



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE



Capital Consulting
Corporation



RESEARCH

Third National Survey of WIC Participants (NSWP-III)

APPENDIX F. LOCAL AGENCY SURVEY TABLES

CONTRACT #: AG-3198-K-15-0077

Submitted by:

Capital Consulting Corporation (CCC)

11821 Parklawn Drive, Suite 230

Rockville, MD 20852

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Tables	2
Table 1a. Percent of Local Agencies Retaining and Not Retaining Information on Denied Applicants	2
Table 1b. Average Percentage of Denials, by Mode of Denial Determination	4
Table 1c. Percentage of New Applicants That Were Denied Certification in Last 12 Months.....	5
Table 1d. Percentage of WIC Participants Seeking Certification or Recertification That Were Denied in Last 12 Months.....	6
Table 1e. Percentage of New Applicants and Current Participants That Were Denied Certification/Recertification in Last 12 Months	7
Table 1f. Average Percentage of Current Participant Denials, by Reason for Denials	8
Table 1g. Average Percentage of New Applicant Denials, by Reason for Denials	9
Table 1h. Local Agencies and Sites that Retain Information on Denied Applicants in 2009 and 2019.....	10
Table 1i. Percentage of New Applicants That Were Denied Certification in 2009 and 2019	10
Table 1j. Percentage of WIC Participants Seeking Certification or Recertification That Were Denied in 2009 and 2019	10
Table 1k. Average Percentage of Denials, by Reason for Denials in 2009 and 2019.....	11
Table 2a. Percentage of Local Agencies Accepting Various Documentation as Proof of Identity	12
Table 2b. Percentage of Local Agencies Accepting Various Documentation as Proof of Residency	14
Table 3. Caseload Size and Cross-Training Among Certification Staff at Local Agencies	16
Table 4a. Percent of Local Agencies That Provide Certifications at Alternative Sites, Overall and By Certification Categories	18
Table 4b. Policies Regarding Scheduling Appointments for Certifications at Alternative Sites	19
Table 5a. Average Percentage of Infants Certified for Fully Breastfeeding Packages, by Age at Certification... 20	
Table 5b. Average Percentage of Infants Certified for Fully Breastfeeding Packages, by State/Indian Tribal Organization.....	21
Table 6a. Documentation Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Income.....	23
Table 6b. Most Frequently Provided Documentation Type Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Income	26
Table 6c. Documentation Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Program Participation	28
Table 6d. Most Frequently Provided Documentation Type Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Program Participation.....	29
Table 7a. Percentage of Local Agencies by Administrative Structure Type.....	30
Table 7b. Percentage of Local Agencies by Administrative Structure Type in 2009 and 2019.....	30
Table 8a. Average Number of WIC Sites Operating Under a Local Agency, by Type of Site	31

Table 8b. Services Provided by Local Agency	33
Table 8c. Percentage of Local Agencies, by Services Provided in Clinics, Satellites and Mobile Units, by How Many Can Provide Services	34
Table 8d. Services Provided by Local Agency, by Type of Site Where Service Provided	36
Table 9a. Average Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff at Local Agencies, by Site and Staff Type	39
Table 9b. Average Number of Full-Time Staff at Local Agencies, by Staff Type	40
Table 9c. Average Number of Part-Time Staff at Local Agencies, by Staff Type	43
Table 9d. Percentage of WIC Clinic Staff that are Bilingual or Multilingual	46
Table 9e. Staff Turnover and Hiring at Local Agencies, by Staff Type	48
Table 9f. Difficulties that Local Agencies Face in Retaining, Recruiting, and Hiring Staff	52
Table 9g. Percentage of Staff Positions at Local Agencies that Were Vacant, by Staff Type	54
Table 9h. Percentage of Local Agencies with Staff Positions that Were Vacant, by Retention Rate	57
Table 9i. Percentage of Local Agencies with Staff Positions that Were Vacant, by Presence of Bilingual or Multilingual Staff.....	58
Table 9j. Average Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff at Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019, by Site and Staff Type	60
Table 9k. Average Number of Full-Time Staff at Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019, by Staff Type	60
Table 9l. Average Number of Part-Time Staff at Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019, by Staff Type	60
Table 9m. Languages Spoken by Local Agency Staff in 2009 and 2019	61
Table 10a. Number of Participants Served by Local Agencies per Month.....	62
Table 10b. Local Agency Operating Days and Hours, by Number of Participants Served by the Local Agency ..	63
Table 10c. Local Agencies with Extended Hours of Operation, by Number of Participants Served by the Local Agency	64
Table 10d. Number and Percentage of Participants Served by Local Agencies per Month in 2009 and 2019....	65
Table 11a. Local Agencies that Calculate Retention for WIC Participants.....	66
Table 11b. Average Retention Rates by Certification Category, Fiscal Years 2014–2018	67
Table 11c. Local Agencies' Definitions of Retention	68
Table 11d. Local Agencies' Frequency of Calculating Retention Rates.....	70
Table 11e. Local Agency-Calculated Retention Rate vs. State Agency-Calculated Retention Rate, Fiscal Year 2018	71
Table 11f. Local Agency Site Characteristics Associated with Higher and Lower Retention Rates, Fiscal Year 2018	72
Table 11g. Percentage of Local Agencies that Contact Pregnant Women Who Miss First Appointment to Reschedule.....	73
Table 11h. Activities Taken to Increase WIC Participant Retention Rates Among Local Agencies.....	74
Table 12a. Location of Local WIC Agency Facilities.....	76

Table 12b. Physical Security Rating of Local Agency's Location	76
Table 12c. Adequacy Rating of Local Agency's Physical Space.....	77
Table 12d. Descriptors of the Physical Space in which Local Agencies Operate in 2009 and 2019	78
Table 12e. Physical Security Rating of Local Agency's Location in 2009 and 2019	78
Table 13a. Local Agencies with the Equipment to Perform Necessary Tasks	79
Table 13b. Local Agencies with the Equipment to Perform Necessary Tasks in 2009 and 2019	79
Table 14a. Average Number of Days and Hours of Operation Per Week Among Local Agencies	80
Table 14b. Average Number of Days and Hours of Operation Per Week Among Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019	81
Table 15. Characteristics of Local Agencies	82

INTRODUCTION

The local agency (LA) data from 718 agencies was weighted to represent all LAs in the nation. As such, the weighted descriptive results are representative of all 1,797 LAs. To understand differences among agencies, data were analyzed according to the following:

- Relationship of the LA to the parent State agency (SA) (State affiliated, Local government, Non-government)¹
- Number of participants served per month by the entire agency (up to 750; 750 to 1,999; 2,000 to 4,499; 4,500 or more)²
- Location based on the FNS Region (Mid-Atlantic [MARO], Midwest [MWRO], Mountain Plains [MPRO], Northeast [NERO], Southeast [SERO], Southwest [SWRO], Western [WRO])
- LA's urbanicity (Completely Rural, Mostly Rural, Completely Urban)³

Survey results are presented as weighted percentages and means. In addition, statistical testing was conducted for select tables as determined by the study's research questions. Statistical testing used included the Chi-square test, *t*-test, and *z*-test.

Tables with comparisons to NSWP-II were prepared when feasible (i.e., when similar questions were asked of both studies) and can be found in Appendix F. Comparisons cannot be made to NSWP-I because this study did not include LA-specific findings. NSWP-I only included 79 LAs that were certifying WIC participants selected for the in-person survey.

For additional information regarding survey methodology, see *Appendix A, Technical Appendix: State and Local Agency Surveys*.

¹ Derived from the Local Agency Survey question 18. See *Appendix A, Technical Appendix: State and Local Agency Surveys* for the survey instrument.

² Derived from the Local Agency Survey question 31. See *Appendix A, Technical Appendix: State and Local Agency Surveys* for the survey instrument.

³ Urbanicity of LA was based on the sampling frame of LAs and originated from Census 2010 estimates and rural definitions. Completely rural counties have a population that is 100 percent rural. Mostly rural counties have a population that is 50.0–99.9 percent rural. Mostly urban counties have a population that is less than 50.0 percent rural.

TABLES

Table 1a. Percent of Local Agencies Retaining and Not Retaining Information on Denied Applicants

Percent of Local Agencies Retaining and Not Retaining Information on Denied Applicants	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Does your local agency keep information on denied applicants? ¹								
Yes (%)	88.9	90.7	86.4	92.2	83.6	90.3	94.7	93.7
No (%)	11.1	9.3	13.6	7.8	16.4	9.7	5.3	6.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	364	924	506	756	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	148	348	221	275	159	144	132
Reasons Information is Not Retained ²								
Denials are rare/phone screened (%)	25.3	24.9	27.2	19.4	30.0	14.3	29.7	11.9
Reason not specified (%)	19.4	26.8	19.2	13.6	18.9	24.4	16.8	14.6
Letter is given to denied applicant (%)	17.5	18.1	18.5	14.0	11.7	35.3	28.5	10.0
No requirement to do so (%)	9.3	14.2	5.0	19.1	11.4	5.0	0.0	13.2
System limitations (cannot access data or run reports) (%)	8.6	0.0	6.5	22.4	3.8	8.3	10.8	38.4
Confidentiality reasons (%)	5.4	6.7	6.8	0.0	6.9	6.0	0.0	0.0
State retains records (%)	3.2	0.0	5.1	0.0	1.1	6.7	14.2	0.0
Other reason ³ (%)	11.3	9.3	11.8	11.5	16.2	0.0	0.0	11.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	199	34	126	40	124	38	18	19
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	73	12	45	16	44	14	7	8
Type of Information Retained ⁴								
Name of applicant (%)	98.8	97.8	99.1	99.1	98.3	100.0	99.0	98.4
Reason for denial (%)	98.2	98.1	98.5	97.7	97.2	98.6	98.0	100.0
Date of denial (%)	96.7	95.8	97.6	96.1	95.8	97.5	95.9	98.6
Date of application (%)	92.7	93.2	92.9	92.1	92.6	94.1	90.4	93.5
WIC applicant category (%)	85.6	84.9	86.5	84.8	86.3	89.3	84.0	80.9
Address (%)	83.3	83.5	83.1	83.3	80.4	91.3	81.2	81.5
Phone number (%)	82.4	82.8	82.7	81.6	81.4	89.5	79.7	78.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,473	319	715	440	592	310	286	268
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	596	131	271	194	217	128	126	118

¹ Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs.

² Data presented are among the LAs that do not keep information on denied applicants.

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

³ Examples of other reasons that information was not retained included applicants are only denied due to income (weighted $n = 9$).

⁴ Data presented are among the LAs that keep information on denied applicants. Data were missing for 7.7 percent of LAs. This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100.

Notes: Multiple responses were allowed for type of information retained; percentages will not sum to 100. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted n 's for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted n .

Source: NSW-III Local Agency Survey, questions 6 and 7.

Percent of Local Agencies Retaining and Not Retaining Information on Denied Applicants	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Does your local agency keep information on denied applicants?¹										
Yes (%)	98.7	90.0	81.5	95.7	92.5	90.9	84.8	77.7	89.0	90.9
No (%)	1.3	10.0	18.5	4.3	7.5	9.1	15.2	22.3	11.0	9.1
Total number of respondents (weighted n)	106	417	406	177	267	183	238	202	462	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted n)	77	140	130	93	106	66	105	71	177	469
Reasons Information is Not Retained²										
Denials are rare/phone screened (%)	0.0	42.9	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	52.9	4.5	23.5
Reason not specified (%)	0.0	28.6	25.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	6.3	0.0	17.4	28.8
Letter is given to denied applicant/copy kept (%)	0.0	28.6	4.2	25.0	50.0	33.3	6.3	6.9	15.7	23.1
No requirement to do so (%)	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	6.3	19.4	6.1	6.5
System limitations (cannot access data or run reports) (%)	0.0	0.0	4.2	50.0	0.0	33.3	12.5	0.0	23.5	4.9
Confidentiality reasons (%)	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	6.1	7.5
State retains records (%)	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.9	1.3
Other reason ³ (%)	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	20.8	16.7	4.4
Total number of respondents (weighted n)	1	42	75	8	20	17	36	45	51	103
Total number of respondents (unweighted n)	1	14	24	4	8	6	16	15	19	39
Type of Information Retained⁴										
Name of applicant (%)	100.0	99.2	99.0	97.6	100.0	98.2	97.4	97.9	98.0	99.3
Reason for denial (%)	100.0	98.3	96.9	97.6	98.9	98.2	98.7	93.5	98.7	98.7
Date of denial (%)	98.6	97.5	96.9	91.8	98.9	96.4	96.1	96.3	95.4	97.3
Date of application (%)	98.6	95.8	92.9	85.9	94.3	94.6	85.7	94.1	94.0	92.1
WIC applicant category (%)	82.4	91.5	86.7	82.4	88.6	94.6	64.9	73.3	89.8	85.9
Address (%)	87.8	89.0	76.5	85.9	94.3	92.9	55.8	70.8	88.0	83.3
Phone number (%)	82.4	89.0	76.5	84.7	92.0	92.9	55.8	76.6	86.1	81.9
Total number of respondents (weighted n)	102	351	306	162	222	155	175	144	366	962

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	74	118	98	85	88	56	77	51	142	403
--	----	-----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----

¹ Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs.

² Data presented are among the LAs that do not keep information on denied applicants.

³ Examples of other reasons that information was not retained included applicants are only denied due to income (weighted *n* = 9).

⁴ Data presented are among the LAs that keep information on denied applicants. Data were missing for 7.7 percent of LAs. This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100.

Notes: Multiple responses were allowed for type of information retained; percentages will not sum to 100. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 6 and 7.

Table 1b. Average Percentage of Denials, by Mode of Denial Determination

Mode	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Screening phone calls (%)	28.1	15.9	31.8	30.1	24.4	35.2	34.5	22.6
Formal in-person applications (%)	42.0	46.7	38.9	44.8	35.3	49.2	46.1	49.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,028	208	544	277	494	230	157	141
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	399	82	200	117	178	91	68	59

Mode	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Screening phone calls (%)	21.5	40.1	24.0	28.1	18.4	17.7	24.9	15.8	33.3	28.2
Formal in-person applications (%)	53.7	35.2	35.6	43.0	64.0	56.7	42.3	45.8	34.4	45.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	32	292	275	120	106	64	141	128	296	605
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	23	98	88	63	42	23	62	45	111	243

Notes: Survey question 13 was only asked of LAs that provided an official letter of denial to applicants who were determined ineligible for WIC and it was asked of LAs that screened applicants to make an eligibility determination by telephone. Data were missing for 4.7 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 13.

Table 1c. Percentage of New Applicants That Were Denied Certification in Last 12 Months

Percentage Denied	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Less than or equal to 1 percent (%)	67.3	70.0	65.2	69.4	74.4	54.7	62.5	71.5
2 to 4 percent (%)	27.1	25.3	28.3	26.3	21.7	35.4	31.0	25.0
5 to 7 percent (%)	3.7	3.1	4.8	2.0	2.4	6.8	3.2	3.5
8 to 10 percent (%)	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.9	0.7	2.2	1.7	0.0
Greater than 10 percent (%)	0.8	0.8	0.5	1.4	0.8	0.8	1.6	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,778	358	919	502	748	387	331	297
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	710	145	346	219	272	158	144	130

Percentage Denied	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Less than or equal to 1 percent (%)	68.4	71.2	66.2	65.2	61.9	72.3	66.0	74.9	72.7	63.8
2 to 4 percent (%)	23.7	23.0	27.7	27.2	34.3	21.5	31.1	17.5	23.8	30.2
5 to 7 percent (%)	6.6	2.9	4.6	4.3	2.9	3.1	2.9	4.6	2.9	3.8
8 to 10 percent (%)	0.0	1.4	0.8	1.1	1.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Greater than 10 percent (%)	1.3	1.4	0.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.7	0.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	105	414	406	175	264	180	233	202	457	1,119
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	76	139	130	92	105	65	103	71	175	464

Notes: Data were collected from LAs in summer 2019. LAs were asked, "Of applicants new to your WIC agency, what percentage in the past 12 months was denied certification?" Data were missing for 1.1 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 8.

Table 1d. Percentage of WIC Participants Seeking Certification or Recertification That Were Denied in Last 12 Months

Percentage Denied	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Less than or equal to 1 percent (%)	64.8	72.0	59.5	69.3	71.6	51.4	64.6	65.4
2 to 4 percent (%)	27.6	24.3	31.1	23.5	23.0	37.4	28.7	24.4
5 to 7 percent (%)	5.5	2.9	6.2	6.0	3.8	7.5	4.8	8.1
8 to 10 percent (%)	0.9	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.4	3.0	0.6	0.0
Greater than 10 percent (%)	1.3	0.8	1.6	1.0	1.2	0.8	1.3	2.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,778	358	919	502	748	387	331	297
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	710	145	346	219	272	158	144	130

Percentage Denied	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Less than or equal to 1 percent (%)	60.5	59.7	60.8	63.0	74.3	73.8	66.0	78.3	68.4	60.8
2 to 4 percent (%)	27.6	33.8	26.9	27.2	22.9	20.0	29.1	12.7	26.0	30.9
5 to 7 percent (%)	10.5	5.0	7.7	6.5	1.0	6.2	3.9	2.8	4.1	6.5
8 to 10 percent (%)	1.3	0.0	1.5	2.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.9	0.8
Greater than 10 percent (%)	0.0	1.4	3.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.0	4.6	0.7	0.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	105	414	406	175	264	180	233	202	457	1,119
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	76	139	130	92	105	65	103	71	175	464

Notes: Data were collected from LAs in summer 2019. LAs were asked, "Of current WIC participants seeking certification (or recertification) at your WIC agency, what percentage in the past 12 months was denied certification?" Data were missing for 1.1 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 9.

