

Gov. Rendell Proposes Deep Cut in Food Funding

In budget documents delivered to the Pennsylvania General Assembly on February 9th, Governor Edward G. Rendell proposed a cut of \$2,450,000 in the State Food Purchase Program for the fiscal year that begins July 1st. Program funds, currently set at \$17,450,000, are used by counties to purchase food that is then made available at no cost to food pantries and cupboards. The cut proposed by the Governor could reduce those grants by 14 percent. For an estimate of how each county would be affected, see page 7.

The State Food Purchase Program (SFPP) began in 1983 with an appropriation of \$8 million. Since then, it has received bipartisan support and has grown by an average of \$450,000 each year. The Governor's proposal, if implemented by the General Assembly, would mark a sharp departure from this history.

"A cut now in state funding for food would be especially ill-timed," said Ann Foor, director of the Keystone Community Action Program in Huntingdon. "At the county level we're already trying to soften the impact of cuts in food and shelter funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). If the State also implements a cut, we may see pantries in our area closing." See related article on FEMA cuts below.

Food bankers and food program managers meeting February 10th in Harrisburg also voiced opposition to the proposed cut. "That's nearly two months of food out of our operation,"

said Steveanna Wynn, executive director of the SHARE Food Program in Philadelphia. "I assume no one wants community cupboards to close for part of the year and we won't. But there's no way the emergency feeding network can keep up the existing level of service and meet anticipated demand if the State takes away that much food."

Michael Pechart, Policy Specialist with the PA Department of Agriculture, attempted to put the proposed reduction into context. "The federal government is implementing lots of cuts, many of which have a

Continued on page 6...SFPP Cuts

Counties Also Hit by Federal Cuts

County governments use food and shelter grants from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to support food pantries, house homeless families, avoid evictions and foreclosures and meet needs following fires and floods.

Due to the difficult federal fiscal situation, FEMA reduced Pennsylvania's food and shelter grants this year by \$624,000. Counties are feeling the impact. Bucks, Warren, Elk, Fulton and Forest counties all absorbed 50 percent cuts while in Bedford and Huntingdon counties the cuts were 20 – 25 percent. According to a January 25th article in the *Johnstown Tribune-Democrat*, the reductions come at a time of increased need at food pantries. Joann Leeds, director of the American Red Cross in Bedford County, said "cuts are forcing food banks to provide meals for an allocation far short of what is needed."

The United Way of Pennsylvania, which allocates a portion of the funds, received numerous requests from counties trying to offset the federal cuts. Unfortunately, it had only enough money to help counties that had not received a direct federal allocation. "There appears to be a structural funding problem that only our representatives in Congress can solve," said Sandy Strauss, of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches and member of the United Way's allocation committee. For details describing FEMA cuts, see page 7.

IN THIS ISSUE

February 2005
Volume XXVI Issue I

Philadelphia Merger	2
Nutrition	2
SHARE	3
Director's Column	3
Federal Budget	4
Food Stamps	5
Governor's Proposal	6
Proposal's Impact Table	7

Visit our website at
www.pahunger.org

Philabundance and Food Bank Merge in Philadelphia

In late January, the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank and Philabundance finalized their merger. The newly constituted agency, which will carry on the Philabundance name, serves more than 1,100 human service agencies in nine counties of southeastern PA and New Jersey.

"The merger will give food pantries access to a wider variety and greater quantity of food. And the overall process will work better for them," explained Mary Gainer, Director of Agency Relations for Philabundance. "We wouldn't have done this if it wasn't going to be an improvement."

Richard Shaeffer, Administration Services Director for Philadelphia's Office of Emergency Shelter and Services, echoed this confidence: "It's a good thing. The merger promotes efficiency through coordination. It will make it easier to find those pockets where more help is needed while also minimizing duplication."

The merger has brought changes for Philadelphia area food cupboards and mixed feelings about the outcome. "I'm disappointed but am willing to give it a try," stated Patience Jacobs, the Director of Food Ministry for the Crusaders for Christ Church in Philadelphia. Mrs. Jacobs has been buying from the Greater Philadelphia Food Bank for over 17 years. Her two disappointments thus far have been a loss of the "family-friendly" ambiance that the Food Bank's personnel had provided and an increase in delivery costs put in place after the merger was finalized. Mrs. Jacobs is pleased, though, with the noticeable increase in the selection of food in the walk-through area of the warehouse.

