage by far of elderly eligibles qualifying for the minimum benefit (2 percent). The next lowest percentages were 14 percent, in Maine, and 15 percent, in North and South Dakota. These states had among the largest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction and relatively high average shelter deduction amounts. The seven states in which at least half of the elderly eligible population qualified for the minimum benefit (Delaware, Georgia, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin) are all states that have expanded categorical eligibility; most have among the lowest poverty levels. The highest percentage—55 percent—was in Wisconsin, the same state with the highest corresponding rate among elderly participants. More than half of the states had a higher percentage of elderly eligibles qualifying for the minimum benefit in FY 2009 than the percentage of elderly participants in FY 2007. The largest difference was in Washington, where 53 percent of elderly eligibles qualified for the minimum benefit, versus 10 percent of elderly participants.

Table III.15. Percentage of Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Households Qualifying for the Minimum Benefit or Less and Qualifying for the Maximum Benefit and Average Benefit for Elderly Eligible SNAP Households, by State, FY 2009

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Eligibles (Standard Error)		Average Benefit ($) (Standard Error)
	With Minimum Benefit or Less	With Maximum Benefit	
United States	**37 (0.9)**	**14 (0.7)**	**102 (2)**
Alabama	22 (1.1)	11 (1.0)	107 (3)
Alaska	30 (1.2)	17 (1.1)	126 (4)
Arizona	47 (1.2)	13 (1.0)	94 (3)
Arkansas	20 (1.0)	12 (1.1)	113 (3)
California	38 (2.2)	17 (2.2)	108 (8)
Colorado	23 (1.0)	18 (1.1)	117 (3)
Connecticut	17 (1.3)	28 (1.2)	134 (3)
Delaware	53 (1.1)	12 (0.7)	83 (2)
District of Columbia	25 (1.1)	11 (1.3)	93 (3)
Florida	25 (1.1)	10 (1.0)	103 (4)
Georgia	55 (1.1)	10 (0.7)	79 (2)
Hawaii	2 (0.3)	14 (1.4)	265 (11)
Idaho	22 (0.9)	18 (1.3)	127 (4)
Illinois	26 (1.0)	14 (1.1)	109 (3)
Indiana	21 (1.0)	19 (1.2)	118 (4)
Iowa	21 (1.0)	23 (1.5)	131 (4)
Kansas	24 (1.0)	19 (1.3)	118 (3)
Kentucky	22 (1.1)	11 (1.1)	107 (4)
Louisiana	18 (0.9)	14 (1.1)	122 (3)
Maine	14 (0.8)	24 (1.1)	145 (4)
Maryland	20 (0.9)	17 (1.1)	123 (3)
Massachusetts	18 (0.9)	26 (1.3)	138 (3)
Michigan	48 (1.0)	15 (0.9)	96 (2)
Minnesota	55 (1.3)	10 (0.8)	73 (3)
Mississippi	18 (1.0)	11 (1.2)	116 (6)
Missouri	27 (1.1)	14 (1.1)	102 (3)
Montana	19 (1.1)	24 (1.4)	135 (4)
Nebraska	23 (1.1)	19 (1.3)	117 (3)
Nevada	24 (1.2)	15 (1.1)	113 (4)
New Hampshire	18 (1.0)	28 (1.3)	139 (3)
New Jersey	21 (1.1)	14 (1.1)	114 (3)
New Mexico	20 (1.2)	12 (1.2)	117 (6)
New York	44 (1.0)	14 (0.7)	94 (2)
North Carolina	23 (1.0)	13 (1.0)	110 (3)
North Dakota	15 (0.7)	28 (1.5)	143 (3)
Ohio	20 (1.0)	20 (1.1)	128 (3)
Oklahoma	23 (1.0)	16 (1.1)	109 (3)
Oregon	48 (1.2)	14 (0.8)	89 (3)
Pennsylvania	50 (1.0)	14 (0.8)	89 (2)
Rhode Island	19 (1.0)	18 (1.3)	118 (3)
South Carolina	51 (1.2)	10 (0.7)	81 (2)
South Dakota	15 (0.9)	26 (1.4)	144 (4)
Tennessee	21 (0.9)	14 (1.0)	115 (3)
Texas	39 (1.4)	9 (0.9)	96 (5)
Utah	23 (1.3)	16 (1.7)	132 (11)
Vermont	33 (1.1)	24 (1.1)	122 (3)
Virginia	23 (0.9)	13 (1.0)	113 (3)
Washington	53 (1.2)	13 (0.8)	81 (3)
West Virginia	18 (1.0)	15 (1.5)	123 (6)
Wisconsin	55 (1.1)	13 (0.9)	78 (2)
Wyoming	25 (1.2)	19 (1.4)	114 (3)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Nationally, 14 percent of elderly eligibles were in SNAP households that qualified for the maximum benefit for their SNAP household size in FY 2009, similar to the 15 percent of elderly participants that received the maximum benefit in FY 2007. (In FY 2009, the maximum benefit for a one-person SNAP household was $200 for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia. In Alaska and Hawaii, the maximum benefit was $239 and $314, respectively.) The percentage of elderly eligibles that qualified for the maximum benefit varied from 9 percent in Texas to 28 percent in Connecticut, New Hampshire, and North Dakota. As with participants, the states that had the lowest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for the minimum benefit also had among the highest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for the maximum benefit. Likewise, three of the states that had the highest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for the minimum benefit also had among the lowest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for the maximum benefit (10 percent in Georgia, Minnesota, and South Carolina). However, Mississippi had a relatively low percentage qualifying for both the minimum (18 percent) and the maximum benefit (11 percent).

In most states, the average percentage of elderly eligibles qualifying for the maximum benefit was higher than the similar percentage of elderly participants in FY 2007. Two notable exceptions were California and New York; in both, the percentage of elderly eligibles qualifying for the maximum benefit was at least 20 percentage points lower than the corresponding percentage of participants.

Nationally, the average monthly SNAP household benefit for which elderly eligibles qualified was $102, significantly higher than the minimum benefit. Among states, Hawaii had by far the largest average elderly eligibles benefit—$265—reflecting in part the higher maximum benefit in that state. The seven states with the next highest average benefits were Maine, South Dakota, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Montana, and Connecticut, with average benefits ranging from $145 to $134. These states all had among the highest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction and the maximum benefit, and among the highest average shelter deductions.

Unlike Hawaii, these states did not have high elderly eligibles poverty rates, relative to other states. Minnesota had the lowest average elderly eligibles benefit ($73), followed by Wisconsin, Georgia, South Carolina, Washington, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Oregon, with average elderly eligibles benefits ranging from $78 to $89. These states had high percentages of elderly eligibles receiving Social Security and qualifying for the minimum benefit. Minnesota, Wisconsin, Georgia, South Carolina, and Washington also had among the lowest percentages qualifying for a shelter deduction.

3. Characteristics of the Low-Income SNAP-Ineligible Elderly Population

Nationally, 20 percent of SNAP-ineligible individuals with gross income under 200 percent of the poverty level were elderly, slightly higher than the elderly percentage of SNAP-eligible individuals (Table III.16). However, the elderly percentage among ineligibles varied substantially across states. In states with expanded categorical eligibility policies that exempt essentially all SNAP households from the asset and net income tests, only elderly individuals who had too high an income to qualify for a positive SNAP benefit or did not meet citizenship or residency requirements

Table III.16. Elderly Percentage of Low-Income SNAP-Ineligible Individuals, FY 2009

	Estimated Low-Income SNAP-Ineligible Individuals				
	Percentage Elderly		Percentage Elderly		Percentage Elderly
United States	**20**				
Alabama	24	Kentucky	23	North Dakota	23
Alaska	12	Louisiana	26	Ohio	22
Arizona	14	Maine	38	Oklahoma	22
Arkansas	23	Maryland	40	Oregon	15
California	20	Massachusetts	18	Pennsylvania	2
Colorado	19	Michigan	4	Rhode Island	22
Connecticut	24	Minnesota	16	South Carolina	5
Delaware	5	Mississippi	23	South Dakota	22
District of Columbia	27	Missouri	23	Tennessee	24
Florida	28	Montana	22	Texas	22
Georgia	1	Nebraska	21	Utah	12
Hawaii	24	Nevada	22	Vermont	16
Idaho	16	New Hampshire	23	Virginia	24
Illinois	23	New Jersey	24	Washington	3
Indiana	19	New Mexico	23	West Virginia	29
Iowa	22	New York	2	Wisconsin	2
Kansas	21	North Carolina	23	Wyoming	22

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

were ineligible for SNAP.[17] On the other hand, the percentage of elderly ineligibles was almost twice the national percentage in Maryland and Maine (40 and 38 percent, respectively), both states that expanded categorical eligibility only for SNAP households with children.

Nationally the characteristics of low-income elderly individuals ineligible for SNAP differed from the characteristics of elderly eligibles in notable ways (Tables III.17 and III.18). Compared to elderly eligibles, fewer elderly ineligibles were in one-person SNAP households (45 percent), were in poverty (11 percent), received Medicaid (11 percent), were in SNAP households that received SSI (one percent), or had excess shelter expenses (29 percent). More elderly ineligibles than elderly eligibles had countable assets (80 percent) and were in SNAP households that received Social Security (88 percent).

The differences among elderly eligibles and ineligibles were most acute in states with expanded categorical eligibility policies. For example, none of the elderly ineligibles in the eight states in which elderly individuals are not subject to income or asset tests (Delaware, Georgia, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin) were in one-person SNAP units, had income below the poverty level, or had countable assets. In the two additional states without an asset test—Massachusetts and North Dakota—and the three states in which few households are subject to an asset test—Arizona, Oregon, and Vermont no elderly ineligibles were in poverty. In the remaining states, poverty rates among elderly ineligibles ranged from 9 percent in Nevada to 18 percent in Minnesota and 19 percent in Alaska.

Among states with some one-person elderly ineligible SNAP households, the lowest percentages were in Arizona and Mississippi (32 and 33 percent, respectively) and the highest

[17] In this report, we consider SNAP households that meet the income and asset standards or are categorically eligible to be ineligible for SNAP if they do not qualify for a positive benefit. As mentioned in Chapter II, a "SNAP household" is a group of individuals that would be required to apply for SNAP together and is not necessarily eligible for or participating in SNAP.

Table III.17. Estimated Percentage of Elderly Ineligibles in One-Person SNAP Household, in Poverty, and with Countable Assets by State, FY 2009

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Ineligibles (Standard Error)		
	In One-Person SNAP Household	In Poverty	With Countable Assets
United States	**45 (1.4)**	**11 (0.8)**	**80 (1.1)**
All exempt from asset and net income tests: Delaware, Georgia, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin	0	0	0
All exempt from asset test			
Massachusetts	52 (1.9)	0	0
North Dakota	45 (1.9)	0	0
Almost all exempt from asset and net income tests			
Arizona	32 (3.0)	0	69 (3.4)
Oregon	36 (2.8)	0	77 (2.9)
Vermont	38 (3.0)	0	82 (2.4)
Other			
Alabama	41 (1.2)	10 (0.8)	75 (1.5)
Alaska	44 (1.4)	19 (0.9)	92 (0.8)
Arkansas	36 (1.1)	10 (0.8)	76 (1.5)
California	52 (1.4)	12 (1.0)	80 (1.2)
Colorado	52 (1.8)	12 (0.8)	84 (1.1)
Connecticut	52 (1.8)	16 (1.0)	91 (0.9)
District of Columbia	70 (1.6)	11 (1.2)	75 (2.6)
Florida	45 (1.4)	11 (0.7)	81 (1.1)
Hawaii	38 (1.1)	17 (1.1)	89 (1.3)
Idaho	42 (1.7)	11 (0.8)	85 (1.2)
Illinois	52 (1.5)	12 (0.8)	84 (1.1)
Indiana	51 (1.4)	10 (0.7)	84 (1.1)
Iowa	44 (1.6)	17 (1.1)	89 (0.8)
Kansas	49 (1.6)	13 (0.8)	87 (1.0)
Kentucky	45 (1.4)	13 (1.1)	80 (1.3)
Louisiana	35 (1.2)	10 (0.9)	72 (2.1)
Maine	42 (1.5)	17 (1.2)	90 (0.9)
Maryland	48 (1.4)	14 (1.0)	81 (1.3)
Minnesota	42 (2.2)	18 (1.4)	98 (0.6)
Mississippi	33 (1.2)	11 (1.1)	70 (2.5)
Missouri	47 (1.3)	11 (0.7)	83 (1.0)
Montana	41 (1.5)	14 (0.9)	90 (0.9)
Nebraska	47 (1.7)	15 (0.9)	89 (0.8)
Nevada	48 (1.6)	9 (0.7)	77 (1.4)
New Hampshire	46 (1.6)	16 (1.2)	90 (0.8)
New Jersey	51 (1.6)	12 (0.9)	84 (1.0)
New Mexico	44 (1.8)	11 (1.1)	77 (1.7)
North Carolina	44 (1.3)	13 (0.9)	80 (1.2)
Ohio	47 (1.3)	12 (0.8)	87 (1.0)
Oklahoma	42 (1.2)	11 (0.8)	80 (1.3)
Rhode Island	50 (1.7)	13 (0.9)	87 (1.0)
South Dakota	42 (1.6)	17 (1.2)	90 (0.9)
Tennessee	42 (1.2)	10 (0.8)	78 (1.3)
Texas	41 (1.7)	14 (1.3)	86 (1.4)
Utah	37 (1.8)	11 (1.0)	86 (1.5)
Virginia	46 (1.3)	10 (0.7)	80 (1.2)
West Virginia	38 (1.3)	11 (1.0)	78 (1.5)
Wyoming	43 (1.6)	14 (0.9)	88 (0.8)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model

Table III.18. Percentage of Elderly Ineligibles in SNAP Households with Medicaid, SSI, Social Security, and Excess Shelter Expenses by State, FY 2009

	Estimated Percentage of Elderly Ineligibles (Standard Error)			
	With Medicaid	With SSI	With Social Security	With Excess Shelter Expenses
United States	**11 (0.7)**	**1 (0.2)**	**88 (0.7)**	**29 (1.1)**
Alabama	13 (0.8)	1 (0.4)	90 (0.7)	21 (1.1)
Alaska	6 (0.6)	1 (0.2)	86 (0.7)	36 (1.2)
Arizona	9 (1.7)	1 (0.5)	84 (2.8)	14 (2.1)
Arkansas	13 (0.9)	1 (0.3)	88 (0.7)	22 (1.2)
California	12 (1.0)	- [a]	88 (1.1)	26 (1.4)
Colorado	10 (0.8)	1 (0.5)	87 (0.8)	35 (1.3)
Connecticut	8 (0.6)	0 (0.3)	87 (0.9)	72 (1.6)
Delaware	16 (3.1)	3 (1.4)	87 (4.4)	9 (4.9)
District of Columbia	15 (1.4)	1 (0.2)	89 (1.1)	26 (1.5)
Florida	12 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	88 (0.7)	20 (1.1)
Georgia	22 (3.9)	10 (4.4)	86 (5.9)	9 (4.6)
Hawaii	8 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	86 (1.0)	24 (1.4)
Idaho	10 (0.7)	1 (0.3)	86 (0.8)	33 (1.7)
Illinois	11 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	88 (0.7)	26 (1.2)
Indiana	9 (0.6)	0 (0.1)	89 (0.6)	34 (1.2)
Iowa	8 (0.6)	0 (0.1)	87 (0.9)	36 (1.4)
Kansas	9 (0.7)	0 (0.1)	87 (0.8)	30 (1.3)
Kentucky	12 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	89 (0.8)	23 (1.2)
Louisiana	14 (1.0)	1 (0.4)	88 (1.0)	23 (1.3)
Maine	7 (0.6)	0 (0.1)	87 (0.9)	69 (1.4)
Maryland	11 (0.7)	0 (0.1)	88 (0.8)	30 (1.2)
Massachusetts	12 (0.9)	2 (0.5)	91 (0.9)	38 (1.9)
Michigan	15 (3.7)	3 (1.3)	84 (4.8)	15 (4.7)
Minnesota	4 (0.7)	0 (0.1)	84 (1.3)	39 (1.9)
Mississippi	14 (1.1)	2 (0.6)	89 (1.0)	19 (1.3)
Missouri	10 (0.6)	1 (0.1)	89 (0.6)	23 (1.1)
Montana	7 (0.6)	0 (0.1)	87 (0.8)	52 (1.6)
Nebraska	8 (0.7)	0 (0.2)	87 (0.8)	32 (1.3)
Nevada	13 (1.0)	1 (0.3)	88 (0.8)	23 (1.3)
New Hampshire	8 (0.6)	0 (0.1)	87 (0.9)	57 (1.3)
New Jersey	11 (0.8)	1 (0.4)	87 (0.8)	33 (1.2)
New Mexico	15 (1.4)	1 (0.4)	85 (1.4)	27 (1.5)
New York	24 (5.5)	10 (3.2)	82 (6.2)	16 (5.0)
North Carolina	12 (0.8)	1 (0.1)	88 (0.7)	24 (1.2)
North Dakota	10 (1.0)	0 (0.2)	91 (1.2)	41 (2.1)
Ohio	8 (0.5)	0 (0.1)	89 (0.7)	54 (1.4)
Oklahoma	11 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	88 (0.6)	24 (1.2)
Oregon	6 (1.3)	1 (0.4)	86 (2.1)	17 (2.5)
Pennsylvania	14 (3.5)	4 (1.5)	85 (3.8)	10 (3.6)
Rhode Island	10 (0.7)	1 (0.6)	87 (0.8)	52 (1.5)
South Carolina	22 (3.8)	6 (2.9)	87 (3.9)	4 (3.0)
South Dakota	8 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	86 (0.9)	65 (1.6)
Tennessee	12 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	89 (0.7)	25 (1.2)
Texas	10 (1.1)	1 (0.6)	84 (1.5)	30 (1.9)
Utah	10 (1.3)	1 (0.3)	85 (1.0)	24 (1.6)
Vermont	6 (1.4)	1 (0.5)	87 (2.4)	43 (3.3)
Virginia	12 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	88 (0.7)	26 (1.1)
Washington	13 (3.7)	6 (2.6)	81 (5.3)	12 (5.0)
West Virginia	11 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	89 (0.7)	25 (1.4)
Wisconsin	9 (2.5)	3 (1.4)	81 (5.4)	6 (3.2)
Wyoming	8 (0.6)	0 (0.2)	87 (0.8)	29 (1.3)

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

percentage was in the District of Columbia (70 percent). Among states with an asset test, Arizona and Mississippi had the` lowest percentage of elderly ineligibles with countable assets (69 and 70 percent, respectively) and Minnesota had the highest (98 percent).

In most states, the percentage of elderly ineligibles with Medicaid was 16 percent or less. Exceptions were Georgia, New York, and South Carolina, where the percentages were 22, 24, and 22 percent, respectively. Those states, along with Washington, also had the highest percentages of elderly ineligibles with SSI—6 percent for South Carolina and Washington and 10 percent in Georgia and New York. In all states, the percentages with Medicaid or SSI were lower among elderly ineligibles than elderly eligibles.

C. Estimates of State Elderly SNAP Eligibility Rates

The SNAP eligibility rate—the percentage of the low-income population eligible for SNAP—is a useful tool for assessing program performance and comparing elderly participation across states. We used the 2009 Baseline of the MATH SIPP+ model to examine FY 2009 SNAP eligibility rates nationally and by state for elderly individuals below 200 percent of poverty and two subgroups: low-income elderly individuals in SNAP households with SSI and low-income elderly individuals in one-person SNAP households. Estimates of the total number of elderly individuals below 200 percent of poverty, the number eligible, and eligibility rates by state can be found in Appendix C. As mentioned earlier, the eligibility rate estimates presented in this section are drawn from the same data source as the tabulations of elderly eligibles presented in III.B, and so can be compared directly.

1. Eligibility Rates for All Low-Income Elderly Individuals

In FY 2009, more than 16 million elderly individuals had income under 200 percent of poverty and an estimated 8.5 million, or 53 percent, were eligible for SNAP (Table III.19). State elderly eligibility rates varied widely. Eligibility rates are influenced by both the SNAP policies in effect and the characteristics of the low-income population. For instance, most states with relatively high eligibility rates have implemented policies specifically designed to increase eligibility, such as

Table III.19. Estimated Number and SNAP Eligibility Rate of Elderly Individuals with Income Below 200 Percent of Poverty, by State, 2009

	Elderly Individuals with Income below 200 Percent of Poverty		
	Number (000s)	Number Eligible (000s)	Eligibility Rate (Row Percent)
United States	**16,257**	**8,540**	**53**
Alabama	309	126	41
Alaska	30	11	37
Arizona	335	284	85
Arkansas	204	79	39
California	1,807	326	18
Colorado	189	71	37
Connecticut	168	71	42
Delaware	43	41	95
District of Columbia	33	16	50
Florida	1,239	429	35
Georgia	425	404	95
Hawaii	92	37	40
Idaho	68	22	32
Illinois	634	225	35
Indiana	306	110	36
Iowa	158	51	32
Kansas	143	47	33
Kentucky	279	113	41
Louisiana	319	132	41
Maine	80	33	40
Maryland	265	107	40
Massachusetts	297	190	64
Michigan	506	485	96
Minnesota	205	121	59
Mississippi	223	99	44
Missouri	327	113	34
Montana	63	20	32
Nebraska	93	30	32
Nevada	133	51	38
New Hampshire	57	20	35
New Jersey	387	142	37
New Mexico	126	53	42
New York	1,129	1,058	94
North Carolina	532	214	40
North Dakota	39	26	66
Ohio	595	223	37
Oklahoma	243	91	37
Oregon	207	179	86
Pennsylvania	737	704	96
Rhode Island	54	22	40
South Carolina	284	273	96
South Dakota	49	19	39
Tennessee	402	158	39
Texas	1,223	713	58
Utah	74	21	28
Vermont	32	28	88
Virginia	351	132	37
Washington	286	274	96
West Virginia	161	63	39
Wisconsin	285	277	97
Wyoming	28	9	32

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

expanding categorical eligibility to most low-income households or counting few, if any, vehicle assets. These state rules were summarized in Table II.2.

In the 13 states that had eligibility rates of 64 percent or more, virtually no applicants were subject to an asset test.[18] Most of these states also eliminated the net income test for most or virtually all applicants, the exceptions being Massachusetts and North Dakota, which retained the net income test for most households. In contrast, California, the state with the lowest elderly eligibility rate, has a policy that excludes SSI recipients from SNAP eligibility. Another 12 states had elderly eligibility rates of 36 percent or less.[19]

2. Eligibility Rates for Subgroups of Low-Income Elderly Individuals

Table III.20 presents the estimated number and eligibility rates for low-income elderly individuals in SNAP households with SSI and low-income elderly individuals in one-person SNAP households by state in FY 2009. Nationally, 73 percent of the former were eligible for SNAP; this eligibility rate rises to 96 percent when low-income elderly individuals in California are excluded from the calculation. The high eligibility rate for SSI recipients is not surprising, given that many are in households in which every member receives some form of public assistance and so are categorically eligible for SNAP. All states except for California had elderly SSI recipient eligibility rates of more than 90 percent, with Michigan and Wisconsin reaching 99 percent.

Among the 13 states with the highest overall eligibility rates, all except Massachusetts also had one of the 13 highest SSI recipient eligibility rates. Minnesota, with an SSI recipient eligibility rate of 98 percent, was also in the top quarter of states. Among the 13 states with the lowest overall eligibility rates, the percentage of the low-income population that received SSI was lower than

[18] The 13 states in which the eligibility rate was 64 percent or more were Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

[19] The 13 states in which the eligibility rate was 36 percent or less were California, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Utah, and Wyoming.

Table III.20. Estimated Number and SNAP Eligibility Rate of Elderly Individuals with SSI or in One-Person SNAP Households with Income Below 200 Percent of Poverty, by State, 2009

	Low-Income Elderly with SSI		Low-Income Elderly in One-Person Households	
	Number (000s)	Eligibility Rate (Row Percent)	Number (000s)	Eligibility Rate (Row Percent)
United States	**2,019**	**73**	**8,635**	**58**
U.S. (minus California)	**1,548**	**96**	**7,612**	**63**
Alabama	38	94	152	50
Alaska	3	94	16	48
Arizona	26	98	162	88
Arkansas	23	94	90	49
California	470	0	1,022	22
Colorado	16	94	110	44
Connecticut	14	97	104	51
Delaware	3	98	23	97
District of Columbia	5	97	24	53
Florida	132	93	632	42
Georgia	53	97	231	97
Hawaii	9	95	41	49
Idaho	4	92	32	39
Illinois	63	95	364	41
Indiana	16	97	176	44
Iowa	9	97	78	39
Kansas	8	96	78	40
Kentucky	39	95	141	46
Louisiana	40	93	137	52
Maine	6	97	40	50
Maryland	27	97	144	47
Massachusetts	46	95	175	68
Michigan	42	99	277	98
Minnesota	17	98	111	67
Mississippi	34	92	96	57
Missouri	23	95	175	42
Montana	3	95	30	42
Nebraska	5	96	49	40
Nevada	10	93	72	43
New Hampshire	2	97	30	44
New Jersey	46	94	219	43
New Mexico	17	94	63	48
New York	204	98	643	96
North Carolina	56	96	277	49
North Dakota	2	97	21	72
Ohio	42	96	331	46
Oklahoma	21	93	121	46
Oregon	15	98	110	90
Pennsylvania	69	98	395	98
Rhode Island	7	93	32	49
South Carolina	30	98	142	98
South Dakota	4	95	24	49
Tennessee	41	95	198	47
Texas	171	96	603	64
Utah	4	94	31	37
Vermont	3	98	18	91
Virginia	38	95	186	44
Washington	27	98	161	97
West Virginia	16	95	71	47
Wisconsin	19	99	161	98
Wyoming	1	96	14	41

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

average in all except Florida. Given the high eligibility rate of elderly SSI recipients, the low proportion of this group in some states may contribute to those states' low overall eligibility rates.

Nationally, the eligibility rate of low-income elderly individuals in one-person SNAP households was 58 percent, slightly higher than the overall low-income elderly SNAP eligibility rate. Rates varied widely across states, from less than one-quarter of California's single low-income elderly population being SNAP-eligible to 98 percent of that population in Michigan, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Wisconsin being eligible. For the 15 states with the highest overall eligibility rates and the five states with the lowest, the state's rank, based on its one-person eligibility rate relative to other states' rates, was identical to the rank based on their overall eligibility rate. Most other states also had similar rankings for the two rates. Because the one-person eligibility rate is, on average, only slightly higher than the overall eligibility rate, the prevalence of one-person SNAP households in a state does not appear to have much effect on the overall eligibility rate.

D. Estimates of State Elderly SNAP Participation Rates

Estimated SNAP participation rates are the ratio of estimated numbers of participants to estimated numbers of eligibles. The shrinkage estimates of state elderly SNAP participation rates presented here are substantially more precise than direct sample estimates. They are based on fairly small samples of households in each state, however, so there is still substantial uncertainty associated with the estimates for some states. The standard errors of the estimated elderly participation rates, along with the estimated rates, ranks, and numbers of elderly participants and eligibles by state for FY 2002 through FY 2006, can be found in Appendix D.

Although the numerators of the participation rate estimates presented in this section are drawn from the same data source as the tabulations of elderly participants presented in III.A, they differ slightly. To maintain consistency with the denominator for the participation rate estimates, we excluded from the numerator those SNAP households that were categorically eligible and would fail the SNAP income tests. The tabulations in III.A include such SNAP households. The denominators

of the participation rate estimates differ in several ways, described above, from the estimates of elderly eligibles presented in III.B, and so should not be compared directly to those estimates.

As discussed in Chapter II, the participation rate estimates presented in this report are based in part on regression estimates. Consequently, researchers should be cautious about using these estimates to model elderly SNAP participation levels.

1. Trend in National Elderly SNAP Participation Rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006

Nationally, the estimated SNAP participation rate among elderly individuals increased steadily, from 25 percent in FY 2002 to 34 percent in FY 2006, a statistically significant increase of 9 percentage points (Table III.21). Increases from FY 2003 to FY 2004 and from FY 2005 to FY 2006 also were statistically significant at the 95-percent confidence level.

Table III.21. National SNAP Participation Rates for Eligible Elderly Individuals and for All Eligible Individuals, FY 2002 to FY 2006

	Estimated SNAP Participation Rates (Standard Errors)				
Fiscal Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Elderly individuals[a]	25 (0.9)	26 (1.1)	30 (1.0)	31 (1.1)	34 (1.2)
All individuals	54 (0.5)	56 (0.6)	61 (0.6)	65 (0.7)	67 (0.6)
Ratio of elderly rate to all individuals rate	47	47	48	47	51

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for years shown; census 2000 data.

[a]The elderly participation rates for FY 2002 through FY 2004 differ slightly from those in Leftin and Wolkwitz (2009) because they are based on revised participant data files that are methodologically consistent with the participant data files for FY 2005 and FY 2006.

During the same period, the estimated national SNAP participation rate for all individuals rose 14 percentage points, from 54 percent to 67 percent. The increase between FY 2002 and FY 2006 was statistically significant at the 95-percent confidence level, as was each increase between consecutive years.

Although the *percentage point* increase in rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006 was larger for all individuals than for elderly individuals, the *percentage* increase in rates was larger for elderly individuals. The elderly participation rate increased by 37 percent, while the all-individuals rate

increased by 26 percent. As a result, the elderly participation rate rose from 47 percent of the all-individuals rate in FY 2002 to 51 percent of the all-individuals rate in FY 2006. As seen in Table III.21, all of the relative increase in the elderly participation rate occurred between FY 2005 and FY 2006.

2. Trends in State Elderly SNAP Participation Rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006

Like the national elderly participation rate, state elderly participation rates increased between FY 2002 and FY 2006 (Table III.22). Although there was variation across states and between consecutive years, the change from FY 2002 to FY 2006 was positive in every state. In two-thirds of the states, the change was statistically significant, for the most part at a 95-percent confidence level (Table III.23).

The upward trend in state elderly participation rates between FY 2002 and FY 2006 was similar to the trend in state participation rates for all individuals. In all states, the all-individuals participation rate increased between FY 2002 and FY 2006. The increase in the all-individuals rate was statistically significant at the 95-percent confidence level in all but seven states (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and Wyoming).

Among states with statistically significant elderly participation rate changes from FY 2002 to FY 2006, five—Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, and Washington—had a rate increase of 15 percentage points or more. These five states also had increases of 15 percentage points or more in their participation rates for all individuals. Another 12 states had statistically significant elderly participation rate increases of 10 to 14 percentage points.[20] Again, each of these 12 states had significant increases of at least 10 percentage points in their rate for all individuals, as well.

[20]The 12 states with statistically significant rate increases of 10 to 14 percentage points were Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Texas.

Table III.22. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates by State, FY 2002 to FY 2006

	Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation Rates (Percentage)				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
United States	**25**	**26**	**30**	**31**	**34**
Alabama	20	22	22	21	26
Alaska	28	29	25	31	38
Arizona	18	24	26	27	26
Arkansas	20	23	23	27	27
California	7	7	11	9	10
Colorado	20	22	24	22	27
Connecticut	31	26	29	31	34
Delaware	17	18	22	23	27
District of Columbia	28	32	30	30	41
Florida	35	34	43	43	44
Georgia	26	27	29	29	35
Hawaii	61	52	58	61	63
Idaho	20	24	26	23	23
Illinois	30	28	32	37	40
Indiana	21	25	26	29	30
Iowa	19	21	24	26	30
Kansas	23	26	27	27	31
Kentucky	28	32	29	33	34
Louisiana	23	28	25	30	33
Maine	36	40	38	45	50
Maryland	22	18	21	21	28
Massachusetts	16	17	20	20	32
Michigan	27	29	30	37	43
Minnesota	27	26	27	26	33
Mississippi	21	26	24	21	31
Missouri	29	33	34	44	45
Montana	18	25	24	23	25
Nebraska	26	27	30	30	33
Nevada	23	25	30	27	28
New Hampshire	22	19	21	20	25
New Jersey	28	21	29	28	34
New Mexico	17	24	25	26	30
New York	35	33	42	43	50
North Carolina	21	22	25	24	30
North Dakota	25	25	26	22	25
Ohio	24	29	30	32	36
Oklahoma	22	31	29	32	34
Oregon	40	42	38	46	45
Pennsylvania	23	25	29	31	34
Rhode Island	22	21	26	22	24
South Carolina	23	27	27	30	33
South Dakota	18	20	20	16	21
Tennessee	30	35	33	39	39
Texas	20	24	28	28	32
Utah	21	24	27	27	30
Vermont	35	33	33	35	38
Virginia	27	26	30	29	34
Washington	28	30	33	37	43
West Virginia	26	32	28	31	30
Wisconsin	18	20	21	22	26
Wyoming	16	19	21	15	20

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for years shown; Census 2000 data.

Table III.23. Trends in Estimated State Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, FY 2002 to FY 2006

	Significant Rate Increase Between 2002 and 2006		Trend from 2002 to 2006	Number of Significant Changes Between Consecutive Years
	Percentage Point	Percent		
Alabama	6 points	30	No trend	One increase (2005–06)
Alaska	none	-	Up 3 years	None
Arizona	8 points	43	Up 3 consecutive years	One increase (2002–03)
Arkansas	7 points	35	Up 3 years	None
California	none	-	Up 3 years	None
Colorado	7 +points	34	Up 3 years	One increase (2005–06)
Connecticut	none	-	Up 3 consecutive years	None
Delaware	11 points	63	Up all years	None
District of Columbia	none	-	Up 3 years	None
Florida	9 points	24	No trend	One increase (2003–04)
Georgia	9 points	36	Up all years	One increase (2005–06)
Hawaii	none	-	Up 3 consecutive years	None
Idaho	none	-	No trend	None
Illinois	11 points	36	Up 3 consecutive years	One increase (2004–05)
Indiana	9 points	41	Up all years	None
Iowa	11 points	58	Up all years	None
Kansas	7 points	31	Up 3 years	One increase (2005–06)
Kentucky	6 points	22	Up 3 years	None
Louisiana	10 points	46	Up 3 years	One increase (2002–03)
Maine	14 points	39	Up 3 years	One increase (2004–05)
Maryland	6 points	29	No trend	One increase (2005–06)
Massachusetts	16 points	100	Up 3 years	One increase (2005–06)
Michigan	16 points	58	Up all years	Two increases (2004–05, 2005–06)
Minnesota	6 points	22	No trend	One increase (2005–06)
Mississippi	10 points	47	No trend	One increase (2005–06)
Missouri	16 points	53	Up all years	One increase (2004–05)
Montana	none	-	No trend	None
Nebraska	7 points	28	Up all years	None
Nevada	none	-	Up 3 years	One increase (2003–04)
New Hampshire	none	-	No trend	One increase (2005–06)
New Jersey	none	-	No trend	One decrease (2002–03), One increase (2003–04)
New Mexico	13 points	78	Up all years	One increase (2002–03)
New York	15 points	42	Up 3 consecutive years	One increase (2003–04)
North Carolina	9 points	41	Up 3 years	One increase (2005–06)
North Dakota	none	-	Up 3 years	None
Ohio	12 points	50	Up all years	One increase (2002–03)
Oklahoma	11 points	50	Up 3 years	One increase (2002–03)
Oregon	none	-	No trend	None
Pennsylvania	11 points	47	Up all years	One increase (2003–04)
Rhode Island	none	-	No trend	One increase (2003–04)
South Carolina	10 points	41	Up all years	None
South Dakota	none	-	No trend	None
Tennessee	9 points	29	No trend	None
Texas	13 points	65	Up all years	Three increases (2002–03, 2003–04, 2005–06)
Utah	9 points	45	Up all years	None
Vermont	none	-	No trend	None
Virginia	8 points	29	No trend	Two increases (2003–04, 2005–06)
Washington	15 points	52	Up all years	One increase (2005–06)
West Virginia	none	-	No trend	None
Wisconsin	8 points	48	Up all years	One increase (2005–06)
Wyoming	none	-	Up 3 years	None

Note: Statistical significance is determined at 90-percent confidence level.

In addition to examining *percentage point* increases in participation rates, we also looked at the *percentage* increase in state elderly participation rates from FY 2002 to FY 2006. The highest percentage increase was in Massachusetts, where the elderly participation rate rose by 100 percent, from 16 percent in FY 2002 to 32 percent in FY 2006. Nine other states had participation rate increases of at least 50 percent from FY 2002 to FY 2006 (Delaware, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington). By comparison, increases from FY 2002 to FY 2006 in the participation rate for all individuals ranged from 3 to 45 percent. Texas had the highest percentage increase in its all-individuals participation rate (45 percent), followed by Massachusetts, (42 percent).

3. Comparisons of State Elderly Participation Rates Across States and to National Rates

We compared state elderly participation rates across states and to the national elderly participation rate (Table III.24). Hawaii's elderly participation rate was higher than that of every other state in all five years, and Florida, Maine, New York, and Oregon had participation rates that were significantly higher than two-thirds of the states in all five years. California's elderly participation rate was lower than the rate of every other state in all five years. No state other than California had a rate that was significantly lower than two-thirds of the other states in all five years, although Wyoming's participation rate was significantly lower than two-thirds of the other states in three out of the five years.

Hawaii's high elderly participation rate is likely due in part to that state's high poverty rate among elderly eligibles—65 percent of elderly eligibles were in poverty in Hawaii, compared to the national average of 42 percent (Section III.B). On average, eligible individuals in poverty are more likely to participate in SNAP than eligibles with slightly higher incomes. California's low elderly percentage among SNAP participants is likely due in large part to a state policy that makes SSI recipients ineligible for SNAP. On average, SNAP-eligible individuals who receive SSI or other forms of public assistance are more likely to participate than eligibles who do not receive other

Table III.24. Comparisons of Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, FY 2002 to FY 2006

	State Rate Significantly Different from National Rate	State Rate Significantly Different from Two-Thirds of Other States' Rates
Alabama	Lower all 5 years	n/a
Alaska	n/a	n/a
Arizona	Lower 3 years	n/a
Arkansas	Lower 4 years	n/a
California	Lower all 5 years	Lowest every year
Colorado	Lower all 5 years	n/a
Connecticut	Higher 1 year	n/a
Delaware	Lower all 5 years	Lower 2 years
District of Columbia	n/a	n/a
Florida	Higher all 5 years	Higher all 5 years
Georgia	n/a	n/a
Hawaii	Higher all 5 years	Highest every year
Idaho	Lower 4 years	Lower 1 year
Illinois	Higher 3 years	Higher 2 years
Indiana	Lower 3 years	n/a
Iowa	Lower all 5 years	n/a
Kansas	Lower 2 years	n/a
Kentucky	Higher 1 year	n/a
Louisiana	Lower 1 year	n/a
Maine	Higher all 5 years	Higher all 5 years
Maryland	Lower all 5 years	Lower 2 years
Massachusetts	Lower 4 years	Lower 2 years
Michigan	Higher 2 years	Higher 2 years
Minnesota	Lower 1 year	n/a
Mississippi	Lower 3 years	n/a
Missouri	Higher all 5 years	Higher 3 years
Montana	Lower 4 years	n/a
Nebraska	n/a	n/a
Nevada	Lower 1 year	n/a
New Hampshire	Lower 4 years	Lower 2 years
New Jersey	Lower 1 year	n/a
New Mexico	Lower 4 years	n/a
New York	Higher all 5 years	Higher all 5 years
North Carolina	Lower all 5 years	n/a
North Dakota	Lower 2 years	n/a
Ohio	n/a	n/a
Oklahoma	Higher 1 year	n/a
Oregon	Higher all 5 years	Higher all 5 years
Pennsylvania	n/a	n/a
Rhode Island	Lower 3 years	n/a
South Carolina	n/a	n/a
South Dakota	Lower all 5 years	Lower 2 years
Tennessee	Higher 3 years	Higher 2 years
Texas	Lower 1 year	n/a
Utah	Lower 1 year	n/a
Vermont	Higher 2 years	Higher 1 year
Virginia	n/a	n/a
Washington	Higher 3 years	Higher 1 year
West Virginia	Higher 1 year, lower 1 year	n/a
Wisconsin	Lower all 5 years	Lower 1 year
Wyoming	Lower all 5 years	Lower 3 years

Note: Statistical significance is determined at a 90-percent confidence level.

n/a = not applicable (state rate not statistically significantly different).

public assistance, so the absence of this group from the eligible California SNAP population may reduce that state's participation rate.

The elderly participation rate in six states (Florida, Hawaii, Maine, Missouri, New York, and Oregon) was significantly higher than the national participation rate in all five years. The rate for five additional states (Illinois, Michigan, Tennessee, Vermont, and Washington) was significantly higher than the national rate in two or three out of the five years. Ten states had elderly participation rates significantly lower than the national rate in all five years.[21] Twelve additional states had rates significantly lower than the national rate in two, three, or four years.[22]

4. Trends in the Number of Elderly Eligibles and Participants from FY 2002 to FY 2006

An increase in a state's participation rate can be due to a decrease in the number of eligibles or an increase in the number of participants. If the numbers of participants and eligibles both move in the same direction, a relative increase in participants or a relative decrease in eligibles also will result in an increase in the state's participation rate. To gain a better understanding of the state elderly participation rate increases between FY 2002 and FY 2006, we examined trends in the number of elderly eligibles and elderly participants.

In half of the states and the District of Columbia, the number of elderly eligibles decreased from FY 2002 to FY 2006 (Table III.25). The size of the decrease varied, from one percent in the District of Columbia to 41 percent in New Mexico. However, the decreases in elderly eligibles between FY 2002 and FY 2006 were statistically significant in only five states. Maine, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and South Carolina had decreases that were statistically significant at the 95-percent confidence level, and Georgia had a decrease that was statistically significant at the 90-percent level.

[21] The 10 states with elderly participation rates that were significantly lower than the national rate in all five years were Alabama, California, Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, Maryland, North Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

[22] The 12 states with elderly participation rates that were significantly lower than the national rate in two to four years were Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Rhode Island.

Table III.25. Change in Estimated Number of Elderly SNAP Eligibles and Participants and Estimated Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, FY 2002 to FY 2006

	Percent Change from 2002 to 2006		Percentage Point Increase in Participation Rates from 2002 to 2006
	Eligibles	Participants	
Alabama	-5	23	6 **
Alaska	-12	21	10
Arizona	25	79	8 **
Arkansas	-18	11	7 **
California	44	113	3
Colorado	-11	18	7 **
Connecticut	13	24	3
Delaware	19	108	11 **
District of Columbia	-1	42	12
Florida	-2	22	9 *
Georgia	-17	14	9 **
Hawaii	-9	-5	3
Idaho	8	24	3
Illinois	4	42	11 **
Indiana	13	59	9 **
Iowa	5	66	11 **
Kansas	-5	24	7 **
Kentucky	12	37	6 **
Louisiana	17	70	10 **
Maine	-19	13	14 **
Maryland	-10	17	6 **
Massachusetts	37	173	16 **
Michigan	-13	37	16 **
Minnesota	-15	4	6 **
Mississippi	-18	20	10 **
Missouri	-15	31	16 **
Montana	-10	20	6
Nebraska	-6	21	7 **
Nevada	5	26	5
New Hampshire	2	18	4
New Jersey	-5	16	6
New Mexico	-41	5	13 **
New York	-4	36	15 **
North Carolina	12	58	9 **
North Dakota	17	20	1
Ohio	11	67	12 **
Oklahoma	-27	10	11 **
Oregon	56	75	5
Pennsylvania	-7	36	11 **
Rhode Island	1	10	2
South Carolina	-24	7	10 **
South Dakota	29	43	2
Tennessee	11	44	9 **
Texas	35	123	13 **
Utah	-8	33	9 **
Vermont	21	32	3
Virginia	3	33	8 **
Washington	25	89	15 **
West Virginia	-13	-1	4
Wisconsin	-3	44	8 **
Wyoming	23	51	4

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for years shown and Census 2000 data.

