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Negative Brief: Food Stamps/SNAP

NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY / OPENING QUOTES

The Affirmative’s plan is, for many people, logistically impossible.

Liz Ben-Ishai, 2015 (Ben-Ishai is a senior policy analyst on the job quality team at CLASP. Her work focuses on paid leave and responsive workplaces. Ms. Ben-Ishai graduated from the University of Michigan with an M.A. and Ph.D. in political science.) “Volatile Job Schedules and Access to Public Benefits” September 16, 2015 <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/2015.09.16-Scheduling-Volatility-and-Benefits-FINAL.pdf>

As workers struggle with employer scheduling practices that leave them with little stability, predictability, and flexibility, many must turn to the safety net for support. While some aspects of public benefits programs are adapting to the realities of the labor market, others are premised on an assumption that recipients can find fulltime, standard-hour, predictable employment when desired. This is clearly not the reality for most recipients of income support. Further, some states administering public benefit programs ignore the many logistical challenges created by volatile job scheduling. Keeping an appointment or taking a phone call may be out of reach for a worker who receives little notice of her schedule or faces the constant threat of losing much-needed hours at work.

INHERENCY

1. States are already acting

22 States are holding back SNAP benefits from unemployed ABAWD

Ed Bolen, Dottie Rosenbaum, Stacy Dean, and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Bolen: Senior Policy Analyst. His work focuses on state and federal issues in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Rosenbaum: Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow at Center on Budget & Policy Priorities. Dean: Vice President for Food Assistance Policy, CBPP. Keith-Jennings: Research Analyst, CBPP. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research) “More Than 500,000 Adults Will Lose SNAP Benefits in 2016 as Waivers Expire” March 18, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/more-than-500000-adults-will-lose-snap-benefits-in-2016-as-waivers-expire>

More than 500,000 and as many as 1 million of the nation’s poorest people will be cut off SNAP (formerly known as the Food Stamp Program) over the course of 2016, due to the return in many areas of a three-month limit on SNAP benefits for unemployed adults aged 18-49 who aren’t disabled or raising minor children. These individuals will lose their food assistance benefits after three months regardless of how hard they are looking for work. The impact will be felt in the 22 states that must or are choosing to reimpose the time limit in 2016.

2. Food Stamp Cost is Falling

Spending due to recession

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Both write for the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs. Brynne Keith-Jennings - B.A. in International Relations from Pomona College and a Master of Public Policy degree from the Univ of Southern Calif.) “House 2017 Budget Plan Would Slash SNAP by More Than $150 Billion Over Ten Years” March 21, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/house-2017-budget-plan-would-slash-snap-by-more-than-150-billion-over-ten#_ftnref7>

SNAP spending grew sharply after 2007 due to three factors: the depth of the Great Recession and the slow, uneven recovery, which made more people eligible; improvements in reaching eligible households, particularly working-poor families; and the 2009 Recovery Act’s temporary benefit boost, which ended in November 2013.

SNAP participant numbers fell since recession ended

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Both write for the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs. Brynne Keith-Jennings - B.A. in International Relations from Pomona College and a Master of Public Policy degree from the Univ of Southern Calif.) “House 2017 Budget Plan Would Slash SNAP by More Than $150 Billion Over Ten Years” March 21, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/house-2017-budget-plan-would-slash-snap-by-more-than-150-billion-over-ten#_ftnref7>

SNAP caseloads grew substantially during the recession but have declined for the past several years. As of December 2015, the number of SNAP participants had fallen by 2.6 million people since peaking three years earlier (in December 2012). CBO projects that SNAP caseloads will fall from 45.8 million people in fiscal year 2015 to 33.1 million in 2026.

SNAP spending isn’t a problem: It will fall to pre-recession levels as the economy improves

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center in 2000.Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Brynne Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research. She holds a B.A. in International Relations from Pomona College and a Master of Public Policy degree from the University of Southern California.) “House 2017 Budget Plan Would Slash SNAP by More Than $150 Billion Over Ten Years” March 21, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/house-2017-budget-plan-would-slash-snap-by-more-than-150-billion-over-ten#_ftnref7> (brackets added)

As Figure 1 shows, SNAP spending is falling as a share of GDP, and CBO [Congressional Budget Office] projects it will return to close to pre-recession levels once the economy fully recovers. SNAP does not contribute to the nation’s long-term budget problems because it is projected to grow no faster than the economy over time.

