

SNAP PARTICIPATION IN Yavapai County

SNAP - Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Harvey Grady
Cornucopia Community Advocates • February 18, 2014



ECONOMY, HUNGER & POVERTY

A strong rural economy reduces hunger and poverty by energizing business in diverse vital sectors so that a range of bottom-to-top jobs is available to offer not only a livable minimum wage but also several career ladders. Such an economy encourages its school graduates to seek trade skills and higher education so that they remain local and invest in their community instead of moving away to “big city” job opportunities and higher pay.

Yavapai County’s economy has morphed from cattle, mining and farming in the “old days” to a predominantly tourist-driven economy that offers mainly low-paying jobs at resorts, retail sales, restaurants, and scenic attractions. Tourism varies with weather, availability of vacation money, and international news - factors *beyond* local control.

The county’s *poverty rate* has continued to rise from 12.0% in 2000 to 18.4% in 2011, a dramatic **53% rise** since the Great Recession of 2008-2009.¹ Those living in poverty have historically been minority groups, the less-educated, the disabled, the mentally ill, and the elderly. Yet starting in 2008, the **middle class** also began sliding into poverty due to business downsizing or closing, loss of jobs, fewer work hours, lower wages, loss of home market value, and home foreclosure. In 2010, **30%** of persons waiting in line at a local food bank were still working yet unable to financially take care of themselves or their family.²

Persons who never before experienced poverty and hunger had to do what they could to survive with hope that the economy would recover. Yet the U.S. Census Bureau reported that **39%** of Arizona families were sliding into poverty in 2011.³ A U.S. Federal Reserve Bank study showed that the middle class had lost 40% of its wealth since the recession.⁴

What does a middle class father or mother do when faced with unexpected loss of income? Often, a parent seeks another part-time job, yet he/she can also apply for religious and/or government financial aid. The Arizona Department of Economic Security offers financial aid to individuals and families that qualify for federal and state requirements.⁵ None of these aid programs meet an individual’s or family’s total financial needs. Instead, they offer partial subsistence intended to help a person or family through financial crisis until they can get back on their own feet - in other words, find sustainable income.

This report looks at the SNAP program - *Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program* formerly known as “food stamps” - in Yavapai County over a recent two-year period to identify its impact on the county’s economy and community levels of participation.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

If Yavapai County had a strong economy, we would not likely be considering the impact of SNAP on our county's residents and economy. As it is, SNAP acts as an *economic stimulus* as well as a nutritional service to our county by injecting more than \$40 million annually into retail grocers as SNAP participants shop for food. If these low-income individuals and families did not have SNAP to help them get by, what would the impact be on them and on our county?

THANKS TO:

Persons and organizations that assisted in this study:

Donna Roberts, Arizona Department of Economic Security, Phoenix.

Jean Littlehale - Catholic Charities Community Services, Prescott.

Linda Hamman, Arizona Department of Economic Security, Phoenix.

Arizona Community Action Association, Phoenix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County	5
FINDINGS	5
RECOMMENDATION	6
<i>Snap Participation as Economic Stimulus</i>	6
TABLE 1. SNAP PAYMENTS TO YAVAPAI COMMUNITIES IN 2013	7
TABLE 2. FOOD RETAILERS ACCEPTING SNAP CARD PAYMENTS IN 2013	9
TABLE 3. FOOD RETAILERS REVENUE FROM SNAP PARTICIPANTS IN 2013	11
<i>A Case for Increasing Snap Participation</i>	12
<i>Purpose of the SNAP Program</i>	13
SNAP ELIGIBILITY	13
SNAP Payments	14
<i>Supporting and Encouraging Work</i>	15
<i>Two-Year Comparison</i>	15
<i>Change in SNAP Participation</i>	16
TABLE 4. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION TOTALS	16
<i>Community Decrease in SNAP Participation - Total Counts</i>	18
<i>Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Total Counts</i>	18
<i>Age Groups</i>	19
<i>SNAP Participation - Children</i>	20
TABLE 5. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN	20
<i>Community Decrease in SNAP Participation - Children</i>	22
<i>Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Children</i>	22
<i>SNAP Coverage of the County's Children</i>	23
<i>SNAP Participation - Adults</i>	23
TABLE 6. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION OF ADULTS	24
<i>Community Decrease in SNAP Participation - Adults</i>	25
<i>Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Adults</i>	25
<i>SNAP Coverage of the County's Adults</i>	26
<i>SNAP Participation - Seniors</i>	26
TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION OF SENIORS	26
<i>Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Seniors</i>	28
<i>SNAP Coverage of the County's Seniors</i>	28
<i>Snap Participation and Poverty</i>	28
<i>A Case for Increasing Snap Participation</i>	31
<i>End Notes</i>	31

SNAP PARTICIPATION IN YAVAPAI COUNTY

The Yavapai Food Council has opted to participate in a SNAP Enrollment Partnership with the Arizona Community Action Association (ACAA) and the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) and recently received a grant from United Way of Yavapai County that includes an objective to increase SNAP enrollment in Yavapai County.