* Change is statistically different from zero at a 90-percent level of significance.
** Change is statistically different from zero at a 95-percent level of significance.

The number of elderly eligibles increased from FY 2002 to FY 2006 in the other half of the states, ranging from a one-percent increase in Rhode Island to a 56-percent increase in Oregon. As with the decreases in elderly eligibles, many of the increases were not statistically significant. Exceptions were Oregon, Texas, and Washington, whose increases in elderly eligibles between FY 2002 and FY 2006 were statistically significant at the 95-percent level, and Arizona, Delaware, Massachusetts, and Vermont, whose increases were statistically significant at the 90-percent level.

The number of elderly participants increased from FY 2002 to FY 2006 in all but two states—Hawaii and West Virginia—where the number decreased. In both of those states, the number of elderly eligibles also decreased, and the percentage decrease in the number of elderly participants was less than the percentage decrease in elderly eligibles. In states that had an increase in elderly eligibles, the percentage increase in elderly participants from FY 2002 to FY 2006 was greater than the percentage increase in elderly eligibles.

In four states, the increase in elderly participants between FY 2002 and FY 2006 was more than 100 percent. In Massachusetts, the number of elderly participants increased by 173 percent, from 20,000 in FY 2002 to 55,000 in FY 2006. Texas had a 123 percent increase, from 96,000 to 214,000; California, a 113 percent increase, from 19,000 to 40,000; and Delaware, a 108 percent increase, from 2,000 to 4,000.

5. Effect of Changes in Numbers of Eligibles and Participants on Participation Rates

Although every state's estimated elderly SNAP participation rate increased from FY 2002 to FY 2006, the factors that contributed to the increase varied by state. Among states with relatively large increases in SNAP participation rates between FY 2002 and FY 2006, the rate change in some cases appears to have been driven by a change in the number of eligibles and in others by a change in the number of participants.

In Massachusetts, the state with the largest increase in its elderly SNAP participation rate, the number of elderly eligibles increased by more than one-third. However, the number of elderly

participants in the state increased dramatically over the same period—by 173 percent—leading to a large participation rate increase. Similarly, Texas experienced an increase of more than one-third in the number of eligibles and an increase of more than 100 percent in the number of participants, again leading to a large participation rate increase. The increases in elderly participation rates in Delaware, Iowa, Ohio, and Washington also were the result of a larger percentage increase in participants than eligibles.

The remaining states with large rate increases between FY 2002 and FY 2006 experienced a decrease in the number of eligibles and an increase in the number of participants. While the changes in both numbers contributed to the participation rate increases, in some states the decrease in eligibles appears to have contributed more to the rate increase, while in others, the increase in participants appears to have contributed more. In New York, the number of eligibles fell by less than 5 percent, while the number of participants rose by 36 percent. The reverse was true in New Mexico, where the number of eligibles fell by more than 40 percent and the number of participants rose by 5 percent. In Oklahoma, as in New Mexico, the percentage decrease in eligibles was larger than the percentage increase in participants, while in Michigan and Missouri, the percentage decrease in eligibles was less than the percentage increase in participants.

6. Changes Between Consecutive Years in State Elderly Participation Rates and Number of Elderly Eligibles and Participants

To this point, our discussion of trends in elderly participation rates and the number of elderly eligibles and participants has focused on changes from FY 2002 to FY 2006. Here, we examine changes between consecutive years in participation rates and numbers of elderly eligibles and participants. Changes in estimated rates over time may be due to statistical variability as well as true changes in rates. The statistical variability is sufficiently great that a large change in a state's rate from year to year should be interpreted cautiously. Despite this uncertainty, it can be informative to examine statistically significant changes between consecutive years.

In 15 states, elderly participation rates rose each year from FY 2002 to FY 2006, while in another 20 states, elderly participation rates rose each year but one (Table III.26). In no state did the elderly participation rate decrease between consecutive years more often than it increased. Most participation rate changes between consecutive years were not statistically significant, however. Half of the states had one statistically significant increase between two consecutive years, Michigan and Virginia had two, and Texas had three. Across all of the states, there was only one statistically significant decrease between consecutive years—in New Jersey, between FY 2002 and FY 2003.

Between consecutive years, the largest statistically significant decreases in elderly eligibles occurred in New Mexico, from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (34 percent); Oklahoma, from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (30 percent); Colorado, from FY 2005 to FY 2006 (28 percent); and Utah, from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (28 percent) (Appendix D, Tables D.1–D.5).

Between consecutive years, the largest statistically significant increases in elderly eligibles occurred in Wyoming, from FY 2004 to FY 2005 (110 percent); the District of Columbia, from FY 2003 to FY 2004 (61 percent); Texas, from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (41 percent); and Washington, from FY 2002 to FY 2003 (40 percent).

Table III.26. Direction of Change in Estimated Number of Elderly SNAP Eligibles and Participants and Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, by Year, FY 2002 to FY 2006

	2002 to 2003			2003 to 2004			2004 to 2005			2005 to 2006		
	E	P	Rate	E	P	Rate	E	P	Rate	E	P	Rate
Alabama	↓	↑	↑ **	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ *
Alaska	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑
Arizona	↑	↑	↑ **	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓
Arkansas	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑
California	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑
Colorado	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑ **
Connecticut	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑
Delaware	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
District of Columbia	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑
Florida	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑ **	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑
Georgia	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑ **
Hawaii	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↑
Idaho	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓
Illinois	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑ *	↓	↑	↑
Indiana	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑
Iowa	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Kansas	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ *
Kentucky	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Louisiana	↑	↑	↑ *	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Maine	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑ *	↓	↑	↑
Maryland	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ **
Massachusetts	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ **
Michigan	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑ **	↓	↑	↑ *
Minnesota	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ **
Mississippi	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑ **
Missouri	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑ **	↓	↓	↑
Montana	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑
Nebraska	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Nevada	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑ *	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑
New Hampshire	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ *
New Jersey	↑	↓	↓ **	↓	↑	↑ **	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑
New Mexico	↓	↓	↑ **	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↑
New York	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑ **	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
North Carolina	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑ **
North Dakota	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑
Ohio	↑	↑	↑ **	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑
Oklahoma	↓	↓	↑ **	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑
Oregon	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓
Pennsylvania	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑ *	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑
Rhode Island	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑ *	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑
South Carolina	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑
South Dakota	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑
Tennessee	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓
Texas	↑	↑	↑ *	↓	↑	↑ *	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑ *
Utah	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑
Vermont	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑
Virginia	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ *	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑ **
Washington	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑ *
West Virginia	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓
Wisconsin	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↓	↑	↑ *
Wyoming	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↑

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for years shown; census 2000 data.

Note: Arrows in columns headed by 'E' and 'P' denote the direction of change in the number of elderly eligibles and participants, respectively, from one year to the next. Arrows in columns headed by 'Rate' denote the direction of change in the elderly SNAP participation rate.

* Change is statistically different from zero at a 90-percent level of significance.

** Change is statistically different from zero at a 95-percent level of significance.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

IV. SUMMARY

In an average month in FY 2009, an estimated 16.3 million elderly individuals had income under 200 percent of poverty, and an estimated 53 percent of these individuals were eligible for SNAP. The estimated 8.6 million elderly individuals eligible for SNAP comprised 16 percent of the national eligible population. The elderly percentage of the SNAP eligible population varied across states from 7 percent to 28 percent.

The number of elderly individuals participating in SNAP rose steadily from 1.6 million in FY 2000 to 2.3 million in FY 2007. During the same time period, the number of all SNAP participants rose from 16.9 million in FY 2000 to 25.9 percent in FY 2007. In FY 2007, elderly participants comprised 9 percent of the national participant population. From FY 2000 to FY 2007, the number of elderly participants increased in all but two states. While the increase was minimal in some states, six states experienced an increase in the number of elderly participants of more than 100 percent.

In FY 2006, an estimated 34 percent of eligible elderly individuals participated in SNAP. As with the number of elderly SNAP participants, the elderly SNAP participation rate increased steadily from FY 2002 through FY 2006. Estimated elderly SNAP participation rates increased in every state from FY 2002 to FY 2006, although both the state rates and the amount of increase varied substantially across states. In some states, the participation rate increase was driven by a large increase in the number of elderly participants, while in others it was driven primarily by a decrease in the number of elderly eligibles.

Although the estimates of SNAP eligibles and participants presented in this report are not directly comparable, the characteristics of the elderly eligible population often appear to vary from those of the elderly SNAP-participating population. The characteristics of both populations frequently varied by state, and the characteristics of the elderly SNAP population also occasionally varied over time. For example, the estimated percentage of elderly SNAP eligibles qualifying for the

minimum benefit in FY 2009 was 37 percent, while the FY 2000 to FY 2007 average percentage of elderly SNAP participants receiving the minimum benefit was 21 percent. (In FY 2009, the minimum benefit was $16 for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia and slightly higher for Alaska and Hawaii. In FY 2000 through FY 2007, the minimum benefit was $10 for all states.) Among both elderly eligibles in FY 2009 and elderly participants in FY 2007, the estimated percentage qualifying for or receiving the minimum benefit varied across states, from 2 percent to more than 50 percent. Nationally, the percentage of elderly participants receiving the minimum benefit dropped from around 28 percent in FY 2000 through FY 2002 to 17 percent in FY 2006 and FY 2007.

Variations in characteristics appear to be related to state SNAP eligibility policies as well as state demographics and economic climates. For example, the states with the largest percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for the minimum benefit are all states that have expanded categorical eligibility and most have among the lowest poverty levels. The state with the lowest percentage of elderly eligibles qualifying for the minimum benefit—Hawaii—had the highest minimum benefit among states. Other states with low percentages had relatively high percentages of elderly eligibles qualifying for a shelter deduction and relatively high average shelter deduction amounts.

A rigorous analysis of the correlation between various policy, economic, and demographic factors and state elderly participation and eligibility rates and the characteristics of elderly eligibles and participants was beyond the scope of this research. However, future research can use the rich data on elderly individuals' eligibility for and participation in SNAP presented in this report in combination with information on efforts to increase elderly SNAP participation and data on economic and demographic changes that affect states' elderly populations to assess the success of past efforts to increase elderly SNAP participation and predict the effectiveness of additional efforts.

REFERENCES

Boussy, Carole, Russell H. Jackson, and Nancy Wemmerus. "Evaluation of SSI/FSP Joint Processing Alternatives Demonstration." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Service, January 2000.

Cody, Scott, Allen Schirm, Elizabeth Stuart, Laura Castner, and Alan Zaslavsky. "Sources of Variation in State Level Food Stamp Participation Rates." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, November 2007.

Cody, Scott and James Ohls. "Evaluation of the USDA Elderly Nutrition Demonstrations: Volume I, Evaluation Findings." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, July 2005.

Cunnyngham, Karen E. and Laura A. Castner. "Reaching Those in Need: State Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Rates in 2007." Alexandria, VA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, November 2009.

Cunnyngham, Karen E., Laura A. Castner, and Allen L. Schirm. "Empirical Bayes Shrinkage Estimates of State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2004-2006 for All Eligible People and the Working Poor." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, February 2009.

Cunnyngham, Karen E., Laura A. Castner, and Allen L. Schirm. "Reaching Those in Need: State Food Stamp Participation Rates in 2006." Alexandria, VA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, November 2008.

Gabor, Vivian, Susan Schreiber Williams, Hilary Bellamy, and Brooke Layne Hardison. "Seniors' Views of the Food Stamp Program and Ways to Improve Participation—Focus Group Findings in Washington State." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, June 2002.

Haider, Steven J., Robert F. Schoeni, and Alison Jacknowitz. "Food Stamps and the Elderly: Why Is Participation So Low?" Ann Arbor, MI: National Poverty Center, May 2003.

Klerman, Jacob Alex, and Caroline Danielson. "Determinants of the Food Stamp Program Caseload." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, January 2009.

LeBlanc, Michael, Biing-Hwan Lin, and David Smallwood. "Food Assistance: How Strong Is the Safety Net?" *Amber Waves*, vol. 4, no. 4, September 2006, pp. 11-15.

Lee, Jung Sun and Edward A. Frongillo, Jr. "Understanding Needs Is Important for Assessing the Impact of Food Assistance Program Participation on Nutritional and Health Status in U.S. Elderly Persons." *The Journal of Nutrition*, vol. 13, no. 3, March 2001, pp. 765-773.

Leftin, Joshua. "Trends in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Rates: 2001 to 2008." In *Current Perspectives on SNAP Participation*. Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, June 2010.

Leftin, Joshua, Andrew Gothro, and Esa Eslami. "Characteristics of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Households: Fiscal Year 2009." Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, forthcoming.

Leftin, Joshua and Kari Wolkwitz. "Trends in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Rates: 2000 to 2007." In *Current Perspectives on SNAP Participation*. Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, June 2009.

Mabli, James, Emily Sama Martin, and Laura Castner. "Effects of Economic Conditions and Program Policy on State Food Stamp Program Caseloads, 2000 to 2006." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, August 2009.

Maryns, Nicholas. "Access and Access Barriers to Getting Food Stamps: A Review of the Literature." Washington, DC: Food Research and Action Center, February 2008.

Nord, Mark, Margaret Andrews, and Steven Carlson. "Household Food Security in the United States, 2008." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, November 2009.

Ratcliffe, Caroline, Signe-Mary McKernan, and Kenneth Finegold. "The Effect of State Food Stamp and TANF Policies on Food Stamp Program Participation." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, January 2008.

Salmon, Mary Anne and Jessalyn Gooden Bridges. "Waiting for Dinner: Elderly on the Waiting List for Home-Delivered Meals." Mississippi State, MS: Southern Rural Development Center, February 2005.

Smith, Joel. "Technical Working Paper: Creation of the September 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ Model and Database." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, May 2010.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. "Evaluation of the 2004/2005 Food Stamp Outreach Projects." Washington, DC, January 2008.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. "Food Stamp Program State Options Report, Seventh Edition." Washington, DC, November 2007.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. "Food Stamp Program State Options Report, Eighth Edition." Washington, DC, June 2009.

Wilde, Parke, and Elizabeth Dagata. "Food Stamp Participation by Eligible Older Americans Remains Low." *Food Review*, vol. 25, no. 2, Summer/Fall 2002, pp. 25-29.

Wolkwitz, Kari. "Trends in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Participation Rates: 2000 to 2006." In *Current Perspectives on SNAP Participation*. Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, June 2008.

Wolkwitz, Kari, and Daisy Ewell. "Technical Documentation for the Fiscal Year 2008 SNAP QC Database and QC Minimodel." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2009.

Wolkwitz, Kari, and Daisy Ewell. "Technical Documentation for the Fiscal Year 2007 FSPQC Database and QC Minimodel." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2008.

Wolkwitz, Kari, and Daisy Ewell. "Technical Documentation for the Fiscal Year 2006 FSPQC Database and QC Minimodel." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2007.

Wolkwitz, Kari, and Josh Leftin. "Characteristics of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Households: Fiscal Year 2007." Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, September 2008.

Wolkwitz, Kari, and Carole Trippe. "Characteristics of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Households: Fiscal Year 2008." Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, September 2009.

Wu, April Yanyuan. "Why Do So Few Elderly Use Food Stamps?" Chicago, IL: The Harris School of Public Policy Studies, The University of Chicago, October 2009.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX A

TABLES SHOWING CHARACTERISTICS OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN SNAP, FISCAL YEARS 2000 TO 2007

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table A.1. Number and Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants by Year

	Number of SNAP Participants (000s)			Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over (Standard Error)
	All	In Units with Elderly Participants	Elderly Participants	
Fiscal year 2000	16,879	1,903	1,626	9.6 (0.4)
Fiscal year 2001	16,815	1,809	1,562	9.3 (0.3)
Fiscal year 2002	18,572	1,829	1,575	8.5 (0.2)
Fiscal year 2003	20,738	1,994	1,689	8.1 (0.1)
Fiscal year 2004	23,286	2,304	1,918	8.2 (0.1)
Fiscal year 2005	24,841	2,406	2,045	8.2 (0.1)
Fiscal year 2006	25,555	2,607	2,226	8.7 (0.1)
Fiscal year 2007	25,887	2,623	2,263	8.7 (0.1)

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.2. Number of SNAP Participants Age 60 or Over by State and Year

	Elderly SNAP Participants (000s)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**1,626**	**1,562**	**1,575**	**1,689**	**1,918**	**2,045**	**2,226**	**2,263**
Alabama	38	35	28	33	29	33	35	31
Alaska	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	3
Arizona	14	13	15	23	24	29	27	30
Arkansas	25	22	21	22	22	25	23	25
California	24	16	19	24	29	30	40	34
Colorado	17	14	15	16	18	18	16	18
Connecticut	18	18	18	20	21	20	22	24
Delaware	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4
District of Columbia	5	5	5	4	7	5	7	7
Florida	155	163	166	164	181	192	201	198
Georgia	57	57	57	56	56	59	64	66
Hawaii	15	14	15	14	15	15	14	14
Idaho	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	6
Illinois	59	66	65	69	84	86	93	91
Indiana	24	24	24	30	32	39	38	37
Iowa	10	9	10	9	11	12	16	13
Kansas	13	12	12	12	12	13	15	14
Kentucky	37	37	37	41	45	50	51	45
Louisiana	39	31	29	44	39	48	48	52
Maine	16	13	14	16	16	16	16	17
Maryland	24	22	22	21	22	24	25	28
Massachusetts	24	23	21	24	27	36	55	56
Michigan	54	54	57	65	64	73	79	83
Minnesota	20	19	21	18	17	19	21	24
Mississippi	31	28	27	32	30	26	33	35
Missouri	37	35	37	41	43	53	49	48
Montana	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5
Nebraska	8	8	8	9	7	9	10	9
Nevada	7	8	10	10	13	14	12	14
New Hampshire	4	4	5	4	4	5	6	5
New Jersey	41	43	38	37	46	43	44	48
New Mexico	13	13	13	12	14	13	13	14
New York	236	213	221	152	243	267	299	302
North Carolina	58	52	53	58	67	65	85	83
North Dakota	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	5
Ohio	55	54	51	66	71	69	86	78
Oklahoma	27	28	29	27	26	30	31	30
Oregon	21	23	26	31	34	41	44	43
Pennsylvania	68	76	68	75	98	90	92	112
Rhode Island	6	6	6	5	7	6	7	8
South Carolina	31	30	35	29	36	38	37	41
South Dakota	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4
Tennessee	54	59	52	62	75	74	73	77
Texas	102	90	96	165	171	184	218	208
Utah	6	5	6	5	6	5	7	7
Vermont	5	5	5	5	6	5	6	6
Virginia	46	40	39	42	47	48	52	56
Washington	25	24	23	34	36	43	44	52
West Virginia	20	18	21	21	21	25	20	25
Wisconsin	19	15	17	20	21	23	25	26
Wyoming	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.3. Percentage of SNAP Participants Age 60 or Over by State and Year

	Elderly SNAP Participants (Percent of State SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**9.6**	**9.3**	**8.5**	**8.1**	**8.2**	**8.2**	**8.7**	**8.7**
Alabama	9.7	8.8	6.6	7.1	5.9	6.2	6.5	5.7
Alaska	6.1	3.9	5.0	4.7	4.7	3.9	4.6	5.1
Arizona	5.4	4.5	4.1	5.0	4.6	5.4	5.3	5.7
Arkansas	10.0	8.8	7.6	7.2	6.6	6.9	6.3	6.8
California	1.3	1.0	1.1	1.4	1.6	1.6	2.0	1.7
Colorado	11.3	9.7	8.5	8.1	7.4	7.5	6.4	7.4
Connecticut	10.8	11.6	11.1	11.3	10.9	10.2	11.0	11.9
Delaware	5.1	6.0	5.4	5.9	6.1	6.1	6.5	6.2
District of Columbia	6.4	7.2	6.5	5.6	7.8	6.0	7.9	8.7
Florida	17.9	19.1	17.8	16.3	15.6	15.5	17.0	16.4
Georgia	10.4	10.2	9.0	7.6	6.7	6.5	7.1	7.2
Hawaii	12.5	13.2	14.5	14.7	15.1	15.8	16.5	15.8
Idaho	8.2	6.9	6.1	4.7	5.3	5.9	5.5	6.6
Illinois	7.7	8.2	7.6	7.4	8.0	7.5	7.7	7.5
Indiana	8.3	7.1	5.9	6.6	6.2	7.3	6.7	6.4
Iowa	7.9	7.4	6.9	5.9	6.5	6.0	7.3	5.7
Kansas	11.1	10.0	8.6	7.7	7.1	7.7	8.2	7.6
Kentucky	9.5	9.1	8.5	8.4	8.5	9.0	8.8	7.6
Louisiana	7.9	6.1	4.9	6.9	5.7	6.7	7.7	8.3
Maine	15.7	12.8	13.1	12.7	11.9	10.8	10.4	10.9
Maryland	11.1	10.6	9.8	8.3	8.1	8.5	8.5	9.2
Massachusetts	10.3	10.6	8.6	8.2	8.1	9.8	12.9	12.4
Michigan	8.9	8.7	7.8	8.0	6.9	7.1	7.1	7.0
Minnesota	10.1	9.8	9.8	8.1	7.4	7.8	8.4	8.9
Mississippi	11.4	9.6	8.6	9.0	8.0	6.9	8.1	8.3
Missouri	9.1	8.1	7.6	7.2	6.4	7.0	6.2	5.9
Montana	8.4	7.1	7.0	6.8	6.8	5.9	6.6	6.4
Nebraska	9.3	10.2	9.3	8.9	6.4	7.7	8.1	7.6
Nevada	11.5	12.1	10.3	9.3	11.5	11.2	10.7	11.5
New Hampshire	12.1	11.0	12.4	9.1	9.0	9.7	10.3	8.3
New Jersey	12.2	13.7	12.0	10.9	12.5	11.2	11.2	11.7
New Mexico	7.4	8.0	7.7	6.3	6.5	5.7	5.6	6.2
New York	16.4	16.1	16.6	10.8	15.4	15.5	17.0	17.1
North Carolina	12.2	10.8	9.4	9.1	9.0	8.3	10.0	9.5
North Dakota	9.8	9.8	8.9	9.0	9.3	8.2	9.1	10.3
Ohio	9.1	8.7	7.1	7.9	7.7	7.1	8.3	7.5
Oklahoma	11.0	11.0	9.3	7.4	6.5	7.5	7.4	7.4
Oregon	9.3	8.7	7.7	8.4	8.7	9.7	10.4	9.9
Pennsylvania	8.9	10.4	9.0	9.3	10.3	8.8	8.6	10.1
Rhode Island	7.8	8.0	8.8	7.4	9.1	8.5	9.4	10.6
South Carolina	10.3	9.5	9.2	6.5	7.4	7.5	7.1	7.6
South Dakota	9.3	8.2	6.4	6.9	7.6	5.6	7.5	7.0
Tennessee	11.1	11.5	8.9	8.8	9.6	8.9	8.7	9.1
Texas	7.7	6.7	6.2	8.9	7.6	7.8	8.7	8.7
Utah	7.2	6.6	6.3	4.4	5.0	4.1	5.7	5.3
Vermont	13.2	14.0	12.0	13.1	13.6	12.5	13.3	12.0
Virginia	13.9	12.2	11.3	10.9	10.7	10.2	10.5	11.2
Washington	8.7	7.9	6.9	8.8	8.1	8.6	8.3	9.8
West Virginia	8.8	8.2	9.0	8.7	8.4	9.7	7.9	9.4
Wisconsin	10.0	7.2	6.6	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.8	6.9
Wyoming	5.4	6.2	5.3	5.9	5.0	7.5	7.8	7.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.4a. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2000

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	(Standard Error)	
United States	**16,879**	**100.0**	**1,903**	**100.0**	**1,626**	**100.0**	**9.6**	**(0.4)**
Alabama	394	2.3	48	2.5	38	2.3	9.7	(1.1)
Alaska	37	0.2	5	0.3	2	0.1	6.1	(1.1)
Arizona	256	1.5	19	1.0	14	0.9	5.4	(0.4)
Arkansas	246	1.5	34	1.8	25	1.5	10.0	(0.6)
California	1,799	10.7	33	1.7	24	1.5	1.3	(0.3)
Colorado	153	0.9	20	1.0	17	1.1	11.3	(0.7)
Connecticut	164	1.0	19	1.0	18	1.1	10.8	(1.0)
Delaware	32	0.2	2	0.1	2	0.1	5.1	(1.0)
District of Columbia	81	0.5	6	0.3	5	0.3	6.4	(0.9)
Florida	865	5.1	175	9.2	155	9.5	17.9	(0.9)
Georgia	542	3.2	67	3.5	57	3.5	10.4	(0.6)
Hawaii	118	0.7	17	0.9	15	0.9	12.5	(1.0)
Idaho	56	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3	8.2	(0.8)
Illinois	758	4.5	69	3.6	59	3.6	7.7	(0.5)
Indiana	293	1.7	28	1.5	24	1.5	8.3	(0.6)
Iowa	120	0.7	11	0.6	10	0.6	7.9	(0.5)
Kansas	116	0.7	14	0.7	13	0.8	11.1	(0.9)
Kentucky	396	2.3	44	2.3	37	2.3	9.5	(0.6)
Louisiana	493	2.9	53	2.8	39	2.4	7.9	(0.5)
Maine	100	0.6	17	0.9	16	1.0	15.7	(1.0)
Maryland	218	1.3	31	1.6	24	1.5	11.1	(1.0)
Massachusetts	229	1.4	25	1.3	24	1.5	10.3	(0.7)
Michigan	611	3.6	60	3.1	54	3.3	8.9	(0.7)
Minnesota	194	1.2	21	1.1	20	1.2	10.1	(0.7)
Mississippi	271	1.6	41	2.1	31	1.9	11.4	(0.5)
Missouri	412	2.4	42	2.2	37	2.3	9.1	(0.6)
Montana	58	0.3	6	0.3	5	0.3	8.4	(1.1)
Nebraska	82	0.5	8	0.4	8	0.5	9.3	(1.0)
Nevada	61	0.4	8	0.4	7	0.4	11.5	(1.0)
New Hampshire	36	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.3	12.1	(1.5)
New Jersey	339	2.0	46	2.4	41	2.5	12.2	(0.8)
New Mexico	169	1.0	18	0.9	13	0.8	7.4	(0.7)
New York	1,439	8.5	256	13.5	236	14.5	16.4	(1.2)
North Carolina	474	2.8	68	3.6	58	3.5	12.2	(0.6)
North Dakota	31	0.2	3	0.2	3	0.2	9.8	(1.0)
Ohio	601	3.6	61	3.2	55	3.4	9.1	(0.6)
Oklahoma	250	1.5	31	1.6	27	1.7	11.0	(0.6)
Oregon	226	1.3	23	1.2	21	1.3	9.3	(0.8)
Pennsylvania	760	4.5	75	3.9	68	4.2	8.9	(0.6)
Rhode Island	71	0.4	6	0.3	6	0.3	7.8	(0.7)
South Carolina	295	1.7	39	2.1	31	1.9	10.3	(0.6)
South Dakota	43	0.3	5	0.3	4	0.2	9.3	(1.0)
Tennessee	492	2.9	63	3.3	54	3.3	11.1	(0.6)
Texas	1,326	7.9	129	6.8	102	6.3	7.7	(0.5)
Utah	79	0.5	6	0.3	6	0.3	7.2	(1.0)
Vermont	40	0.2	6	0.3	5	0.3	13.2	(1.6)
Virginia	329	2.0	57	3.0	46	2.8	13.9	(0.8)
Washington	288	1.7	28	1.5	25	1.5	8.7	(0.6)
West Virginia	226	1.3	26	1.4	20	1.2	8.8	(0.6)
Wisconsin	186	1.1	21	1.1	19	1.1	10.0	(0.6)
Wyoming	22	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	5.4	(0.8)

Source: Revised FY 2000 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4b. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2001

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	(Standard Error)	
United States	**16,815**	**100.0**	**1,809**	**100.0**	**1,562**	**100.0**	**9.3**	**(0.3)**
Alabama	394	2.3	47	2.6	35	2.2	8.8	(0.6)
Alaska	36	0.2	3	0.2	1	0.1	3.9	(0.8)
Arizona	286	1.7	19	1.0	13	0.8	4.5	(0.4)
Arkansas	254	1.5	30	1.7	22	1.4	8.8	(0.5)
California	1,617	9.6	20	1.1	16	1.0	1.0	(0.2)
Colorado	149	0.9	16	0.9	14	0.9	9.7	(0.7)
Connecticut	152	0.9	20	1.1	18	1.1	11.6	(0.8)
Delaware	31	0.2	2	0.1	2	0.1	6.0	(0.8)
District of Columbia	71	0.4	6	0.3	5	0.3	7.2	(0.7)
Florida	853	5.1	179	9.9	163	10.4	19.1	(0.8)
Georgia	555	3.3	70	3.8	57	3.6	10.2	(0.7)
Hawaii	106	0.6	15	0.8	14	0.9	13.2	(1.0)
Idaho	58	0.3	4	0.2	4	0.3	6.9	(0.7)
Illinois	798	4.7	76	4.2	66	4.2	8.2	(0.8)
Indiana	335	2.0	26	1.5	24	1.5	7.1	(0.5)
Iowa	124	0.7	10	0.6	9	0.6	7.4	(0.5)
Kansas	119	0.7	13	0.7	12	0.8	10.0	(0.7)
Kentucky	402	2.4	44	2.5	37	2.4	9.1	(0.6)
Louisiana	510	3.0	38	2.1	31	2.0	6.1	(0.5)
Maine	102	0.6	14	0.8	13	0.8	12.8	(0.8)
Maryland	205	1.2	25	1.4	22	1.4	10.6	(0.7)
Massachusetts	215	1.3	24	1.4	23	1.5	10.6	(0.7)
Michigan	626	3.7	58	3.2	54	3.5	8.7	(0.5)
Minnesota	193	1.1	22	1.2	19	1.2	9.8	(0.6)
Mississippi	294	1.7	35	1.9	28	1.8	9.6	(0.5)
Missouri	434	2.6	40	2.2	35	2.3	8.1	(0.8)
Montana	60	0.4	5	0.3	4	0.3	7.1	(0.7)
Nebraska	77	0.5	9	0.5	8	0.5	10.2	(0.7)
Nevada	68	0.4	9	0.5	8	0.5	12.1	(1.0)
New Hampshire	34	0.2	4	0.2	4	0.2	11.0	(1.3)
New Jersey	311	1.8	48	2.7	43	2.7	13.7	(0.7)
New Mexico	160	1.0	17	0.9	13	0.8	8.0	(0.5)
New York	1,321	7.9	230	12.7	213	13.6	16.1	(0.9)
North Carolina	480	2.9	63	3.5	52	3.3	10.8	(0.6)
North Dakota	37	0.2	4	0.2	4	0.2	9.8	(0.9)
Ohio	625	3.7	61	3.4	54	3.5	8.7	(0.7)
Oklahoma	254	1.5	34	1.9	28	1.8	11.0	(0.6)
Oregon	266	1.6	25	1.4	23	1.5	8.7	(0.7)
Pennsylvania	731	4.3	87	4.8	76	4.9	10.4	(0.6)
Rhode Island	70	0.4	6	0.3	6	0.4	8.0	(0.7)
South Carolina	314	1.9	37	2.1	30	1.9	9.5	(0.5)
South Dakota	44	0.3	4	0.2	4	0.2	8.2	(1.1)
Tennessee	512	3.0	71	3.9	59	3.8	11.5	(0.7)
Texas	1,345	8.0	116	6.4	90	5.8	6.7	(0.4)
Utah	77	0.5	5	0.3	5	0.3	6.6	(0.7)
Vermont	37	0.2	5	0.3	5	0.3	14.0	(1.5)
Virginia	326	1.9	45	2.5	40	2.5	12.2	(0.6)
Washington	300	1.8	26	1.4	24	1.5	7.9	(0.7)
West Virginia	215	1.3	21	1.1	18	1.1	8.2	(0.5)
Wisconsin	210	1.2	17	0.9	15	1.0	7.2	(0.5)
Wyoming	22	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	6.2	(0.8)

Source: Revised FY 2001 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4c. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2002

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent		(Standard Error)
United States	**18,572**	**100.0**	**1,829**	**100.0**	**1,575**	**100.0**	**8.5**	**(0.2)**
Alabama	426	2.3	36	2.0	28	1.8	6.6	(0.5)
Alaska	44	0.2	4	0.2	2	0.1	5.0	(0.7)
Arizona	372	2.0	19	1.1	15	1.0	4.1	(0.4)
Arkansas	280	1.5	26	1.4	21	1.3	7.6	(0.5)
California	1,651	8.9	24	1.3	19	1.2	1.1	(0.3)
Colorado	174	0.9	17	0.9	15	0.9	8.5	(0.6)
Connecticut	163	0.9	19	1.1	18	1.2	11.1	(0.8)
Delaware	38	0.2	2	0.1	2	0.1	5.4	(0.6)
District of Columbia	71	0.4	6	0.3	5	0.3	6.5	(0.8)
Florida	929	5.0	178	9.7	166	10.5	17.8	(0.9)
Georgia	631	3.4	73	4.0	57	3.6	9.0	(0.6)
Hawaii	105	0.6	16	0.9	15	1.0	14.5	(0.9)
Idaho	67	0.4	4	0.2	4	0.3	6.1	(0.8)
Illinois	862	4.6	74	4.1	65	4.2	7.6	(0.5)
Indiana	396	2.1	28	1.5	24	1.5	5.9	(0.5)
Iowa	139	0.7	11	0.6	10	0.6	6.9	(0.5)
Kansas	135	0.7	13	0.7	12	0.7	8.6	(0.6)
Kentucky	440	2.4	47	2.6	37	2.4	8.5	(0.6)
Louisiana	579	3.1	38	2.1	29	1.8	4.9	(0.4)
Maine	110	0.6	16	0.9	14	0.9	13.1	(0.8)
Maryland	223	1.2	25	1.4	22	1.4	9.8	(0.6)
Massachusetts	241	1.3	23	1.3	21	1.3	8.6	(0.6)
Michigan	724	3.9	63	3.4	57	3.6	7.8	(0.5)
Minnesota	213	1.1	24	1.3	21	1.3	9.8	(0.8)
Mississippi	320	1.7	36	2.0	27	1.7	8.6	(0.5)
Missouri	490	2.6	43	2.3	37	2.4	7.6	(0.7)
Montana	61	0.3	5	0.3	4	0.3	7.0	(0.7)
Nebraska	85	0.5	8	0.5	8	0.5	9.3	(0.7)
Nevada	96	0.5	12	0.7	10	0.6	10.3	(0.8)
New Hampshire	39	0.2	5	0.3	5	0.3	12.4	(1.4)
New Jersey	318	1.7	45	2.5	38	2.4	12.0	(0.7)
New Mexico	167	0.9	17	1.0	13	0.8	7.7	(0.5)
New York	1,334	7.2	238	13.0	221	14.1	16.6	(0.9)
North Carolina	567	3.1	68	3.7	53	3.4	9.4	(0.5)
North Dakota	36	0.2	4	0.2	3	0.2	8.9	(0.8)
Ohio	719	3.9	56	3.0	51	3.3	7.1	(0.6)
Oklahoma	307	1.7	32	1.8	29	1.8	9.3	(0.5)
Oregon	339	1.8	27	1.5	26	1.7	7.7	(0.7)
Pennsylvania	751	4.0	77	4.2	68	4.3	9.0	(0.6)
Rhode Island	70	0.4	6	0.4	6	0.4	8.8	(0.8)
South Carolina	376	2.0	44	2.4	35	2.2	9.2	(0.6)
South Dakota	47	0.3	3	0.2	3	0.2	6.4	(0.8)
Tennessee	577	3.1	61	3.3	52	3.3	8.9	(0.7)
Texas	1,543	8.3	123	6.7	96	6.1	6.2	(0.4)
Utah	89	0.5	7	0.4	6	0.4	6.3	(0.6)
Vermont	39	0.2	5	0.3	5	0.3	12.0	(1.2)
Virginia	346	1.9	45	2.5	39	2.5	11.3	(0.7)
Washington	340	1.8	28	1.5	23	1.5	6.9	(0.5)
West Virginia	229	1.2	26	1.4	21	1.3	9.0	(0.6)
Wisconsin	251	1.4	19	1.0	17	1.1	6.6	(0.5)
Wyoming	23	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	5.3	(0.8)

Source: Revised FY 2002 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4d. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2003

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over (Standard Error)	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent		
United States	**20,738**	**100.0**	**1,994**	**100.0**	**1,689**	**100.0**	**8.1**	**(0.1)**
Alabama	460	2.2	44	2.2	33	1.9	7.1	(0.5)
Alaska	49	0.2	5	0.2	2	0.1	4.7	(0.7)
Arizona	448	2.2	32	1.6	23	1.3	5.0	(0.4)
Arkansas	307	1.5	30	1.5	22	1.3	7.2	(0.4)
California	1,681	8.1	36	1.8	24	1.4	1.4	(0.3)
Colorado	202	1.0	19	0.9	16	1.0	8.1	(0.6)
Connecticut	175	0.8	23	1.1	20	1.2	11.3	(0.7)
Delaware	45	0.2	3	0.2	3	0.2	5.9	(0.6)
District of Columbia	79	0.4	5	0.3	4	0.3	5.6	(0.6)
Florida	1,007	4.9	179	9.0	164	9.7	16.3	(0.7)
Georgia	735	3.5	75	3.8	56	3.3	7.6	(0.5)
Hawaii	99	0.5	16	0.8	14	0.9	14.7	(0.9)
Idaho	78	0.4	4	0.2	4	0.2	4.7	(0.6)
Illinois	936	4.5	87	4.4	69	4.1	7.4	(0.6)
Indiana	451	2.2	33	1.7	30	1.8	6.6	(0.5)
Iowa	150	0.7	11	0.5	9	0.5	5.9	(0.4)
Kansas	154	0.7	13	0.6	12	0.7	7.7	(0.5)
Kentucky	488	2.4	52	2.6	41	2.4	8.4	(0.5)
Louisiana	637	3.1	62	3.1	44	2.6	6.9	(0.4)
Maine	128	0.6	18	0.9	16	1.0	12.7	(0.7)
Maryland	249	1.2	25	1.2	21	1.2	8.3	(0.5)
Massachusetts	291	1.4	27	1.3	24	1.4	8.2	(0.6)
Michigan	817	3.9	80	4.0	65	3.8	8.0	(0.6)
Minnesota	229	1.1	21	1.0	18	1.1	8.1	(0.6)
Mississippi	351	1.7	39	1.9	32	1.9	9.0	(0.4)
Missouri	573	2.8	50	2.5	41	2.5	7.2	(0.5)
Montana	71	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3	6.8	(0.7)
Nebraska	96	0.5	9	0.5	9	0.5	8.9	(0.7)
Nevada	108	0.5	11	0.5	10	0.6	9.3	(0.8)
New Hampshire	43	0.2	4	0.2	4	0.2	9.1	(1.1)
New Jersey	336	1.6	42	2.1	37	2.2	10.9	(0.6)
New Mexico	191	0.9	17	0.9	12	0.7	6.3	(0.4)
New York	1,417	6.8	155	7.8	152	9.0	10.8	(0.8)
North Carolina	636	3.1	67	3.4	58	3.4	9.1	(0.5)
North Dakota	39	0.2	4	0.2	4	0.2	9.0	(0.7)
Ohio	838	4.0	73	3.6	66	3.9	7.9	(0.5)
Oklahoma	367	1.8	33	1.7	27	1.6	7.4	(0.5)
Oregon	370	1.8	34	1.7	31	1.8	8.4	(0.6)
Pennsylvania	806	3.9	88	4.4	75	4.4	9.3	(0.6)
Rhode Island	71	0.3	6	0.3	5	0.3	7.4	(0.7)
South Carolina	443	2.1	34	1.7	29	1.7	6.5	(0.5)
South Dakota	51	0.2	5	0.3	4	0.2	6.9	(0.8)
Tennessee	706	3.4	75	3.8	62	3.7	8.8	(0.6)
Texas	1,859	9.0	197	9.9	165	9.8	8.9	(0.4)
Utah	104	0.5	6	0.3	5	0.3	4.4	(0.4)
Vermont	41	0.2	6	0.3	5	0.3	13.1	(1.2)
Virginia	383	1.8	47	2.4	42	2.5	10.9	(0.6)
Washington	390	1.9	37	1.9	34	2.0	8.8	(0.6)
West Virginia	242	1.2	26	1.3	21	1.2	8.7	(0.6)
Wisconsin	287	1.4	22	1.1	20	1.2	6.8	(0.5)
Wyoming	25	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	5.9	(0.8)

Source: Revised FY 2003 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4e. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2004

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	(Standard Error)	
United States	**23,286**	**100.0**	**2,304**	**100.0**	**1,918**	**100.0**	**8.2**	**(0.1)**
Alabama	483	2.1	37	1.6	29	1.5	5.9	(0.4)
Alaska	49	0.2	5	0.2	2	0.1	4.7	(0.8)
Arizona	518	2.2	34	1.5	24	1.3	4.6	(0.4)
Arkansas	339	1.5	30	1.3	22	1.2	6.6	(0.4)
California	1,839	7.9	49	2.1	29	1.5	1.6	(0.3)
Colorado	240	1.0	20	0.9	18	0.9	7.4	(0.5)
Connecticut	192	0.8	24	1.1	21	1.1	10.9	(0.8)
Delaware	55	0.2	4	0.2	3	0.2	6.1	(0.6)
District of Columbia	84	0.4	8	0.3	7	0.3	7.8	(0.7)
Florida	1,161	5.0	202	8.8	181	9.4	15.6	(0.6)
Georgia	839	3.6	75	3.2	56	2.9	6.7	(0.5)
Hawaii	96	0.4	17	0.7	15	0.8	15.1	(0.9)
Idaho	88	0.4	5	0.2	5	0.2	5.3	(0.5)
Illinois	1,045	4.5	103	4.5	84	4.4	8.0	(0.6)
Indiana	510	2.2	36	1.6	32	1.6	6.2	(0.5)
Iowa	175	0.8	13	0.6	11	0.6	6.5	(0.5)
Kansas	164	0.7	14	0.6	12	0.6	7.1	(0.5)
Kentucky	533	2.3	56	2.4	45	2.4	8.5	(0.6)
Louisiana	688	3.0	52	2.2	39	2.1	5.7	(0.4)
Maine	136	0.6	18	0.8	16	0.8	11.9	(0.7)
Maryland	270	1.2	26	1.1	22	1.1	8.1	(0.6)
Massachusetts	332	1.4	29	1.3	27	1.4	8.1	(0.6)
Michigan	936	4.0	80	3.5	64	3.4	6.9	(0.5)
Minnesota	237	1.0	18	0.8	17	0.9	7.4	(0.6)
Mississippi	372	1.6	37	1.6	30	1.5	8.0	(0.5)
Missouri	669	2.9	53	2.3	43	2.2	6.4	(0.5)
Montana	76	0.3	6	0.3	5	0.3	6.8	(0.7)
Nebraska	112	0.5	8	0.4	7	0.4	6.4	(0.5)
Nevada	117	0.5	15	0.6	13	0.7	11.5	(0.8)
New Hampshire	47	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2	9.0	(1.1)
New Jersey	366	1.6	52	2.2	46	2.4	12.5	(0.7)
New Mexico	219	0.9	18	0.8	14	0.7	6.5	(0.4)
New York	1,577	6.8	269	11.7	243	12.7	15.4	(0.8)
North Carolina	745	3.2	81	3.5	67	3.5	9.0	(0.5)
North Dakota	41	0.2	4	0.2	4	0.2	9.3	(0.8)
Ohio	924	4.0	80	3.5	71	3.7	7.7	(0.5)
Oklahoma	401	1.7	34	1.5	26	1.4	6.5	(0.4)
Oregon	395	1.7	39	1.7	34	1.8	8.7	(0.7)
Pennsylvania	947	4.1	113	4.9	98	5.1	10.3	(0.6)
Rhode Island	73	0.3	8	0.3	7	0.3	9.1	(0.8)
South Carolina	488	2.1	48	2.1	36	1.9	7.4	(0.5)
South Dakota	52	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2	7.6	(0.9)
Tennessee	784	3.4	92	4.0	75	3.9	9.6	(0.6)
Texas	2,237	9.6	222	9.6	171	8.9	7.6	(0.4)
Utah	123	0.5	8	0.3	6	0.3	5.0	(0.5)
Vermont	42	0.2	6	0.3	6	0.3	13.6	(1.3)
Virginia	442	1.9	57	2.5	47	2.5	10.7	(0.6)
Washington	437	1.9	40	1.7	36	1.9	8.1	(0.6)
West Virginia	248	1.1	25	1.1	21	1.1	8.4	(0.6)
Wisconsin	318	1.4	23	1.0	21	1.1	6.7	(0.5)
Wyoming	25	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	5.0	(0.8)

