

Shared Tables, **Shared Struggles**

**The Impact of Adult Food Insecurity on
Families in California**

Shared Tables, **Shared Struggles**

**The Impact of Adult Food Insecurity on
Families in California**

Kumar Chandran

November 2007



California Food Policy Advocates is a statewide public policy and advocacy organization dedicated to improving the health and well-being of low-income Californians by increasing their access to nutritious and affordable food.

As California's only statewide anti-poverty program with a focus on hunger and malnutrition among low-income people, CFPA employs a variety of strategies to develop and implement public policies that recognize the value of adequate nutrition and its fundamental contribution to good health and development, education, and productivity.

These strategies include:

- Research that demonstrates the scope and nature of hunger in California and the efficacy of public and private food programs in mitigating it.
- Development and promotion of strategies and programs to meet the nutrition needs of low-income communities and individuals.
- Public education and advocacy to ensure the inclusion of nutrition in the formation and implementation of sound public policy.
- Technical assistance, training, and support to low-income communities in their efforts to identify and overcome hunger and hunger-related deficiencies.
- Collaboration, through conferences, communication, and coalition-building, among food program providers and other community-based organizations throughout California to facilitate their working together to mitigate hunger and poverty.

Shared Tables, Shared Struggles: The Impact of Adult Food Insecurity on Families in California

November 2007

California Food Policy Advocates
116 New Montgomery Street, Suite 633
San Francisco, CA 94105
Phone: 415.777.4422
Fax: 415.777.7766
E-Mail: cfpa@cfpa.net

www.cfpa.net

Acknowledgments

CFPA would like to acknowledge the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and the California Budget Project for their great work which inspired this report.

CFPA would also like to acknowledge a few of our funders who made this work possible:

MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger

The California Endowment

The California Wellness Foundation

Wallis Foundation

Any mistakes or inaccuracies contained herein are the sole fault and responsibility of the author.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	4
Hunger Amidst Harvest.....	6
Touched by Hunger: The Struggles of Low-Income Households in California.....	8
Lost Dollars, Empty Plates: The Underutilization of Federal Resources.....	10
Appendix A – County-by-County Profiles.....	14
Appendix B – Methodology	16

Executive Summary

Across the state, working families in California are finding it increasingly difficult to make ends meet. With costs rising in many arenas – from gas to housing to health care, many households across the state must make difficult budgetary decisions on how to spend limited household resources and on what spending to forego. A recent report by the California Budget Project, for example, found that a family of four would need to earn about \$72,000 per year to make ends meet. However, this report also found that only about half of California’s workers earn enough with two full-time working adults to reach this level.¹

One slice of this household budget is food spending and, according to a report released in June 2007, approximately 2.5 million low-income adults (defined as those at less than 200 percent of the federal poverty line (FPL)) in California could not afford to put adequate food on the table on a consistent basis. Based on data from the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) and published by the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA), this report on food insecurity and hunger in California found that 30 percent of low-income adults struggle to put food on the table.²

Unfortunately, much of the food they are able to afford or find easily accessible is often the least nutritious. Calorie-laden but nutrition-deficient food is often the cheapest, most convenient, and most readily available to many low-income Californians. A recent report found that living in low socioeconomic neighborhoods was associated with a higher body mass index (BMI) – a commonly used measure for overweight and obesity.³

Survey data tells us that the vast majority of these adults do not live alone. Rather, they often live with spouses, children, grandparents, or other relatives or friends. Realizing that others in the household suffer and feel the pinch when one adult of the household struggles with food insecurity, *Shared Tables, Shared Struggles* provides data on the numbers of these other people living with food insecure adults. The study also reports

¹ *Making Ends Meet: How Much Does It Cost to Raise a Family in California*. California Budget Project. October 2007. http://www.cbp.org/pdfs/2007/0710_mem_003.pdf

² Harrison GG et al. *Food Security Among California’s Low-Income Adults Improves, but Most Severely Affected Do Not Share in Improvement*. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2007.

³ Wang MC et al. “Socioeconomic and Food-Related Physical Characteristics of the Neighbourhood Environment are Associated with Body Mass Index”. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 2007;61:491-498.

on California's participation in two of the important federal nutrition assistance programs – Food Stamp Program and School Breakfast Program – designed to alleviate this persistent food insecurity and hunger.