In this report, we identify SNAP revenue to food retailers in the county that offers economic stimulus in 2013 as well as nutritional aid to qualified individuals and families.

To establish trends in SNAP participation, we offer a comparison of July 2011 and July 2013 participation by zip code and age group to determine trends.

FINDINGS

- In 2011, SNAP distributed **\$46 million** to participants living in Yavapai County that they spent in buying food, yet in 2013 SNAP distributed only **\$42 million**, a revenue reduction of **\$4 million** (8.5%), due to reduction in the number of participants and the amount of monthly payments.
- SNAP payments not only provide revenue to food retailers, they also increase revenue for government and other entities that rely on taxation.
- SNAP benefits in Yavapai County amount to 3% of Arizona SNAP benefits in 2013, which correlates with the county's 3% of Arizona population.
- Prescott Valley food retailers received \$10,209,032 in SNAP revenue in 2013. If SNAP participation was higher, food retailers and the community would receive millions more.
- Prescott food retailers received \$7,073,760 in SNAP revenue in 2013, followed by Cottonwood-Verde Village at \$6,256,176, Camp Verde at \$3,442,764, and Chino Valley at \$3,403,969.
- Crown King received the smallest amount of SNAP revenue (\$18,679) in 2013.
- In 2013, 151 food retailers in the county were eligible to receive revenue from SNAP participants. They received \$278,888 in average yearly revenue from SNAP food purchases.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

- The total number of SNAP participants *decreased 5%* from July 2011 to July 2013, compared to a 1% decrease in Arizona participation.
- Child (ages 0-17) participation *decreased 6%*, compared to a less than 1% increase in Arizona.
- Adult (ages 18-64) participation *decreased 7%*, along with a 1% decrease in Arizona.
- Senior (ages 65+) participation *increased 25%*, compared to a 16% increase in Arizona.
- Countywide SNAP participation included 92.7% of the number of individuals living in poverty in 2013.
- In larger communities, SNAP participation was *lower* than poverty counts – Prescott at 85.4%, Cottonwood-Verde Village at 73.8%, and Sedona at 69.6%, with the exception of Prescott Valley at 118%.
- In smaller rural communities, SNAP participation was *higher* than poverty counts – Beaver Creek at 187.5%, Dewey-Humboldt at 157.0%, and Kirkland at 154.9%.

RECOMMENDATION

Countywide efforts should be made to *increase* SNAP participation along with increasing participation in other federal food programs for children, families and seniors. Not only will increased participation assist food-insecure individuals and families, but also food retailers and communities throughout the county will receive greater revenue to support their sustainability.

SNAP PARTICIPATION AS ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Since the prevalence of poverty and hunger relate to a weak economy, it is important to consider the revenue, the *economic stimulus* to the county and its communities that SNAP provides. We can view SNAP revenue as a partial compensation for the revenue that a healthier economy would produce through higher employment and wages.

In 2013, the Yavapai County population was 3% of Arizona population, and the county's share of SNAP revenue was also 3%.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

In 2011, SNAP distributed \$3,834,753 a month times 12 months equals **\$46,017,036 per year** to participants living in Yavapai County that they spent in buying food, according to the DES Family Assistance Administration Statistical Bulletin of July 2011. These funds went to a total of 15,359 households and 31,143 persons. The average monthly payment per household was \$249.67, and \$123.13 per person.

Two years later in 2013, SNAP distributed \$3,509,339 a month times 12 months equals **\$42,112,079 per year** to participants in the county, a revenue *reduction* of \$3,904,957 (8.5%) that was *not* available for buying food. These funds went to 14,559 households and 29,308 persons. The average monthly payment per household was \$241.03, and \$119.74 per person.

The amount of average monthly SNAP payments decreased by \$8.64 (3.4%) per household, and by \$3.39 (2.8%) per person, over the two-year period.

In addition, in 2013 the SNAP program served 800 fewer households and 1,835 fewer persons, compared to 2011.

An additional reduction in SNAP payments occurred November 1, 2013 on a national level due to exhaustion of federal funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, but this reduction is not included in 2013 financial figures since it took place in November near the end of the year.

Table 1 shows the yearly amount of SNAP funds used by participants for buying food in their communities in 2013.