Source: Revised FY 2004 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4f. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2005

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	(Standard Error)	
United States	**24,841**	**100.0**	**2,406**	**100.0**	**2,045**	**100.0**	**8.2**	**(0.1)**
Alabama	523	2.1	50	2.1	33	1.6	6.2	(0.5)
Alaska	54	0.2	3	0.1	2	0.1	3.9	(0.6)
Arizona	531	2.1	40	1.7	29	1.4	5.4	(0.4)
Arkansas	367	1.5	31	1.3	25	1.2	6.9	(0.4)
California	1,958	7.9	43	1.8	30	1.5	1.6	(0.3)
Colorado	241	1.0	22	0.9	18	0.9	7.5	(0.5)
Connecticut	199	0.8	22	0.9	20	1.0	10.2	(0.7)
Delaware	61	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2	6.1	(0.7)
District of Columbia	86	0.3	6	0.3	5	0.3	6.0	(0.6)
Florida	1,240	5.0	214	8.9	192	9.4	15.5	(0.7)
Georgia	897	3.6	76	3.1	59	2.9	6.5	(0.5)
Hawaii	92	0.4	16	0.7	15	0.7	15.8	(1.0)
Idaho	91	0.4	7	0.3	5	0.3	5.9	(0.5)
Illinois	1,141	4.6	99	4.1	86	4.2	7.5	(0.6)
Indiana	539	2.2	46	1.9	39	1.9	7.3	(0.5)
Iowa	201	0.8	15	0.6	12	0.6	6.0	(0.5)
Kansas	175	0.7	17	0.7	13	0.7	7.7	(0.5)
Kentucky	561	2.3	64	2.7	50	2.5	9.0	(0.6)
Louisiana	707	2.8	63	2.6	48	2.3	6.7	(0.5)
Maine	148	0.6	17	0.7	16	0.8	10.8	(0.7)
Maryland	284	1.1	27	1.1	24	1.2	8.5	(0.5)
Massachusetts	365	1.5	40	1.7	36	1.8	9.8	(0.7)
Michigan	1,027	4.1	83	3.4	73	3.5	7.1	(0.6)
Minnesota	247	1.0	22	0.9	19	0.9	7.8	(0.6)
Mississippi	379	1.5	31	1.3	26	1.3	6.9	(0.5)
Missouri	748	3.0	61	2.6	53	2.6	7.0	(0.6)
Montana	79	0.3	6	0.3	5	0.2	5.9	(0.7)
Nebraska	116	0.5	10	0.4	9	0.4	7.7	(0.6)
Nevada	120	0.5	15	0.6	14	0.7	11.2	(0.8)
New Hampshire	51	0.2	5	0.2	5	0.2	9.7	(1.0)
New Jersey	386	1.6	52	2.2	43	2.1	11.2	(0.7)
New Mexico	236	1.0	18	0.8	13	0.7	5.7	(0.5)
New York	1,725	6.9	288	12.0	267	13.1	15.5	(0.8)
North Carolina	786	3.2	82	3.4	65	3.2	8.3	(0.5)
North Dakota	42	0.2	4	0.2	3	0.2	8.2	(0.7)
Ohio	977	3.9	85	3.5	69	3.4	7.1	(0.5)
Oklahoma	405	1.6	36	1.5	30	1.5	7.5	(0.4)
Oregon	423	1.7	45	1.9	41	2.0	9.7	(0.7)
Pennsylvania	1,019	4.1	102	4.2	90	4.4	8.8	(0.6)
Rhode Island	74	0.3	7	0.3	6	0.3	8.5	(0.7)
South Carolina	509	2.0	48	2.0	38	1.9	7.5	(0.5)
South Dakota	56	0.2	5	0.2	3	0.2	5.6	(0.7)
Tennessee	827	3.3	91	3.8	74	3.6	8.9	(0.6)
Texas	2,374	9.6	216	9.0	184	9.0	7.8	(0.6)
Utah	131	0.5	6	0.2	5	0.3	4.1	(0.4)
Vermont	44	0.2	6	0.2	5	0.3	12.5	(1.1)
Virginia	474	1.9	54	2.3	48	2.4	10.2	(0.6)
Washington	503	2.0	48	2.0	43	2.1	8.6	(0.7)
West Virginia	256	1.0	30	1.3	25	1.2	9.7	(0.7)
Wisconsin	340	1.4	24	1.0	23	1.1	6.7	(0.5)
Wyoming	25	0.1	2	0.1	2	0.1	7.5	(0.9)

Source: FY 2005 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4g. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2006

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	(Standard Error)	
United States	**25,555**	**100.0**	**2,607**	**100.0**	**2,226**	**100.0**	**8.7**	**(0.1)**
Alabama	532	2.1	40	1.5	35	1.6	6.5	(0.5)
Alaska	55	0.2	4	0.2	3	0.1	4.6	(0.7)
Arizona	520	2.0	34	1.3	27	1.2	5.3	(0.5)
Arkansas	370	1.4	29	1.1	23	1.0	6.3	(0.5)
California	1,977	7.7	46	1.8	40	1.8	2.0	(0.3)
Colorado	245	1.0	19	0.7	16	0.7	6.4	(0.4)
Connecticut	204	0.8	25	1.0	22	1.0	11.0	(0.8)
Delaware	64	0.3	5	0.2	4	0.2	6.5	(0.7)
District of Columbia	85	0.3	8	0.3	7	0.3	7.9	(0.8)
Florida	1,184	4.6	226	8.7	201	9.0	17.0	(0.8)
Georgia	910	3.6	87	3.3	64	2.9	7.1	(0.5)
Hawaii	87	0.3	17	0.6	14	0.6	16.5	(1.0)
Idaho	89	0.3	6	0.2	5	0.2	5.5	(0.5)
Illinois	1,198	4.7	107	4.1	93	4.2	7.7	(0.6)
Indiana	561	2.2	40	1.5	38	1.7	6.7	(0.5)
Iowa	220	0.9	18	0.7	16	0.7	7.3	(0.6)
Kansas	178	0.7	16	0.6	15	0.7	8.2	(0.6)
Kentucky	576	2.3	66	2.5	51	2.3	8.8	(0.5)
Louisiana	625	2.4	64	2.4	48	2.2	7.7	(0.7)
Maine	155	0.6	18	0.7	16	0.7	10.4	(0.7)
Maryland	299	1.2	30	1.2	25	1.1	8.5	(0.6)
Massachusetts	428	1.7	62	2.4	55	2.5	12.9	(0.7)
Michigan	1,114	4.4	90	3.5	79	3.5	7.1	(0.6)
Minnesota	257	1.0	24	0.9	21	1.0	8.4	(0.7)
Mississippi	404	1.6	40	1.6	33	1.5	8.1	(0.5)
Missouri	788	3.1	58	2.2	49	2.2	6.2	(0.6)
Montana	78	0.3	7	0.3	5	0.2	6.6	(0.7)
Nebraska	118	0.5	10	0.4	10	0.4	8.1	(0.6)
Nevada	116	0.5	13	0.5	12	0.6	10.7	(0.7)
New Hampshire	55	0.2	6	0.2	6	0.3	10.3	(1.1)
New Jersey	397	1.6	51	2.0	44	2.0	11.2	(0.7)
New Mexico	238	0.9	17	0.7	13	0.6	5.6	(0.5)
New York	1,753	6.9	331	12.7	299	13.4	17.0	(0.9)
North Carolina	844	3.3	108	4.1	85	3.8	10.0	(0.6)
North Dakota	42	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2	9.1	(0.7)
Ohio	1,028	4.0	95	3.6	86	3.8	8.3	(0.5)
Oklahoma	422	1.7	36	1.4	31	1.4	7.4	(0.5)
Oregon	424	1.7	53	2.0	44	2.0	10.4	(0.7)
Pennsylvania	1,069	4.2	103	3.9	92	4.1	8.6	(0.6)
Rhode Island	72	0.3	8	0.3	7	0.3	9.4	(0.8)
South Carolina	522	2.0	50	1.9	37	1.7	7.1	(0.5)
South Dakota	58	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2	7.5	(0.8)
Tennessee	841	3.3	95	3.7	73	3.3	8.7	(0.6)
Texas	2,512	9.8	264	10.1	218	9.8	8.7	(0.5)
Utah	130	0.5	8	0.3	7	0.3	5.7	(0.5)
Vermont	46	0.2	7	0.3	6	0.3	13.3	(1.2)
Virginia	492	1.9	56	2.2	52	2.3	10.5	(0.6)
Washington	527	2.1	47	1.8	44	2.0	8.3	(0.6)
West Virginia	257	1.0	25	0.9	20	0.9	7.9	(0.5)
Wisconsin	363	1.4	27	1.0	25	1.1	6.8	(0.5)
Wyoming	24	0.1	2	0.1	2	0.1	7.8	(1.2)

Source: FY 2006 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.4h. All SNAP Participants and Elderly Participants by State, FY 2007

	All SNAP Participants		Participants in Units with Elderly		Elderly Participants		Percent of Participants Age 60 or Over	
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	(Standard Error)	
United States	**25,887**	**100.0**	**2,623**	**100.0**	**2,263**	**100.0**	**8.7**	**(0.1)**
Alabama	536	2.1	38	1.4	31	1.4	5.7	(0.4)
Alaska	55	0.2	5	0.2	3	0.1	5.1	(0.7)
Arizona	532	2.1	41	1.6	30	1.3	5.7	(0.5)
Arkansas	370	1.4	33	1.3	25	1.1	6.8	(0.5)
California	2,020	7.8	40	1.5	34	1.5	1.7	(0.3)
Colorado	245	0.9	22	0.8	18	0.8	7.4	(0.5)
Connecticut	205	0.8	27	1.0	24	1.1	11.9	(0.7)
Delaware	66	0.3	5	0.2	4	0.2	6.2	(0.7)
District of Columbia	83	0.3	9	0.3	7	0.3	8.7	(0.8)
Florida	1,208	4.7	215	8.2	198	8.8	16.4	(0.8)
Georgia	910	3.5	84	3.2	66	2.9	7.2	(0.5)
Hawaii	89	0.3	15	0.6	14	0.6	15.8	(1.0)
Idaho	85	0.3	7	0.3	6	0.2	6.6	(0.6)
Illinois	1,228	4.7	102	3.9	91	4.0	7.5	(0.5)
Indiana	568	2.2	43	1.7	37	1.6	6.4	(0.5)
Iowa	231	0.9	14	0.5	13	0.6	5.7	(0.6)
Kansas	181	0.7	16	0.6	14	0.6	7.6	(0.6)
Kentucky	592	2.3	54	2.1	45	2.0	7.6	(0.5)
Louisiana	629	2.4	63	2.4	52	2.3	8.3	(0.5)
Maine	156	0.6	18	0.7	17	0.8	10.9	(0.7)
Maryland	308	1.2	34	1.3	28	1.2	9.2	(0.6)
Massachusetts	452	1.7	60	2.3	56	2.5	12.4	(0.8)
Michigan	1,183	4.6	96	3.7	83	3.7	7.0	(0.6)
Minnesota	270	1.0	27	1.0	24	1.1	8.9	(0.7)
Mississippi	421	1.6	42	1.6	35	1.5	8.3	(0.5)
Missouri	815	3.1	61	2.3	48	2.1	5.9	(0.7)
Montana	78	0.3	6	0.2	5	0.2	6.4	(0.7)
Nebraska	119	0.5	10	0.4	9	0.4	7.6	(0.6)
Nevada	120	0.5	16	0.6	14	0.6	11.5	(0.8)
New Hampshire	57	0.2	5	0.2	5	0.2	8.3	(0.9)
New Jersey	408	1.6	56	2.1	48	2.1	11.7	(0.7)
New Mexico	228	0.9	19	0.7	14	0.6	6.2	(0.5)
New York	1,767	6.8	327	12.5	302	13.4	17.1	(1.0)
North Carolina	877	3.4	107	4.1	83	3.7	9.5	(0.6)
North Dakota	45	0.2	5	0.2	5	0.2	10.3	(0.8)
Ohio	1,038	4.0	87	3.3	78	3.4	7.5	(0.4)
Oklahoma	408	1.6	35	1.3	30	1.3	7.4	(0.5)
Oregon	432	1.7	46	1.8	43	1.9	9.9	(0.7)
Pennsylvania	1,114	4.3	129	4.9	112	5.0	10.1	(0.7)
Rhode Island	75	0.3	9	0.3	8	0.4	10.6	(0.9)
South Carolina	534	2.1	52	2.0	41	1.8	7.6	(0.5)
South Dakota	60	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2	7.0	(0.8)
Tennessee	845	3.3	94	3.6	77	3.4	9.1	(0.6)
Texas	2,381	9.2	243	9.3	208	9.2	8.7	(0.5)
Utah	122	0.5	7	0.3	7	0.3	5.3	(0.5)
Vermont	49	0.2	6	0.2	6	0.3	12.0	(1.1)
Virginia	502	1.9	67	2.5	56	2.5	11.2	(0.6)
Washington	528	2.0	59	2.3	52	2.3	9.8	(0.6)
West Virginia	261	1.0	30	1.1	25	1.1	9.4	(0.7)
Wisconsin	381	1.5	29	1.1	26	1.2	6.9	(0.5)
Wyoming	22	0.1	2	0.1	2	0.1	7.4	(1.0)

Source: FY 2007 SNAP QC data file.

Table A.5. Elderly SNAP Participants by Age Cohort and Year

	Elderly Participants	Elderly Participants by Age Cohort				
		Age 60 to 64	Age 65 to 69	Age 70 to 74	Age 75 to 79	Age 80 or Older
Number (000s)						
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	393	349	332	271	281
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	367	342	328	252	272
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	403	342	302	259	269
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	433	371	327	262	296
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	509	448	353	284	325
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	567	434	379	318	346
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	588	490	426	342	380
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	622	512	394	348	386
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants						
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	24.2	21.5	20.4	16.6	17.3
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	23.5	21.9	21.0	16.2	17.4
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	25.6	21.7	19.2	16.4	17.1
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	25.6	22.0	19.4	15.5	17.5
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	26.5	23.3	18.4	14.8	16.9
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	27.7	21.2	18.5	15.6	16.9
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	26.4	22.0	19.1	15.4	17.1
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	27.5	22.6	17.4	15.4	17.1
Standard Error of Percentage						
Fiscal year 2000		0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Fiscal year 2001		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
Fiscal year 2002		0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6
Fiscal year 2003		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6
Fiscal year 2004		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
Fiscal year 2005		0.7	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7
Fiscal year 2006		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Fiscal year 2007		0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.6. Elderly SNAP Participants by Age Cohort and State, Average FY 2000–2007

	Elderly Participants (Number in 000s)	Elderly Participants by Age Cohort (Row Percent)				
		Age 60 to 64	Age 65 to 69	Age 70 to 74	Age 75 to 79	Age 80 or Older
United States	**1,863**	**26.0**	**22.1**	**19.1**	**15.7**	**17.2**
Alabama	33	26.1	21.5	18.8	13.1	20.4
Alaska	2	39.4	28.4	18.2	9.1	4.9
Arizona	22	34.6	23.3	18.8	11.1	12.2
Arkansas	23	25.7	19.9	18.3	14.5	21.7
California	27	57.6	15.9	13.6	8.1	4.8
Colorado	17	30.7	21.8	19.9	13.6	13.9
Connecticut	20	28.5	22.3	19.1	15.4	14.7
Delaware	3	28.3	26.5	18.3	11.7	15.3
District of Columbia	6	30.0	23.0	19.1	13.7	14.1
Florida	177	18.6	21.8	20.8	17.1	21.6
Georgia	59	28.6	20.4	19.1	14.7	17.2
Hawaii	14	19.5	17.8	19.8	21.9	21.0
Idaho	5	29.1	23.4	16.9	14.0	16.6
Illinois	77	27.2	24.6	18.7	14.8	14.7
Indiana	31	31.5	23.9	16.7	14.6	13.2
Iowa	11	28.3	20.0	17.8	14.3	19.6
Kansas	13	25.9	22.3	20.7	15.5	15.6
Kentucky	43	30.3	25.1	18.7	13.4	12.6
Louisiana	41	29.8	20.7	18.1	14.1	17.3
Maine	16	27.0	20.1	18.6	16.6	17.7
Maryland	24	27.2	21.9	18.1	16.7	16.1
Massachusetts	33	27.4	21.9	17.2	16.6	16.9
Michigan	66	30.8	21.9	18.3	15.6	13.5
Minnesota	20	24.7	21.0	19.9	15.5	18.9
Mississippi	30	24.1	20.6	16.3	16.4	22.6
Missouri	43	26.5	22.0	18.4	15.2	18.0
Montana	5	32.6	23.1	16.9	12.1	15.4
Nebraska	8	25.4	22.7	19.2	14.4	18.1
Nevada	11	25.8	23.7	19.9	12.6	18.0
New Hampshire	5	27.4	22.8	19.6	16.8	13.4
New Jersey	43	23.2	22.7	21.4	17.4	15.4
New Mexico	13	28.9	22.0	18.7	13.9	16.4
New York	242	20.5	23.3	20.3	17.7	18.1
North Carolina	65	25.5	18.8	20.1	16.0	19.6
North Dakota	4	21.8	18.8	17.4	18.1	23.9
Ohio	66	31.0	22.6	18.1	13.8	14.6
Oklahoma	29	27.1	22.4	16.6	15.7	18.3
Oregon	33	30.4	23.0	19.5	12.9	14.2
Pennsylvania	85	30.6	23.5	16.7	14.7	14.4
Rhode Island	6	23.4	23.1	20.5	16.1	16.9
South Carolina	35	27.3	21.2	18.2	14.6	18.7
South Dakota	4	27.0	16.5	18.6	15.3	22.7
Tennessee	66	26.3	21.7	19.4	15.4	17.3
Texas	154	21.9	21.6	20.4	17.9	18.3
Utah	6	30.5	19.7	20.0	15.9	14.0
Vermont	5	23.9	21.1	19.0	16.9	19.0
Virginia	46	24.3	21.9	19.6	15.6	18.6
Washington	35	28.9	23.8	18.0	14.7	14.6
West Virginia	21	34.3	22.6	16.4	13.3	13.4
Wisconsin	21	26.2	20.9	17.8	15.4	19.7
Wyoming	1	25.6	24.3	21.0	15.3	13.8

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.7a. Percentage of SNAP Participants Age 60 to 64 by State and Year

	SNAP Participants Age 60 to 64 (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**24.2**	**23.5**	**25.6**	**25.6**	**26.5**	**27.7**	**26.4**	**27.5**
Alabama	24.7	26.3	24.2	26.4	24.4	29.7	24.3	29.0
Alaska	40.7	41.7	40.4	37.2	31.5	38.1	45.6	39.8
Arizona	31.3	33.8	35.4	36.4	34.8	35.0	34.2	34.5
Arkansas	20.4	22.0	23.1	28.0	30.2	25.7	28.8	27.3
California	75.1	55.5	69.0	54.7	54.1	66.5	47.8	48.6
Colorado	30.2	24.9	32.3	27.5	30.0	34.1	31.7	34.1
Connecticut	30.8	28.3	28.4	27.3	29.7	24.9	27.3	30.8
Delaware	19.4	23.2	34.3	27.3	22.2	34.3	27.9	31.9
District of Columbia	20.5	24.7	37.7	40.1	32.0	28.9	25.4	32.6
Florida	17.5	16.1	18.5	22.1	19.9	20.6	16.3	18.1
Georgia	23.8	24.8	23.2	25.6	34.7	24.5	31.7	38.9
Hawaii	16.7	20.5	19.2	18.4	17.0	19.2	22.0	23.4
Idaho	21.9	23.5	30.4	22.9	30.2	31.0	38.5	31.6
Illinois	32.4	23.7	24.4	24.1	26.6	30.1	27.1	28.6
Indiana	30.6	30.9	33.5	30.3	29.1	35.1	27.5	34.6
Iowa	25.7	30.6	24.2	25.6	31.5	34.2	25.0	29.1
Kansas	22.3	17.2	21.1	24.9	29.6	28.9	28.6	32.6
Kentucky	21.2	27.8	26.7	30.4	33.0	33.9	33.8	31.8
Louisiana	26.1	17.9	30.7	34.1	29.1	35.0	32.0	29.6
Maine	25.3	27.6	29.1	28.6	23.2	28.7	28.4	25.8
Maryland	29.1	28.3	22.8	25.9	30.7	28.6	28.2	24.2
Massachusetts	25.4	22.6	26.3	22.4	27.9	31.5	27.8	29.4
Michigan	30.5	27.9	31.5	32.5	32.9	32.5	33.9	24.9
Minnesota	23.2	25.4	23.9	24.6	24.3	26.1	23.0	26.9
Mississippi	20.8	25.1	26.5	24.9	21.8	21.9	22.9	28.3
Missouri	19.7	22.8	26.9	24.3	27.6	31.0	26.5	30.1
Montana	30.7	35.1	26.1	31.9	24.7	34.0	39.3	38.3
Nebraska	21.2	20.5	22.8	24.3	25.6	23.9	27.9	35.6
Nevada	31.1	26.6	18.8	34.3	31.1	22.0	22.6	22.6
New Hampshire	24.1	32.1	25.9	31.1	20.0	33.4	26.0	27.1
New Jersey	21.8	24.2	22.5	20.4	21.9	20.6	31.5	22.0
New Mexico	31.2	22.5	30.4	27.5	29.9	37.4	24.2	27.7
New York	18.7	22.5	18.6	23.6	17.2	24.7	19.2	20.8
North Carolina	17.6	21.2	26.0	20.7	31.0	27.6	27.8	28.2
North Dakota	19.8	17.2	26.7	21.2	27.4	16.0	17.5	27.0
Ohio	31.9	29.7	29.8	30.8	32.5	29.7	29.7	33.3
Oklahoma	23.9	27.0	25.5	22.1	30.1	26.9	29.3	31.0
Oregon	26.5	26.1	31.1	33.0	29.5	29.8	34.5	29.2
Pennsylvania	35.1	23.2	33.2	25.2	31.8	30.3	31.7	33.1
Rhode Island	17.5	24.3	19.0	34.5	27.5	20.8	25.6	20.0
South Carolina	25.0	22.7	28.1	19.9	31.5	24.9	32.1	31.3
South Dakota	32.8	22.3	21.2	22.8	32.7	31.1	23.6	28.2
Tennessee	17.7	19.4	20.2	26.0	28.4	30.5	28.1	34.0
Texas	20.4	19.5	30.4	18.4	21.4	20.2	23.2	23.0
Utah	24.4	25.5	26.8	30.2	36.9	36.8	34.7	26.7
Vermont	26.0	25.7	23.5	17.3	20.0	28.2	24.0	26.2
Virginia	20.2	22.9	23.5	24.1	23.2	30.9	22.1	26.6
Washington	25.5	24.4	29.0	24.3	33.5	30.2	29.6	30.9
West Virginia	38.1	31.7	35.6	30.3	34.8	33.0	37.6	33.6
Wisconsin	17.8	20.0	25.1	30.3	25.5	23.3	28.2	34.5
Wyoming	28.9	24.2	21.8	35.0	21.9	28.8	15.6	29.6

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.7b. Percentage of SNAP Participants Age 65 to 74 by State and Year

	SNAP Participants Age 65 to 74 (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**41.9**	**42.9**	**40.9**	**41.4**	**41.7**	**39.8**	**41.1**	**40.1**
Alabama	43.4	37.0	43.8	31.4	41.0	44.8	40.4	41.1
Alaska	43.0	58.3	47.6	48.1	53.4	44.1	45.8	38.5
Arizona	39.4	41.9	35.1	40.8	51.1	42.7	42.8	39.5
Arkansas	38.8	40.9	38.3	34.6	31.8	39.0	36.3	44.9
California	12.2	37.7	18.1	31.1	37.3	24.6	39.8	28.8
Colorado	38.3	49.1	38.4	42.4	42.6	42.4	41.9	39.7
Connecticut	34.1	42.4	44.2	45.0	39.7	41.6	39.5	44.1
Delaware	43.6	51.8	40.8	46.6	42.4	37.5	53.4	42.5
District of Columbia	49.0	40.9	42.2	35.9	41.9	42.2	41.6	42.7
Florida	40.8	41.2	41.0	39.7	42.6	45.0	46.3	42.8
Georgia	40.0	40.4	42.1	38.9	30.3	44.3	43.3	36.1
Hawaii	46.4	37.7	38.7	35.8	35.8	41.4	37.0	27.6
Idaho	48.5	33.8	38.1	48.7	38.6	40.8	32.9	41.5
Illinois	43.2	47.4	41.0	47.5	45.4	37.9	40.4	45.2
Indiana	41.4	41.0	43.1	37.7	52.2	37.3	39.9	35.2
Iowa	37.0	37.0	45.4	40.5	33.7	32.8	39.4	38.0
Kansas	40.9	44.2	47.5	40.4	47.6	40.4	40.8	43.6
Kentucky	48.5	42.9	40.3	41.5	40.4	45.7	45.9	44.0
Louisiana	47.0	39.2	39.4	33.7	33.2	33.5	42.1	42.2
Maine	44.8	37.3	38.7	38.0	40.9	31.3	41.9	36.3
Maryland	42.6	39.9	42.3	40.2	40.0	35.6	41.8	38.4
Massachusetts	45.6	47.7	37.0	45.5	38.8	34.5	35.9	37.2
Michigan	41.1	44.7	36.5	40.9	40.2	38.8	36.7	43.2
Minnesota	43.7	38.3	40.9	46.9	37.9	35.4	45.4	38.4
Mississippi	33.9	36.8	32.9	38.6	38.9	38.6	39.6	35.8
Missouri	43.7	46.8	40.1	39.7	41.8	37.0	38.0	38.4
Montana	32.7	39.5	42.1	53.7	48.5	27.9	38.0	37.1
Nebraska	40.7	37.7	39.8	51.6	40.7	41.9	45.3	37.0
Nevada	43.4	38.3	53.1	42.8	37.6	48.6	42.8	42.2
New Hampshire	43.5	42.5	44.9	38.9	48.6	40.7	38.3	42.7
New Jersey	43.9	44.7	44.7	43.5	48.4	45.6	39.2	42.8
New Mexico	41.3	48.2	43.0	41.6	41.2	31.5	40.0	39.7
New York	45.2	47.0	46.0	44.0	46.4	40.2	42.9	39.5
North Carolina	41.8	40.6	42.8	44.9	36.4	37.5	38.0	32.7
North Dakota	38.4	37.7	36.8	40.7	35.2	36.9	35.4	30.9
Ohio	33.7	41.8	44.1	45.3	43.1	41.4	34.2	42.5
Oklahoma	39.6	36.0	41.0	43.0	37.0	40.3	38.7	36.3
Oregon	44.5	42.1	43.2	37.8	46.9	45.6	36.4	44.9
Pennsylvania	39.6	47.3	37.9	42.0	35.7	42.3	40.9	37.8
Rhode Island	51.2	43.7	49.2	36.2	39.4	42.5	41.4	44.9
South Carolina	39.3	43.5	38.0	40.0	37.4	43.2	34.9	39.5
South Dakota	33.1	33.4	35.3	34.4	27.7	36.6	40.6	38.6
Tennessee	46.3	44.9	36.5	37.4	41.2	40.7	43.0	38.4
Texas	44.8	41.6	39.6	45.7	44.4	34.1	43.7	41.9
Utah	41.6	42.5	43.2	42.5	32.1	30.5	38.1	47.3
Vermont	35.1	36.7	33.6	34.5	38.2	47.1	42.7	50.8
Virginia	40.4	44.2	38.4	41.0	48.0	41.9	41.5	37.0
Washington	51.5	39.9	44.2	38.6	43.0	38.1	37.9	44.7
West Virginia	37.1	42.7	38.6	35.5	37.1	40.2	38.9	41.4
Wisconsin	41.0	41.2	33.0	41.5	36.0	39.6	42.8	34.8
Wyoming	36.8	33.5	43.9	34.3	58.0	50.3	54.7	46.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.7c. Percentage of SNAP Participants Age 75 or Older by State and Year

	SNAP Participants Age 75 or Older (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**33.9**	**33.6**	**33.5**	**33.0**	**31.7**	**32.5**	**32.4**	**32.4**
Alabama	31.9	36.7	32.0	42.2	34.7	25.4	35.3	29.8
Alaska	16.3	0.0	12.0	14.7	15.1	17.9	8.7	21.6
Arizona	29.3	24.2	29.5	22.8	14.1	22.2	23.0	26.0
Arkansas	40.9	37.1	38.6	37.4	38.0	35.3	34.9	27.8
California	12.7	6.8	12.9	14.2	8.6	8.9	12.4	22.7
Colorado	31.5	26.0	29.3	30.1	27.4	23.5	26.4	26.1
Connecticut	35.2	29.3	27.3	27.7	30.6	33.5	33.2	25.2
Delaware	36.9	25.0	24.9	26.2	35.4	28.2	18.6	25.6
District of Columbia	30.5	34.4	20.1	24.0	26.1	28.9	33.0	24.7
Florida	41.7	42.7	40.5	38.1	37.5	34.4	37.4	39.1
Georgia	36.2	34.8	34.7	35.5	34.9	31.2	25.1	24.9
Hawaii	36.9	41.8	42.1	45.8	47.2	39.4	41.0	49.0
Idaho	29.6	42.7	31.6	28.3	31.2	28.2	28.6	26.9
Illinois	24.4	28.9	34.5	28.4	28.1	32.0	32.6	26.2
Indiana	28.0	28.1	23.4	32.0	18.7	27.6	32.6	30.2
Iowa	37.3	32.4	30.4	33.9	34.9	33.0	35.7	32.9
Kansas	36.8	38.7	31.4	34.7	22.8	30.8	30.5	23.8
Kentucky	30.3	29.3	32.9	28.1	26.7	20.3	20.3	24.2
Louisiana	26.9	42.9	30.0	32.2	37.7	31.5	26.0	28.1
Maine	29.9	35.1	32.2	33.4	35.9	40.0	29.8	37.8
Maryland	28.3	31.8	34.8	33.9	29.3	35.7	30.1	37.4
Massachusetts	29.0	29.7	36.7	32.1	33.3	34.1	36.3	33.4
Michigan	28.5	27.5	32.0	26.6	26.9	28.7	29.4	31.9
Minnesota	33.2	36.3	35.2	28.5	37.8	38.4	31.6	34.7
Mississippi	45.3	38.1	40.6	36.6	39.3	39.5	37.6	35.8
Missouri	36.6	30.4	33.0	36.1	30.6	32.1	35.6	31.5
Montana	36.6	25.4	31.7	14.4	26.8	38.0	22.7	24.5
Nebraska	38.1	41.8	37.4	24.1	33.7	34.2	26.8	27.4
Nevada	25.6	35.0	28.1	22.8	31.3	29.4	34.7	35.1
New Hampshire	32.4	25.4	29.2	29.9	31.4	25.9	35.6	30.2
New Jersey	34.4	31.1	32.8	36.1	29.7	33.8	29.2	35.2
New Mexico	27.5	29.3	26.7	30.9	28.9	31.2	35.8	32.6
New York	36.1	30.5	35.4	32.4	36.4	35.1	37.9	39.7
North Carolina	40.6	38.2	31.2	34.3	32.6	34.9	34.2	39.1
North Dakota	41.7	45.2	36.5	38.1	37.3	47.1	47.1	42.1
Ohio	34.3	28.5	26.1	23.9	24.4	28.8	36.2	24.2
Oklahoma	36.5	36.9	33.5	34.9	32.8	32.8	32.0	32.7
Oregon	29.0	31.8	25.7	29.2	23.6	24.5	29.2	25.9
Pennsylvania	25.3	29.4	28.8	32.7	32.4	27.4	27.4	29.1
Rhode Island	31.3	32.0	31.8	29.3	33.0	36.8	32.9	35.1
South Carolina	35.7	33.8	33.9	40.1	31.1	31.9	33.0	29.1
South Dakota	34.1	44.2	43.5	42.8	39.6	32.4	35.8	33.1
Tennessee	36.0	35.7	43.3	36.5	30.4	28.9	28.9	27.6
Texas	34.8	38.9	30.0	35.9	34.2	45.7	33.1	35.1
Utah	34.0	32.0	30.0	27.3	31.0	32.7	27.2	26.0
Vermont	38.9	37.5	42.9	48.2	41.8	24.8	33.3	23.0
Virginia	39.4	32.9	38.1	34.9	28.7	27.2	36.3	36.4
Washington	23.1	35.6	26.8	37.1	23.6	31.7	32.5	24.4
West Virginia	24.8	25.6	25.8	34.2	28.0	26.9	23.5	24.9
Wisconsin	41.2	38.8	41.8	28.2	38.6	37.1	29.0	30.7
Wyoming	34.4	42.4	34.3	30.6	20.1	20.9	29.7	24.0

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.8. Elderly SNAP Participants by Type of Eligibility and Year

	Elderly SNAP Participants	Elderly Participants by Mutually Exclusive Type of Eligibility			
		SSI CAP Participant	Pass Income and Asset Tests	Categorically Eligible	
				Pure PA	Other
Number (000s)					
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	0	1,612	15	0
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	0	1,542	16	3
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	0	1,558	11	6
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	0	1,663	14	12
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	191	1,705	11	10
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	225	1,792	11	17
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	232	1,962	12	20
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	288	1,938	14	23
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants					
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	0.0	99.1	0.9	0.0
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	0.0	98.8	1.0	0.2
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	0.0	98.9	0.7	0.4
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	0.0	98.5	0.8	0.7
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	10.0	88.9	0.6	0.5
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	11.0	87.7	0.5	0.8
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	10.4	88.2	0.5	0.9
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	12.7	85.6	0.6	1.0
Standard Error of Percentage					
Fiscal year 2000		-	0.1	0.1	-
Fiscal year 2001		-	0.2	0.1	0.1
Fiscal year 2002		-	0.1	0.1	0.1
Fiscal year 2003		-	0.2	0.1	0.1
Fiscal year 2004		0.5	0.5	0.1	0.1
Fiscal year 2005		0.6	0.7	0.1	0.1
Fiscal year 2006		0.5	0.6	0.1	0.2
Fiscal year 2007		0.6	0.6	0.1	0.2

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.9. Elderly SNAP Participants by Type of Eligibility and State, Average FY 2000–2007

	Elderly Non-SSI CAP Participants (Number in (000s)	Elderly by Mutually Exclusive Type of Eligibility (Row Percent)		
		Pass Income and Asset Tests	Categorically Eligible	
			Pure PA	Other
United States	**1,746**	**98.6**	**0.7**	**0.7**
Alabama	33	99.3	0.6	0.8
Alaska	2	95.3	4.7	0.0
Arizona	22	99.6	0.1	1.4
Arkansas	23	99.5	0.5	0.0
California	27	99.3	0.5	1.3
Colorado	17	92.5	7.5	0.0
Connecticut	20	98.8	1.0	0.3
Delaware	3	92.7	1.1	6.3
District of Columbia	6	99.9	0.0	0.8
Florida	165	99.4	0.6	0.0
Georgia	59	99.3	0.6	0.7
Hawaii	14	99.9	0.1	0.0
Idaho	5	98.7	1.1	0.5
Illinois	77	99.7	0.3	0.0
Indiana	31	99.5	0.6	0.0
Iowa	11	98.5	1.4	0.3
Kansas	13	99.7	0.4	0.0
Kentucky	42	98.7	1.3	0.0
Louisiana	41	99.6	0.6	0.0
Maine	16	99.3	0.6	0.1
Maryland	24	99.3	0.5	0.4
Massachusetts	32	98.2	1.2	0.7
Michigan	66	93.7	0.9	5.4
Minnesota	20	98.9	1.1	0.0
Mississippi	24	99.4	0.6	0.0
Missouri	43	99.1	0.9	0.0
Montana	5	99.2	1.0	0.0
Nebraska	8	99.7	0.3	0.0
Nevada	11	99.7	0.2	0.1
New Hampshire	5	99.6	0.4	0.0
New Jersey	43	99.8	0.2	0.0
New Mexico	13	99.1	0.8	0.3
New York	190	98.9	0.8	0.4
North Carolina	61	99.0	0.9	0.5
North Dakota	4	98.1	1.6	0.6
Ohio	66	99.4	0.6	0.0
Oklahoma	29	99.0	1.0	0.2
Oregon	33	92.3	0.6	8.3
Pennsylvania	84	99.4	0.6	0.0
Rhode Island	6	99.0	0.8	1.1
South Carolina	31	99.8	0.2	0.3
South Dakota	4	99.8	0.4	0.0
Tennessee	66	99.4	0.6	0.3
Texas	126	97.1	0.8	2.9
Utah	6	99.4	0.6	0.0
Vermont	5	99.0	1.0	0.0
Virginia	46	99.6	0.4	0.0
Washington	28	99.0	0.5	0.9
West Virginia	21	98.7	1.3	0.0
Wisconsin	21	92.9	1.9	6.0
Wyoming	1	99.8	0.4	0.0

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.10. SSI CAP Participants by State and Year

	SSI CAP Participants			
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
Number (000s)				
United States	191	225	232	288
Florida	0	13	40	45
Kentucky	0	0	0	6
Louisiana	0	0	0	5
Massachusetts	0	2	1	5
Mississippi	13	9	11	15
New York	101	119	106	91
North Carolina	0	3	3	24
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	6
South Carolina	10	6	11	4
Texas	55	61	44	67
Virginia	0	0	0	1
Washington	12	12	14	17
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants				
United States	10.0	11.0	10.4	12.7
Florida	0.0	6.7	20.1	22.8
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.7
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3
Massachusetts	0.0	4.5	2.5	8.6
Mississippi	42.7	35.2	34.0	44.0
New York	41.8	44.5	35.6	30.0
North Carolina	0.0	4.0	3.4	28.5
Pennsylvania	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7
South Carolina	27.7	16.1	30.9	10.4
Texas	32.3	33.2	20.1	32.4
Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Washington	32.4	28.1	32.8	33.3

Sources: Revised FY 2004 SNAP QC data file and FY 2005-2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.11. Elderly Participants by SNAP Unit Composition and Year

		Elderly Participants by SNAP Unit Composition			
				Mixed Elderly, Nonelderly	
	Elderly SNAP Participants	Single Elderly Person	Multiple Elderly People	All	Elderly and Children Under Age 18 Only
Number (000s)					
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	1,171	278	177	61
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	1,157	236	168	64
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	1,151	262	162	56
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	1,219	289	180	62
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	1,353	329	236	67
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	1,454	354	237	78
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	1,611	385	230	68
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	1,654	378	231	72
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants					
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	72.0	17.1	10.9	3.8
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	74.1	15.1	10.8	4.1
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	73.1	16.6	10.3	3.5
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	72.2	17.1	10.7	3.7
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	70.6	17.1	12.3	3.5
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	71.1	17.3	11.6	3.8
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	72.4	17.3	10.3	3.1
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	73.1	16.7	10.2	3.2
Standard Error of Percentage					
Fiscal year 2000		0.9	0.7	0.5	0.3
Fiscal year 2001		0.8	0.7	0.4	0.3
Fiscal year 2002		0.8	0.7	0.4	0.3
Fiscal year 2003		0.8	0.8	0.4	0.3
Fiscal year 2004		0.8	0.8	0.5	0.3
Fiscal year 2005		1.0	0.9	0.5	0.3
Fiscal year 2006		0.8	0.8	0.5	0.3
Fiscal year 2007		0.9	0.8	0.5	0.3

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.12. Elderly Participants by SNAP Unit Composition and State, Average FY 2000–2007

	Elderly Participants (Number in 000s)	Elderly by SNAP Unit Composition (Row Percent)			
		Single Elderly Person	Multiple Elderly People	Mixed Elderly and Nonelderly	
				All	Elderly and Children under Age 18 Only
United States	**1,863**	**72.3**	**16.8**	**10.9**	**3.5**
Alabama	33	67.0	13.4	19.7	7.1
Alaska	2	55.4	6.2	38.4	7.3
Arizona	22	61.7	18.9	19.5	5.9
Arkansas	23	68.9	12.8	18.4	4.4
California	27	65.9	15.0	19.1	8.1
Colorado	17	78.5	11.8	9.7	3.5
Connecticut	20	78.1	14.0	8.0	2.7
Delaware	3	75.9	10.2	13.9	6.0
District of Columbia	6	83.1	4.8	12.7	6.2
Florida	177	71.9	21.2	7.0	2.3
Georgia	59	71.6	11.2	17.1	6.6
Hawaii	14	68.4	25.1	6.5	2.2
Idaho	5	75.7	15.2	9.1	3.0
Illinois	77	73.1	17.5	9.4	2.9
Indiana	31	80.7	10.0	9.3	2.6
Iowa	11	76.2	13.6	10.2	3.1
Kansas	13	80.0	11.8	8.2	3.2
Kentucky	43	65.6	18.0	16.4	2.7
Louisiana	41	68.4	13.2	18.4	5.6
Maine	16	79.8	13.0	7.2	1.5
Maryland	24	71.9	16.4	11.7	5.4
Massachusetts	33	73.7	19.3	7.0	1.9
Michigan	66	76.8	13.2	10.0	3.0
Minnesota	20	75.4	17.3	7.3	1.6
Mississippi	30	73.8	11.4	14.8	5.6
Missouri	43	72.1	15.6	12.3	4.5
Montana	5	81.9	7.8	11.3	3.5
Nebraska	8	78.6	13.7	7.8	2.8
Nevada	11	78.6	14.9	6.6	1.8
New Hampshire	5	82.1	12.7	5.2	1.7
New Jersey	43	71.6	18.9	9.5	4.0
New Mexico	13	60.2	19.5	20.3	6.7
New York	242	73.0	21.3	5.7	1.6
North Carolina	65	72.5	14.0	13.5	4.1
North Dakota	4	76.2	16.4	7.4	1.8
Ohio	66	80.6	10.9	8.4	3.2
Oklahoma	29	74.9	12.8	12.3	4.5
Oregon	33	74.8	17.7	7.5	2.0
Pennsylvania	85	73.9	16.3	9.8	3.5
Rhode Island	6	80.4	12.5	7.2	2.8
South Carolina	35	73.4	10.1	16.5	6.0
South Dakota	4	70.6	15.0	14.4	5.2
Tennessee	66	69.1	15.1	15.8	4.7
Texas	154	65.4	21.1	13.4	5.4
Utah	6	76.4	14.5	9.1	3.1
Vermont	5	78.7	16.0	5.3	1.3
Virginia	46	75.2	14.7	10.1	3.4
Washington	35	70.6	21.3	8.1	2.5
West Virginia	21	67.3	16.6	16.1	2.3
Wisconsin	21	74.0	19.3	6.7	2.3
Wyoming	1	75.5	12.7	13.3	5.6

