FOOD BANK OF THE SOUTHERN TIER
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, May 12, 2020
8:00 AM – 10:00 AM
AGENDA

	TOPIC	FACILITATOR	ACTION	TIME
1.	Welcome and Call to Order	Joe Thomas		2
2.	Opening Prayer	Steve Hoyt		2
3.	Approval of April 14, 2020 Minutes	Joe Thomas	Approve	1
4.	Check-in	Joe Thomas	Discuss	10
5.	COVID-19 Updates	Natasha Thompson	Discuss	15
6.	COVID Phase 2 Planning • When to open for volunteers? • When can we bring back MFPs as drive-thrus? • When to allow staff back in the office & what precautions should we take? • What new ways of doing business do we want to carry forward?	Natasha Thompson	Discuss	40
7.	May BOD Meeting Agenda	Joe Thomas	Review/Approve	10
8.	2019 Audit	Steve Hoyt	Update	10
9.	Follow-up Items	Natasha Thompson	Update	5
10.	Other Business	Joe Thomas	Discuss	5

Next Meeting:
Tuesday, June 9, 2020
8:00AM – 10:00AM
Opening Prayer: Mary Pat Dolan

Please RSVP to Lynn Dates: lynn.dates@foodbankst.org*

Board Member	In Attendance	Unable to Attend
Joe Thomas (Chair)	**X**	
Steve Hoyt	**X**	
Mary Pat Dolan	**X**	
Jessica Renner	**X**	
Ex-Officio		
Laura Opelt	**X**	
Natasha Thompson	**X**	
Staff		
Tim Currie	**X**	
Meghan Parsons	**X**	
Lynn Dates	**X**	

1. **Welcome & Call to Order**
   Joe Thomas called the meeting to order 9:00 am.

2. **Opening Prayer**
   Natasha Thompson led the opening prayer.

3. **Approval of the March 10, 2020 Minutes**
   Mary Pat Dolan made a motion to approve the March minutes.
   Steve Hoyt seconded. None opposed. Minutes approved.

4. **Check-in**
   Committee members went around the room and provided updates on their personal & professional lives.

5. **COVID-19 Updates**
   Natasha, Tim, and Meghan reviewed their COVID-19 BOD Update presentation which focused on Operations, Fundraising, Expenses and Personnel.

   Tim discussed current inventory including our supplies of wholesale, TEFAP and donated product, noting that we've rented a refrigerated truck since the warehouse freezer is full. Tim said agencies that are open are working to satisfy need, and we are on track to distribute 1.6M lbs again in April. Community Food Distribution (CFD) and Food Hubs are projected to distribute in excess of 500K pounds of food per month. Tim estimates that Food Hubs, CFDs, agency wholesale product and COVID related operating costs have totaled $145K – this is on top of normal operating expenses. Natasha reviewed Client Demand, reporting a 54% increase at pantries and meals sites and that small and rural sites are reaching many more new clients.

   Meghan provided an update on fundraising and noted that as of mid-April we are 52% to our 2020 budget. She highlighted several major donor gifts and new grants, including $424K from Jeff Bezos via Feeding America. She went on to discuss our plan for the grant which needs to be spent down by May 12. Meghan shared the importance of focusing on donor stewardship at this time since many of our existing donors have increased their gifts. We've also seen a significant increase in new donors that we hope to retain over the long-term. She said that the recommendation is to continue to make our case for funding and remain donor focused. The Committee offered to send thank you messages to donors at the right time.

   Natasha shared some of her concerns with the group around future planning and the impact of this event on fundraising, operations, agency sustainability, client demand and advocacy & education. The committee agreed

that we should develop a mid-term & long-term plan and perhaps tap into some local experts (especially if they are already donors) who can help us think through some of these challenges.

6. **FANO/Bezos Gift Plan – (**Meghan reviewed see above)

7. **Spend Down Policy**
   Joe discussed the idea of a Spend Down Policy which was brought up at the last Executive Committee meeting. The group unanimously agreed that the Leadership Team should feel comfortable spending reserve funds if necessary, to meet increased needs. Joe noted that the Executive Committee members can serve as a resource to provide outside perspective when needed since this situation could continue for a long time.

8. **Follow-up Items**
   - **CCDOR Bar Date Memo** – Natasha shared that the Bar Date Memo language is now on the Website and we are compliant with CCDOR requirements.

