

May 9, 2018

U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative:

On behalf of the below 167 organizations dedicated to advancing the health, economic security, and opportunity of women and families and eradicating their barriers to success, we write to express our opposition to the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018 (H.R. 2). This bill's proposed changes to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) threaten the economic security of women and families by proposing restrictions on categorical eligibility, mandatory participation in the federal child support enforcement program, harsh expansions of work requirements, and increased paperwork for families and states.

Millions of people across the country face challenges in feeding their families.¹ Many people are just one job loss, one schedule downgrade, or one sickness away from needing SNAP to help feed their families. SNAP is critical in filling this need. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2016, SNAP served more than 44.2 million people in nearly 21.8 million households on average each month.² Half of children in the U.S. will receive SNAP at some point during childhood, and half of all adults will do so at some point between the ages of 20 and 65.³ SNAP is also essential to women, who make up 63 percent of SNAP adult recipients. SNAP serves a diverse group of people of every race, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, and disability status in rural, suburban, and urban areas of the United States.⁴

Congress should combat hunger and food insecurity by protecting and strengthening SNAP in a bipartisan Farm Bill. Yet, H.R. 2 abandons that bipartisan approach and contains harsh

¹ FOOD RES. & ACTION CTR., HOUSEHOLD FOOD INSECURITY RATES, 2014-2016, <http://frac.org/research/resource-library/household-food-insecurity-rates-2014-2016>.

² U.S. DEP'T OF AGRIC., CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM HOUSEHOLDS: FISCAL YEAR 2016 XV (Nov. 2017), available at <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/ops/Characteristics2016.pdf>.

³ FOOD RES. & ACTION CTR., THE ROLE OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN IMPROVING HEALTH AND WELL-BEING (Dec. 2017), available at <http://www.frac.org/wp-content/uploads/hunger-health-role-snap-improving-health-well-being.pdf>.

⁴ NAT'L WOMEN'S LAW CTR. & FOOD RES. & ACTION CTR., CUTTING FOOD ASSISTANCE IS A BAD DEAL FOR WOMEN AND FAMILIES 1 (May 2018), available at <https://nwlc.org/resources/cutting-food-assistance-is-a-bad-deal-for-women-and-families/> (providing FY 2016 data for women and children participation in SNAP and survey data for LGBT participation).

proposals that would lead to more than 2 million individuals losing SNAP benefits altogether or having them reduced.⁵

H.R. 2’s proposal to restrict categorical eligibility would cause some working women and families to lose access to SNAP, and would increase administrative burdens for many others.

H.R. 2 proposes a \$5 billion ten-year cut to SNAP food benefits by eliminating a state option (broad-based categorical eligibility) that allows states to adjust SNAP asset tests and to screen families with gross incomes slightly above 130 percent of the poverty line, who often have significant expenses like child care and housing, to determine if they qualify for a SNAP benefit. Many states have chosen this simplification option.⁶ The proposed change would take SNAP away from low-income working people with children, re-impose a “cliff effect” when they improve their earnings, eliminate their children’s direct connection to free school meals,⁷ and significantly increase states’ administrative costs and burdens.

H.R. 2’s proposal requiring single parents to participate in the federal child support enforcement program could harm single mothers, including survivors of domestic violence.

Currently, states decide whether or not SNAP recipients must participate in the federal child support enforcement program, and only a few states have adopted the option.⁸ Moreover, single parents, most of whom are mothers, often have good reasons for deciding not to engage with child support enforcement officials. Some who may receive support (whether through informal arrangements or divorce-related agreements) may not want to jeopardize their relationship with the noncustodial parent to pursue enforcement, especially if they know the other parent cannot pay. Moreover, some parents, including survivors of domestic violence, may decide that seeking a child support order and payment would put them or their children at risk. Taking SNAP benefits away from single parents who decide that pursuing child support enforcement is not in their family’s best interest asks them to make untenable choices between basic food assistance and, in some cases, their physical safety.

H.R. 2’s proposals to expand work requirements threaten particular harm to women and their families.

⁵ ED BOLEN ET AL., CTR. ON BUDGET AND POL’Y PRIORITIES, CHAIRMAN CONAWAY’S FARM BILL WOULD INCREASE FOOD INSECURITY AND HARDSHIP (updated Apr. 18, 2018), <https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/4-16-18fa.pdf>.

⁶ U.S. DEP’T OF AGRIC., BROAD-BASED CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY (Feb. 2018), available at <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/snap/BBCE.pdf>.

