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The study, *Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families: Identifying Food Source, Need, and Tools for Connecting* was conducted for the New Jersey Department of Human Services (DHS) by researchers from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. This research project was initiated under the April 2001 New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act (NJHP&NAPA) with the goal of developing an overall understanding of food sources and human need for food in New Jersey, as well, as a fiscally sound strategy for better linking food with need. NJHP&NAPA also established a Governor-appointed 13-member Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee (HPAC) to assist the DHS Commissioner in providing guidance on the needs assessment to be conducted by Rutgers, as well as, to develop state recommendations to improve food security, based on study findings. The study was originally contracted to run from July 2002-June 2004 and was extended through October 2005.

Conditions of food insecurity in New Jersey are growing. According to a 2005 report by The Association for Children of New Jersey, the trajectory of New Jersey households living in poverty is steadily increasing. This fact continues to be obscured by co-existing wealth in the State. The goal of the research project, *Increasing Food Security for New Jersey Families*, is to understand the strengths and challenges of the emergency food system in terms of its ability to connect the available resources with low-income residents in need. We have discovered profound commitment among the staff and volunteers that provide emergency food services, and also, the need to support their work in attempting to meet poverty-based need that is growing faster than food donations.

The Introduction and Overview component provides a brief history of the project, as well as, the key findings and recommendations that are reviewed in depth in the subsequent six Sections. Part One addresses the New Jersey Emergency Food System and includes the Gap Analysis Report and Toolkit (Section I), and the report, Food Waste Generation in New Jersey’s Food Manufacturing Sector (Section II). Part Two presents research on New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) and includes the Emergency Food Provider Survey Report (Section III); the Food Pantry Report (Section IV); the Soup Kitchen Report (Section V); and Nutrition Education Recommendations (Section VI).

*Increasing Food Security for New Jersey Families* has developed a wealth of data. Among many recommendations, and at the request of our interviewees, we encourage that the study be shared widely through print and electronic form. Additionally, much of the research data (especially Sections I and III) can be used to develop a map-based website on community food security and hunger prevention strategies in New Jersey. The website could locate New Jersey emergency food resources, provide nutrition education handouts and recipes, post relevant literature, and include links to resources such as on-line applications for Food Stamps. This recommendation of course presumes access to computers, internet, and technical training. Many low-income clients have access through public libraries, however, emergency food providers (soup kitchens, food pantries, shelters) need support in acquiring the same for their offices.
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**Agency**: A non-profit, community based organization that packages or cooks food provided by a food bank for people seeking emergency food assistance, who would otherwise not get enough to eat or not eat well. An agency may operate one or more food programs, such as a pantry or a food kitchen, and may provide additional non-food services.

**America’s Second Harvest, The Nation’s Food Bank Network (ASH or A2H)**: The national anti-hunger non-profit organization that organizes over 200 food banks and food rescue organizations, of which the Food Bank is a participating member.

**Calorie**: When the word calorie is used in common conversation with regard to one’s dietary intake, people are actually referring to a unit that is 1,000 time the value of a calorie, from a scientific perspective, i.e., the amount of energy required to raise one gram of water one degree Celsius. Placing a capital “C” at the beginning of the word does not change its meaning to the lay reader, but communicates to scientists that what is really being communicated is a unit of measure equal to 1,000 calories.

**Community Food Security**: A condition in which all community residents obtain a safe, culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice.

**Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)**: A farm marketing strategy wherein a farmer sets a price for a share of the year's produce from her/his farm, then recruits a group of participants who purchase a membership in the farm, whereby they receive a weekly supply of fresh-picked produce.

**Convenience Sample**: Individuals or groups selected at the convenience of the investigator or primarily because they were available at a convenient time or place.

**Correlation**: A statistical determination of the degree to which two variables are related.

**Emergency Food Participant**: Any individual- elderly, adult, or child- who receives food from a soup kitchen or food pantry, whether present at the food program or sharing the household of someone who has received a food package from a program.

**Emergency Food Program (Also Emergency Food Provider) (EFP)**: A soup kitchen, food pantry, or shelter serving people who seeking food relief.

**Emergency Food Network**: The community of food providers or the individuals that staff them including soup kitchens, food pantries, and shelters.

**Emergency Food System**: Emergency food systems incorporate food-related processes that extend from field to plate (see also Food System), but emphasize the specific components that help low-income persons access food, for example: public sector programs like Food Stamps and WIC; non-profit projects like soup kitchens, food pantries, and urban gardens; and private-NGO partnerships that funnel food donations to food banks.
**Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP):** A federally funded program, funded through the USDA’s Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, to provide nutrition education services to low-income families with children.

**Farmers’ Market:** A farm marketing strategy that provides direct sales opportunities for farmers to consumers, usually at a community-based location. Traditionally an opportunity to buy the freshest foods from local farmers.

**Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program:** The WIC Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) is associated with the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, popularly known as WIC. WIC-eligible participants and low-income seniors are issued FMNP coupons in addition to their regular WIC food instruments. These coupons can be used to buy fresh, unprepared fruits, vegetables and herbs from farmers, farmers' markets or roadside stands (“farm retailers”) that have been approved by the State agency to accept FMNP coupons. Currently, 44 State agencies operate the FMNP.

**Farm Retailer:** An individual or a business that arranges direct sales from a farm. Can include participants at farmers’ markets, roadside stands, farm tailgate operations, and youth farm stands. (See also Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program.)

**Food Bank:** A nonprofit organization that solicits, collects, purchases, and stores food and related products from manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and government agencies and distributes it to community and emergency food programs.

**Food Insecurity:** The term used by the USDA to describe a person who does not have assured access at all the times to enough nutritious food to lead a healthy, active life.

**Food Pantry:** An emergency food program that distributes food items to individuals and families. Food pantries typically provide three-to-five food packages (groceries) for the preparation of nutritionally balanced meals and are a key source of emergency food for the working poor and for people whose food stamp benefits have run out before the end of the month.

**Food Security:** A term developed by the USDA to describe someone who has access all the times to enough food to lead an active, healthy life. The term includes at a minimum: 1) the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe food, and 2) the assured ability to acquire nutritious and safe food in socially acceptable ways (e.g., without relying on emergency food supplies, scavenging, stealing or other coping strategies).

**Food Stamp Program:** The federal Food Stamp Program serves as the first line of defense against hunger. It enables low-income families to buy nutritious food with Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) cards. Food Stamp recipients are able to buy eligible food items in authorized retail food stores.

**Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP):** A state program, funded through the federal Food Stamp Program (through USDA’s Food and Nutrition Service), that is aimed at providing education to enable Food Stamp Program participants to improve their food security and maximize food stamps to eat healthful foods. In New Jersey, at the time this report was created, this program was contracted by the Food Stamp Office to Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.
Food Sufficiency: Having enough food available for the household. This may differ from food security, in that the food available may not meet the tests of nutritional adequacy, safety, or ability to be acquired in socially acceptable ways.

Food System: Food systems consist of food-related processes that occur in a unit of space. Food system processes extend from field to plate and include: food production, processing, transportation, wholesaling, retailing, preparation, waste and recycling, and the institutions and other factors that affect these processes. The US food system operates on a global scale; we regularly consume products that cannot be grown in the US like coffee and bananas. Increasingly, our global food system exports products to us like beef, wheat, and apples that we can raise in the US. Food systems are not static and can be described as becoming more “local” when, e.g., more of the food consumed “locally” is also produced and/or processed “locally.” (See also local food system and emergency food system.)

Hunger: There are a number of definitions for hunger, including the following: the involuntary lack of access to food for an intermittent or extended period of time; and the uneasy or painful sensation that can be caused by lack of food. Hunger can be caused by external forces that limit someone’s resources or ability to obtain sufficient food and may result in detrimental physical and psychological consequences. Many scientists consider hunger to be chronic inadequate nutritional intake due to low income, i.e., people do not have to experience pain to be considered hungry from a nutritional perspective.

Intercept Interview: A quantitative data collection method in which individuals are interviewed immediately after their experience with a business or organization.

Key Informant: An individual who is in a position to know the community or situation the researcher is interested in.

Kitchen: See “Soup Kitchen.”

Local Food System: A food system or part of a food system where food consumed “locally” is also produced and/or processed “locally.” There is no consensus on the spatial characteristics of “local” and has been used in reference to a county, state, regional, even a country. See also “Food System.”

Malnutrition: A serious health impairment resulting from substandard nutrient intake. Malnutrition may result from lack of food, a chronic shortage of key nutrients, or impaired absorption or metabolism associated with chronic conditions or diseases.

Paid Employment: An individual working at an EFP that is paid wages by the program or agency and is not an unpaid volunteer.

Pantry: See “Food Pantry.”

Program, see “Emergency Food Program.”

Program Staff, see “Staff.”

Prepared Foods: Meals prepared for serving in a restaurant, cafeteria, etc., or especially at a soup kitchen.

Semi-structured Survey: An interview tool used to obtain general information relevant to specific issues, to probe for what is not known, and to gain a range of insights on
specific issues. Semi-structured interviews start with more general questions, but retain
the flexibility of inserting more specific questions that do not need to be prepared in
advance, allowing the interviewer to probe for details or discuss issues.

**Soup Kitchen:** A soup kitchen is a place where food is offered to the poor for free, or at
a reasonably low price. Individual volunteers, as well as, groups like church groups or
scouts, often help out. Soup kitchens sometimes get their food from a food bank for free
or at a low price, because they can be considered a charity.

**Social Desirability: Survey:** The propensity of a responder to give socially desirable
responses, i.e., survey participants providing responses they believe the interviewer
wishes to hear.

**Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC):**
WIC provides supplemental nutritious foods and nutrition counseling to low income,
nutritionally at-risk pregnant women, infants, and children up to the age of five.

**Staff:** Individuals working at an EFP, either as a paid employee or unpaid volunteers.

**Summer Food Service Program:** The Summer Food Program (SFSP) provides
reimbursements to schools, local government agencies and community-based
organizations for meals and snacks served to children during the summer months.

**The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP):** Under TEFAP, commodity
foods are made available by the USDA to states. States provide the food to local agencies
that are selected, usually food banks, which distribute the food to soup kitchens and food
pantries that directly serve the public.

**Unpaid Volunteer:** An individual working at EFP that is not a paid employee.
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The study, *Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families: Identifying Food Source, Need, and Tools for Connecting* was conducted for the New Jersey Department of Human Services (DHS) by researchers from Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. This research project was initiated under the April 2001 New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act (NJHP&NAPA) with the goal of developing an overall understanding of food sources and human need for food in New Jersey, as well as a fiscally sound strategy for better linking food with need. The study was originally contracted to run from July 2002-June 2004 and was extended through October 2005.

### I. Background

The NJHP&NAPA required the establishment of a Governor-appointed 13-member Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee (HPAC) to assist the Commissioner of the DHS in providing guidance on the needs assessment to be conducted by Rutgers, as well as, to develop state recommendations to improve food security, based on study findings. Due to changes in the governorship, the HPAC was formed one year after the start of the project and met for the first time with the Rutgers research team 15 months into the 24 month project. Initial research and a projected timeline were shared. During this introduction to the research project, the HPAC announced its dissatisfaction with two of the research objectives and called a halt to them. They spent the following seven months deliberating alternatives presented by Rutgers. In June 2004, a one year no-cost extension through June 2005 was formalized that identified the modifications desired by the HPAC.

The original scope of work included five parts:

1. Identify and quantify, at all steps in the State’s food delivery system, wholesome and nutritious food that goes to waste before it can be made available to those in need of such food.
2. Identify and quantify the need for emergency or supplemental feeding for families and individuals in the State.

---

1 Anne C. Bellows, Ph.D., is Principle Investigator of *Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families: Identifying Food Source, Need, and Tools for Connecting*. Dr. Bellows is a Research Associate at the Food Policy Institute, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 3 Rutgers Plaza, ASB III, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Tel: 732-932-1966, ext. 1222; Fax: 732-932-9544. Co-Principal Investigator is Brian Schilling; co-authors are Lucas Marxen, Dr. Deborah Palmer Keenan, and Audrey Adler. Research team biographies follow the Introduction and Overview.
3. Develop a fiscally judicious plan to secure food from loss to deterioration or waste and to transport and apportion that food to emergency feeding programs throughout the State.
4. Develop strategies for behaviorally focused educational outreach with at-risk families and individuals.
5. Analyze nutritional sufficiencies and deficiencies in existing emergency food programs and develop solutions to generate nutritionally complete, culturally acceptable diets.

The amendment of June 2004 eliminated further research on Objective 1 (the Report on Food Waste Generation in New Jersey’s Manufacturing Sector was largely completed) and Objective 3 in its entirety. These Objectives were replaced with a new Gap Analysis research component wherein geographical information systems (GIS) mapping techniques were used to analyze spatial relationships between emergency food resources and need in New Jersey in order to help identify priorities for policy and programmatic decisions. The new component included the additional task of undertaking a new survey of New Jersey emergency food providers (EFPs) to research select aspects of EFPs’ infrastructure and needs, including transportation, storage, computer and internet capacity, nutrition education, and interest in regional networking.

II. Need for This Project

Conditions of food insecurity in New Jersey are growing. According to a 2005 report published by The Association for Children of New Jersey, the trajectory of New Jersey households living in poverty is steadily increasing. This fact continues to be obscured by the co-existing wealth in the State. In 2003, New Jersey had the highest median household income in the country. However, citing reports from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, ACNJ notes that New Jersey ranks the 42nd worst in the U.S. for income parity and “child poverty increased 20 percent from 2000-2003—almost four times the national average of 4.6 percent.” The statistics in New Jersey reflect a national trend away from economic security for all. Yet New Jersey’s situation is particularly severe. Federal poverty guidelines are calculated using the cost of food alone. The guidelines do not take into consideration, e.g., the cost of housing, child care, transportation, health care, different tax burdens. In 2002, 19 percent of families with children in New Jersey were calculated to be working poor or poor according to federal classifications of low-income. However in the same year, 34 percent of New Jersey families could not afford to pay for food, housing, child care and transportation according to a Self-Sufficiency Standard that takes these costs into account. Self-Sufficiency Standards have been completed in New Jersey in 1999, 2002, and 2005. The rising self-sufficiency wage requirements are “primarily due to an increase in the cost of housing, child care, and transportation, as well as an increase in taxes.”
III. Improving Food Security in the New Jersey Food System

During this age of bio-terrorism and homeland security concerns, the concept of food security can be confusing. In 1990, the American Institute of Nutrition adopted the definition that food security is “...the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, and an assured ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways...”7 According to the Census Bureau, households showing the greatest risk for food insecurity are: a) headed by a single woman; b) have children; c) include Hispanic or African American residents; d) have incomes below the poverty line.8 Food security has been described as a function of poverty and economic health,9 where poverty is the gap between need and resources.10 Traditionally, food insecurity has been measured at the national, household, and individual level,11 with an emphasis on designing public and private non-profit programs in response.12 Three national reporting systems provide varying levels of reliability, validation, specificity, and sensitivity with regard to measuring food security: 1) the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals (CSFII); 2) the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES); and 3) the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program.13 Additional data comes from the US Centers for Disease Control (CDC)’s Behavioral Risk assessments. More recently in the US, food security has also been addressed at the community scale.14 Community food security is defined as, “a condition in which all community residents obtain a safe, culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice.”15 Since the late 1990s, USDA, US non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the academic community have collaborated on methodologies to conduct community food security assessments and evaluate community food security projects.16

The research project Increasing Food Security for New Jersey Families does not attempt to measure food security and insecurity in New Jersey. Rather, its goal is to develop an overall understanding of food sources and human need for food in New Jersey, as well as, a fiscally sound method to link sources and needs in the New Jersey food system. Food systems research addresses processes that extend from “field to plate,” and include: food production, processing, wholesaling, retailing, waste and recycling, as well as, the institutions and other factors that affect these processes.17 Emergency food systems emphasize the specific components of food systems that help low-income persons access food, for example: public sector programs like Food Stamps and WIC; non-profit projects like soup kitchens, food pantries, and urban gardens; and private-NGO partnerships that funnel food donations to food banks. When the project Increasing Food Security for New Jersey Families was initiated, the goal was to maximize the opportunities inside the New Jersey food system to source food for low-income persons. Objective 1 of the original design of the project called for the inventory and analysis of food production, manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing in New Jersey to find out where wholesome and nutritious food might be going to waste that could be captured and diverted into the state’s emergency food network. The original Objective 3 sought to develop a website that persons in the production and distribution end of the food system could use to communicate quickly and efficiently with emergency providers who could pick-up and
distribute the food while it was still fresh and useable. \textit{Spatial geography} was understood to define efficiency, i.e., efficient linkages would be defined by the closest possible spatial relationship between the availability of surplus and the emergency food provider ready and able to absorb the donated food.

Objective 1 and 3 were confounded in unexpected ways. Concerns with agro-terrorism threats complicated our efforts to inventory farmers; they resisted participation. The stretched economy meant that wholesalers moved more of their second quality products into secondary and tertiary markets instead of donating it to emergency food operations; we found little to inventory. The HPAC informed us at our first meeting with them that research on retailers was a low priority because they already had excellent established relationships with New Jersey retailers and with them, sufficiently good information. Thus, the website plan (Objective 3) that was designed to link the New Jersey food system and New Jersey emergency food providers (EFPs, soup kitchens, food pantries, etc.) was discarded. The one piece of the food system where we had some success was an inventory and survey of New Jersey food manufacturers; the research component was completed before the HPAC met for the first time.

By describing New Jersey’s \textit{emergency} food system, the Gap Analysis Report and Toolkit (Section I) achieve many of the intentions of Objective 1 and 3. The research located and mapped institutions in the food system (EFPs, WIC offices, schools with high percentages of students eligible for free and reduced price meals, Food Stamp use, WIC-authorized farm retailers) that benefit low-income State residents. This data can easily be translated (and supplemented) into a website to provide those in need with information about where they can go for food relief. Additionally, a website that mapped emergency food resources would be useful for networking among resource providers, as well as, an information source for conventional market-based members of the food system (e.g., farmers and retailers) to know where they can donate surplus foodstuffs. Indeed the potential uses of the Gap Analysis research lies at the heart of many of the recommendations that follow.

\textbf{IV. Outline of Report}

The Introduction and Overview is followed by Part One on the New Jersey Emergency Food System. Part One includes two research reports, the Gap Analysis Report and Toolkit (Section I) and Food Waste Generation in New Jersey’s Food Manufacturing Sector (Section II).

Part Two presents research on New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (EFPs). Part Two begins with New Jersey Emergency Food Providers: An Overview of Programs, Needs, and Possibilities for Regional Cooperation (Section III). The next two research reports focus on Food Pantries (Section IV) and Soup Kitchens (Section V). The final Section provides recommendations related to nutrition education for New Jersey’s Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Emergency Feeding Agencies (Section VI).
V. Summary Findings and Recommendations

The following Summary reviews the major findings and related recommendations in all six Sections of the report, Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families: Identifying Food Source, Need, and Tools for Connecting. Research findings are in normal text. Recommendations are italicized.

A. Communicating the Capacities of the Emergency Food Network in New Jersey.

The study Improving Food Security in New Jersey was prepared because insufficient information was available on emergency feeding needs and resources in the State. Indeed, we found the need and desire for this information with every group with whom we interacted throughout the course of the study. We start therefore with the finding that a communication system is necessary to share information about and between emergency food providers. Enhanced communications is strongly needed as an umbrella strategy for meeting needs. It is, therefore, subsequently woven throughout the analyses and recommendations.

A.1. Location of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (EFPs)

The first step necessary to examining the capacities of EFPs in New Jersey was to create a list of providers, as only partial lists previously existed. By January 2005, with the help of the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and NJDHS, the Rutgers research group amassed a single list of 1,121 emergency food providers in New Jersey, after screening for duplicates and closed offices. Section I, the Gap Analysis Report and Toolkit maps these EFPs. We have since identified more providers and recognize that our list is incomplete. We know that some providers, especially those that are both small and specifically food pantries, form and disappear fluidly according to the season (e.g., proximity to Thanksgiving and December holidays) and the availability of volunteer labor. Some of the original lists included the provider type (e.g., soup kitchen, food pantry, shelter, and other less well defined categories); others did not. In the first four months of 2005, Rutgers sent these providers a survey and received 463 useable responses (Section III, EFP Report). The survey responses on EFP type alternately substantiated, contradicted, or left questionable the given (as opposed to survey respondent-identified) EFP type.

Research should be conducted on an ongoing basis to track, at minimum, the existence, location, type, and contact information of emergency food providers in New Jersey.

The Gap Analysis Toolkit is described in Section I, The Gap Analysis Report and is available to NJDHS in CD form. The Toolkit provides precise street address and other EFP contact information that must be treated as confidential, unless permission is otherwise granted by the EFPs. EFP location data is sensitive. Some EFPs are small, operate with minimal, usually volunteer, staffing, and are open sporadically, e.g., once
per month, or for holidays or other special events; these EFPs cannot manage appeals for help from the general public. Some EFPs direct their services to a discrete public, e.g., residents of a town or neighborhood, congregants of a faith-based group, and persons diagnosed with HIV; some of these EFPs do not welcome general inquiries. Finally and most importantly, some EFPs feed (and sometimes house) vulnerable populations, e.g., victims of domestic violence. These EFPs’ contact information may not be shared without explicit permission.

Information on and about individual EFP providers, including their names and addresses, may not be made publicly available unless specifically authorized by the EFP. All lists provided under contract to NJ DHS carry this stipulation. All EFPs must retain the right to take their names off of public lists should they find it necessary. According to the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, referrals to non-public EFPs are best made through New Jersey Regional Food Banks or by assistance workers who have been given authorization to do so.

A.2. Different Types of EFPs

The population surveyed in the Section III Report on Emergency Food Providers received more responses from food pantries than from any other group. Of the total 463 useable questionnaire responses received, 82% (n=381) represented agencies that run food pantries; of these, 79 run other emergency food programs. Sixty-eight soup kitchen providers (15%; n=68) responded, of which 45 run other food programs. Forty shelters (9%; n=40) sent in questionnaires, of which 19 run additional food programs. Seventy-five (16%) identified the “other” category which ranged from housing projects to weather emergency shelters. Eighty-five of the respondents (18%) run multiple EFP programs, of which the soup kitchen and food pantry combination is the most common (6%; n=28). These multiple program EFPs tend to service more clients and be open more days per month than other EFPs, suggesting better infrastructure, funding, and probably tenure.

Persons working on emergency food relief do not have a common understanding of the breadth of facilities that offer emergency food relief. The consequence may be that the actual need for food and related efforts of hunger prevention are underestimated in New Jersey. To expand, 16% (n=75) of the respondents indicated that soup kitchens, food pantries, and shelters were too narrow a way of describing the places where they give away emergency food; they described their organizations as including housing, health care, job training, and childcare centers, as well as, Red Cross, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and similar centers for poised for disaster relief, as needed. Of these 75 respondents, 35 (7%) selected “other only.”

To measure the full extent of hunger prevention activities in New Jersey with increasing accuracy, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee (HPAC) should determine the breadth of organizations that deliver emergency food and make that information publicly available.
A.3. Ability to Provide Nutritionally Adequate Emergency Food

EFPs are constantly looking for higher quantities and better quality of food. The Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee members report that food donations are down as emergency food demand increases apparently due to a tightening economic market and the development of previously non-existent secondary and tertiary markets for retail and wholesale food. EFPs need help and want advice, especially from their peers, on best practices for grant writing, fundraising, and food drives, in order to obtain more and higher quality food (especially in terms of fresh fruits and vegetables, quality meats and fish, dairy products, and other calcium-rich foods; see Sections IV-VI). They also need information and the capacity to distribute food that meets the dietary needs of their clients (e.g., foods that do not exacerbate diabetes or heart disease problems; that meet halal, kosher, or vegetarian requirements; and that will be accepted by various ethnic groups).

Promote a website of mapped EFPs to members of the food industry (farmers, distributors, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers) so that they can quickly source the closest provider who might be able to use salvageable food before it goes to waste.

Encourage communication of best practices among EFP operators on food procurement.

According to the Food Pantry Soup Kitchen Reports (Sections IV and V), EFP Clients and Operators place the greatest emphasis on the need for fresh fruits and vegetables, high quality proteins, and surprisingly, bread. According to nutrient analyses of foods provided at the food pantries and soup kitchens, the EFPs most lacked calcium-rich foods (including dairy alternatives) and fresh fruits and vegetables. From a nutritional standpoint, the authors question the need for more meat because there appears to be adequate protein in less popular proteins that are available at EFPs, e.g., beans, cereals, powdered milk, and rice; however, the clients and their families would positively view increased availability of more meats and poultry.

Funding might creatively subsidize EFP access to more high quality foods, e.g., grants programs to EFPs and regional food banks.

Nutrition education should enhance protein consumption via available high protein foods via recipes and cooking instruction that are most palatable to EFP clients. Information should be developed and distributed to EFPs through print and electronic communication.

A.4. Spatial Analysis of New Jersey Emergency Food Resources and Needs

Section I, the Gap Analysis Report and Toolkit uses geographical information systems (GIS) methods to map census poverty data against emergency food resources in New Jersey. Resource-based data include New Jersey EFPs, schools whose enrollments include 20% or more of the students eligible for free and reduced priced school meals, the location of the Supplementary Nutrition for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)
program offices, WIC-approved farm retailers participating in the Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), and food stamp use by municipality. Over 150 State and County maps are developed to analyze gaps between emergency food resources and need, however, this is only the very beginning of what can be done with the accumulated data. The Gap Analysis Toolkit provides this data in digital CD form to DHS. The potential to direct the power of the Toolkit lies in the ability of hunger relief decision makers and GIS professionals to cooperate and create maps customized to specific needs.

Allowing for the confidentiality of EFPs that do not want to be publicly known, this CD can be used to:

- Strategize means of closing the gap between food resources and food need.
- Enhance nutrition education opportunities to help clients in need identify and locate food resources.
- Help parties interested in hunger relief to develop maps for analytical or practical purposes that are tailored to a territory, organization, and/or program, as needed.
- Develop a map-based website on the New Jersey emergency food system (See A.4.iii. below) to provide hunger relief organizations, their target populations, and other interested parties with a better understanding of the spatial distribution of emergency food resources in the State.

A.5. EFPs’ Work: Mentoring, Sharing, and Accessing Information

Information about the work of EFPs in New Jersey will first and foremost benefit New Jersey emergency food providers. They have much to learn from each other. Other emergency food services (e.g. Food Stamp and WIC offices) and clients need to know more about EFPs also, as well as, where they are located. To participate in an electronic network of information sharing, NJ EFPs need support for computers, internet access, and technical training.

A.5.i. Peer Support and Mentoring among EFP Staff and Volunteers

EFP directors, staff, and volunteers understand themselves to be part of a larger community of persons addressing the needs of low-income persons in the State and region. They want to learn more about each other and from each other. In the EFP Report (Section III), well over four-fifths of EFP respondents indicated an interest in regional cooperation, including a willingness to be in contact with other providers (89%; n=385), share their survey answers with other providers (92%; n=396), and be listed in a public directory in New Jersey (86%; n=370). Additional comments identified interests in cooperative food drives, learning about additional sources of donated food, fundraising, and sharing best practices in database management, office administration, and volunteer recruitment. In on-site interviews with directors and managers of soup kitchens and food pantries (See Food Pantry and Soup Kitchen Reports, Sections IV and V), each individual asked for a copy of the outcome of the research project, Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families.
Develop, support, and encourage new and existing strategies that foster communication, strategic planning, best practices, training, and peer mentoring among EFP operators using print, electronic, networking, publication, and other methods.

A.5.ii. Information for Food Insecure People Who Do Not Access EFPs

The Food Pantry and Soup Kitchen Reports (Sections IV and V) showed the surprising finding that many low-income and food insecure persons are not familiar with food pantries and soup kitchens, particularly the former. Even more persons do not know where these emergency food resources are located. Among 407 food insecure individuals interviewed at diverse urban sites away from EFPs, 35% (n=142) stated they were unfamiliar with the terms “food pantry” or “soup kitchen.”

Proactively use multiple print, counseling, and electronic outlets to publicize basic, definitional information on emergency food providers describing what they are, whom they serve, and where they are located (to the extent it is publicly available). Information on County Welfare Offices, WIC and other social service agencies, the location of WIC-authorized farmers’ markets should be introduced and defined as well.

A.5.iii. Accessing Information: For and About EFPs in New Jersey

Information about emergency food services in New Jersey is partially available from numerous websites that are not centralized under one umbrella with electronic links. Generally, this information is also not tied to low-cost and effective internet mapping and transportation software. As a result, providers, service counselors, and clients do not have a simple spatial understanding of the closest resources and the most appropriate transportation options to access them.

Develop a website to publicize the services of the New Jersey emergency food system. Include:

- Basic definitions of different kinds of emergency food and related services, including, EFPs (soup kitchen, food pantry, shelter, etc.), WIC, the WIC Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), Food Stamps, free and reduced price school breakfast and lunch programs, nutrition education, utility relief, etc.
- A GIS-based map that locates all of these emergency food services and is overlaid with street maps, public transportation routes, etc. Coordinate mapped locations with data fields for hours of operation, phone numbers, eligibility criteria, etc. Providers should have discrete access to update their operation in “real time.”
- Provide electronic links to relevant sites and literature that may be of interest to the New Jersey emergency food providers, their clients, and other interested parties, including a copy of the report, Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families.
A.5.iv. Develop EFPs’ Technical Infrastructure and Capacity

In the mailed survey to EFPs (See EFP Report Section III), three-quarters of respondents (75%; n=342) reported having a computer and 70% (n=315) claimed to have internet access. Soup kitchens and especially food pantries are much less likely to have computers and internet access as compared to shelters. Additional information suggested these figures were misleadingly optimistic. Based on written comments, we know that some part of those reporting “access” were actually describing computers and internet connection that are owned by staff, volunteers, or parent organizations (e.g., church, social agency, etc.). In such cases, these technical resources were not routinely available to the EFP because they were shared and/or not housed at the EFP office (if there is one). A reliance on computers and internet that are housed away from the EFP office involves delayed work and moving paperwork that sometimes includes confidential client information. Personal laptop computers may be prone to theft. EFPs need consistent and reliable internet access to use web-based resources effectively.

Computers and internet access additionally facilitate basic administrative functions including efficient and more confidential record keeping, research, and grant writing. Federal and other food and nutrition programs increasingly presume that consumers of and advocates for their information and services (e.g. on-line Food Stamp applications) have computers, internet access, and the technical ability to use them. Possession of additional computers and technical training in their use would allow volunteers to assist clients in completing online applications, such that they could access Food Stamps and other benefits to which they might be eligible to meet better their food needs.

Sponsor hardware, software, and technical training for EFPs interested in obtaining computers and internet access. Where possible, recruit technical trainers /mentors from the EFP community.

Develop strategies to help EFPs meet the costs of reliable and consistent internet access for web access (e.g. to download on-line Food Stamp application forms for eligible clients) and internet participation (e.g. for regional EFP communication).

As noted above, data shows that EFP operators have a clear interest in building networks with their peers. Email listserves provide a low-cost method of maintaining contact quickly and relatively inexpensively.

Encourage and provide technical support as necessary EFPs to participate in an electronic list. This might be a new list or an expansion of existing communication lists, for example, that of the Anti-Hunger Leaders organized by the Statewide Emergency Food Anti-Hunger Network (SEFAN).19
**B. Clientele at New Jersey EEPs is Increasing in Number**

Numbers of persons visiting New Jersey EFPs is rising. Preliminary data suggests that the number and percent of children and families, working poor, and new immigrant groups for an important part of this increase.

*Undertaken research to track these trends.*

**B.1. Client Load**

In the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (EFP Report, Section III), three-quarters of the respondents (75%; n=333) reported an increase in their client load from 2003-2004. Of the 19% (n=82) who report no change for that period, we know that some part of that group caps growth because they do not have the labor or the food to serve more people. This growth is consistent with reports of rise in EFP use elsewhere.

*Continue and increase basic funding support to regional food banks to subsidize the cost per pound of food purchased by EFPs.*

*Conduct ongoing annual research regarding trends for the demand for emergency food services in New Jersey.*

**B.1.i. Children and Families**

Child poverty is increasing dramatically in New Jersey. In the EFP Report (Section III), respondents reported a 43%/57%, child/adult client ratio (n=250). Unsolicited and open-ended comments address a growing and/or changing clientele base (n=12), notably an increase in families with small children. Interview responses in the Food Pantry and Soup Kitchen Reports (Sections IV and V) show that, in terms of numbers of children and families represented by the interviewed clientele, food pantries are possibly more important sources of nutrition for families, including children, than are soup kitchens. Existing and alternative programs need to be examined to respond to this need.

*Subsidize EFPs’ cost per pound of food to free money for changing budget priorities. One provider, for example, thanked the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee for its support to food banks, which in turn, lowered the cost per pound that the EFP needed to pay for emergency food and from which savings the EFP was able to buy diapers, baby food, and other items for their growing client pool of families with small children that are difficult or impossible to procure in their present budget.*

*Encourage communication among EFPs to develop Best Practices pertinent to meeting needs of children and families.*

*Encourage participation of low-income and food insecure children in free and reduced price school meal programs. EFP, WIC, and social service counselors should discuss the existence and value of this program with parents and guardians.*
B.1.ii. Working Poor

Having a job does not ensure the ability to afford basic expenses; visiting NJ EFPs and welfare assistance offices as a client does not preclude having a job. Of the food insecure persons interviewed and reported on in the Food Pantry and Soup Kitchen Reports (Sections IV and V, respectively), 22% (n=60) of those who used a food pantry were employed, 18% (n=38) of those who used a soup kitchen were employed, and 29% (n=102) of those at welfare offices, who used neither a food pantry nor a soup kitchen, were employed. Because of the high cost of housing in New Jersey and the rising cost of fuel nationally, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee directed the Rutgers study team to look specifically at the working poor in New Jersey. The working poor was defined as the population between 130% (maximum income for Food Stamp eligibility) and 200% of the U.S. Census Poverty Guidelines. (See for example, Figures 2 in each of the County maps in Section I, Gap Analysis Report.) The working poor often lives in the urban fringe, mingles with more economically secure populations and is thus relatively invisible, and has little experience in availing itself of emergency food resources.

Employers paying at or near minimum wage should be required to provide their employees with basic information that directs them to more particular details on emergency food resources in New Jersey.

B.1.iii. Changing Clientele Demographics

New demographic groups at risk of food insecurity face many challenges, e.g., social stigma and cultural reticence, language barriers, and lack of information. These clients include migrants and immigrants, as well as, the working poor more generally. For various reasons, newly at-risk households may not even consider themselves eligible for food resource support. Lack of English language ability complicates low-income persons’ access to information about available food resources, including EFPs.

Make information about food assistance programs and emergency food resources easily and broadly available in both print and electronic form.

Create a bank of persons skilled in diverse languages who can be called upon on an emergency, as-needed, basis to assist emergency food clients and providers who face language barriers in communicating. To create this bank, inventory New Jersey EFPs, food banks, WIC offices, and EFNEP and FSNEP sites to determine: a) client language needs; and b) teacher, staff, and volunteer language capacity.

Train and/or advise EFPs on how to access and prepare culturally appropriate foods.

Initiate and/or expand relationships with leadership in ethnic and cultural groups (for example, Hispanic/Latin, South Asian/Indian, and Korean) to develop strategies to make emergency food resources acceptable and less stigmatized to those in need.
**B.2. Expanding EFP Services**

Expanding EFP services is important. Soup kitchens provide the most basic resource. Food pantries may have more flexibility in both expanding and shrinking in size. All service planning must take into consideration the limitations of EFPs’ labor base.

**B.2.i. Soup Kitchens**

Soup kitchens are needed by some low-income persons in New Jersey more than are food pantries. The homeless, for example, have no place to store or cook resources they might receive from a pantry. As reported above, New Jersey has far fewer soup kitchens than it has food pantries. Soup kitchens are probably less well represented because of the higher costs of start-up, space maintenance, and trained staff. In the Soup Kitchen Report (Section V), authors could not find a soup kitchen in Gloucester County to visit. In Somerset County only one soup kitchen existed and it was not able to accommodate a visit. (See Gap Analysis, Section I, for statewide map of soup kitchens.)

*Provide seed money for soup kitchen start-ups in locations determined by the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and the Anti-Hunger Network of New Jersey.*

**B.2.ii. Food Pantries**

Food pantries can be opened with relatively little infrastructure because they generally do not require cooking facilities. Even without refrigeration, they can distribute many foods, especially processed foods (canned, dried, packaged). However, according to fluctuating needs in the community and the changing availability of volunteers, food pantries grow and fade back relatively easily.

*Because food pantries can open at some, even small, level of service with relatively little infrastructure development, they should be tracked for their relative capacity to respond to unexpected need and/or emergency or disaster situations.*

*Provide incentives for volunteer participation and food pantry sustainability to increase the viability of smaller operations, and provide sustained food pantry support to communities in need.*

**B.2.iii. Labor Support**

**Small and Large EFPs.** To understand EFP operations, it is necessary to keep their labor force in mind. Many EFPs have staff and volunteer support that is already overextended. At the same time, based on written comments, we know that some EFPs consciously stay small because their volunteer base is fragile and providers insist on providing high quality care that does not overburden their help.

*When considering options to expand EFP resources, small operations should not be overshadowed by large ones because some may have the labor capacity to absorb new programs, albeit serving small numbers.*
Volunteers. Investigating the role of EFP volunteers was not part of any of the project research components. Nevertheless, almost one out of ten respondents (9%; n=43) wrote about their volunteer workforce in the “Additional comments” section of the EFP Report (Section III). Volunteers tend to be older and often not in the best health or condition for the demanding work of moving large volumes of food. Younger persons are not “stepping up” and some EFPs are in a quandary regarding the viability of their labor support. Volunteers donate not only their time and expertise, but also the use of their vehicles and often the gas necessary for food pick-ups, the use of their computers and related technical equipment and services, non-reimbursed cell phone use, and sometimes personal storage space for food. While some volunteers have the financial luxury to donate their labor for free, others who are retired, underemployed, or on fixed income, struggle to pay the transportation costs necessary to travel to the EFP and assist.

Consider, in the planning of all new programming initiatives, the potential strengths and limitations of EFPs’ volunteer-based workforce, as described by the providers.

Reward volunteers. Provide resounding public recognition to their work without which EFPs could not operate. Provide as possible training opportunities, community credit (an unspecified EFP respondent’s suggestion), and stipends.

Help EFPs with recruitment and the development of best practice reports on managing volunteer labor forces.

Research trends in volunteer demographics to anticipate changes relevant to the development of future emergency food programs and policies.

C. Sourcing More and Better Food

EFPs struggle to access more and better food for their clients. Parallel challenges are the need for transportation and storage, especially cold storage. Sources throughout the food system need to be investigated.

C.1. Food Storage and Transportation

Food fuels EFP operations. However, without reliable vehicles that haul food when it is available and needed, and without adequate cold and dry storage to warehouse the food until cooked and distributed, an EFP cannot function. According to the EFP Report (Section III), EFPs are forced to turn away food almost twice as often because of problems with storage space (20% of the time; n=463) as they are due to transportation problems (12% of the time; n=463). This is probably because EFPs rely heavily on the use of staff and volunteers’ personal vehicles. No similar recourse exists for storage.
Consider the availability of EFPs’ storage and transportation resources when planning initiatives to improve EFPs’ access to food. Develop strategies to improve their resource infrastructure to make food access more efficient.

C.1.i. Food Storage for EFPs

Refrigerator and freezer space is in greater demand (respectively, 10% and 16% of responding EFPs need these resources and might be willing to borrow them) than dry storage (8% of responding EFPs). Cold storage is particularly important for stocking high quality food like fresh produce, dairy, meat, and eggs.

Provide funding for cold storage units.

Investigate the possibilities of community cold storage facilities for use by EFPs. Community cold storage is being investigated at present by at least one New Jersey EFP (New Brunswick).20

C.1.ii. Food Storage for EFP Clients

A challenge for EFP clients, especially for those who are homeless, is the lack of food storage space and kitchen facilities to refrigerate and cook the food they can acquire.

This underscores the previous recommendation for seed money for soup kitchens where clients can get a hot or cold meal.

Investigate and/or fund community storage (room-temperature and cold), as well as, community kitchens with stoves and/or microwaves.21

Investigate waivers to allow for the purchase of hot prepared food (e.g. hot roasted chicken) with Food Stamps for those living in extreme poverty or a high degree of food insecurity. This was recently allowed in Missouri in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and the influx of Gulf state evacuees.

C.1.iii. Food Transportation for EFPs

According to the EFP Report (Section III), providers drive to food banks and other sources to pick up about 80% of the food they distribute. Only about 20% of the food is delivered (n=268). This saves delivery costs for the EFP, however, staff and volunteers whose cars are often used, frequently bear the cost. Further, personal vehicles (and many that are owned by EFPs) are typically small or family-sized and require extra trips to food sources, adding time and gas costs that volunteers sometimes cannot afford. Use of vehicles must also be adjusted to owners’ schedules. Some EFPs also deliver food to clients or bring clients to their EFP site.

Consider a grant program to help EFPs that struggle with transportation needs to access better vehicles cooperatively or independently.
C.1.iv. Sharing Food Storage and Transportation Resources

Nine percent (n=39) of responding EFPs report sharing transportation resources. Seven (n=29) percent share food storage space. Many more (32%; n=129) indicate a general interest in borrowing or sharing. Multiple program EFPs share transportation and storage resources more often than other EFPs, suggesting that the process of borrowing and sharing takes time and labor of which most EFPs have little. Resources that some respondents would most like to borrow -- vehicles, drivers, and freezer space – are, not surprisingly, the valuables that other EFPs are least ready to share.

Develop (or build upon an existing) listserv and encourage its use so that New Jersey EFPs can request help if they have an immediate need for support (e.g., a store must suddenly unload hundreds of gallons of milk and an EFP needs both a working truck and cold storage). This might, in particular, help newer EFPs that have not developed a strong network.

Make available a web-based map of New Jersey EFPs that includes transportation overlays facilitate EFPs’ ability to plan cooperative and efficient food pick-ups.

C.2. Finding More Food in the New Jersey Food System

One of the original research project objectives was to identify and quantify, at all steps in the State’s food delivery system, wholesome and nutritious food that goes to waste before it can be made available to those in need of such food. As mentioned earlier, it was not possible to pursue this objective on farms because of privacy and bioterrorism-related concerns; and, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee informed us that they already had good connections among wholesalers and retailers. Research on food manufacturers was undertaken (Section II). Information related to farms, farmers’ markets, and gardening, including the availability of produce for sale to low-income populations, is nevertheless shared here for the benefit of the reader.

C.2.i. Farms

“Civic agriculture” is a term coined by Thomas Lyson (2004) to refer to the reconnection of farms, food, and community.22 New Jersey farms experience tremendous pressure from development interests, weather, and the fluctuating markets. Many participate, nevertheless, in the time-honored tradition of gleaning, whereby they allow recovery of unpicked produce from their fields post-harvest. Participation varies by year. Most farms do not have the capacity to respond to diverse requests for food. To this end, the New Jersey Agricultural Society houses the Farmers Against Hunger (FAH) initiative. FAH acts as a clearinghouse for farmers and emergency food providers. Its mission is to collect and distribute surplus fruits and vegetables from New Jersey farmers to those in need through local community organization.23

Support the activities of Farmers Against Hunger and the New Jersey Agricultural Society.
According to a page on the USDA American Marketing Service website, community supported agriculture (CSA) is a farm marketing strategy wherein a “farmer sets a price for a share of the year's produce from his/her farm, then recruits a group of participants who purchase a membership in the farm, whereby they receive a weekly supply of fresh-picked produce.” CSAs are already a fixture in New Jersey and are growing in number. Many CSAs have incorporated models that include a free share for a local soup kitchen (e.g., the Cook Student Organic Farm, Rutgers University), payment schedules, and sliding fee scales with a limited number of shares for low-income members.

Consult with interested EFPs and other parties interested in a low-income food buying cooperative, and New Jersey farmers who presently are, or who are considering, establishing CSA marketing strategies, with the objective of advancing opportunities for New Jersey farm sales and purchases that mutually benefit New Jersey farmers and low-income residents.

C.2.ii. Farmers' Markets

Farmers’ retail operations at markets, farmstands, youth farmstands, and tailgate operations provide the freshest and highest quality fruits and vegetables that are sorely needed in all diets, but that are often lacking in low-income persons’ diets. Fresh produce is one of the foods EFPs have the most difficulty sourcing, paying for, and storing. Through the Supplementary Nutrition for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program offices, WIC runs the WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) wherein WIC annually provides $20 vouchers to each WIC-eligible mother and each child five years old and under, as well as, to low income seniors, for the purchase of fruits and vegetables at New Jersey WIC-approved farm retailers. While small, this program offers unusual opportunities for low-income persons to purchase very healthy and fresh produce that is important for children’s health and critical to introducing fresh produce at an early age. Unfortunately, the redemption rate of these vouchers is low for families, 61% for families; 91% for seniors. As can be seen in the County Figures 6 maps (See Gap Analysis Report, Section I), one reason for the low redemption rate is the distance between WIC offices where coupons are distributed and the location of the WIC-approved farm retailers.

Provide information at EFPs to encourage eligible persons to acquire FMNP vouchers, to redeem them, and to seek assistance as necessary in accessing the farm retailers.

Encourage more farm retailers to participate and to locate markets near WIC offices.

Encourage mobile farm tailgate operations to frequent WIC office locales and work with local health authorities to streamline relevant requirements for farmers.

Low-income New Jersey residents shop at farmers’ markets but presently cannot pay with their Food Stamps. Of the clients interviewed at food pantries (n=80), soup kitchens (n=77), and Board of Social Services offices (n=197), 24% (n=84) got produce from a
farmers’ market in the last year (Sections IV and V). Many States have experimented with ways for farmers’ market retailers to use electronic benefit transfer (EBT) technologies to accept Food Stamps from low-income (and other) shoppers. Although it conducted some initial tests with the technology, New Jersey has not yet successfully applied it. New York State serves as a local model for replication of successful implementation of EBT technologies at farmers’ markets.³¹

Work with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture, farmers’ market leaders, and farmers to realize the capacity of farmers’ market retailers to use EBT technology to accept Food Stamps (and other credit and bank resources).

The Youth Farm Stand (YFS) Program was begun at Rutgers in New Jersey by Dr. Michael Hamm (now at Michigan State University), the original author of the *Improving Food Security for New Jersey* research proposal. The YFS program hires young people from low-income urban communities and teaches them entrepreneurial skills, knowledge about the New Jersey food system, and basic nutrition, and provides them with jobs in-season selling New Jersey grown fruits and vegetables. This project links low-income populations with nutrition education and job training in a project that imbues principles of healthy eating beyond the emergency food system. Some YFS were aligned with the WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), see above. YFS depends on local organizations to fundraiser annually for their local administrative costs. Since 2002, this program has not increased in size or scope.

Review and expand the Youth Farm Stand project initiative. Consider strategies to revitalize funding for this program.

C.2.iii. Local Production: Gardens

Urban and rural gardening has the potential to produce increased contributions of high quality fresh fruits and vegetables to New Jersey residents of all income levels, including low-income residents. Of the clients interviewed at food pantries (n=80), soup kitchens (n=77), and Board of Social Services offices (n=197), 14% (n=48) grew food in a home or community garden in the last year (Sections IV and V). Local gardening does not replace EFPs’ and their clients’ needs for food. Rather, gardens provide a seasonally-limited supplement of high quality food that is in short supply and high demand at New Jersey EFPs. At the national³² and New Jersey state levels,³³ local food production is being incorporated into strategies to increase community food security. Gardening contributes to child and adult nutritional health, provides a valuable opportunity for exercise, a positive environment for mental outlook, and “builds community.”³⁴ Hazards from chemicals or heavy metals must and can be addressed.³⁵

Where possible, EFPs can start demonstration or container gardens on their property both to increase their fresh fruits and vegetables and encourage their clients with access to private or public open space to think of relatively easy ways to grow produce of their own.
Encourage EFPs to incorporate a “Plant-A-Row” program in their town or region whereby home growers set aside some of their production for a local pantry or soup kitchen. The Franklin Food Bank in Franklin, New Jersey (actually, a food pantry) serves as a New Jersey model for both growing on-site and initiating the Plant-A-Row program in New Jersey.

Support community garden and urban agriculture projects in and near low-income communities.

Support school-based garden programs in low-income communities to familiarize students with high quality fresh produce, its nutritional value, and the basic skills to grow fruits and vegetables.

C.2.iv. Manufacturers

The Report on New Jersey’s Food Manufacturing Sector (Section II) highlights findings generated from an initial list of 582 manufacturers, from which 192 returned completed surveys (response rate 44%). The survey queried the amount and type of food-related waste that was each facility produced on a weekly basis and asked about related disposal methods. The majority said that food-related waste from their operations is not suitable for hunger relief programs. Only 18% (n=32) are presently sending food to hunger relief programs. Many that are not presently participating in a hunger relief program would be interested in learning more about these opportunities. Of those that agreed to be contacted and who wanted to learn more about hunger relief, a list of 71 New Jersey food manufacturers was generated and provided with contact information to NJ DHS.

Contact New Jersey food manufacturers that are interested in learning more about hunger relief programs and who stated that they were willing to be contacted. By consensus of the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and the NJ DHS, the list of these manufacturers shall be used for outreach by New Jersey Regional Food Banks. Limiting the distribution of this list is intended to avoid burdening the manufacturers with multiple requests for help.

Provide a website that encompasses the mapped locations of EFPs willing to have a public profile so that interested food manufacturers will have available contact information regarding those EFPs closest to them. Ideally, this information will reduce research costs for manufacturers seeking to find a home quickly for food that is appropriate for healthy human consumption and that the manufacturers cannot use.

