

2012 was the fifth year during which the Gallup organization, as part of the Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index, asked hundreds of thousands of households the food hardship question “Have there been times in the past twelve months when you did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed?” In 2012, 18.2 percent of households answered “Yes” to this question.

That continually high rate of food hardship in 2012 is evidence of both the lingering effects of the terrible recession (e.g., high unemployment and underemployment; stagnant and falling wages), and the failure of Congress to respond robustly with initiatives to boost jobs, wages and public income and nutrition support programs. These economic and political shortfalls continue to take a harsh toll on the nation’s food security.

While, as will be shown, the number of households affirming food hardship in every quarter in 2012 was somewhat lower than in late 2011, the numbers were basically the same as in most of 2009, 2010 and the first half of 2011. For four and a half years, the share of households telling Gallup that they didn’t have enough money for food at times over the past year has never gone below 17.5 percent in any quarter and still is only a bit below the peak of 19.5 percent.

More than one in six households told Gallup they were suffering food hardship not just nationally, but:

- in four out of seven regions (the Midwest, Southeast, Southwest and West)
- in 30 states
- in 56 out of 100 large Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs)
- in 207 Congressional Districts.¹

¹ Regional and State data described here are for 2012. MSA and Congressional District data are for 2011-2012 combined, in order to produce adequate sample sizes and thereby reduce margins of error.

National Food Hardship Rates, 2008-2012

Year	Food Hardship Rate
2008	17.8
2009	18.3
2010	18.0
2011	18.6
2012	18.2

The ratio was even higher – at least one in five:

- in the Southeast and Southwest regions
- in 20 states
- in 16 out of 100 large MSAs
- in 107 Congressional Districts.

While unemployment and underemployment rates have remained high and millions of households experienced food hardship: Congress in 2012 and early 2013 failed to enact most of the job creation initiatives the President requested; the Senate voted in 2012 to cut the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as food stamps) by several billion dollars; Congress has harmed low-income programs, including WIC and other nutrition programs, while failing to resolve self-imposed fiscal crises; and Congress has not taken up the President’s proposal to forestall the scheduled November 2013 cut in SNAP benefits.

This is just unacceptable. Food hardship, a marker for household struggles with hunger, is a national scourge that harms children, working-age adults and seniors, harms health, learning and productivity, and drives up health and other costs for families, employers and government. This is a national problem that requires a serious national response. The President and Congress and state and local officials must do better. Mississippi may have the worst rate among states, with one in four households reporting food hardship, but the “best” state, booming North Dakota, has one in ten households struggling with food hardship – just as unacceptable a problem given its prosperity. The worst MSAs may be Bakersfield, California and New Orleans, but 92 of

100 MSAs have at least one in eight (12.5 percent or more) households reporting food hardship. The worst congressional district may be in New York City, but 354 congressional districts – including rural, suburban and urban districts – have rates of 12.5 percent or more.

What this report shows is that the need for efforts to reduce hunger is essential to every state, every MSA, and every congressional district. Americans do not always recognize how pervasive hunger is, or that it is a problem where they live. In our communities it is often hidden by families that do not want to share their economic struggles. Sometimes it hides behind doors of nice houses with mortgages in default or the heat turned off. Sometimes it hides behind the stoic faces of parents who skip meals to protect their children from hunger. It goes unseen by those not looking for it. In a poll conducted in 2011 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 these Gallup data show is that Americans in every community are hungry.

Fortunately, polls also demonstrate that Americans in every community want the federal government to attack hunger aggressively, not reduce anti-hunger efforts. In polls conducted for FRAC in 2012, about seven in 10 (69 percent) voters said the federal government should have a major role to ensure that low-income families and children have the food and nutrition they need. Seventy-two percent of voters said the federal government should be spending more money on solving hunger or should continue to spend the same amount. When voters were told that Congress is considering cutting billions of dollars to reduce government spending, 75 percent of them told pollsters that cutting food assistance programs like the food stamp program is the wrong way to reduce government spending. And these attitudes cross party lines.

About This Report

This report is one of a series in which the FRAC has been analyzing survey data that are being collected by Gallup through the Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index (“Gallup-Healthways”) and provided to FRAC.

The Gallup Healthways survey has several key, unusual characteristics: 1) annual estimates with quick turnaround for national (by month), state, MSA, and congressional level food hardship rates; 2) large sample sizes that allow estimation of food hardship at the MSA and congressional district levels; and 3) weighted data that are representative of the nation, states, MSAs, and congressional districts.

Because Gallup’s partnership with Healthways is interviewing approximately 1,000 households per day almost every day, year-round, that makes possible the depth and breadth of

analysis in this report. (Further technical notes on the sample size and methodology appear at the end of the text.)

Gallup measures food hardship with the following question: **“Have there been times in the past twelve months when you did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed?”** In this report we define an answer of “yes” as reflecting “food hardship.” FRAC uses this phrase to avoid confusion with the Census Bureau/USDA study that produces annual “food insecurity” numbers, but the concepts are comparable.

This report looks at new Gallup data for 2012 and examines 2012 food hardship rates (or, for smaller geographic areas, 2011-2012 rates). The appendix contains charts providing the data:

- for the nation, by month and by quarter;
- for all states in 2012, by rank;
- for all states in 2012, listed alphabetically;
- for the 100 largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in 2011-2012, by rank;
- for the 100 largest Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in 2011-2012, alphabetically;
- for all congressional districts, in rank order by food hardship rate, for 2011-2012 combined; and
- for all congressional districts, organized alphabetically by state, for 2011-2012 combined.

Food Hardship in the Nation

FRAC’s analysis for the nation as a whole in 2012 shows that 18.2 percent of respondents reported food hardship that year – down modestly from the late 2011 levels, but as discussed earlier, otherwise basically unchanged from late 2008 to 2011.

In 2008, the nation’s huge recession hit and the rate of households affirming food hardship rose from 16.1 percent in March to 20.3 percent in November and 19.4 percent in December. Since then, the national rate in any given month has never fallen below 17.1 percent. In other words, the nation’s food hardship rate – much too high before the recession – was made worse by the recession and the nation has yet even to retrace that path, much less start tackling the long-term problem. Families simply do not have adequate resources – from wages, income supports and SNAP – to purchase enough food.

The official government “U-6” unemployment rate – reflecting a combination of unemployment and underemployment – was slightly below 15 percent throughout most of 2012, down from the worst of the recession but still far above the 7 to 10 percent rate that prevailed throughout most of the decade before the recession. At the same time, while the SNAP program is hugely

important to provide nutrition resources to both working and non-working households – supplementing wages or Social Security or other sources of income – the benefits just are not enough for most families to make it through the month. No less an authority than an expert committee of the prestigious Institute of Medicine issued a report in January 2013 explaining that the SNAP allotment is not enough for most families. This will get worse in November 2013: unless the President and Congress act, SNAP participants will see their benefits drop this coming fall – most likely by \$20-\$25 for a family of three – as cuts made by a 2010 law take effect.