SNAP spending is falling and the increase in benefits is expiring

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

SNAP spending fell as a share of GDP in 2015. Spending on SNAP (formerly food stamps) as a share of GDP fell by 4 percent in 2015. In 2014 it fell by 11 percent, largely due to the expiration of the Recovery Act’s SNAP benefit increase on November 1, 2013. That expiration lowered average benefits by about 7 percent for the rest of 2014, Agriculture Department (USDA) data show.

SNAP caseloads continue to fall

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

SNAP caseloads began falling in 2014 and continued falling in 2015. SNAP caseload growth slowed substantially in 2012 and 2013, and caseloads fell by about 2 percent in 2014 and another 2 percent in 2015. For more than two years, fewer people have participated in SNAP each month than in the same month one year earlier. The number of people receiving SNAP has fallen by 2.6 million people since peaking in December 2012. In 42 states, the number of SNAP participants was lower in December 2015 than in December 2012.

2% to 4% decrease each year in SNAP participants

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

Nationally, for more than two years fewer people have participated in SNAP each month than in the same month of the prior year; about 2.6 million fewer people participated in SNAP in December 2015 than in December 2012, when participation peaked. CBO expects that as the economy improves, the number of participants will fall by about 2 to 4 percent each year over the next decade: from 45.8 million in fiscal year 2015 to 44.7 million in 2016, 42.8 million in 2017, and 33.1 million by 2026. By 2026, CBO forecasts that the share of the population receiving SNAP will return close to 2007 levels, at about 9 percent.

SOLVENCY

1. Wrong Target for Budget

SNAP is not part of the long-term federal budget problem

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

CBO’s forecast indicates SNAP isn’t part of the long-term budget problem. As the economic recovery continues and fewer low-income people qualify for SNAP, CBO expects SNAP spending to fall further in future years, returning to its 1995 level as a share of GDP by 2020. Thus, while CBO recently projected that the overall gap between federal spending and revenues will grow over the coming decade, SNAP is not contributing to this problem; CBO forecasts that SNAP will decline as a share of the economy over the entire ten-year budget window.

Caseloads grew due to Recession

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

SNAP caseloads grew significantly between 2007 and 2011 as the recession and lagging recovery led more low-income households to qualify and apply for help. The number of people eligible for SNAP rose from 37 million in 2007 to 45 million in 2009 and 51 million in 2013, USDA data show. The participation rate among eligible individuals also rose, from 69 percent in 2007 to 85 percent in 2013 (the most recent year available). The rise in the participation rate likely reflects the severity of the downturn and state efforts to reach more eligible households — particularly working families and senior citizens — by simplifying SNAP policies and procedures, among other factors.

2. Unemployment Wrong Target

Unemployment Rate not primary reason for SNAP Participation. The main reasons are poverty and food insecurity

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

Poverty and food insecurity, or the share of families lacking consistent access to adequate food, rose significantly during the recession and stayed well above pre-recession levels in 2014. Both are better indicators of SNAP participation than the unemployment rate, and their only modest improvement since the end of the recession suggests that the drop in the unemployment rate masks continued hardship for many.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Poorest hurt

Link: SNAP supplements low-paying jobs

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center in 2000.Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Brynne Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research. She holds a B.A. in International Relations from Pomona College and a Master of Public Policy degree from the University of Southern California.) “House 2017 Budget Plan Would Slash SNAP by More Than $150 Billion Over Ten Years” March 21, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/house-2017-budget-plan-would-slash-snap-by-more-than-150-billion-over-ten#_ftnref7>

In addition to acting as a safety net for people who are elderly, disabled, or temporarily unemployed, SNAP supplements the wages of low-income workers and their families. The number of SNAP households that have earnings while participating in SNAP has more than tripled, from about 2 million in 2000 to about 7 million in 2014. The share of all SNAP households that have earnings while participating in SNAP also rose over that period, from about 27 percent to about 31 percent.

