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## PART I

## Objectives of Today's Presentation

* Show differences in CalFresh access at below county levels - census tracts, zip codes, neighborhoods, etc.

Highlight population subgroups having CalFresh access lower than expected based on poverty levels.

Highlight the causes of spatial dissimilarities in CalFresh access using statistical analysis.

* Seek further directions on next steps, and taking this analysis outside CDSS.


## The Issue!

- Socio-economic indicators at the county level rarely show significant correlations with CalFresh access.
- Existing research methods and capabilities limited our capacity to produce usable information at neighborhood levels.
- Geocoding analytics allow us to assemble a rich data set using a variety of resources.


## Objectives of Today's Presentation

* Show differences in CalFresh access at below county levels - census tracts, zip codes, neighborhoods, etc using geocoding analytics.
* Highlight population subgroups having CalFresh access lower than expected based on poverty levels using geocoding analytics.

Gecoding is a technique that can help us:
I. map recipient level data, and
II. assess CalFresh reach at community levels.

Based on the poverty estimates for an area, this spatial analytical tool will enable us to identify places:

- where potential CalFresh eligibles reside,
- where CalFresh reach is low, and more importantly,
- where more effective and targeted outreach strategies could be directed.


## Geocoding

## Why geocode?



## Exploring Causes of Spatial Dissimilarities: A six-county Analysis

- Background Information
- Accounts for roughly a third of the State's total and CalFresh population.
- Varied socioeconomic characteristics poverty, language spoken, etc.


## Diversity Index (2010)* and Program Access Index (2011)**



* We followed the methodology used by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) in their calculation of the 1990 and 2000 index . "Who's Your Neighbor? Residential Segregation and Diversity in California" By Juan Onésimo Sandoval, Hans P. Johnson, and Sonya M. Tafoya Public Policy Institute of California, California Counts Population Trends And Profiles, Volume 4 Number 1•August 2002
*Based on calculations by the Research Services Branch, CDSS
PAI : Program Access Index.


Monterey County: CalFresh Recipient Addresses and Distance from EBT Locations (Zip Codes 93905 and 93906)


## Measuring CalFresh Access

## County: Program Access Index (PAI)

VS.
Neighborhood: Program Reach Index (PRI)

## Program Access Index (PAI)

$$
\mathrm{PAI}=\frac{\text { (CalFresh Participants) }-(\text { Disaster CalFresh Program Participants) }}{\text { (Individuals with Income }<125 \% \text { Poverty Threshold) }- \text { (FDPIR Participants) }- \text { (SSI Recipients) }}
$$

Where:
FDPRI: Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations
SSI: Supplemental Security Income
Source: http://www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/PAI2011.pdf

## Program Reach Index (PRI) *

Census Tract CalFresh Participants
Tract pop size X Tract proportion below poverty level X 1.3 -SSISSP

* Geography-based or population-based


## Advantages of Using PRI

Measure CalFresh access at below county levels.
Measure differences in access among population subgroups.

Use results to devise targeted CalFresh outreach activities.

Help uncover the limitations of PAI methodology.

# Application Example: LA County on the Map 

## Potential Eligible - Below 130 percent Poverty

## vs.

CalFresh Access - PRI


L.A. County Tracts: Percent Spetaking Laftiguages other than English by Position Above or Below Median

## (Median = 58.3)



## L.A. County Tracts: Percent Betiow Povertyalby Positiōn Above or Below Median

## (Median = 11.2)



## (* Poverty median = 11.2)

## Tracts with percent below poverty lower than county median *

* Average percent below poverty $\mathbf{=} 5.0$ percent

Tracts with percent below poverty higher than county median

* Average percent below poverty = $\mathbf{2 4 . 0}$ percent




## L.A. County: Average Poverty Level Tract by Language (other than English) Deciles



Socioeconomic Characteristics, Decile-level Averages: Decile1 vs. Decile10


## PART II

## 1. Re-evaluation of existing measurement tools

- Denominator adjustments.