C.2.v. Wholesalers and Retailers

Wholesalers and retailers, including restaurants and cafeterias, occasionally need or want to dispose of food that is appropriate for healthy human consumption. Sometimes, however, the food is discarded because the food industry does not know, or have the time to investigate, alternate options for disposal. Providing easily accessible location and contact information on EFPs (willing to be publicly known) would reduce investigation costs. While members of the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee already have very
good relations with the food industry, the publication of an EFP location and contact list might, in particular, benefit small EFPs that do not have time and resources for outreach to potential wholesale and retail food donors.

*A website that encompasses the mapped locations of EFPs willing to have a public profile, will provide interested wholesalers and retailers with contact information to those EFPs closest to them. Ideally, this available information will reduce research costs for wholesalers and retailers seeking to find a home quickly for food that is appropriate for healthy human consumption and that they cannot use.*

**D. Nutrition Education and Information**

Nutrition education is offered in many different forms and in many different sites across New Jersey, including at EFPs, in WIC offices, in schools, and in other locations. WIC, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) are federal programs that reach the most New Jersey low-income residents. EFPs, Food Stamp offices, and other social service agencies have the capacity to provide important nutrition information, such as where to go for emergency food resources; many do provide this and related nutrition education.

**D.1. Background**

Nutrition education is important for everyone in order for them to learn how to optimize nutrition through participating in food assistance programs for which they are eligible and through an improved ability to make wise food choices within limiting constraints. Nutrition education and information also complements other emergency food services by teaching strategies to achieve the best possible dietary quality on restrained resources, and to maintain food sufficiency and avoid hunger. Enhanced food security is taught through practical education aimed toward improving: dietary quality, access opportunities for food and other available assistance programs, food safety, and shopping and resource management behaviors.

**D.2. Nutrition Education at EFPs**

Nutrition education can be accomplished both through formal classes and through less formal information provided via handouts or posted materials. In response to survey questionnaires mailed to EFPs (reported in Section III), only 12% (n=54) of the 463 respondents claimed that they presently offer nutrition education classes, although 44% (n=180) would like to. During personal interviews, when food pantry directors were asked if they would like to receive nutrition education print materials that could be distributed to their clients, nearly all (90%; n=19; Food Pantry Report, Section IV) replied yes. Asked the same question, all soup kitchen directors answered, yes (100%; n=19; Soup Kitchen Report Section V). Those directors who had computers and internet access (food pantry directors: 71%; n=15; soup kitchen directors: 90%; n=17) all indicated that they would download, print, and use nutrition education handouts that would be sent via links to a website. Three additional directors who did not have on-site
internet access, said they would access such resources elsewhere (See Sections IV and V, as well as, VI).

*Develop a section on the statewide emergency food assistance website that will include educational resources for EFPs to start-up and/or expand their on-site nutrition education activities. Simple flyers could be prepared and posted for EFPs to download. As per written survey suggestions and comments, specific information could be included related to nutrition and health (e.g., for nutrition and HIV). Additionally, the website could post professional opportunities for EFPs, e.g., to be trained as a trainer in nutritional counseling.*

Less than half of the EFP respondents (EFP Report, Section III) now provide information on nutrition programs including food stamps (46%; n=212), Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC; 38%; n=176), the free and reduced school lunch and breakfast program (14%; n=63), and other related nutrition information (21%; n=99). Compared to other EFP types, shelters demonstrate the highest participation in providing nutrition information. This maybe a function of mandate; we know that many shelters are required by their various funders to have their clients apply for Food Stamps. Three times as many EFPs supply WIC and food stamp information as provide literature on free and reduced school lunch and breakfast programs.

*Investigate the finding that EFPs do not strongly publicize free and reduced school meal programs and ensure that they do, where appropriate (i.e., where children and families are represented in the clientele).*

*Provide education regarding access to online applications or pertinent resources and programs to volunteers and staff who work at emergency feeding sites, so they can assist patrons in applying for benefits for which they may be eligible.*

The food pantry report (Section IV) revealed that some available foods are commonly going unused due to lack of familiarity in cooking them and surfeit availability (e.g., periodically with breakfast cereal). The include beans, cereals, powdered milk, and rice.

*Provide nutrition education through the provision of recipes and cooking instruction in order to enhance bean, powdered milk and rice use through palatable means. Distribute related educational materials to clientele. Suggestions should be shared on alternate uses for breakfast cereals, e.g., trail mix snacks or breading for chicken or fish.*

A study of the nutrient value of food that is served at food pantries and soup kitchens was conducted in the related Reports (Sections IV and V). Results suggest that EFPs fail to meet client needs in terms of adequate fruit, vegetables, and calcium-rich food intake. The amount of fat and Calories was high, but difficult to judge because, in the case of soup kitchen clients for example, the meals studied might comprise a client’s sole or major intake of food for the day.
Provide nutrition education at EFPs that includes strategies for clients to supplement their diets with calcium-rich foods (including dairy alternatives) and fresh fruits and vegetables, including participation in WIC and the Farmers Market Nutrition Program, as eligibility allows. Additionally, education directly applicable to the caloric and fat content of foods in food packages distributed and client energy needs may be warranted.

**D.3. Nutrition Education through EFNEP and FSNEP Programming**

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) offer a series of classes with measurable impacts. Employing these programs ensures the dissemination of research-based advice, a component of all programs that are part of the Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension at Rutgers University. The New Jersey teaching sites that provide EFNEP and FSNEP programs are mapped in the Gap Analysis Report (Section III). The majority of the EFNEP and FSNEP Education Sites are located in urban cities in the northeast, New Brunswick and Trenton in the central region, and Camden in the southwest. The EFNEP program is also concentrated in southern Cape May County and FSNEP is additionally located in Cumberland, Monmouth, northern Ocean, Warren and Hunterdon Counties. Neither EFNEP nor FSNEP teaching sites were available in Atlantic, Bergen, Morris, Salem, and Sussex Counties at the time this report was written; however, the FSNEP program was scheduled for expansion into Salem County in federal fiscal year 2006. While there is good regional distribution of teaching sites in Essex and Passaic, the density of service is overwhelmed by the population in need. EFNEP has been funded at approximately the same level for more than 35 years, and is a shrinking program. For FSNEP, funding is less a problem than simple space availability, as the federal government matches all local contributions including the value of teaching and office space provided.

Facilitate expansion of nutrition education programs, particularly in counties underserved by FSNEP and EFNEP programs. Assistance in the form of free office space, as well as, minimal start-up costs is necessary for this to happen. A relatively low cost strategy to expand services might be to take advantage of the existing federal support for the FSNEP program. Additionally, the EFNEP and FSNEP programs have, and may be willing to develop more, curriculum materials that should continue to be shared with EFPs.

**E. Recommendations for Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and NJ DHS**

In honor of requests made by virtually all food pantry and soup kitchen directors interviewed (Sections IV and V), as well as, the many unsolicited comments made on the mailed survey to emergency food providers (Section III), we recommend that this report be widely distributed to EFP directors and other interested parties throughout the State of New Jersey. Because of its length, we encourage making it available in an electronic form, ideally from the proposed website from whence it could be downloaded.
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Recommendation: A full-time permanent position should be created in the New Jersey Department of Human Services for someone to work on behalf of community food security and emergency food provision in the State. Approval of this staff line would show recognition for the critical nature of hunger prevention work on behalf of an expanding population of low-income New Jersey residents.

Recommendation: Develop a Best Practices Study of the New Jersey County Comprehensive Emergency Assistance Service (CEAS) committees be conducted to promote a state-level discussion on how CEAS offices can better coordinate their services with EFPs’ needs. Some EFPs (Section III) stressed how heavily they rely on county services for food relief resources. County CEAS committees vary dramatically in terms of efficiency and service; some EFPs work with more than one CEAS committee because their services cross county lines.

Recommendation: In concert with efforts to promote Community Food Planning among professional planners, geographers, and community development advocates, work with municipal planners in New Jersey to encourage them to include community food security in their long range development plans.38

G. Recommendations for NJ State Dietetic Association

Registered dietitians and nutritional sciences students and graduates represent strong, largely untapped resource bases for New Jersey emergency feeding sites. The following are some recommendations regarding how these groups may assist EFPs. These recommendations should be considered for initiation via State resources to establish formalized linkages.

Recommendation: Registered dietitians and nutrition students and graduates, living within close proximity of pantries and soup kitchen locations, should be recruited as volunteers to do nutrient analyses to assist emergency feeding sites, and help them better understand their particular needs. Such analyses would assist individual EFPs in assessing the nutrient contributions they make to their clients’ diets, as well as aide them in identifying foods and food groups they may want to target for food drives, when possible. The nutrient analysis work done in this study should be used as a model for more comprehensive analyses, i.e., where non-packaged foods are weighed, foods are logged on a number of days during various seasons of the year, and food packages are analyzed according to the number of people and meals they are intended to serve. Such analyses could be performed and explained to food pantry directors and/or personnel.

Recommendation: Registered dietitians and nutrition students and graduates, should be recruited to promote education among pantry clients, provide support for nutrition education volunteers, or to do direct teaching.
Recommendation: Registered dietitians and nutrition students and graduates, should be recruited to assist with making nutritionally sound, dietary recommendations in accordance with cultural food practices. These recommendations could be used by EFPs to enhance their outreach to potentially under-served audiences.

Recommendation: Annual funding should be provided to the New Jersey Dietetic Association for their Annual Conference to fund a speaker to inform New Jersey Dietitians about State hunger prevention efforts and ways they could assist/volunteer.

VI. Rutgers Research Team

Anne C. Bellows, Ph.D., Principle Investigator, is a geographer and planner who works as a Research Associate at the Food Policy Institute, Rutgers University and as an Adjunct Professor at Cook College, Rutgers and the John C. Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Seton Hall University. Dr. Bellows specializes in research on community activisms and human rights related to food security, environmental management, and health. Her research in the U.S., Poland, and other countries looks, i.a., at health benefits and risks of urban agriculture and community food security. She is the author of over 50 project reports and published articles and chapters and has been invited to lecture at over 25 academic and organizational events. In New Jersey, she serves as a member of the Health Task Force of the Healthier New Brunswick 2010 Initiative and the Board of Directors of the Rutgers Community Health Foundation.

Brian Schilling, Co-Principle Investigator, is Associate Director of the Food Policy Institute and Adjunct Instructor in the Department of Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics at Cook College, Rutgers University. Much of his research has been focused on New Jersey farm viability and agricultural economic development at the urban-rural fringe. In recent years, his research focus has broadened to also include food system security and bioterrorism, and other policy issues in the food system. Throughout his career Mr. Schilling has worked closely with the agricultural and food industries and has served on a number of industry and government task forces and working groups. He is the author of 80 papers and briefings on various issues relating to the food and agricultural system and has given more than 40 invited lectures to academic, business, government, and industry groups.

Lucas Marxen, Co-Author, is a Research Analyst at the Food Policy Institute. Mr. Marxen received a Masters in City and Regional Planning from the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy in 2003, where he specialized in land use issues and physical planning. Much of his research involves the use of analytical tools such as GIS technology and multivariate analysis to address planning and policy issues in New Jersey. In recent years, his research and publications have focused on such areas as agricultural viability and economic development, food security, and biosecurity issues involving the food supply.
Debra Palmer Keenan, Ph.D., Co-Author, is an Associate Professor/Extension Specialist in Community Nutrition residing in the Departments of Nutritional Sciences and Extension Specialist at Rutgers University. She wears many hats at Rutgers, including: Associate Director of the Nutrition and Food Security Program at the Food Policy Institute; Director of the NJ Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program; and, State Coordinator for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Dr. Keenan also is also active in teaching and research specifically geared toward household food security and educational issues encountered when delivering nutrition education to the public, most specifically limited resource urban populations.

Audrey Adler, Co-Author, currently conducts and coordinates many community-based nutrition studies at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey working on projects sponsored by both government and private organizations. Before coming to nutrition and academia, Audrey worked for twenty years in the business sector, where she designed and managed computer software projects, among many other things; and, also worked in the food service industry as a chef at the corporate headquarters of an international company. Audrey has completed the educational requirements to become a Registered Dietitian, and will have completed her Masters of Science in Nutrition by the end of 2005.

The development of this report also benefited tremendously from the help of Food Policy Institute staff, especially student researchers, Seada Avdovic and Melanie Daniels, as well as, administrators, Wendy Stellatella and Miranda Vata, and new student help, Chandani Patel and Karolina Zagajewska.
Endnotes


2 Ibid. p. 2. Referenced from Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2004. *Working Hard, Falling Short*. This measure is based on a comparison of the top and bottom quintile of earners.


4 Op cit. at 1. p.1. ACNJ writes that federal classification of low-income is less than $36,200 for a family of four.
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See also the USDA Community Food Projects Program, [http://www.csrees.usda.gov/nea/food/in_focus/hunger_if_competitive.html](http://www.csrees.usda.gov/nea/food/in_focus/hunger_if_competitive.html), a project inside USDA’s Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service and funded through 1996 Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act (FAIR).

Ibid.

See also Community Food Security Website, [http://foodsecurity.org/views_cfs_faq.html](http://foodsecurity.org/views_cfs_faq.html).


For the evaluation of Community Food Projects, see: National Research Center, Inc. with coordination by USDA Community Food Projects Program] Venice, CA: Community Food Security Coalition. (http://foodsecurity.org/pubs.html#cfp_eval).


As reported in Sections IV and V, 407 people were interviewed in diverse New Jersey urban centers away from emergency food provider establishments. From that group, 142 (35%) were not familiar with soup kitchens or food pantries. Of the 142:

77 (19%) were not familiar with either soup kitchens or food pantries.
31 (8%) did not know what a food pantry was (but had heard of soup kitchens)
34 (8%) did not know what a soup kitchen was (but had heard of food pantries).

http://www.sefan.org/


See multiple resources, e.g. Food Share Kitchen [http://www.foodshare.net/kitchen07.htm](http://www.foodshare.net/kitchen07.htm); and Community Kitchens, Building Community Around Food, [http://www.communitykitchens.ca/](http://www.communitykitchens.ca/).


See Farmers Against Hunger, Coordinator Judy Grignon, New Jersey Agricultural Society, PO Box 331, Trenton, NJ 08625. Tel: 609-462-9691; 609-394-7766; email: jgrignon2000@yahoo.com [http://www.state.nj.us/agriculture/agsociety/fah.htm](http://www.state.nj.us/agriculture/agsociety/fah.htm).


Community Supported Agriculture in New Jersey, [http://aesop.rutgers.edu/~njuep/csof/csamap.html](http://aesop.rutgers.edu/~njuep/csof/csamap.html).

Cook Student Organic Farm at Rutgers, [http://aesop.rutgers.edu/~njuep/csof/](http://aesop.rutgers.edu/~njuep/csof/).
Just Food is an organization in NYC that has developed a network of CSAs linking NYC consumers and local farms. Just Food has emphasized the need for low-income options and has helped form buying clubs and other low-income membership strategies; see, http://www.justfood.org/csa.

In New York City and elsewhere, faith-based organizations that do not already run an EFP have organized CSA buying clubs for their membership where the membership includes many low-income persons. The organization Just Food (ibid) helps to connect these incipient buying clubs with regional farmers interested in starting or expanding CSAs. See reference to Cook Student Organic Farm, op cit at Compare also to approach at commercial WinterGreen Farm in Noti, Oregon, http://www.wintergreenfarm.com, and http://www.wintergreenfarm.com/fflc2.html.


Conversations with Ms. Dorothy Ngumezi, Research Scientist and Program Coordinator for the New Jersey WIC Farmstand Project, Department of Health and Senior Services, June-September 2005. Percents are for the 2004 growing season.


Ibid.

“Plant-a-Row” Project; http://www.gardenwriters.org/par.


Both the Journal of Planning Education and Research and the Progressive Planning Journal had special issues on food and planning in 2004.
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I. Executive Summary

The Gap Analysis Report on Emergency Food Needs and Resources in New Jersey is one of several components of the research project, *Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families* that has been prepared for the New Jersey Department of Human Services (NJDHS) and the New Jersey Governor’s Appointed Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee (Committee) by Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Although *Improving Food Security* was initiated in July 2002, the Gap Analysis Project was one of several research projects considered by NJDHS and the Committee during the second year. The Gap Analysis Project began in July 2004. The objective of the Gap Analysis Report was intended to aid planning and policy development on targeting resources to underserved food-insecure persons. The Report employs a research method that allows concentrations of poverty and emergency food resources to be mapped in order to identify visually the discrepancies between food needs and service delivery.

The Gap Analysis Report reflects on an electronic library built by the authors that includes data on New Jersey emergency food resources and needs. In the first part of the Report, an overview of the New Jersey-wide datasets is presented and a series of county-scale need-and-resources relationships are analyzed. In the second part, the structure of the Gap Analysis Toolkit, i.e. the library of emergency food variables relevant to New Jersey, is introduced. Need-based datasets originate from 2000 U.S. Census reports on poverty. Resource-based data include New Jersey emergency food providers (EFPs), schools whose enrollments include 20% or more of the students eligible for free and reduced school meals, the location of the Supplementary Nutrition for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program offices, WIC-approved farm retailers participating in the Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), and Food Stamp use by municipality.

The Gap Analysis Toolkit converts the electronic library of data on New Jersey emergency food resources and needs to a CD format that is included for NJDHS as an Appendix to the Gap Analysis Report. The Report provides only the beginning of possible analyses on the library of data. We hope that it will be used and expanded upon. In its CD format, further analysis requires the combined capabilities of knowledge of New Jersey emergency food issues and capacity in mapping software. We encourage consideration of wider and simpler dissemination, for example through the development of a New Jersey Food Security Website that, among many possibilities, would allow viewers to easily locate emergency food resources in the State.

Applying Gap Analysis data benefits from additional information sources. Data show an increase in household poverty in general, and children in poverty in particular. According to a 2005 report published by The Association for Children of New Jersey, the trajectory of New Jersey households living in poverty is steadily increasing. The number of children living in families receiving welfare increased 4% from 2003 to 2004 and 11% more children were enrolled for Food Stamp benefits in 2004 than in 2000. Additional evidence of the number of
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children living in poverty was uncovered in open-ended comments in the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (Section III). Some respondents provided unprompted narratives on how they cater to increasing numbers of children. Interview responses in the Food Pantry and Soup Kitchen Reports (Sections IV and V) show that, in terms of numbers of children and families represented by the interviewed clientele, food pantries are possibly even more important sources of nutrition for families, including children, than are soup kitchens. Soup kitchens, on the other hand, are critical to the homeless who have no or limited access to cooking and refrigeration facilities, yet they are outnumbered by food pantries, 4 to 1.

The Gap Analysis finding that stands out foremost is that, both on a statewide and a county scale, institutional emergency food resources cluster in urban centers where the population density and the number of food insecure persons are highest. This is particularly noticeable in the case of EFPs which depend on local resources to survive, but is also the case in stronger institutions like WIC and the Food Stamp Program. While that makes sense in terms of efficiency in reaching large numbers of clients, the pattern results in a systemic disadvantage to more rural and suburban persons also living in and near poverty. Program efficiency however, in terms of reaching the greatest number of clients, should not be the only way to evaluate the effectiveness of emergency food programs. Policy to support and/or expand these resources should, for example, balance the needs of the rural and suburban poor who often have greater transportation barriers with the needs of more densely populated urban poor. Future efforts should develop strategies to bring resources that are more available in the State’s cities out to low-income rural and suburban residents.

At the same time, our data show that the numbers of persons visiting New Jersey EFPs is rising and EFP directors are overwhelmed in urban and rural areas alike. As a Research Team, we recommend creative strategies to overcome the gap between food resources and need including expansion of EFP services. We particularly recommend providing seed money for soup kitchens which are limited in number and provide critical relief to homeless populations who, without refrigeration or cooking privileges, can benefit little from a large portion of food provided by food pantries. For this reason, authors of the Gap Analysis Report include a map and related analysis specifically on soup kitchens (both soup kitchen “only” and soup kitchens that operate with food pantries, shelters, etc.) in the State. Food pantries are much more numerous; they usually require less infrastructure to operate. At a rudimentary level (e.g., those that are very small, operate sporadically, and/or house no refrigeration), food pantries open (and close down) relatively easily, making them additionally important EFP resources to consider for expansion strategies. (See section III for an analysis on 463 EFP respondents and type of EFP.)

While institutional emergency food resources tend to be clustered in urban areas with some very important ones in suburban and rural areas, food that could be moved into the emergency food system is grown, raised, and caught mostly in New Jersey rural areas, but also in suburban and urban small lots, plots, and green houses. New Jersey offices of the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) participate in the WIC & Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Programs to provide WIC recipients and low-income seniors vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). Experience shows that the closer the proximity of approved farm retailers to WIC offices, the greater possibility recipients have to cash their
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vouchers. Monmouth County is by far the best example of how farm retailers and WIC offices can be successfully paired. Other retail and household-based production strategies to bring fresh produce into urban (and rural) low-income communities should be considered, including community gardens and plant-a-row programs. These programs can be added to the Gap Analysis Toolkit.

In the Gap Analysis Report (Section I), we learned and mapped what was expected, that there is a high eligibility of students (k-12) for free and reduced school meals where there is high poverty. We have also learned, however, that there is higher eligibility than there is participation in these subsidized school meal programs. This means that an important food resource is not being fully utilized. In the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (Section III), we learned that three times as many emergency food providers (EFPs) supply WIC and Food Stamp information as provide literature on free and reduced school lunch and breakfast programs. Thus, the participation of school students eligible for free and reduced school meals should be mapped to determine where children living in and near poverty are not taking advantage of this school-based program. Barriers to participation should be studied. Strategies to promote this important nutrition program should include education to parents and schools. Venues for highlighting use of school meal programs might include WIC program offices, County Welfare offices, emergency food providers, and EFNEP and FSNEP teaching sites. Preliminary data shows that the base of New Jersey EFP-clientele appears to be shifting towards children and families. This change should be further studied to determine needs and trends.

Nutrition education is important for all income groups in order for them to learn how to optimize nutrition through wise food choices. In the case of low-income groups, nutrition education also teaches strategies to achieve the best possible dietary quality on restrained resources, and to maintain food sufficiency and avoid hunger. The New Jersey teaching sites of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) are mapped in the Gap Analysis Report. EFNEP and FSNEP are different programs with different missions. (Please see Part III of the Gap Analysis Report, State Level Analysis, for further explanation, as well as, Section VI Nutrition Education Recommendations.) The majority of the EFNEP and FSNEP Education Sites are located in urban cities in the northeast, New Brunswick and Trenton in the central region, and Camden in the southwest. The EFNEP program is also concentrated in southern Cape May County and FSNEP is additionally located in Cumberland, Monmouth, northern Ocean, Warren and Hunterdon Counties. Neither EFNEP nor FSNEP teaching sites were available in Atlantic, Bergen, Morris, Salem, and Sussex Counties at the time this report was written; however, the FSNEP program was scheduled for expansion into Salem County in federal fiscal year 2006. While there is good regional distribution of teaching sites in Essex and Passaic, the density of service is overwhelmed by the population in need. All other counties can be characterized as having more urban-based education sites that might not be readily available to low-income individuals who live at a distance and face additional transportation challenges. Expansion of nutrition education in New Jersey needs to address counties and sub-county rural areas where there are no nutrition
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3 Conversations with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. Participation in free and reduced school meal programs was not available within the time frame of the study.

4 Data was not available during the creation of this study and report.
education services. At the same time, existing program services should be evaluated for their ability to expand.

Food Stamp use is mapped by municipality. We know that use is lower than eligibility. The question remains, how to increase enrollment and use of the Food Stamp Program. Each County has only one Welfare Office where clients apply for and receive Food Stamps. Because on-line enrollment is now possible, emergency food providers (EFPs), especially shelters, have been tapped for assistance in enrolling Food Stamp eligible persons. Most counties have several WIC offices. Consideration should be given to encouraging WIC offices, especially those at a distance from the single Welfare Office, to help eligible WIC clients enroll in Food Stamp programs. Presently, WIC offices only provide referral information to the local county Welfare Office. A challenge to this recommendation is that almost none of the WIC offices presently have the capacity, i.e., internet connections, to help Food Stamp eligible persons enroll.

This report provides a general analysis of emergency food needs and resources in New Jersey and its counties. Future use of the Toolkit should focus on sub-regional and local level analysis, for example, to identify organizations that may be willing to combine efforts to address a common concern in a given area. Like any library, The Gap Analysis Toolkit requires maintenance for it to remain a useful resource. Census data will need to be updated in 2010. Future datasets might include more detailed poverty and population data including custom sets available for a fee. Additional datasets of interest might be public and private transportation routes, other school meal programs like breakfasts, after-school snacks, and summer programs, and community gardens.
II. Background

Overview

Food insecurity challenges many individuals and families in New Jersey. Considerable effort is made by government and private organizations to provide aid to those people facing hunger issues. Often it is difficult for these organizations to determine where populations in need reside and what resources may already exist that they can tap into. One strategy to assess need and target limited resources is to understand where needs and resources are located geographically.

Gap analysis is a research method that allows concentrations of poverty and emergency food resources to be visually apparent on a map in order to identify discrepancies between food needs and service delivery. Gap Analysis utilizes GIS (geographical information systems) mapping methods and technology to present complex (multi-layered) data in a relatively easy-to-understand and compelling manner. The research method facilitates planning and policy development to focus on how to prioritize the extension of resources to underserved food-insecure persons. Gap Analysis supports advocacy work because the visual element of maps supplements arguments in a way that text often cannot.

Gap analysis builds a library of data that can be accessed for the development of specific reports. It operates much like more familiar hard copy libraries and resources on the internet. We can describe how to use a library or the internet and we can go to them to research and write about specific topics. A full analysis of a library or the internet is not practical or even possible. On a smaller scale, the Gap Analysis Report operates in a similar way. Part One of the Report provides an overview of statewide and county level data on selected poverty and emergency food resource variables. The variables and the form of review were identified in consultation with the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee. Part Two of the Report describes the Gap Analysis Toolkit, including the Toolkit CD provided with the report. This section describes the “library of data” provided with the Report in a CD form. Use of the CD-based library also introduces the user to added variable attributes. Depending on the variable, these attributes might include, for example, phone numbers, addresses, and contact names.

Using this report to its full potential requires collaboration between persons with an understanding of and specific questions about emergency food needs and resources in New Jersey and persons with GIS-proficiency. Part One of the Gap Analysis Report presents data analysis that all readers can absorb and respond to. Reading it ideally should provoke a learning process about other research questions that might be asked of the Gap Analysis GIS library. Part Two presents the New Jersey Gap Analysis Toolkit. This section identifies the parameters of the datasets (the GIS library) that are provided with the report. Using this Toolkit requires the expertise of someone with GIS capability. Asking appropriate questions involves the capabilities and limitations of the Toolkit, someone with an understanding of emergency feeding operations in New Jersey, and the skills of someone with GIS-proficiency.
**Report Organization**

The Gap Analysis Report is organized as follows:

**Gap Analysis**
- The State Level Analysis introduces the variables investigated in the gap analysis. Each of the variables is mapped at the state level to give the reader an approximation of the variable’s distribution across the state.
- The County Level Analysis section presents smaller scale analyses that are grouped into the six regional food bank areas. Seven permutations of gap analysis are conducted for each county. From the multitude of analytical possibilities, these combinations of need and resource variables were decided upon in consultation with the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Group and the New Jersey Department of Human Services.

**Gap Analysis Toolkit**
- The Gap Analysis Toolkit is the structural core of this Gap Analysis Report. The written section is accompanied by the CD provided with this report. The CD is the library. The written section describes the source and description of the data variable and the names and codes that file the data in the CD electronic library.

**Dataset Limitations**

Gap Analysis serves as a research method that provides a powerful and alternative way of presenting data. Used alone or with complementary research strategies, it can strengthen, challenge, or help interpret existing theories. Gap analysis maps cannot direct policy making without this larger context in which they can be understood and critiqued. In this larger research project, *Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families*, the gap analysis method operates in tandem with diverse surveys that provide quantitative and qualitative data, nutrient analysis, and focus group studies that help us form recommendations for future action. Together with the experience of those familiar with emergency food provision, Gap Analysis offers a powerful tool to illustrate a framework of need, resources, and policy choices in New Jersey.

Geographic information systems (GIS) is a mapping software that relies on precise locational information to map subjects. When public entities (governments, most organizations, businesses) are mapped and those maps are publicly available, there is no problem. On the other hand, it is generally inappropriate to reveal locational information on private residences and confidential organizations. The database of emergency food providers addresses this issue as follows:

- The location of the providing organization is usually where the food is accessed. Especially in the case of small pantries, this information is often not the same as the contact address for the managers of the program.
Some shelter addresses are strictly confidential to maintain confidentiality for the clients (e.g., for victims of domestic violence). In such cases, we either do not include the shelter in the GIS database, or if separate, we may include a central office location.

As with any library, the existing datasets should be updated and can be expanded. For example, we include a 2004-2005 dataset of New Jersey schools where 20% or more of enrolled students are eligible for free and reduced lunch and breakfast programs. The next update will be available in late Spring 2006 and ideally should be appended. The most recent available poverty data from the 2000 Census is included in this report. Already it is out-of-date, but newer updates will not be available until after 2010.

Dataset expansion can (and sometimes should) be tailored to local needs. An example might entail someone working at a county level that would like to map local bus routes against existing datasets. Bus routes are critical for low-income persons wanting to gain access to geographically dispersed emergency food resources. Bus routes change frequently. It might be appropriate for that particular county to add its own bus routes dataset. The county would also know when the bus dataset needed to be updated.

Some datasets are not available or not appropriate additions for a publicly accessible Gap Analysis project. At the beginning of this project, for example, New Jersey farms that participate in gleaning programs benefiting low-income populations were to be mapped for this study as an emergency food resource. However, farmers so engaged operate presently through the New Jersey Agricultural Society. This organization relieves farmers from coping with multiple and conflicting requests for help as they manage their way through the auguries of good and bad harvest seasons. The geographic information system (GIS) program relies on precise locational information to map subjects. Revealing farmers’ locations takes away the privacy that they need and seek.

Many addresses associated with a point do not belong or do not fit in a GIS database. In the case of the farmer, the farmer does not want her/his location known. We have mapped only 1,114 emergency food providers (EFPs), although we used a mailing list of 1,1121 for the Survey of EFPs. Some EFPs did not share their GIS addresses because they provide confidential shelter to clients in distress, e.g., from domestic violence. (We were able to contact these sites using unmappable post office addresses.) Some EFPs shared their GIS addresses but stipulated that they do not want their location publicly known because they cannot accommodate more clients or because their client pool is limited by some combination of characteristics (municipal residence, health status, age, etc.). In these cases, the lists may not be made public.
III. Gap Analysis: State Level Analysis

Overview

In this section, we introduce the reader to the major datasets that are available in the Gap Analysis Toolkit. The variables included here were selected in collaboration with the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and the New Jersey Department of Human Services. Employing these variables in strategic analysis helps to evaluate the needs and resources of food insecure people in New Jersey and identify priority areas for policy intervention. The datasets include:

Needs
- Poverty Data (overview of the need variables in the Gap Analysis Toolkit)

Resources
- Emergency Food Providers (n=1,114)
- EFNEP/FSNEP Nutrition Teaching Sites (Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program; n=509)
- Schools with Greater than 20% of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced School Lunch and Breakfast (n=1,095)
- WIC Program Centers and Local Offices (Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women Infant Children Program) (n=217)
- WIC-Authorized Farm Retail Outlets (Farmers’ markets, farm stands, tailgate operations, and youth farm stands) (n=250)
- Food Stamp Use (by municipality)

The presentation in Section Three introduces a relatively basic visual introduction to the datasets at the State level. Consider, for example, the schools data. Over 1,000 New Jersey schools have enrollments with 20% or more of the student being eligible for free and reduced lunch and breakfast programs. The schools are represented by dot clusters on a half-page map in Figure 3. This map provides three separate services:

1. It illustrates the general distribution of schools with high and relatively high-subsidized school meal programs.
2. It suggests to an interested party where they might want to investigate such schools at a smaller scale, i.e., on a map that includes less land and more detail (i.e., a regional, county, or municipal map) and where it is easier to see the locations of the individual schools.
3. Interested parties can refer to the Gap Analysis Toolkit CD library for more information on the schools, for example, the addresses and phone numbers of the various schools. A GIS-accomplished researcher can also re-configure the data to include, for example, only the schools that have 50% (or any percent greater than 20) or more students eligible for subsidized school meals.
Summary of Statewide Findings and Recommendations

Much of New Jersey’s population lives in the large cities that lie along the transportation corridor that links New York City and Philadelphia. Cities clustering around Newark in the northeast and Trenton and Camden in the southwest are also home to some of the highest numbers of low-income and food insecure persons per census tract in the State. The less densely populated rural and suburban parts of New Jersey also experience relatively high numbers of persons living in poverty. Municipalities of more rural counties along the central and southern coast and in the southern part of the State experience high concentrations of food insecure people as do census tracts throughout pockets of the rural northwestern part of the State.

Emergency Food Providers
Clustered, as well as, scattered emergency food providers (EFPs) are distributed throughout the State. EFPs are generally concentrated in urban areas, although they also appear throughout the rural parts of the State. From the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (Section III), we know that EFPs come in many forms. Some are open only once or twice per month or service only one family each month. Others are open daily and welcome literally thousands every month. The characteristics of an EFP can reflect the need (e.g. a large soup kitchen in response to a large demand, or, a shelter specifically designated for persons with HIV/AIDs). The characteristics of an EFP can also reflect available resources (a food pantry will limit clients, e.g., to those who reside in a co-located town as required by funders, or e.g., to a maximum number of persons because its limited volunteer base can handle no more). From the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (Section III), the Food Pantry Report (Section IV), and the Soup Kitchen Report (Section V), we also know that the need for emergency food usually surpasses the availability and the capacity of the EFPs to meet that need. Many EFPs struggle to meet the needs of their clients. We therefore recommend creative strategies to overcome the gap between food resources and need including expansion of EFP services.

Soup kitchens are needed by some low-income persons in New Jersey more than are food pantries. The homeless, for example, have no place to store or cook resources they might receive from a pantry. New Jersey has far fewer soup kitchens than it has food pantries (Section III). Soup kitchens are probably less well represented because of the higher costs of start-up, space maintenance, and trained staff. Research uncovered only a closed soup kitchen in Gloucester County and only one soup kitchen each in Warren, Hunterdon, Somerset, and Salem Counties (See Figure III.D.) Provide seed money for soup kitchen start-ups in locations determined by the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and the Anti-Hunger Network of New Jersey.

Food pantries, especially those that are very small, operate sporadically, and/or house no refrigeration, open (and close down) relatively easily, making them additionally important EFP resources to consider for expansion strategies. Additionally, food pantries are frequented more by children and families, possibly because they have a less imposing atmosphere for children. Food pantries should be tracked for their relative capacity to respond to unexpected need and/or emergency or disaster situations. Provide incentives for volunteer participation and food pantry sustainability to increase the viability of smaller operations, and provide sustained food pantry support to communities in need.
Emergency food providers can benefit from having access to the Gap Analysis data in an easy-to-use publicly-available website format. When counseling clients, providers could consult the map layers to show their clients where to go for local available emergency food resources. Providers willing to be publicly listed could have discrete access to the website in order to update information on their operations (hours of operation, services, referral requirements, request for volunteers, etc.). *Make the Gap Analysis Report, along with the entire study, Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families available to EFPs in print, electronic, and web-based forms.*

Given limited resources, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee has shown interest in the possibilities of resource sharing among EFPs in the State. With the hope of supporting regional networking, the EFP Survey queried respondents about their general interest in regional cooperation. It further attempted to establish respondents’ transportation and storage needs and/or surpluses (as well as other goods, services, and information) that might be shared. *A website with selective entrance and data access for EFPs is one approach.* Points on the Gap Analysis maps (e.g., of EFP locations) can be linked to the survey data in cases where respondents expressly reported their interest in regional cooperation and willingness to have their responses shared with other EFPs. *Gap Analysis maps have the advantage, for example, of showing providers interested in sharing resources the distances between potential borrowers and lenders of vehicles, cold storage, etc. (Section III.) An associated listserv would help EFPs communicate with each other.*

**Nutrition Education**

Nutrition education is offered in many different forms and in many different sites across New Jersey, including at EFPs, in schools, and in other locations. The Gap Analysis project mapped the nutrition education teaching sites of the New Jersey Expanded Food and Nutrition Program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP). EFNEP and FSNEP programs offer a series of classes with measurable impacts. Employing these programs ensures the dissemination of research-based advice, a component of all programs that are part of the Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension at Rutgers University. Offices of the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) are also mapped. WIC provides nutrition counseling, however, it is limited to low-income pregnant women and women with children aged five and younger. WIC nutrition counseling is characterized by less time spent in education, but has the added benefit of food supplementation. Since these are the only nutrition education programs mapped, we cannot speak conclusively about the availability of all nutrition education in New Jersey, neither from the perspective of location nor program content. These federally supported programs are, nevertheless, undoubtedly the largest available to low-income New Jersey residents.

Mapping FSNEP and EFNEP programs has the advantage that the programs adhere to a known standard and curriculum protocol. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. EFNEP programming is available to any low-income children and low-income adult groups where 50% or more of the participants are caregivers of young children or pregnant. “Low-income” is loosely defined, but typically interpreted as those at or below 185% of the
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poverty level. FSNEP programming is available at sites that serve Food Stamp program eligible individuals exclusively, or sites that provide a good means of reaching Food Stamp eligibles and that can document that at least 50 percent of those reached will have gross incomes at or below 185% of the poverty threshold.

EFNEP and FSNEP teaching sites are located predominantly in NJ urban centers. While there are some sites located in more rural counties, neither EFNEP nor FSNEP are available in Atlantic, Bergen, Morris, Salem, or Sussex Counties; however, program expansion into Salem County has been scheduled. We know from Dr. Debra Palmer Keenan, New Jersey State EFNEP Coordinator and Director of New Jersey FSNEP programs, that one of the key problems for the FSNEP program is a lack of office space for housing personnel and supplies. Additionally, EFNEP has been funded at approximately the same level for more than 35 years, and is thus a shrinking program. For FSNEP, funding is less a problem than simple space availability, as the federal government matches all local contributions including the value of teaching and office space provided. We note that existing emergency food providers (soup kitchens, food pantries, and shelters) reported in our Survey of New Jersey EFPs that there is interest in providing (additional) nutrition education to clients at their existing EFP sites. Expansion of nutrition education programs is encouraged, particularly in counties underserved by FSNEP and EFNEP programs; however, assistance in the form of free office space, as well as, minimal start-up costs is necessary for this to happen. A relatively low cost strategy to expand services might be to take advantage of the existing federal support for the FSNEP program. Additionally, the EFNEP and FSNEP programs have, and may be willing to develop more, curriculum materials that should continue to be shared with EFPs.

Schools With 20% or More of Their Students on Free/Reduced School Meals

Schools in New Jersey that have 20% or more of their student population eligible for free and reduced school meal programs are concentrated in the northeast and southwest urban areas, in the shore counties, and in the southern part of the state. We know from the Survey of New Jersey EFPs that providers offer their clients information about free and reduced school meal programs less often than they do information about Food Stamps and WIC. In the future, it would be valuable to map participation rates in the free and reduced school lunch and breakfast programs in addition to the schools that have a significant percent (20+ percent) of their students eligible for those programs at New Jersey schools. Consideration should be given to the development of easy-to-distribute information materials that can help EFPs inform their clients about the school meal programs, as well as, after-school snacks, free milk, and summer feeding programs, where applicable.

5 Conversations with Dr. Debra Palmer Keenan, Associate Professor in the Department of Nutritional Sciences, Extension Specialist in Community Nutrition, and Director for Nutrition and Food Security Program at the Food Policy Institute, Rutgers University, 2005. Dr. Keenan is lead author of two sections of Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families, New Jersey Food Pantries, New Jersey Soup Kitchens, and Recommendations for Expanding Nutrition Education Services through EFNEP and FSNEP sites.

6 Data on participation rates of eligible students in the free and reduced school meal programs are available by special request from the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. Eligibility data is available in late Spring, however, participation rate data cannot be generated until late Summer. To date (September 2005), we have not received the participation rate data.
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The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP)
Offices of The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, better known as WIC, are relatively evenly distributed throughout all New Jersey counties with a higher concentration in the urban northeast and southwest, especially near Newark. As mentioned above under Nutrition Education, WIC provides its clientele with critical food supplements, as well as, nutrition counseling. Additionally, WIC recipients (and low-income seniors over 60 and at 185% of Federal Poverty Guidelines) are eligible for the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). FMNP participants receive vouchers with which to buy locally grown fresh fruits and vegetables from FMNP-authorized farmers who sell at farmers’ markets, farm stands, and youth farm stands. As perhaps expected, there are more farm stands in rural than in urban areas. More surprisingly, there are more community farmers’ markets located in urban rather than in suburban and rural areas. According to the NJ FMNP Program Coordinator, most of these farmers’ markets are, however, not easily accessible to WIC participants (urban and rural alike) because of transportation barriers. The 2004 redemption rate for WIC recipients was only 61%. Seniors, on the other hand, have a 91% redemption rate. Most counties provide seniors with organized transportation to the farmers’ markets. Nutritionists and site workers often accompany seniors on these trips, thereby providing the opportunity to emphasize the value of consuming fresh fruits and vegetables. Seniors may also own or have access to a personal vehicle more often than do their WIC counterparts. Additionally, seniors typically have greater experience with fresh foods than do the younger WIC parents. From growing, preparing, and eating these foods over time, seniors often value fresh fruits and vegetables in a way that is foreign to younger generations.7 Efforts should be considered to: a) recruit more farmers and enroll more farm stands into the WIC program; b) where possible, coordinate more retail farm operations near sites where WIC recipients receive their vouchers; and c) promote the WIC-authorized farm tailgate operations that might encourage farmers to travel to underserved populations.

Food Stamp Use
We have mapped the number of persons using Food Stamps in 2005 by municipality.8 Ideally we would compare this to the eligible population (individuals at 130% of poverty9) and calculate the Food Stamp use rate. Unfortunately this is not possible because our Census data is from 2000. We do know that the use rate is much less than 100%, meaning that an important source of food support is underutilized. We know that Food Stamp applications are now available on the internet, both to download and to fill out on-line. According to members of the Governor’s New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, we learned that most shelters strive to link their clients to additional support resources. Food pantries and soup kitchens often do not have the same level of technical support (computers and internet access) to enroll their clients for Food Stamps. We encourage the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and Department of

7 Conversations with Ms. Dorothy Ngumezi, Research Scientist and Program Coordinator for the New Jersey WIC Farmstand Project, Department of Health and Senior Services, June-September 2005.
8 Report of Food Stamp Use by Municipality received from Dr. Rudy Myers, Assistant Director, Office of Planning and Operations Review, Division of Family Development, New Jersey Department of Human Services. June 2005.
9 For information on poverty guidelines, see http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/05poverty.shtml. Poverty guidelines are established for administrative purposes — for instance, determining financial eligibility for certain federal programs. Poverty guidelines are issued each year in the Federal Register by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). See also, http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/05fedreg.htm.
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*Human Services to help more EFPs gain access to their own computer/s and to train EFP providers to help their clients apply for Food Stamp program eligibility.*

As mentioned above, the FMNP program promotes the consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables among select low-income populations by linking them with New Jersey farm retailers. Some states, notably our neighbor New York State, have encouraged and helped farmers to accept Food Stamps. The biggest challenge is that Food Stamp redemption requires retailers to have electronic benefit transfer (EBT) technology, i.e., the equipment to extract dollar value from the holder’s benefit card. The FNMP vouchers operate more like money and require no similar technology investment. On behalf of farmers’ markets and farm stand operators, the New Jersey Department of Agriculture has conducted some initial forays into the promotion of EBT-based transfer operations. *We suggest that the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee consider encouraging the New Jersey Department of Agriculture to continue the initiative of promoting the use of EBTs at farmers’ markets and farm stands. A test study of implementing EBTs might be considered in a county like Monmouth where there is a relatively dense availability of farm retailers and where a number of WIC offices are fairly well co-located with farm retailers. Farm retailers who already have a positive experience of accepting WIC vouchers may be most open to using EBTs to accept Food Stamps.*

**Accessing New Jersey Emergency Food Resources**

There are at least two ways to think about the location of food resources. Typically, limited resources are targeted to where the concentration of poverty is the highest. A new resource center may logically be located where the most people can be reached. This way of addressing food security concentrates the resources in low-income population-dense urban areas. Another way of allocating resources is to strive to make them equally accessible, as measured by their even spatial distribution. This second approach benefits low-income rural and suburban residents who typically have more limited access to private and public transportation and who may experience chronic problems reaching resources that are concentrated in distant urban centers. A balance of the two approaches (concentration versus equal spatial distribution of resources) may provide the most equitable, though never a perfect, distribution of limited resources.

Services and resources for food insecure persons may be available and yet not accessible. We understand that food is available in stores, yet only legally accessible if one has money to buy it. A common problem for emergency food clients is the lack of adequate transportation with which to access available goods and services.10 Lower income persons have less access to personal vehicles. Public transit alternatives are often limited. We know from comments in the Survey of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) that some EFPs will transport their clients to and from their offices because the clients have no other way to access the EFP. The maps that follow show that

---

low-income persons may need to travel significant distances to access unevenly distributed food resources. Typically, the longer the distance from home to a resource center, the more challenging is an emergency food client’s trip. As this report is being written in early Fall 2005, energy costs are escalating. It can be expected, therefore, that transportation challenges related to food access will increase for low-income New Jersey residents. The combined findings suggest that further study be conducted on transportation barriers between emergency food resources and populations in need to identify barriers and strategies to improve transportation linkages.

Although access to emergency food resources is often challenging for both urban and rural low-income residents, it may be worse for persons residing in more rural parts of New Jersey. Molnar et al. (2001) write that, “[t]he density and capacity of agencies to serve the poor is higher in urban areas than in sparsely populated rural locales where distance and dispersal tend to be barriers to supplying and accessing donated food.” As a function of food insecurity throughout the United States, the availability and nutritional adequacy of emergency food sources tends to be worse in more rural than in more urban areas (USDA 1999). The Gap Analysis Report does show that New Jersey rural areas experience both significant levels of poverty and the relative lack of emergency food resources. This indicates that rural low-income New Jersey residents generally travel farther to access emergency food resources than do their urban counterparts. With respect for extensive public outreach to the rural sector in the area of transportation support in many parts of the state, low-income rural populations still may experience more food access-related transportation challenges than their urban counterparts. While the State of New Jersey has made efforts to improve rural and suburban transportation linkages to the cities, our findings suggest that these initiatives might be revisited to specifically address the access of low-income rural populations to a diverse set of emergency food resources.

Transportation can also pose a challenge for urban populations seeking emergency food resources. In the last ten years, studies have begun to build the argument that public planners need to integrate food planning into their repertoire. Planners are encouraging each other to build an urban infrastructure that facilitates and encourages accessible relationships between food producers (gardeners and urban-area farms), a “middle” food industry (restaurants, manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, as well as, soup kitchens, food pantries, and shelters), and consumers. This urban strategy emphasizes the objectives of public health, community food security, and community well-being. Well-conceived conventional and alternative transportation networks play a critical role in these efforts to democratize access to community

---

14 See, for example, the work of the Community Food Security Coalition and World Hunger Year (WHY)’s Food Security Learning Center. Websites listed in note (4) above.
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food resources. The Gap Analysis Toolkit provides a data library that offers users a tool to expand work on community food security in New Jersey. With the development of a modest website and relatively few revisions (e.g. to protect the confidentiality of some EFPs that do not want to be publicly listed), the Gap Analysis Toolkit can be used at the local and State level to contribute to community food security planning efforts. Use of the Gap Analysis data can be expanded, for example, by encompassing transportation overlay maps. With a well designed website, use will increase exponentially and the need for electronic mapping expertise\textsuperscript{15} to manipulate the data will decrease, particularly for less complex analyses.

\textsuperscript{15} Electronic mapping expertise is necessary to manipulate geographic information systems (GIS). GIS employs multiple grids of point, line, and shape data to handle voluminous spatial data in a figurative or mapping format.
Datasets

New Jersey Population Living In and Near Poverty

This report employs 2000 U.S. Census data to describe the need for emergency food resources in New Jersey. Much of this basic data is available for free on the internet. Once downloaded, it can be converted to a database format that can be used with the GIS software. On the attached CD, the Gap Analysis Toolkit provides many of these datasets, broken down to the census tract scale in New Jersey. Poverty data are available for households, families, and individuals, by ratio of income to poverty variables, and by race. All of these datasets are further broken down by multiple variables (age, various poverty levels, female vs. male head of household, etc.). Please refer to the Gap Analysis Toolkit section for a more complete description.

At its most basic level, the Toolkit simplifies access to U.S. Census poverty data. The calculation of individuals and households living at the poverty level (“100% of poverty”) is determined by federal guidelines and derived from variables like household income and number of children and adults living in the home. It is officially recognized that persons living at somewhat greater means than poverty also face food insecurity. For example, at 130% of poverty and below, adults are eligible for Food Stamps and children, for free school lunches. At 185% of poverty and below, seniors and WIC-eligible mothers are eligible for support including vouchers for farmers’ markets. Children from households at greater than 130% of poverty and up to 185% of poverty are eligible for reduced price school lunches. Because minimum wage is relatively low and basic costs like housing so high (especially in New Jersey), persons registered at 130-200% of poverty are unofficially designated the “working poor,” reflecting economic hardship including food insecurity at higher income levels.

Figures III.A. and III.B. show the concentration of New Jersey residents at the census tract level living at 100% and 200% of the poverty index. The maps show that as we broaden our understanding of food insecure populations from the federal poverty guidelines (100% poverty) to include the working poor (up to 200% poverty), the percent of the population living in vulnerable circumstances increases dramatically. Notably, the yellow (0-5% of the census tract population) assumes a huge portion of Figure III.A. (<100% poverty) and a very diminished portion of Figure III.B. (food insecure, working poor). From relative obscurity in Figure III.A., the middle and dark browns (25-60% of the census tract population) assume a significant portion of Figure III.B. (<200% poverty).

