

Food Hardship in America: A Look at National, Regional, State, and Metropolitan Statistical Area Data on Household Struggles With Hunger

August 2018

Introduction

“Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed?” That question is part of a survey conducted by Gallup as part of the Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index; 337,690 households participated in 2016–2017.¹

This analysis of the Gallup data by the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) looks at the rates at which Americans answered “yes” to this question nationally, regionally, at the state level, and at the local level (by Metropolitan Statistical Area, or MSA) in 2016 and 2017. The report looks at rates overall, and then separately for households with children and households without children.

Key Findings

- After several years of fairly continuous improvement (reductions) in the food hardship rate as the nation recovered from the recession (e.g., the national rate fell in 2014, 2015, and 2016), the food hardship rate rose from 15.1 percent in 2016 to 15.7 percent in 2017.
- Households with children are particularly vulnerable to hunger — their food hardship rate nationally is approximately one-third higher than the rate for households without children, and jumped to 18.4 percent in 2017, from 17.5 percent in 2016.
- In every part of the nation, substantial numbers of households are struggling with hunger. At least 1 in 7 households suffered from food hardship in 2016–2017 in 24 states and the District of Columbia; and in 63 out of 108 MSAs in the study.

- The Southwest region (as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food and Nutrition Service, or FNS) overtook the Southeast region in 2017 as the region with the highest rate of food hardship.

The rise in the national rate in 2017 is significant. After the height of the recession, the national food hardship rate had fallen from nearly 18.9 percent in 2013 to 15.1 percent in 2016.

National Food Hardship Rate by Year for all Households, 2008–2017

Year	Food Hardship Rate
2008	17.8%
2009	18.3%
2010	18.0%
2011	18.6%
2012	18.2%
2013	18.9%
2014	17.2%
2015	16.0%
2016	15.1%
2017	15.7%

As the economy continued to recover from the Great Recession, however, tens of millions of Americans still were being left behind by the failure of the economy to provide family-supporting wages and the failure of Congress and the states to respond with adequately robust initiatives to boost jobs, wages, and public programs for struggling individuals and families.

¹ Slightly fewer households — 336,980 — answered the food hardship question.

Reflecting these problems in 2017, the food hardship rate increased. This was not a phenomenon of a particular point in the year. Each of the last three quarters in 2017 had a higher rate than any quarter in 2016 (see chart on page 3).

The nation's unemployment rate continued to fall in 2017, but wages were largely stagnant, and safety net supports [e.g., the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Medicaid, Affordable Care Act premium subsidies] were under attack.

The resulting inability of people to consistently afford enough food for their household ultimately harms children, working-age adults, people with disabilities, and seniors. It harms health, learning, and productivity; and it drives up health care and other costs for families, employers, and government.

Food hardship is a serious national problem that requires a serious national response. Yet, as the data show, the country continues to fail to grapple seriously with food hardship and poverty, despite the harm they do and despite available solutions.

The nation has an unacceptable long-term food hardship problem. Yet, Americans do not always recognize how pervasive struggles against hunger are, or that hunger is a problem where they live. In American communities, hunger often is hidden by individuals or families that do not want to share with their neighbors the fact that they are struggling economically. Sometimes hunger hides behind doors of nice houses with mortgages in default, or the heat turned off, or all of the income going to housing costs, leaving little or no money for food. Sometimes it hides behind the stoic faces of parents or grandparents who skip meals to protect their children or grandchildren from hunger. It goes unseen by those not looking for it.

In a poll conducted for Tyson Foods and FRAC, two-thirds of Americans rated hunger as a worse problem at the national level than at their community level, but what the food hardship data in this report underscore is that significant numbers of Americans in every region, every state, and every community are struggling against hunger.

Data in This Report

The report and the appendices contain food hardship data

- for the nation by year, quarter, and month, since 2008 (Appendix A);

- for the FNS regions by year, since 2008 (Appendix B);
- for all states and the District of Columbia for 2016 and 2017, with the states listed alphabetically, and, separately, by ranking (Appendix C); and
- for the 108 MSAs represented in the 2016–2017 Gallup data, listed alphabetically and by ranking (Appendix D).

In addition, the report contains data on food hardship rates for households with children and households without children, as well as the ratios between those rates. These data appear alongside the overall rates in the appendices listed above.

Because Gallup's survey involves interviewing so many households year-round, it has several key, unusual characteristics:


- 1) large sample sizes that allow estimation of food hardship at the state level and at the MSA level;
- 2) weighted data that are representative of the nation, regions, states, and MSAs; and
- 3) a large enough national sample size to allow monthly and quarterly analyses of the food hardship rate. (Technical notes on the sample size and methodology appear at the end of the report.)

Food Hardship in the Nation

Nationally in 2017, 15.7 percent of respondents reported food hardship. This is up from the 15.1 percent rate in 2016.


A look at the data by year and by quarter (see Appendix A) provides a detailed picture of what has happened: the food hardship rate increased at the beginning of the recession, then it slowly and somewhat erratically trended down after that, with the sharpest sustained drops in 2014 and 2015. Specifically, the food hardship rate was 16.4 percent in the first quarter of 2008, and then increased rapidly over the next three quarters to 19.6 percent as the impacts of the Great Recession widened and deepened. In the ensuing four-and-a-half years, as the modest recovery began (from 2009 through the first three quarters of 2013), the rate varied between 17.5 percent and 19.7 percent. It was not until 2014 that the rate dipped below 17.5 percent — and it did so for every quarter in that year. The food hardship rate continued to fall in 2015 and 2016, and was below 15.5 percent in each of the four quarters of 2016.

But then in 2017, the rate rose and approached 16 percent in the last three quarters of the year. The rate now is barely below early 2008 levels.



Food Hardship by Region

In the regions as defined by FNS, rates of food hardship in 2017 were highest in the Southwest Region (19.3 percent), with the Southeast Region (17.1 percent) the second worst, and all other regions at 15 percent or lower. The Southwest region includes Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.



Appendix B shows the rates for each region for each year from 2008–2017.

Food Hardship in States

Rates of food hardship in 2017 varied from a low of 8 percent in North Dakota to a high of 22 percent in Mississippi.

Mississippi may have the worst rate among states, with an extraordinary 1 in 5 households reporting food hardship, but food hardship is a significant problem in every state — even North Dakota’s 1 in 12 is hardly acceptable. Nearly half of the states — 24 — plus the District of Columbia had at least 1 in 7 respondent households (14.3 percent or more) answer in 2016–2017 that they did not have enough money to buy food at some point in the past 12 months.

The 20 States With the Worst Food Hardship Rates in 2016–2017

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Mississippi	22.0%	1
Louisiana	21.3%	2
West Virginia	20.3%	3
Alabama	19.7%	4
Arkansas	19.5%	5
Oklahoma	19.1%	6
South Carolina	18.3%	7
New Mexico	17.7%	8
Georgia	17.3%	9
Nevada	17.1%	10
Arizona	17.1%	11
Kentucky	17.0%	12
Tennessee	16.8%	13
Texas	16.7%	14
Florida	16.6%	15
Rhode Island	16.4%	16
North Carolina	16.4%	17
Ohio	16.2%	18
Delaware	15.9%	19
Indiana	15.8%	20

Of the 20 states with the worst rates, eight were in the Southeast region and five were in the Southwest.

Data for all 50 states and the District of Columbia are in two tables in Appendix C, listed alphabetically and ranked by food hardship rate.

Food Hardship in MSAs

MSAs are Census Bureau-defined areas that include central cities plus the surrounding counties with strong economic and social ties to the central cities. In looking at MSA food hardship rates, FRAC aggregated 2016 and

2017 data to produce more accurate estimates and smaller margins of error.

While there was variation around the country, the inability to purchase adequate food was a serious problem in every MSA.

Of the 108 MSAs represented in the Gallup survey in 2016 and 2017,

- 63 had at least 1 in 7 (14.3 percent or more) respondent households answer that they did not have enough money to buy needed food at times in the past 12 months; and
- 86 had at least 1 in 8 (12.5 percent or more) households affirmatively answer that they struggle to afford food.

The worst MSAs are: Bakersfield, CA; Youngstown-Warren-Boardman OH/PA; Fresno, CA; Jackson, MS; New Orleans-Metairie, LA; Memphis, TN-MS-AR; and Winston-Salem, NC.

Of the 20 MSAs with the highest rates, 10 were in the FNS Southeast region (including four in Florida); seven in the Southwest region; three in the West; and one in the Midwest.

The 20 MSAs With the Worst Food Hardship Rates in 2016–2017

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Bakersfield, CA	23.2%	1
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	22.0%	2
Fresno, CA	22.0%	3
Jackson, MS	21.3%	4
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	21.1%	5
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	20.7%	6
Winston-Salem, NC	20.2%	7
Baton Rouge, LA	20.1%	8
Albuquerque, NM	20.0%	9
Columbia, SC	19.5%	10
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	19.4%	11
Tulsa, OK	19.3%	12
El Paso, TX	19.2%	13
Greensboro-High Point, NC	19.2%	14
Oklahoma City, OK	19.2%	15
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	19.1%	16
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	18.8%	17
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	18.4%	18
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	18.3%	19
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	18.2%	20

See Appendix D for MSA data, with MSAs listed alphabetically and then by food hardship rank.

Households With Children and Without Children

In this section, FRAC looks at the data separately for households with children and households without children, and the relative rates between them. Given how high child poverty rates are, compared to poverty rates for households without children, it is unsurprising that the food hardship rate is considerably higher in households with children. The difference, however, underscores how much harm America is causing to its children because of the poverty and hunger rates they suffer. In some states and MSAs, the gap is remarkably large; only in a few is it quite small.

National Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

As indicated earlier, food hardship rose nationally from 2016 to 2017. This was true for both households with children and households without children. But the households with children rate rose considerably more — by nearly a full percentage point.

National Rates of Food Hardship for Households With and Without Children, 2016 and 2017

Year	Households With Children	Households Without Children
2016	17.5%	13.7%
2017	18.4%	14.1%

In 2017, the national food hardship rate for households with children was almost one-third higher than that for households without children. At 18.4 percent, nearly 1 in 5 households with children said there were times in 2017 when they did not have enough money to buy needed food. This represents progress from the recession years' rates, but represents as well a deep indictment of the “normal” levels of child poverty and hunger when the economy is generally strong.

Regional Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

The Southwest Region, which (as indicated earlier) had the highest overall food hardship rate, also had the highest rate by far for households with children in 2017 — 21.8 percent. From 2009 through 2015, the Southeast rate was the worst among the regions, but in 2016 and 2017, the Southwest overtook it (19.3 percent versus 17.1 percent).