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.13. Percentage of Elderly Participants in One-Person SNAP Units by State and Year

	Elderly Participants in One-Person SNAP Units (Percent of State Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**72.0**	**74.1**	**73.1**	**72.2**	**70.6**	**71.1**	**72.4**	**73.1**
Alabama	70.8	66.1	67.1	63.0	67.3	59.7	69.5	71.6
Alaska	40.6	57.0	52.7	49.2	52.4	63.0	67.8	59.1
Arizona	68.4	53.7	67.0	54.9	59.3	60.7	61.7	67.1
Arkansas	62.8	71.4	69.1	67.8	65.5	76.6	63.7	73.3
California	69.3	63.3	73.1	73.0	47.0	52.1	71.3	77.8
Colorado	81.4	83.3	74.6	76.2	81.8	77.2	77.0	76.6
Connecticut	83.9	80.7	81.6	78.5	71.9	76.5	75.5	77.9
Delaware	78.3	79.4	79.8	74.8	77.0	68.6	78.1	75.9
District of Columbia	84.0	80.2	85.7	79.1	84.5	87.6	79.7	84.0
Florida	71.4	76.3	73.2	72.8	72.7	67.7	67.9	73.9
Georgia	75.1	71.8	72.6	68.2	66.0	67.8	77.3	73.4
Hawaii	65.9	71.1	67.8	74.6	64.5	63.7	68.8	71.4
Idaho	74.6	73.9	71.6	74.5	86.8	69.4	76.0	78.3
Illinois	72.7	71.6	77.8	68.1	75.4	76.1	68.1	74.9
Indiana	81.0	79.6	72.9	82.6	78.0	81.7	82.5	84.0
Iowa	80.7	77.4	78.4	74.1	76.1	73.1	77.7	73.3
Kansas	75.2	81.6	79.5	89.0	76.3	79.7	78.5	81.2
Kentucky	62.4	69.5	70.1	64.8	61.0	65.7	62.2	70.3
Louisiana	64.8	73.9	73.5	67.9	70.8	68.4	60.8	70.6
Maine	77.5	81.7	78.8	77.3	84.0	77.9	78.1	82.9
Maryland	68.5	73.8	73.4	72.8	70.1	80.6	67.8	69.2
Massachusetts	72.3	75.1	70.3	64.5	66.9	67.0	84.0	76.2
Michigan	76.8	80.9	83.5	77.1	73.6	74.7	68.7	81.3
Minnesota	72.2	80.1	66.3	84.2	75.4	78.7	75.3	73.1
Mississippi	64.3	71.1	70.8	78.3	74.8	80.2	73.6	77.3
Missouri	79.6	77.2	72.9	75.8	72.3	70.0	68.9	64.2
Montana	82.7	81.8	85.5	76.1	81.5	76.4	81.2	90.1
Nebraska	80.4	75.9	76.7	81.3	80.2	75.9	80.0	78.1
Nevada	85.6	82.9	77.3	79.4	75.5	75.1	82.0	75.9
New Hampshire	78.6	87.3	81.2	80.9	80.6	77.8	87.0	82.9
New Jersey	72.0	72.9	75.1	75.9	65.9	68.1	74.8	69.8
New Mexico	59.5	60.3	58.6	61.7	59.0	59.9	68.2	54.6
New York	73.9	76.9	70.9	80.3	70.4	72.3	74.7	68.5
North Carolina	69.3	71.7	73.2	74.3	71.2	73.3	74.6	72.1
North Dakota	80.4	73.0	77.2	80.3	72.8	83.4	71.7	73.4
Ohio	86.1	75.9	83.0	82.3	77.3	74.6	83.6	82.2
Oklahoma	75.6	74.8	76.4	68.1	76.3	73.6	76.7	77.3
Oregon	83.5	78.3	82.0	76.7	68.1	68.2	73.2	76.2
Pennsylvania	79.1	75.4	76.3	71.1	71.6	79.4	73.8	68.0
Rhode Island	82.5	88.9	77.8	84.4	74.9	83.8	78.5	75.7
South Carolina	72.7	75.4	73.5	75.3	68.3	72.7	75.1	74.5
South Dakota	66.2	55.1	91.2	69.4	69.0	76.2	65.4	76.7
Tennessee	69.3	69.6	75.0	73.4	69.7	65.7	69.1	63.7
Texas	56.2	66.0	59.6	57.4	66.8	67.6	67.7	73.4
Utah	76.9	78.0	74.9	84.3	75.9	79.7	73.7	71.2
Vermont	83.4	79.4	80.7	74.1	69.7	84.7	77.8	80.2
Virginia	69.0	78.4	74.0	81.4	67.5	76.7	75.4	79.4
Washington	64.0	69.3	69.3	69.8	71.7	67.0	75.9	73.1
West Virginia	66.5	66.9	65.4	62.8	65.8	66.1	72.1	72.4
Wisconsin	71.9	77.7	79.6	72.2	81.0	67.4	71.0	74.3
Wyoming	80.8	78.9	62.7	70.5	66.7	78.3	73.2	89.5

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.14. Elderly SNAP Participants by Poverty Level and Year

		Elderly Participants by Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty Level					
		At or Below 100% of Poverty			Above 100% of Poverty		
	Elderly SNAP Participants	0 to 100%	0 to 75%	76% to 100%	Above 101%	101% to 130%	Above 130%
Number (000s)							
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	1,390	419	971	237	210	27
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	1,331	307	1,024	231	202	29
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	1,338	321	1,018	236	208	29
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	1,413	487	926	276	243	32
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	1,599	534	1,066	319	266	52
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	1,720	646	1,074	325	269	56
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	1,831	571	1,260	395	315	80
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	1,845	478	1,367	418	345	73
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants							
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	85.5	25.8	59.7	14.5	12.9	1.7
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	85.2	19.7	65.6	14.8	12.9	1.8
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	85.0	20.4	64.6	15.0	13.2	1.8
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	83.7	28.8	54.8	16.3	14.4	1.9
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	83.4	27.8	55.6	16.6	13.9	2.7
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	84.1	31.6	52.5	15.9	13.1	2.7
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	82.3	25.6	56.6	17.7	14.1	3.6
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	81.5	21.1	60.4	18.5	15.2	3.2
Standard Error of Percentage							
Fiscal year 2000		0.7	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.2
Fiscal year 2001		0.7	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.2
Fiscal year 2002		0.6	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.2
Fiscal year 2003		0.5	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.2
Fiscal year 2004		0.6	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.3
Fiscal year 2005		0.5	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.3
Fiscal year 2006		0.6	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.3
Fiscal year 2007		0.6	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.3

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.15. Elderly SNAP Participants by Poverty Level and State, Average FY 2000-2007

	Elderly Participants (Number in 000s)	Elderly Participants by Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty (Row Percent)					
		At or Below 100% of Poverty			Above 100% of Poverty		
		0 to 100%	0 to 75%	76% to 100%	Above 101%	101% to 130%	Above 130%
United States	**1,863**	**83.7**	**25.2**	**58.4**	**16.3**	**13.8**	**2.5**
Alabama	33	86.7	27.0	59.7	13.3	11.5	1.8
Alaska	2	57.5	32.9	24.6	42.5	38.7	3.8
Arizona	22	86.6	39.9	46.7	13.4	11.5	1.9
Arkansas	23	86.9	23.6	63.4	13.1	11.9	1.4
California	27	80.5	61.4	19.1	19.5	17.3	2.1
Colorado	17	75.2	9.5	65.7	24.8	21.5	3.3
Connecticut	20	76.4	25.9	50.6	23.6	20.7	2.9
Delaware	3	76.2	30.1	46.1	23.8	15.3	8.5
District of Columbia	6	89.1	41.2	47.9	10.9	9.7	1.3
Florida	177	89.0	34.2	54.8	11.0	9.6	1.4
Georgia	59	83.6	27.9	55.7	16.4	15.1	1.4
Hawaii	14	92.2	73.5	18.7	7.8	7.1	0.9
Idaho	5	81.3	11.9	69.4	18.7	17.9	0.8
Illinois	77	81.6	28.8	52.9	18.4	15.5	2.9
Indiana	31	73.4	21.8	51.6	26.6	20.7	5.9
Iowa	11	79.2	20.0	59.3	20.8	18.2	2.6
Kansas	13	78.9	21.8	57.1	21.1	20.0	1.1
Kentucky	43	87.8	25.7	62.1	12.2	11.1	1.1
Louisiana	41	87.1	27.4	59.8	12.9	11.1	1.8
Maine	16	70.9	10.9	60.0	29.1	25.5	3.6
Maryland	24	86.6	34.3	52.3	13.4	11.3	2.0
Massachusetts	33	72.1	12.7	59.4	27.9	24.3	3.6
Michigan	66	72.9	15.6	57.3	27.1	17.9	9.1
Minnesota	20	85.3	19.3	66.0	14.7	13.3	1.3
Mississippi	30	92.1	26.0	66.1	7.9	7.4	0.6
Missouri	43	80.6	22.1	58.5	19.4	17.7	1.7
Montana	5	82.7	25.4	57.2	17.3	14.7	2.6
Nebraska	8	76.0	16.6	59.3	24.0	22.3	1.8
Nevada	11	84.2	23.8	60.4	15.8	14.0	1.9
New Hampshire	5	72.6	9.4	63.2	27.4	23.3	4.0
New Jersey	43	85.0	22.4	62.6	15.0	13.3	1.8
New Mexico	13	86.9	28.5	58.4	13.1	12.5	0.6
New York	242	87.2	16.8	70.4	12.8	10.2	2.7
North Carolina	65	80.3	21.0	59.4	19.7	17.6	2.0
North Dakota	4	72.2	16.9	55.3	27.8	22.0	5.8
Ohio	66	82.4	28.9	53.5	17.6	15.1	2.6
Oklahoma	29	88.2	15.2	73.0	11.8	11.0	0.8
Oregon	33	66.0	21.3	44.7	34.0	21.8	12.2
Pennsylvania	85	83.1	12.3	70.8	16.9	15.3	1.5
Rhode Island	6	84.3	13.6	70.7	15.7	13.7	2.0
South Carolina	35	88.3	31.5	56.8	11.7	10.7	1.4
South Dakota	4	77.8	17.6	60.2	22.2	19.4	2.8
Tennessee	66	79.2	25.8	53.4	20.8	19.3	1.6
Texas	154	89.5	36.1	53.4	10.5	8.4	2.2
Utah	6	86.9	35.1	51.8	13.1	11.8	1.3
Vermont	5	66.2	7.3	58.9	33.8	29.2	4.6
Virginia	46	86.5	26.5	59.9	13.5	12.9	0.6
Washington	35	86.8	23.8	63.0	13.2	10.5	2.7
West Virginia	21	85.1	24.8	60.3	14.9	13.9	1.0
Wisconsin	21	60.5	8.1	52.4	39.5	30.8	8.8
Wyoming	1	81.1	19.5	61.7	18.9	18.3	0.7

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.16a. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants in Poverty by State and Year

	Elderly SNAP Participants in Poverty (Percent of State Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**85.5**	**85.2**	**85.0**	**83.7**	**83.4**	**84.1**	**82.3**	**81.5**
Alabama	85.9	88.4	87.0	86.2	83.5	87.3	84.5	91.1
Alaska	51.5	55.3	50.8	55.0	48.1	58.7	71.4	64.7
Arizona	91.3	91.9	86.2	87.9	89.1	87.3	82.2	82.6
Arkansas	88.0	89.3	86.5	85.3	88.2	83.2	86.5	88.6
California	80.6	81.6	79.7	83.9	82.3	85.2	82.7	70.0
Colorado	78.0	75.4	74.4	67.7	78.6	76.2	77.7	73.0
Connecticut	68.7	75.8	78.5	77.7	79.9	75.8	75.2	78.8
Delaware	92.0	67.3	84.1	82.0	84.0	70.0	74.1	67.8
District of Columbia	90.3	88.1	86.8	90.7	85.3	89.3	90.7	91.1
Florida	89.5	89.1	89.9	86.3	89.0	89.2	90.1	88.8
Georgia	84.4	89.8	85.8	79.8	83.2	80.6	84.3	81.0
Hawaii	90.6	90.2	89.6	93.1	94.1	94.2	94.0	91.8
Idaho	83.4	80.1	75.7	82.0	87.2	78.5	85.5	78.3
Illinois	84.2	82.9	85.5	76.5	84.4	83.3	80.8	76.9
Indiana	80.5	72.4	79.0	69.5	71.7	72.7	72.6	71.9
Iowa	74.1	84.5	83.4	80.9	77.4	79.3	76.5	79.9
Kansas	84.2	77.4	77.4	82.1	83.6	77.7	73.7	76.6
Kentucky	88.9	89.0	89.1	89.8	85.5	86.3	88.0	86.5
Louisiana	93.1	87.3	87.6	87.1	86.2	90.0	83.9	83.5
Maine	71.7	72.8	75.9	74.4	71.6	68.7	68.4	64.7
Maryland	91.7	81.8	89.3	89.1	86.5	85.7	85.5	84.0
Massachusetts	65.2	65.5	65.1	57.6	67.0	73.5	84.3	76.0
Michigan	84.1	81.0	78.1	74.5	74.8	71.7	63.1	64.3
Minnesota	86.0	87.0	76.6	89.9	85.7	87.0	85.6	85.7
Mississippi	89.7	91.9	90.7	93.5	92.6	96.0	92.2	90.7
Missouri	85.4	89.3	79.1	82.5	82.1	80.0	77.7	72.2
Montana	79.5	87.7	84.2	85.3	80.2	86.7	82.7	76.3
Nebraska	74.1	76.7	74.8	80.6	72.5	72.4	79.4	76.2
Nevada	87.7	88.2	87.2	79.7	88.2	79.8	79.5	85.4
New Hampshire	70.2	73.6	76.6	67.1	84.1	72.7	71.3	66.0
New Jersey	81.7	87.6	85.7	81.8	86.8	83.7	85.4	86.1
New Mexico	91.5	90.7	85.8	87.9	88.3	90.0	81.8	80.1
New York	84.2	86.4	88.7	92.6	85.6	88.5	87.7	85.8
North Carolina	84.0	80.2	86.1	81.5	77.1	77.1	80.5	78.4
North Dakota	83.5	66.3	67.9	62.7	82.1	82.9	69.9	65.4
Ohio	87.1	84.2	89.2	85.5	79.3	83.0	76.4	79.3
Oklahoma	92.7	90.6	86.0	87.8	82.9	89.8	85.6	90.3
Oregon	80.1	75.2	68.6	62.2	61.7	64.5	65.9	60.1
Pennsylvania	85.0	88.5	82.8	78.0	87.9	82.9	76.7	83.4
Rhode Island	83.4	93.1	87.7	84.2	80.0	80.2	85.8	81.6
South Carolina	91.0	91.6	89.9	87.9	86.6	86.4	89.1	85.1
South Dakota	83.0	63.0	84.2	85.8	75.4	84.1	80.4	69.1
Tennessee	82.8	79.9	82.0	82.8	75.5	77.2	76.6	79.2
Texas	92.6	91.6	90.0	90.8	88.4	95.0	84.1	87.1
Utah	87.4	80.9	89.1	81.4	85.4	88.6	88.0	91.7
Vermont	70.3	69.7	54.6	68.7	71.4	67.4	64.7	61.5
Virginia	89.6	86.5	89.0	85.9	89.4	83.4	87.3	81.9
Washington	92.1	81.2	84.9	87.9	85.3	88.1	86.5	87.3
West Virginia	86.5	90.9	82.5	85.3	88.0	86.0	85.5	78.0
Wisconsin	64.1	60.0	58.2	67.9	53.8	63.1	56.6	60.8
Wyoming	78.1	81.1	88.2	74.0	96.9	80.0	70.9	85.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.16b. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Gross Income Under 75 Percent of Poverty Level by State and Year

	SNAP Participants Under 75% of Poverty (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**25.8**	**19.7**	**20.4**	**28.8**	**27.8**	**31.6**	**25.6**	**21.1**
Alabama	23.8	24.1	22.3	30.7	27.0	34.8	30.9	22.1
Alaska	40.8	33.1	31.5	31.4	28.7	26.7	40.5	29.8
Arizona	47.6	38.6	32.4	41.4	44.6	47.6	36.9	31.0
Arkansas	22.0	19.8	15.2	27.9	27.4	30.4	26.7	18.5
California	73.2	72.6	57.5	66.5	68.8	67.4	51.4	47.0
Colorado	7.9	6.1	4.7	5.5	9.7	14.7	13.0	12.6
Connecticut	21.7	17.7	20.4	36.5	28.6	36.0	20.9	24.0
Delaware	41.2	15.0	31.3	31.1	35.1	36.2	25.8	26.3
District of Columbia	46.1	30.8	32.8	41.0	49.7	45.5	45.4	35.7
Florida	38.4	20.3	23.7	39.5	41.9	47.1	36.0	25.8
Georgia	25.8	18.6	21.0	27.9	31.0	34.4	33.7	29.1
Hawaii	71.6	66.0	68.6	78.7	77.5	78.1	75.2	72.1
Idaho	11.3	10.2	4.3	16.1	13.2	13.6	10.5	15.1
Illinois	33.1	16.4	22.1	34.0	35.0	39.4	30.2	18.7
Indiana	24.6	17.5	20.4	17.4	23.0	29.2	23.7	16.3
Iowa	22.3	12.0	14.4	20.8	21.5	32.2	24.4	9.5
Kansas	20.9	12.2	10.4	26.3	33.4	32.0	25.3	13.4
Kentucky	24.2	19.6	19.5	24.0	30.0	33.5	27.3	23.7
Louisiana	33.5	13.8	25.6	27.4	29.2	41.5	24.3	20.3
Maine	11.6	10.7	9.2	11.9	12.3	12.2	9.1	10.0
Maryland	37.0	26.8	27.5	40.5	44.2	44.1	30.9	25.3
Massachusetts	12.2	11.1	10.8	12.5	16.4	15.5	10.8	12.8
Michigan	20.5	18.8	14.2	9.9	13.4	19.7	18.6	11.0
Minnesota	15.8	20.5	13.0	21.0	18.9	28.2	15.5	22.1
Mississippi	26.6	23.5	21.9	26.3	24.3	44.9	28.2	15.4
Missouri	23.4	16.7	16.5	27.8	20.0	34.8	20.4	14.1
Montana	22.7	25.3	14.9	23.4	24.1	41.0	29.8	21.8
Nebraska	14.4	15.7	13.7	12.8	14.9	22.1	21.0	16.9
Nevada	22.8	24.7	22.9	30.9	21.0	24.6	27.4	17.7
New Hampshire	8.0	5.2	9.0	4.8	9.0	19.0	11.5	6.3
New Jersey	19.7	22.3	19.9	21.3	22.6	24.1	25.9	22.5
New Mexico	36.8	20.2	30.1	28.9	24.1	39.3	29.1	20.7
New York	15.3	18.4	16.0	37.1	15.5	12.7	12.5	15.9
North Carolina	23.7	13.8	19.2	18.5	22.1	28.8	23.4	16.8
North Dakota	20.7	4.8	11.5	21.9	23.1	28.0	17.2	10.1
Ohio	36.3	16.9	22.0	37.0	36.5	34.8	31.2	14.8
Oklahoma	13.2	16.3	10.5	17.2	16.5	16.9	16.4	14.7
Oregon	28.2	16.7	19.6	22.8	16.7	30.4	21.5	14.8
Pennsylvania	13.8	9.4	13.5	9.2	11.4	11.0	13.5	15.7
Rhode Island	14.4	13.9	13.5	15.0	6.6	16.9	18.3	11.5
South Carolina	33.7	28.5	24.9	33.4	29.1	40.1	38.6	23.7
South Dakota	15.4	11.7	7.1	22.4	16.3	26.1	26.2	14.5
Tennessee	17.4	22.8	23.2	27.6	23.5	33.6	29.1	25.7
Texas	32.6	28.8	26.2	31.3	44.0	46.6	35.5	34.2
Utah	33.1	22.5	34.7	49.3	37.9	40.3	35.4	29.4
Vermont	6.2	12.9	3.3	8.8	3.5	5.6	4.2	13.7
Virginia	30.6	17.0	18.1	28.7	35.1	33.6	28.1	19.5
Washington	20.2	15.0	22.4	36.5	26.6	27.9	19.9	19.8
West Virginia	29.9	16.7	22.3	25.0	26.0	33.0	23.9	19.6
Wisconsin	5.9	3.0	6.3	10.2	4.4	7.9	7.4	15.8
Wyoming	21.1	20.2	17.9	15.7	17.8	21.0	19.2	22.0

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.16c. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Gross Income Between 76 and 100 Percent of Poverty Level by State and Year

	SNAP Participants Between 76 and 100% of Poverty (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**59.7**	**65.6**	**64.6**	**54.8**	**55.6**	**52.5**	**56.6**	**60.4**
Alabama	62.1	64.3	64.6	55.5	56.4	52.5	53.6	69.0
Alaska	10.7	22.3	19.3	23.5	19.4	32.1	30.9	34.9
Arizona	43.6	53.3	53.8	46.4	44.4	39.7	45.3	51.6
Arkansas	66.0	69.5	71.3	57.3	60.7	52.8	59.8	70.1
California	7.4	9.0	22.2	17.4	13.5	17.8	31.3	23.0
Colorado	70.2	69.3	69.7	62.2	68.8	61.5	64.8	60.4
Connecticut	47.0	58.0	58.1	41.2	51.3	39.8	54.3	54.8
Delaware	50.9	52.3	52.9	50.8	48.9	33.7	48.3	41.5
District of Columbia	44.2	57.3	54.0	49.7	35.5	43.8	45.3	55.4
Florida	51.1	68.8	66.2	46.8	47.2	42.1	54.1	63.1
Georgia	58.6	71.2	64.7	51.9	52.2	46.2	50.6	51.9
Hawaii	19.0	24.2	21.0	14.4	16.5	16.1	18.8	19.7
Idaho	72.0	69.9	71.4	65.9	74.0	64.9	75.0	63.2
Illinois	51.1	66.5	63.5	42.5	49.4	43.9	50.6	58.1
Indiana	55.9	54.9	58.6	52.2	48.7	43.5	48.9	55.6
Iowa	51.8	72.6	69.0	60.0	55.9	47.2	52.1	70.4
Kansas	63.3	65.2	67.0	55.8	50.1	45.6	48.4	63.2
Kentucky	64.6	69.4	69.6	65.8	55.5	52.8	60.7	62.9
Louisiana	59.6	73.5	62.0	59.7	57.0	48.5	59.5	63.1
Maine	60.0	62.1	66.7	62.5	59.4	56.4	59.3	54.7
Maryland	54.7	55.0	61.8	48.5	42.3	41.6	54.6	58.7
Massachusetts	53.0	54.4	54.3	45.1	50.5	58.0	73.5	63.2
Michigan	63.6	62.3	63.9	64.6	61.5	52.0	44.5	53.3
Minnesota	70.2	66.5	63.6	68.9	66.8	58.8	70.1	63.6
Mississippi	63.1	68.3	68.7	67.3	68.3	51.1	64.0	75.3
Missouri	62.0	72.6	62.6	54.6	62.2	45.2	57.3	58.1
Montana	56.9	62.4	69.4	61.9	56.1	45.8	52.9	54.5
Nebraska	59.7	61.0	61.1	67.7	57.6	50.2	58.4	59.3
Nevada	64.9	63.6	64.3	48.8	67.2	55.3	52.1	67.7
New Hampshire	62.2	68.3	67.5	62.3	75.1	53.7	59.8	59.7
New Jersey	62.1	65.3	65.8	60.6	64.2	59.5	59.4	63.6
New Mexico	54.8	70.5	55.6	59.0	64.1	50.7	52.7	59.4
New York	69.0	68.0	72.7	55.5	70.1	75.8	75.2	69.9
North Carolina	60.3	66.4	66.9	63.0	55.0	48.3	57.1	61.6
North Dakota	62.7	61.4	56.3	40.8	58.9	54.9	52.7	55.3
Ohio	50.8	67.3	67.2	48.5	42.8	48.2	45.3	64.5
Oklahoma	79.5	74.3	75.5	70.5	66.4	72.9	69.2	75.6
Oregon	52.0	58.4	49.0	39.3	45.1	34.0	44.4	45.3
Pennsylvania	71.2	79.1	69.3	68.8	76.5	71.9	63.2	67.7
Rhode Island	69.0	79.3	74.2	69.2	73.4	63.3	67.5	70.2
South Carolina	57.2	63.2	65.0	54.5	57.5	46.4	50.5	61.4
South Dakota	67.5	51.3	77.1	63.4	59.1	58.1	54.2	54.6
Tennessee	65.4	57.0	58.8	55.2	52.0	43.6	47.5	53.5
Texas	60.0	62.9	63.8	59.5	44.4	48.4	48.6	53.0
Utah	54.4	58.3	54.5	32.1	47.4	48.4	52.6	62.3
Vermont	64.1	56.8	51.3	59.9	67.9	61.8	60.4	47.8
Virginia	59.0	69.5	70.9	57.2	54.3	49.8	59.2	62.4
Washington	71.9	66.2	62.5	51.5	58.7	60.2	66.6	67.5
West Virginia	56.6	74.2	60.2	60.3	62.1	53.0	61.6	58.4
Wisconsin	58.2	57.0	52.0	57.7	49.4	55.2	49.2	45.0
Wyoming	57.0	60.9	70.3	58.3	79.1	59.0	51.7	63.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.16d. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Gross Income Above 100 Percent of Poverty Level by State and Year

	SNAP Participants Above 100% of Poverty (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**14.5**	**14.8**	**15.0**	**16.3**	**16.6**	**15.9**	**17.7**	**18.5**
Alabama	14.1	11.6	13.0	13.8	16.5	12.7	15.5	8.9
Alaska	48.5	44.7	49.2	45.0	51.9	41.3	28.6	35.3
Arizona	8.7	8.1	13.8	12.1	10.9	12.7	17.8	17.4
Arkansas	12.0	10.7	13.5	14.7	11.8	16.8	13.5	11.4
California	19.4	18.4	20.3	16.1	17.7	14.8	17.3	30.0
Colorado	22.0	24.6	25.6	32.3	21.4	23.8	22.3	27.0
Connecticut	31.3	24.2	21.5	22.3	20.1	24.2	24.8	21.2
Delaware	8.0	32.7	15.9	18.0	16.0	30.0	25.9	32.2
District of Columbia	9.7	11.9	13.2	9.3	14.7	10.7	9.3	8.9
Florida	10.5	10.9	10.1	13.7	11.0	10.8	9.9	11.2
Georgia	15.6	10.2	14.2	20.2	16.8	19.4	15.7	19.0
Hawaii	9.4	9.8	10.4	6.9	5.9	5.8	6.0	8.2
Idaho	16.6	19.9	24.3	18.0	12.8	21.5	14.5	21.7
Illinois	15.8	17.1	14.5	23.5	15.6	16.7	19.2	23.1
Indiana	19.5	27.6	21.0	30.5	28.3	27.3	27.4	28.1
Iowa	25.9	15.5	16.6	19.1	22.6	20.7	23.5	20.1
Kansas	15.8	22.6	22.6	17.9	16.4	22.3	26.3	23.4
Kentucky	11.1	11.0	10.9	10.2	14.5	13.7	12.0	13.5
Louisiana	6.9	12.7	12.4	12.9	13.8	10.0	16.1	16.5
Maine	28.3	27.2	24.1	25.6	28.4	31.3	31.6	35.3
Maryland	8.3	18.2	10.7	10.9	13.5	14.3	14.5	16.0
Massachusetts	34.8	34.5	34.9	42.4	33.0	26.5	15.7	24.0
Michigan	15.9	19.0	21.9	25.5	25.2	28.3	36.9	35.7
Minnesota	14.0	13.0	23.4	10.1	14.3	13.0	14.4	14.3
Mississippi	10.3	8.1	9.3	6.5	7.4	4.0	7.8	9.3
Missouri	14.6	10.7	20.9	17.5	17.9	20.0	22.3	27.8
Montana	20.5	12.3	15.8	14.7	19.8	13.3	17.3	23.7
Nebraska	25.9	23.3	25.2	19.4	27.5	27.6	20.6	23.8
Nevada	12.3	11.8	12.8	20.3	11.8	20.2	20.5	14.6
New Hampshire	29.8	26.4	23.4	32.9	15.9	27.3	28.7	34.0
New Jersey	18.3	12.4	14.3	18.2	13.2	16.3	14.6	13.9
New Mexico	8.5	9.3	14.2	12.1	11.7	10.0	18.2	19.9
New York	15.8	13.6	11.3	7.4	14.4	11.5	12.3	14.2
North Carolina	16.0	19.8	13.9	18.5	22.9	22.9	19.5	21.6
North Dakota	16.5	33.7	32.1	37.3	17.9	17.1	30.1	34.6
Ohio	12.9	15.8	10.8	14.5	20.7	17.0	23.6	20.7
Oklahoma	7.3	9.4	14.0	12.2	17.1	10.2	14.4	9.7
Oregon	19.9	24.8	31.4	37.8	38.3	35.5	34.1	39.9
Pennsylvania	15.0	11.5	17.2	22.0	12.1	17.1	23.3	16.6
Rhode Island	16.6	6.9	12.3	15.8	20.0	19.8	14.2	18.4
South Carolina	9.0	8.4	10.1	12.1	13.4	13.6	10.9	14.9
South Dakota	17.0	37.0	15.8	14.2	24.6	15.9	19.6	30.9
Tennessee	17.2	20.1	18.0	17.2	24.5	22.8	23.4	20.8
Texas	7.4	8.4	10.0	9.2	11.6	5.0	15.9	12.9
Utah	12.6	19.1	10.9	18.6	14.6	11.4	12.0	8.3
Vermont	29.7	30.3	45.4	31.3	28.6	32.6	35.3	38.5
Virginia	10.4	13.5	11.0	14.1	10.6	16.6	12.7	18.1
Washington	7.9	18.8	15.1	12.1	14.7	11.9	13.5	12.7
West Virginia	13.5	9.1	17.5	14.7	12.0	14.0	14.5	22.0
Wisconsin	35.9	40.0	41.8	32.1	46.2	36.9	43.4	39.2
Wyoming	21.9	18.9	11.8	26.0	3.1	20.0	29.1	14.6

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.17. Median Poverty Level of Elderly SNAP Participants by State and Year

	Median Poverty Level of Elderly SNAP Participants							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**81**	**81**	**81**	**79**	**81**	**81**	**82**	**82**
Alabama	78	79	79	78	78	77	78	79
Alaska	97	99	100	99	101	98	92	98
Arizona	76	76	79	77	76	77	77	79
Arkansas	77	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
California	44	36	52	45	54	56	74	76
Colorado	83	84	84	82	81	80	81	82
Connecticut	84	82	80	77	82	81	82	79
Delaware	76	85	78	82	78	77	79	79
District of Columbia	76	76	77	77	76	77	76	76
Florida	77	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
Georgia	77	79	79	78	78	77	78	79
Hawaii	68	68	69	67	67	67	68	68
Idaho	82	84	86	82	82	83	82	83
Illinois	79	81	79	81	78	77	78	80
Indiana	77	81	80	84	84	83	83	84
Iowa	78	81	79	77	82	77	84	83
Kansas	80	79	81	77	78	78	82	80
Kentucky	78	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
Louisiana	77	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
Maine	88	86	85	84	86	87	89	89
Maryland	77	79	78	77	78	77	78	79
Massachusetts	94	97	97	95	93	92	92	92
Michigan	80	81	81	85	83	83	86	88
Minnesota	87	87	90	87	89	85	87	86
Mississippi	77	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
Missouri	77	79	79	77	82	80	83	87
Montana	79	79	79	78	78	77	78	79
Nebraska	82	82	80	82	88	83	81	80
Nevada	81	82	84	82	83	82	83	83
New Hampshire	82	80	87	85	82	84	85	87
New Jersey	82	83	83	82	82	81	79	82
New Mexico	77	80	79	77	79	77	78	82
New York	89	89	89	86	87	86	86	89
North Carolina	77	81	79	79	79	79	78	79
North Dakota	77	84	86	81	79	77	86	88
Ohio	77	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
Oklahoma	82	84	84	82	82	81	82	82
Oregon	77	83	86	85	85	83	86	87
Pennsylvania	81	83	83	83	82	81	81	82
Rhode Island	87	86	88	85	86	85	85	86
South Carolina	77	79	79	77	78	77	78	79
South Dakota	83	86	80	77	83	78	82	85
Tennessee	80	79	79	79	83	83	80	79
Texas	77	79	79	77	76	77	78	76
Utah	77	79	77	76	78	77	76	77
Vermont	87	88	99	91	92	89	89	89
Virginia	77	79	79	77	78	78	78	79
Washington	80	84	80	77	81	83	81	82
West Virginia	77	79	79	82	78	81	79	79
Wisconsin	96	98	97	94	100	98	99	96
Wyoming	83	82	81	84	79	85	80	79

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.18. Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with SSI Income by Poverty Level and Year

	All Elderly Participants in Units with SSI Income	Elderly Participants in Units with SSI Income by Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty Level			
		At or Below 100% of Poverty			Above 100% of Poverty
		All	0 to 75%	76% to 100%	
Number (000s)					
Fiscal year 2000	979	929	255	674	50
Fiscal year 2001	966	915	161	754	51
Fiscal year 2002	946	902	155	747	44
Fiscal year 2003	965	910	289	621	55
Fiscal year 2004	1,115	1,053	317	737	62
Fiscal year 2005	1,152	1,102	396	706	50
Fiscal year 2006	1,231	1,174	286	888	57
Fiscal year 2007	1,267	1,209	221	988	58
Percent of All Elderly Participants in Units with SSI Income					
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	94.9	26.0	68.9	5.1
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	94.7	16.7	78.0	5.3
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	95.3	16.4	79.0	4.7
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	94.3	29.9	64.3	5.7
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	94.4	28.4	66.0	5.6
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	95.6	34.4	61.3	4.4
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	95.3	23.3	72.1	4.7
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	95.4	17.4	78.0	4.6
Standard Error of Percentage					
Fiscal year 2000		0.4	1.0	1.0	0.4
Fiscal year 2001		0.5	0.9	0.8	0.5
Fiscal year 2002		0.4	0.8	0.8	0.4
Fiscal year 2003		0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5
Fiscal year 2004		0.5	0.9	1.0	0.5
Fiscal year 2005		0.4	1.1	1.2	0.4
Fiscal year 2006		0.5	0.9	1.0	0.5
Fiscal year 2007		0.4	0.9	0.9	0.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.19. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants in Units with SSI Income Who Are in Poverty by State and Year

	Elderly SNAP Participants in Units with SSI Income and in Poverty (Percent of State Elderly Participants in Units with SSI Income)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**94.9**	**94.7**	**95.3**	**94.3**	**94.4**	**95.6**	**95.3**	**95.4**
Alabama	94.9	95.3	94.6	95.6	98.8	97.2	94.3	96.2
Alaska	38.0	33.3	31.2	50.4	41.2	56.0	80.4	43.4
Arizona	96.6	94.8	98.6	96.8	98.2	97.9	93.5	100.0
Arkansas	94.2	98.1	97.6	95.7	95.2	97.4	97.5	98.7
California[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	84.2	86.8	78.3	68.3	80.5	88.8	79.0	82.8
Connecticut	72.4	78.6	83.0	79.2	89.1	82.8	85.3	92.0
Delaware	100.0	93.8	98.8	97.1	94.4	91.3	88.2	94.7
District of Columbia	96.8	98.0	97.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.4
Florida	97.2	98.0	97.9	95.5	95.6	96.8	98.2	97.4
Georgia	96.6	96.9	96.1	93.8	95.8	88.7	100.0	96.2
Hawaii	97.6	98.0	95.3	98.9	99.0	97.9	100.0	98.8
Idaho	92.3	95.3	92.5	100.0	95.2	94.3	98.4	98.2
Illinois	90.0	87.0	92.5	81.9	89.2	92.5	90.5	92.1
Indiana	93.0	92.0	97.4	89.3	96.6	98.3	95.1	92.2
Iowa	89.8	93.8	95.9	92.8	92.3	98.1	97.5	98.3
Kansas	97.3	98.8	94.7	98.0	100.0	97.5	100.0	95.9
Kentucky	95.6	93.2	97.8	97.2	96.8	97.5	98.1	95.4
Louisiana	97.4	95.6	95.8	94.2	97.4	98.7	100.0	96.2
Maine	96.6	96.6	96.1	94.3	97.8	100.0	98.1	98.5
Maryland	98.7	92.2	97.1	98.0	97.1	97.5	95.3	93.6
Massachusetts	70.0	71.4	70.3	62.4	75.9	75.2	89.1	80.8
Michigan	93.8	94.9	100.0	89.9	95.2	90.6	88.2	92.4
Minnesota	96.0	92.2	88.0	95.7	88.4	96.8	93.4	87.2
Mississippi	97.1	96.9	97.6	96.5	99.3	100.0	97.3	98.3
Missouri	96.8	98.4	93.9	93.0	92.5	94.4	93.7	88.0
Montana	95.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nebraska	86.0	98.6	93.8	100.0	96.1	96.9	94.9	94.8
Nevada	97.2	97.2	99.0	91.6	97.4	97.5	98.7	99.2
New Hampshire	78.0	96.6	96.8	91.0	97.3	97.6	93.4	95.9
New Jersey	94.2	96.1	95.3	92.2	92.6	91.5	95.5	91.4
New Mexico	97.7	97.5	97.4	94.7	95.9	95.6	95.7	95.2
New York	95.4	93.7	96.0	98.9	93.6	97.0	97.6	96.3
North Carolina	96.3	95.1	96.9	95.1	93.0	97.7	92.2	94.4
North Dakota	93.7	94.5	95.4	95.9	97.7	95.3	89.6	85.1
Ohio	94.9	95.5	97.2	94.8	95.9	98.4	93.6	97.5
Oklahoma	97.4	98.5	97.0	98.2	97.0	95.0	95.7	98.9
Oregon	95.7	98.1	91.0	91.6	90.9	95.0	96.6	96.9
Pennsylvania	97.4	98.8	98.3	96.5	96.8	95.3	92.0	98.4
Rhode Island	96.4	100.0	94.8	95.9	96.5	93.0	95.2	96.7
South Carolina	96.1	97.9	97.7	98.8	95.4	98.2	100.0	97.9
South Dakota	92.3	94.8	100.0	100.0	96.1	100.0	100.0	88.0
Tennessee	96.5	96.0	95.7	97.8	92.9	90.9	92.0	98.6
Texas	96.5	98.8	99.1	96.1	96.8	99.4	95.6	96.5
Utah	93.9	91.6	98.8	98.6	96.0	100.0	98.0	100.0
Vermont	98.6	92.3	100.0	91.9	95.9	97.4	97.7	88.2
Virginia	97.8	96.9	95.6	99.4	96.0	93.4	98.5	97.8
Washington	97.9	92.4	95.0	98.8	96.6	97.8	96.8	100.0
West Virginia	98.3	96.7	91.7	93.7	99.2	99.2	97.3	96.5
Wisconsin	82.6	65.4	69.5	85.4	75.6	85.8	83.4	90.4
Wyoming	100.0	100.0	97.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.9

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table A.20. Elderly SNAP Participants by Benefit Level and Year

	All Elderly SNAP Participants	Elderly Participants by Benefit Level				
		$1 to $10	$11 to $50	$51 to $100	$101 to $150	$151 or more
Number (000s)						
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	447	478	317	250	136
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	447	428	319	257	110
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	441	391	311	300	132
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	355	454	421	316	142
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	322	483	401	472	240
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	310	486	455	553	241
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	372	465	473	361	555
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	396	456	520	352	539
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants						
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	27.5	29.4	19.5	15.4	8.3
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	28.6	27.4	20.4	16.5	7.1
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	28.0	24.8	19.7	19.0	8.4
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	21.0	26.9	24.9	18.7	8.4
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	16.8	25.2	20.9	24.6	12.5
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	15.2	23.8	22.2	27.0	11.8
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	16.7	20.9	21.2	16.2	24.9
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	17.5	20.1	23.0	15.6	23.8
Standard Error of Percentage						
Fiscal year 2000		0.9	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.8
Fiscal year 2001		1.1	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.7
Fiscal year 2002		1.0	0.8	0.6	1.0	0.7
Fiscal year 2003		0.6	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5
Fiscal year 2004		0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7
Fiscal year 2005		0.5	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7
Fiscal year 2006		0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7
Fiscal year 2007		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.21a. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Benefits of $10 or Less by State and Year

	SNAP Participants with Benefits of $10 or Less (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**27.5**	**28.6**	**28.0**	**21.0**	**16.8**	**15.2**	**16.7**	**17.5**
Alabama	18.3	20.6	19.8	19.2	14.4	11.0	21.1	13.5
Alaska	37.1	37.8	43.9	46.8	50.3	42.2	32.0	39.1
Arizona	13.0	9.2	16.7	8.4	7.1	13.9	12.4	13.7
Arkansas	27.9	30.4	35.4	28.3	27.9	24.1	20.2	35.6
California	19.2	13.6	19.1	9.1	6.7	11.7	14.5	9.1
Colorado	59.1	56.3	50.4	45.8	38.2	25.6	27.0	31.4
Connecticut	39.6	37.0	35.9	31.8	17.8	14.6	19.6	17.4
Delaware	17.9	33.3	23.3	20.3	17.1	23.5	21.4	21.8
District of Columbia	21.0	23.2	26.7	18.7	19.8	21.8	18.9	22.2
Florida	19.1	19.8	17.9	18.1	11.7	10.8	10.9	11.4
Georgia	29.2	33.3	38.8	16.8	15.1	15.9	12.2	18.8
Hawaii	1.0	0.9	3.2	1.5	0.4	0.9	2.2	1.6
Idaho	52.0	60.6	46.3	21.8	26.0	16.1	16.0	25.3
Illinois	30.6	31.9	21.7	15.0	12.9	13.9	12.3	16.6
Indiana	39.6	40.3	37.5	13.6	17.2	16.5	23.0	18.4
Iowa	40.8	34.1	41.0	25.6	25.6	15.4	18.7	22.4
Kansas	32.5	33.2	42.7	26.8	23.6	23.3	27.6	26.9
Kentucky	30.2	28.0	33.2	18.9	14.1	13.0	12.2	12.9
Louisiana	17.6	19.3	15.5	10.3	10.8	5.4	10.0	11.4
Maine	37.1	42.9	37.6	24.4	19.9	18.8	16.5	23.9
Maryland	15.1	19.9	16.6	15.8	13.6	12.4	17.4	17.6
Massachusetts	46.5	51.0	48.4	37.1	23.1	23.9	15.0	20.8
Michigan	21.4	27.7	19.7	18.5	16.1	19.2	24.7	22.9
Minnesota	53.1	52.7	56.9	39.9	37.0	34.1	35.1	38.5
Mississippi	33.7	32.5	39.4	19.5	30.2	19.3	19.9	29.5
Missouri	24.6	29.7	33.4	19.5	23.0	23.0	29.9	30.6
Montana	21.4	33.8	39.4	29.3	25.7	10.6	13.9	24.4
Nebraska	38.3	37.4	39.8	44.2	44.4	36.8	32.6	34.9
Nevada	24.9	29.9	21.0	21.3	20.8	17.5	21.7	18.1
New Hampshire	39.5	33.4	36.8	39.7	35.3	19.1	31.4	24.3
New Jersey	27.3	21.2	24.7	19.0	14.0	13.6	10.4	12.4
New Mexico	28.4	26.8	27.4	27.1	20.4	16.8	26.3	20.2
New York	15.5	17.8	12.9	18.7	5.4	5.4	10.4	7.3
North Carolina	38.2	37.8	36.3	26.9	26.2	26.2	22.8	19.6
North Dakota	26.7	42.5	29.9	24.6	10.3	6.6	13.1	16.2
Ohio	28.9	22.9	28.3	17.9	16.7	14.0	16.4	23.2
Oklahoma	52.5	51.5	51.4	43.1	43.6	34.6	33.8	39.6
Oregon	33.9	36.7	45.7	24.5	24.1	23.4	27.5	30.5
Pennsylvania	47.1	43.6	45.6	21.4	19.4	19.0	17.2	11.6
Rhode Island	53.1	48.0	46.0	43.2	39.1	37.1	28.9	11.6
South Carolina	19.4	21.0	25.7	25.0	19.5	16.3	15.1	22.1
South Dakota	23.0	26.7	21.4	13.2	20.7	14.4	6.6	17.7
Tennessee	42.8	34.5	39.1	36.0	32.6	31.0	28.6	26.4
Texas	17.9	22.1	23.1	14.6	9.4	4.2	11.1	10.3
Utah	29.9	28.4	33.3	17.0	26.9	21.9	21.8	20.8
Vermont	40.5	37.0	51.8	25.5	20.7	14.7	15.9	16.0
Virginia	23.7	30.5	31.1	26.9	23.0	24.0	20.5	28.8
Washington	32.6	45.6	33.8	7.6	8.8	7.3	11.7	10.5
West Virginia	18.1	20.6	20.8	27.5	16.4	18.1	19.2	34.0
Wisconsin	70.6	69.2	64.0	53.7	55.3	48.8	47.5	52.7
Wyoming	41.5	43.8	35.9	34.8	20.3	30.0	18.9	19.7