The Food Bank, founded in 1981, has been a mainstay for food cupboards

to obtain the canned goods, cereals and meat that go into family food packages. Philabundance started three years later with the mission of "food rescue". It too has served the food cupboard network through the provision of baked goods, fresh fruits and vegetables. Over the years Philabundance has become the larger of the two with 2003 revenue of \$28,374,000. The Food Bank's 2003 revenue was \$8,316,000. After national food bank and food rescues merged a few years ago, the two local boards of directors began considering a merger as well. "Our mission is to end hunger. This brings us closer to accomplishing that mission," said Gainer.

By absorbing the Food Bank's mission, Philabundance takes on a part of the responsibility of keeping cupboards supplied with non-perishable food. Of course, food banks aren't the only source; other sources are collections through congregations and civic groups, federal TEFAP commodities and the State Food Purchase Program. In contrast to these sources, food from a food bank comes at a price – often 18 cents per pound – to cover costs of storage and handling. Most cupboards have tiny budgets and depend on their food bank partners to keep this cost as low as possible.

In addition to assuming the responsibility for food banking, the reorganized Philabundance has broadened its mission to include a community kitchen that prepares ready-to-serve meals. Homeless shelters and transitional living facilities purchase most of the meals. Food rescue continues but now is a smaller share of the broader mission.

Nutrition and Agriculture

Health and nutrition are hot topics across America. This is mostly in response to the alarming increase in the number of children and adults who are suffering from obesity-related diseases. At its 14th annual Farming for the Future Conference, the Pennsylvania Association for Sustainable Agriculture (PASA) addressed "The Link Between Nutrition and Agriculture."

Dr. Paul Hepperly of the Rodale Institute set the tone by promoting the Institute's motto: Healthy Soil, Healthy Food, Healthy People. Other speakers elaborated on his theme, contending that the demand for food to be cheaper, quicker, and more accessible has resulted in a loss of vital nutrients and an increase in caloric and hydrogenated (trans) fat consumption. To cite another example, during the past century natural sugars have been replaced in our diets by high fructose corn syrup, which converts to fat more readily than any other sugar.

Speakers also criticized the low-fat revolution. Not all fats are created equal. Trans fats have largely replaced saturated fat, which must be disclosed on nutrition labels. However, saturated fatty acids play a vital role in maintaining a healthy immune system whereas research indicates that trans fats do the opposite.

Dr. Steven Marks of Geisinger Medical Center contended that poor eating habits and food choices are the root causes of common diseases. Today's generation of children is the first generation predicted not to out-live their parents. Marks argued that while hypertension, heart disease, and diabetes are the known killers, bad food is the real culprit setting these killers in motion.

If You Eat, You're In

Hunger Action is currently recruiting churches and community groups in central Pennsylvania to host SHARE sites. SHARE (Self-Help and Resource Exchange) is a program where people can purchase a package of food for minimal cost and two hours of community service. Everyone in the community can participate. SHARE's motto is "If you eat, you're in!"

SHARE is a private, non-profit program that provides ways for neighbors to purchase food economically and get more involved in their neighborhoods through community service. The food is procured in large quantities and the savings are passed down to the consumers. Each customer receives about \$35 worth of food for the cost of approximately \$18.

SHARE buyers purchase the food from growers, brokers and packaging plants. The food is not donated, government surplus, or salvage. It is high quality and nutritious food. A choice of items is available including meat, staples and fruits and vegetables. During the summer months packages with farm fresh produce from Lancaster County are available. There are many ways to pay for the food including cash, check, credit card and the EBT/Access Card. Anyone is welcome to fill out a monthly order form.

Each SHARE participant must give two hours of community service for each food package purchased. Community service is defined as service to benefit one's neighbor or community. Anything done for another person or organization without pay is community service.

"More SHARE programs are needed in the central Pennsylvania region," stated Berry Friesen, executive director of the Pennsylvania Hunger Action Center. "SHARE makes buying healthy food accessible to everyone in the community, regardless of economic level. That's what distinguishes SHARE from the rest." To inquire about what it takes to host a SHARE site, contact Sonia Fernandez at Hunger Action at 717-233-6705.