Across California, over 7.6 million people live in households with the nearly 2.5 million low-income adults who are reported by UCLA to be food insecure. Since the last time CFPA released this report in 2005, the number of Californians who struggle with achieving adequate nutrition or live with someone who does increased by approximately 500,000 – from 9.6 million to 10.1 million. The federal government provides a number of nutrition assistance programs to help these families to afford and consume healthy, nutritious meals on a regular basis. Two of these important programs are the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP). However, California severely underutilizes these programs. Only 50 percent of eligible FSP participants enroll in the program, meaning that over two million low-income Californians are losing out on these vital resources to augment household food expenditures. This low FSP participation rate places California among the lowest in the nation.

California also underperforms the national average on school breakfast participation. The SBP provides low-income children the chance to start their day off with a healthy meal at no, or minimal, cost to them. Working families can save limited household resources by knowing that their children are able to eat a balanced breakfast in school every school day morning. However, even though over three million students are eligible for free or reduced-price breakfasts, only about 925,000 students eat breakfast in school. Given the academic and health benefits of breakfast, it is an urgent matter for California to remedy this situation.

This low participation in these vital nutrition programs comes at a huge cost, not just to the health and well-being of low-income Californians, but also in terms of lost federal dollars. Because both FSP and SBP are federal programs, California receives federal funds based on participation in these programs. CFPA estimates that with full participation in these programs, California could bring in over \$2.8 billion dollars per year. Research shows that for every dollar spent via food stamps, the local economy benefits by \$1.84.⁴ Thus, by improving participation in these programs, California can not only improve the health and well-being of its most vulnerable citizens but also bring in valuable federal resources which can generate further economic output in the state.

⁴ *The Business Case for Increasing Food Stamp Program Participation*. USDA FNS. Last Modified: 6/8/2007. <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/outreach/business-case.htm>

Food insecurity and hunger are preventable social ills and the federal nutrition programs provide key solutions. At a time of rising rates of obesity and overweight – disproportionately so in low-income communities – and rising health care costs, California cannot afford the ill effects of food insecurity and hunger – particularly when it is turning down millions – even billions – in federal dollars due to poor utilization of federal nutrition programs. State and federal policy makers can create conditions for greater use of these critical programs. California Food Policy Advocates’ legislative agenda calls for the following key steps to ensure that all Californians have access to healthy, affordable food:

- Making sure that *every* hungry child has a chance to start the day with a school breakfast.
- Making sure that low-income Californians have improved access to healthy, affordable foods – through improved purchasing power with food stamps and healthier school meals.
- Making sure that working families in California do not face unnecessary barriers to participating in the Food Stamp Program.

Introduction

California Food Policy Advocates' biennial report on the struggles of low-income Californians to put food on the table is one that CFPA hopes to eventually stop writing. Unfortunately, the numbers do not make this a possibility yet as California now has over ten million residents who are food insecure or live with an adult who is food insecure. Taking advantage of the data generated by the 2005 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), this report provides food insecurity and hunger information on a county-by-county basis with numbers that demonstrate how children, seniors, and others in a household are touched by hunger when one adult household member struggles to put food on the table. Given the economic prosperity and the vast agricultural bounty of this state, California should not have its residents facing empty plates.

While many households in California struggle to put food on the table, it is also too common for the food they do manage to consume to be the least healthful and nutritious. Often, low-income Californians lack access to affordable, nutritious foods, while, compounding the problem, they often have more than adequate access to cheap, unhealthy foods. Poorly stocked liquor stores and fried food-heavy chain restaurants abound in low-income communities.⁵ Such a situation creates what many view as a paradoxical situation – rising rates of overweight and obesity in food insecure, low-income households.⁶ In addition to the health consequences of excess weight, food insecurity is also related to malnutrition, poor adherence to medications, decreased ability to resist illness, and increased likelihood of hospitalization.⁷ Given the health consequences of both food insecurity and obesity, these households must deal with a double burden of poor health outcomes.

Fortunately, a range of policies already exists which can make great contributions to reducing the food insecurity and hunger across the state. Given sufficient political will, these policies can improve the lives of millions across California. Over the years, our federal government has responded to hunger and food insecurity by creating a number of nutrition programs – such as the Food Stamp Program, WIC, and the school meals programs – to protect low-income Americans from the consequences of hunger and

⁵ “A Place for Healthier Living: Improving Access to Physical Activity and Healthy Foods”. Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, June 2004.
http://www.jointcenter.org/publications_recent_publications/health/a_place_for_healthier_living_improving_access_to_physical_activity_and_healthy_foods

⁶ Wang MC. Op. Cit. Note 3.