A separate FRAC analysis of USDA-generated data from 2000-2011 (2012 data are not yet available) showed that median food spending for all households has plummeted in the last 10 years, especially in the recession and since. Racial and ethnic disparities exist as well. Median spending on food among all Black households and Hispanic households fell to the point where it was actually **below** the amount needed to purchase the Thrifty Food Plan, the inadequate government definition of what is needed that is used for determining SNAP benefits.

Bringing down 2012's food hardship rate will require higher employment, better wages, and better nutrition supports.

Food Hardship by Region

Looking at the rates of food hardship in the USDA Food and Nutrition Service's seven geographic regions, the hardest hit regions in 2012, as in previous years, were the Southeast and Southwest (each 21.1 percent), while the regions with lower rates were the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic and Mountain Plains. This largely tracked the state and local rates, as will be seen in later sections. (To see which states are in each Food and Nutrition Service region, go to <http://1.usa.gov/V9PkPd>.)

Food Hardship by Region, 2012

Region	Food Hardship Rate
Mid-Atlantic	15.9
Midwest	17.0
Mountain Plains	15.7
Northeast	15.9
Southeast	21.1
Southwest	21.1
Western	18.7

Food Hardship in the States

Rates in the states varied from a low of 10.9 percent in North Dakota to a high of 24.6 percent in Mississippi – nearly two and a half times higher. Still, food hardship is a significant problem in **every state** – even one in ten is hardly acceptable. And **20 states had at least one in five respondents** (20 percent or more) answer that they did not

have enough money to buy food at some point in the past 12 months. **Forty-two states overall, including the District of Columbia, had 15 percent or more** of respondents affirming food hardship. In only one state did fewer than one in eight respondents answer the question affirmatively.

Of the 16 states with the worst rates, seven were in the Southeast, four were in the Southwest, three were in the West, and two in the Mid-Atlantic region. Data for all 50 states and the District of Columbia are in the Appendix.

Top 20 States for Food Hardship, 2012

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Mississippi	24.6	1
Louisiana	24.5	2
West Virginia	24.2	3
Alabama	23.6	4
Arkansas	22.8	5
Tennessee	22.2	6
Georgia	22.0	7
Nevada	22.0	7
Texas	21.8	9
North Carolina	21.6	10
South Carolina	21.5	11
Florida	21.3	12
Delaware	21.2	13
Arizona	20.9	14
California	20.6	15
Oklahoma	20.6	15
Ohio	20.5	17
Indiana	20.4	18
Kentucky	20.3	19
Michigan	20.2	20

Food Hardship in Metropolitan Areas

Metropolitan Statistical Areas (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 2011 and 2012 data to produce more accurate estimates.

Of the 100 MSAs with the largest number of respondents to the Gallup-Healthways survey in 2011-2012, **16 MSAs had at least one in five respondents** answering that they did not have enough money to buy needed food at times in the past 12 months, and **74 of the 100 largest MSAs had 15 percent or more** of households affirmatively answering this question. Again, while there was variation around the

Top 25 MSAs for Food Hardship, 2011-2012

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	Food Hardship 2011-2012	
	Rate	Rank
Bakersfield, CA	26.7	1
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	23.0	2
Greensboro-High Point, NC	23.0	2
Dayton, OH	22.5	4
Fresno, CA	22.4	5
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	22.3	6
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	22.2	7
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	22.0	8
Asheville, NC	21.8	9
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	21.5	10
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	20.8	11
Baton Rouge, LA	20.7	12
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	20.7	12
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	20.5	14
San Antonio, TX	20.5	14
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	20.0	16
Oklahoma City, OK	19.9	17
Little Rock-N Little Rock-Conway, AR	19.8	18
Albuquerque, NM	19.7	19
Jacksonville, FL	19.6	20
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	19.6	20
Tulsa, OK	19.1	22
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	19.0	23
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	19.0	23
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	18.8	25

country, the inability to purchase adequate food was a serious problem in every MSA. In only eight MSAs was it below 12.5 percent (one in eight respondents).

Despite the common impression that urban poverty and economic hardship are clustered in the Northeast and Midwest, most of the MSAs with the highest rates of food hardship were in the Southeast and Southwest, plus California. Of the 25 MSAs with the worst rates, six were in Florida, four were in California, and two each were in Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Texas.

Food Hardship in Congressional Districts

The Gallup-Healthways survey also provides an adequate sample to measure food hardship in every one of America's 436 congressional districts (including one in the District of Columbia). FRAC aggregated 2011-2012 data to produce more accurate estimates at the congressional district level.

The results show widespread food hardship. **Twenty-six congressional districts had a rate of 25 percent or more** – at least one in four respondents answered the Gallup-Healthways question “yes.” **One-hundred and seven congressional districts had a rate of at least 20**

percent rate, and 269 had rates of 15 percent or higher. Only 28 districts in the country reported a rate lower than 10 percent. In other words, the vast majority of congressional districts in the country had more than one in ten respondents reporting food hardship. The median congressional district had a rate of 16.5 percent. Of the 30 districts with the worst rates, six were in California, six were in Texas, four were in Florida, and two were in Illinois.²

The appendix includes two separate lists with the food hardship rate for every congressional district in 2011-2012. The first is designed to make it easy for readers to find rates in specific districts of interest to them: it is organized alphabetically by state and, within the state, by the congressional district number. That list gives the rate for each

² Important note on interpreting Congressional District food hardship rates: except in a relatively small number of Congressional districts, the redistricting that occurred for the 2012 election, based on the 2010 census, means that the districts represented by members of the 113th Congress in 2013-2014 are physically different from the districts in 2011-2012 when Gallup polled respondents. Eighteen states lost or gained one or more House seats. And the remaining states (except, obviously, for those with just one House member) also redistricted to varying degrees. In other words, it would be inaccurate to say that the current representative of a particular Congressional District represents exactly the district of the same number in which a certain percent of households reported food hardship in 2011-2012; the geographic make-up of the district has changed. Therefore, unlike prior years, FRAC has not put the names of members of Congress next to the district numbers.

district and also shows where each district ranks nationally, with 1 being the highest (worst) food hardship rate and 436 being the lowest. The second list is organized by rank among the 436 districts, with 1 being the highest rate and 436 being the lowest.

Ranking 300th or even 400th on this list, however, should not be a point of pride. After all, the “best” district in the country has one in 16 households suffering food hardship. What this list shows is that food hardship is a problem in every corner of America, and should be a concern for every member of Congress. In the end, the nation’s food hardship problem does not boil down to the more than two dozen districts with rates over 25 percent or even to the half of all districts above the median of 16.5 percent. It boils down to the fact that in 436 congressional districts in this extraordinarily wealthy nation, somewhere between 6.2 percent and 36.3 percent of respondents – and in 408 districts, 10 percent or more of respondents – affirmed to Gallup that there were “times in the past twelve months when [they] did not have enough money

to buy food that [they or their family] needed.” That is a national problem demanding aggressive steps toward a solution.

