



Hungriest Communities
A Report on Hunger in Alaska



Executive Summary

According to the USDA's 2007 report on household food security in the United States, over 12 percent of Alaskan households are food insecure, meaning that at some time during the year they had difficulty providing enough food for all members of their household. About five percent of those who are food insecure in Alaska are classified as having very low food security, the term for a person who consistently reduced their food intake or had disrupted eating patterns due to inadequate resources for food. Also noted in this study, Alaska and Iowa have the fastest rate of growth in food insecurity over the last 9 years. Both states saw a 3.7 percent increase in families who struggled to eat adequately or had substantial food disruptions.

The USDA reports that 29,400 households in Alaska experience hunger, but it doesn't tell us where they are and why they are hungry. Has the cost of food exceeded their budget? Does their community have access to federal nutrition programs, which the USDA study states helps feed more than half of food insecure households? Is the anti-hunger network reaching the community to provide food?

In hopes to find answers to these questions, the Alaska Food coalition put together this report. In this study of Alaska's Hungriest Communities, the Alaska Food Coalition compiled data from several sources and categorized communities based on their supply of food resources and demand for those resources by community members. Formulas were developed to analyze communities on four areas.

- 1. Percentage of income spent on food**
- 2. Number of eligible food stamp participants who are not currently enrolled**
- 3. Percentage of schools in the community that serve both breakfast and lunch**
- 4. Pounds of food distributed by the anti-hunger community**

This report finds that hunger is prevalent in all of Alaska and affects every community to varying degrees. Some communities are making big strides toward solving the problem, while others lag behind in addressing the issue, but every community in Alaska has room to improve.

Table of Contents

3.....	Introduction
4.....	Data and Methodology
6.....	Statewide Trends
	a. Percentage of income spent on food
	b. Number of eligible food stamp participants who are not currently enrolled
	c. Percentage of schools in the community that serve both breakfast and lunch
	d. Pounds of food distributed by the anti-hunger community
8.....	Regional Analysis
	a. Southwest Alaska and Aleutians
	b. Far North Alaska
	c. Interior Alaska
	d. Southcentral Alaska
	e. Southeast Alaska
12.....	Conclusion
12.....	Acknowledgements
12.....	Endnotes
13.....	Appendix

Introduction

Hunger is real in Alaska. According to the USDA's 2007 report on household food security in the United States, over 12 percent of Alaskan households are food insecure, meaning that at some time during the year they had difficulty providing enough food for all members of their household. About five percent of those who are food insecure in Alaska are classified as having very low food security, the term for a person who consistently reduced their food intake or had disrupted eating patterns due to inadequate resources for food.¹

Hunger is only getting worse. Alaska has the fastest rate of growth in food insecurity over the last 9 years, experiencing a 3.7 percent increase in families who struggled to eat adequately or had substantial food disruptions.²

Addressing the hunger issue is both a public and private responsibility. Federal and state governments administer programs such as food stamps, WIC (Women, Infants, and Children), National School Lunch Program (NSLP), School Breakfast Program (SBP), Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), and Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR). For many of these programs, the government relies on school districts, tribes and nonprofits to distribute the food. Additionally, statewide and regional food banks and their partner agencies, collectively known as the emergency food system, provide millions of pounds of food to the hungry in Alaska.

For all of the effort put forth to address the problem, it is not getting better. Food pantries and soup kitchens around the state are seeing an increase in the number of people in need. Bean's Café in Anchorage, the largest soup kitchen in the state, has seen a 20 percent increase in just the last year. In rural Alaska, times are even tougher. In Nome, an annual food drive in May 2008 that usually keeps the shelves full for three months was all distributed within four weeks.³

In this study of Alaska's Hungriest Communities, the Alaska Food Coalition compiled data from several sources and categorized communities based on their supply of food resources and demand for those resources by community members. Population estimates are for the incorporated areas of communities only. Formulas were developed to analyze communities on four areas:

Percentage of income spent on food:

Because of geography, climate and distance from the continental United States, the cost of living in Alaska is higher than other locations in the country. In the current economic times of job loss, stagnant wages, high fuel costs and a turbulent housing market, for many Alaskans the ability to meet the most basic need - food - is being tested even more than usual. In urban areas, most families spend a little more than the 10 percent that average American families spend on food. In rural Alaska, where prices can be three times higher than the cost in urban areas, much larger portions of budgets are allocated to food purchase. This report will look at the cost variances in relation to per capita income.

Number of eligible food stamp participants who are not currently enrolled:

It has often been said that food stamps are the most effective way to boost the economy. According to the Food Research and Action Center, Alaska ranks 22nd in the nation for food stamp program participation.⁴

In the last five years, the number of Alaskans receiving food stamp benefits has increased by more than 20 percent, but the rate of participation remains about the same.⁵ This report will look at the number of residents in each community who are likely eligible but not currently enrolled, suggest reasons why participation rates vary among communities and suggest ways to increase participation rates.

Percentage of schools in the community that serve both breakfast and lunch:

Children are always a focus when it comes to eliminating hunger. A community that makes sure it's children are fed is a community that is investing in the future. In the United States, the easiest and most effective way to make sure our kids aren't hungry is through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP). This analysis ranks communities by the participation in both meal programs in every school in the district.

Pounds of food distributed by the anti-hunger community:

While federal food programs such as WIC (Women, Infants and Children), Food Stamps and NSLP and SBP supply much of the food assistance that low-income Americans receive, the United States boasts a very large network of food banks, pantries, soup kitchens, tribes, and other nonprofits that provide food to hungry people.

In Alaska, the emergency food system is supported by five food banks that manage the distribution of USDA commodities and donated foods in the state. Those food banks and their partner agencies distributed a little over 6.7 million pounds of food throughout the state from July 2007- June 2008.⁶ This report compares both the number of pounds per person in poverty for each community and a regional look at the total number of pounds distributed versus the number of pounds needed to address the hunger problem.

The following is a description of the data and methodology, a narrative including an analysis of the data on both the state and regional level and a conclusion with recommendations.

Data sources and methodology

Data was compiled from several resources to create four areas of analysis. The sources of data and formula creation details are described below:

Percent of Income Spent on Food

Formula: $(\text{Regional Food Cost} \times 52) / (\text{Per Capita Income} \times 2)$

For the purpose of the Hungriest Communities study, this formula is based on a household of four, with two working adults between the ages of 20-50 with two children 6-11 years old.

Regional Food Costs were taken from the Food Cost Survey compiled by the Cooperative Extension Service at University of Fairbanks. The survey is conducted once a quarter. Numbers from March and July 2008 were used for this study. All communities surveyed are grouped by native region and an average was taken for that region. The resulting average was then applied to all communities in that region.

Per Capita Income was taken from Census 2000, the most current evaluation of every city in the state of Alaska. Per capita income is the mean income received in 1999 computed for every man, woman, and child in a geographic area. It is derived by dividing the total income of all people 15 years old and over in a geographic area by the total population in that area. The assumption for this survey is that there were two contributing incomes for the family of four.

Scoring:

- 1 = Up to 25% of Income Spent on Food**
- 2 = 26% - 50%**
- 3 = 51% - 75%**
- 4 = 76% or higher**

Data Deceptions: It is unlikely that a family would spend more than seventy-five percent of their budgets on food, even in Alaska, where food can be extremely expensive. However, a small percentage of communities fell into that category based on our formula. This deception comes from the use of older per capita income information and more recent research on the cost of food. Salaries have increased since 2000, but not in all areas of the state and not at the same rate for every job, thus the 2000 information is the most accurate we could acquire. On the other end of the spectrum, the food costs are from 2008, so are much more current. In categorizing the communities, we attempted to make a general statement about food costs vs. income in participating communities.

