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In May 2020, food insecurity rates remained high but had moderated somewhat since the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic.1 Efforts to increase Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits and provide school meals and charitable food likely reduced pressure on food budgets for many households. However, not all adults whose families needed assistance with out-of-school meals reported receiving it. Adults with lower incomes, adults whose families have lost work or work-related income during the pandemic, non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic adults, parents living with children under 19, and adults with at least one noncitizen family member continued experiencing higher rates of food insecurity than other adults, further exacerbating social and health disparities across the country.

In this brief, we examine how the pandemic has affected food insecurity and access to school meals and charitable food distribution for adults and their families in the US. We use data from the first wave of the Urban Institute's Coronavirus Tracking Survey, a nationally representative survey of nonelderly adults fielded May 14 through 27, 2020, and from the Health Reform Monitoring Survey (HRMS), fielded March 25 through April 10, 2020.2 The tracking survey respondents are a subset of the HRMS participants, allowing us to monitor how the pandemic has affected these adults over time. We find the following:

- In May, more than one in six adults (17.7 percent) and more than one in five parents living with children (21.8 percent) reported that their households experienced food insecurity during the prior 30 days. These rates were moderately lower than those reported in the March/April
HRMS, which found that 20.9 percent of adults and 24.6 percent of parents living with children reported food insecurity in the early weeks of the pandemic.

- Nearly-one third of adults with low incomes were food insecure, and adults whose families have experienced employment disruptions during the pandemic also faced a disproportionately high rate of food insecurity (25.3 percent).

- Marked racial and ethnic disparities in food insecurity persisted; Hispanic adults' and Black adults' household food insecurity rates were 27.1 percent and 27.0 percent, approximately double that of white adults' households (13.5 percent). Rates of very low food security followed a similar pattern: 10.2 percent of Black adults and 10.7 percent of Hispanic adults reported very low household food security, compared with 5.3 percent of white adults.

- One in four adults in families with noncitizens (25.5 percent) reported experiencing food insecurity in the previous 30 days, compared with 16.8 percent of adults whose family members were all citizens. Families with noncitizen members are excluded from some assistance programs, and others may not be reached by assistance they are eligible for because of stigma or fear.

- Nearly one in eight adults (12.1 percent) and more than one in seven adults whose families have experienced employment or income losses (14.8 percent) reported that their households received charitable food, such as groceries from a food pantry or free meals, in the previous 30 days. Approximately 19.1 percent of Hispanic adults' households and 20.8 percent of non-Hispanic Black adults' households received charitable food in the prior month, compared with 8.5 percent of white adults' households. Receipt of charitable food was also more common among parents living with children (17.2 percent), especially those with lower incomes (27.5 percent).

- Though nearly one in three (30.9 percent) parents of school-age children reported receiving school-based meals during pandemic school closures, we find that only 61.0 percent of parents whose families received free or reduced-price meals during the school year reported receiving school meal assistance during closures. As a result, about two in five parents with low incomes appear not to have been reached by efforts to replace school food at the time of the survey.

Background

Though some workers returned to jobs as economic activity began resuming during the spring, widespread closures and concerns about exposure to the coronavirus continued across the country. Millions of people continued to file initial unemployment claims, and long lines at food banks persisted across the US. Other research indicates that more than one in five households and two in five households with children ages 12 and under had reported food insufficiency (a different but related measure of food need) as of April 2020, and an increase in 9.9 million families experiencing food insecurity is expected if unemployment and poverty increase to Great Recession levels.
In March, Congress acted to ameliorate some of this damage by passing the Families First Coronavirus Response Act,\(^8\) which included several provisions for federal nutrition programs, including increased allocations for SNAP and flexibility for states to give households the maximum monthly SNAP allotment for their household size. The legislation also temporarily halted SNAP work requirements for unemployed adults under age 50 without children in their household and provided flexibility for states to adapt their regular child nutrition programs to maintain children’s access to meals (e.g., by allowing schools to provide meals during school closures).\(^9\) The legislation also allowed states to provide emergency funds to families with children that would have received free or reduced-priced meals if not for school closures through the Pandemic EBT (P-EBT) program.\(^10\) Though 45 states and Washington, DC, had initiated a P-EBT program by early July, initial implementation of these new programs was uneven.\(^11\)