Table 1e. Percentage of New Applicants and Current Participants That Were Denied Certification/Recertification in Last 12 Months

Percentage Denied	New Applicants	Current Participants	Z-Statistic	p-value
Less than or equal to 1 percent (%)	67.3	64.8	1.0	0.33
2 to 4 percent (%)	27.1	27.6	-0.2	0.86
5 to 7 percent (%)	3.7	5.5	-1.6	0.11
8 to 10 percent (%)	1.1	0.9	0.2	0.80
Greater than 10 percent (%)	0.8	1.3	-0.8	0.44
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,778			
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	710			

Notes: Z-test for proportions showed no significant difference across pairs (e.g., new applicants vs. participants denied at $\leq 1\%$), indicating the denial rate is the same between these groups. Data were collected from LAs in summer 2019. Data were missing for 1.1 percent of LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 8, 9.

Table 1f. Average Percentage of Current Participant Denials, by Reason for Denials

Reason	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Income ineligibility (average %)	59.5	58.4	60.7	58.1	56.2	61.7	66.0	56.9
Categorical ineligibility (average %)	22.1	16.0	20.3	28.8	24.9	18.8	22.9	19.6
Lack of documentation provided for residency (average %)	7.6	9.8	7.9	6.1	7.7	10.3	4.1	7.5
Lack of documentation provided for identity (average %)	6.5	7.8	6.5	5.7	8.7	7.2	3.1	5.6
Other ¹ (average %)	41.0	37.3	37.8	48.8	34.1	35.4	61.0	30.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,512	297	778	437	602	341	290	266
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	606	120	294	192	218	140	126	117

Reason	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Income ineligibility (average %)	57.2	64.3	53.2	66.5	65.5	62.3	50.5	54.1	55.4	61.9
Categorical ineligibility (average %)	15.1	22.1	26.8	13.6	22.2	9.1	30.4	23.3	29.4	19.4
Lack of documentation provided for residency (average %)	8.5	6.2	12.2	4.0	6.5	7.9	5.7	8.2	6.0	8.1
Lack of documentation provided for identity (average %)	5.7	6.0	8.5	5.2	8.4	6.8	3.0	6.3	6.9	6.4
Other ¹ (average %)	53.7	5.3	44.5	80.5	44.7	51.7	14.0	5.0	60.8	41.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	98	349	359	145	219	139	204	159	379	974
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	71	117	115	76	87	50	90	56	146	404

¹ Other reasons for denial included lack of required documentation provided for income, adjunctive income eligibility, or unspecified (weighted *n* = 23); the applicant did not come back after 30-day temporary certification (weighted *n* = 12); the applicant did not bring the infant/child to the appointment (weighted *n* = 3); and there were custody issues (weighted *n* = 3).

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 15.9 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 10.

Table 1g. Average Percentage of New Applicant Denials, by Reason for Denials

Reason	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Income ineligibility (average %)	65.1	62.5	65.6	65.9	62.0	66.4	72.3	63.0
Categorical ineligibility (average %)	10.1	6.7	9.6	12.9	10.6	9.3	10.3	9.1
Lack of documentation provided for residency (average %)	6.8	9.0	6.5	5.9	6.0	9.3	4.1	7.3
Lack of documentation provided for identity (average %)	6.2	9.4	5.7	5.2	6.5	9.0	3.5	5.0
Other ¹ (average %)	32.4	11.3	32.5	38.6	32.1	20.2	53.1	23.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,664	336	865	463	676	375	315	287
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	666	136	326	204	246	153	137	125

Reason	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Income ineligibility (average %)	69.2	67.8	57.4	68.3	68.8	65.8	64.5	55.3	67.4	65.8
Categorical ineligibility (average %)	4.4	13.0	11.5	9.0	11.5	3.4	9.1	13.5	8.0	10.3
Lack of documentation provided for residency (average %)	5.8	7.0	8.3	4.9	7.0	5.1	6.6	5.4	5.1	7.5
Lack of documentation provided for identity (average %)	6.1	7.2	8.2	5.5	6.1	3.4	3.4	6.6	5.6	6.4
Other ¹ (average %)	30.8	10.0	44.8	44.5	36.5	43.3	5.0	5.0	44.4	32.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	100	387	378	169	252	166	211	180	432	1,053
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	73	130	121	89	100	60	93	63	166	437

¹ Other reasons for denial included lack of required documentation provided for income, adjunctive income eligibility, or lack of required documentation in general (type of documentation was unspecified) (weighted *n* = 23); the applicant did not come back after 30-day temporary certification (weighted *n* = 12), the applicant did not bring the infant/child to the appointment (weighted *n* = 3); and there were custody issues (weighted *n* = 3).

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 7.4 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 10.

Table 1h. Local Agencies and Sites that Retain Information on Denied Applicants in 2009 and 2019

Local Agencies and Sites that Retain Information on Denied Applicants	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Does your local agency keep information on denied applicants?		
Yes (%)	84.1	88.9
No (%)	15.5	11.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,794
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	717
Type of Information Retained		
Name of applicant (%)	98.3	98.8
Reason for denial (%)	99.0	98.2
Date of denial (%)	96.8	96.7
Date of application (%)	89.0	92.7
WIC applicant category (%)	84.1	85.6
Address (%)	86.8	83.3
Phone number (%)	84.6	82.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,473
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	596

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 6 and 7; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 15.

Table 1i. Percentage of New Applicants That Were Denied Certification in 2009 and 2019

Percentage Denied	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Less than or equal to 10 percent (%)	96.4	99.2
Greater than 10% (%)	3.6	0.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,778
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	710

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 8; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 13.

Table 1j. Percentage of WIC Participants Seeking Certification or Recertification That Were Denied in 2009 and 2019

Percentage Denied	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Less than or equal to 10 percent (%)	96.6	98.7
Greater than 10% (%)	3.4	1.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,778
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	710

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 9; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 13.

Table 1k. Average Percentage of Denials, by Reason for Denials in 2009 and 2019

Reasons	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)	
		New Applicants	Current Participants
Income ineligibility (average %)	66.2	65.1	59.5
Categorical ineligibility (average %)	33.9	10.1	22.1
Lack of documentation provided for residency (average %)	13.9	6.8	7.6
Lack of documentation provided for identity (average %)	21.1	6.2	6.5
Other (average %)	51.1	32.4	41.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,664	1,512
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	666	606

Notes: In NSWP-III, the percentage of denials by reason was asked separately for new WIC applicants versus current WIC participants.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 10; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 14.

Table 2a. Percentage of Local Agencies Accepting Various Documentation as Proof of Identity

Documentation Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Driver's license, State ID (%)	99.9	99.6	100.0	100.0	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
Birth certificate (%)	97.5	98.9	96.6	98.2	96.2	98.9	97.4	100.0
Crib card, hospital discharge papers, or hospital ID bracelet (%)	94.9	94.3	95.3	94.8	91.8	95.9	98.7	97.1
Military ID (%)	92.5	92.1	91.6	94.5	88.8	94.2	94.9	97.5
Passport or immigration records (%)	91.1	86.6	90.6	95.4	85.7	93.3	96.5	96.5
Work, school, or bus pass ID w/photo and name (%)	86.2	88.3	84.9	87.2	80.6	87.6	93.1	92.0
Immunization record (%)	85.5	77.6	88.4	85.8	80.8	83.5	91.8	93.3
Foster placement letter (%)	79.7	80.6	81.0	76.8	76.2	82.5	81.0	85.6
Social Security card (%)	78.3	83.0	73.1	84.6	71.5	85.5	83.9	81.7
Medicaid card (%)	72.8	69.5	72.1	76.5	72.4	72.4	72.4	73.9
Voter's registration card (%)	62.8	63.8	60.3	66.6	52.8	64.8	70.4	77.6
Letter from government agency (including WIC) w/name form/letter (%)	61.2	64.5	61.2	58.9	56.8	61.2	65.2	68.7
Marriage license (%)	47.7	51.1	46.9	46.6	34.2	55.1	60.7	57.8
Employment paystubs (%)	44.4	52.6	42.1	42.6	40.0	44.7	49.1	51.1
WIC documentation (%)	7.8	5.9	7.6	9.6	5.5	13.5	9.3	5.2
Court/legal documentation (%)	5.6	8.2	4.4	5.7	3.7	8.0	8.1	4.6
Medical/health records (including home birth records, medical IDs, Mother's Verification of Facts) (%)	4.5	6.6	4.5	2.9	3.0	4.5	7.3	5.5
Tribal documents (ID card, census, CDIB, enrollment letter) (%)	4.0	10.5	2.7	1.8	6.6	2.2	1.5	3.0
Verification of other State benefits (%)	4.0	9.1	2.0	4.0	1.8	5.6	7.5	3.9
Baptismal/confirmation/religious church record (%)	3.9	7.4	3.0	3.0	0.5	4.9	6.4	8.5
Other ¹ (%)	14.7	14.0	15.4	13.8	9.8	17.5	20.0	17.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797	364	927	506	759	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718	148	349	221	276	159	144	132

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Driver's license, State ID (%)	98.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9
Birth certificate (%)	98.7	97.2	97.7	98.9	96.2	97.0	98.1	95.8	95.9	98.5
Crib card, hospital discharge papers, or hospital ID bracelet (%)	97.4	97.2	90.8	95.7	97.2	97.0	92.4	90.6	92.6	96.7
Military ID (%)	96.1	87.9	93.1	93.5	96.2	92.4	93.3	86.9	92.7	93.5
Passport or immigration records (%)	97.4	87.9	89.2	95.7	94.3	90.9	90.5	83.1	87.2	94.2
Work, school, or bus pass ID w/photo and name (%)	93.5	82.3	88.5	93.5	87.7	86.4	79.0	78.9	83.7	88.6
Immunization record (%)	66.2	82.3	86.9	71.0	94.3	93.9	91.4	73.4	87.7	86.7
Foster placement letter (%)	72.7	80.1	80.0	81.7	83.0	80.3	76.2	74.6	76.3	82.1
Social Security card (%)	89.6	80.9	60.0	86.0	96.2	69.7	81.0	70.9	76.2	80.6
Medicaid card (%)	77.9	64.5	73.8	66.7	73.6	83.3	79.0	67.3	75.7	72.6
Voter's registration card (%)	61.0	49.6	54.6	54.8	85.8	78.8	68.6	50.7	62.6	65.1
Letter from government agency (including WIC w/name form/letter) (%)	50.6	53.9	58.5	58.1	82.1	62.1	61.9	61.6	59.8	61.8
Marriage license (%)	74.0	44.0	32.3	40.9	70.8	51.5	44.8	23.0	50.3	51.0
Employment paystubs (%)	24.7	29.8	35.4	37.6	73.6	43.9	66.7	43.6	44.0	44.6
WIC documentation (%)	5.2	8.5	6.2	6.5	13.2	9.1	4.8	9.5	10.0	6.6
Court/legal documentation (%)	5.2	1.4	4.6	6.5	14.2	7.6	2.9	5.7	5.0	5.8
Medical/health records (including home birth records, medical IDs, Mother's Verification of Facts) (%)	1.3	0.7	4.6	3.2	13.2	3.0	4.8	3.0	3.8	5.0
Tribal documents (ID card, census, CDIB, enrollment letter) (%)	0.0	2.1	7.7	1.1	0.0	3.0	10.5	6.0	4.2	3.6
Verification of other State benefits (%)	1.3	1.4	1.5	9.7	10.4	0.0	5.7	4.3	3.6	4.1
Baptismal/confirmation/religious church record (%)	2.6	0.0	0.8	7.5	11.3	6.1	3.8	2.8	2.6	4.6
Other ¹ (%)	7.8	9.2	10.0	7.5	28.3	16.7	23.8	14.3	12.9	15.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	406	177	267	183	238	202	465	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	130	93	106	66	105	71	178	469

¹ Examples of other documentation accepted as proof of identity included an insurance card/policy (weighted *n* = 56); income tax form (weighted *n* = 50); vehicle registration (weighted *n* = 40); visual recognition at recertification appointment (weighted *n* = 40); and a bill, account statement, or mail (weighted *n* = 27). LAs were allowed to enter up to four "other" responses and may, therefore, be counted in multiple categories.

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 1.

Table 2b. Percentage of Local Agencies Accepting Various Documentation as Proof of Residency

Documentation Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Current utility/tax bill, rent receipt, mortgage receipt, or lease receipt with name and address on it (%)	99.5	99.1	99.7	99.6	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
Letter from government agency (including WIC) w/name and address (%)	82.1	78.4	83.8	81.5	83.0	84.2	80.6	79.6
Postmarked mail from reliable third party with name and address (%)	80.4	72.5	82.5	82.3	74.8	87.3	79.3	86.6
Property tax bill (%)	79.6	79.1	78.6	81.9	75.2	81.2	84.6	82.8
Driver's license (%)	79.3	77.8	77.2	84.5	69.9	86.1	89.0	83.6
Medicaid document (%)	78.7	70.3	79.1	84.0	74.2	80.1	82.0	83.3
Signed statement by applicant that he/she is victim of loss or disaster, or is homeless, a migrant person, or military personnel (%)	77.1	74.9	76.4	79.9	68.9	81.6	84.8	84.1
Shelter documentation (%)	76.3	79.2	72.0	82.0	64.5	82.6	85.8	88.5
Recent paystub (%)	75.7	69.1	74.7	82.4	71.1	80.1	75.1	82.0
State or Tribal-issued license or ID w/name and address (%)	70.3	74.9	68.2	71.0	63.5	72.6	76.4	78.0
TANF document (%)	68.3	66.9	63.8	77.7	61.3	68.4	71.3	83.3
Income tax return/W-2 form (%)	65.3	58.7	66.3	68.3	64.6	61.9	67.5	69.2
Checkbook, bank statement (%)	63.0	58.4	63.8	64.8	58.5	66.3	63.2	70.5
Social Security statement (%)	63.0	56.2	62.5	68.9	57.7	61.5	69.2	72.1
Vehicle registration (%)	60.1	56.0	60.8	61.6	54.0	60.2	67.5	68.3
Hospital/clinic receipt or record (%)	50.4	38.4	53.6	53.3	45.1	52.7	53.9	57.4
Landlord statement, rental agreement, written/verbal testimony from person the participant lives with for residence verification (%)	5.4	9.8	4.9	3.0	5.0	8.2	4.8	3.4
Verification of other State benefits (%)	5.0	9.3	4.4	2.9	4.2	5.1	5.6	6.5
Foster care placement letter (%)	3.8	5.5	3.8	2.4	0.9	4.5	4.7	9.2
Voter's registration (%)	3.7	7.0	3.1	2.4	2.3	3.2	6.6	3.7
Other ¹ (%)	12.0	17.1	10.4	11.4	6.9	15.1	19.0	14.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797	364	927	506	759	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718	148	349	221	276	159	144	132

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Current utility/tax bill, rent receipt, mortgage receipt, or lease receipt with name and address on it (%)	98.7	100.0	99.2	98.9	100.0	100.0	99.0	98.5	100.0	99.5
Letter from government agency (including WIC) w/name and address (%)	83.1	87.2	81.5	92.5	79.2	71.2	77.1	79.3	86.8	80.6
Postmarked mail from reliable third party with name and address (%)	90.9	83.7	74.6	91.4	74.5	75.8	81.9	68.6	78.1	83.5
Property tax bill (%)	79.2	77.3	74.6	81.7	88.7	87.9	74.3	68.5	80.1	81.4
Driver's license (%)	94.8	90.8	49.2	94.6	92.5	57.6	94.3	71.9	77.1	81.6
Medicaid document (%)	81.8	69.5	75.4	88.2	75.5	93.9	83.8	76.7	75.2	80.5
Signed statement by applicant that he/she is victim of loss or disaster, or is homeless, a migrant person, or military personnel (%)	84.4	78.7	70.0	77.4	80.2	78.8	78.1	59.6	79.6	79.2
Shelter documentation (%)	92.2	73.0	69.2	89.2	77.4	83.3	70.5	67.4	69.5	80.6
Recent paystub (%)	76.6	71.6	62.3	90.3	88.7	63.6	89.5	65.1	75.5	77.8
State or Tribal-issued license or ID w/name and address (%)	83.1	73.8	50.0	80.6	85.8	43.9	88.6	59.6	70.4	72.2
TANF document (%)	74.0	55.3	65.4	79.6	61.3	80.3	83.8	61.1	62.8	71.9
Income tax return/W-2 form (%)	70.1	64.5	58.5	72.0	72.6	54.5	71.4	60.4	66.0	65.9
Checkbook, bank statement (%)	72.7	60.3	53.1	67.7	85.8	45.5	64.8	51.5	64.3	64.5
Social Security statement (%)	70.1	63.1	54.6	72.0	64.2	62.1	66.7	48.8	64.5	65.0
Vehicle registration (%)	63.6	59.6	56.9	53.8	67.9	48.5	69.5	44.5	60.4	62.7
Hospital/clinic receipt or record (%)	55.8	49.6	41.5	48.4	69.8	34.8	56.2	36.9	56.6	50.3
Landlord statement, rental agreement, written/verbal testimony from person the participant lives with for residence verification (%)	0.0	5.7	7.7	2.2	4.7	6.1	5.7	5.4	4.7	5.6
Verification of other State benefits (%)	1.3	4.3	3.8	1.1	12.3	6.1	3.8	11.4	3.9	4.3
Foster care placement letter (%)	1.3	1.4	0.8	0.0	11.3	7.6	5.7	2.4	1.6	4.9
Voter's registration (%)	2.6	0.0	3.1	0.0	10.4	7.6	3.8	7.4	2.8	3.4
Other ¹ (%)	11.7	4.3	7.7	8.6	27.4	16.7	15.2	8.8	11.1	13.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	406	177	267	183	238	202	465	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	130	93	106	66	105	71	178	469

¹ Examples of other documentation accepted as proof of residency included school records, including financial aid (weighted *n* = 47); military records (weighted *n* = 42); insurance card/policy (weighted *n* = 27); court documents (weighted *n* = 21); and passport/VISA (weighted *n* = 15). LAs were allowed to enter up to five "other" responses and may therefore be counted in multiple categories.

