

“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?” The answers to this question posed to hundreds of thousands of households by the Gallup organization, as part of the Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index, reveal that Americans in every community and every state struggle to put food on the table. The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) refers to this struggle as food hardship.

Seventeen percent of surveyed households in 2014 answered “Yes” to experiencing food hardship. As the economy works to recover from the Great Recession, these findings show that there are still millions of Americans who are being left behind. The persistence of a high rate of food hardship underscores the failure of the economy to provide family-supporting jobs and the failure of Congress to respond with adequately robust initiatives to boost jobs, wages and public support programs, such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as food stamps) and child nutrition programs.

The high rate of food hardship in 2014 was not an isolated or concentrated phenomenon. **One in six** households was suffering food hardship not just nationally, but:

- in 23 states
- in 72 out of 100 large Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs)<sup>1</sup>

This national scourge of food hardship has widespread negative impacts on low-income people. This is true for most communities across diverse socioeconomic and geographic areas and on the nation as a whole.

Food hardship – a marker for household struggles with hunger – harms children, working-age adults, people with disabilities and seniors; harms health, learning and productivity; and drives up health and other costs for families, employers and government. This is a serious national problem that requires a serious national response. Yet, as the survey findings indicate, the country

continues to fail to grapple with food hardship and poverty despite available solutions.

The need for efforts to reduce hunger is essential to every state, every MSA, and every community, and the data in this report underscore that conclusion.

This report looks at new Gallup data and examines 2014 food hardship rates (or, for MSAs 2013-2014 rates). The report and the appendix contain charts providing the data:

- for the nation, by year, quarter, and month;
- for all states in 2014, by rank;
- for all states in 2014, listed alphabetically;
- for the 100 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in 2013-2014 with the largest Gallup sample, by rank; and
- for those 100 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in 2013-2014, alphabetically.

Because Gallup's partnership with Healthways is interviewing so many households per day almost every day, year-round, this survey has several key, unusual characteristics: 1) large sample sizes that allow estimation of food hardship annually at the state level, and biannually at the MSA level; 2) weighted data that are representative of the nation, states, and MSAs; and 3) a large enough national sample size to allow monthly and quarterly analysis of the food hardship rate. (Further technical notes on the sample size and methodology appear at the end of the text.)

## Food Hardship in the Nation

In the nation as a whole in 2014, 17.2 percent of respondents reported food hardship. That is the lowest rate since Gallup began collecting these data in early 2008.

A look at the data by quarter (see Appendix A) provides a clearer picture of what has happened: the food hardship rate increased at the beginning of the recession, and has been slowly and somewhat erratically trending down since then, with the sharpest sustained drops in 2014. Specifically, the food hardship rate was 16.3 percent in the first quarter of 2008 and then increased rapidly over the next three quarters to 19.5 percent as

<sup>1</sup> State data described here are for 2014. MSA data are for 2013-2014, combined, in order to produce adequate sample sizes and thereby reduce margins of error.

the Great Recession deepened. In the ensuing four and a half years, in 2009 through the first two quarters of 2013, the rate varied between 17.5 percent and 19.4 percent. It was not until 2014 that the rate got below 17.5 percent – and it did so for every quarter in that year.

In short, the positive side is that the rate has recovered almost to pre-recession levels. The longer view, however, shows that an appalling one in six households is reporting food hardship – just as was true before the recession. The nation has an unacceptable long-term food hardship problem.

Americans do not always recognize how pervasive struggles against hunger are, or that hunger 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, or all the income going to housing costs, leaving little or none for food. 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 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 food hardship data underscore is that Americans in every state and every community are struggling against hunger.

### Food Hardship in States

Rates in the states in 2014 varied from a low of 9.3 percent in North Dakota to a high of 24.7 percent in Mississippi (see Appendix B). Mississippi may have the worst rate among states, with one in four households reporting food hardship, but the “best” state, North Dakota, has one in eleven households struggling with food hardship – just as unacceptable a problem given its prosperity.