⁷ Hampton T. “Food Insecurity Harms Health, Well-Being of Millions in the United States”. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. October 24/31, 2007, Vol. 298, No. 16.

poor nutrition. Unfortunately, these important health supports are severely underutilized and therefore have failed to reach their full potential. In the sections that follow, the *Shared Tables, Shared Struggles* report will explore the data on food insecurity and hunger in California as well as some of the necessary policy responses to combat these social ills.

Hunger Amidst Harvest

California enjoys a rich and diverse agricultural economy that supplies much of the food for not only the rest of the country, but also much of the world. California is the nation's largest agricultural producer and exporter and is the fifth largest supplier of food and agricultural commodities in the world.⁸ In a state that produces such an abundance of food, it is a tragic – and avoidable – irony that so many struggle to put some of this food on their plates.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), almost 12 percent of Californians are “food insecure.” Food insecurity occurs whenever the availability of nutritionally adequate and safe food or the ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways, is limited or uncertain.⁹ A recent report from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and California Food Policy Advocates (CFPA) found that 30 percent of low-income adults in California are food insecure.¹⁰

Much of California's agricultural bounty can be found in its Central Valley; much of the food insecurity and hunger in California can also be found in this region. As Table 1 indicates, the top five counties in terms of value of agricultural production rank among the fifteen worst counties in terms of food insecurity. Altogether, these five counties have over one million residents whose lives are somehow touched by hunger. Kings County – which ranks in the top ten for agricultural value – ranks worst in food insecurity in the state.

⁸ *California Agriculture: Highlights 2006*. CDFA.

<http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/files/pdf/card/AgHighlightsBrochure06.pdf>

⁹ Nord M, et al. *Household Food Insecurity in the United States, 2005*. Economics Research Services, United States Department of Agriculture. <http://ers.usda.gov/Publications/ERR29/ERR29.pdf>

¹⁰ Harrison GG. Op. Cit. Note 2.

County	Value of Agricultural Production (in \$1,000)	Food Insecurity Rank	Number Food Insecure or Living in a Food Insecure Household
Fresno	\$4,640,166	4	478,000
Tulare	\$4,360,854	7	196,000
Kern	\$3,546,925	13	305,000
Monterey ¹¹	\$3,273,000	15	168,000
Merced	\$2,388,058	3	124,000
Total for Top Five Agricultural Counties			1,271,000

Table 1. Top Five Counties, by Value of Agricultural Production

Hunger is a problem with a clear solution: affordable, consistent access to an adequate supply of nutritious food. California clearly has the agricultural resources to address hunger in this state. However, as this report indicates, while the appropriate food assistance programs are available, they are not being enlisted in a way that will alleviate hunger.

¹¹ For statistical purposes, food insecurity data for Monterey County also includes neighboring San Benito County

Touched by Hunger: The Struggles of Low-Income Households in California

Starting in 2001 and repeated every two years following, UCLA has conducted a statewide survey called the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS). Using food insecurity and hunger data from this survey, UCLA and CFPA release a report on food insecurity every two years. Published in June 2007, the most recent report on food insecurity used data from the survey conducted in 2005 and found that approximately 2.5 million low-income adults in California struggled to put adequate food on the table on a consistent basis in the previous year.

CHIS likely underestimates the extent of food insecurity for two reasons. First, only those individuals whose household income was below 200 percent of the federal poverty level (just over \$41,000 per year for a family of four) were asked the food insecurity questions. However, a significant number of people experience food insecurity at incomes above 200 percent of the federal poverty line.¹² Moreover, many experts on poverty agree that the federal poverty line for all the 48 contiguous states often does not reflect significant regional differences in cost of living. As many throughout the country realize in their everyday lives, the cost of living is often higher in certain places as reflected in differentials in housing, gas, and other expenses. A recent report by the California Budget Project found that a family with two working parents and two children would need an annual income of \$72,343 to make ends meet. This study also found that about half of California's workers earn less than the hourly wage necessary to support such a family on a basic budget.¹³ Thus, by limiting the food insecurity questions to only those at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty line, CHIS likely misses a significant number of people who have difficulties feeding themselves or their families.

¹² Nord M et al. Op. Cit. Note 9.