Additionally, it is known that subsistence fishing and hunting play a large role in supplementing the diets of many Alaskans. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game manages permits for this activity, but the data collected is not complete and thus was not included in this survey.

Percent Eligible for Food Stamps, but Not Currently Participating

Formula: $\text{Number (Number Eligible for Food Stamps - Number Currently Enrolled)} / \text{Number Eligible for Food Stamps}$

The number of residents eligible for Food Stamps comes from Census 2000 and the State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services. The census tabulates the percentage of residents that live at 100% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). The Department of Health and Social Services then calculated the percentage at 130%, the rate at which residents would likely be eligible for food stamps. Granted, this is the most basic qualifying factor as determining eligibility for food stamps is a very complicated process, but to get the basic idea, only 130% of FPL was used. The resulting percentage was then taken from the 2007 Population Estimates from the Alaska Community Information Database (http://www.commerce.state.ak.us/dca/commdb/CF_COMDB.htm). The current number enrolled in the Food Stamp Program comes from the average number of individuals in 2007 and was supplied by the Alaska Division of Public Assistance.

Scoring:

- 1 = Less than 15% of likely eligible residents are not currently enrolled in Food Stamps**
- 2 = Between 16% - 50%**
- 3 = Between 51% - 75%**
- 4 = More than 75%**

Data Deceptions: Once again, poverty percentages come from Census 2000 and population estimates are current. If a community population has changed dramatically, it is likely that the poverty percentages could have been affected as well, thus throwing off the percent eligible but not participating for some communities.

Percentage of Schools that Serve Breakfast or Lunch through NSLP and/or SBP

Formula: None

In Alaska, any school that serves breakfast through the School Breakfast Program also serves lunch through the National School Breakfast Program with just one exception. In a list from the 2006-2007 school year provided by the State of Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, a list was created of all schools in each community that participated in breakfast and lunch. Those schools were then grouped by community.

Scoring:

- 1 = 100% of schools in community serve both breakfast and lunch**
- 2 = 50% - 99%**
- 3 = 1% - 49%**
- 4 = None**

Data Deception: The data is very straight forward in this analysis. The communities that are listed as N/A are those communities that do not have a school.

Pounds of Food Per Person in Poverty Distributed by Food Banks

Formula: $\text{Pounds of Food From Regional Food Bank} / \text{Population Living at 130\% or lower of Federal Poverty Line}$

There are five food banks in the state. Those food banks gather both donated and government food and distribute it to anti-hunger agencies across the state. They are located in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai and Kodiak. All of those food banks, with the exception Fairbanks Community Food Bank, submitted the number of pounds they distributed in each community. That number was then divided by the estimated population in the community that is living at or below 130% of the FPL.

Scoring:

- 1 = Greater than 75 lbs. of food per person in poverty**
- 2 = 10 - 75 lbs.**
- 3 = 0 - 10 lbs.**
- 4 = No registered pounds from the regional food banks**

Data Deceptions: Unfortunately, one regional food bank did not provide the pounds they distribute per community. Therefore, while it is likely that some interior communities are getting food from the Fairbanks Community Food Bank, it is not reflected in this analysis. Additionally, not all donated food comes through food banks. Some anti-hunger agencies are acquiring food on their own. There is not an accurate estimation of the impact this food makes on Alaska communities.

After being ranked in each category, communities were then given a total score. The best score a community could receive was a four; the worst a 16. Based upon those numbers, communities were then categorized into three areas for improvement:

Score

4-8: Addressing the Hunger Need

9-12: Room for Improvement

13-16: Not Adequately Addressing the Hunger Need

Table 1: Regional Averages*

*These ratings are from a 1 – 4, with 1 being the best and 4 the worst score in each category. The overall score is the four categories added together.

		Hunger Category				
		Income Spent on Food	Food Stamp Participation	School Meals	Pounds of Food From Anti-Hunger Network	Overall Score
Region	Southwest Alaska and Aleutians	2.92	2.32	2.46	3.56	11.15
	Far North	2.52	1.71	1.29	3.69	9.17
	Interior	1.28	2.72	2.14	3.72	9.64
	Southcentral	1.4	2.78	2.45	2.64	8.88
	Southeast	1.45	2.36	1.6	3.43	9.45
	STATEWIDE AVERAGE	1.91	2.38	1.99	3.41	9.66

Statewide Trends

Percentage of Income Spent on Food

According to the U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2007 Americans spent almost 10 percent of their income on food.⁷ Additional surveys indicate that low income consumers spend a larger share on food than middle or high income Americans. Data from the 2007 Consumer Expenditure Survey indicates that households earning \$10,000 to \$14,999 a year spent an average of 25 percent of their income on food.⁸

The average ranking for all communities in the state is a 1.89, equating to about 25 percent of income spent on food. In the two largest cities, Fairbanks and Anchorage, Alaskans spend about 15 percent of their income on food, approximately \$120 per week for a household of four. In smaller communities, this percentage increases considerably. As expected, the largest increases are seen in communities located off the road system, where the cost to transport food into villages is very high. The University of Fairbanks Cooperative Extension Service surveys Alaska communities to review food costs. If Anchorage is used as the baseline community, food costs are most expensive in the rural areas of Southwest Alaska and least expensive in the Matanuska Valley.⁹ Consistent with this finding, the Hungriest Communities survey found that residents of southwest Alaska spent a greater percentage of their income on food, and residents of the Matanuska Valley a lower percentage of their income, than those in other regions of the state.

Food Stamp Program Participation

The average monthly food stamp benefit in Alaska is \$127.69 which translates to more than 86 million federal dollars going directly to low-income Alaskans through the food stamp program.¹⁰ The food stamp program is a federal entitlement program, which means that all persons eligible are guaranteed services. Based on 2007 data, Food Bank of Alaska estimates that if all eligible individuals were to participate in this program, another 30 million dollars would be coming directly to Alaskans in need.

Alaska's food stamp participation rates vary greatly. Across the state, the average score is 2.4, equating to approximately 30 percent of eligible residents that are missing out on this federal assistance. In many rural communities the food stamp participation rates are higher than the state average. Alaska is the only state in the country that still employs fee agents, a dedicated person who works in conjunction with the Division of Public Assistance to process and interview clients in rural areas. It is likely that significant differences in participation among rural communities are related to the availability of a fee agent in the community.

Percentage of Schools that Participate in National School Lunch Program or School Breakfast Program

The average rating is a 1.4, seeming to support the assumption that most schools in Alaska serve both lunch and breakfast. In fact, nearly all public, traditional setting schools in Alaska offer lunch, but only 68 percent of schools that serve lunch also serve breakfast.¹¹ Approximately 10,000 low-income children attend schools that don't currently serve breakfast.¹² Studies show that kids who start their day with breakfast are less obese, have higher test scores and lower incidences of behavior and discipline issues at school, giving lots of evidence to support making sure every child starts the day with a good meal.¹³

Anecdotally, in several communities school meals are offered but the provider is not participating in the National School Lunch Program or School Breakfast Program. In some of these cases, faith-based organizations and other nonprofits have programs to provide meals or snacks in schools. Because there is not a reliable source for this information, it is not included in this study.