TABLE 1. SNAP PAYMENTS TO YAVAPAI COMMUNITIES IN 2013

Community	Participants	Payment	Revenue
Ash Fork	483	\$1,436.88	\$694,013
Bagdad	51	\$1,436.88	\$73,281
Beaver Creek	820	\$1,436.88	\$1,178,242
Big Park	353	\$1,436.88	\$507,219
Black Canyon City	440	\$1,436.88	\$632,227
Camp Verde	2,396	\$1,436.88	\$3,442,764
Chino Valley	2,369	\$1,436.88	\$3,403,969

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	Participants	Payment	Revenue
Clarkdale	530	\$1,436.88	\$761,546
Congress	171	\$1,436.88	\$245,706
Cordes-Mayer	1,216	\$1,436.88	\$1,747,246
Cornville	546	\$1,436.88	\$784,536
Cottonwood-VV	4,354	\$1,436.88	\$6,256,176
Crown King	13	\$1,436.88	\$18,679
Dewey-Humboldt	1,210	\$1,436.88	\$1,738,625
Jerome	64	\$1,436.88	\$91,960
Kirkland	246	\$1,436.88	\$353,472
Paulden	985	\$1,436.88	\$1,415,327
Prescott 86301	2,086	\$1,436.88	\$2,997,332
Prescott 86302	12	\$1,436.88	\$17,243
Prescott 86303	1,666	\$1,436.88	\$2,393,842
Prescott 86304	9	\$1,436.88	\$12,932
Prescott 86305	1,145	\$1,436.88	\$1,645,228
Prescott 86313	5	\$1,436.88	\$7,184
Prescott (city)	4,923	\$1,436.88	\$7,073,760
Prescott Valley	7,105	\$1,436.88	\$10,209,032
Sedona	761	\$1,436.88	\$1,093,466
Seligman	208	\$1,436.88	\$298,871
Skull Valley	45	\$1,436.88	\$64,660
Yarnell	81	\$1,436.88	\$116,387
Yavapai County	29,308	\$1,436.88	\$42,112,079

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Prescott Valley food retailers received \$10,209,032 in food purchases by SNAP participants, the largest amount in the county in 2013.

Prescott food retailers received \$7,073,760 in SNAP revenue in 2013, followed by Cottonwood-Verde Village at \$6,256,176, Camp Verde at \$3,442,764, and Chino Valley at \$3,403,969.

Crown King received the smallest amount of SNAP revenue (\$18,679) in 2013.

Table 2 shows 151 food retailers in the county that accepted SNAP card payments in 2013 as shown by community and zip code. Food retailers include grocery stores, convenience stores, supermarkets, discount food stores, gas stations offering food, specialty food stores, and health food stores.⁶

TABLE 2. FOOD RETAILERS ACCEPTING SNAP CARD PAYMENTS IN 2013

Community	SNAP	Total	% SNAP
Ash Fork	4	4	100%
Bagdad	1	2	50%
Beaver Creek	3	3	100%
Big Park	2	3	67%
Black Canyon City	3	4	75%
Camp Verde	11	11	100%
Chino Valley	13	13	100%
Clarkdale	0	0	-
Congress	2	2	100%
Cordes-Mayer	6	6	100%
Cornville	3	3	100%
Cottonwood-VV	26	26	100%
Crown King	0	0	-
Dewey-Humboldt	4	4	100%
Jerome	0	1	0%

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Kirkland	1	1	100%
Paulden	3	3	100%
Prescott 86301	17	17	100%
Prescott 86302	0	0	-
Prescott 86303	4	4	100%
Prescott 86304	0	0	-
Prescott 86305	5	5	100%
Prescott 86313	0	0	-
Prescott (city)	26	26	100%
Prescott Valley	26	26	100%
Sedona	13	13	100%
Seligman	2	3	67%
Skull Valley	0	0	-
Yarnell	2	2	100%
Yavapai County	151	156	97%

Food retailers in both large and small communities accept payments from SNAP participants, amounting to 97% of food retailers in the county in 2013.

Eighteen of 25 zip codes have 100% food retailer acceptance of SNAP payments. This finding indicates that Yavapai County food retailers recognize their financial benefits from SNAP participant customers.

If the number of SNAP participants decreases, and if the amount of SNAP participant payments declines, these 151 food retailers receive less money.

We find that both types of decrease occurred between July 2011 and July 2013, resulting in less revenue to food retailers and governmental and other entities that rely on taxes.

On a community and zip code level, SNAP payments to individuals and families produced considerable income for food retailers.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Table 3 shows 2013 yearly and average food retailer revenue from SNAP participants.

TABLE 3. FOOD RETAILERS REVENUE FROM SNAP PARTICIPANTS IN 2013

Community	Participants	Yearly Revenue	Retailers	Average Revenue
Ash Fork	483	\$694,013	4	\$173,503
Bagdad	51	\$73,281	1	\$73,281
Beaver Creek	820	\$1,178,242	3	\$392,747
Big Park	353	\$507,219	2	\$253,609
Black Canyon City	440	\$632,227	3	\$210,742
Camp Verde	2,396	\$3,442,764	11	\$312,979
Chino Valley	2,369	\$3,403,969	13	\$261,844
Clarkdale	530	\$761,546	0	na
Congress	171	\$245,706	2	\$122,853
Cordes-Mayer	1,216	\$1,747,246	6	\$291,208
Cornville	546	\$784,536	3	\$261,512
Cottonwood-VV	4,354	\$6,256,176	26	\$240,622
Crown King	13	\$18,679	0	na
Dewey-Humboldt	1,210	\$1,738,625	4	\$434,656
Jerome	64	\$91,960	0	na
Kirkland	246	\$353,472	1	\$353,472
Paulden	985	\$1,415,327	3	\$471,776
Prescott 86301	2,086	\$2,997,332	17	\$176,314
Prescott 86302	12	\$17,243	0	na
Prescott 86303	1,666	\$2,393,842	4	\$598,461