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 2.

Table 3. Caseload Size and Cross-Training Among Certification Staff at Local Agencies

Caseload Size and Cross-Training Among Certification Staff at Local Agencies	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Caseload Size ¹								
Average monthly caseload among full-time certification staff per LA (n)	1,671	1,710	1,028	2,797	324	956	1,557	6,134
Range (n)	0–169,773	0–72,000	0–18,637	6–169,773	0–7,000	0–6,500	73–13,120	30–169,773
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,727	344	888	495	735	384	313	292
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	690	140	334	216	268	157	137	127
Cross-Training Availability								
LA has certification staff who are crosstrained ² (%)	74.0	69.5	73.1	78.8	74.0	75.6	72.9	75.4
LA does not have certification staff who are cross-trained ³ (%)	26.0	30.5	26.9	21.2	26.1	24.4	27.1	24.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797	364	927	506	759	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718	148	349	221	276	159	144	132
Cross-Trained Staff ⁴								
Average percentage of staff who are cross-trained per LA	80.9	82.7	78.9	83.3	82.9	79.8	78.2	80.4
Range (%)	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	1.0–100.0	1.0–100.0	12.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	7.0–100.0	1.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,327	253	676	399	561	294	241	228
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	535	105	255	175	206	122	105	100

Caseload Size and Cross-Training Among Certification Staff at Local Agencies	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Caseload Size¹										
Average monthly caseload among full-time certification staff per LA (n)	2,444	951	471	1,426	1,395	4,375	3,113	218	886	2,252
Range (n)	50–30,000	0–13,000	0–5,200	30–11,000	29–14,000	3–72,000	1–169,773	0–1,400	15–36,500	0–169,773
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	100	399	397	173	254	172	231	196	443	1,088
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	73	134	127	91	101	62	102	69	170	451
Cross-Training Availability										

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Caseload Size and Cross-Training Among Certification Staff at Local Agencies	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
LA has certification staff who are cross-trained ² (%)	80.5	73.1	72.3	73.1	63.2	71.2	90.5	76.4	69.2	75.5

Caseload Size and Cross-Training Among Certification Staff at Local Agencies	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
LA does not have certification staff who are cross-trained ³ (%)	19.5	27.0	27.7	26.9	36.8	28.8	9.5	23.6	30.8	24.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	406	177	267	183	238	202	465	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	130	93	106	66	105	71	178	469
Cross-Trained Staff⁴										
Average percentage of staff who are cross-trained per LA	77.2	74.5	85.2	72.6	77.9	78.5	94.6	84.6	81.7	80.0
Range (%)	7.0–100.0	1.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	15.0–100.0	2.0–100.0	20.0–100.0	30.0–100.0	20.0–100.0	10.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	85	307	294	129	169	128	215	154	322	851
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	62	103	94	68	67	46	95	55	125	355

¹ Data were missing for 3.9 percent of LAs.

² Staff are cross-trained on all of the following tasks: assessing categorical eligibility criteria, assessing residential eligibility criteria, assessing nutritional risk criteria, assessing income/adjunctive income eligibility, and issuing benefits (vouchers/EBT cards).

³ Staff specialize in one or more, but not all, of the following tasks: assessing categorical eligibility criteria, assessing residential eligibility criteria, assessing nutritional risk criteria, assessing income/adjunctive income eligibility, and issuing benefits (vouchers/EBT cards).

⁴ Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs.

Notes: Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 16, 16A, and 17.

Table 4a. Percent of Local Agencies That Provide Certifications at Alternative Sites, Overall and By Certification Categories

Percent of Local Agencies that Provide Certifications at Alternative Sites	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Certifications provided at alternative sites (%)	50.1	59.1	43.2	56.3	42.3	54.2	56.3	57.4
Certifications are not provided at alternative sites (%)	49.9	41.0	56.8	43.7	57.7	45.8	43.7	42.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797	364	927	506	759	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718	148	349	221	276	159	144	132
Certifications Provided at Alternative Sites for...¹								
All certification categories (%)	90.0	93.8	85.8	93.0	88.3	93.3	90.1	88.5
Pregnant women (%)	92.8	93.8	89.9	96.1	91.9	93.3	92.5	93.7
Breastfeeding women (%)	94.3	99.4	90.4	96.1	93.1	94.5	93.8	96.8
Postpartum women (%)	94.5	99.4	90.1	97.1	93.1	95.9	93.0	96.8
Infant (%)	96.3	99.4	92.7	99.1	95.8	97.3	95.4	96.8
Child (%)	92.3	95.0	89.0	94.8	89.1	98.6	92.5	89.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	900	215	400	285	321	211	186	173
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	375	89	158	128	120	91	83	77

Percent of Local Agencies that Provide Certifications at Alternative Sites	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Certifications provided at alternative sites (%)	74.0	41.8	47.7	66.7	42.5	50.0	54.3	39.3	47.9	52.9
Certifications are not provided at alternative sites (%)	26.0	58.2	52.3	33.3	57.6	50.0	45.7	60.7	52.1	47.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	406	177	267	183	238	202	465	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	130	93	106	66	105	71	178	469
Certifications Provided at Alternative Sites for...¹										
All certification categories (%)	91.2	81.4	85.5	100.0	82.2	100.0	98.2	89.0	92.2	89.3
Pregnant women (%)	93.0	88.1	90.3	100.0	84.4	100.0	98.2	92.9	94.2	92.2
Breastfeeding women (%)	98.2	89.8	88.7	100.0	93.3	100.0	98.2	89.0	97.3	94.0
Postpartum women (%)	96.5	91.5	88.7	100.0	93.3	100.0	98.2	89.0	96.6	94.5
Infant (%)	98.2	94.9	91.9	100.0	95.6	100.0	98.2	96.1	98.6	95.5
Child (%)	93.0	83.1	88.7	100.0	91.1	100.0	98.2	92.1	92.8	92.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	78	176	194	118	113	92	129	79	223	598

Percent of Local Agencies that Provide Certifications at Alternative Sites	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	57	59	62	62	45	33	57	28	90	257

¹Data presented are among the LAs that provide certifications at alternative sites.

Notes: Multiple responses were allowed for the certification categories where certifications are provided at alternate sites; percentages will not sum to 100. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 14 and 14A.

Table 4b. Policies Regarding Scheduling Appointments for Certifications at Alternative Sites

Policy	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Alternative sites follow program policies/perform same functions as traditional sites (%)	41.6	36.9	44.5	41.1	38.8	38.7	46.4	47.5
Have satellite clinics, but do not specify policies for those sites (%)	50.0	52.1	49.0	50.0	52.4	56.2	41.0	46.0
Other ¹	8.3	11.1	6.6	8.9	8.8	5.1	12.7	6.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	875	205	397	273	313	206	176	172
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	364	85	157	122	117	88	79	76

Policy	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Alternative sites follow program policies/perform same functions as traditional sites (%)	36.4	39.0	42.6	50.9	38.6	36.7	44.6	44.6	55.2	36.3
Have satellite clinics, but do not specify policies for those sites (%)	54.6	52.5	50.8	40.7	52.3	56.7	44.6	48.6	41.4	53.4
Other ¹	9.1	8.5	6.6	8.5	9.1	6.7	10.7	6.8	3.4	10.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	76	176	191	112	111	83	127	74	214	587
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	55	59	61	59	44	30	56	26	86	252

¹Examples of other policies included certification is provided at alternative sites as requested or necessary (weighted *n* = 10).

Notes: Data presented are among the LAs that provide certifications at alternative sites. Policies were reported by LAs in an open-text response. Data were missing for 0.6 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 15.

Table 5a. Average Percentage of Infants Certified for Fully Breastfeeding Packages, by Age at Certification

Infant Age at Certification	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
1 to 3 months	63.2	62.3	65.1	60.3	60.8	64.3	70.0	59.5
4 to 6 months	14.1	13.7	13.9	14.8	14.1	14.0	13.8	14.5
7 to 9 months	7.0	6.4	7.1	7.2	7.0	6.7	6.4	8.1
10 to 12 months	4.3	5.0	4.0	4.6	4.1	4.8	3.8	5.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,677	345	858	474	713	364	319	269
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	668	140	323	205	259	149	137	118

Infant Age at Certification	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
1 to 3 months	64.9	62.9	58.5	62.5	66.8	68.5	63.3	63.1	67.2	61.5
4 to 6 months	12.9	15.8	14.1	14.5	13.6	12.6	12.9	15.5	12.8	14.4
7 to 9 months	6.3	7.8	7.3	5.7	5.9	5.5	8.8	6.7	6.4	7.3
10 to 12 months	3.7	3.5	5.5	4.2	3.8	3.6	5.4	4.9	3.9	4.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	96	387	390	162	257	166	218	193	436	1,048
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	70	130	125	85	102	60	96	68	166	434

Notes: This table presents average percentages by infant age; percentages may not sum to 100. Data were missing for 6.7 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*. The average percentage of infants certified at 1 to 3 months was significantly different between LAs serving up to 750 participants per month and LAs serving 2,000 to 4,499 participants per month ($t = 2.85$, Bonferroni adjusted p -value = 0.03); and between LAs serving 2,000 to 4,499 participants per month and LAs serving 4,500 or more participants per month ($t = 2.91$, Bonferroni adjusted p -value = 0.03). No other significant pair-wise differences were found at $p \leq 0.05$.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 5.

Table 5b. Average Percentage of Infants Certified for Fully Breastfeeding Packages, by State/Indian Tribal Organization

State/Indian Tribal Organization	1 to 3 months	4 to 6 months	7 to 9 months	10 to 12 months
Arkansas	39.0	24.0	24.0	13.0
Arizona	43.1	13.6	15.8	5.7
Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona*	55.8	17.4	11.5	5.8
California	57.5	15.0	9.4	6.8
Colorado	51.8	29.3	10.1	6.1
Connecticut	70.0	18.3	8.0	3.8
District of Columbia	55.0	12.5	7.5	5.0
Delaware	52.5	4.0	1.0	0.5
Florida	64.0	13.5	7.2	5.5
Georgia	51.3	31.1	7.3	10.3
Iowa	65.7	15.8	8.7	9.8
Idaho	87.0	8.0	4.7	0.3
Illinois	53.0	14.9	10.5	3.3
Indiana	61.3	12.9	6.8	3.2
Kansas	61.1	11.5	4.9	4.1
Kentucky	67.8	13.2	7.4	4.3
Louisiana	66.1	9.9	3.7	2.2
Massachusetts	69.2	9.4	7.1	5.1
Maryland	84.2	8.4	4.9	2.5
Maine	89.0	6.7	3.3	1.0
Michigan	59.0	21.7	8.6	3.4
Minnesota	74.9	13.5	5.6	2.3
Missouri	56.2	12.7	8.4	6.6
Mississippi	33.4	17.0	2.0	0.4
Montana	49.3	16.1	9.0	9.4
North Carolina	71.9	11.6	5.2	2.3
North Dakota	77.4	6.8	2.7	2.0
Nebraska	75.3	19.0	4.3	1.5
Winnebago Tribe*	40.0	40.0	15.0	5.0
Nevada	60.7	5.5	1.6	0.8
New Hampshire	46.0	15.5	8.5	3.5
New Jersey	51.9	15.3	5.1	2.9
New Mexico	85.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos*	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Pueblo of Zuni*	94.0	2.0	—	—
New York	60.0	12.6	5.0	4.2
Ohio	54.7	18.1	9.2	5.9
Oklahoma	66.9	11.8	5.2	5.2
Muscogee (Creek) Nation*	52.0	28.0	10.0	10.0
Osage Nation*	60.0	15.0	15.0	10.0
WCD Enterprises, Inc - Wichita, Caddo, and Delaware*	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Oregon	77.9	12.3	7.4	4.4
Pennsylvania	66.3	14.6	6.3	2.8
Rhode Island	48.8	41.3	5.0	5.0
South Dakota	47.1	9.5	6.2	3.8
Rosebud Sioux Tribe*	—	—	—	—

State/Indian Tribal Organization	1 to 3 months	4 to 6 months	7 to 9 months	10 to 12 months
Tennessee	87.0	7.4	3.4	2.3
Texas	70.2	14.3	6.1	3.7
Utah	52.8	20.6	13.6	7.6
Virginia	63.0	14.0	7.9	5.4
Vermont	60.6	29.0	7.0	3.4
Washington	68.6	10.9	8.5	5.1
Wisconsin	75.7	15.0	5.6	2.9
West Virginia	63.8	10.0	6.5	3.8
Wyoming	78.4	5.0	2.1	1.7

— Data not available.

* Indian Tribal Organization.

Notes: This table presents average percentages by infant age; percentages may not sum to 100. Data were missing for 6.7 percent of LAs. The LAs in Alabama and South Carolina that were sampled for the LA Survey did not respond and are considered survey nonrespondents; these LAs are not reflected in the 6.7 percent.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 5.

Table 6a. Documentation Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Income

Documentation Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
1st Paystub/earnings statement (%)	98.5	96.4	99.1	98.9	98.4	98.0	97.9	100.0
Social Security benefits (award letter, statement of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	90.0	87.8	90.8	90.2	85.9	91.7	96.6	92.4
Unemployment compensation (letter, check stub, copy of check) (%)	89.6	86.3	90.5	90.5	84.1	93.2	94.1	95.2
Public assistance or TANF (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	88.9	89.6	87.6	90.7	84.6	91.0	90.6	97.0
State SSI or State disability insurance (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	87.6	84.7	88.5	88.1	84.8	87.2	91.2	91.7
SNAP letter showing current eligibility (%)	85.1	85.3	84.6	85.8	78.7	88.7	89.4	92.4
Military pay (leave and earnings statement, check stub, copy of check) (%)	83.5	75.7	86.2	84.1	75.1	89.7	87.7	91.9
Alimony or child support (copy of check, agreement, divorce/separation decrees, court order) (%)	83.1	79.3	83.2	85.5	75.5	88.6	87.4	90.9
Workers compensation (award statement, check stub, copy of check, statement from insurance company) (%)	82.2	78.7	83.4	82.4	76.2	86.2	91.6	82.3
IRS tax return (%)	81.5	72.9	87.4	76.7	79.7	82.2	81.4	86.2
Foster care placement letter (%)	81.5	76.9	82.9	82.1	76.4	84.8	83.7	87.3
W-2 form (%)	79.6	76.5	81.9	77.7	82.0	79.7	73.6	81.5
Letter from employer (%)	77.4	72.7	79.3	77.4	69.1	81.2	84.1	87.1
Any government or private pension, annuity, or survivor's benefits (notice of benefits, check stub or copy of check) (%)	76.4	71.9	77.5	77.4	69.4	77.3	85.2	83.2
Veteran's payments (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	74.4	72.6	76.0	72.9	66.6	74.5	84.0	83.8
Savings account earnings statement (%)	56.4	51.7	56.7	59.4	45.5	60.9	61.7	73.6
Scholarship/financial aid letter (%)	52.9	45.4	52.1	59.8	42.0	54.5	62.2	68.8
Estate or trust earnings statement (%)	52.5	51.0	52.1	54.1	46.2	56.9	55.7	59.7
Interest or dividends statement (%)	49.8	49.5	49.0	51.4	41.9	53.8	56.2	58.1
Business records (%)	44.1	39.0	48.4	39.9	34.4	44.9	52.6	59.1
Energy assistance (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	34.1	33.1	34.1	34.9	31.6	30.4	39.0	38.9
Medicaid documentation or verification (%)	29.8	29.8	28.2	32.8	24.1	33.7	36.0	33.9
Other documents ¹ (%)	11.4	18.9	10.0	8.7	8.4	10.9	16.9	14.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,796	362	927	506	757	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	147	349	221	275	159	144	132

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
1st Paystub/earnings statement (%)	100.0	99.3	98.5	95.7	100.0	97.0	98.1	98.6	99.4	98.1
Social Security benefits (award letter, statement of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	97.4	88.7	86.9	89.2	95.3	84.8	93.3	82.0	90.0	91.5
Unemployment compensation (letter, check stub, copy of check) (%)	94.7	90.8	85.4	90.3	93.4	86.4	90.5	80.4	88.2	91.9
Public assistance or TANF (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	98.7	87.9	83.8	91.4	86.8	86.4	97.1	76.6	90.3	90.5
State SSI or State disability insurance (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	93.4	87.2	86.2	90.3	90.6	80.3	88.6	82.3	87.7	88.6
SNAP letter showing current eligibility (%)	89.5	85.8	76.9	92.5	85.8	86.4	88.6	71.4	82.6	88.6
Military pay (leave and earnings statement, check stub, copy of check) (%)	92.1	83.7	80.8	84.9	88.7	77.3	81.9	69.6	81.8	86.7
Alimony or child support (copy of check, agreement, divorce/separation decrees, court order) (%)	93.4	78.7	82.3	89.2	86.8	78.8	81.9	71.3	80.9	86.1
Workers compensation (award statement, check stub, copy of check, statement from insurance company) (%)	92.1	81.6	81.5	88.2	84.9	77.3	76.2	75.5	81.6	83.6
IRS tax return (%)	86.8	82.3	86.2	77.4	83.0	69.7	80.0	81.8	85.8	79.6
Foster care placement letter (%)	86.8	84.4	82.3	78.5	75.5	75.8	85.7	79.4	78.1	83.2
W-2 form (%)	86.8	85.1	80.8	66.7	83.0	65.2	81.9	76.6	83.0	78.8
Letter from employer (%)	89.5	68.1	76.9	83.9	90.6	74.2	72.4	59.1	78.3	80.4
Any government or private pension, annuity, or survivor's benefits (notice of benefits, check stub or copy of check) (%)	88.2	71.6	74.6	80.6	81.1	69.7	79.0	67.8	77.2	77.5
Veteran's payments (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	81.6	69.5	76.2	71.0	80.2	66.7	79.0	59.8	73.8	77.3
Savings account earnings statement (%)	64.5	52.5	46.9	76.3	62.3	48.5	61.0	38.6	55.6	60.0
Scholarship/financial aid letter (%)	53.9	42.6	44.6	58.1	55.7	59.1	73.3	33.6	49.2	57.9
Estate or trust earnings statement (%)	57.9	51.8	49.2	51.6	57.5	37.9	62.9	40.9	56.6	52.8
Interest or dividends statement (%)	51.3	51.1	43.8	55.9	58.5	33.3	55.2	39.3	55.1	49.4
Business records (%)	43.4	37.6	43.8	41.9	50.0	37.9	56.2	31.1	43.0	46.9
Energy assistance (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	31.6	41.1	23.8	29.0	43.4	27.3	39.0	31.9	38.1	32.9
Medicaid documentation or verification (%)	30.3	27.0	17.7	43.0	31.1	34.8	40.0	19.2	25.7	33.3

Documentation Type	FNS Region						Urbanicity			
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Other documents ¹ (%)	5.3	6.4	9.2	14.0	17.9	12.1	17.1	11.9	11.2	11.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	105	420	406	177	267	183	238	202	465	1,128
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	76	141	130	93	106	66	105	71	178	468

¹Examples of other documents included self-declaration (weighted *n* = 29), adjunctive income eligibility (weighted *n* = 29), letter of support (weighted *n* = 20), regular contributions from a person not in the household (weighted *n* = 19), and tribal documentation/dividends/payments (weighted *n* = 15). LAs were allowed to enter up to four "other" responses and may, therefore, be counted in multiple categories.