¹³ California Budget Project. Op. Cit. Note 1.

Household Size	Estimated Number of Adults Reporting Food Insecurity	% of Total
1 person	256,000	10.3
2 persons	377,000	15.2
3 persons	370,000	14.9
4 persons	458,000	18.4
5 persons	452,000	18.2
6 persons	270,000	10.9
7 persons	141,000	5.7
8 or more persons	162,000	6.5
Total	2,486,000	100

Table 2. Household Size

The second reason that CHIS may underestimate food insecurity is the focus of this study. *Shared Tables, Shared Struggles* reanalyzes the food insecurity and hunger data from CHIS by including the other people living in the household with these food insecure adults. CHIS does not assess all household members for hunger and food insecurity. Rather, CHIS surveys the food insecurity status of one adult per household who reports on his or her *own* food insecurity, not the nutritional status of other household members (other adults or children). CHIS data underestimate the true extent of food insecurity in California by not surveying the status of other members in the household.

As Table 2 indicates, the 2.5 million adults experiencing food insecurity in California live with other people; only approximately 256,000 of these adults live alone. Using this data on household size, we can estimate the number of other people living in the households where one adult reported food insecurity is over seven million. When one combines the 7.6 million other household members living with the 2.5 million low-income adults reported to be food insecure, California has approximately 10.1 million people who struggle to put food on the table or live with someone who does. Los Angeles County alone has the highest number at 2.8 million people. To report only the 2.5 million low-income adults as being the only people in California who find it difficult to meet their daily nutritional needs would underestimate the problem. As discussed above, the majority of these adults live with other household members who likely feel similar economic constraints in their ability to make ends meet. Moreover, with the costs of living rising across the state and the country, more than just those at 200 percent of the poverty line are likely to face difficult household budget decisions.

Lost Dollars, Empty Plates: The Underutilization of Federal Resources

Ideally, working Californians would be paid living wages that would ensure adequate income to cover all the costs of living, such as housing, utilities, food, health care, and education. Unfortunately, not all Californians are able to earn a living wage nor are they able to find stable employment. Fortunately, the federal nutrition assistance programs provide a social safety net to support those struggling to put food on the table. Programs like the Food Stamp Program provide low-income, working families with a certain amount of money per month specifically for groceries which families can use to supplement existing food dollars and free up budgetary resources for other basic necessities, such as housing, health care costs, or utilities. In addition, the school meal programs provide low-income students with a free or reduced-price meal in school for both breakfast and lunch. Parents of low-income children who eat a school breakfast and a school lunch can save scarce household resources for other meals in the evening or on weekends and school holidays.

Other federal nutrition assistance programs exist that serve different populations – such as women of reproductive age, infants, and the elderly. (See www.cfpa.net for information and further details on these programs). While some programs require state or local governments to pay for program administration, the vast majority of the costs of the federal nutrition assistance programs are borne by the federal government. This financing arrangement makes utilization of these programs an excellent investment for California. For example, the federal government provides funding not only to pay for reimbursing the meals served through the school lunch and breakfast programs, but also the programs' administrative costs. The federal Food Stamp Program is a particularly thrifty investment for states. Federal food stamp benefits are entirely federally funded and the federal government also picks up 50 percent of the program's administrative costs.

Moreover, the economic benefits of the Food Stamp Program extend beyond direct federal food stamp expenditures. First, since food stamps must be spent (or their benefits are lost), they have an immediate impact on local economies. In addition, food stamps can only be spent on food. They thus enable families to purchase food they would not otherwise be able to afford, increasing local demand for food-related products and services. Overall, USDA has shown that the Food Stamp Program has an economic multiplier effect of \$1.84 in local economic activity for every food stamp dollar spent.¹⁴

¹⁴ *The Business Case for Increasing Food Stamp Program Participation*. USDA FNS. Last Modified: 6/8/2007. <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/outreach/business-case.htm>

Unfortunately, California has not taken nearly enough advantage of these smart investment opportunities. Considerable federal resources are being turned away that could be used in the fight to reduce hunger. The Food Stamp Program and the School Breakfast Program are just two examples of how unused or lost federal dollars mean continued empty plates in California.