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	Participants	Yearly Revenue	Retailers	Average Revenue
Prescott 86304	9	\$12,932	0	na
Prescott 86305	1,145	\$1,645,228	5	\$329,046
Prescott 86313	5	\$7,184	0	na
Prescott (city)	4,923	\$7,073,760	26	\$272,068
Prescott Valley	7,105	\$10,209,032	26	\$392,655
Sedona	761	\$1,093,466	13	\$84,113
Seligman	208	\$298,871	2	\$149,436
Skull Valley	45	\$64,660	0	na
Yarnell	81	\$116,387	2	\$58,194
Yavapai County	29,308	\$42,112,079	151	\$278,888

SNAP-qualified food retailers in 22 of 28 zip codes in the county received SNAP revenue in 2013. They received an average yearly revenue of \$278,888 per retailer.

A CASE FOR INCREASING SNAP PARTICIPATION

For whatever reasons, SNAP participation and payments declined in Yavapai County from 2011 to 2013. This decline resulted in a \$4 million revenue reduction for the county, an 8.5% drop. Those funds were *not* available to food retail stores in the county and thus contributed to a lower economy for the commercial food sector.

On the other hand, if SNAP participation had increased, more funds would be spent in food retailers in support of the commercial food sector and tax-funded entities.

While economic development focuses on adding businesses and jobs, that process in a rural Arizona county is made more difficult by the lack of community amenities to attract new businesses.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Transportation costs are higher in rural areas due to increased distances to suppliers and customers. These, and other factors, cause rural counties and communities to lag behind large cities in economic *recovery* in hard times and in economic *growth* in boom times.

As the rural economy of Yavapai County struggles to recover from the Great Recession of 2008-09, local efforts should be made to *increase* SNAP participation along with increasing other federal food programs for children, families and seniors.

Social agencies are aware that people living in or near poverty often do *not* know about food programs or how to access them. Through more extensive outreach, these agencies can educate individuals and families about food programs and assist them in applying for benefits.

PURPOSE OF THE SNAP PROGRAM

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program was created in the 1970s to alleviate malnutrition and starvation of low-income persons. In 2012, it helped almost 47 million low-income Americans to afford a nutritionally adequate diet. Nearly 72% of SNAP participants are in families with children. More than one-quarter participants are in households with seniors or persons with disabilities.⁷

After unemployment insurance, SNAP is the most responsive federal program providing additional assistance during economic downturns. It also is an important nutritional support for low-wage working families, low-income seniors, and people with disabilities and with fixed income.

The federal government pays the full cost of SNAP benefits and splits the cost of administering the program with states cooperating with the program.

SNAP ELIGIBILITY

SNAP eligibility is broadly available to almost all households with low incomes. Under federal rules, to qualify for SNAP benefits, a household must meet three criteria:

- 🗎 Household gross monthly income must be at or below 130% of the federal poverty line, or \$2,069 per month or \$24,800 per year in fiscal 2013. Households with an elderly or disabled person need not meet this limit.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

- Household monthly net income, or income after deductions are applied for items such as high housing costs and child care, must be less than or equal to the poverty line (about \$19,100 a year or \$1,591 a month for a three-person family in fiscal year 2013).
 - Its assets must fall below certain limits: households without an elderly or disabled member must have assets of \$2,000 or less, and those with an elderly or disabled member must have assets of \$3,250 or less.
-

SNAP PAYMENTS

Nationally, the average SNAP participant received about \$133.41 a month, or about \$4.45 a day in fiscal year 2012.⁸ In Arizona, the average SNAP recipient received \$126.71 a month, about \$4.22 a day, in fiscal year 2011.⁹ In fiscal year 2013, that amounted to \$124.66 per month or \$4.15 per day.

The SNAP benefit formula targets benefits according to need: very poor households receive larger benefits than households closer to the poverty line since they need more help in affording an adequate diet. The benefit formula assumes that families spend 30 percent of their net income for food; SNAP makes up the difference between that 30 percent contribution and the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan, a low-cost but nutritionally adequate diet established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

A family with no net income receives the maximum benefit amount, which usually equals the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan for a household of its size, though it is temporarily higher because of the 2009 Recovery Act. For example, a family of three that has \$600 in net monthly income would receive the maximum benefit (\$526) minus 30 percent of its net income (30 percent of \$600 is \$180), or \$346. In November 2013, Recovery Act funding ran out, and SNAP payments declined accordingly. In Arizona, the average decrease was \$36 per month.