⁷ See FOOD RES. & ACTION CTR., SNAP AND SCHOOL MEALS, available at <http://www.frac.org/wp-content/uploads/snap-categorical-eligibility-and-school-meals.pdf>.

⁸ BOLEN, *supra* note 5, at 16.

The majority of adult SNAP recipients who can work, do work.⁹ And SNAP already contains work requirements. The statute requires all working-age adults (with limited exceptions) to register for work and accept a job if offered.¹⁰ In addition, individuals aged 18 to 49 who are not students, pregnant, caring for a child or family member who is “incapacitated,” and do not have a disability cannot receive SNAP for more than three months in a 36-month period if they do not work or participate in a work training program for at least 20 hours a week.¹¹ Furthermore, states can go further than the statute and impose tougher work requirements (up to 30 hours per week) on most adult SNAP recipients and cut off benefits, including those for children in the household, for people who do not meet the requirements.¹²

It is already challenging for many unemployed or underemployed workers to meet SNAP’s current time limits. Women are overrepresented in the low-wage workforce,¹³ which is plagued by unstable and unpredictable work schedules, nonstandard hours,¹⁴ part-time work,¹⁵ and few benefits like paid sick leave.¹⁶ Women are also especially vulnerable to discrimination and harassment at work,¹⁷ which can result in lost hours or job loss.¹⁸ Domestic violence survivors

⁹ CTR. ON BUDGET AND POL’Y PRIORITIES, CHART BOOK: SNAP HELPS STRUGGLING FAMILIES PUT FOOD ON THE TABLE (Feb. 14, 2018), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/chart-book-snap-helps-struggling-families-put-food-on-the-table>.

¹⁰ 7 U.S.C. § 2015(d) (2018).

¹¹ 7 U.S.C. § 2015(o) (2018).

¹² BOLEN, *supra* note 5, at 4.

¹³ JASMINE TUCKER & KAYLA PATRICK, NAT’L WOMEN’S LAW CTR., LOW-WAGE JOBS ARE WOMEN’S JOBS: THE OVERREPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN LOW-WAGE WORK 2 (Aug. 2017), available at <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Low-Wage-Jobs-are-Womens-Jobs.pdf>.

¹⁴ See generally JULIE VOGTMAN & JASMINE TUCKER, NAT’L WOMEN’S LAW CTR., COLLATERAL DAMAGE: SCHEDULING CHALLENGES FOR WORKERS IN LOW-WAGE JOBS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES (April 2017), available at <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Collateral-Damage.pdf>.

¹⁵ In March 2018, 11.5 percent of women working part-time did so involuntarily. Nat’l Women’s Law Ctr. calculations based on U.S. DEP’T OF LABOR, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY, TABLE A-18 EMPLOYED AND UNEMPLOYED FULL- AND PART-TIME WORKERS BY AGE, SEX, RACE, AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ETHNICITY, available at <https://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/cpseea18.htm>. Involuntary part-time work is especially common in some low-wage sectors, such as retail work. DANIEL SCHNEIDER & KRISTEN HARKNETT, WASH. CTR. FOR EQUITABLE GROWTH, SCHEDULE INSTABILITY AND UNPREDICTABILITY AND WORKER AND FAMILY HEALTH AND WELLBEING 16 (Sept. 2016), available at <http://equitablegrowth.org/working-papers/schedule-instability-and-unpredictability/>. In addition, many who choose to work part-time voluntarily, especially women, choose to work part-time because they cannot access affordable child care. TUCKER & PATRICK, *supra* note 13, at 8.

¹⁶ KATHERINE GALLAGHER ROBBINS & JULIE VOGTMAN, NAT’L WOMEN’S LAW CTR., LOW-WAGE JOBS HELD PRIMARILY BY WOMEN WILL GROW THE MOST OVER THE NEXT DECADE (Apr. 2016), available at <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Low-Wage-Jobs-Held-Primarily-by-Women-Will-Grow-the-Most-Over-the-Next-Decade.pdf>.