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.21b. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Benefits of $11 to $100 by State and Year

	SNAP Participants with Benefits of $10 to $100 (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**48.8**	**47.8**	**44.5**	**51.8**	**46.1**	**46.0**	**42.1**	**43.1**
Alabama	66.0	54.5	58.8	51.8	57.9	59.2	52.4	60.4
Alaska	9.7	18.4	12.7	7.5	14.1	11.8	21.8	18.4
Arizona	55.3	52.8	56.8	47.4	41.8	36.9	33.7	37.8
Arkansas	54.0	50.4	49.4	52.1	47.2	55.1	53.2	44.8
California	15.1	27.0	15.0	15.4	14.6	22.1	22.1	36.1
Colorado	31.8	35.2	37.8	42.5	46.8	37.4	37.8	33.5
Connecticut	48.2	48.9	48.9	50.6	50.0	46.8	38.1	27.2
Delaware	59.3	54.9	47.7	42.6	46.3	33.0	38.0	39.9
District of Columbia	52.2	48.9	48.8	56.5	48.6	38.6	49.1	48.5
Florida	58.0	58.8	58.2	54.7	50.4	44.8	45.7	42.3
Georgia	55.7	47.7	40.7	54.2	51.8	55.7	45.8	42.8
Hawaii	24.7	30.7	28.7	21.5	24.2	11.2	16.8	10.1
Idaho	33.2	29.7	45.7	52.6	60.3	47.9	51.9	55.0
Illinois	48.2	50.0	54.9	54.5	52.1	42.0	40.8	47.4
Indiana	51.4	45.9	40.7	53.4	50.9	42.4	43.6	50.8
Iowa	48.8	54.5	50.7	55.0	55.5	58.1	51.4	51.8
Kansas	57.7	57.9	50.8	62.7	52.9	51.7	50.5	53.5
Kentucky	56.9	60.9	54.0	62.1	60.8	59.1	59.3	57.6
Louisiana	59.5	66.7	52.8	60.1	51.1	56.4	45.9	59.5
Maine	47.5	40.1	41.0	44.5	48.2	50.2	48.9	49.2
Maryland	63.2	58.2	57.8	57.1	52.2	52.4	51.7	53.9
Massachusetts	36.9	30.5	32.4	34.5	34.8	43.8	54.6	47.3
Michigan	57.8	48.5	54.8	48.8	45.0	34.9	20.8	26.6
Minnesota	37.5	32.5	32.9	45.5	45.1	45.2	47.5	41.2
Mississippi	51.0	51.5	45.9	65.1	56.0	65.4	58.2	50.1
Missouri	61.0	56.5	50.8	60.9	55.4	55.5	55.2	51.3
Montana	65.3	46.3	46.7	48.0	46.1	46.9	44.7	38.0
Nebraska	54.6	50.1	50.3	45.4	40.7	48.0	46.2	44.2
Nevada	49.7	50.8	48.1	46.9	58.2	47.8	45.8	43.9
New Hampshire	44.9	56.7	44.8	48.6	37.0	46.0	39.4	45.7
New Jersey	43.9	47.9	35.7	48.0	43.4	45.8	43.0	34.0
New Mexico	48.8	51.6	49.5	48.7	58.8	46.4	44.8	50.4
New York	36.0	30.0	23.5	40.7	14.5	24.6	13.1	18.0
North Carolina	49.5	48.3	44.9	56.1	48.8	50.0	54.0	56.5
North Dakota	58.3	47.8	43.5	44.8	40.7	31.9	40.3	24.8
Ohio	56.3	57.5	55.7	53.6	51.9	45.0	31.7	43.3
Oklahoma	37.0	33.1	37.5	45.3	41.1	48.8	48.4	44.8
Oregon	51.6	50.0	39.9	49.8	46.3	42.1	39.2	41.6
Pennsylvania	36.5	43.8	38.4	55.7	51.7	45.4	47.0	44.4
Rhode Island	29.8	36.1	37.6	36.6	34.2	34.7	29.9	32.8
South Carolina	58.2	57.6	58.1	55.9	62.4	59.7	61.6	52.2
South Dakota	59.8	52.6	60.8	47.1	36.3	41.5	45.5	34.4
Tennessee	47.1	49.9	44.1	46.4	49.8	40.4	48.7	46.5
Texas	54.3	55.9	48.7	60.1	60.9	68.3	57.0	61.6
Utah	59.1	58.5	50.6	62.6	43.8	56.7	41.5	44.7
Vermont	44.8	39.2	32.0	55.1	53.5	47.4	29.4	33.4
Virginia	58.9	54.1	53.2	57.0	51.1	56.6	56.1	50.7
Washington	55.0	45.3	47.2	64.9	58.7	57.0	58.5	64.5
West Virginia	59.6	66.6	59.3	56.4	65.1	58.3	66.7	45.6
Wisconsin	19.3	26.2	25.0	33.0	33.5	36.1	32.0	27.3
Wyoming	44.4	47.1	58.0	40.9	54.1	37.9	53.4	52.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.21c. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Benefits of $101 or More by State and Year

	SNAP Participants with Benefits of $101 or more (Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**23.7**	**23.5**	**27.4**	**27.1**	**37.1**	**38.8**	**41.1**	**39.4**
Alabama	15.6	24.9	21.4	28.9	27.8	29.8	26.6	26.2
Alaska	53.1	43.8	43.4	45.7	35.6	45.9	46.2	42.5
Arizona	31.7	38.0	26.6	44.3	51.2	49.2	53.9	48.6
Arkansas	18.0	19.2	15.2	19.6	24.9	20.8	26.6	19.6
California	65.8	59.5	66.0	75.4	78.7	66.3	63.3	54.8
Colorado	9.1	8.4	11.8	11.7	14.9	37.1	35.2	35.1
Connecticut	12.2	14.1	15.2	17.5	32.2	38.6	42.3	55.3
Delaware	22.8	11.8	28.9	37.1	36.6	43.6	40.6	38.2
District of Columbia	26.8	27.9	24.5	24.8	31.6	39.6	32.0	29.4
Florida	22.9	21.5	24.0	27.2	37.8	44.4	43.4	46.3
Georgia	15.2	19.0	20.5	29.0	33.1	28.4	42.0	38.4
Hawaii	74.3	68.4	68.1	76.9	75.4	88.0	80.9	88.3
Idaho	14.8	9.7	8.0	25.5	13.7	36.1	32.1	19.7
Illinois	21.2	18.1	23.4	30.5	35.0	44.1	46.9	35.9
Indiana	9.0	13.9	21.9	33.1	31.8	41.1	33.4	30.8
Iowa	10.3	11.4	8.3	19.4	18.9	26.5	29.9	25.8
Kansas	9.8	8.9	6.5	10.5	23.5	25.0	21.9	19.6
Kentucky	12.9	11.1	12.8	19.1	25.2	27.9	28.4	29.5
Louisiana	22.9	14.0	31.7	29.6	38.0	38.1	44.1	29.1
Maine	15.4	17.0	21.4	31.1	31.9	31.0	34.6	26.9
Maryland	21.6	21.9	25.6	27.0	34.2	35.2	30.9	28.5
Massachusetts	16.6	18.5	19.2	28.4	42.1	32.2	30.4	31.9
Michigan	20.8	23.8	25.5	32.6	38.9	45.9	54.5	50.5
Minnesota	9.4	14.8	10.2	14.6	17.9	20.7	17.5	20.3
Mississippi	15.4	16.0	14.7	15.5	13.7	15.3	21.9	20.3
Missouri	14.4	13.8	15.8	19.6	21.6	21.5	14.9	18.0
Montana	13.4	19.9	13.8	22.6	28.2	42.5	41.4	37.6
Nebraska	7.1	12.5	9.9	10.4	15.0	15.2	21.2	20.9
Nevada	25.5	19.4	31.0	31.7	21.0	34.7	32.5	38.0
New Hampshire	15.6	9.9	18.4	11.7	27.6	34.9	29.2	30.0
New Jersey	28.8	30.9	39.5	33.1	42.6	40.6	46.6	53.6
New Mexico	22.8	21.5	23.0	24.2	20.9	36.7	28.9	29.4
New York	48.5	52.2	63.6	40.6	80.1	70.0	76.5	74.8
North Carolina	12.3	13.9	18.7	17.1	25.0	23.8	23.2	24.0
North Dakota	15.0	9.6	26.7	30.6	49.1	61.5	46.6	59.0
Ohio	14.9	19.7	16.0	28.4	31.5	40.9	51.9	33.6
Oklahoma	10.5	15.4	11.2	11.6	15.2	16.6	17.8	15.6
Oregon	14.5	13.2	14.4	25.6	29.6	34.5	33.2	27.9
Pennsylvania	16.4	12.6	16.1	22.9	28.9	35.6	35.8	44.0
Rhode Island	17.1	16.0	16.4	20.3	26.7	28.2	41.2	55.6
South Carolina	22.4	21.4	16.2	19.1	18.2	24.1	23.3	25.7
South Dakota	17.2	20.7	17.9	39.7	43.0	44.1	47.9	48.0
Tennessee	10.1	15.6	16.8	17.6	17.6	28.6	22.7	27.1
Texas	27.9	22.0	28.2	25.3	29.7	27.5	31.9	28.1
Utah	11.0	13.1	16.2	20.4	29.3	21.4	36.7	34.4
Vermont	14.8	23.7	16.2	19.5	25.8	38.0	54.6	50.6
Virginia	17.4	15.4	15.7	16.1	25.8	19.3	23.3	20.6
Washington	12.4	9.1	19.0	27.4	32.6	35.7	29.8	25.0
West Virginia	22.3	12.8	19.9	16.1	18.5	23.6	14.0	20.5
Wisconsin	10.0	4.6	10.9	13.4	11.2	15.0	20.5	20.0
Wyoming	14.2	9.1	6.0	24.3	25.5	32.1	27.6	27.9

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.22. Average Benefit Among Elderly SNAP Units by State and Year

	Average Benefit Among Elderly SNAP Units ($)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**61**	**60**	**66**	**72**	**86**	**87**	**91**	**90**
Alabama	53	67	68	82	84	92	66	70
Alaska	275	216	196	164	186	155	162	170
Arizona	84	91	73	109	112	108	113	114
Arkansas	60	55	50	64	64	66	70	61
California	115	115	116	129	187	145	123	122
Colorado	36	36	40	46	54	89	87	86
Connecticut	41	53	46	55	77	84	87	102
Delaware	62	46	67	78	84	95	91	90
District of Columbia	65	67	63	70	74	85	74	78
Florida	65	61	66	71	85	91	96	92
Georgia	51	53	60	84	88	83	105	97
Hawaii	135	135	136	147	152	162	168	169
Idaho	34	31	35	63	53	89	75	75
Illinois	61	53	67	83	89	94	104	89
Indiana	37	43	56	77	82	86	76	79
Iowa	37	39	39	57	58	72	71	66
Kansas	40	38	35	46	60	75	61	61
Kentucky	42	45	50	60	76	87	84	78
Louisiana	76	59	79	100	94	98	102	82
Maine	51	53	58	74	76	76	79	70
Maryland	67	64	66	69	83	83	82	80
Massachusetts	46	47	47	65	82	77	75	76
Michigan	57	59	71	82	92	91	103	103
Minnesota	33	42	46	48	49	65	57	59
Mississippi	55	52	50	57	53	57	65	59
Missouri	46	42	51	66	66	62	57	58
Montana	53	52	48	57	73	106	97	81
Nebraska	36	44	40	37	45	51	56	62
Nevada	60	55	72	75	60	77	73	82
New Hampshire	47	46	54	46	63	78	62	67
New Jersey	67	72	81	78	87	95	96	112
New Mexico	62	56	67	73	64	89	78	78
New York	93	93	110	80	136	118	132	134
North Carolina	44	41	57	55	67	71	69	84
North Dakota	53	38	64	66	95	107	109	109
Ohio	43	51	52	69	77	93	98	79
Oklahoma	34	43	35	46	55	53	57	52
Oregon	42	41	43	65	68	79	75	70
Pennsylvania	44	45	46	68	77	81	86	98
Rhode Island	46	49	46	59	64	64	85	102
South Carolina	56	55	53	57	67	65	79	79
South Dakota	61	64	64	108	95	115	103	100
Tennessee	38	50	46	54	56	68	69	73
Texas	72	65	69	75	80	80	78	81
Utah	53	43	62	59	72	60	82	87
Vermont	45	54	44	63	72	82	99	103
Virginia	56	49	50	53	69	61	62	66
Washington	48	40	56	80	84	83	84	73
West Virginia	66	49	62	54	62	65	57	63
Wisconsin	28	26	32	45	37	43	51	54
Wyoming	52	40	42	61	85	69	79	73

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.23. Average Benefit Among Elderly SNAP Units with SSI Income by State and Year

	Average Benefit Among Elderly SNAP Units with SSI Income ($)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**59**	**59**	**66**	**69**	**85**	**87**	**91**	**88**
Alabama	47	63	67	78	72	93	66	77
Alaska	246	120	65	149	130	74	145	51
Arizona	85	89	65	109	112	122	118	125
Arkansas	53	49	50	59	57	71	70	67
California[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	38	34	37	40	48	78	70	79
Connecticut	34	50	39	49	78	95	87	111
Delaware	47	49	70	80	92	115	87	93
District of Columbia	47	57	41	51	67	55	58	74
Florida	70	67	68	75	88	96	98	95
Georgia	50	54	58	85	82	80	106	107
Hawaii	145	135	144	157	151	162	174	171
Idaho	29	26	41	55	53	81	78	66
Illinois	60	52	62	75	88	93	102	93
Indiana	39	38	49	72	80	88	83	91
Iowa	38	40	37	67	54	81	84	76
Kansas	51	40	40	52	58	69	79	59
Kentucky	38	43	42	58	78	97	80	78
Louisiana	70	55	75	93	86	91	91	72
Maine	62	59	56	85	103	106	96	93
Maryland	54	63	60	69	78	81	75	70
Massachusetts	43	42	46	57	76	69	61	71
Michigan	58	63	79	98	105	96	111	125
Minnesota	28	32	32	37	33	51	41	41
Mississippi	51	45	50	60	50	51	61	52
Missouri	46	45	52	63	74	75	61	52
Montana	62	59	61	57	80	98	96	99
Nebraska	40	56	49	43	51	51	67	67
Nevada	59	54	80	78	57	82	80	80
New Hampshire	59	54	52	45	60	73	71	87
New Jersey	63	72	82	83	82	86	94	103
New Mexico	57	54	64	67	67	83	82	81
New York	91	86	107	57	137	114	131	125
North Carolina	40	45	45	62	63	81	73	77
North Dakota	45	36	61	55	95	102	94	109
Ohio	38	55	49	69	75	89	102	85
Oklahoma	25	38	31	42	48	41	46	41
Oregon	40	44	45	74	80	88	99	85
Pennsylvania	42	49	57	69	76	89	98	87
Rhode Island	51	44	41	51	54	68	71	107
South Carolina	48	47	41	50	58	64	80	81
South Dakota	50	78	65	108	102	110	119	115
Tennessee	36	57	51	56	58	74	72	83
Texas	64	57	62	66	68	63	63	61
Utah	43	42	72	54	74	49	93	85
Vermont	56	45	60	70	74	108	113	131
Virginia	52	45	41	53	67	61	63	62
Washington	44	42	51	92	90	83	72	72
West Virginia	62	51	64	54	66	72	65	78
Wisconsin	24	22	26	44	27	33	47	67
Wyoming	37	39	35	40	117	90	97	66

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table A.24. Elderly SNAP Participants by Benefit as a Percentage of Maximum Benefit and Year

	All Elderly SNAP Participants	Elderly Participants by Benefit as a Percentage of Maximum Benefit				
		1 to 25 Percent	26 to 50 Percent	51 to 75 Percent	76 to 99 Percent	100 Percent
Number (000s)						
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	829	300	242	105	150
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	800	299	213	107	143
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	766	298	215	121	175
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	716	404	286	139	145
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	691	431	311	212	272
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	735	487	336	212	274
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	777	506	365	232	345
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	801	532	378	223	329
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants						
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	51.0	18.5	14.9	6.5	9.2
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	51.2	19.1	13.6	6.8	9.2
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	48.6	18.9	13.7	7.7	11.1
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	42.4	23.9	16.9	8.2	8.6
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	36.0	22.5	16.2	11.1	14.2
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	36.0	23.8	16.5	10.4	13.4
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	34.9	22.8	16.4	10.4	15.5
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	35.4	23.5	16.7	9.8	14.6
Standard Error of Percentage						
Fiscal year 2000		1.3	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7
Fiscal year 2001		1.8	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.9
Fiscal year 2002		1.6	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.9
Fiscal year 2003		0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.5
Fiscal year 2004		0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
Fiscal year 2005		0.8	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6
Fiscal year 2006		0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6
Fiscal year 2007		0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.6

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.25a. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Benefits Between 1 to 25 Percent of the Maximum Benefit by State and Year

	Participants with Benefits Between 1 to 25 of Maximum (Percent of Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**51.0**	**15.7**	**48.6**	**42.4**	**36.0**	**36.0**	**34.9**	**35.4**
Alaska	45.2	14.2	51.9	54.3	61.3	46.1	44.1	55.8
Arizona	36.4	16.8	43.2	26.7	21.2	20.6	26.3	28.1
Arkansas	61.3	6.5	66.1	54.8	54.5	50.3	48.2	61.4
California	23.1	47.1	21.6	15.4	10.0	22.7	20.3	17.8
Colorado	69.7	3.9	68.0	65.8	55.7	38.1	37.9	37.4
Connecticut	59.6	9.6	61.3	57.1	34.3	30.4	34.1	26.4
Delaware	38.0	21.3	42.0	36.5	34.0	31.0	31.2	36.2
District of Columbia	45.0	19.6	49.6	38.7	34.8	38.2	41.5	46.7
Florida	36.0	12.8	40.9	39.1	29.7	26.0	26.4	20.1
Georgia	53.8	5.6	56.6	42.2	41.5	37.6	24.3	32.0
Hawaii	9.4	14.3	10.5	5.7	8.0	3.0	8.6	7.0
Idaho	76.5	7.1	73.6	43.2	43.5	37.1	35.7	39.3
Illinois	50.7	14.4	44.4	30.8	24.9	25.2	23.3	29.6
Indiana	68.8	7.4	54.5	30.9	34.1	27.2	33.2	37.8
Iowa	71.5	7.0	68.7	45.8	45.5	34.9	39.4	37.7
Kansas	63.3	4.3	67.3	52.8	42.5	41.8	47.3	49.1
Kentucky	71.1	2.9	65.5	51.2	45.5	41.0	40.4	33.4
Louisiana	46.3	13.1	33.2	21.9	21.9	16.5	23.0	43.7
Maine	51.8	12.2	53.1	39.5	33.5	35.6	32.4	37.5
Maryland	48.0	14.9	40.2	41.8	31.9	28.0	40.2	35.2
Massachusetts	58.4	12.6	63.4	49.5	37.6	52.4	45.7	39.4
Michigan	42.1	15.2	34.6	35.2	29.3	31.3	32.1	34.9
Minnesota	78.9	5.9	75.4	61.9	65.7	54.6	61.2	54.9
Mississippi	66.9	6.0	69.2	41.2	62.0	61.1	55.7	54.4
Missouri	58.6	8.0	57.6	42.8	50.0	48.0	56.1	64.2
Montana	40.3	8.7	67.4	52.9	43.1	26.9	23.1	37.7
Nebraska	70.5	6.3	65.5	75.0	66.5	62.5	51.4	54.6
Nevada	44.9	21.3	32.7	35.6	49.1	40.6	38.9	36.5
New Hampshire	55.0	15.6	55.2	58.1	49.5	43.4	51.6	53.9
New Jersey	42.3	22.8	35.5	36.6	32.2	30.9	31.8	21.5
New Mexico	61.9	7.3	61.9	54.1	61.5	40.9	45.0	51.9
New York	25.8	44.2	21.4	26.5	12.2	24.9	15.3	15.7
North Carolina	68.0	5.2	61.5	52.8	50.3	46.5	52.4	50.8
North Dakota	45.7	11.3	47.8	42.2	25.8	16.4	29.1	28.0
Ohio	63.0	11.4	53.8	39.7	36.6	32.8	28.8	37.8
Oklahoma	75.7	4.1	76.1	71.4	63.4	65.2	61.1	66.7
Oregon	63.8	11.8	65.1	40.6	37.2	35.3	44.5	41.9
Pennsylvania	65.1	10.9	63.0	42.5	37.5	31.4	30.1	30.9
Rhode Island	63.4	13.7	56.9	58.7	51.7	51.9	35.7	23.9
South Carolina	66.3	8.0	64.1	61.5	61.8	50.3	38.8	42.3
South Dakota	43.3	5.6	29.2	25.7	28.2	26.7	28.5	29.3
Tennessee	72.1	5.6	64.5	61.3	59.0	52.2	52.6	49.9
Texas	51.6	12.2	52.7	48.1	38.6	43.9	44.6	39.5
Utah	61.4	8.5	53.7	47.9	47.9	52.2	37.7	42.1
Vermont	53.6	10.7	59.3	47.2	40.1	32.3	22.5	25.9
Virginia	61.1	7.5	55.8	55.1	47.7	47.0	48.0	49.7
Washington	58.3	6.5	54.3	25.7	23.0	31.7	26.8	44.1
West Virginia	49.4	12.7	49.2	59.7	47.9	56.7	52.9	56.0
Wisconsin	83.4	5.5	79.5	69.7	74.4	69.0	66.5	65.9
Wyoming	59.7	8.6	72.0	63.2	29.6	41.3	40.8	27.5

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.25b. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Benefits Between 26 to 75 Percent of the Maximum Benefit by State and Year

	Participants with Benefits Between 26 to 75 of Maximum (Percent of Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**33.4**	**32.8**	**32.6**	**40.8**	**38.7**	**40.3**	**39.2**	**40.2**
Alabama	38.9	36.1	38.0	44.3	46.5	53.9	36.5	41.9
Alaska	40.6	43.0	31.4	33.7	24.6	28.8	36.6	19.0
Arizona	46.8	48.9	41.2	48.8	49.6	58.2	36.2	40.9
Arkansas	32.1	28.4	26.1	37.8	36.9	38.0	41.0	33.4
California	29.8	21.1	21.1	24.8	28.9	28.5	30.2	40.8
Colorado	26.4	26.0	26.0	25.9	34.6	37.2	38.6	44.2
Connecticut	30.8	36.0	27.3	30.2	42.0	44.5	40.8	33.9
Delaware	40.8	37.5	35.6	39.8	35.8	40.3	41.7	34.8
District of Columbia	35.3	33.1	31.7	46.6	44.0	34.3	40.1	29.4
Florida	51.2	49.6	42.7	43.2	45.0	52.2	50.2	59.3
Georgia	40.6	33.1	35.8	41.2	40.4	46.1	53.4	49.5
Hawaii	76.3	72.2	70.8	76.3	72.2	75.6	71.8	69.4
Idaho	16.4	13.1	22.7	39.8	50.7	41.7	49.8	51.0
Illinois	34.9	30.6	37.5	49.2	52.4	46.4	46.5	45.2
Indiana	23.8	25.0	35.3	41.1	43.7	51.1	46.4	42.4
Iowa	21.5	28.5	26.4	47.6	43.2	57.1	46.3	48.7
Kansas	32.5	36.4	29.4	40.4	45.4	44.5	42.9	38.3
Kentucky	26.0	27.0	30.1	43.8	42.6	44.9	45.9	53.2
Louisiana	40.6	43.0	47.2	60.2	55.2	68.3	56.9	42.2
Maine	36.0	28.2	30.1	37.4	45.0	49.1	48.0	48.8
Maryland	37.1	39.2	43.5	42.2	46.2	51.5	39.7	49.2
Massachusetts	29.0	24.8	26.9	30.4	32.3	24.7	32.4	40.2
Michigan	42.7	34.2	44.1	40.5	46.1	36.3	30.9	24.6
Minnesota	15.2	19.3	15.9	27.6	19.1	31.8	26.5	34.6
Mississippi	27.0	25.9	27.9	50.9	33.8	32.7	37.8	35.9
Missouri	33.4	34.2	34.0	46.4	37.9	43.2	38.7	31.1
Montana	51.1	40.4	26.2	34.1	35.3	50.4	53.9	42.1
Nebraska	23.2	32.7	26.7	18.2	23.6	32.1	37.9	34.1
Nevada	33.8	41.2	48.7	38.6	37.5	37.8	41.0	42.7
New Hampshire	29.3	34.8	27.5	30.1	29.3	29.8	26.5	28.2
New Jersey	34.9	37.3	35.0	40.3	40.0	39.6	34.6	41.7
New Mexico	30.8	28.9	27.1	38.6	28.4	44.0	44.4	39.6
New York	30.0	28.1	22.2	44.6	15.8	21.4	23.9	27.1
North Carolina	26.8	28.3	28.3	37.0	38.1	39.8	34.0	35.6
North Dakota	43.0	28.2	31.9	37.2	45.3	35.5	40.0	30.1
Ohio	25.6	29.8	33.5	40.3	44.0	42.3	35.5	41.5
Oklahoma	20.3	22.5	18.5	23.4	30.4	27.1	28.2	25.7
Oregon	24.4	27.1	23.4	38.7	46.2	43.8	34.6	38.9
Pennsylvania	24.0	27.1	28.7	43.3	43.6	44.1	47.4	43.3
Rhode Island	22.9	28.2	31.6	23.4	30.1	29.5	34.1	39.9
South Carolina	25.7	29.4	29.4	29.4	27.0	40.5	51.8	46.1
South Dakota	51.1	51.1	52.9	56.1	50.0	48.4	40.8	31.4
Tennessee	22.4	31.0	29.7	29.4	30.9	33.6	34.7	38.6
Texas	36.3	32.3	35.6	39.6	47.2	39.7	41.3	43.6
Utah	30.1	35.1	37.2	39.0	36.0	33.8	41.3	34.6
Vermont	35.7	39.0	27.7	35.6	42.1	41.0	41.3	32.6
Virginia	31.4	32.4	36.7	36.3	39.3	41.0	43.3	37.5
Washington	35.2	26.5	36.4	56.7	55.2	48.5	51.6	43.4
West Virginia	37.9	33.1	41.5	31.7	43.5	33.2	39.2	36.8
Wisconsin	11.2	15.6	14.3	20.8	17.4	23.1	20.5	21.7
Wyoming	31.7	22.1	23.8	23.3	60.1	49.4	41.0	55.3

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.25c. Percentage of Elderly SNAP Participants with Benefits Between 76 to 100 Percent of the Maximum Benefit by State and Year

	Participants with Benefits Between 76 to 100 of Maximum (Percent of Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**15.7**	**16.0**	**18.8**	**16.8**	**25.2**	**23.7**	**25.9**	**24.4**
Alabama	8.4	11.5	11.4	12.7	16.7	10.4	11.0	12.2
Alaska	14.2	10.5	16.7	12.0	14.2	25.1	19.2	25.2
Arizona	16.8	18.0	15.6	24.6	29.2	21.2	37.5	31.0
Arkansas	6.5	7.1	7.8	7.4	8.6	11.7	10.8	5.2
California	47.1	59.1	57.3	59.8	61.1	48.7	49.5	41.4
Colorado	3.9	4.7	6.1	8.4	9.7	24.7	23.4	18.4
Connecticut	9.6	10.8	11.4	12.7	23.8	25.1	25.1	39.8
Delaware	21.3	6.1	22.4	23.8	30.2	28.6	27.1	29.0
District of Columbia	19.6	20.0	18.7	14.8	21.2	27.5	18.4	23.9
Florida	12.8	11.5	16.4	17.7	25.3	21.8	23.4	20.7
Georgia	5.6	8.4	7.7	16.6	18.1	16.3	22.3	18.5
Hawaii	14.3	20.3	18.7	17.9	19.8	21.4	19.6	23.6
Idaho	7.1	4.8	3.7	16.9	5.8	21.3	14.4	9.7
Illinois	14.4	12.9	18.0	20.1	22.8	28.4	30.2	25.2
Indiana	7.4	8.9	10.1	28.0	22.3	21.7	20.3	19.9
Iowa	7.0	5.0	4.9	6.6	11.3	8.0	14.3	13.6
Kansas	4.3	3.6	3.3	6.9	12.1	13.7	9.8	12.6
Kentucky	2.9	4.9	4.4	5.0	11.9	14.2	13.7	13.4
Louisiana	13.1	8.5	19.6	17.9	22.9	15.2	20.1	14.1
Maine	12.2	13.8	16.8	23.1	21.6	15.3	19.6	13.7
Maryland	14.9	15.9	16.3	16.1	21.9	20.5	20.0	15.6
Massachusetts	12.6	15.1	9.7	20.2	30.1	23.0	21.9	20.4
Michigan	15.2	20.6	21.3	24.3	24.6	32.3	37.0	40.5
Minnesota	5.9	10.4	8.7	10.5	15.3	13.6	12.4	10.5
Mississippi	6.0	8.3	2.9	7.8	4.2	6.3	6.5	9.7
Missouri	8.0	7.5	8.3	10.7	12.1	8.8	5.2	4.7
Montana	8.7	8.7	6.4	13.1	21.6	22.7	23.1	20.2
Nebraska	6.3	6.3	7.8	6.8	10.0	5.4	10.8	11.3
Nevada	21.3	14.7	18.6	25.9	13.4	21.5	20.1	20.8
New Hampshire	15.6	9.2	17.3	11.7	21.2	26.8	21.9	18.0
New Jersey	22.8	25.1	29.5	23.1	27.8	29.5	33.6	36.8
New Mexico	7.3	8.2	11.0	7.3	10.0	15.1	10.5	8.6
New York	44.2	46.4	56.3	28.8	72.0	53.7	60.9	57.2
North Carolina	5.2	3.0	10.2	10.1	11.6	13.7	13.6	13.6
North Dakota	11.3	6.6	20.4	20.6	28.9	48.1	31.0	41.9
Ohio	11.4	13.0	12.7	20.0	19.4	24.9	35.7	20.7
Oklahoma	4.1	6.4	5.4	5.1	6.2	7.7	10.7	7.6
Oregon	11.8	8.5	11.5	20.7	16.6	20.9	20.9	19.2
Pennsylvania	10.9	8.3	8.2	14.2	18.9	24.5	22.5	25.8
Rhode Island	13.7	15.1	11.4	17.9	18.2	18.6	30.2	36.2
South Carolina	8.0	9.2	6.5	9.1	11.2	9.3	9.4	11.6
South Dakota	5.6	11.6	17.9	18.1	21.9	24.8	30.7	39.3
Tennessee	5.6	7.7	5.7	9.3	10.1	14.1	12.6	11.4
Texas	12.2	11.9	11.7	12.3	14.2	16.4	14.1	17.0
Utah	8.5	8.6	9.2	13.1	16.1	14.1	21.0	23.3
Vermont	10.7	13.4	12.9	17.2	17.8	26.7	36.1	41.5
Virginia	7.5	8.9	7.5	8.6	12.9	12.0	8.7	12.8
Washington	6.5	5.8	9.3	17.5	21.8	19.9	21.7	12.5
West Virginia	12.7	7.3	9.3	8.7	8.6	10.2	7.9	7.2
Wisconsin	5.5	2.9	6.2	9.5	8.2	8.0	13.0	12.4
Wyoming	8.6	7.2	4.2	13.5	10.3	9.3	18.2	17.2

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.26. Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Earned Income by Age Cohort and Average Earnings by Year

	Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Earned Income			
	Total	Age 60 to 64	Age 65 to 74	Age 75 or Older
Number (000s)				
Fiscal year 2000	60	33	20	7
Fiscal year 2001	49	23	20	6
Fiscal year 2002	61	32	22	7
Fiscal year 2003	72	36	27	9
Fiscal year 2004	89	51	27	11
Fiscal year 2005	85	51	28	6
Fiscal year 2006	98	56	31	10
Fiscal year 2007	116	66	38	11
Percent of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Earned Income				
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	54.4	33.2	12.5
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	45.7	41.4	12.9
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	53.0	35.6	11.4
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	49.7	37.4	12.9
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	57.7	30.1	12.2
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	60.2	32.7	7.1
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	57.8	32.1	10.1
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	57.2	33.1	9.6
Standard Error of Percentage				
Fiscal year 2000		3.9	3.1	2.4
Fiscal year 2001		3.8	3.8	2.2
Fiscal year 2002		3.9	3.8	2.4
Fiscal year 2003		3.7	3.7	2.7
Fiscal year 2004		3.5	3.3	2.4
Fiscal year 2005		3.8	3.7	1.4
Fiscal year 2006		3.6	3.5	2.1
Fiscal year 2007		3.3	3.3	2.0
Average Monthly Unit Earnings Among Units with Earnings ($)				
Fiscal year 2000	432	482	409	373
Fiscal year 2001	374	376	386	262
Fiscal year 2002	394	440	352	317
Fiscal year 2003	508	610	314	491
Fiscal year 2004	552	600	479	480
Fiscal year 2005	453	470	400	471
Fiscal year 2006	546	579	581	376

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.27. Elderly Participants in SNAP Units Receiving Earned Income by Age Cohort and State, Average FY 2000-2007

	Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Earned Income				
	Percent of All Elderly Participants	Total Number (000s)	By Age (Percent of Elderly with Earnings)		
			60 to 64	65 to 74	75 or Older
United States	**4.2**	**79**	**55.3**	**33.9**	**10.8**
Alabama	2.8	1	66.4	23.6	10.1
Alaska	11.9	0	54.1	37.5	8.5
Arizona	6.5	1	80.1	14.5	5.4
Arkansas	4.5	1	54.3	35.3	10.3
California	12.9	3	76.7	14.0	9.3
Colorado	5.3	1	48.6	37.5	13.9
Connecticut	2.7	1	54.5	28.7	16.8
Delaware	4.6	0	65.1	25.3	9.6
District of Columbia	4.2	0	46.3	34.0	19.6
Florida	3.8	7	46.6	40.7	12.7
Georgia	4.6	3	51.3	41.7	7.0
Hawaii	6.8	1	45.6	42.7	11.8
Idaho	5.4	0	73.4	23.3	3.3
Illinois	4.3	3	44.9	45.4	9.7
Indiana	4.0	1	69.7	19.6	10.7
Iowa	7.2	1	67.7	21.6	10.7
Kansas	4.7	1	52.2	31.9	15.9
Kentucky	3.6	2	39.4	44.1	16.5
Louisiana	4.7	2	56.4	34.6	9.0
Maine	3.7	1	46.4	45.6	7.9
Maryland	4.1	1	57.8	27.5	14.7
Massachusetts	2.7	1	46.4	46.4	7.2
Michigan	5.7	4	61.5	27.0	11.5
Minnesota	4.3	1	54.3	32.4	13.3
Mississippi	2.8	1	58.4	24.2	17.4
Missouri	3.3	1	53.4	40.0	6.6
Montana	5.9	0	66.1	26.9	7.0
Nebraska	5.4	0	51.1	32.0	16.9
Nevada	1.9	0	47.2	49.4	3.4
New Hampshire	2.7	0	53.7	28.1	18.2
New Jersey	2.8	1	45.3	40.7	14.1
New Mexico	5.5	1	58.8	26.0	15.2
New York	2.9	7	49.6	39.6	10.8
North Carolina	3.9	3	59.9	25.1	15.0
North Dakota	8.6	0	50.4	38.0	11.6
Ohio	4.2	3	47.6	38.9	13.6
Oklahoma	2.2	1	63.4	17.4	19.2
Oregon	6.8	2	62.1	32.3	5.6
Pennsylvania	4.1	3	55.5	27.5	17.0
Rhode Island	2.5	0	53.7	31.9	14.4
South Carolina	3.7	1	57.7	25.9	16.4
South Dakota	6.0	0	52.9	29.9	17.2
Tennessee	3.6	2	52.1	42.0	5.9
Texas	6.2	10	59.1	34.9	5.9
Utah	5.2	0	56.2	33.6	10.3
Vermont	6.3	0	44.9	36.0	19.1
Virginia	3.9	2	51.1	33.9	15.0
Washington	2.0	1	67.0	24.4	8.6
West Virginia	2.2	0	63.5	31.7	4.9
Wisconsin	4.9	1	49.3	40.7	10.0
Wyoming	4.5	0	43.2	52.0	4.8

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.28. Elderly Participants by SNAP Unit Receipt of Unearned Income and Average Unearned Income by Year

	All Elderly SNAP Participants, All Unearned Income	Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Unearned Income		
		SSI	Social Security	Other
Number (000s)				
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	979	1,108	397
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	966	1,059	364
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	946	1,064	351
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	965	1,149	344
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	1,115	1,283	384
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	1,152	1,379	434
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	1,231	1,515	444
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	1,267	1,575	486
Percent of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Unearned Income				
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	60.2	68.1	24.4
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	61.9	67.8	23.3
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	60.1	67.6	22.3
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	57.1	68.1	20.4
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	58.1	66.9	20.0
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	56.4	67.4	21.2
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	55.3	68.1	19.9
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	56.0	69.6	21.5
Standard Error of Percentage				
Fiscal year 2000		0.7	0.8	0.6
Fiscal year 2001		0.7	0.8	0.6
Fiscal year 2002		0.8	0.8	0.6
Fiscal year 2003		0.7	0.8	0.6
Fiscal year 2004		0.8	0.7	0.6
Fiscal year 2005		0.8	0.9	0.7
Fiscal year 2006		0.8	0.8	0.6
Fiscal year 2007		0.8	0.8	0.7
Average Monthly Unit Unearned Income Among Units with Unearned Income ($)				
Fiscal year 2000	611	333	516	182
Fiscal year 2001	625	349	522	174
Fiscal year 2002	645	356	548	187
Fiscal year 2003	657	357	562	227
Fiscal year 2004	677	375	582	221
Fiscal year 2005	695	377	610	228
Fiscal year 2006	722	395	629	218
Fiscal year 2007	740	391	636	206

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.29. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units Receiving SSI by State and Year

	Elderly Participants in Units Receiving SSI (Percent of Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**60.2**	**61.9**	**60.1**	**57.1**	**58.1**	**56.4**	**55.3**	**56.0**
Alabama	66.0	68.2	64.7	57.0	55.8	58.7	52.8	63.6
Alaska	36.9	38.9	43.5	45.3	24.2	30.0	42.4	32.3
Arizona	66.2	60.8	56.2	58.4	48.5	48.8	51.5	43.5
Arkansas	62.1	60.8	53.9	61.1	50.6	47.8	49.5	50.3
California	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	61.5	60.6	61.9	52.0	55.8	44.5	54.4	48.5
Connecticut	53.4	55.9	64.3	60.2	64.5	59.5	55.3	51.9
Delaware	46.4	40.3	52.0	33.1	47.4	38.6	38.5	35.6
District of Columbia	58.6	53.6	47.5	38.5	37.4	41.2	44.0	46.6
Florida	62.2	63.5	59.4	60.8	57.3	57.7	59.3	59.6
Georgia	54.0	66.1	52.4	49.8	61.2	50.7	44.3	45.0
Hawaii	60.7	52.2	53.0	61.3	56.7	61.1	54.4	60.4
Idaho	59.8	50.8	47.4	44.3	61.1	47.4	51.5	47.6
Illinois	68.2	68.8	64.1	52.4	70.5	60.0	53.2	60.4
Indiana	50.7	46.2	40.7	32.8	32.6	38.6	35.5	37.6
Iowa	52.9	52.7	56.7	58.0	46.1	53.7	42.6	49.2
Kansas	53.9	53.4	49.0	43.6	51.4	40.3	41.1	43.4
Kentucky	62.1	73.0	68.3	65.0	62.9	63.0	59.5	65.7
Louisiana	65.3	74.1	60.6	61.5	52.4	56.3	56.4	59.6
Maine	39.2	46.6	49.5	46.6	41.1	38.5	34.7	29.1
Maryland	62.2	60.1	54.9	60.8	55.8	54.9	54.4	63.7
Massachusetts	69.7	72.5	81.2	64.4	68.6	72.6	76.0	75.7
Michigan	51.7	46.5	49.9	49.1	52.0	40.8	43.5	37.4
Minnesota	68.6	73.3	70.8	73.0	69.1	69.0	66.7	71.2
Mississippi	64.1	69.0	67.1	74.6	70.5	68.1	65.3	66.3
Missouri	54.7	52.5	57.1	57.6	44.4	44.6	48.5	43.2
Montana	41.8	50.3	49.5	43.8	45.4	37.6	42.8	41.2
Nebraska	45.3	45.8	47.8	49.1	33.3	40.3	51.6	40.4
Nevada	57.7	58.4	64.3	58.0	55.3	54.9	48.0	59.3
New Hampshire	35.1	41.0	32.1	39.1	40.5	29.4	34.6	35.9
New Jersey	58.4	63.8	61.1	65.3	68.8	59.4	63.0	60.1
New Mexico	57.4	55.6	54.2	57.3	59.7	54.8	49.7	53.5
New York	68.6	73.9	76.2	57.8	72.8	76.1	76.4	70.4
North Carolina	53.7	54.0	57.4	52.7	50.7	40.7	52.6	50.0
North Dakota	51.1	46.3	39.3	39.2	43.6	44.4	31.4	35.1
Ohio	52.2	58.3	61.0	58.4	53.5	55.2	52.1	51.9
Oklahoma	62.1	59.9	56.1	60.0	47.2	61.0	43.9	59.2
Oregon	45.9	41.3	38.2	34.9	35.9	35.0	33.8	33.4
Pennsylvania	53.8	64.0	54.3	53.5	64.9	55.1	52.2	62.8
Rhode Island	63.2	75.8	69.1	62.1	58.1	59.0	67.5	65.4
South Carolina	66.3	63.2	63.2	57.0	58.0	53.8	57.0	51.1
South Dakota	51.6	38.0	51.4	45.6	38.8	36.8	41.0	34.0
Tennessee	52.1	47.7	48.8	43.8	38.9	38.5	38.7	40.4
Texas	73.3	71.5	67.2	76.8	72.0	73.6	61.2	64.9
Utah	61.8	63.6	61.5	56.4	48.2	55.2	50.8	56.6
Vermont	42.3	35.6	23.9	37.7	42.1	38.7	38.2	43.4
Virginia	67.0	57.2	61.9	57.0	58.9	47.2	54.9	54.2
Washington	73.4	65.5	60.6	68.9	57.0	58.3	55.3	62.2
West Virginia	61.6	61.6	61.6	57.8	64.7	54.5	58.3	53.6
Wisconsin	45.8	46.0	45.3	47.6	34.1	35.0	38.7	32.6
Wyoming	31.9	41.8	57.5	20.8	52.1	43.5	48.7	46.3