Recommendations

Food hardship rates are too high in every corner of the nation. It is crucial that the nation move toward full employment, strengthen wages, and develop public supports that will dramatically decrease these food hardship numbers and do so quickly.

For FRAC’s seven-point strategy specifically aimed at reaching the President’s goal of ending childhood hunger by 2015, see <http://bit.ly/YXVDSO>. As a nation, even in difficult times, we have the resources to eliminate hunger for everyone, regardless of age or family configuration. The cost of not doing so – in terms of damage to health, education, early childhood development and productivity – is just too high. The moral cost of not doing so is even higher

Top 30 Congressional Districts for Food Hardship, 2011-2012

State	District	Food Hardship 2011-2012	
		Rate	Rank
New York	16th	36.3	1
California	34th	32.8	2
California	20th	31.9	3
Florida	3rd	30.9	4
California	47th	30.2	5
Arizona	4th	30.1	6
Texas	30th	29.8	7
Florida	17th	28.5	8
Texas	29th	28.5	8
Michigan	13th	27.9	10
California	35th	27.6	11
Texas	28th	27.2	12
Texas	9th	27.2	12
Illinois	4th	27.1	14
Alabama	7th	27.1	14
Texas	20th	26.8	16
Florida	23rd	26.7	17
Mississippi	2nd	26.7	17
Nevada	1st	26.6	19
Pennsylvania	1st	26.3	20
California	43rd	26.1	21
North Carolina	1st	25.9	22
Kentucky	5th	25.6	23
Illinois	2nd	25.2	24
California	37th	25.1	25
Georgia	2nd	25.0	26
West Virginia	3rd	24.9	27
South Carolina	6th	24.8	28
Louisiana	2nd	24.8	28
Texas	15th	24.7	30
Florida	25th	24.7	30

The policy path for the nation to reduce the suffering and unnecessary costs caused by hunger, poverty and reduced opportunity is clear: higher employment rates, more full-time jobs, and better wages and benefits; stronger income supports through unemployment insurance, TANF, refundable tax credits, and other means; and stronger nutrition programs. That last point means broadened eligibility; improved access among those who are eligible (fewer than three in four who are eligible for SNAP receive benefits; barely half of eligible children receive school breakfast); and improved benefits, especially in SNAP.

As noted earlier, a committee of the Institute of Medicine (IOM) issued an important report earlier this year that found SNAP benefits to be too low for most families. The report's detailing of the shortcomings underscores why recent 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 point 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 as Congress starts fresh on a Farm Bill this year. And Congress must restore the cut that will reduce monthly benefits beginning in November 2013.

Methodology

Results are based on telephone (landline or cellular) interviews in 2012 for national and state estimates, and in 2011 through 2012 for MSA and congressional district estimates, with randomly sampled adults, age 18 or older in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Total sample sizes for 2011 and 2012 were 352,789 and 352,817 respectively. Margins of error were calculated using 90 percent confidence intervals.

Data are weighted to be representative at the national, state, MSA, and congressional district levels based on known census figures for age, race, sex, education, population density (for national estimates), number of adults in the household and phone status (i.e., landline vs. 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.

Because differences within MSAs and congressional districts from year to year are often small and sample sizes for each year can be limiting, there is potential for overlap across the years. Therefore, readers are cautioned against comparing a

2011-2012 rate for a particular MSA or congressional district to our prior report data for 2010-2011.

At the national level for 2012 (n=352,817) the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 1 percentage point. At the regional level for 2012 (n=352,817; range: 34,521-71,754), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 1 percentage point. At the state level for 2012 (n=352,817; range: 824-32,131), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 2.2 percentage points.

At the MSA level for 2011-2012 (n=415,474; range: 907-30,151), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 2.1 percentage points. At the congressional district level for 2011-2012 (n=689,763; range: 619-4,633), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 3.1 percentage points.

At the national level for 2008-2012 by month (n=1,593,548; range: 13,242-31,375), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 1 percentage point. At the national level for 2008-2012 by quarter (n=1,593,548; range: 43,794-91,634), the margin of error was less than or equal to ± 1 percentage point.

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Michael Burke, Heather Hartline-Grafton and Jim Weill.

National Food Hardship Rate, by Month 2008-2012

Month	Food Hardship Rate
2008	
January 2008	16.5
February 2008	16.2
March 2008	16.1
April 2008	16.7
May 2008	17.4
June 2008	17.4
July 2008	17.0
August 2008	19.1
September 2008	18.5
October 2008	18.8
November 2008	20.3
December 2008	19.4
2009	
January 2009	18.8
February 2009	19.0
March 2009	18.6
April 2009	18.2
May 2009	18.4
June 2009	17.3
July 2009	17.7
August 2009	17.9
September 2009	18.1
October 2009	18.9
November 2009	18.3
December 2009	18.2
2010	
January 2010	18.1
February 2010	17.9
March 2010	18.0
April 2010	17.1
May 2010	17.9
June 2010	17.5
July 2010	17.6
August 2010	18.2
September 2010	18.0
October 2010	19.3
November 2010	18.2
December 2010	18.6

Month	Food Hardship Rate
2011	
January 2011	18.4
February 2011	17.6
March 2011	17.6
April 2011	17.4
May 2011	18.4
June 2011	18.3
July 2011	19.1
August 2011	18.8
September 2011	19.8
October 2011	20.1
November 2011	19.0
December 2011	19.0
2012	
January 2012	18.3
February 2012	18.1
March 2012	18.6
April 2012	17.5
May 2012	18.3
June 2012	18.7
July 2012	18.8
August 2012	18.4
September 2012	17.9
October 2012	18.1
November 2012	17.9
December 2012	17.8

National Food Hardship Rate by Quarter, 2008-2012

Quarter	Food Hardship Rate
1st 2008	16.3
2nd 2008	17.1
3rd 2008	18.2
4th 2008	19.5
1st 2009	18.8
2nd 2009	18.0
3rd 2009	17.9
4th 2009	18.5
1st 2010	18.0
2nd 2010	17.5
3rd 2010	17.9
4th 2010	18.7
1st 2011	17.9
2nd 2011	18.0
3rd 2011	19.2
4th 2011	19.4
1st 2012	18.4
2nd 2012	18.2
3rd 2012	18.4
4th 2012	17.9

Food Hardship in 2012 by State, by Rank

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Mississippi	24.6	1
Louisiana	24.5	2
West Virginia	24.2	3
Alabama	23.6	4
Arkansas	22.8	5
Tennessee	22.2	6
Georgia	22.0	7
Nevada	22.0	7
Texas	21.8	9
North Carolina	21.6	10
South Carolina	21.5	11
Florida	21.3	12
Delaware	21.2	13
Arizona	20.9	14
California	20.6	15
Oklahoma	20.6	15
Ohio	20.5	17
Indiana	20.4	18
Kentucky	20.3	19
Michigan	20.2	20
New Mexico	19.3	21
Rhode Island	19.3	21
Alaska	19.2	23
Oregon	18.5	24
Missouri	18.2	25
New York	17.7	26
Illinois	17.6	27
Utah	17.3	28
New Jersey	17.1	29
Wyoming	16.8	30
Maine	16.6	31
Hawaii	16.5	32
Pennsylvania	16.5	32
Colorado	16.2	34
Maryland	16.2	34
Kansas	16.1	36
Virginia	16.1	36
Washington	16.0	38
Idaho	15.4	39
Montana	15.1	40
District of Columbia	15.0	41
Massachusetts	15.0	41
Iowa	14.9	43
South Dakota	14.9	43
Connecticut	14.6	45
New Hampshire	14.4	46
Wisconsin	14.0	47
Nebraska	13.8	48
Minnesota	13.7	49
Vermont	12.8	50
North Dakota	10.9	51