When comparing rates for households with children to those without, however, the Northeast region had the biggest gap, with the households with children rate being 1.5 times higher (Appendix B, Table B.4). The Northeast's rate for households without children was close to the lowest among regions, but its rate for households with children was the third highest.

Food Hardship Rate Among Households With Children, by Region,¹ by Year, 2008–2017

Region	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mid-Atlantic	20.6%	20.9%	20.4%	20.9%	20.5%	21.5%	19.0%	17.9%	16.1%	18.1%
Midwest	22.8%	23.4%	21.5%	22.4%	21.2%	21.8%	19.7%	17.9%	16.4%	17.5%
Mountain Plains	21.0%	21.3%	21.2%	21.1%	19.7%	20.5%	17.4%	15.8%	14.9%	15.8%
Northeast	20.5%	20.4%	20.5%	20.9%	20.4%	22.4%	20.1%	20.1%	17.1%	18.5%
Southeast	25.5%	27.8%	27.0%	27.4%	25.6%	26.4%	23.2%	21.8%	19.7%	19.6%
Southwest	26.0%	26.3%	26.3%	26.6%	25.5%	25.5%	22.9%	20.1%	20.5%	21.8%
West	23.2%	25.1%	24.2%	24.4%	24.1%	23.2%	21.0%	17.4%	16.6%	17.1%

¹Regions are as defined by U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service.

State Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

In 2016–2017,

- Ten states and the District of Columbia had at least 1 in 5 households with children that struggled with food hardship. (See Appendix C, Table, C.3.)
- Only 12 states had rates below 15 percent for households with children, while 38 states had rates below 15 percent for households without children. (See Appendix C, Table C.1.)
- Nine of the 15 states with the worst food hardship rates for households with children were in the Southeast and Southwest (using definitions of regions from FNS). (See the top-right table on this page.)
- In seven states and the District of Columbia, the food hardship rate for households with children was at least half again higher than the rate for households without children. (See the bottom-right table on this page.)
- Only in North Dakota was the food hardship rate of households with children lower than for other households. (See Appendix C, Table C.2.)

State Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

Food Hardship Rate	Number of States	
	Households With Children	Households Without Children
20% or Higher	11	—
15 - <20%	28	13
10 - <15%	11	34
1 - <10%	1	4

The charts on the right show the 15 states with the worst food hardship rates among households with children, and then the 15 states with the worst ratio of food hardship in households with children compared to food hardship in

other households. The appendices present these data about households with and without children for all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

15 States With the Worst Food Hardship Rates Among Households With Children

State	Rate: Households With Children
Mississippi	25.8%
Louisiana	24.1%
Delaware	23.4%
District of Columbia	23.3%
Arkansas	23.2%
Arizona	22.8%
West Virginia	22.4%
Oklahoma	22.3%
Alabama	21.7%
New Mexico	21.5%
Florida	20.9%
South Carolina	19.9%
Rhode Island	19.7%
Texas	19.6%
Ohio	19.5%

15 States With the Worst Ratio of Food Hardship Among Households With Children Compared to Households Without Children

State	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children
District of Columbia	1.9	23.3%	12.0%
Delaware	1.9	23.4%	12.6%
Arizona	1.7	22.8%	13.7%
Alaska	1.7	17.3%	10.5%
New York	1.5	18.6%	12.1%
Nebraska	1.5	16.2%	10.9%
Iowa	1.5	14.9%	10.2%
Hawaii	1.5	19.3%	13.2%
Florida	1.4	20.9%	14.5%
Minnesota	1.4	12.7%	8.9%
Wisconsin	1.4	14.2%	9.9%
Pennsylvania	1.4	16.7%	11.7%
Illinois	1.4	17.3%	12.3%
New Mexico	1.4	21.5%	15.4%
New Jersey	1.4	16.1%	11.5%

MSA Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

Of the 108 large MSAs with Gallup data in 2016 and 2017, 30 had food hardship rates for households with children above 20 percent, including five with rates 25 percent or higher.

MSA Rates of Food Hardship in Households With and Without Children

Food Hardship Rate	Number of States	
	Households With Children	Households Without Children
25% or Higher	5	—
20 - <25%	25	2
15 - <20%	50	34
10 - <15%	25	64
1 - <10%	3	8

The chart below shows the 20 worst MSA food hardship rates among households with children. Appendix D presents data on households with and without children for all 108 MSAs represented in the Gallup data, alphabetically by rank (see Appendix D).

The 20 MSAs With the Worst Food Hardship Rates in 2016–2017

MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Bakersfield, CA	23.2%	1
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	22.0%	2
Fresno, CA	22.0%	3
Jackson, MS	21.3%	4
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	21.1%	5
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	20.7%	6
Winston-Salem, NC	20.2%	7
Baton Rouge, LA	20.1%	8
Albuquerque, NM	20.0%	9
Columbia, SC	19.5%	10
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	19.4%	11
Tulsa, OK	19.3%	12
El Paso, TX	19.2%	13
Greensboro-High Point, NC	19.2%	14
Oklahoma City, OK	19.2%	15
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	19.1%	16
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	18.8%	17
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	18.4%	18
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	18.3%	19
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	18.2%	20

Food Hardship Factors

Many families simply do not have adequate resources — wages, Social Security and other retirement benefits, public program income supports, like Supplemental Security Income and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), child support payments, SNAP (food stamps), and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) — to purchase enough food and also pay for rent, utilities, and other basics.

Too many working-age adults are unemployed or working part-time jobs, but want full-time employment. Many others are working for wages that are not enough to afford the basics for themselves and their families. When factoring in inflation, wages for the bottom quintiles of American workers basically have been flat for decades. Income support programs, like TANF, Unemployment Insurance, and Worker’s Compensation, are inadequate and increasingly difficult to apply for and maintain. While SNAP is critical in providing nutrition assistance to both working and non-working households — by supplementing wages, Social Security, or other sources of income — the nutrition benefits just are not enough for most families to make it through the month.

An expert committee of the prestigious Institute of Medicine (IOM) issued a report in January 2013 explaining that the SNAP allotment — based on the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s “Thrifty Food Plan” — is not enough for most families. A December 2015 White House report on the long-term benefits of SNAP underscored the inadequacy of current SNAP benefit amounts for households.

The data in this report portray an economic and political failure that is leaving tens of millions of Americans struggling with hunger, and this struggle is happening in every community in America.

Recommendations

High food hardship rates throughout the nation now can no longer be blamed on the Great Recession or the pace of the recovery; rather, they are a reflection of the nation’s long-term failure to address poverty and hunger. It is crucial that the nation take actions that will dramatically decrease these food hardship numbers. The cost of not doing so — in terms of damage to health, education, early childhood development, and productivity — is too high.

The path to reduce the suffering and unnecessary human, community, and national costs caused by hunger, poverty, and reduced opportunity is clear:

- higher employment rates;
- more full-time jobs and jobs with hours and schedules that fit the needs of working parents;
- more child care and other supports to make work more feasible and family-supporting;
- better wages and job benefits;
- stronger income supports for those out of work, unable to work, or working at low wages, through improved unemployment insurance, TANF, refundable tax credits, and other means; and
- strengthened nutrition programs.

That last point means broadened eligibility, improved access among those who are eligible (only 4 out of 5 eligible people receive SNAP benefits and barely half of eligible children receive school breakfast), and upgraded benefit amounts, especially in SNAP.

As noted earlier, an IOM committee issued an important report in 2013 that found SNAP benefits to be too low for most families. The report's detailing of the shortcomings underscores why proposals in Congress to cut SNAP benefits by billions of dollars would worsen health and hunger for struggling children, seniors, and working families.

Some of the flaws the IOM committee pointed to (e.g., the lag in SNAP benefits keeping up with inflation, and the failure in computing families' ability to purchase food to fully account for shelter costs) are due to previous cuts made by Congress. Congress needs to fix the problems rather than doubling down on harming the most vulnerable Americans. Protecting and strengthening SNAP must be a top priority, and Congress must reject pending proposals to harm this leading national defense against deeper hunger.

These recommendations are described in more detail in the [Plan of Action to End Hunger in America](#) that FRAC released in late 2015.

Eight Essential Strategies for Ending Hunger

- 1) Create jobs, raise wages, increase opportunity, and share prosperity;
- 2) Improve government income support programs for struggling families;
- 3) Strengthen SNAP;
- 4) Strengthen child nutrition programs;
- 5) Target supports to especially vulnerable populations;
- 6) Work with states, localities, and nonprofits to expand and improve participation in federal nutrition programs;
- 7) Make sure all families have convenient access to reasonably priced, healthy food; and
- 8) Build political will to address hunger and poverty.

Conclusion

Americans in every community want their political leaders to attack hunger aggressively, not reduce anti-hunger efforts. In polls that FRAC has commissioned, voters overwhelmingly say the federal government should have a major role in ensuring that low-income households — particularly children — have the food and nutrition they need.

Voters overwhelmingly say the federal government should be spending more money on solving hunger or should continue to spend the same amount. When voters are told that Congress is considering cutting billions of dollars to reduce government spending on anti-hunger programs, they overwhelmingly tell pollsters that cutting food assistance programs, like SNAP, is the wrong way to reduce government spending. These attitudes cross party lines. With such strong agreement among constituents, key political leaders should support aggressive anti-hunger efforts and pursue bipartisan cooperation toward finding solutions that end hunger and poverty for their constituents and the nation as a whole.

About FRAC

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national nonprofit organization working to eradicate poverty-related hunger and undernutrition in the United States.

For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, visit www.frac.org.

Methodology

Results are based on Gallup's telephone (landline or cellular) interviews in 2008–2017 for national and regional estimates, and in 2016 and 2017 for state and MSA estimates, with randomly sampled adults, age 18 or older in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. While individuals were asked a variety of questions, this report focuses on the questions regarding food hardship and household composition. The question used to measure food hardship was, "Have there been times in the past 12 months when you did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed?" Respondents could answer "yes" or "no." A household was classified as having experienced food hardship if they answered "yes."

Respondents were also asked, "How many children under the age of 18 are living in your household?" If the respondent indicated there were no children, they were classified as a "household without children." If the respondent indicated there was at least one child, they were classified as a "household with children."

Data are weighted to be representative at the national, regional, state, and MSA levels based on known figures for age, race/ethnicity, sex, education, population density (for national estimates), region, and phone status (i.e., landline versus cellular). In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of public opinion polls.