The subsequent congressional package, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security, or CARES, Act provided additional funding for several safety net programs facing growing demand for assistance.\(^12\) These programs included SNAP; child nutrition programs; older adult nutrition assistance; nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and other US territories; the Emergency Food Assistance Program, which purchases and distributes federal commodities to food banks and other organizations; and the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations. The CARES Act also significantly expanded eligibility and benefits for unemployment insurance and authorized one-time direct cash payments to most US households.

Below, we consider how much adults and parents (adults who report being the parent or guardian of children or stepchildren under 19 who live with them) in the US report experiencing food insecurity, how food insecurity varies across demographic groups, and how external resources, such as charitable meals and school meal services, are reaching households during the pandemic.

**Results**

*In May 2020, 17.7 percent of adults ages 18 to 64 reported that they experienced food insecurity in the prior 30 days, representing a 3.2 percentage-point drop from 20.9 percent in March/April 2020. However, food insecurity rates remained high, especially among adults whose families lost work or work-related income because of the pandemic, adults with low incomes, Hispanic and non-Hispanic Black adults, and parents living with children.*

As noted, the share of adults reporting household food insecurity declined moderately, from 20.9 percent in March/April 2020 to 17.7 percent in May 2020 (figure 1). Additionally, significantly fewer adults reported being worried about their families having enough to eat in the next month, dropping from 25.3 percent in March/April to 17.0 percent in May (data not shown). A previous brief found that food insecurity declined among adults whose families lost work or work-related income because of the pandemic and received unemployment insurance (UI) benefits, from 27.1 percent in March/April to 24.1 percent in May (Karpman and Acs 2020). In contrast, food insecurity did not change among adults whose families lost work or income and applied for UI but had not received benefits by the May
survey. That analysis also found that UI recipients reported a sharp reduction in worrying about having enough to eat in the next month (31.9 percent in March/April versus 19.5 percent in May). Among adults whose families applied for UI benefits but had not received them by May, the share worried about having enough to eat in the next month remained essentially unchanged (30.0 percent in March/April versus 28.5 percent in May).

**FIGURE 1**

Share of Adults Ages 18 to 64 Who Experienced Food Insecurity, Including Very Low Food Security, Overall and among Parents Living with Children under 19, March/April and May 2020

![Graph showing food insecurity and very low food security rates](image)

**Sources:** May estimates are from the Urban Institute Coronavirus Tracking Survey, wave 1. March/April estimates are from the Urban Institute Health Reform Monitoring Survey (HRMS).

**Notes:** Parents are adults who are parents or guardians of children or stepchildren under 19 who live with them. The Coronavirus Tracking Survey was conducted May 14 through 27, 2020, and 93.1 percent of respondents completed the survey by May 20. The HRMS was conducted March 25 through April 10, 2020, and 74.5 percent of respondents completed the survey by March 31. Tracking survey respondents were sampled from the participants in the March/April HRMS.

*/*/**/*** May estimate differs significantly from March/April estimate at the 0.10/0.05/0.01 level, using two-tailed tests.

Figure 2 shows that loss of work or work-related income continued to affect US households’ abilities to purchase food, with one in four (25.3 percent) adults in families that lost work or income because of the pandemic having reported food insecurity in the 30 days before the May survey. Families with low incomes are also disproportionately harmed by the economic effects of the pandemic; among adults whose family incomes are below 250 percent of the federal poverty level, 31.9 percent experienced food insecurity in the last 30 days, compared with only 6.6 percent of adults in families with higher incomes.
Figure 2 also shows that marked racial and ethnic disparities persisted in May, with 27.0 percent of non-Hispanic Black adults and 27.1 percent of Hispanic adults reporting food insecurity—significantly greater shares than that of non-Hispanic white adults (13.5 percent). Very low food security rates followed a similar pattern, with 10.2 percent of Black adults’ households and 10.7 percent of Hispanic adults’ households experiencing very low food security, compared with 5.3 percent of white adults’ households (data not shown). The survey sample size does not allow us to examine food insecurity rates for other racial and ethnic groups (13.8 percent overall). However, recent reports indicate several Native American communities are also experiencing high rates of need.13

Parents with children living in the household have been hard hit as well; more than one in five (21.8 percent) parents living with children under 19 reported food insecurity, a significantly higher share than that for adults not living with children (15.4 percent).