9. **Other Business**

   The meeting adjourned at 9:15 am.

   Minutes respectfully submitted by,

   Lynn Dates
   Executive Assistant to
   Natasha Thompson
   President & CEO

FOOD BANK OF THE SOUTHERN TIER

Board of Directors Meeting

May 21, 2020

4:00 PM - 6:00 PM

AGENDA

TOPIC	FACILITATOR	ACTION	TIME
1. Welcome & Call to Order	Joe Thomas		2
2. Opening Prayer	Carin Rouleau		3
3. Approval of Minutes - February 20, 2020	Joe Thomas	Approval	5
4. BOD Education- COVID-19 Updates	Natasha Thompson/ Meghan Parsons/ Tim Currie	Discuss	25
5. Committee Updates			
a. DOR Update • All Boards Convening	Carin Rouleau	Update	5
b. N&CG Committee • BOD Recruitment	Grace Park	Discuss	15
c. Finance Committee • 2019 Audit • March Financials • Q1 Adjustments	Steve Hoyt	Approve	20
d. Development Committee • Q1 Fundraising Report	John Bayne/ Meghan Parsons	Update	15
6. CEO Report	Natasha Thompson	Update	5
7. COO Report	Tim Currie	Update	5
8. Executive Session	Joe Thomas	Discussion	5

Next Meeting:
June 18, 2020
4:00 PM-6:00 PM
Opening Prayer: John Bayne

Please RSVP to Lynn Dates at Lynn.dates@foodbankst.org *

Food Bank of the Southern Tier
COVID-19 Operational Assessment

Moving forward from the COVID-19 pandemic will require an organizational assessment to examine how we conduct program activities, office space allocations, customer interaction, staff engagement, public events, communication strategies, telecommuting, etc. How do we reimagine our future and examine HOW we do WHAT we do, and rebound from this pandemic as a stronger agency? Consider the following:

NOTE – This document is a work in progress; any revisions, suggestions, changes, and comments are welcomed and encouraged that help us facilitate a more comprehensive assessment of our operations.

Physical Office Space
Within your department, do you have staff sharing an office or desk? If so, how many staff are doing so, and are those desks at least 6 feet apart? (we can have maintenance measure if you are unable)
Will desks/offices need to be reconfigured to achieve one person per office and/or adequate social distance for that office?
How could your department operations support the "phase in" of returning to the office (which may be the gradual phase in at the 25% - 50% - 75% levels).
We will continue to follow CDC/public health guidance to implement disinfecting plans. Are there special considerations necessary to support your department operations?

Common spaces/shared areas/bathrooms/conference rooms
How can your department continue to support the virtual workplace, if there are limits imposed on "in person" meetings?
What does the "Future" conference room look like?
Reception area. How would the "future" reception area be configured? Ex – main reception may include fewer chairs, temporary plexiglass shield, lines on the floor to establish 6ft. boundaries etc.
Shared Equipment. How will your department use shared office equipment? Ex. – Do copiers need to be relocated from common areas to avoid multiple staff in one area at one time?
Facilities. How would we manage "future" restroom facilities? Ex. Install motion sensor sinks, toilets, paper towel, soap and toilet paper dispensers?
How would we manage common areas (where personnel are likely to congregate and interact) in general? How would we enforce strict social distancing protocols? Ex. – post reminders about social distancing guidance.

Telecommuting and Telework will likely be encouraged for the time being.
How can we encourage and support this to limit staff in physical office space?
The transition to telecommuting/telework was rapid and happened in a matter of days. Within your department, what has worked well for telecommuting and what could be improved?
Who among your staff can telecommute/telework? Who cannot?
What can and cannot be accomplished by telework? Are there contract outcomes and deliverables that are or are not being met? E.g. JSY, NRM, NOEP
What changes are needed to job descriptions to allow telecommuting/telework?
How are managers and supervisors monitoring job performance while telecommuting/telework?

How are managers and supervisors monitoring staff compliance with wage and hour laws?
What IT equipment/service would enhance telecommuting/telework? Additional PC/laptop/Chromebook/monitors/cameras/microphones/internet access?
What other equipment might be needed? Desks, chairs, etc.
What IT software or programs (or access to) would enhance telecommuting/telework? (i.e. What's App, Skype, Zoom, Teams, others?)
What telephone equipment is needed?