Food Hardship in 2012 by State, Alphabetically		
State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Alabama	23.6	4
Alaska	19.2	23
Arizona	20.9	14
Arkansas	22.8	5
California	20.6	15
Colorado	16.2	34
Connecticut	14.6	45
Delaware	21.2	13
District of Columbia	15.0	41
Florida	21.3	12
Georgia	22.0	7
Hawaii	16.5	32
Idaho	15.4	39
Illinois	17.6	27
Indiana	20.4	18
Iowa	14.9	43
Kansas	16.1	36
Kentucky	20.3	19
Louisiana	24.5	2
Maine	16.6	31
Maryland	16.2	34
Massachusetts	15.0	41
Michigan	20.2	20
Minnesota	13.7	49
Mississippi	24.6	1
Missouri	18.2	25
Montana	15.1	40
Nebraska	13.8	48
Nevada	22.0	7
New Hampshire	14.4	46
New Jersey	17.1	29
New Mexico	19.3	21
New York	17.7	26
North Carolina	21.6	10
North Dakota	10.9	51
Ohio	20.5	17
Oklahoma	20.6	15
Oregon	18.5	24
Pennsylvania	16.5	32
Rhode Island	19.3	21
South Carolina	21.5	11
South Dakota	14.9	43
Tennessee	22.2	6
Texas	21.8	9
Utah	17.3	28
Vermont	12.8	50
Virginia	16.1	36
Washington	16.0	38
West Virginia	24.2	3
Wisconsin	14.0	47
Wyoming	16.8	30

Food Hardship Rate in 2011-2012 for 100 Large Metropolitan Statistical Areas, by Rank

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Bakersfield, CA	26.7	1
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	23.0	2
Greensboro-High Point, NC	23.0	2
Dayton, OH	22.5	4
Fresno, CA	22.4	5
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	22.3	6
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	22.2	7
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	22.0	8
Asheville, NC	21.8	9
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	21.5	10
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	20.8	11
Baton Rouge, LA	20.7	12
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	20.7	12
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	20.5	14
San Antonio, TX	20.5	14
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	20.0	16
Oklahoma City, OK	19.9	17
Little Rock-N Little Rock-Conway, AR	19.8	18
Albuquerque, NM	19.7	19
Jacksonville, FL	19.6	20
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	19.6	20
Tulsa, OK	19.1	22
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	19.0	23
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	19.0	23
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	18.8	25
Knoxville, TN	18.7	26
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	18.7	26
Toledo, OH	18.7	26
Columbia, SC	18.4	29
Tucson, AZ	18.3	30
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	18.3	30
Springfield, MA	18.3	30
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	18.2	33
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	18.2	33
Charleston-N Charleston-Summerville, SC	18.0	35
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	18.0	35
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	18.0	35
Akron, OH	17.9	38
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	17.9	38
Anchorage, AK	17.8	40
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	17.8	40
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	17.8	40
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	17.7	43
Spokane, WA	17.5	44
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	17.3	45
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	17.2	46
Richmond, VA	17.2	46
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	17.1	48
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC	17.1	48
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	17.0	50
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	17.0	50

Food Hardship Rate in 2011-2012 for 100 Large Metropolitan Statistical Areas, by Rank

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	17.0	50
Boise City-Nampa, ID	16.9	53
Austin-Round Rock, TX	16.9	53
Columbus, OH	16.8	55
Wichita, KS	16.8	55
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	16.6	57
Worcester, MA	16.6	57
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	16.6	57
Salt Lake City, UT	16.5	60
New York-North New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	16.3	61
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	16.2	62
Winston-Salem, NC	16.0	63
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	16.0	63
Bradenton-Sarasota-Venice, FL	16.0	63
Baltimore-Towson, MD	15.9	66
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	15.9	66
New Haven-Milford, CT	15.7	68
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	15.7	68
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	15.4	70
Denver-Aurora, CO	15.4	70
St. Louis, MO-IL	15.3	72
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	15.2	73
Kansas City, MO-KS	15.0	74
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	14.8	75
Raleigh-Cary, NC	14.8	75
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	14.1	77
Durham, NC	14.1	77
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	14.0	79
Colorado Springs, CO	14.0	79
Rochester, NY	13.8	81
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	13.7	82
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	13.5	83
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	13.5	83
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	13.3	85
Syracuse, NY	13.2	86
Pittsburgh, PA	13.1	87
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	13.0	88
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	12.9	89
York-Hanover, PA	12.8	90
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	12.7	91
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	12.6	92
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	12.3	93
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	12.2	94
Honolulu, HI	12.2	94
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	12.1	96
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	11.7	97
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	11.5	98
Lancaster, PA	9.8	99
Madison, WI	8.7	100

Food Hardship Rate in 2011-2012 for 100 Large Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Alphabetically

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Akron, OH	17.9	38
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	14.8	75
Albuquerque, NM	19.7	19
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	16.0	64
Anchorage, AK	17.8	40
Asheville, NC	21.8	9
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	18.0	37
Austin-Round Rock, TX	16.9	54
Bakersfield, CA	26.7	1
Baltimore-Towson, MD	15.9	66
Baton Rouge, LA	20.7	12
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	20.8	11
Boise City-Nampa, ID	16.9	53
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	12.7	91
Bradenton-Sarasota-Venice, FL	16.0	65
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	12.3	93
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	13.5	83
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	19.0	23
Charleston-N Charleston-Summerville, SC	18.0	35
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	16.6	59
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	16.6	57
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	17.3	45
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	17.2	46
Colorado Springs, CO	14.0	80
Columbia, SC	18.4	29
Columbus, OH	16.8	55
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	18.3	31
Dayton, OH	22.5	4
Denver-Aurora, CO	15.4	71
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	12.9	89
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	18.0	36
Durham, NC	14.1	78
Fresno, CA	22.4	5
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	17.0	51
Greensboro-High Point, NC	23.0	3
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC	17.1	49
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	11.7	97
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	13.7	82
Honolulu, HI	12.2	95
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	18.8	25
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	17.7	43
Jacksonville, FL	19.6	20
Kansas City, MO-KS	15.0	74
Knoxville, TN	18.7	26
Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL	22.0	8
Lancaster, PA	9.8	99
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	22.2	7
Little Rock-N Little Rock-Conway, AR	19.8	18
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	19.0	24
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	20.5	14
Madison, WI	8.7	100