Consistently, though with greater concentration in the latter, Figures III.A. and III.B. confirm that poverty conditions exist in rural, suburban, and urban parts of New Jersey. This is an important point because of a broad public perception that poverty is mostly an urban problem. Following this perception, policy concerning social and economic services is sometimes weighted toward the density of need in urban areas. On the one hand, such policy
understandably seeks to address most efficiently the greatest number of persons at-risk for food insecurity. On the other hand, by reinforcing the public presumption of poverty as an urban phenomenon, urban-centric policy minimizes public attention to the large area of rural and suburban needs. This veiling of need further challenges low-income rural populations that often face transportation barriers to urban-based services.

Broadly speaking, the shoreline, the sweep of southern Jersey and the northwest part of the State make up most of the census tracts in poverty. The middle/north-middle part of the State is the most economically secure. In the southern part of the State, examples of very high rural poverty concentrations are in Bridgeton City and Galloway Township in Cumberland and Atlantic County, respectively. Among others in the middle of the State, Pemberton Township in suburban/rural Burlington County and a part of Woodbridge Township in the suburban Middlesex County experience high poverty. Rural Montague Township in Sussex County is an example of high economic insecurity in northwest New Jersey. There is often less surprise in the urban concentrations of poverty that are found in the census tracts making up Camden, Trenton, and the multiple cities that make up the Newark metropolitan area (Jersey City, Union, Union City, Elizabeth, Linden, Bayonne, Passaic). These cities lie along a northeast – southwest corridor that links New York and Philadelphia.

Figures III.A. and III.B. show only the simplest forms of Census Data. In the County Level Analysis section, the reader will see datasets that draw upon subsets of the New Jersey population living in poverty, including Hispanics, children, and the “working poor.” Given the availability of the Gap Analysis Toolkit, the permutations for further independent analysis are considerable. Further, there is the opportunity to create new variables. At the request of the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, Toolkit designer Lucas Marxen created two custom-made variables that are included in the Gap Analysis Toolkit:

- Working poor; individuals (130-200% of poverty)
- Children living at less than 185% of poverty; percent of children (eligible for free and reduced school meals)
Figure III.A. Percent of New Jersey Residents Living at <100% of Poverty, 2000 US Census, Census Tract Level
Figure III. B. Percent of New Jersey Residents Living at <200% of Poverty, 2000 US Census, Census Tract Level
New Jersey Emergency Food Providers

Figure III.C. shows an approximation of the geographic location of emergency food providers (EFPs) in New Jersey. The EFPs were accumulated through the development of the Survey of NJ EFPs (see related section of the Final Report) and are considered representative but not complete. Figure III.C. does not distinguish soup kitchens, pantries, and shelters. Limitations of the list are discussed in the background section.

There are large clusters of EFPs in the urban cities in the northeast and southwest of the State. Additional concentrations appear in and around Atlantic City, Bridgeton City, and generally along New Jersey coast. With the exception of the Pinelands area in eastern Burlington and western Ocean Counties, numerous EFP locations dot more suburban and rural areas of the state.

Measuring the gap between resources and needs requires on the ground analysis with a great deal of input from local practitioners. In the urban areas of New Jersey, where EFPs are clustered there exists both a higher level of service, but also higher population density and often a higher concentration of persons living at or near the poverty level. In rural and suburban areas, where the population density is lower, analyzing whether there are “enough” EFP services to meet demand is only one question to ask. Another question is whether they are accessible. Low-income populations typically have limited car access and may have significant problems reaching EFPs located out-of-town. This condition is exacerbated by the relative lack of public transportation in rural areas.

Figure III.C. New Jersey Statewide Locations of Emergency Food Providers
New Jersey Soup Kitchens

New Jersey Soup Kitchens are one type of emergency food provider (EFP) in the State. Some low-income persons, in particular the homeless, need soup kitchens more than food pantries because they have no place to store or cook food resources received from a pantry. For this reason, we emphasize our recommendation for seed money for soup kitchen start-ups. New Jersey has fewer soup kitchens than food pantries. Research has uncovered only one kitchen in Warren, Hunterdon, Somerset, and Salem Counties. The soup kitchen in Gloucester County was not operating during the time of the report.

The total list of EFPs was created with help from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and other sources for the purpose of the EFP Survey (Section III) and the Gap Analysis. Some lists included the EFP type (e.g. soup kitchen, food pantry, shelter); others did not. Many of the survey respondents, however, did not describe their EFP operation in their survey responses the same way that our initial lists had cataloged them. For this reason, we delineate, in Figure III.D. below, between “substantiated” and “not substantiated” soup kitchen locations. Of the 463 useable responses (41% response rate), 68 (15%) described their operation as including a soup kitchen. 45 of these (66% of all soup kitchens that responded to the survey) run additional EFP programs like food pantries and shelters.

Figure III.D. New Jersey Soup Kitchens
New Jersey Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided

Figure III.E. shows the geographic locations in New Jersey of education sites where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) programming is provided. Similar with the spatial distribution of EFPs, the majority of EFNEP and FSNEP Education Sites are located in urban cities in the northeast, New Brunswick and Trenton in the central region, and Camden in the southwest. The EFNEP program is also concentrated in southern Cape May County and FSNEP is located in Cumberland, Monmouth, northern Ocean, Warren and Hunterdon Counties. Unlike EFPs, teaching sites are not prevalent in more suburban and rural areas of the state; some counties have no sites. This means that many food insecure families in these areas may be unable to receive important nutrition education information and materials.

EFNEP has existed for over 30 years and now operates in all 50 U.S. States on a fixed budget. It assists limited-resource audiences to acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes, and changed behavior necessary for nutritionally sound diets, and to contribute to improvement of the total family diet and nutritional well-being. FSNEP began in 1992 with participating State agencies; New Jersey began participating in the mid-1990s. This optional USDA program works on matching funds. The goal of FSNEP is to provide educational programs that increase, within a limited budget, the likelihood of all Food Stamp recipients making healthy food choices and choosing active lifestyles consistent with the most recent advice reflected in the Federal Dietary Guidelines.

Figure III.E. New Jersey Statewide Locations of EFNEP/FSNEP Teaching Sites
New Jersey Schools with 20+% Students Eligible for Free and Reduced School Lunch and Breakfast

The geographic locations of New Jersey schools with 20+% of their students eligible for free or reduced school lunch and breakfast are shown in Figure III.F. Many of the schools meeting this criterion are clustered in the more urban areas of the state that have large numbers of persons living at or near poverty. There are also a significant number of schools with 20+% student eligibles in the more rural southern and ocean regions of the state.

Eligibility for reduced price lunch is a family income at 185% of poverty. Eligibility for free lunch and breakfast is a family income at 130% of poverty. Further information can be found at http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/FRP/frp.process.htm.

Figure III.F. New Jersey Statewide Schools with +20% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch
New Jersey-based WIC Program Centers and Local Offices

Figure III.G. illustrates the geographic locations of The Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program Centers and Local Offices across the state. Although there is a heavy concentration of these locations in the northeast, there is a relatively uniform distribution of them throughout the remainder of the state bringing their services and programs to even the rural and decentralized areas.

It is important to remember that what appears an even distribution of services can belie differential access potential. For example, suburban and rural areas typically have more limited public transportation services than do more urban areas. A transportation deficit creates barriers for low-income persons who also have more limited access to personal automobiles.

Figure III.G. New Jersey Statewide Locations of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices
New Jersey-based WIC-Authorized Farm Retail Outlets

The geographic locations of WIC- Authorized Farmers’ Markets, Farm Stands, and Youth Farm Stands across the state are shown in Figure III.H. These farm retail outlets provide pregnant women and parents with small children the opportunity to redeem their WIC vouchers for locally grown fresh fruits and vegetables, all of which are particularly important in fulfilling the dietary requirements of this segment of the population. While these farm retail outlets are distributed throughout the state, areas exist where there are not any locations for miles. Ironically, urban areas have more farmers’ markets than do rural areas. Rural areas tend to have more farm stands than do their urban counterparts.

The New Jersey WIC Farmers’ Market Nutrition Program was started in 1994 as a collaborative effort between the New Jersey Department of Agriculture and New Jersey WIC. The Program provides locally grown fresh fruits, vegetables and herbs to eligible New Jersey WIC participants and also low-income seniors. In doing so, the Program reinforces the importance of the nutritional and financial health of New Jersey’s women, infants, children and farmers. Each eligible WIC participant receives four $5.00 checks (a total of $20.00 per participant issued once per season) for the parent plus for each child in the family who is five years or younger. With the checks, participants can purchase fruits, vegetables and herbs from authorized farmers. Grocery stores and other markets cannot accept WIC check vouchers.

Figure III.H. New Jersey Statewide Locations of WIC Authorized Farm Retail Outlets
New Jersey Food Stamp Use by Municipality

Figure III.I. illustrates the population using Food Stamps by municipality across the state. The municipalities with the greatest number of individuals using Food Stamps are clustered in and around the major urban centers of the state outside of New York City and Philadelphia. While these populations decrease as you move further into the more suburban and rural areas of the state, there are still significantly large populations using Food Stamps in southern region of the state.

Ideally this dataset would show Food Stamp use rate, i.e., individuals enrolled in the Food Stamp program as a percentage of the eligible population. Unfortunately, although the New Jersey Department of Human Services can supply 2005 Food Stamp use data, the comparable U.S. Census data are five years old. Significant changes in the population at the municipal level do not allow a comparison of the 2000 and 2005 data in order to establish a use rate.
New Jersey Food Manufacturers Who are Interested in Learning More about Hunger Prevention Opportunities

The Rutgers study team conducted research on New Jersey food manufacturers to assess what post-production food might be available and appropriate for use by emergency food providers. That report follows the Gap Analysis section. In Figure III.J., we simply add a relevant map overlay to highlight the location of those 72 New Jersey food manufacturers that positively answered the question, ‘would you like to receive more information about hunger relief programs?’ The list, with respondents’ answers to two additional questions was provided to the New Jersey Department of Human Services and the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee. The list will be shared with Directors of the six New Jersey regional food banks for their outreach efforts. We hope that discreet and coordinated use of these lists will lead to rewarding relationships between the manufacturers and the emergency food providers. We do not include manufacturers in the county and regional level analyses that follow.

Figure III.J. New Jersey Food Manufacturers Who Would Like to Receive More Information About Hunger Relief Programs in New Jersey
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IV. **County and Regional Level Analysis**

*Overview*

This section provides a series of analyses on each of the 21 New Jersey Counties to assess the gaps existing between the need for emergency food services and the existing resources and outlets. With input from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee and the Department of Human Services, the analyses are standardized for each county to provide examples of how the Gap Analysis Toolkit can be used. An important objective of this section is to remind the reader that the Toolkit functions like a library. The analyses address specific research questions of any number that can be pursued.

The county level analysis is organized by Food Bank Area to provide convenient access to information on adjoining counties. It should be noted that this particular regional breakdown has both advantages and disadvantages. The services of the 6 New Jersey Regional Food Banks cover the entire State. The Food Banks’ geographical delineations of service are recognized at many levels including the New Jersey Departments of Human Service and Community Affairs. On the other hand, many emergency food providers have limited or no connection to the regional food banks. Further, the six Regional Food Banks do not include two other important regional food depots, the Middlesex County Food Organization and Outreach Distribution Services (MCFOODS) and the Southern New Jersey Food Bank. These latter two food distributors are recognized as food banks by the New Jersey Department of Agriculture and participate as such in the federal Commodity Foods Program.

Each county level analysis includes 7 map-based analyses that compare food security needs and resources in New Jersey. All census data are shown at the Census Tract level except for the Population Using Food Stamps, which is shown at the Municipal level. A brief analysis is provided for each of the maps. The studied variables are:

- Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty Level (Figures 1)
- Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130% - 200% of poverty level) (Figures 2)
- EFNEP/FSNEP Education Sites and Population Under 130% Poverty Level (Figures 4)
- EFNEP/FSNEP Education Sites and Hispanic Population Below Poverty Level (Figures 5)
- Schools with 20% or more of students eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch Program and Population of Children under 185% of Poverty Level (Figures 5)
- WIC Program Centers, Local Offices, Authorized Farmers’ Markets, Authorized Farm Stands, and Authorized Youth Farm Stands (Figures 6)
- WIC Program Centers and Local Offices and Municipal Population Using Food Stamps (Figures 7)
For initial orientation, please see the map, New Jersey Counties and the Six Regional Community Food Banks, p. ii. The county level analyses of each Food Bank Area are introduced with a map of the Food Bank Area to re-orient the reader to its location in New Jersey and the counties inside its borders. The county analyses follow in alphabetical order.

Appendix A includes county political maps that include all of the municipalities inside each county. Municipalities are not included on maps in the analysis section for a number of reasons of data-related reasons. Occasionally, census tracts are not organized by municipal borders. In some rural areas (e.g. Atlantic County), a census tract may include more than one municipality. Some counties have so many small municipalities (e.g., Monmouth County, especially along the shore) that even a full-page map does not delineate them clearly. Most importantly, including both municipal and census data, along with emergency food resource points creates a confusing map that does not tell an understandable or a compelling story. With the exception of the Food Stamp maps, we need to show census tract data to transmit poverty data. For this reason, municipal boundaries are not included or named except as a reference in Appendix A.
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Summary and Recommendations of County and Regional Level Analysis

Each of the 21 New Jersey County level analyses provides seven maps (Figures 1-7) showing the same set of variables mentioned above. This section provides a summary of those 147 maps that follow. The section is divided into a review of emergency food providers (EFPs), sites that provide EFNEP AND FSNEP education, schools with 20% and more of students eligible for free and reduced school meals, and WIC program connected with farm retailers and Food Stamp use.

Readers will notice that the values associated with the color scales of Figures 1-5 and 7 differ by county. (See for example, the color scale for Figures 1 in Bergen and Essex, the first two counties analyzed). The color scale responds to the natural breaks in data for each county, allowing finer analysis of differences within each individual county. This advantage, however, impairs the ability to compare the county maps with each other on the basis of color-coding.

Emergency Food Providers
In each New Jersey County, the locations of emergency food providers (food pantries, shelters, and soup kitchens) are mapped against two kinds of census tract data. Figures 1 show the number of individuals registered at less than 130% of poverty in 2000, who are referred to as the “low-income poor.” Figures 2 locate individuals at 130-200% of poverty, who are referred to as the “low-income working poor.” It should be remembered that the list of 1,117 map-able emergency food providers was developed in 2004 and 2005. As noted in the Limitations section of the attached Report on the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers, we know that this list is a very good approximation of the EFPs in New Jersey and yet is certainly still missing some providers. Among those EFPs that are included are very small agencies that may operate inconsistently or seasonally and they “come and go.”

Concentrations of low-income poor and working poor generally overlap, though in some cases the working poor live in a slightly more suburban environment than do the urban poor. Poor and working poor low-income populations overlap in rural areas.

Routinely we find that EFPs cluster in the counties’ urban center/s where the population density and the number of food insecure persons are highest. This spatial organization makes sense in terms of efficiency in reaching large numbers of clients. Urban locations may also be more convenient for agency operations. However, the pattern results in a systemic disadvantage to more rural and suburban persons in need. The following counties appear to have particularly problematic distribution of EFP services relative to non-urban populations in need: Gloucester, Mercer, Salem, Somerset, and Sussex. Counties that appear to have somewhat better spatial distribution of EFP services than most include: Hunterdon, Camden, Middlesex, Warren, and Monmouth.
Program efficiency, in terms of reaching the greatest number of clients, may not be the only way to evaluate the effectiveness of EFPs. Programs to support and/or expand EFPs might, for example, balance the needs of the rural and suburban poor and working poor who possibly have greater transportation barriers with the needs of more densely populated urban poor and working poor.

Nutrition Education
Nutrition education is important for all income groups in order to learn how to optimize their nutritional intake by making wise food choices. In the case of low-income groups, nutrition education also teaches strategies to achieve the best possible dietary quality on restrained resources. EFNEP and FSNEP teaching sites are certainly not the only source of nutrition education for low-income persons, as evidenced by findings from the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers. EFNEP and FSNEP are, however, tested and standardized national programs that are widely distributed throughout New Jersey. The existence of EFNEP and FSNEP sites does not of course make them universally available. Proximity is an issue for some low-income individuals.

EFNEP and FSNEP teaching sites are mapped both against all and against specifically Hispanic low-income poor populations (Figures 2 and 3 at <130% of poverty). A large number of EFNEP and FSNEP clientele are Spanish-speaking, thus the ability to speak Spanish is important for communication. Of the 47 out-reach nutrition educators hired to assist with the EFNEP and FSNEP programs, 23 (49%) speak Spanish as of Fall 2005. EFNEP and FSNEP teaching sites are mapped both against all and against specifically Hispanic low-income poor populations (Figures 2 and 3 at <130% of poverty). Mapping teaching sites against low-income populations asks the simple locational question, “are teaching sites near populations in need?”

Neither EFNEP nor FSNEP teaching sites are available in Atlantic, Bergen, Morris, Salem, and Sussex Counties. Essex and Passaic have a relatively good regional distribution of teaching sites in census tracts with relatively high and very high numbers of low-income poor (<130% of poverty). The density of need, however, suggests that the number of sites is overwhelmed by the population in need. All other counties can be characterized as having education sites that serve great need, but some significant part(s) of the county also encompass large numbers of low-income individuals who might have difficulty with transportation to the existing sites.

Expansion of nutrition education in New Jersey should address counties where there appear to be no or limited nutrition education services, as defined by the availability of FSNEP and EFNEP sites. From the Survey of Emergency Food Providers (Section III), we know that many EFPs are interested in providing nutrition education but many need training, information materials, and better strategies for outreach to their clientele. Additionally, existing FSNEP and EFNEP programs should be evaluated for their ability to expand. With this recommendation, we recognize that the FSNEP program in particular is designed to work in collaboration with local communities that help raise matching funds to make this nutrition education program work. EFNEP and FSNEP educational sites may house resources (information materials, trainers, etc.) that can be integrated programmatically with EFPs’ interest in providing nutrition education. Finally, we urge attention both to: a) urban areas with extensive nutrition educational
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programming that is nevertheless overwhelmed by clients; and b) more rural parts of the counties where need may be high and yet underserved because of the low population density.

Analysis of the counties and teaching sites with the Hispanic population living below 130% of poverty can be summarized as follows:

- The five Counties that have no EFNEP/FSNEP teaching sites (see above) have significant concentrations of Hispanic population living below 130% of poverty.
- Counties that have unevenly distributed and high concentrations of Hispanics below 130% poverty are generally urban and the distribution of EFPs near these population concentrations is good. The counties include: Essex, Passaic, Union (except in the southwest), Hudson (except in the north), and Mercer.
- Counties where the Hispanic population below 130% of poverty is spread out relatively “evenly” (no or few high numbers below 130% of poverty) and where EFP services seem fairly well distributed are Cumberland, Monmouth, and Ocean (except in southern Ocean County).
- In seven counties, high numbers of Hispanic residents below 130% of poverty live in three or more low-income clusters in various parts of the counties. In these seven counties, the availability of teaching services is variable. The seven are: Burlington (not good access to EFNEP/FSNPE sites); Camden (good in the urban areas. nothing in the south); Cape May (fair, except in the northwest); Gloucester (fairly good generally); Hunterdon (particularly lacking in teaching sites near low-income Hispanics); Middlesex (good, except in the northeast; appears readily accessible to high numbers of Hispanic poor living in adjacent Somerset County); Warren (fairly good generally).

Mapping the low-income Hispanic population in need against a set of emergency food resources invites inquiry into the capacity of resource providers to respond to low-income persons’ needs who cannot speak English. In New Jersey, Spanish is the most needed, but certainly not the only language necessary to communicate with the burgeoning immigrant population. No emergency food resource center will have personnel capable in all necessary languages. It is important, however, for providers to know how to find translation support, particularly in emergency situations.

Overall, an inventory at New Jersey EFPs, food banks, WIC offices, and EFNEP and FSNEP sites might be considered for: a) client language needs; and b) teacher/staff/volunteer language capacity. The purpose of this inventory would be to respond to New Jersey’s large immigrant communities, many of who are low-income and quite possibly not availing themselves of various emergency food resources. A “language bank” of nutrition educators and EFP and food bank staff and volunteers might be a useful component of regional cooperation among emergency food providers. More specifically, should an EFP need to convey nutrition information to a non-English speaker, the “language bank” might locate an EFP staff or volunteer who speaks the needed language and can counsel the client over the phone. As outlined in the Survey of Emergency Food Providers Report, nutrition education includes the objective of making information available to clients on nutrition programs like Food Stamps, WIC, school meal programs, etc.
Schools With 20%+ of the Student Body Eligible for Free and Reduced School Meals

Schools provide an important and sometimes a critical source of nutrition for low-income children. This resource, like Food Stamps, is readily available; it does not rely on community programs. Nevertheless, families and schools sometimes need encouragement to increase the participation of eligible children in these programs.

Schools with 20% or more of their student body that are eligible for free and reduced school lunch and breakfast were mapped against children in New Jersey below 185% of poverty (Figures 5). At 130% of poverty, children are eligible for free lunch and breakfast. Between 130-185% of poverty, they are eligible for reduced priced meals.

County maps (Figures 5) are useful for knowing the relative concentration of children in poverty by census tract across the counties (percent of total number of children under 18). Figures 5 locate schools relative to concentrations of low-income children (<185% by census tract). The data, however, are problematic because students travel across census tracts to school. This cannot be helped as poverty data is not available by school district. Nevertheless, it is clear that high concentrations of poverty near schools indicate a need to encourage families to have their children participate in free and reduced school meal programs.

Mapping school eligibility data (available in May 2005 for data collected in September 2004) is not as useful as knowing participation in the free and reduced price meal programs. At the time of this report, student eligibility data were ready, but participation data were not. Participation data, compared with locations of EFPs, nutrition education centers and WIC locations, would suggest places where participation in free and reduced school meal programs most need to be encouraged.

The participation of school students eligible for free and reduced school meals should be mapped to determine where children living in and near poverty are not taking advantage of this school-based program. Barriers to participation should be studied. Strategies to promote this important nutrition program should include education to parents and schools. Venues for highlighting use of school meal programs might include WIC program offices, County Welfare offices, emergency food providers, and EFNEP/FSNEP teaching sites.

WIC Locations and WIC-Farmstand Programs for WIC Recipients and Low-income Seniors

The Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) provides important resources for food security in New Jersey. WIC supports nutrition counseling and provides food supplements to single parents (most typically women) and their children ages 5 and below who are at or below 185% of poverty. (The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below.) WIC offices provide referral information for Food Stamp eligible persons. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to low-income populations.

New Jersey farmers produce fresh fruits, vegetables, and other products that enhance the dietary quality of all New Jersey consumers. New Jersey participates in the national US Department of Agriculture program, the WIC & Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), to
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provide WIC recipients and low-income seniors vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). The beauty of this program lies in its ability to help: a) low-income WIC families and seniors access fresh fruits and vegetables; b) the productive agricultural sector of New Jersey’s economy; c) all New Jersey residents’ access to fresh fruits and vegetables as a benefit of economically secure farmers and the public farm retail outlets they provide for. Many States have developed facilities for farmers’ market vendors and farm stands to accept Food Stamps as well. At this writing, New Jersey has not implemented such a program.

Each of the county sets of analyses includes two maps (Figures 6 and 7) that locate WIC administrative and program offices. Figures 6 map WIC offices against the location of WIC-approved farm retailers. Experience shows that the closer the proximity of approved farm retailers to WIC offices, the greater possibility recipients have to cash their vouchers. In the 2004 farm retail season, for example, WIC recipients redeemed 61% of vouchers and seniors, 91% of vouchers. The New Jersey Program Coordinator notes that many counties provide seniors with organized transportation to the farmers’ market. Nutritionists and site workers often accompany seniors on these trips, thereby providing the opportunity to emphasize the value of consuming fresh fruits and vegetables. Seniors often have accumulated more resources over their lifetimes than have young parents, meaning that they more typically have access to a car. Additionally, seniors typically have greater experience with fresh foods than do the younger WIC parents. From growing, preparing, and eating these foods over time, seniors often value fresh fruits and vegetables in a way that is foreign to younger generations. Figures 7 map WIC offices against Food Stamp use at the municipal level. Comparing Figures 6 and 7 also demonstrates where the location of Food Stamp use is relative to the location of WIC-approved farm retailers.

Very generally speaking, farmers’ markets tend to be found more often in urban locations that include a high density of Food Stamp use. Farm stands are often in more suburban and rural communities where Food Stamp use ranges from very low to high. Where paired, farmers’ markets tend to be mapped next to WIC outlets more often than are farm stands. Figure 7 maps generally demonstrate that WIC offices are located in municipalities where Food Stamp use is the highest. “Tailgate” operations have the advantage that they are mobile and can theoretically move from WIC location to location. In reality, tailgate farm retailers who would like to serve WIC clients experience challenges including: needing to coordinate with already taxed WIC

---

16 Conversations with Ms. Dorothy Ngumezi, Research Scientist and Program Coordinator for the New Jersey WIC Farmstand Project, Department of Health and Senior Services, June-September 2005.
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staff, complex and sometimes expensive health regulations and rules, and the possible perception of unfair market competition.

Monmouth County is by far the best example of how farm retailers and WIC offices can be successfully paired. All but two of the 11 WIC offices in Monmouth County are paired or closely matched with a farmers’ market. In fact, Monmouth County is blessed with a multitude of farmers’ markets (most near shore communities) as compared to the rest of the State. Additionally these farmers’ markets are located in high Food Stamp use areas. This reinforces the recommendation that steps be taken to aid farm retailers in accepting Food Stamp dollars, for example, through subsidized hand held electronic benefit transfer (EBT) monitors.

Three counties, all relatively rural -- Sussex, Warren, and Salem -- had no WIC offices matched with WIC-approved farm retailers. These counties have both rural poor in low-density populations and agricultural economies that would benefit from financial transactions through the existing WIC program. They also have an extended Food Stamp program. Other counties had one or two matched WIC offices and WIC-approved farm retailers.

Together the maps in Figures 6 and 7 beg four recommendations:

1) The New Jersey Department of Agriculture and New Jersey WIC offices should:
   a) continue to encourage more farm retailers to participate in the WIC and Seniors Farmers’ Market Nutrition Programs generally; and b) strive to co-locate WIC offices and approved farm retailers specifically. Farmers’ markets have the benefit of a more institutionalized structure that may have more reliable hours, better selection, and more competitive costs than do farm stands and tailgate operations. On the other hand, tailgate operations are typically mobile which allows them greater flexibility whereby they can be scheduled in different locations over the course of a month to serve a geographically dispersed population.

2) The State should encourage and facilitate the acceptance of Food Stamps at farm retail outlets, especially but not only, farmers’ markets. The New Jersey Department of Agriculture has begun this initiative, but it could be expanded. Working models exist, e.g., in New York State.

3) WIC offices might be considered as locations where eligible clients could be encouraged to apply for Food Stamp eligibility. Presently clients are simply referred to the single (and often distant) welfare office in the county that administers Food Stamps. To do this, WIC program offices need computers and internet access which presently, many offices do not have available. With this recommendation, we also recognize that the heavy workload that WIC staff presently carries might pose an initial barrier to this suggestion.

4) Ideally, WIC offices should also be able to disperse Food Stamps to eligible WIC clients because there are from 3-28 WIC offices in any one county (exception is Hunterdon with one WIC program office only) and only one County Welfare Agency that presently disperses Food Stamps. We understand that this suggestion is massively complicated by an administrative structure that is presently not compatible with the recommendation.
We offer it nonetheless with respect to the difficulties many clients, especially parents with small children in tow, have accessing the multiple emergency food services that are “available” to them.
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Community Food Bank of New Jersey Region
31 Evans Terminal Road; Hillside, N.J. 07205
Ph: (908) 355-3663; Fax: (908) 355-0270
http://www.njfoodbank.org/

The region served by the Community Food Bank of New Jersey is comprised of the following counties: Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and Union. Being located in the Central and Northeastern region of New Jersey, this Food Bank Area contains some of the most densely populated areas in the state. The many urban centers in this region house a large number of potentially food insecure populations and for this reason a very large number of the emergency food outlets are located in this region of the state. For detail on the location of municipalities, please consult the Appendix for County Political Maps.

Figure IV.A. Community Food Bank of New Jersey
BERGEN COUNTY

Bergen County lies along the western shore of the Hudson River in northeast New Jersey. While much of the northern region of the county is relatively affluent, there are areas close to the large urban cities of Paterson and Newark in Passaic and Essex County that have large populations that are at risk for food insecurity. As the following maps will show, most of the emergency food resources are concentrated in the southern region of the county where the largest populations in poverty reside. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Bergen County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Bergen County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. There is a greater concentration of people under the 130% threshold in the southern region of the county near the cities of Newark and Paterson. Many of the EFPs in the county are clustered around these areas of concentrated poverty. However, much of the northern part of the county may be underserved as there are few EFPs located in this region, yet there are hundreds of individuals that are potentially in need of the services provided.

Figure 1: Bergen County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of the working poor is in the southern region of the county. Many of the EFPs in the county are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, the northern region of the county has a moderate number of working poor that is not as easily served due to the more dispersed nature of the low-income population.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. While there is a large low-income population in Bergen County, there are no sites offering EFNEP or FSNEP education. There are some sites located nearby in adjoining counties, however, much of the eligible population in Bergen County may not have the transportation resources available to visit these sites. This becomes even more of an issue in the northeastern region of the county. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. Due to the lack of sites offering EFNEP or FSNEP education in Bergen County, a lack of nutrition education may be a major gap in the county’s available emergency food services that should be addressed in order to help ensure that all low-income residents receive appropriate nutrition education.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the central and southern regions of the County, and those schools tend to be close to regions of high concentration of low-income residents in adjacent counties. These schools also are located in areas where there are large percentages of children meeting the requirement of being under 185% of the poverty level. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Bergen County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Bergen County shows a moderate gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their Food Stamps and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. The majority of WIC Centers/Offices are located across the middle of the county with only a few authorized farm retail outlets within close proximity to the WIC program offices. The majority of the authorized farm retail outlets are located in the northeastern region of the county where, as shown previously, there is a smaller number of eligible people and no WIC Centers/Offices in close proximity. This gap limits the ability of families receiving WIC FMNP vouchers to redeem them on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by WIC-eligible families and low-income seniors.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorizd New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps in Bergen County tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. WIC-eligible persons living along the New York border have the farthest distance to travel to access WIC services. This is also where the number of Food Stamp users is low relative to the rest of Bergen County.

Figure 7: Bergen County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
ESSEX COUNTY

Essex County is located on the Northeastern region of New Jersey and is home to the city of Newark. The City of Newark contains a large number of individuals that are in need of emergency food assistance, and as the following maps will illustrate, this is where the majority of the counties’ resources are located. While there do not appear to be any significant spatial gaps in EFP coverage of the county, the extremely large population in need in Newark and its surrounding areas suggests that resources may be strained for many of the hunger relief organizations and nutrition education programs in this area. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Essex County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Essex County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. There is a greater concentration of people under the 130% threshold in the southeastern region of the county near the City of Newark. Many of the EFPs in the county are clustered around this area of concentrated poverty. Much of the northwestern part of the county has low numbers of individuals under 130% of the poverty level and has few EFPs located in this region.

Figure 1: Essex County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of the working poor is in the southeastern region of the county. However, high concentrations of the working poor also appear outside the core of the lowest-income population (under 130% of poverty) in the City of Newark. This area in the northern and western part of the county includes a few EFPs.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Sites where EFNEP and FSNEP are provided are dispersed throughout the region of highest poverty in the southeastern region of the county. While there appears to be good spatial coverage in the county where most of the low-income residents reside, the large number of people under 130% of poverty may be straining the resources of these sites and increased support may be needed to address future need. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Essex County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The map shows that census tracts with high numbers of Hispanic residents below the poverty level have education sites nearby. These sites may require additional resources to provide bi-lingual support for their nutrition education programs.

Figure 4: Essex County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the southeastern region of the county and they are clustered in the areas of high eligible populations. Of considerable note is that there are census tracts in this County where the percent of children under 185% of poverty level is reaching close to 100% as shown by the upper bound of 92.2%. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Essex County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Essex County shows a good number of authorized farm retail outlets in the county. Almost all of these locations are within a close distance to the numerous WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. This relieves WIC recipients from needing to travel large distances to redeem their WIC farmers’ market vouchers for fresh produce from local farmers. The majority of these authorized farm stands are located in the eastern half of the county where the largest numbers of people in poverty reside. Where there is a dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers, WIC clients are challenged to redeem their FMNP vouchers, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.

Figure 6: Essex County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. This map shows that the numbers of individuals using Food Stamps is very high in the southeastern part of Essex County. The WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are also highly concentrated in this region.
HUDSON COUNTY

Hudson County is located on the Hudson River and is home to Jersey City. The populations at risk for food insecurity are concentrated along the I-95 corridor, with the largest numbers residing in the Jersey City. While Jersey City appears to have adequate hunger relief and nutrition education sites within its borders, the north and western parts of the county have relatively few of them. This suggests possible gaps in these areas where the need for emergency food and nutrition education may not be adequately met. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Hudson County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Hudson County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. The areas of greater concentration of people under the 130% threshold are clustered around the I-95 corridor that transects the county from northeast to southwest. Due to the small area of the county, many of the EFPs are within a short distance of areas with concentrated poverty; however, the majority of these locations are in Jersey City. While there is a high number of individuals in poverty in the northeastern part of the county, the locations of EFPs are sparser there suggesting a possible gap of service in this area.

Figure 1: Hudson County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Unlike the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of the working poor is in the northeastern region of the county. This area also has fewer EFPs than in the more impoverished areas of Jersey City and the need for hunger relief may exceed the resources available.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. These sites are concentrated in the census tracts comprising Jersey City where some of the highest numbers of people in need reside. The northeastern part of the county, however, has very few sites within close proximity to its census tracts of high poverty. This suggests a possible gap in the services provided by these education sites, as low-income residents in the northeast may not be receiving adequate nutrition education. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided in Hudson County and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The map shows that census tract with high numbers of Hispanic residents below the poverty level exist in the northeastern region of the Hudson County and have few education sites nearby. This illustrates a moderate gap in education services, as there may be too few education sites to provide nutrition education to those in need, and in particular to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists along the I-95. These schools are clustered in census tracts with the areas of high eligible populations. Almost the entire county is comprised of areas where more than 20% of the children are under 185% of poverty. Also of considerable note is that there are census tracts in this County where the percent of children under 185% of poverty level is very high as indicated by the upper bound of 84%. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Hudson County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Hudson County only has a few authorized farm retail outlets in the county, most of them located in the northern area of Jersey City. While almost all of these locations are within a close distance to numerous WIC Program Centers and Local Offices, the rest of the county has no authorized farm retail outlets within close proximity to WIC offices. This gap limits the ability of families receiving WIC farmers’ market vouchers through WIC programs to redeem them on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by WIC-eligible families and low-income seniors.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. This map shows that participation in the Food Stamp Program is prevalent throughout Hudson County, with the highest usage in Jersey City with more than 27,000 individuals enrolled. The WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are most numerous along the I-95 corridor.
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Middlesex County is located centrally in New Jersey along the eastern coast. The cities of New Brunswick and Perth Amboy are located within its borders and comprise the largest areas of poverty in the county. Most emergency food resources and nutrition education sites are located in these two cities or elsewhere in the northern part of the county. The southern part of the county has moderate to low numbers of individuals living below 130% of poverty. These persons are geographically dispersed and may face challenges accessing emergency food providers. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Middlesex County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Middlesex County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the City of New Brunswick on the eastern side of the county and Perth Amboy City on the western side of the county. Most other EFPs are distributed fairly uniformly across the northern part of the county, however, much of the southern part may be underserved as there are few EFPs located in this region, yet there are hundreds of individuals that are potentially in need of the services provided.

Figure 1: Middlesex County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in Middlesex County and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. The heaviest concentration of working poor is in the northern region of the county. Many of the EFPs are located within proximity of these northern areas and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, there are a few areas of high numbers of working poor, especially in the southern part of the county that may not be as easily served by existing EFPs.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. This map illustrates a possible gap between the need and the services being provided in Middlesex County. Sites offering EFNEP programming are located across the north-central part of the county, including Perth Amboy; those offering FSNEP are clustered around New Brunswick. While there are moderate numbers of low-income residents throughout the county, there is only one site for FSNEP in the large southern tract of the county and no sites in the northeastern corner. Some low-income residents in Middlesex County may not have the transportation resources necessary to visit these sites. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Middlesex County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. As shown previously, the sites offering EFNEP and FSNEP education are located almost exclusively in New Brunswick and Perth Amboy, which is also where the only significant populations of Hispanics below the poverty level reside. These sites may already be providing nutrition education specifically directed to Hispanic population, but if not, may require additional resources to develop programs and materials suitable to their cultural needs.

**Figure 4: Middlesex County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level**
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the New Brunswick and Perth Amboy areas, as well as, in the northeast and northwest border of the county. These schools also are located in areas where there are large percentages of children meeting the requirement of being under 185% of the poverty level. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

**Figure 5: Middlesex County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level**
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Middlesex County shows a moderate gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. The majority of WIC Centers/Offices are located around New Brunswick and Perth Amboy with only a few authorized farm retail outlets located within a close proximity. The majority of the authorized farm retail outlets are located in the southern region of the county where there are no WIC Centers/Offices in close proximity. This gap limits the ability of families to redeem WIC farmers’ market vouchers on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by WIC-eligible families and low-income seniors.

Figure 6: Middlesex County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers/Local Offices. There are almost no WIC Program Centers or Local Offices in the southern region of the county.

Figure 7: Middlesex County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
MORRIS COUNTY

Morris County is located in north central New Jersey. The largest concentrations of poverty in the county are located in the towns of Dover, Morristown, Boonton, and Parsippany-Troy-Hills. While most emergency food resources are located in these areas, other areas of the county may be underserved. The lack of any EFNEP/FESNEP education sites in the county may represent a gap in the ability of low-income families to receive appropriate nutrition education. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Morris County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Morris County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the towns of Dover, Morristown, and Boonton, which are grouped in the central region of the county. The remainder of the county may be underserved as there are few EFPs located outside of these three towns, yet there are hundreds of individuals who are potentially in need of the services provided.

Figure 1: Morris County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. The heaviest concentration of working poor is in the towns of Dover and Morristown. Many of the EFPs in the county are located within proximity of these areas of high numbers of the working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, the western part of the county has a fair number of working poor spread across a large area who live a considerable distance from the EFPs in the county.

Figure 2: Morris County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Although there is a significant number of low-income residents in Morris County, no sites exist where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided. Additionally, few sites are located in adjoining counties, making the prospect of traveling to a nearby county for these programs daunting. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Morris County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and Hispanic residents who are registered in the 2000 Census below the poverty level. As shown previously, there are no sites offering EFNEP or FSNEP education in Morris County. This may be a major gap in the county that should be addressed in order to help ensure that all low-income persons are receiving nutrition education, as appropriate. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in Dover, Morristown, and Boonton. Schools also are located in the areas where the percentage of children meeting the requirement of being under 185% of the poverty level exceeds 20%. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Morris County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Morris County shows a moderate gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. While the WIC authorized farm retail outlets are spread uniformly through most of the county, the WIC Centers/Offices are only located in Dover, Morristown and Boonton with only a few authorized farm retail outlets within a close proximity. The majority of the authorized farm retail outlets are located where there are no WIC Centers/Offices in close proximity. In addition, the northern part of the county is void of any WIC locations. These gaps limit the ability of many families to redeem farmers’ market vouchers received through WIC programs on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by WIC-eligible families and low-income seniors.

Figure 6: Morris County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices.

Figure 7: Morris County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
PASSAIC COUNTY

Passaic County is located in northern New Jersey and contains the cities of Paterson and Passaic. The areas comprising the cities of Paterson and Passaic have large populations that are at risk for food insecurity. As the following maps will show, most of the emergency food resources are concentrated in this southern region of the county where the largest populations in poverty reside. Addressing the needs of food insecure populations in the northern region of the county may be a challenge as the impoverished population tends to be more decentralized, making it difficult to strategically locate resources in this area. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Passaic County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Passaic County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the cities of Paterson and Passaic in the southeastern region of the county. The remainder of the EFPs in the county is distributed throughout the other areas, even in those census tracts with relatively small populations under the 130% threshold.

Figure 1: Passaic County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of the working poor is in cities of Paterson and Passaic. Many of the EFPs in the county are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. Even the more suburban and rural areas of the northwestern region have EFPs in areas with moderate populations of working poor and may be able to meet the needs of this group with the proper resources.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Sites where nutrition education is provided are concentrated in the areas comprising the cities of Paterson and Passaic. While these areas have some of the highest numbers of people in need of such programs, the northwestern part of the county has only a single site to be utilized by the hundreds who are eligible for nutrition education. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The map shows that census tracts with high numbers of Hispanic residents below the poverty level live in the Cities of Paterson and Passaic and have many education sites nearby. If they are not already, it would be helpful if these sites could provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that includes bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.

Figure 4: Passaic County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the Cities of Paterson and Passaic. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Passaic County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Passaic County shows a substantial gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. While the WIC Centers/Offices are spread relatively uniformly through most of the county, there are only two WIC authorized farm retail outlets within the county. Only one WIC office serves the northern part of the county. The distance between where clients receive WIC farm stand vouchers and the WIC-authorized farm retailers limits the ability of families to redeem vouchers for fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by WIC-eligible families and low-income seniors.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. The population using Food Stamps in Passaic County tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices.

Figure 7: Passaic County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
SOMERSET COUNTY

Somerset County lies in the central region of New Jersey. As the following maps show, most of the county’s emergency food resources are concentrated in a few areas in the eastern region, creating large gaps throughout the rest of the county where significant populations in poverty reside. Even in the township of Franklin on the southwestern border of the county, there are relatively few resources available. Some individuals may travel, if possible, into Middlesex County to utilize the resources in the City of New Brunswick. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Somerset County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Somerset County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. There is a greater concentration of people under the 130% threshold in the central region of the county and in the southwestern region near the city of New Brunswick in Middlesex County. There is a significant spatial gap in the location of EFPs and the population potentially in need of hunger relief. The majority of EFPs are clustered in the center of the county, leaving the areas to the north and south with large numbers of people in need potentially underserved. It is possible that those populations in the southeastern part of the county are taking advantage of the resources across the county border in New Brunswick. However, traveling even that relatively short distance may be problematic.

Figure 1: Somerset County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of the working poor is in the southeastern and central region of the county. Many of the EFPs in the county are located in the central region and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of the population in this area. However, the northern and southern region of the county has a significant number of working poor that does not have many EFPs in close proximity to adequately serve this population.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. The map below illustrates a gap between the need and the services being provided in Somerset County. While there are large numbers of low-income residents, only two sites exist that offer FSNEP educational programming. These two are located on the southeastern border of the county. Much of the eligible population in Somerset County may not have the transportation resources available to visit these sites. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Somerset County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. As shown previously, there are only two education sites in Somerset County. This may be a major gap in the county which should be considered for follow-up in order to help ensure that Hispanic and other population groups are receiving appropriate nutrition education.

Figure 4: Somerset County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools which had 20% or more of their student population eligible (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the western region of the county. These schools are located in areas where there are large percentages of children under 185% of the poverty level. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Somerset County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Somerset County shows a moderate gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. The majority of WIC Centers/Offices are located along the western border of the county with only a few authorized farm retail outlets within a close proximity. The majority of the authorized farm retail outlets are located in the western region of the county where, as shown previously, there is a large number of eligible people and no WIC Centers/Offices in close proximity. This gap limits the ability of families receiving farmers’ market vouchers through WIC programs to redeem them on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps in Somerset County tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. There are some areas of high Food Stamp participation in the south and southwestern region where there is probably a WIC-eligible population that needs to travel a significant distance to WIC offices.
UNION COUNTY

Union County is located in the northeastern region of New Jersey. The cities of Elizabeth and Plainfield are located within its borders and comprise the largest areas of poverty in the county. Most emergency food resources and nutrition education sites reside in these two cities or elsewhere in the central part of the county. The northwestern part of the county has moderate to low levels of poverty that are spread out over a large area. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Union County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Union County, as well as, the number of persons in each census tract who are living below 130% of poverty. EFPs are concentrated in the City of Elizabeth on the eastern side of the county and Plainfield City on the western part. Most other EFPs are distributed fairly uniformly across the central part of the county, however, much of the northwestern part may be underserved as there are few EFPs located in this region; yet there are hundreds of individuals that are potentially in need of the services provided.

Figure 1: Union County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. The heaviest concentration of working poor is in the Cities of Elizabeth and Plainfield, and there is also a significant number spread across the central region of the county. Many of the EFPs are located within proximity of these areas with high numbers of the working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, there are many areas at considerable distances that may not be as easily served.

Figure 2: Union County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. While there are low-income residents throughout the county, sites providing FSNEP education are concentrated around the highest density of low-income in City of Elizabeth. Much of the eligible population in Union County, particularly from the central and northwestern region, may not have the transportation resources available to visit these sites. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the FSNEP nutrition education programs, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. As shown previously, the sites offering FSNEP education are located almost exclusively in Elizabeth, where major populations of Hispanics below the poverty level reside. There is a significant number of Hispanic residents living below the poverty level in Plainfield City who only have one education site within close proximity from which to receive nutrition education. Efforts should be continued to increase the number of Spanish speakers in education sites in these areas, as well as, to provide the additional resources, where possible, to develop programs and materials suitable to Hispanic cultural needs.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools which had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the Elizabeth and Plainfield areas, as well as, the central region of the county outside of Elizabeth. These schools are located in areas where large percentages of the children live at or below 185% of the poverty level. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Union County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
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Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Union County shows a good number of authorized farm retail outlets. Some of these locations are within a close distance to WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. This provides WIC clients and low-income seniors with the possibility of redeeming their vouchers on fresh produce from local farmers. WIC offices are located in the northeast and southwest part of the county. WIC-authorized farm retailers are more broadly distributed than are WIC offices. A dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers challenges the ability of FMNP voucher recipients to redeem them, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps in Union County tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. With almost no WIC Program Centers or Local Offices in the central and southeast region of Union County, the population group eligible for WIC program services may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in WIC programs in their county.
Community Food Bank of New Jersey Southern Branch Region

6735 Black Horse Pike  
Egg Harbor Township, NJ 08234-3901  
Ph: 609-383-8843  
Email: southernbranch@njfoodbank.org  
http://www.okus.com/foodbank/

The Community Food Bank of New Jersey Southern Branch is comprised of the following counties: Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland. Being located in the Southern region of New Jersey, this Food Bank Area contains many rural areas with often diffuse populations as well as larger shore towns with more concentrated impoverished populations. The many rural areas with diffuse and potentially food insecure populations challenge coordination of hunger relief efforts. For detail on the location of municipalities, please consult the Appendix A for County Political Maps.

Figure IV.B. Community Food Bank of New Jersey, Southern Branch
ATLANTIC COUNTY

Atlantic County is located in southern New Jersey along the east coast. The county has a large number of potentially food insecure populations with high concentrations in Pleasantville City and Atlantic City. There are numerous hunger relief resources spread across the county, however gaps exist in nutrition education due to the lack of any EFNEP/FSNEP education sites. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see the Appendix A, Atlantic County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Atlantic County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in Pleasantville and Atlantic City in the southeastern region of the county. The remainder of EFPs in the Atlantic County is distributed throughout the other parts of the county, even in those census tracts with a relatively small population under the 130% of poverty threshold.

![Figure 1: Atlantic County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level](image)
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of working poor is in Pleasantville and Atlantic City, however, there are areas of high numbers of working poor in the western part of the county as well. Many of the EFPs in the county are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. Even the more suburban and rural areas of the northwestern region have EFPs in areas with moderate populations of working poor and may be able to meet the needs of that group with the proper resources.

Figure 2: Atlantic County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Although there is a large low-income population, Atlantic County offers no sites that provide EFNEP or FSNEP education. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP programming, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. As shown previously, there are no EFNEP or FSNEP education sites in Atlantic County, creating a major gap in the county that should be addressed in order to help ensure that all low-income residents receive appropriate nutrition education.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in Pleasantville City and Atlantic City. Almost half of the census tracts in Atlantic County have more than 20% of children under the 185% threshold. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Atlantic County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Atlantic County shows a fair number of WIC-authorized farm retail outlets. Many of these locations are relatively close to WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. This provides people in these areas with the option of redeeming their farmers’ market vouchers on fresh produce from local farmers. The majority of the farm retail sites are located in the western half of the county where it is more rural. A dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers challenges the ability of FMNP voucher recipients to redeem them, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.

Figure 6: Atlantic County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps in Atlantic County tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. However, some users of Food Stamps in the north and northeast region of the county, who may be eligible for WIC programs, probably travel a considerable distance in order to visit a WIC office.

Figure 7: Atlantic County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
CAPE MAY COUNTY

Cape May County is located in southern tip of New Jersey. The county has a large number of potentially food insecure residents with particularly high numbers concentrated in Wildwood City. Numerous hunger relief resources are spread across the county, however, gaps probably exist in the availability of nutrition education due to the lack of any EFNEP/FSNEP education sites in Cape May County. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Cape May County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Cape May County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in Wildwood City and Middle Township in the southern region of the county. The remainder of EFPs are distributed throughout most of the county.