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 0.1 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 3.

Table 6b. Most Frequently Provided Documentation Type Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Income

Documentation Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Medicaid documentation or verification (%)	79.1	78.0	79.3	79.7	70.1	81.9	89.2	79.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	535	108	261	166	182	131	119	102
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	222	46	101	75	70	53	53	46
1st Paystub/earnings statement (%)	43.6	40.4	46.0	41.5	52.3	40.7	32.9	35.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,769	349	919	500	745	381	324	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	706	142	346	218	270	156	141	132
Public assistance or TANF (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	19.8	13.6	22.7	19.1	18.8	17.4	22.2	23.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,596	325	812	459	640	354	300	293
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	644	133	309	202	235	146	131	128
SNAP letter showing current eligibility (%)	8.5	13.7	6.0	9.4	6.8	9.3	10.7	9.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,528	309	785	434	596	345	296	279
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	616	127	299	190	219	140	130	122
Other documents ¹ (%)	23.6	30.4	20.4	19.8	44.7	9.9	14.6	17.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	205	68	93	44	64	42	56	43
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	83	26	37	20	22	18	24	19

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Medicaid documentation or verification (%)	82.6	73.7	65.2	92.5	87.9	87.0	71.4	61.8	80.6	80.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	32	113	72	76	83	64	95	39	120	376
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	23	38	23	40	33	23	42	14	49	159
1st Paystub/earnings statement (%)	39.5	47.1	60.2	30.3	34.0	32.8	39.8	62.3	43.7	40.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	105	417	400	169	267	177	233	199	462	1,107
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	76	140	128	89	106	64	103	70	177	459
Public assistance or TANF (notice of benefits, check stub, copy of check) (%)	20.0	25.8	14.7	15.3	25.0	21.1	14.7	14.8	21.6	19.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	103	369	340	162	232	158	231	155	420	1,021
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	75	124	109	85	92	57	102	55	162	427

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
SNAP letter showing current eligibility (%)	10.3	9.9	6.0	10.5	9.9	12.3	3.2	10.0	6.2	9.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	94	360	312	164	229	158	211	144	384	999
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	68	121	100	86	91	57	93	51	149	416
Other documents ¹ (%)	25.0	22.2	50.0	15.4		12.5	38.9	20.9	23.4	24.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	6	27	37	25	48	22	41	24	52	129
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	4	9	12	13	19	8	18	9	20	54

¹ Examples of other documents most frequently provided included adjunctive income eligibility (weighted *n* = 27), self-declaration (weighted *n* = 20), and letter of support (weighted *n* = 11).

Notes: For each document type, the number of respondents is the number of LAs that checked the document type as satisfying the income documentation. The percentage indicates the proportion of LAs that marked the specific document type as one of up to three documents most frequently provided. Document types in which less than 1 percent of LAs marked the document as most frequently provided are not included in this table. Data were missing for 0.1 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 3.

Table 6c. Documentation Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Program Participation

Documentation Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Award letter or notice of benefits (%)	95.8	94.2	96.6	95.4	94.8	96.8	95.6	97.1
Electronic access (%)	86.2	83.5	87.4	85.8	84.3	82.7	89.7	91.4
Valid program or member ID card (%)	75.7	73.2	75.0	78.9	76.0	69.4	78.3	79.1
Other ¹ (%)	10.4	11.0	9.1	12.5	9.5	10.7	12.0	11.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,788	364	923	501	759	382	328	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	714	148	347	219	276	156	143	132

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Award letter or notice of benefits (%)	96.1	94.3	97.7	96.7	94.3	96.9	95.2	94.4	96.4	95.8
Electronic access (%)	89.6	85.1	90.0	94.6	83.8	81.5	79.8	84.0	87.4	86.0
Valid program or member ID card (%)	92.2	71.6	72.3	80.4	75.2	89.2	68.3	82.1	77.6	73.8
Other ¹ (%)	10.4	9.9	9.2	7.6	16.2	12.3	7.7	7.2	9.5	11.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	406	175	264	180	236	200	463	1,125
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	130	92	105	65	104	70	177	467

¹ Examples of other types of documentation included Medicaid (weighted *n* = 54), phone verification (weighted *n* = 30), foster care placement letter (weighted *n* = 12), and verbal verification from program staff via telephone (weighted *n* = 11).

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 0.5 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 4.

Table 6d. Most Frequently Provided Documentation Type Accepted by the Local Agency as Proof of Program Participation

Documentation Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Electronic access (%)	57.8	55.6	63.9	47.7	59.9	56.4	52.5	60.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,540	304	806	430	640	316	294	276
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	617	124	302	191	232	130	128	121
Valid program or member ID card (%)	44.3	39.8	42.1	51.1	40.9	51.5	47.4	41.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,354	266	692	395	576	265	257	239
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	548	110	263	175	210	112	113	106
Award letter or notice of benefits (%)	9.3	16.6	6.2	9.7	9.4	10.9	8.1	8.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,713	343	892	478	719	370	314	293
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	684	140	335	209	262	151	136	128
Other ¹ (%)	37.5	39.5	34.0	40.9	44.7	38.8	46.3	10.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	187	40	84	63	72	41	39	34
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	74	15	32	27	26	17	16	15

Documentation Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Electronic access (%)	44.9	68.3	62.4	40.2	64.8	39.6	56.6	59.2	64.1	54.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	95	357	365	166	222	147	188	168	405	968
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	69	120	117	87	88	53	83	59	155	403
Valid program or member ID card (%)	53.5	39.6	44.7	67.6	30.4	48.3	39.4	42.4	39.3	46.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	98	301	294	141	199	161	161	164	359	831
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	71	101	94	74	79	58	71	57	140	351
Award letter or notice of benefits (%)	5.4	6.0	7.9	4.5	14.1	11.1	16.2	14.9	4.0	10.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	102	396	397	169	249	175	224	189	446	1,078
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	74	133	127	89	99	63	99	66	171	447
Other ¹ (%)	25.0	42.9	16.7		35.3	75.0	62.5	19.2	48.7	35.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	11	42	37	13	43	22	18	14	44	128
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	8	14	12	7	17	8	8	5	17	52

¹ Examples of other types of documentation most frequently provided included Medicaid (weighted *n* = 48), phone verification (weighted *n* = 24), foster care placement letter (weighted *n* = 12), and verbal verification from program staff via telephone (weighted *n* = 11).

Notes: For each document type, the number of respondents is the number of LAs that checked the document type as satisfying the income documentation. The percentage indicates the proportion of LAs that marked the specific document type as one of up to three documents most frequently provided. Data were missing for 0.5 percent of LAs. The total number of respondents to question 4 can be found in Table 6c. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 4.

Table 7a. Percentage of Local Agencies by Administrative Structure Type

Administrative Structure Type	Percentage
A local government entity administering WIC	49.5
A nonprofit organization that has been contracted to run WIC	26.1
Part of the State agency	17.0
A tribal entity/organization administering WIC	3.3
Not a local agency, but rather a clinic under a local agency	2.1
Other ¹	2.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718

¹Examples of other types of structures included hospital (weighted *n* = 20), an independent/contracted facility (weighted *n* = 5), and multiple sites (weighted *n* = 4).

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 18.

Table 7b. Percentage of Local Agencies by Administrative Structure Type in 2009 and 2019

Local Agency is...	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
A local government entity administering WIC (%)	41.9	49.5
Part of the State agency (%)	29.3	17.0
A nonprofit organization that has been contracted to run WIC (%)	26.2	26.1
Not a local agency, but rather a clinic under a local agency (%)	2.7	2.1
Other (%)	—	2.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,797
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	718

— Data not available.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 18; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 23.

Table 8a. Average Number of WIC Sites Operating Under a Local Agency, by Type of Site

Type of Site	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Clinics ¹								
Average number of clinics per LA (n)	3.2	4.5	2.4	3.6	1.9	2.0	3.3	7.9
Range (n)	0–96	0–96	0–38	0–50	0–80	1–11	1–21	1–96
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,786	361	925	500	756	386	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	714	147	348	219	275	158	144	132
Satellites ²								
Average number of satellites per LA (n)	2.0	2.5	1.2	3.2	1.4	1.6	2.2	3.6
Range (n)	0–68	0–60	0–15	0–68	0–60	0–8	0–23	0–68
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,212	239	653	321	511	279	214	197
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	488	99	247	142	187	115	93	88
Mobile Units ³								
Average number of mobile units per LA (n)	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.8
Range (n)	0–22	0–13	0–22	0–2	0–6	0–13	0–2	0–22
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	894	171	492	231	395	184	149	153
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	351	70	183	98	144	74	61	66

Type of Site	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Clinics¹										
Average number of clinics per LA (n)	3.9	2.3	2.2	2.4	3.2	6.1	4.4	3.1	2.3	3.6
Range (n)	1–27	0–20	0–80	1–10	1–21	1–96	1–50	1–80	0–21	0–96
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	403	177	267	175	238	202	465	1,118
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	129	93	106	63	105	71	178	465
Satellites²										
Average number of satellites per LA (n)	2.4	1.2	2.1	2.9	1.6	3.4	1.8	2.3	1.6	2.1
Range (n)	0–19	0–13	0–60	0–14	0–23	0–68	0–7	0–60	0–10	0–68
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	81	310	272	124	156	100	170	128	329	756
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	59	104	87	65	62	36	75	45	128	315

Type of Site	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Mobile Units³										
Average number of mobile units per LA (n)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.4
Range (n)	0–2	0–3	0–13	0–1	0–22	0–6	0–6	0–13	0–3	0–22
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	48	247	200	70	118	97	113	118	222	554
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	35	83	64	37	47	35	50	41	85	225

¹Data were missing for 0.6 percent of LAs.

²Data were missing for 32.5 percent of LAs.

³Data were missing for 50.2 percent of LAs.

Notes: Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 22.

Table 8b. Services Provided by Local Agency

Services Provided	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Conduct certifications (%)	99.3	99.6	99.2	99.3	100.0	98.3	99.2	99.2
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	99.1	98.8	99.2	99.3	99.6	98.3	99.1	99.2
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	99.0	98.9	98.8	99.3	98.8	98.3	100.0	99.2
Provide referrals to other services (%)	98.9	98.7	98.7	99.4	98.4	98.2	100.0	100.0
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	98.4	96.7	98.8	98.7	98.2	97.5	98.1	100.0
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	97.1	97.7	96.4	97.9	96.8	96.2	98.3	97.4
Perform blood testing (%)	96.0	98.8	96.8	92.6	97.9	96.3	95.8	90.9
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	87.7	89.4	86.1	89.3	82.6	88.1	94.4	93.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,661	335	876	451	714	361	297	273
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	659	136	329	194	260	146	128	119

Services Provided	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Conduct certifications (%)	98.4	99.2	100.0	98.8	99.0	100.0	99.0	100.0	100.0	98.9
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	98.4	98.5	100.0	98.8	100.0	98.3	99.0	100.0	99.3	98.9
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	98.4	98.5	99.2	98.8	100.0	100.0	97.9	100.0	98.6	98.9
Provide referrals to other services (%)	98.4	98.5	98.4	98.8	99.0	100.0	100.0	98.7	98.6	99.1
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	98.4	98.5	100.0	98.8	98.0	94.8	97.9	98.7	98.2	98.4
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	96.8	96.2	98.4	96.5	99.0	98.3	93.8	95.7	97.7	97.1
Perform blood testing (%)	98.4	96.2	100.0	95.3	98.0	98.3	84.5	96.4	97.8	95.2
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	84.1	84.7	86.4	94.2	89.9	89.7	87.6	83.4	85.3	89.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	87	390	390	164	249	161	220	196	438	1,027
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	63	131	125	86	99	58	97	69	167	423

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 7.6 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 23.

Table 8c. Percentage of Local Agencies, by Services Provided in Clinics, Satellites and Mobile Units, by How Many Can Provide Services

Services Provided	Extent Service Provided			Total Number of Respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	Total Number of Respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)
	All Can Do%	Some Can Do %	None Can Do %		
Clinics ¹					
Conduct certifications	92.4	7.2	0.4	1,475	602
Perform blood testing	89.1	8.4	2.4	1,443	590
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI)	93.5	6.3	0.2	1,468	600
Conduct nutrition counseling	89.2	10.3	0.5	1,460	597
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding)	77.8	17.7	4.5	1,365	559
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards)	94.7	4.0	1.3	1,458	596
Provide referrals to other services	97.0	2.8	0.2	1,468	600
Access WIC participant records electronically	96.4	2.8	0.8	1,462	597
Satellites ²					
Conduct certifications	93.9	5.0	1.1	651	276
Perform blood testing	88.5	7.4	4.2	628	265
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI)	92.9	5.4	1.6	645	273
Conduct nutrition counseling	90.8	8.5	0.7	649	275
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding)	56.1	21.3	22.6	591	252
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards)	95.2	3.0	1.8	644	273
Provide referrals to other services	98.1	1.6	0.3	646	274
Access WIC participant records electronically	95.6	3.4	1.1	649	275
Mobile Units ³					
Conduct certifications	86.3	10.6	3.1	89	36
Perform blood testing	76.6	10.8	12.6	80	32
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI)	85.5	4.2	10.3	86	35
Conduct nutrition counseling	82.8	13.7	3.6	84	34
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding)	45.3	21.4	33.3	78	32

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Services Provided	Extent Service Provided			Total Number of Respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	Total Number of Respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)
	All Can Do%	Some Can Do %	None Can Do %		
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards)	85.9	5.0	9.0	86	35
Provide referrals to other services	93.9	0.0	6.1	86	35
Access WIC participant records electronically	95.0	0.0	5.0	84	34

¹Data presented are among LAs that reported operating one or more clinics. Missing data varied by service type and ranged from 17.0 percent to 23.2 percent of LAs.

²Data presented are among LAs that reported operating one or more satellites. Missing data varied by service type and ranged from 4.8 percent to 13.6 percent of LAs.

³Data presented are among LAs that reported operating one or more mobile units. Missing data varied by service type and ranged from 2.5 percent to 14.1 percent of LAs.

Note: Total number of respondents varied by item; percentages are calculated by item.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 23.