Food Supplied through the Anti-Hunger Network

In Alaska, the emergency food system is supported by five food banks that manage the distribution of USDA commodities and donated foods in the state. Those food banks and their partner agencies distributed a little over 6.7 million pounds of food throughout the state from July 2007- June 2008.¹⁴

The average score for communities in Alaska is a 3.4, equating to less than 10 lbs of food distributed per person in poverty. Studies conducted by Brandeis University and the Food Bank Council of Michigan estimate that the emergency food system should distribute 234 pounds of food per person in poverty, every year, in order to meet the need.¹⁵ By that standard and 2000 Census data of people in poverty, Alaskans need 13,946,000 pounds of food assistance annually. The anti-hunger network is currently meeting only half of the need.¹⁶

Based on 2000 Census data of the number of residents living in poverty, 4.3 million pounds of food should be distributed in Alaska communities located off the road system.¹⁷ During 2007-08, it is estimated that a little under 300,000 pounds of food was shipped to those communities.¹⁸

In addition to the cost and logistical barriers of serving rural Alaska, there is a federal tax code (170e3) that impacts the availability of food assistance. The Internal Revenue Service dictates that donated foods can be distributed only by groups that hold 501c3 designation or are religious organizations. While Alaska has a large number of 501c3 nonprofits, the infrastructure of most rural Alaska communities is provided by the village or tribal entity, which often do not have a nonprofit designation. These are the organizations that usually have the facility and personnel to manage food distribution programs, but they are ineligible to receive donated foods. Of the entire amount of food that goes through the anti-hunger network, donated food accounts for more than 40 percent of the total with much potential to increase. USDA commodities are just 20 percent of the total amount of food, with limited opportunity for serious growth.

Regional Analysis

Southwest Alaska and Aleutians*

*See Table 2 and Table 3

Included Census Districts: Aleutians East, Aleutians West, Bethel, Bristol Bay, Dillingham, Lake and Peninsula, Wade Hampton, Yukon-Koyukuk

Number of Communities Surveyed: 104

Population in Surveyed Communities: 43,485

Overall Scores: In comparison to other regions of the state, communities in Southwest Alaska and the Aleutian Islands rank very low in the areas surveyed that address hunger. The average overall score is 11.15 and all but five communities have scores in the “Room for Improvement” or “Not Adequately Addressing the Hunger Need” categories.

Food Costs & Income: Both the Aleutian Islands and Southwest Alaska boast fairly expensive food prices relative to the Anchorage baseline. Based on their score of 2.52 in this category, approximately 48 percent of household income is spent on food. This is almost twice the state average and the highest average of any region in the state. A family of four living in these areas spends an average of \$300 per week compared to an Anchorage family whose cost is \$123 per week. With the formula created for the study, households in this area would be spending the large majority of their income on food if they relied only on purchased foods. Given the cost and availability of food, it is likely that many of these communities rely heavily on subsistence foods to maintain their diets.

Within this region, residents of the Aleutian Islands have a higher per capita income than those in Southwest, which results in a larger percentage of income spent on food in the Southwest. For the communities in the Hungriest Communities study, the average per capita income on the Aleutian Islands is \$20,221 and the average per capita income for the Southwest Alaska communities studied is \$10,874.

Food Stamps: In this category, the Southwest and Aleutian Islands rank second in the state behind the Far North, with an average score of 2.32. Within the region, food stamp participation rates vary significantly. Many communities in the Southwest have very high participation in the food stamp program with an average of 73 percent. However, in the Aleutian Islands, in many communities food stamp benefits are reaching less than one-third of the eligible population. It is likely that the communities with very high participation have a food stamp fee agent available to assist eligible residents with the application process. Given the difference in per capita income for the two areas, it is probable that fee agent services are not accessible in the Aleutians where a much smaller percentage of the community is likely eligible for food stamps.

School Meals: This region has the worst ranking in the state in the category of school meals with an average score of 2.46 even though 37 of 40 communities in the more heavily populated Bethel and Wade-Hampton districts serve both breakfast and lunch at school. As school districts get smaller and distances between schools becomes greater, the cost for providing both lunch and breakfast becomes too much for schools and they offer only one meal. Three (of 27) Yukon Koyukuk communities and most (7 of 11) of the communities on the Aleutian Islands do not participate in either the National School Lunch or School Breakfast Program. It is unknown if some communities are serving school meals but not participating in the federal program; if this is the case, the school districts are missing out on a considerable reimbursement from the federal government.

Emergency Food System: The emergency food system provides very little food to Southwest Alaska and the Aleutians, giving it the next to lowest average score of 3.56. Based on the percentage of residents that live at the Federal Poverty Level in Southwest Alaska the Aleutians, more than 2 million pounds of food is needed in the area to address hunger. Currently only 100,000 pounds are reaching residents of this region.

Only three communities in the Aleutian Islands census district have food distribution programs and those communities distribute about 84 pounds per person in poverty. In the Southwest, 20 of the 92 communities studied distribute food and average about 27 pounds per person in poverty. Most emergency food programs in the region are not eligible to access donated food products and are distributing federal commodities through The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) and/or Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR).

Far North Alaska*

*See Table 4 and Table 5

Included Census Districts: Nome, North Slope, Northwest Arctic**Number of Communities Surveyed: 34****Population in Surveyed Communities: 23,234**

Overall Scores: With an average overall score of 9.17 for the region, the Far North ranks second among the five state regions in this study. A combination of very high food stamp participation rates and a large majority of schools that serve both breakfast and lunch have pushed this region toward the top. While no communities got a 4, the highest rating, 11 of the 34 communities surveyed were categorized as “Addressing the Hunger Need”.

Food Cost & Income: The average ranking for the Far North is 2.52, equating to approximately 40 percent of income spent on food. This ranking is the second best in the state. Within the Far North region, Nome has the lowest food cost at \$212.58/week for a family of four; food costs in other hub communities such as Kotzebue and Barrow are close to \$300/week. The oil and mining industry have unique impacts on the per capita incomes of this region. In addition to providing jobs, many of the shareholders of native corporations receive sizable dividends from natural resources rights, making a positive impact on income and giving extra resources available for food purchase. Additionally subsistence fishing and hunting are prevalent in the Far North and likely contribute a considerable amount of food to the diet.

Food Stamps: The Far North holds the second best average for food stamps with a 1.71. As a region, the Far North has an excellent food stamp participation rate; approximately 91 percent of eligible residents are enrolled. It is likely that most of these remote villages have a fee agent.

School Meals: With an average of 1.29, the Far North holds the best average ranking for school meal service. The majority of schools (32 of 35) located in the Far North provide both breakfast and lunch through the federally funded programs. Interestingly, the community with the least expensive food prices, Nome, is one of the three communities in the Far North that does not provide a breakfast for all kids in school.

Emergency Food System: As with much of Alaska that is off the road system, the anti-hunger system has a lot of room for improvement in the Far North. The average ranking for the area is 3.69, equating to less than 10 lbs of food per person in poverty. The Far North ranks fourth of the five regions in the state for this category. Six of the 34 communities studied in this region receive food from the anti-hunger network. Only two of those six communities are eligible to access donated foods. The rest of the communities participate in one of two federal food programs, TEFAP and/or FDPIR. Just over 820,000 pounds of food is needed to address the hunger need and only 50,000 lbs. currently reaches residents of the Far North.