Figure 1: Cape May County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, some of the heaviest concentration of working poor is in Wildwood City, however, there are also areas of heavy concentrations of working poor in parts of Lower Township on the western coast. Many of the EFPs in the county are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. The northern region of the county has fewer EFPs in areas with moderate population of working poor and may under-serve the potential needs of this group in that area.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Cape May County has a number of sites where EFNEP programming is provided. These sites are concentrated in the southern area of the county in Middle Township, as well as the northeast corner of the county, in and near census tracts with the highest ranges of persons living below 130% of poverty. The northwestern part of the county has no site offering EFNEP (or FSNEP) education although several hundred persons live at or near poverty in that area. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP programming, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Cape May County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The map shows that the areas of high Hispanic populations below the poverty level have education sites nearby, except in the northwestern region of the county. If they are not already, these sites should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic population that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. There is a concentration of schools with 20% or more of the student population on free and reduced lunch in Wildwood City and Middle Township. These schools also are located in areas where there are large percentages of children meeting the requirement of being under 185% of the poverty level. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Cape May County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Cape May County shows a considerable gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. The majority of WIC-authorized farm retail outlets are located along the southwestern coast of the county with no WIC Centers/Offices within a close proximity. This gap of services limits the opportunities for WIC families and low-income seniors to redeem their FMNP vouchers on fresh farm produce that contains important nutrients.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers/Local Offices with the exception of the far southern part of Cape May County where very high concentrations of Food Stamp users reside.

**Figure 7: Cape May County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps**
CUMBERLAND COUNTY

Cumberland County is located in southern New Jersey bordering the Delaware River. The largest concentrations of poverty in the county are located in the cities of Bridgeton, Millville, and Vineland. Most emergency food resources are located in and near these areas; the least of these resources are available in the southern half of the county along the Delaware River. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Cumberland County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Cumberland County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the Cities of Bridgeton, Millville, and Vineland, all of which are grouped in the northern part of the county. The remainder of the county is relatively well served as there are EFPs located almost uniformly throughout the rest of the county. Residents living in the southern-most areas and the eastern border of the county may experience the most difficulty accessing EFPs.

Figure 1: Cumberland County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. The heaviest concentration of working poor lives in City of Vineland, however, there are also large populations in parts of Bridgeton City, Millville City, and Commercial Township. Many of the EFPs in the county are located within proximity of these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, the eastern part of the county has a considerable number of working poor who are spread across a large area that is a considerable distance from the EFPs in the county.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Sites that offer FSNEP education in Cumberland County are concentrated in the cities of Bridgeton and Vineland, with other locations spread throughout the county. The distribution of other sites for FSNEP programs is very good with the possible exception of the eastern border of the county. Areas in the southeast part of the county may not be receiving adequate nutrition education. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFNEP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided in Cumberland County and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The map shows that the areas of high Hispanic populations below the poverty level have education sites nearby. If they are not already, these sites should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.

Figure 4: Cumberland County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in Bridgeton, Millville, and Vineland. These schools are also located in the areas where the percentage of children meeting the requirement of being under 185% of the poverty level exceeds 20%. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Cumberland County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Cumberland County enjoys a good number of authorized farm retail outlets. Many of these locations are within a reasonable distance to WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. This provides people in these areas with the option of redeeming their farmers’ market vouchers on fresh produce from local farmers. The majority of these locations are in the northern half of the county, while the southern half of the county has almost no WIC locations suggesting that these areas are underserved by WIC programs. A dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers challenges the ability of FMNP voucher recipients to redeem them, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. Eligible WIC recipients from the relatively high Food Stamp use areas of Cumberland County, the central and southern part of the county, may need to travel a considerable way to reach a WIC office.

Figure 7: Cumberland County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Census Tract Level
Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative Region
151 Mercer Street
Trenton, NJ 08611
(609) 396-1506
http://www.mercerstreetfriends.org/home.asp

Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative is the smallest regional food bank and includes only Mercer County. Being located in the western region of New Jersey, this Food Bank Area contains the state capital of Trenton, as well as, its surrounding suburbs. The potentially food insecure populations reside mostly in the city of Trenton, although there are moderate numbers in the more suburban towns in the eastern part of the county. For detail on the location of municipalities, please consult Appendix A for County Political Maps.

Figure IV.C. Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative
MERCER COUNTY

Mercer County is located in western New Jersey and contains the state capital, Trenton. The City of Trenton has the largest and most concentrated population at risk for food insecurity in the county. As the following maps will show, most of the emergency food resources are located in this southwestern region of the county. The remainder of the county offers fewer resources to the more geographically dispersed food insecure population. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Mercer County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Mercer County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in and near the City of Trenton in the southwestern region of the county. The remainder of the county, particularly in the center and south, south-central reaches, may be underserved as there are few EFPs located outside of Trenton, yet there are hundreds of individuals that are potentially in need of the services provided.

Figure 1: Mercer County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level

![Map of Mercer County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level]
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of working poor is in City of Trenton, as well as, its neighboring suburbs. Large, but more moderate numbers of working poor are distributed throughout much of the east, south, and central parts of the county. Many of the EFPs are located directly in the areas with the highest numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. The more suburban area in the western region of the county may be underserved as there are hundreds of working poor in this area and few EFPs that meet the potential need of this population.

Figure 2: Mercer County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Sites offering EFNEP and FSNEP education are concentrated in the City of Trenton and its surrounding suburbs where the highest concentration of people in need reside, and where need may surpass the capacity of even these sites. The eastern part of the county, on the other hand, has hundreds of eligible residents distributed over a large area, but has no EFNEP or FSNEP site near by. Efforts should be considered to address these possible gaps in nutrition education so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided in Mercer County and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The map shows the co-location of sites offering EFNEP and FSNEP education and a concentration of Hispanic residents who are registered in the 2000 Census below the poverty level in the City of Trenton. If they are not already, these sites should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials. There are a moderate number of Hispanic residents below the poverty level living in the eastern part of the county who do not have any education sites within close proximity, suggesting a gap in these services in that area.

Figure 4: Mercer County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in the City of Trenton and its neighboring townships in the southwestern part of the county. These are also the areas where the percentage of children meeting the requirement of being under 185% of the poverty level exceeds 20%. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Mercer County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). With the possible exception of Trenton, Mercer County shows a substantial gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. While the WIC authorized farm retail outlets are fairly well spread uniformly through most of the county, the WIC Centers/Offices are concentrated in the city of Trenton and its neighboring townships. In addition, the western part of the county has only a few WIC locations across a large area, none within close proximity of WIC authorized farm retail outlets. These gaps limit the ability of families to redeem farmers’ market vouchers received through WIC programs on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by pregnant women, mothers, and children.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices, and the distribution of offices is very well laid out. However some users of Food Stamps in the very central region of the county may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in the WIC program in their county.
The Northwest New Jersey Community Action Program (NORWESCAP) Food Bank Area is comprised of the following counties: Hunterdon, Sussex, and Warren. Located in the Northwestern region of New Jersey, this Food Bank Area contains many rural areas with low-density residential patterns. The many rural areas are home to many low-income and potentially food insecure residents. The dispersed nature of rural areas may complicate the coordination of hunger relief efforts in this region. For detail on the location of municipalities, please consult Appendix A for County Political Maps.

Figure IV. D. NORWESCAP Food Bank
HUNTERDON COUNTY

Hunterdon County lies in the western region of New Jersey along the border with Pennsylvania. As the following maps will show, low-income residents are dispersed throughout the county making it difficult to coordinate emergency food resources to meet the needs of this population. While the number of individuals with a potential need for emergency hunger relief is low compared to many other counties in New Jersey, they still represent significant need for services. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Hunterdon County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Hunterdon County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. The population under the 130% threshold is spread throughout the county with higher levels of this low-income group in many of the county’s boroughs. EFPs are relatively evenly distributed and may be able to provide food assistance to most populations in need. We note, however, that in some areas in the northwestern and far southeastern parts of the county, low-income residents may need to travel several miles to reach the closest EFP.

Figure 1: Hunterdon County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the working poor tend to be spread throughout the county with the highest number in Flemington Borough. Many of the EFPs in the county are located near areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of the population in this area. A relatively small, but possibly significant spatial gap in services exists in the northwest, south, and southeast part of the county. This may lead to possible gaps in service due to possible transportation constraints.

Figure 2: Hunterdon County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by FSNEP in Hunterdon County offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. The map below illustrates a gap between the need for nutrition education and the available FSNEP services in Hunterdon County. While there is a large low-income community in the western region of the county, all sites where FSNEP education is provided are located on the eastern side of the county. Much of the eligible population in Hunterdon County may not have the transportation resources available to visit these sites. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Hunterdon County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. According to the 2000 Census, a relatively small number of Hispanic residents live below the poverty level in the county; most of them reside in Flemington Borough and Clinton Town. There are education sites within close proximity of both areas that, given adequate resources, should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.

Figure 4: Hunterdon County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. There are only three schools in the county meeting these criteria. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. The Hunterdon County schools with 20% or more of their student population eligible for free and reduced meals are not located in the heart of the western and northeastern parts of the county where most of the low-income children live. This suggests that some low-income students travel (probably by school bus) considerable distance to school and to their potential source of school-subsidized meals. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Hunterdon County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). The only WIC Center/Office is located in Flemington Borough. A WIC-authorized farmers’ market is co-located in close proximity. The lack of additional WIC Centers/Offices may severely limit the delivery of traditional WIC services to eligible populations in Hunterdon County, as well as, the access to FMNP vouchers. For those with access to vouchers, the location of farm retailers is limited to a swath through the west-central part of the county. A dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers challenges the ability of FMNP voucher recipients to redeem them, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.

Figure 6: Hunterdon County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the single WIC Program Center and Local Office location in the Hunterdon County. With no other WIC Program Centers or Local Offices in the rest of the county, WIC eligible persons from areas in and outside of high Food Stamp use areas may have problems accessing WIC services.
SUSSEX COUNTY

Sussex County lies in the north-northwestern tip of New Jersey. As the following maps will show, the larger part of the county’s low-income population is concentrated in the northern cap and northeastern part of the county. This very rural part of New Jersey is home to relatively few emergency food resources, possibly it is difficult to meet the needs of the population. We note again, that the number of individuals with potential need for emergency hunger relief is low compared to many of the more urban and suburban counties in New Jersey. Need in Sussex County is frustrated by distance to resources, that in turn, may not be heavily allocated in the region because of the relatively low numbers of persons in need. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Sussex County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Sussex County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. The population under the 130% threshold is at higher levels in the northern cap and the northeastern parts of the county, as well as, in Newton Town. EFPs are spread throughout the center of the county, providing food assistance to much of the population in need. In some areas in the northwestern parts of the county, however, low-income residents may need to travel a considerable distance to reach the closest EFP.

Figure 1: Sussex County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the working poor tend to be most represented in the northern half of the county with large numbers of working poor living as well in some of the boroughs in the southern half of the county. Many of the EFPs in the county are located near areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of the population in this area. However, the northern, western, and northeastern regions of the county have a considerable number of working poor that do not have many EFPs in close proximity. This may lead to possible gaps in service due to possible transportation constraints.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. Neither program operates in Sussex County although a significant number of low-income residents reside in the county. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided in Sussex County and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. The 2000 US Census shows relatively few Hispanics living below the poverty level in Sussex County. The highest number resides in Vernon Township in the western part of the county. As shown previously, there are no sites offering EFNEP or FSNEP education in Sussex County, creating a major gap in the county that should be addressed in order to help ensure that low-income residents of all backgrounds have access to nutrition education.

Figure 4: Sussex County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. There are three schools in the county meeting these criteria. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. The three schools with 20% or more of their student population eligible for free and reduced meals are located in some, but not all, of the areas where there are large percentages of children living under 185% of the poverty level. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Sussex County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). WIC Centers and Offices are distributed relatively evenly throughout Sussex County. WIC-authorized farm retailers are distributed rather thinly, with few or none on the western and eastern sides of the county. Two WIC offices are located in close proximity to WIC authorized farm stands. Distance between authorized retailers and WIC offices where FMNP vouchers are distributed may frustrate the ability of some WIC clients to redeem their vouchers on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by pregnant women, mothers, and children.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers/Local Offices. However, some users of Food Stamps who may be eligible for WIC services and who live in the western, northwestern, and central parts of the very rural County of Sussex may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in the WIC programs.

**Figure 7: Sussex County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level**
WARREN COUNTY

Warren County lies in the northwestern region of New Jersey. As the following maps will show, the low-income residents in the county are concentrated in Phillipsburg Town in the southwestern part of the county and in the northern part of the county. The rural and decentralized nature of the population makes it difficult for the county’s emergency food resources to meet the needs of this population. While the number of individuals with potential need for emergency hunger relief is low compared to many other counties in New Jersey, it represents a significant need. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Warren County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Warren County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. The population under the 130% threshold is spread throughout the county with higher levels in the northwest and in Phillipsburg Town in the south. EFPs are also spread throughout the county, providing food assistance to much of the population in need, however, in some areas in the northwestern part of the county, low-income residents may need to travel a considerable distance to reach the closest EFP.

Figure 1: Warren County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the higher numbers of working poor tend to be in the northwestern part of the county, as well as, Phillipsburg Town with the addition of Washington Borough. Many of the EFPs in the county are located near areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of the population in this area.

Figure 2: Warren County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites in Warren County by FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. This map illustrates a possible gap between the need and the services for nutrition education being provided in Warren County. While there is a large low-income population in the northern region of the county, the majority of the sites providing FSNEP education are located in its southern part. Much of the eligible population in Warren County (especially those in the northern parts) may not have the transportation resources available to visit these sites. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through the FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Warren County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. Relatively few Hispanics living below the poverty level reside in Warren County. Most are located in Phillipsburg, Washington Borough, and Hackettstown. There are education sites within close proximity of these areas that, given adequate resources, should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students at 185% of poverty and below exists in Phillipsburg, Washington Borough, and Hackettstown. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Warren County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). WIC Offices and Centers are located in the central and southern part of Warren County, mostly in more densely populated boroughs. No WIC offices exist in the northern part of the county. WIC-authorized farm retailers are located throughout the state. Though none of the farm retailers appears to be co-located with a WIC office, most have one in fairly close proximity. The lack of WIC Centers/Offices in the north may limit eligible populations’ access both to traditional WIC programs and to the FMNP. A dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers challenges the ability of FMNP voucher recipients to redeem them, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.

Figure 6: Warren County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the WIC Program Centers/Local Offices located in the county.

Figure 7: Warren County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties Region

3300 Route 66
Neptune Twp, New Jersey 07753
Ph: 732-918-2600
Fax: 732-918-2660
http://www.foodbankmoc.org/

The Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties Area is comprised of Monmouth and Ocean Counties. Being located in the central region of New Jersey along the east coast, this Food Bank Area contains many rural areas with often diffuse populations, as well as, larger shore towns with more concentrated low-income populations. The many rural areas with potentially food insecure populations may make it difficult to coordinate hunger relief efforts because of the spatial distance between needs and resources. For detail on the location of municipalities, please consult Appendix A for County Political Maps.

Figure IV.E. Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties
MONMOUTH COUNTY

Monmouth County is located in central New Jersey along the east coast. The county has a large number of potentially food insecure residents residing throughout the county, with high concentrations in some of the shore towns. There are many hunger relief resources available in the eastern region of the county; they become sparser in its western part. Monmouth County is blessed with farmers markets and farm stands, and has perhaps the best availability in New Jersey of WIC offices co-located with WIC-authorized farm retailers. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Monmouth County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Monmouth County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in shore towns on the southern and northern regions of the county. EFPs are also spread throughout the county, providing food assistance to most populations in need. However, in some areas in the central and western parts of the county, low-income residents may need to travel a considerable distance to reach the closest EFP.

Figure 1: Monmouth County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of working poor is in many of the shore towns, however, there are also areas of high working poor in the south and southwestern parts of the county. Many of the EFPs are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. Even the more suburban and rural areas of the northwestern region have EFPs in areas with moderate populations of working poor and may be able to meet the needs of this group with the proper resources.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. This map illustrates a possible gap between the need and the services for nutrition education being provided in Monmouth County. There is a large low-income population spread throughout the county. While many sites offer FSNEP education throughout the county, many low-income residents, particularly in the southwest part of the county, do not live in close proximity to the sites and would probably need to travel relatively far to participate. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. Most of the more concentrated poverty level Hispanic populations live in shore towns, however, there are inland census tracts that also exhibit higher numbers in poverty. There are sites offering FSNEP education within close proximity of almost all of these areas of larger numbers of low-income Hispanics. Given adequate resources, the sites should be able to provide nutrition education to these Hispanic populations, noting of course that the population may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools that have 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. Census tracts with 20-78% of the children under 18 years of age below 185% of poverty exist along the shore and in the central and southern county census tracts. A concentration of schools with 20% and more of their students eligible for free and reduced meals exists in towns along the coastal region of the county. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Monmouth County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Monmouth County enjoys a relative wealth of WIC-authorized farm retail outlets. Many of these locations are within a close distance to WIC Program Centers and Local Offices. This provides people in these areas with the option of redeeming their farmers’ market vouchers on fresh produce from local farmers. The majority of the farmers’ markets are located in the eastern half of the county, which is more densely populated. The WIC-authorized farm stands tend to be located more inland. While not perfect, the spatial relationship between WIC offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers represents a model that might be evaluated for replication, as appropriate, in other regions in the State.

**Figure 6: Monmouth County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level**
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In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps in Monmouth County tends to be concentrated around the locations of the well distributed WIC Program Centers and Local Offices in Monmouth County.
Ocean County is located on the east coast of New Jersey stretching from the central to southern region of the state. A large number of potentially food insecure populations is distributed throughout the county. Hunger relief resources are concentrated in the northeastern region of the county. They become sparser in the western and southern regions of the county. This challenges hunger relief efforts in the more western and southern regions as the relevant populations are often spread out over a large area. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Ocean County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Ocean County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in northeastern region with additional EFPs located in the central and southern parts of the county. A significant gap in EFP service may exist in the western corner of the county. Overall, clients in need probably need to travel farthest to access EFP services if they live in the western or central parts of the county.
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, large numbers of working poor are spread throughout the county. Many of the EFPs are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, the western corner of the county has a considerable number of working poor without any EFPs in close proximity. This possible gap between needs and resources may lead to challenges in service delivery due to clients’ possible transportation constraints.

Figure 2: Ocean County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites in Ocean County by FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. The map below illustrates a gap between the need and the services for nutrition education being provided in Ocean County. While there is a large low-income population throughout the county, almost all sites offering FSNEP education are located in northeastern region of the county leaving the rest of the county potentially underserved. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Ocean County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. Most of the areas of high Hispanic populations below the poverty level are in the northeastern region of the county. There are education sites within close proximity of these areas that, given adequate resources, should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.

Figure 4: Ocean County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. Of considerable note are the census tracts in Ocean County where half to 100% of the children under 18 were recorded living at 185% of poverty or below in 2000. A concentration of schools with 20% and more students eligible for free and reduced meals exists in the northeastern region of the county. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

**Figure 5: Ocean County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level**
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Ocean County has a number of WIC-authorized farm retail outlets, most of which are farmstands. A few of the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are located near the farm retailers. The western corner of the county has no WIC offices and the central and southern parts benefit from only two WIC-authorized farm retailers. A dislocation of WIC offices and farm retailers challenges the ability of FMNP voucher recipients to redeem them, thereby frustrating their access to healthy fresh fruits and vegetables.

Figure 6: Ocean County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. With the exception of the western cap of the county, the population using Food Stamps in Ocean County tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices.

Figure 7: Ocean County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
The Food Bank of South Jersey (FBSJ) is located in the southwestern region of New Jersey and is comprised of the following counties: Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, and Salem. FBSJ includes both, the densely populated City of Camden and its suburbs, and many rural areas with diffuse populations. FBSJ addresses the food distribution challenges associated with high poverty rates in both concentrated urban and dispersed rural low-income communities. For details on the location of municipalities, please consult Appendix A for County Political Maps.
BURLINGTON COUNTY

Burlington County is located in the western region of New Jersey along the Delaware River. The county has a large number of low-income and potentially food insecure residents living in the northern region. There are many hunger relief resources in the northwestern part of the county and fewer in the central, eastern and southern parts. Hunger relief efforts in the more rural western and southern regions may be challenged, therefore, by the distance low-income persons need to travel for services. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Burlington County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Burlington County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the northwestern region of the county, where most of low-income individuals live. However, a gap in service may exist in some areas in the southern and eastern parts of the county where low-income residents may need to travel a considerable distance to reach the closest EFP.

Figure 1: Burlington County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, high numbers of working poor are located in the northern part of the county. Many of the EFPs are located directly in these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. The map below illustrates a gap between the need and the services being provided in Burlington County. While there are large numbers of low-income residents, all of the sites offering FSNEP education are located in northwestern region of the county around Mount Holly Township, possibly leaving the rest of the county’s low-income residents underserved. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. Only one of the areas with high numbers of Hispanic residents below the poverty level, in Mount Holly, is within close proximity to sites offering FSNEP education sites. The remainder of areas with large numbers of low-income Hispanics may not be receiving the nutrition education they need.

Figure 4: Burlington County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Hispanic Population Below Poverty (100%), Census Tract Level
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. Please note the large number of census tracts with 40-68% and 20-40% of the children living at less than 185% of poverty. All but one of the schools with more than 20% of its students eligible for free/reduced meals are located in the northern part of the county. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Burlington County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Burlington County shows a moderate gap between the WIC locations where WIC-eligible food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets where WIC families can redeem those vouchers. The WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are concentrated in the northern region of the county, as are the WIC-authorized farm retailers. Two WIC offices appear almost co-located with an authorized farm retailer. In at least two other cases, retailers are located in proximity to the WIC offices. The southern part of the county is bereft of both WIC offices and WIC-authorized farm stands. This complicates access to traditional WIC, as well as, the newer FMNP services for residents in the southern part of the county.

Figure 6: Burlington County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers/Local Offices in Burlington County. However, there are a large number of Food Stamp users in Pemberton Township, as well as, some areas in the southeastern region of the county, who may be eligible for WIC services and may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in WIC programs.

Figure 7: Burlington County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using
Food Stamps, Municipal Level
CAMDEN COUNTY

Camden County is located in the southwestern region of New Jersey and contains the City of Camden. There is a large number of low-income and potentially food insecure residents living throughout the county. The greatest concentration of poor and working poor persons live in and near Camden with as many as 3,146 persons at 130% of poverty in one census tract alone. A great many hunger relief resources exist in the northern region of the county, however, they become sparser in the southern part of the county. This challenges hunger relief efforts in the more rural eastern and southern regions because the relevant populations are often spread out over a large area. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Camden County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Camden County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the north/northwestern region of the county around the City of Camden, but are also spread more thinly throughout the county.

Figure 1: Camden County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty Level, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, large numbers of working poor are spread throughout the county with concentrations in Camden and areas in the western region. Many of the EFPs are located in close proximity to these areas with high numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, the southern region of the county has a considerable number of working poor with fewer EFPs in close proximity. This may lead to possible gaps in service.

Figure 2: Camden County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. The map below illustrates a gap between the need for nutrition education and the location of EFNEP services provided in Camden County. While there is a very large low-income population located throughout the county, all of the sites offering EFNEP education are located in and near the City of Camden, possibly leaving the rest of the county underserved. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible individuals and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Camden County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided in Camden County and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. A concentration of Hispanic residents below the poverty level is located in the city of Camden. There are education sites within close proximity of these areas that, given adequate resources, should be able to provide nutrition education to Hispanic populations that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. Please note the large number of census tracts in and near Camden where 50-100% of children live below 185% of poverty, as well as, census tracts throughout the county where 20-50% of children are below 185% of poverty. A concentration of schools with 20% and more of their students eligible for free and reduced school meals exists in and near Camden. Such schools are also relatively evenly distributed along the entire southern side of the county. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Camden County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Camden County shows a gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to redeem them. The WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are concentrated in the northwestern region of the county. An additional WIC office lies in the south central, and another in the eastern part, of the county. In and near Camden, WIC-authorized farm retailers are located in proximity to some of the WIC offices, but may be difficult to access them. In the southern and eastern parts of the county, farm retailers are not proximate to WIC offices, complicating access by WIC eligible residents. These gaps limit the ability of families to redeem farmers’ market vouchers received through WIC programs on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by pregnant women, mothers, and children.

Figure 6: Camden County WIC Program Centers, Local Offices and Authorized Farm Retail Outlets, Census Tract Level
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers/Local Offices in Camden County. However, some users of Food Stamps who live in the central, southern, and eastern parts of the county, who are also WIC-eligible, may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in the WIC services. Some of these latter residents may be visiting WIC offices in Gloucester County.

Figure 7: Camden County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
GLOUCESTER COUNTY

Gloucester County is located in the southwestern part of New Jersey along the Delaware River. The county has a large number of low-income and potentially food insecure residents. Many hunger relief resources are located in the northern and eastern regions of the county, however, they become sparser in the western part. Due to the rural nature of most of Gloucester County, the diffused low-income population may be challenged in accessing the available hunger relief resources. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Gloucester County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Gloucester County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in the eastern and northern parts of the county, with many in Glassboro Borough and Woodbury City. EFPs are also spread throughout the southern region of the county. A gap in service may exist in the northwestern part where populations may need to travel a considerable distance to reach the closest EFP.

Figure 1: Gloucester County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, large numbers of working poor are spread throughout the county, with the highest numbers in Woodbury City. Many of the EFPs in the county are located directly in the census tracks that show larger numbers of working poor and, given adequate resources, may be able to meet the potential needs of this population. However, the northwestern region of the county has a considerable number of working poor without many EFPs in close proximity. This may lead to possible gaps in service.

Figure 2: Gloucester County Emergency Food Providers and Working Poor Population (130-200% Poverty), Census Tract Level
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. The map below shows that, with few exceptions, there is good spatial coordination between concentrations of low-income residents and sites providing EFNEP education in Gloucester County. Low-income populations in need of nutrition education in the northwestern and southern regions of the county may have some problem reaching the teaching sites. Efforts should be considered to address this gap, if applicable, so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through EFNEP and FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. Most of the Hispanic residents living below the poverty level reside in the Boroughs of Glassboro and Paulsboro, which have nutrition education sites in close proximity. Given adequate resources, including Spanish-language instructors, the education sites should be able to provide EFNEP and FSNEP nutrition education to the Hispanic populations including those that may require bi-lingual nutrition education courses and materials.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. Please note that in several census tracts, a third to over half of the children live below 185% of poverty. In even more census tracts, 20-35% of children live below 185% of poverty. A concentration of schools with 20% and more of their students eligible for free and reduced meals exists in the north-northeastern cap of the county. With the exception of the far western corner of the county, these schools are in close proximity to the census tracts indicating high numbers of eligible children. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Gloucester County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Gloucester County shows a fair number of WIC-authorized farm retail outlets (especially farm stands). WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are located solely along the northern and northeastern border of the county. With one exception, WIC offices are not located near farm retailers. The dislocation between WIC offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers limits the ability of families to redeem farmers’ market vouchers on fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by pregnant women, mothers, and children.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be concentrated around the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices, which lies along the north-southeast line of Gloucester County. However, some users of Food Stamps, who are also WIC-eligible and who live in the southern region of the county, may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in WIC programs.
SALEM COUNTY

Salem County is located in the southwestern corner of New Jersey where the Delaware River opens into the Delaware Bay. While the number of individuals with potential need for emergency hunger relief is generally low compared to many of the more urban and suburban counties in New Jersey, these individuals represent significant need. The county offers relatively few hunger relief resources. Accessing the available resources might be challenging for Salem County’s rural and decentralized low-income residents. For detail on the location of county municipalities, please see Appendix A, Salem County Political Map.

Figure 1 illustrates the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in Salem County, as well as, the population below 130% of the poverty level. EFPs are concentrated in Penns Grove Borough and Salem City. These locations account for almost all of the EFPs in the county. Thus, the remainder of the county’s potentially food insecure population may be underserved and certainly at a disadvantage relative to the distance they might need to travel to access the available EFPs.

Figure 1: Salem County Emergency Food Providers and Population Under 130% of Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 2 shows the geographic location of EFPs in the county and overlays the population between 130% and 200% of the poverty level. This population represents the “working poor” who are often overlooked in hunger relief efforts due to their higher income, but who are often in need of emergency food services. Similar to the population under 130% of the poverty level, the heaviest concentration of working poor is in Penns Grove Borough and Salem City, however, there are also areas of high working poor in the eastern part of the county. Many of the EFPs are located directly in Penns Grove and Salem, however the rest of the county’s working poor are not in close proximity to any EFPs. Efforts might be considered to increase the number of EFP locations across the county and to provide adequate resources to meet the potential needs of these populations.
Figure 3 displays the geographic location of where the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) education sites are provided and the population under 130% of the poverty level. Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security. There are no sites providing EFNEP or FSNEP education in Salem County although there is a significant low-income population. Efforts should be considered to address this gap so that eligible people and families can participate in the nutrition education programs offered through FSNEP sites, as well as, through expanded nutrition education opportunities in the county’s EFP agencies.

Figure 3: Salem County Sites Where EFNEP or FSNEP Education is Provided and Population Under 130% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 4 shows the geographic location of sites where EFNEP or FSNEP education is provided in Salem County and the Hispanic residents who are counted in the 2000 Census as living below the poverty level. At a threshold of 100% of poverty, the data show the number of Hispanic persons per census tract who have a particular vulnerability to food insecurity. Education sites near large populations of low-income Hispanics probably need Spanish language capacity on their staff and in their program materials. As shown previously, there are no sites offering FSNEP education in Salem County, creating a major gap that should be addressed in order to help ensure all low-income persons are receiving proper nutrition education.
With US Department of Agriculture funding, schools provide food resources for low-income students. Figure 5 reflects 2004-2005 school data analyzed to identify those schools who had 20% or more of their student population eligible for (not participating in) the free or reduced meal program, i.e., the student population at 185% of poverty or less. Children under 130% of poverty may receive school lunch for free. Children at 130-185% of poverty may pay substantially subsidized prices for school lunches. The catchment area for schools is a school district. There are no poverty statistics for school districts, only for census tracts. Therefore, the schools are mapped against 2000 Census data showing the percent of children below 185% of poverty in each of the county census tracts. Schools with 20% and more of their students eligible for free and reduced meals are concentrated in Penns Grove Borough and Salem City, and also distributed throughout the county. Future efforts in support of food security might target emergency food clients in these areas who have school-age children to remind them of the school-based food programs in which their children can participate.

Figure 5: Salem County Schools with +20% Free/Reduced Lunch and Children Under 185% Poverty, Census Tract Level
Figure 6 shows the geographic locations of the New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) offices and WIC-authorized farm retailers who participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP). Salem County shows a gap between the locations where food insecure families receive their farmers’ market vouchers and the farm retail outlets that are authorized to accept them. The three WIC Centers/Offices in the county are located in Penns Grove Borough and Salem City. The eastern side of the county has no WIC offices. Eligible families may rely on WIC offices in Gloucester and Atlantic County. The three Salem County WIC offices are within relatively close proximity of WIC-authorized farm retail outlets. WIC-authorized farmstands are located in the central and western parts of the county, though none presently exist in the south and eastern sides. Due to distances between where WIC-recipients pick up their vouchers and the WIC-authorized farm retailers, some families may experience problems redeeming their vouchers. Such a situation limits families’ access to fresh farm produce that contains many important nutrients needed by pregnant women, mothers, and children.
In Figure 7, the WIC Program Centers and Local Offices are shown mapped against the number of persons in each municipality that uses Food Stamps. WIC supplementary feeding programs provide nutrition counseling and food supplements to single parents and their children ages 5 and below, who are at or below 185% of poverty. The Food Stamp Program is for those at 130% of poverty and below. As part of a national program, New Jersey WIC offices also provide their clients and low-income seniors with vouchers for fresh fruits and vegetables from WIC-authorized New Jersey farm retailers (farmers’ markets, farm stands, youth farm stands, and farm tailgate operations). WIC offices refer clients to County Welfare Offices who are likely to be eligible for the Food Stamp Program, but not yet enrolled. Together, Food Stamps and WIC services form a significant part of the emergency food services available to food insecure populations. For the most part, the population using Food Stamps tends to be in close proximity to the location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices in Salem County. However, since there are only three locations in two municipalities of the entire county, WIC-eligible Food Stamp users (and non-Food Stamp users) may need to travel a considerable distance in order to participate in the WIC programs.

Figure 7: Salem County WIC Program Centers/Local Offices and Population Using Food Stamps, Municipal Level
V. Gap Analysis Toolkit

Overview

The Gap Analysis Toolkit can aid decision makers and geographic information systems (GIS) professionals in analyzing where “gaps” may exist between the populations in need of food assistance and the food resources that are available. Through the use of GIS software and datasets, the Toolkit allows the manipulation of numerous food assistance and population databases to visually illustrate the “gaps” in hunger relief efforts.

The potential to direct the power of this Toolkit lies in the ability of hunger relief decision makers and GIS professionals to cooperate and create maps with customized geography, and datasets in response to the particular needs of an organization, a program, or a territory. This section outlines the different components of the Toolkit. With the large amount of data included and the ability to append additional data, the usefulness of the Toolkit is only bound by the creativity of those using it.

The review of datasets in the following sections provides a GIS-knowledgeable person with an introduction to the database CD of the Toolkit. Datasets were selected in collaboration with the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee. They include:

- New Jersey Emergency Food Providers; this list originates from the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (n=1,114).
- Teaching sites of two State-wide nutrition education programs, Expanded Food and Nutrition Education program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP), (n=509 for both programs).
- New Jersey Schools where 20% or more of enrolled students are eligible for free and reduced lunch and breakfast (where offered) programs (n=1,095).
- New Jersey-based Women Infant Children (WIC) administrative centers and local offices (n=217).
- WIC Authorized farmers’ markets, farm stands, and youth farm stands (n=250).
- Food Stamp use (raw use data by NJ municipality)
- Census poverty data at the census tract level in New Jersey.

Each dataset in the Toolkit CD includes the file name, the dataset source, a description of the data, and a description of the variable. The following section provides a written description of what can be found on the CD.
**Dataset Limitations**

The datasets are limited to those points that can be mapped. The dataset for emergency food providers, for example, does not include those sites that do not have a regular “store front” that welcomes all potential clients. Some datasets should not be created because of their confidential nature. A case in point are domestic violence shelters that will share only a post office box address.

The interpretation of most of the maps in this report must take into consideration that the poverty data from the 2000 US Census are already six years old. These data are being compared against the newest sources of other data sets, for example, the 2004-2005 data on eligibility for free and reduced price school meals and the 2005 list of farm retailers participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program. The necessity to adjust the interpretation of maps according to the age of the data will continue as datasets are updated and added. Care should be taken when reporting these figures and any limitations or suspected inaccuracies should be noted.

**Recommendations for Future Use**

As stated earlier, the applications for the Gap Analysis Toolkit are only constrained by the creativity of its users and the data available. The Toolkit can provide hunger relief organizations with the data and analysis they need in order to better serve their target populations, track the effectiveness of their programs and initiatives, and to leverage the funding and resources necessary to remain successful in battling food insecurity in New Jersey.

To remain accurate and useful, the data for this Toolkit must be updated regularly. During the data collection period for this report, we found many incongruities when we ground tested some of the addresses in lists given to us. By “ground tested” I mean that we called owners, occasionally visited, and compared lists to internet addresses. Some addresses were no longer valid or had changed. While continual updating of these datasets would be labor intensive, an “update schedule” should be designed to keep data relevant and collection efforts reasonable. Using the sources provided below, future users of this Toolkit will be able to contact the appropriate agencies or organizations to request updated data.

Examples of additional datasets that might be considered for future inclusion are:

- More detailed Census data on population and poverty. In addition to the Census Tract level provided in the Toolkit, the U.S. Census Bureau provides this data at the Census Block Group level, allowing a much finer level of detail and analysis. Also, custom datasets can be developed by the U.S. Census Bureau for a fee, allowing hunger relief organizations to purchase more detailed and specific datasets to fit their needs.

- Common transportation routes, especially at the local level. Considering that transportation limitations can confound the ability of both urban and rural populations
to access hunger relief resources, knowledge of what mass transit opportunities exist in different regions of the state may aid in making these resources available.

While this report provides general analyses of emergency food resources in the state and its counties, future use of the Toolkit might focus on sub-regional and local level analysis. The ability to analyze where gaps may exist within municipalities or regions within a county will assist in developing future strategies and resource allocations to more effectively meet the needs of low-income populations. Given the limited financial and personnel resources of many hunger relief organizations, the capability to easily locate near-by hunger relief resources and guide clients to them efficiently might be a considerable asset.

An additional benefit to local and sub-regional use of this Toolkit is the ability for hunger relief organizations to identify other organizations that may be willing to combine efforts to address a common concern in a given area. Through the creation of partnerships, hunger relief and nutrition education organizations may be able more effectively to integrate and focus their efforts to address pressing issues, while sharing the financial and personnel costs of such initiatives. Facilitating this process entails the integrated use of the Gap Report Toolkit and survey data from the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers, as well as, the engagement of staff and volunteers from interested EFPs.

The Gap Analysis Toolkit can be a powerful resource if it is made available to the individuals and organizations that need it. With respect for the need to keep some of the data confidential (e.g., EFPs that do not want a public profile), with respect for the confidentiality for EFPs that elect not to be publicly known, we highly recommend that this Toolkit be made publicly available. This can be done in two ways:

- Resources might be devoted for GIS software and staff training at Food Banks and/or other locations to expand the proper use of the Toolkit. Food Bank Areas, for example, may want to dedicate staff to provide analysis on request to emergency food providers in their region. ESRI provides a free GIS map viewing software package called ArcReader, which would allow local sites with limited resources to view and manipulate maps created with the Gap Analysis Toolkit by parent and regional organizations.
- A website might be developed to broaden access and use of much of the Gap Analysis data to a broader public who would not require GIS capabilities to engage with the information. For example:
  - Hunger relief providers could use an easy-to-use publicly-available website to counsel clients on where to go for additional local available emergency food resources (Food Stamps, farmers markets, WIC offices, sites that offer EFNEP and FSNEP education, etc.)
  - Hunger relief providers who are willing to be publicly listed could have discrete access to the website in order to update information on their operations (hours of operation, services, referral requirements, request for volunteers, etc.).
  - Selective website entrance might also serve to link interested hunger relief providers to promote regional cooperation and communication.
**Gap Analysis Toolkit Datasets**

**Emergency Food Providers**

**DATASET SOURCES**
This dataset was created with assistance from the members of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Council including members from the New Jersey Department of Agriculture, New Jersey Regional Food Bank System, and Linden Department of Community Social Services, as well as the Rutgers Department of Nutritional Sciences. All data was collected between June and December 2004.

**DESCRIPTION OF DATA**
This dataset provides the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in New Jersey. A list of Emergency Food Providers in the state was generated with help from the members of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Council. The data was then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

**FILE NAMES**
- efp.shp
- efp.shx
- efp.dbf
- efp.prj
- efp.sbn
- efp.sbx
- efp.shp.xml

**VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS**
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
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- ARC_Zone – Geocoded zip code
- ID – Assigned identification number for Emergency Food Provider
- County - County of EFP
- FdBank – New Jersey Food Bank Area ID number
  - 1 = Community Food Bank of New Jersey Area
  - 2 = Community Food Bank of New Jersey Southern Branch Area
  - 3 = Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative Area
  - 4 = Northwest New Jersey Community Action Program (NORWESCAP) Food Bank Area
  - 5 = Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties Area
  - 6 = Food Bank of South Jersey
- EFPName1 – Primary name of Emergency Food Provider
- EFPName2 – Secondary name of Emergency Food Provider
- Address - Street address of EFP
- City – Geographic City of EFP
- Zip – Geographic Zip Code of EFP
- MailAddr – Mailing address of EFP
- MailCity – Mailing City of EFP
- MailZip – Mailing Zip Code of EFP
- Phone – Phone number of EFP
- Fax – Fax number of EFP
- Email – Email address of EFP
- Website – Website address of EFP

Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) Teaching Sites

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created with assistance from Debra Palmer Keenan, New Jersey State EFNEP Coordinator and Director of New Jersey FSNEP programs, and her staff. EFNEP and FSNEP County Projects are administered out of Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension Program. All data were collected between December 2004 and February 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of sites in New Jersey that provide education programming from the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP). The list of the teaching sites was generated with help from New Jersey State EFNEP Coordinator and Director of New Jersey FSNEP County Projects. The
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data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security.

EFNEP operates in all 50 U.S. States on a fixed budget. It has been in existence for over 30 years. EFNEP programming is available to any low-income children and low-income adult groups where 50% or more of the participants are caregivers of young children or pregnant. “Low-income” is loosely defined, but typically interpreted as those at or below 185% of the poverty level.

FSNEP began in 1992 with participating State agencies. New Jersey has been a participating state since the mid-1990s. FSNEP programming is available at sites that serve Food Stamp program eligible individuals exclusively, or sites that provide a good means of reaching Food Stamp eligibles and that can document that at least 50 percent of those reached will have gross incomes at or below 185% of the poverty threshold.

FILE NAMES

- EFFSNEP.shp
- EFFSNEP.shx
- EFFSNEP.dbf
- EFFSNEP.prj
- EFFSNEP.sbn
- EFFSNEP.sbx
- EFFSNEP.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
• **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
• **County** - County of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **LegDist** – Legislative District number of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Type** – Type of education site (EFNEP or FSNEP)
• **Name** – Name of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Address** - Street address of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **City** – Geographic City of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Zip** – Geographic Zip Code of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Phone** – Phone number of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Fax** – Fax number of EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Contact** – Contact person for EFNEP/FSNEP site
• **Email** – Email address of EFNEP/FSNEP site

**Schools with 20% or More of Students with Free or Reduced Lunch**

**DATASET SOURCE**
This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Education. Data are for the 2004-2005 academic year and were collected in May 2005.

**DESCRIPTION OF DATA**
This dataset provides the geographic location of schools with 20% or more of their students eligible for free or reduced meals in New Jersey. Students from households at less than 130% of poverty are eligible for free lunches. Students from households between 130% and 185% of poverty are eligible for reduced price lunches. Eligibility should not be confused with participation. Participation data are available upon request, but could not be secured for the 2004-2005 academic year during the period of this research project. A list of schools meeting this criterion in the state was provided by the New Jersey Department of Education. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

**FILE NAMES**
• schools.shp
• schools.shx
• schools.dbf
• schools.dbf
• schools.prj
• schools.sbn
VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **CO** – NJ Department of Education County Code
- **COUNTY** – County of school
- **DIST** – NJ Department of Education School District Code
- **DISTRICT** – School District of school
- **SCH** – NJ Department of Education School Code
- **SCHOOLS** – School name
- **TENROLL** – Total enrollment of students
- **COLOC** – NJ Department of Education County of Location Code
- **PCTPOV** – Percent of enrolled students eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program
- **Address1** – Street address of school
- **Address2** – Secondary or additional address information for school
- **CITY** – City of school
- **ZIP** – Zip Code of school
- **schtype** – Type of school (Elementary School, Middle School, etc.)
- **Phone** – Phone number of school

Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC)
Program Centers and Local Offices

**DATASET SOURCE**

This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Data were collected in the Fall 2004.
DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices in New Jersey. A list of centers was provided by the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- wicoff.shp
- wicoff.shx
- wicoff.dbf
- wicoff.prj
- wicoff.sbn
- wicoff.sbx
- wicoff.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **County** – County of WIC Program Center
- **Name** – Name of WIC Program Center
- **Address** – Street address of WIC Program Center
- **Address2** – Secondary or additional address information for WIC Program Center
- **City** – Geographic City of WIC Program Center
- **Zip** – Geographic Zip Code of WIC Program Center
- **Contact** – Contact person for WIC Program Center
- **Phone** – Phone number of WIC Program Center
- **Fax** – Fax number of WIC Program Center
- **Email** – Email address of WIC Program Center
- **Type** – Type of location (Program Center or Local Office)
Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC)-Authori
d Farm Retailers Participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP)

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Hea
th and Senior Services, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and C
ildren (WIC). Data were collected in the Fall 2004.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of WIC-authorized Farmers’ Markets in New Jersey that participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) and are authorized by WIC to accept FMNP vouchers. The list of farmers’ markets was provided by the WIC office in the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- farmmarket.shp
- farmmarket.shx
- farmmarket.dbf
- farmmarket.prj
- farmmarket.sbn
- farmmarket.sbx
- farmmarket.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
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- Y – Y coordinate of point
- ARC_Street – Geocoded street address
- ARC_Zone – Geocoded zip code
- County - County of farmers’ market
- Name – Name of farmers’ market
- Address - Street address of farmers’ market
- City – Geographic City of farmers’ market
- Zip – Geographic Zip Code of farmers’ market
- Contact – Contact person for farmers’ market
- Phone – Phone number of contact person

Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC)
Authorized Farm Stands and Youth Farm Stands

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Data were collected in the Fall 2004.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of WIC-authorized Farm Stands and Youth Farm Stands in New Jersey that participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), and are authorized by WIC to accept FMNP vouchers. The list of Farm Stands and Youth Farm Stands was provided by the WIC office in the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- wicfarm.shp
- wicfarm.shx
- wicfarm.dbf
- wicfarm.prj
- wicfarm.sbn
- wicfarm.sbx
- wicfarm.shp.xml
Municipal Food Stamp Use Data

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created from data provided by New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Family Services and GIS data made publicly available by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Data were collected in May 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the number of individuals using Food Stamps by New Jersey municipality. The data were broken down to show both the number of adults and the number of children using Food Stamps. Data on the number of individuals using Food Stamps were provided by the New Jersey Department of Human Services. The data were then joined to a municipal GIS shape file.
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provided by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- munfs.shp
- munfs.shx
- munfs.dbf
- munfs.prj
- munfs.sbn
- munfs.sbx
- munfs.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **AREA** – Area of the municipality in square feet
- **PERIMETER** – Perimeter of the municipality in feet
- **FIPSSTCO** – Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the state and county of the municipality
- **FIPSCO** - Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the county of the municipality
- **FIPS** - Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the county and municipality
- **SSN** – Social Security Number Area
- **MUN** – Name of municipality
- **COUNTY** – County of municipality
- **MUNCOUNTY** – Name of municipality and its county
- **ACRES** – Area of the municipality in acres
- **SQ_MILES** – Area of the municipality in square miles
- **POP2000** – U.S. Census reported population for the year 2000
- **POP1990** – U.S. Census reported population for the year 1990
- **POP1980** – U.S. Census reported population for the year 1980
- **POPDEN2000** – U.S. Census reported population density for the year 2000
- **POPDEN1990** – U.S. Census reported population density for the year 1990
- **POPDEN1980** – U.S. Census reported population density for the year 1980
- **FSChild** – Number of children using Food Stamps
- **FSAult** – Number of adults using Food Stamps
- **FSTot** – Total number of individuals using Food Stamps
U.S. Census Poverty Data by Census Tract

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created from data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau and GIS data made publicly available by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Data were from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and was collected in the Spring of 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides various measures of poverty and population statistics in New Jersey at the census tract level. The data were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau’s “American Fact Finder” Data Query Tool. These data were then transformed to meet the needs of this project and joined to a census tract GIS shape file provided by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- census.shp
- census.shx
- census.dbf
- census.prj
- census.sbn
- census.sbx
- census.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

Geographic Variables
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **FIPSSTCO** – Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the state and county of the census tract
- **TRACT** – Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the census tract
- **STFID** – 11-digit census tract identifier key
- **TRACTID** – Census tract identification number
- **COUNTY** – County of census tract
- **NAME** – Verbose name of census tract
- **Area** – Area of census tract in square feet
- **Perimeter** – Perimeter of census tract in feet
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- Acres – Area of census tract in acres
- Hectares – Area of census tract in hectares
- Sq_Miles – Area of census tract in square miles

General Race and Age Population Variables
- Totpop – Total population
- White – White population
- Black – Black or African American population
- AIAN – American Indian and Alaskan Native population
- Asian – Asian population
- NHOPI – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population
- Other – Other Race population
- TorMR – Two or More Races population
- NotHisp – Non-Hispanic population
- NHWhite - Non-Hispanic White population
- NHBlack - Non-Hispanic Black population
- NHAIAN - Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaskan Native population
- NHAsian - Non-Hispanic Asian population
- NHNHOPI - Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population
- NHOther - Non-Hispanic Other Race population
- NHTorMR - Non-Hispanic Two or More Races population
- Hisp – Hispanic population
- HWhite – Hispanic White population
- HBlack – Hispanic Black population
- HAIAN – Hispanic American Indian and Alaskan Native population
- HAsian – Hispanic Asian population
- HNHOPI – Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population
- HOther – Hispanic Other Race population
- HTorMR – Hispanic Two or More Races population
- PU18 – Population under the age of 18
- P1864 – Population between the ages of 18 and 64
- PO65 – Population 65 years of age and older
- Male – Male population
- MU18 – Males under the age of 18
- M1864 – Males between the ages of 18 and 64
- M65O – Males 65 years of age and older
- Female – Female population
- FU18 – Females under the age of 18
- F1864 – Females between the ages of 18 and 64
- F65O – Females 65 years of age and older
Household Poverty Variables

- **TotalHH** - Total number of households
- **MHHI** – Median household income
- **TPovHH** – Total number of households for which poverty status is determined
- **HU150** – Households under 150% of poverty level
- **HU150MC** – Households under 150% of poverty level with married couple
- **HU150FMH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with families with male householder only
- **HU150FFH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with families with female householder
- **HU150NMH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with non-family male households only
- **HU150NFH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with non-family households
- **HO150** – Households over 150% of poverty level
- **HO150MC** - Households over 150% of poverty level with married couple
- **HO150FMH** - Households over 150% of poverty level with families with male householder only
- **HO150FFH** - Households over 150% of poverty level with families with female householder only
- **HO150NMH** - Households over 150% of poverty level with non-family male householder only
- **HO150NFH** - Households over 150% of poverty level with non-family female householder only