Table 8d. Services Provided by Local Agency, by Type of Site Where Service Provided

Services Provided	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Clinics ¹								
Conduct certifications (%)	99.2	100.0	99.6	98.0	97.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	98.9	99.0	99.2	98.4	97.6	99.1	100.0	100.0
Provide referrals to other services (%)	98.9	99.0	99.2	98.5	98.0	98.5	100.0	100.0
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	98.1	99.0	98.1	97.5	96.1	98.5	99.5	100.0
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	97.9	98.1	98.1	97.5	95.3	98.5	100.0	100.0
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	97.1	97.6	97.4	96.5	94.4	98.0	99.2	99.2
Perform blood testing (%)	95.1	96.6	95.7	93.0	96.0	96.2	96.6	90.1
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	88.0	91.7	85.9	88.9	82.5	87.3	94.1	92.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,481	300	725	456	563	320	296	294
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	605	125	279	201	208	135	130	128
Satellites ²								
Provide referrals to other services (%)	98.7	96.3	98.7	100.0	98.3	100.0	96.2	100.0
Conduct certifications (%)	98.6	98.4	98.5	98.9	96.9	100.0	100.0	98.3
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	98.6	94.2	99.4	100.0	98.3	100.0	98.0	98.1
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	98.3	96.3	98.7	98.7	98.3	99.2	96.9	98.3
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	97.1	94.0	96.4	100.0	94.5	99.2	96.9	99.0
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	96.8	94.7	97.3	97.2	97.4	98.4	93.9	96.6
Perform blood testing (%)	92.1	92.9	94.5	87.9	97.2	93.5	95.1	78.8
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	70.0	67.7	67.0	75.7	65.4	76.5	63.0	77.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	653	120	319	213	218	170	126	135
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	277	53	126	98	83	73	57	62
Mobile Units ³								
Conduct certifications (%)	96.9	100.0	93.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.4
Provide referrals to other services (%)	91.2	73.1	93.7	100.0	87.5	100.0	87.7	92.4

Services Provided	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Mobile Units ³								
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	90.7	86.5	86.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.7	84.3
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	89.7	65.7	93.7	100.0	87.5	100.0	81.0	92.4
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	88.4	79.2	90.5	91.3	88.7	84.1	81.0	92.4
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	87.2	86.5	86.9	88.1	85.2	100.0	87.7	83.9
Perform blood testing (%)	78.9	73.1	93.7	58.3	76.2	78.0	81.0	77.8
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	58.8	47.7	57.6	68.8	70.4	64.0	54.0	58.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	89	19	44	26	20	9	21	37
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	36	8	17	11	8	4	9	14

Services Provided	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Clinics¹										
Conduct certifications (%)	100.0	98.2	100.0	97.7	98.9	100.0	100.0	98.4	100.0	99.0
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	100.0	97.2	98.9	98.9	98.9	100.0	100.0	96.4	98.4	99.5
Provide referrals to other services (%)	100.0	97.2	98.9	97.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.0	99.2	99.0
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	98.6	96.3	97.8	97.7	98.9	100.0	99.0	94.4	99.2	98.3
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	100.0	97.2	97.8	97.7	96.7	100.0	97.9	92.7	97.9	98.8
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	98.6	96.3	96.8	96.6	97.8	100.0	95.8	92.3	97.8	97.6
Perform blood testing (%)	100.0	96.3	98.9	93.2	97.8	96.4	83.3	91.8	96.5	95.0
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	89.2	83.5	82.8	90.9	93.3	89.1	92.7	81.7	87.3	89.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	102	325	290	167	227	153	218	155	361	965
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	74	109	93	88	90	55	96	55	142	408
Satellites²										
Provide referrals to other services (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.2	96.2	100.0	98.0	100.0	100.0	98.0
Conduct certifications (%)	100.0	97.8	100.0	96.2	100.0	100.0	98.0	93.7	100.0	98.6
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.2	92.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9

Services Provided	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Satellites²										
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	95.3	100.0	100.0	96.2	96.2	100.0	98.0	100.0	100.0	97.4
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	93.0	95.6	100.0	96.2	96.2	100.0	98.0	93.7	99.2	96.7
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	95.3	97.8	100.0	94.3	96.2	100.0	94.1	100.0	97.3	96.3
Perform blood testing (%)	86.0	93.3	100.0	88.7	92.3	100.0	84.3	100.0	98.7	88.4
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	65.1	66.7	65.9	71.7	53.8	88.9	80.4	71.4	70.6	69.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	59	134	128	101	65	50	116	47	178	428
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	43	45	41	53	26	18	51	17	73	187
Mobile Units³										
Conduct certifications (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.4
Provide referrals to other services (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	33.3	92.9	100.0	55.4	100.0	93.0
Conduct nutrition counseling (%)	100.0	75.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	92.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	89.1
Access WIC participant records electronically (%)	80.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	33.3	92.9	100.0	55.4	100.0	91.2
Provide food instruments (vouchers/EBT cards) (%)	60.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	92.9	83.3	100.0	100.0	86.4
Take anthropometric measurements for height, weight, and body mass index (BMI) (%)	100.0	75.0	50.0	100.0	66.7	92.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.0
Perform blood testing (%)	80.0	100.0	50.0	50.0	33.3	92.9	66.7	55.4	100.0	78.7
Offer other educational seminars (e.g., on breastfeeding) (%)	60.0	25.0	0.0	100.0	66.7	64.3	83.3	44.6	61.1	59.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	7	12	6	4	8	39	14	6	7	76
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	5	4	2	2	3	14	6	2	3	31

¹ Data presented are among LAs that reported operating one or more clinics and provided at least one response per site. Data were missing for 16.6 percent of LAs.

² Data presented are among LAs that reported operating one or more satellites and provided at least one response per site. Data were missing for 4.5 percent of LAs.

³ Data presented are among LAs that reported operating one or more mobile units and provided at least one response per site. Data were missing for 2.5 percent of LAs.

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Percentages represent the proportion of LAs that indicated "all can do" or "some can do" at question 23 out of all LAs that provided at least one response by site. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 23.

Table 9a. Average Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff at Local Agencies, by Site and Staff Type

Average Number of FTE Staff at Local Agencies	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Average FTE across all LAs (n)	16.9	21.7	12.6	21.1	6.1	8.0	20.1	51.4
Median FTE across LAs (n)	7.0	6.5	6.0	9.6	3.4	5.9	11.7	28.8
Range (n)	0.0–585.5	0.5–456	0.0–139.5	0.0–585.5	0.0–132.0	1.0–36.0	3.0–261.5	7.0–585.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,687	350	864	472	706	362	325	283
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	675	142	327	206	257	148	141	124

Average Number of FTE Staff at Local Agencies	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Average FTE across all LAs (n)	18.0	9.7	6.0	16.7	28.7	27.1	25.9	6.4	10.9	21.2
Median FTE across LAs (n)	14.0	5.0	3.9	11.3	10.3	10.3	10.3	3.0	4.6	10.2
Range (n)	1.0–95.0	0.0–105.0	0.0–41.0	3.0–100.5	2.0–261.5	1.0–456.0	0.0–585.5	0.0–132.0	0.0–261.5	0.0–585.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	102	384	381	166	257	175	222	184	443	1,060
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	74	129	122	87	102	63	98	64	170	441

Notes: LAs were asked to provide the number of full-time and part-time staff; every two part-time staff are counted as one FTE. The web survey calculated the FTE using the information provided by respondents at question 27. At question 27A, respondents were asked whether they agreed with the total FTE estimate. Approximately 25 percent of the respondents disagreed with the estimate and provided their own estimate at question 27B. This table excludes cases where the self-reported FTE estimate differed from the survey-calculated estimate by +/- 10 FTEs (5.2 percent of LAs). Outliers were removed. Data were missing for 1.0 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 27, 27A, and 27B.

Table 9b. Average Number of Full-Time Staff at Local Agencies, by Staff Type

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Director (n)	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,493	279	770	443	554	334	316	281
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	607	117	294	196	204	138	138	123
Manager (n)	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	976	174	510	292	349	205	184	230
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	399	73	196	130	127	86	80	102
Administrative staff (n)	5	6	4	5	2	2	6	11
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,350	250	703	398	464	308	304	267
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	547	103	269	175	171	125	131	116
Certification specialist (n)	4	10	2	3	1	1	4	11
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	929	186	459	284	335	189	203	196
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	378	78	178	122	124	80	87	84
Registered dietitian (n)	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,149	237	570	342	372	248	267	254
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	473	101	221	151	139	104	116	110
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (n)	3	3	2	4	1	2	3	7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,025	194	490	342	317	232	223	245
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	432	84	194	154	119	100	101	108
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (n)	3	2	2	5	0	1	2	10
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	939	198	446	294	323	207	185	216
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	395	87	176	132	122	91	83	95
Registered nurse (n)	2	5	1	1	1	1	4	3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	900	169	496	235	370	198	153	172
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	357	69	187	101	135	79	66	74
Physician (n)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	714	128	364	222	266	147	138	155
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	291	54	141	96	99	61	60	68

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Social Worker (n)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	710	127	361	222	267	147	131	158
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	289	53	140	96	99	61	57	69
Other professional (n)	2	3	1	2	1	1	2	4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	967	183	469	315	310	201	220	228
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	395	75	183	137	115	83	94	99
Other (n)	3	7	3	2	0	2	3	7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	105	23	44	37	15	38	22	30
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	45	9	18	18	6	16	9	14

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Director (n)	1	2	1	1	2	2	4	2	1	2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	100	322	306	164	244	153	204	128	377	988
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	73	108	98	86	97	55	90	45	147	415
Manager (n)	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	76	206	200	108	169	111	107	88	239	649
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	55	69	64	57	67	40	47	30	94	275
Administrative staff (n)	4	3	2	6	9	6	3	2	3	5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	85	304	250	150	249	155	156	104	349	898
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	62	102	80	79	99	56	69	36	136	375
Certification specialist (n)	3	1	1	1	4	13	4	1	3	4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	67	161	200	82	149	128	143	83	208	638
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	49	54	64	43	59	46	63	29	83	266
Registered dietitian (n)	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	1	1	2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	89	232	215	120	209	119	163	86	260	803
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	65	78	69	63	83	43	72	30	104	339
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (n)	4	1	1	5	4	4	4	2	1	4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	92	197	178	147	191	103	118	70	233	722
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	67	66	57	77	76	37	52	25	95	312

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (n)	3	0	0	2	1	2	14	0	1	4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	85	161	172	118	151	114	138	75	202	662
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	62	54	55	62	60	41	61	27	83	285
Registered nurse (n)	0	2	1	0	6	1	0	1	3	2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	58	206	219	72	154	94	97	96	234	569
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	42	69	70	38	61	34	43	33	91	233
Physician (n)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	55	149	156	72	118	72	91	62	170	482
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	40	50	50	38	47	26	40	21	69	201
Social Worker (n)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	54	146	156	72	121	75	86	67	167	476
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	39	49	50	38	48	27	38	23	68	198
Other professional (n)	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	73	203	175	91	184	116	125	80	218	669
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	53	68	56	48	73	42	55	28	85	282
Other (n)	1	12	1	1	4	8	2	0	2	4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	7	3	16	23	18	25	14	8	12	84
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	5	1	5	12	7	9	6	3	5	37

Notes: Number of respondents varied by staff type and missing data ranged from 11.5 percent to 57.9 percent, depending on staff type. Question 27 did not allow respondents to indicate whether a position was not applicable for their LA and did not instruct respondents to enter zero if there were no staff to report in each column. The rate of missing data may be attributed to these limitations. The average number of staff is calculated per staff type based on the number of LAs that responded to that item. The web survey calculated the FTE using the information provided by respondents at question 27. At question 27A, respondents were asked whether they agreed with the total FTE estimate. Approximately 25 percent of the respondents disagreed with the estimate and provided their own estimate at question 27B. This table excludes cases where the self-reported FTE estimate differed from the survey-calculated estimate by +/- 10 FTEs (5.2 percent of LAs). Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 27.

Table 9c. Average Number of Part-Time Staff at Local Agencies, by Staff Type

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Director (n)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	794	153	420	222	365	156	124	142
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	312	60	159	93	132	63	52	62
Manager (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	628	113	341	175	259	126	117	121
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	253	46	131	76	94	52	51	53
Administrative staff (n)	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	948	166	497	285	385	195	182	175
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	376	67	189	120	139	79	78	75
Certification specialist (n)	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	656	110	348	198	274	130	124	121
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	263	45	134	84	100	55	52	53
Registered dietitian (n)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	927	158	496	273	397	195	156	169
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	363	63	187	113	143	78	65	73
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (n)	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	744	126	366	251	287	164	142	144
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	307	54	142	111	106	71	63	64
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	647	101	338	208	253	137	116	134
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	264	43	130	91	93	57	50	60
Registered nurse (n)	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	747	135	418	195	353	142	121	121
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	291	53	156	82	125	57	50	54
Physician (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	560	93	298	169	230	115	97	112
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	226	39	115	72	84	48	41	50

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Social Worker (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	564	95	300	169	235	115	96	112
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	228	40	116	72	86	48	41	50
Other professional (n)	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,091	178	590	323	424	250	211	199
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	441	76	224	141	154	103	92	88
Other (n)	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	75	26	24	25	26	16	14	20
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	33	10	11	12	10	7	6	10

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Director (n)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	41	188	212	69	101	75	109	86	219	489
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	30	63	68	36	40	27	48	29	85	198
Manager (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	44	125	166	63	88	61	82	67	161	400
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	32	42	53	33	35	22	36	23	66	164
Administrative staff (n)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	56	265	212	89	128	80	116	102	251	595
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	41	89	68	47	51	29	51	35	97	244
Certification specialist (n)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	43	125	175	55	91	61	107	69	161	426
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	31	42	56	29	36	22	47	24	65	174
Registered dietitian (n)	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	47	194	269	78	118	97	125	104	223	601
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	34	65	86	41	47	35	55	35	87	241
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (n)	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	61	155	166	93	113	61	95	75	184	484
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	44	52	53	49	45	22	42	26	77	204

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (n)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	47	119	162	70	96	55	97	64	151	432
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	34	40	52	37	38	20	43	22	63	179
Registered nurse (n)	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	44	217	200	59	96	61	70	104	209	434
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	32	73	64	31	38	22	31	35	82	174
Physician (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	41	113	147	55	88	50	66	59	143	358
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	30	38	47	29	35	18	29	20	59	147
Social Worker (n)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	41	110	147	55	88	50	73	61	140	363
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	30	37	47	29	35	18	32	21	58	149
Other professional (n)	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	74	289	225	126	171	83	122	93	293	704
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	54	97	72	66	68	30	54	32	114	295
Other (n)	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	8	6	12	13	8	14	14	6	11	59
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	6	2	4	7	3	5	6	2	4	27

Notes: Number of respondents varied by staff type and missing data ranged from 35.3 percent to 66.8 percent, depending on staff type. Question 27 did not allow respondents to indicate whether a position was not applicable for their LA and did not instruct respondents to enter zero if there were no staff to report in each column. The rate of missing data may be attributed to these limitations. The average number of staff is calculated per staff type based on the number of LAs that responded to that item. The web survey calculated the FTE using the information provided by respondents at question 27. At question 27A, respondents were asked whether they agreed with the total FTE estimate. Approximately 25 percent of the respondents disagreed with the estimate and provided their own estimate at question 27B. This table excludes cases where the self-reported FTE estimate differed from the survey-calculated estimate by +/- 10 FTEs (5.2 percent of LAs). Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 27.

Table 9d. Percentage of WIC Clinic Staff that are Bilingual or Multilingual

Language	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Average percentage of bilingual or multilingual staff per LA ¹	22.8	17.8	19.2	32.9	9.8	21.2	32.8	47.3
Range (average percentage)	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	364	925	506	759	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	148	348	221	276	159	144	132
Languages Spoken Among Bilingual Staff to Assist in Providing WIC Services²								
Spanish (%)	93.1	88.9	94.9	92.6	92.5	90.4	96.4	92.6
French/Creole (%)	12.7	15.4	7.8	18.0	4.3	13.4	10.5	21.0
Cantonese/Mandarin (%)	8.1	5.2	6.7	11.5	2.4	4.9	9.0	14.6
Tagalog (%)	7.5	5.8	8.1	7.7	0.8	3.0	3.8	19.8
Arabic (%)	7.3	7.2	4.9	10.6	1.4	3.6	6.0	15.8
Portuguese (%)	6.5	2.4	5.3	10.2	3.2	9.2	2.2	10.8
Vietnamese (%)	6.3	4.6	6.2	7.2	0.8	3.3	7.5	12.0
Hindi (%)	5.6	2.4	4.2	8.9	3.1	1.1	5.0	11.7
Russian (%)	4.3	3.8	2.5	6.9	0.0	0.6	6.5	8.8
Farsi (%)	3.6	1.4	3.7	4.5	0.0	1.6	2.7	8.9
Hmong (%)	2.7	1.4	2.2	4.1	1.2	0.8	2.8	5.4
Korean (%)	2.5	0.0	2.3	4.0	0.8	0.0	2.2	6.1
Cambodian (%)	2.0	1.4	1.4	3.1	0.8	3.5	0.0	3.5
Swahili (%)	1.9	1.4	2.5	1.3	0.0	1.3	3.7	2.3
Urdu (%)	1.7	1.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	1.6	2.2	2.8
Somali (%)	1.6	3.1	1.5	1.1	0.0	2.1	1.9	2.4
Punjabi (%)	1.6	1.0	1.4	2.1	0.0	0.0	3.1	2.8
Khmer (%)	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.4	0.7	0.8
Laotian (%)	0.8	0.0	0.5	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5
Fulani (%)	0.6	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.6
Tamil (%)	0.5	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.8
Other (%)	19.1	28.8	12.5	23.2	14.5	13.6	16.2	30.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,031	183	488	361	239	236	259	296
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	436	79	195	162	94	100	112	129

Language	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Average percentage of bilingual or multilingual staff per LA ¹	25.8	8.3	12.1	37.8	20.5	34.4	47.9	7.2	11.6	30.2
Range (average percentage)	0.0–98.0	0.0–56.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–88.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–94.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	406	177	267	180	238	202	465	1,127
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	130	93	106	65	105	71	178	468
Languages Spoken Among Bilingual Staff to Assist in Providing WIC Services²										
Spanish (%)	92.9	92.2	87.2	88.9	97.5	93.2	96.6	83.2	94.4	93.5
French/Creole (%)	28.6	0.0	8.5	47.2	12.7	0.0	3.4	2.3	6.2	14.8
Cantonese/Mandarin (%)	3.6	3.9	4.3	18.1	5.1	0.0	17.2	3.8	0.0	10.0
Tagalog (%)	17.9	3.9	2.1	6.9	5.1	4.5	14.9	3.8	1.6	8.9
Arabic (%)	19.6	7.8	2.1	13.9	3.8	2.3	8.0	0.0	1.4	9.0
Portuguese (%)	10.7	0.0	4.3	22.2	5.1	2.3	4.6	3.8	1.4	7.7
Vietnamese (%)	5.4	2.0	2.1	6.9	1.3	6.8	17.2	0.0	1.4	7.7
Hindi (%)	10.7	3.9	2.1	9.7	6.3	2.3	5.7	0.0	5.2	6.0
Russian (%)	7.1	0.0	0.0	9.7	2.5	0.0	10.3	0.0	1.4	5.2
Farsi (%)	7.1	0.0	0.0	4.2	3.8	0.0	9.2	0.0	0.0	4.5
Hmong (%)	1.8	5.9	0.0	2.8	1.3	0.0	5.7	0.0	3.0	2.9
Korean (%)	0.0	2.0	2.1	5.6	0.0	2.3	4.6	0.0	1.2	2.9
Cambodian (%)	1.8	0.0	0.0	5.6	1.3	0.0	4.6	0.0	1.2	2.3
Swahili (%)	3.6	0.0	2.1	2.8	3.8	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.4
Urdu (%)	7.1	0.0	0.0	5.6	1.3	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.2
Somali (%)	0.0	2.0	2.1	2.8	1.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.1
Punjabi (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	2.0
Khmer (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.2
Laotian (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.0
Fulani (%)	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Tamil (%)	1.8	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.7
Other (%)	25.0	21.6	21.3	30.6	8.9	20.5	14.9	16.8	16.8	19.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	77	152	147	137	199	122	197	60	158	812
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	56	51	47	72	79	44	87	23	65	348

¹ LAs were asked to provide the percentage of bilingual staff across all clinics. Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs.