¹⁷ See, e.g., REST. OPPORTUNITIES CTRS. UNITED & FORWARD TOGETHER, THE GLASS FLOOR: SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY 5 (2014), available at http://rocunited.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/REPORT_The-Glass-Floor-Sexual-Harassment-in-the-Restaurant-Industry2.pdf; HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH, CULTIVATING FEAR: THE VULNERABILITY OF IMMIGRANT FARMWORKERS IN THE US TO SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT (May 2012), available at <https://www.hrw.org/report/2012/05/15/cultivating-fear/vulnerability-immigrant-farmworkers-us-sexual-violence-and-sexual> (documenting pervasive sexual harassment and violence among immigrant farmworker

also face challenges obtaining and maintaining employment because abusers may ruin the survivor's credit score and rental history, sabotage transportation and child care arrangements, and steal or control assets.¹⁹ Despite these significant obstacles facing low-wage working women, H.R. 2 would expand work requirements in ways that would further penalize women across the country who are trying to feed their families and find quality work.

Including people aged 50 to 59 years old in the work requirements will hurt older women.

H.R. 2's proposal to impose stricter work requirements for people aged 50 to 59 years old would be particularly harmful for older women, who face longer periods of unemployment. In March 2018, 23 percent of unemployed women aged 45 to 54 years and 31 percent of unemployed women aged 55 to 64 years had been unemployed for six months or more (compared to 22 percent for unemployed women aged 20 to 64 years old).²⁰ Subjecting women aged 50 to 59 years old to a work requirement will lead to families losing SNAP benefits and increased food insecurity.

Including parents with children aged six and older in the work requirements will harm families.

H.R. 2 proposes imposing stricter work requirements for parents caring for a child six or older. But parents with school-aged children also have significant caregiving responsibilities, including during afterschool hours and school vacations, and when medical emergencies arise. Especially if they are employed in the low-wage workforce, it would be challenging for these parents to consistently meet H.R. 2's proposed work requirements. Imposing work requirements on

women); IRMA MORALES WAUGH, EXAMINING THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCES OF MEXICAN IMMIGRANT FARMWORKING WOMEN, 16 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 237, 241 (Jan. 2010), *available at* <http://vaw.sagepub.com/content/16/3/237.abstract> (80 percent of female farmworkers in California's Central Valley reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment); UNITE HERE LOCAL 1, HANDS OFF, PANTS ON: SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN CHICAGO'S HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY (July 2016), *available at* <https://www.handsoffpantson.org/wp-content/uploads/HandsOffReportWeb.pdf> (58 percent of hotel workers and 77 percent of casino workers surveyed reported being sexually harassed by a guest); HART RESEARCH ASSOC., KEY FINDINGS FROM A SURVEY OF WOMEN FAST FOOD WORKERS (Oct. 5, 2016), *available at* <http://hartresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Fast-Food-Worker-Survey-Memo-10-5-16.pdf> (nationwide survey of workers in the fast food industry found nearly 40 percent of the women reported experiencing unwanted sexual behaviors on the job, and 21 percent of those workers reported that they suffered negative workplaces consequences after raising the harassment with their employer).

¹⁸ NAT'L WOMEN'S LAW CTR., SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE (Nov. 2016), *available at* <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Sexual-Harassment-Fact-Sheet.pdf>.

¹⁹ INSTITUTE FOR WOMEN'S POLICY RESEARCH, THE ECONOMIC COST OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING (Aug. 2017), <https://iwpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/B367-Economic-Impacts-of-IPV-08.14.17.pdf>.

²⁰ Nat'l Women's Law Ctr. calculations based on U.S. DEP'T OF LABOR, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, LABOR FORCE STATISTICS FROM THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY, TABLE A-36 (last accessed Apr. 18, 2018), *available at* <https://www.bls.gov/web/empsit/cpseea36.htm> [hereinafter NWLC calculations based on Labor Force Statistics].

parents of school-aged children will likely lead to more families with children losing their food assistance, which will negatively impact children's development and health.

Increasing the weekly hours requirement will increase food insecurity.

As described above, the nature of low-wage jobs already makes it challenging to meet SNAP's current work requirement. Therefore, H.R. 2's proposal to increase the number of hours from 20 to 25 per week could lead to more women and families losing their SNAP benefits.

Creating harsher time limits and sanctions will make more families lose SNAP benefits.

H.R. 2 proposes an unforgiving work requirement that would threaten to take food off families' tables if individuals are unable to meet the work requirement in a single month. In addition, the initial sanction for failing to meet work requirements within a month would be a one-year bar from receiving SNAP benefits, unless the individual later gains employment for 20 hours a week or qualifies for an exemption. Subsequent failures would result in a three-year bar. The one-month time limit will have an especially harsh impact on women, given that unemployed women age 16 and older experienced a median period of unemployment that was more than twice that amount of time (9.6 weeks) in March 2018.²¹ Consequently, in many cases, unemployed women are almost guaranteed to exceed the time limit and face sanctions.