Family Poverty Variables

- **TotFam** – Total number of families
- **FBPL** – Families below poverty level
- **FBMC** – Families below poverty level with married couple
- **FBMCCU18** - Families below poverty level with married couple and children under the age of 18
- **FBMCNC** - Families below poverty level with married couple and no children
- **FBMH** - Families below poverty level with male householder only
- **FBMHCUCU18** - Families below poverty level with male householder only and children under the age of 18
- **FBMHNC** - Families below poverty level with male householder only and no children
- **FBFH** - Families below poverty level with female householder only
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- FBFHCU18 - Families below poverty level with female householder only and children under the age of 18
- FBFHNC - Families below poverty level with female householder only and no children
- FAPL - Families above poverty level
- FAMC - Families above poverty level with married couple
- FAMCCU18 - Families above poverty level with married couple with children under the age of 18
- FAMCNC - Families above poverty level with married couple with no children
- FAMH - Families above poverty level with male householder only
- FAMHCU18 - Families above poverty level with male householder only and children under the age of 18
- FAMHNC - Families above poverty level with male householder only with no children
- FAFH - Families above poverty level with female householder only
- FAFHCU18 - Families above poverty level with female householder only and children under the age of 18
- FAFHNC - Families above poverty level with female householder only and no children

Individual Poverty by Age and Sex Variables

- TPovPop – Total population for which poverty status is determined
- BPL – Population below poverty level
- BPLU18 – Population under the age of 18 below poverty level
- BPL1864 – Population between the ages of 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BPL65O – Population 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- BM – Males below poverty level
- BMU18 – Males under the age of 18 below poverty level
- BM1864 – Males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BM65O – Males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- BF – Females below poverty level
- BFU18 – Females under the age of 18 below poverty level
- BF1864 – Females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BF65O – Females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- APL – Population above poverty level
- APLU18 - Population under the age of 18 above poverty level
- APL1864 - Population between the ages of 18 and 64 above poverty level
- APL65O - Population 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- AM - Males above poverty level
- AMU18 - Males under the age of 18 above poverty level
- AM1864 - Males between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- AM65O - Males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
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- **AF** - Females above poverty level
- **AFU18** - Females under the age of 18 above poverty level
- **AF1864** - Females between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AF65O** - Females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

### Ratio of Income to Poverty Variables (Percent of Poverty Level)

- **U50PL** – Population under 50% of poverty level
- **U75PL** - Population under 75% of poverty level
- **U100PL** - Population under 100% of poverty level
- **U125PL** - Population under 125% of poverty level
- **U130PL** - Population under 130% of poverty level
- **U150PL** - Population under 150% of poverty level
- **U175PL** - Population under 175% of poverty level
- **U185PL** - Population under 185% of poverty level
- **U200PL** - Population under 200% of poverty level
- **O200PL** – Population at or over 200% of poverty level
- **U50U18** – Population under the age of 18 under 50% poverty level
- **U75U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 75% poverty level
- **U100U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 100% poverty level
- **U125U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 125% poverty level
- **U130U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 130% poverty level
- **U150U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 150% poverty level
- **U175U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 175% poverty level
- **U185U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 185% poverty level
- **U200U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 200% poverty level
- **O200U18** – Population under the age of 18 at or over 200% poverty level
- **U501864** – Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 50% poverty level
- **U751864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 75% poverty level
- **U1001864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 100% poverty level
- **U1251864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 125% poverty level
- **U1301864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 130% poverty level
- **U1501864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 150% poverty level
- **U1751864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 175% poverty level
- **U1851864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 185% poverty level
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- U2001864 - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 200% poverty level
- O2001864 - Population between the ages 18 and 64 at or over 200% poverty level
- U5065O – Population 65 years of age and older under 50% poverty level
- U7565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 75% poverty level
- U10065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 100% poverty level
- U12565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 125% poverty level
- U13065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 130% poverty level
- U15065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 150% poverty level
- U17565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 175% poverty level
- U18565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 185% poverty level
- U20065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 200% poverty level
- O20065O - Population 65 years of age and older at or over 200% poverty level

White Race Poverty Variables

- WBPL – White population below poverty level
- WMBPL – White males below poverty level
- WMU18B – White males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- WM1864B - White males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- WM65OB - White males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- WFBPL – White females below poverty level
- WFU18B - White females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- WF1864B – White females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- WF65OB - White females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- WAPL - White population above poverty level
- WMAPL – White males above poverty level
- WMU18A - White males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- WM1864A - White males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- WM65OA - White males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- WFAPL – White females above poverty level
- WFU18A - White females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- WF1864A - White females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- WF65OA - White females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
Black or African American Race Poverty Variables

- BBPL – Black population below poverty level
- BMBPL – Black males below poverty level
- BMU18B – Black males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- BM1864B - Black males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BM65OB - Black males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- BFBPL – Black females below poverty level
- BFU18B - Black females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- BF1864B – Black females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BF65OB - Black females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- BAPL - Black population above poverty level
- BMAPL – Black males above poverty level
- BMU18A - Black males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- BM1864A - Black males between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- BM65OA - Black males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- BAPL – Black females above poverty level
- BFU18A - Black females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- BF1864A - Black females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- BF65OA - Black females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

American Indian and Alaskan Native Race Poverty Variables

- AABPL – American Indian and Alaskan Native population below poverty level
- AAMBPL – American Indian and Alaskan Native males below poverty level
- AAMU18B – American Indian and Alaskan Native males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- AAM1864B - American Indian and Alaskan Native males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- AAM65OB - American Indian and Alaskan Native males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- AAFBPL – American Indian and Alaskan Native females below poverty level
- AAFU18B - American Indian and Alaskan Native females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- AAF1864B – American Indian and Alaskan Native females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- AAF65OB - American Indian and Alaskan Native females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- AAAAPL - American Indian and Alaskan Native population above poverty level
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- **AAMAPL** – American Indian and Alaskan Native males above poverty level
- **AAMU18A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **AAM1864A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AAM65OA** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **AAFAPL** – American Indian and Alaskan Native females above poverty level
- **AAFU18A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **AAF1864A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AAF65OA** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

**Asian Race Poverty Variables**

- **ASBPL** – Asian population below poverty level
- **ASMBPL** – Asian males below poverty level
- **ASMU18B** – Asian males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **ASM1864B** - Asian males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **ASM65OB** - Asian males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **ASFBPL** – Asian females below poverty level
- **ASFU18B** - Asian females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **ASF1864B** – Asian females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **ASF65OB** - Asian females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **ASAPL** - Asian population above poverty level
- **ASMAPL** – Asian males above poverty level
- **ASMU18A** - Asian males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **ASM1864A** - Asian males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **ASM65OA** - Asian males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **ASFAPL** – Asian females above poverty level
- **ASFU18A** - Asian females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **ASF1864A** - Asian females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **ASF65OA** - Asian females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

**Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Race Poverty Variables**

- **NPBPL** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population below poverty level
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- **NPMBPL** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males below poverty level
- **NPMU18B** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **NPM1864B** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **NPM65OB** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **NPFBPL** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females below poverty level
- **NPFU18B** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **NPF1864B** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **NPF65OB** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **NPAPL** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population above poverty level
- **NPMAPL** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males above poverty level
- **NPMU18A** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NPM1864A** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NPM65OA** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **NPFAPL** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females above poverty level
- **NPFU18A** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NPF1864A** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NPF65OA** - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

*Other Race Poverty Variables*

- **ORBPL** – Other Race population below poverty level
- **ORMBPL** – Other Race males below poverty level
- **ORMU18B** – Other Race males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **ORM1864B** - Other Race males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **ORM65OB** - Other Race males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **ORFBPL** – Other Race females below poverty level
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• **ORFU18B** - Other Race females under 18 years of age below poverty level
• **ORF1864B** – Other Race females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
• **ORF65OB** - Other Race females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
• **ORAPL** - Other Race population above poverty level
• **ORMAPL** – Other Race males above poverty level
• **ORMU18A** - Other Race males under 18 years of age above poverty level
• **ORM1864A** - Other Race males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
• **ORM65OA** - Other Race males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
• **ORFAPL** – Other Race females above poverty level
• **ORFU18A** - Other Race females under 18 years of age above poverty level
• **ORF1864A** - Other Race females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
• **ORF65OA** - Other Race females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

Two or More Races Poverty Variables

• **TRBPL** – Two or More Races population below poverty level
• **TRMBPL** – Two or More Races males below poverty level
• **TRMU18B** – Two or More Races males under 18 years of age below poverty level
• **TRM1864B** - Two or More Races males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
• **TRM65OB** - Two or More Races males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
• **TRFBPL** – Two or More Races females below poverty level
• **TRFU18B** - Two or More Races females under 18 years of age below poverty level
• **TRF1864B** – Two or More Races females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
• **TRF65OB** - Two or More Races females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
• **TRAPL** - Two or More Races population above poverty level
• **TRMAPL** – Two or More Races males above poverty level
• **TRMU18A** - Two or More Races males under 18 years of age above poverty level
• **TRM1864A** - Two or More Races males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
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- **TRM65OA** - Two or More Races males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **TRFAPL** – Two or More Races females above poverty level
- **TRFU18A** - Two or More Races females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **TRF1864A** - Two or More Races females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **TRF65OA** - Two or More Races females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

*Hispanic Poverty Variables*

- **HBPL** – Hispanic population below poverty level
- **HMBPL** – Hispanic males below poverty level
- **HMU18B** – Hispanic males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **HM1864B** - Hispanic males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **HM65OB** - Hispanic males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **HFBPL** – Hispanic females below poverty level
- **HFU18B** - Hispanic females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **HF1864B** – Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **HF65OB** - Hispanic females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **HAPL** - Hispanic population above poverty level
- **HMAPL** – Hispanic males above poverty level
- **HMU18A** - Hispanic males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **HM1864A** - Hispanic males between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **HM65OA** - Hispanic males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **HFAPL** – Hispanic females above poverty level
- **HFU18A** - Hispanic females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **HF1864A** – Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **HF65OA** - Hispanic females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **NHBPL** – Non-Hispanic population below poverty level
- **NHMBPL** – Non-Hispanic males below poverty level
- **NHMU18B** – Non-Hispanic males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **NHM1864B** - Non-Hispanic males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **NHM65OB** - Non-Hispanic males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **NHFBPL** – Non-Hispanic females below poverty level
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- **NHFU18B** - Non-Hispanic females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **NHF1864B** – Non-Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **NHF65OB** - Non-Hispanic females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **NHAPL** - Non-Hispanic population above poverty level
- **NHMAPL** – Non-Hispanic males above poverty level
- **NHMU18A** - Non-Hispanic males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NHM1864A** - Non-Hispanic males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NHM65OA** - Non-Hispanic males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **NHFAPL** – Non-Hispanic females above poverty level
- **NHFU18A** - Non-Hispanic females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NHF1864A** - Non-Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NHF65OA** - Non-Hispanic females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

**Custom Variables Created for Report**

- **WP130200** – Working Poor (population between 130% and 200% poverty level)
- **PctChU185** – Percent of children under 185% poverty level
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I. Objective

The goal of this project is to develop an overall understanding of the emergency feeding system in New Jersey, including potential food sources and human need for emergency food. One of the project objectives was to identify and quantify wholesome and nutritious food that goes to waste before it can be made available to those in need of such food. This project component focused on identifying and quantifying food-related waste items generated by the food manufacturing sector and contributed to hunger relief organizations, and identifying manufacturers that may be interested in participating in hunger relief programs.

II. Approach

A list of 582 New Jersey food manufacturers was generated from the *Harris InfoSource Selectory CD-ROM All Businesses Database*. Each manufacturer was contacted to confirm the contact information contained in the database and pre-announce the survey. Each manufacturer was also screened to eliminate companies that did not have physical processing facilities in New Jersey or were engaged in manufacturing activities deemed not relevant to hunger relief efforts (i.e., ice manufacturers). After screening, a total of 436 manufacturers remained in the database. Each of these was sent a mail survey (see Appendix A).

The survey queried the amount and type of food-related waste generated by each facility on a weekly basis and current disposal methods. Respondents were specifically asked to estimate the volume of food-related waste that was potentially usable by the emergency food system. The survey also gauged manufacturers’ interest in participating in hunger relief programs. Two weeks following the initial mailing, a reminder post card was sent out to non-responding companies. Telephone follow-ups were conducted two weeks after the reminder post cards were sent. Of the 436 manufacturers contacted, 192 completed surveys for a response rate of 44% (see Appendix B for details). The survey results were compiled into a SPSS database for analysis.

NOTE: Care should be exercised in interpreting survey results. Findings should not be viewed as representative of the entire population of New Jersey food manufacturers. It should also be noted that several very large food-related waste generators in the sample significantly influence the aggregate estimated waste volumes.

---

1 Brian Schilling is Associate Director of the Food Policy Institute and Lucas Marxen is a Research Analyst at the Food Policy Institute. Correspondence may be directed to Brian Schilling (schilling@aesop.rutgers.edu or 732.932.1966 ext. 3106).
III. Summary of Findings

Current Participation and Interest in Hunger Relief Efforts

Only 18 percent of food manufacturers (n=32) interviewed are presently sending food to hunger relief programs.

- A total of about 35,000 pounds of food per week are being donated to hunger relief groups.
- Manufacturers providing food to the emergency food system span a range of product areas. Most often, the primary product lines were baked goods, meat products, frozen foods, and pastas.

Many food manufacturers that are not presently participating in a hunger relief or food-recycling program report being interested in learning more about these opportunities.

Of the food manufacturers surveyed:

- 46 percent (79 out of 170) were “very” or “somewhat” interested in learning more about hunger relief or food-related waste recycling programs.
- 44 percent (84 out of 191) said that they would like to receive more information about hunger relief programs.

Table 1 shows the number of food manufacturers surveyed that would like to receive more information about hunger relief programs by Food Bank Area. A full list of surveyed manufacturers that (1) showed interest in learning more about hunger relief or food-related waste recycling programs and (2) would like to receive more information about hunger relief programs is provided in Appendix C. Figure 1 shows the geographic location of these manufacturers.

Table 1: Manufacturers Requesting More Information about Hunger Relief Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Bank Area</th>
<th>Surveyed Manufacturers Requesting More Information on Hunger Relief Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank of NJ Southern Branch</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank of New Jersey</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank of South Jersey</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWESCP Food Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Manufacturers Requesting More Information about Hunger Relief Programs
Nearly 35,000 pounds of food are channeled to hunger relief organizations each week by food manufacturers participating in the survey.

Table 2 shows the number of food manufacturers surveyed that contribute food-related waste to hunger relief organizations by Food Bank Area and the estimated pounds of product contributed per week. A county breakdown of this information is provided in Table 3. Figure 2 shows the geographic location of the surveyed manufacturers that are currently contributing to hunger relief organizations.

Table 2: Manufacturers Contributing to Hunger Relief Organizations by Food Bank Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Bank Area</th>
<th>Surveyed Manufacturers</th>
<th>Lbs./Week Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank of NJ Southern Branch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank of New Jersey</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank of South Jersey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWESCP Food Bank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,753</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Manufacturers Contributing to Hunger Relief Organizations by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Surveyed Manufacturers</th>
<th>Lbs./Week Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,753</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Manufacturers Contributing to Hunger Relief Organizations
APPENDIX A - Food-Related Waste Survey Instrument
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**Company:**
**Respondent:**
**Title:**
**Phone #:**
**Fax#:**
**Type of Business** (manufacturing, retail, wholesale, foodservice, etc.):

**PLEASE NOTE:** For the purposes of this survey, **FOOD-RELATED WASTE** includes all of the following:
- vegetable trims, unsalable fruits, vegetables, salad or fruit bar wastes (frozen and non-frozen);
- floral trims, leaves or spoiled flowers;
- unsalable bakery products (all types), excess batter, day old breads and pastries;
- meat, poultry, eggs, seafood and all dairy products;
- non-dairy beverages;
- damaged canned goods;
- dry goods such as pasta beans, flour, rice, cereal, sugar, coffee, tea etc.; and
- paper materials for example soiled paper, waxed or wrapped paper, waxed cardboard, paper egg cartons or fruit trays, corrugated paper, paper towels, tissues, registered receipts, and coin wrappers.

1) On average, how many **pounds** of **food-related waste** are generated at your facility on a **weekly basis**? ___________(pounds/week)

2) Please estimate the percentage of **total food-related waste** produced at your business that falls into each of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Waste Category</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Weekly Food-Related Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce (fruits and vegetables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery and Grains (breads, cereal, rice, pasta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared food waste (leftover in serving trays or individual plate waste)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat and Poultry (including eggs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood (fish, shellfish, shrimp, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages (non-dairy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned Goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper waste (packaging, napkins, waxed paper etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (i.e. florals) Please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3) Please estimate the percentage of your business’s **food-related waste** that is disposed of through the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food-Related Waste Disposal Option</th>
<th>Percentage of Food-Related Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General waste disposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to hunger relief organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food composting facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal feed operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renderer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper/Cardboard Recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) What portion of the discarded food from your business do you believe could potentially be usable by the emergency food system (i.e., hunger relief organizations)?

- 0%
- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-100%
- Don’t Know

5) If you **do not** currently participate in any program(s) for **hunger relief or food-waste recycling**, how interested are you in learning more about these opportunities?

- Very interested
- Some what interested
- Not at all interested

6) What would be the main factors/benefits **encouraging** you to participate in a **hunger relief or food-waste recycling** program?

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

7) What are the primary reasons that your company **does not** presently participate in a **hunger relief or food-waste recycling** program?

__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________

8) Would you like to receive more information about **food-waste recycling programs**?

- Yes
- No

9) Would you like to receive more information about **hunger relief programs**?

- Yes
- No

**Please Return To:**
Food Policy Institute
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
ASB III, Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Tel: 732-932-1966, ext. 3107
Fax: 732-932-9544; Email: hendrickson@aesop.rutgers.edu
APPENDIX B - County Breakdown of New Jersey Food Manufacturers in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Food Manufacturers</th>
<th>Manufacturers Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape May</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Jersey</strong></td>
<td><strong>436</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

The New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee requested that Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, conduct a Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers to establish the transportation, storage, nutrition education, and technology needs of emergency food providers (EFPs) in New Jersey. The Advisory Committee’s objectives were both to understand EFPs’ needs and to promote linkages among EFPs to maximize available resources through borrowing and sharing. These objectives fit directly into the New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act of 2001 (210th Legislature) directive to work with the New Jersey regional food banks to:

- enhance access and the availability of food;
- promote educational programs; and
- assess needs

Rutgers amassed a previously non-existing list of 1,121 emergency food providers (EFPs) in New Jersey and administered a two-page mailed questionnaire that was sent out in January 2005. The Hunger Advisory Committee and its Subcommittee on the Rutgers Research Project participated in all stages of survey construction, distribution, and analysis. Reflecting the committed engagement of New Jersey emergency food providers, the survey yielded 474 returned questionnaires (42.3%), of which 463 (41.3%) served as useable responses.

Taken together, the EFPs reflect a web of service that operates in an independent, decentralized, and somewhat precarious manner to secure the most basic needs of the lowest-income and working poor New Jersey residents. Survey respondents self-identified the programs run by their agencies: 82% represent a food pantry, 15% run a soup kitchen, 9% operate a shelter, and 16% identify an “other” category. Eighteen percent of respondents run more than one of these programs. EFPs represented in this report range from those that help one family per month to those that monthly feed well over 1,000 individuals. There are EFP agencies that are open one day per month and others that are open daily to the public. But this does not fully reflect availability. Among the smallest and the largest EFPs are those that remain on call “24/7” for crises; 95% of pantries accept walk-ins and/or referrals.

EFPs are adjusting to changing trends in their client base. Three-quarters (75%) of respondents experienced an increase in their client load from 2003-2004. Yet most EFPs are small. Staying small equals staying manageable for some EFPs. Respondents serve fewer children (43%) than adults (57%), but open-ended comments indicate that the number of infants, children, and families seen by some EFPs is increasing. Changing client demographics require adjustments in EFPs’ programs and spending.

Over 80% of survey respondents identified an interest in cooperating with each other to share their resources. Many EFPs need reliable vehicles to haul food, and they need adequate cold and dry storage to warehouse the food until it is cooked and distributed. They also want communication systems to help them share best practices on nutrition education, office management, food drives, volunteer recruitment and retention, and fundraising.
Major Findings and Recommendations for Future Research and Projects

Background

This survey investigated the subjects of transportation, storage, nutrition education, technology needs, regional cooperation and other issues of emergency food providers (EFPs) in New Jersey. The surveyed population is weighted toward food pantries. Of the total 463 useable questionnaire responses; 82% (n=381) represented agencies that run food pantries of which 79 run other emergency food programs. Sixty-eight soup kitchen providers (15%; n=68) responded, of which 45 run other food programs. Forty shelters (9%; n=40) sent in questionnaires, of which 19 run additional food programs. Seventy-five (16%; n=75) identified the “other” category which ranged from housing projects to weather emergency shelters.

Eighty-five of the respondents (18%; n=85) run multiple EFP programs, of which the soup kitchen and food pantry combination is the most common (6%; n=28). These multiple program EFPs tend to service more clients and be open more days per month than other EFPs, suggesting better infrastructure, funding, and probably tenure. Food pantries “only” range from being seldom open to daily operations, suggesting that they can be started with minimal resources. Because they require relatively little infrastructure, they can grow and fade back relatively easily according to community needs, labor support, etc.

To understand EFP operations, it is necessary to keep their labor force in mind. It would be logical to think that a large scale agency, as measured in terms of number of meals or number of clients served per month, would be open more days per month than a smaller scale agency. In many cases this is true. In some high poverty urban centers, large scale EFPs work independently and cooperatively on a daily basis to serve up to 30,000 clients per month. At the same time, a quarter (27%; n=10) of EFP respondents serving relatively few meals per month are open full-time or daily. While these numbers are small, they show the trend of many small EFPs providing consistent secure service in their communities. Based on written comments, we surmise that some EFPs consciously stay small because their volunteer base is fragile and they insist on providing high quality care that does not overburden their help. Many small and large EFPs limit client access in various ways, including to: residents of a town (n=12), region (n=4), or county (n=4); HIV/AIDS patients with documentation (n=4); seniors (n=6); youth (n=3); disabled (n=3); and the mentally ill (n=3).

Transportation and Storage

The survey addresses food transportation and storage resources that EFPs have, need, and may want to borrow or share. Food fuels EFP operations. However, without reliable
vehicles that haul food when it is available and needed, and without adequate cold and dry storage to warehouse the food until cooked and distributed, an EFP cannot function. EFPs are forced to turn away food almost twice as often because of problems with storage space (20% of the time) as they are due to transportation problems (12% of the time). This is probably because EFPs rely heavily on the use of staff and volunteers’ personal vehicles. No similar recourse exists for storage.

Roughly speaking, providers drive to food banks and other sources to pick up about 80% of the food they distribute. Only about 20% of the food is delivered (n=268). This demonstrates EFPs’ attempts to save delivery costs, however, the real costs to staff and volunteers whose cars are often used are undercounted. Further, personal vehicles (and many that are owned by EFPs) are typically small or family-sized and require extra trips to food sources, adding time and gas costs. Use of vehicles must also be adjusted to owners’ schedules.

Respondents who need additional transportation resources reported to what purpose they would put such vehicles. Picking up food was the primary need (51%; n=237), followed by delivering food (24%; n=109). Among “other needs,” a category for write-in comments, respondents noted that they use additional vehicles to transport disabled and house-bound clients (n=23) to EFPs, medical and other appointments, and grocery stores for shopping. These clients include those who have no car or who live off of public transportation routes.

Nine percent (n=39) of responding EFPs report sharing transportation resources. Seven percent (n=29) percent share food storage space. Many more (32%; n=129) indicate a general interest in borrowing or sharing. Multiple program EFPs share transportation and storage resources more often than other EFPs, suggesting that the process of borrowing and sharing takes time and labor of which most EFPs have little. Resources that some respondents would most like to borrow -- vehicles, drivers, and freezer space -- are, not surprisingly, the valuables that other EFPs are least ready to share. Develop communication links between interested EFPs that will facilitate information and negotiation related to sharing transportation (and other) resources. Options include an electronic email list that should probably be closed and moderated. Information about the list might be housed at a Statewide emergency food website.

Refrigerator and freezer space is in greater demand (respectively, 10% and 16% of responding EFPs need these resources and might be willing to borrow them) than dry storage (8% of responding EFPs). Cold storage is particularly important for stocking high quality food like fresh produce, dairy, meat, and eggs. Investigate the possibilities of community cold storage facilities for use by EFPs. Freezer and refrigerators are among the needed resources investigated in the survey. They are critical to EFPs’ ability to provide higher quality food (fresh fruits, vegetables, dairy, fish, poultry meats, and eggs) specifically, and generally, to warehouse large food bank purchases and donations when they come available. Community cold storage is being investigated at present by at least one New Jersey EFP (New Brunswick). Working models exist to build from.
Nutrition Education

Nutrition education and information complements emergency food services. While only 12% (n=54) of respondents presently offer nutrition education classes, 44% (n=180) would like to. A statewide emergency food assistance website could include educational resources and pertinent links for EFPs to start-up and/or expand their on-site nutrition education activities. Simple flyers could be prepared and posted for EFPs to download. As per written survey suggestions and comments, information could be included related to nutrition and health (e.g., good taste and better health on less money). Specific requests, e.g., for dietary education for HIV populations, should be given or designed by Registered Dietitians. Additionally, the website could post professional opportunities for EFP staff and volunteers, e.g., to be trained as a trainer in giving research-based nutritional advice.

Less than half of the respondents now provide information on nutrition programs including Food Stamps (46%; n=212), Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC; 38%; n=176), the free and reduced school lunch and breakfast program (14%; n=63), and other related nutrition information (21%; n=99). Compared to other EFP types, shelters demonstrate the highest participation in providing nutrition information. This may be a function of mandate; we know that many shelters are required to have their clients apply for Food Stamps. Three times as many EFPs supply WIC and Food Stamp information as provide literature on free and reduced school lunch and breakfast programs. We recommend that EFPs strongly publicize free and reduced school meal programs. As appropriate, the Advisory Committee might consider strategies to promote information on these school-based programs in EFPs and other agencies that counsel food-insecure populations.

Technical Resources

Office technology that includes a computer and internet access improves communication capacity, administrative efficiency, and client confidentiality. Three-quarters of respondents (75%) report having a computer and 70% claim internet access. Based on written comments, we know that some part of those reporting “access” are actually describing computers and internet connection that are owned by staff, volunteers, or parent organizations (e.g., church, social agency, etc.). In such cases, these technical resources are not routinely available to the EFP because they are shared and/or not housed at the EFP office (if there is one). A reliance on computers that are housed away from the EFP office involves moving paperwork that sometimes includes confidential client information. Personal laptop computers may be prone to theft.

Computers and internet access facilitate basic EFP administrative functions including efficient and more confidential record keeping, low-cost communications, research, and grant writing. Federal and other food and nutrition programs increasingly presume that
consumers of their information and services (e.g. on-line Food Stamp applications) have computers, internet access, and the ability to use them. Through their written comments, EFPs declared a range of knowledge and facility with computers and internet, e.g., one asked for administrative software advice, another offered it. Some EFPs reported having set up a webpage, others requested help doing so. Help New Jersey EFPs develop a cheap and low cost communication system. Ideally, such a project would: a) provide computers (one Advisory Committee member thought it would be possible to procure a corporate-based donation of computers); b) facilitate email and internet access; c) introduce training as necessary; d) set up an electronic communications list that would be moderated by an EFP nominated peer. Such a regional EFP system could be discretely interfaced with a statewide emergency food website. EFP-specific communication and services would not be available to the general public.

Emergency Food Providers: Regional Cooperation

Those who responded to the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers expressed their desire to help with, learn from, and expand their professional contacts in multiple ways. Their interest came in the forms of personal conversations with the author, written comments on many of the returned questionnaire, and answers to questions on regional cooperation. Well over four-fifths of EFP respondents indicated an interest and willingness to be in contact with other providers (89%; n=385), share their survey answers with other providers (92%; n=396), and be listed in a public directory in New Jersey (86%; n=370). Additional comments identified interests in cooperative food drives, learning about additional sources of donated food, fundraising, and sharing best practices in database management, office administration, and volunteer recruitment. The Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee should consider sharing this report with all respondents who returned surveys, as well as, to all other New Jersey EFPs and other interested stakeholders. The report might be used as a springboard to set up focus groups to: a) generate feedback on the survey results from interested providers; b) build interest in regional and statewide cooperation; c) test interest levels in borrowing and sharing resources. This report could be posted at a statewide emergency food website.

Emergency Food Clients

Respondents report that their client base is made up of fewer children than adults (43%/57%). However, the ratio is high and may reflect national data showing that there is a greater percent of children living with food insecurity than percent of adults.i Three-quarters (75%; n=333) of respondents experienced an increase in their client load from 2003-2004. Unsolicited and open-ended comments address a growing and/or changing clientele base (n=12), notably an increase in families with small children. These data suggest a need for

---

further research to determine if there is a change in clients’ demographics at EFPs, and if so, how those changes impact program and spending priorities. Surely the design of website or other information resources for emergency food providers and their clients need to take demographic trends into consideration. Those changes may include parameters like ethnicity and language in addition to age. Those in New Jersey who need emergency food services will benefit from better access to information on emergency food providers and related nutrition education information. Some low-income residents are not familiar with emergency food services. The User/Non-User report notes that many interviewees eligible for emergency food support were not familiar with the EFP network, especially the food pantries. Many low-income residents do not know where to find EFPs. Advisory Committee members inform us that regional food banks often are gate keepers to EFPs. Most commonly, this protects the typically small EFPs that cannot accommodate a large influx of clients. Occasionally, the “gate-keeping” also serves to reduce some clients’ attempted duplicate or other inappropriate access of multiple EFPs. The survey results show, however, that a significant portion of the respondent pool (86%; n=370) stated that they would be willing to have their contact information made public. We recommend that the Advisory Committee consider the initiation of a highly simplified, publicly accessible, and interactive website that that lists willing and interested New Jersey EFPs and other food resources (See Gap Analysis Report), including their location, hours of operation, capacity, access requirements (e.g. referral or not), description of services, etc. The website should be designed for emergency food service users, as well as, for providers and other social service counselors. An ideal website would also be multi-lingual, post nutrition education materials and related articles and reports, be easily and discretely updated by users (e.g., the EFPs), and provide links to other sites (e.g., Food Stamp applications).

Volunteers

The role of volunteers was not introduced in the questionnaire, yet almost one out of ten respondents (9%; n=43) wrote about their volunteer workforce in the “Additional comments” section. When considering programs in support of EFPs, it must be remembered that volunteers are the bedrock of most EFPs’ existence. All new programming should take this workforce strength and its limitations into consideration. Volunteers tend to be older and often not in the best health or condition for the demanding work of moving large volumes of food. Younger persons are not “stepping up” and some EFPs feel in a quandary about their labor support. Some respondents propose ways of rewarding volunteers through training opportunities, community credit (unspecified), and stipends. The Advisory Committee might consider generating a way to publicly acknowledge and thank these volunteers. Research into changing trends in EFPs’ workforce base would yield insights relevant to the development of future emergency food programs and policies.
Best Practices Studies

The survey project yielded recommendations for future research on a series of Best Practices Studies that are relevant to the more specific range of questions in the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers. Comments that inform these recommendations come from Advisory Committee members, EFP representatives who helped with survey design, EFP respondents who called for information, and unsolicited written comments on the questionnaires.

The recommended Best Practices Studies can be divided into two groups. The first group of studies would benefit from surveying best practices among EFP peers. The topics include:

1. EFP Office Management: database management, general office administration, and volunteer recruitment and retention;
2. Fundraising and grant writing (11 respondents wrote comments requesting help locating financial assistance);
3. Accessing more food from vendors, food drives, local farms and gardens (including food bank farms, plant-a-row, etc.);
4. Accessing better quality food, including fresh produce, calcium-rich foods, eggs, fish, and meat;
5. Providing nutrition information and/or classes;
6. Developing programs that increase clients’ independence from emergency feeding programs. Existing examples include job training in the food industry (including food production), “clothing banks” for clients starting new jobs, general employment counseling.

We additionally recommend a Best Practices Study of the New Jersey County Comprehensive Emergency Assistance Service (CEAS) committees. In early stages of the Rutgers Research Project, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee recognized that county CEAS committees vary dramatically in terms of efficiency and service. The Advisory Committee considered an alternative research project that would investigate best practices among CEAS committees. This option might be re-considered as some EFPs in the study stressed how heavily they rely on county services for various food relief resources. EFPs, some of whom provide services across county lines, interact with multiple county CEAS offices. A CEAS Best Practices Study might promote a state-level discussion on how CEAS offices could better coordinate their services with EFPs’ needs.
I. Introduction

I.A. Background

The Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers was requested by the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee (Hunger Advisory Committee) in June 2004 as a means to understand food transportation and storage, office technology, and nutrition education needs of emergency food providers (EFPs) in New Jersey. The Advisory Committee’s objectives were both to understand EFPs’ needs and to promote linkages among EFPs to maximize available resources through borrowing and sharing.

I.B. Survey Design and Method

The two page survey questionnaire was developed through the combined efforts of the Rutgers research team, the Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee’s Subcommittee on the Rutgers Research Project, the New Jersey Department of Human Services (DHS), and participant volunteers from the EFP community in New Jersey. Early drafts were field tested by members of the Statewide Emergency Food Action Network (SEFAN) and four additional EFP representatives in the State. The team balanced the need for data against the construction of a survey instrument that EFP representatives would be willing and able to fill out. The questionnaire and survey protocol was approved for research on human subjects by the Institutional Review Board of the Rutgers Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. Regular meetings between Rutgers researchers and the Advisory Committee’s Subcommittee on Research provided an opportunity to review the survey progress and data analysis. A copy of the survey is provided in the Appendix.

With the help of Advisory Committee members during the late Summer and early Fall of 2004, the Rutgers team developed an initial database of over 1150 soup kitchen, shelter, and food pantry EFPs in New Jersey. No such list had been attempted for years. Because many providers operate outside of both public (e.g., the United States Department of Agriculture’s Commodity Supplemental Food Program) and private food programs (e.g., the New Jersey regional food bank system), New Jersey EFPs are not easily tabulated. At the beginning of the project it was not clear how many EFPs functioned in the State. The Advisory Committee’s best guess was about 1,000. After cleaning the list for duplicate entries and organizations without direct EFP functions, the Rutgers study amassed a list of 1,121 EFPs to survey. Much time was spent entering and updating addresses and contact information. At this point, we believe that the EFP list is a good approximation, but not a complete list of New Jersey providers.

It is not possible to establish a survey response rate by EFP type (pantry, soup kitchen, shelter, other). Some, but not all, of the original EFP lists given to Rutgers indicated the provider type. Some EFP type descriptions were confusing or not used consistently. For example, a number of EFPs were simply characterized as “on-site.” Phone calls (made when phone numbers were available and accurate) revealed that the term “on-site” was used in multiple and conflicting ways. The term “on-site” was therefore not used in the questionnaire. Phone calls and survey
returns also revealed that the respondents often declared different identities than were indicated in the original lists.

The surveyed population was sent packets containing a cover letter addressed from the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, a brightly colored survey questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope. These packets were mailed out on January 18, 2005. Forty-eight (4.3% of the 1,121 sent) were returned “undeliverable.” Within the survey timeframe, better addresses were found on the internet for 17 of these and resent. Follow-up reminder postcards were mailed on January 28 to the 798 EFPs that had not yet answered. From a final list of 1,121 survey recipients, 474 (42.3%) agencies responded and 463 responses were useable, a 41.3 percent response rate. Of these, 462 were returned by mail, five responses were taken over the phone, and seven questionnaires were filled out at a NJ Faith-based Conference in January. Eleven respondents’ agencies were not included in the final analysis because their EFP no longer existed or was an agency that did not engage in any emergency food program activity. The response was fairly representative of all counties in New Jersey (see Tables 1 and 2).

Postal service and inter-office delays challenged the ability of many EFPs to respond in a timely manner. Some EFPs may never have received the questionnaire. Survey questionnaires continued to be returned throughout Spring 2005. The last questionnaires included in analysis arrived in May 2005. Three additional questionnaires have been received, the most recent in the first week of August 2005.

The two-page survey questionnaire was designed for simplicity and efficiency. Our goal was to investigate key EFP issues while respecting respondents’ busy schedules and maximizing the response rate. Most of the questions are composed in a yes/no or a multiple choice format. Three of the latter included an “other, please describe” category, which together with the Additional Comment section at the end provided an open-ended format. The quantitative and qualitative data complement each other and are both presented in this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Number surveyed</th>
<th>Useable Responses received n=463</th>
<th>Percent of Total Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent of Total Useable Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape May</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Average county response rate = 41%</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Survey Response Rate by New Jersey Food Bank Administrative Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Bank Administrative Area</th>
<th>Total Number surveyed</th>
<th>Useable Responses received n=463</th>
<th>Percent of Total Surveyed</th>
<th>Percent of Total Useable Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bergen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hudson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Middlesex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank of South Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Burlington (all but New Gretna)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Camden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gloucester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Salem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Bank of NJ Southern Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cape May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Burlington (only New Gretna)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food bank of Monmouth and Ocean counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ocean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWESCAP Food bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hunterdon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mercer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100% of n=463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Survey Respondents

II.A. General Background

Respondents were asked to identify the program types that their agencies operate. They were offered three general categories to choose from: soup kitchen, shelter, and pantry. If these did not represent their operation in full or in part, a fourth option “other” was available with space to describe their activities. Respondents were encouraged to “check all that apply.” Eighty-five (n=85; 18.2%) selected multiple categories.

Table 3 provides a simple account of how respondents answered the four questions. *Soup kitchens* are represented by 14.7% (n=68) of the total sample. Two-thirds (n=45; 66.2%; see also Table 5) of all soup kitchens run other programs (shelter, pantry, and/or “other”). *Shelter* programs are represented in only 8.6% (n=40) of the total survey responses of which almost half (n=19; 47.5%; see also Table 6) operate other programs (soup kitchens, food pantries, and/or “other” programs). *Pantries* are most represented in the survey sample. Respondents whose organizations include a food pantry make up four-fifths (n=378; 82%) of the survey population. Of them, 20.7% (n=76; see also Table 7) identify additional program categories. Sixteen percent of EFPs (16.2%; n=75; see also Table 8) identify as *other* and operate something other than a soup kitchen, shelter, or pantry. Each of the program categories will be addressed in depth. As noted above, 18.2% of respondents identified more than one category. The sum of their responses is therefore greater than n=463 and 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFP Respondent Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total (n=463) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of Table 4 is to divide all respondents into discrete, non-overlapping categories. Together they equal 100% of the EFP respondents (n=463) and represent one profile of respondents. Specifically, Table 4 highlights the difference between respondents that choose only one EFP category and those EFPs with multiple programs. “Food pantries only” account for two-thirds (65.2%) of respondents. “Soup kitchens only” form 5.0% and “Shelters only” include 4.5% of the total. “Other only” represent 6.9% of the respondents. Of the 18.2% of EFPs with multiple programs, “Soup Kitchens & Food Pantries” form 6.0% (n=28) of the total respondent sample and was retained as an independent category because of its size. “Other Multiple Programs” make up 12.3% (n=57) of the total respondent pool.
Table 4. Respondent EFP Type, Adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFP Respondent Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total n=463</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen only</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter only</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry only</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other only</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen &amp; Food Pantry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>463</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.B. Soup Kitchens

Soup kitchens (see Table 5) report multiple programs more often than do pantries or shelters. Two-thirds (n=45; 66.2%) of respondents that run soup kitchens also run other programs. This may be because the resources necessary to leverage the kitchen facilities, food, labor support, and other costs indicate program longevity and the sophistication to expand. Results indicate that providers are more likely to run a soup kitchen and a food pantry (n=28; 41.2%) than to operate a soup kitchen alone (n=23, 33.8%). Relatively few soup kitchens also operate a shelter (n=3; 4.4%), “other” program (n=2; 2.9%), or combinations of three or more programs (see Table 5).

Table 5. Respondent EFP Type: Soup Kitchen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soup Kitchens</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total n=68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen, Only</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Shelter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Food Pantry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen, Food Pantry, and Shelter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and “Other”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen, Food Pantry, and “Other”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen, Food Pantry, Shelter, and “Other”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Respondents Identifying as Soup Kitchen</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.C. Shelters

Shelters (see Table 6) comprise the smallest portion (n=40; 8.6%) of the respondent sample. Slightly over half (n=21; 52.5%) identify no other food program, while 47.5% (n=19) of respondents do identify other programs.
Table 6. Respondent EFP Type: Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, <em>Only</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and Soup Kitchen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and Food Pantry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, Soup Kitchen, and Food Pantry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and “Other”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, Food Pantry, and “Other”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter, Soup Kitchen, Food Pantry, and “Other”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Identifying as a Shelter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.D. Food Pantries

Operating a food pantry is all or part of the work of the vast majority of respondents (n=381; 82.3% of all EFPs). Twenty-one percent identify additional program areas (soup kitchen, shelter, and other) in which they are involved (see Table 7).

Table 7. Respondent EFP Type: Food Pantry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Pantries</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total (n=381)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry, <em>Only</em></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry and Soup Kitchen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry and Shelter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry, Soup Kitchen, and Shelter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry and “Other”</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry, Soup Kitchen and “Other”</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry, Shelter, and “Other”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry, Soup Kitchen, Shelter, and “Other”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents Identifying as a Food Pantry</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.E. “Other”

Respondents were given a fourth option to identify themselves, “other, please describe” which was selected by 75 (16.2%) of respondents. Of these 75 respondents, 32 (6.9%) identified only in this category and will be referred to as “other only.” The balance of 43 “others” had at least one other identity as a soup kitchen, shelter, or pantry.

Of the 75 “other” respondents, 72 provided a written description of their programs. Six described more than one “other” category. Descriptions of the “other” programs break down as follows:
### Table 8: Respondent EFP Type: “Other”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFP Respondent Type: Other</th>
<th>Number (n=75)</th>
<th>Percent “Other” Respondents (n=75) %</th>
<th>Percent All Respondents (n=463) %</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Expands upon Soup Kitchen, Shelter, and Food Pantry, including: group home (Shelter category also checked); rooming house or hotel rooms purchased when money is available and until shelter building can be purchased (Shelter category also checked).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Includes: emergency, disaster relief, FEMA, as-needed, drop-in, telephone requests. Note, this category cannot distinguish “emergency” as short-term personal &amp; household issues versus, “emergency” that responds to weather, fire, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Food Distribution (in-house; on-site)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Emergency food provision is sometimes deemed separate from “normal” Food Pantry or Soup Kitchen services, and includes: frozen meals, PB&amp;J sandwiches, bagged lunches, community outreach with lunch; walk-in lunch program, Sunday prayer breakfast, hot meal every 4th Sunday, day-old baked goods, ready-to-eat packages for the homeless, food vouchers and shopping assistance, monthly grocery shopping, congregate eating site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Delivery Services (in-house, off-site)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Includes: meals-on-wheels, mobile van, senior house delivery, food pantry-on-wheels (with meals on wheels) for homebound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution to other agencies, including other EFPs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Includes: general “distribution” (2), Ocean County food pantry network with 33 food pantry’s, monthly distribution, distribution for FISH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Options</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Housing options that respondents did not identify under Shelter, including: permanent housing, homeless shelter where clients prepare/purchase most of their own meals, group home (2), residential rehab/substance abuse facility (3), DDD skilled home, transitional housing, low-income apartment complex, half-way home for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Children’s Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Includes: child care center following CCFP guidelines, pre-school, day care-after school program, after-school program (not pre-school aged kids) (3), after-school ministry, after-care feeding program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and General Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Includes: community outreach and counseling, drop-in center, information and referral, appointments only, various social needs, senior nutrition program, YMCA, and ministerial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Supply Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Includes: clothing (12), furniture (1), financial assistance (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Includes: job training site, teaching kitchen, employment agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-related Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Includes: in-patient rehab, women's clinic, detox and rehab services (including recovery meetings).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Service Load

III.A. Background

Service load refers to the number of clients seen by EFPs, the days of operation, and the number of meals served, number of persons served, and accessibility in terms of being open to walk-ins and referrals. All EFPs were asked about how their service load changed between 2003-2004 and how many days they presently operate per month. The number of meals served was asked of soup kitchens and shelters. Food pantries were asked to count the number of persons (including adults and children) that they serve. The distinct questions targeted to the different types of EFP operations reflect their (typically) separate program tracking methods. As will be seen, respondents often answered questions not targeted to their agency type.

III.B. Client Load Trends: 2003-2004

Of the 442 respondents that commented on changes in their client load, three-quarters (75%; n=333) report an increase from 2003-2004 (see Table 9 below). Few (6%; n=27) identify a decrease. Almost a fifth (19%; n=82) report no change. “Not changed” might be explained by some providers’ unwillingness and/or inability to expand their operations. Based on written comments we know that reasons not to expand include having a fixed and stable client base (e.g. HIV/AIDS-only service center) and a determination not to strain resources. One provider, for example, wrote that their service takes on only one family each month. The “not changed” finding may also simply reflect no change in client demand.

Table 9. Change in Client Load from 2003 to 2004 (n=442)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Not changed</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.C. Days of Public Operation

437 respondents answered the question, ‘how many days per month are your food programs available to the public?’ Answers ranged from no public availability (14 are open zero days per month) to open every day of the month to the public (48 EFPs are open 28-31 days per month). Table 10 regroups the answers according to a weekly work schedule. These categories are used in Table 11.
Table 10. Days Per Month Adjusted to the Work Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Per Month Identified by Respondent</th>
<th>Approximate Equivalent Days Per Week</th>
<th>Work Status Adjusted to the Work Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Open to Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Rarely Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-18</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Half-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-27</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Open Daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-seven percent (47%; n=204) are open rarely or part-time. The average number of days open is 12 per month, representing a half-time schedule. Thirty-eight percent (38%; n=164) are open full time or daily.

Three percent (3%; n=14) are not open to the public. These EFPs include: a) shelters for specific clientele (e.g. transitional housing or group home); b) food pantries open to discrete groups or “by appointment only”; and c) “other” programs that are available only on referral or for crises like hurricanes, floods, and fire.

In open-comment sections and in the margins, a few providers note that on days when they are not “open” to the public, they remain “on-call” and continue to provide snacks and/or sandwiches upon request and respond to referrals and other “emergencies.” Results do not make clear the frequency of this situation.

Table 11. Public Operation of Emergency Food Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Not Open</th>
<th>Rarely Open</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Half-time</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Open Daily</th>
<th>Total Public Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2% 21.3% 25.4% 12.6% 26.5% 11.0% 100.0%
Table 11 above indicates that most EFPs tend to be open either on a limited (rarely or part-time) or a full-time (full-time and daily) basis. Fewer EFPs are represented on a half-time basis (which is also the mean, 12 days per month). “Shelter only” respondents identify themselves as the program type least open to the public; they tend to be open full-time or daily. “Other” EFPs are distributed along the continuum from open rarely to open daily. A majority of EFPs with multiple programs are open full-time or daily.

The data invite two resource-related hypotheses. First, having multiple programs suggests a more mature or well-established EFP that may have greater access to resources allowing them to remain open for more days of operation than can single-program EFPs. Second, pantries may be evenly distributed between “few days open” and “most days open” because: a) pantries can start with minimal resources. They have relatively small infrastructure needs and can grow and fade back with relative ease. A small neighborhood group of volunteers that collects donated foods through food drives and fundraisers, and makes those goods available a few times per year qualifies as a food pantry; and b) the public demand for pantry resources is consistent and strong whether services are available frequently or infrequently.

### III.D. Meals Provided Per Month (Shelters and Soup Kitchens)

The question, “how many meals do you provide per month?” was directed to shelter (n=68 total) and soup kitchen (n=40 total) respondents. Nevertheless, 140 respondents replied indicating that EFPs that do not have a shelter or a soup kitchen also answered the question. Answers ranged from 0-30,000 meals served per month. Half (n=70) serve 265 meals or less. The average number of meals served, 2,027, is skewed by a few very large programs.

Table 12 groups the responses into approximate thirds. Twenty-eight percent (28%; n=39) of respondent EFPs serve 1-99 meals, 29% (n=40) serve 100-999 meals, and 34% (n=48) serve 1,000-30,000. Nine percent (9%; n=13) report serving zero meals. Half of the respondents serve less than 265 meals per month, thus most EFPs serve few meals relative to the range (0-30,000). The eight EFPs serving 10,000-30,000 meals per month are valuable exceptions. However, the dominance of large and usually well-known EFPs can mask the importance of smaller providers in large and small communities around the State.

The total number of meals per month reported by the 140 respondents to this question was 283,753. This is, of course, a fraction of the total number of emergency meals served per month in New Jersey.

**Table 12. Adjusted Meals Served per Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meals Provided Per Month (n=140)</th>
<th>Program Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>No Program</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-99</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-999</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-30,000</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median= 265 meals; mean= 2,027 meals.
Table 13. Adjusted Meals per Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider¹</th>
<th>Adjusted Meals Per Month and Program Size Number and Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 No Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Programs that include Soup Kitchens and/or Food Pantries n=54</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only and Other Only n=365</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs n=463)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ EFPs organized to highlight soup kitchens and shelters. All EFPs that have no soup kitchen or shelter fall into the “Food Pantry Only and Other Only” category.

Table 13 compares meals served and EFP type. The EFPs are re-organized to highlight the soup kitchens, shelters, and the EFPs with multiple programs that include a soup kitchen and/or a shelter. The question of number of meals served was directed to shelters and soup kitchens. Nevertheless, “food pantries only” and “other only” respondents answered as well. The majority of shelters and soup kitchens – EFPs with both only one program category and those with multiple food programs – serve 100 or more meals per month. A third to one-half of shelter or soup kitchen programs serve between 1,000 and 30,000 meals per month (eight serve 10,000-30,000). As mentioned earlier, multiple program EFPs are open more days per month than are single program agencies. Similarly, multiple program EFPs that include soup kitchens and/or shelters have the largest percent of the programs serving the most meals per month. Food pantries and “Other” providers tend to serve fewer meals per month (1-99) than do shelters and soup kitchens.