Food hardship is a significant problem in **every state** – even one in eleven is hardly acceptable. And **nearly half of the states – 23 states – had at least one in six respondents** (16.7 percent or more) answer that they did not have enough money to buy food at some point in the past 12 months. **Thirty-two states overall, including the District of Columbia, had 15 percent or more of respondents affirming food hardship.**

Of the 15 states with the worst rates, eight were in the USDA Food and Nutrition Service Southeast region, four were in the Southwest, one was in the West, and one in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Data for all 50 states and the District of Columbia are in Appendices B and C.

20 States with the Worst Food Hardship Rates in 2014		
	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Mississippi	24.7	1
Louisiana	22.5	2
West Virginia	22.0	3
Tennessee	21.7	4
Kentucky	21.4	5
Alabama	21.3	6
Arkansas	21.1	7
North Carolina	20.8	8
Georgia	20.1	9
South Carolina	19.9	10
New Mexico	19.6	11
Oklahoma	19.5	12
Arizona	19.2	13
Florida	18.5	14
Michigan	18.5	14
Delaware	18.4	16
Texas	18.4	16
Vermont	18.2	18
Ohio	18.1	19
New York	17.6	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 2013 and 2014 data to produce more accurate estimates and smaller margins of error.

The worst MSAs may be Greensboro-High Point, North Carolina, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and Fresno, California, but 98 of 100 MSAs have at least one in eight (12.5 percent or more) households reporting food hardship. While there was variation around the country, the inability to purchase adequate food was a serious problem in every MSA.

Of the 100 MSAs with the largest number of respondents to the Gallup-Healthways survey in 2013-2014:

- 32 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
- 86 had 15 percent or more of households affirmatively answering they struggle to afford food.

See Appendices D and E.

## 20 MSAs with the Worst Food Hardship Rates in 2014

	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Greensboro-High Point, NC	27.9	1
Baton Rouge, LA	24.9	2
Fresno, CA	24.9	2
Bakersfield, CA	24.3	4
Jackson, MS	22.9	5
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.8	6
Columbia, SC	22.8	6
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	22.7	8
Dayton, OH	22.6	9
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	22.4	10
Little Rock-N Little Rock-Conway, AR	22.1	11
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC	22.0	12
Chattanooga, TN-GA	21.7	13
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	21.7	13
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	21.4	15
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	21.3	16
San Antonio, TX	21.3	16
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	21.0	18
Oklahoma City, OK	21.0	18
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	21.0	18

Most of the MSAs with the highest rates of food hardship were in the Southeast, plus California. Of the 20 MSAs with the worst rates, three were in Florida, three were in California, and two each were in Louisiana, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

### Food Hardship Factors

Many families simply do not have adequate resources – from wages, Social Security and other retirement benefits, income supports, SNAP and WIC – to purchase enough food. Too many working-age adults are unemployed or working part-time jobs, but want full-time jobs. Many are working for wages that are not enough to afford the basics for themselves and their families. Income support programs like TANF, Unemployment Insurance and Worker’s Compensation are inadequate and increasingly difficult to apply for and maintain benefits. And while SNAP is critical in providing nutrition assistance 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. An expert committee of the prestigious Institute of Medicine issued a [report](#) in January 2013 explaining why the SNAP allotment is not enough for most families.

As this report reviews the state and MSA data, then, it is important to bear in mind that these data represent 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.

### Americans Look to Government for Solutions

The President and Congress and state and local officials must do better to address hunger and poverty.

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

Voters 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. And these attitudes cross party lines.

### Recommendations

Food hardship rates are too high throughout 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.

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.

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 (only four of the five 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 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 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.

## About This Report

This report is one of a series in which FRAC has been analyzing survey data that are being collected by Gallup through the Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index and provided to FRAC. 2014 is the seventh year Gallup has collected such data.

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 survey and analysis that produces annual “food insecurity” numbers, but the concepts are comparable.

## Methodology

Results are based on telephone (landline or cellular) interviews in 2014 for national and state estimates, and in 2013 and 2014 for MSA estimates, with randomly sampled adults, age 18 or older in

all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Total sample sizes for 2013 and 2014 were 178,067 and 176,699 respectively. Margins of error were calculated using 90 percent confidence intervals.

Data are weighted to be representative at the national, 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 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 states and MSAs 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 2013-2014 rate for a particular state or MSA to our prior report data for 2011-2012.