H.R.2's Employment and Training proposal will not help people find work—it will just increase hunger.

In an attempt to mitigate the impact of the expanded work requirements and harsher time limits and sanctions, H.R. 2 provides additional funding for SNAP's Employment and Training (E&T) programs and purports to guarantee a job training slot to anyone subject to the SNAP work requirement. However, H.R. 2's E&T proposal is set up to fail. It is underfunded, establishes unrealistic time frames, and it cuts SNAP benefits. The end result is that instead of gaining skills and quality jobs, millions of families will risk losing their SNAP benefits under this proposal.

In order to meet the proposal's guarantee of a training slot for all those subjected to the SNAP work requirement who are not working 20 hours per week, about three million slots each month in job training programs would need to be available.²² However, states would likely be

²¹ NWLC calculations based on Labor Force Statistics. Unemployed women ages 55-64 experienced a longer median duration of unemployment (13.6 weeks). *Id.*

²² BOLEN, *supra* note 5, at 9-11.

unable to leverage their existing employment training systems, which are much smaller in scope²³ and already severely underfunded, to serve the three million additional people every month.

From the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, we know that mandatory work programs can be quite costly, due to the need for monitoring and verifying participation. In 2016, the median state spent nearly \$5,000 on work activities and monitoring for each mandatory TANF participant.²⁴ If SNAP E&T programs were similarly costly, \$15 billion in investments each year would be required to serve the three million additional people who would be subject to H.R. 2's new work requirements.²⁵ The funding proposed in H.R. 2, however, amounts to only \$30 per month per participant, which is vastly inadequate to ensure those who would be subject to the proposed expanded work requirements would receive quality job training services. Moreover, the E&T funding in H.R. 2 would be financed by SNAP benefit cuts—a terrible tradeoff where SNAP benefits are cut for some families to finance unworkable and untested²⁶ E&T programs for other families.

In sum, the expanded work requirements proposed in H.R. 2 will not help women find quality jobs any faster; they will just take away food assistance and therefore increase hunger for more women and families.

H.R. 2's proposals to increase paperwork burdens will have harmful ripple effects.

H.R. 2 contains several proposals that will increase paperwork requirements for families, who are struggling to feed their families and find quality work, and states, which will need to process the additional paperwork and track compliance with the expanded work requirements. Creating

²³ Nationwide, the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Adult Program job training served only 153,000 people in 2015 and TANF provided education or job training to only 36,000 TANF recipients in 2016. BOLEN, *supra* note 5, at 8.

²⁴ LADONNA PAVETTI, CTR. ON BUDGET AND POL'Y PRIORITIES, MANDATORY WORK PROGRAMS ARE COSTLY, HAVE LIMITED LONG-TERM IMPACT (Apr. 12, 2018), <https://www.cbpp.org/blog/mandatory-work-programs-are-costly-have-limited-long-term-impact>.

²⁵ BOLEN, *supra* note 5, at 8. A more robust and effective training program could cost \$7,500 to \$14,000 annually per participant. LADONNA PAVETTI, CTR. ON BUDGET AND POL'Y PRIORITIES, OPPORTUNITY-BOOSTING JOB PREPAREDNESS TAKES SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT, EVIDENCE SHOWS (Apr. 12, 2018), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/opportunity-boosting-job-preparedness-takes-significant-investment>.

²⁶ There are evidence-based state demonstration projects testing SNAP employment services, but they were not all operational until April 2016. U.S. DEP'T OF AGRIC., EVALUATION OF SNAP EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PILOTS: FISCAL YEAR 2017 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS 5, *available at* <https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/snap/SNAP-E-and-T-Report-Congress-FY2017.pdf>. Results from these studies will not be available for a few years. H.R. 2's two-year time window would preclude states from being able to use lessons learned from those projects to develop their E&T programs.

higher administrative burdens increases the chances that families struggling to feed their families will lose their access to SNAP.