² Data presented are among the LAs that reported a percentage of bilingual or multilingual staff greater than zero. Percentages represent the percentage of LAs with any staff that speak the language listed.

Notes: Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 28 and 29.

Table 9e. Staff Turnover and Hiring at Local Agencies, by Staff Type

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Average rate of staff turnover in last 12 months per LA ¹ (%)	12.4	16.2	10.8	12.8	11.9	14.1	11.9	11.8
Range (%)	0.0–100.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–66.7	0.0–66.7	0.0–100.0	0.0–74.1	0.0–40.0	0.0–56.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,116	201	589	326	439	229	231	207
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	454	84	225	145	160	96	102	91
Percentage of Staff Hired Within the Past 12 Months, by Staff Type²								
Director (%)	28.9	33.4	27.7	28.7	23.5	27.8	53.6	16.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	806	133	418	255	297	183	154	162
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	324	55	159	110	109	76	65	70
Office Manager (%)	12.8	11.6	14.7	10.1	12.8	17.2	4.1	15.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	296	42	160	95	107	46	46	91
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	121	17	61	43	38	20	20	40
Administrative staff (%)	25.7	31.4	24.1	25.4	24.2	33.2	26.6	20.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	831	140	445	246	298	160	176	188
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	333	57	170	106	109	64	74	82
Certification specialist (%)	20.8	21.7	23.4	16.0	12.4	26.6	27.0	21.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	290	47	153	90	96	52	76	64
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	118	21	60	37	35	24	31	27
Registered dietitian (%)	24.8	25.0	25.3	23.8	28.2	23.8	22.4	23.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	680	121	365	194	230	132	142	169
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	270	47	139	84	82	54	58	72
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (%)	26.3	34.4	25.3	24.1	26.5	30.0	22.3	26.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	461	78	193	190	101	119	112	127
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	202	35	78	89	39	53	50	59
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (%)	20.1	21.8	18.1	22.2	28.2	17.2	29.2	12.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	213	35	104	74	42	47	47	76
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	97	19	44	34	18	22	22	34

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Registered nurse (%)	25.6	26.1	27.4	18.1	29.7	34.0	8.9	9.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	350	69	222	59	206	60	42	37
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	125	25	78	22	70	23	15	15
Physician (%)	16.5	0.0	22.4	†	38.3	†	0.0	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	19	5	14	†	8	†	8	3
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	7	2	5	0	3	0	3	1
Social Worker/Psychologist/Therapist (%)	30.7	21.7	38.6	23.7	29.8	0.0	40.0	41.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	27	8	14	6	16	3	3	6
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	11	3	5	3	6	1	1	3
Other professional (%)	26.7	31.9	26.2	24.5	21.2	29.2	30.3	29.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	640	114	322	203	197	146	133	156
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	262	48	123	91	72	62	58	67
Other (%)	34.0	57.5	35.5	13.1	35.3	45.5	8.3	46.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	61	19	18	23	18	18	14	11
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	26	7	8	11	7	7	6	6

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Average rate of staff turnover in last 12 months per LA ¹ (%)	13.1	13.1	11.1	12.8	12.5	10.3	13.4	8.5	13.3	12.5
Range (%)	0.0–40.0	0.0–66.7	0.0–100.0	0.0–42.9	0.0–74.1	0.0–56.3	0.0–75.0	0.0–50.0	0.0–100.0	0.0–74.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	84	268	247	118	159	89	152	102	279	735
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	61	90	79	62	63	32	67	36	110	308
Percentage of Staff Hired Within the Past 12 Months, by Staff Type²										
Director (%)	28.8	25.0	19.2	18.8	45.0	31.5	39.4	33.5	21.3	31.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	185	181	80	118	75	116	54	220	532
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	37	62	58	42	47	27	51	19	88	217

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Office Manager (%)	14.3	19.2	14.4	13.6	0.3	11.1	18.5	18.8	6.3	14.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	21	39	91	42	48	25	32	32	71	193
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	15	13	29	22	19	9	14	11	28	82
Administrative staff (%)	24.5	22.7	22.1	17.4	30.0	38.9	28.8	28.3	24.0	26.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	47	220	153	89	136	86	100	70	205	557
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	34	74	49	47	54	31	44	24	80	229
Certification specialist (%)	25.9	14.5	12.3	3.3	36.8	31.9	19.0	0.0	15.4	24.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	22	48	56	15	28	55	66	17	69	204
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	16	16	18	8	11	20	29	7	27	84
Registered dietitian (%)	25.1	27.3	22.2	24.0	17.9	35.1	25.6	33.8	21.0	24.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	34	146	162	59	98	69	111	72	145	463
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	25	49	52	31	39	25	49	25	57	188
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (%)	26.4	28.8	14.3	29.4	31.6	22.0	26.5	27.8	31.7	24.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	48	71	66	91	93	39	52	23	98	340
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	35	24	21	48	37	14	23	8	43	151
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (%)	26.4	25.0	27.1	9.2	23.9	28.3	12.7	3.8	24.8	19.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	32	12	37	25	25	17	66	8	53	152
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	23	4	12	13	10	6	29	4	24	69
Registered nurse (%)	25.0	28.7	28.5	0.0	11.2	24.7	0.0	34.9	25.7	21.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	14	137	125	4	43	25	2	69	110	170
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	10	46	40	2	17	9	1	23	41	61
Physician (%)	†	0.0	100.0	†	0.0	0.0	†	55.4	0.0	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	†	3	3	†	10	3	†	6	5	8
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	2	2	3
Social Worker/Psychologist/Therapist (%)	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	30.7	†	†	38.6	45.4	19.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1	3	3	2	18	†	†	8	5	13
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	1	1	1	1	7	0	0	3	2	6
Other professional (%)	38.1	18.8	26.1	21.8	36.0	25.8	27.7	28.5	21.3	28.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	43	152	112	84	121	55	73	52	148	440
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	31	51	36	44	48	20	32	18	60	184

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Other (%)	16.7	4.2	66.7	0.0	73.5	25.0	33.3	0.0	78.8	27.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	6	6	9	10	10	11	9	6	11	44
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	4	2	3	5	4	4	4	2	4	20

† Not applicable.

¹ Turnover rate is the number of staff who have left the agency divided by the total number of full-time, part-time, and vacant positions. See notes for discussion of cases excluded from this table. Data were missing for 33.8 percent of LAs.

² Number of respondents varied by staff type. Percentage of staff hired is calculated per staff type as the number of staff hired divided by the number of full-time and part-time staff. Data was collected in the summer of 2019.

Notes: Number of respondents varied by staff type and missing data ranged from 50.7 percent to 98.9 percent, depending on staff type. Question 27 did not allow respondents to indicate whether a position was not applicable for their LA and did not instruct respondents to enter 0 if there were no staff to report in each column. The rate of missing data may be attributed to these limitations. The average number of staff is calculated per staff type based on the number of LAs that responded to that item. The web survey calculated the FTE using the information provided by respondents at question 27. At question 27A, respondents were asked whether they agreed with the total FTE estimate. Approximately 25 percent of the respondents disagreed with the estimate and provided their own estimate at question 27B. This table excludes cases for which the self-reported FTE estimate differed from the survey-calculated estimate by +/- 10 FTEs (5.2 percent of LAs). Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 27.

Table 9f. Difficulties that Local Agencies Face in Retaining, Recruiting, and Hiring Staff

Difficulty	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Salaries not competitive (%)	55.9	62.0	54.0	54.9	46.3	63.4	52.8	74.6
Limited career opportunities (%)	43.7	41.5	45.3	42.0	32.6	49.0	48.2	58.9
Salaries not commensurate with level of job duties (%)	29.8	33.3	29.9	27.1	24.7	28.5	34.8	39.0
Required skillset lacking (%)	16.2	14.4	17.4	15.3	11.3	21.5	13.0	24.4
Benefits not competitive (%)	12.7	8.0	10.8	19.4	14.4	10.5	10.9	11.8
Workload too great (%)	11.4	13.9	9.3	13.6	6.6	11.6	11.9	23.3
Minimal training and job growth offered (%)	10.1	12.2	9.2	10.2	8.7	13.7	7.6	12.1
Low employee morale (%)	9.6	10.5	9.0	10.1	6.3	7.3	11.6	17.7
Location of local agency hard to get to (%)	5.7	11.1	3.6	5.5	6.5	5.2	8.2	8.8
Lack of support from State (%)	4.3	6.5	3.7	3.8	5.9	4.7	5.6	6.5
Crowded space (%)	3.6	4.1	2.4	5.4	2.5	4.9	5.0	7.6
Location of local agency unsafe (%)	1.4	1.2	0.5	3.1	3.5	4.8	2.3	3.9
Other ¹ (%)	6.9	6.1	7.6	6.1	0.6	1.4	0.0	4.7
None of the above (%)	25.9	22.7	26.8	24.8	34.5	19.8	25.5	8.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,791	361	927	503	753	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	716	147	349	220	274	159	144	132

Difficulty	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Salaries not competitive (%)	79.2	60.3	41.1	59.1	73.6	47.7	46.7	39.6	57.6	58.1
Limited career opportunities (%)	74.0	42.6	31.8	57.0	44.3	40.0	43.8	18.0	40.5	49.5
Salaries not commensurate with level of job duties (%)	50.6	25.5	15.5	36.6	43.4	29.2	32.4	17.2	29.1	32.3
Required skillset lacking (%)	24.7	20.6	14.7	12.9	16.0	7.7	16.2	3.8	15.0	18.9
Benefits not competitive (%)	10.4	18.4	10.1	16.1	15.1	4.6	8.6	10.3	14.9	12.1
Workload too great (%)	15.6	12.1	3.9	15.1	15.1	9.2	16.2	4.8	6.8	14.6
Minimal training and job growth offered (%)	19.5	8.5	7.0	10.8	12.3	9.2	11.4	3.7	11.5	10.6

Difficulty	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Low employee morale (%)	26.0	8.5	1.6	9.7	12.3	9.2	15.2	2.2	9.3	11.1
Location of local agency hard to get to (%)	6.5	8.5	2.3	5.4	6.6	4.6	5.7	3.6	4.6	6.4
Lack of support from State (%)	10.4	1.4	3.1	4.3	7.5	4.6	4.8	0.7	4.1	5.0
Crowded space (%)	5.2	2.1	3.9	4.3	3.8	1.5	5.7	6.1	4.3	2.8
Location of local agency unsafe (%)	5.2	1.4	0.8	1.1	0.0	3.1	1.0	0.0	0.7	1.9
Other ¹ (%)	6.5	3.5	8.5	8.6	8.5	6.2	7.6	4.6	5.9	7.7
None of the above (%)	5.2	20.6	38.8	17.2	15.1	35.4	30.5	46.2	27.9	20.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	420	403	177	267	180	238	202	465	1,124
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	141	129	93	106	65	105	71	178	467

¹ Other difficulties included lack of funding (weighted *n* = 23), difficulty recruiting for a rural area (weighted *n* = 10), it is difficult to recruit for registered dietitian, specifically (weighted *n* = 5), lack of support from the county (weighted *n* = 5), and lack of job security due to government shutdowns (weighted *n* = 3).

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 0.3 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 30.

Table 9g. Percentage of Staff Positions at Local Agencies that Were Vacant, by Staff Type

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Director (%)	2.7	4.1	2.4	2.6	3.3	2.0	4.0	1.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	805	115	449	241	308	170	155	167
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	323	49	170	104	113	71	65	71
Office Manager (%)	7.8	20.5	6.9	3.2	5.5	11.5	14.5	4.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	316	46	178	91	111	54	61	84
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	128	19	68	41	39	23	27	36
Administrative staff (%)	7.2	14.3	4.7	7.4	5.2	9.1	9.0	7.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	739	132	393	214	277	141	155	157
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	300	56	150	94	102	59	67	68
Certification specialist (%)	7.9	15.1	7.3	4.1	3.9	14.2	6.8	9.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	300	59	151	90	98	62	76	63
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	124	26	61	37	36	28	32	27
Registered dietitian (%)	8.6	15.2	4.7	11.1	6.8	11.8	9.2	8.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	639	119	334	186	211	126	141	155
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	255	47	128	80	76	51	59	66
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (%)	10.7	9.8	12.8	8.9	12.1	13.7	7.5	9.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	434	71	182	181	94	115	99	124
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	192	32	75	85	36	51	45	59
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (%)	10.3	11.5	13.2	5.5	13.8	16.7	3.4	8.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	234	41	113	80	49	53	47	84
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	107	22	49	36	21	26	22	37
Registered nurse (%)	4.1	1.0	4.3	7.8	4.4	2.1	5.9	4.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	331	70	212	49	195	57	41	33
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	119	26	75	18	67	22	15	13
Physician (%)	19.6	4.8	26.8	†	28.7	100.0	3.3	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	23	8	16	†	8	2	11	3
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	9	3	6	0	3	1	4	1

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Social Worker/Psychologist/Therapist (%)	27.9	27.0	37.1	0.0	44.1	0.0	11.6	5.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	37	13	19	6	21	3	8	6
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	15	5	7	3	8	1	3	3
Other professional (%)	11.1	22.0	8.3	9.3	8.9	8.2	16.1	12.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	630	115	327	188	198	137	132	156
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	257	48	126	83	72	58	56	68
Other (%)	6.3	13.7	0.0	4.5	10.7	1.2	11.7	2.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	15	11	25	15	16	10	11
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	23	6	5	12	6	7	4	6

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Director (%)	1.2	1.6	0.8	0.5	7.4	1.3	5.1	0.0	1.2	3.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	47	185	184	80	123	64	122	62	212	531
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	34	62	59	42	49	23	54	22	84	217
Office Manager (%)	11.5	13.3	5.0	4.8	11.8	10.0	0.0	7.2	8.5	7.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	22	45	94	40	58	28	29	35	83	197
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	16	15	30	21	23	10	13	12	32	84
Administrative staff (%)	16.0	3.4	1.1	12.7	6.4	10.1	13.3	5.8	6.0	8.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	48	173	147	84	126	64	97	64	204	471
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	35	58	47	44	50	23	43	22	80	198
Certification specialist (%)	19.5	3.2	5.9	1.4	11.8	11.9	4.0	17.3	6.2	7.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	29	48	56	13	30	55	68	26	68	205
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	21	16	18	7	12	20	30	10	27	87
Registered dietitian (%)	17.5	7.2	6.2	3.6	7.5	9.3	13.5	6.6	4.5	10.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	34	125	159	53	96	58	113	66	134	439
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	25	42	51	28	38	21	50	22	53	180
Degreed/licensed nutritionist (%)	12.0	1.3	10.7	8.0	17.3	23.0	3.2	23.0	6.5	10.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	57	69	86	86	39	48	25	88	321
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	37	19	22	45	34	14	21	9	39	144

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Trained nutrition paraprofessional (%)	15.0	0.0	7.7	0.3	17.1	27.0	8.6	27.6	9.2	9.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	33	9	41	32	30	17	73	14	49	172
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	24	3	13	17	12	6	32	6	23	78
Registered nurse (%)	0.0	3.6	4.1	0.0	3.7	1.3	50.0	2.0	3.1	5.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	12	119	119	4	50	22	5	65	111	155
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	9	40	38	2	20	8	2	22	41	56
Physician (%)	†	0.0	0.0	100.0	3.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	4.5	34.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	†	3	3	2	10	3	2	3	8	12
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	0	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	3	5
Social Worker/Psychologist/Therapist (%)	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	22.1	†	100.0	50.8	26.0	16.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1	6	3	2	23	†	2	9	13	16
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	1	2	1	1	9	0	1	3	5	7
Other professional (%)	16.0	6.6	11.4	14.8	12.7	16.9	6.7	20.3	6.2	11.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	45	158	119	76	116	50	66	52	154	423
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	33	53	38	40	46	18	29	18	61	178
Other (%)	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	12.5	0.0	7.1	7.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	6	3	6	11	8	8	9	6	4	41
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	4	1	2	6	3	3	4	2	2	19

† Not applicable.

Notes: Number of respondents varied by staff type. Percentage of staff is calculated per staff type as the number of vacant positions divided by the number of full-time and part-time staff. Missing data varied by staff type and ranged from 52.3 percent of LAs to 98.6 percent of LAs. Question 27 did not allow respondents to indicate whether a position was not applicable for their LA and did not instruct respondents to enter 0 if there were no staff to report in each column. The rate of missing data may be attributed to these limitations. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 27.