SUPPORTING AND ENCOURAGING WORK

In addition to acting as a safety net for people who are elderly, disabled, or temporarily unemployed, SNAP is designed to supplement the wages of low-income workers. The program acts as an economic stimulus not only for its participants but also for the community in which they live.

SNAP benefits are one of the fastest, most effective forms of economic stimulus because they get money into the economy quickly. Moody's Analytics estimates that in a weak economy, every \$1 increase in SNAP benefits generates about \$1.70 in economic activity. Similarly, the Congressional Budget Office rated an increase in SNAP benefits as one of the two most cost-effective of all spending and tax options it examined for boosting growth and jobs in a weak economy.¹⁰



TWO-YEAR COMPARISON

To attain a quick overview of SNAP participation in Yavapai County, we obtained data from the Arizona Department of Economic Security, including zip code data on SNAP participation for July 2011 and July 2013. These data sets permit:

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

1. Comparison of the economic impact of SNAP participation on the county in two separate years.
2. Counts of SNAP participants throughout the county by zip code.
3. Comparison of 2011 and 2013 counts to determine trends - does SNAP participation increase, remain the same, or decrease over two years.
4. Comparison of SNAP counts and the number of persons living in poverty.

CHANGE IN SNAP PARTICIPATION

Seen as both a nutritional resource for qualified persons and a contribution to the county's economy, SNAP participants resided in each zip code and community in Yavapai County. While SNAP penetration throughout the county represents the "good news," a two-year comparison of the number of participants shows the "bad news" of a *decline* in all but three communities from 2011 to 2013.

Table 4 compares total SNAP participation counts over a two-year period.

TABLE 4. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION TOTALS

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Ash Fork	539	483	-56	-10%
Bagdad	73	51	-22	-30%
Beaver Creek	975	820	-155	-16%
Big Park	415	353	-62	-15%
Black Canyon City	500	440	-60	-12%
Camp Verde	2,516	2,396	-120	-5%
Chino Valley	2,413	2,369	-44	-2%
Clarkdale	541	530	-11	-2%
Congress	177	171	-6	-3%

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Cordes-Mayer	1,347	1,216	-131	-10%
Cornville	679	546	-133	-20%
Cottonwood-VV	4,927	4,354	-573	-12%
Crown King	8	13	5	63%
Dewey-Humboldt	1,368	1,210	-158	-12%
Jerome	57	64	7	12%
Kirkland	276	246	-30	-11%
Paulden	1,014	985	-29	-3%
Prescott 86301	2,147	2,086	-61	-3%
Prescott 86302	35	12	-23	-66%
Prescott 86303	1,717	1,666	-51	-3%
Prescott 86304	5	9	4	80%
Prescott 86305	1,143	1,145	2	0%
Prescott 86313	7	5	-2	-29%
Prescott Valley	7,674	7,105	-569	-7%
Sedona	4	761	757	18925%
Seligman	187	208	21	11%
Skull Valley	46	45	-1	-2%
Yarnell	75	81	6	8%
Rural areas	-	-	-	-
Yavapai County	30,865	29,370	-1,495	-5%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>		
Arizona	1,112,839	1,101,325	-11,514	-1%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>100%</i>		






SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Over the two-year period, total SNAP participation in Yavapai County declined by 1,495 persons, a *5% decrease*. This decline was *greater* than the 1% decrease in Arizona SNAP participation.

Community Decrease in SNAP Participation - Total Counts






During the 5% decline in total SNAP participation in the county, 21 of 28 zip codes experienced decreased total participation and 7 zip codes had increases.

Five zip codes experiencing the greatest *numerical* declines were:

-  Cottonwood-Verde Village - 573 fewer participants
-  Prescott Valley - 569 fewer participants
-  Dewey-Humboldt - 158 fewer participants
-  Beaver Creek (Rimrock & Lake Montezuma) - 155 fewer participants
-  Cornville - 133 fewer participants.



We've excluded the post office mailbox zip codes in Prescott from this list due to their very low numbers.

Five zip codes with the greatest *percentage* declines were:

-  Bagdad - 30% decline
-  Cornville - 20% decline
-  Beaver Creek - 16% decline
-  Big Park (Village of Oak Creek) - 15% decline
-  Black Canyon City - 12% decline.

Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Total Counts

During a two-year period of countywide decrease in SNAP participation, 7 zip codes experienced *numerical* increases.

-  Sedona - from 4 persons in 2011 to 761 in 2013 = a 757 participant increase
-  Seligman - from 187 to 208 = a 21 participant increase

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

- Jerome - from 57 to 64 = a 7 participant increase
- Yarnell - from 75 to 81 = a 6 participant increase
- Crown King - from 8 to 13 = a 5 participant increase
- Prescott 86305 - from 1,143 to 1,145 = a 2 participant increase.