At the national level for 2014 (sample size=176,067) the margin of error was less than or equal to  $\pm 0.1$  percentage point. At the national level for 2008-2014 by month (sample size range: 13,156 – 31,428), the margin of error was less than or equal to  $\pm 1.3$  percentage points. At the national level for 2008-2014 by quarter (sample size range: 42,791 – 91,786), the margin of error was less than or equal to  $\pm 0.3$  percentage points.

At the state level for 2014 (sample size range: 417 – 16,986), the margin of error was less than or equal to  $\pm 3.0$  percentage points.

At the MSA level for 2013-2014 (sample size range: 651 – 17,405), the margin of error was less than or equal to  $\pm 2.7$  percentage points.

## Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by the Food Research and Action Center (FRAC).

## Appendix A: Nation by Year, Quarter, and Month

### National Food Hardship Rates, 2008-2014

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

### National Food Hardship Rates by Quarter, 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
	Food Hardship Rate						
Quarter 1	16.3	18.8	18.0	17.9	18.4	18.8	17.4
Quarter 2	17.1	18.0	17.5	18.0	18.2	17.7	16.7
Quarter 3	18.2	17.9	17.9	19.2	18.4	19.7	17.2
Quarter 4	19.5	18.5	18.7	19.4	17.9	19.2	17.3

### National Food Hardship by Month, 2008-2014

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
	Food Hardship Rate						
January	16.5	18.8	18.1	18.4	18.3	18.8	17.6
February	16.2	19.0	17.9	17.6	18.1	19.3	17.6
March	16.1	18.6	18.0	17.6	18.6	18.3	16.9
April	16.7	18.2	17.1	17.4	17.5	17.7	16.9
May	17.4	18.4	17.9	18.4	18.3	17.8	16.6
June	17.4	17.3	17.5	18.3	18.7	17.7	16.8
July	17.0	17.7	17.6	19.1	18.8	19.9	16.9
August	19.1	17.9	18.2	18.8	18.4	20.0	17.8
September	18.5	18.1	18.0	19.8	17.9	19.3	16.7
October	18.8	18.9	19.3	20.1	18.1	19.5	17.7
November	20.3	18.3	18.2	19.0	17.9	19.0	17.1
December	19.4	18.2	18.6	19.0	17.8	19.2	17.2

## Appendix B: State, by rank

Food Hardship in 2014 by State, by Rank		
State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Mississippi	24.7	1
Louisiana	22.5	2
West Virginia	22.0	3
Tennessee	21.7	4
Kentucky	21.4	5
Alabama	21.3	6
Arkansas	21.1	7
North Carolina	20.8	8
Georgia	20.1	9
South Carolina	19.9	10
New Mexico	19.6	11
Oklahoma	19.5	12
Arizona	19.2	13
Florida	18.5	14
Michigan	18.5	14
Delaware	18.4	16
Texas	18.4	16
Vermont	18.2	18
Ohio	18.1	19
New York	17.6	20
Indiana	17.0	21
Missouri	16.9	22
Nevada	16.8	23
California	16.4	24
Idaho	16.3	25
District of Columbia	15.9	26
Illinois	15.8	27
New Jersey	15.6	28
Rhode Island	15.6	28
Oregon	15.2	30
Pennsylvania	15.2	30
Virginia	15.1	32
Kansas	14.9	33
Massachusetts	14.9	33
Iowa	14.6	35
Utah	14.5	36
Washington	14.5	36
Connecticut	14.3	38
Maine	14.3	38
Colorado	14.1	40
New Hampshire	14.1	40
Maryland	14.0	42

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Alaska	13.9	43
Montana	12.8	44
Nebraska	12.8	44
Wisconsin	12.4	46
Hawaii	11.9	47
South Dakota	11.4	48
Minnesota	11.2	49
Wyoming	10.9	50
North Dakota	9.3	51