Brink: Childless adults are poor

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center in 2000.Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Brynne Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research. She holds a B.A. in International Relations from Pomona College and a Master of Public Policy degree from the University of Southern California.) “House 2017 Budget Plan Would Slash SNAP by More Than $150 Billion Over Ten Years” March 21, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/house-2017-budget-plan-would-slash-snap-by-more-than-150-billion-over-ten#_ftnref7>

About 1 million childless adults living in areas of high unemployment. This group has average income of only 17 percent of the poverty line (about $2,000 a year for a single individual), and SNAP is the only government assistance that most of them receive. Currently, childless adults aged 18-49 who are not disabled and are not working at least 20 hours a week or participating in a qualifying workfare or job training program can receive SNAP for only three months in any 36-month period. States may seek temporary waivers from the time limit for areas with high unemployment, where jobs are scarce.

Brink: ABAWD Most Needy

Connie Ma, 2016 (Master of Public Policy Candidate The Sanford School of Public Policy Duke University) “Community Colleges as Partners in the Third-Party Match Model of the SNAP Employment and Training Program” Submitted: Thursday, April 21, 2016 <http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/12033/Connie%20Ma%20MP%20FINAL%20With%20Appendices.pdf?sequence=1>

ABAWDs are some of the poorest and most disadvantaged SNAP recipients. ABAWDs receive an average gross income of $2,200 per year, which is 19 percent of the poverty line ($11,770 for a family of one), and over 82% of them live in households with income below 50 percent of the poverty line. SNAP represents one of the only supports they can receive, since single adults do not qualify for cash assistance from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and many ABAWDs are also “longterm unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits”. 60% of ABAWDs are men. ABAWDs have low educational attainment– about 25% of ABAWDs lack a high school diploma or GED, compared to 12% of the national population, and about 50% have only a high school diploma or GED, compared to 30% nationally. In 2003, a survey of 15 different states and their SNAP E&T programs found that the mandatory SNAP E&T participants (primarily ABAWDs) were a very difficult population to employ, as they typically could not read or use computers, which kept them from accessing other employment services.

Impact: SNAP has huge impact on keeping Americans out of poverty

Melissa S. Kearney and Benjamin H. Harris, 2013 (Melissa S. Kearney is a nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Maryland, where she has been on the faculty since 2006. She is also a research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), a faculty affiliate of the Notre Dame Lab for Economic Opportunities (LEO), and an affiliated scholar of J-PAL. Kearney's research focuses on issues of social policy, poverty, and inequality. Benjamin H. Harris was the Policy Director of The Hamilton Project; a Fellow in Economic Studies at Brookings; and Deputy Director of the Retirement Security Project at Brookings. His work focused on tax, budget, and retirement security.) “Hunger and the Important Role of SNAP as Part of the American Safety Net” November 22, 2013 <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2013/11/22-hunger-snap-safety-net-kearney-harris>

The Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) is our nation’s most important anti-hunger program. Last year, the program distributed $75 billion in benefits to nearly 46.6 million people. These benefits had a remarkable impact on the prevalence of poverty in the United States. By including food stamp benefits in income, SNAP was estimated to keep 4.9 million Americans—including 2.2 million children—out of poverty in 2011. Similarly, the program also had an outstanding impact on the poorest of Americans, reducing the number of Americans in extreme poverty by half—from 1,600,000 to 857,000 in 2011.n the table.

Impact: Poor left jobless and hungry

John Hammontree, 2016 (writes Opinion & Commentary for AL.com, a local news source) “More than 900,000 Alabamians don't know where their next good meal is coming from” June 05, 2016 <http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/more_than_900000_alabamians_do.html>

But potentially more damaging is the legislature's decision earlier this year, to implement the ABAWD (Able Bodied Adults Without Dependents) time limit, which could cost as many as 32,000 Alabamians access to nutritional food because they've been unable to find work. It's easy to understand the desire to tie benefits to employment, but in reality, some rural Alabamians are forced to face the one-two punch of a lack of employment opportunity, and a lack of food. In a state that finds pride in Christian-values, we should always strive to feed those in need. Thomas points out that there are also programs that work to make sure SNAP participants have access to farmers markets, and some even will match SNAP participants' money dollar for dollar, meaning that those on SNAP eat healthier and their money goes directly to local farmers, benefitting the local economy and Alabama farmers. We're not ourselves when we're hungry. Hungry families struggle in school, in the workforce and in their healthcare costs. Providing access to nutritional food may in reality help lower our educational and healthcare costs, but that's not why we should do it. We should do it because no Alabamian should be forced to choose between paying their bills and eating.

Impact: SNAP crucial to help make ends meet.