The Food Stamp Example: The Food Stamp Program is the largest nutrition assistance program and the nation's first line of defense against hunger and food insecurity. Unfortunately, this line of defense is weaker in California than in 47 other states and the District of Columbia; California ranks third worst in the nation in terms of Food Stamp Program participation with only half of those eligible participating. While this represents a modest improvement as California used to rank last in the nation, the Golden State is a leader for the country in so many facets, it should not be a laggard in this respect.¹⁵

The Food Stamp Program provides significant spending power for low-income families. The average food stamp benefit per person is just over \$99 per person per month, all of which must be spent on food. Research shows that food stamp recipients get more nutritional value per dollar than the general population.¹⁶ Yet despite these valuable benefits, California is lagging in Food Stamp Program enrollment. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, about half of eligible California residents do not receive food stamps. In addition, with only 34 percent of eligible working poor participating in the program, California ranks next to last in the country when participation is measured amongst eligible working poor. States in the top ten of Food Stamp Program participation rates are able to reach into the mid-80s and higher with Missouri achieving 95 percent participation among the eligible population and 89 percent participation among the eligible working poor. California's low participation among the working poor could be improved with policies to make it easier for working families to take part in the program – such as eliminating unnecessary trips to the Food Stamp office and bringing the application process into the 21st century with electronic improvements.

This underutilization of the Food Stamp Program comes at a cost. California Food Policy Advocates estimates that if California achieved full food stamp participation, the

¹⁵ Cunnyngham KE et al. *Reaching those in Need: State Food Program Participation Rates in 2005*. USDA FNS. October 2007.

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/Participation/Reaching2005.pdf>

¹⁶ Food Research and Action Center,

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/fsp_faq.html

state could bring in over \$2.5 billion in federal reimbursements. Even at the state's modest goal of 68-percent participation among eligible people, California could gain over \$900 million annually in federal dollars.

The Breakfast Example: 2008 is to be the year of education. Governor Schwarzenegger and Superintendent Jack O'Connell will make education and closing the achievement gap top priorities. Academic literature and common sense tell us that a hungry child cannot learn. The federal School Breakfast Program offers free and reduced-price meals to all low-income children and provides a valuable tool for both fighting hunger and improving education. All children, but especially hungry, low-income children, should start the day with breakfast. Moreover, these children are often also the same children lagging behind in academic performance. However, too many schools in California do not have a breakfast program and those that do often suffer from poor participation.

Over 1500 schools in California with more than 700,000 students do not even offer breakfast. Of these schools, approximately 600 qualify as "severe need" due to their low-income student population. These "severe need" schools have a special responsibility to serve breakfast and this responsibility is matched with a government incentive: higher reimbursements. Of those schools that do offer breakfast, participation is often a problem. California underperforms the national average in school breakfast participation. Although more than three million kids are eligible for free and reduced-price breakfast, less than one million of these low-income children are participating in the breakfast program.¹⁷ This means, of course, that over two million needy children are missing out on the most important meal of their school day.

As with the Food Stamp Program, such underutilization comes at a high cost. In addition to the federal administrative funds the state would receive for increased utilization of the breakfast program, California would receive significant federal funds for meal reimbursement if it served breakfast to all children eligible for free and reduced-price meals. If all kids who ate lunch in school also ate breakfast, California could bring in over \$333 million. Even at a lower rate of 70 percent of students who ate lunch also eating breakfast, California could earn over \$233 million. Given the extent of California's hunger and food insecurity problem, these resources should not be squandered.

The Food Stamp Program and the School Breakfast Program are just two examples of how California is failing to take advantage of federal programs that can help families to

¹⁷ Chandran K. *Running on Empty: A Report on the School Breakfast Program in California*. California Food Policy Advocates. September 2007.
<http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/Participation/Reaching2005.pdf>

put food on the table. Given the large number of Californians vulnerable to poor nutrition, the state must commit to employing the plentiful federal resources that are available.

Policy Responses: A number of potential policies can improve California's participation in the Food Stamp and School Breakfast Programs. For food stamps, California can make it easier for those who are eligible to apply for food stamps by reducing many of the administrative barriers which discourage application. In many cases, reducing these administrative barriers also reduces administrative costs. Examples of such policies are to make those who already qualify for other means-tested social programs to automatically qualify for food stamps or to reduce the number of trips to the food stamp office required of applicants.