Interior Alaska*

*See Table 6 and Table 7

Census Districts Included: Southeast Fairbanks, Fairbanks North Star, Denali**Number of Communities Surveyed: 18****Population in Surveyed Communities: 47,734*****(Population includes only incorporated areas; Fairbanks vicinity is approximately 82,000 people, but the incorporated area has a population of just under 32,000 people)**

Overall Score: Though the Interior has the best score when looking at the percent of income spent on food, it ranks fourth in the state overall. This is probably because the area gets a low rating for the amount of food from the anti-hunger network. As was explained earlier, this score is likely due to the lack of data from the Fairbanks Community Food Bank.

Food Costs & Income: All of the communities surveyed in this region are on the road system, decreasing the cost of food and giving this area the best average in the state (1.28). The average per capita income from the 18 communities surveyed in this area is just over \$19,000. The most recent analysis of food costs in the Fairbanks area notes that it costs \$126.04 to feed a family of four for one week. Using these figures, you can approximate that communities in the area spend about 17 percent of their income on food purchase, one of the most economical communities in the state.

Food Stamps: The average ranking for the Interior is poor, ranking fourth of five regions with a 2.72. Food Stamps are widely used in the region, but participation rates are varied. As with the other large urban center, Southcentral, the Interior needs work on food stamp outreach. The Denali and Fairbanks North Star districts have a 45 percent participation rate. The two standout communities in this region, North Pole and Two Rivers, along with many of the communities in the Southeast Fairbanks district, have a much higher percentage of their eligible population enrolled in the program with an average of 73 percent of eligible residents participating.

School Meals: Interior Alaska is sitting in the middle on the issue of school meals. The region ranks third in the state with an average of 2.14. The Fairbanks North Star School District has made feeding kids a priority and was the first school district in the state to eliminate the reduced-price category for school meals. This excellent effort to feed more kids is marred by the knowledge that the three communities within the Denali census district are some of the very few in the state that do not participate in either the National School Lunch Program or the School Breakfast Program.

Emergency Food System: This region ranked last in the state the distribution of pounds per person in poverty despite the knowledge that Interior Alaska has a very stable emergency food system, which is coordinated by the area's regional food bank, Fairbanks Community Food Bank. Based on poverty data, it is estimated that 2.5 million pounds is needed for distribution in the incorporated communities of Interior Alaska. More than 1.7 million pounds is distributed through the regional food bank, Fairbanks Community Food Bank. Unfortunately, no public information is available regarding how much food was distributed to the communities in the region.

Southcentral Alaska*

***See Table 8 and Table 9**

Census Districts Included: Anchorage, Kenai Peninsula, Matanuska Susitna, Kodiak, Valdez and Cordova

Number of Communities Surveyed: 50

Population in Surveyed Communities: 356,657

Overall Ranking: Southcentral Alaska claims the number one overall ranking with an 8.88. This is still far from a 4, the best score a community can receive, and is close to falling in the middle category of "Room for Improvement". With a variety of communities both large and small and on and off the road system, Southcentral communities are very diverse. The only community in the state that received a 4 ranking (Wasilla) is in Southcentral, but there are also four communities with a 13 ranking, near the worst of the communities in Alaska.

Food Costs & Income: Though Southcentral has the two most economical locations (Anchorage and Mat-Su) in terms of food costs, it also has several communities off the road system, which puts the region as a whole just behind Interior Alaska. While Anchorage is the baseline for comparison (\$123.24 per week for a family of four), the Mat-Su area boasts the cheapest food at \$118.43 per week for a family of four. The communities that spend the most on food are those on the Kodiak Islands (\$170.60) and Cordova (\$220.02). On average, Southcentral communities spend approximately 25 percent of their income on food.

Food Stamps: With few exceptions, Southcentral Alaska communities have below average food stamp participation rates, giving it the worst ranking in the state. Wasilla, Palmer and Soldotna rank high, nearing 100 percent of eligible participants enrolled, but this may be skewed by the fact that the most accurate poverty numbers for the area are from Census 2000 and all of those areas have experienced a high population growth in the last ten years. The communities of Karluk and Ouzinkie also rank high in this category, likely because a food stamp fee agent is located in those communities. One explanation for lower participation in the food stamp program in communities such as Anchorage may be the availability of other social service programs. Anti-hunger agencies such as soup kitchens and food pantries are plentiful in this area and may give residents an alternate outlet that is easier to access than food stamps.

School Meals: Almost half of all of Alaska's children attend a school in Southcentral Alaska. The average ranking for this area is 2.45, just ahead of the poorest ranked area of Southwest Alaska and the Aleutians. School lunch is served in all of the public, traditional-setting schools in this region. School breakfast is served in many of the schools, but very small schools and those with low percentages of students that qualify for free or reduced-price meals often do not offer the breakfast program. In Anchorage alone, nearly 2,000 students that qualify for free or reduced price meals currently go to schools that do not offer breakfast.

Emergency Food System: With three of the five food banks located in this region, a large portion of the total food from the anti-hunger network stays in Southcentral Alaska. Southcentral has the best ranking in the state (2.64); the next closest region (Southeast) has a 3.43. Sixty percent of the communities surveyed in this region have food distribution programs and in those communities, approximately 100 lbs per person in poverty is distributed. In the Mat-Su area, which has the lowest food costs in the state, the emergency food system distributes the largest amount of food per person in poverty with an average of 140 pounds. Currently, 4.7 million pounds of food is distributed in Southcentral Alaska. According to the number of residents living in poverty and the estimate of needing 234 pounds per person in poverty from the emergency food system, the Southcentral area needs to be distributing 6.5 million pounds of food.

Southeast Alaska*

*See Table 10 and Table 11

Census Districts Included: Haines, Juneau, Ketchikan Gateway, Prince Wales Ketchikan, Sitka, Skagway Hoonah Angoon, Wrangell Petersburg, Yakutat

Number of Communities Surveyed: 28

Population in Surveyed Communities: 62,563

Overall Ranking: Southeast Alaska ranks in the middle of the pack for nearly every category in the study. With an overall ranking of 9.45, the area shows that there is effort being made to end hunger, but there is still room for improvement.

Food Costs & Income: The average ranking for Southeast Alaska is a 1.45, which equates to approximately 20 percent of income spent on food. The impact of transportation on food costs is less than in other regions of the state because the communities are not as remote and the more temperate climate in the Southeast allows almost year-round access of the waterways. The average cost of food in the area is \$159 per week for a family of four.

Food Stamps: The larger communities of Southeast Alaska have a respectable food stamp participation rate around 50 percent giving the region a third place ranking at 2.36. The exception is Sitka, where more than 60 percent of eligible residents are not currently signed up for the program. In the smaller communities where, like much of rural Alaska, tribal councils are the heart of the community and likely employ a food stamp fee agent, food stamp participation is fairly high.

School Meals: Southeast Alaska communities vary widely on their participation in the federally-reimbursed school meal programs. The average ranking for the region is a 1.6, just below the highest ranked Far North. A few communities do not have schools, thus have no need for the program. Four communities, Wrangell, Gustavus, Pelican and Tenakee Springs, all have schools but do not participate in the National School Lunch Program or the School Breakfast Program. The largest city in the area, Juneau, does not serve breakfast through the School Breakfast Program in any of its schools.