John Hammontree, 2016 (writes Opinion & Commentary for AL.com, a local news source) “More than 900,000 Alabamians don't know where their next good meal is coming from” June 05, 2016 <http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/more_than_900000_alabamians_do.html>

This program provides financial assistance to families to supplement their grocery budget. In Alabama, the average SNAP beneficiary receives only about $4/day ($121.77/month) so while these benefits aren't typically enough to carry a family through the month, many people do rely on these benefits to help make ends meet. Rather than the callous accusations of "welfare queens" or "freeloaders, the vast majority of individuals on SNAP are children, elderly, disabled, or working families who are simply struggling to keep the lights on and food on the table.

Turn: Taxpayer dollars lost

John Hammontree, 2016 (writes Opinion & Commentary for AL.com, a local news source) “More than 900,000 Alabamians don't know where their next good meal is coming from” June 05, 2016 <http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/more_than_900000_alabamians_do.html>

The impact that a lack of access to nutritional food can have on a family cannot be overstated. Many Alabamians have a knee-jerk opposition to "food stamps," but hungry families can cost the state much more in the long run. "Food insecurity has devastatingly negative impacts on school performance, productivity, and most importantly, long term health and the ability to age in your own home," according to Will Thomas, an Alabama native and Hunger Program Analyst for the AARP Foundation. Hungry kids have been shown to have lower test scores, more behavior problems, and are more likely to repeat a grade, correlations that can have real impacts on the state's education budget and future workforce. Recent studies have shown that severely food insecure individuals will require an average nearly twice as much as moderately food secure individuals in annual healthcare costs.

Impact: Ripple effect

Morgan Zalot, 2016 (Reporter for NBC News, Philadelphia, a local news source) “Limits Place Thousands in Montco, Bucks, Chesco at Risk of Losing Food Assistance” Jun 1, 2016 <http://www.nbcphiladelphia.com/news/local/Limits-Place-Thousands-in-Montco-Bucks-Chesco-at-Risk-of-Losing-Food-Assistance-381576701.html>

Fisher at Philadelphia's Coalition Against Hunger said that the SNAP time limits will worsen food insecurity across the region and the state -- both for people who lose their benefits and people who don't, who will be forced to try to stretch their own resources to help friends and relatives who lose access. "It has a ripple effect," Fisher said. "That's a really unfortunate reality, that it comes from somewhere, and usually from those who need help the most."

2. No income, no food

Link: Work Requirement.

Connie Ma, 2016 (Master of Public Policy Candidate The Sanford School of Public Policy Duke University) “Community Colleges as Partners in the Third-Party Match Model of the SNAP Employment and Training Program” Submitted: Thursday, April 21, 2016 <http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/12033/Connie%20Ma%20MP%20FINAL%20With%20Appendices.pdf?sequence=1> (brackets in original)

Able-bodied adults aged 18-49 without dependents (ABAWDs) need to meet specific work requirements in order to receive SNAP benefits. The US Department of Agriculture defines work requirement as “work[ing] at least 20 hours per week, participat[ing] in a qualifying work program 20 hours per week, or participat[ing] in a workfare program”. Job search alone does not fulfill work requirements. If they do not fulfill the work requirement, ABAWDs are limited to three months of SNAP benefits within a three-year time span. ABAWDs can also receive state-level exemptions (e.g. for homelessness, pregnancy) to these work registration requirements, which differ from state to state.

Link: ABAWD can’t find jobs.

Connie Ma 2016 (Master of Public Policy Candidate The Sanford School of Public Policy Duke University) “Community Colleges as Partners in the Third-Party Match Model of the SNAP Employment and Training Program” Submitted: Thursday, April 21, 2016 <http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/12033/Connie%20Ma%20MP%20FINAL%20With%20Appendices.pdf?sequence=1>

ABAWDs are some of the poorest and most disadvantaged SNAP recipients. ABAWDs receive an average gross income of $2,200 per year, which is 19 percent of the poverty line ($11,770 for a family of one), and over 82% of them live in households with income below 50 percent of the poverty line. SNAP represents one of the only supports they can receive, since single adults do not qualify for cash assistance from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and many ABAWDs are also “longterm unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits”. 60% of ABAWDs are men. ABAWDs have low educational attainment– about 25% of ABAWDs lack a high school diploma or GED, compared to 12% of the national population, and about 50% have only a high school diploma or GED, compared to 30% nationally. In 2003, a survey of 15 different states and their SNAP E&T programs found that the mandatory SNAP E&T participants (primarily ABAWDs) were a very difficult population to employ, as they typically could not read or use computers, which kept them from accessing other employment services.