Though the food insecurity rate for parents living with children improved significantly between March/April and May, declining from 24.6 percent to 21.8 percent (figure 1), continued school and child care closures and the associated loss of meals for children likely contributed to the persistent concerns about affording an adequate diet.
In May, one in four adults in families with noncitizens had experienced food insecurity in the prior 30 days. Families with noncitizen members have been excluded from some government assistance programs.

Whereas one in four adults in families with noncitizens (25.5 percent) experienced food insecurity in the prior 30 days, 16.8 percent of adults whose family members were all citizens reported food insecurity in the prior 30 days (table 1). Because stigma, fear, and/or exclusion from benefits can prohibit families with noncitizens from being reached by government assistance, alleviating high rates of food insecurity for these families requires additional attention, including more intensive outreach and more inclusive programs and policies.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Adults Ages 18 to 64 Who Experienced Food Insecurity, Including Low and Very Low Food Security, by Family Citizenship Status, May 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any noncitizen in the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low food security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Urban Institute Coronavirus Tracking Survey, wave 1. The survey was conducted May 14 through 27, 2020.
Note: **/*** Estimate differs significantly from that for adults in families with noncitizens at the 0.10/0.05/0.01 level, using two-tailed tests.

One in eight adults reported receiving charitable food in the 30 days before the May survey. Rates of charitable food receipt were higher for those who reported losing work or work-related income in the pandemic, low-income adults’ households, parents living with children, and Black adults’ and Hispanic adults’ households.

In May, 12.1 percent of adults reported receiving some charitable food in the prior 30 days, which includes receiving free meals and/or free groceries (figure 3). Among adults in families with low incomes, 22.4 percent reported receiving charitable food. Parents living with children were more likely to report receipt of charitable food than adults not living with children (17.2 percent versus 9.2 percent), and this rate is even higher among parents losing work or work-related income (22.0 percent; figure 4). And as shown in figure 4, parents with low incomes reported significantly higher rates of charitable food receipt (27.5 percent) than parents with higher incomes (6.7 percent).

The Urban Institute’s Well-Being and Basic Needs Survey, fielded among a similar population in December 2019, also collected data on charitable food use. After accounting for differences in demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the samples, 6.3 percent of adults had received free meals in the prior 30 days as of May, compared with 4.3 percent of adults in December (data not shown). Receipt of free groceries remained unchanged, however. These data suggest adults’ increased rates of charitable food receipt in the past few months have resulted from the pandemic.
FIGURE 3
Share of Adults Ages 18 to 64 Reporting Receipt of Any Charitable Food, Overall and by Family Income, Race/Ethnicity, and Presence of Children under 19 in the Family, May 2020

Notes: FPL is federal poverty level. We define family as the respondent, their spouse or partner, and any of their children or stepchildren under 19 who live with them. Other includes non-Hispanic adults who are not Black or white or are more than one race. The survey was conducted May 14 through 27, 2020.
*/**/*** Estimate differs significantly from reference group (^) at the 0.10/0.05/0.01 level, using two-tailed tests.

FIGURE 4
Share of Parents Living with Children under 19 Reporting Receipt of Any Charitable Food, Overall and by Family Income, May 2020

Notes: FPL is federal poverty level. We define family as the respondent, their spouse or partner, and any of their children or stepchildren under 19 who live with them. The survey was conducted May 14 through 27, 2020.
*/**/*** Estimate differs significantly from reference group (^) at the 0.10/0.05/0.01 level, using two-tailed tests.
Nearly one in three (30.9 percent) parents with school-age children reported receiving school-based meals, but local and government-level school meal responses to the pandemic have not reached many families that received free or reduced-price meals before school closures.