Warehouse & Program Operations
What changes need to be made to Warehouse Operations in order to minimize staff/volunteer contact/exposure risk? (e.g. agency pick-ups, agency deliveries, retail pick-up, receiving, order fulfillment, etc.)
Do these measures require special equipment or supplies? Changes to existing policies or procedures? Construction or redesign of existing space?
What changes need to be made to the Mobile Food Pantry (MFP) program in order to resume operations and minimize staff/volunteer/client contact/exposure risk? What about PantryTrak?
Do these measures require special equipment or supplies? Changes to existing policies or procedures?
What changes need to be made to the Volunteer program in order to resume operations and minimize staff/volunteer contact/exposure risk?
Do these measures require special equipment or supplies? Changes to existing policies or procedures? Construction or redesign of existing space?

What changes need to be made to the Agency Site Visit process in order to resume operations and minimize staff/volunteer contact/exposure risk?
Do these measures require special equipment or supplies? Changes to existing policies or procedures?
What changes need to be made to the JSY & NOEP Programs in order to resume operations and minimize staff/client contact/exposure risk?
Do these measures require special equipment or supplies? Changes to existing policies or procedures?
Considering the added trauma this pandemic has caused, what ways can we incorporate trauma informed approaches into our interactions and operations? What additional precautions should we take for vulnerable populations?
HR Protocols/Procedure/Policy
What practices, procedures, policies need to be amended to minimize employee exposure risk?

Review policy for calling in sick. Should it be revised to emphasize work from home if showing signs/symptoms of illness, and/or using available sick time?
Travel – How can we minimize non-essential travel and adhere to CDC guidelines regarding isolation following travel?
What other accommodations are needed for personnel who are members of a vulnerable population? (Minimize in person meetings, encourage virtual meetings, added cleaning protocols in general).
What added cleaning protocols need to be implemented?
How can we support staff and/or volunteers and/or their families impacted by the virus?

Staff Support
Other than EAP and the COVID-19 Resources folder, how can we support employee's emotional health and attend to their fears?
Other (Please use this section to share additional thoughts, concerns and ideas)

The Impact of the Coronavirus on Food Insecurity: State-Level Estimates

Developed by the Feeding America Research Team

Adam Dewey
Emily Engelhard
Monica Hake
Dr. Craig Gundersen
(Technical Advisory Group Member)

Last updated: 4/21/2020 *| This document is subject to be updated as new insights become available. Please check HungerNet or contact the Feeding America Research Team for the latest version.*

Background

As the crisis related to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic continues, Feeding America has been working with our Technical Advisory Group and others to analyze and share information about impacts on food insecurity via briefs, visuals, and talking points. Our first analysis is available in a brief entitled *The Impact of Coronavirus on Food Insecurity* and focused on how food insecurity may change at the national level based on projected changes to poverty and unemployment as a result of COVID-19. These estimates utilize the model developed for *Map the Meal Gap* to identify three scenarios for the full population that increase in severity:

Scenario	Change to Poverty (percentage points)	Change to Unemployment (percentage points)
A	1.5	1.1
B	2.6	4.5
C	4.8	7.6

State-level Data

Using the same approach and assumptions, we have produced estimates of the potential impacts of COVID-19 on food insecurity for each state. Those data can be found beginning on the next page. For each state, we are providing:

- **Early access to the food insecurity rate and the number of food-insecure people by state for 2018, the most recent data available.** Historically these values are released in tandem with the county-level estimates for *Map the Meal Gap*, but we are sharing them in advance to support the current needs of the network. These figures are base values from which the projected values have been calculated.
- **The projected overall food insecurity rate, the projected additional number of food insecure people, and the percent change in food insecurity that those figures represent.** These three estimates are shown for each scenario.

Below is an example of how the data should be interpreted, using Scenario C estimates for Alaska as an example:

> *If Alaska's unemployment increases by 7.6 percentage points and poverty increases by 4.8 percentage points, the overall food insecurity rate will rise to 18.1% and an additional 39,000 people will experience food insecurity. This represents a 41% increase.*

Frequently Asked Questions

Below we provide responses to commonly asked questions. If you have other questions that are not addressed below, please contact research@feedingamerica.org.

Why have we provided three scenarios?