Link: Long-Term Unemployment high – they can’t find jobs, that’s why they need SNAP

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

Long-term unemployment hit record highs in the recent recession and remains unusually high; in January 2016, roughly a quarter (26.9 percent) of the nation’s 7.8 million unemployed workers had been looking for work for 27 weeks or longer. By contrast, the long-term unemployed never constituted more than 26 percent of all unemployed workers in any prior recession back to World War II, and the figure has certainly never been so high this far into an economic recovery. Workers who have been unemployed for more than six months are only half as likely as those unemployed for shorter periods to have found employment by one month later; they also are more likely to have exhausted assets and other support and to seek help from SNAP.

Impact: Serious impact on the poorest. When they lose SNAP, they have little money and no other programs, and no assistance finding a job.

Ed Bolen, 2015 (Ed Bolen joined the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in 2010 as a Senior Policy Analyst. His work focuses on state and federal issues in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Prior to joining the Center, Bolen was Senior Policy Analyst at California Food Policy Advocates. While there, he advocated for administrative and legislative improvements to food assistance programs and provided training and technical assistance to community-based organizations. He also has worked in public health law, most recently consulting on legal strategies to combat childhood obesity with the National Policy and Legal Analysis Network. Prior to that, Bolen was senior staff attorney at the Child Care Law Center, specializing on licensing, subsidy and legislative issues affecting low-income families in child care and early education settings. He received his law degree from University of California Hastings.) “Maine’s SNAP Cutoff Foreshadows Tough Times for Poor Jobless Workers” February 4, 2015 <http://www.cbpp.org/blog/maines-snap-cutoff-foreshadows-tough-times-for-poor-jobless-workers>

The loss of SNAP benefits can have a serious impact. People subject to the three-month limit have average monthly income of about 19 percent of the poverty line (about $2,200 per year for a household of one in 2014) and typically don’t qualify for other income support. The time limit is especially harsh because state and local agencies don’t need to help the affected people find jobs or provide a place in a job training program that would allow them to keep benefits.

Impact: ABAWD are the poorest and most disadvantaged SNAP recipients

Connie Ma, 2016 (Master of Public Policy Candidate The Sanford School of Public Policy Duke University) “Community Colleges as Partners in the Third-Party Match Model of the SNAP Employment and Training Program” Submitted: Thursday, April 21, 2016 <http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/12033/Connie%20Ma%20MP%20FINAL%20With%20Appendices.pdf?sequence=1>

Millions of vulnerable individuals in North Carolina rely on in-kind food benefits that may be taken away if they cannot find work. Able-bodied adults aged 18-49 without dependents (ABAWDs) need to meet specific work requirements in order to receive Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits, known as Food and Nutrition Services benefits (FNS) in North Carolina. If they do not fulfill the work requirement, ABAWDs are limited to three months of SNAP benefits within a three-year time span. ABAWDs are some of the poorest and most disadvantaged SNAP recipients, with average gross incomes of $2,200 per year or 19 percent of the poverty line. In October 2015, North Carolina Governor Pat McCrory signed into law House Bill 318, which bars the state from ever seeking work requirement waivers for ABAWDs on the basis of high unemployment. As a result, between 85,000 and 105,000 North Carolina ABAWDs may lose their FNS benefits beginning in 2016.

“If they can’t find work, they can just volunteer” Response: Not enough opportunities

Jess Bidgood, 2015 (Reporter for the New York Times) “States Tighten Conditions for Receiving Food Stamps as the Economy Improves” April 11, 2015 <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/12/us/politics/states-tighten-conditions-for-receiving-food-stamps-as-the-economy-improves.html?_r=0>

Officials have emphasized that people can meet the work requirement by volunteering about six hours a week, and that is happening here: Warren Bailey, 40, has been unable to find work in towing or fast food and so has signed up as a pantry volunteer. But there is concern in the state that there is not enough volunteering or job-training capacity for food stamp recipients who cannot find jobs, especially in rural parts. “If you’re not lucky like me and found this place, the food pantry, I don’t even know where else I would go,” Mr. Bailey said.