Food Hardship Rate in 2011-2012 for 100 Large Metropolitan Statistical Areas, Alphabetically

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	19.6	21
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	20.7	13
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	13.5	84
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	12.2	94
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	18.2	34
New Haven-Milford, CT	15.7	68
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	23.0	2
New York-North New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	16.3	61
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	17.0	50
Oklahoma City, OK	19.9	17
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	14.1	77
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	21.5	10
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	16.2	62
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	18.7	27
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	15.9	67
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	17.8	41
Pittsburgh, PA	13.1	87
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	12.6	92
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	15.2	73
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY	13.3	85
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	17.8	42
Raleigh-Cary, NC	14.8	76
Richmond, VA	17.2	47
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	22.3	6
Rochester, NY	13.8	81
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	17.9	39
Salt Lake City, UT	16.5	60
San Antonio, TX	20.5	15
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	15.4	70
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	13.0	88
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	12.1	96
Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA	17.0	52
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	18.2	33
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	14.0	79
Spokane, WA	17.5	44
Springfield, MA	18.3	32
St. Louis, MO-IL	15.3	72
Syracuse, NY	13.2	86
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	20.0	16
Toledo, OH	18.7	28
Tucson, AZ	18.3	30
Tulsa, OK	19.1	22
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	15.7	69
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	11.5	98
Wichita, KS	16.8	56
Winston-Salem, NC	16.0	63
Worcester, MA	16.6	58
York-Hanover, PA	12.8	90
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	17.1	48

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
New York	16th	36.3	1
California	34th	32.8	2
California	20th	31.9	3
Florida	3rd	30.9	4
California	47th	30.2	5
Arizona	4th	30.1	6
Texas	30th	29.8	7
Florida	17th	28.5	8
Texas	29th	28.5	8
Michigan	13th	27.9	10
California	35th	27.6	11
Texas	28th	27.2	12
Texas	9th	27.2	12
Illinois	4th	27.1	14
Alabama	7th	27.1	14
Texas	20th	26.8	16
Florida	23rd	26.7	17
Mississippi	2nd	26.7	17
Nevada	1st	26.6	19
Pennsylvania	1st	26.3	20
California	43rd	26.1	21
North Carolina	1st	25.9	22
Kentucky	5th	25.6	23
Illinois	2nd	25.2	24
California	37th	25.1	25
Georgia	2nd	25.0	26
West Virginia	3rd	24.9	27
South Carolina	6th	24.8	28
Louisiana	2nd	24.8	28
Texas	15th	24.7	30
Florida	25th	24.7	30
Florida	11th	24.6	32
Texas	18th	24.5	33
Alabama	1st	24.2	34
Indiana	7th	24.2	34
California	18th	24.2	34
California	31st	24.1	37
Michigan	14th	24.0	38
California	38th	23.8	39
North Carolina	12th	23.8	39
New Jersey	13th	23.8	39
California	33rd	23.7	42
Illinois	1st	23.6	43
New York	10th	23.4	44
New Jersey	10th	23.3	45
Louisiana	5th	23.1	46
New York	11th	23.0	47
Texas	27th	22.9	48
Texas	16th	22.8	49
Tennessee	3rd	22.8	49
Arkansas	1st	22.7	51

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
Mississippi	4th	22.7	51
New York	15th	22.6	53
Arkansas	4th	22.5	54
Texas	1st	22.5	54
California	21st	22.4	56
Texas	5th	22.3	57
Illinois	3rd	22.3	57
Oklahoma	5th	22.3	57
Louisiana	7th	22.1	60
Georgia	1st	22.1	60
Alabama	4th	21.9	62
Alabama	3rd	21.9	62
New Jersey	1st	21.9	62
California	25th	21.9	62
Wisconsin	4th	21.8	66
Virginia	3rd	21.8	66
West Virginia	2nd	21.7	68
Florida	8th	21.7	68
Georgia	13th	21.7	68
California	5th	21.7	68
New York	7th	21.7	68
Tennessee	9th	21.6	73
Oklahoma	2nd	21.5	74
California	41st	21.3	75
Arizona	7th	21.2	76
Indiana	2nd	21.2	76
Florida	12th	21.1	78
Mississippi	1st	21.1	78
Georgia	12th	21.0	80
Ohio	1st	21.0	80
California	19th	21.0	80
New York	12th	21.0	80
Alabama	2nd	20.8	84
California	32nd	20.8	84
Missouri	8th	20.8	84
Tennessee	8th	20.7	87
Florida	18th	20.6	88
New York	6th	20.6	88
Ohio	8th	20.6	88
North Carolina	10th	20.5	91
North Carolina	11th	20.5	91
California	51st	20.4	93
Ohio	3rd	20.4	93
Georgia	9th	20.3	95
North Carolina	8th	20.3	95
Mississippi	3rd	20.3	95
Virginia	9th	20.2	98
Tennessee	4th	20.2	98
Michigan	12th	20.2	98
New Jersey	2nd	20.1	101
Arizona	1st	20.1	101

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
Ohio	11th	20.1	101
Ohio	7th	20.1	101
Texas	25th	20.0	105
Louisiana	4th	20.0	105
Tennessee	1st	20.0	105
Georgia	8th	19.8	108
Texas	4th	19.8	108
Texas	19th	19.8	108
South Carolina	5th	19.8	108
Tennessee	6th	19.8	108
Indiana	6th	19.8	108
Louisiana	1st	19.7	114
Maryland	7th	19.7	114
Texas	23rd	19.6	116
North Carolina	7th	19.5	117
Louisiana	3rd	19.5	117
Georgia	3rd	19.5	117
North Carolina	13th	19.5	117
California	28th	19.4	121
Oklahoma	3rd	19.4	121
Michigan	5th	19.3	123
New York	17th	19.2	124
California	44th	19.2	124
Georgia	5th	19.2	124
Missouri	7th	19.2	124
Florida	2nd	19.1	128
Georgia	4th	19.1	128
California	45th	19.0	130
South Carolina	4th	19.0	130
Texas	17th	19.0	130
Oregon	2nd	18.9	133
Tennessee	2nd	18.9	133
California	22nd	18.9	133
South Carolina	3rd	18.9	133
North Carolina	2nd	18.9	133
Florida	21st	18.9	133
California	49th	18.9	133
California	7th	18.9	133
California	39th	18.9	133
Michigan	7th	18.8	142
Nevada	2nd	18.7	143
Texas	2nd	18.7	143
Ohio	17th	18.7	143
Kentucky	6th	18.7	143
Pennsylvania	2nd	18.7	143
Missouri	1st	18.6	148
Florida	1st	18.6	148
Florida	4th	18.6	148
California	2nd	18.5	151
Ohio	15th	18.5	151
Florida	6th	18.5	151