Director's Column



In March we welcome a new responsibility here at Hunger Action: the provision of staff and an office for the Pennsylvania **Nutrition Education Network**.

Many readers have read about the PA Nutrition Education Program (PANEP) in these pages over the years. It's a companion program to Food Stamps and is designed to provide information about grocery shopping, food preparation and diet to low-income consumers. The **Nutrition Education Network** is a small part of the PANEP and serves the broader effort through separate but complementary functions: professional development and the promotion of best practices; a social marketing campaign focused on fresh fruits and vegetables; nutrition research; and the facilitation of opportunities for civic engagement in the broad agenda related to nutrition and public health.

The Penn State University (PSU) administers the PANEP under the leadership of Dr. Barbara Lohse. Along with her small staff, Dr. Lohse oversees a Program that created 7.8 million educational interactions last year through the expenditure of nearly \$10 million. Starting in March, and under a contract with PSU, Hunger Action will provide and staff the **Nutrition Education Network's** Harrisburg office.

Three individuals are joining Hunger Action to carry this new responsibility: Meg Bruening, a nutritionist with experience in the WIC Program; Steve Gauvry, an educator with experience in school administration; and Shannon Clark, a generalist with experience in restaurant management and accounting. I hope they will be able to meet many of you in the months and years ahead.

Back in 1978, when Hunger Action started, its name was the Pennsylvania Coalition on Food and Nutrition (PCFN). Ending hunger and promoting healthy nutrition were together at the beginning; we're glad for the opportunity now to bring them back together again. According to the USDA's annual food security study, two-thirds of Food Stamp eligible households are food secure. Think of that; with so little income, most Food Stamp eligible families are able to manage their food budgets and food preparation so that no one is anxious about hunger.

This ability to be food secure despite having low income is priceless. With the addition of the **Nutrition Education Network**, we at Hunger Action will be better equipped to support efforts across our Commonwealth to strengthen that ability.

Time to Raise Minimum Wage

Eighty members of the Pennsylvania House, including two Republicans (John Taylor and George Kenney) have introduced legislation to raise Pennsylvania's minimum wage. House Bill 257 would immediately raise the minimum from \$5.15 an hour to \$6, with increases on January 1 of succeeding years to \$6.75 in 2006 and \$7.15 in 2007. For all subsequent years, the State's minimum wage would be indexed to a Consumer Price Index.

If enacted, Pennsylvania would follow New York and Delaware where legislators have tired of waiting for the Congress to act. Such legislation is also advancing in New Jersey. According to House Democratic Whip Mike Veon, Pennsylvanians earning the minimum wage are taking home fewer dollars in inflation-adjusted terms than at any time since 1949.

HB 257 is expected to fail in the General Assembly because of the opposition of Republican leadership in both the House and the Senate. However, Senator Rick Santorum, a Republican leader at the national level, apparently has decided that an increase in the federal minimum wage is a good idea. He has introduced legislation to raise it to \$6.25 over the next two years. Last year in the 108th Congress Republican leadership blocked attempts to raise the minimum.

Hunger Action has repeatedly said that raising the minimum wage is the most effective way for legislators to reduce the risk of hunger in Pennsylvania.

PA Legislative Session Calendar

March 14-16, 21-22*, 29-30**

April 4-6, 11-13, 18-20*

* Senate only ** House only

Sorting Out the President's 2006 Budget

In early February President George W. Bush proposed a federal budget for the fiscal year that begins in October. Since then the media have been filled with reports about what it would and would not accomplish. Here we begin to sort it out.

Would the President's proposed budget cut the deficit?

No. In 2006 it would produce a deficit of nearly \$400 billion – about the same as the past two years. And after adding the additional \$81 billion the President is expected to request for the war in Iraq and the additional \$77 billion needed to extend relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax (both are sure to happen), the President's budget would yield a record deficit of around \$550 billion. To be sure, the President has called for \$214 billion in cuts in domestic spending programs over the next five years, including \$18 billion in 2006. But despite these cuts, the President's plan grows the deficit because everything it saves in program cuts it spends on more tax cuts.

What impact would it have on Food Stamps?