3. Working Poor Hurt

Link: Volatile Job schedule

Dr. Liz Ben-Ishai, 2015 (senior policy analyst on the job quality team at CLASP; M.A. and Ph.D. in political science from Univ of Michigan.) “Volatile Job Schedules and Access to Public Benefits” Sept 16, 2015 <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/2015.09.16-Scheduling-Volatility-and-Benefits-FINAL.pdf>

For many low-wage workers, Monday-through-Friday, nine-to-five jobs are a thing of the past. Instead, volatile schedules are the norm, especially in retail, restaurant, and other service jobs. Among early career workers (ages 26 to 32) in hourly jobs, more than 40 percent receive one week or less advance notice of their job schedules. Half of these workers have no input into their schedules and three-quarters experience fluctuations in the number of hours they work, with hours varying by more than eight hours per week on average. Many workers receive less than three days’ notice.

Link: Full-time jobs difficult to obtain

Dottie Rosenbaum and Brynne Keith-Jennings, 2016 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow who joined the Center on Budget and policy Priorities in 2000. Her work focuses primarily on federal and state issues in SNAP as well as issues that involve the coordination of SNAP and other state-administered health and income security programs, such as Medicaid, TANF, and child care. Keith-Jennings joined the Center in June 2011. Her work focuses on federal and state SNAP policies and research.) “SNAP Costs and Caseloads Declining” March 8, 2016 <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-costs-and-caseloads-declining>

The share of workers who are working part time because they can’t find a full-time job neared historic highs during the recession and remains elevated

Link: Poverty takes away food stamps

Liz Ben-Ishai, 2015 (Ben-Ishai is a senior policy analyst on the job quality team at CLASP. Her work focuses on paid leave and responsive workplaces. Ms. Ben-Ishai graduated from the University of Michigan with an M.A. and Ph.D. in political science.) “Volatile Job Schedules and Access to Public Benefits” September 16, 2015 <http://www.clasp.org/resources-and-publications/publication-1/2015.09.16-Scheduling-Volatility-and-Benefits-FINAL.pdf>

Ironically, the very job scheduling issues that contribute to many workers’ financial insecurity and consequent need for public benefits often create obstacles to accessing these benefits. Some of these programs require recipients to work a certain number of hours. As a result, when workers are scheduled for fewer hours, their wages and their public benefits go down. Temporary increases in work hours can also be cause for concern. Workers who fail to report increased earnings—even if temporary—can be denied benefits or even charged with fraud. Workers who report increased earnings may have their benefits cut or become ineligible. This is often referred to as the “benefits cliff.” Yet many workers whose income increases as a result of additional hours may quickly lose those hours, making them eligible for benefits once again. The reapplication process can be cumbersome and time consuming, contributing to a process known as “churn” that is as costly for administrative agencies as it is a hardship for families.

Impact: Hunger. Food stamps and other programs mostly solved hunger in America

Dottie Rosenbaum and Zoe Neuberger 2005 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow at Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Neuberger – senior policy analyst at CBPP and former analyst at the White House Office of Management & Budget; law degree from Yale Univ. and Master in Public Policy degree from Harvard) 17 Aug 2005 Food and Nutrition Programs: Reducing Hunger, Bolstering Nutrition <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-and-nutrition-programs-reducing-hunger-bolstering-nutrition>

Following the creation and expansion of the domestic food assistance programs in the second half of the 20th century, severe hunger, which had been a significant national problem, has become rare. The food assistance programs were developed in several steps. Concerns about the nutritional status of young men drafted for service in World War II led to the enactment of the National School Lunch Act in 1946. The Food Stamp Program was established on a pilot basis in the early 1960s, and extended nationwide in the early 1970s, to help low-income families and individuals purchase a nutritionally adequate diet. The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children, popularly known as WIC, was created in the early 1970s to improve the health of low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children who are found to be at nutritional risk. In the 1960s, various studies found hunger to be a significant problem in the United States. Today, it has become relatively rare, although it still exists.

Impact: Hunger. Food stamps are highly effective at reducing hunger

Dottie Rosenbaum and Zoe Neuberger 2005 (Rosenbaum is a Senior Fellow at Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Neuberger – senior policy analyst at CBPP and former analyst at the White House Office of Management & Budget; law degree from Yale Univ. and Master in Public Policy degree from Harvard) 17 Aug 2005 Food and Nutrition Programs: Reducing Hunger, Bolstering Nutrition <http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-and-nutrition-programs-reducing-hunger-bolstering-nutrition>

The Food Stamp Program is highly effective at reducing hunger in part because it provides benefits (in the form of a debit card) that can be used only to purchase food. Research has shown that the requirement that food stamp benefits be spent only on food increases food expenditures two to nine times more than would the provision of a similar amount of cash aid.