In May, only 61.0 percent of parents whose children received free or reduced-price meals during the school year reported that their families had received school meal assistance, which could include meals picked up from school sites or delivered to homes, since closures began (figure 5). Consequently, at the time of the survey, about two in five parents whose families had incomes low enough to qualify for free or reduced-price school meals appeared not to have been reached by efforts to replace school food. The burden of school closures on family food budgets is more pronounced for parents with low incomes, 44.4 percent of whom reported receiving school-based meals, compared with 15.3 percent of parents in families with higher incomes. At the time of the survey, the new P-EBT programs had not been widely implemented across the US, so we cannot determine whether or how some families may have been receiving electronic benefits designed to replace school-based meals.

**FIGURE 5**
Share of Parents Whose School-Age Children Have Received School-Based Meals during School Closures, Overall and by Family Income and Receipt of Free or Reduced-Price Meals before School Closures, May 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Income below 250% of FPL</th>
<th>Income at or above 250% of FPL</th>
<th>Received FRP meals before closures</th>
<th>Did not receive FRP meals before closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All parents</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>13.6%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents in families losing work or work-related income</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>15.3%***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income below 250% of FPL^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income at or above 250% of FPL^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received FRP meals before closures^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive FRP meals before closures^</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Notes:** FPL is federal poverty level. FRP is free or reduced-price. School-age children are ages 6 through 18. The survey was conducted May 14 through 27, 2020.

`/*`/***/*** Estimate differs significantly from reference group (*) at the 0.10/0.05/0.01 level, using two-tailed tests.
Discussion

Though food insecurity rates declined moderately from the early weeks of the pandemic, 17.7 percent of nonelderly adults were food insecure as of mid/late May, and adults in families that lost work or work-related income, adults with low incomes, parents living with children, Black adults and Hispanic adults, and adults in families with at least one noncitizen had markedly higher food insecurity rates than their peers. Charitable food had reached one in eight adults in the prior month, and nearly one in three parents of school-age children affected by school closures reported that their family had received assistance from programs designed to replace school meals. But about 40 percent of parents who reported their children had received free and reduced-price meals before school closures did not appear to be reached by emergency food response programs offered through schools, despite ongoing, district-level efforts to reach families.16

At the time of the survey, P-EBT may not have reached many families with children, because such programs were just getting underway in many states by late spring. Insights from early implementation of P-EBT in different states will show how these programs can reach families who may face significant barriers to accessing other school food strategies. Currently, P-EBT will end in summer 2020, but extending it into the 2020–21 school year could provide support to families who cannot count on regular access to in-person school meals. Nevertheless, multiple out-of-school meal strategies may still be needed, particularly for immigrant families, who may be reluctant to participate in an EBT program because of fears about public charge determinations.17 P-EBT programs are not subject to the administration’s new public charge rule, which significantly expands the criteria for determining whether applicants for permanent residency (i.e., green cards) may be denied based on past or potential use of government benefit programs. However, these programs’ similarity to other EBT programs, like SNAP, may be concerning for immigrant families reluctant to accept any public assistance, even that for which they are eligible.

SNAP will continue being a critical program for mitigating food insecurity. States report rising applications for SNAP benefits, but federal program data lags prevent us from knowing how many more families are participating in SNAP at this time. In addition, though many households have benefitted from higher monthly SNAP benefits since the passage of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act, Congress has not yet increased the maximum SNAP benefit. Congress took this measure during the Great Recession, and evidence shows the higher maximum benefit helped reduce food insecurity (Nord and Prell 2011). Increasing the maximum benefit may also be particularly important given that food prices are rising to levels unseen since the early 1970s.18 Research has shown the existing maximum SNAP benefit does not cover the cost of a low-income meal in 99 percent of US counties (Waxman, Gundersen, and Thompson 2018).