Emergency Food System: One of the five regional food banks is located in Juneau, but it distributes very little food outside of the capital city, which impacts the regional score, a mediocre third place at 3.43. In addition to Juneau emergency food programs, Hydaburg is one of 13 participating tribes in FDPIR and distributed 34 lbs. per person in poverty from October 2007 - October 2008. Unfortunately though, on the whole, Southeast Alaska receives very little food through the anti-hunger network. Just over 1.1 million pounds is needed to address hunger in this area and currently only 85,550 pounds is being distributed.

Conclusion

Hunger isn't going away and given the current tough economic times, we are seeing drastic increases in need. While some regions and communities are doing better than others, every one has room for improvement. On a positive note, there are lots of ways to fight the battle and we have many communities that are putting forth a valiant effort to assist their community members in need. With a combination of both public and private efforts, an even greater impact can be made. The following specific recommendations are suggested:

- To increase the food stamp participation rates in rural Alaska, it is the recommendation of the Alaska Food Coalition that fee agents be accessible in all communities that do not have a Division of Public Assistance office.
- According to the Alaska School Nutrition Association, federal reimbursements alone do not cover the increasing costs of providing quality meals to kids and school districts often contribute general operating funds to sustain existing programs. It is the recommendation of the Alaska Food Coalition that the state provide reimbursement to school districts that are administering both NSLP and SBP to supplement the federal reimbursement and local district contributions.
- It is the recommendation of Alaska Food Coalition that regional food banks collaborate to gather and distribute more food to all of Alaska, but particularly to Southwest Alaska. Based on the number of residents living below the poverty level, just over 2 million pounds of food is needed to address the hunger issue in this area. These efforts must be partnered with work at the federal legislative level to eliminate the tax code (170e) that prevents many of our tribal communities from receiving donated foods.

Hunger is a community problem and it will take every resource we have to end it. There is not a perfect solution and every community must assess the best way that they can tackle the issues. The resources are available---it's now time for us to use those resources to their full advantage to end hunger in Alaska.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Kerri Burrows, Alaska Food Coalition Manger. Editorial review and assistance were provided by Andrea Thistle, President, Alaska Food Coalition; Susannah Morgan, Executive Director, Food Bank of Alaska and Robin Stilwell, Director of Advocacy and Agency Relations, Food Bank of Alaska.

Alaska Food Coalition gratefully acknowledges the guidance and vision of Tracey Burke, PhD, MSW, UAA Professor of Social Work and Sharon Chamard, PhD, UAA Assistant Professor, Justice Center.

End Notes

1. Nord, M., Andrews, M., Carlson, S., "Household Food Security in the United States," 2008, available through www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/ERR66/ER66.pdf.
2. Ibid.
3. Jim Crockett and Lance Johnson, executive directors of Bean's Café and Nome Community Center, respectively. Phone conversation with Alaska Food Coalition. Spring 2008.
4. Food, Research and Action Center, "State of the States 2008," 2008, pg 19, available through www.frac.org/pdf/SOS_2008_withcover_nov08.pdf
5. Ibid.
6. Poundage reports from Kenai Peninsula Food Bank, Food Bank of Alaska, Kodiak Island Food Bank, Southeast Food Bank and Fairbanks Community Food Bank.
7. Clauson, A., "Despite Higher Food Price, Percent of U.S. Income Spent on Food Remains Constant," 2008, available through www.ers.usda.gov/AmberWaves/September08/Findings/PercentofIncome.htm
8. U.S. Department of labor, Bureau of labor Statistics, "Consumer Expenditure Survey 2007," 2008, available through <http://www.bls.gov/cex/2007/standar/income.pdf>

9. University of Alaska Fairbanks, "Alaska Food Cost Survey," 2008, available through www.usa.edu/ces/fcs/index.html.
10. Food, Research and Action Center, "State of the States 2008," 2008, pg 19, available through www.frac.org/pdf/SOS_2008_withcover_nov08.pdf
11. Ibid, pg 20.
12. Alaska Food Coalition analysis of data 2006-2007 data released by the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, Child Nutrition Services.
13. Begelle, "More Than Test Scores: Results of the Universal School Breakfast Pilot in MN," 1999:15.
14. Poundage reports from Kenai Peninsula Food Bank, Food Bank of Alaska, Kodiak Island Food Bank, Southeast Food Bank and Fairbanks Community Food Bank.
15. Center on Hunger and Poverty, Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University.
16. Calculation by Alaska Food Coalition
17. Calculated by Alaska Food Coalition; 234 lbs per person in poverty x estimated number of residents in community that live at 100% of the Federal Poverty Line or lower. Note that the communities in the survey (235 do not represent the entire population of the state). Census Bureau 2006 estimate of the state population is 670,053. Total population of the communities surveyed in Hungriest Communities is 533,673.

Appendix

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Table 2. Southwest and Aleutians by Rank						
Nenana	Yukon Koyukuk	1	1	1	2	5
Bethel	Bethel	2	2	2	2	8
Kongiganak	Bethel	4	1	1	2	8
Dillingham	Dillingham	2	3	1	2	8
Mountain Village	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	2	8
Aniak	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	1	2	8
Akiak	Aleutians East	4	2	1	2	9
Kasigluk	Bethel	4	1	1	3	9
St. Mary's	Wade Hampton	2	3	1	3	9
Alakanuk	Wade Hampton	4	2	1	2	9
Chevak	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Hooper Bay	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Kotlik	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Scammon Bay	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Fort Yukon	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	2	9
Holy Cross	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	1	4	9
Shageluk	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	1	4	9
St. George	Aleutians West	2	3	4	1	10
Mekoryuk	Bethel	3	2	1	4	10
Atmautluak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Chefornak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Chuathbaluk	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Kipnuk	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10