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.30. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units Receiving Social Security by State and Year

	Elderly Participants in Units Receiving Social Security (Percent of Elderly Participants)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**68.1**	**67.8**	**67.6**	**68.1**	**66.9**	**67.4**	**68.1**	**69.6**
Alabama	83.3	84.3	81.7	81.0	81.5	81.9	80.9	78.0
Alaska	69.4	77.7	65.3	67.1	75.2	62.7	58.8	75.8
Arizona	57.4	60.7	66.1	69.9	64.9	64.6	66.0	63.0
Arkansas	87.0	86.7	85.5	85.1	81.4	83.0	82.4	83.2
California	20.9	36.9	37.1	26.6	28.5	32.4	38.0	58.0
Colorado	71.9	70.2	67.2	72.2	67.1	66.3	62.0	66.1
Connecticut	68.5	68.4	61.6	60.2	61.8	61.5	66.8	58.9
Delaware	63.8	81.0	70.4	78.7	69.3	75.5	73.1	79.4
District of Columbia	61.7	64.3	60.0	67.0	67.1	69.1	64.1	67.7
Florida	61.7	60.6	64.4	64.1	61.0	61.4	60.3	58.8
Georgia	78.6	82.8	79.0	76.9	77.9	79.2	79.3	82.1
Hawaii	48.8	54.1	58.1	54.1	57.4	57.6	59.5	56.3
Idaho	81.3	73.8	83.7	79.8	80.3	81.8	73.6	80.1
Illinois	52.9	54.7	54.3	56.7	56.2	58.9	58.7	59.2
Indiana	79.5	80.3	82.9	86.4	88.3	76.0	84.1	82.8
Iowa	75.2	79.1	83.2	81.7	75.2	80.2	80.4	77.2
Kansas	79.2	81.6	84.3	78.1	71.3	76.0	78.4	78.4
Kentucky	78.3	68.9	72.4	78.4	75.8	73.5	77.5	73.4
Louisiana	83.4	73.7	72.5	77.9	79.3	79.6	73.0	76.9
Maine	90.9	88.6	89.8	82.0	84.0	88.4	84.4	90.8
Maryland	58.6	56.6	56.9	56.2	53.7	59.5	62.0	52.1
Massachusetts	55.2	51.5	55.2	47.6	59.0	51.1	59.3	55.3
Michigan	68.8	76.4	76.9	74.2	63.5	76.5	74.4	81.5
Minnesota	64.1	52.5	63.4	57.3	54.9	54.9	59.5	46.6
Mississippi	83.7	80.9	82.2	79.0	83.1	83.3	77.2	83.8
Missouri	85.6	82.4	78.0	81.4	81.7	71.3	84.4	85.4
Montana	86.0	77.6	82.9	85.5	81.2	75.7	80.8	79.3
Nebraska	86.2	83.4	79.9	80.9	83.8	85.5	80.0	72.8
Nevada	74.6	74.4	73.4	73.3	72.3	68.0	73.1	64.1
New Hampshire	85.9	83.7	79.7	89.1	80.9	75.4	78.4	87.0
New Jersey	58.0	53.3	63.5	57.4	52.4	54.1	50.8	61.5
New Mexico	75.1	83.7	75.5	78.5	76.9	77.9	81.6	73.7
New York	49.9	51.3	46.0	39.2	50.6	52.2	49.4	57.8
North Carolina	87.2	86.0	84.1	85.7	81.6	87.4	82.3	82.7
North Dakota	84.2	86.5	87.1	83.9	84.0	84.8	89.5	85.7
Ohio	66.4	70.4	67.4	65.5	66.8	75.4	73.5	73.0
Oklahoma	79.6	79.9	84.7	79.7	80.8	73.5	83.6	72.3
Oregon	74.9	76.9	67.2	74.5	78.2	68.8	75.6	84.3
Pennsylvania	67.1	68.3	69.8	69.3	64.3	66.4	67.2	72.0
Rhode Island	72.7	62.5	72.1	59.6	69.3	65.8	63.3	61.5
South Carolina	61.1	55.3	58.2	63.3	70.5	75.6	76.4	78.1
South Dakota	78.0	90.0	93.8	79.3	84.0	86.7	83.3	89.5
Tennessee	85.8	82.4	76.2	81.9	86.3	82.9	87.8	84.3
Texas	82.4	71.7	76.9	74.3	70.3	67.0	73.6	75.4
Utah	67.5	63.7	62.3	58.9	62.8	63.7	66.9	64.6
Vermont	78.4	87.9	88.8	94.8	85.3	85.3	92.7	85.1
Virginia	66.1	74.2	74.5	77.5	69.0	70.1	71.2	67.7
Washington	47.3	52.2	56.6	49.0	51.0	53.7	53.1	50.7
West Virginia	77.6	77.1	79.4	74.3	73.0	79.3	75.9	76.9
Wisconsin	81.5	85.1	81.0	75.3	83.3	83.2	79.1	77.2
Wyoming	87.0	89.9	83.6	88.6	84.9	88.5	88.0	88.4

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.31. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with Other Unearned Income by State and Year

	Elderly Participants in Units with Other Unearned Income (Percent of Elderly Participants)[a]							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**24.4**	**23.3**	**22.3**	**20.4**	**20.0**	**21.2**	**19.9**	**21.5**
Alabama	20.3	16.9	16.0	16.0	15.4	17.9	8.7	13.4
Alaska	91.2	83.3	81.3	81.4	81.6	83.1	88.9	83.4
Arizona	24.8	22.5	24.9	15.9	19.3	15.4	16.0	20.0
Arkansas	23.9	18.0	17.6	16.7	11.7	12.3	14.6	12.9
California	63.5	37.5	48.9	38.3	44.7	50.9	40.8	22.9
Colorado	77.2	80.4	75.2	77.7	70.7	63.6	72.4	64.6
Connecticut	41.7	42.7	43.8	43.2	35.9	34.8	34.8	31.6
Delaware	22.4	11.1	20.2	22.9	17.5	27.2	26.2	18.8
District of Columbia	14.9	23.7	22.6	20.3	14.0	15.7	17.7	11.2
Florida	19.4	17.7	15.8	10.4	10.4	11.1	10.6	11.2
Georgia	27.9	19.4	19.5	19.9	16.2	15.2	12.1	21.5
Hawaii	23.4	27.6	19.4	18.8	23.1	19.5	18.3	25.2
Idaho	64.0	52.2	55.0	49.0	60.1	49.1	55.2	58.1
Illinois	39.3	37.4	36.7	36.6	29.5	29.1	28.4	25.5
Indiana	21.7	23.9	23.4	14.1	19.3	22.9	11.5	14.1
Iowa	13.4	22.3	17.6	16.1	19.4	15.9	11.8	14.0
Kansas	13.7	16.4	18.9	16.8	17.2	16.1	13.5	16.9
Kentucky	23.4	12.6	21.1	16.9	13.7	16.5	13.6	16.3
Louisiana	27.0	26.2	20.8	16.3	21.0	21.5	23.6	20.7
Maine	30.5	29.8	26.5	22.9	18.4	21.8	41.9	50.6
Maryland	15.6	13.7	14.8	19.4	15.4	15.4	15.4	10.6
Massachusetts	20.4	18.3	13.2	21.0	24.4	19.4	15.5	14.0
Michigan	18.6	16.0	16.1	17.3	18.4	20.8	55.6	49.8
Minnesota	16.7	12.9	10.5	14.0	14.6	12.4	13.9	8.2
Mississippi	18.6	20.5	21.8	15.4	13.9	13.5	13.3	14.3
Missouri	15.3	14.8	20.4	16.1	16.6	18.6	13.7	18.0
Montana	24.9	23.0	21.2	12.2	26.8	18.0	17.4	23.5
Nebraska	28.9	32.2	33.7	31.2	28.5	33.1	23.9	31.7
Nevada	18.2	15.0	13.1	9.6	15.4	20.4	14.0	16.1
New Hampshire	33.7	46.3	36.9	43.7	44.5	29.8	39.2	35.0
New Jersey	15.0	15.7	17.9	20.8	18.3	22.3	19.6	18.4
New Mexico	25.9	16.1	16.2	14.9	16.4	17.9	16.6	12.1
New York	19.5	23.7	17.1	25.7	14.5	21.6	12.4	25.6
North Carolina	19.0	30.7	17.3	16.9	17.7	21.4	15.5	12.4
North Dakota	17.5	28.0	31.2	20.5	14.4	13.1	25.1	19.8
Ohio	16.2	18.2	12.8	19.3	27.8	17.4	18.2	12.8
Oklahoma	75.8	73.2	77.2	78.6	72.3	77.8	67.2	73.6
Oregon	30.5	33.6	40.5	25.1	31.0	22.9	39.1	27.6
Pennsylvania	34.6	26.3	24.0	22.3	21.7	18.4	19.8	13.2
Rhode Island	12.1	9.5	5.5	14.2	15.2	15.3	12.5	15.8
South Carolina	17.3	15.4	15.5	15.9	16.5	11.7	10.8	13.6
South Dakota	37.5	42.4	31.7	36.0	40.8	36.9	18.3	23.1
Tennessee	29.9	27.0	26.7	14.8	21.1	20.1	17.7	14.3
Texas	20.6	16.3	24.6	12.6	12.7	15.2	11.0	17.5
Utah	14.2	11.2	18.4	16.8	12.8	14.0	11.2	11.3
Vermont	44.2	43.0	36.6	36.4	26.3	27.3	21.4	30.0
Virginia	18.0	18.2	13.7	12.0	15.3	13.6	14.8	12.9
Washington	14.3	15.7	16.1	16.1	38.8	57.4	60.8	60.4
West Virginia	19.1	15.8	17.9	16.8	15.1	17.2	16.3	19.0
Wisconsin	17.8	19.8	23.6	13.5	22.3	19.3	19.1	16.5
Wyoming	21.4	21.7	20.5	21.1	15.2	17.0	6.7	13.2

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] Other unearned income is unearned income other than SSI or Social Security.

Table A.32. Average Gross Income Among Elderly SNAP Units by State and Year

	Average Gross Income Among Elderly SNAP Units ($)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**613**	**624**	**642**	**653**	**679**	**690**	**716**	**736**
Alabama	625	628	647	690	660	730	691	706
Alaska	1,066	1,133	940	1,094	1,127	966	1,027	1,087
Arizona	580	611	627	636	656	689	679	740
Arkansas	644	625	666	661	683	680	733	733
California	420	394	464	459	537	578	495	599
Colorado	654	670	703	727	696	714	744	799
Connecticut	631	624	624	652	692	701	774	722
Delaware	529	680	620	678	647	800	730	778
District of Columbia	524	576	571	595	591	565	641	635
Florida	585	602	599	632	627	632	641	679
Georgia	604	621	635	662	685	706	689	719
Hawaii	641	631	653	630	651	671	699	706
Idaho	628	642	744	665	656	724	738	758
Illinois	603	629	622	684	652	666	698	727
Indiana	613	644	661	703	721	743	739	773
Iowa	622	621	646	700	692	730	745	746
Kansas	613	638	665	634	670	704	730	737
Kentucky	619	616	630	665	676	677	717	732
Louisiana	595	624	631	673	697	684	717	706
Maine	652	651	671	683	706	728	772	792
Maryland	598	593	603	646	647	645	706	730
Massachusetts	684	690	734	773	748	765	752	799
Michigan	614	621	668	741	748	774	802	825
Minnesota	634	606	675	655	671	677	716	731
Mississippi	611	594	639	634	641	635	671	695
Missouri	600	621	651	666	696	712	763	843
Montana	620	598	648	656	669	675	721	744
Nebraska	633	645	654	671	703	726	713	755
Nevada	580	592	661	633	668	679	701	734
New Hampshire	644	631	644	709	692	708	743	799
New Jersey	611	612	648	667	662	685	684	714
New Mexico	635	663	643	705	704	695	719	808
New York	641	641	673	543	719	707	744	768
North Carolina	627	665	646	689	686	721	743	755
North Dakota	602	714	702	701	667	660	800	818
Ohio	580	615	584	620	675	702	712	731
Oklahoma	601	631	658	662	683	676	707	711
Oregon	591	636	657	737	778	744	818	842
Pennsylvania	603	641	656	699	678	709	753	744
Rhode Island	624	590	652	652	728	691	693	767
South Carolina	590	569	625	617	668	674	680	716
South Dakota	662	713	638	693	718	728	718	773
Tennessee	631	637	645	663	707	726	750	753
Texas	606	597	632	645	640	623	692	653
Utah	579	644	624	641	619	624	658	658
Vermont	668	653	738	738	751	758	803	811
Virginia	602	606	618	632	650	671	679	716
Washington	617	645	650	648	678	693	673	741
West Virginia	612	635	669	685	673	707	739	755
Wisconsin	734	743	746	739	795	841	888	842
Wyoming	627	625	661	740	687	733	726	704

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.33. Average SSI Income Among Elderly SNAP Units with SSI by State and Year

	Average SSI Income Among Elderly SNAP Units with SSI ($)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**198**	**216**	**212**	**201**	**217**	**211**	**217**	**218**
Alabama	174	150	163	168	161	186	161	200
Alaska	107	131	118	180	78	92	153	123
Arizona	206	227	180	204	176	192	186	181
Arkansas	143	128	140	148	133	139	151	153
California[a]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colorado	173	184	212	165	164	157	208	196
Connecticut	197	182	225	234	247	268	237	225
Delaware	143	125	159	117	167	134	135	122
District of Columbia	180	158	176	107	146	128	157	169
Florida	218	247	216	235	231	229	236	269
Georgia	139	166	143	152	165	157	133	137
Hawaii	250	228	240	252	231	252	238	267
Idaho	130	168	136	118	167	145	162	120
Illinois	255	283	249	234	293	235	226	264
Indiana	138	137	111	99	89	139	116	126
Iowa	162	131	143	177	154	155	131	140
Kansas	140	128	132	129	182	144	139	153
Kentucky	166	247	205	199	198	198	189	227
Louisiana	153	210	208	170	142	148	203	192
Maine	76	98	98	118	115	89	113	81
Maryland	222	231	221	242	254	208	240	290
Massachusetts	315	334	350	349	314	377	357	392
Michigan	171	148	155	181	206	124	168	121
Minnesota	228	260	250	310	282	278	265	383
Mississippi	163	181	178	221	183	180	205	190
Missouri	125	141	172	161	122	167	183	134
Montana	99	130	129	136	121	136	128	136
Nebraska	115	119	146	137	85	102	146	150
Nevada	152	169	197	182	182	187	161	249
New Hampshire	107	114	97	95	138	105	127	101
New Jersey	224	259	235	270	289	259	279	269
New Mexico	168	158	166	178	174	159	140	198
New York	299	326	362	270	374	360	403	334
North Carolina	130	134	155	144	142	110	146	138
North Dakota	115	125	100	111	126	135	108	101
Ohio	178	192	214	211	197	190	180	200
Oklahoma	161	158	131	171	140	190	139	198
Oregon	138	141	142	110	131	144	152	106
Pennsylvania	193	238	196	208	250	237	243	259
Rhode Island	203	253	224	241	236	228	268	289
South Carolina	244	261	282	222	194	189	191	186
South Dakota	150	98	95	132	112	87	100	86
Tennessee	124	133	168	130	116	127	102	122
Texas	196	237	186	226	219	222	180	189
Utah	190	228	219	233	182	193	191	242
Vermont	129	72	57	84	142	100	100	132
Virginia	209	166	189	166	201	169	200	212
Washington	310	283	235	312	266	264	225	287
West Virginia	172	195	187	211	199	200	216	214
Wisconsin	167	145	161	181	120	143	179	163
Wyoming	67	73	146	28	166	104	137	107

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table A.34. Average Social Security Income Among Elderly SNAP Units with Social Security by State and Year

	Average Social Security Income Among Elderly SNAP Units with Social Security ($)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**355**	**357**	**374**	**385**	**393**	**414**	**431**	**447**
Alabama	417	416	439	459	458	485	490	458
Alaska	381	437	380	375	576	418	395	557
Arizona	281	304	368	364	375	392	422	407
Arkansas	443	447	477	476	474	508	528	527
California	123	216	226	164	221	260	279	453
Colorado	363	347	357	398	389	396	381	431
Connecticut	352	356	313	312	349	370	414	393
Delaware	337	510	412	478	404	545	517	574
District of Columbia	288	314	298	379	352	383	365	402
Florida	320	326	349	359	347	360	365	365
Georgia	410	407	439	446	438	488	505	523
Hawaii	268	310	337	314	339	330	361	355
Idaho	443	416	511	455	431	505	470	511
Illinois	273	292	296	374	310	350	390	412
Indiana	419	469	508	562	591	517	582	585
Iowa	417	436	464	464	468	495	556	526
Kansas	437	468	484	451	436	484	538	517
Kentucky	391	333	375	402	435	437	476	440
Louisiana	395	348	370	388	475	461	419	433
Maine	521	508	533	514	546	607	581	649
Maryland	321	316	332	320	322	359	389	333
Massachusetts	320	296	338	316	345	318	335	345
Michigan	390	429	458	474	432	595	538	614
Minnesota	350	302	388	308	328	355	392	306
Mississippi	418	375	406	380	429	431	429	463
Missouri	442	438	427	445	527	466	551	636
Montana	481	382	468	482	469	473	502	503
Nebraska	463	488	471	490	546	551	508	496
Nevada	382	381	409	420	421	419	481	415
New Hampshire	461	468	488	546	499	524	547	654
New Jersey	337	301	366	349	306	343	321	392
New Mexico	385	441	405	431	434	438	493	504
New York	279	264	258	195	284	288	296	356
North Carolina	452	477	449	512	499	559	527	527
North Dakota	410	470	520	506	503	493	605	606
Ohio	347	375	341	343	403	464	450	472
Oklahoma	385	404	457	415	458	427	500	431
Oregon	401	453	422	517	579	520	563	660
Pennsylvania	348	360	422	419	374	422	435	439
Rhode Island	377	313	412	355	438	378	380	428
South Carolina	291	266	291	358	390	454	454	481
South Dakota	413	543	495	439	488	526	566	624
Tennessee	451	456	424	493	534	527	594	573
Texas	370	308	368	367	346	341	436	399
Utah	318	367	327	324	369	377	417	378
Vermont	463	517	611	598	562	602	653	589
Virginia	338	392	387	420	393	449	444	434
Washington	265	323	349	294	335	367	345	359
West Virginia	384	381	423	391	419	457	469	480
Wisconsin	510	545	511	496	571	630	604	619
Wyoming	469	495	446	587	498	583	571	558

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

Table A.35. Average Other Unearned Income Among Elderly SNAP Units with Other Unearned Income by State and Year

	Average Other Unearned Income Among Elderly Units with Other Unearned Income ($)[a]							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**45**	**40**	**42**	**46**	**44**	**47**	**44**	**44**
Alabama	28	38	36	52	34	28	26	34
Alaska	528	377	401	448	395	360	385	353
Arizona	59	54	62	50	65	51	61	55
Arkansas	40	33	38	27	28	17	30	23
California	224	146	161	162	192	258	170	73
Colorado	102	116	124	147	120	130	139	131
Connecticut	73	79	85	99	76	58	99	74
Delaware	48	29	49	59	52	77	48	52
District of Columbia	55	91	87	98	64	47	67	47
Florida	27	19	21	17	24	24	28	31
Georgia	42	30	42	41	39	41	28	43
Hawaii	68	53	40	46	68	54	62	49
Idaho	48	42	92	39	42	46	71	56
Illinois	55	40	60	47	33	53	54	39
Indiana	40	30	35	24	37	60	25	31
Iowa	30	43	33	27	50	40	23	41
Kansas	24	39	46	44	36	47	36	54
Kentucky	49	21	40	39	31	37	30	44
Louisiana	43	52	47	67	44	50	78	71
Maine	44	34	31	39	39	21	61	59
Maryland	46	32	43	65	42	43	50	51
Massachusetts	45	47	42	82	75	59	45	45
Michigan	36	38	43	54	52	39	69	56
Minnesota	43	26	24	30	33	28	43	25
Mississippi	22	31	40	27	24	16	16	24
Missouri	27	30	28	47	31	66	20	59
Montana	30	42	33	24	49	53	49	76
Nebraska	28	32	24	41	48	60	43	84
Nevada	41	35	31	29	44	66	44	66
New Hampshire	43	49	59	52	32	67	46	42
New Jersey	30	37	43	43	50	68	45	42
New Mexico	71	49	57	59	51	48	51	67
New York	50	49	37	72	39	52	26	45
North Carolina	28	44	35	26	32	38	34	48
North Dakota	48	47	53	53	20	28	51	49
Ohio	39	44	20	47	62	44	53	40
Oklahoma	53	58	54	73	67	54	55	55
Oregon	38	28	69	33	47	50	71	31
Pennsylvania	58	33	30	51	39	41	45	29
Rhode Island	31	25	12	42	52	47	33	45
South Carolina	33	30	25	26	34	21	29	32
South Dakota	28	71	30	78	109	115	51	61
Tennessee	52	44	45	21	44	55	37	31
Texas	20	32	39	25	36	30	30	29
Utah	53	22	49	45	47	38	19	29
Vermont	63	49	46	52	30	31	29	58
Virginia	31	31	37	26	30	27	29	26
Washington	33	34	50	39	65	56	96	89
West Virginia	51	45	46	69	47	41	45	60
Wisconsin	47	49	57	43	59	53	63	43
Wyoming	30	46	34	81	23	27	18	34

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] Other unearned income is unearned income other than SSI or Social Security.

Table A.36. Elderly SNAP Participants by Receipt of Income Deductions and Average Deduction by Year

	Elderly SNAP Participants	Elderly Participants Receiving Deduction		
		Medical	Shelter	SSI CAP or MFIP[a]
Number (000s)				
Fiscal year 2000	1,626	228	960	0
Fiscal year 2001	1,562	201	925	0
Fiscal year 2002	1,575	217	944	0
Fiscal year 2003	1,689	263	1,186	0
Fiscal year 2004	1,918	286	1,347	191
Fiscal year 2005	2,045	307	1,420	225
Fiscal year 2006	2,226	328	1,587	232
Fiscal year 2007	2,263	299	1,626	288
Percent of Elderly SNAP Participants				
Fiscal year 2000	100.0	14.0	59.0	0.0
Fiscal year 2001	100.0	12.9	59.3	0.0
Fiscal year 2002	100.0	13.7	60.0	0.0
Fiscal year 2003	100.0	15.6	70.3	0.0
Fiscal year 2004	100.0	14.9	70.3	10.0
Fiscal year 2005	100.0	15.0	69.5	11.0
Fiscal year 2006	100.0	14.8	71.3	10.4
Fiscal year 2007	100.0	13.2	71.8	12.7
Standard Error of Percentage				
Fiscal year 2000		0.4	0.8	-
Fiscal year 2001		0.5	1.3	-
Fiscal year 2002		0.5	1.1	-
Fiscal year 2003		0.5	0.7	-
Fiscal year 2004		0.5	0.7	0.5
Fiscal year 2005		0.5	0.8	0.6
Fiscal year 2006		0.6	0.7	0.5
Fiscal year 2007		0.6	0.7	0.6
Average Deduction Among Units with Deduction ($)				
Fiscal year 2000	282.5	112.6	214.5	0.0
Fiscal year 2001	287.5	117.9	225.0	0.0
Fiscal year 2002	308.2	124.5	251.5	0.0
Fiscal year 2003	312.1	116.0	213.9	0.0
Fiscal year 2004	363.2	135.8	254.8	0.0
Fiscal year 2005	360.4	146.8	254.4	0.0
Fiscal year 2006	384.7	133.8	286.1	0.0
Fiscal year 2007	412.6	163.3	308.4	0.0

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] Deductions are not used to calculate benefit levels for these units eligible through an SSI CAP or Minnesota's FIP.

Table A.37. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with a Medical Expense Deduction by State and Year

	Elderly Participants in Units with a Medical Deduction (Percent of Elderly Participants)[a]							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**14.0**	**12.9**	**13.7**	**15.6**	**14.9**	**15.0**	**14.8**	**13.2**
Alabama	28.1	28.4	34.7	34.3	37.6	30.2	31.1	19.7
Alaska	12.3	0.0	0.0	4.8	2.3	7.7	2.2	8.8
Arizona	7.9	11.1	10.2	17.1	20.0	11.4	10.9	8.5
Arkansas	21.1	23.3	23.2	25.7	17.9	24.5	24.0	11.7
California	3.4	8.9	1.6	4.2	11.0	16.4	5.0	10.5
Colorado	8.5	10.1	14.1	8.9	10.0	10.7	9.1	8.7
Connecticut	0.6	2.2	2.1	3.9	5.6	5.5	6.5	3.0
Delaware	1.4	11.1	10.8	16.9	13.5	11.9	16.6	8.4
District of Columbia	7.5	7.6	9.9	12.5	13.7	12.9	6.3	7.9
Florida	4.8	1.9	4.6	2.9	2.8	3.4	1.4	2.7
Georgia	23.6	16.0	22.6	29.8	16.6	27.6	23.9	14.6
Hawaii	5.5	5.3	6.1	7.5	4.5	5.4	6.3	4.9
Idaho	14.1	21.7	17.2	15.0	9.1	23.0	16.7	14.0
Illinois	9.0	10.3	10.9	6.6	5.6	10.8	10.2	6.1
Indiana	28.8	29.6	34.3	45.5	44.9	37.5	35.1	22.9
Iowa	24.2	25.5	22.9	17.6	25.4	21.2	24.5	16.1
Kansas	19.9	21.9	21.2	27.1	12.4	25.2	23.1	19.6
Kentucky	21.3	13.5	15.6	18.4	18.7	26.2	17.5	19.0
Louisiana	32.5	23.4	26.3	29.2	40.2	28.9	41.8	26.5
Maine	11.9	12.0	11.3	16.9	13.1	21.8	15.7	9.8
Maryland	7.0	11.1	9.1	13.3	7.1	10.3	7.4	7.6
Massachusetts	3.0	8.3	6.0	12.8	12.0	5.0	4.5	6.4
Michigan	16.0	10.6	16.6	17.6	19.0	29.1	17.8	23.3
Minnesota	9.2	6.2	3.9	6.3	4.2	5.0	6.7	2.1
Mississippi	15.7	10.5	12.7	9.3	5.4	9.3	6.0	7.7
Missouri	27.9	31.4	30.4	37.4	24.9	30.1	28.1	32.2
Montana	24.9	23.8	21.3	23.7	30.4	35.7	30.0	17.2
Nebraska	19.9	14.1	16.6	17.4	20.5	27.5	20.7	19.0
Nevada	4.5	5.2	3.8	3.4	10.9	5.7	7.8	10.8
New Hampshire	28.8	11.4	28.3	41.4	26.6	25.7	22.2	31.1
New Jersey	6.8	4.1	5.6	12.3	5.8	3.1	5.3	5.2
New Mexico	8.9	12.7	10.2	14.2	14.0	7.1	11.4	6.0
New York	6.4	5.7	5.8	11.2	14.2	9.1	12.0	12.4
North Carolina	20.4	18.4	23.7	21.4	26.5	20.5	16.6	16.6
North Dakota	35.1	36.1	48.1	46.5	43.2	43.4	43.3	41.3
Ohio	23.5	23.8	17.0	18.7	24.1	23.1	15.8	15.0
Oklahoma	8.4	7.7	9.8	14.1	10.4	5.0	6.3	5.3
Oregon	25.2	31.7	27.9	34.7	31.1	30.9	36.0	37.4
Pennsylvania	10.3	5.9	7.8	11.0	8.1	12.8	14.2	14.4
Rhode Island	7.5	3.5	5.1	6.0	13.8	7.8	5.0	9.0
South Carolina	11.4	9.5	12.3	9.8	6.2	15.2	8.3	14.7
South Dakota	29.5	39.0	30.8	30.5	33.0	24.4	23.8	29.1
Tennessee	14.6	14.2	14.3	10.7	8.8	10.8	9.0	13.2
Texas	21.9	24.7	22.4	15.3	17.7	8.9	20.4	14.2
Utah	6.5	9.4	10.7	3.7	11.0	9.8	6.8	6.4
Vermont	16.9	15.1	21.0	18.2	24.8	26.3	26.7	28.7
Virginia	14.7	20.7	19.5	18.6	11.1	17.6	14.8	8.7
Washington	5.3	5.5	4.8	6.3	11.6	10.0	9.7	9.6
West Virginia	19.8	16.8	20.7	17.8	14.5	21.5	16.9	10.7
Wisconsin	29.6	22.4	22.1	19.2	25.8	33.1	30.1	29.6
Wyoming	30.8	32.8	14.5	20.8	20.3	21.3	20.5	20.3

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] Deductions are not used to calculate benefit levels for units eligible through an SSI CAP or Minnesota's FIP.

Table A.38. Percentage of Elderly Participants in SNAP Units with an Excess Shelter Expense Deduction by State and Year

	Elderly Participants in Units with a Shelter Deduction (Percent of Elderly Participants)[a]							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**59.0**	**59.3**	**60.0**	**70.3**	**70.3**	**69.5**	**71.3**	**71.8**
Alabama	60.6	59.9	59.7	77.3	81.9	65.9	70.8	81.5
Alaska	23.7	50.9	31.8	21.7	39.4	58.7	52.9	45.9
Arizona	63.1	58.9	57.7	70.9	72.0	69.5	78.8	82.6
Arkansas	46.2	46.0	50.5	53.8	57.2	71.3	64.2	64.5
California	71.4	54.5	80.1	45.6	80.8	63.5	59.6	76.2
Colorado	47.5	53.7	51.9	60.0	73.6	78.9	78.2	79.1
Connecticut	57.9	59.8	50.8	53.9	79.2	81.0	79.3	78.8
Delaware	64.5	62.1	58.4	74.9	82.0	81.0	85.2	74.3
District of Columbia	52.6	44.3	50.4	48.7	65.8	54.2	54.2	60.5
Florida	70.7	72.0	69.5	76.5	84.9	80.3	80.5	84.9
Georgia	51.8	51.4	46.7	76.9	80.2	74.3	85.5	89.3
Hawaii	50.0	57.7	59.1	58.5	54.8	56.6	53.7	56.9
Idaho	41.5	24.0	53.9	80.6	82.2	88.0	79.0	80.6
Illinois	62.0	53.4	64.6	83.1	91.0	88.9	83.5	94.4
Indiana	46.9	48.7	52.4	86.6	85.6	79.6	78.3	82.0
Iowa	44.4	46.2	46.0	67.1	79.9	77.7	83.5	79.4
Kansas	57.0	55.0	61.6	70.3	76.7	81.4	73.8	75.8
Kentucky	32.2	37.6	41.1	61.8	77.0	79.3	76.0	69.1
Louisiana	62.7	66.2	69.5	82.8	89.8	91.0	90.5	70.0
Maine	71.3	66.6	65.2	73.6	92.5	91.3	92.2	92.6
Maryland	58.6	59.1	69.3	67.4	78.0	80.8	73.3	71.2
Massachusetts	62.9	63.4	54.0	71.5	82.7	71.5	87.5	83.2
Michigan	76.8	76.8	82.1	83.0	81.8	80.1	89.8	84.4
Minnesota	31.3	38.9	44.8	63.8	63.3	63.1	73.4	69.6
Mississippi	32.2	34.1	34.2	65.9	33.8	39.8	43.5	42.4
Missouri	60.7	62.0	56.9	76.7	74.1	71.0	68.9	59.4
Montana	75.0	52.4	47.0	56.3	78.0	72.5	80.2	74.7
Nebraska	56.3	64.4	58.7	46.4	60.7	56.1	69.4	69.8
Nevada	76.9	76.6	79.0	83.5	77.6	85.2	86.2	84.0
New Hampshire	62.0	65.6	61.4	67.6	70.8	76.2	71.9	80.7
New Jersey	70.1	70.6	72.8	75.4	75.9	81.9	82.0	84.6
New Mexico	32.5	35.6	35.7	53.7	57.9	65.1	67.7	64.5
New York	83.5	82.8	85.8	70.9	51.2	45.9	55.3	60.8
North Carolina	40.1	41.6	49.1	73.4	78.0	73.8	76.3	57.1
North Dakota	62.2	55.2	75.5	68.6	88.4	89.1	84.9	83.4
Ohio	43.1	54.8	49.3	71.4	73.8	75.5	79.2	76.3
Oklahoma	35.3	45.6	42.8	53.7	58.3	55.8	70.4	61.9
Oregon	43.9	49.8	43.1	90.9	86.8	85.5	76.7	82.4
Pennsylvania	58.9	50.6	51.4	78.5	81.2	80.7	85.4	81.4
Rhode Island	45.2	49.8	52.0	49.4	57.3	57.9	64.0	84.9
South Carolina	63.3	59.4	48.2	57.7	39.7	53.4	35.7	60.5
South Dakota	60.5	61.7	82.7	75.0	84.5	77.1	87.5	82.6
Tennessee	40.1	47.4	44.0	56.8	66.3	68.4	66.2	74.4
Texas	52.5	47.6	42.6	58.9	43.9	51.7	50.6	45.9
Utah	53.1	56.3	48.1	66.9	64.4	55.6	70.1	67.7
Vermont	65.7	71.0	68.4	84.0	90.2	96.7	92.0	93.0
Virginia	44.1	49.8	46.3	61.8	66.3	64.6	65.2	67.5
Washington	51.0	47.4	52.2	88.1	91.3	94.8	92.4	91.9
West Virginia	63.9	59.7	64.1	57.2	67.0	65.0	74.9	66.9
Wisconsin	34.3	42.4	44.6	63.0	70.7	67.5	73.5	70.4
Wyoming	42.0	40.4	27.7	61.7	70.5	80.4	85.9	77.7

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

[a] Deductions are not used to calculate benefit levels for units eligible through an SSI CAP or Minnesota's FIP.

Table A.39. Average Shelter Expense Deduction Among Elderly SNAP Units with Deduction by State and Year

	Average Shelter Expense Deduction Among Elderly SNAP Units with Deduction ($)							
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007
United States	**214**	**225**	**251**	**214**	**255**	**254**	**286**	**308**
Alabama	131	145	152	159	171	158	159	176
Alaska	209	142	203	143	181	352	226	363
Arizona	191	204	203	228	266	245	320	285
Arkansas	112	107	131	123	131	145	155	142
California	155	200	172	256	354	241	324	365
Colorado	169	183	255	214	214	322	333	372
Connecticut	216	218	230	249	289	331	373	418
Delaware	161	209	197	233	266	290	306	372
District of Columbia	240	263	178	192	213	253	238	235
Florida	198	199	207	220	247	234	251	282
Georgia	140	155	138	176	209	191	265	273
Hawaii	120	149	146	138	155	168	190	194
Idaho	130	177	161	189	165	255	268	236
Illinois	209	202	232	252	236	271	297	285
Indiana	130	186	170	258	289	312	281	309
Iowa	120	131	141	177	181	209	227	251
Kansas	124	132	116	134	175	186	179	206
Kentucky	112	129	116	141	164	178	196	203
Louisiana	151	158	192	225	237	193	216	203
Maine	216	236	272	300	276	252	308	302
Maryland	226	190	194	191	226	248	247	248
Massachusetts	265	253	442	293	374	339	337	367
Michigan	178	203	259	313	347	344	407	484
Minnesota	155	166	186	176	199	220	194	216
Mississippi	111	129	114	150	159	142	173	201
Missouri	133	118	172	169	183	163	161	186
Montana	178	156	162	204	225	253	271	287
Nebraska	128	143	150	140	166	184	195	201
Nevada	204	191	229	276	194	252	246	303
New Hampshire	228	239	246	220	240	339	372	354
New Jersey	246	262	313	449	287	299	314	388
New Mexico	172	192	149	175	160	193	196	201
New York	406	439	508	227	532	520	500	560
North Carolina	131	153	167	164	166	184	184	232
North Dakota	171	171	219	241	269	319	340	421
Ohio	168	184	174	247	292	290	397	314
Oklahoma	116	121	127	115	159	144	166	153
Oregon	141	168	165	238	228	255	279	277
Pennsylvania	154	183	188	244	260	298	342	346
Rhode Island	218	244	236	297	342	313	413	452
South Carolina	106	109	115	130	173	157	206	191
South Dakota	194	206	238	284	241	322	346	421
Tennessee	107	159	149	147	175	190	186	193
Texas	163	139	154	166	183	176	220	255
Utah	159	165	172	208	205	198	231	263
Vermont	234	256	278	296	305	347	442	466
Virginia	142	157	152	142	181	167	181	213
Washington	156	171	165	248	254	227	244	220
West Virginia	144	132	140	137	158	165	158	184
Wisconsin	142	179	153	168	183	191	243	225
Wyoming	114	111	112	184	217	221	263	261

Sources: Revised FY 2000–2004 SNAP QC data files and FY 2005–2007 SNAP QC data files.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX B

TABLES SHOWING THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR SNAP, FISCAL YEAR 2009

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table B.1. All SNAP-Eligible Individuals and Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by State, 2009

	All SNAP-Eligible Individuals		Individuals in Units with Eligible Elderly		Eligible Elderly Individuals		Percent of Eligible Individuals Age 60 or Over
	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	Number (000s)	Percent	
United States	**53,288**	**100.0**	**10,063**	**100.0**	**8,622**	**100.0**	**16.2**
Alabama	888	1.7	154	1.5	128	1.5	14.4
Alaska	122	0.2	13	0.1	11	0.1	9.0
Arizona	1,754	3.3	334	3.3	287	3.3	16.3
Arkansas	522	1.0	96	1.0	80	0.9	15.3
California	5,176	9.7	417	4.1	338	3.9	6.5
Colorado	586	1.1	84	0.8	73	0.8	12.4
Connecticut	428	0.8	81	0.8	73	0.8	17.1
Delaware	191	0.4	47	0.5	41	0.5	21.4
District of Columbia	113	0.2	19	0.2	17	0.2	14.7
Florida	2,436	4.6	513	5.1	436	5.1	17.9
Georgia	1,966	3.7	469	4.7	404	4.7	20.5
Hawaii	188	0.4	45	0.5	37	0.4	19.6
Idaho	197	0.4	27	0.3	22	0.3	11.3
Illinois	1,705	3.2	270	2.7	229	2.7	13.4
Indiana	959	1.8	131	1.3	112	1.3	11.7
Iowa	361	0.7	59	0.6	52	0.6	14.3
Kansas	354	0.7	56	0.6	48	0.6	13.6
Kentucky	799	1.5	135	1.3	115	1.3	14.3
Louisiana	894	1.7	163	1.6	134	1.6	15.0
Maine	265	0.5	41	0.4	33	0.4	12.6
Maryland	900	1.7	135	1.3	109	1.3	12.1
Massachusetts	949	1.8	217	2.2	190	2.2	20.1
Michigan	2,712	5.1	558	5.5	485	5.6	17.9
Minnesota	539	1.0	138	1.4	121	1.4	22.4
Mississippi	665	1.2	127	1.3	100	1.2	15.0
Missouri	828	1.6	134	1.3	115	1.3	13.8
Montana	145	0.3	24	0.2	21	0.2	14.4
Nebraska	207	0.4	35	0.3	31	0.4	14.8
Nevada	336	0.6	61	0.6	52	0.6	15.3
New Hampshire	101	0.2	23	0.2	21	0.2	20.5
New Jersey	846	1.6	169	1.7	145	1.7	17.2
New Mexico	389	0.7	65	0.6	55	0.6	14.0
New York	4,287	8.0	1,203	12.0	1,058	12.3	24.7
North Carolina	1,470	2.8	257	2.6	217	2.5	14.7
North Dakota	131	0.2	28	0.3	26	0.3	19.6
Ohio	1,706	3.2	264	2.6	228	2.6	13.4
Oklahoma	609	1.1	109	1.1	92	1.1	15.1
Oregon	988	1.9	207	2.1	180	2.1	18.3
Pennsylvania	2,490	4.7	796	7.9	704	8.2	28.3
Rhode Island	159	0.3	25	0.3	22	0.3	13.9
South Carolina	1,271	2.4	318	3.2	273	3.2	21.5
South Dakota	108	0.2	22	0.2	20	0.2	18.2
Tennessee	1,074	2.0	194	1.9	160	1.9	14.9
Texas	6,004	11.3	877	8.7	722	8.4	12.0
Utah	271	0.5	27	0.3	21	0.2	7.8
Vermont	126	0.2	32	0.3	29	0.3	22.9
Virginia	846	1.6	158	1.6	134	1.6	15.9
Washington	1,467	2.8	309	3.1	274	3.2	18.7
West Virginia	334	0.6	77	0.8	64	0.7	19.1
Wisconsin	1,363	2.6	309	3.1	277	3.2	20.3
Wyoming	58	0.1	10	0.1	9	0.1	15.6

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.2. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Age Cohort and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Individuals (Number in 000s)	Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Age (Row Percent)				
		60 to 64	65 to 69	70 to 74	75 to 79	80 or Older
United States	**8,622**	**22.5**	**17.8**	**18.0**	**16.2**	**25.5**
Alabama	128	24.5	19.4	18.6	15.3	22.2
Alaska	11	25.0	18.4	17.2	15.2	24.1
Arizona	287	20.1	17.6	17.5	17.8	27.0
Arkansas	80	26.2	19.8	18.2	14.7	21.1
California	338	35.6	16.0	17.9	11.5	19.1
Colorado	73	25.3	18.6	18.6	14.5	22.9
Connecticut	73	23.3	17.3	18.8	16.3	24.4
Delaware	41	18.7	17.8	17.6	17.6	28.3
District of Columbia	17	24.2	19.8	19.7	15.3	21.0
Florida	436	25.1	18.6	18.9	14.8	22.6
Georgia	404	20.2	18.0	17.8	17.3	26.8
Hawaii	37	24.2	18.3	20.2	13.8	23.5
Idaho	22	26.3	19.8	18.0	13.3	22.5
Illinois	229	24.6	18.5	18.5	14.9	23.6
Indiana	112	24.8	19.2	17.7	15.0	23.2
Iowa	52	25.4	18.3	18.3	13.7	24.3
Kansas	48	25.7	18.9	18.2	13.6	23.6
Kentucky	115	24.5	18.8	18.1	14.8	23.7
Louisiana	134	25.6	19.7	18.4	14.8	21.4
Maine	33	23.4	18.8	18.3	14.9	24.6
Maryland	109	25.7	19.8	18.3	14.5	21.7
Massachusetts	190	22.7	16.6	17.5	16.6	26.6
Michigan	485	18.4	16.9	17.6	17.6	29.4
Minnesota	121	21.2	17.2	17.8	16.8	27.0
Mississippi	100	25.0	19.4	18.6	15.7	21.4
Missouri	115	24.7	19.2	18.0	14.5	23.6
Montana	21	25.2	18.6	18.3	13.4	24.4
Nebraska	31	25.7	18.2	18.2	13.7	24.1
Nevada	52	25.3	18.8	18.6	14.4	22.9
New Hampshire	21	21.9	18.1	18.3	15.4	26.3
New Jersey	145	24.2	19.1	19.0	14.6	23.1
New Mexico	55	25.2	17.7	18.7	16.1	22.3
New York	1,058	19.9	17.3	17.6	17.2	28.0
North Carolina	217	24.5	19.0	18.7	15.3	22.5
North Dakota	26	23.1	15.7	16.9	16.3	28.0
Ohio	228	23.9	18.6	17.9	15.2	24.5
Oklahoma	92	25.0	19.5	18.5	14.6	22.5
Oregon	180	19.8	16.6	17.0	17.5	29.1
Pennsylvania	704	18.6	16.8	17.5	17.7	29.4
Rhode Island	22	23.9	18.1	18.6	15.3	24.1
South Carolina	273	19.9	17.6	18.2	17.7	26.5
South Dakota	20	24.1	18.6	18.4	14.3	24.5
Tennessee	160	24.9	19.6	18.3	14.9	22.3
Texas	722	23.4	18.3	18.4	17.6	22.3
Utah	21	28.2	19.4	17.1	12.8	22.4
Vermont	29	19.5	15.8	16.7	17.9	30.2
Virginia	134	25.8	19.6	18.3	14.3	22.0
Washington	274	19.1	16.4	17.4	17.5	29.7
West Virginia	64	24.9	18.4	17.4	14.9	24.3
Wisconsin	277	17.7	16.2	17.5	17.8	30.8
Wyoming	9	25.0	18.2	18.5	13.6	24.7

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.3. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Type of Eligibility and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Individuals (Number in 000s)	Elderly by Mutually Exclusive Type of Eligibility (Row Percent)			
		Pass Income and Asset Tests	Categorically Eligible[a]		
			All	Pure PA	Other
United States	**8,622**	**68.0**	**32.0**	**0.6**	**31.4**
Alabama	128	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Alaska	11	99.1	0.9	0.9	0.0
Arizona	287	43.9	56.1	0.5	55.7
Arkansas	80	99.2	0.8	0.8	0.0
California	338	98.3	1.7	1.7	0.0
Colorado	73	97.7	2.3	2.3	0.0
Connecticut	73	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Delaware	41	37.7	62.3	0.2	62.1
District of Columbia	17	99.3	0.7	0.7	0.0
Florida	436	98.9	1.1	1.1	0.0
Georgia	404	42.2	57.8	0.2	57.6
Hawaii	37	99.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
Idaho	22	98.9	1.1	1.1	0.0
Illinois	229	99.3	0.7	0.7	0.0
Indiana	112	99.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
Iowa	52	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Kansas	48	99.2	0.8	0.8	0.0
Kentucky	115	99.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
Louisiana	134	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Maine	33	96.7	3.3	0.4	2.9
Maryland	109	96.2	3.8	0.7	3.1
Massachusetts	190	63.3	36.7	0.7	36.0
Michigan	485	38.8	61.2	0.2	61.0
Minnesota	121	50.9	49.1	0.2	49.0
Mississippi	100	99.3	0.7	0.7	0.0
Missouri	115	99.3	0.7	0.7	0.0
Montana	21	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Nebraska	31	99.3	0.7	0.7	0.0
Nevada	52	98.9	1.1	1.1	0.0
New Hampshire	21	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
New Jersey	145	98.8	1.2	1.2	0.0
New Mexico	55	98.4	1.6	1.6	0.0
New York	1,058	47.1	52.9	0.5	52.4
North Carolina	217	99.2	0.8	0.8	0.0
North Dakota	26	56.8	43.2	0.2	42.9
Ohio	228	99.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
Oklahoma	92	99.1	0.9	0.9	0.0
Oregon	180	39.9	60.1	0.3	59.8
Pennsylvania	704	37.4	62.6	0.2	62.4
Rhode Island	22	99.1	0.9	0.9	0.0
South Carolina	273	43.5	56.5	0.2	56.4
South Dakota	20	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Tennessee	160	99.4	0.6	0.6	0.0
Texas	722	69.5	30.5	0.8	29.7
Utah	21	99.2	0.8	0.8	0.0
Vermont	29	43.5	56.5	0.2	56.4
Virginia	134	99.2	0.8	0.8	0.0
Washington	274	34.6	65.4	0.2	65.2
West Virginia	64	99.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
Wisconsin	277	32.2	67.8	0.2	67.6
Wyoming	9	99.2	0.8	0.8	0.0

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] These categorically eligible households would have failed the SNAP income and asset tests had they been subject to them.