Table 9h. Percentage of Local Agencies with Staff Positions that Were Vacant, by Retention Rate

Retention Rate	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Percentage of LAs with high retention rates (90.0%–100.0%) that had vacant staff positions (%)	73.9	100.0	0.0	†	†	100.0	100.0	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	5	4	1	†	†	1	3	1
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	1
Percentage of LAs with medium retention rates (44.6%–89.9%) that had vacant staff positions (%)	49.4	56.4	100.0	0.0	50.0	†	0.0	54.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	19	9	5	6	5	†	1	13
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	9	4	2	3	2	0	1	6
Percentage of LAs with low retention rates (0.0%–44.5%) that had vacant staff positions (%)	51.5	100.0	0.0	100.0	39.0	100.0	39.0	†
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	12	4	6	2	5	3	5	†
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	5	2	2	1	2	1	2	0

Retention Rate	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Percentage of LAs with high retention rates (90.0%–100.0%) that had vacant staff positions (%)	50.0	†	†	†	100.0	†	†	†	†	73.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	3	†	†	†	3	†	†	†	†	5
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Percentage of LAs with medium retention rates (44.6%–89.9%) that had vacant staff positions (%)	0.0	†	†	†	66.7	†	50.0	†	50.0	49.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	3	†	†	†	8	†	9	†	5	14
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	2	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	2	7

Retention Rate	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Percentage of LAs with low retention rates (0.0%–44.5%) that had vacant staff positions (%)	†	0.0	†	100.0	100.0	†	†	†	†	51.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	†	6	†	4	3	†	†	†	†	12
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5

† Not applicable.

Notes: Data were missing for 42.1 percent of LAs with low retention rates, 44.2 percent of LAs with medium retention rates, and 69.3 percent of LAs with high retention rates. Question 27 did not allow respondents to indicate whether a position was not applicable for their LA and did not instruct respondents to enter 0 if there were no staff to report in each column. The rate of missing data may be attributed to these limitations. Since one or more categories in all the four subgroups had a very small cell size (0 or 1), the Study Team did not conduct a significance test (multiple comparison in survey logistic regression) as it would not be a meaningful representation of statistical significance. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 27 and 33C.

Table 9i. Percentage of Local Agencies with Staff Positions that Were Vacant, by Presence of Bilingual or Multilingual Staff

Staff Type	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
LAs with bilingual or multilingual staff that had vacant positions (%)	60.2	75.9	56.2	57.8	36.3	56.2	63.7	75.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	715	123	342	250	152	147	178	237
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	307	54	140	113	60	62	79	105
LAs without bilingual or multilingual staff that had vacant positions (%)	25.9	27.5	22.4	35.5	16.9	34.8	44.8	100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	454	92	278	85	287	100	51	7
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	172	37	99	36	101	41	23	3

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
LAs with bilingual or multilingual staff that had vacant positions (%)	71.1	45.7	41.9	72.5	79.2	64.0	50.7	42.3	58.1	61.7

Appendix F. Local Agency Survey Tables

Staff Type	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	62	104	97	97	134	69	152	41	92	582
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	45	35	31	51	53	25	67	16	39	252
LAs without bilingual or multilingual staff that had vacant positions (%)	68.4	21.6	12.8	46.7	23.5	33.3	54.5	19.1	15.6	38.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	26	152	147	29	43	33	25	75	190	190
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	19	51	47	15	17	12	11	25	72	75

† Not applicable.

Notes: Data were missing for 30.7 percent of LAs with bilingual or multilingual staff and 40.5 percent of LAs without bilingual or multilingual staff. Question 27 did not allow respondents to indicate whether a position was not applicable for their LA and did not instruct respondents to enter 0 if there were no staff to report in each column. The rate of missing data may be attributed to these limitations. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 27 and 28.

Table 9j. Average Number of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff at Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019, by Site and Staff Type

Average Number of FTE Staff at Local	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Average FTE across all LAs (n)	17.9	16.9
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,687
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	675

Note: Outliers have been removed from the calculation of average FTE.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 27; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-10, Appendix D Table 30.

Table 9k. Average Number of Full-Time Staff at Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019, by Staff Type

Staff Type	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Director	1.7	2.0
Manager	3.0	1.0
Administrative staff	5.7	5.0
Certification specialist	7.4	4.0
Registered dietitian	3.2	2.0
Degreed/licensed nutritionist	4.2	3.0
Trained nutrition paraprofessional	8.8	3.0
Registered nurse	6.7	2.0
Physician	1.9	0.0
Social worker	5.6	0.0
Other professional	4.2	2.0
Other	5.9	3.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	*
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	*

* The weighted *n* in NSWP-III varied by staff type.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 27, 27A, and 27B; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-12, Appendix D Table 30.

Table 9l. Average Number of Part-Time Staff at Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019, by Staff Type

Staff Type	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Director	1.0	0.3
Manager	1.1	0.1
Administrative staff	2.3	1.1
Certification specialist	1.9	0.6
Registered dietitian	1.8	0.8
Degreed/licensed nutritionist	1.3	0.6
Trained nutrition paraprofessional	1.9	0.3
Registered nurse	2.4	1.2
Physician	1.4	0.0
Social worker	1.8	0.0
Other professional	1.9	2.0
Other	2.4	1.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	*

Staff Type	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	*

* The weighted *n* in NSWP-III varied by staff type.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 27; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-12, Appendix D Table 30.

Table 9m. Languages Spoken by Local Agency Staff in 2009 and 2019

Language	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Spanish (%)	70.5	93.1
Other (%)	27.1	19.1
French/Creole (%)	10.3	12.7
Cantonese/Mandarin (%)	7.8	8.1
Tagalog (%)	7.5	7.5
Arabic (%)	7.1	7.3
Portuguese (%)	6.5	6.5
Vietnamese (%)	8.7	6.3
Hindi (%)	5.9	5.6
Russian (%)	6.7	4.3
Farsi (%)	4.2	3.6
Hmong (%)	5.6	2.7
Korean (%)	5.9	2.5
Cambodian (%)	4.3	2.0
Swahili (%)	3.3	1.9
Urdu (%)	4.0	1.7
Somali (%)	4.3	1.6
Punjabi (%)	3.4	1.6
Khmer (%)	3.6	1.0
Laotian (%)	5.1	0.8
Fulani (%)	2.2	0.6
Tamil (%)	2.2	0.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,031
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	436

Notes: Multiple responses were allowed, so totals do not equal 100%. NSWP-III percentages were calculated among LAs that reported having bilingual staff.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 29; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-16, Appendix D Table 35.

Table 10a. Number of Participants Served by Local Agencies per Month

Number of Participants Served	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			FNS Region							Urbanicity		
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Average, Median, and Range														
Average number of participants served per LA per month (n)	3,437	2,728	2,722	5,255	4,578	1,590	1,067	3,157	3,046	7,128	8,103	543	1,308	4,843
Median number of participants served per LA per month (n)	1,038	588	928	1,702	2,913	685	333	1,704	1,505	2,500	2,580	137	547	1,802
Range (n)	4–200,000	5–72,000	4–72,000	6–200,000	73–46,378	15–22,503	4–11,000	75–24,000	50–43,472	5–72,000	20–200,000	5–11,000	4–36,500	18–200,000
Total Number of Participants by Size of LA														
Up to 750 (%)	42.6	54.0	44.4	31.2	9.3	53.6	70.8	25.8	28.9	25.0	30.5	82.7	62.2	27.2
750 to 1,999 (%)	21.9	14.4	24.9	21.6	26.7	25.7	15.4	28.0	30.8	15.6	14.3	12.4	21.5	23.7
2,000 to 4,499 (%)	18.6	19.0	16.0	23.0	36.0	12.9	6.9	24.7	24.0	31.3	21.0	2.6	12.7	23.9
4,500+ (%)	17.0	12.6	14.7	24.3	28.0	7.9	6.9	21.5	16.4	28.1	34.3	2.2	3.6	25.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,781	360	919	502	103	417	406	177	262	177	238	202	462	1,116
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	711	146	346	219	75	140	130	93	104	64	105	71	177	463

Note: LA size is based on the number of participants served and segmented by the following ranges: up to 750 participants; 750 to 1,999 participants; 2,000 to 4,499 participants; and 4,500 or more participants. Data were missing for 0.9 percent of LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 31.

Table 10b. Local Agency Operating Days and Hours, by Number of Participants Served by the Local Agency

Local Agency Operating Days and Hours	Overall	Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Average number of days open per week	5	4	5	5	5
Range (days)	1–6	1–6	1–6	4–6	4–6
Average number of hours of operation per week (HH:MM)	41:06	36:00	42:27	45:36	47:00
Range (HH:MM)	4:00–66:30	4:00–63:00	9:00–60:30	34:30–60:00	16:00–66:30
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	755	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	275	159	144	132

Notes: The Local Agency Survey did not ask about the availability of operating hours on Sundays. Operating days and hours were not reported for 0.2 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 26.

Table 10c. Local Agencies with Extended Hours of Operation, by Number of Participants Served by the Local Agency

Number of Participants Served	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			FNS Region							Urbanicity		
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Local Agency Has Extended Hours														
Up to 750 (%)	26.8	43.0	26.0	21.4	9.4	36.5	46.5	22.5	24.6	12.8	21.9	56.1	48.5	19.4
750 to 1,999 (%)	24.6	19.8	26.3	24.4	22.6	31.7	23.3	30.0	29.5	23.1	7.8	22.8	30.7	23.0
2,000 to 4,499 (%)	25.8	21.2	26.6	26.5	35.8	20.6	16.3	27.5	29.5	30.8	26.6	7.5	13.8	29.9
4,500+ (%)	22.9	16.1	21.1	27.6	32.1	11.1	14.0	20.0	16.4	33.3	43.8	13.6	6.9	27.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	954	142	445	367	73	188	134	152	154	108	145	33	201	720
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	403	61	175	167	53	63	43	80	61	39	64	12	81	310
Local Agency Does Not Have Extended Hours														
Up to 750 (%)	60.7	60.6	61.6	57.7	9.1	67.5	82.6	46.2	34.9	44.0	43.9	88.0	72.8	40.9
750 to 1,999 (%)	18.8	11.1	23.6	13.8	36.4	20.8	11.6	15.4	32.6	4.0	24.4	10.4	14.4	25.2
2,000 to 4,499 (%)	10.3	17.8	6.1	13.4	36.4	6.5	2.3	7.7	16.3	32.0	12.2	1.6	11.8	13.1
4,500+ (%)	10.2	10.5	8.7	15.1	18.2	5.2	3.5	30.8	16.3	20.0	19.5	0.0	1.0	20.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	824	215	474	135	30	229	269	25	108	69	93	169	262	393
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	307	84	171	52	22	77	86	13	43	25	41	59	96	152

Notes: Operating days and hours were not reported for 0.2 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 26 and 31.

Table 10d. Number and Percentage of Participants Served by Local Agencies per Month in 2009 and 2019

Number of Participants Served by LA Per Month	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Overall		
Average number (n)	2,805	3,437
Total Number of Participants by Size of LA		
Up to 750	25.2	42.6
750 to 1,999	27.3	21.9
2,000 to 4,499	23.1	18.6
4,500+	24.4	17.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,781
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	711

Notes: LA size is based on the number of participants served and segmented by the following ranges: up to 750 participants; 750 to 1,999 participants; 2,000 to 4,499 participants; and 4,500 or more participants.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 31; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-1, Appendix D Table 2A.

Table 11a. Local Agencies that Calculate Retention for WIC Participants

Local Agencies that Calculate Retention for WIC Participants	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
LA calculates retention rates (%)	15.9	25.1	12.7	14.3	16.3	17.3	13.4	15.4
LA does not calculate retention rates ¹ (%)	84.1	74.9	87.3	85.7	83.7	82.7	86.6	84.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,337	296	687	354	550	289	259	230
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	537	119	262	156	199	119	113	102

Local Agencies that Calculate Retention for WIC Participants	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
LA calculates retention rates (%)	13.3	14.4	21.9	14.3	14.6	14.3	13.2	11.8	16.2	16.4
LA does not calculate retention rates ¹ (%)	86.7	85.6	78.1	85.7	85.4	85.7	86.8	88.2	83.8	83.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	83	289	300	133	224	136	172	141	338	858
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	60	97	96	70	89	49	76	50	128	359

¹ Includes LAs that reported retention is determined by the State agency (weighted *n* = 929) and LAs that reported retention is not determined at all (weighted *n* = 195).

Notes: Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs and 25.5 percent of LAs were not sure if their agency calculated retention. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 33 and 33C.

Table 11b. Average Retention Rates by Certification Category, Fiscal Years 2014–2018

Certification Category	Fiscal Year 2014	Fiscal Year 2015	Fiscal Year 2016	Fiscal Year 2017	Fiscal Year 2018
Pregnant					
Average retention rate (%)	76.2	78.0	75.7	74.9	66.1
Range (%)	1.1–100.0	10.0–100.0	9.0–100.0	9.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	56	71	80	70
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	22	23	29	33	30
Breastfeeding					
Average retention rate (%)	78.1	77.6	70.1	75.8	68.4
Range (%)	8.0–100.0	6.0–100.0	1.1–100.0	7.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	59	72	78	65
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	22	24	30	32	28
Postpartum					
Average retention rate (%)	75.4	79.0	76.2	67.7	68.2
Range (%)	1.2–100.0	4.0–100.0	4.0–100.0	1.1–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	59	72	75	65
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	22	24	30	31	28
Infant					
Average retention rate (%)	82.8	82.5	75.9	79.6	70.8
Range (%)	23.0–100.0	23.0–100.0	1.0–100.0	23.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	61	72	78	68
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	22	25	30	32	29
Child					
Average retention rate (%)	82.6	83.3	80.3	78.5	71.0
Range (%)	49.0–100.0	50.0–100.0	44.0–100.0	1.0–100.0	0.0–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	51	59	75	81	71
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	22	24	31	33	30

Notes: Retention rates represent the ratio of retained participants to certified participants. The average retention rate across all LAs is presented in this table. Not all LAs that calculate retention (unweighted *n* = 83) provided the necessary information to calculate the retention rate. The number (unweighted) of LAs that provided the necessary information (i.e., number of certified participants and number of retained participants, or the percentage of retained participants) to calculate retention rates in each fiscal year, and in each certification category ranged from 22 to 33 LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 33C.

Table 11c. Local Agencies' Definitions of Retention

Definition	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Based on data or reports (monthly, quarterly, yearly) for maintaining caseload/participants served (%)	22.2	20.7	19.2	29.3	23.2	13.3	36.2	21.4
Continuing to utilize/issue benefits (%)	17.9	8.4	24.7	20.3	7.4	30.0	34.3	13.3
Continuing to participate in WIC until they are deemed ineligible (%)	16.8	12.6	21.6	14.9	20.0	12.2	18.7	14.8
Calculation based on active versus inactive, eligible participants (%)	13.4	15.8	16.6	5.0	13.7	12.2	7.2	14.0
Showing up to appointments at WIC (%)	10.8	4.6	20.0	4.5	4.4	23.2	14.3	6.6
Other (%)	35.0	49.0	19.1	41.0	43.8	24.0	27.5	38.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	205	72	83	51	87	50	32	34
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	80	28	30	22	31	19	14	15

Definition	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Based on data or reports (monthly, quarterly, yearly) for maintaining caseload/participants served (%)	28.6	23.1	14.3	10.0	41.7	28.6	20.0	39.9	20.4	21.1
Continuing to utilize/issue benefits (%)	42.9	7.7	19.0	40.0	16.7	0.0	20.0	16.0	9.2	21.6
Continuing to participate in WIC until they are deemed ineligible (%)	0.0	30.8	19.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	20.0	0.0	32.6	12.2
Calculation based on active versus inactive, eligible participants (%)	0.0	7.7	19.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	20.0	17.8	16.0	11.9
Showing up to appointments at WIC (%)	14.3	15.4	9.5	20.0	8.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	16.2
Other (%)	57.1	23.1	38.1	60.0	25.0	57.1	10.0	66.2	26.4	35.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	10	39	66	19	30	19	23	14	55	136
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	7	13	21	10	12	7	10	5	19	56

Notes. Data presented are among the LAs that calculate retention. Data were missing for 5.8 percent of LAs. Definitions of retention were specified by LAs in an open-text response. Open-text responses were coded into one or more definitions; percentages may not sum to 100. Responses left as "other" could not be categorized into a definition category and varied widely. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 33 and 33A.

Table 11d. Local Agencies' Frequency of Calculating Retention Rates

Frequency	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Daily (%)	5.5	8.4	6.2	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	6.4
Weekly (%)	18.4	22.8	18.0	12.5	20.2	29.7	0.0	17.0
Monthly (%)	69.1	74.7	62.0	73.1	67.1	67.6	89.0	54.6
Quarterly (%)	16.6	9.4	22.1	17.5	15.7	24.9	17.6	7.1
Annually (%)	14.5	15.6	19.7	3.8	13.8	25.7	0.0	15.6
Other ¹ (%)	6.1	6.3	7.0	4.5	5.4	6.2	0.0	14.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	212	74	87	51	90	50	35	36
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	83	29	32	22	32	19	15	16

Frequency	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Daily (%)	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.7	6.0
Weekly (%)	12.5	0.0	28.6	20.0	30.8	14.3	10.0	18.7	20.7	17.5
Monthly (%)	87.5	64.3	71.4	60.0	84.6	42.9	70.0	81.3	78.8	63.9
Quarterly (%)	0.0	21.4	9.5	40.0	30.8	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.3	20.9
Annually (%)	25.0	7.1	19.0	10.0	15.4	28.6	0.0	0.0	16.9	15.3
Other ¹ (%)	0.0	7.1	4.8	10.0	0.0	14.3	10.0	0.0	5.5	7.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	11	42	66	19	33	19	23	17	55	141
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	8	14	21	10	13	7	10	6	19	58

¹Other frequencies included at midterm follow-up and certification (weighted *n* = 3 LAs), every other year (weighted *n* = 2 LAs), and as needed (weighted *n* = 2 LAs).

Notes. Data presented are among the LAs that calculate retention. This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, questions 33 and 33B.

