



Hunger in America 2014

Report for Vermont Foodbank

Lamoille County Data





A Report on Charitable Food Distribution in 2013

Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics

Areas of volunteer/staff training needs

| Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics | | | |
|---|----------|------------|-------------------------|
| | | Perce | entage |
| | | | Margin of Erro |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) |
| Partner Agency by Type | | | |
| Faith-based or located in a religious institution | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not faith-based | 11 | 91.7% | 8.3% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 12 | 100.0% | • |
| Number of Programs by Type | | | |
| Meal | 4 | 22.2% | 17.5% |
| Grocery | 8 | 44.4% | 21.0% |
| Food-related benefits | 1 | 5.6% | 9.7% |
| Non-food | 5 | 27.8% | 18.9% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 18 | 100.0% | • |
| | Median | C | Manain of |
| | wedian | Sum | Margin of Error(+/-) |
| Agency Staffing | _ | | |
| Agency full-time equivalent staff at time of survey | 3 | 155 | 203 |
| | Count | Estimate | Margin Of Error(+/-) |
| mber of agencies with no full-time equivalent staff at time of vey | 3 | 25.0% | 22.9% |
| | Median | Sum | Margin of Error(+/-) |
| Program Volunteers | | • | • |
| Number of program volunteers (weekly) | 0 | 273 | 259 |
| | Min | Max | Median |
| Total volunteer hours per week per program | 0 | 500 | 70 |
| Average Percentage of Program Volunteers by Age | | | |
| 18 and younger | | 3.7% | |
| 19-59 | | 32.0% | |
| 60 and older | | 64.3% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | | 100% | • |
| | | Percentage | |
| | Count | Estimate | Margin of |
| D | | | Error(+/-) |
| Program Challenges Difficulty obtaining volunteers (some or a lot of difficulty) | 4 | 57.1% | 39.3% |
| Difficulty retaining volunteers (some or a lot of difficulty) | 2 | 28.6% | 35.8% |
| | <u> </u> | 20.070 | 33.070 |

Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics

| Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| | | Perce | entage |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | Margin of Error (+/-) |
| Accessing local food resources | 1 | 7.7% | 13.7% |
| Food safety and sanitation | 3 | 23.1% | 21.7% |
| Advocacy training | 3 | 23.1% | 21.7% |
| Client choice | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Food Stamp (SNAP) application assistance and outreach | 1 | 7.7% | 13.7% |
| Fundraising/grant writing | 5 | 38.5% | 25.0% |
| Nonprofit management / board governance | 3 | 23.1% | 21.7% |
| Nutrition education | 5 | 38.5% | 25.0% |
| Social media | 1 | 7.7% | 13.7% |
| Summer feeding | 1 | 7.7% | 13.7% |
| Technology assistance | 1 | 7.7% | 13.7% |
| Volunteer recruitment/retention/staff succession planning | 3 | 23.1% | 21.7% |
| | | Count | |
| | No Volunteers | Half of total | More than half |
| | | volunteers or | of total |
| Course of Drogram Valuations | | less | volunteers |
| Source of Program Volunteers | 0 | 6 | 4 |
| Connected to Agency | 0 5 | 6 1 | 1 1 |
| Religious groups | 5 4 | | 0 |
| United Way | • | 3 | • |
| Other Civic/Nonprofit | 4 4 | 3 | 0 0 |
| Companies or business groups | - | 3 4 | • |
| Kindergarten through 12th grade school programs | 3 4 | | 0 |
| Colleges/Universities | 3 | 3 4 | 0 0 |
| Court-ordered community service Clients | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Volunteers connected to food bank | | | |
| Some Other Source | 6 3 | 0 2 | 0 |
| Some Other Source | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Average Percentage of Total Program Food Distributed | | | |
| Lamoille | | 60.1% | |
| Other | | 4.2% | |
| Donations | | 5.9% | |
| Purchased | | 29.8% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | | 100.0% | |

| | | entage | |
|--|-------|----------|-------------------------|
| | Count | Estimate | Margin of Error(+/-) |
| Program Access to Vehicles | | | |
| Owns truck(s), van(s), or car(s) for pickups | 4 | 44.4% | 32.7% |
| Rents/leases truck(s), van(s), or car(s) for pickups | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Depends on personal truck(s), van(s), or car(s) of staff or volunteers for pickups | 5 | 50.0% | 30.6% |
| Works with other programs to share the responsibility for pickups | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Food and groceries are delivered to program | 6 | 66.7% | 31.0% |

Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics

| | | Percentage | | |
|---|-------|------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | Margin of Error | |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) | |
| Program Reported Changes in Demand and Supply in the Past 12 months | | | | |
| Volume of clients compared to prior year | | | | |
| Saw any increase | 7 | 58.3% | 26.7% | |
| About the same | 5 | 41.7% | 26.7% | |
| Saw any decrease | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 12 | 100.0% | | |
| Food available to meet needs of clients | | • | • | |
| More food than needed | 2 | 16.7% | 20.2% | |
| Enough food to meet needs | 10 | 83.3% | 16.7% | |
| Less food than needed | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 12 | 100.0% | • | |
| Programs Turning Clients Away in the Past 12 Months | | | | |
| Programs turning clients away for any reason | 1 | 9.1% | 16.5% | |
| Programs turning clients away frequently or occasionally due to | | | | |
| Program ran out of food | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Clients came more often than program rules allow | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Client lived outside the program's service area | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| No ID | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Income too high | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Other | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Program Restrictions | | | | |
| Any Type Of Service Restriction | 7 | 58.3% | 26.7% | |
| Daily | 1 | 8.3% | 15.0% | |
| Weekly | 1 | 8.3% | 15.0% | |
| Monthly | 5 | 41.7% | 26.7% | |
| Quarterly/Seasonally | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Annually | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Agency Nutrition and Health Services | | | | |
| Agencies that provide any type of nutrition services | 7 | 58.3% | 26.1% | |
| Fliers or written materials | 4 | 33.3% | 24.9% | |
| Cooking classes or demonstrations | 3 | 25.0% | 22.9% | |
| Nutrition workshops or classes or meetings with dietitians | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| Referrals | 6 | 50.0% | 26.4% | |
| Other | 2 | 16.7% | 19.7% | |
| Agencies that do not provide any type of nutrition services | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 12 | 100.0% | • | |
| For those offering nutrition services how many led by: | | | | |
| Agency Staff | 6 | 85.7% | 14.3% | |
| Agency volunteers | 2 | 40.0% | 51.7% | |
| Local nutritionists or other health professionals in partnership | 3 | 60.0% | 40.0% | |

| Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics | | | | |
|---|-------|----------|-----------------|--|
| | | Percent | | |
| | | | Margin of Error | |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) | |
| with agency | | | | |
| Staff from food bank | 1 | 25.0% | 58.4% | |
| Staff from Farm Bureau or Cooperative extension | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Staff from local colleges/universities | 1 | 25.0% | 58.4% | |
| Someone else | 1 | 25.0% | 58.4% | |
| Agency Obstacles to Distribution of Healthier Foods | | | | |
| Client reasons (unwillingness to eat, inability to store, etc.) | 6 | 50.0% | 26.4% | |
| Too expensive to purchase healthier foods | 9 | 75.0% | 22.9% | |
| Inability to store/handle healthier foods | 3 | 27.3% | 25.0% | |
| Lack of knowledge about healthier foods | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Healthier food not a priority | 2 | 18.2% | 21.6% | |
| Inability to obtain healthier foods from other donors/food sources | 8 | 66.7% | 24.9% | |
| Agency Services Related to Government Programs | | | | |
| Agencies that provided any SNAP-related services | 7 | 58.3% | 26.1% | |
| Screening for eligibility | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% | |
| Application assistance | 3 | 27.3% | 25.0% | |
| Education about the program | 7 | 58.3% | 26.1% | |
| Recertification for the program | 3 | 27.3% | 25.0% | |
| Agencies that did not provide any SNAP-related services | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 12 | 100.0% | • | |
| Aganay Bassana far Nat Offsring SNAD Sarvings Among | | | | |
| Agency Reasons for Not Offering SNAP Services, Among Agencies Reporting Not Offering Them | | | | |
| Staff-related issues | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% | |
| Not enough time | 1 | 25.0% | 58.4% | |
| Lacking physical space or equipment | 1 | 33.3% | 66.7% | |
| SNAP is not part of what this agency does | 4 | 80.0% | 20.0% | |
| Other reason | 1 | 25.0% | 58.4% | |
| Other reason | 1 | 25.0% | 36.4% | |
| Agency Services Related to Other Non-SNAP Programs | _ | | | |
| Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women Infants and Children (WIC) | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| program | | | | |
| Medicaid or other health care programs | 7 | 58.3% | 26.1% | |
| Supplemental Security income (SSI) | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| Tax preparation or Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) assistance | 4 | 33.3% | 24.9% | |
| Housing assistance like Section 8 | 5 | 41.7% | 26.1% | |
| Agencies Providing Combinations of Other non-SNAP Program Services | | | | |
| One non-food service | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% | |
| Two non-food services | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| 11011 1000 00111000 | J | 0 /0 | 070 | |

Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics

| Table A1 Agency and Program Characteristics | | | |
|--|------------|---------------|----------------------------------|
| | | Perc | entage |
| | | | Margin of Error |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) |
| Three non-food services | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Four or more non-food services | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Agency Reductions in the past 12 Months | | | |
| Experienced Cutbacks | 1 | 9.1% | 16.1% |
| Cut hours of operation | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Lay off staff | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Limit the area served | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Did not Experience Cutbacks | 10 | 90.9% | 9.1% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 11 | 100.0% | • |
| Agencies reporting challenges associated with continuing to provide services | | | |
| Not enough money | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not enough food supplies | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not enough paid staff or personnel | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not enough volunteers | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not enough money for transportation | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Building or location problems | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not enough leadership | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Not enough community support | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| Community doesn't need this program | 1 | 8.3% | 14.6% |
| | | Count | |
| | No Funding | Half of total | More than half sof total funding |
| Agency funding | | , . | . |
| Government | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Individuals | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Corporations | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Foundations | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Religious institutions | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Client fees | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| Other | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| Outo | 7 | 3 | 1 |

| | | Percentage | | |
|---|-------|------------|-------------------------|--|
| | Count | Estimate | Margin of Error(+/-) | |
| Program Reliance on Food Bank: Effect if program no longer received food from food bank | | | | |
| Major effect | 8 | 66.7% | 25.5% | |
| Minor effect | 4 | 33.3% | 25.5% | |
| No effect at all | 0 | 0% | 0% | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 12 | 100.0% | | |

Table A2 Client Counts

| | We | ekly | Мо | nthly | Annually | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | Duplicated counts | Unduplicated counts | Duplicated counts | Unduplicated counts | Duplicated counts | Unduplicated counts |
| Total number of individual clients, all programs | 800 (+/-100) | 600 (+/-100) | 3,500 (+/-500) | 2,300 (+/-700) | 42,000 (+/-5,600) | 6,200 (+/-2,100) |
| Total number of client households, all programs | 400 (+/-100) | 200 (+/-100) | 1,800 (+/-300) | 900 (+/-300) | 21,500 (+/-3,500) | 2,500 (+/-800) |
| Total number of individual clients by meal and grocery programs | | | | | | |
| Meal programs | 200 (+/-0) | 200 (+/-0) | 1,100 (+/-100) | 500 (+/-100) | 12,800 (+/-1,000) | 1,000 (+/-100) |
| Grocery Programs | 600 (+/-100) | 500 (+/-100) | 2,400 (+/-500) | 2,200 (+/-700) | 29,300 (+/-5,500) | 6,100 (+/-2,100) |
| Total number of individual clients by selected program subtypes (not mutually exclusive) | | | | | | |
| Pantries | 600 | 500 | 2,400 | 2,100 | 29,300 | 6,000 |