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
Louisiana	6th	18.5	151
California	1st	18.4	155
Georgia	10th	18.4	155
Florida	24th	18.4	155
Ohio	6th	18.4	155
Kentucky	2nd	18.3	159
California	17th	18.3	159
Arkansas	3rd	18.3	159
New Mexico	2nd	18.3	159
Kentucky	3rd	18.2	163
Texas	32nd	18.2	163
Florida	7th	18.2	163
Missouri	4th	18.2	163
Texas	12th	18.0	167
North Carolina	6th	18.0	167
Alaska	At-Large	17.9	169
Indiana	8th	17.8	170
North Carolina	5th	17.8	170
Maine	2nd	17.7	172
Arizona	3rd	17.7	172
Kentucky	1st	17.7	172
Massachusetts	2nd	17.7	172
Texas	8th	17.7	172
Florida	15th	17.6	177
Michigan	6th	17.6	177
Florida	9th	17.6	177
Michigan	4th	17.6	177
Texas	13th	17.6	177
West Virginia	1st	17.5	182
California	27th	17.5	182
Arkansas	2nd	17.5	182
Oregon	4th	17.5	182
Florida	10th	17.5	182
Maryland	2nd	17.4	187
Washington	5th	17.4	187
Alabama	5th	17.4	187
Washington	6th	17.4	187
Missouri	6th	17.3	191
New Mexico	3rd	17.3	191
Pennsylvania	11th	17.3	191
Oklahoma	4th	17.3	191
Illinois	15th	17.2	195
Florida	20th	17.2	195
Oklahoma	1st	17.2	195
Ohio	18th	17.2	195
Tennessee	5th	17.1	199
Utah	3rd	17.0	200
California	23rd	16.9	201
New Mexico	1st	16.9	201
South Carolina	1st	16.9	201
Delaware	At-Large	16.8	204

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
Illinois	5th	16.8	204
California	3rd	16.8	204
Ohio	4th	16.7	207
Ohio	10th	16.6	208
Georgia	7th	16.6	208
Kansas	4th	16.6	208
Indiana	9th	16.6	208
Colorado	1st	16.5	212
Pennsylvania	3rd	16.5	212
Washington	2nd	16.5	212
Washington	9th	16.5	212
Kentucky	4th	16.5	212
Texas	6th	16.5	212
New Jersey	8th	16.5	212
New York	2nd	16.4	219
Michigan	1st	16.4	219
Georgia	11th	16.4	219
Nevada	3rd	16.4	219
Rhode Island	2nd	16.4	219
Colorado	3rd	16.4	219
Indiana	1st	16.4	219
Indiana	3rd	16.3	226
Oregon	3rd	16.3	226
Indiana	4th	16.3	226
Texas	24th	16.3	226
Ohio	9th	16.2	230
Alabama	6th	16.2	230
North Carolina	3rd	16.2	230
Florida	22nd	16.2	230
Virginia	5th	16.1	234
Florida	16th	16.0	235
Missouri	3rd	16.0	235
Texas	14th	15.9	237
Ohio	5th	15.9	237
New York	28th	15.9	237
Pennsylvania	12th	15.8	240
Rhode Island	1st	15.7	241
Michigan	15th	15.7	241
Ohio	13th	15.7	241
New York	13th	15.7	241
Colorado	7th	15.7	241
Washington	4th	15.7	241
Texas	11th	15.6	247
New Jersey	4th	15.6	247
Florida	5th	15.6	247
Pennsylvania	14th	15.5	250
New York	24th	15.5	250
California	9th	15.5	250
Illinois	7th	15.5	250
Illinois	18th	15.4	254
New York	22nd	15.4	254

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
New York	9th	15.4	254
Illinois	12th	15.4	254
Virginia	6th	15.4	254
Pennsylvania	10th	15.3	259
New York	21st	15.3	259
Virginia	4th	15.2	261
Illinois	11th	15.2	261
California	53rd	15.2	261
Minnesota	5th	15.2	261
California	52nd	15.2	261
Florida	13th	15.1	266
Idaho	2nd	15.1	266
Utah	1st	15.1	266
Pennsylvania	15th	15.0	269
Florida	19th	14.9	270
Michigan	3rd	14.9	270
Missouri	5th	14.9	270
Michigan	2nd	14.9	270
New York	23rd	14.9	270
Maryland	1st	14.9	270
New Jersey	6th	14.8	276
Florida	14th	14.8	276
Virginia	2nd	14.8	276
Colorado	5th	14.6	279
Arizona	2nd	14.6	279
Massachusetts	1st	14.6	279
Idaho	1st	14.6	279
Iowa	5th	14.5	283
Illinois	16th	14.5	283
Illinois	17th	14.5	283
California	6th	14.4	286
Oregon	5th	14.4	286
Ohio	14th	14.4	286
Nebraska	2nd	14.4	286
Missouri	9th	14.4	286
Texas	31st	14.3	291
Texas	3rd	14.3	291
Montana	At-Large	14.2	293
Ohio	2nd	14.2	293
Minnesota	8th	14.2	293
Hawaii	2nd	14.2	293
Utah	2nd	14.1	297
Texas	26th	14.1	297
Pennsylvania	9th	14.1	297
Illinois	8th	14.0	300
Illinois	14th	14.0	300
New Hampshire	1st	13.9	302
Virginia	1st	13.9	302
California	40th	13.9	302
Oregon	1st	13.9	302
California	10th	13.8	306

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
Maryland	4th	13.8	306
Massachusetts	8th	13.8	306
Pennsylvania	17th	13.8	306
Wisconsin	1st	13.7	310
Tennessee	7th	13.7	310
Arizona	8th	13.7	310
Wyoming	At-Large	13.6	313
Connecticut	3rd	13.6	313
North Carolina	9th	13.6	313
Kansas	2nd	13.6	313
Colorado	2nd	13.6	313
South Carolina	2nd	13.6	313
Washington	3rd	13.6	313
South Dakota	At-Large	13.5	320
Wisconsin	7th	13.5	320
New York	4th	13.5	320
California	26th	13.5	320
California	8th	13.4	324
Maryland	5th	13.4	324
Pennsylvania	7th	13.3	326
Connecticut	1st	13.3	326
New York	27th	13.3	326
California	11th	13.3	326
Pennsylvania	5th	13.3	326
Massachusetts	3rd	13.3	326
Michigan	10th	13.3	326
Illinois	19th	13.3	326
New York	29th	13.2	334
Wisconsin	6th	13.1	335
Kansas	1st	13.1	335
Texas	7th	13.1	335
Ohio	12th	13.1	335
Kansas	3rd	13.1	335
Arizona	6th	13.0	340
New York	20th	13.0	340
Nebraska	3rd	13.0	340
Massachusetts	5th	13.0	340
California	29th	12.9	344
Vermont	At-Large	12.7	345
New York	5th	12.7	345
Pennsylvania	13th	12.7	345
Iowa	1st	12.7	345
Colorado	4th	12.7	345
California	46th	12.6	350
Michigan	11th	12.6	350
Iowa	2nd	12.6	350
California	4th	12.5	353
Ohio	16th	12.5	353
Iowa	3rd	12.4	355
California	13th	12.4	355
Connecticut	2nd	12.4	355