Small and large EFPs that serve meals appear to have a clientele base that needs steady access to food over the entire course of a week and a month. As might be expected, EFPs that serve the most meals are open full-time or daily. Table 14 below shows that 87% (n=39) of the largest programs (1,000-30,000 meals per month) are run in EFPs that are open full-time or daily (5-7 days per week). The smaller and medium scale programs (1-999 meals per month) tend to be part- or half-time (1-4 days per week) operations. Yet, even EFPs serving the fewest meals per month (1-99) are well represented in the full-time and daily category (27%).
### Table 14. Meals per Month by Days Open to the Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Work Schedules of Emergency Food Providers</th>
<th>No Program</th>
<th>1-99 Small</th>
<th>100-999 Medium</th>
<th>1000+ Large</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Open</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely Open</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time and Half-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time and Daily</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III.E. Number of Persons Served (Food Pantries)

The survey posed a three-part question to food pantry operators: 1) “How many people do you serve over the course of a month?” and, “if available, please specify” 2) the number of children and 3) the number of adults served per month. Respondents were not consistent in answering the entire three-part question. 387 respondents (84%) provided information on how many people are served per month. 281 respondents included child and adult data. In only 250 of these 281 cases, the number of children per month, plus the number of adults per month, equals the total number of people served. Because this discrepancy suggests either shortcomings in client records or an arithmetic challenge in the question (or both), we report below on only the 250 cases (89% of 281). Of these 250 cases, five percent (n=13) represent EFPs that did not self-identify as a food pantry.

Table 15 demonstrates the large size variation in the number of individuals served by diverse EFPs. The number of total people served per month ranges from 1-3,600; children range from 0-2,100; and adults from 0-2,300. Large programs are exceptions, important but rare. Most operations are much smaller. EFP respondents report serving more adults (57%) than children (43%). The median of clients served per month for total people is 175. For children, the median is 75; for adults, 96.

---

**ii** One EFP is deleted here from analysis. This EFP operates as a freestanding EFP and it additionally represents 30 pantries. In the questionnaire, the respondent comments largely about the EFPs’ individual “home” operation. However, for the question on how many meals served, the respondent reports on numbers served by the entire Coalition, i.e., 23,000 people, of which 10,000 are children and 13,000 are adults.

**iii** Of note is that the EFP discussed in footnote 1 has the same children/month vs. adult/month ratio (43:57) as the rest of the population. In other words, the one EFP that was deleted because it appeared to report on the combined service of 30 member EFPs reflects locally the child/adult ratio found statewide.
### Table 15. Clients Served Per Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clients Served Per Month (n=250)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People/Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum (100%)</td>
<td>97,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th Percentile</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th Percentile</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th Percentile</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80th Percentile</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, some respondents wrote their responses in the margins, separating data for “adults” and “seniors.” This reflects their internal program reporting requirements. In these cases, adults and seniors were combined for analysis.

Table 15 also reports on the question responses by percentile of total responses. Note that because Table 15 reports on three separate questions, at any particular percentile, the number of “people/month” does not equal the number of “children/month” plus the number of “adults/month.” Twenty percent (20%) of EFPs serve fewer than 60 people total. (The 20th percentile for children is 24 and for adults, 30.) Eighty percent (80%) of EFPs in Table 15 serve less than 500 people total. (The 80th percentile for children is 234 and for adults, 259.) Twenty-four (24) EFPs in this sample serve 1,000 persons or more, 7 EFPs report serving over 1000 children, and 11 EFPs serve over 1,000 adults.

---

iv “Percentiles” is a report on question responses that have been organized from the smallest to largest answer. In the case of “People/Month”, for example, there are 250 responses organized from 1 to 3,600 clients per month. Table 15 divides that “string” of numbers into 5 equal parts of 50 respondents each. The 20th percentile indicates what the 50th person in the “string” of numbers reported (60). The 40th percentile reflects the 100th person’s answer (120), etc. In the case of the number of people served per month, for example, we know that the range of the “string” of answers is 1-3,600. We also see that at the 80th percentile, 80% or 200 respondents have served 500 or fewer people per month. We know, therefore, that the vast majority of EFPs are small relative to the maximum of 3,600 people per month reported served. More specifically we could say, four-fifths of the respondents serve less than one-sixth of the largest reporting EFP.

v At any percentile, the number of “people/month” does not equal the number of “children/month” plus the number of “adults/month.” This is because Table 15 is reporting on three different questions. The same 250 persons have answered each of the three questions, however, the same case is not represented at the percentile reported for each of the three separate questions. See and compare how the median reported for People/Month does not equal Children/Month plus Adults/Month.

vi Data on the n=250 set (people = children + adults) does not differ greatly from all persons who answered the question, ‘how many people do you serve month?’ (n=387; again, excluding the EFP referenced in Footnotes 1 and 2). Range is 1-10,081. Half of the EFPs responding serve 150 persons or fewer; 80% serve less than 464. The mean, 387, is skewed by 12 EFPs serving 1000 persons or more.
**III.F. Referrals and Walk-ins (Food Pantries)**

The question, “Do you accept referrals or walk-ins?” was targeted to food pantries. Of the 396 EFPs that answered the question, 92% (n=365) operate food pantries and 8% (n=33) do not. By far, most EFPs (95%; n=346) that manage a food pantry do accept referrals and/or walk-ins. Only about half (55%; n=17) of the EFPs that do not include a pantry program reported that they would accept referrals and/or walk-ins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EFPs’ Acceptance of Referral and/or Walk-ins</th>
<th>Number and Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, Accept</td>
<td>No, Do Not Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry (Food Pantry only and Multiple Programs with a food pantry)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Food Pantry EFPs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.G. Additional Comments**

In the Additional Comments section at the end of the questionnaire, respondents offered a number of insights related to their organizations’ service load.

Twelve (12) EFPs specifically commented on their growing and/or changing clientele. Responding to increased demand requires different kinds of purchases as well as more food, equipment, space, and volunteers. Responding to changing demands requires program and budgetary flexibility. For example:

- *Our agency, founded many years ago, by a single volunteer has recently undergone a change in director and clients serviced. We aim to reach infants and their homeless mothers as well as our more traditional senior citizen base. HPP funding [Hunger Prevention Program] has contributed greatly to helping us reach this goal. The HPP money covers food costs that now allow us to buy infant formula, baby food, and diapers for the homeless families. Thank you.*
- *The need has increased in the past year. More families show up for food. We also have people who travel to get to us.*
- *We have experienced tremendous growth over the past two years; as a result we will need more food to meet the needs of the community adequately. Consequently we also need a refrigerator, freezer and possibly a computer.*
- *We are in desperate need of another vehicle and freezer. Our client count has greatly increased over the year.*

Seventy nine (79) EFPs respondents addressed service load in terms of how they broaden or limit access to their organizations given growing demand and limited resources. Twenty-six (26) state that their organizations provide emergency, as-needed, walk-in, on-call, hot-line, or
crisis services. “Emergency” refers both to private/individual and public emergencies. The following are examples of how EFPs cope with emergencies:

- **On-call:** “[w]e turn away no one away without food [even if just a peanut butter sandwich], but explain what location they can go to for additional food.”
- **Limited program days versus availability for emergencies:** “Program is available 2 days per month and on call every day for emergencies.”
- **Crisis services:** “We provide food to fire victims as the need arises.” Similar services were referenced for storms and floods.
- **Walk-in and referrals:** “We accept calls from [County] Hunger Relief ... as well as referrals from local social workers, other agencies, congregation members and we do get some walk-ins.” And, in another case, “We accept referrals or walk-ins one time only until documentation is provided. Walk-ins under the appearance of drug/alcohol not serviced.”

Respondents describe how and why they control access to their facilities. They are limited by resources: money, staff, volunteers, transportation, storage (especially freezers and refrigerators are mentioned), and building size. As a result, program days and program size are limited at most EFPs. Five (5) note limited seasonal access; three (3), for example, note only being open in November and December.

We are a very small food pantry acting simply as a back up for other agencies in the community. We have very little space and basically can handle all that currently comes our way. Volunteers are very hard to come by. We are currently not looking to expand. We can help those that come our way without taking on more. We serve 2-3 families.

EFPs respond to the demand for emergency food support through the development of targeted programs. These programs allow EFPs to focus limited resources by not being available to everyone all the time. Examples of these programs include those that limit eligible clients to: residents of a town (12), region (4), or county (4); HIV/AIDS patients with documentation (4); seniors (6); youth (3); disabled (3); and the mentally ill (3). For example:

Our food pantry is limited to residents of [two towns] only. No limitations on the soup kitchen.

### IV. Transportation and Food Storage Space

#### IV.A. Background

When the survey was first drafted, the Hunger Advisory Committee’s attention was focused on EFPs’ transportation resources. Picking up food or having it delivered from bank depots or donating stores, restaurants, and manufacturing centers provides the substance of emergency food programs. Without a reliable vehicle that can haul the quantities available and needed, an EFP cannot function. Given limited resources, one hope of the Committee was that regional EFP networks might be encouraged to share needed resources, including possibly, transportation.
In the process of field testing early drafts of the questionnaire, EFP managers pointed out that food storage facilities are actually of equal and possibly greater importance than transportation. If there is inadequate cold or dry storage, it does not matter if a car or truck is available to pick up the food; there will be no place to store it. As a result, the questionnaire was amended to include some storage-related questions.

Finally, in reviewing survey responses, especially the open-ended comments at the end of the questionnaire, the importance of the EFPs’ workforce, especially the volunteers, was established and linked to transportation concerns. Many EFPs rely on the use of staff and volunteers’ personal vehicles to move food. They further depend on those persons’ physical strength to pack, unpack, stock, and move food. To consider sharing transportation resources is then to share the progressively more rare, increasingly needed, and often elder backbone of what makes EFPs run, the community volunteers.

**IV.B. Adequacy of Existing Transportation Resources and Food Storage Space**

Part B. of this section on Transportation and Food Storage Space investigates the adequacy of existing transportation and storage resources. First, it establishes a level of need for these resources by asking EFPs whether they turn down food because of a lack of transportation to retrieve the food and/or the space to store it. Second, the section addresses the availability, use, and specific needs for transportation.

**IV.B.1. Transportation and Storage: Limits to Food Access**

Respondents were asked if they ever turn away food because of problems with transportation or food storage space. Almost twice as many respondents identified storage to be a reason to turn away food (20%; n=88) as did respondents that marked food transportation (12%; n=51) as a reason to reject food.
Table 17. Turning Away Food Due to Transportation or Food Storage Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Food Storage Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number EFPs Responding</td>
<td>Number and Percent, “Yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative importance of storage at first surprised Hunger Prevention Hunger Advisory Committee members. However in all likelihood, storage is identified more strongly here than transportation because volunteers and staff regularly donate their personal transportation resources (cars, trucks, insurance, time). The same people do not have adequate or appropriate space (dry storage, refrigerators, and freezers) to share. This does not reduce EFPs’ need for both more transportation and storage support. Rather, it suggests that more options are available to patch together transportation needs than to address storage problems.

IV.B.2. Transportation: Availability, Use, and Needs

EFPs were asked about their agencies’ primary and secondary vehicles. Sixty-one percent (n=284) of all 463 respondents said that their agencies owned, leased, or borrowed a primary vehicle. Even fewer (28%; n=131) reported on a secondary vehicle. By examining the answers to these questions and comparing them to respondents’ written comments, it is clear that the question confused some respondents. They appear to have mixed together information on vehicles owned by their agencies, their partners (e.g. a church or a city social agency), their staff and volunteers, and those vehicles that are leased. The data is therefore not very useful from a quantitative perspective. However, it still tells a very important story. “Mixing together” personal, agency, and other resources (such as transportation vehicles) is exactly what enables the EFPs to function in a climate of great demand and limited resources. The necessity of cobbling together available resources frames how providers describe and carry out their work.
EFP respondents received a paired question set, “What percentage of food that you cook or give to people is: a) delivered to; and b) picked up by your agency?” It was assumed that the sum of the two answers would be 100%. 428 respondents assigned a value (0-100) to both questions (#12 and #13), but only 268 respondents (63% of 428) offered numbers that added to 100%. (Other respondents’ answers totaled more or less than 100%). Perhaps EFPs were considering other “sources” of food, e.g. food might “originate” onsite through: a) donation drop-off; b) EFP gardens (numerous cases exist); or c) prepared “from scratch” on premises. The math of percentages may also have challenged some respondents. For reporting purposes, only those respondents who answered both questions and whose answers added to 100% are included in Table 18.

Table 18. Percent of Food that EFP Picks Up or Has Delivered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered vs. Picked-up Food: How food that is cooked or given to people arrives in the agency</th>
<th>Percent of Food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food that is delivered to your agency (n=268)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum value reported (n=89; 33.2%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum value reported (n=23; 8.6%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food that is picked up by your agency (n=268)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum value reported (n=23; 8.6%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum value reported (n=89; 33.2%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agencies pick up much more food than they have delivered. A full third of respondents (33% at the minimum value, 0; n=89) reported that no food was delivered versus nine percent who wrote that no food was picked up. Half of the respondents (at the median; n=134) report that at least 80% of their food is picked up by their agencies. In contrast, half (again, at the median; n=134) report that up to 20% of the food they use is delivered. Because of costs, convenience, or other constraints, few EFPs rely on delivered foods. Clearly, EFPs must have reliable vehicles and drivers to achieve this level of food pick-up.

Table 19 below reinforces the findings in Table 18. Respondents were asked, “If you need additional transportation, what would you use it for?” The following options were offered for respondents to “tick off”: general office business, picking up food, delivering food, “other, please specify” which included an open-ended comment opportunity. Over half of all respondents reported that they need additional transportation to pick up food (51%; n=237). Almost a quarter said they needed additional transportation to deliver food (24%; n=109). General office business plays a relatively small role in providers’ overall needs for additional transportation. Twelve percent chose to expand the description of their additional transportation needs.
Table 19. Uses for Additional Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses for Additional Transportation</th>
<th>Number that Checked Use</th>
<th>Percent of Total (n=463)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General office business</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picking up food</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering food</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation needs:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Need a truck, unspecified (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Need trucks and cars specifically for food-related transportation: hot/cold delivery, fresh produce, bread and cake pick-up, dropping off bread racks (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transporting clients (23), including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General transportation for EFP clients, unspecified (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Homebound (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disabled/Invalids (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medical and other appointments (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grocery shopping (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation to respondent’s own or another EFP (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transporting volunteers (otherwise they cannot help) (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pick-up/drop-off household goods, furniture, and clothes (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Youth activities, including educational after-school (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, do not need more transportation (written as comment)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “other transportation needs” relates an important story that is backed up by the additional comments below. EFPs generally need more and larger vehicles to make their pick-ups more efficient. However, to support their emergency food programs, EFPs use vehicles for more than food procurement. They try to address the needs of their clients not only by helping them access emergency food, but also by driving them to medical and other appointments and bringing them food shopping. Some EFPs additionally try to provide their clientele with household goods, furniture, and clothes as needed. Other EFPs specifically target young people from their clientele and attempt to help them with educational and social engagements. EFPs also help their volunteers, who are older, vehicle-less, and in less-than-good-health, to travel between their homes and the EFP site.

**IV.C. Additional Comments**

**IV.C.1. Transportation**

Sixty-one respondents (13% of all respondents) wrote transportation related comments. The general theme is a dramatic, chronic, or interim need for more vehicles. A rare comment came from one (1) respondent who noted that the EFP had sufficient vehicles. S/he also noted, however, that they were volunteers’ cars and that the EFP had no intention of expanding.
One respondent (1) wrote that free available food had been foregone for the lack of a vehicle to pick it up (and storage space to keep it). Two (2) others claimed that they are at a crisis point due to a lack of transportation, one (1) of whom would need to close within the year if the situation does not change:

We are not sure if we will be open to serve needy families next year. We do not have a van or truck to pick up food.

Six (6) respondents commented on the need for bigger, newer, and more reliable vehicles. Larger vehicles are more efficient because they accommodate more food, reduce the number of food pick-up trips, and save gas and labor time. Newer vehicles typically break down less often. Another six (6) respondents described paying for additional transportation support including: renting U-Haul trucks for food bank pick-ups (2), renting second vehicles (2), and paying for pick-up (2).

- [We] use [a] service agency to pick up from drop off point. Volunteers pick up food when necessary.
- We rent a U-haul for Food Bank trips.
- It would be nice to have a choice to have our food pick-up delivered at a reasonable cost.

EFP-owned vehicles allow dedicated and flexible use; trips can be made when necessary instead of when a private vehicle is available and the owner is comfortable with the specific service. Most vehicles are owned by staff or volunteers, not by the EFP or even the parent organization (church, social service agency, etc.). Twenty-one (21) respondents said that they used their own vehicle or that the EFP relied on staff and/or volunteers’ donated use of privately owned cars, vans, and trucks. Five (5) respondents specifically stated that their EFP had no vehicle. Five (5) additionally said that the vehicles owned by the EFP were old and/or unreliable.

We don’t have a vehicle to pick up a quantity of food from the [Food Bank] and rely on volunteers to help with their vehicles.

In addition to picking up food, four (4) EFPs note that they need vehicles to deliver food to shut-ins and/or pick-up and drop off clients who have no other way to reach the EFP.

[Our clients] are 75% physically challenged, no longer drive, have their grandchildren. So they are unable to pick up their [pantry] bags. We do not have a vehicle. We therefore cannot deliver food.

IV.C.2. Storage

Thirty-four respondents wrote about food storage space in the open-ended comment section at the end of the questionnaire. These providers attest to the limiting factor of space in the development of EFP programs. The most critical need for many appears to be freezer space and to a lesser extent refrigerator space. These resources are connected to the ability of EFPs to make high quality foods available, such as, quality fresh fruits and vegetables and protein-rich
foods like dairy, eggs, fish, and meats. (See comments on the Nutrient Analysis section of the report.) Storage, especially adequate cold storage, also allows EFPs to accept unexpected or last minute food donations that the EFPs are not staffed or programmed to distribute immediately.

Three respondents (3) report turning down food because of a lack of storage space (e.g., “We do not have space to store large quantities – what comes in goes out that day.”). One (1) reports the need to “rehab” their agency’s kitchen to bring it up to code in order to use it for a soup kitchen. One (1) respondent specifically articulates turning down food for lack of freezer space. Another eight (8) state that they have no freezer and need one; two (2) respondents need another freezer. Four (4) write that they need more refrigerator space. Seven (7) respondents comment that they want to expand but cannot due to space shortages generally. Four EFPs (4) and/or their parent organizations are planning or are in the process of constructing a larger physical space for their programs.

We are currently building on to our church and when finished will have a larger storage area. The food we occasionally have to turn down is frozen due to the size of our freezer.

Two (2) respondents related privileges and support they enjoy from local community organizations and businesses that allows them to their store periodic food overflows: one (1) utilizes space in a local VFW (Veterans of Foreign Wars) building; the other (1) makes use of the freezers of both a local food manufacturer and the Knights of Columbus (1).

We do not turn away food because of transportation but I use my own car (wagon) and I’m limited as to how much I can get from our food bank. If we get a large donation of food such as the P.O. Drive, we get space from the VFW or some other organization.

One (1) respondent interpreted “food storage space” to include kitchen cooking space. Her/his challenge was getting the EFP’s cooking space rehabilitated to pass food handling inspections. This is somewhat ironic because, unlike many agencies, her/his EFP was able to organize adequate paid and volunteer labor and find the necessary donated food.

We now have a financial need to get a local church's kitchen "rehabbed" to meet the health codes and building codes. As a result, we are conducting various fundraisers to get the substantial funds needed to properly equip the kitchen, dinning hall and restrooms (to meet access standards). Conforming will enable us to serve the free hot meals to the clients in need. A fund raising event, a convocation called "Empty Bowls" will occur on April 15th in our [Township] High School cafeteria and will offer an informative, educational presentation, open to our whole community during a "soup only" luncheon…. We are able to secure the people to feed, to secure most of the food to feed them routinely, to secure volunteers to run their five-day week program, but we are stuck on hold for the hot meals because of the lack of a kitchen to prepare the meals.

Eight (8) respondents note that they have just enough space for their own needs. They want neither to expand nor to share with other EFPs.
V. Partnering to Borrow and Share Transportation and Storage Resources

V.A. Background
Section V. investigates the degree to which EFPs: a) presently partner with other agencies to share transportation and storage resources; and b) might be interested in borrowing or sharing those resources. Overall, there appear to be relatively few resources to share. However, the EFP community has a strong sense of shared mission that invokes a desire to work together where possible.

V.B. Interest in Partnerships to Borrow and Share
Respondents note that generally, EFPs do not share each others’ transportation and food storage resources. Table 20 shows that food storage space is shared even less (7%; n=29) than are transportation resources (9%; n=39). Multiple-program EFPs, excluding those that are specifically soup kitchen and pantry combined EFPs, most typically share transportation and storage resources (16-22% of all respondents).

Table 20. Partnering to Share Transportation or Food Storage Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Yes, We Partner with Other EFPs to Share Two separate questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number EFPs Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many more respondents indicate an interest in sharing or borrowing resources than are presently engaged in such a partnership. Of the 405 respondents who answered the question “Would your agency be interested in participating in shared transportation and/or food storage resources with other pantries and soup kitchens in your area?”, 32% (n=129) answered “yes.”
Respondents were then asked the paired question, what specific resources their agencies: a) have and might be willing to share; and b) need and might be willing to borrow. Generally speaking, if respondents’ agencies have vehicles and drivers, they are reluctant to share them (6-10% yes, share). Those who need the same resources tend to be somewhat more interested in borrowing them (8-22% yes, borrow), especially vehicles, drivers, and freezers.

### Table 21. Transportation and Storage Resources to Share or Borrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Sharing and Borrowing Resources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two separate questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, my agency has these resources and might be willing to share</td>
<td>n=463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, my agency needs these resources and might be willing to borrow</td>
<td>n=463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Storage</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V.C. Interest in Regional and New Jersey Statewide Cooperation

The Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee seeks to promote closer linkages between New Jersey EFPs with the objective of their sharing information and, possibly, resources. Four questions were included toward the end of the survey questionnaire to assess EFPs’ interest in such cooperation. Respondents were asked if their contact information and/or their survey answers might be shared with other EFPs. They were also asked if they would be willing to have their contact information included in a public directory of New Jersey EFPs. Finally, they were asked if they would mind being contacted for additional information.

Representing all survey respondents (n=463), Tables 22-24 show that well over four-fifths of respondents are willing to be in contact with other providers, share information with them, and be listed in a New Jersey public directory. Surprisingly, only 68.7% (n=301) were willing to be contacted for additional information. Given providers’ interest in being known publicly and being in contact with their peers, it is possible that this low number can be attributed in part to the wording of the yes/no question (“If needed, would you mind being contacted for additional information?”).

Table 22 below shows that at least 90% of most EFP types are interested in sharing their contact information with other EFPs. The exception are “shelters only” (63%; n=12) and “other only” (75%; n=21). Table 23 shows that at least 92% (n=396) of all EFP types are willing to have their survey answers shared with other EFPs, again with the exception of “shelters only” (74%; n=14) and “other only” (85%; n=23). Shelters house vulnerable populations (e.g. domestic violence survivors). It is not surprising, therefore, that they are extremely careful about sharing information that might jeopardize their clients. The reasons that “other only” EFPs are reluctant is less clear, though a review of Table 8 suggests that: a) some “other only” EFPs might not feel “part of the group” as they already identified
themselves as separate from pantry, soup kitchen, and shelter EFPs; and b) some also attend to vulnerable populations, e.g. children, shelter populations, and clients receiving various kinds of counseling.

**Table 22. Sharing EFP Contact Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Yes, The Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee May Share My Contact Information with Other EFPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number EFPs Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 23. Sharing EFP Survey Answers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Yes, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee May Share My Survey Answers with Other EFPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number EFPs Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 shows that 86% (n=370) of EFPs are willing to be included in a public directory, with soup kitchens (96%; n=22), food pantries (88%; n=248), and soup kitchen and pantry combined agencies (92%; n=23) showing the greatest interest. Here, once again, “shelters only” (60%; n=12) and “other only” (46%; n=11) show the least enthusiasm. It is logical that “shelters only” and “others only” would have even less enthusiasm for public attention than for
networking with other New Jersey EFPs. Small food pantries that limit the use of their services (See III.G.) and/or that rely on clients’ referrals from larger agencies might also want to avoid general public attention.

Table 24. Participation in a Public Directory of New Jersey EFPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Yes, the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee may Include Our Contact Information for a Public Directory of New Jersey EFPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number EFPs Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V.D. Additional Comments

Building resource sharing partnerships among EFPs faces the challenge of limited resources and protective programs. Thirty-three (33) respondents offered a wide range of comments on the subject.

There were some clear ‘yes, we presently partner or would like to share resources with other EFPs.’ Twelve (12) respondents pointed out that they presently partner with other EFPs on transportation (5), storage (1), with Food Banks (2), the Passaic area food coalition (2), and delivering food to soup kitchens (1). One (1) respondent described the value of sharing information. Examples include:

- We are always interested in collaborating with other facilities that might aid us and that we can provide assistance to increase our outreach.
- We currently participate in shared transportation; I deliver to numerous agencies.
- We partner with [Church] in Paterson- they use our [past date] food in the men's shelter and they deliver food from Entemann's Pepperidge Farm Outlet.

Respondents were most eager to exchange storage/space use and labor for food pick-up, and to a slightly lesser extent, interested in sharing transportation, freezer, refrigerator, stove, and excess food resources. They were eager to exchange information, including on their own best practices, e.g., how to source bakery items, produce, and dairy.
We work closely with three other churches [food pantries] in our area. We share some pick-up transportation of food up from [Food Bank]. We speak on the phone when a client has a problem – to come together to help in extra ways. We meet once a year to discuss what we can do better. We work as one unit during Thanksgiving and Christmas.

We have three major food drives per year. Cooperation in advertising with other organizations to sponsor local drives would be valuable assistance in donor solicitation for support of pantry activities.

There were also some clear ‘no, we do not want to or cannot partner to share resources with other EFPs.’ Some EFPs had insufficient or barely enough resources for their own use. Other EFPs have no liberty to share because they borrow or receive their resources from public agencies (e.g. municipal (2) and county (1)) or non-public organizations (e.g. church (4), Salvation Army, private individuals, etc.). Some shelters, especially domestic violence shelters, do not want to reveal their locations.

Transportation and storage space cannot be shared with other programs due to Federal funding regulations.

I have no authority to rent or share or loan anything-at mercy of this city! [The City] provides [our] truck.

Our pantry can only serve [City] people. We cannot go beyond our limits because of space. We do not have room in our refrigerator, freezer and dry storage, so it cannot be shared.

Four (4) respondents made it clear that they were not eager to share their volunteers or staff (if they had any) because they were older, not in good health, and/or overextended.

I wouldn’t mind sharing space but we usually don’t have room and our drivers are older men so I don’t think it would be good for them to have to pick-up for other agencies as well. We need some young lifters and drivers. Our older men are awesome but I don’t want to give them more of a load.

We do not have people to pick up or deliver food even if we had a vehicle.

Telling are the tentative “maybe” comments. Many EFP resources that might be shared – labor, transportation, and storage – are essentially already borrowed, for example, volunteers’ time, use of volunteers’ vehicles, and space from parent organizations. Respondent often appeared not to have the authority to speak for the availability of any resources. Sharing required an internal, group discussion.

We are interested in participating in shared food transportation and/or food storage but we need director’s approval, especially for storage.

All sharing would be after July with permission from new 2005 pastor. We partnered with another EFP in 2004 but not in 2005.

We are unsure if we can share our resources.
VI. Nutrition Education

VI.A. Background

The questionnaire asked three question sets about nutrition education. The purpose was to learn about existing strategies that EFPs use both to broaden their clients’ understanding of food resources for low income populations, as well as, to teach nutrition principals. The first question set addresses information that EFPs give out on federal and other nutrition programs (Food Stamps, WIC, free and reduced school meals). The second and third questions focus on nutrition education classes that EFPs presently offer or might offer.

VI.B. Nutrition Program Information

Respondents were asked about the kinds of nutrition program information that they provide to their clients. Table 25 presents whether respondents checked the options provided: Food Stamps, WIC, school lunch/breakfast, and “other information.”

Table 25. Nutrition Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Number of EFPs That Do Provide Nutrition Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n=463</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Each variable had a “tick-off” protocol, i.e., if Food Stamp information was offered it was ticked-off and defined as “yes.” If it was not ticked-off, it was defined “no.”

Less than half of the respondents provide information on nutrition programs including Food Stamps, WIC, the free and reduced school lunch and breakfast program or other related information (Table 25, row “Total”). Food Stamp program information is most commonly provided (46%; n=212), followed by WIC information (38%; n=176). Three times as many EFPs provide WIC and Food Stamp information as provide information on free and reduced
school lunch and breakfast programs (14%; n=63). Twenty-one percent of respondents (21%; n=99) checked “other information.”

Of the 99 respondents that checked “other information,” 36 elaborated on their programs. These EFPs provide information and research as necessary and requested by their clients. A few EFPs offer additional health services. General “other information” themes included:

1. Other-General (19): Referrals to local and state services, referrals to federal services—social security/TANF, financial, housing & legal services, heating and “ec” (sic).
2. Other-Food and Nutrition (10): Meals-on-wheels, referrals to other EFPs and nutrition education centers, faith-based kitchens, nutrition information including cooking tips and demonstrations.
4. Senior services (2).
5. Child services (1): Advice on how to qualify for and obtain child support.
6. Health (5): Health and medical services generally, medicaid and medicare, access to a nurse who takes blood pressure, and health screenings.

“Shelter only” and “other multiple programs” EFPs show the highest participation in providing nutrition information. Approximately two-thirds of those respondents provide Food Stamp and WIC information. This may be explained, in part, by the fact that many shelters (including those in multiple programs) are required by their funding agencies to have their clients apply for Food Stamps. “Shelters only” most actively share information on free and reduced lunch and breakfast programs; but still less than half promoted these programs. Soup kitchen respondents report the least engagement in providing nutrition information.

Many shelters are required to give out Food Stamp information. Providing information on general assistance (TANF) is a standard practice for many providers. The lower participation in providing information on free and reduced school lunch and breakfast programs is not clear and warrants further investigation. Given comments on EFPs seeing more families, the lesser attention on school meal programs might be a function of EFPs adjusting to changing trends in their clientele base (see Additional Comments in previous section). At the same time, however, WIC programs are relatively well promoted.

**VI.C. Nutrition Education**

Relatively few EFP respondents (12%; n=54) indicated that their agencies provide nutrition education classes to their clients. Over 40 percent (44%; n=180) would like to offer classes. Table 26 shows that “shelters only” are the biggest provider of nutrition education (58%; n=11). Almost three-quarters of “shelters only” (71%; n=10) and “other multiple programs” (74%; n=38) would like to offer nutrition education. Fifty-eight percent (58%; n=11) of “shelters only” currently provide nutrition education. Approximately five times as many “soup kitchens only” and “food pantries only” want to offer nutrition education as presently do.
Combined “soup kitchens and pantries” show an even greater discrepancy between currently offering nutrition education (4%; n=1) and wanting to in the future (56%; n=15).

Table 26. Nutrition Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider</th>
<th>Number of EFPs Currently Providing Nutrition Education to Clients</th>
<th>Number of EFPs Interested in Providing On-site Nutrition Education Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n=463</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Number of Clients that EFP Can Accommodate Per Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>4872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80th</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who answered ‘yes, they were interested in offering on-site nutrition education classes’ were asked how many clients they could accommodate per class. 158 respondents answered the question claiming they could accommodate zero to 400 persons (see Table 27 above). Half of the respondents (at the median; n=76) had capacity for 20 persons or less. Eighty percent (80%; n=126) of respondents could absorb 40 persons or less per class. Nine respondents showed interest or capability in accommodating 100 or more clients per class (a number that is rather too high for effective teaching).
VI.D. Additional Comments

Nine (9) EFPs presently offer and four (4) EFPs recently offered nutrition education classes. The classes are or were offered by staff, volunteers, and/or a Borough nurse. Existing nutrition classes are described as targeting parents of pre-K children (2), the HIV/AIDS population (1), and are linked to cooking classes (1). One (1) respondent noted that EFP clients were referred to other agencies for nutrition education. The four EFPs that “recently” offered nutrition education classes were discouraged by poor client turn-out; one of these four was willing to try again.

- Current staff currently provides clients with nutrition education classes.
- We work with our borough nurse who screens and gives additional information for help to applicants.
- We provide clients nutrition education classes-currently 2 times a year. We are interested in education classes, specifically for the HIV/AIDS community.
- We provide nutrition education classes as part of our pre-K curriculum.
- We offered cooking classes and covered nutrition in 2004.
- We have held nutrition education classes in the past and have experienced poor turn out. But I am always willing to try again.

Nutrition education is offered infrequently for all or part of the clientele.

- We provide only the occasional workshop - educational classes.
- Nutrition education and information are provided to all participants. Congregate nutrition participants receive on-site nutrition education four times each year.
- We provide nutrition education classes twice per year.

Some respondents clearly indicated an interest in offering nutrition education (10), particularly programs targeted to specific communities, e.g., persons with HIV/AIDS and parents of children. Some respondents (7) thought there would be benefits to their clients in offering on-site classes and for trainers to come and give those classes (as opposed to being sent brochures etc.). One noted a limitation of space to hold classes. Another said the trainer would need to speak Spanish.

- We would like to offer any education we can for parents. Educator must speak Spanish.
- We are very interested in nutrition education and possibly conducting on site classes.
Some note that they would like their staff and volunteers to be trained to teach the nutrition education classes. Two respondents described their preferred alternatives to education classes. One wanted literature and handouts for clients. Another respondent made a strong case for nutrition and health videos that could be played in the EFP waiting area. Those comments, cosigned by two of the EFP representatives, are reproduced here in their own ABC format.

A. Are there videos available that I could put in the waiting room of the pantry? I am thinking something like a community bulletin board of what is available in the community relating to health issues. (Perhaps a video of where to go for that). Also in partnership with the video, flyers that list the locations and services.

B. I believe that I could get some clients together for a seminar/workshop event on good healthy food choices, but I need help with flyers and such. So maybe sometime in the summer but could I get help from your group on this?

C. Is there somewhere I can get something in writing on the guidelines and requirements to qualify for TANF and Food Stamps. Better yet, a workshop for the volunteers. We have a small group of pantries’ volunteers that meet every other month or so and at the last meeting we talked about getting someone from the Food Stamp office to come and speak to us.

Finally, two respondents indicated no interest in nutrition education. One stipulated “at this time.” The other relies on welfare classes to teach nutrition education.

We also tried nutrition classes but our clients were not coming to "classes". Many are already going to welfare classes.

**VII. Technical Capacity**

**VII.A. Background**

Computers and internet access facilitate basic EFP administrative functions including record keeping, low-cost communications, research, and grant writing. Federal and other food and nutrition programs increasingly presume that consumers of their information and services (e.g. on-line Food Stamp applications): a) have computers and internet access; and, b) are computer and internet savvy. Computer capability and internet access among New Jersey EFPs spans the range from zero to fully equipped and knowledgeable. The following discussion describes that range and ends with the recommendation for a best practices study.
VII.B. Computer and Internet Access

In the survey questionnaire, EFPs were asked if they have a computer and internet access. Three-quarters (75%; n=342) of responding agencies state that they have a computer; 70% (n=315) report having internet access. “Soup kitchens only” and “food pantries only” are the least likely to have access to computers and internet technology (see Table 28), probably because they are often dependent on outside or parent organizations (see Additional Comments below). “Shelters only” are most likely to have computer technologies; 100% (n=20) of these respondents have computers and 95% (n=19) have internet access.

Table 28. Technical Capacity (Computer and Internet Access)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Emergency Food Provider (n=total number of survey respondents)</th>
<th>Yes, Computer Access</th>
<th>Yes, Internet Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number EFPs Responding</td>
<td>Number and Percent, “Yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen Only n=23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter Only n=21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry Only n=302</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Only n=32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen and Pantry n=28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiple Programs n=57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All EFPs) n=463</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII.C. Additional Comments

Thirty-one (31) respondents wrote additional comments that addressed computer and internet access. Computers and internet access facilitate the most common and often cheapest communication mode, email. Increasing numbers of these EFPs use computers to manage client data bases. They are also necessary for grant writing and research. Relying on personal computers and email at home is inefficient in terms of getting office work accomplished. Ten respondents described their interest in a computer in categories of need that we have defined as “possible” (6), “definite” (3), or “desperate” (1). An example of a comment defined as “definite” need follows:

*We are in need of a computer. It would be a plus to our pantry as well as easy to keep up with clients and other information.*

Those EFPs that do not have computers and/or internet in their EFP offices either: a) do without; b) use staff or volunteers’ personal computers and internet service at home; or borrow
from other sources, as available. Computers are often located in the EFPs’ parent organization (e.g. church or social agency) and are not available for EFPs’ general use (8).

- The van, computer is all church office equipment that we use if available (sic).
- The church has a computer but we do not use it.

Several respondents (7) identified a specific kind of need for expanded internet access. Internet facilitates communication through email. It allows a number of EFPs to conduct research for the EFP and for clients (see also discussion under Nutrition Education and extended discussion of Table 25). For example, an important use of computers and internet is the capability to apply on-line for Food Stamp eligibility, although, no respondents made this point. Many EFPs that do have computers, do not have funds for internet service. A few have set up websites; others would like to. One respondent writes:

- I wish [our County] had a free service for a web site for us. We could then update and change our info regarding events and needs on the internet.
- We would like to have internet access but are on a light budget and it cannot be afforded. We have looked into "free" service for non-profits but can't locate any. Any info on free or discounted services would be appreciated.

Were there support for computer access, one respondent requested laptops to protect against vandalism. (Note, Hunger Advisory Committee members were surprised by this statement. They believe EFPs generally prefer desk-top models that are more cumbersome and less likely to “walk away,” i.e., be stolen.)

There is a range of computer knowledge in the EFPs and a need for best practices information. Some staff and volunteers are computer savvy; others want training. Some respondents make informed suggestions on software, hardware, and internet purchases; others want help doing so:

- I have received a grant through my church denomination of $1200 for a computer and printer but I haven’t yet bought one as I am interested in a software that can be used for food pantries…. that was compatible with the food banks and other pantries.
- Records database made with File Maker pro.

These findings point to an interest in best practices studies on technical capacity for EFP offices. The comments also identify significant technical skill and experience among the EFPs. To a great degree, some New Jersey EFP members have an important base of information and technical experience that might be tapped to help the work of their New Jersey EFP peers.

VIII. Other Needed Resources

VIII.A. Background

The Additional Comments section at the end of the questionnaire provided an open-ended opportunity for respondents to share thoughts and provide more information. Respondents’ comments both expanded on their answers in earlier sections and introduced additional topics.
This section elicited two pronounced themes not introduced earlier in the questionnaire. One is the role and status of the volunteer workforce supporting EFP operations. The second is respondents’ request for help identifying additional funding resources.

It is tempting to try to help EFPs reach more clients by supporting food acquisition, transportation, storage, etc. It is important, however, to understand that program expansion can burden a fragile volunteer structure that is foundational to many EFPs. Some providers would like to expand; others would not. These sections are included not to discourage program expansion, but to identify some of the workforce and additional funding parameters that should be considered.

VIII.B. Volunteers

Forty-three respondents commented on their volunteer workforce. Most EFPs rely in part (8) or in full (10) on volunteer support. EFP services get cut or do not grow as much for lack of volunteers, especially young and strong workers, as for any other reasons.

- Volunteers are very hard to come by. We are currently not looking to expand. We can help those that come our way without taking on more. We serve 2-3 families.
- Our budget runs approximately $23,000 per year. We have one employee supervising the kitchen, [and] volunteers (5 per day) who prepare the food. Over 100 volunteers work in our kitchen, 5 at a time. The kitchen supervisor prepares daily menus on a weekly basis with the assistance of a nutritionist volunteer.

Seven (7) respondents comment that they need more volunteers. Some have cut back services because of the shortage of persons willing to work and help without pay.

- Need more volunteers to open pantry on other days. Previously we were available on three days [now one day per month].
- One of the largest problems our pantry faces is finding eager volunteers who live near the church.
- We would be interested in participating in shared transportation and/or food storage but at [the] present moment do not have the manpower.

Because of limited funding and (for some) the insecurity of a volunteer workforce, some EFPs fear a client demand that they cannot support. They are therefore reluctant to be part of a public directory.

- We are a total volunteer organization dependent upon donations from the community and our parishioners. We do not advertise but people in need within [our municipality] come to us via word of mouth. We are open every Saturday.
- We have the town food pantry. Our space is small but adequate in the church basement. Our church volunteers are stretched already in their efforts. We take referrals but don’t publicly advertise.
Volunteers are described as quite wonderful, but sometimes older and not very strong or healthy (4). This is also cited as a reason that EFPs are reluctant to engage in an exchange of services or resources. Agencies do not want to tax their senior volunteers and staff members.

_We have volunteers currently that are wonderful, however, the majority of them are “willing” seniors from the community, who cannot always lift heavy boxes. It is a wonderful thing that they are there to help us, and they get great joy out of doing the work. However, we have a great responsibility if something were to happen to them (i.e. heart attack, broken bones, box cutter accidents, shortness of breath, etc.)_

Volunteers donate more than just their time and skills. EFPs rely on volunteers to use their cars and other vehicles for food pick-ups and other client services (14). Agencies also depend on the volunteers to use their own computers for word processing and accounting.

- [Our EFP] does not have a vehicle. However, individual volunteers pick up food each week using their own personal vehicles. We serve 350-400 families.
- The food for [our food pantry] is housed in one of our local churches but the setting does not permit the opportunity for recipients to physically go to the pantry, rather volunteers will bring emergency food to the recipient, perhaps at the church office, the municipal building (where Social Services is housed) or to their home if volunteers are available. Food distributions are run from one of our churches on pre-arranged dates and recipients pick up their food or it is delivered by volunteers.

Four (4) EFPs want to reward their volunteers with wages or stipends (3) or community credit (1). They would like to offer training (2) to improve volunteers’ performance in the area of nutrition education and record keeping. Computers would help volunteers with tasks of writing funding proposals and keep client records.

- More money to get better food is always welcome; or to stipend volunteers from the community;...
- [We would like....] a workshop for the volunteers ... that meet every other month or

**VIII.C. General Funding**

Eleven (11) respondents requested help locating financial assistance. Ten specified a need for more food (10), especially for meat (1) and food for children (1). One specifically requested the opportunity to buy food bank food at a reduced cost (suggesting 14 cents per pound). Four (4) want to provide wages, stipends, or community credit to volunteers.

- If there are any grants available please let us know for pantry
- We would love help with monetary/grants, etc.
- With the ever-rising cost of food commodities, we are always very grateful for any assistance we are able to secure. If you know of any programs for which we might be approved, please contact me at [phone number].
- More money to get better food is always welcome.
• If the state/county would provide grants to pantries it would be helpful. It’s difficult to provide the meats with only donations.

The requests for help above were written for general support. Others, mentioned earlier, refer more specifically to transportation, storage, computers, or other needs. One final quote links the need for a computer with the capability of the EFP to apply for general operation funds that can improve the EFP’s administrative efficiency and volunteers’ grant writing capacity.

At the present time, we are in need of a complete computer system…. This will enable our volunteers to effectively perform their jobs in maintaining our food pantry records, and writing future grants to secure more funding.

IX. Study Limitations

Emergency food providers are a difficult group to reach. This section reviews limitations of the study and in the findings. The intention is both to describe limits on interpreting the findings and to provide our experience for anyone interested in surveying EFPs in New Jersey or elsewhere.

We built a previously unavailable list of EFPs that exceeded by 11% the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee’s highest estimate (1,000) of how many EFPs there might be in New Jersey. We know now, however, that our list is incomplete. The extent to which it is incomplete is partly a function of how one defines which agency types should be included. The study opened the rather thorny question of exactly what groups make up the universe of emergency food providers in New Jersey. A combination of executive decisions by the Hunger Advisory Committee and our ability to retrieve good lists (i.e. with up-to-date contact information) defined the contours of our final surveyed list. Soup kitchens and food pantries are obvious emergency food providers. The Hunger Advisory Group made the decision to include shelters. The following points outline how our list could have been improved:

• The six New Jersey regional food banks were an important source of providers. They track EFPs that buy food from their depots. However, not all EFPs use the food banks. The smallest most typically do not to use them. From the lists received from the food distribution center M.C.F.O.O.D.S. in Middlesex County (not one of the six regional food banks), we learned that M.C.F.O.O.D.S. knew of many more EFPs than did the (geographically overlapping) regional food bank. Only recently in June 2005, we learned about a similar organization in the southern part of the State that might similarly have increased our list. As mentioned earlier, the Emergency Food Coalition of Passaic County returned a survey. In it they referred to their own food services plus spoke on behalf of their 30 coalition members in Paterson (we did include the service load data in our analyses). It would have been preferable to have that list of 30 coalition members in our original list. (We do have 26 Paterson EFPs in the data base.)
• We have learned that the list might have been expanded by outreach to each New Jersey County Comprehensive Emergency Assistance Services (CEAS) Committee.
• We know that we did not have a complete list of shelters in the surveyed population.
Based on the few EFPs in our data base with Spanish language names, the high rate and number of Spanish-first language immigrants in New Jersey, as well as 2000 U.S. Census data showing Hispanics living at or near the poverty level in New Jersey, we suspect that we did not have all Hispanic/Spanish-first-language EFPs in our original provider list.

Following a decision of the Hunger Advisory Committee, after-school programs that participate in the USDA Commodities Program were not included.

“Emergency” is an umbrella term that “emergency” food providers and others use to describe services under conditions of both chronic poverty and sudden crisis (fire, storm, flood). In general, EFPs responding to poverty conditions embrace all persons affected by sudden crises. EFPs that primarily organize in response to sudden crisis often do not routinely serve populations coping at or near poverty indices. The conflation of these separate functions causes some confusion in building lists of EFPs. Teasing the groups apart, however, would be challenging as exemplified in a respondent’s comment, “[our] program is available 2 days per month and on call every day for emergencies.” In survey responses, the conflation probably contributed to some of the “other only” EFPs. The line between the two separate functions remains imprecise.

Our experience indicates that many shelter providers do not consider themselves emergency food providers (EFPs). We received a number of questionnaires with contact information and a comment that the survey was not relevant for the shelter agency. When we called, and explained that the shelter’s food service fell within our definition of an EFP, we could collect information over the phone. Surely a portion of shelter operators discarded the survey before sending us a note stating they should not have been on our list.

Some providers are so small and operate so seasonally that they are hard to learn about. Some prefer not to attract attention. In most of these cases, the “agency’s” contact information is actually personal and private, often residential information. Beyond conducting a limited amount of outreach, for example, several food drives per year, the volunteers cannot extend themselves and there is no regular staff to cope with additional requests or project ideas. Personal relationships and promises of confidentiality secured the M.C.F.O.O.D.S. list. Other lists might be “out there” and forthcoming, but the process of finding them is sensitive. The tenuous and personal nature of these providers, virtually all of them completely volunteer, raises the question of how they should be counted and how and if they should be tracked.

The pool of survey respondents ranged from very small, serving one family per month, to very large, serving thousands. The report analyzes this range but cannot do justice to the meaning of these different scales in terms of EFP program operations. The reader is cautioned to bear this in mind when considering our analyses and recommendations, as well as, when making her/his own.

Although the response rate was exceptionally good (42.3%), it probably could have been even higher. As mentioned, no list was previously available. We had to confirm or find complete information for at least 50% of the addresses we originally received. Forty-eight of the original mailing were returned undeliverable. After repeated efforts, 25 remained undeliverable. From
providers’ phone calls, we know that the US Postal Service did not consistently deliver mail in a timely fashion. Parent organizations (e.g. churches, social agencies, etc.) that receive mail for the EFPs did not always forward mail promptly. Most EFPs operate on a “shoe string” and cannot attend to non-critical mail immediately. Nevertheless, the survey did enjoy a high response rate and that must be attributed to the commitment of providers to their work. Providers’ phone calls and comments attached to the survey questionnaire attest to their interest in the results of the survey and their willingness to help further the efforts of the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee.

The survey questionnaire was not translated into Spanish or other language. This was probably not a significant problem for our surveyed population given that our base of clearly identified Hispanic/Spanish-first-language EFPs was small. The lack of a Spanish-language questionnaire is, however, a piece of the larger possible study limitation that Hispanic/Spanish-first-language EFPs might be underrepresented.

The number of questions that could be included on the 2-page instrument limited the questionnaire. More or different questions might have provided better or more in-depth results. One respondent was dissatisfied with the questions and wrote,

Some of these questions are not “yes and no” answers. We would need to do some research to answer them. I think there should be other questions like do we help clients with clothing, monies to pay utilities, etc. [as well as] information on how we deal with people who are taking advantage of the system.

A longer Additional Comments section might have encouraged more open-ended comments. We note, however, that respondents who did choose to write comments were not inhibited about attaching extra pages of their thoughts as well as other documentation if they wanted more space.

Although the questionnaire was designed for simplicity and low literacy levels, some of the survey questions challenged respondents. Math-related questions in particular were challenging. The following questions caused problems. They are discussed further in the report:

- Questions related to service load (meals served, individuals served) were targeted to specific EFP types (shelters and soup kitchens vs. food pantries). Many respondents were, however, not inclined to limit their answers to those addressed to the EFP type with which they had identified. The report addresses this problem by analyzing responses by EFP type (see III.D.-III.F).
- Pantry respondents were asked for the number of individuals they served. Twenty-two (22) answered in terms of families or households. Twenty-eight (28) other respondents answered in such a way that clearly identified how many individuals and how many families they represented were served by the respondents. Family size for those 28 families was averaged to 2.8. That number, 2.8, was then multiplied against the 22 respondents that provided only a number of families and households to create numbers that could be used in the analysis (see III.E.).
• Pantry respondents were further asked, “if available, please specify the number of children and the number of adults served per month.” The assumption was that those numbers would add up to the total number of persons. This was not consistently the case. As a result, we report on all responses for the number of persons served. For the number of children and adults, however, we only present on cases (n=250) in which the number of children, plus the number of adults, equals the number of all persons (see III.E.).