We have configured the first two scenarios to reflect what was observed during the Great Recession. The percentage point changes in unemployment and poverty under **Scenario A** are those that resulted after one year (2007-2008), and the percentage point changes in unemployment and poverty under **Scenario B** are those that resulted after two years (2007-2009). Given the swift loss of jobs and unprecedented nature of this pandemic (the current recession has taken hold much more quickly than the Great Recession), we have also included a third **scenario (C)** that represents a more significant change to poverty and unemployment and an 'upper bound'. See below for information about how this scenario compares to other expert opinion and estimates from other sources.

How are these estimates calculated?

Using what we know from *Map the Meal Gap* about the relationships between poverty, unemployment, and food insecurity, we apply the changes to poverty and unemployment indicated in the table above to arrive at new estimates for food insecurity. The *Map the Meal Gap* model does rely on other indicators, such as homeownership and disability, but in the short term we would expect the most significant changes to be to poverty and unemployment as jobs are lost and income will be lower for many people. Poverty and unemployment are also the largest drivers of food insecurity in the Map the Meal Gap model and have remained so since we began estimating local-level food insecurity 10 years ago.

It is important to be aware that our calculations rely on annual estimates, which are averages of values throughout the year. While unemployment claims have soared in recent weeks, the annual figures used in these projections take into account lower unemployment rates at the beginning of the year and potential declines in unemployment after the current quarantines expire.

What is the timeframe over which you expect these changes to occur?

These projections represent annual estimates of what food insecurity could be for 2020.

How do these estimates compare to other expert opinion or estimates from other sources?

Feeding America has been working with members of our Technical Advisory Group, experts in diverse fields, on the approach and assumptions involved in calculating these estimates. In addition, we have consulted with external experts and monitored other publications and trustworthy sources of information to ensure our estimates are plausible.

For example, Scenario C is based on an increase to the annual unemployment rate of 7.6 percentage points, which would equate to a total rate of 11.5% (the 2018 base rate was 3.9%). A recent Wall Street Journal poll of 60 economists predicted rates which, when considered across the year, are close to the unemployment rates assumed in Scenario C.

How do these estimates relate to demand on my food bank?

The figures in this release are estimates of food insecurity, the gold standard for measuring the ability of a household to afford and access food. While these estimates do not equate to the increased demand that a food bank may face, in the absence of a more reliable source of information (e.g. robust administrative data from Service Insights on pre-Coronavirus client demand and consistent data collection around how that demand is changing over time), these figures could be used as a proxy for demand.

How can these numbers be used?

These figures can be used to communicate about the impact of the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) on people in your state with policy makers, government officials, volunteers, donors, the media, and the public broadly.

This data can also be used to approximate increased demand and inform operational impacts. Feeding America's strategy team has created a COVID-19 Cost Impact Assessment tool to support members in forecasting costs related to responding to COVID-19 in their service area. This tool mirrors the approach FANO took to arrive at the $1.4 B national six-month impact estimate. Overall, the approach involves quantifying three challenges to arrive at a total cost: 1) Increased need and associated demand for charitable food (approximated by forecasted increases in food insecurity); 2) Reduced supply / declining donations; 3) Increased operating and last mile distribution costs.

The tool is **available here.** Members using the tool should input baseline annual values in 'Yellow' cells (NAR, QPR data provided within the tool for reference), and input key assumptions for their service area in the 'Pink' cells. Please contact Julia Luscombe, Managing Director Strategic Planning with questions or feedback on the cost impact assessment tool. We will continue to update the tool as our work to forecast the impact of the COVID-19 crisis continues.

How do I get these data for my food bank or counties within my service area?

Good news! Feeding America is already hard at work producing these estimates and developing plans to release this data at the county, congressional district, and service area level as part of the 2020 *Map the Meal Gap* release.

I have more questions. Who do I contact?

Contact research@feedingamerica.org with any additional questions you have.

The Impact of the Coronavirus on Food Insecurity: State-Level Estimates For the Overall Population

Revised: 4/21/2020

Contact research@feedingamerica.org with questions.