Table 11e. Local Agency-Calculated Retention Rate vs. State Agency-Calculated Retention Rate, Fiscal Year 2018

Local Agency-Calculated Retention Rate vs. State Agency-Calculated Retention Rate	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Local Agency Retention Rate								
Average (%)	67.9	78.8	57.4	65.9	70.0	45.4	59.6	84.4
Range (%)	0.0–100.0	12.6–100.0	20.2–92.8	0.0–89.9	0.0–100.0	12.6–91.9	20.0–100.0	76.3–92.7
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	73	27	24	22	26	9	19	19
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	31	12	9	10	10	4	8	9
State Agency Retention Rate								
Average (%)	85.7	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Range (%)	70.0–100.0	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Total number of SA respondents	12	†	†	†	†	†	†	†

Local Agency-Calculated Retention Rate vs. State Agency-Calculated Retention Rate	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Local Agency Retention Rate										
Average (%)	79.7	22.7	90.0	58.4	77.9	†	83.6	93.8	44.5	68.9
Range (%)	47.5–92.7	0.0–42.0	77.0–95.2	20.0–87.0	12.6–100.0	†	76.3–89.9	85.0–100.0	0.0–84.7	12.6–100.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	7	15	12	8	18	†	14	8	11	54
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	5	5	4	4	7	0	6	3	4	24
State Agency Retention Rate										
Average (%)	80.7	94.8	92.1	83.8	70.0	82.7	†	†	†	†
Range (%)	†	†	82.8–100	†	†	71.1–93.6	†	†	†	†
Total number of SA respondents	1	1	4	1	1	4	0	†	†	†

† Not applicable.

Notes: Retention rates were reported for fiscal year 2018. Data were missing for 65.5 percent of LAs that calculated retention and 52.0 percent of SAs that calculated retention.**Sources:** NSW-III Local Agency Survey, question 33; NSW-III State Agency Survey, question 18.

Table 11f. Local Agency Site Characteristics Associated with Higher and Lower Retention Rates, Fiscal Year 2018

Local Agency Site Characteristics Associated with Higher and Lower Retention Rates	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
High retention rates (90.0%–100.0%)	23.5	46.2	18.7	0.0	45.4	14.7	13.5	7.3
Medium retention rates (44.6%–89.9%)	47.5	37.6	31.8	77.5	24.5	26.8	44.5	92.7
Low retention rates (0.0%–44.5%)	29.0	16.1	49.5	22.5	30.0	58.5	42.1	0.0
Chi-square	†		‡		$\chi^2 = 5.298^{\wedge}$			
P-value	†		‡		$p = 0.071$			
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	73	27	24	22	26	9	19	19
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	31	12	9	10	10	4	8	9

Local Agency Site Characteristics Associated with Higher and Lower Retention Rates	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
High retention rates (90.0%–100.0%)	40.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	28.6	†	0.0	71.3	0.0	21.2
Medium retention rates (44.6%–89.9%)	60.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	57.1	†	100.0	28.7	45.8	50.6
Low retention rates (0.0%–44.5%)	0.0	100.0	0.0	50.0	14.3	†	0.0	0.0	54.2	28.2
Chi-square				‡				$\chi^2 = 0.305^{^^}$		
P-value				‡				$p = 0.858$		
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	7	15	12	8	18	†	14	8	11	54
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	5	5	4	4	7	0	6	3	4	24

† Not applicable.

‡ Chi-square test could not be conducted due to small cell sizes.

[^] For the purposes of the Chi-square test, the categories "Up to 750" and "750 to 1,999" were combined into one category, "Up to 1,999"; and the categories "2,000 to 4,499" and "4500+" were combined into one category, "2,000+."^{^^} For the purposes of the Chi-square test, "Mostly Rural" and "Completely Rural" categories were combined into one category, "Rural."

Notes: Retention rates were reported for fiscal year 2018. Data were missing for 65.5 percent of LAs that calculated retention. LAs were flagged as having low, medium and high retention rate based on the distribution of retention rates. LAs were flagged as high retention rate if the LA's retention rate was 90.0 percent–100.0 percent (greater than or equal to the 75th percentile), medium retention rate if the LA's retention rate was 44.6 percent–89.9 percent (between 25th and 74th percentile), or as having a low retention rate if the LA's retention rate was 0.0 percent–44.5 percent (less than 25th percentile).

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 33.

Table 11g. Percentage of Local Agencies that Contact Pregnant Women Who Miss First Appointment to Reschedule

Local agency...	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Attempts to contact to reschedule (%)	98.6	100.0	98.4	97.9	98.8	98.9	98.3	98.0
Does not attempt to contact to reschedule (%)	1.4	0.0	1.6	2.1	1.2	1.1	1.7	2.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	364	924	506	756	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	148	348	221	275	159	144	132

Local agency...	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Attempts to contact to reschedule (%)	97.4	97.9	98.5	100.0	98.1	100.0	99.0	98.5	98.0	98.8
Does not attempt to contact to reschedule (%)	2.6	2.1	1.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	1.0	1.5	2.0	1.2
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	417	406	177	267	183	238	202	462	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	140	130	93	106	66	105	71	177	469

Notes: Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 34.

Table 11h. Activities Taken to Increase WIC Participant Retention Rates Among Local Agencies

Activities Taken	Overall	Relationship of LA to SA			Number of Participants Served by Entire LA			
		State-Affiliated	Local Government	Non-Government	Up to 750	750 to 1,999	2,000 to 4,499	4,500+
Encourage healthcare professionals to inform eligible women to enroll and remain active (%)	93.8	94.3	91.7	97.2	91.6	92.7	96.9	97.0
Encourage current participants to invite eligible family and friends to enroll and remain active (%)	83.0	83.4	82.4	83.7	82.5	84.0	80.6	84.5
Text message appointment reminders (%)	74.3	77.9	71.2	77.3	74.3	70.8	78.1	73.9
Post social media advertisements (%)	69.3	59.5	73.8	68.2	69.3	71.5	70.1	66.2
Advertise via traditional delivery channels (%)	61.5	59.0	66.6	54.0	63.0	58.9	61.3	60.7
Send first birthday card to WIC caregivers on child's first birthday (%)	32.2	18.5	37.7	31.9	31.5	35.0	32.3	29.8
Community engagement, outreach, and partnerships (%)	15.6	17.1	14.0	17.4	12.0	13.4	22.4	20.4
Provide transportation to and from sites (%)	7.7	7.9	6.0	10.5	9.6	8.5	5.4	3.6
Provide childcare onsite (%)	0.9	1.5	0.9	0.4	1.2	0.6	0.9	0.6
Other ¹ (%)	4.2	4.7	3.5	5.0	0.9	5.8	7.1	7.4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	364	924	506	756	389	331	302
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	148	348	221	275	159	144	132

Activities Taken	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Encourage healthcare professionals to inform eligible women to enroll and remain active (%)	93.5	95.0	90.0	94.6	95.3	98.5	92.4	80.6	95.3	95.5
Encourage current participants to invite eligible family and friends to enroll and remain active (%)	87.0	80.7	83.1	84.9	81.1	87.9	81.9	84.6	81.5	83.3
Text message appointment reminders (%)	77.9	78.6	81.5	78.5	58.5	65.2	74.3	71.8	72.1	75.6
Post social media advertisements (%)	62.3	79.3	71.5	69.9	58.5	45.5	81.0	69.6	73.6	67.5
Advertise via traditional delivery channels (%)	62.3	59.3	63.8	54.8	72.6	47.0	64.8	61.6	66.3	59.6
Send first birthday card to WIC caregivers on child's first birthday (%)	28.6	50.0	19.2	52.7	34.9	10.6	22.9	15.2	34.7	34.2
Community engagement, outreach, and partnerships (%)	15.6	11.4	17.7	18.3	17.0	15.2	16.2	12.2	14.5	16.7
Provide transportation to and from sites (%)	2.6	12.9	5.4	2.2	7.5	4.5	11.4	1.1	6.3	9.4

Activities Taken	FNS Region							Urbanicity		
	MARO	MWRO	MPRO	NERO	SERO	SWRO	WRO	Completely Rural	Mostly Rural	Mostly Urban
Provide childcare onsite (%)	0.0	0.7	1.5	1.1	0.9	0.0	1.0	1.2	0.0	1.2
Other ¹ (%)	10.4	1.4	1.5	6.5	7.5	6.1	3.8	1.2	4.7	4.5
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	106	417	406	177	267	183	238	202	462	1,130
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	77	140	130	93	106	66	105	71	177	469

¹ Examples of other activities included email communication (weighted *n* = 4), follow-ups with missed appointments/no-shows and terminated participants to invite them back or re-apply (weighted *n* = 3), referrals (weighted *n* = 3), local breastfeeding group (weighted *n* = 3), and health fair (weighted *n* = 3).

Notes: This survey question allowed the respondent to select all options that applied; percentages will not sum to 100. Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs. Number of participants served by entire LA was missing for 0.9 percent of LAs; the weighted and unweighted *n*'s for this subgroup will not sum to the overall weighted and unweighted *n*.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 35.

Table 12a. Location of Local WIC Agency Facilities

Physical Space	Percentage
Health department or medical clinic	69.6
Nonprofit	9.1
Standalone WIC clinic	6.9
Community Center	3.8
Full service hospital	3.2
Social services office or agency	2.4
Indian Health Service facility	1.5
School	0.3
Religious center	0.2
Mobile clinic (van)	0.2
Head Start	0.1
Migrant health center and/or camp	0.0
Other ¹	2.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718

¹ Examples of other types of locations included Federally Qualified Health Center (weighted *n* = 18) and multiple sites being used (weighted *n* = 16).

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 19.

Table 12b. Physical Security Rating of Local Agency's Location

Rating	Average and Rating Distribution
Average rating among all LAs	3.5
Rating Distribution	
Very safe (no incidents) (%)	53.4
Safe (occasional minor incidents) (%)	44.2
Unsafe (occasional major incidents or frequent minor incidents) (%)	2.5
Very unsafe (frequent major incidents) (%)	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,796
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717

Notes: Physical security may be described as protection from natural disasters such as fire or earthquake; burglary or vandalism of the site; unauthorized visitors; etc. The rating scale is very safe = 4, safe = 3, unsafe = 2, very unsafe = 1. Data were missing for 0.08 percent of LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 21.

Table 12c. Adequacy Rating of Local Agency's Physical Space

Physical Space Descriptor	Average Rating	Percentage Distribution					Weighted <i>n</i>	Unweighted <i>n</i>
		Completely Adequate	Mostly Adequate	Somewhat Adequate	Not at All Adequate	Not Applicable		
Large waiting rooms/reception areas (greater than 15x15 feet)	3.5	57.7	23.9	6.3	2.2	9.9	1,759	702
Small waiting rooms/reception areas (15x15 feet or smaller)	3.1	24.2	26.6	12.3	3.1	33.8	1,705	681
Rooms, offices, or cubicles where clients are seen	3.4	53.0	34.5	10.6	1.5	0.3	1,786	714
Separate breastfeeding rooms	3.3	52.5	24.1	12.1	4.8	6.5	1,777	710
Large training/conference/multipurpose rooms	3.3	47.6	18.7	8.5	7.1	18.1	1,773	709
Small training/conference/multipurpose rooms	3.2	38.2	22.9	12.6	4.4	21.9	1,734	691
Administrative offices (no clients seen)	3.4	50.1	19.5	6.9	4.1	19.3	1,752	699
Administrative cubicles (no clients seen)	3.3	28.7	11.4	5.8	4.1	50.0	1,710	682
Laboratory (height/weight taking areas)	3.5	57.0	27.2	9.6	1.9	4.3	1,782	712
Other ¹	3.1	46.4	8.1	23.7	5.6	16.1	34	15

¹ Examples of other spaces included kitchen (weighted *n* = 7), common spaces (weighted *n* = 4), operator/call center (weighted *n* = 4), medium size spaces (weighted *n* = 3), and playroom (weighted *n* = 3).

Notes: Respondents were asked to rate the adequacy of each type of space for optimally delivering services to WIC participants. Responses of "Not Applicable" were excluded from calculating the average rating. The rating scale is completely adequate = 4, mostly adequate = 3, somewhat adequate = 2, not at all adequate = 1. The percentage of missing data varied by physical space descriptor and ranged from 0.6 percent to 5.1 percent of LAs; most LAs (98 percent) did not provide an "other" response.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 20.

Table 12d. Descriptors of the Physical Space in which Local Agencies Operate in 2009 and 2019

Physical Space	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Health department/medical clinic (%)	73.6	69.6
Nonprofit	13.1	9.1
Standalone WIC clinic	—	6.9
Community Center	—	3.8
Full service hospital	6.3	3.2
Social services office or agency	7.1	2.4
Indian Health Service facility	—	1.5
School	—	0.3
Religious center	—	0.2
Mobile clinic (van)	—	0.2
Head Start	—	0.1
Migrant health center and/or camp	—	0.0
Other	—	2.6
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,797
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	718

— Data not available.

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 19; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-19, Appendix D Table 1.**Table 12e. Physical Security Rating of Local Agency's Location in 2009 and 2019**

Physical Security Rating of Local Agency's Location	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Very safe (no incidents) (%)	56.8	53.4
Safe (occasional minor incidents) (%)	40.1	44.2
Unsafe (occasional major incidents or frequent minor incidents) (%)	2.7	2.5
Very unsafe (frequent major incidents) (%)	0.4	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,796
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	717

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 21; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 3.

Table 13a. Local Agencies with the Equipment to Perform Necessary Tasks

Local Agency...	Tasks		
	Enter/Access Client Certification Information	Perform Hematological Tests	Take Anthropometric Measurements
Has the necessary equipment (%)	100.0	98.2	99.6
Does not have the necessary equipment (%)	0.0	1.8	0.3
Does not know if they have the necessary equipment (%)	0.0	0.0	0.1
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	1,795	1,794
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	717	717

Notes: Data were missing for 0.2 percent of LAs for enter/access client certification information, 0.1 percent of LAs for perform hematological tests, and 0.2 percent of LAs for take anthropometric measurements. Weighted *n*'s vary because the composition of LAs varies by column.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 32.

Table 13b. Local Agencies with the Equipment to Perform Necessary Tasks in 2009 and 2019

Tasks	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Enter/Access Client Certification Information		
Has the necessary equipment (%)	98.2	100.0
Does not have the necessary equipment (%)	1.8	0.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,794
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	717
Perform Hematological Tests		
Has the necessary equipment (%)	89.2	98.2
Does not have the necessary equipment (%)	10.8	1.8
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,795
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	717
Take Anthropometric Measurements		
Has the necessary equipment (%)	99.9	99.6
Does not have the necessary equipment (%)	0.1	0.3
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,794
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	717

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 32; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Appendix D Table 4.

Table 14a. Average Number of Days and Hours of Operation Per Week Among Local Agencies

Average Number of Days and Hours of Operation per Week among Local Agencies	Average	Range
Operating Days and Hours¹		
Average number of days open per week	4.8	1–6
Average hours of operation per week (HH:MM)	41:06	4:00–66:30
Average hours of operation per day (HH:MM)	8:36	3:00–12:00
Monday	8:54	2:00–12:00
Tuesday	8:54	2:00–12:00
Wednesday	8:54	2:00–12:00
Thursday	8:54	2:00–12:30
Friday	7:54	3:00–12:00
Saturday	6:36	2:00–10:30
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,794	
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	717	
Extended Hours of Operation²		
Average number of days with extended hours offered per week	2.2	1–6
Average number of extended hours offered per week (HH:MM)	4:24	00:30–20:30
Average number of extended hours offered per day (HH:MM)	2:24	00:18–10:00
Monday	1:12	00:18–4:00
Tuesday	1:18	00:18–3:00
Wednesday	1:12	00:18–3:00
Thursday	1:12	00:18–3:00
Friday	1:00	00:30–3:00
Saturday	6:36	2:00–10:30
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	962	
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	407	

¹ Operating days and hours were not reported for 0.2 percent of LAs.

² Extended hours is defined as operating hours after 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and any Saturday hours. Extended hours of operation are presented among the 54 percent (weighted) of LAs that reported extended hours.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 26.

Table 14b. Average Number of Days and Hours of Operation Per Week Among Local Agencies in 2009 and 2019

Average Number of Days and Hours of Operation per Week among Local Agencies	NSWP-II (2009)	NSWP-III (2019)
Operating Days and Hours		
Average number of days open per week	4.7	4.8
Average hours of operation per week	36	41
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	1,794
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	717
Extended Hours of Operation		
Average number of extended hours offered per week	4.9	4
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	2,291	965
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	503	407

Sources: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey, question 26; NSWP-II Final Report Volume 2, Exhibit 4-20, Appendix D Table 2.

Table 15. Characteristics of Local Agencies

Characteristic	Percentage of all LAs
Relationship of LA to SA	
State-Affiliated	20.2
Local Government	51.6
Non-Government	28.1
FNS Region	
MARO	5.9
MWRO	23.4
MPRO	22.6
NERO	9.8
SERO	14.9
SWRO	10.2
WRO	13.2
LA Urbanicity	
Completely rural	11.3
Mostly rural	25.9
Mostly urban	62.9
Number of Participants Served by Entire LA¹	
Up to 750	42.6
750 to 1,999	21.8
2,000 to 4,499	18.6
4,500+	17.0
Total number of respondents (weighted <i>n</i>)	1,797
Total number of respondents (unweighted <i>n</i>)	718

¹ Number of participants served by the entire LA was not reported by 0.9 percent of LAs.

Source: NSWP-III Local Agency Survey.

Prepared by Capital Consulting Corporation (CCC) and 2M Research Services for the USDA Food and Nutrition Service (Project Officer: Karen Castellanos-Brown)

Non-Discrimination Statement:

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at [How to File a Program Discrimination Complaint](#) and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.