4. Future Devastation

Link: Permanent Action. Mandate 2 says state waivers will be ended permanently – they can never come back again when another recession strikes

Link: SNAP grew more important doing the Great Recession of 2007-2009

Joel Cuffey, Elton Mykerezi, Timothy Beatty, 2015 (Cuffey: Graduate Student, Applied Economics University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Mykerezi: Associate Professor, Applied Economics & Extension Economist, Center for Community Vitality. Beatty: Associate Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics University of California, Davis. Selected Paper prepared for presentation for the 2015 Agricultural & Applied Economics Association and Western Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, July 26-28) “Food Assistance and Labor Force Outcomes of Childless Adults: Evidence from the CPS” July 26, 2015 <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/205821/1/Mykerezi_Beatty_Cuffey_ABAWDWorkIncentives_r.pdf>

The Great Recession of 2007 to 2009 led by the housing crisis has resulted in substantial economic insecurity among U.S. households, with poverty rates reaching 15 percent, unemployment 10 percent, and food insecurity at a record high 14.9 percent in 2010. SNAP is the largest component of the U.S. food safety net. Between 2007 and 2011, participation in SNAP increased from 26.3 million to 44.7 million and spending increased from $33.2 billion to $75.7 billion (USDA, 2012).

Brink: Economic Downturn Coming

Chris Vermeulen, 2016 (founder of AlgoTrades Systems., is an internationally recognized market technical analyst and trader; is responsible for market research and trade alerts for multiple newsletter publications; designed an automated algorithmic trading software for the S&P500 index.) “Prepare For Financial and Economic Crisis, Expected to Last Until 2020” Feb 19, 2016

The relentless rise in the stock markets from the lows of 2009, to the highs seen in 2015, have made many market participants complacent. Every dip, has been bought and the traders have been rewarded. However, on close analysis, the economy and the equity markets are setting themselves up for a harsh winter ahead, which is expected to persist until 2020. The equity markets will have to go through "The Great Reset" and even the Fed will not be able to rescue us. A collapse does not happen all at once. The weak links give out first, followed by the stronger ones. Similarly, this time, it is China's economic slowdown, the oil crisis and a probable Euro crisis, all of which will end with the crisis of the largest economy of the world.

Impact: Wide-Spread hunger, with the SNAP work requirement in place

Jess Bidgood, 2015 (Reporter for the New York Times) “States Tighten Conditions for Receiving Food Stamps as the Economy Improves” April 11, 2015 <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/12/us/politics/states-tighten-conditions-for-receiving-food-stamps-as-the-economy-improves.html?_r=0>

Around the country, food pantry directors are girding for an influx of hungry adults as the work requirement re-emerges. In Wisconsin, the time limit kicked in statewide on April 1, and the independent Legislative Fiscal Bureau there has estimated that 31,000 people could lose their food stamps. “We’re going to run out of food,” said Sherrie Tussler, the executive director of the Hunger Task Force Milwaukee. “It’s going to cause wide-scale hunger here in Milwaukee, and we’re in trouble.”

5. Increased taxpayer expense

Link: AFF cuts people from SNAP

Turn: Hungry people cost taxpayers in other ways

John Hammontree, 2016 (writes Opinion & Commentary for AL.com, a local news source) “More than 900,000 Alabamians don't know where their next good meal is coming from” June 05, 2016 <http://www.al.com/opinion/index.ssf/2016/06/more_than_900000_alabamians_do.html>

The impact that a lack of access to nutritional food can have on a family cannot be overstated. Many Alabamians have a knee-jerk opposition to "food stamps," but hungry families can cost the state much more in the long run. "Food insecurity has devastatingly negative impacts on school performance, productivity, and most importantly, long term health and the ability to age in your own home," according to Will Thomas, an Alabama native and Hunger Program Analyst for the AARP Foundation. Hungry kids have been shown to have lower test scores, more behavior problems, and are more likely to repeat a grade, correlations that can have real impacts on the state's education budget and future workforce. Recent studies have shown that severely food insecure individuals will require an average nearly twice as much as moderately food secure individuals in annual healthcare costs.
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