



March 28, 2011

Extended Unemployment Benefits are Critical for Missouri Families and Missouri's Economy

Amy Blouin, Executive Director

Like nearly every state, Missouri is experiencing sustained high levels of unemployment due to the recession. In February, Missouri's unemployment rate stood at 9.4 percent, only very slightly below what it was one year ago.¹

The Unemployment Insurance (UI) system helps many of the people who have lost their jobs by temporarily replacing part of their wages. During recessions and while unemployment levels remain high, the U.S. Congress has historically stepped in and provided temporary, wholly federally funded extended UI benefits that provide workers who have been hardest hit by the recession with additional benefits.

In order to take advantage of the extended benefits for Missourians, the Missouri General Assembly must approve a technical change to Missouri statute. The legislation carrying that technical change is House Bill 163. Similar legislation was approved by Missouri lawmakers during the 2009 and 2010 state legislative sessions.

In the current legislative session, however, a small group of Missouri senators is preventing passage of the measure. **If the Missouri Senate fails to pass House Bill 163 this week, 9,767 Missourians will lose extended unemployment benefits on April 2nd and 56,667 additional Missourians will be impacted in the near future.** Failure to pass the bill also means that Missouri would forfeit as much as \$105 million in federally funded extended benefits that would be payable to the Missourians who have been hardest hit by the recession.²

Not only does this move impact tens of thousands of Missourians, it holds economic consequences. According to the Congressional Budget Office, "Households receiving unemployment benefits tend to spend the additional benefits quickly, making this option both timely and cost-effective in spurring economic activity and employment."³ CBO indicates that providing additional unemployment insurance benefits boosts economic activity and increases employment.

¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics; Missouri's Unemployment Rate was 9.6 percent in February 2010

² Missouri Department of Labor

³ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, "Emergency Unemployment Insurance Benefits Remain Critical for the Economy" November 2010

The number of Missourians impacted by county is included in the table, below. The table provides a column on the total impacted and the number of Missourians by County who are impacted by the April 2nd deadline.

Missouri Unemployment by County⁴				
County	Unemployment Rate (Feb. 2011)	Estimated Recipients (March 2011)		
		Regular UI	Extended Benefits Total	Extended Benefits Subject to April 2nd Deadline
Adair	8.2%	122	97	17
Andrew	8.6%	151	120	21
Atchison	8.2%	17	14	2
Audrain	9.1%	320	254	44
Barry	9.5%	274	218	38
Barton	11.0%	99	79	14
Bates	13.8%	136	108	19
Benton	12.2%	184	146	25
Bollinger	10.9%	122	97	17
Boone	6.4%	1,006	799	138
Buchanan	8.8%	895	711	123
Butler	8.7%	380	302	52
Caldwell	13.3%	101	80	14
Callaway	8.2%	405	322	55
Camden	15.2%	563	447	77
Cape Girardeau	7.9%	597	475	82
Carroll	12.9%	142	113	19
Carter	11.1%	70	56	10
Cass	11.0%	825	656	113
Cedar	8.9%	118	94	16
Chariton	10.6%	84	66	11
Christian	9.3%	919	730	126
Clark	11.0%	33	26	5
Clay	8.9%	1,930	1,534	264
Clinton	12.8%	170	135	23
Cole	7.4%	519	412	71
Cooper	10.4%	177	141	24
Crawford	12.7%	420	334	58

⁴ Missouri Department of Labor Data

Dade	9.6%	77	61	10
Dallas	11.0%	356	283	49
Daviess	11.5%	61	48	8
Dekalb	11.3%	79	63	11
Dent	11.2%	167	133	23
Douglas	9.9%	149	118	20
Dunklin	11.6%	301	239	41
Franklin	12.0%	2,074	1,648	284
Gasconade	11.8%	279	221	38
Gentry	7.7%	25	20	3
Greene	8.4%	3,277	2,604	449
Grundy	8.3%	73	58	10
Harrison	10.4%	46	36	6
Henry	10.9%	236	188	32
Hickory	13.1%	120	95	16
Holt	8.0%	23	18	3
Howard	9.2%	82	65	11
Howell	9.0%	474	377	65
Iron	11.8%	120	96	16
Jackson	10.8%	7,554	6,002	1,035
Jasper	8.3%	1,005	798	138
Jefferson	11.1%	4,079	3,241	559
Johnson	9.6%	430	341	59
Knox	7.1%	16	13	2
Laclede	12.3%	611	485	84
Lafayette	12.7%	300	238	41
Lawrence	8.8%	377	300	52
Lewis	9.0%	50	40	7
Lincoln	13.7%	1,004	798	138
Linn	13.6%	97	77	13
Livingston	9.5%	101	81	14
Macon	9.8%	149	118	20
Madison	10.7%	90	71	12
Maries	8.2%	378	301	52
Marion	8.9%	106	84	14
McDonald	9.1%	141	112	19
Mercer	8.6%	20	16	3
Miller	15.1%	372	296	51

Mississippi	10.9%	113	90	15
Moniteau	9.7%	107	85	15
Monroe	14.1%	135	107	18
Montgomery	12.1%	215	171	30
Morgan	15.0%	305	243	42
New Madrid	9.6%	168	133	23
Newton	8.8%	461	366	63
Nodaway	7.2%	82	65	11
Oregon	9.3%	76	60	10
Osage	7.3%	100	80	14
Ozark	10.6%	63	50	9
Pemiscot	10.7%	137	109	19
Perry	7.1%	142	112	19
Pettis	9.6%	401	319	55
Phelps	8.7%	314	250	43
Pike	9.7%	175	139	24
Platte	8.6%	657	522	90
Polk	10.3%	386	307	53
Pulaski	8.9%	178	142	24
Putnam	7.8%	27	22	4
Ralls	9.5%	118	93	16
Randolph	10.6%	377	299	52
Ray	12.8%	233	185	32
Reynolds	15.8%	100	80	14
Ripley	9.8%	130	103	18
Saline	9.0%	161	128	22
Schuyler	10.9%	21	16	3
Scotland	8.6%	8	7	1
Scott	9.9%	392	311	54
Shannon	17.1%	99	79	14
Shelby	9.6%	51	41	7
St Charles	8.7%	4,926	3,914	675
St Clair	12.1%	87	69	12
St Francois	12.1%	959	762	131
St Louis City	11.4%	5,063	4,023	693
St Louis County	8.9%	14,512	11,530	1,988
Ste Genevieve	11.3%	250	199	34
Stoddard	9.9%	337	268	46

Stone	19.9%	454	361	62
Sullivan	7.9%	32	25	4
Taney	22.0%	779	619	107
Texas	9.5%	209	166	29
Vernon	8.0%	111	88	15
Warren	12.0%	636	505	87
Washington	16.1%	505	402	69
Wayne	10.3%	113	89	15
Webster	9.9%	454	360	62
Worth	7.6%	16	13	2
Wright	10.5%	265	211	36
Missouri Total	9.4%	71,318	56,667	9,767

The Mission of the Missouri Budget Project is to advance public policies that improve economic opportunities for all Missourians, particularly low and middle income families, by providing reliable and objective research, analysis and advocacy. Contact the MBP through our website at www.mobudget.org