Availability of other economic assistance during the recession will also influence food insecurity outcomes. A previous analysis showed that adults whose families received UI benefits were less likely to report food insecurity in May than in March/April, and they became less worried about affording food in the coming month during this period (Karpman and Acs 2020). But with the $600 weekly UI
benefit supplement expiring July 31, these families face heightened risk of food insecurity. Food budgets are often where families under financial pressure cut back first, and with double-digit unemployment rates, elevated food insecurity rates are unlikely to abate significantly in the near term—and could even increase with abrupt reductions in emergency assistance.

Who is significantly affected by food insecurity and who has been reached by certain supports during the pandemic are still unclear. Our survey sample size did not permit estimates for all racial and ethnic groups, and we therefore lack estimates for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and those who report multiple racial and ethnic identities. In addition, we could not analyze racial and ethnic differences among white, Hispanic, and Black parents living with children because of sample size restrictions. Additional research in all of these communities is needed to inform sustained efforts to improve food access in both the near term and the longer-term recovery period.

The intersection of food insecurity, which is associated with a range of poor health outcomes (Gundersen and Ziliak 2015), and the COVID-19 pandemic represents a dual public health crisis. Many of the same groups who have experienced disproportionate rates of food insecurity, including communities of color, have also been hardest hit by the coronavirus. To achieve a meaningful food security recovery, these communities will require a deeper, intentional investment of resources, as well as policies and programs that promote racial equity.

Data and Methods

This brief draws on data from the first wave of the Urban Institute’s Coronavirus Tracking Survey, a nationally representative, internet-based survey of nonelderly adults designed to assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on adults and their families and how those impacts change over time. A total of 4,352 adults ages 18 to 64 participated in the first wave, which was fielded May 14 through 27, 2020, with 93.1 percent of respondents completing the survey between May 14 and 20. The respondents were sampled from the 9,032 adults who participated in the most recent round of the Urban Institute’s Health Reform Monitoring Survey, which was fielded March 25 through April 10, 2020. The HRMS sample is drawn from Ipsos’s KnowledgePanel, the nation’s largest probability-based online panel. The panel is recruited from an address-based sampling frame covering 97 percent of US households and includes households with and without internet access. Participants can take the survey in English or Spanish.

The tracking survey includes an oversample of non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic HRMS participants. Survey weights adjust for unequal selection probabilities and are poststratified to the characteristics of the national nonelderly adult population based on benchmarks from the Current Population Survey and American Community Survey. The margin of sampling error, including the design effect, for the full sample of adults in the first wave of the tracking survey is plus or minus 1.9 percentage points for a 50 percent statistic at the 95 percent confidence level. The second wave of the tracking survey will be fielded in the summer of 2020. Additional information about the
March/April 2020 HRMS and the questionnaires for the HRMS and first wave of the Coronavirus Tracking Survey can be found at hrms.urban.org.

Notes

1. Our estimate of household food insecurity is based on the six-item short form of the US Department of Agriculture’s Household Food Security Survey Module and uses a 30-day reference period. Respondents with two to four affirmative responses are defined as having low household food security, and respondents with five to six affirmative responses are defined as having very low household food security. These groups are jointly defined as being food insecure. Affirmative responses include reporting that it was often or sometimes true that the food the household bought just didn’t last, and the household didn’t have money to get more; it was often or sometimes true that the household could not afford to eat balanced meals; adults in the household ever cut the size of meals or skipped meals because there was not enough money for food; meals were cut or skipped for 3 or more of the last 30 days; the respondent ate less than they felt they should because there wasn’t enough money for food; and the respondent was ever hungry but didn’t eat because there wasn’t enough money for food.

2. Of the 4,352 respondents to the first wave of the tracking survey, 93.1 percent completed the survey between May 14 and 20. Of the 9,032 respondents to the March/April 2020 Health Reform Monitoring Survey, 74.5 percent completed the survey between March 25 and 31.


15 Data for race/ethnicity breakdowns regarding receipt of school-based meals are unavailable because of the survey’s limited sample size.


17 Bernstein, Karpman, Gonzalez, and Zuckerman, “Immigrant Families Hit Hard by the Pandemic May Be Afraid to Receive the Help They Need,” Urban Institute.
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