The Food Stamp Program is an entitlement and the President did not propose to change that. Indeed, his budget projects Food Stamp spending to grow by 11 percent in 2006. The only change he requested is a slight narrowing of categorical eligibility, saving \$57 million in 2006. The President has called for a \$600 million cut in subsidy payments to farmers under the Farm Program. Before this would happen, the Senate and House Agriculture Committees would need to go along. That is highly unlikely. More likely is for those Committees to meet the President's request by cutting the Food Stamp Program.

What impact would it have on discretionary food programs?

TEFAP, the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program and CSFP would be flat-funded; because of inflation, this would amount to a 2-3 percent cut. WIC would receive a 6 percent increase. The President's 5-year plan to cap domestic discretionary programs would save \$214 billion. This would cause a 16 percent cut in those programs by 2010. Contrary to established practice, however, the budget fails to provide details on where those cuts would occur. It is highly unlikely that food programs would escape.

What about state and local governments? Would they gain or lose?

They would lose. Funds for Medical Assistance would be reduced, even though health costs are rising. In addition, grants to state and local governments for programs other than Medical Assistance would be cut by 4.5 percent in 2006. Pennsylvania's state and county governments would need to find nearly \$1 billion in local revenue to replace the loss of these federal funds.

How does the President want to change the budget process?

The President has asked Congress to adopt rules that would require a matching cut for every increase in entitlement program spending. He would exempt tax cuts from such a rule.

In summary, the President's plan makes little sense as a budget-balancing plan. Perhaps it is better understood as the opening move in a public relation campaign, designed to create a furor about deficits and elicit support for spending cuts that the President hasn't publicly requested.

Changing Patterns of Food Stamp Enrollment in Pennsylvania

As part of reducing the federal budget deficit, some in Congress want to put new limits on the Food Stamp Program. To inform that debate, Hunger Action assembled the following information about the Food Stamp Program in Pennsylvania.

In December 2004, for the first time since May 1997, Food Stamp enrollment exceeded one million individuals. From 1997 and into 2001 Food Stamp enrollment steadily fell until it reached a low of 733,292 during May 2001. Then, as the economy slipped into recession, enrollment began to climb back up to one million.

While overall enrollment at the end of 2004 is very similar to enrollment in May 1997, the composition of the caseload has shifted significantly.

- Currently households that do not receive any form of cash assistance (TANF, General Assistance or SSI) constitute the majority (56 percent) of the Food Stamp caseload. This contrasts to May 1997 when such households were only 41 percent of the total. This change reflects in part the steady and steep decline in the number of households receiving cash assistance (especially TANF), many of whom are now working but can not make ends meet without Food Stamps.
- Despite the economic recovery that began in late 2001, Food Stamp enrollment has continued to climb, particularly among the elderly and among households that had wages from employment. In May 1997 Pennsylvania had 70,671 Food Stamp households in which there was no cash assistance and someone had a job. By December 2004 that number had jumped to 99,729, a 41 percent increase.
- In May 1997 Food Stamp recipients in the 10 counties in the southeast and southwest corners of Pennsylvania constituted 58.5 percent of the caseload. Now, they constitute only 52.8 percent. Both Allegheny and Philadelphia counties have fewer Food Stamp recipients now than then. Meanwhile, enrollment in many more rural counties in the "T" is up sharply – Lancaster by 87 percent, Lebanon by 49 percent and York by 48 percent.

These data suggest that traditional linkages between cash assistance and Food Stamps, and between urbanized areas and Food Stamps, are loosening. New enrollment patterns that reflect the prevalence of low-wage employment are emerging. And Pennsylvania is probably only a few years away from a 50-50 enrollment split between the "T" and non-"T" counties.

Nutrition plays a central role to ensure that children are prepared for and succeeding in school and that adults are healthy and productive. If Congress cuts back on basic nutritional supports, we can expect the repercussions of these cuts to negatively impact on both educational and health systems – potentially with much greater costs to both families and states. Thus, Hunger Action has asked the members of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation to:

- **Oppose efforts to block grant the Food Stamp Program.** A block grant would eliminate the counter-cyclical feature of the Food Stamp Program. During times of recession, when need is greater, there would be no additional public spending available via the Food Stamp Program. This would lead to Food Stamp Program waiting lists, to greater suffering in affected households for children and families, and to deeper and longer economic recessions.
- **Resist spending caps on food and nutrition programs.** A spending cap would force cuts in benefits and restrictions in eligibility. This is the approach Congress adopted in 1996 as part of a budget-balancing effort. Subsequently, however, it realized that the cuts only served to undermine the goals of Welfare Reform, made the Program more administratively complex and increased the need at food pantries. Thus, Congress eventually reversed nearly all of the 1996 cuts. Reflecting these hard-won lessons, in 2002 the Bush Administration launched a new marketing and outreach campaign under the slogan "Food Stamps Make America Stronger."