Table A3 Characteristics of Clients and their Households

| | | Perc | centage |
|--|-------|----------|----------------|
| | | | Margin of Erre |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) |
| Client Age | | | |
| 0-5 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 6-17 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 18-29 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 30-49 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 50-59 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 60-64 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 65 or older | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Client Race/Ethnicity | | | |
| White Non-Hispanic | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Black Non-Hispanic | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Hispanic | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Other | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Household Size | | | |
| 1 member | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 2 to 3 members | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 4 to 6 members | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| More than 6 members | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Primary Language Spoken By Adults at Home | | | |
| English | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Spanish | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Other | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| | | | |
| Housing | | | |
| Non-temporary housing | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| House or townhouse | 390 | 42.6% | 32.4% |
| Apartment | 357 | 39.0% | 10.0% |
| Mobile home or house trailer | 160 | 17.5% | 24.2% |
| Other | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Temporary housing | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Households without access to stove, microwave or hot plate | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Households without access to refrigeration | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Housing payment arrangements (non-temporary housing) | | | |
| Own with Mortgage | ++ | ++ | ++ |

Table A3 Characteristics of Clients and their Households

| erson or family ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | | | Perc | centage |
|--|--|----------------------------|----------|---|
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Characteristic | Count | Estimata | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Own free and clear | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Rent or Lease | | | |
| ## ## ## the past 12 months 160 17.4% 14.7% person or family ++ ++ ++ ++ eviction in the past five 172 19.1% 24.4% ### ### ## ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### ### #### ### ### #### ### ### #### ### ### #### #### #### #### #### #### ###### | Do not have to pay rent | | | |
| the past 12 months 160 17.4% 14.7% person or family ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Total excluding nonresponse | | | |
| the eviction in the past five 172 19.1% 24.4% 1 | Respondents lived at least two places in the past 12 months | | | |
| eviction in the past five 172 19.1% 24.4% ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ + | Respondents started living with another person or family | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Respondents experienced foreclosure or eviction in the past five years | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Education | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Household Highest Education Level | | | |
| ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## | Less than high school | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ertificate, or degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ + | High school diploma | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 2-year college degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ + | General equivalency diploma or GED | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Business, trade, or technical license, certificate, or degree beyond high school | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Some college beyond high school or a 2-year college degree | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 2-year college degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ + | Four-year college degree or higher | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ertificate, or degree ++ ++ ++ ++ 2-year college degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Client Education level | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Less than high school | ++ | 44 | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | High school diploma | | | |
| ertificate, or degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ 2-year college degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ed ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ + | General equivalency diploma or GED | | | |
| 2-year college degree ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ + | Business, trade, or technical license, certificate, or degree | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ed ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | beyond high school | • • | • • | • |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Some college beyond high school or a 2-year college degree | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | | | • | * |
| red ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | Military Service | | | |
| red ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | - | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| ++ ++ ++ ++ | | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ | Not currently serving | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ | | | | |
| | | | | |
| ++ ++ ++ | | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| n who worked the most | Four-year college degree or higher Total excluding nonresponse Military Service No household member has ever served At least one household member has served Not currently serving Household member currently serving Unknown if currently serving Total excluding nonresponse Household Employment (of the person who worked the most in the past 12 months; in some households, this person may | ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ | | ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ |
| and an object of the second control of the s | ot be working) | | | |
| nolds, this person may | Vork Status | | | |
| | Worked for pay in the last 4 weeks | 313 | 34.1% | 33.4% |
| 313 34.1% 33.4% | Worked for pay in the last 12 months | 433 | 47.2% | 34.8% |
| 313 34.1% 33.4% 433 47.2% 34.8% | Currently out of work | 603 | 65.9% | 33.4% |
| 313 34.1% 33.4% 433 47.2% 34.8% 603 65.9% 33.4% | Currently out of work, but actively looking in the last 4 weeks | ++ | ++ | ++ |