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank			
State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
Minnesota	4th	12.4	355
California	24th	12.4	355
New Hampshire	2nd	12.4	355
Texas	21st	12.3	361
Maryland	3rd	12.3	361
Pennsylvania	19th	12.3	361
Maine	1st	12.3	361
Texas	10th	12.3	361
Maryland	6th	12.3	361
Indiana	5th	12.2	367
Virginia	7th	12.2	367
New Jersey	9th	12.2	367
California	16th	12.1	370
Michigan	8th	12.1	370
New York	3rd	12.1	370
Massachusetts	4th	12.0	373
Texas	22nd	12.0	373
Wisconsin	8th	12.0	373
District of Columbia	At-Large	12.0	373
Connecticut	5th	12.0	373
California	15th	11.9	378
California	36th	11.9	378
New York	1st	11.9	378
Massachusetts	9th	11.9	378
New Jersey	3rd	11.8	382
Iowa	4th	11.7	383
Pennsylvania	6th	11.6	384
Massachusetts	6th	11.5	385
California	50th	11.5	385
Arizona	5th	11.4	387
New York	26th	11.3	388
New York	25th	11.3	388
Massachusetts	10th	11.3	388
New York	19th	11.2	391
California	42nd	11.1	392
Connecticut	4th	11.1	392
Illinois	6th	10.8	394
Pennsylvania	8th	10.8	394
Nebraska	1st	10.6	396
Illinois	9th	10.6	396
Minnesota	6th	10.6	396
North Carolina	4th	10.5	399
Washington	8th	10.5	399
Wisconsin	3rd	10.5	399
Michigan	9th	10.3	402
Wisconsin	2nd	10.3	402
Minnesota	7th	10.2	404
Minnesota	3rd	10.2	404
New York	18th	10.1	406
Washington	1st	10.0	407
Illinois	13th	10.0	407

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, by National Rank

State	District	Food Hardship Rate	National Rank
New Jersey	12th	9.8	409
Minnesota	1st	9.8	409
Illinois	10th	9.7	411
Pennsylvania	4th	9.5	412
North Dakota	At-Large	9.5	412
Missouri	2nd	9.4	414
Pennsylvania	18th	9.4	414
Virginia	10th	9.3	416
Georgia	6th	9.3	416
New Jersey	5th	9.3	416
Minnesota	2nd	9.2	419
Colorado	6th	9.2	419
Hawaii	1st	9.1	421
Virginia	11th	9.1	421
Washington	7th	8.9	423
California	12th	8.7	424
Massachusetts	7th	8.7	424
Pennsylvania	16th	8.6	426
New Jersey	11th	8.5	427
California	30th	8.3	428
Maryland	8th	8.1	429
California	48th	8.0	430
New York	14th	7.7	431
Wisconsin	5th	7.7	431
New York	8th	7.7	431
New Jersey	7th	7.5	434
California	14th	7.1	435
Virginia	8th	6.2	436

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
Alabama		
1st	24.2	34
2nd	20.8	84
3rd	21.9	63
4th	21.9	62
5th	17.4	189
6th	16.2	231
7th	27.1	15
Alaska		
At-Large	17.9	169
Arizona		
1st	20.1	102
2nd	14.6	280
3rd	17.7	173
4th	30.1	6
5th	11.4	387
6th	13.0	340
7th	21.2	76
8th	13.7	312
Arkansas		
1st	22.7	51
2nd	17.5	184
3rd	18.3	161
4th	22.5	54
California		
1st	18.4	155
2nd	18.5	151
3rd	16.8	206
4th	12.5	353
5th	21.7	71
6th	14.4	286
7th	18.9	140
8th	13.4	324
9th	15.5	252
10th	13.8	306
11th	13.3	329
12th	8.7	424
13th	12.4	356
14th	7.1	435
15th	11.9	378
16th	12.1	370
17th	18.3	160
18th	24.2	36
19th	21.0	82
20th	31.9	3
21st	22.4	56
22nd	18.9	135
23rd	16.9	201
24th	12.4	359
25th	21.9	65
26th	13.5	323
27th	17.5	183
28th	19.4	121
29th	12.9	344
30th	8.3	428

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
31st	24.1	37
32nd	20.8	85
33rd	23.7	42
34th	32.8	2
35th	27.6	11
36th	11.9	379
37th	25.1	25
38th	23.8	39
39th	18.9	141
40th	13.9	304
41st	21.3	75
42nd	11.1	392
43rd	26.1	21
44th	19.2	125
45th	19.0	130
46th	12.6	350
47th	30.2	5
48th	8.0	430
49th	18.9	139
50th	11.5	386
51st	20.4	93
52nd	15.2	265
53rd	15.2	263
Colorado		
1st	16.5	212
2nd	13.6	317
3rd	16.4	224
4th	12.7	349
5th	14.6	279
6th	9.2	420
7th	15.7	245
Connecticut		
1st	13.3	327
2nd	12.4	357
3rd	13.6	314
4th	11.1	393
5th	12.0	377
Delaware		
At-Large	16.8	204
District of Columbia		
At-Large	12.0	376
Florida		
1st	18.6	149
2nd	19.1	128
3rd	30.9	4
4th	18.6	150
5th	15.6	249
6th	18.5	153
7th	18.2	165
8th	21.7	69
9th	17.6	179
10th	17.5	186
11th	24.6	32
12th	21.1	78
13th	15.1	266

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
14th	14.8	277
15th	17.6	177
16th	16.0	235
17th	28.5	8
18th	20.6	88
19th	14.9	270
20th	17.2	196
21st	18.9	138
22nd	16.2	233
23rd	26.7	17
24th	18.4	157
25th	24.7	31
Georgia		
1st	22.1	61
2nd	25.0	26
3rd	19.5	119
4th	19.1	129
5th	19.2	126
6th	9.3	417
7th	16.6	209
8th	19.8	108
9th	20.3	95
10th	18.4	156
11th	16.4	221
12th	21.0	80
13th	21.7	70
Hawaii		
1st	9.1	421
2nd	14.2	296
Idaho		
1st	14.6	282
2nd	15.1	267
Illinois		
1st	23.6	43
2nd	25.2	24
3rd	22.3	58
4th	27.1	14
5th	16.8	205
6th	10.8	394
7th	15.5	253
8th	14.0	300
9th	10.6	397
10th	9.7	411
11th	15.2	262
12th	15.4	257
13th	10.0	408
14th	14.0	301
15th	17.2	195
16th	14.5	284
17th	14.5	285
18th	15.4	254
19th	13.3	333
Indiana		
1st	16.4	225
2nd	21.2	77