For school breakfast, California should mandate that all schools qualifying as "severe need" must offer breakfast to its students. These schools qualify as severe need due to their low-income student population and receive an extra reimbursement per meal served. These schools have a special responsibility to serve breakfast and should do so. Other efforts to improve breakfast participation are to serve breakfast outside the traditional, "before-the-bell" and in the cafeteria setting. Experience proves that when breakfast is incorporated into the school day – either with breakfast in the classroom or during a morning recess – participation skyrockets. In addition, the successful California Fresh Start program to increase offerings of fresh fruits in breakfast did not receive funding in the past legislative session. This program dramatically increased servings of fruit offered in breakfast programs throughout the state. Research has shown that increased fruit consumption is a key obesity prevention strategy.

These policies are just a few of those that can help Californians who struggle to put food on the table for themselves and their families (for more policies and ways to help, visit www.cfpa.net). With sufficient political will, California can ensure that all its residents are able to have access to and afford nutritious, healthy foods.

Appendix A: Methodology and Data Sources

FOOD INSECURITY DATA

CFPA used data from the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), which was conducted by the University of California, Los Angeles in 2005. CHIS, the largest state health survey in the country, collected data from households drawn from every county in the state. Due to small sample sizes, some counties were put together as regional groupings. Because CHIS only measured the food insecurity of one adult, CFPA used household size data from CHIS to estimate how many individuals are living in households affected by food insecurity. By multiplying the number of people in each household by the number of households and then subtracting the number of adults already counted by CHIS, CFPA calculated an estimate of the number of individuals in households touched by food insecurity.

www.chis.ucla.edu

TOTAL POPULATION

CFPA gathered the population data from the U.S. Census Bureau, Population Estimates Program. The data reflect the population estimates for July 2006 and includes population of all ages.

<http://www.census.gov/popest/counties/>

TOTAL POPULATION BELOW 200 PERCENT OF POVERTY

CFPA used data gathered from CHIS to report the number of people below 200 percent of the federal poverty line.

www.chis.ucla.edu

FOOD STAMP FEDERAL DOLLARS LOST / TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACT OF LOW FOOD STAMP PARTICIPATION

To calculate the total lost federal dollars due to underutilization of the Food Stamp Program, CFPA multiplied the estimated number of people eligible but not participating by the average food stamp benefit of \$99.05 per month multiplied by 12 months. While individual county performance may vary, we applied the statewide participation rate to county figures in order to provide a rough distribution of non-participants throughout the state. The number of non-participants was calculated by subtracting the number of participants in each county from the

total number of eligible people. We then calculated lost federal dollars if participation were at 100 percent and 68 percent.

The total economic impact of low food stamp participation was calculated using a methodology adapted from a USDA study on the business case for food stamps. A multiplier effect that results from increased food expenditures by low-income individuals as a result of food stamp benefits was used to determine lost economic impact of greater participation in the program.

Average Food Stamp Benefit, by state: <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/18fsavgben.htm>

Food Stamp Participation Rates, by state:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/Participation/Reaching2005.pdf>

Multiplier effect calculation, <http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsp/outreach/business-case.htm>

SCHOOL BREAKFAST FEDERAL DOLLARS LOST

To calculate the total lost federal dollars, CFPA subtracted the number of free, reduced, and paid breakfasts from the number of free, reduced, and paid lunches and multiplied each difference by the corresponding federal reimbursement rate. The sum of these products equals the lost federal dollars if participation in school breakfast equaled that of school lunch. A lower amount was calculated for 70 percent participation of students who ate lunch also eating breakfast.

This calculation assumes that similar proportions of free, reduced, and paid meals would be served in both breakfast and lunch. This lost dollars calculation only includes schools currently participating in breakfast and thus does not include lost dollars from schools not even offering breakfast programs. Additionally, this calculation does not include the higher reimbursement rates for "severe need" schools nor does it include state reimbursement.

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/sn/>

Appendix B: County Profiles: Struggles and Solutions

For county specific data pages, please visit http://www.cfpa.net/press/shared_press.htm

These data pages contain information on food insecurity and hunger in California by county. They identify the number of people “touched” by hunger as described in previous sections. Please note that small sample sizes require us to present food insecurity information for some counties not as a county estimate, but as an estimate for a regional grouping:

- Humboldt, Del Norte
- Mendocino, Lake
- Sutter, Yuba
- Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine
- Siskiyou, Lassen, Trinity, Modoc
- Tehama, Glenn, Colusa
- Nevada, Plumas, Sierra
- Monterey, San Benito

Please see the methodology in Appendix A for details on how the data were compiled.