Table A3 Characteristics of Clients and their Households

| | | Perc | centage |
|---|-------|----------|----------------|
| Ol and the size is | 0 | F:- | Margin of Erro |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) |
| Hours worked per week, among persons who worked the most in the household | | | |
| 1-10 hours per week | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 11-20 hours per week | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 21-30 hours per week | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 31-40 hours per week | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Over 40 hours per week | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Time out of work, among households where previously most employed person is not working | | | |
| Less than 1 month | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 1-6 months | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 7-12 months | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| More than 1 year | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Out of the workforce, in the past 4 weeks, and not looking for work because | | | |
| Retired | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Disabled/poor health; caretaker for another person | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Other | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Potential Barriers and Bridges to Employment | | | |
| Respondent responsible for grandchildren in household | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Household member(s) released from prison in the past | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 12 months | | | |
| Adult client student status | | | |
| Full-time student(s) | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Part-time student(s) | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Health, Health Insurance, and Medical Bills | | | |
| Household: Health status of respondent | | | |
| Excellent | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Very good | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Good | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Fair | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Poor | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Household member in poor health | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Household member with diabetes | 267 | 29.8% | 35.9% |
| Household member with high blood pressure | 280 | 31.2% | 16.2% |
| Household member with man blood bressure | | , - | |
| Household: no member has health insurance | ++ | ++ | ++ |

Table A3 Characteristics of Clients and their Households

| Table A3 Characteristics of Chefts and their Households | | Percentage | | |
|---|-------|--------------|-------|--|
| | | Margin of Er | | |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) | |
| Income | | | | |
| Household Annual Income | | | | |
| \$0 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| \$1 - \$10,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| \$10,001 - \$20,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| \$20,001 - \$30,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| More than \$30,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| | | | | |
| Household Annual Income as % of Poverty Level | | | | |
| 0% (no income) | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 1% - 50% | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 51% - 75% | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 76% - 100% | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 101%-130% | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 131% - 150% | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 151% - 185% | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 186% or higher | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Household Monthly Income | | | | |
| \$0 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| \$1 - \$1,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| \$1,001 - \$2,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| \$2,001 - \$3,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| More than \$3,000 | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Households living in poverty | 494 | 82.4% | 17.6% | |

Table A4 Clients Use of Food Assistance

| Table A4 Clients Use of Food Assistance | | B (| |
|---|--------|------------|--------------------------|
| | | Percentage | |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | Margin of Error (+/-) |
| Food Security | Obdite | Lotimate | (+1) |
| Food secure | 407 | 45.3% | 15.8% |
| Food insecure | 491 | 54.7% | 15.8% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 898 | 100.0% | |
| Total exciduing nomesponse | 030 | 100.070 | • |
| Spending Tradeoffs | | | |
| Choose between paying for food and paying for other | | | |
| expenses (ever in the past 12 months) | | | |
| Medicine/medical care | 369 | 46.4% | 15.1% |
| Utilities | 218 | 37.8% | 32.9% |
| Housing | 278 | 45.0% | 43.0% |
| Transportation | 241 | 29.8% | 29.4% |
| Education | 107 | 13.2% | 10.6% |
| | | | |
| Choice of food versus medical care | | | |
| Every month | 128 | 16.1% | 19.2% |
| Sometimes | 240 | 30.2% | 16.0% |
| Never | 427 | 53.6% | 15.1% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 796 | 100.0% | • |
| | | | |
| Choice of food versus utilities | | | |
| Every month | 87 | 15.2% | 11.1% |
| Sometimes | 130 | 22.6% | 32.6% |
| Never | 359 | 62.2% | 32.9% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 577 | 100.0% | |
| | | | |
| Choice of food versus housing | | | |
| Every month | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Sometimes | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Never | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| | | | |
| Choice of food versus transportation | | | |
| Every month | 104 | 12.8% | 10.7% |
| Sometimes | 138 | 17.0% | 27.0% |
| Never | 568 | 70.2% | 29.4% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 809 | 100.0% | |
| | | | |
| Choice of food versus education | | | |
| Every month | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Sometimes | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Never | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |

Table A4 Clients Use of Food Assistance

| Table A4 Clients Use of Food Assistance | | Percentage | | |
|---|-------|------------|-----------------|--|
| Characteristic | Count | | Margin of Error | |
| | | Estimate | (+/-) | |
| | | | | |
| Household SNAP Participation | | | | |
| Currently receiving SNAP | 658 | 80.9% | 19.1% | |
| Not currently receiving SNAP | 156 | 19.1% | 20.0% | |
| Never Applied | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Have Applied | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Unknown | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 814 | 100.0% | | |
| Time to exhaustion of benefits for households receiving SNAP | | | | |
| 1 Week or less | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 2 Weeks | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 3 Weeks | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| 4 Weeks | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| More than 4 Weeks | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Potential SNAP income eligibility among client households not receiving SNAP | | | | |
| Not income-eligible | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Potentially income-eligible | 104 | 66.8% | 27.1% | |
| At 130% threshold | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| At higher broad-based categorical | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| eligibility (BBCE) threshold | | | | |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 155 | 100.0% | • | |
| Reasons for not Applying for SNAP, among households that have never applied | | | | |
| Didn't think eligible | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Personal reasons | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Too difficult to apply | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Never Heard of Program | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Other | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Other Program Participation | | | | |
| Household participation in programs targeted at school-aged children (ages 5-18) | | | | |
| Free or reduced-price school lunch programs | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Free or reduced-price school breakfast programs | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Afterschool snack or meal programs | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| BackPack weekend food programs | ++ | ++ | ++ | |
| Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) (among all households) | ++ | ++ | ++ | |

Table A4 Clients Use of Food Assistance

| Table A4 Clients Use of Food Assistance | | Percentage | |
|--|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | | Margin of Error | |
| Characteristic | Count | Estimate | (+/-) |
| Households participating in at least one child nutrition | | | |
| program | | | |
| One program | 373 | 40.7% | 35.1% |
| Two or more programs | 323 | 35.3% | 9.8% |
| Strategies for Food Assistance | | | |
| I usually wait to come to this program until I run out of food | 622 | 67.9% | 18.7% |
| I plan to get food here on a regular basis | 294 | 32.1% | 18.7% |
| Total excluding nonresponse | 916 | 100.0% | • |
| Top Products Desired by Clients but Not Currently Receiving at Program | | | |
| Beverages such as water or juice | 265 | 33.5% | 25.4% |
| Dairy products such as milk, cheese or yogurt | 465 | 58.9% | 25.0% |
| Fresh fruits and vegetables | 471 | 59.6% | 16.6% |
| Grains such as bread or pasta | 112 | 14.2% | 16.4% |
| Non-food items like shampoo, soap, or diapers | 221 | 27.9% | 15.9% |
| Nothing | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Other foods or products | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Protein food items like meats | 398 | 50.4% | 24.8% |
| This is my first time coming to this program | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Coping Strategies | | | |
| Types of household coping strategies used in the past 12 months | | | |
| Eaten food past expiration date | 446 | 54.8% | 23.4% |
| Grew food in garden | 165 | 18.0% | 16.6% |
| Sold or pawned personal property | 240 | 26.2% | 27.6% |
| Purchased food in dented or damaged packages | 500 | 61.5% | 17.3% |
| Purchased inexpensive, unhealthy food | 707 | 77.2% | 22.8% |
| Received help from family or friends | 498 | 55.5% | 32.6% |
| Watered down food or drinks | 352 | 44.3% | 24.3% |
| Number of household coping strategies used | | | |
| None | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 1 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 2 | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| 3 or more | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| Total excluding nonresponse | ++ | ++ | ++ |