			Scenario A (Poverty +1.5, Unemployment +1.1)				Scenario B (Poverty +2.6, Unemployment +4.5)				Scenario C (Poverty +4.8, Unemployment +7.6)			
State	Base (2018) Food Insecurity Rate	Base (2018) Number of Food-insecure people	Projected Food Insecurity Rate	Projected Additional Food Insecure People	Projected Total Food Insecure People	Percent change	Projected Food Insecurity Rate	Projected Additional Food Insecure People	Projected Total Food Insecure People	Percent Change	Projected Food Insecurity Rate	Projected Additional Food Insecure People	Projected Total Food Insecure People	Percent Change
AK	12.9%	95,190	13.9%	7,000	102,000	8	15.9%	22,000	117,000	24	18.1%	39,000	134,000	41
AL	17.0%	829,240	18.0%	49,000	878,000	6	20.0%	148,000	977,000	18	22.2%	256,000	1,085,000	31
AR	17.3%	521,480	18.3%	30,000	551,000	6	20.3%	91,000	612,000	18	22.5%	158,000	679,000	30
AZ	13.1%	937,300	14.1%	71,000	1,008,000	8	16.1%	217,000	1,154,000	23	18.3%	375,000	1,312,000	40
CA	10.8%	4,291,810	11.8%	394,000	4,686,000	9	13.9%	1,197,000	5,489,000	28	16.1%	2,070,000	6,362,000	48
CO	9.9%	566,500	10.9%	57,000	624,000	10	13.0%	172,000	739,000	30	15.2%	298,000	865,000	53
CT	11.9%	426,620	12.9%	36,000	463,000	8	15.0%	108,000	535,000	25	17.2%	187,000	614,000	44
DC	11.6%	81,400	12.6%	7,000	88,000	9	14.6%	21,000	102,000	26	16.8%	37,000	118,000	45
DE	12.6%	121,850	13.6%	10,000	132,000	8	15.6%	29,000	151,000	24	17.8%	51,000	173,000	42
FL	13.0%	2,768,500	14.0%	212,000	2,981,000	8	16.0%	645,000	3,414,000	23	18.2%	1,115,000	3,884,000	40
GA	12.5%	1,318,470	13.5%	105,000	1,423,000	8	15.6%	318,000	1,636,000	24	17.8%	551,000	1,869,000	42
HI	11.2%	159,040	12.2%	14,000	173,000	9	14.2%	43,000	202,000	27	16.4%	74,000	233,000	47
IA	9.7%	305,100	10.7%	31,000	336,000	10	12.7%	96,000	401,000	31	14.9%	165,000	470,000	54
ID	10.8%	189,970	11.8%	17,000	207,000	9	13.9%	53,000	243,000	28	16.1%	92,000	282,000	48
IL	10.1%	1,283,560	11.1%	127,000	1,411,000	10	13.1%	386,000	1,670,000	30	15.3%	667,000	1,951,000	52
IN	13.2%	883,260	14.2%	67,000	950,000	8	16.2%	203,000	1,086,000	23	18.4%	350,000	1,233,000	40
KS	12.7%	368,760	13.7%	29,000	398,000	8	15.7%	88,000	457,000	24	17.9%	152,000	521,000	41
KY	14.8%	662,670	15.8%	45,000	708,000	7	17.9%	135,000	798,000	20	20.1%	234,000	897,000	35
LA	16.1%	751,910	17.1%	46,000	798,000	6	19.2%	141,000	893,000	19	21.4%	244,000	996,000	32
MA	8.9%	617,380	9.9%	69,000	686,000	11	12.0%	209,000	826,000	34	14.2%	361,000	978,000	59
MD	11.0%	667,110	12.0%	60,000	727,000	9	14.1%	183,000	850,000	27	16.3%	316,000	983,000	47
ME	12.9%	173,070	13.9%	13,000	186,000	8	16.0%	41,000	214,000	23	18.2%	70,000	243,000	41
MI	13.6%	1,359,660	14.6%	100,000	1,460,000	7	16.6%	303,000	1,663,000	22	18.8%	523,000	1,883,000	39
MN	8.2%	461,210	9.2%	56,000	517,000	12	11.2%	170,000	631,000	37	13.5%	294,000	755,000	64
MO	13.3%	813,830	14.3%	61,000	875,000	8	16.3%	185,000	999,000	23	18.5%	321,000	1,135,000	39
MS	18.7%	559,340	19.7%	30,000	589,000	5	21.8%	90,000	649,000	16	24.0%	156,000	715,000	28
MT	10.3%	109,150	11.3%	11,000	120,000	10	13.3%	32,000	141,000	30	15.5%	56,000	165,000	51
NC	14.0%	1,456,210	15.0%	103,000	1,559,000	7	17.1%	314,000	1,770,000	22	19.3%	543,000	1,999,000	37
ND	6.8%	51,610	7.8%	8,000	60,000	15	9.8%	23,000	75,000	45	12.0%	40,000	92,000	77
NE	12.3%	237,440	13.3%	19,000	256,000	8	15.3%	58,000	295,000	25	17.5%	101,000	338,000	43
NH	9.3%	125,590	10.3%	14,000	140,000	11	12.3%	41,000	167,000	33	14.5%	71,000	197,000	57
NJ	8.7%	774,870	9.7%	89,000	864,000	11	11.7%	270,000	1,045,000	35	13.9%	466,000	1,241,000	60
NM	15.1%	315,990	16.1%	21,000	337,000	7	18.1%	63,000	379,000	20	20.3%	110,000	426,000	35
NV	12.8%	388,410	13.8%	30,000	418,000	8	15.8%	92,000	480,000	24	18.0%	159,000	547,000	41
NY	11.1%	2,166,040	12.1%	195,000	2,361,000	9	14.1%	592,000	2,758,000	27	16.3%	1,023,000	3,189,000	47
OH	13.9%	1,624,180	14.9%	116,000	1,740,000	7	16.9%	354,000	1,978,000	22	19.1%	612,000	2,236,000	38
OK	15.1%	594,150	16.1%	39,000	633,000	7	18.1%	119,000	713,000	20	20.3%	206,000	800,000	35
OR	11.9%	498,730	12.9%	42,000	541,000	8	14.9%	127,000	626,000	25	17.1%	219,000	718,000	44
PA	10.9%	1,401,930	11.9%	128,000	1,530,000	9	14.0%	388,000	1,790,000	28	16.2%	670,000	2,072,000	48
RI	11.4%	120,970	12.4%	11,000	132,000	9	14.5%	32,000	153,000	27	16.7%	55,000	176,000	46
SC	11.8%	600,450	12.8%	51,000	651,000	8	14.8%	154,000	754,000	26	17.0%	266,000	866,000	44