The comparatively huge increase of SNAP participation in Sedona suggests a problem with July 2011 data that shows only 4 participants, an abnormally low count. DES may wish to review and possibly correct the July 2011 count in Sedona.

AGE GROUPS

The monthly SNAP participation reports from DES show counts by Age Groups and Hispanic and Non-Hispanic segments of the population. This report deals only with the counts of *Age Groups*.

The three Age Groups include:

- 0-17 years of age (children)
- 18-64 years of age (adults)
- 65+ years of age (seniors).

We will examine the two-year trends in each Age Group, starting with children participating in SNAP.



SNAP Participation - Children

Children range in age from birth to 17 years. They belong to low-income families that qualify for SNAP.

Table 5 compares SNAP participation counts of children over the two-year period.

TABLE 5. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Ash Fork	218	171	-47	-22%
Bagdad	29	22	-7	-24%
Beaver Creek	422	365	-57	-14%
Big Park	150	151	1	1%
Black Canyon City	162	138	-24	-15%
Camp Verde	1,095	1,045	-50	-5%
Chino Valley	1,014	1,042	28	3%
Clarkdale	206	207	1	0%
Congress	58	58	0	0%

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Cordes-Mayer	465	400	-65	-14%
Cornville	230	197	-33	-14%
Cottonwood-VV	2,011	1,802	-209	-10%
Crown King	0	4	4	<i>Increase</i>
Dewey-Humboldt	551	477	-74	-13%
Jerome	15	16	1	7%
Kirkland	95	78	-17	-18%
Paulden	456	429	-27	-6%
Prescott 86301	696	606	-90	-13%
Prescott 86302	3	0	-3	-100%
Prescott 86303	526	481	-45	-9%
Prescott 86304	0	3	3	<i>Increase</i>
Prescott 86305	361	333	-28	-8%
Prescott 86313	1	0	-1	-100%
Prescott Valley	3,426	3,172	-254	-7%
Sedona	0	289	289	<i>Increase</i>
Seligman	42	48	6	14%
Skull Valley	21	17	-4	-19%
Yarnell	15	10	-5	-33%
Rural areas	-	-	-	-
Yavapai County	12,268	11,561	-707	-6%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>40%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>-1%</i>	
Arizona	536,718	538,385	1,667	0%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>48%</i>	<i>49%</i>		

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Over the two-year period, SNAP participation of children in Yavapai County declined by 707 children, a *6% decrease*. This decline was greater than the less than 1% decrease in Arizona SNAP participation of children.

Community Decrease in SNAP Participation - Children

During the two-year period of decline in Total SNAP participation in the county, 19 of 28 zip codes experienced declines in child participants, 8 zip codes had increases, and one zip code had no change.

Five zip codes with the greatest *numerical* decreases were:

- 🌐 Prescott Valley - from 3,426 children in 2011 to 3,172 in 2013 = a 254 child participant decrease
- 🌐 Cottonwood-Verde Village - from 2,011 to 1,802 = a 209 child participant decrease
- 🌐 Prescott 86301 - from 696 to 606 = a 90 child participant decrease
- 🌐 Cordes-Mayer - from 465 to 400 = a 65 child participant decrease
- 🌐 Beaver Creek - from 422 to 365 = a 57 child participant decrease.

Five zip codes with the greatest *percentage* decreases were:

- 🌐 Yarnell - 33% decline
- 🌐 Bagdad - 24% decline
- 🌐 Ash Fork - 22% decline
- 🌐 Skull Valley - 19% decline
- 🌐 Kirkland - 18% decline.

These small rural communities had comparatively small counts of child participants, yet had higher percentage decreases.

Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Children

The top five of eight zip codes experiencing an *increase* in child participation were:

- 🌐 Sedona - from 0 child participants in 2011 to 289 in 2013 = a 289 child participant increase
- 🌐 Chino Valley - from 1,014 to 1,042 = a 28 child participant increase

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

- Seligman - from 42 to 48 = a 6 child participant increase
- Crown King - from 0 to 4 = a 4 child participant increase
- Prescott 86304 - from 0 to 3 = a 3 child participant increase.

The Sedona count of zero child participants in July 2011 is anomalous and possibly a miscount. The increases in other zip codes are comparatively small.

SNAP Coverage of the County's Children

In 2013, SNAP served 11,561 children out of 40,307 children residing in the county in 2012, a *coverage rate of 27%* based on 2012 population figures.

In 2013, SNAP served 538,385 Arizona children at a rate of 49%.

SNAP coverage of Yavapai County children strongly lags behind the coverage of Arizona children.



SNAP Participation - Adults

In this category, adults range in age from 18 to 64 years.

Table 6 compares SNAP adult participation counts of the two-year period.