The Food Stamp Program has become a vital part of the household budget for many Pennsylvania households struggling to achieve self-sufficiency. The Program must remain strong. To cut it now would only lead to greater costs in the future.

Governor Proposes Hefty Increases for Public Welfare, Education and Treasury

The Governor's budget proposal brought bad news for Pennsylvanians who avoid hunger only because of the help provided by local pantries and cupboards. But it brought better news for consumers of other human services and education. Examples of the Governor's more positive recommendations follow.

- Increase funding for subsidized child care by \$24 million. The additional money would be used to provide subsidies for an additional 1,000 children, improve childcare reimbursement rates and improve teacher quality.
- Increase funding for Head Start by \$15 million. This would serve an additional 2,500 children.
- Increase funding in job training and other "human capital" investments by \$101 million. Included would be \$23 million in new spending for community colleges, \$14 million for "industry training partnerships", \$10 million for nurse education and \$10 million for additional student educational grants.
- Increase K-12 Basic Education funding by \$109 million and Special Ed funding by \$23 million (2.5 percent each).
- Increase funding for Medical Assistance (MA) by \$285 million. Along with this increase the Governor proposed limits on the frequency MA participants may use medical services and new participant co-pays. Savings of \$168 million are expected from these new limitations.
- Restructure the Tobacco Settlement Fund to provide an additional \$25 million to grow enrollment in adultBasic health insurance by 41,500 adults.
- Increase funding for School Breakfast and Lunch by \$288,000, a 1 percent increase. The Governor did not budget enough to cover an increase in the breakfast and lunch reimbursement rate; for that to happen, the General Assembly would need to come up with another \$4 million.
- Maintain level funding for Food Stamp outreach at \$440,000. This funding is matched by the USDA, thus doubling the amount available for outreach.
- Maintain level funding for the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program at \$2 million. Despite a USDA cut of \$550,000 from last summer's program, PDA officials believe that \$2 million in state funds will be enough to keep this program operating at last summer's participation level.

In all, the Governor proposed an \$815 million increase in General Fund spending, all of which he directed toward the departments of Public Welfare and Education. He also proposed that Treasury receive a hefty increase to pay rising debt service. To achieve a balanced budget, all other Commonwealth agencies and programs would be cut by 7 percent.

From page 1...SFPP Cuts

negative impact on state budgets. We're especially feeling this in Medical Assistance where we had to come up with \$1.7 billion in state dollars to meet rising costs. This is a difficult budget and the pain of it will need to be shared."

Joyce Rothermel, chief executive officer of the Greater Pittsburgh Community Food Bank, urged state leaders not to sacrifice food in order to fund medical care. "Let's be realistic about the connection between nutrition and health. People who lack access to the food they need are at greater medical risk. So this cut – if it's implemented – will in the long run only make the Medical Assistance funding problem worse."

According to a February 27 article in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, the PA Department of Agriculture (PDA) would attempt to reduce the size of the cuts in county grants through the reallocation of other funds. Two such sources are named in the article: \$2 million currently retained by PDA and used to cover the costs of accepting federal bonus food commodities; and \$1 million currently distributed to the counties for equipment purchases as well as food.

Sheila Christopher, executive director of the PA Association of Regional Food Banks (PARF), said these measures would not offset the loss of state funding. "PDA is authorized to use \$2 million to bring in TEFAP bonus food, which costs about 20 cents per pound in handling charges. If PDA stops doing that, the food supply to pantries statewide could drop by 10 million pounds. That's enough to provide a 3-day food package to 200,000 families. As for the \$1 million that currently may be used for equipment, a large percentage of that money is already being used for food."

According to Christopher, PARF's members have begun contacting legislators to explain the seriousness of what is at stake. "Our kids, their parents, our elderly neighbors – they all need a consistent diet of healthy food to thrive. For that to happen, we need the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to support our food pantries. This is too important to ignore. We all need to speak up."