At the national level for 2017 (sample size: 160,498), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 0.22 percentage points. At the national level for 2008–2017 by month (sample size range: 21,278–31,540), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 1.1 percentage points. At the national level for 2008–2017 by quarter (sample size range: 70,004–92,540), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 0.57 percentage points.

At the state level for 2016–2017 (sample size range: 1,854–69,258), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 3.1 percentage points.

At the MSA level for 2016–2017 (sample size range: 615 to 18,319), the margin of error ranged from ± 0.7 to ± 6.2 percentage points. This report includes only MSAs where at least 300 households responded to the survey in either 2016 or 2017.

Total national sample sizes for the food hardship and households with children questions for 2017 were 160,498 and 160,465, respectively. Margins of error were calculated using 90 percent confidence intervals. At the national level for 2017, the margin of error was ± 3.0 percentage points. At the state level for 2016–2017 (sample size range: 879–33,574), the margin of error ranged from ± 0.2 percentage points to ± 11.6 percentage points.

At the MSA level for 2016–2017 (sample size range: 615 to 18,314), the margin of error ranged from ± 0.48 percentage points to ± 19.0 percentage points.

Ninety percent confidence intervals were used to construct the margin of error for each food hardship rate.

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Randy Rosso, FRAC's Senior Research and Policy Analyst.

Table of Contents — Appendices

Appendix A — National Rates

Page 12

Table A.1. Food Hardship Rate by Year, 2008–2017

Page 13

Table A.2. Food Hardship Rate by Quarter, 2008–2017

Page 14

Table A.3. Food Hardship Rate by Month, 2008–2017

Appendix B — Regional Rates

Page 17

Table B.1. Food Hardship Rate by Region, by Year, 2008–2017

Page 17

Table B.2. Food Hardship Rate Among Households With Children, by Region, by Year, 2008–2017

Page 17

Table B.3. Food Hardship Rate Among Households Without Children, by Region, by Year, 2008–2017

Page 18

Table B.4. Ratio of Food Hardship Rate Among Households With Children to Rate Among Households Without Children, by Region, by Year, 2008–2017

Appendix C — State Rates

Page 19

Table C.1. Sorted Alphabetically Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017
Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Page 20

Table C.2. Sorted by Overall Rank Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017
Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Page 21

Table C.3. Sorted by Households With Children Rate Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017
Households With Children

Page 21

Table C.4. Sorted by Households Without Children Rate Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017
Households With Children

Page 22

Table C.5. Sorted by Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children) Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017
Households With and Without Children

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Page 23

Table D.1. Sorted Alphabetically Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Page 26

Table D.2. Sorted by Overall Rank (Worst to Best) Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
Households With and Without Children

Page 29

Table D.3. Sorted by Households With Children Rate (Worst to Best) Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
Households With Children

Page 32

Table D.4. Sorted by Households Without Children Rate Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
Households Without Children

Page 35

Table D.5. Sorted by Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children) Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
Households With and Without Children

Appendix A — National Rates

Table A.1.

National Food Hardship Rate by Year, 2008–2017

Year	All Households		Households With Children		Households Without Children		Ratio of Households With Children to Households Without Children
	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	
2008	17.8%	0.2%	23.0%	5.5%	14.5%	3.1%	1.6
2009	18.3%	0.2%	24.1%	6.0%	14.9%	3.2%	1.6
2010	18.0%	0.2%	23.4%	5.5%	14.9%	3.0%	1.6
2011	18.6%	0.2%	23.8%	5.4%	15.5%	2.9%	1.5
2012	18.2%	0.2%	22.8%	4.8%	15.4%	2.6%	1.5
2013	18.9%	0.3%	23.3%	4.7%	16.1%	2.5%	1.5
2014	17.2%	0.2%	20.8%	3.8%	15.0%	1.9%	1.4
2015	16.0%	0.2%	19.2%	3.4%	14.2%	1.6%	1.3
2016	15.1%	0.2%	17.5%	2.6%	13.7%	1.1%	1.3
2017	15.7%	0.2%	18.4%	3.0%	14.1%	1.3%	1.3

Appendix A — National Rates

Table A.2.

National Food Hardship Rate by Year, 2008–2017

Year	Quarter	All Households		Households With Children		Households Without Children		Ratio of Households With Children to Households Without Children
		Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	
2008	1	16.4%	0.4%	21.1%	5.2%	13.3%	2.6%	1.6
2008	2	17.3%	0.5%	21.8%	5.0%	14.4%	2.3%	1.5
2008	3	18.3%	0.5%	23.8%	6.0%	14.9%	2.9%	1.6
2008	4	19.6%	0.5%	26.0%	7.0%	15.5%	3.5%	1.7
2009	1	18.8%	0.4%	24.8%	6.4%	15.2%	3.2%	1.6
2009	2	18.0%	0.4%	23.6%	6.0%	14.7%	2.9%	1.6
2009	3	17.9%	0.4%	23.6%	6.1%	14.5%	3.1%	1.6
2009	4	18.5%	0.4%	24.3%	6.2%	15.0%	3.2%	1.6
2010	1	18.0%	0.4%	23.4%	5.8%	14.7%	2.9%	1.6
2010	2	17.5%	0.4%	22.8%	5.6%	14.4%	2.7%	1.6
2010	3	17.9%	0.3%	22.9%	5.4%	15.0%	2.6%	1.5
2010	4	18.7%	0.4%	24.5%	6.1%	15.4%	3.0%	1.6
2011	1	17.8%	0.4%	22.3%	4.8%	15.2%	2.3%	1.5
2011	2	18.0%	0.3%	23.1%	5.5%	14.9%	2.7%	1.5
2011	3	19.2%	0.4%	25.1%	6.3%	15.8%	3.0%	1.6
2011	4	19.3%	0.4%	24.8%	5.9%	16.1%	2.9%	1.5
2012	1	18.3%	0.3%	23.1%	5.1%	15.5%	2.5%	1.5
2012	2	18.1%	0.4%	22.4%	4.6%	15.6%	2.2%	1.4
2012	3	18.3%	0.4%	23.2%	5.2%	15.5%	2.5%	1.5
2012	4	17.9%	0.4%	22.7%	5.2%	15.1%	2.5%	1.5
2013	1	18.8%	0.5%	23.4%	5.1%	15.8%	2.4%	1.5
2013	2	17.7%	0.5%	21.6%	4.3%	15.3%	1.9%	1.4
2013	3	19.7%	0.5%	24.4%	5.2%	16.9%	2.3%	1.4
2013	4	19.2%	0.5%	24.2%	5.4%	16.2%	2.5%	1.5
2014	1	17.4%	0.5%	21.2%	4.3%	15.1%	1.8%	1.4
2014	2	16.7%	0.5%	19.6%	3.3%	15.0%	1.2%	1.3
2014	3	17.2%	0.5%	20.9%	4.2%	15.0%	1.7%	1.4
2014	4	17.3%	0.5%	21.4%	4.5%	14.9%	2.0%	1.4
2015	1	15.8%	0.5%	19.1%	3.7%	13.9%	1.4%	1.4
2015	2	15.7%	0.5%	18.8%	3.5%	14.0%	1.3%	1.3
2015	3	16.6%	0.5%	20.1%	3.9%	14.7%	1.5%	1.4
2015	4	15.8%	0.5%	18.6%	3.3%	14.2%	1.2%	1.3
2016	1	15.0%	0.4%	17.9%	3.4%	13.3%	1.2%	1.3
2016	2	14.9%	0.4%	17.2%	2.7%	13.7%	0.8%	1.3
2016	3	15.4%	0.5%	17.8%	2.8%	14.1%	0.9%	1.3
2016	4	15.1%	0.5%	17.1%	2.5%	13.9%	0.7%	1.2
2017	1	15.3%	0.4%	18.5%	3.6%	13.5%	1.4%	1.4
2017	2	15.9%	0.4%	18.4%	2.9%	14.6%	0.9%	1.3
2017	3	15.8%	0.4%	18.4%	3.0%	14.3%	1.1%	1.3
2017	4	15.7%	0.6%	18.6%	3.4%	14.1%	1.0%	1.3

Appendix A — National Rates

Table A.3.