A REPORT ON HUNGER IN ALASKA

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Kwethluk	Bethel	4	2	1	3	10
Napakiak	Bethel	4	2	1	3	10
Napaskiak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Nunapitchuk	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Stony River	Bethel	4	3	1	2	10
Tuluksak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Naknek	Bristol Bay	2	3	4	1	10
Chignik	Lake and Peninsula	2	3	4	1	10
Port Heiden	Lake and Peninsula	2	3	4	1	10
Emmonak	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Nunam Iqua	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Pilot Station	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Russian Mission	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Galena	Yukon Koyukuk	1	4	1	4	10
McGrath	Yukon Koyukuk	1	3	2	4	10
Anvik	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	1	4	10
Nikolai	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	1	4	10
Atka	Aleutians West	2	4	4	1	11
Unalaska/Dutch Harbor	Aleutians West	2	4	1	4	11
Akiachak	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Eek	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Kwigillingok	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Newtok	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Nightmute	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Quinhagak	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Sleetmute	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Toksook Bay	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Tununak	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Ekwok	Dillingham	3	3	1	4	11
Port Alsworth	Lake and Peninsula	1	2	4	4	11
Iliamna	Lake and Peninsula	2	1	4	4	11
Manley Hot Springs	Yukon Koyukuk	1	2	4	4	11
Allakaket	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	4	11
Chalkyitsik	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	4	11
Minto	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	4	11
Takotna	Yukon Koyukuk	2	4	1	4	11
Grayling	Yukon Koyukuk	3	3	1	4	11
Crooked Creek	Bethel	4	3	1	4	12
Goodnews Bay	Bethel	4	3	1	4	12
Twin Hills	Dillingham	2	2	4	4	12
Koliganek	Dillingham	3	1	4	4	12
Perryville	Lake and Peninsula	2	2	4	4	12
Nondalton	Lake and Peninsula	4	3	4	1	12
Central	Yukon Koyukuk	1	3	4	4	12
Arctic Village	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Beaver	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Hughes	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Huslia	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Kaltag	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Nulato	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Ruby	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Tanana	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Venetie	Yukon Koyukuk	3	1	4	4	12
Nelson Lagoon	Aleutians East	2	3	4	4	13
Adak	Aleutians West	1	4	4	4	13
St. Paul	Aleutians West	2	3	4	4	13
Lower Kalskag	Bethel	4	4	1	4	13
Tuntutuliak	Bethel	4	1	4	4	13
Upper Kalskag	Bethel	4	4	1	4	13
Egegik	Lake and Peninsula	2	3	4	4	13
Pilot Point	Lake and Peninsula	3	2	4	4	13
Koyukuk	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	4	4	13
Circle	Yukon Koyukuk	3	2	4	4	13
False Pass	Aleutians East	2	4	4	4	14
King Cove	Aleutians East	2	4	4	4	14
Sand Point	Aleutians East	2	4	4	4	14
King Salmon	Bristol Bay	2	4	4	4	14
Aleknagik	Dillingham	3	3	4	4	14
Clark's Point	Dillingham	3	3	4	4	14
Manokotak	Dillingham	4	2	4	4	14
New Stuyahok	Dillingham	4	2	4	4	14
Togiak	Dillingham	4	2	4	4	14
Chignik Lake	Lake and Peninsula	3	3	4	4	14
Stevens Village	Yukon Koyukuk	3	3	4	4	14
Akutan	Aleutians East	3	4	4	4	15
Levelock	Lake and Peninsula	3	4	4	4	15
Kokhanok	Lake and Peninsula	4	3	4	4	15
Oscarville	Bethel	4	4	n/a	4	
South Naknek	Bristol Bay	3	4	n/a	4	
Newhalen	Lake and Peninsula	4	4	n/a	4	
Pitkas Point	Wade Hampton	3	4	n/a	4	

Table 3. Southwest and Aleutians by Community

Adak	Aleutians West	1	4	4	4	13
Akiachak	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Akiak	Bethel	4	2	1	2	9
Akutan	Aleutians East	3	4	4	4	15
Alakanuk	Wade Hampton	4	2	1	2	9

A REPORT ON HUNGER IN ALASKA

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Aleknagik	Dillingham	3	3	4	4	14
Allakaket	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	4	11
Aniak	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	1	2	8
Anvik	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	1	4	10
Arctic Village	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Atka	Aleutians West	2	4	4	1	11
Atmautluak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Beaver	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Bethel	Bethel	2	2	2	2	8
Central	Yukon Koyukuk	1	3	4	4	12
Chalkyitsik	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	4	11
Chefornak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Chevak	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Chignik	Lake and Peninsula	2	3	4	1	10
Chignik Lake	Lake and Peninsula	3	3	4	4	14
Chuathbaluk	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Circle	Yukon Koyukuk	3	2	4	4	13
Clark's Point	Dillingham	3	3	4	4	14
Crooked Creek	Bethel	4	3	1	4	12
Dillingham	Dillingham	2	3	1	2	8
Eek	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Egegik	Lake and Peninsula	2	3	4	4	13
Ekwok	Dillingham	3	3	1	4	11
Emmonak	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
False Pass	Aleutians East	2	4	4	4	14
Fort Yukon	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	2	9
Galena	Yukon Koyukuk	1	4	1	4	10
Goodnews Bay	Bethel	4	3	1	4	12
Grayling	Yukon Koyukuk	3	3	1	4	11
Holy Cross	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	1	4	9
Hooper Bay	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Hughes	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Huslia	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Iliamna	Lake and Peninsula	2	1	4	4	11
Kaltag	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Kasigluk	Bethel	4	1	1	3	9
King Cove	Aleutians East	2	4	4	4	14
King Salmon	Bristol Bay	2	4	4	4	14
Kipnuk	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Kokhanok	Lake and Peninsula	4	3	4	4	15
Koliganek	Dillingham	3	1	4	4	12
Kongiganak	Bethel	4	1	1	2	8
Kotlik	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Koyukuk	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	4	4	13
Kwethluk	Bethel	4	2	1	3	10

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Kwigillingok	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Levelock	Lake and Peninsula	3	4	4	4	15
Lower Kalskag	Bethel	4	4	1	4	13
Manley Hot Springs	Yukon Koyukuk	1	2	4	4	11
Manokotak	Dillingham	4	2	4	4	14
McGrath	Yukon Koyukuk	1	3	2	4	10
Mekoryuk	Bethel	3	2	1	4	10
Minto	Yukon Koyukuk	2	1	4	4	11
Mountain Village	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	2	8
Naknek	Bristol Bay	2	3	4	1	10
Napakiak	Bethel	4	2	1	3	10
Napaskiak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Nelson Lagoon	Aleutians East	2	3	4	4	13
Nenana	Yukon Koyukuk	1	1	1	2	5
New Stuyahok	Dillingham	4	2	4	4	14
Newhalen	Lake and Peninsula	4	4	n/a	4	
Newtok	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Nightmute	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Nikolai	Yukon Koyukuk	2	3	1	4	10
Nondalton	Lake and Peninsula	4	3	4	1	12
Nulato	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Nunam Iqua	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Nunapitchuk	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Oscarville	Bethel	4	4	n/a	4	
Perryville	Lake and Peninsula	2	2	4	4	12
Pilot Point	Lake and Peninsula	3	2	4	4	13
Pilot Station	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Pitkas Point	Wade Hampton	3	4	n/a	4	
Port Alsworth	Lake and Peninsula	1	2	4	4	11
Port Heiden	Lake and Peninsula	2	3	4	1	10
Quinhagak	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Ruby	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12
Russian Mission	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	4	10
Sand Point	Aleutians East	2	4	4	4	14
Scammon Bay	Wade Hampton	4	1	1	3	9
Shageluk	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	1	4	9
Sleetmute	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
South Naknek	Bristol Bay	3	4	n/a	4	
St. George	Aleutians West	2	3	4	1	10
St. Mary's	Wade Hampton	2	3	1	3	9
St. Paul	Aleutians West	2	3	4	4	13
Stevens Village	Yukon Koyukuk	3	3	4	4	14
Stony River	Bethel	4	3	1	2	10
Takotna	Yukon Koyukuk	2	4	1	4	11
Tanana	Yukon Koyukuk	2	2	4	4	12

A REPORT ON HUNGER IN ALASKA

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Togiak	Dillingham	4	2	4	4	14
Toksook Bay	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Tuluksak	Bethel	4	1	1	4	10
Tuntutuliak	Bethel	4	1	4	4	13
Tununak	Bethel	4	2	1	4	11
Twin Hills	Dillingham	2	2	4	4	12
Unalaska/Dutch Harbor	Aleutians West	2	4	1	4	11
Upper Kalskag	Bethel	4	4	1	4	13
Venetie	Yukon Koyukuk	3	1	4	4	12