Statewide data collected by Hunger Action highlights the urgency of the matter. During October 2004 the typical pantry provided food to 146 households over the course of the month, an increase of nearly 6 percent from October 2003.

County	State Food Purchase Program Funds				FEMA Funds		
	2004-05 Allocation Grant	Share of 2004-05 TEFAP Set-Aside	Estimated 2005-06 Allocation	2005-06 Proposed Difference	2003-04 Award	2004-05 Award	2004-05 Difference
Adams	\$ 70,622	\$ 9,142	\$ 68,565	-\$11,199	\$ 18,917	\$ 17,404	-\$1,513
Allegheny	\$ 1,462,064	\$ 189,267	\$ 1,419,482	-\$231,849	\$ 638,870	\$ 615,875	-\$22,995
Armstrong	\$ 111,255	\$ 14,402	\$ 108,015	-\$17,642	\$ 43,299	\$ 40,768	-\$2,531
Beaver	\$ 252,298	\$ 32,660	\$ 244,950	-\$40,008	\$ 62,200	\$ 57,224	-\$4,976
Bedford	\$ 75,767	\$ 9,808	\$ 73,560	-\$12,015	\$ 42,245	\$ 33,955	-\$8,290
Berks	\$ 442,828	\$ 57,325	\$ 429,931	-\$70,222	\$ 236,352	\$ 195,297	-\$41,055
Blair	\$ 217,783	\$ 28,192	\$ 211,440	-\$34,535	\$ 69,723	\$ 59,045	-\$10,678
Bradford	\$ 86,999	\$ 11,262	\$ 84,465	-\$13,796	\$ 34,177	\$ 30,736	-\$3,441
Bucks	\$ 357,312	\$ 46,255	\$ 346,905	-\$56,661	\$ 306,797	\$ 155,453	-\$151,344
Butler	\$ 158,625	\$ 20,534	\$ 154,005	-\$25,154	\$ 61,745	\$ 56,805	-\$4,940
Cambria	\$ 223,901	\$ 28,984	\$ 217,380	-\$35,505	\$ 88,727	\$ 79,994	-\$8,733
Cameron	\$ 9,656	\$ 1,250	\$ 9,375	-\$1,531	\$ 6,050	\$ 5,566	-\$484
Carbon	\$ 74,114	\$ 9,594	\$ 71,955	-\$11,753	\$ 44,317	\$ 38,773	-\$5,544
Centre	\$ 91,325	\$ 11,822	\$ 88,665	-\$14,482	\$ 44,909	\$ 44,363	-\$546
Chester	\$ 217,227	\$ 28,120	\$ 210,900	-\$34,447	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0
Clarion	\$ 64,226	\$ 8,314	\$ 62,355	-\$10,185	\$ 18,708	\$ 18,803	\$ 95
Clearfield	\$ 159,676	\$ 20,670	\$ 155,025	-\$25,321	\$ 62,525	\$ 56,297	-\$6,228
Clinton	\$ 59,158	\$ 7,658	\$ 57,435	-\$9,381	\$ 29,421	\$ 22,888	-\$6,533
Columbia	\$ 75,968	\$ 9,834	\$ 73,755	-\$12,047	\$ 42,152	\$ 41,672	-\$480
Crawford	\$ 152,476	\$ 19,738	\$ 148,035	-\$24,179	\$ 59,823	\$ 53,342	-\$6,481
Cumberland	\$ 112,986	\$ 14,626	\$ 109,695	-\$17,917	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0
Dauphin	\$ 290,939	\$ 37,663	\$ 282,465	-\$46,136	\$ 117,945	\$ 111,125	-\$6,820
Delaware	\$ 579,777	\$ 75,053	\$ 562,891	-\$91,939	\$ 276,265	\$ 265,936	-\$10,329
Elk	\$ 44,311	\$ 5,736	\$ 43,020	-\$7,027	\$ 24,407	\$ 12,338	-\$12,069
Erie	\$ 482,627	\$ 62,477	\$ 468,571	-\$76,533	\$ 192,960	\$ 173,275	-\$19,685
Fayette	\$ 344,906	\$ 44,649	\$ 334,861	-\$54,694	\$ 97,202	\$ 89,348	-\$7,854
Forest	\$ 9,996	\$ 1,294	\$ 9,705	-\$1,585	\$ 6,717	\$ 3,417	-\$3,300
Franklin	\$ 115,551	\$ 14,958	\$ 112,186	-\$18,324	\$ 70,472	\$ 64,834	-\$5,638
Fulton	\$ 17,690	\$ 2,290	\$ 17,175	-\$2,805	\$ 9,474	\$ 4,745	-\$4,729
Greene	\$ 79,336	\$ 10,270	\$ 77,025	-\$12,581	\$ 21,002	\$ 19,763	-\$1,239
Huntingdon	\$ 70,019	\$ 9,064	\$ 67,980	-\$11,103	\$ 36,305	\$ 27,141	-\$9,164