National Food Hardship Rate by Month, 2008–2017

Year	Month	All Households		Households With Children		Households Without Children		Ratio of Households With Children to Households Without Children
		Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	
2008	1	16.5%	0.6%	21.1%	5.2%	13.6%	2.2%	1.5
2008	2	16.3%	0.8%	20.8%	5.4%	13.3%	2.1%	1.6
2008	3	16.2%	0.8%	21.3%	5.9%	12.9%	2.5%	1.7
2008	4	16.8%	0.8%	21.8%	5.8%	13.7%	2.3%	1.6
2008	5	17.6%	0.8%	22.2%	5.5%	14.7%	2.0%	1.5
2008	6	17.4%	0.9%	21.4%	4.8%	15.0%	1.6%	1.4
2008	7	17.0%	0.8%	22.6%	6.4%	13.5%	2.7%	1.7
2008	8	19.2%	0.9%	24.4%	6.1%	15.9%	2.4%	1.5
2008	9	18.7%	0.9%	24.4%	6.6%	15.2%	2.6%	1.6
2008	10	18.8%	0.8%	24.3%	6.3%	15.4%	2.6%	1.6
2008	11	20.4%	0.9%	27.1%	7.5%	16.2%	3.4%	1.7
2008	12	19.4%	0.9%	26.8%	8.3%	15.0%	3.5%	1.8
2009	1	18.8%	0.7%	24.5%	6.4%	15.4%	2.7%	1.6
2009	2	19.0%	0.6%	25.0%	6.6%	15.4%	2.9%	1.6
2009	3	18.6%	0.6%	25.0%	7.0%	14.9%	3.1%	1.7
2009	4	18.2%	0.6%	24.3%	6.7%	14.8%	2.8%	1.6
2009	5	18.4%	0.6%	23.4%	5.7%	15.5%	2.2%	1.5
2009	6	17.3%	0.6%	23.2%	6.5%	13.8%	2.9%	1.7
2009	7	17.7%	0.6%	23.4%	6.3%	14.4%	2.7%	1.6
2009	8	17.9%	0.6%	23.6%	6.3%	14.5%	2.8%	1.6
2009	9	18.1%	0.6%	23.9%	6.4%	14.6%	2.9%	1.6
2009	10	18.9%	0.6%	24.6%	6.2%	15.6%	2.8%	1.6
2009	11	18.3%	0.6%	24.0%	6.4%	14.7%	3.0%	1.6
2009	12	18.2%	0.7%	24.3%	6.7%	14.5%	3.0%	1.7
2010	1	18.1%	0.6%	23.8%	6.3%	14.6%	2.9%	1.6
2010	2	17.9%	0.6%	23.2%	6.0%	14.6%	2.6%	1.6
2010	3	18.0%	0.6%	23.2%	5.8%	14.9%	2.5%	1.6
2010	4	17.1%	0.6%	22.2%	5.7%	14.1%	2.4%	1.6
2010	5	17.9%	0.6%	23.1%	5.9%	14.7%	2.5%	1.6
2010	6	17.5%	0.6%	22.9%	6.1%	14.3%	2.6%	1.6
2010	7	17.6%	0.6%	21.9%	5.0%	15.1%	1.9%	1.5
2010	8	18.2%	0.6%	23.9%	6.3%	14.9%	2.7%	1.6
2010	9	18.0%	0.6%	23.0%	5.5%	15.1%	2.3%	1.5
2010	10	19.3%	0.6%	25.8%	7.1%	15.5%	3.2%	1.7
2010	11	18.2%	0.6%	23.1%	5.6%	15.2%	2.3%	1.5
2010	12	18.6%	0.7%	24.3%	6.4%	15.4%	2.6%	1.6
2011	1	18.3%	0.6%	23.7%	6.0%	15.2%	2.5%	1.6
2011	2	17.6%	0.6%	21.5%	4.6%	15.3%	1.7%	1.4
2011	3	17.5%	0.6%	21.6%	4.6%	15.1%	1.9%	1.4
2011	4	17.4%	0.6%	22.5%	5.7%	14.4%	2.4%	1.6
2011	5	18.4%	0.6%	23.6%	5.8%	15.2%	2.5%	1.6
2011	6	18.2%	0.6%	23.2%	5.6%	15.2%	2.5%	1.5
2011	7	19.1%	0.6%	25.2%	6.8%	15.6%	2.8%	1.6
2011	8	18.7%	0.6%	24.6%	6.5%	15.3%	2.8%	1.6
2011	9	19.7%	0.6%	25.6%	6.5%	16.4%	2.7%	1.6
2011	10	20.0%	0.6%	25.8%	6.4%	16.7%	2.8%	1.5
2011	11	19.0%	0.6%	24.2%	5.8%	15.9%	2.5%	1.5
2011	12	19.0%	0.6%	24.5%	6.2%	15.7%	2.6%	1.6
2012	1	18.3%	0.6%	22.5%	4.9%	15.8%	1.9%	1.4
2012	2	18.1%	0.6%	23.3%	5.8%	15.0%	2.5%	1.6
2012	3	18.6%	0.6%	23.6%	5.6%	15.6%	2.3%	1.5
2012	4	17.4%	0.6%	21.0%	4.2%	15.4%	1.5%	1.4

Appendix A — National Rates

Table A.3.

National Food Hardship Rate by Month, 2008–2017 CONTINUED

Year	Month	All Households		Households With Children		Households Without Children		Ratio of Households With Children to Households Without Children
		Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	
2012	5	18.3%	0.6%	22.4%	4.7%	15.8%	1.9%	1.4
2012	6	18.6%	0.6%	23.6%	5.6%	15.7%	2.3%	1.5
2012	7	18.8%	0.6%	24.0%	5.8%	15.7%	2.5%	1.5
2012	8	18.4%	0.6%	23.4%	5.6%	15.4%	2.3%	1.5
2012	9	17.9%	0.6%	22.2%	5.0%	15.4%	1.9%	1.4
2012	10	18.1%	0.6%	22.7%	5.3%	15.3%	2.1%	1.5
2012	11	17.9%	0.6%	22.3%	5.1%	15.2%	2.1%	1.5
2012	12	17.8%	0.7%	23.0%	5.9%	14.7%	2.4%	1.6
2013	1	18.8%	0.9%	23.0%	5.1%	16.3%	1.7%	1.4
2013	2	19.3%	1.0%	24.6%	6.3%	15.9%	2.5%	1.6
2013	3	18.3%	0.9%	22.6%	5.2%	15.4%	2.0%	1.5
2013	4	17.7%	0.9%	21.6%	4.7%	15.3%	1.6%	1.4
2013	5	17.8%	0.8%	21.9%	4.9%	15.3%	1.7%	1.4
2013	6	17.7%	0.9%	21.2%	4.4%	15.5%	1.3%	1.4
2013	7	19.9%	0.9%	24.2%	5.2%	17.2%	1.8%	1.4
2013	8	20.0%	0.8%	25.4%	6.3%	16.6%	2.5%	1.5
2013	9	19.3%	0.9%	23.5%	5.0%	16.9%	1.6%	1.4
2013	10	19.5%	0.9%	24.3%	5.7%	16.5%	2.1%	1.5
2013	11	19.0%	0.9%	24.1%	6.0%	15.9%	2.2%	1.5
2013	12	19.2%	0.9%	24.1%	5.8%	16.2%	2.1%	1.5
2014	1	17.6%	0.8%	21.1%	4.3%	15.5%	1.3%	1.4
2014	2	17.6%	0.9%	21.5%	4.8%	15.3%	1.4%	1.4
2014	3	16.9%	0.8%	20.9%	4.8%	14.5%	1.6%	1.4
2014	4	16.9%	0.8%	20.4%	4.4%	14.9%	1.2%	1.4
2014	5	16.6%	0.8%	18.8%	2.9%	15.3%	0.5%	1.2
2014	6	16.8%	0.8%	19.8%	3.8%	14.9%	1.1%	1.3
2014	7	16.9%	0.8%	20.4%	4.3%	14.9%	1.2%	1.4
2014	8	17.8%	0.8%	22.4%	5.4%	15.3%	1.7%	1.5
2014	9	16.7%	0.8%	20.0%	4.1%	14.8%	1.1%	1.3
2014	10	17.7%	0.8%	21.8%	4.9%	15.3%	1.6%	1.4
2014	11	17.1%	0.8%	21.0%	4.7%	14.7%	1.6%	1.4
2014	12	17.2%	0.9%	21.3%	4.9%	14.7%	1.7%	1.4
2015	1	16.3%	0.8%	19.6%	4.1%	14.4%	1.1%	1.4
2015	2	15.7%	0.8%	18.7%	3.9%	14.0%	0.9%	1.3
2015	3	15.5%	0.8%	18.8%	4.1%	13.5%	1.2%	1.4
2015	4	16.0%	0.8%	18.4%	3.2%	14.6%	0.6%	1.3
2015	5	15.6%	0.8%	19.0%	4.3%	13.6%	1.2%	1.4
2015	6	15.7%	0.8%	18.8%	4.0%	13.9%	1.0%	1.4
2015	7	17.1%	0.8%	20.3%	4.0%	15.3%	1.0%	1.3
2015	8	16.1%	0.8%	19.8%	4.5%	13.9%	1.4%	1.4
2015	9	16.8%	0.8%	20.3%	4.3%	14.9%	1.1%	1.4
2015	10	16.3%	0.8%	19.1%	3.5%	14.8%	0.8%	1.3
2015	11	15.8%	0.8%	19.4%	4.4%	13.7%	1.3%	1.4
2015	12	15.2%	0.8%	17.3%	2.9%	13.9%	0.5%	1.2
2016	1	15.9%	0.8%	20.0%	4.9%	13.7%	1.5%	1.5
2016	2	15.1%	0.8%	18.2%	3.9%	13.4%	0.9%	1.4
2016	3	13.9%	0.7%	15.6%	2.5%	12.9%	0.3%	1.2
2016	4	14.5%	0.7%	16.9%	3.2%	13.1%	0.6%	1.3
2016	5	14.8%	0.7%	17.4%	3.3%	13.5%	0.7%	1.3
2016	6	15.4%	0.8%	17.2%	2.6%	14.5%	0.2%	1.2
2016	7	16.2%	0.8%	18.3%	2.9%	15.0%	0.3%	1.2
2016	8	15.2%	0.8%	18.0%	3.6%	13.7%	0.8%	1.3

Appendix A — National Rates

Table A.3.

National Food Hardship Rate by Month, 2008–2017 CONTINUED

Year	Month	All Households		Households With Children		Households Without Children		Ratio of Households With Children to Households Without Children
		Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	Food Hardship Rate	Margin of Error	
2016	9	14.9%	0.8%	17.0%	3.0%	13.6%	0.5%	1.3
2016	10	14.6%	0.8%	17.3%	3.4%	13.2%	0.7%	1.3
2016	11	15.9%	0.8%	18.3%	3.2%	14.5%	0.6%	1.3
2016	12	14.7%	0.8%	15.7%	1.8%	14.2%	0.2%	1.1
2017	1	15.5%	0.7%	18.8%	4.0%	13.7%	1.1%	1.4
2017	2	15.2%	0.8%	18.8%	4.4%	13.1%	1.3%	1.4
2017	3	15.1%	0.7%	17.8%	3.4%	13.6%	0.8%	1.3
2017	4	15.2%	0.7%	17.8%	3.3%	13.8%	0.6%	1.3
2017	5	16.0%	0.8%	17.6%	2.3%	15.1%	0.1%	1.2
2017	6	16.5%	0.8%	19.8%	4.1%	14.7%	1.1%	1.4
2017	7	15.8%	0.8%	18.5%	3.5%	14.2%	0.8%	1.3
2017	8	15.7%	0.7%	18.1%	3.1%	14.3%	0.7%	1.3
2017	9	15.8%	0.7%	18.5%	3.4%	14.2%	0.8%	1.3
2017	10	15.5%	0.9%	18.4%	3.8%	13.8%	0.8%	1.3
2017	11	15.9%	1.1%	17.9%	3.0%	14.9%	0.0%	1.2
2017	12	16.0%	1.1%	19.7%	4.8%	14.0%	0.9%	1.4

Appendix B — Regional Rates

Table B.1.

Food Hardship Rate by Region,¹ by Year, 2008–2017

Region	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mid-Atlantic	15.9%	15.8%	15.6%	16.0%	15.9%	16.6%	15.6%	14.4%	13.2%	15.0%
Midwest	17.7%	17.6%	16.5%	17.6%	17.0%	17.1%	15.9%	14.6%	14.4%	14.4%
Mountain Plains	16.5%	16.3%	16.3%	16.6%	15.7%	17.2%	14.6%	13.8%	12.7%	13.6%
Northeast	16.2%	16.0%	15.6%	16.5%	15.9%	18.0%	16.7%	15.5%	14.5%	14.7%
Southeast	19.7%	21.2%	21.1%	21.8%	21.0%	21.4%	20.2%	18.3%	17.7%	17.1%
Southwest	19.6%	20.7%	20.8%	21.0%	21.1%	21.3%	19.1%	17.6%	17.6%	19.3%
West	17.8%	18.6%	18.4%	18.6%	18.7%	19.1%	16.5%	15.3%	14.2%	14.9%

¹Regions are as defined by U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service.