Table 4. Far North by Rank

St. Michael	Nome	3	1	1	2	7
Stebbins	Nome	3	1	1	2	7
Point Hope	North Slope	2	1	1	3	7
Golovin	Nome	2	1	1	4	8
Wales	Nome	2	1	1	4	8
Koyuk	Nome	3	2	1	2	8
Anaktuvuk Pass	North Slope	2	1	1	4	8
Kaktovik	North Slope	2	1	1	4	8
Point Lay	North Slope	2	1	1	4	8
Nome	Nome	1	2	4	2	9
Elim	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Gambell	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Savoonga	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Shaktoolik	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Shishmaref	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Teller	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Barrow	North Slope	2	3	2	2	9
Wainwright	North Slope	2	2	1	4	9
Kiana	Northwest Arctic	3	1	1	4	9
Noorvik	Northwest Arctic	3	1	1	4	9
Shungnak	Northwest Arctic	3	1	1	4	9
Unalakleet	Nome	2	3	1	4	10
Diomedes	Nome	3	2	1	4	10
White Mountain	Nome	3	2	1	4	10
Nuiqsut	North Slope	2	3	1	4	10
Ambler	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Buckland	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Deering	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Kobuk	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Noatak	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Selawik	Northwest Arctic	4	1	1	4	10
Brevig Mission	Nome	4	2	1	4	11
Kotzebue	Northwest Arctic	2	2	3	4	11

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Kivalina	Northwest Arctic	4	2	1	4	11
Atqasuk	North Slope	3	4	1	4	12

Table 5. Far North by Community

Ambler	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Anaktuvuk Pass	North Slope	2	1	1	4	8
Atqasuk	North Slope	3	4	1	4	12
Barrow	North Slope	2	3	2	2	9
Brevig Mission	Nome	4	2	1	4	11
Buckland	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Deering	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Diomedea	Nome	3	2	1	4	10
Elim	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Gambell	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Golovin	Nome	2	1	1	4	8
Kaktovik	North Slope	2	1	1	4	8
Kiana	Northwest Arctic	3	1	1	4	9
Kivalina	Northwest Arctic	4	2	1	4	11
Kobuk	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Kotzebue	Northwest Arctic	2	2	3	4	11
Koyuk	Nome	3	2	1	2	8
Noatak	Northwest Arctic	3	2	1	4	10
Nome	Nome	1	2	4	2	9
Noorvik	Northwest Arctic	3	1	1	4	9
Nuiqsut	North Slope	2	3	1	4	10
Point Hope	North Slope	2	1	1	3	7
Point Lay	North Slope	2	1	1	4	8
Savoonga	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Selawik	Northwest Arctic	4	1	1	4	10
Shaktolik	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Shishmaref	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Shungnak	Northwest Arctic	3	1	1	4	9
St. Michael	Nome	3	1	1	2	7
Stebbins	Nome	3	1	1	2	7
Teller	Nome	3	1	1	4	9
Unalakleet	Nome	2	3	1	4	10
Wainwright	North Slope	2	2	1	4	9
Wales	Nome	2	1	1	4	8
White Mountain	Nome	3	2	1	4	10

A REPORT ON HUNGER IN ALASKA

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Two Rivers	Fairbanks North Star	1	1	1	4	7
Eagle	Southeast Fairbanks	1	1	1	4	7
Northway	Southeast Fairbanks	1	1	1	4	7
North Pole	Fairbanks North Star	1	1	2	4	8
Salcha	Fairbanks North Star	1	2	1	4	8
Fairbanks	Fairbanks North Star	1	3	1	4	9
Tanacross	Southeast Fairbanks	2	2	1	4	9
Delta Junction	Southeast Fairbanks	1	1	4	4	10
Tok	Southeast Fairbanks	1	3	4	2	10
Eielson AFB	Fairbanks North Star	2	4	1	4	11
Tetlin	Southeast Fairbanks	3	3	1	4	11
Anderson	Denali	1	3	4	4	12
Cantwell	Denali	1	4	4	4	13
Healy	Denali	1	4	4	4	13
Ester	Fairbanks North Star	1	4	n/a	4	
Fox	Fairbanks North Star	1	4	n/a	4	
Moose Creek	Fairbanks North Star	1	4	n/a	1	
Fort Greely	Southeast Fairbanks	2	4	n/a	4	

Table 7. Interior by Community

Anderson	Denali	1	3	4	4	12
Cantwell	Denali	1	4	4	4	13
Delta Junction	Southeast Fairbanks	1	1	4	4	10
Eagle	Southeast Fairbanks	1	1	1	4	7
Eielson AFB	Fairbanks North Star	2	4	1	4	11
Ester	Fairbanks North Star	1	4	n/a	4	
Fairbanks	Fairbanks North Star	1	3	1	4	9
Fort Greely	Southeast Fairbanks	2	4	n/a	4	
Fox	Fairbanks North Star	1	4	n/a	4	
Healy	Denali	1	4	4	4	13
Moose Creek	Fairbanks North Star	1	4	n/a	1	
North Pole	Fairbanks North Star	1	1	2	4	8
Northway	Southeast Fairbanks	1	1	1	4	7
Salcha	Fairbanks North Star	1	2	1	4	8
Tanacross	Southeast Fairbanks	2	2	1	4	9
Tetlin	Southeast Fairbanks	3	3	1	4	11
Tok	Southeast Fairbanks	1	3	4	2	10
Two Rivers	Fairbanks North Star	1	1	1	4	7

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Ouzinkie	Kodiak Island	1	1	1	1	4
Palmer	Matanuska and Susitna	1	1	1	1	4
Wasilla	Matanuska and Susitna	1	1	1	1	4
Chitina	Valdez and Cordova	2	2		1	5
Soldotna	Kenai Peninsula	1	1	3	1	6
Kodiak	Kodiak Island	1	2	2	1	6
Big Lake	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	1	6
Talkeetna	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	1	6
Anchorage	Anchorage	1	3	2	1	7
Old Harbor	Kodiak Island	2	3	1	1	7
Willow	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	2	7
Anchor Point	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	2	2	8
Kenai	Kenai Peninsula	1	2	3	2	8
Nikiski	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	2	2	8
Sterling	Kenai Peninsula	1	4	1	2	8
Seward	Kenai Peninsula	2	2	2	2	8
Cordova	Valdez and Cordova	1	3	1	3	8
Homer	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	3	2	9
Kasilof	Kenai Peninsula	1	2	4	2	9
Seldovia	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	4	1	9
Chiniak	Kodiak Island	1	3	1	4	9
Sutton-Alpine	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	4	9
Copper Center	Valdez and Cordova	2	2	4	1	9
Mentasta Lake	Valdez and Cordova	2	2	1	4	9
Ninilchik	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	4	2	10
Port Graham	Kenai Peninsula	2	2	4	2	10
Nanwalek	Kenai Peninsula	3	2	1	4	10
Larsen Bay	Kodiak Island	2	3	1	4	10
Trapper Creek	Matanuska and Susitna	1	4	4	1	10
Hope	Kenai Peninsula	2	4	4	1	11
Tyonek	Kenai Peninsula	2	4	1	4	11
Akhiok	Kodiak Island	3	3	1	4	11
Gakona	Valdez and Cordova	1	2	4	4	11
Glennallen	Valdez and Cordova	1	2	4	4	11
Valdez	Valdez and Cordova	1	4	3	3	11
Whittier	Valdez and Cordova	1	2	4	4	11
Slana	Valdez and Cordova	1	3	4	4	12
Cooper Landing	Kenai Peninsula	1	4	4	4	13
Fritz Creek	Kenai Peninsula	1	4	4	4	13
Port Lions	Kodiak Island	1	4	4	4	13
Chenega Bay	Valdez and Cordova	2	3	4	4	13
Clam Gulch	Kenai Peninsula	1	2	n/a	1	