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
3rd	16.3	226
4th	16.3	228
5th	12.2	367
6th	19.8	113
7th	24.2	35
8th	17.8	170
9th	16.6	211
Iowa		
1st	12.7	348
2nd	12.6	352
3rd	12.4	355
4th	11.7	383
5th	14.5	283
Kansas		
1st	13.1	336
2nd	13.6	316
3rd	13.1	339
4th	16.6	210
Kentucky		
1st	17.7	174
2nd	18.3	159
3rd	18.2	163
4th	16.5	216
5th	25.6	23
6th	18.7	146
Louisiana		
1st	19.7	114
2nd	24.8	29
3rd	19.5	118
4th	20.0	106
5th	23.1	46
6th	18.5	154
7th	22.1	60
Maine		
1st	12.3	364
2nd	17.7	172
Maryland		
1st	14.9	275
2nd	17.4	187
3rd	12.3	362
4th	13.8	307
5th	13.4	325
6th	12.3	366
7th	19.7	115
8th	8.1	429
Massachusetts		
1st	14.6	281
2nd	17.7	175
3rd	13.3	331
4th	12.0	373
5th	13.0	343
6th	11.5	385
7th	8.7	425
8th	13.8	308
9th	11.9	381

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
10th	11.3	390
Michigan		
1st	16.4	220
2nd	14.9	273
3rd	14.9	271
4th	17.6	180
5th	19.3	123
6th	17.6	178
7th	18.8	142
8th	12.1	371
9th	10.3	402
10th	13.3	332
11th	12.6	351
12th	20.2	100
13th	27.9	10
14th	24.0	38
15th	15.7	242
Minnesota		
1st	9.8	410
2nd	9.2	419
3rd	10.2	405
4th	12.4	358
5th	15.2	264
6th	10.6	398
7th	10.2	404
8th	14.2	295
Mississippi		
1st	21.1	79
2nd	26.7	18
3rd	20.3	97
4th	22.7	52
Missouri		
1st	18.6	148
2nd	9.4	414
3rd	16.0	236
4th	18.2	166
5th	14.9	272
6th	17.3	191
7th	19.2	127
8th	20.8	86
9th	14.4	290
Montana		
At-Large	14.2	293
Nebraska		
1st	10.6	396
2nd	14.4	289
3rd	13.0	342
Nevada		
1st	26.6	19
2nd	18.7	143
3rd	16.4	222
New Hampshire		
1st	13.9	302
2nd	12.4	360

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
New Jersey		
1st	21.9	64
2nd	20.1	101
3rd	11.8	382
4th	15.6	248
5th	9.3	418
6th	14.8	276
7th	7.5	434
8th	16.5	218
9th	12.2	369
10th	23.3	45
11th	8.5	427
12th	9.8	409
13th	23.8	41
New Mexico		
1st	16.9	202
2nd	18.3	162
3rd	17.3	192
New York		
1st	11.9	380
2nd	16.4	219
3rd	12.1	372
4th	13.5	322
5th	12.7	346
6th	20.6	89
7th	21.7	72
8th	7.7	433
9th	15.4	256
10th	23.4	44
11th	23.0	47
12th	21.0	83
13th	15.7	244
14th	7.7	431
15th	22.6	53
16th	36.3	1
17th	19.2	124
18th	10.1	406
19th	11.2	391
20th	13.0	341
21st	15.3	260
22nd	15.4	255
23rd	14.9	274
24th	15.5	251
25th	11.3	389
26th	11.3	388
27th	13.3	328
28th	15.9	239
29th	13.2	334
North Carolina		
1st	25.9	22
2nd	18.9	137
3rd	16.2	232
4th	10.5	399
5th	17.8	171
6th	18.0	168

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
7th	19.5	117
8th	20.3	96
9th	13.6	315
10th	20.5	91
11th	20.5	92
12th	23.8	40
13th	19.5	120
North Dakota		
At-Large	9.5	413
Ohio		
1st	21.0	81
2nd	14.2	294
3rd	20.4	94
4th	16.7	207
5th	15.9	238
6th	18.4	158
7th	20.1	104
8th	20.6	90
9th	16.2	230
10th	16.6	208
11th	20.1	103
12th	13.1	338
13th	15.7	243
14th	14.4	288
15th	18.5	152
16th	12.5	354
17th	18.7	145
18th	17.2	198
Oklahoma		
1st	17.2	197
2nd	21.5	74
3rd	19.4	122
4th	17.3	194
5th	22.3	59
Oregon		
1st	13.9	305
2nd	18.9	133
3rd	16.3	227
4th	17.5	185
5th	14.4	287
Pennsylvania		
1st	26.3	20
2nd	18.7	147
3rd	16.5	213
4th	9.5	412
5th	13.3	330
6th	11.6	384
7th	13.3	326
8th	10.8	395
9th	14.1	299
10th	15.3	259
11th	17.3	193
12th	15.8	240
13th	12.7	347
14th	15.5	250

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
15th	15.0	269
16th	8.6	426
17th	13.8	309
18th	9.4	415
19th	12.3	363
Rhode Island		
1st	15.7	241
2nd	16.4	223
South Carolina		
1st	16.9	203
2nd	13.6	318
3rd	18.9	136
4th	19.0	131
5th	19.8	111
6th	24.8	28
South Dakota		
At-Large	13.5	320
Tennessee		
1st	20.0	107
2nd	18.9	134
3rd	22.8	50
4th	20.2	99
5th	17.1	199
6th	19.8	112
7th	13.7	311
8th	20.7	87
9th	21.6	73
Texas		
1st	22.5	55
2nd	18.7	144
3rd	14.3	292
4th	19.8	109
5th	22.3	57
6th	16.5	217
7th	13.1	337
8th	17.7	176
9th	27.2	13
10th	12.3	365
11th	15.6	247
12th	18.0	167
13th	17.6	181
14th	15.9	237
15th	24.7	30
16th	22.8	49
17th	19.0	132
18th	24.5	33
19th	19.8	110
20th	26.8	16
21st	12.3	361
22nd	12.0	374
23rd	19.6	116
24th	16.3	229
25th	20.0	105
26th	14.1	298
27th	22.9	48

Food Hardship 2011-2012 by Congressional District, Organized by State and District

District	Food Hardship Rate 2011-2012	National Rank
28th	27.2	12
29th	28.5	9
30th	29.8	7
31st	14.3	291
32nd	18.2	164
Utah		
1st	15.1	268
2nd	14.1	297
3rd	17.0	200
Vermont		
At-Large	12.7	345
Virginia		
1st	13.9	303
2nd	14.8	278
3rd	21.8	67
4th	15.2	261
5th	16.1	234
6th	15.4	258
7th	12.2	368
8th	6.2	436
9th	20.2	98
10th	9.3	416
11th	9.1	422
Washington		
1st	10.0	407
2nd	16.5	214
3rd	13.6	319
4th	15.7	246
5th	17.4	188
6th	17.4	190
7th	8.9	423
8th	10.5	400
9th	16.5	214
West Virginia		
1st	17.5	182
2nd	21.7	68
3rd	24.9	27
Wisconsin		
1st	13.7	310
2nd	10.3	403
3rd	10.5	401
4th	21.8	66
5th	7.7	432
6th	13.1	335
7th	13.5	321
8th	12.0	375
Wyoming		
At-Large	13.6	313