Table B.4. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by FSP Unit Composition and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Individuals (Number in 000s)	Elderly by SNAP Unit Composition (Row Percent)			
		Single Elderly Person	Multiple Elderly People	Mixed Elderly and Nonelderly	
				All	Elderly and Children under Age 18 Only
United States	**8,622**	**59.0**	**29.1**	**11.9**	**0.2**
Alabama	128	60.1	25.3	14.6	0.1
Alaska	11	67.9	21.0	11.0	0.3
Arizona	287	50.1	37.6	12.2	0.3
Arkansas	80	55.2	31.0	13.7	0.1
California	338	69.5	15.7	14.8	0.8
Colorado	73	67.1	21.9	11.0	0.3
Connecticut	73	74.4	17.4	8.2	0.3
Delaware	41	55.6	33.4	11.0	0.1
District of Columbia	17	77.9	11.6	10.5	0.1
Florida	436	62.1	25.8	12.1	0.2
Georgia	404	55.8	32.3	11.9	0.1
Hawaii	37	54.7	32.2	13.1	0.5
Idaho	22	56.0	29.9	14.1	0.5
Illinois	229	66.7	21.3	12.0	0.2
Indiana	112	69.3	18.8	12.0	0.2
Iowa	52	59.3	29.4	11.3	0.1
Kansas	48	66.4	23.1	10.5	0.1
Kentucky	115	57.7	29.1	13.2	0.0
Louisiana	134	53.4	30.9	15.8	0.1
Maine	33	61.3	24.4	14.2	0.3
Maryland	109	62.3	22.2	15.5	0.2
Massachusetts	190	62.1	27.3	10.5	0.3
Michigan	485	56.1	33.0	11.0	0.1
Minnesota	121	61.8	28.3	9.9	0.2
Mississippi	100	55.1	27.9	17.0	0.1
Missouri	115	64.4	22.7	12.9	0.2
Montana	21	60.6	27.2	12.2	0.5
Nebraska	31	65.6	24.2	10.3	0.5
Nevada	52	61.2	25.1	13.7	0.4
New Hampshire	21	65.2	25.2	9.6	0.1
New Jersey	145	66.1	22.2	11.7	0.2
New Mexico	55	56.5	29.3	14.2	0.7
New York	1,058	58.5	31.4	10.1	0.3
North Carolina	217	62.9	24.0	13.1	0.1
North Dakota	26	60.4	31.5	8.1	0.3
Ohio	228	68.8	19.4	11.8	0.1
Oklahoma	92	61.3	26.4	12.3	0.1
Oregon	180	55.2	34.1	10.7	0.2
Pennsylvania	704	55.0	35.1	9.9	0.1
Rhode Island	22	70.7	18.8	10.4	0.4
South Carolina	273	51.2	36.4	12.4	0.0
South Dakota	20	63.0	27.3	9.7	0.4
Tennessee	160	58.9	26.1	15.0	0.2
Texas	722	54.2	30.8	15.0	0.6
Utah	21	56.1	28.5	15.4	0.8
Vermont	29	57.0	33.4	9.6	0.1
Virginia	134	62.3	25.0	12.6	0.1
Washington	274	57.2	33.4	9.4	0.2
West Virginia	64	53.4	31.1	15.5	0.0
Wisconsin	277	57.3	34.1	8.6	0.1
Wyoming	9	62.4	26.5	11.0	0.4

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.5. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Poverty Level and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Individuals (Number in 000s)	Elderly by Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty (Row Percent)					
		At or Below 100% of Poverty			Above 100% of Poverty		
		All	0 to 75%	76% to 100%	All	101% to 130%	Above 130%
United States	**8,622**	**41.7**	**18.7**	**23.0**	**58.3**	**24.8**	**33.5**
Alabama	128	59.8	25.6	34.2	40.2	27.1	13.1
Alaska	11	55.0	17.3	37.6	45.0	30.0	15.0
Arizona	287	32.9	19.6	13.3	67.1	22.6	44.5
Arkansas	80	57.0	24.1	32.9	43.0	28.0	15.0
California	338	32.0	20.6	11.4	68.0	42.8	25.2
Colorado	73	49.1	21.3	27.8	50.9	31.7	19.1
Connecticut	73	46.9	18.6	28.4	53.1	26.7	26.4
Delaware	41	26.2	14.4	11.8	73.8	20.8	53.0
District of Columbia	17	63.7	32.1	31.6	36.3	25.0	11.3
Florida	436	56.8	27.4	29.4	43.2	27.9	15.3
Georgia	404	30.1	15.1	15.0	69.9	20.6	49.4
Hawaii	37	65.1	41.2	23.9	34.9	24.9	10.0
Idaho	22	47.9	17.7	30.2	52.1	30.9	21.2
Illinois	229	56.2	28.3	27.9	43.8	28.0	15.8
Indiana	112	52.1	28.3	23.8	47.9	28.6	19.3
Iowa	52	54.8	31.6	23.3	45.2	27.8	17.3
Kansas	48	54.0	30.9	23.1	46.0	28.3	17.6
Kentucky	115	59.8	23.6	36.2	40.2	27.5	12.7
Louisiana	134	59.8	27.6	32.3	40.2	26.6	13.6
Maine	33	45.2	16.6	28.6	54.8	28.8	26.1
Maryland	109	59.2	31.7	27.6	40.8	24.5	16.3
Massachusetts	190	43.7	16.1	27.6	56.3	30.6	25.7
Michigan	485	28.5	12.5	16.0	71.5	20.7	50.8
Minnesota	121	30.4	8.7	21.8	69.6	21.7	47.8
Mississippi	100	64.9	27.7	37.2	35.1	24.3	10.8
Missouri	115	54.0	26.1	27.9	46.0	30.6	15.4
Montana	21	46.1	25.1	21.1	53.9	31.3	22.6
Nebraska	31	54.0	24.8	29.2	46.0	29.6	16.4
Nevada	52	56.1	20.5	35.6	43.9	27.7	16.2
New Hampshire	21	50.5	22.8	27.7	49.5	27.2	22.3
New Jersey	145	56.0	11.0	44.9	44.0	25.7	18.4
New Mexico	55	59.0	28.9	30.1	41.0	25.6	15.4
New York	1,058	35.3	10.3	25.0	64.7	19.7	45.1
North Carolina	217	61.2	30.0	31.2	38.8	26.0	12.8
North Dakota	26	36.7	19.8	16.9	63.3	31.7	31.6
Ohio	228	46.1	22.9	23.2	53.9	30.4	23.5
Oklahoma	92	56.2	17.2	39.1	43.8	28.4	15.4
Oregon	180	29.0	16.0	13.0	71.0	23.8	47.3
Pennsylvania	704	27.8	9.8	18.0	72.2	21.0	51.2
Rhode Island	22	52.2	8.5	43.7	47.8	28.0	19.9
South Carolina	273	35.5	18.8	16.7	64.5	20.4	44.1
South Dakota	20	47.9	17.7	30.1	52.1	28.9	23.3
Tennessee	160	57.6	27.2	30.4	42.4	27.4	15.0
Texas	722	43.7	21.2	22.5	56.3	25.4	30.9
Utah	21	51.5	27.2	24.3	48.5	30.3	18.2
Vermont	29	29.5	11.9	17.6	70.5	22.9	47.6
Virginia	134	56.0	26.9	29.1	44.0	27.1	16.9
Washington	274	27.7	14.8	12.9	72.3	21.0	51.3
West Virginia	64	56.4	28.0	28.4	43.6	28.2	15.4
Wisconsin	277	28.2	13.2	15.0	71.8	20.4	51.5
Wyoming	9	53.2	24.6	28.6	46.8	30.8	16.0

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.6. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals with SSI Income by Poverty Level and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly in Units with SSI Income (Number in 000s)	Elderly in Units with SSI Income by Gross Income as a Percentage of Poverty Level (Row Percent)			
		At or Below 100% of Poverty			Above 100% of Poverty
		All	0 or 75%	76% to 100%	
United States	**1,598**	**86.6**	**41.0**	**45.6**	**13.4**
Alabama	38	89.6	61.0	28.6	10.4
Alaska	3	72.7	3.2	69.4	27.3
Arizona	29	82.0	53.7	28.2	18.0
Arkansas	23	86.9	52.7	34.2	13.1
California	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	15	67.7	26.8	40.9	32.3
Connecticut	13	79.9	3.3	76.7	20.1
Delaware	3	82.5	62.8	19.7	17.5
District of Columbia	5	92.5	75.6	16.9	7.5
Florida	130	90.6	58.7	32.0	9.4
Georgia	55	84.8	52.0	32.8	15.2
Hawaii	10	95.1	83.4	11.7	4.9
Idaho	4	86.7	7.5	79.3	13.3
Illinois	63	91.9	64.0	27.9	8.1
Indiana	16	88.6	78.3	10.3	11.4
Iowa	9	89.9	60.9	29.0	10.1
Kansas	8	90.6	73.9	16.7	9.4
Kentucky	40	86.7	48.8	37.9	13.3
Louisiana	39	89.3	56.7	32.6	10.7
Maine	6	85.7	26.6	59.1	14.3
Maryland	27	92.2	65.9	26.3	7.8
Massachusetts	46	74.9	4.2	70.7	25.1
Michigan	48	80.6	24.8	55.8	19.4
Minnesota	18	81.9	4.3	77.7	18.1
Mississippi	32	89.4	60.1	29.3	10.6
Missouri	24	89.9	65.2	24.7	10.1
Montana	3	90.3	59.9	30.3	9.7
Nebraska	5	90.6	36.7	53.9	9.4
Nevada	10	90.8	7.8	82.9	9.2
New Hampshire	2	88.1	4.0	84.1	11.9
New Jersey	46	91.2	6.8	84.5	8.8
New Mexico	17	90.9	55.7	35.2	9.1
New York	217	85.9	6.2	79.7	14.1
North Carolina	56	91.8	66.1	25.7	8.2
North Dakota	2	89.6	65.7	24.0	10.4
Ohio	44	89.7	65.6	24.1	10.3
Oklahoma	20	89.7	5.9	83.8	10.3
Oregon	17	80.7	54.1	26.6	19.3
Pennsylvania	78	81.0	5.3	75.7	19.0
Rhode Island	7	88.0	3.6	84.5	12.0
South Carolina	32	85.9	61.0	24.9	14.1
South Dakota	4	88.2	25.0	63.1	11.8
Tennessee	41	88.7	59.1	29.6	11.3
Texas	177	85.7	54.4	31.3	14.3
Utah	4	88.6	54.8	33.9	11.4
Vermont	3	76.4	4.0	72.4	23.6
Virginia	38	90.1	59.0	31.1	9.9
Washington	30	81.9	53.0	28.9	18.1
West Virginia	17	82.9	53.7	29.2	17.1
Wisconsin	21	82.3	3.4	78.9	17.7
Wyoming	1	89.8	31.9	57.9	10.2

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.7. Median Poverty Level of Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by State, 2009

	Median Poverty Level of Eligible Elderly	
	All Eligible Elderly	Eligible Elderly in SNAP Units with SSI Income
United States	**109**	**80**
Alabama	90	74
Alaska	95	95
Arizona	122	74
Arkansas	93	74
California	111	-[a]
Colorado	101	77
Connecticut	104	95
Delaware	133	74
District of Columbia	87	74
Florida	92	74
Georgia	129	74
Hawaii	85	70
Idaho	102	81
Illinois	93	74
Indiana	98	74
Iowa	95	74
Kansas	96	74
Kentucky	90	80
Louisiana	90	74
Maine	105	76
Maryland	89	74
Massachusetts	104	90
Michigan	131	76
Minnesota	126	82
Mississippi	88	74
Missouri	96	74
Montana	104	74
Nebraska	96	75
Nevada	93	79
New Hampshire	99	78
New Jersey	94	78
New Mexico	88	74
New York	123	85
North Carolina	89	74
North Dakota	113	74
Ohio	104	74
Oklahoma	94	80
Oregon	127	75
Pennsylvania	131	78
Rhode Island	98	81
South Carolina	121	74
South Dakota	102	76
Tennessee	92	74
Texas	107	74
Utah	98	74
Vermont	127	86
Virginia	93	74
Washington	131	74
West Virginia	93	74
Wisconsin	132	85
Wyoming	97	76

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table B.8. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Benefit Level and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Individuals (Number in 000s)	Elderly by Benefit Level (Row Percent)[a]				
		$1 to Minimum	Above Minimum to $50	$51 to $100	$101 to $150	$151 or more
United States	**8,622**	**36.7**	**10.1**	**13.5**	**9.5**	**30.2**
Alabama	128	22.1	15.1	22.1	11.0	29.7
Alaska	11	29.7	9.6	14.2	10.2	36.2
Arizona	287	46.9	7.5	10.1	7.6	27.9
Arkansas	80	20.2	17.7	17.6	11.0	33.5
California	338	37.7	7.6	12.9	8.3	33.5
Colorado	73	22.7	12.6	19.5	10.1	35.1
Connecticut	73	17.1	9.7	12.7	17.3	43.2
Delaware	41	53.4	6.6	8.9	7.7	23.3
District of Columbia	17	25.5	15.5	22.5	11.0	25.6
Florida	436	24.6	16.3	16.4	11.6	31.1
Georgia	404	54.8	7.1	10.0	6.6	21.5
Hawaii	37	1.7	4.2	9.2	9.2	75.8
Idaho	22	21.5	11.8	16.8	10.2	39.7
Illinois	229	25.6	12.0	18.8	12.0	31.6
Indiana	112	21.2	11.5	16.4	15.9	35.0
Iowa	52	20.9	9.5	15.4	13.4	40.9
Kansas	48	24.1	11.1	18.1	11.4	35.2
Kentucky	115	22.4	12.5	20.2	12.7	32.1
Louisiana	134	18.1	14.0	20.9	10.7	36.3
Maine	33	14.0	10.0	13.6	13.5	48.9
Maryland	109	19.8	11.3	20.2	13.0	35.6
Massachusetts	190	18.2	8.4	17.4	11.0	45.0
Michigan	485	47.5	6.2	9.3	8.0	28.9
Minnesota	121	55.1	10.5	7.6	6.8	20.0
Mississippi	100	18.1	16.0	23.1	10.3	32.5
Missouri	115	26.7	12.8	19.6	10.0	31.0
Montana	21	18.8	9.6	14.1	14.2	43.2
Nebraska	31	23.4	11.5	18.1	11.2	35.8
Nevada	52	24.0	16.9	13.8	10.2	35.1
New Hampshire	21	17.5	10.1	12.6	13.8	46.0
New Jersey	145	21.4	13.5	17.9	13.8	33.3
New Mexico	55	20.0	13.1	17.9	12.3	36.6
New York	1,058	44.0	8.4	11.4	8.8	27.5
North Carolina	217	22.5	13.9	20.7	10.2	32.7
North Dakota	26	14.7	10.9	13.3	11.2	50.0
Ohio	228	19.6	11.1	14.5	11.3	43.5
Oklahoma	92	23.1	21.0	13.5	8.6	33.8
Oregon	180	48.4	7.5	10.6	7.6	25.9
Pennsylvania	704	49.7	7.2	8.6	9.0	25.6
Rhode Island	22	19.1	12.7	14.4	19.0	34.9
South Carolina	273	50.9	9.8	10.2	6.3	22.9
South Dakota	20	15.0	10.4	12.3	13.5	48.9
Tennessee	160	21.5	13.3	20.3	11.0	33.9
Texas	722	38.5	10.7	13.7	9.2	27.8
Utah	21	22.8	10.6	17.9	11.0	37.8
Vermont	29	32.6	7.3	10.0	9.0	41.1
Virginia	134	22.9	12.7	19.6	11.5	33.2
Washington	274	53.3	6.9	9.4	7.2	23.2
West Virginia	64	18.1	12.1	20.8	12.9	36.0
Wisconsin	277	55.1	8.5	7.3	5.9	23.2
Wyoming	9	25.4	10.7	18.1	11.0	34.8

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] In FY 2009, post-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the minimum benefit for one- and two-person units was $16 for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia, $19 for most of Alaska, and $25 for Hawaii.

Table B.9. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Benefit as a Percentage of Maximum Benefit and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Individuals (Number in 000s)	Elderly by Benefit as a Percentage of Maximum Benefit				
		1 to 25 Percent	26 to 50 Percent	51 to 75 Percent	76 to 99 Percent	100 Percent
United States	**8,622**	**51.0**	**18.2**	**10.4**	**6.5**	**13.9**
Alabama	128	43.5	28.1	11.2	6.0	11.1
Alaska	11	48.2	16.7	12.0	6.3	16.7
Arizona	287	58.6	14.7	8.2	5.3	13.3
Arkansas	80	44.8	23.3	12.5	7.4	12.0
California	338	50.0	19.3	8.9	5.2	16.6
Colorado	73	39.4	22.8	10.8	9.3	17.7
Connecticut	73	29.3	14.7	19.3	8.6	28.1
Delaware	41	63.8	10.6	8.3	5.7	11.6
District of Columbia	17	43.3	28.0	11.2	6.2	11.4
Florida	436	46.0	25.0	11.9	6.8	10.3
Georgia	404	65.4	13.8	6.8	4.5	9.6
Hawaii	37	10.2	28.0	33.3	14.9	13.5
Idaho	22	38.3	23.2	10.8	9.5	18.4
Illinois	229	41.6	26.4	11.3	7.0	13.8
Indiana	112	37.2	18.7	16.1	8.7	19.2
Iowa	52	34.5	20.5	12.6	9.4	23.1
Kansas	48	39.1	22.6	10.7	8.2	19.4
Kentucky	115	41.5	27.9	13.3	6.5	10.8
Louisiana	134	38.3	27.8	12.3	7.9	13.6
Maine	33	28.4	17.1	16.0	14.2	24.2
Maryland	109	36.3	26.2	12.8	7.8	16.8
Massachusetts	190	31.9	18.9	14.5	8.6	26.1
Michigan	485	57.6	11.1	9.9	6.1	15.3
Minnesota	121	68.3	10.9	6.4	4.0	10.5
Mississippi	100	40.8	30.8	12.0	5.7	10.7
Missouri	115	45.7	23.7	11.0	6.0	13.6
Montana	21	32.2	19.9	14.7	9.2	24.1
Nebraska	31	38.9	22.6	10.9	8.3	19.4
Nevada	52	46.1	19.7	11.2	7.8	15.2
New Hampshire	21	30.8	16.1	15.6	9.3	28.2
New Jersey	145	38.4	26.6	12.2	8.9	14.0
New Mexico	55	37.5	29.7	12.8	8.4	11.6
New York	1,058	55.1	14.9	9.9	6.0	14.0
North Carolina	217	41.2	26.8	11.1	7.5	13.3
North Dakota	26	29.9	15.9	14.3	12.0	27.9
Ohio	228	34.6	17.7	13.9	14.0	19.7
Oklahoma	92	49.2	18.1	10.5	6.7	15.5
Oregon	180	60.2	13.5	7.3	5.5	13.6
Pennsylvania	704	60.4	10.7	9.6	5.5	13.8
Rhode Island	22	35.3	18.9	19.8	8.2	17.8
South Carolina	273	64.9	13.8	6.9	4.0	10.5
South Dakota	20	28.8	15.0	16.5	13.5	26.1
Tennessee	160	40.4	26.5	12.2	7.3	13.6
Texas	722	53.0	21.8	10.8	5.7	8.7
Utah	21	40.0	23.5	12.1	8.0	16.4
Vermont	29	43.2	12.8	11.2	8.8	24.0
Virginia	134	40.3	26.4	12.0	8.1	13.2
Washington	274	63.4	12.6	6.3	5.1	12.5
West Virginia	64	38.8	24.5	13.2	8.0	15.5
Wisconsin	277	67.4	8.9	6.1	4.3	13.3
Wyoming	9	40.9	22.4	10.8	6.8	19.0

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.10. Average Benefit Among Elderly SNAP Units by State, 2009

	Average Benefit Among Eligible Elderly SNAP Units ($)	
	All Eligible Elderly Units	Eligible Elderly SNAP Units with SSI Income
United States	**102**	**135**
Alabama	107	135
Alaska	126	85
Arizona	94	127
Arkansas	113	138
California	108	-[a]
Colorado	117	121
Connecticut	134	121
Delaware	83	138
District of Columbia	93	113
Florida	103	123
Georgia	79	142
Hawaii	265	324
Idaho	127	139
Illinois	109	134
Indiana	118	136
Iowa	131	145
Kansas	118	128
Kentucky	107	142
Louisiana	122	148
Maine	145	192
Maryland	123	143
Massachusetts	138	133
Michigan	96	159
Minnesota	73	107
Mississippi	116	135
Missouri	102	125
Montana	135	175
Nebraska	117	118
Nevada	113	106
New Hampshire	139	160
New Jersey	114	132
New Mexico	117	133
New York	94	128
North Carolina	110	129
North Dakota	143	189
Ohio	128	176
Oklahoma	109	102
Oregon	89	136
Pennsylvania	89	139
Rhode Island	118	140
South Carolina	81	123
South Dakota	144	188
Tennessee	115	141
Texas	96	134
Utah	132	138
Vermont	122	168
Virginia	113	136
Washington	81	136
West Virginia	123	145
Wisconsin	78	80
Wyoming	114	110

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table B.11. Elderly Eligible Individuals in SNAP Units Receiving Earned Income by Age Cohort and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly in SNAP Units with Earned Income			
	Total Number (000s)	By Age (Row Percent)		
		60 to 64	65 to 74	75 or Older
United States	**993**	**54.1**	**31.9**	**14.1**
Alabama	12	57.4	29.8	12.8
Alaska	2	55.0	33.4	11.6
Arizona	35	49.7	33.3	16.9
Arkansas	10	58.1	30.7	11.2
California	56	67.2	24.0	8.8
Colorado	9	55.0	32.7	12.3
Connecticut	8	55.5	32.2	12.4
Delaware	5	50.3	34.6	15.1
District of Columbia	2	56.8	31.5	11.7
Florida	51	53.2	34.6	12.2
Georgia	44	52.6	32.9	14.5
Hawaii	6	53.2	35.9	10.9
Idaho	3	54.8	34.4	10.8
Illinois	26	55.9	31.6	12.4
Indiana	12	55.4	30.8	13.9
Iowa	7	55.7	33.1	11.1
Kansas	6	55.9	32.7	11.3
Kentucky	13	57.0	31.6	11.4
Louisiana	14	57.2	28.6	14.1
Maine	5	55.0	33.1	11.8
Maryland	13	58.7	30.1	11.3
Massachusetts	21	54.4	29.0	16.6
Michigan	49	51.0	33.3	15.7
Minnesota	16	52.9	33.9	13.2
Mississippi	10	58.0	29.6	12.3
Missouri	13	57.6	29.5	12.9
Montana	3	55.5	32.0	12.6
Nebraska	4	57.7	31.7	10.6
Nevada	7	56.0	31.8	12.2
New Hampshire	2	51.7	33.7	14.6
New Jersey	18	52.0	35.7	12.4
New Mexico	7	59.5	28.8	11.7
New York	112	52.0	33.1	14.9
North Carolina	22	57.1	30.1	12.9
North Dakota	4	58.2	27.0	14.8
Ohio	26	54.6	30.2	15.2
Oklahoma	11	55.4	32.6	12.0
Oregon	21	50.7	32.2	17.1
Pennsylvania	75	50.8	33.5	15.7
Rhode Island	2	57.0	30.9	12.0
South Carolina	29	51.5	32.5	16.0
South Dakota	3	56.4	31.8	11.8
Tennessee	17	55.7	31.1	13.2
Texas	90	52.4	31.5	16.1
Utah	4	54.3	33.4	12.4
Vermont	4	50.4	32.1	17.5
Virginia	17	57.2	32.0	10.8
Washington	31	52.6	32.4	15.0
West Virginia	7	49.6	36.0	14.4
Wisconsin	29	51.1	32.8	16.1
Wyoming	1	57.6	30.8	11.7

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.12. Average Earnings Among SNAP Units with Eligible Elderly Individuals and Earned Income by Age Cohort and State, 2009

	Average Monthly Unit Earnings Among Units with Earnings ($)				
	All Units with Eligibility Elderly	By Age of Unit Head			
		Under 60	60 to 64	65 to 74	75 to Older
United States	**932**	**1,275**	**1,017**	**707**	**589**
Alabama	891	994	957	680	934
Alaska	1,005	1,521	1,142	729	496
Arizona	986	1,539	1,050	725	535
Arkansas	951	1,077	1,026	763	824
California	922	1,124	978	545	383
Colorado	984	1,242	1,101	729	698
Connecticut	966	1,307	1,135	711	487
Delaware	958	1,459	1,059	752	554
District of Columbia	787	857	865	620	809
Florida	923	1,101	1,012	725	777
Georgia	959	1,386	1,069	738	522
Hawaii	1,028	1,500	1,109	757	562
Idaho	1,049	1,264	1,196	796	698
Illinois	900	1,115	970	665	801
Indiana	945	1,219	1,067	671	717
Iowa	908	1,200	1,002	684	620
Kansas	909	1,237	1,007	628	676
Kentucky	885	972	984	685	726
Louisiana	909	979	972	731	979
Maine	1,076	1,542	1,205	681	516
Maryland	999	1,450	979	733	880
Massachusetts	826	1,152	910	702	366
Michigan	885	1,335	990	614	520
Minnesota	949	1,550	1,046	668	480
Mississippi	871	940	914	669	1,089
Missouri	893	1,080	982	631	814
Montana	938	1,142	1,104	660	624
Nebraska	945	1,295	1,044	662	617
Nevada	1,003	1,272	1,098	752	726
New Hampshire	910	1,250	1,068	652	584
New Jersey	979	1,047	1,025	965	722
New Mexico	1,031	1,187	1,158	746	652
New York	939	1,406	1,033	744	486
North Carolina	914	1,138	961	688	900
North Dakota	872	1,329	1,004	679	318
Ohio	921	1,166	1,056	643	696
Oklahoma	952	1,148	1,031	731	805
Oregon	905	1,437	997	630	484
Pennsylvania	895	1,411	1,009	643	469
Rhode Island	999	1,440	1,047	842	614
South Carolina	912	1,223	980	784	568
South Dakota	1,004	1,564	1,142	734	512
Tennessee	948	1,123	1,011	749	874
Texas	1,006	1,300	1,059	836	623
Utah	987	1,200	1,100	707	611
Vermont	858	1,422	1,000	582	410
Virginia	946	1,200	1,008	750	785
Washington	909	1,434	1,017	640	447
West Virginia	854	768	1,002	727	784
Wisconsin	861	1,431	976	568	436
Wyoming	1,009	1,357	1,134	673	687

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.13. Elderly Eligible Individuals by SNAP Unit Receipt of Unearned Income and State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Units Receiving Unearned Income					
		SSI		Social Security		Other	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**1,485**	**17.2**	**6,900**	**80.0**	**565**	**6.6**
Alabama	128	36	28.3	101	79.1	6	4.6
Alaska	11	3	28.0	9	77.2	1	8.0
Arizona	287	26	9.0	235	81.9	20	7.0
Arkansas	80	22	27.5	61	76.9	4	4.7
California	338	0	0.0	258	76.4	31	9.1
Colorado	73	15	20.5	55	76.3	5	6.5
Connecticut	73	13	17.9	57	77.3	6	8.1
Delaware	41	3	6.6	35	85.1	3	7.2
District of Columbia	17	5	28.1	13	76.9	1	4.4
Florida	436	124	28.5	328	75.1	23	5.4
Georgia	404	51	12.6	339	83.9	23	5.6
Hawaii	37	9	23.3	26	71.8	3	7.0
Idaho	22	4	16.1	17	75.4	2	7.0
Illinois	229	60	26.1	174	75.9	13	5.7
Indiana	112	16	13.9	89	78.8	8	7.3
Iowa	52	8	16.1	39	74.7	4	8.3
Kansas	48	8	15.7	36	75.5	4	7.7
Kentucky	115	38	32.8	87	76.1	6	4.9
Louisiana	134	37	27.8	102	76.3	6	4.5
Maine	33	6	17.4	26	78.6	2	7.3
Maryland	109	26	23.9	81	74.7	7	6.4
Massachusetts	190	43	22.7	145	76.2	20	10.3
Michigan	485	41	8.6	412	85.0	38	7.8
Minnesota	121	16	13.5	100	82.6	9	7.3
Mississippi	100	31	30.9	78	78.3	4	4.4
Missouri	115	22	19.5	90	78.7	7	6.5
Montana	21	3	12.6	16	77.9	2	8.5
Nebraska	31	5	15.0	24	76.8	3	8.2
Nevada	52	10	18.9	39	75.0	3	5.5
New Hampshire	21	2	11.0	16	77.9	2	8.0
New Jersey	145	43	29.8	109	75.1	9	6.0
New Mexico	55	16	29.9	41	74.6	3	4.8
New York	1,058	199	18.8	855	80.8	70	6.6
North Carolina	217	54	24.9	168	77.5	11	5.2
North Dakota	26	2	7.9	21	80.8	3	10.6
Ohio	228	41	17.9	182	79.8	15	6.4
Oklahoma	92	19	20.6	72	77.5	5	5.4
Oregon	180	15	8.2	150	83.3	14	7.5
Pennsylvania	704	68	9.6	593	84.2	55	7.8
Rhode Island	22	7	29.4	17	78.0	1	5.5
South Carolina	273	29	10.7	229	83.9	18	6.5
South Dakota	20	3	17.3	15	78.6	1	6.7
Tennessee	160	39	24.4	123	77.0	9	5.4
Texas	722	165	22.8	578	80.0	27	3.7
Utah	21	4	18.3	15	71.5	2	8.5
Vermont	29	3	9.2	24	83.5	3	9.4
Virginia	134	36	26.7	101	75.0	7	5.4
Washington	274	26	9.6	229	83.7	23	8.3
West Virginia	64	15	24.0	48	75.3	3	5.2
Wisconsin	277	19	6.9	237	85.4	24	8.6
Wyoming	9	1	12.1	7	78.1	1	8.0

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.14. Average Income Amounts Among SNAP Units with Eligible Elderly Individuals and Income Type by State, 2009

	Average Gross Income ($)	Average Income from Source Among SNAP Units with Income Type ($)		
		SSI	Social Security	All Other
United States	**1,092**	**429**	**925**	**434**
Alabama	939	378	807	421
Alaska	1,177	543	928	473
Arizona	1,178	464	988	452
Arkansas	972	411	815	483
California	1,030	-[a]	955	503
Colorado	968	470	832	439
Connecticut	993	523	865	369
Delaware	1,256	401	1,031	459
District of Columbia	872	398	785	354
Florida	946	421	802	435
Georgia	1,217	426	1,031	449
Hawaii	1,027	452	873	495
Idaho	1,028	484	859	511
Illinois	945	422	812	396
Indiana	950	393	838	419
Iowa	940	463	808	415
Kansas	936	433	829	406
Kentucky	955	427	785	436
Louisiana	945	417	812	455
Maine	1,067	432	893	468
Maryland	950	434	817	446
Massachusetts	1,021	473	863	349
Michigan	1,241	426	1,004	436
Minnesota	1,210	440	1,000	434
Mississippi	931	383	795	442
Missouri	952	393	820	406
Montana	1,006	448	880	413
Nebraska	938	423	818	400
Nevada	943	455	814	496
New Hampshire	963	486	858	378
New Jersey	976	424	818	422
New Mexico	962	437	790	501
New York	1,187	453	991	425
North Carolina	914	392	792	409
North Dakota	1,053	400	926	362
Ohio	1,012	399	865	411
Oklahoma	948	413	818	455
Oregon	1,200	439	1,010	423
Pennsylvania	1,244	438	1,020	430
Rhode Island	997	407	835	395
South Carolina	1,177	397	1,003	437
South Dakota	1,009	417	871	426
Tennessee	950	411	815	448
Texas	1,077	427	909	477
Utah	1,005	443	848	503
Vermont	1,199	462	1,000	390
Virginia	959	424	823	447
Washington	1,238	434	1,025	419
West Virginia	965	457	811	461
Wisconsin	1,233	436	1,008	406
Wyoming	941	407	824	430

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] In California, SSI recipients are ineligible for SNAP.

Table B.15. Elderly Eligible Individuals by SNAP Unit Receipt of Deductions and State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Units Receiving Deduction			
		Medical		Shelter	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**4,719**	**54.7**	**4,818**	**55.9**
Alabama	128	60	46.6	66	51.8
Alaska	11	6	53.7	8	71.2
Arizona	287	172	59.9	127	44.2
Arkansas	80	39	49.3	40	49.5
California	338	183	54.0	182	53.8
Colorado	73	35	48.9	58	79.7
Connecticut	73	37	50.0	66	90.1
Delaware	41	25	62.0	21	51.2
District of Columbia	17	6	37.5	9	53.4
Florida	436	211	48.3	172	39.5
Georgia	404	232	57.4	159	39.5
Hawaii	37	16	44.2	17	45.2
Idaho	22	12	55.2	17	74.3
Illinois	229	111	48.3	131	57.2
Indiana	112	57	50.8	93	82.8
Iowa	52	28	54.7	39	75.4
Kansas	48	25	51.5	32	65.6
Kentucky	115	58	50.4	59	51.9
Louisiana	134	63	47.1	79	59.3
Maine	33	18	54.9	30	90.0
Maryland	109	50	45.9	74	67.5
Massachusetts	190	114	59.7	168	88.0
Michigan	485	309	63.8	317	65.5
Minnesota	121	69	57.4	49	40.9
Mississippi	100	43	43.3	44	43.8
Missouri	115	59	51.2	56	49.1
Montana	21	12	57.2	19	88.7
Nebraska	31	16	51.6	20	66.4
Nevada	52	24	47.2	29	55.5
New Hampshire	21	11	54.3	18	88.9
New Jersey	145	68	46.4	107	73.6
New Mexico	55	25	46.4	31	56.6
New York	1,058	593	56.0	673	63.6
North Carolina	217	99	45.5	115	53.0
North Dakota	26	17	67.9	24	93.8
Ohio	228	122	53.4	202	88.6
Oklahoma	92	46	49.4	46	50.0
Oregon	180	114	63.1	87	48.4
Pennsylvania	704	451	64.0	403	57.2
Rhode Island	22	11	48.0	19	86.0
South Carolina	273	157	57.7	75	27.5
South Dakota	20	10	53.6	18	91.3
Tennessee	160	77	48.1	92	57.4
Texas	722	332	46.0	336	46.6
Utah	21	11	53.7	11	53.2
Vermont	29	19	67.4	25	85.8
Virginia	134	64	48.1	79	58.7
Washington	274	177	64.8	121	44.0
West Virginia	64	34	53.6	41	63.6
Wisconsin	277	185	66.6	110	39.6
Wyoming	9	5	53.1	5	59.5

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.16. Average Deduction Amounts Among Eligible Elderly SNAP Units with Deductions by State, 2009

	Average Medical Deduction Among Units with Deduction ($)	Average Shelter Expense Deduction Among Units with Deduction ($)
United States	**217**	**396**
Alabama	219	323
Alaska	216	346
Arizona	223	397
Arkansas	230	379
California	231	440
Colorado	216	372
Connecticut	200	567
Delaware	217	371
District of Columbia	182	333
Florida	217	423
Georgia	207	362
Hawaii	216	393
Idaho	236	385
Illinois	212	371
Indiana	210	363
Iowa	229	383
Kansas	227	386
Kentucky	219	328
Louisiana	224	341
Maine	223	517
Maryland	211	362
Massachusetts	247	511
Michigan	222	399
Minnesota	197	367
Mississippi	227	325
Missouri	221	367
Montana	238	434
Nebraska	226	375
Nevada	214	362
New Hampshire	221	475
New Jersey	211	370
New Mexico	207	367
New York	211	398
North Carolina	213	343
North Dakota	264	515
Ohio	206	452
Oklahoma	224	407
Oregon	231	407
Pennsylvania	226	388
Rhode Island	202	419
South Carolina	217	400
South Dakota	221	491
Tennessee	218	353
Texas	180	348
Utah	243	414
Vermont	241	518
Virginia	218	374
Washington	228	406
West Virginia	227	330
Wisconsin	228	404
Wyoming	229	367

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.17. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Level of Shelter Expense Deductions and State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly with Deduction	Eligible Elderly by Level of Shelter Expense Deduction					
		$1 - $200		$201 - $400		$401 or Higher	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**4,818**	**1,862**	**38.6**	**1,217**	**25.3**	**1,739**	**36.1**
Alabama	66	32	48.1	15	22.2	20	29.7
Alaska	8	4	45.9	1	18.5	3	35.5
Arizona	127	50	39.7	33	25.7	44	34.6
Arkansas	40	14	35.9	11	28.5	14	35.6
California	182	54	29.9	54	29.8	73	40.3
Colorado	58	26	44.7	9	16.4	22	38.9
Connecticut	66	6	8.8	24	36.9	36	54.3
Delaware	21	9	43.9	4	20.9	7	35.2
District of Columbia	9	4	47.6	2	20.3	3	32.1
Florida	172	62	35.8	48	27.7	63	36.5
Georgia	159	71	44.4	39	24.6	49	31.0
Hawaii	17	7	43.7	4	22.6	6	33.7
Idaho	17	7	40.7	4	23.6	6	35.7
Illinois	131	56	42.8	28	21.7	47	35.6
Indiana	93	43	46.4	16	17.7	33	35.9
Iowa	39	16	40.7	10	25.9	13	33.4
Kansas	32	13	40.8	7	22.5	12	36.7
Kentucky	59	28	46.6	14	23.4	18	30.1
Louisiana	79	36	45.1	20	24.8	24	30.1
Maine	30	4	12.2	10	34.0	16	53.8
Maryland	74	34	46.7	16	21.1	24	32.2
Massachusetts	168	37	21.9	55	33.1	76	45.0
Michigan	317	121	38.0	83	26.2	113	35.7
Minnesota	49	21	42.7	11	22.9	17	34.4
Mississippi	44	20	46.2	10	23.4	13	30.5
Missouri	56	22	39.8	14	25.7	19	34.5
Montana	19	6	32.0	5	26.7	8	41.3
Nebraska	20	8	41.3	5	23.0	7	35.7
Nevada	29	11	37.8	8	26.5	10	35.7
New Hampshire	18	4	23.9	6	29.9	9	46.1
New Jersey	107	50	47.0	18	16.3	39	36.7
New Mexico	31	12	39.5	7	24.1	11	36.4
New York	673	272	40.3	157	23.3	245	36.4
North Carolina	115	50	43.3	28	24.4	37	32.2
North Dakota	24	4	17.4	8	33.0	12	49.6
Ohio	202	53	26.2	69	34.1	80	39.7
Oklahoma	46	15	32.6	14	29.7	17	37.7
Oregon	87	36	41.7	20	23.4	30	34.9
Pennsylvania	403	162	40.3	95	23.5	146	36.2
Rhode Island	19	6	29.7	6	33.8	7	36.5
South Carolina	75	27	36.6	23	31.2	24	32.1
South Dakota	18	3	15.3	7	38.2	8	46.4
Tennessee	92	39	42.8	23	25.0	30	32.2
Texas	336	151	44.9	75	22.3	111	32.9
Utah	11	4	34.2	3	26.7	4	39.1
Vermont	25	5	19.6	8	30.7	12	49.6
Virginia	79	32	40.8	18	22.8	29	36.4
Washington	121	51	42.2	28	23.2	42	34.5
West Virginia	41	19	48.0	10	24.3	11	27.7
Wisconsin	110	42	38.4	31	28.6	36	32.9
Wyoming	5	2	38.5	1	26.1	2	35.4

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.18. Elderly Eligible Individuals in SNAP Units with Assets by State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Units with Assets			
		Any Assets		Assets Countable Toward Asset Limit[a]	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**7,239**	**84.0**	**1,416**	**16.4**
Alabama	128	101	78.7	42	32.8
Alaska	11	9	85.2	5	44.7
Arizona	287	252	87.8	2	0.8
Arkansas	80	64	80.2	28	34.7
California	338	265	78.5	159	47.0
Colorado	73	58	79.7	30	41.6
Connecticut	73	60	81.3	35	48.4
Delaware	41	37	89.6	0	0.0
District of Columbia	17	12	70.2	5	30.9
Florida	436	341	78.1	157	36.0
Georgia	404	348	86.3	0	0.0
Hawaii	37	27	73.9	15	41.3
Idaho	22	19	83.9	10	45.7
Illinois	229	180	78.8	90	39.3
Indiana	112	91	81.0	50	44.8
Iowa	52	44	84.8	26	49.7
Kansas	48	39	81.9	23	47.7
Kentucky	115	92	80.6	39	34.2
Louisiana	134	105	78.5	42	31.6
Maine	33	29	85.8	16	46.4
Maryland	109	85	78.3	38	35.0
Massachusetts	190	165	86.5	0	0.0
Michigan	485	442	91.3	0	0.0
Minnesota	121	107	88.8	0	0.0
Mississippi	100	78	77.9	29	29.0
Missouri	115	94	81.8	48	42.3
Montana	21	18	86.6	11	53.2
Nebraska	31	25	83.1	15	50.1
Nevada	52	40	77.1	19	37.0
New Hampshire	21	18	84.6	11	53.1
New Jersey	145	113	77.7	55	37.8
New Mexico	55	42	76.6	17	32.0
New York	1,058	899	84.9	0	0.0
North Carolina	217	169	78.0	79	36.4
North Dakota	26	24	91.9	0	0.0
Ohio	228	189	83.0	104	45.4
Oklahoma	92	74	80.6	35	38.4
Oregon	180	163	90.3	2	1.0
Pennsylvania	704	640	90.9	0	0.0
Rhode Island	22	18	79.4	9	39.4
South Carolina	273	238	87.3	0	0.0
South Dakota	20	17	84.8	10	48.9
Tennessee	160	127	79.1	57	35.4
Texas	722	565	78.3	14	2.0
Utah	21	18	83.7	10	48.7
Vermont	29	27	93.2	1	1.7
Virginia	134	105	78.1	49	36.4
Washington	274	250	91.3	0	0.0
West Virginia	64	53	83.2	24	37.0
Wisconsin	277	257	92.8	0	0.0
Wyoming	9	8	84.0	5	50.0

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] These are assets that count toward program asset limits under state rules.