A REPORT ON HUNGER IN ALASKA

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Nikolaevsk	Kenai Peninsula	2	4	n/a	4	
Karluk	Kodiak Island	2	1	n/a	4	
Houston	Matanuska and Susitna	1	2	n/a	3	
Skwentna	Matanuska and Susitna	1	4	n/a	4	
Chistochina	Valdez and Cordova	2	3	n/a	4	
Gulkana	Valdez and Cordova	2	4	n/a	4	
Kenny Lake	Valdez and Cordova	2	4	n/a	4	
McCarthy	Valdez and Cordova	2	4	n/a	4	

Table 9. Southcentral by Community

Akhiok	Kodiak Island	3	3	1	4	11
Anchor Point	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	2	2	8
Anchorage	Anchorage	1	3	2	1	7
Big Lake	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	1	6
Chenega Bay	Valdez and Cordova	2	3	4	4	13
Chiniak	Kodiak Island	1	3	1	4	9
Chistochina	Valdez and Cordova	2	3	n/a	4	
Chitina	Valdez and Cordova	2	2		1	5
Clam Gulch	Kenai Peninsula	1	2	n/a	1	
Cooper Landing	Kenai Peninsula	1	4	4	4	13
Copper Center	Valdez and Cordova	2	2	4	1	9
Cordova	Valdez and Cordova	1	3	1	3	8
Fritz Creek	Kenai Peninsula	1	4	4	4	13
Gakona	Valdez and Cordova	1	2	4	4	11
Glennallen	Valdez and Cordova	1	2	4	4	11
Gulkana	Valdez and Cordova	2	4	n/a	4	
Homer	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	3	2	9
Hope	Kenai Peninsula	2	4	4	1	11
Houston	Matanuska and Susitna	1	2	n/a	3	
Karluk	Kodiak Island	2	1	n/a	4	
Kasilof	Kenai Peninsula	1	2	4	2	9
Kenai	Kenai Peninsula	1	2	3	2	8
Kenny Lake	Valdez and Cordova	2	4	n/a	4	
Kodiak	Kodiak Island	1	2	2	1	6
Larsen Bay	Kodiak Island	2	3	1	4	10
McCarthy	Valdez and Cordova	2	4	n/a	4	
Mentasta Lake	Valdez and Cordova	2	2	1	4	9
Nanwalek	Kenai Peninsula	3	2	1	4	10
Nikiski	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	2	2	8
Nikolaevsk	Kenai Peninsula	2	4	n/a	4	
Ninilchik	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	4	2	10
Old Harbor	Kodiak Island	2	3	1	1	7

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Ouzinkie	Kodiak Island	1	1	1	1	4
Palmer	Matanuska and Susitna	1	1	1	1	4
Port Graham	Kenai Peninsula	2	2	4	2	10
Port Lions	Kodiak Island	1	4	4	4	13
Seldovia	Kenai Peninsula	1	3	4	1	9
Seward	Kenai Peninsula	2	2	2	2	8
Skwentna	Matanuska and Susitna	1	4	n/a	4	
Slana	Valdez and Cordova	1	3	4	4	12
Soldotna	Kenai Peninsula	1	1	3	1	6
Sterling	Kenai Peninsula	1	4	1	2	8
Sutton-Alpine	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	4	9
Talkeetna	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	1	6
Trapper Creek	Matanuska and Susitna	1	4	4	1	10
Tyonek	Kenai Peninsula	2	4	1	4	11
Valdez	Valdez and Cordova	1	4	3	3	11
Wasilla	Matanuska and Susitna	1	1	1	1	4
Whittier	Valdez and Cordova	1	2	4	4	11
Willow	Matanuska and Susitna	1	3	1	2	7

Table 10. Southeast by Rank

Haines	Haines	1	2	2	2	7
Ketchikan	Ketchikan Gateway	1	1	3	2	7
Coffman Cove	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	1	1	4	7
Kake	Wrangell Petersburg	1	1	1	4	7
Juneau	Juneau	1	2	3	2	8
Metlakatla	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	1	1	4	8
Hoonah	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	2	2	1	3	8
Petersburg	Wrangell Petersburg	1	3	1	3	8
Hollis	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	3	1	4	9
Thorne Bay	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	2	2	4	9
Sitka	Sitka	1	3	3	2	9
Wrangell	Wrangell Petersburg	1	2	4	2	9
Craig	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	2	3	4	10
Hydaburg	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	2	4	2	10
Klawock	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	2	4	2	10
Port Alexander	Wrangell Petersburg	2	3	1	4	10
Hyder	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	4	1	4	11
Angoon	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	2	1	4	4	11
Pelican	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	3	4	4	12
Tenakee Springs	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	3	4	4	12
Gustavus	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	4	4	4	13
Skagway	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	4	4	4	13
Saxman	Ketchikan Gateway	2	3	n/a	4	

A REPORT ON HUNGER IN ALASKA

Community	Census district	Demand #1 - Percent of Income Spent on Food	Demand #2 - Percent Eligible, but Not Participating in FS	% of Schools that Serve Breakfast and Lunch	Supply #2 - Pounds Per Person in Poverty	Total
Kasaan	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	2	n/a	4	
Whale Pass	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	1	n/a	4	
Naukati Bay	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	3	n/a	4	
Klukwan	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	2	3	n/a	4	
Yakutat	Yakutat	1	3	1	4	

Table II. Southeast by Community

Angoon	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	2	1	4	4	11
Coffman Cove	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	1	1	4	7
Craig	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	2	3	4	10
Gustavus	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	4	4	4	13
Haines	Haines	1	2	2	2	7
Hollis	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	3	1	4	9
Hoonah	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	2	2	1	3	8
Hydaburg	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	2	4	2	10
Hyder	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	4	1	4	11
Juneau	Juneau	1	2	3	2	8
Kake	Wrangell Petersburg	1	1	1	4	7
Kasaan	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	2	n/a	4	
Ketchikan	Ketchikan Gateway	1	1	3	2	7
Klawock	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	2	4	2	10
Klukwan	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	2	3	n/a	4	
Metlakatla	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	1	1	4	8
Naukati Bay	Prince Wales Ketchikan	2	3	n/a	4	
Pelican	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	3	4	4	12
Petersburg	Wrangell Petersburg	1	3	1	3	8
Port Alexander	Wrangell Petersburg	2	3	1	4	10
Saxman	Ketchikan Gateway	2	3	n/a	4	
Sitka	Sitka	1	3	3	2	9
Skagway	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	4	4	4	13
Tenakee Springs	Skagway Hoonah Angoon	1	3	4	4	12
Thorne Bay	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	2	2	4	9
Whale Pass	Prince Wales Ketchikan	1	1	n/a	4	
Wrangell	Wrangell Petersburg	1	2	4	2	9
Yakutat	Yakutat	1	3	1	4	

February 2009

The Alaska Food Coalition
c/o Food Bank of Alaska
2121 Spar Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501-1855

907.272.3663 Main
907.222.3103 Direct
907.277.7368 Fax

www.alaskafood.org