For example, H.R. 2 proposes to eliminate a valuable connection between the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) and SNAP. LIHEAP helps an estimated 6.3 million households heat their homes.²⁷ Currently, states have the flexibility to use a Standard Utility Allowance for households receiving LIHEAP benefits, instead of requiring each of those households to provide documentation of their utility costs in order to receive the utility cost income deduction. This deduction helps families receive higher SNAP benefits, recognizing the need for families to heat their homes and eat. H.R. 2 proposes to eliminate this LIHEAP-SNAP connection for households without an elderly member, resulting in an extra burden upon those households to provide documentation for their utility cost before receiving a deduction. This will increase the paperwork burden for families struggling to make ends meet, lead to more paperwork for states to process, and cut SNAP benefits by an estimated \$5.3 billion over ten years.²⁸

In addition, SNAP already contains paperwork requirements that can harm people with disabilities. Though the existing work requirements include an exemption for people with documented medical conditions, too many state agencies fail to help individuals prove they are exempt, even if they have difficulty obtaining the necessary records or verification from a doctor. Consequently, this exemption does not consistently protect this population from the harsh consequences of the current three-month time limit. Subjecting more people to work requirements and increasing the amount and frequency of paperwork required to demonstrate their exemption eligibility will place SNAP benefits at risk for many families.

Furthermore, studies evaluating work requirements in the TANF program found that sanctions commonly occurred because of paperwork glitches and hard-to-navigate requirements.²⁹ Unfortunately, the work requirement proposals in H.R. 2 create a large risk of similar consequences—families could be locked out of their SNAP benefits for one year, then three

²⁷ DEP'T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., ADMIN. FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES, LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, REPORT TO CONGRESS 2014, at vi (Dec. 2016), *available at* https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ocs/fy14_liheap_rtc_final.pdf.

²⁸ Letter from Cong. Budget Off. to Rep. Michael Conaway, Table 2 – Details of Increases and Decreases in Direct Spending and Revenues of H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018, As Introduced on April 12, 2018 (Apr. 13, 2018), *available at* <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/115th-congress-2017-2018/costestimate/hr2.pdf>.

²⁹ *See, e.g.*, JUNE GIBBS BROWN, OFF. OF THE INSPECTOR GEN., DEP'T OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVS., TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES: EDUCATING CLIENTS ABOUT SANCTIONS (Oct. 1999), *available at* <https://oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-09-98-00291.pdf>; JUNE GIBBS BROWN, OFF. OF THE INSPECTOR GEN., DEP'T OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVS., TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES: IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF CLIENT SANCTIONS (July 1999), *available at* <https://oig.hhs.gov/oei/reports/oei-09-98-00290.pdf>; ANDREW J. CHERLIN ET AL., OPERATING WITHIN THE RULES: WELFARE RECIPIENTS' EXPERIENCES WITH SANCTIONS AND CASE CLOSINGS, 76 SOC. SERV. REV. 387 (2002).

years, because of increased paperwork requirements associated with work requirements. Increasing bureaucratic red tape does not help get more people quality jobs—it will only increase food insecurity.

Instead of seeking to prevent women and families from getting the food assistance they need, Congress should combat hunger by protecting and strengthening SNAP.

As a nation, we should fight hunger by helping families struggling to make ends meet and put food on the table. Congress should increase SNAP benefits so fewer families have to choose between food and other necessities, as well as invest in workers and families in order to help families attain economic self-sufficiency. Expanding harsh work requirements, cutting SNAP benefits, and increasing paperwork burdens on states and families struggling to find quality work, put food on the table, and pay for other necessities will undermine, not increase, families' economic self-sufficiency. We urge you to vote NO on H.R. 2.

Sincerely,

State/Local Organizations

YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley
YWCA Silicon Valley

Alabama

YWCA Central Alabama

Colorado

Jewish Family Service of Colorado

Arizona

Arizona YWCA Metropolitan Phoenix
Northern Arizona Council of Governments

Connecticut

YWCA Hartford Region
YWCA New Britain

California

4Cs of Alameda County
California Child Care Resource and Referral Network
Fremont Family Resource Center
Legal Aid at Work
Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health
Mercy Brown Bag Program
Pacifica's Environmental Family Pathways LA
Western Center on Law and Poverty

Florida

Farmworker Association of Florida
Your Plate Health & Wellness Center

Hawaii

YWCA O'ahu

Illinois

Community Organizing and Family Issues (COFI)

Parents Organized to Win, Educate and
Renew - Policy Action Council - Illinois
(POWER-PAC Illinois)

YWCA Elgin
YWCA Kankakee
YWCA of the Sauk Valley
YWCA of the University of Illinois

Indiana

Indiana Alliance for Retired Americans
Indiana Institute for Working Families
Marian University
Middle Way House
YWCA Muncie