Table B.19. Elderly Eligible Individuals in SNAP Units with Financial Assets by State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Units with Financial Assets			
		Any Financial Assets		Assets Countable Toward Asset Limit[a]	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**6,227**	**72.2**	**1,408**	**16.3**
Alabama	128	80	62.2	42	32.8
Alaska	11	8	73.6	5	44.6
Arizona	287	223	77.9	2	0.8
Arkansas	80	50	62.8	27	34.3
California	338	212	62.7	159	47.0
Colorado	73	48	65.7	30	41.6
Connecticut	73	52	70.7	35	48.4
Delaware	41	33	80.7	0	0.0
District of Columbia	17	10	57.7	5	30.9
Florida	436	274	62.9	154	35.2
Georgia	404	303	75.0	0	0.0
Hawaii	37	23	63.2	15	41.3
Idaho	22	15	68.5	10	45.6
Illinois	229	150	65.6	89	39.0
Indiana	112	75	67.1	50	44.8
Iowa	52	37	72.4	25	49.2
Kansas	48	34	69.7	23	47.7
Kentucky	115	74	64.6	39	34.2
Louisiana	134	82	61.2	42	31.6
Maine	33	25	74.1	15	46.0
Maryland	109	71	65.2	38	35.0
Massachusetts	190	151	79.4	0	0.0
Michigan	485	406	83.7	0	0.0
Minnesota	121	96	79.3	0	0.0
Mississippi	100	61	60.7	29	29.0
Missouri	115	78	68.0	48	42.3
Montana	21	16	74.4	11	53.2
Nebraska	31	22	71.4	15	49.7
Nevada	52	31	60.4	19	36.7
New Hampshire	21	15	73.1	11	52.9
New Jersey	145	94	64.7	55	37.8
New Mexico	55	32	58.5	17	32.0
New York	1,058	802	75.8	0	0.0
North Carolina	217	137	63.5	79	36.3
North Dakota	26	22	84.8	0	0.0
Ohio	228	160	70.3	104	45.4
Oklahoma	92	59	64.3	35	38.4
Oregon	180	148	82.2	2	1.0
Pennsylvania	704	587	83.4	0	0.0
Rhode Island	22	15	67.4	9	39.3
South Carolina	273	209	76.7	0	0.0
South Dakota	20	14	71.9	9	48.5
Tennessee	160	101	63.4	57	35.4
Texas	722	445	61.7	11	1.6
Utah	21	15	71.2	10	48.7
Vermont	29	25	87.3	1	1.7
Virginia	134	85	63.5	49	36.4
Washington	274	232	84.8	0	0.0
West Virginia	64	41	64.7	24	37.0
Wisconsin	277	241	86.9	0	0.0
Wyoming	9	6	70.4	5	49.7

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] These are financial assets that count toward program asset limits under state rules.

Table B.20. Elderly Eligible Individuals in SNAP Units with Vehicle Assets by State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Elderly Eligibles in SNAP Units with Financial Assets			
		Any Financial Assets		Assets Countable Toward Asset Limit[a]	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**4,923**	**57.1**	**11,905**	**0.1**
Alabama	128	66	51.4	0	0.0
Alaska	11	6	55.1	20	0.2
Arizona	287	184	64.2	0	0.0
Arkansas	80	43	53.5	422	0.5
California	338	174	51.4	0	0.0
Colorado	73	36	50.0	0	0.0
Connecticut	73	36	48.5	0	0.0
Delaware	41	26	64.7	0	0.0
District of Columbia	17	6	37.4	0	0.0
Florida	436	214	49.1	5,799	1.3
Georgia	404	249	61.6	0	0.0
Hawaii	37	16	44.0	0	0.0
Idaho	22	13	56.7	37	0.2
Illinois	229	110	48.2	800	0.3
Indiana	112	58	51.7	0	0.0
Iowa	52	29	55.5	267	0.5
Kansas	48	25	51.3	0	0.0
Kentucky	115	62	53.8	0	0.0
Louisiana	134	69	51.6	0	0.0
Maine	33	19	57.7	160	0.5
Maryland	109	52	48.0	0	0.0
Massachusetts	190	109	57.1	0	0.0
Michigan	485	325	67.0	0	0.0
Minnesota	121	73	60.8	0	0.0
Mississippi	100	50	50.5	0	0.0
Missouri	115	60	52.6	0	0.0
Montana	21	12	58.6	0	0.0
Nebraska	31	16	52.1	238	0.8
Nevada	52	25	49.2	179	0.3
New Hampshire	21	11	54.0	58	0.3
New Jersey	145	68	46.6	0	0.0
New Mexico	55	27	50.4	0	0.0
New York	1,058	614	58.0	0	0.0
North Carolina	217	105	48.7	376	0.2
North Dakota	26	17	65.5	0	0.0
Ohio	228	121	53.2	0	0.0
Oklahoma	92	49	53.3	130	0.1
Oregon	180	118	65.6	153	0.1
Pennsylvania	704	466	66.2	0	0.0
Rhode Island	22	11	47.5	36	0.2
South Carolina	273	172	62.9	0	0.0
South Dakota	20	11	55.8	98	0.5
Tennessee	160	82	51.1	0	0.0
Texas	722	380	52.6	3,082	0.4
Utah	21	11	53.2	0	0.0
Vermont	29	20	68.5	0	0.0
Virginia	134	65	48.6	0	0.0
Washington	274	181	66.0	0	0.0
West Virginia	64	37	58.5	0	0.0
Wisconsin	277	188	68.0	0	0.0
Wyoming	9	5	55.2	51	0.6

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

[a] These are vehicle assets that count toward program asset limits under state rules.

Table B.21. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Sharing of Expenses and State, 2009

	Eligible Elderly Who Do Not Pay All Expenses with Own Money						Assistance Comes From Outside Household	
	Food Expenses		Housing Expenses		Other Expenses			
	Number (000s)	Percent of Elderly	Number (000s)	Percent of Elderly	Number (000s)	Percent of Elderly	Number (000s)	Percent of Elderly
United States	**1,622**	**18.8**	**1,737**	**20.2**	**1,516**	**17.6**	**317**	**3.7**
Alabama	23	18.2	25	19.6	21	16.7	4	3.3
Alaska	2	15.2	2	16.9	2	14.2	0	2.9
Arizona	65	22.6	69	24.0	61	21.4	12	4.2
Arkansas	16	19.7	17	21.2	15	18.6	3	3.7
California	48	14.1	52	15.4	44	12.9	8	2.2
Colorado	11	15.3	13	17.3	10	14.3	3	3.7
Connecticut	9	12.6	10	14.1	8	11.4	2	2.8
Delaware	8	20.8	9	21.6	8	19.4	2	3.7
District of Columbia	2	9.8	2	12.5	2	9.1	0	2.5
Florida	77	17.7	85	19.5	73	16.6	20	4.6
Georgia	79	19.6	83	20.5	75	18.5	14	3.4
Hawaii	8	20.6	8	22.4	7	19.1	2	5.3
Idaho	4	19.4	5	21.0	4	18.2	1	4.2
Illinois	35	15.5	40	17.4	32	14.2	8	3.7
Indiana	16	14.2	18	15.7	15	13.1	4	3.3
Iowa	9	17.5	10	19.0	8	15.9	2	3.6
Kansas	8	15.8	8	17.5	7	14.4	2	3.7
Kentucky	21	18.5	23	19.9	20	17.2	4	3.2
Louisiana	27	20.5	30	22.1	25	18.8	5	3.5
Maine	6	18.5	7	19.6	6	16.5	1	3.0
Maryland	18	16.7	20	18.7	17	15.3	4	3.6
Massachusetts	35	18.6	38	19.9	33	17.5	7	3.7
Michigan	101	20.8	103	21.3	94	19.4	18	3.7
Minnesota	22	18.6	23	19.1	21	17.0	4	3.6
Mississippi	20	19.5	21	20.9	18	18.1	3	3.4
Missouri	19	16.7	21	18.2	18	15.3	4	3.4
Montana	4	17.9	4	18.6	3	16.1	1	3.8
Nebraska	5	15.9	5	17.4	4	14.6	1	3.4
Nevada	9	18.1	10	19.9	9	17.0	2	4.4
New Hampshire	3	16.6	4	17.5	3	14.6	1	3.7
New Jersey	23	16.1	27	18.3	22	14.9	7	4.5
New Mexico	10	18.5	12	21.1	10	17.9	3	5.3
New York	203	19.2	217	20.5	191	18.0	40	3.8
North Carolina	36	16.6	40	18.3	33	15.2	7	3.3
North Dakota	5	19.4	5	20.0	5	18.5	1	3.1
Ohio	34	14.7	36	15.9	30	13.1	8	3.3
Oklahoma	16	17.7	18	19.2	15	16.5	3	3.8
Oregon	39	21.5	40	22.4	36	20.2	7	3.7
Pennsylvania	151	21.5	157	22.2	143	20.2	26	3.6
Rhode Island	3	13.4	3	15.2	3	12.1	1	2.9
South Carolina	61	22.2	63	23.0	57	21.0	10	3.6
South Dakota	3	16.1	3	17.1	3	14.7	1	3.0
Tennessee	30	18.5	33	20.3	27	17.1	6	3.5
Texas	136	18.8	151	20.9	128	17.8	30	4.2
Utah	5	21.7	5	23.3	4	20.3	1	5.3
Vermont	6	21.1	6	21.7	6	19.7	1	3.2
Virginia	23	17.1	26	19.2	22	16.0	5	3.7
Washington	56	20.6	58	21.3	53	19.4	10	3.5
West Virginia	14	21.7	15	22.8	13	20.3	3	4.7
Wisconsin	57	20.5	58	21.0	53	19.3	9	3.3
Wyoming	2	17.5	2	18.5	1	16.1	0	3.8

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.22. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Receipt of Housing Assistance and State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Eligible Elderly by Receipt of Assistance					
		Lives in Public Housing		Receives Rental Assistance		Assistance Includes Utilities	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**979**	**11.4**	**228**	**2.6**	**726**	**8.4**
Alabama	128	16	12.6	4	2.8	12	9.3
Alaska	11	1	13.2	0	2.9	1	9.5
Arizona	287	24	8.3	6	2.0	18	6.3
Arkansas	80	10	12.5	2	2.9	8	9.4
California	338	36	10.7	9	2.6	26	7.8
Colorado	73	11	14.6	2	3.1	8	10.5
Connecticut	73	12	17.0	3	3.8	9	12.3
Delaware	41	3	8.0	1	1.8	2	6.0
District of Columbia	17	4	23.5	1	4.4	3	16.8
Florida	436	58	13.4	14	3.1	43	9.7
Georgia	404	39	9.6	9	2.3	29	7.2
Hawaii	37	5	14.7	1	3.9	4	9.9
Idaho	22	2	9.9	1	2.4	2	7.4
Illinois	229	34	14.9	8	3.5	25	10.9
Indiana	112	16	13.8	4	3.2	12	10.3
Iowa	52	6	12.3	2	2.9	5	9.0
Kansas	48	7	14.8	2	3.3	5	10.7
Kentucky	115	14	12.1	3	3.0	11	9.3
Louisiana	134	16	12.1	4	2.8	12	9.1
Maine	33	4	11.6	1	2.7	3	9.0
Maryland	109	17	15.2	4	3.4	12	10.9
Massachusetts	190	23	12.0	6	3.0	17	8.7
Michigan	485	38	7.7	9	1.8	28	5.7
Minnesota	121	13	10.7	3	2.3	9	7.6
Mississippi	100	11	11.3	2	2.4	8	8.4
Missouri	115	15	13.3	3	3.0	11	10.0
Montana	21	2	11.5	1	2.4	2	8.5
Nebraska	31	5	15.3	1	3.2	3	10.9
Nevada	52	7	13.1	2	3.5	5	9.9
New Hampshire	21	3	13.6	1	3.4	2	10.2
New Jersey	145	22	14.9	5	3.5	16	10.7
New Mexico	55	6	11.9	1	2.6	5	9.1
New York	1,058	125	11.9	31	2.9	92	8.6
North Carolina	217	33	15.2	7	3.4	24	11.2
North Dakota	26	2	9.2	1	2.0	2	7.0
Ohio	228	29	12.9	7	3.0	23	9.9
Oklahoma	92	12	12.9	3	3.0	9	9.7
Oregon	180	16	9.0	4	2.1	12	6.6
Pennsylvania	704	59	8.3	14	2.0	43	6.2
Rhode Island	22	4	16.2	1	3.8	3	12.3
South Carolina	273	23	8.5	5	1.9	17	6.4
South Dakota	20	3	12.9	1	2.7	2	9.6
Tennessee	160	21	12.9	5	3.0	16	9.8
Texas	722	90	12.5	20	2.8	71	9.8
Utah	21	2	11.0	1	2.6	2	7.7
Vermont	29	2	8.1	1	1.8	2	5.8
Virginia	134	20	14.6	4	3.3	14	10.7
Washington	274	26	9.4	6	2.2	19	6.8
West Virginia	64	5	8.0	1	2.2	4	6.3
Wisconsin	277	24	8.7	6	2.0	18	6.4
Wyoming	9	1	13.3	0	2.7	1	9.8

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.23. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Receipt of Energy or Transportation Assistance and State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Eligible Elderly by Receipt of Assistance			
		Energy		Transportation	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**367**	**4.3**	**164**	**1.9**
Alabama	128	7	5.6	2	1.9
Alaska	11	1	4.9	0	2.1
Arizona	287	10	3.4	4	1.5
Arkansas	80	5	5.8	2	1.9
California	338	14	4.1	9	2.7
Colorado	73	4	5.3	2	2.7
Connecticut	73	4	5.0	2	3.1
Delaware	41	1	3.2	1	1.3
District of Columbia	17	1	5.9	1	3.4
Florida	436	21	4.9	11	2.6
Georgia	404	15	3.7	6	1.4
Hawaii	37	2	4.5	1	2.3
Idaho	22	1	5.0	0	1.8
Illinois	229	12	5.0	6	2.6
Indiana	112	6	5.5	3	2.2
Iowa	52	3	4.9	1	2.2
Kansas	48	3	5.2	1	2.5
Kentucky	115	7	5.8	2	1.7
Louisiana	134	7	5.1	2	1.8
Maine	33	2	5.1	1	1.9
Maryland	109	6	5.1	3	2.6
Massachusetts	190	8	4.0	4	2.2
Michigan	485	15	3.2	6	1.3
Minnesota	121	5	3.8	2	1.6
Mississippi	100	6	5.5	2	1.9
Missouri	115	6	5.2	2	2.0
Montana	21	1	4.9	0	1.9
Nebraska	31	2	5.3	1	2.5
Nevada	52	3	5.3	1	2.3
New Hampshire	21	1	5.0	0	2.3
New Jersey	145	7	4.9	4	2.7
New Mexico	55	3	5.1	1	2.7
New York	1,058	39	3.7	21	2.0
North Carolina	217	12	5.7	5	2.5
North Dakota	26	1	4.2	0	1.3
Ohio	228	11	4.8	5	2.0
Oklahoma	92	5	5.8	2	2.0
Oregon	180	7	3.7	2	1.3
Pennsylvania	704	23	3.2	9	1.3
Rhode Island	22	1	5.5	1	2.6
South Carolina	273	10	3.6	4	1.3
South Dakota	20	1	5.7	0	1.9
Tennessee	160	9	5.6	3	1.9
Texas	722	32	4.5	15	2.1
Utah	21	1	4.4	0	1.8
Vermont	29	1	3.3	0	1.2
Virginia	134	7	5.3	3	2.3
Washington	274	9	3.3	4	1.5
West Virginia	64	3	5.3	1	1.4
Wisconsin	277	9	3.1	4	1.4
Wyoming	9	0	5.5	0	2.0

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table B.24. Elderly SNAP-Eligible Individuals by Health Insurance Coverage and State, 2009

	All Eligible Elderly	Eligible Elderly by Health Insurance Coverage					
		Medicare		Medicaid		Private Insurance	
	Number (000s)	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent	Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,622**	**6,990**	**81.1**	**2,810**	**32.6**	**4,545**	**52.7**
Alabama	128	103	80.4	57	44.5	54	41.9
Alaska	11	9	78.3	4	31.7	6	54.7
Arizona	287	236	82.4	74	26.0	168	58.6
Arkansas	80	63	78.4	34	42.4	35	44.1
California	338	240	70.9	107	31.7	159	47.1
Colorado	73	57	78.6	30	41.1	32	44.8
Connecticut	73	59	80.7	29	39.4	35	47.7
Delaware	41	34	84.5	9	21.6	26	63.3
District of Columbia	17	14	81.1	9	56.9	5	31.9
Florida	436	340	77.9	190	43.6	188	43.1
Georgia	404	338	83.6	108	26.7	228	56.4
Hawaii	37	29	77.9	16	43.0	16	44.3
Idaho	22	17	76.9	8	34.0	11	51.1
Illinois	229	182	79.3	98	42.9	101	44.3
Indiana	112	90	80.5	43	38.7	53	47.6
Iowa	52	40	77.8	18	34.1	27	52.6
Kansas	48	38	77.9	18	37.2	24	49.3
Kentucky	115	91	79.3	48	42.2	53	46.1
Louisiana	134	105	78.5	60	45.3	55	41.2
Maine	33	27	79.8	11	32.7	18	53.7
Maryland	109	85	78.4	49	45.1	44	40.4
Massachusetts	190	151	79.4	56	29.6	113	59.2
Michigan	485	409	84.5	94	19.5	324	66.9
Minnesota	121	99	82.4	29	23.9	72	59.9
Mississippi	100	80	79.5	47	46.6	40	40.3
Missouri	115	92	80.0	45	39.1	55	47.7
Montana	21	16	78.3	6	29.3	12	56.2
Nebraska	31	24	78.4	12	37.7	15	49.2
Nevada	52	40	78.0	23	44.7	21	41.3
New Hampshire	21	17	81.5	7	33.9	11	53.4
New Jersey	145	115	79.2	64	43.8	61	41.7
New Mexico	55	42	77.5	25	46.6	21	38.8
New York	1,058	877	82.9	308	29.1	596	56.3
North Carolina	217	174	80.3	100	46.1	89	41.2
North Dakota	26	20	79.3	5	20.6	17	67.4
Ohio	228	184	80.9	81	35.7	115	50.6
Oklahoma	92	73	79.3	37	40.6	43	46.2
Oregon	180	150	83.0	39	21.7	116	64.1
Pennsylvania	704	592	84.1	144	20.5	463	65.8
Rhode Island	22	18	81.1	10	43.4	10	43.9
South Carolina	273	228	83.6	73	26.9	155	56.7
South Dakota	20	16	79.5	7	34.0	10	53.0
Tennessee	160	127	79.6	70	43.5	68	42.6
Texas	722	583	80.8	306	42.4	277	38.3
Utah	21	16	73.7	7	33.5	11	52.1
Vermont	29	24	82.8	5	17.5	20	69.1
Virginia	134	105	78.4	59	43.9	56	42.1
Washington	274	229	83.5	54	19.6	183	66.9
West Virginia	64	50	78.0	24	37.8	32	49.6
Wisconsin	277	235	84.9	49	17.6	194	69.8
Wyoming	9	7	78.7	3	35.9	5	51.4

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

APPENDIX C

TABLES SHOWING NUMBER OF ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS BELOW 200 PERCENT OF POVERTY, NUMBER ELIGIBLE FOR SNAP, AND SNAP ELIGIBILITY RATES BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 2009

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table C.1. Eligibility Rates for Elderly Individuals in SNAP Units with Income Below 200 Percent of Poverty by State, FY 2009

	Elderly Individuals Below 200 Percent of Poverty		
	Number (000s)	Eligible for SNAP	
		Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**16,257**	**8,540**	**52.5**
Alabama	309	126	40.9
Alaska	30	11	37.0
Arizona	335	284	84.8
Arkansas	204	79	38.5
California	1,807	326	18.0
Colorado	189	71	37.4
Connecticut	168	71	42.2
Delaware	43	41	94.6
District of Columbia	33	16	50.3
Florida	1,239	429	34.6
Georgia	425	404	94.9
Hawaii	92	37	39.7
Idaho	68	22	32.1
Illinois	634	225	35.5
Indiana	306	110	36.1
Iowa	158	51	32.1
Kansas	143	47	33.1
Kentucky	279	113	40.6
Louisiana	319	132	41.3
Maine	80	33	40.4
Maryland	265	107	40.4
Massachusetts	297	190	64.2
Michigan	506	485	95.8
Minnesota	205	121	58.7
Mississippi	223	99	44.3
Missouri	327	113	34.5
Montana	63	20	32.3
Nebraska	93	30	32.4
Nevada	133	51	37.9
New Hampshire	57	20	35.4
New Jersey	387	142	36.7
New Mexico	126	53	42.3
New York	1,129	1,058	93.7
North Carolina	532	214	40.2
North Dakota	39	26	66.2
Ohio	595	223	37.4
Oklahoma	243	91	37.4
Oregon	207	179	86.4
Pennsylvania	737	704	95.5
Rhode Island	54	22	40.5
South Carolina	284	273	95.9
South Dakota	49	19	39.2
Tennessee	402	158	39.2
Texas	1,223	713	58.3
Utah	74	21	27.9
Vermont	32	28	87.9
Virginia	351	132	37.5
Washington	286	274	95.6
West Virginia	161	63	39.2
Wisconsin	285	277	97.2
Wyoming	28	9	32.2

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table C.2. Eligibility Rates for Elderly Individuals in SNAP Units with Income Below 200 Percent of Poverty and SSI Income by State, FY 2009

	Elderly Individuals Below 200 Percent of Poverty and with SSI Income		
	Number (000s)	Eligible for SNAP	
		Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**2,019**	**1,482**	**73.4**
Alabama	38	36	93.9
Alaska	3	3	94.3
Arizona	26	26	97.6
Arkansas	23	22	94.3
California	470	0	0.0
Colorado	16	15	93.9
Connecticut	14	13	96.7
Delaware	3	3	98.4
District of Columbia	5	5	97.1
Florida	132	124	93.4
Georgia	53	51	96.5
Hawaii	9	9	95.4
Idaho	4	4	92.0
Illinois	63	60	95.1
Indiana	16	16	97.0
Iowa	9	8	96.7
Kansas	8	8	96.0
Kentucky	39	38	95.0
Louisiana	40	37	93.1
Maine	6	6	96.9
Maryland	27	26	96.8
Massachusetts	46	43	94.6
Michigan	42	41	98.6
Minnesota	17	16	97.9
Mississippi	34	31	92.0
Missouri	23	22	95.1
Montana	3	3	95.4
Nebraska	5	5	95.6
Nevada	10	10	93.2
New Hampshire	2	2	96.6
New Jersey	46	43	93.7
New Mexico	17	16	93.8
New York	204	199	97.6
North Carolina	56	54	95.8
North Dakota	2	2	97.0
Ohio	42	41	96.1
Oklahoma	21	19	92.7
Oregon	15	15	98.4
Pennsylvania	69	68	98.1
Rhode Island	7	6	93.2
South Carolina	30	29	98.2
South Dakota	4	3	94.7
Tennessee	41	39	95.1
Texas	171	164	95.8
Utah	4	4	93.5
Vermont	3	3	98.1
Virginia	38	36	94.8
Washington	27	26	98.4
West Virginia	16	15	94.9
Wisconsin	19	19	99.1
Wyoming	1	1	95.8

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

Table C.3. Eligibility Rates for Elderly Individuals in One-Person SNAP Units with Income Below 200 Percent of Poverty by State, FY 2009

	Elderly Individuals Below 200 Percent of Poverty and in One-Person SNAP Units		
	Number (000s)	Eligible for SNAP	
		Number (000s)	Row Percent
United States	**8,635**	**5,045**	**58.4**
Alabama	152	76	50.2
Alaska	16	7	47.6
Arizona	162	143	88.2
Arkansas	90	44	48.8
California	1,022	230	22.5
Colorado	110	48	43.5
Connecticut	104	53	51.2
Delaware	23	23	97.0
District of Columbia	24	13	53.2
Florida	632	267	42.2
Georgia	231	225	97.4
Hawaii	41	20	48.8
Idaho	32	12	38.8
Illinois	364	151	41.4
Indiana	176	77	43.6
Iowa	78	30	38.6
Kansas	78	32	40.4
Kentucky	141	65	46.3
Louisiana	137	71	51.7
Maine	40	20	49.9
Maryland	144	67	46.7
Massachusetts	175	118	67.8
Michigan	277	272	97.9
Minnesota	111	75	67.0
Mississippi	96	55	56.8
Missouri	175	73	41.6
Montana	30	12	41.5
Nebraska	49	20	40.3
Nevada	72	31	43.5
New Hampshire	30	13	43.8
New Jersey	219	94	42.9
New Mexico	63	30	48.1
New York	643	619	96.2
North Carolina	277	135	48.8
North Dakota	21	15	72.2
Ohio	331	154	46.4
Oklahoma	121	56	46.3
Oregon	110	99	89.9
Pennsylvania	395	387	98.0
Rhode Island	32	15	48.7
South Carolina	142	140	98.1
South Dakota	24	12	49.4
Tennessee	198	93	47.1
Texas	603	388	64.3
Utah	31	12	37.3
Vermont	18	16	91.0
Virginia	186	82	44.4
Washington	161	157	97.3
West Virginia	71	34	47.1
Wisconsin	161	159	98.5
Wyoming	14	6	40.6

Source: 2009 Baseline of the 2005 MATH SIPP+ model.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

APPENDIX D

TABLES SHOWING ELDERLY SNAP PARTICIPATION RATES, RANKS, AND NUMBER OF ELDERLY PARTICIPANTS AND ELIGIBLES BY STATE, FISCAL YEARS 2002 THROUGH 2006

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Table D.1. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, Ranks, and Number of Elderly Participants and Eligibles by State, FY 2002

	Participation Rate (Standard Error)	Rank	Number of Participants	Number of Eligibles
Alabama	20 (2.2)	39	27,948	138,902
Alaska	28 (5.2)	15	2,077	7,538
Arizona	18 (2.3)	45	15,308	84,301
Arkansas	20 (2.2)	40	20,941	105,373
California	7 (2.5)	51	18,852	286,952
Colorado	20 (2.3)	37	13,340	65,849
Connecticut	31 (4.1)	7	18,124	58,096
Delaware	17 (2.5)	47	1,904	11,283
District of Columbia	28 (5.1)	12	4,680	16,504
Florida	35 (2.8)	5	165,515	469,664
Georgia	26 (3.0)	19	56,661	218,081
Hawaii	61 (6.1)	1	15,188	25,045
Idaho	20 (2.7)	38	3,949	19,600
Illinois	30 (2.4)	9	65,155	219,460
Indiana	21 (2.3)	33	23,564	110,379
Iowa	19 (2.2)	42	9,578	50,114
Kansas	23 (2.2)	26	11,707	49,970
Kentucky	28 (2.9)	13	36,962	132,587
Louisiana	23 (2.6)	28	28,399	125,209
Maine	36 (2.9)	3	14,285	39,604
Maryland	22 (2.7)	31	21,696	100,163
Massachusetts	16 (2.2)	50	20,226	126,761
Michigan	27 (2.8)	17	53,148	194,881
Minnesota	27 (3.1)	16	20,659	75,444
Mississippi	21 (3.1)	35	27,362	129,464
Missouri	29 (2.7)	10	37,322	127,596
Montana	18 (3.1)	43	4,265	23,102
Nebraska	26 (2.6)	21	7,916	30,901
Nevada	23 (2.8)	24	9,868	42,012
New Hampshire	22 (2.7)	32	4,781	22,084
New Jersey	28 (2.8)	14	38,101	136,690
New Mexico	17 (2.9)	48	12,750	76,554
New York	35 (3.0)	4	220,041	620,532
North Carolina	21 (2.1)	34	53,313	249,952
North Dakota	25 (3.0)	22	3,186	12,979
Ohio	24 (2.5)	23	51,332	212,535
Oklahoma	22 (2.4)	30	28,397	127,373
Oregon	40 (4.3)	2	23,678	59,137
Pennsylvania	23 (2.0)	27	67,569	289,339
Rhode Island	22 (2.4)	29	6,109	27,222
South Carolina	23 (2.3)	25	34,612	147,455
South Dakota	18 (2.8)	44	3,041	16,497
Tennessee	30 (3.4)	8	51,124	169,833
Texas	20 (2.2)	41	95,613	489,502
Utah	21 (3.2)	36	5,585	26,691
Vermont	35 (3.8)	6	4,646	13,453
Virginia	27 (2.5)	18	38,803	145,912
Washington	28 (2.9)	11	23,072	81,263
West Virginia	26 (3.1)	20	20,521	79,083
Wisconsin	18 (2.0)	46	15,757	89,162
Wyoming	16 (2.8)	49	1,231	7,638

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for 2002; census 2000 data.

Table D.2. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, Ranks, and Number of Elderly Participants and Eligibles by State, FY 2003

	Participation Rate (Standard Error)	Rank	Number of Participants	Number of Eligibles
Alabama	22 (2.4)	38	32,624	145,816
Alaska	29 (6.1)	16	2,288	7,930
Arizona	24 (2.8)	33	22,562	94,447
Arkansas	23 (2.1)	37	22,203	94,624
California	7 (3.5)	51	24,361	367,954
Colorado	22 (2.5)	40	16,353	76,055
Connecticut	26 (3.7)	24	19,706	75,953
Delaware	18 (2.8)	49	2,471	13,551
District of Columbia	32 (5.4)	9	4,404	13,679
Florida	34 (2.8)	5	163,830	486,001
Georgia	27 (3.1)	20	56,213	205,321
Hawaii	52 (6.1)	1	14,473	27,951
Idaho	24 (2.9)	36	3,682	15,633
Illinois	28 (2.6)	18	68,893	245,382
Indiana	25 (2.7)	30	29,852	120,594
Iowa	21 (2.3)	43	8,788	42,561
Kansas	26 (2.4)	26	11,821	46,327
Kentucky	32 (2.9)	10	40,978	129,470
Louisiana	28 (3.3)	17	43,722	154,804
Maine	40 (3.8)	3	16,168	40,558
Maryland	18 (2.4)	48	20,469	111,796
Massachusetts	17 (2.0)	50	23,604	140,907
Michigan	29 (3.1)	14	62,948	213,439
Minnesota	26 (3.0)	23	18,472	70,829
Mississippi	26 (3.4)	22	31,668	120,681
Missouri	33 (3.2)	7	41,472	125,724
Montana	25 (3.8)	31	4,809	19,599
Nebraska	27 (2.9)	19	8,588	31,364
Nevada	25 (2.9)	28	9,988	40,073
New Hampshire	19 (2.6)	47	3,905	20,925
New Jersey	21 (2.3)	41	36,787	172,153
New Mexico	24 (3.0)	32	12,075	50,356
New York	33 (3.0)	6	152,132	456,132
North Carolina	22 (2.1)	39	57,780	265,395
North Dakota	25 (3.3)	29	3,439	13,836
Ohio	29 (2.9)	15	65,866	223,448
Oklahoma	31 (2.7)	12	27,150	88,673
Oregon	42 (4.8)	2	28,735	68,194
Pennsylvania	25 (2.3)	27	74,619	298,262
Rhode Island	21 (2.4)	42	5,217	25,164
South Carolina	27 (2.5)	21	28,998	106,859
South Dakota	20 (3.4)	44	3,555	17,553
Tennessee	35 (3.9)	4	62,256	178,544
Texas	24 (2.4)	35	163,036	690,594
Utah	24 (3.3)	34	4,588	19,304
Vermont	33 (4.1)	8	5,330	16,178
Virginia	26 (2.6)	25	41,720	162,916
Washington	30 (3.1)	13	34,372	113,798
West Virginia	32 (3.1)	11	20,986	66,397
Wisconsin	20 (2.4)	45	19,536	97,595
Wyoming	19 (3.3)	46	1,460	7,647

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for 2003; census 2000 data.

Table D.3. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, Ranks, and Number of Elderly Participants and Eligibles by State, FY 2004

	Participation Rate (Standard Error)	Rank	Number of Participants	Number of Eligibles
Alabama	22 (2.3)	43	28,582	131,533
Alaska	25 (6.5)	35	2,275	9,048
Arizona	26 (2.7)	30	24,053	92,209
Arkansas	23 (2.6)	42	22,404	96,839
California	11 (4.0)	51	28,859	267,007
Colorado	24 (2.4)	40	17,834	75,220
Connecticut	29 (4.5)	20	20,958	72,488
Delaware	22 (2.5)	44	3,194	14,855
District of Columbia	30 (5.3)	14	6,551	21,941
Florida	43 (3.3)	2	181,203	418,190
Georgia	29 (3.0)	19	56,200	193,956
Hawaii	58 (5.8)	1	14,590	25,068
Idaho	26 (3.0)	33	4,653	18,209
Illinois	32 (2.7)	10	84,006	265,268
Indiana	26 (2.7)	32	31,532	122,765
Iowa	24 (2.5)	41	11,333	47,852
Kansas	27 (2.6)	27	11,719	43,289
Kentucky	29 (3.0)	17	45,492	154,585
Louisiana	25 (3.1)	34	39,406	154,926
Maine	38 (3.7)	4	16,117	42,060
Maryland	21 (2.6)	46	21,866	101,998
Massachusetts	20 (2.9)	49	26,571	131,856
Michigan	30 (3.0)	13	63,521	210,097
Minnesota	27 (3.3)	25	17,466	63,709
Mississippi	24 (2.9)	38	29,712	122,376
Missouri	34 (3.3)	6	42,586	126,219
Montana	24 (4.1)	39	5,143	21,427
Nebraska	30 (2.8)	15	7,139	23,934
Nevada	30 (3.3)	12	13,473	44,455
New Hampshire	21 (3.0)	47	4,249	20,171
New Jersey	29 (3.1)	22	45,656	158,851
New Mexico	25 (3.0)	37	14,205	57,714
New York	42 (3.6)	3	241,176	576,622
North Carolina	25 (2.1)	36	66,891	267,575
North Dakota	26 (3.7)	29	3,814	14,450
Ohio	30 (2.9)	11	70,898	233,410
Oklahoma	29 (2.6)	18	26,164	88,931
Oregon	38 (4.4)	5	32,173	84,863
Pennsylvania	29 (2.3)	21	97,766	339,846
Rhode Island	26 (2.9)	31	6,686	25,788
South Carolina	27 (2.5)	26	36,068	132,772
South Dakota	20 (3.6)	50	3,960	19,816
Tennessee	33 (4.1)	7	75,294	229,449
Texas	28 (2.4)	24	167,343	608,155
Utah	27 (3.6)	28	6,164	23,080
Vermont	33 (3.8)	8	5,753	17,615
Virginia	30 (2.7)	16	47,517	160,786
Washington	33 (3.1)	9	35,505	108,736
West Virginia	28 (3.1)	23	20,930	75,831
Wisconsin	21 (2.4)	45	21,008	97,787
Wyoming	21 (3.4)	48	1,264	6,106

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for 2004; census 2000 data.

Table D.4. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, Ranks, and Number of Elderly Participants and Eligibles by State, FY 2005

	Participation Rate (Standard Error)	Rank	Number of Participants	Number of Eligibles
Alabama	21 (2.5)	44	32,599	152,532
Alaska	31 (5.6)	16	2,122	6,841
Arizona	27 (2.9)	29	28,769	106,396
Arkansas	27 (2.8)	31	25,145	93,822
California	9 (3.0)	51	30,481	357,163
Colorado	22 (2.3)	41	18,014	81,243
Connecticut	31 (3.9)	18	20,047	65,005
Delaware	23 (2.7)	37	3,319	14,163
District of Columbia	30 (4.9)	19	5,198	17,150
Florida	43 (3.4)	6	191,843	447,531
Georgia	29 (3.0)	25	58,702	200,018
Hawaii	61 (5.5)	1	14,558	23,916
Idaho	23 (3.0)	38	5,365	22,976
Illinois	37 (2.8)	10	85,724	233,922
Indiana	29 (2.9)	24	39,478	134,324
Iowa	26 (2.4)	34	11,918	45,531
Kansas	27 (2.5)	32	13,424	50,286
Kentucky	33 (3.1)	12	50,259	153,033
Louisiana	30 (3.4)	21	47,571	159,313
Maine	45 (3.7)	3	15,956	35,079
Maryland	21 (2.0)	46	24,159	117,439
Massachusetts	20 (2.9)	47	35,259	177,427
Michigan	37 (3.1)	8	67,727	181,672
Minnesota	26 (3.2)	33	19,313	73,764
Mississippi	21 (3.1)	45	26,263	125,051
Missouri	44 (3.7)	4	52,615	120,494
Montana	23 (4.1)	39	4,673	20,452
Nebraska	30 (2.8)	20	8,889	29,683
Nevada	27 (3.3)	28	13,509	49,889
New Hampshire	20 (2.6)	48	4,904	24,704
New Jersey	28 (3.2)	26	43,358	153,082
New Mexico	26 (3.1)	35	13,389	51,717
New York	43 (3.6)	5	267,002	621,048
North Carolina	24 (2.2)	36	65,091	269,294
North Dakota	22 (3.1)	40	3,447	15,413
Ohio	32 (2.9)	13	69,354	213,544
Oklahoma	32 (2.7)	14	30,141	94,019
Oregon	46 (4.4)	2	38,509	84,400
Pennsylvania	31 (2.3)	17	89,682	290,577
Rhode Island	22 (3.0)	42	6,291	28,499
South Carolina	30 (2.6)	22	38,339	128,432
South Dakota	16 (3.4)	49	3,146	19,577
Tennessee	39 (4.0)	7	73,509	186,652
Texas	28 (2.5)	27	182,310	646,968
Utah	27 (3.4)	30	5,401	20,025
Vermont	35 (3.8)	11	5,480	15,683
Virginia	29 (2.6)	23	48,340	164,303
Washington	37 (3.2)	9	43,337	118,176
West Virginia	31 (3.7)	15	24,982	80,459
Wisconsin	22 (2.1)	43	20,617	95,490
Wyoming	15 (3.4)	50	1,900	12,818

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for 2005; census 2000 data.

Table D.5. Elderly SNAP Participation Rates, Ranks, and Number of Elderly Participants and Eligibles by State, FY 2006

	Participation Rate (Standard Error)	Rank	Number of Participants	Number of Eligibles
Alabama	26 (2.6)	42	34,357	131,561
Alaska	38 (6.2)	13	2,507	6,659
Arizona	26 (3.1)	43	27,407	105,510
Arkansas	27 (2.8)	40	23,195	86,296
California	10 (2.7)	51	40,193	412,152
Colorado	27 (2.5)	39	15,802	58,396
Connecticut	34 (4.4)	20	22,402	65,860
Delaware	27 (2.9)	38	3,959	14,417
District of Columbia	41 (6.7)	9	6,668	16,341
Florida	44 (4.0)	6	201,180	459,309
Georgia	35 (3.2)	15	64,317	181,912
Hawaii	63 (6.4)	1	14,431	22,749
Idaho	23 (2.9)	48	4,879	21,243
Illinois	40 (3.1)	10	92,629	228,735
Indiana	30 (3.0)	32	37,579	124,524
Iowa	30 (2.8)	31	15,936	52,653
Kansas	31 (2.5)	29	14,532	47,528
Kentucky	34 (3.2)	19	50,592	148,456
Louisiana	33 (3.6)	24	48,368	146,003
Maine	50 (4.2)	3	16,116	32,129
Maryland	28 (2.7)	37	25,299	90,532
Massachusetts	32 (3.5)	27	55,135	173,114
Michigan	43 (3.5)	8	72,994	169,637
Minnesota	33 (3.3)	22	21,478	64,322
Mississippi	31 (3.4)	28	32,949	105,707
Missouri	45 (3.9)	5	48,768	108,813
Montana	25 (4.1)	46	5,132	20,801
Nebraska	33 (3.0)	25	9,557	29,077
Nevada	28 (3.6)	36	12,396	44,102
New Hampshire	25 (3.0)	44	5,653	22,424
New Jersey	34 (3.5)	18	44,360	130,005
New Mexico	30 (3.5)	35	13,366	45,055
New York	50 (3.9)	2	298,748	593,149
North Carolina	30 (2.6)	33	84,219	279,438
North Dakota	25 (3.6)	45	3,810	15,200
Ohio	36 (3.0)	14	85,603	235,848
Oklahoma	34 (2.8)	21	31,174	93,025
Oregon	45 (4.6)	4	41,379	92,000
Pennsylvania	34 (2.4)	16	92,135	268,214
Rhode Island	24 (3.1)	47	6,725	27,618
South Carolina	33 (2.8)	23	37,171	112,094
South Dakota	21 (3.4)	49	4,346	21,199
Tennessee	39 (3.9)	11	73,479	188,609
Texas	32 (2.5)	26	213,551	661,216
Utah	30 (3.6)	30	7,420	24,447
Vermont	38 (4.0)	12	6,153	16,262
Virginia	34 (2.7)	17	51,512	150,078
Washington	43 (3.5)	7	43,697	101,388
West Virginia	30 (3.7)	34	20,340	68,450
Wisconsin	26 (2.4)	41	22,745	86,908
Wyoming	20 (3.5)	50	1,865	9,428

Sources: SNAP QC, CPS, and administrative data for 2006; census 2000 data.

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

www.mathematica-mpr.com

Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC

Mathematica® is a registered trademark of Mathematica Policy Research