The Impact of the Coronavirus on Food Insecurity: State-Level Estimates For the Overall Population

Revised: 4/21/2020

Contact research@feedingamerica.org with questions.

			Scenario A (Poverty +1.5, Unemployment +1.1)				Scenario B (Poverty +2.6, Unemployment +4.5)				Scenario C (Poverty +4.8, Unemployment +7.6)			
State	Base (2018) Food Insecurity Rate	Base (2018) Number of Food-insecure people	Projected Food Insecurity Rate	Projected Additional Food Insecure People	Projected Total Food Insecure People	Percent change	Projected Food Insecurity Rate	Projected Additional Food Insecure People	Projected Total Food Insecure People	Percent Change	Projected Food Insecurity Rate	Projected Additional Food Insecure People	Projected Total Food Insecure People	Percent Change
SD	10.8%	95,080	11.8%	9,000	104,000	9	13.8%	27,000	122,000	28	16.0%	46,000	141,000	49
TN	14.0%	950,280	15.0%	67,000	1,017,000	7	17.1%	205,000	1,155,000	22	19.3%	354,000	1,304,000	37
TX	15.0%	4,295,240	16.0%	286,000	4,581,000	7	18.0%	869,000	5,164,000	20	20.2%	1,502,000	5,797,000	35
UT	11.0%	347,370	12.0%	31,000	378,000	9	14.0%	96,000	443,000	28	16.2%	165,000	512,000	48
VA	9.9%	842,890	10.9%	85,000	928,000	10	12.9%	258,000	1,101,000	31	15.1%	446,000	1,289,000	53
VT	11.3%	70,580	12.3%	6,000	77,000	9	14.3%	19,000	90,000	27	16.5%	33,000	104,000	46
WA	10.7%	804,060	11.7%	75,000	879,000	9	13.7%	228,000	1,032,000	28	15.9%	394,000	1,198,000	49
WI	8.9%	515,930	9.9%	58,000	574,000	11	11.9%	176,000	692,000	34	14.1%	304,000	820,000	59
WV	13.9%	250,600	14.9%	18,000	269,000	7	16.9%	55,000	306,000	22	19.1%	95,000	346,000	38
WY	12.2%	70,640	13.2%	6,000	77,000	8	15.3%	17,000	88,000	25	17.5%	30,000	101,000	43