Iowa

YWCA of Black Hawk County, Waterloo, IA

Maine

Maine Women's Lobby
YWCA of Mount Desert Island

Maryland

Maryland National Organization for Women
Montgomery County Community Action
Board
Public Justice Center

Massachusetts

YWCA Boston
YWCA Cambridge
YWCA Central Mass., Inc.
YWCA of Lowell

Michigan

Housing Services Mid Michigan
YWCA Kalamazoo

Minnesota

Lutheran Social Service

Missouri

Empower Missouri
Healthy Nevada

New Jersey

Anti-Poverty Network of New Jersey
God's Army Ministries of NJ

New York

City Harvest
Congregation Rodeph Sholom
Food For All
Greater Rochester Community of Churches,
Inc.
Kids R Kids Feeding Program, Inc.
Network of Religious Communities Food
Pantry
New York Paid Leave Coalition
Sisters of Mercy
Urban Pathways
YWCA Binghamton & Broome County
YWCA NorthEastern New York

North Dakota

United Way of Grand Forks, EGF & Area
YWCA Cass Clay

Ohio

YWCA Alliance
YWCA Columbus
YWCA Dayton
YWCA Mahoning Valley
YWCA of Van Wert County

Oregon

Family Promise of Washington County

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania Council of Churches
Sisters of Saint Joseph of Chestnut Hill,
Philadelphia, PA
Women's Law Project
YWCA Westmoreland County

Rhode Island

Blackstone Valley Community Action Program
YWCA Rhode Island

South Carolina

Harvest Hope Food Bank
South Carolina Appleseed Legal Justice Center
YWCA of the Upper Lowland, Inc.

Tennessee

NOAH

Texas

Education Equals Making Community
Connections
Texas These Are They
UUFHC

Utah

YWCA Utah

Vermont

Hunger Free Vermont
Vermont Network Against Domestic & Sexual
Violence

Washington

El Centro de la Raza

YWCA Clark County

YWCA Olympia

YWCA of Spokane

Wisconsin

YWCA Madison

Regional Organizations/State Coalitions

Family Values@Work
Washington-Virginia District, CME Church
YWCA National Capital Area

National Organizations

National Women's Law Center

9to5, National Association of Working
Women
A Better Balance
Alianza Nacional de Campesinas
American Federation of State, County, and
Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
American Federation of Teachers
American Psychological Association
Asset Building Strategies
Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network
for Healthy Families and Communities
Center for Community Change Action
Center for Law and Social Policy
Center for Popular Democracy Action
Coalition of Labor Union Women
Coalition on Human Needs
Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the
Good Shepherd, US Provinces
Daily Kos
Division for Early Childhood of the Council for
Exceptional Children (DEC)

Equal Rights Advocates
Every Child Matters
Families USA
Feminist Majority
Food Research & Action Center (FRAC)
Friends of the Earth
Futures Without Violence
Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization
of America, Inc.
Health Care for America Now
Hispanic Federation
In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's
Reproductive Justice Agenda
Justice in Aging
Labor Project for Working Families in
partnership with FV@W
LIFT
MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
MomsRising
Movement Advancement Project
NAACP
National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the
Good Shepherd
National Asian Pacific American Women's
Forum (NAPAWF)
National Association of Counsel for Children
National Association of Social Workers
National Center for Law and Economic Justice
National Center for Lesbian Rights
National Coalition for the Homeless
National Council of Jewish Women
National Domestic Workers Alliance
National Employment Law Project
National Health Law Program
National Institute for Reproductive Health
National Latina Institute for Reproductive
Health

National Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade
Association
National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund
National Low Income Housing Coalition
National Organization for Women
National Partnership for Women & Families
National WIC Association
National Women's Health Network
NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice
Peace and Justice Team of Congregation of
Saint Joseph
PFLAG National
Phenomenal Woman Action Campaign
Planned Parenthood Federation of America
Poligon Education Fund
Prosperity Now
Restaurant Opportunities Centers United
Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty
Law
Sexuality Information and Education Council
of the United States (SIECUS)
Sikh American Legal Defense and Education
Fund
Sisters of the Holy Cross
Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed
Virgin Mary
Social Security Works
The Employee Rights Advocacy Institute For
Law & Policy
The National Crittenton Foundation
United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness
Ministries
Voices for Progress
Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement
(WISER)
Woodstock Institute
YWCA USA