TABLE 6. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION OF ADULTS

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Ash Fork	279	268	-11	-4%
Bagdad	40	28	-12	-30%
Beaver Creek	527	408	-119	-23%
Big Park	233	166	-67	-29%
Black Canyon City	304	261	-43	-14%
Camp Verde	1,314	1,225	-89	-7%
Chino Valley	1,300	1,207	-93	-7%
Clarkdale	303	285	-18	-6%
Congress	101	98	-3	-3%
Cordes-Mayer	786	709	-77	-10%
Cornville	414	313	-101	-24%
Cottonwood-VV	2,615	2,231	-384	-15%
Crown King	8	9	1	13%
Dewey-Humboldt	750	643	-107	-14%
Jerome	38	37	-1	-3%
Kirkland	160	145	-15	-9%
Paulden	523	516	-7	-1%
Prescott 86301	1,349	1,355	6	0%
Prescott 86302	32	9	-23	-72%
Prescott 86303	1,089	1,048	-41	-4%
Prescott 86304	3	5	2	67%
Prescott 86305	720	737	17	2%

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Prescott 86313	6	5	-1	-17%
Prescott Valley	3,990	3,601	-389	-10%
Sedona	3	403	400	13333%
Seligman	126	128	2	2%
Skull Valley	23	25	2	9%
Yarnell	49	59	10	20%
Rural areas	-	-	-	-
Yavapai County	17,085	15,924	-1,161	-7%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>55%</i>	<i>54%</i>	<i>-1%</i>	
Arizona	535,509	515,895	-19,614	-4%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>48%</i>	<i>47%</i>	<i>-1%</i>	

Over the two-year period, SNAP participation of adults in Yavapai County declined by 1,161 adults, a 7% decrease. This decline was greater than the 1% decrease in Arizona SNAP participation of adults.

Community Decrease in SNAP Participation - Adults

All but seven communities experienced a decrease in adult SNAP participants. The largest numerical decreases occurred in Prescott Valley (389), Cottonwood-Verde Village (384), and Beaver Creek (119).

The largest percentage decreases happened in Bagdad (30%), Big Park (29%), and Cornville (24%).

Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Adults

The largest numerical increase SNAP participants (400 persons) occurred in Sedona, yet that is likely due to a 2011 miscout. The Prescott 86304 increase was attributed to a very low count, since it represents only post office boxes. Yarnell had a 20% increase, followed by Skull Valley at 9% and Seligman at 2% - small rural communities.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

SNAP Coverage of the County's Adults

In 2013, SNAP served 15,924 out of 116,407 adults residing in the county, a *coverage rate of 14%* based on 2012 population figures.

In 2013, SNAP served 515,895 Arizona adults at a rate of 13%.

SNAP coverage of Yavapai County adults was slightly higher than the coverage of Arizona adults.



SNAP Participation - Seniors

Seniors range in age from 65 years and more.

Table 7 compares SNAP participation of seniors (age 65+) over the two-year period.

TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION OF SENIORS

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Ash Fork	42	44	2	5%
Bagdad	4	1	-3	-75%
Beaver Creek	26	47	21	81%
Big Park	32	36	4	13%

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Black Canyon City	34	41	7	21%
Camp Verde	107	126	19	18%
Chino Valley	99	120	21	21%
Clarkdale	32	38	6	19%
Congress	18	15	-3	-17%
Cordes-Mayer	96	107	11	11%
Cornville	35	36	1	3%
Cottonwood-VV	301	321	20	7%
Crown King	0	0	0	0%
Dewey-Humboldt	67	90	23	34%
Jerome	4	11	7	175%
Kirkland	21	23	2	10%
Paulden	35	40	5	14%
Prescott 86301	102	125	23	23%
Prescott 86302	0	3	3	<i>Increase</i>
Prescott 86303	102	137	35	34%
Prescott 86304	2	1	-1	-50%
Prescott 86305	62	75	13	21%
Prescott 86313	0	0	0	0%
Prescott Valley	258	332	74	29%
Sedona	1	69	68	6800%
Seligman	19	32	13	68%
Skull Valley	2	3	1	50%

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	July 2011	July 2013	Difference	Percent
Yarnell	11	12	1	9%
Rural areas	-	-	-	-
Yavapai County	1,512	1,885	373	25%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>5%</i>	<i>3%</i>	<i>1%</i>	
Arizona	40,612	47,045	6,433	16%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>4%</i>	<i>0%</i>	

Community Increase in SNAP Participation - Seniors

Over the two-year period, SNAP participation of seniors in Yavapai County increased by 373 adults, a *25% rise*. This increase was greater than the 16% rise in Arizona SNAP participation of seniors.

In contrast to decreases child and adult participation in SNAP, senior participation *increased* in every zip code. This increase in senior participation was especially welcome, since seniors comprise 26.3% of the county's population, nearly twice Arizona's 14.8% of seniors, and only 6% of SNAP participation in Yavapai County in July 2013.