Appendix B — Regional Rates

Table B.2.

Food Hardship Rate Among Households With Children, by Region,¹ by Year, 2008–2017

Region	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mid-Atlantic	20.6%	20.9%	20.4%	20.9%	20.5%	21.5%	19.0%	17.9%	16.1%	18.1%
Midwest	22.8%	23.4%	21.5%	22.4%	21.2%	21.8%	19.7%	17.9%	16.4%	17.5%
Mountain Plains	21.0%	21.3%	21.2%	21.1%	19.7%	20.5%	17.4%	15.8%	14.9%	15.8%
Northeast	20.5%	20.4%	20.5%	20.9%	20.4%	22.4%	20.1%	20.1%	17.1%	18.5%
Southeast	25.5%	27.8%	27.0%	27.4%	25.6%	26.4%	23.2%	21.8%	19.7%	19.6%
Southwest	26.0%	26.3%	26.3%	26.6%	25.5%	25.5%	22.9%	20.1%	20.5%	21.8%
West	23.2%	25.1%	24.2%	24.4%	24.1%	23.2%	21.0%	17.4%	16.6%	17.1%

¹Regions are as defined by U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service.

Appendix B — Regional Rates

Table B.3.

Food Hardship Rate Among Households Without Children, by Region,¹ by Year, 2008–2017

Region	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mid-Atlantic	13.1%	12.9%	12.9%	13.3%	13.3%	13.7%	13.6%	12.4%	11.6%	13.3%
Midwest	14.7%	14.2%	13.8%	14.9%	14.6%	14.4%	13.8%	13.0%	13.4%	12.7%
Mountain Plains	13.6%	13.3%	13.3%	13.9%	13.3%	15.0%	13.0%	12.6%	11.5%	12.3%
Northeast	13.6%	13.6%	13.0%	14.0%	13.5%	15.6%	14.9%	13.1%	13.1%	12.7%
Southeast	16.3%	17.5%	17.8%	18.7%	18.4%	18.3%	18.4%	16.3%	16.6%	15.7%
Southwest	15.3%	17.1%	17.2%	17.3%	18.1%	18.4%	16.5%	16.0%	15.8%	17.6%
West	14.0%	14.4%	14.7%	14.9%	15.1%	16.4%	13.6%	14.0%	12.7%	13.6%

¹Regions are as defined by U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service.

Appendix B — Regional Rates

Table B.4.

Ratio of Food Hardship Rate Among Households With Children to Rate Among Households Without Children, by Region,¹ by Year, 2008–2017

Region	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Mid-Atlantic	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Midwest	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.4
Mountain Plains	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Northeast	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.5
Southeast	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2
Southwest	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2
West	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.3

¹Regions are as defined by U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service.

Appendix C — State Rates

Table C.1.: Sorted Alphabetically

Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Alabama	19.7%	4	21.7%	18.7%	1.2
Alaska	12.9%	38	17.3%	10.5%	1.7
Arizona	17.1%	11	22.8%	13.7%	1.7
Arkansas	19.5%	5	23.2%	17.5%	1.3
California	14.1%	29	15.8%	13.0%	1.2
Colorado	12.7%	41	15.2%	11.4%	1.3
Connecticut	12.6%	42	14.9%	11.5%	1.3
Delaware	15.9%	19	23.4%	12.6%	1.9
District of Columbia	14.8%	24	23.3%	12.0%	1.9
Florida	16.6%	15	20.9%	14.5%	1.4
Georgia	17.3%	9	18.8%	16.4%	1.1
Hawaii	15.3%	21	19.3%	13.2%	1.5
Idaho	14.1%	28	15.7%	13.2%	1.2
Illinois	14.0%	30	17.3%	12.3%	1.4
Indiana	15.8%	20	18.9%	14.2%	1.3
Iowa	11.7%	46	14.9%	10.2%	1.5
Kansas	11.8%	45	12.6%	11.4%	1.1
Kentucky	17.0%	12	18.6%	16.1%	1.2
Louisiana	21.3%	2	24.1%	19.8%	1.2
Maine	13.5%	33	15.8%	12.5%	1.3
Maryland	12.6%	43	14.8%	11.4%	1.3
Massachusetts	11.6%	47	13.8%	10.6%	1.3
Michigan	15.1%	22	17.4%	14.0%	1.2
Minnesota	10.3%	50	12.7%	8.9%	1.4
Mississippi	22.0%	1	25.8%	19.7%	1.3
Missouri	14.2%	27	16.8%	12.8%	1.3
Montana	13.2%	36	15.7%	12.0%	1.3
Nebraska	12.8%	40	16.2%	10.9%	1.5
Nevada	17.1%	10	19.0%	16.2%	1.2
New Hampshire	14.2%	26	17.6%	12.7%	1.4
New Jersey	13.2%	35	16.1%	11.5%	1.4
New Mexico	17.7%	8	21.5%	15.4%	1.4
New York	14.3%	25	18.6%	12.1%	1.5
North Carolina	16.4%	17	18.6%	15.3%	1.2
North Dakota	8.0%	51	6.1%	9.0%	0.7
Ohio	16.2%	18	19.5%	14.6%	1.3
Oklahoma	19.1%	6	22.3%	17.2%	1.3
Oregon	14.8%	23	18.3%	13.2%	1.4
Pennsylvania	13.3%	34	16.7%	11.7%	1.4
Rhode Island	16.4%	16	19.7%	14.7%	1.3
South Carolina	18.3%	7	19.9%	17.4%	1.1
South Dakota	10.3%	49	12.2%	9.2%	1.3
Tennessee	16.8%	13	18.0%	16.2%	1.1
Texas	16.7%	14	19.6%	14.8%	1.3
Utah	12.5%	44	14.9%	10.7%	1.4
Vermont	12.8%	39	14.4%	12.2%	1.2
Virginia	13.7%	31	15.8%	12.4%	1.3
Washington	12.9%	37	15.7%	11.6%	1.4
West Virginia	20.3%	3	22.4%	19.3%	1.2
Wisconsin	11.3%	48	14.2%	9.9%	1.4
Wyoming	13.6%	32	14.2%	13.4%	1.1
US	15.4%		17.9%	13.9%	1.3

Appendix C — State Rates

Table C.2.: Sorted by Overall Rank

Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Mississippi	22.0%	1	25.8%	19.7%	1.3
Louisiana	21.3%	2	24.1%	19.8%	1.2
West Virginia	20.3%	3	22.4%	19.3%	1.2
Alabama	19.7%	4	21.7%	18.7%	1.2
Arkansas	19.5%	5	23.2%	17.5%	1.3
Oklahoma	19.1%	6	22.3%	17.2%	1.3
South Carolina	18.3%	7	19.9%	17.4%	1.1
New Mexico	17.7%	8	21.5%	15.4%	1.4
Georgia	17.3%	9	18.8%	16.4%	1.1
Nevada	17.1%	10	19.0%	16.2%	1.2
Arizona	17.1%	11	22.8%	13.7%	1.7
Kentucky	17.0%	12	18.6%	16.1%	1.2
Tennessee	16.8%	13	18.0%	16.2%	1.1
Texas	16.7%	14	19.6%	14.8%	1.3
Florida	16.6%	15	20.9%	14.5%	1.4
Rhode Island	16.4%	16	19.7%	14.7%	1.3
North Carolina	16.4%	17	18.6%	15.3%	1.2
Ohio	16.2%	18	19.5%	14.6%	1.3
Delaware	15.9%	19	23.4%	12.6%	1.9
Indiana	15.8%	20	18.9%	14.2%	1.3
Hawaii	15.3%	21	19.3%	13.2%	1.5
Michigan	15.1%	22	17.4%	14.0%	1.2
Oregon	14.8%	23	18.3%	13.2%	1.4
District of Columbia	14.8%	24	23.3%	12.0%	1.9
New York	14.3%	25	18.6%	12.1%	1.5
New Hampshire	14.2%	26	17.6%	12.7%	1.4
Missouri	14.2%	27	16.8%	12.8%	1.3
Idaho	14.1%	28	15.7%	13.2%	1.2
California	14.1%	29	15.8%	13.0%	1.2
Illinois	14.0%	30	17.3%	12.3%	1.4
Virginia	13.7%	31	15.8%	12.4%	1.3
Wyoming	13.6%	32	14.2%	13.4%	1.1
Maine	13.5%	33	15.8%	12.5%	1.3
Pennsylvania	13.3%	34	16.7%	11.7%	1.4
New Jersey	13.2%	35	16.1%	11.5%	1.4
Montana	13.2%	36	15.7%	12.0%	1.3
Washington	12.9%	37	15.7%	11.6%	1.4
Alaska	12.9%	38	17.3%	10.5%	1.7
Vermont	12.8%	39	14.4%	12.2%	1.2
Nebraska	12.8%	40	16.2%	10.9%	1.5
Colorado	12.7%	41	15.2%	11.4%	1.3
Connecticut	12.6%	42	14.9%	11.5%	1.3
Maryland	12.6%	43	14.8%	11.4%	1.3
Utah	12.5%	44	14.9%	10.7%	1.4
Kansas	11.8%	45	12.6%	11.4%	1.1
Iowa	11.7%	46	14.9%	10.2%	1.5
Massachusetts	11.6%	47	13.8%	10.6%	1.3
Wisconsin	11.3%	48	14.2%	9.9%	1.4
South Dakota	10.3%	49	12.2%	9.2%	1.3
Minnesota	10.3%	50	12.7%	8.9%	1.4
North Dakota	8.0%	51	6.1%	9.0%	0.7
US	15.4%		17.9%	13.9%	1.3

Appendix C — State Rates

Table C.3.: Sorted by Households With Children Rate

Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017

Households With Children

State	Rate: Households With Children
Mississippi	25.8%
Louisiana	24.1%
Delaware	23.4%
District of Columbia	23.3%
Arkansas	23.2%
Arizona	22.8%
West Virginia	22.4%
Oklahoma	22.3%
Alabama	21.7%
New Mexico	21.5%
Florida	20.9%
South Carolina	19.9%
Rhode Island	19.7%
Texas	19.6%
Ohio	19.5%
Hawaii	19.3%
Nevada	19.0%
Indiana	18.9%
Georgia	8.8%
Kentucky	18.6%
New York	18.6%
North Carolina	18.6%
Oregon	18.3%
Tennessee	18.0%
New Hampshire	17.6%
Michigan	17.4%
Alaska	17.3%
Illinois	17.3%
Missouri	16.8%
Pennsylvania	16.7%
Nebraska	16.2%
New Jersey	16.1%
California	15.8%
Virginia	15.8%
Maine	15.8%
Idaho	15.7%
Washington	15.7%
Montana	15.7%
Colorado	15.2%
Iowa	14.9%
Utah	14.9%
Connecticut	14.9%
Maryland	14.8%
Vermont	14.4%
Wisconsin	14.2%
Wyoming	14.2%
Massachusetts	13.8%
Minnesota	12.7%
Kansas	12.6%
South Dakota	12.2%
North Dakota	6.1%
US	17.9%