## Appendix C: State, alphabetically

Food Hardship in 2014 by State, Alphabetical		
State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Alabama	21.3	6
Alaska	13.9	43
Arizona	19.2	13
Arkansas	21.1	7
California	16.4	24
Colorado	14.1	40
Connecticut	14.3	38
Delaware	18.4	16
District of Columbia	15.9	26
Florida	18.5	14
Georgia	20.1	9
Hawaii	11.9	47
Idaho	16.3	25
Illinois	15.8	27
Indiana	17.0	21
Iowa	14.6	35
Kansas	14.9	33
Kentucky	21.4	5
Louisiana	22.5	2
Maine	14.3	38
Maryland	14.0	42
Massachusetts	14.9	33
Michigan	18.5	14
Minnesota	11.2	49
Mississippi	24.7	1
Missouri	16.9	22
Montana	12.8	44
Nebraska	12.8	44
Nevada	16.8	23
New Hampshire	14.1	40
New Jersey	15.6	28
New Mexico	19.6	11
New York	17.6	20
North Carolina	20.8	8
North Dakota	9.3	51
Ohio	18.1	19
Oklahoma	19.5	12
Oregon	15.2	30
Pennsylvania	15.2	30
Rhode Island	15.6	28
South Carolina	19.9	10
South Dakota	11.4	48

State	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Tennessee	21.7	4
Texas	18.4	16
Utah	14.5	36
Vermont	18.2	18
Virginia	15.1	32
Washington	14.5	36
West Virginia	22.0	3
Wisconsin	12.4	46
Wyoming	10.9	50

## Appendix D: Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), by rank

Food Hardship in 2013-2014 by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), by Rank		
MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Greensboro-High Point, NC	27.9	1
Baton Rouge, LA	24.9	2
Fresno, CA	24.9	2
Bakersfield, CA	24.3	4
Jackson, MS	22.9	5
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.8	6
Columbia, SC	22.8	6
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	22.7	8
Dayton, OH	22.6	9
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	22.4	10
Little Rock-N Little Rock-Conway, AR	22.1	11
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC	22.0	12
Chattanooga, TN-GA	21.7	13
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	21.7	13
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	21.4	15
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	21.3	16
San Antonio, TX	21.3	16
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	21.0	18
Oklahoma City, OK	21.0	18
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	21.0	18
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	20.9	21
Winston-Salem, NC	20.8	22
Albuquerque, NM	20.5	23
Tulsa, OK	20.4	24
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	20.3	25
Salt Lake City, UT	20.3	25
Wichita, KS	20.3	25
Asheville, NC	20.1	28
Charleston-N Charleston-Summerville, SC	20.1	28
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	20.1	28
Springfield, MA	20.0	31
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	20.0	31
Knoxville, TN	19.8	33
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	19.7	34
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	19.6	35
Worcester, MA	19.6	35
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	19.5	37
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	19.5	37
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	19.4	39
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	19.4	39
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	19.3	41
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	19.2	42
Columbus, OH	19.2	42



Food Hardship in 2013-2014 by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), by Rank

MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	19.2	42
New Haven-Milford, CT	19.0	45
New York-North New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	19.0	45
Jacksonville, FL	18.9	47
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	18.8	48
Fayetteville, Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	18.7	49
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	18.7	49
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	18.7	49
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	18.6	52
Spokane, WA	18.6	52
Toledo, OH	18.6	52
Boise City-Nampa, ID	18.3	55
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	18.3	55
Colorado Springs, CO	18.1	57
Richmond, VA	18.1	57
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	18.0	59
St. Louis, MO-IL	17.9	60
Kansas City, MO-KS	17.7	61
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	17.5	62
Akron, OH	17.4	63
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	17.4	63
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	17.4	63
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	17.2	66
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	17.1	67
Raleigh-Cary, NC	17.1	67
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	16.9	69
Syracuse, NY	16.9	69
Tucson, AZ	16.9	69
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	16.7	72
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	16.6	73
Baltimore-Towson, MD	16.5	74
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	16.5	74
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	16.3	76
Bradenton-Sarasota-Venice, FL	16.0	77
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	16.0	77
Austin-Round Rock, TX	15.7	79
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	15.7	79
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	15.6	81
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	15.5	82
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	15.5	82
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	15.4	84
Rochester, NY	15.3	85
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	15.0	86

Food Hardship in 2013-2014 by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), by Rank

MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Denver-Aurora, CO	14.6	87
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	14.5	88
Pittsburgh, PA	14.4	89
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	14.4	89
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	14.3	91
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	13.8	92
Provo-Orem, UT	13.6	93
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	13.5	94
Honolulu, HI	13.5	94
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	13.1	96
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	13.1	96
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	13.0	98
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	11.9	99
Madison, WI	11.2	100

## Appendix E: Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), alphabetically

Food Hardship in 2013-2014 by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), Alphabetically		
MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Akron, OH	17.4	63
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY	13.8	92
Albuquerque, NM	20.5	23
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	19.2	42
Asheville, NC	20.1	28
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA	19.4	39
Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	22.8	6
Austin-Round Rock, TX	15.7	79
Bakersfield, CA	24.3	4
Baltimore-Towson, MD	16.5	74
Baton Rouge, LA	24.9	2
Birmingham-Hoover, AL	19.3	41
Boise City-Nampa, ID	18.3	55
Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH	14.5	88
Bradenton-Sarasota-Venice, FL	16.0	77
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT	13.0	98
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY	15.4	84
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	21.0	18
Charleston-N Charleston-Summerville, SC	20.1	28
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC	19.7	34
Chattanooga, TN-GA	21.7	13
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI	16.5	74
Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN	19.6	35
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH	17.4	63
Colorado Springs, CO	18.1	57
Columbia, SC	22.8	6
Columbus, OH	19.2	42
Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX	18.8	48
Dayton, OH	22.6	9
Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL	21.3	16
Denver-Aurora, CO	14.6	87
Des Moines-West Des Moines, IA	13.5	94
Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI	19.4	39
Fayetteville, Springdale-Rogers, AR-MO	18.7	49
Fresno, CA	24.9	2
Grand Rapids-Wyoming, MI	14.3	91
Greensboro-High Point, NC	27.9	1
Greenville-Mauldin-Easley, SC	22.0	12
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA	15.7	79
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT	16.0	77
Honolulu, HI	13.5	94
Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown, TX	18.7	49
Indianapolis-Carmel, IN	18.6	52

Food Hardship in 2013-2014 by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), Alphabetically

MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Jackson, MS	22.9	5
Jacksonville, FL	18.9	47
Kansas City, MO-KS	17.7	61
Knoxville, TN	19.8	33
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV	20.3	25
Little Rock-N Little Rock-Conway, AR	22.1	11
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA	18.7	49
Louisville-Jefferson County, KY-IN	21.4	15
Madison, WI	11.2	100
Memphis, TN-MS-AR	22.7	8
Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	20.9	21
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	15.6	81
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI	11.9	99
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro-Franklin, TN	19.5	37
New Haven-Milford, CT	19.0	45
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA	21.7	13
New York-North New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA	19.0	45
Ogden-Clearfield, UT	17.4	63
Oklahoma City, OK	21.0	18
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA	15.0	86
Orlando-Kissimmee, FL	20.1	28
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA	17.1	67
Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	16.9	69
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	21.0	18
Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD	16.7	72
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	19.2	42
Pittsburgh, PA	14.4	89
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME	16.6	73
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	17.2	66
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA	18.3	55
Provo-Orem, UT	13.6	93
Raleigh-Cary, NC	17.1	67
Richmond, VA	18.1	57
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA	22.4	10
Rochester, NY	15.3	85
Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA	16.3	76
Salt Lake City, UT	20.3	25
San Antonio, TX	21.3	16
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	15.5	82
San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA	14.4	89
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA	13.1	96
Scranton--Wilkes-Barre, PA	18.0	59
Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA	15.5	82

Food Hardship in 2013-2014 by Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), Alphabetically

MSA	Food Hardship Rate	Rank
Spokane, WA	18.6	52
Springfield, MA	20.0	31
St. Louis, MO-IL	17.9	60
Syracuse, NY	16.9	69
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	19.5	37
Toledo, OH	18.6	52
Tucson, AZ	16.9	69
Tulsa, OK	20.4	24
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC	17.5	62
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV	13.1	96
Wichita, KS	20.3	25
Winston-Salem, NC	20.8	22
Worcester, MA	19.6	35
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA	20.0	31