SNAP Coverage of the County's Seniors

In 2013, SNAP served 1,885 out of 55,923 seniors residing in the county, a *coverage rate of 3%* based on 2012 population figures.

In 2013, SNAP served 47,045 Arizona seniors at a rate of 5%.

SNAP coverage of Yavapai County seniors was lower than the coverage of Arizona seniors.

SNAP PARTICIPATION AND POVERTY

How does SNAP participation relate to poverty counts? Table 8 compares SNAP participation with poverty counts by zip code.

TABLE 8. COMPARISON OF SNAP PARTICIPATION & POVERTY COUNT

Community	Population	SNAP	Poverty	Percent
Ash Fork	1,885	483	385	125.6%
Bagdad	2,219	51	64	79.3%
Beaver Creek	4,806	820	437	187.5%
Big Park	6,147	353	486	72.7%
Black Canyon City	2,886	440	372	118.2%
Camp Verde	10,925	2,396	3,223	74.3%
Chino Valley	10,839	2,369	1,875	126.3%
Clarkdale	4,168	530	429	123.5%
Congress	2,146	171	266	64.3%
Cordes-Mayer	5,734	1,216	1,095	111%
Cornville	5,152	546	819	66.7%
Cottonwood-VV	22,884	4,354	5,900	73.8%
Crown King	177	13	na	na
Dewey-Humboldt	8,858	1,210	771	157%
Jerome	477	64	72	88.9%
Kirkland	1,637	246	159	154.9%
Paulden	5,231	985	1,057	93.2%
Prescott 86301	20,626	2,086	na	na
Prescott 86302	-	12	na	na
Prescott 86303	17,082	1,666	na	na
Prescott 86304	-	9	na	na
Prescott 86305	17,356	1,145	na	na

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

Community	Population	SNAP	Poverty	Percent
Prescott 86313	257	5	na	na
Prescott (city)	40,308	4,923	5,764	85.4%
Prescott Valley	39,114	7,105	6,024	118%
Sedona	10,037	761	1,094	69.6%
Seligman	1,267	208	214	97.1%
Skull Valley	743	45	0	na
Yarnell	649	81	91	89.1%
Rural areas	9,335	na	na	na
Yavapai County	212,637	29,370	31,683	92.7%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>13.8%</i>	<i>14.9%</i>	
Arizona	6,553,255	1,101,325	1,061,627	104%
<i>Percent</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>16.8%</i>	<i>16.2%</i>	

In 2013, SNAP participation for Yavapai County totaled 29,370 persons compared to 31,683 persons living in poverty. For the county, SNAP participation was *92.7% of the poverty count*. For Arizona, SNAP participation was 104% of the poverty count.

In 2013, Yavapai County SNAP participants comprised 13.8% of the county's 2012 population, compared to the poverty count of 14.9%.

In 2013, Arizona SNAP participants composed 16.8% of the state's 2012 population. compared to the poverty count of 16.2%.

SNAP participation in Yavapai County lags behind the states' level of participation, so increased effort in recruiting SNAP participants is needed in Yavapai County.

A CASE FOR INCREASING SNAP PARTICIPATION

For whatever reasons, SNAP participation and payments declined in Yavapai County from 2011 to 2013. This decline resulted in a \$4 million revenue reduction for the county, an 8.5% drop. Those funds were *not* available to food retail stores in the county and thus contributed to a lower economy for the commercial food sector.

On the other hand, if SNAP participation had increased, more funds would be spent in food retailers in support of the commercial food sector.

While economic development focuses on adding businesses and jobs, that process in a rural Arizona county is made more difficult by the lack of community amenities to attract new businesses. Transportation costs are higher in rural areas due to increased distances to suppliers and customers. These, and other factors, cause rural counties and communities to lag behind large cities in economic recovery in hard times and in economic growth in boom times.

As the rural economy of Yavapai County struggles to recover from the Great Recession of 2008-09, local efforts should be made to *increase* SNAP participation along with increasing other federal food programs for children, families and seniors.

Social agencies are aware that people living in or near poverty often do *not* know about food programs or how to access them. Through more extensive outreach, these agencies can educate individuals and families about food programs and assist them in applying for benefits.

END NOTES

1 U.S. Census Bureau reports 2000, 2010, and 2012.

2 "Map the Meal Gap," Feeding America 2012.

3 U.S. Census Bureau report 2011.

4 "Changes in U.S. Family Finances from 2007 to 2010," Federal Reserve Bulletin, June 2012.

SNAP Participation in Yavapai County

5 AZ-DES website for food assistance: https://www.azdes.gov/nutrition_assistance/.

6 USDA Food and Nutrition Service - SNAP Retailer Locator website - <http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/retailerlocator>.

7 Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2013.

8 AZ-DES Statistical Bulletin July 2011.

9 AZ-DES Statistical Bulletin July 2013.

9. Supporting Families, Strengthening Communities: The Economic Importance of Nutrition Assistance," Executive Office of the President, 2013.