Indiana	\$ 116,827	\$ 15,123	\$ 113,424	-\$18,526	\$ 50,794	\$ 46,980	-\$3,814
Jefferson	\$ 76,508	\$ 9,904	\$ 74,280	-\$12,132	\$ 27,627	\$ 25,297	-\$2,330
Juniata	\$ 20,672	\$ 2,676	\$ 20,070	-\$3,278	\$ 6,181	\$ 5,687	-\$494
Lackawanna	\$ 265,664	\$ 34,391	\$ 257,927	-\$42,128	\$ 113,282	\$ 107,116	-\$6,166
Lancaster	\$ 399,576	\$ 51,726	\$ 387,938	-\$63,363	\$ 196,328	\$ 179,430	-\$16,898
Lawrence	\$ 156,478	\$ 20,256	\$ 151,921	-\$24,814	\$ 53,347	\$ 48,862	-\$4,485
Lebanon	\$ 118,749	\$ 15,372	\$ 115,290	-\$18,831	\$ 50,608	\$ 45,173	-\$5,435
Lehigh	\$ 366,984	\$ 47,507	\$ 356,296	-\$58,195	\$ 328,983	\$ 307,777	-\$21,206
Luzerne	\$ 421,383	\$ 54,549	\$ 409,110	-\$66,821	\$ 191,054	\$ 183,006	-\$8,048
Lycoming	\$ 157,111	\$ 20,338	\$ 152,535	-\$24,914	\$ 71,148	\$ 67,684	-\$3,464
McKean	\$ 78,548	\$ 10,168	\$ 76,260	-\$12,456	\$ 25,443	\$ 23,942	-\$1,501
Mercer	\$ 186,200	\$ 24,104	\$ 180,777	-\$29,527	\$ 55,642	\$ 56,315	\$ 673
Mifflin	\$ 72,291	\$ 9,358	\$ 70,186	-\$11,464	\$ 33,881	\$ 29,231	-\$4,650
Monroe	\$ 169,796	\$ 21,980	\$ 164,851	-\$26,926	\$ 86,525	\$ 80,069	-\$6,456
Montgomery	\$ 411,727	\$ 53,299	\$ 399,736	-\$65,290	\$ 367,897	\$ 335,578	-\$32,319
Montour	\$ 20,379	\$ 2,638	\$ 19,785	-\$3,232	\$ 8,760	\$ 8,059	-\$701
Northampton	\$ 239,382	\$ 30,988	\$ 232,410	-\$37,960	*	*	*
Northumberland	\$ 109,571	\$ 14,184	\$ 106,380	-\$17,375	\$ 61,137	\$ 55,600	-\$5,537
Perry	\$ 43,028	\$ 5,570	\$ 41,775	-\$6,823	\$ 22,008	\$ 20,247	-\$1,761
Philadelphia	\$ 3,687,498	\$ 477,353	\$ 3,580,101	-\$584,750	\$ 992,796	\$ 941,628	-\$51,168
Pike	\$ 42,858	\$ 5,548	\$ 41,610	-\$6,796	\$ 12,586	\$ 11,579	-\$1,007
Potter	\$ 29,463	\$ 3,814	\$ 28,605	-\$4,672	\$ 12,546	\$ 11,764	-\$782
Schuylkill	\$ 179,992	\$ 23,300	\$ 174,750	-\$28,542	\$ 96,776	\$ 87,786	-\$8,990
Snyder	\$ 36,184	\$ 4,684	\$ 35,130	-\$5,738	\$ 12,797	\$ 11,773	-\$1,024
Somerset	\$ 116,338	\$ 15,060	\$ 112,950	-\$18,448	\$ 53,070	\$ 47,375	-\$5,695
Sullivan	\$ 8,405	\$ 1,088	\$ 8,160	-\$1,333	\$ 6,050	\$ 5,566	-\$484
Susquehanna	\$ 61,584	\$ 7,972	\$ 59,790	-\$9,766	\$ 26,775	\$ 23,000	-\$3,775
Tioga	\$ 56,902	\$ 7,366	\$ 55,245	-\$9,023	\$ 26,665	\$ 21,815	-\$4,850
Union	\$ 33,017	\$ 4,274	\$ 32,055	-\$5,236	\$ 12,232	\$ 11,253	-\$979
Venango	\$ 102,356	\$ 13,250	\$ 99,375	-\$16,231	\$ 29,995	\$ 28,911	-\$1,084
Warren	\$ 62,681	\$ 8,114	\$ 60,855	-\$9,940	\$ 27,404	\$ 13,856	-\$13,548
Washington	\$ 252,963	\$ 32,746	\$ 245,596	-\$40,114	\$ 71,724	\$ 65,986	-\$5,738
Wayne	\$ 61,692	\$ 7,986	\$ 59,895	-\$9,783	\$ 22,353	\$ 20,215	-\$2,138
Westmoreland	\$ 413,986	\$ 53,591	\$ 401,929	-\$65,648	\$ 121,136	\$ 111,445	-\$9,691
Wyoming	\$ 37,698	\$ 4,880	\$ 36,600	-\$5,978	\$ 17,480	\$ 16,082	-\$1,398
York	\$ 323,878	\$ 41,927	\$ 314,445	-\$51,359	\$ 194,533	\$ 175,271	-\$19,262
Total	\$ 15,449,787	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 14,999,817	-\$2,449,970	\$ 6,251,269	\$ 5,627,540	-\$623,729