Appendix C — State Rates

Table C.4.: Sorted by Households Without Children Rate

Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017

Households Without Children

State	Rate: Households Without Children
Louisiana	19.8%
Mississippi	19.7%
West Virginia	19.3%
Alabama	18.7%
Arkansas	17.5%
South Carolina	17.4%
Oklahoma	17.2%
Georgia	16.4%
Tennessee	16.2%
Nevada	16.2%
Kentucky	16.1%
New Mexico	15.4%
North Carolina	15.3%
Texas	14.8%
Rhode Island	14.7%
Ohio	14.6%
Florida	14.5%
Indiana	14.2%
Michigan	14.0%
Arizona	13.7%
Wyoming	13.4%
Oregon	13.2%
Hawaii	13.2%
Idaho	13.2%
California	13.0%
Missouri	12.8%
New Hampshire	12.7%
Delaware	12.6%
Maine	12.5%
Virginia	12.4%
Illinois	12.3%
Vermont	12.2%
New York	12.1%
Montana	12.0%
District of Columbia	12.0%
Pennsylvania	11.7%
Washington	11.6%
Connecticut	11.5%
New Jersey	11.5%
Maryland	11.4%
Colorado	11.4%
Kansas	11.4%
Nebraska	10.9%
Utah	10.7%
Massachusetts	10.6%
Alaska	10.5%
Iowa	10.2%
Wisconsin	9.9%
South Dakota	9.2%
North Dakota	9.0%
Minnesota	8.9%
US	13.9%

Appendix C — State Rates

**Table C.5.: Sorted by Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Food Hardship Rate by State, 2016–2017**

Households With and Without Children

State	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children
District of Columbia	1.9	23.3%	12.0%
Delaware	1.9	23.4%	12.6%
Arizona	1.7	22.8%	13.7%
Alaska	1.7	17.3%	10.5%
New York	1.5	18.6%	12.1%
Nebraska	1.5	16.2%	10.9%
Iowa	1.5	14.9%	10.2%
Hawaii	1.5	19.3%	13.2%
Florida	1.4	20.9%	14.5%
Minnesota	1.4	12.7%	8.9%
Wisconsin	1.4	14.2%	9.9%
Pennsylvania	1.4	16.7%	11.7%
Illinois	1.4	17.3%	12.3%
New Mexico	1.4	21.5%	15.4%
New Jersey	1.4	16.1%	11.5%
Utah	1.4	14.9%	10.7%
New Hampshire	1.4	17.6%	12.7%
Oregon	1.4	18.3%	13.2%
Washington	1.4	15.7%	11.6%
Rhode Island	1.3	19.7%	14.7%
Colorado	1.3	15.2%	11.4%
Ohio	1.3	19.5%	14.6%
Indiana	1.3	18.9%	14.2%
Texas	1.3	19.6%	14.8%
South Dakota	1.3	12.2%	9.2%
Arkansas	1.3	23.2%	17.5%
Missouri	1.3	16.8%	12.8%
Mississippi	1.3	25.8%	19.7%
Montana	1.3	15.7%	12.0%
Massachusetts	1.3	13.8%	10.6%
Oklahoma	1.3	22.3%	17.2%
Maryland	1.3	14.8%	11.4%
Connecticut	1.3	14.9%	11.5%
Virginia	1.3	15.8%	12.4%
Maine	1.3	15.8%	12.5%
Michigan	1.2	17.4%	14.0%
California	1.2	15.8%	13.0%
Louisiana	1.2	24.1%	19.8%
North Carolina	1.2	18.6%	15.3%
Idaho	1.2	15.7%	13.2%
Vermont	1.2	14.4%	12.2%
Nevada	1.2	19.0%	16.2%
Alabama	1.2	21.7%	18.7%
West Virginia	1.2	22.4%	19.3%
Kentucky	1.2	18.6%	16.1%
Georgia	1.1	18.8%	16.4%
South Carolina	1.1	19.9%	17.4%
Kansas	1.1	12.6%	11.4%
Tennessee	1.1	18.0%	16.2%
Wyoming	1.1	14.2%	13.4%
North Dakota	0.7	6.1%	9.0%
US	1.3	17.9%	13.9%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.1.: Sorted Alphabetically

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Akron, OH	16.6%	35	19.1%	15.6%	1.2
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	11.6%	95	14.5%	10.4%	1.4
Albuquerque, NM	20.0%	9	27.2%	15.5%	1.8
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	13.9%	70	19.0%	11.6%	1.6
Anchorage, AK	10.8%	100	8.6%	12.0%	0.7
Asheville, NC	17.7%	22	12.5%	19.6%	0.6
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	16.2%	40	17.8%	15.2%	1.2
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	19.4%	11	22.0%	17.8%	1.2
Austin-Round Rock, TX	13.0%	83	15.7%	11.3%	1.4
Bakersfield, CA	23.2%	1	23.4%	22.9%	1.0
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	13.2%	80	15.7%	12.0%	1.3
Baton Rouge, LA	20.1%	8	23.3%	18.5%	1.3
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	16.4%	37	18.4%	15.4%	1.2
Boise City, ID	14.6%	57	16.7%	13.4%	1.2
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	11.1%	99	12.6%	10.3%	1.2
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	12.8%	85	17.3%	10.1%	1.7
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	15.6%	48	18.9%	14.0%	1.4
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	14.2%	64	24.4%	10.5%	2.3
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	13.9%	69	16.1%	12.7%	1.3
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	15.4%	50	17.0%	14.5%	1.2
Chattanooga, TN-GA	17.4%	26	16.5%	18.0%	0.9
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	14.5%	59	17.4%	12.9%	1.4
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	13.4%	78	14.5%	12.8%	1.1
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	15.6%	46	20.2%	13.7%	1.5
Colorado Springs, CO	17.1%	29	17.1%	16.7%	1.0
Columbia, SC	19.5%	10	19.1%	19.8%	1.0
Columbus, OH	16.5%	36	17.9%	15.6%	1.1
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	15.2%	51	17.3%	13.9%	1.2
Dayton, OH	16.0%	42	20.7%	13.9%	1.5
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	18.8%	17	23.5%	17.2%	1.4
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	12.4%	87	14.6%	11.3%	1.3
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	9.9%	103	10.1%	9.9%	1.0
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	15.7%	45	17.8%	14.7%	1.2
Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	12.0%	90	13.9%	11.0%	1.3
El Paso, TX	19.2%	13	20.2%	17.9%	1.1
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	15.7%	44	20.5%	12.6%	1.6

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.1.: Sorted Alphabetically CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Fresno, CA	22.0%	3	23.8%	20.6%	1.2
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	13.0%	82	15.7%	11.2%	1.4
Greensboro-High Point, NC	19.2%	14	25.2%	16.1%	1.6
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	16.2%	39	18.2%	15.1%	1.2
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	13.9%	72	18.4%	12.2%	1.5
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	11.6%	97	10.1%	12.2%	0.8
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	17.0%	30	20.0%	14.6%	1.4
Huntsville, AL	13.9%	67	11.9%	14.8%	0.8
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	16.1%	41	18.3%	14.7%	1.2
Jackson, MS	21.3%	4	29.8%	16.2%	1.8
Jacksonville, FL	15.2%	52	15.8%	14.7%	1.1
Kansas City, MO-KS	12.1%	88	12.7%	11.8%	1.1
Knoxville, TN	14.9%	55	13.3%	15.5%	0.9
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	19.1%	16	25.6%	15.5%	1.6
Lancaster, PA	7.7%	108	11.5%	5.1%	2.2
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	17.2%	27	23.0%	14.1%	1.6
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	18.4%	18	19.9%	17.7%	1.1
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	14.4%	62	16.0%	13.3%	1.2
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	15.6%	47	19.4%	13.6%	1.4
Madison, WI	8.1%	107	11.9%	6.4%	1.9
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	20.7%	6	22.7%	19.5%	1.2
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	17.7%	23	21.3%	15.6%	1.4
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	11.9%	92	12.7%	11.6%	1.1
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	10.1%	102	11.2%	9.3%	1.2
Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC-NC	14.4%	63	19.3%	12.2%	1.6
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	14.4%	61	16.9%	13.1%	1.3
New Haven-Milford, CT	13.5%	77	14.4%	13.1%	1.1
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	21.1%	5	24.9%	18.9%	1.3
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	15.5%	49	19.1%	13.3%	1.4
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	12.9%	84	16.3%	11.9%	1.4
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	11.8%	94	13.4%	10.5%	1.3
Oklahoma City, OK	19.2%	15	22.9%	17.1%	1.3
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	13.9%	74	16.3%	12.4%	1.3
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	18.2%	20	22.9%	15.6%	1.5
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	9.6%	104	12.2%	7.3%	1.7
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	17.5%	24	29.6%	13.2%	2.2