• Pantry respondents were also asked a yes/no question, “Do you accept referrals or walk-ins?” Some respondents made it clear that one was relevant and not the other. If either one was identified (by circling or written comment), “yes” was entered. However, this question would have been more successful as two questions instead of one (see III.F.).

• EFP respondents received a paired question set, “What percentage of food that you cook or give to people is: a) delivered to; and b) or picked up by your agency?” It was assumed that the sum of the two answers would be 100%. 428 respondents assigned a value (0-100) to both 12 and 13, but only 268 (63% of 428) offered numbers that added to 100%. (See IV.B.2.) For reporting purposes, only those respondents who answered both questions and whose answers added to 100% are included.

• The questionnaire included a question set that inquired of the ownership and reliability of the agency’s primary and secondary vehicle. Written comments reveal that many EFPs rely on the use of staff and volunteers’ vehicles to transport food. By comparing comments and question answers in a number of cases we could see that the respondent was describing her/his own vehicle when checking off answers about the agency vehicle. We therefore consider the data not very useful from a quantitative perspective, but valuable for understanding EFPs’ transportation challenges. (See IV.B.2.)

• The questionnaire asked if the respondent’s EFP has a computer and internet access. Again, we could see that many respondents were struggling to discuss their EFPs’ technical capacity that benefited not from an EFP-owned computer, but from one owned by staff, volunteer, or parent organization (church, social agency, etc.). This data is better than the transportation data mentioned above because the question is very simple. It benefits as well from the additional comments that expand our understanding of the answer. (See VII.)

• The final survey question asks, “If needed, would you mind being contacted for additional information?” Much discussion and debate surrounded the construction of this question, resulting in the decision to formulate a friendly style of inquiry. Surprisingly, only two- thirds (65.0%) of respondents were willing to be contacted for additional information. Given that, on the three preceding questions, providers showed great interest in being known publicly and being in contact with their peers, it is possible that this low number can be attributed in part to the wording of the question (see V.C.).

Eighteen percent (18%) of respondents identified their EFP with more than one category (soup kitchen, shelter, food pantry, “other”), forming 14 discreet type combinations (e.g., “pantry only,” “pantry and shelter,” “other, soup kitchen, shelter,” etc.). With the help of the Subcommittee on the Rutgers Research Project, we organized the variables into one set of variable combinations so that they could be compared with other survey variables. This set includes six discrete groups (see discussion II.A.; Table 4). It is practical in terms of statistical
analysis and because the number of cases is not large for most groups. It should be remembered, however, that a collapse of groups from 14 to six distorts analysis by EFP type.

As the survey data was being entered, at least one out of 10 survey responses required a phone conversation to unravel inconsistencies in addresses, EFP types, or other issues. For example, we found that parent organizations sometimes filled out forms for the EFPs and the addresses provided differed from those in our data base. While we caught many problems, we stress that the final data set offers an approximate representation only of the surveyed pool of 1,121 New Jersey EFPs.
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SURVEY OF NEW JERSEY EMERGENCY FOOD PROVIDERS
SURVEY OF NEW JERSEY EMERGENCY FOOD PROVIDERS

Thank you for your help!
Please print clearly.

Your Emergency Food Program (EFP) __________________________________________________________

Street Address _____________________________________________________________________________

Mailing address, if not same as above ___________________________________________________________

Phone ________________________ Fax ___________________ E-mail ______________________________

Website __________________________________________________________________________________

Your name ________________________________________  Title ___________________________________

Best time and phone number for reaching you __________________________________________________

General Questions
1. Describe your EFP program. (check all that apply)
   ____ Soup kitchen  ____ Shelter  ____ Pantry  ____ Other, please describe _________________

2. How often are your food programs available to the public?  _____ Days per month

3. Approximately how much food does your EFP provide?
   Shelters and Soup Kitchens:  How many meals do you provide per month?_____________________
   Pantries:  How many people do you serve over the course of a month?______________________
   Pantries:  If available, please specify: _____ # Children/month  _____ # Adults/month
   Pantries:  Do you accept referrals or walk-in's?  _____ Yes          _____ No

   Has your client load...  _____ Increased  _____ Decreased  _____ Not changed

5. Do you turn away food because of problems with
   Food transportation?  _____ Yes          _____ No  Food storage space?  _____ Yes          _____ No

6. Do you presently partner with another EFP or other agency to share
   Food transportation?  _____ Yes          _____ No  Food storage space?  _____ Yes          _____ No

Nutrition Education
7. Does your agency provide information on any of the following programs to your clients?
   _____ Food Stamps  _____ WIC  _____ School  _____ Other
   Lunch/Breakfast

8. Does your agency currently provide clients nutrition education classes?  _____ Yes          _____ No

9. Would your agency be interested in providing on-site nutrition education classes?
   _____ Yes          _____ No
   If yes, how many clients could you accommodate per class?  _____# Clients

Technology
10. Does your agency have a computer?  _____ Yes          _____ No

11. Does your agency have internet access?  _____ Yes          _____ No
Transportation

12. What percentage of food that you cook or give to people is delivered to your agency? ____________%

13. What percentage of food that you cook or give to people is picked up by your agency? ____________%

14. If you need additional transportation, what would you use it for?
   _____ General office business       _____ Picking up food       _____ Delivering food
   _____ Other, please specify ________________________________

15. Is your agency’s primary vehicle reliable?  ___ Yes  ___ No  ____ We have no vehicles
   Is the vehicle...  ___ Owned  ___ Leased  ____ Borrowed

16. Is your agency’s secondary vehicle reliable?  ___ Yes  ___ No  ____ We don’t have a 2nd vehicle
   Is the vehicle...  ___ Owned  ___ Leased  ____ Borrowed

State and Regional Cooperation

17. Would your agency be interested in participating in shared transportation and/or food storage resources with other pantries and soup kitchens in your area?  ___ Yes  ___ No

18. Please check all resources that your agency has and might be willing to share.
   _____ Vehicles  _____ Drivers  _____ Refrigerator  _____ Freezer  _____ Dry Storage

19. Please check all resources that your agency needs and might be willing to borrow.
   _____ Vehicles  _____ Drivers  _____ Refrigerator  _____ Freezer  _____ Dry Storage

Resource Information

20. May we share your contact information with other EFPs?  ___ Yes  ___ No

21. May we share your answers with other EFPs?  ___ Yes  ___ No

22. May we use your contact information for a public directory of New Jersey EFPs?  ___ Yes  ___ No

23. If needed, would you mind being contacted for additional information?  ___ Yes  ___ No

Additional comments: Please add any additional comments that are important to you, e.g., on your EFP’s transportation, storage, computer access, etc. Feel free to add additional sheets as necessary.

Thank you for completing this survey! Please return it by January 28, 2005 in the enclosed addressed envelope to Anne C. Bellows, Ph.D., Food Policy Institute, Rutgers University, ASB III, 3 Rutgers Plaza, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Questions are welcomed, Anne Bellows, 732-932-1966 ext. 1222. This survey is sponsored by the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, funded by the New Jersey Division of Family Development, and administered through Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.
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I. Introduction

In response to the passage of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act, a study was undertaken at Rutgers University to conduct a statewide hunger needs assessment aimed, in part, at identifying strategies and structures for minimizing spoilage of food resources and maximizing the availability of wholesome and nutritious foods to those in need. The study also sought to provide an initial analysis of potential nutrient deficiencies in existing emergency feeding programs and to develop solutions to generate more nutritionally complete and culturally acceptable diets.

The work described in this portion of the overall report was performed to meet these New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act’s research objectives with regard to New Jersey Food Pantries:

- Objective II: Identify and quantify the need for emergency or supplemental feeding for families and individuals in the state; and,
- Objective V: Analyze nutritional sufficiencies and deficiencies in existing emergency food programs and develop solutions to generate nutritionally complete, culturally acceptable diets.

The study’s data collection methods, limitations, and results, as well as recommendations pertaining to potential areas of improvement for food pantries and further studies that may be prudent in regard to enhancing the ability of New Jersey Food Pantries in better meeting their patrons’ food and nutrition needs, are discussed herein.

II. Summary and Recommendations

The results of this investigation strongly suggest that New Jersey Food Pantries do much to support the food sufficiency and dietary quality of a large number of those living in need in this state. For the most part, patrons interviewed were extremely grateful for the food they received from pantries. However, some areas of concern where a need for improvement might be suggested were identified, as were areas where additional research would be prudent to further evaluate the contributions of food pantries as part of New Jersey’s emergency feeding system.

Nutrient Analysis

In this study, the contents of the food packages distributed to patrons at each of the 21 food pantries surveyed were documented. This food package information was subsequently analyzed in terms of:

- the Dietary Reference Intakes (recommended governmental intake levels), by average weekly amounts for each nutrient; and
- the distribution of foods by food groups, as compared to the weekly servings recommended for adults based on the 1992 Food Guide Pyramid.
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The food pantries were most effective at providing:
- protein-rich foods (including meats, poultry, fish, beans, and nuts);
- fruits;
- appropriate average number of Calories of the foods within the recommended intake per week for adults ages 19 through 50; and
- vitamin and mineral levels of the foods at close to or above the dietary reference intakes recommended, with the exception of calcium.

The nutrient analysis of the foods distributed by food pantries should not be considered definitive due to some limitations in the scope of this study. For example, for each site, food package observation included only a single day; and exact measurements of non-packaged foods could not be accomplished within the constraints of one visit, so contents and amounts were estimated.

Food pantry directors would benefit from a more precise analysis of the typical foods they are able to provide to patrons. This knowledge would be valuable as a guide when procuring provisions so they can attempt to supply as nutritionally balanced a package of food as is possible.

Recommendation: The nutrient analysis work done in this study should be used as a model for more comprehensive analyses, i.e., where non-packaged foods are weighed, foods are logged on a number of days during various seasons of the year, and food packages are analyzed according to the number of people and meals they are intended to serve. Such analyses would assist individual food pantries in assessing the nutrient contributions they make to their clients’ diets, as well as aide them in identifying foods and food groups they may want to target for food drives, when possible. Such analyses could be performed and explained to food pantry directors and/or personnel by trained, volunteer nutritionists and/or nutrition students, living within close proximity of pantry locations.

Application of Nutrient Analysis

Food pantry patrons were interviewed, both at food pantries around the state and at government offices in several locations. The food distributed by food pantries was considered good or very well liked, and was thought to be of good or excellent nutritional quality by 89% of the 142 food pantry users interviewed. More than half of those who get food from food pantries indicated they and their families ate almost all of the food items they received at the food pantry. In a supplementary survey, 140 food pantry users were asked if they use all of the food received from the food pantry, and if there were foods in the package they did not know how to use. Nearly half of these participants reported they did not use all the food received, and approximately one in ten did not know how to use particular foods they received, e.g., beets, canned pork, and canned chicken.

The high degree of food acceptability and usability expressed by food pantry patrons suggested the food distributed through food pantries in New Jersey is largely culturally acceptable, at least with regard to those currently accessing food pantries, and who participated in this research.
The average amounts of certain foods provided by food pantries, when analyzed by food groups, compared favorably to the recommended amounts.

- An average of 17 to 20 servings of protein-rich foods per person per week was well within the recommended 14 to 21 servings per week.
- The weekly recommendations for fruits of 14 to 28 servings were nearly met in the food pantry bags at 12 to 13 servings per person per week.

However, less than optimal comparisons were found in food pantry distributions for other food groups.

- Fats and sweets were provided in much higher amounts than the amount that is recommended for good health.
- The average number of vegetable servings was half to two-thirds of the recommended 21 to 35 servings per week.
- The milk group servings distributed were less than one-third of current dietary recommendations of three per day.

The average Calories in the foods distributed were over 14,000, appropriately within the recommended intake per week for adults ages 19 through 50 which is 11,200 – 18,200 Calories. The nutrient content of the average food pantry package provided more than the amount that would be recommended for one person for a week for protein and fat, but substantially less than current calcium recommendations. Most vitamin and mineral levels of the foods provided were close to or above the dietary reference intakes recommended.

Recommendation: Food pantry staff and clientele should carefully consider the caloric content of foods provided in comparison with client energy needs. Also, means of increasing the availability of calcium-rich foods and fresh fruits and vegetables should be explored. Although patrons desired more meats, this report does not support a strong need for additional protein sources. However, further research is warranted to determine if because current protein sources are of lesser desirability and may not be fully consumed, whether or not protein needs are not being met, and if more meats should be made available to clients.

Identifying Additional Needs for Food Pantry Services

Food pantry users from 21 food pantries and from three urban centers were asked if their food supply lasts all month. Slightly more than half of these 142 participants said that they did not have enough food to make it through the month, even when they added the food they got from a food pantry to the food they were able to buy. However, the positive impact pantry foods had on their food supply was clearly evidenced by the comments made throughout patron interviews. Comments made by patrons reflected strong and genuine patron gratitude. In the supplementary survey, food pantry patrons were asked how far into the month they are able to make their food or their food stamps last. Only 18% of the 140 food pantry users said it lasted all month. Thus, despite the positive contribution of food from pantries, a gap in food sufficiency still exists for a majority of patrons.
Some patrons indicated that they did not go to a pantry for food often, i.e., only once in two to three months. For some, their access difficulties included:

- transportation problems, or
- problems getting to the food pantry during its hours of operation.

Those who did not use food pantries indicated:

- they did not know where a food pantry was located,
- they did not know what hours food pantries were open, and
- other negative attitudes, such as embarrassment, inconvenient hours, having better means of getting by, like getting help from the family, and not liking to eat expired food.

In addition, language barriers limited the interviews obtained from some population segments, leaving the possibility that food quality may be less favorably assessed by those who were not able to be interviewed.

Some of those interviewed made random, ancillary comments expressing difficulties associated with food pantry use. Comments were made to the interview staff suggesting:

- Problems were experienced in transporting heavy, can-laden boxes and bags by those who did not own cars. Some indicated that without help, sometimes food was left behind.
- The lack of diabetic foods, or the inability to determine which foods would adhere to diabetic restrictions made by patrons’ health care providers, was problematic.
- The inability to store or cook food, due to homeless conditions and shelter residence, inhibited the use of food pantries by many.

Recommendation: Qualitative, ancillary comments made by participants in reference to issues they have experienced with regard to food pantry use, e.g., lack of ability to transport foods home, and inability to access pantries, should be quantified to further define how food pantries can best serve the population of New Jersey in need of nutritional support. Also, variables that are likely more pertinent to food insecure individuals who were unable to be interviewed as part of this investigation, i.e., those who do not speak English, those living in New Jersey’s extremes and/or those unable to access locations in areas where interviews were performed, need additionally be queried.

Determining Needs of Additional Population Groups

Two-thirds of the 21 food pantries surveyed were not able to address the ethnic or religious food customs of their patrons. Pantry directors indicated this occurred for a variety of reasons, including:

- no perceived need, e.g., believing there was no need in the area, or that the community was happy with whatever it could get, and
- lack of the capacity to address special needs, e.g., distributions were governed by the donations received.
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As a result, most of the pantries tried to have some alternate foods on hand for those patrons for whom particular food item were not acceptable. The degree to which patrons were satisfied with this was not clear.

It is often presumed that the population of individuals who use each food pantry reflect the diversity of the community the pantry serves. For this study, presentation of the interviews in English to those for whom English was not their first language represented a limitation to the number of interviews performed with people for whom English is not their first language, as well as the accuracy of the data collected and to the interpretation of its results. This constraint may also limit the use of emergency food resources for some who have difficulty communicating. It should be noted that some findings may be less valid when applied to these audiences.

**Recommendation:** Work should also be done to compare the ethnic backgrounds of those living in need in New Jersey, to those interviewed via this study, as well as those using food pantry resources. If substantial populations of those living in need are not included in this work, and are to be served by New Jersey food pantries, additional research should be done, by interview staff both well-versed in the language of those to be interviewed, as well as highly familiar food commonly consumed by the target audience, in terms of the foods’ recognition, its local availability and distribution venues, its common preparation methods and its nutritional value, such that patron satisfaction and needs can be adequately assessed.

**Food Pantry Awareness Among the Food Insecure Population**

While surveying food insecure individuals at urban centers in Newark, Camden, and Vineland, investigators observed that a fair number of those who did not get food from food pantries indicated they did not know what a food pantry was. Thus, during the supplementary survey, specific queries were made indicating that:

- A total of 108 people, which is 27% of the 401 respondents, were unfamiliar with the term when asked if they knew what a food pantry was.
- Many of these individuals stated they had never heard of a food pantry after the interviewer defined the term for them.
- For non-users who had never heard of a food pantry, 82% indicated they could not survive the month with enough to eat.

The fact that so many people were unable to define the term “food pantry” and most had never been to one suggests that many food insecure people in need food support were not aware that food pantries existed. Had the concept and availability of food pantries been more widely known, more of the surveyed individuals might have been able to take advantage of an additional resource.

Caution should be used not to generalize this result across the state without investigating the circumstances in specific locations. Different food pantries and communities have made varying levels of effort to increase the awareness of emergency and on-going food resources available to people in need. Areas where consortiums have been created are likely to have achieved a broader dissemination of food resource information to individuals in the community.
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Recommendation: Education with community-based organizations and their employees should be provided to ensure that food insecure individuals and families should be proactively made aware of New Jersey food pantries when pantries are available to serve them, as many do not know of food pantries and would therefore not ask the appropriate entities for a referral.

Food Use Education
As for usage of the foods distributed by food pantries, the 142 food pantry users were asked how much of the food they received were items they and their families were willing to eat.

- Most people (54%) indicated they and their families ate almost all of the food items they received from the food pantry; and
- An additional 42% said they ate at least half of the food items they got from a pantry.

In the follow-up survey, food pantry users were specifically asked if they used all the foods received from the food pantry, as well as if there were any that they did not know how to use.

- Nearly half the participants reported they did not use all the food received.
- Approximately one in ten did not know how to use particular foods they received, e.g., beets, canned pork and canned chicken.

Those foods that were listed as not used varied widely. Taste and texture issues were most commonly cited as reasons for not using foods, like beans. However, some foods, like cereal and rice, went unused because patrons indicated they simply had too many of them.

Recommendation: Education aimed at increasing the use of foods that are less favored or available in abundance should be developed and provided to food pantry patrons.

Food Pantry Best Practices
Investigators observed that some food pantry directors had questions regarding management and expansion issues pertaining to their operations. The capacity and efficiency of the food pantries visited varied widely, along with the funding and access to food resources. Knowledge of some of the practices used by the biggest and the best of New Jersey’s food pantries for sustenance and growth would be beneficial to other pantries that are seeking options to improve or expand their operation. A wealth of knowledge exists among the directors of pantries across the state that could benefit others if shared.

Recommendation: The sharing of best practices among food pantry personnel was identified as a need in discussions with food pantry directors, particularly those from smaller set-ups, and should be organized and made accessible to maximize food resources and minimize hunger throughout the state. Mentoring should be encouraged for those food pantry directors who desire to increase the capacity, efficiency, and/or funding of their operations.
III. Data Collection Methods

Overview

To meet the objectives defined for this research, a sequence of data collection methods was employed, with data collected between June 24, 2003 and September 26, 2005. A total of 761 individuals were interviewed for this work, using a series of survey questionnaires designed to refine the information requested to attain the answers to the research questions posed. All of these individuals, whether emergency feeding system patrons or not, were classified as food insecure, as defined by their responses according to the Short Form of the 12-month Food Security Scale, a 6-item version of the USDA Food Security Survey Module.\(^1\) (Please see Appendix A for this questionnaire and its scoring instructions.) In addition, 40 individuals who were involved in the management of emergency feeding programs were interviewed, 21 from food pantry operations and 19 from soup kitchens.

All of the data collected for this study has been grouped for the purposes of this report into an Investigation Phase and a Follow-up Phase, as described below. The information contained in this report is limited to that which pertains to food pantries, their patrons, and their operation.

1. The Investigation Phase

The initial efforts of this research examined New Jersey food pantries via a sample consisting of one food pantry from each county. Each assessment gleaned information from key informants. “Needs” were assessed in terms of the perceived food quantity, quality, and type. The information gathered during this initial investigation included the following:

- interviews with food pantry management and site personnel (Appendix B);
- logs of the foods distributed on the day the pantries were visited (Appendix B); and
- surveys conducted with select clients, numbering two to seven patrons from each location (Appendix C).

A semi-structured survey was used to garner impressions of how well clients’ needs were met by these food pantries (Appendix C). Ultimately, the food and nutrient sufficiency of foods provided via New Jersey’s food pantries were assessed in a variety of ways, including analyses based on these observations combined with impressions obtained via interviews performed with food pantry clientele throughout all phases of this work.

Next, this study employed a modified survey interview to amass similar information as that collected from patrons at food pantries, this time from a larger number of self-identified food-insecure food pantry users in three of the urban centers within the state (Appendix D). Surveyants were recruited from the Board of Social Services/Department of Citizen Services offices in the cities of Newark, Camden, and Vineland. This interviewing opportunity was

---
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also used to ascertain information from food insecure individuals who did not use food pantries, to determine why they did not use food pantries to improve their food sufficiency.

Since there were great similarities between the structured surveys used at food pantries and those used in the three urban centers, the majority of the data collected during these two efforts have been combined for analysis and reporting purposes, under the heading entitled Information Phase.

Data collected that is included under the Information Phase heading included:
- 142 surveys of individuals who use food pantries;
- 135 surveys of individuals who do not use food pantries;
- 21 interviews with food pantry directors; and
- 21 logs of the food distributed by food pantries.

2. The Follow-up Phase

Following the Information Phase of this work, another more structured survey was administered with an even larger sample of food insecure individuals from Camden, Cumberland, and Essex counties, focused around the same three urban centers as the surveys in the previous phase. This follow-up survey was administered via two data collection methods, i.e., telephone and intercept interviews. These interviews were conducted:
- to provide additional clarity to previously attained information, and
- to obtain a modest amount of additional information, as needed.

Data collected during this phase included:
- 140 surveys of individuals who use food pantries; and
- 267 surveys of individuals who do not use food pantries.

Investigation Phase Data Collection

1. Surveys Conducted at Food Pantries

Data collection at food pantries occurred between June 24, 2003 and February 26, 2005, during which a convenience sample of one food pantry per county (n=21) was visited. This research was limited to one food pantry per county because travel to multiple locations throughout New Jersey was outside this project’s scope due to the high cost of time and human resources involved in such an undertaking.

To identify interview sites, initial lists of food pantries, organized by county, were obtained from several of the regional food banks. Additional food pantry names and locations were solicited, on an as needed basis, from individuals and agencies knowledgeable of New Jersey’s emergency food resources. From these lists, food pantry providers were approached by telephone until contact was made with a provider who agreed to allow study participation to take place at their pantry.
Interviews were conducted with:
- one pantry director and/or staff member per site (n=21), and
- a small convenience sample of patrons.

The convenience sample was composed of the first individuals approached who: spoke English; were over age 18; were willing to complete an interview with the research staff; and, were deemed food insecure when screened. Although the patron sample size was small (n=80), it was appropriate for the primary objectives for this portion of the research, i.e., to test the viability of particular survey questions, as well as to make initial observations to inform new survey questions to be developed and administered to a larger population of food insecure individuals during the next part of this work at the three urban centers described below.

Please see Appendices B and C for the text of the survey tools used with food pantry directors and food pantry participants.

2. Topics Included in Investigation Phase Questionnaires at Food Pantries
Since this interview opportunity took place at food pantries, it was used to make several queries of interest that were not appropriate for any other part of this study. These lines of questioning asked:
- How did you hear about this food pantry?
- Which of the following describes how you get here? (walk, drive, carpool, public transportation, bike, etc.); and,
- What rules does the Food Pantry have about how often you can come here?

The latter question was also asked of the directors/staff, so responses could be compared to those made by the patrons.

Other questions were asked of food pantry patrons regarding:
- if distance or transportation were problematic for patrons, in terms of their ability to get to a food pantry;
- if their food needs were greater at particular times of the month or of the year; and
- if patrons had knowledge of programs and opportunities that could be accessed to improve their food sufficiency.

These questions held up well on the survey administered to pantry patrons and therefore were continued with only minor adjustments for the next set of surveys implemented.

3. Foods Distributed at Food Pantries
Data collection at food pantries was also used as an opportunity to observe the foods being distributed to patrons on the day of each site visit. The contents of food packages were subsequently analyzed using Nutritionist Pro, a nutrient analysis software package used regularly for this purpose. The foods were analyzed with regard to their nutrient and food group sufficiency.
Two types of distribution practices were found among the food pantries surveyed. These practices, described below, affected how variations in food package that were documented were accounted for, and also impacted the analysis of the nutrient values associated with the food package.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution Practice Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Food Pantries Employing the Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Distribution Amount Adjusted for Household Size</td>
<td>These food pantries varied the amount of food given to patrons by the number of people in the household.</td>
<td>10 food pantries (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Distribution Amount Not Adjusted for Household Size</td>
<td>These food pantries gave an equal amount of food to all patrons, regardless of the number of people in the patrons’ household.</td>
<td>11 food pantries (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, nine food pantries (43%) had some optional food items that patrons could take beyond the basic food bags provided. In those cases, optional foods, chosen by a referent individual, were added to the normal provisions documented for the site.

Nutrient content of the typical food package distributed on the day of the site visit were analyzed:
- by individual nutrients, as compared to the Dietary Reference Intakes (government daily recommended intake amounts), using average weekly amounts; and
- by food groups, as compared to the weekly servings recommended for adults based on the 1992 Food Guide Pyramid.

This information, in total, served as a representation of the nutrient and food group data for the foods available to food pantry patrons.

In a discussion with the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee following presentation of the nutrient and food group analysis, it was recommended that the evaluation of the food packages distributed to patrons reflect the number of meals the packages were intended to provide. The food pantry directors of the sites visited were contacted a second time by telephone to determine their expectations for the number of meals the food that was distributed to patrons was intended to provide. Nineteen of the directors responded to this inquiry. Of these, eight directors (42%) stated they did not have a specific number of meals in mind when they had assembled the food packages for their patrons. Therefore, it was not possible to amend the nutrient and food group analyses, as suggested.

4. Surveys Conducted at Urban Centers

The next series of interviews were conducted with food pantry patrons (users) and individuals who did not obtain food from a food pantry (non-users) in Camden, Essex, and Cumberland counties, between November 24, 2004 and September 9, 2005. These counties were chosen for data collection because they were home to very large numbers of Food
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Stamp Program participants, and because they represented geographically diverse regions of the state. All of these interviews were conducted in waiting rooms of Board of Social Services or Department of Citizen Services offices located in the cities of Camden, Newark, and Vineland.

The information about food pantry use was collected as part of a larger survey that also evaluated the impact of soup kitchens on the food supply and dietary intake of food insecure individuals. A goal was set to collect data from 68 individuals in each of the three data collection locations (total n=204); and for the data set from each location to include, at a minimum, 17 food pantry users, 17 food pantry non-users, 17 soup kitchen users, and 17 soup kitchen non-users. This recruitment classification scheme was employed to ensure a reasonably-sized, and geographically-varied sample. This data collection goal of 68 surveys was met in Newark and Camden, however, the surveys collected in Vineland were eight surveys shy of this goal. It was determined that the costs associated with returning to Vineland for these additional interviews outweighed the benefits of obtaining them, since a sufficiently large sample of food pantry users and soup kitchen users had already been collected, as described below.

Prospective survey participants in each city who indicated a willingness to participate in the study were screened based on their age and their use of food pantries and soup kitchens. Qualifying surveyants were then queried to determine their food security status. Those who were food secure were thanked for their time, but were not surveyed.

It was predicted that some of the soup kitchen users and non-users were also likely to be food pantry patrons, and hence would also be asked to complete the food pantry portion of the survey. Therefore the sample size of food pantry users surveyed at the three urban centers would actually become larger than the minimum of required. This turned out to be true, as 62 of the individuals surveyed in this part of the study completed the survey questions relating to food pantry use.

Please see Appendix D for the text of the survey tool used with individuals interviewed at urban centers.

5. Topics Included in Questionnaires at Urban Centers
The individuals who indicated they used food pantries were queried regarding:

- how well and in what ways their food needs were met by supplementing their food supply with foods received from pantries;
- the benefits and difficulties they associated with food pantry use; and
- how they felt about using food pantries to acquire food.

As a result of observation and discussions with food pantry personnel, three questions were added to the survey to be used in the urban center interviews. These questions addressed patrons’ degree of unmet need, including:

- how far into the month people could typically make it without running out of food;
- feelings associated with being a patron of a food pantry; and
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- how people managed when they ran out of food and could not get food from a food pantry.

Additionally, data was also collected from non-users, with a varied line of questioning aimed at determining why, since they were food insecure, they did not use food pantries to supplement their food supply.

In Newark, the first urban center where these surveys were conducted, it was noted that a number of survey respondents did not know what a food pantry was. Consequently, when surveys were initiated in Vineland, non-users were specifically asked if they knew what a food pantry was. Most of those interviewed in Vineland who did not use food pantries (n=31; 76%) said they did not know what a pantry was. Thus, an additional line of inquiry for the Follow-up Phase of this study was established.

6. Total Sample Size for the Investigation Phase
Food pantry directors and staff were interviewed at each of the 21 food pantries that participated in this study.

The individual participants who completed surveys during the Investigation Phase are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food Pantry Users</th>
<th>Food Pantry Non-users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at Food Pantries</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at Urban Centers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up Phase Data Collection

1. The Follow-up Survey Protocol
The Follow-up Phase was conducted to follow-up on a smaller number of particular questions that arose from the Investigation Phase. These included:
- specific questions of interest to the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, based on an oral report presented to them on August 11, 2005, regarding the Investigation Phase work;
- information needed for the development of nutrition education materials most appropriate for this target audience; and
- additional queries to clarify information gained in the previous data, e.g., if food insecure people who did not use food pantries even knew what “food pantries” were.
During the Follow-up Phase, 407 surveys were completed between August 30, 2005 and September 26, 2005, with food insecure individuals from the same three urban centers sampled in the Investigation Phase. The survey was administered to a broad audience of food insecure individuals, i.e., recruitment was not based on initial inquiries regarding food pantry use. As such, the survey percentages from this phase are perhaps better reflective of the percentage of food insecure people who use food pantries, soup kitchens, both, or neither in limited-resource urban areas of New Jersey.

The original data collection protocol planned for this survey’s implementation via telephone interviews to maximize the reach of the survey, while minimizing the resources necessary for its administration. Initially, calls were placed to approximately 1,000 telephone numbers, and only 19 surveys were completed. A combination of problems was experienced, such as:
- a large number of non-working numbers in the data set purchased;
- many individuals reached who did not qualify for study participation due to the fact that they measured “food secure;” and
- individuals refusing participation.

It was therefore determined that a different data collection protocol need be employed. Thus, an additional 388 intercept interviews were completed, and performed with a convenience sample of food insecure individuals reached, predominantly in the Newark environs, where program staff were available to assist and interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish. Locations in Newark used for participant recruitment included: The Adult Learning Center, Templo Roca de Mi Salvacion, Jewish Vocational Services, The Apostle House, St. James Community Outreach Center, Work Force Advantage, New Community Corporation, Kintock, The North Ward Center, The Wise Women Center, Montclair Food Pantry, Renaissance House, La Casa de Don Pedro, East Orange Community Outreach, the Irvington Development Center, Newark Housing Authority. In Cumberland County, participants were once again recruited from the Board of Social Services’ waiting room in Vineland.

Please see Appendix E for the text of the survey tool used in the Follow-up Phase.

2. Topics Included in the Follow-up Questionnaire

Questions were developed to clarify information gathered earlier in this study, including:
- questions designed to determine if food insecure individuals identified at locations other than food pantries knew what the term “food pantry” meant. Further, the query was made in such a way so as to be able to determine if some used food pantries, but simply did not know what they were called;
- questions designed to ascertain if individuals considered that the addition of food obtained from a food pantry constituted the reason they were able to make it through the entire month with enough food.

Pursuant to a question from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, questions were included to clarify what was meant when individuals said they go to a “church program” as a means of acquiring food.
For the purpose of informing future nutrition education efforts for food pantry users, participants were questioned concerning types of foods received from food pantries, but not used by patrons, and the reasons for this. The survey also asked participants about foods received that they did not know how to use.

3. Total Sample Size for the Follow-up Phase
The individual participants who completed surveys during the Follow-up Phase are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food Pantry Users</th>
<th>Food Pantry Non-users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total of Individuals Surveyed</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Study Limitations

While this report provides a great deal of information, and a baseline for additional investigations, there are limitations associated with this research that the reader should consider in reviewing the findings presented within.

First, the nutrient and food group analyses performed were limited to those foods distributed at the 21 sites observed on a single day. This data was further restrained by our inability to make exact measurements due to the complexity and cost of doing so, e.g., weighing all produce, etc., while additionally recording all foods distributed and interviewing site personnel and patrons. It is important to note, however, that the person providing these estimates had completed degree requirements for a master’s degree in nutrition, had completed all requirements for eligibility to sit for the exam administered for certification of Registered Dietitians, and came to this project with a great deal of experience, both in research and food service. Still, some portions recorded were estimated, and were therefore inexact.

Another limitation associated with the Investigation Phase of the work conducted at food pantries was the small number of sites observed. Although a substantial subject pool of food pantry users was queried in the later segments of this project, as a result of the small number of sites visited a small number of site directors and/or staff were interviewed for their impressions. Therefore, the site characteristics provided in this report serve only to detail for the reader the types of sites we assessed, as opposed to providing an accurate portrait of the characteristics of New Jersey food pantries. Additional information regarding a larger number of food pantries, however, is provided in the summary report regarding the survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers, wherein a survey mailed to all New Jersey Food Pantry sites identified is presented.

The findings from surveys conducted at urban centers, as well as those from the Follow-up Phase of this work, were additionally limited by the lack of geographical diversity reflected in the findings. Vineland was intentionally included in both Phases, although to a lesser extent in the Follow-up Phase, to ensure that responses from New Jersey food pantry patrons who hailed from a more rural setting were reflected. Despite this assurance, it is important to note that a strong potential exists that non-users with extreme transportation challenges were likely not available at the sites surveyed. Had we been successful in our ability to administer the final survey via a telephone interview protocol, as originally planned, the lack of telephone service would have limited study findings, but geographical diversity and inclusion of those with more extreme transportation challenges would have been alleviated. However, due to the transient nature, as well as the economic instability of the study population, the telephone number data purchased, which was nearly two years old, was largely invalid. The telephone numbers that were operational tended to belong to people who were not eligible for study participation, i.e., they were food secure, and their telephone numbers were likely operational due to their lesser degree of transience and higher degree of economic stability. As such, the intended method of data collection proved ineffective and impractical; and, the change in study protocol to effectively and practically collect a larger data set, introduced the aforementioned biases to the study results.
Presentation of the interviews in English to those for whom English was not their first language represented another study limitation. In such cases, it appeared that particular questions were more frequently left unanswered. Interviews conducted at food pantries in the Investigation Phase were only performed in English; Information Phase interviews at urban centers, and Follow-up Phase interviews were largely performed in English, with some administered in Spanish, when Spanish-speaking staff were available to assist. Additionally, it should be noted that some findings may be less valid when applied to audiences who were unable to be interviewed due to language barriers.

Of course both phases of this research were plagued with those limitations common to the use of convenience sampling, e.g., the bias that is introduced by the nature of the site participant characteristics. For example, it is likely that those who were present at the sites where data were collected likely had some access to transportation since they were able to get there. Further, those at sites where interviews were performed were usually there to access some type of benefits, and were therefore at least aware of some services available for low-income individuals. If more low-income people had been able to be accessed from different locations, it is likely there would have been some who were even worse off and less informed.

There were also biases introduced into the data collected due to using self-reported information. Issues affiliated with this data collection method are often related to social desirability, e.g., participants providing responses they believe the interviewer wishes to hear, or individuals interviewed at food pantries making more positive comments about pantries, generally. However, convenience sampling and self-report are the best means of obtaining large amounts of information in short amounts of time, and it is predicted the enhanced sample size available through the utilization of these methods decreases the error introduced by these factors.
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V. Results

Overview
Food pantries have demonstrated many successes in meeting the needs of their communities’ food insecure populations. Some of these include:

- Nearly half of the Investigation Phase interviewees who use the services of a food pantry (n=65; 46%) said that the food they got from a food pantry helped them make it through the month with enough food to feed themselves and their families when they added it to the food they were able to buy. Thus, some people have managed to achieve food sufficiency as a result of this emergency feeding assistance.

- Nearly half of the food pantry users (n=75; 53%) reported that they got just the right amount of food; and, few (n=4; 3%) indicated they received more food than they could use from the food pantry.

- The food distributed by food pantries was considered good or very well liked by the vast majority of Investigation Phase survey participants (n=126; 89%). The same number of participants thought the nutritional quality of the food they got from the pantry was good or excellent. Most people (n=76; 54%) indicated they and their families ate almost all of the food items they received at the food pantry; an additional 59 people (42%) said they ate half or more of the food items they got from a pantry.

- The high degree of food acceptability and usability expressed by food pantry patrons suggested the food distributed through food pantries in New Jersey is largely culturally acceptable, at least with regard to those served who participated in this research.

- The food pantries were most effective at providing:
  - protein-rich foods (including meats, poultry, fish, beans, and nuts);
  - fruits;
  - appropriate average number of Calories of the foods within the recommended intake per week for adults ages 19 through 50; and
  - vitamin and mineral levels of the foods at close to or above the dietary reference intakes recommended, with the exception of calcium.

However, the nutrient analysis of the foods distributed by food pantries should not be considered definitive due to some limitations in the scope of this study. For example, for each site, food package observation included only a single day; and exact measurements of non-packaged foods could not be accomplished within the constraints of one visit, so contents and amounts were estimated.
Still, food pantries and their patrons still face many challenges:

- More than half of food pantry patrons in the Investigation Phase (n=75; 53%) said that they did not have enough food to make it through the month, even when they added the food they got from a food pantry to the food they were able to buy. Since most of the food pantry directors believed that their patrons regarded the amount of food distributed was “just right” (n=12; 57%) or “more than enough” (n=6; 29%) to meet patrons’ needs, this potential misunderstanding may contribute to practices that do not support patron food sufficiency.

- Although the Investigation Phase surveys indicated that the food received by patrons from food pantries helped them make it through the month with enough food, the help was often not enough. Follow-up surveys with food pantry users in the Follow-up Phase found that when users were asked if the food in their household generally lasted all month, only 25 (18%) answered that it did. Thus, despite the positive contributions food pantries make to patrons food sufficiency, clearly need remains.

- When asked about the quantity of food received from the food pantry, many pantry patrons indicated the amount of food they got from the food pantry was not nearly enough (n=40; 28%) or was less than they needed (n=21; 15%).

- Food group analysis showed that fats and sweets were provided in much higher amounts than is recommended for good health. The average number of vegetable servings in the food pantry distributions was less than patrons needed to meet the recommended number of servings per week. The milk group servings distributed were substantially below current dietary recommendations of three per day.

- The nutrient content of the average food pantry packages provided more than the amount that would be recommended for one person for a week for protein and fat, but substantially less than Calcium recommendations shown below.

- Nearly half the food pantry participants in the Follow-up Phase survey reported they did not use all the food they received from the food pantry (n=67; 49%); and, approximately one in ten (n=16; 13%) did not know how to use particular foods they received.

- People sometimes expressed negative emotions about using the resources of a food pantry. Of those interviewed at offices in Newark, Camden, and Vineland, 26 food pantry users (42%) and nine non-users (7%) indicated they were embarrassed, uncomfortable, or felt bad about going to a food pantry. Several more people stated they would rather work, make their own way, or get help from family members than accept assistance from a food pantry.

- Some random, ancillary comments expressing difficulties associated with food pantry use were made by food pantry patrons. Comments were made to the interview staff suggesting:
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- Those patrons who did not own or have regular access to cars experienced problems in transporting heavy, can-laden boxes and bags home. Patrons indicated they could manage when a friend was available to help or a cart could be borrowed for these purposes, but when relief was not available, food had to be left behind.

- The lack of diabetic foods available, or patron and food pantry staff inability to determine which foods would adhere to diabetic restrictions made by patrons’ health care providers was problematic.

- The inability to store or cook food, due to homeless conditions and shelter residence, inhibited the use of food pantries by many.

In the Follow-up Phase, 401 food insecure individuals were surveyed. Most respondents (n=260, 65%) did not utilize food pantries, and 237 or 42% used neither food pantries nor soup kitchens to improve their food security. This study identified some potential reasons why food insecure people do not use food pantries.

- The mean monthly incomes of the people who do not use food pantries interviewed in the Follow-up Phase was considerably higher, $940±$925 (n=178), than the mean incomes reported by food pantry patrons, $557±$595 (n=108). This likely explains the higher percentage who were able to make it through the month with enough food, or with ample food stamps, and may also explain, in part, why some were not using food pantry resources.

- A total of 108 people, which is 27% of the 401 respondents to queries regarding if they knew what a food pantry was, were unfamiliar with the term. Many of participants stated they had never heard of a food pantry after the interviewer defined the term for them. For non-users who had never heard of a food pantry, 82% (n=11) indicated they could not survive the month with enough to eat.

- More than one third (n=54; 40%) of the survey respondents at the three urban centers who did not use food pantries said the reason they did not go to one was because they did not know where a pantry was located or, in some cases, what hours they were open.

- A variety of negative attitudes regarding the use of food pantries were expressed by participants. However, most were named by fewer than 10% of the non-users, suggesting that negativity was not substantially affecting patronage. Some negative comments made included: embarrassment, finding pantries were not open at convenient times, having better means of getting by, like getting help from the family, and not liking to eat expired food.

* Standard deviation is a measure of the spread of the data above and below the mean, or average, value. It is expressed next to the mean or average after a “±” sign.
• When asked in the Follow-up survey to select the primary reason they were food insufficient, non-user responses were the same as those chosen by food pantry patrons, but were ranked quite differently. The reasons most cited by those who do not use food pantries were: I live on a fixed income, and it is too low (n=48; 26%); I’m working, but not making enough money (n=43; 24%); I’ve been unemployed a long time (n=21; 12%); and, I’m on public assistance, but it is not enough (n=18; 3%). These responses were consistent with expectations drawn from the patron income and benefit data, which suggested more of the non-users had been working
**Food Pantry Characteristics**

Hours of operation of the 21 pantries assessed were:
- at least one day a week for 17 of the pantries (81%), and
- four or more days a week for 7 pantries (33%).

The remaining four food pantries (19%) were only open one or two days per month.

Within those hours of operation, most food pantries designated how frequently patrons were permitted to receive food:
- Ten pantries (48%) allowed patrons to get food once a month, which was the most common frequency among the pantries surveyed. Some of these pantries had exception policies, e.g., allowing individuals who were homeless to get food from the pantry more frequently, or limiting assistance to three months.
- Ten additional food pantries permitted patrons to get food from the pantry once every one or two weeks.
- One pantry had no rules regarding attendance frequency.

The food pantry directors indicated the number of households they served per week ranged from 6 to 460, with a mean of 114±128 households.

A question from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee resulted in a follow-up investigation with food pantry directors to ascertain the number of meals food packages were intended to provide for patrons. Nineteen food pantry directors responded to our query. Only ten of them were able to provide this type of estimate:
- Some responses were expressed in days of food, as opposed to meals; these were converted to meals, assuming three meals per day.
- In two cases, the directors’ expectations were expressed as a range of days. In these cases, the midpoint of the range was used and converted to a number of meals as above.

Using these calculations, for those ten food pantries, the average number of meals for which provisions were intended to feed patrons was 12±5 meals.

Many food pantries were located in or supported by faith-based organizations. This was the case for 17 (81%) of the 21 pantries surveyed in this project. Patrons surveyed at food pantries and urban centers often mentioned church programs as a strategy used to obtain food. Inquiry from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee suggested the need for clarification to determine whether surveyants’ responses were referring to having used church programs that were, in fact, food pantries, or if they were referring to accessing church soup kitchen meals, or simply attending church events or functions during which food was served. To better understand patrons’ use of the term “church programs,” the Follow-up Phase survey specifically asked about the type or types of church programs accessed. One hundred four (75%) food pantry patrons responded, indicating:
- 73 (72%) used a faith-based organizations’ food pantry;
- 35 (34%) took advantage of soup kitchen availability; and
- 38 (36%) said they attended events or functions offered more generally to the faith-based community to which they belonged.
The strong role faith-based organizations play in New Jersey’s emergency feeding system should be noted.

**Food Pantry Clientele Characteristics**

Surveys were obtained from a total of 282 food pantry users during the course of this study. The distribution of these participants follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at Food Pantries</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at government offices, community centers, and faith-based organizations in Newark, Camden, and Vineland</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Investigation Phase, all food pantry patrons surveyed were food insecure and had received food from a food pantry at least three times within the six months prior to their interview. Food insecure food pantry patrons in the Follow-up Phase also reported they had received food from a food pantry within 6 months of the interview date.

Personal characteristics of the food pantry patrons who participated in these surveys included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• age range</td>
<td>18 to 89 years</td>
<td>18 to 79 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• average age</td>
<td>45±13 years</td>
<td>37±11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• female</td>
<td>96 (68%)</td>
<td>108 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• male</td>
<td>46 (32%)</td>
<td>46 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household size</th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3±2 people</td>
<td>3±2 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>65 (46%)</td>
<td>97 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>57 (41%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hispanic</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide figures from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey for 2002-2003 indicate that the racial breakdown for those living under the poverty threshold in New Jersey were as follows: Black, non-Hispanic (15%); White, non-Hispanic (5%); and Hispanic (15%).

Employment and financial information provided by food pantry users interviewed included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number Employed</strong></td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>38 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Wages</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Hourly: 23 (62% of those employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average hourly rate: $8.21±$2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits Received</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TANF/General Assistance</td>
<td>33 (23%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Security</td>
<td>32 (22%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SSI/SSD</td>
<td>32 (22%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Support</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unemployment</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average monthly household income from wages or benefits</strong></td>
<td>$653±$507 (n=139)</td>
<td>$790±$629 (n=30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patrons’ average reported incomes were below the 2005 Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines for even a single person, which was $798 per month. When considering the mean household size for pantry participants was three, for which the Guidelines are $1,341 per month, these findings are further worrisome.

One of the primary ways food pantry patrons ensured their food supply, other than use of food pantries, was through participation in the food stamp program. However, despite their efforts most still ran out of food prior to the month’s end.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Stamp Program Participants</th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 (49%)</td>
<td>71 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portion of Month Food Stamps Last</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All month</td>
<td>8 (10%)</td>
<td>71 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three weeks</td>
<td>23 (30%)</td>
<td>60 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two weeks</td>
<td>30 (40%)</td>
<td>33 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less than two weeks</td>
<td>15 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Investigation Phase interviews, most survey participants indicated they either obtained food from a food pantry once a month (n=54; 38%) or once every two to three weeks (n=39; 28%). A smaller number of participants responded that they went to a food pantry once a week (n=15; 11%) or more than once a week (n=5; 4%).

Investigation Phase food pantry patrons interviewed at the three urban centers were asked how they felt about using a food pantry. Most patrons had positive feelings, i.e., they indicated:
- it was a good experience (n=42; 67%), and
- they were grateful (n=14; 22%).

Other comments made suggested that patrons would do whatever was necessary to feed their children, and that food obtained from food pantries was helpful in terms of “stretching” what they had.

While most patrons had positive comments regarding their use of food pantries, some negative comments were also heard. Some patrons indicated
- they were uncomfortable using a food pantry (n=11; 18%);
- they felt horribly that they couldn’t independently feed their families (n=10; 16%); or
- they were embarrassed having to go there (n=6; 10%).

Other negative attitudes expressed related to transportation issues, and dissatisfaction with the food provided, however such comments were each made by fewer than 10% of the study population.

Investigation Phase food pantry users were asked about when they most often did not have enough food for themselves or their families.
- Sixty participants (42%) indicated they most often did not have enough food at the end of the month, or the 2\textsuperscript{nd} half of the month.
- Fifty-seven (42%) said that this could happen to them any time during the month, or that it happened all the time.
- Most people (n=91; 64%) reported that the season was not a factor in when they didn’t have enough food.
- Yet 22% (n=32) said they were more likely to not have enough food in winter.
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• A few people (n=7; 5%) said they experienced more difficulty having enough food during the summer because their children were home more of the time, and they did not have the support of the free or reduced-price school meal programs to feed their children.

Foods food pantry participants indicated most frequently that they would like to receive more of were meats, and fresh fruits (some said canned) and vegetables.

When asked how they managed when the food pantry ran out of food and they were thus unable to get food, the majority of Investigation Phase 1 respondents indicated they ate with family or friends, went to another pantry, stretched what they had, or went without food.

A list of the primary reasons people gave for their inability to maintain food sufficiency was developed in the Investigation Phase of this work. As a follow-up, those interviewed in the Follow-up Phase were asked to indicate which was their primary reason. Those reasons selected by 10% or more of the patrons who responded to this survey item were:

• I’m on public assistance, but it is not enough (n=30; 32%);
• I live on a on a fixed income, and it is too low (n=21; 22%);
• I’m working, but not making enough money (n=12; 13%); and,
• I’ve been unemployed a long time (n=10; 11%).

These responses were consistent with expectations drawn from the patron income and benefit data indicated above. It is interesting to note that the total number of respondents for this particular question was only 94 of the 140 patrons who completed this survey, as many were unable to state the primary cause for their lack of ability to maintain food sufficiency due to its multi-factorial nature, i.e., utility costs, medical costs, inability to work, high utility costs, etc., all played a strong role in their dilemma.

In response to queries regarding how patrons had heard about the food pantry in which they were interviewed, most indicated they learned about it from:

• a friend (n=31; 39%),
• a government office referral (n=17; 21%),
• church (n=13; 16%), or
• various other sources, e.g., on the street or through a family member or private agency.