* Northampton County FEMA funds are reflected in those shown for Lehigh.



208 N. Third Street
Suite 200
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Non Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Harrisburg, PA
Permit No. 647

5th Annual Strengthening the Food Resources Safety Net May 24-25, 2005, at the Wyndham Hershey-Harrisburg Hotel

Tuesday, May 24

Morning Speaker: "Nutrition Education Evaluations are FUN (Fantastic, Unique & New)" by Barbara Struempfer, Ph.D., Professor/Extension Nutritionist and Sondra Parmer, MS, Project Manager, Nutrition Education Program.

Lunch Speaker: "Which Way, America?" by nationally known columnist E.J. Dionne (invited), Brookings Institution, Washington D.C.

Wednesday, May 25

Morning Speaker: "Pennsylvania's Interagency Council on Food and Nutrition – An Update" by Cheryl Cook, Deputy Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.

Keynote Speaker: "America's Health Challenges: How We Can Make a Difference" by Dr. Calvin Johnson, Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Health.

Capitol Trip: Travel to the Capitol for two or three General Assembly visits.

Workshops offered include: "Beverages and Competitive Foods in Schools vs. School Wellness Policies", "Summer Food: A Opportunity for Rural Pennsylvania", "Improving Nutrition and Physical Activity through Social Marketing", "A Blueprint to End Hunger: Pennsylvania's Plan", "Prospects for Food and Nutrition Programs in the Next Administration", and "Physical Activity and Children".

Registration available soon! Check www.pahunger.org and www.panen.org for updated information!

THE PENNSYLVANIA HUNGER ADVOCATE

The Pennsylvania Hunger Advocate is made possible in part by a grant from the PA Department of Community and Economic Development. It is published six times a year by the

Pennsylvania Hunger Action Center

208 N. Third Street
Suite 200
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 233-6705

The Center is a nonprofit organization dedicated to eliminating the causes of hunger through advocacy, education and collaboration. Supporters of this work include food providers, growers, religious organizations, food industry members, advocates and consumers.

PA Hunger Action Staff:

Executive Director
Berry D. Friesen

Communications & Special Events
Sue N. Mitchem

Administrative Coordinator
Laura Tobin

Food Stamp Screener
Sonia Fernandez

Secretary
Margaret Kirk

Email: info@pahunger.org
Website: www.pahunger.org