2. Picking the low-hanging fruits (Medi-Cal recipients currently not receiving
CalFresh)

- Based on aid-code analysis, extract the addresses of Medi-Cal recipient that appear to be eligible to receive CalFresh benefits.


## 1. Denominator Adjustment

## Fresno PRI (all ages)



## Proportion of Child-only Households in Counties Wifith High CalFresh Access

PAl by Region, 2010
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## Program Reach Index (PRI) Child-only Method

PRI = $\frac{\text { Census Tract CalFresh Participants }}{\text { Tract pop size X Tract proportion below poverty level X } 1.3-(\text { SSISSP }+ \text { No.ChildOnlyHHs*.94*F) }}$

F: Adjustment factor
$F=$ Total number of families $\div$ number of families with own children under 18

## Denominator Adjustments....contd.

Total CalFresh Households and Child-only CalFresh Households (Top 10 counties for Child-only cases), June 2013

| County | Child-only CalFresh <br> households | Total CalFresh <br> households | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L.A. County | 108,602 | 541944 | 20 percent |
| Orange | 27,567 | 99,489 | 28 percent |
| San Bernardino 20,698 | 148807 | 14 percent |  |
| Riverside | 16,178 | 110752 | 15 percent |
| San Diego | 14,322 | 105565 | 14 percent |
| Fresno | 12,619 | 88114 | 14 percent |
| Santa Clara | 11,066 | 52382 | 21 percent |
| Kern | 10,286 | 56,382 | 18 percent |
| Sacramento | 9,645 | 88674 | 11 percent |
| Alameda | 9,040 | 62192 | 15 percent |

L.A. County: Location of Child-only Households by Tract Percientage of People Speaking Languages Other than English, June 2013


The Ratio of Adjusted PAI (Child-only method) to PAI, by County (Ji̛he 2011) Southern California (map) and top 16 "gainers" (list)


Program Reach Index (PRI), Child-only Househofills Method L.A. County, Decile10

| CalFresh Total | 178,020 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total Eligible | 341,012 |
| SSIISSP*.5 | 22,174 |


| No. Child-only HHs | 27,836 |
| :--- | :--- |
| AllHHs/HHs with Chld. | 235,761 I 109,670 |
| 2.15 |  |$|$| Estimated Ineligibles | 59,840 |
| :--- | :--- |
| PRI I | 0.558 |
| PRI II | 0.687 |
| Difference | 0.129 |

Selected Zip codes: L.A. County


## Selected Zip codes: L.A. County



# Fresno PRI (Child-only method), by Poverty Quintiles : Lowest fifth 

## Total CalFresh <br> 108,668

## Total eligible <br> 188,930

## SSI-SSP*. 5 <br> 32,750

## Child-only*. 94 <br> 10,388

All HHs/ HHs
with<18 47,054 / 22,537 = 2.087
"Estimated" Ineligibles 21,680
PRI - LF 0.69

## Medi-Cal Recipient Analysis

| Medi-cal Recipient Analysis ${ }^{35}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Top 10 Counties) |  |  |
| County | Number | Percent |
| Los Angeles | 565,680 | 37.38 |
| Orange | 101,147 | 6.68 |
| San Bernardino | 81,395 | 5.38 |
| San Diego | 79,436 | 5.25 |
| Riverside | 77,584 | 5.13 |
| Santa Clara | 56,328 | 3.72 |
| Sacramento | 50,417 | 3.33 |
| Fresno | 46,138 | 3.05 |
| Alameda | 44,347 | 2.93 |
| Kern | 44,304 | 2.93 |

- The Program Reach Index (PRI) is as useful an indicator of CalFresh access at the county level as the Program Access Index (PAI).
- The ability to apply PRI at below county levels makes it much more valuable in accessing CalFresh reach at community and neighborhood levels.
- The PRI can help target outreach activities through mapping techniques that highlight areas needing benefits the most.
- Use of the CalFresh Child-only households method provided a sensible refinement by enabling the removal of some ineligible individuals from the denominator.


[^0]:    *Alpine, Mono, Sierra and Trinity are excluded