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.1.: Sorted Alphabetically CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	16.4%	38	19.0%	15.0%	1.3
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	15.0%	54	18.2%	13.3%	1.4
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	15.8%	43	21.4%	12.5%	1.7
Pittsburgh, PA	12.0%	89	15.3%	10.6%	1.4
Portland-South Portland, ME	12.0%	91	13.2%	11.5%	1.1
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	13.1%	81	16.6%	11.5%	1.4
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	17.2%	28	20.0%	15.9%	1.3
Provo-Orem, UT	8.1%	106	8.6%	7.8%	1.1
Raleigh, NC	12.8%	86	14.2%	11.9%	1.2
Richmond, VA	16.6%	34	18.1%	15.8%	1.1
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	17.0%	31	17.7%	16.5%	1.1
Rochester, NY	13.9%	73	18.3%	12.1%	1.5
Sacramento--Roseville--Arden-Arcade, CA	13.7%	75	14.1%	13.6%	1.0
St. Louis, MO-IL	13.9%	68	18.5%	11.6%	1.6
Salt Lake City, UT	13.9%	71	16.8%	12.0%	1.4
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	17.4%	25	21.8%	14.5%	1.5
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	11.6%	96	11.7%	11.5%	1.0
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	10.6%	101	11.3%	10.3%	1.1
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	9.2%	105	11.3%	8.0%	1.4
Santa Rosa, CA	14.0%	66	18.6%	12.4%	1.5
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	13.3%	79	19.7%	10.8%	1.8
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	11.9%	93	12.5%	11.6%	1.1
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	17.0%	32	23.0%	13.9%	1.7
Springfield, MA	16.8%	33	17.9%	16.2%	1.1
Syracuse, NY	13.6%	76	19.0%	11.5%	1.6
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	18.3%	19	22.4%	16.3%	1.4
Toledo, OH	15.2%	53	18.5%	13.7%	1.4
Tucson, AZ	18.0%	21	22.6%	15.7%	1.4
Tulsa, OK	19.3%	12	24.0%	16.8%	1.4
Urban Honolulu, HI	14.2%	65	16.3%	13.0%	1.2
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	14.4%	60	17.0%	13.0%	1.3
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	11.6%	98	15.0%	9.5%	1.6
Wichita, KS	14.6%	58	16.0%	13.7%	1.2
Winston-Salem, NC	20.2%	7	23.3%	18.7%	1.2
Worcester, MA-CT	14.8%	56	16.9%	13.7%	1.2
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	22.0%	2	34.8%	16.6%	2.1

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.2.: Sorted by Overall Rank (Worst to Best)

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Bakersfield, CA	23.2%	1	23.4%	22.9%	1.0
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	22.0%	2	34.8%	16.6%	2.1
Fresno, CA	22.0%	3	23.8%	20.6%	1.2
Jackson, MS	21.3%	4	29.8%	16.2%	1.8
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	21.1%	5	24.9%	18.9%	1.3
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	20.7%	6	22.7%	19.5%	1.2
Winston-Salem, NC	20.2%	7	23.3%	18.7%	1.2
Baton Rouge, LA	20.1%	8	23.3%	18.5%	1.3
Albuquerque, NM	20.0%	9	27.2%	15.5%	1.8
Columbia, SC	19.5%	10	19.1%	19.8%	1.0
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	19.4%	11	22.0%	17.8%	1.2
Tulsa, OK	19.3%	12	24.0%	16.8%	1.4
El Paso, TX	19.2%	13	20.2%	17.9%	1.1
Greensboro-High Point, NC	19.2%	14	25.2%	16.1%	1.6
Oklahoma City, OK	19.2%	15	22.9%	17.1%	1.3
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	19.1%	16	25.6%	15.5%	1.6
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	18.8%	17	23.5%	17.2%	1.4
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	18.4%	18	19.9%	17.7%	1.1
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	18.3%	19	22.4%	16.3%	1.4
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	18.2%	20	22.9%	15.6%	1.5
Tucson, AZ	18.0%	21	22.6%	15.7%	1.4
Asheville, NC	17.7%	22	12.5%	19.6%	0.6
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	17.7%	23	21.3%	15.6%	1.4
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	17.5%	24	29.6%	13.2%	2.2
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	17.4%	25	21.8%	14.5%	1.5
Chattanooga, TN-GA	17.4%	26	16.5%	18.0%	0.9
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	17.2%	27	23.0%	14.1%	1.6
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	17.2%	28	20.0%	15.9%	1.3
Colorado Springs, CO	17.1%	29	17.1%	16.7%	1.0
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	17.0%	30	20.0%	14.6%	1.4
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	17.0%	31	17.7%	16.5%	1.1
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	17.0%	32	23.0%	13.9%	1.7
Springfield, MA	16.8%	33	17.9%	16.2%	1.1
Richmond, VA	16.6%	34	18.1%	15.8%	1.1
Akron, OH	16.6%	35	19.1%	15.6%	1.2
Columbus, OH	16.5%	36	17.9%	15.6%	1.1

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.2.: Sorted by Overall Rank (Worst to Best) CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	16.4%	37	18.4%	15.4%	1.2
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	16.4%	38	19.0%	15.0%	1.3
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	16.2%	39	18.2%	15.1%	1.2
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	16.2%	40	17.8%	15.2%	1.2
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	16.1%	41	18.3%	14.7%	1.2
Dayton, OH	16.0%	42	20.7%	13.9%	1.5
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	15.8%	43	21.4%	12.5%	1.7
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	15.7%	44	20.5%	12.6%	1.6
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	15.7%	45	17.8%	14.7%	1.2
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	15.6%	46	20.2%	13.7%	1.5
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	15.6%	47	19.4%	13.6%	1.4
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	15.6%	48	18.9%	14.0%	1.4
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	15.5%	49	19.1%	13.3%	1.4
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	15.4%	50	17.0%	14.5%	1.2
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	15.2%	51	17.3%	13.9%	1.2
Jacksonville, FL	15.2%	52	15.8%	14.7%	1.1
Toledo, OH	15.2%	53	18.5%	13.7%	1.4
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	15.0%	54	18.2%	13.3%	1.4
Knoxville, TN	14.9%	55	13.3%	15.5%	0.9
Worcester, MA-CT	14.8%	56	16.9%	13.7%	1.2
Boise City, ID	14.6%	57	16.7%	13.4%	1.2
Wichita, KS	14.6%	58	16.0%	13.7%	1.2
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	14.5%	59	17.4%	12.9%	1.4
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	14.4%	60	17.0%	13.0%	1.3
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	14.4%	61	16.9%	13.1%	1.3
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	14.4%	62	16.0%	13.3%	1.2
Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC-NC	14.4%	63	19.3%	12.2%	1.6
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	14.2%	64	24.4%	10.5%	2.3
Urban Honolulu, HI	14.2%	65	16.3%	13.0%	1.2
Santa Rosa, CA	14.0%	66	18.6%	12.4%	1.5
Huntsville, AL	13.9%	67	11.9%	14.8%	0.8
St. Louis, MO-IL	13.9%	68	18.5%	11.6%	1.6
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	13.9%	69	16.1%	12.7%	1.3
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	13.9%	70	19.0%	11.6%	1.6
Salt Lake City, UT	13.9%	71	16.8%	12.0%	1.4
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	13.9%	72	18.4%	12.2%	1.5

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.2.: Sorted by Overall Rank (Worst to Best) CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Overall and in Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Food Hardship Rate	Rank	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)
Rochester, NY	13.9%	73	18.3%	12.1%	1.5
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	13.9%	74	16.3%	12.4%	1.3
Sacramento--Roseville--Arden-Arcade, CA	13.7%	75	14.1%	13.6%	1.0
Syracuse, NY	13.6%	76	19.0%	11.5%	1.6
New Haven-Milford, CT	13.5%	77	14.4%	13.1%	1.1
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	13.4%	78	14.5%	12.8%	1.1
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	13.3%	79	19.7%	10.8%	1.8
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	13.2%	80	15.7%	12.0%	1.3
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	13.1%	81	16.6%	11.5%	1.4
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	13.0%	82	15.7%	11.2%	1.4
Austin-Round Rock, TX	13.0%	83	15.7%	11.3%	1.4
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	12.9%	84	16.3%	11.9%	1.4
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	12.8%	85	17.3%	10.1%	1.7
Raleigh, NC	12.8%	86	14.2%	11.9%	1.2
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	12.4%	87	14.6%	11.3%	1.3
Kansas City, MO-KS	12.1%	88	12.7%	11.8%	1.1
Pittsburgh, PA	12.0%	89	15.3%	10.6%	1.4
Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	12.0%	90	13.9%	11.0%	1.3
Portland-South Portland, ME	12.0%	91	13.2%	11.5%	1.1
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	11.9%	92	12.7%	11.6%	1.1
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	11.9%	93	12.5%	11.6%	1.1
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	11.8%	94	13.4%	10.5%	1.3
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	11.6%	95	14.5%	10.4%	1.4
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	11.6%	96	11.7%	11.5%	1.0
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	11.6%	97	10.1%	12.2%	0.8
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	11.6%	98	15.0%	9.5%	1.6
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	11.1%	99	12.6%	10.3%	1.2
Anchorage, AK	10.8%	100	8.6%	12.0%	0.7
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	10.6%	101	11.3%	10.3%	1.1
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	10.1%	102	11.2%	9.3%	1.2
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	9.9%	103	10.1%	9.9%	1.0
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	9.6%	104	12.2%	7.3%	1.7
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	9.2%	105	11.3%	8.0%	1.4
Provo-Orem, UT	8.1%	106	8.6%	7.8%	1.1
Madison, WI	8.1%	107	11.9%	6.4%	1.9
Lancaster, PA	7.7%	108	11.5%	5.1%	2.2

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.3.: Sorted by Households With Children Rate (Worst to Best)

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Households With Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Rate: Households With Children
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	34.8%
Jackson, MS	29.8%
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	29.6%
Albuquerque, NM	27.2%
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	25.6%
Greensboro-High Point, NC	25.2%
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	24.9%
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	24.4%
Tulsa, OK	24.0%
Fresno, CA	23.8%
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	23.5%
Bakersfield, CA	23.4%
Baton Rouge, LA	23.3%
Winston-Salem, NC	23.3%
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	23.0%
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	23.0%
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	22.9%
Oklahoma City, OK	22.9%
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	22.7%
Tucson, AZ	22.6%
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	22.4%
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.0%
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	21.8%
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	21.4%
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	13%
Dayton, OH	20.7%
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	20.5%
El Paso, TX	20.2%
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	20.2%
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	20.0%
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	20.0%
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	19.9%
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	19.7%
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	19.4%
Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC-NC	19.3%
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	19.1%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.3.: Sorted by Households With Children Rate (Worst to Best) CONTINUED
Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
 Households With Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Rate: Households With Children
Akron, OH	19.1%
Columbia, SC	19.1%
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	19.0%
Syracuse, NY	19.0%
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	19.0%
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	18.9%
Santa Rosa, CA	18.6%
Toledo, OH	18.5%
St. Louis, MO-IL	18.5%
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	18.4%
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	18.4%
Rochester, NY	18.3%
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	18.3%
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	18.2%
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	18.2%
Richmond, VA	18.1%
Springfield, MA	17.9%
Columbus, OH	17.9%
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	17.8%
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	17.8%
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	17.7%
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	17.4%
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	17.3%
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	17.3%
Colorado Springs, CO	17.1%
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	17.0%
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	17.0%
Worcester, MA-CT	16.9%
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	16.9%
Salt Lake City, UT	16.8%
Boise City, ID	16.7%
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	16.6%
Chattanooga, TN-GA	16.5%
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	16.3%
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	16.3%
Urban Honolulu, HI	16.3%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.3.: Sorted by Households With Children Rate (Worst to Best) CONTINUED
Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017
 Households With Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Rate: Households With Children
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	16.1%
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	16.0%
Wichita, KS	16.0%
Jacksonville, FL	15.8%
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	15.7%
Austin-Round Rock, TX	15.7%
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	15.7%
Pittsburgh, PA	15.3%
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	15.0%
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	14.6%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	14.5%
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	14.5%
New Haven-Milford, CT	14.4%
Raleigh, NC	14.2%
Sacramento--Roseville--Arden-Arcade, CA	14.1%
Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	13.9%
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	13.4%
Knoxville, TN	13.3%
Portland-South Portland, ME	13.2%
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	12.7%
Kansas City, MO-KS	12.7%
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	12.6%
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	12.5%
Asheville, NC	12.5%
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	12.2%
Madison, WI	11.9%
Huntsville, AL	11.9%
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	11.7%
Lancaster, PA	11.5%
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	11.3%
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	11.3%
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	11.2%
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	10.1%
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	10.1%
Anchorage, AK	8.6%
Provo-Orem, UT	8.6%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.4.: Sorted by Households Without Children Rate

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Households Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Rate: Households Without Children
Bakersfield, CA	22.9%
Fresno, CA	20.6%
Columbia, SC	19.8%
Asheville, NC	19.6%
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	19.5%
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	18.9%
Winston-Salem, NC	18.7%
Baton Rouge, LA	18.5%
Chattanooga, TN-GA	18.0%
El Paso, TX	17.9%
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	17.8%
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	17.7%
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	17.2%
Oklahoma City, OK	17.1%
Tulsa, OK	16.8%
Colorado Springs, CO	16.7%
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	16.6%
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	16.5%
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	16.3%
Jackson, MS	16.2%
Springfield, MA	16.2%
Greensboro-High Point, NC	16.1%
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	15.9%
Richmond, VA	15.8%
Tucson, AZ	15.7%
Columbus, OH	15.6%
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	15.6%
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	15.6%
Akron, OH	15.6%
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	15.5%
Knoxville, TN	15.5%
Albuquerque, NM	15.5%
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	15.4%
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	15.2%
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	15.1%
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	15.0%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.4.: Sorted by Households Without Children Rate CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017 Households Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Rate: Households Without Children
Huntsville, AL	14.8%
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	14.7%
Jacksonville, FL	14.7%
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	14.7%
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	14.6%
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	14.5%
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	14.5%
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	14.1%
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	14.0%
Dayton, OH	13.9%
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	13.9%
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	13.9%
Wichita, KS	13.7%
Worcester, MA-CT	13.7%
Toledo, OH	13.7%
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	13.7%
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	13.6%
Sacramento--Roseville--Arden-Arcade, CA	13.6%
Boise City, ID	13.4%
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	13.3%
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	13.3%
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	13.3%
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	13.2%
New Haven-Milford, CT	13.1%
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	13.1%
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	13.0%
Urban Honolulu, HI	13.0%
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	12.9%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	12.8%
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	12.7%
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	12.6%
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	12.5%
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	12.4%
Santa Rosa, CA	12.4%
Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC-NC	12.2%
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	12.2%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.4.: Sorted by Households Without Children Rate CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017 Households Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Rate: Households Without Children
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	12.2%
Rochester, NY	12.1%
Salt Lake City, UT	12.0%
Anchorage, AK	12.0%
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	12.0%
Raleigh, NC	11.9%
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	11.9%
Kansas City, MO-KS	11.8%
St. Louis, MO-IL	11.6%
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	11.6%
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	11.6%
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	11.6%
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	11.5%
Syracuse, NY	11.5%
Portland-South Portland, ME	11.5%
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	11.5%
Austin-Round Rock, TX	11.3%
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	11.3%
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	11.2%
Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	11.0%
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre--Hazleton, PA	10.8%
Pittsburgh, PA	10.6%
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	10.5%
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	10.5%
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	10.4%
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	10.3%
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	10.3%
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	10.1%
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	9.9%
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	9.5%
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	9.3%
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	8.0%
Provo-Orem, UT	7.8%
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	7.3%
Madison, WI	6.4%
Lancaster, PA	5.1%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.5.: Sorted by Ratio

(Households With Children to Households Without Children)

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	2.3	24.4%	10.5%
Lancaster, PA	2.2	11.5%	5.1%
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	2.2	29.6%	13.2%
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	2.1	34.8%	16.6%
Madison, WI	1.9	11.9%	6.4%
Jackson, MS	1.8	29.8%	16.2%
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, PA	1.8	19.7%	10.8%
Albuquerque, NM	1.8	27.2%	15.5%
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	1.7	21.4%	12.5%
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	1.7	17.3%	10.1%
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	1.7	12.2%	7.3%
Spokane-Spokane Valley, WA	1.7	23.0%	13.9%
Syracuse, NY	1.6	19.0%	11.5%
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	1.6	25.6%	15.5%
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	1.6	19.0%	11.6%
Las Vegas-Henderson-Paradise, NV	1.6	23.0%	14.1%
Fayetteville-Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	1.6	20.5%	12.6%
St. Louis, MO-IL	1.6	18.5%	11.6%
Myrtle Beach-Conway-North Myrtle Beach, SC-NC	1.6	19.3%	12.2%
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	1.6	15.0%	9.5%
Greensboro-High Point, NC	1.6	25.2%	16.1%
Rochester, NY	1.5	18.3%	12.1%
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	1.5	18.4%	12.2%
Santa Rosa, CA	1.5	18.6%	12.4%
San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX	1.5	21.8%	14.5%
Dayton, OH	1.5	20.7%	13.9%
Cleveland-Elyria, OH	1.5	20.2%	13.7%
Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL	1.5	22.9%	15.6%
Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA	1.4	16.6%	11.5%
Pittsburgh, PA	1.4	15.3%	10.6%
Tucson, AZ	1.4	22.6%	15.7%
New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA	1.4	19.1%	13.3%
Tulsa, OK	1.4	24.0%	16.8%
Louisville/Jefferson County, KY-IN	1.4	19.4%	13.6%
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	1.4	11.3%	8.0%
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	1.4	15.7%	11.2%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.5.: Sorted by Ratio

(Households With Children to Households Without Children) CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	1.4	14.5%	10.4%
Salt Lake City, UT	1.4	16.8%	12.0%
Austin-Round Rock, TX	1.4	15.7%	11.3%
North Port-Sarasota-Bradenton, FL	1.4	16.3%	11.9%
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	1.4	23.5%	17.2%
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX	1.4	20.0%	14.6%
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	1.4	22.4%	16.3%
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	1.4	18.2%	13.3%
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL	1.4	21.3%	15.6%
Buffalo-Cheektowaga-Niagara Falls, NY	1.4	18.9%	14.0%
Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI	1.4	17.4%	12.9%
Toledo, OH	1.4	18.5%	13.7%
Oklahoma City, OK	1.3	22.9%	17.1%
New Orleans-Metairie, LA	1.3	24.9%	18.9%
Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD	1.3	15.7%	12.0%
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	1.3	16.3%	12.4%
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	1.3	17.0%	13.0%
Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO	1.3	14.6%	11.3%
Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro--Franklin, TN	1.3	16.9%	13.1%
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	1.3	13.4%	10.5%
Charleston-North Charleston, SC	1.3	16.1%	12.7%
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	1.3	19.0%	15.0%
Durham-Chapel Hill, NC	1.3	13.9%	11.0%
Baton Rouge, LA	1.3	23.3%	18.5%
Providence-Warwick, RI-MA	1.3	20.0%	15.9%
Urban Honolulu, HI	1.2	16.3%	13.0%
Boise City, ID	1.2	16.7%	13.4%
Winston-Salem, NC	1.2	23.3%	18.7%
Indianapolis-Carmel-Anderson, IN	1.2	18.3%	14.7%
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	1.2	17.3%	13.9%
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	1.2	22.0%	17.8%
Worcester, MA-CT	1.2	16.9%	13.7%
Akron, OH	1.2	19.1%	15.6%
Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH	1.2	12.6%	10.3%
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	1.2	11.2%	9.3%
Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI	1.2	17.8%	14.7%

Appendix D — MSA Rates

Table D.5.: Sorted by Ratio

(Households With Children to Households Without Children) CONTINUED

Average Annual Food Hardship Rate by Metropolitan Statistical Area, 2016–2017

Households With and Without Children

Metropolitan Statistical Area	Ratio (Households With Children to Households Without Children)	Rate: Households With Children	Rate: Households Without Children
Greenville-Anderson-Mauldin, SC	1.2	18.2%	15.1%
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA	1.2	16.0%	13.3%
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	1.2	18.4%	15.4%
Raleigh, NC	1.2	14.2%	11.9%
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA	1.2	17.8%	15.2%
Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC	1.2	17.0%	14.5%
Wichita, KS	1.2	16.0%	13.7%
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	1.2	22.7%	19.5%
Fresno, CA	1.2	23.8%	20.6%
Richmond, VA	1.1	18.1%	15.8%
Portland-South Portland, ME	1.1	13.2%	11.5%
Columbus, OH	1.1	17.9%	15.6%
Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN	1.1	14.5%	12.8%
El Paso, TX	1.1	20.2%	17.9%
Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway, AR	1.1	19.9%	17.7%
Provo-Orem, UT	1.1	8.6%	7.8%
Springfield, MA	1.1	17.9%	16.2%
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	1.1	12.7%	11.6%
New Haven-Milford, CT	1.1	14.4%	13.1%
San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA	1.1	11.3%	10.3%
Jacksonville, FL	1.1	15.8%	14.7%
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	1.1	12.5%	11.6%
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	1.1	17.7%	16.5%
Kansas City, MO-KS	1.1	12.7%	11.8%
Sacramento--Roseville--Arden-Arcade, CA	1.0	14.1%	13.6%
Bakersfield, CA	1.0	23.4%	22.9%
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	1.0	10.1%	9.9%
Colorado Springs, CO	1.0	17.1%	16.7%
San Diego-Carlsbad, CA	1.0	11.7%	11.5%
Columbia, SC	1.0	19.1%	19.8%
Chattanooga, TN-GA	0.9	16.5%	18.0%
Knoxville, TN	0.9	13.3%	15.5%
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	0.8	10.1%	12.2%
Huntsville, AL	0.8	11.9%	14.8%
Anchorage, AK	0.7	8.6%	12.0%
Asheville, NC	0.6	12.5%	19.6%