Patrons at food pantries indicated their primary means of getting to the pantry was walking (n=32; 40%). The majority (n=62; 78%) indicated it was difficult to get to the food pantry due to transportation difficulties. At the urban centers, all those surveyed were queried as to whether distance or transportation made it difficult for them to access food pantries and/or soup kitchens. Again, most food pantry users (n=108; 78%) indicated distance or transportation was a problem.
Food Pantry Strengths

1. Needs Met
Nearly half of the Investigation Phase interviewees (n=65; 46%) said that the food they got from a food pantry helped them make it through the month with enough food to feed themselves and their families when they added it to the food they were able to buy. But 39 (60%) of those who made this claim were those who were interviewed at the food pantry. Of those interviewed in other locations, only 26 (40%) agreed. As such, interviews held at pantries may have influenced participant responses.

Still, of the 25 food pantry patrons from the second round of interviews performed, of those who indicated they were able to make it through the month with enough food for themselves and their families, 18 (72%) reported that the reason they were able to do so was because of the food they received from the food pantry. Clearly, at least some have managed food sufficiency as a result of this emergency feeding assistance. Although food received from food pantries may not ensure food sufficiency for a majority of patrons, the positive impact it had on their food supply was clearly evidenced by the many comments made throughout patron interviews that reflected strong and genuine patron gratitude.

Another strength identified included strong and effective communications between food pantry staff and their clientele regarding pantry access rules. When asked about rules pertaining to patron usage of food pantries, patron responses correlated significantly with those provided by their pantry directors (r=0.4825; p=.0001).

2. Food Quantity
The amount of food distributed to food pantry patrons at each visit varied from site to site. These amounts were reported both by directors of food pantries and by the interviewees who received food from a pantry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of food distributed depends on the number of people in the household being served</th>
<th>Food Pantry Directors</th>
<th>Food Pantry Patrons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of food distributed depends on the number of people in the household being served</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bag</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
<td>42 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bags</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>30 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three bags</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of the food pantry patrons interviewed at food pantries (n=75; 53%) reported that they got just the right amount of food; and, few (n=4; 3%) indicated they received more than they could use.

3. Food Quality
The food distributed by food pantries was considered good or very well liked by the vast majority of Phase 1/Phase 2 survey participants (n=126; 89%). The same number of
participants thought the nutritional quality of the food they got from the pantry was good or excellent.

When patrons were asked how much of the food they received at the food pantry were items they and their families were willing to eat:

- Most people (n=76; 54%) indicated they and their families ate almost all of the food items they received;
- An additional 59 people (42%) said they ate half or more of the food items they got from a pantry.

In the Follow-up Phase, those surveyed were asked if they used all the foods received from the food pantry, and if there were any foods they received that they did not know how to use.

- Nearly half the participants reported they did not use all the food received (n=67; 49%). Those foods that were not used varied widely, and the primary issue cited was taste, with texture being the second most frequent rationale. However, some foods went unused because patrons indicated they simply had too many of them. These foods were predominantly breads and starchy foods, including: bread, cereal, pasta, potatoes, yams, canned meats, tomato sauce and jello.

- Approximately one in ten (n=16; 13%) did not know how to use particular foods they received, e.g., beets, canned pork and canned chicken.

The high degree of food acceptability and usability expressed by food pantry patrons suggested the food distributed through food pantries in New Jersey was largely culturally acceptable, at least with regard to those served who participated in this research.

Directors of food pantries all believed their patrons generally liked the food they received. Further, the directors believed the patrons considered it to be of good to excellent nutritional quality. The directors also reported that, overall, patrons use almost all (57%) or most (33%) of the food they receive from the food pantry.

Food group analysis and nutrient analysis differed for food pantries depending on the type of distribution they practiced. The two distribution practice types found are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution Practice Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Food Pantries Employing the Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Distribution Amount Adjusted for Household Size</td>
<td>These food pantries varied the amount of food given to patrons by the number of people in the household.</td>
<td>10 food pantries (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Distribution Amount Not Adjusted for Household Size</td>
<td>These food pantries gave an equal amount of food to all patrons, regardless of the number of people in the patrons’ household.</td>
<td>11 food pantries (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food group analysis showed that the food pantries were very effective at providing foods from two of the food groups. Servings per week of protein foods under both distribution practices were ample. Recommended servings from the fruit group were nearly met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Group</th>
<th>Food Guide Pyramid recommended servings per week</th>
<th>Mean servings per week provided by pantries that Adjusted for Household Size ± Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean servings per week provided by pantries that did not Adjust for Household Size ± Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protein foods (meats, poultry, fish, beans, and nuts)</td>
<td>14 to 21</td>
<td>21±44</td>
<td>17±20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>14 to 28</td>
<td>13±23</td>
<td>12±12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nutrient analysis for the average Calories of the foods distributed indicated that the amounts provided were appropriately within the recommended intake per week for adults ages 19 through 50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>Dietary Reference Intake recommended Calories per week for adults ages 19 through 50</th>
<th>Amounts provided by pantries that Adjusted for Household Size</th>
<th>Amounts provided by pantries that did not Adjust for Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calories</td>
<td>11,200 – 18,200 Calories</td>
<td>14,640 Calories</td>
<td>14,089 Calories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vitamin and mineral levels of the foods provided were close to or above the dietary reference intakes recommended. Those that did not achieve the recommended amounts, i.e., magnesium, potassium, and zinc, were not so far below requirements as to cause significant concern, with the exception of calcium, which is further discussed below.

4. Qualities Most Appreciated
The majority of food pantry users surveyed in the urban center Investigation Phase interviews expressed positive sentiments when asked how they felt about going to a food pantry (n=56; 76%). They indicated that:
- it was a good experience;
- they were grateful this assistance was available; or
- they would do whatever was needed to feed their children.

Among those who did not get food from a food pantry, many seemed appreciative that pantries existed, and said they would be willing to go to a food pantry if it became necessary, but that they were not needy enough yet.
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Food Pantry Challenges

1. Unmet Needs
   Investigation Phase surveys indicated that the food received by patrons from food pantries helped them make it through the month with enough food for themselves and their families. Yet, when food pantry users were asked if the food in their household generally lasted all month in the follow-up Follow-up Phase survey, only 25 (18%) answered that it did. Thus, despite the positive contributions food pantries make to patrons food sufficiency, clearly need remains.

   Some patrons indicated that they did not go to a pantry for food often. This may be personal choice or personal need, or may be associated with difficulty in accessing the food pantry, such as transportation problems or problems going there within the pantry’s hours of operation.
   - Twenty-one individuals (15%) reported going to a food pantry every other month, and
   - Four individuals (3%) indicated they usually went to a pantry only once every three months.

   The majority of patrons (n=75; 53%) said that they did not have enough food to make it through the month, even when they added the food they got from a food pantry to the food they were able to buy. Since most of the directors believed that their patrons regarded the amount of food distributed was “just right” (n=12; 57%) or “more than enough” (n=6; 29%) to meet patrons’ needs, this potential misunderstanding may contribute to practices that do not support increased food dissemination, and patron food sufficiency.

   Two-thirds of the food pantries surveyed were not able to address the ethnic or religious food customs of their patrons. Pantry directors indicated this occurred for a variety of reasons, from not perceiving a need, e.g., believing there was no need in the area, or the community was happy with whatever it could get, to lacking the capacity to address those needs, e.g., distributions governed by the donations received. As a result, most of the pantries tried to have some alternate foods on hand for those patrons for whom particular food item were not acceptable.

2. Food Quantity
   Three participants (2%) indicated the amount of food they received from the food pantry depended on what the pantry had available on that day. Many pantry patrons indicated the amount of food they got from the food pantry was not nearly enough (n=40; 28%) or was less than they needed (n=21; 15%). Only two food pantry directors (10%) believed their patrons felt they did not receive enough food to meet their needs.

3. Food Quality
   A small number of food pantry patrons indicated they did not like the food they received from the pantry (n=14; 10%). The same number of patrons thought the nutritional quality of the food was poor. Four patrons (3%) said they were willing to eat only a little of the food they received.
Food pantry directors reported no negative feelings among their patrons concerning the food that was distributed; that is, they believed the patrons liked the food items, used most of them, and felt the nutritional quality of the food was good.

Although, overall, study findings suggested patron satisfaction and cultural acceptability of foods distributed via New Jersey food pantries, in reviewing these findings one should recall that interviews were typically performed in English, with some done in Spanish when possible. It stands to reason that food quality may be less favorably assessed by those patrons who were not able to be interviewed as part of this work.

Again, food group analysis and nutrient analysis differed for food pantries depending on the type of distribution they practiced.

Food group analysis showed that foods from the fats and sweets group were provided in much higher amounts than is recommended for good health. The average number of vegetable servings in the food pantry distributions was less than patrons needed to meet the recommended number of servings per week. The milk group servings distributed were substantially below current dietary recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Group</th>
<th>Recommended servings per week from the Food Guide Pyramid</th>
<th>Mean servings per week provided by pantries that Adjusted for household size ± Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean servings per week provided by pantries that did not adjust for household size ± Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fats, Oils, &amp; Sweets</td>
<td>Sparingly</td>
<td>51.9±69.1</td>
<td>113.0±224.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk, Yogurt, &amp; Cheese</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.5±7.1</td>
<td>6.8±19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>21 to 35</td>
<td>10.1±12.3</td>
<td>14.2±19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nutrient content of the average food pantry packages provided more than the amount that would be recommended for one person for a week for protein and fat, but substantially less than Calcium recommendations.
4. Qualities Most Disliked

Twenty-six food pantry users (42%) and nine non-users (7%) interviewed in Phase 2 indicated they were embarrassed, uncomfortable, or felt bad about going to a food pantry. Several more people stated they would rather work, make their own way, or get help from family members than accept assistance from a food pantry.

Some interviewed made random, ancillary comments expressing difficulties associated with food pantry use. Comments were made to the interview staff suggesting:

- Patrons who did not own a car or have easy access to one experienced problems in transporting heavy, can-laden boxes and bags home. Patrons indicated they could manage when a friend was available to help or when a cart was available for these purposes, but when relief was not available, food had to be left behind.
- The lack of diabetic foods available, or patron and food pantry staff inability to determine which foods would adhere to diabetic restrictions made by patrons’ health care providers was problematic.
- The inability to store or cook food, due to homeless conditions and shelter residence, inhibited the use of food pantries by many.

**Potential Reasons Food Insecure People Do Not Use Food Pantries**

In the Follow-up Phase, 401 food insecure individuals were surveyed. Only a small number of these used emergency food services to increase their food sufficiency:

- 140 of these participants (35%) indicated they had obtained food from food pantries,
- 72 (18%) indicated they had obtained meals at soup kitchens, and
- 57 (14%) indicated they had accessed both food pantries and soup kitchens in the past 6 months prior to their interview.

Thus, 260 respondents (65%) did not utilize this resource, and 237 (42%) used neither food pantries, nor soup kitchens to improve their food security. This begs the question, “Why?”

This study identified some potential reasons why food insecure people do not use food pantries.
• Non-users were demographically similar to food pantry patrons; yet, the mean monthly incomes of the people who do not use food pantries interviewed in the Follow-up Phase was considerably higher, $940±$925 (n=178), than the mean incomes reported by food pantry patrons, $557±$595 (n=108). This likely explains the higher percentage who were able to make it through the month with enough food, or with ample food stamps, and may also explain, in part, why some were not using food pantry resources. It also helps potentially explain why a smaller number of non-users (n=36; 27%) reported distance or transportation would be problematic with regard to their ability to access a pantry if they were so inclined.

• The Follow-up Phase respondents were asked if they knew what a food pantry was. A total of 108 people (27%) were unfamiliar with the term. Many of participants stated they had never heard of a food pantry, even after the interviewer had defined the term for them. For non-users who had never heard of a food pantry, 78% (n=76) indicated they could not survive the month with enough to eat.

• More than one third (n=54; 40%) of the survey respondents at the three urban centers who did not use food pantries said the reason they did not go to one was because they did not know where a pantry was located or, in some cases, what hours they were open.

• A variety of negative attitudes regarding the use of food pantries were expressed by participants. However, most were named by fewer than 10% of the non-users, suggesting that negativity was not substantially affecting patronage. Some negative comments made included:
  • being embarrassed;
  • finding pantries were not open at convenient times;
  • having better means of getting by, like getting help from the family; and
  • disliking receiving expired food.

When asked in the Follow-up survey to select the primary reason they were food insufficient, non-user responses were the same as those chosen by food pantry patrons, but were ranked quite differently. The reasons most cited by those who do not use food pantries were:
  • I live on a fixed income, and it is too low (n=48; 26%);
  • I’m working, but not making enough money (n=43; 24%);
  • I’ve been unemployed a long time (n=21; 12%); and,
  • I’m on public assistance, but it is not enough (n=18; 3%).

These responses were consistent with expectations drawn from the patron income and benefit data, which suggested more of the non-users had been working. It is interesting to note that the total number of respondents for this particular question was only 181 of the 260 participants who completed this survey. This reflected that many people were unable to state the primary cause for their inability to maintain food sufficiency, due to its multi-factorial nature, i.e., utility costs, medical costs, inability to work, high utility costs, etc., all played a strong role in their dilemma.
VI. APPENDICES
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Appendix A: Short Form of the 12-month Food Security Scale

1. I’m going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN true, SOMETIMES true, or NEVER true for you in the last 12 months.

The first statement is: "The food that I bought just didn't last, and I didn't have money to get more." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

(1) Often true (2) Sometimes true (3) Never true (4) Don’t know (5) Refused

2. "I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

(1) Often true (2) Sometimes true (3) Never true (4) Don’t know (5) Refused

3. In the last 12 months, since last August did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

(1) Yes (2) No (GO TO 10) (4) Don’t know (GO TO 10) (5) Refused (GO TO 10)

4. If YES. How often did this happen --- almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

(1) Almost every month (2) Some months but not every month (3) Only 1 or 2 months
(4) Don’t know (5) Refused (X) Question not asked because question 8 was NO or missing

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

(1) Yes (2) No (4) Don’t know (5) Refused

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

(1) Yes (2) No (4) Don’t know (5) Refused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score the first six questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The individual is food secure or undetermined if:
  - there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or
  - (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.
In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions.
Circle DOESN'T QUALIFY on the front of this survey form to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.
- Otherwise, continue with the next survey question.
Appendix B: Questionnaire for Food Pantry Directors

CMP

City of Interview: _______________________  ID #: _______________

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FOOD PANTRY DIRECTORS/MANAGERS

1. Describe how food is distributed at this facility.
   - pre-packed bag of food
   - patrons select own food
   - other

2. Are there rules about how often a patron can get bags of food from the food pantry? If so, what are they?

3. When is this facility open to patrons?
   - ___ days/week; specify: _______________________
   - ___ days/month; specify: _______________________
   - Other

4. How many households are served?
   - _______ per week
   - _______ per month
   - Other

5. How much food is available to each patron? _______ bags

6. Do you ever run out of food so that you can't give people the food that they are expecting?
   - What do you do? ________________________________
   - How frequently does this happen? _______________________

7. Does the food pantry attempt to address the ethnic or religious food customs of patrons?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Why or why not? ________________________________

8. What alternatives can you provide if the foods provided in the food bag are not acceptable to a patron?

9. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not nearly enough,
   - 3 is just the right amount, and
   - 5 is more than they can use
   how satisfied do you think patrons are with the amount of food they get here? _______
10. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   • 1 is not at all,
   • 3 is good, and
   • 5 is like it very much
   how much do you think patrons like the food they get here? __________

11. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   • 1 is very bad,
   • 3 is good, and
   • 5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food patrons get here is? __________

12. How much of the foods patrons get here do you think are items they are willing to eat? (Read list.)
   □ Almost all of it
   □ Most of it
   □ About half of it
   □ A little of it
   □ Almost none of it

13. What foods or types of foods that they get here do you think they do not eat?

14. What happens if the food in the bag provided includes items a patron is not willing to eat? Would you say: (Read list.)
   □ They can choose something else
   □ They say no and don't take it
   □ They take the food anyway and find a way to use it
   □ They take the food anyway and give it away
   □ They take the food anyway and throw it away
   □ Other __________________________________________________________________________

15. What foods or types of foods do you think patrons would like to be able to get more of or get more often?
   __________________________________________________________________________________

16. What do you think patrons do if the food pantry runs out of food and they can't get a bag of food?
   __________________________________________________________________________________

17. Do you have a computer with internet access?

18. If we were to provide handouts on a web site, for example, “Stretching Your Food Stamp Dollars”, or “Economical Ways to Use and Prepare Foods Frequently Available at Food Pantries”, would you print them and make them available to your patrons?

19. Would you like to be put on a list-serv where handouts like those just mentioned would be sent as links to a website?
Contents of Average Food Bag Distributed on _____ (date) ____________
Appendix C: Questionnaire for Food Pantry Patrons

DQ    CMP

City of Interview: __________________  ID #: __________

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FOOD PANTRY PATRONS

1. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN, SOMETIMES, or NEVER true for (you/you or the other members of your household) in the last 12 months.

   The first statement is, "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true    (4) Don't know
   (2) Sometimes true (5) Refused
   (3) Never true

2. "(I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true    (4) Don't know
   (2) Sometimes true (5) Refused
   (3) Never true

3. In the last 12 months, since (date 12 months ago) did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

   (1) Yes     (4) Don't know (GO TO 5)
   (2) No (GO TO 5)    (5) Refused (GO TO 5)

4. If YES. How often did this happen---almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

   (1) Almost every month   (4) Don't know
   (2) Some months but not every month (5) Refused
   (3) Only 1 or 2 months

   (X) Question not asked because of negative or missing response to question 3

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

   (1) Yes    (4) Don't know
   (2) No     (5) Refused

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

   (1) Yes    (4) Don't know
   (2) No     (5) Refused
Score the first six questions:
Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual is food secure or undetermined if:
- there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or
- (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.

In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions. Circle DQ on the front of this survey to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

Otherwise, continue with the survey questions.

8. How did you hear about this food pantry?

9. Which of the following describes how you get here? (Read list.)
   - □ Walk
   - □ Carpool with friends/relatives
   - □ Some other way ________________
   - □ Drive
   - □ Take a bus or other public transportation

10. Is distance or transportation a problem in getting here? Describe:
    ______________________________________________________

11. What rules does the Food Pantry have about how often you can come here?

12. How often do you come here? (Do not read list.)
   - □ more than once a week
   - □ every 2 to 3 weeks
   - □ every other month
   - □ once every week
   - □ once a month
   - □ other ________________
   (Prompt for variations)
   - Is there a time during the month that you tend to come here more often than at other times? If so, when:
     ______________________________________________________
   - Do you come more or less often during different seasons of the year? If so, when:
     ______________________________________________________

13. I'm going to read you a list of reasons why some people run out of food. Tell me which of these describe why you run out of food. (Read one category at a time.)

   **Benefits**
   - □ Ran out of Food Stamps
   - □ Food Stamps cut off
   - □ Didn't qualify for food stamps
   - □ Lost subsidized housing
   - □ Unemployment benefits ran out
   - □ Public Assistance is not enough
   - □ Cash welfare (TANF) was cut off
   - □ Didn't qualify for TANF
   - □ SSI/SSD was cut off
### Expenses
- Unusual recent expenses
- Health/medical costs
- High child care costs
- High rent/mortgage costs
- High utility costs
- Fixed income is too low

### Employment
- Unemployed a long time
- Working, but do not make enough money
- Recent job loss
- Seasonal worker

### Personal Factors
- Too sick to work (chronic illness, disability, mental problems)
- Caring for sick family member
- Recent divorce or separation
- Alcohol or drug use
- Domestic abuse/threat of violence
- Lack of child support

Are there any other reasons you can think of that describe why you run out of food?

14. I'm going to read you a list of some ways you might get food. Which of the following have you used in the last 12 months?

- Soup Kitchen
- Another Food Pantry
- Shelter meals
- Church program
- Meals on Wheels
- Senior meal site
- Farmers’ Market
- Home or Community garden
- Hunting or fishing
- Commodities or government surplus food like you would get at food pantries
- Food Stamps
- WIC
- School breakfast
- School lunch
- Head Start/day care meals
- Summer meal program
- Relative
- Friend or Neighbor
- Scavenging (dumpster, road kill)

14. How much food/how many bags of food do you get when you come here?

(Prompt)
- Always the same amount? How much? ____________________
- Amount varies? Describe: _______________________________

15. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not nearly enough,
   - 3 is just the right amount, and
   - 5 is more than you can use
   how would you describe the amount of food you get here? _________

16. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not at all,
   - 3 is good, and
   - 5 is like it very much
   how do you like the food you get here? __________

17. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is very bad,
   - 3 is good, and
   - 5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food you get here is? __________
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18. When you add the food you get here to the rest of the food you buy, are you able to get through the month with enough food?  □  Yes □  No

19. How much of the foods you get here are items that you, or other members of your household, are willing to eat?  (Read list.)
   □  Almost all of it
   □  Most of it
   □  About half of it
   □  A little of it
   □  Almost none of it

20. What foods or types of foods that you get here do you or your family not eat?

21. What happens if the food in the bag provided includes items you are not willing to eat?  Would you say:  (Read list.)
   □  You can choose something else
   □  You take the food anyway and find a way to use it
   □  You can say no and not take it
   □  You take the food anyway and give it away
   □  You take the food anyway and throw it away
   □  Other

22. What foods or types of foods would you like to be able to get more of or get more often?

23. What do you do if the food pantry runs out of food and you can't get a bag of food?

24. Your age: __________

25. Gender: □  Male □  Female

26. Which group do you most closely identify yourself with?
   □  American Indian  □  Asian/Pacific Islander  □  Black (non-Hispanic)
   □  Hispanic  □  White (non-Hispanic)  □  Other: _____________

27. How many people live in your household?
   _____ Adults (not counting yourself)
   _____ Children living with you or eating meals at your house five or more days a week

28. Which of the following describes your household?  (Read list.)
   □  Single parent, female with children under 18
      Is this the primary residence of the children?  □  Yes □  No
   □  Single parent, male with children under 18
      Is this the primary residence of the children?  □  Yes □  No
   □  Single person, no children
   □  Single person with adult roommates
   □  Two parents/adults with children
   □  Two adults, no children
   □  Grandparent(s) caring for children
   □  Multigenerational
   □  Other

29. Are you employed?  □  Yes □  No

30. Does your household currently get food stamps?  □  Yes □  No
   If yes, how long do they usually last?  (Read list.)
   □  They last all month  □  3 weeks  □  2 weeks  □  less than 2 weeks

Section IV - 41
31. Do you receive (read list and check all that apply):
   - Medicaid
   - NJ Kid Care
   - Subsidized housing
   - Social Security
   - TANF/Welfare
   - SSI or SSD
   - Retirement or pension
   - Unemployment
   - Worker’s compensation
   - Alimony
   - Child support
   - Other: ________________________

32. Have you applied for any of these public assistance programs and been denied?
   - Yes
   - No
   If yes, which one(s)?_____________________________________________

33. What is your monthly household income: ___________________

If the interview is completed, circle CMP on the front of this survey.
Appendix D: Questionnaires for Interviews at Urban Centers

FPU   FPN   SKU   SKN   DQ   CMP

City of interview: ____________________ ID #: ____________

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AGENCY CLIENTS

1. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN, SOMETIMES, or NEVER true for (you/you or the other members of your household) in the last 12 months.

   The first statement is, "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true  (2) Sometimes true  (3) Never true
   (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

2. "(I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true  (2) Sometimes true  (3) Never true
   (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

3. In the last 12 months, since (date 12 months ago) did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

   (1) Yes  (2) No (GO TO 5)  (3) Never true
   (4) Don't know (GO TO 5)  (5) Refused (GO TO 5)

4. If YES. How often did this happen---almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

   (1) Almost every month  (2) Some months but not every month  (3) Only 1 or 2 months
   (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

   (X) Question not asked because of negative or missing response to question 3

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

   (1) Yes  (2) No  (3) Never true
   (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

   (1) Yes  (2) No  (3) Never true
   (4) Don't know  (5) Refused
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Score the first six questions:
Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual is food secure or undetermined if:
- there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or,
- (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.

In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions. Circle DQ on the front of this survey form to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

Otherwise, continue with the survey questions.

7. Do you sometimes not have enough food for yourself or your family?
   - Yes     - No

   - Is there a time during the month that this tends to happen more often than at other times? If so, when:

   - Does this happen more or less often during different seasons of the year? If so, when:

8. I'm going to read you a list of reasons why some people run out of food. Tell me which of these describe why you run out of food. (Read one category at a time.)

   **Benefits**
   - Ran out of Food Stamps
   - Food Stamps cut off
   - Didn't qualify for food stamps
   - Lost subsidized housing
   - Unemployment benefits ran out
   - Public Assistance is not enough
   - Cash welfare (TANF) was cut off
   - Didn't qualify for TANF
   - SSI/SSD was cut off

   **Expenses**
   - Unusual recent expenses
   - Health/medical costs
   - High  child care costs
   - High rent/mortgage costs
   - High utility costs
   - Fixed income is too low

   **Employment**
   - Unemployed a long time
   - Working, but do not make enough money
   - Recent job loss
   - Seasonal worker

   **Personal Factors**
   - Too sick to work (chronic illness, disability, mental problems)
   - Caring for sick family member
   - Recent divorce or separation
   - Domestic abuse/threat of violence
   - Alcohol or drug use
   - Lack of child support

   Are there any other reasons you can think of that describe why you run out of food?
9. I'm going to read you a list of ways you might get food. Which ones do you know about, and which ones do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know About</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>DQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church program</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior meal site</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter meals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or Neighbor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' Market</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Community garden</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities or gov't surplus food</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School breakfast</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School lunch</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start/day care meals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer meal program</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scavenging (dumpster, road kill)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting or fishing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If individual uses a food pantry, ask:

How often do you go to a food pantry?
- ☐ more than once a week
- ☐ once every week
- ☐ every 2 to 3 weeks
- ☐ once a month
- ☐ every other month
- ☐ other _____________________

11. If individual uses a soup kitchen, ask:

How often do you go to a soup kitchen?
- ☐ more than once a week
- ☐ once every week
- ☐ every 2 to 3 weeks
- ☐ once a month
- ☐ every other month
- ☐ other _____________________

12. How do you feel about going to a food pantry for food? Why do you feel this way?

13. If you don't use a food pantry, why don't you go when you don't have enough food? (Do not read list.)

- ☐ don't know a location
- ☐ not eligible
- ☐ not worth the trouble
- ☐ embarrassed
- ☐ don't like the food
- ☐ don't get food my family will eat
- ☐ others need the food more
- ☐ other _____________________

14. How do you feel about going to a soup kitchen for food? Why do you feel this way?

15. If you don't use a soup kitchen, why don't you go when you don't have enough food? (Do not read list.)

- ☐ don't know a location
- ☐ not eligible
- ☐ not worth the trouble
- ☐ embarrassed
- ☐ don't like the food
- ☐ don't get food my family will eat
- ☐ others need the food more
- ☐ other _____________________

16. Is distance or transportation a problem in getting to a food pantry or soup kitchen? Describe:

If the individual does not use food pantries or soup kitchens, skip to question # 36.

If the individual uses soup kitchens, but not food pantries, skip to question # 27.

For food pantry users, continue with the next question.
17. How much food/how many bags of food do you get when you go to a food pantry?
(Prompt)
- □ Always the same amount? How much? ____________________
- □ Amount varies? Describe: _______________________________

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
- 1 is not nearly enough,
- 3 is just the right amount, and
- 5 is more than you can use
how would you describe the amount of food you get at the food pantry? __________

19. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
- 1 is not at all,
- 3 is good, and
- 5 is like it very much
how do you like the food you get there? __________

20. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
- 1 is very bad,
- 3 is good, and
- 5 is excellent
how good do you think the nutritional quality of food you get there is? __________

21. When you add the food you get at the food pantry to the rest of the food you buy, are you able to get through the month with enough food?  □ Yes  □ No

22. How much of the foods you get at the food pantry are items that you, or other members of your household, are willing to eat? (Read list.)
- □ Almost all of it
- □ Most of it
- □ About half of it
- □ A little of it
- □ Almost none of it

23. What foods or types of foods that you get there do you or your family not eat?

24. What happens if the food in the bag provided includes items you are not willing to eat? Would you say: (Read list.)
- □ You can choose something else
- □ You can say no and not take it
- □ You take the food anyway and find a way to use it
- □ You take the food anyway and give it away
- □ You take the food anyway and throw it away
- □ Other ________________________________

25. What foods or types of foods would you like to be able to get more of or get more often?

26. What do you do if the food pantry runs out of food and you can't get a bag of food?

If the individual does not use soup kitchens, skip to question # 36.
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27. Which meal(s) do you usually eat at a soup kitchen? ________________________________

28. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not nearly enough,
   - 3 is just the right amount, and
   - 5 is more than you can use
   how would you describe the amount of food you get at the soup kitchen? __________

29. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not at all,
   - 3 is good, and
   - 5 is like it very much
   how do you like the food you get there? __________

30. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is very bad,
   - 3 is good, and
   - 5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food you get there is? __________

31. How much of the foods you get at the soup kitchen are items that you, or other members of your household, are willing to eat? (Read list.)
   - Almost all of it
   - Most of it
   - About half of it
   - A little of it
   - Almost none of it

32. What foods or types of foods that you get there do you or your family not eat?

33. What food or types of foods would you like to be served more often?

34. What happens if you or a member of your household is still hungry when you finish a meal at the soup kitchen?

35. What do you do if the soup kitchen runs out of food and you can't get a meal there?

36. Your age: __________

37. Gender: □ Male □ Female

38. Which group do you most closely identify yourself with?
   - American Indian
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Black (non-Hispanic)
   - Hispanic
   - White (non-Hispanic)
   - Other: _____________

39. How many people live in your household?
   - Adults (not counting yourself)
   - Children living with you or eating meals at your house five or more days a week
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40. Which of the following describes your household?
   - Single parent, female with children under 18
     Is this the primary residence of the children?  Yes  No
   - Single parent, male with children under 18
     Is this the primary residence of the children?  Yes  No
   - Single person, no children
   - Single person with adult roommates
   - Two parents/adults with children
   - Two adults, no children
   - Grandparent(s) caring for children
   - Multigenerational
   - Other ________________________________________________

41. Are you employed?  Yes  No

42. Does your household currently get food stamps?  Yes  No
   If yes, how long do they usually last?
   - They last all month
   - 3 weeks
   - 2 weeks
   - less than 2 weeks

43. Do you receive (check all that apply):
   - Medicaid
   - NJ Kid Care
   - Subsidized housing
   - Social Security
   - TANF/Welfare
   - SSI or SSD
   - Retirement or pension
   - Unemployment
   - Worker's compensation
   - Alimony
   - Child support
   - Other: ________________________

44. Have you applied for any of these public assistance programs and been denied?
   - Yes  No
   If yes, which one(s)?_____________________________________________

45. What is your monthly household income: ____________________

   If the interview is completed, circle CMP on the front of this survey.
Appendix E: Questionnaires for Interviews in the Follow-up Phase

Telephone Survey

Interviewer: ____________  Interviewer: circle as appropriate, according to directions:

DOESN’T QUALIFY

COMPLETE

Telephone Number Called: ____________________________

Screening Script

Good morning/afternoon. I am ________________ from Rutgers University.

I am working with a group of researchers who know that many people living in New Jersey sometimes have a difficult time being able to afford enough food to feed themselves and their families, and that sometimes people need help. We are doing a study to try to figure out how to better help others when they are in need.

This survey will take less than 10 minutes of your time, if you are willing to participate. Results from the survey will be used to recommend ways that emergency programs can do a better job of helping people.

1. In order to figure out who to interview, could you tell me, of the people who are 18 years old or older who live in your household who had the most recent birthday? I don’t mean who is the youngest, but who had the last birthday.

   A. Person who answered the phone had the most recent birthday ----- Ask: Would you be willing to answer a few questions?
      If YES ----- skip to question 5
      If NO ----- skip to question 4

   B. Someone else had the most recent birthday; record person’s name ___________ ----- then skip to question 3

   C. Person does not know all of the birthdays of household ----- skip to question 2.

   D. Person does not know any birthdays other than their own --- Ask: Would you be willing to answer a few questions?
      If YES ----- skip to question 5
      If NO ----- skip to question 4

   E. Person offers to do the survey, but is not 18 years old: say:
      For this study I need to talk to people who are at least 18. Are there other people in your household who are 18 years old or older?
      If YES: record person’s name ________________ ----- then skip to question 3

   F. Person refuses to participate ----- skip to question 4
2. Of the birthdays you do know, who had the most recent birthday?
   A. Person who answered the phone ---- Ask: Would you be willing to answer a few questions?
      If YES ----- skip to question 5
      If NO ----- skip to question 4
   B. Someone else; record person’s name ____________________________ ----- then go to question 3

3. Ask to speak to that person
   A. If that person is not at home, ask: When could I call back to talk to him/her?
      Record answer: _______________________________________________
      Thank you. I will call back ________________.
   B. If that person comes to the phone, repeat the introduction; say:
      Good morning/afternoon. I am __________________ from Rutgers University.
      I am working with a group of researchers who know that many people living in New Jersey
      sometimes have a difficult time being able to afford enough food to feed themselves and their
      families, and that sometimes people need help. We are doing a study to try to figure out how
      to better help others when they are in need.
      This survey will take less than 10 minutes of your time, if you are willing to participate.
      Results from the survey will be used to recommend ways that emergency programs can do a
      better job of helping people. Would you be willing to answer a few questions?
      If YES ----- skip to question 5
      If NO ----- go to question 4

4. The survey only takes about ten minutes, and we would really appreciate your help and cooperation. Is
   there another time that would be better for us to talk with you?
   A. If YES, record answer: _____________________________________
   B. If NO, say: Thank you for your time.

5. Your answers will be confidential and will be combined with the answers from all the people who have
   been part of this project. Your name will not be linked with any information we report. By answering
   these questions today you will be agreeing to let us include your answers in our combined results. Any
   questions about this survey may be directed to Audrey Adler at (732) 932-0532 or The Office of
   Research and Sponsored Programs at (732) 932-0150 ext. 2104.

Begin the survey at question 6; ask survey questions in the order listed.
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Telephone Survey

Section 1

6. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN true, SOMETIMES true, or NEVER true for you in the last 12 months.

   The first statement is: "The food that I bought just didn't last, and I didn't have money to get more." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true  (2) Sometimes true  (3) Never true  (4) Don't know  5) Refused

7. "I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true  (2) Sometimes true  (3) Never true  (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

8. In the last 12 months, since last August did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

   (1) Yes  (2) No (GO TO 10)  (4) Don't know (GO TO 10)  (5) Refused (GO TO 10)

9. If YES. How often did this happen --- almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

   (1) Almost every month  (2) Some months but not every month  (3) Only 1 or 2 months  (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

10. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

    (1) Yes  (2) No  (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

11. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

    (1) Yes  (2) No  (4) Don't know  (5) Refused

---

Score the first six questions:
Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The individual is food secure or undetermined if:
  • there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or,
  • (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.
In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions.
Circle DOESN'T QUALIFY on the front of this survey form to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

• Otherwise, continue with survey question 12.
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Section 2

13. Can you tell me what a food pantry is? Yes No

If the respondent says YES move on to question 13.

If the respondent says NO, define a food pantry as follows (then move on to question 13):

A food pantry is a place where people who are hungry or in need of food can receive some free groceries. At many food pantries people are given a bag or more of food, but at some food pantries people take food off of shelves like you do in a grocery store. Food pantries are sometimes found in church buildings or the building of another religious or private organization, but some may be located in their own space or in a space in a bigger building. Depending on the rules at the food pantry, sometimes people are not allowed to get food unless they have a referral or proof that they are in need; while at other pantries anyone is allowed to get food there.

14. In the past 6 months have you gotten food from a food pantry? Yes No

If the answer is NO, go to question 16.
If the answer is YES, go to question 14.

Do you use all of the foods you get at the food pantry?

If the answer is YES, go to question 15.
If the answer is NO, ask: Which ones don’t you use?

Record each food mentioned in the “Food Items” column in the table below. Probe for details on each food; for example, if they say a food that comes in many forms, such as corn, ask if it is fresh, frozen, canned, etc. Record the details with the food items in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Items</th>
<th>Reasons (include all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next ask: For each food you just mentioned, please tell me if any of these reasons describe why you don’t use it. Record the letters corresponding to their answers in the “Reasons” column in the table above.

a. Not enough flavor
b. Don’t like the taste
c. Don’t like the texture
d. Too salty
e. Too much fat
f. Don’t know how to fix them so they taste good
g. Get too many of them
h. Kids don’t like them
i. Don’t fit in with the foods from my culture
Improving Food Security for New Jersey Families

15. Do you get any foods at the food pantry that you don’t know how to use?
   If the answer is NO, go to question 16.
   If the answer is YES, ask: Which ones don’t you know how to use?

16. Can you tell me what a soup kitchen is?  Yes  No
   If they say YES move on to question 17.
   If they say NO, define a food pantry as follows (then move on to question 17):
   A soup kitchen is a place where people who are hungry or in need of food can receive free meals.
   They do not just serve soup, they serve whole meals. Soup kitchens are sometimes found in church
   buildings or the building of another religious or private organization, but some may be located in
   their own space or in a space in a bigger building.

17. In the past 6 months have you had a meal at a soup kitchen?  Yes  No

18. Does your household currently receive food stamps?  Yes  No
   If the answer to question 18 is YES, go to question 19.
   If the answer to question 18 is NO, go to question 21.

19. Would you say that the food stamps usually last:
   □ 1 week
   □ 2 weeks
   □ 3 weeks
   □ all month
   If necessary, tell the participant: Please pick the ONE answer that is most often true for you.
   If the answer to question 19 was ALL MONTH, and the answer to either question 13 or question 17 was YES
   (the individual has gone to a food pantry or has had a meal at a soup kitchen), ask:

20. Are you able to make your food stamps last all month because you:
   □ get food from a food pantry
   □ eat meals at soup kitchens (or)
   □ both get food from a food pantry and eat meals at soup kitchens or
   □ some other reason (explain) ________________________________
   If the participant answered questions 19 and 20, skip to question 23.
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21. Would you say that the food in your household generally lasts:

- [ ] 1 week
- [ ] 2 weeks
- [ ] 3 weeks
- [ ] all month

If necessary, tell the participant: Please pick the ONE answer that is most often true for you.

If the answer to question 21 was ALL MONTH, and the answer to either question 13 or question 17 was YES (the individual has gone to a food pantry or has had a meal at a soup kitchen), ask:

22. Are you able to make your food last all month because you:

- [ ] get food from a food pantry
- [ ] eat meals at soup kitchens (or)
- [ ] both get food from a food pantry and eat meals at soup kitchens or
- [ ] some other reason (explain) __________________________

Section 3

23. Some people have told us that when they are hungry or need food, they go to a church or to another religious organization. Is this true for you?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If the answer to question 23 was NO, go to question 25.
If the answer to question 23 was YES, ask:

24. I am going to read a list of ways people obtain food from a church or other religious organization when they are hungry or need food. Please say yes to ALL of the answers that apply to you:

- [ ] the church or other religious organization gives out bags of food to people in need; I have received food in this way.

- [ ] the church or other religious organization serves meals especially for people who are in need or hungry; I have gone to those.

- [ ] the church or other religious organization has events or special times when there are meals available for members and others (not especially for people who are hungry or in need); I have gone to those.
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25. I am going to read you the top reasons why people tell us they have trouble getting through the month with enough food. Please listen carefully, and tell me which of these reasons makes getting through the month with enough food MOST difficult for you. If you need me to, I can read the list several times.

Check only the ONE answer the participant indicates as the reason that makes having enough food most difficult.

- [ ] On a fixed income, but it is too low
- [ ] Unemployed a long time
- [ ] Public assistance is not enough
- [ ] Can’t work due to illness, accident, or disability
- [ ] Didn’t qualify for TANF or welfare
- [ ] Can’t work because of alcohol or drug use
- [ ] Ran out of food stamps
- [ ] High utility costs
- [ ] Didn’t qualify for food stamps
- [ ] High rent, mortgage, or property taxes
- [ ] Working but not making enough money
- [ ] High health or medical costs

Section 4

26. How old are you? ________

27. How old are the other people who live in your household? ____________________________________

28. What is your gender?  [ ] Male  [ ] Female

29. Which ethnic group do you most closely identify yourself with?
- [ ] American Indian
- [ ] Asian/Pacific Islander
- [ ] Black (non-Hispanic)
- [ ] Hispanic
- [ ] White (non-Hispanic)
- [ ] Other: _____________

30. Are you currently employed?  Yes  No

   If the answer to question 30 was NO, go to question 32.
   If the answer to question 30 was YES, ask:

31. Do you get paid by the hour?  Yes  No

   If the answer is yes, ask: What is your hourly rate? __________

   If the answer is no, ask: How much do you make? (record in their own words) __________________

32. What is your monthly household income? __________________

Thank you for your time. I appreciate your help in completing this survey.

Interviewer: Please circle COMPLETE on the front of this survey.
New Jersey Soup Kitchens:
An Overview of Their Strengths and Challenges

Part Two: Section V

Developed By:

Dr. Debra Palmer Keenan, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor
Department of Nutritional Sciences,
Associate Extension Specialist in Community Nutrition,
Rutgers Food Policy Institute’s Associate Director
for the Nutrition and Food Security Program

Audrey Adler,
Senior Program Coordinator in Research and Development,
Department of Nutritional Sciences

October 2005

Food Policy Institute
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
ASB III, 3 Rutgers Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Tel: (732) 932-1966
Fax: (732) 932-9544
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.......................................................................................................................................................... 1

Summary and Recommendations .......................................................................................................................... 2

Nutrient Analysis .............................................................................................................................................. 2

Caloric Content of Meals .................................................................................................................................. 2

Support New Soup Kitchens in Areas of Need ................................................................................................. 3

Addressing Cultural Issues in the Community ................................................................................................. 3

Soup Kitchen Awareness ................................................................................................................................. 3

Improving Nutrient Content of Meals ............................................................................................................ 4

Soup Kitchen Best Practices ............................................................................................................................ 4

Data Collection Methods ................................................................................................................................ 5

Overview .......................................................................................................................................................... 5

1. The Investigation Phase ............................................................................................................................. 5

2. The Follow-up Phase ................................................................................................................................ 6

Investigation Phase Data Collection ............................................................................................................... 6

1. Surveys Conducted at Soup Kitchens ......................................................................................................... 6

2. Topics Included in Investigation Phase Questionnaires at Soup Kitchens ........................................... 7

3. Foods Served at Soup Kitchens ................................................................................................................ 7

4. Surveys Conducted at Urban Centers ........................................................................................................ 8

5. Topics Included in Questionnaires at Urban Centers ............................................................................. 9

6. Total Sample Size for the Investigation Phase ....................................................................................... 9

Follow-up Phase Data Collection .................................................................................................................. 10

1. The Follow-up Survey Protocol ................................................................................................................. 10

2. Topics Included in the Follow-up Questionnaire .................................................................................... 10

3. Total Sample Size for the Follow-up Phase ............................................................................................. 11

Study Limitations .......................................................................................................................................... 12

Results ............................................................................................................................................................. 14

Overview .......................................................................................................................................................... 14

Soup Kitchen Characteristics ............................................................................................................................. 17

Soup Kitchen Clientele Characteristics .......................................................................................................... 17

Soup Kitchen Strengths .................................................................................................................................. 21

1. Needs Met .................................................................................................................................................. 21

2. Food Quantity .......................................................................................................................................... 21

3. Food Quality .......................................................................................................................................... 21

4. Qualities Most Appreciated ................................................................................................................... 22
Soup Kitchen Challenges.................................................................................................................. 22
  1. Unmet Needs.......................................................................................................................... 22
  2. Food Quantity ..................................................................................................................... 23
  3. Food Quality ....................................................................................................................... 23
  4. Qualities Most Disliked ..................................................................................................... 24

Potential Reasons Food Insecure People Do Not Use Soup Kitchens........................................... 24

Appendix A: Short Form of the 12-month Food Security Scale .................................................. 26
Appendix B: Questionnaire for Soup Kitchen Directors.............................................................. 28
Appendix C: Questionnaire for Soup Kitchen Patrons................................................................. 31
Appendix D: Questionnaires for Interviews at Urban Centers.................................................... 36
Appendix E: Questionnaires for Interviews in the Follow-up Phase........................................... 42
We appreciate and would like to acknowledge those Soup Kitchen Directors and staff who provided us with information about their operation and facilitated our surveys with their patrons. These included: Fred Soper, Atlantic City Rescue Mission, Atlantic City, NJ; Alison DuBois, Bergen County Community Action Center, Hackensack, NJ; Mrs. Drayton, Tabernacle Baptist Church, Burlington, NJ; Karen Talarico, Cathedral Soup Kitchen, Camden, NJ; Bishop Charles A. Farrow Sr., Bethel Commandment Church of the Living God of New Jersey, Whitesboro, NJ; Anne Budde, St. Vincent de Paul/Cumberland, Bridgeton, NJ; John Butler, St. James A.M.E. Church, Newark, NJ; Angelique Williams, Let’s Celebrate Square Meal Community Center, Jersey City, NJ; Rev. David Ruisard, Rockaway Reformed Church, Whitehouse Station, NJ; Cathy Vandegrift, Trenton Area Soup Kitchen, Trenton, NJ; Father Robert Counselman, Trinity Episcopal Church, Woodbridge, NJ; Nancy Mester, The Kitchen at St. Mark’s, Keansburg, NJ; Nancy McDonald, Community Soup Kitchen of Morristown, Morristown, NJ; Vincent and Harriet Zenna, Upper Room Soup Kitchen, Lakewood, NJ; Dr. Stafford J. Miller, St. Philip’s Ministry of the United Methodist Church, Paterson, NJ; Vickie Orsini, Oasis Soup Kitchen, Salem, NJ; Reverend Wade Abbott, Harvest House; Glenwood, NJ; Captain Henry Thibault, The Salvation Army – Plainfield, Plainfield, NJ; and Debbie Stefano, Meals on Us Soup Kitchen, Phillipsburg, NJ.

We also wish to thank those who authorized and facilitated our research activities in Camden, Newark, and Vineland: Frank Ambrose and Carol Trakemas, Camden County Board of Social Services; Cindy Romanik and Frank LaMarro, Cumberland County Board of Social Services; and Bruce Nigro, Arlene Steinbacher, and Gerald Moreno, Essex County Department of Citizen Services. Other individuals who assisted with contacts around the state, and who were invaluable to this work included: Adele LaTourette, Statewide Emergency Food & Anti-Hunger Network; Kamili Williams, Community Food Bank of NJ; Bea O’Rourke, Center for Food Action, and Laurel King, Monmouth Ocean Food Bank.

Special acknowledgement should go to all the members of the Hunger Prevention Commission Advisory Committee, particularly those who served on the Rutgers Research Sub-Committee. These individuals spent countless hours reviewing early drafts of this work, and their experience and insights added greatly to what we were able to accomplish. They are Gina Williams, Committee Chair, Volunteers of America Delaware Valley; Sharon Reilly-Tobin, Co-Chair, Catholic Community Services; Sandy Accomando, Apostle House & St. James CDC; Carol Byrd-Bredbenner, Nutritional Sciences Department, Rutgers University; Kathleen DiChiara, Community Food Band of New Jersey; Hope Holland, New Jersey Department of Agriculture; Joe Kunzman, Somerset County Board of Social Services; Jaques Lebel, New Jersey, Department of Community Affairs; Bedzaida Mendez, Food Bank of South Jersey; Jeanette Page-Hawkins, Director, Division of Family Development; Sheldon Presser, Association for Children of New Jersey; and Mary Ellen Tango, Linden Department of Community Social Services.
Finally, we would like to render a very special thanks to those students and EFNEP and FSNEP staff who assisted in data collection, often meeting very difficult deadlines. These individuals were: Sheila Allen, Pamela Ballard, Linda Banks, Doreen Canetti, Diana Cangemi, Suesan Cota, Monique Gregory, Judy Klavens-Giunta, LeeAnn Mandrillo, Kay McKinnie, Rosa Ortiz, Maria Rodriguez, Elsa Rosado, Kelly Ryan, Andrea S. Smith, and Lindsey Vogel.
Introduction

In response to the passage of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act, a study was undertaken at Rutgers University to conduct a statewide hunger needs assessment aimed, in part, at identifying strategies and structures for minimizing spoilage of food resources and maximizing the availability of wholesome and nutritious foods to those in need. The study also sought to provide an initial analysis of potential nutrient deficiencies in existing emergency feeding programs and to develop solutions to generate more nutritionally complete and culturally acceptable diets.

The work described in this portion of the overall report was performed to meet these New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act’s research objectives with regard to New Jersey Soup Kitchens:

- Objective II: Identify and quantify the need for emergency or supplemental feeding for families and individuals in the state; and,
- Objective V: Analyze nutritional sufficiencies and deficiencies in existing emergency food programs and develop solutions to generate nutritionally complete, culturally acceptable diets.

The study’s data collection methods, limitations, and results, as well as recommendations pertaining to potential areas of improvement for food pantries and further studies that may be prudent in regard to enhancing the ability of New Jersey Soup Kitchens in better meeting their patrons’ food and nutrition needs, are discussed herein.
Summary and Recommendations

This investigation has gathered information that describes how important a contribution New Jersey’s Soup Kitchens make to the support of the population living in need in this state. Most patrons of soup kitchens who were interviewed for this project expressed their gratitude for the meals they received from soup kitchens. In particular, soup kitchens play a valuable role in supporting New Jersey’s citizens who are homeless and living in shelters. Where this population has difficulty in coping with unprepared foods due to lack of cooking facilities and storage space, the soup kitchens become an essential means of providing sustenance and nutritional value for these individuals. Additionally, most soup kitchens were able to provide a surfeit of Calories in the meals they served, which may fill a critical need for any of their patrons who depend on the soup kitchen for their main meal, or only meal of the day.

Still, there are some areas which are of concern or where improvement might be suggested. Some of these identified areas where additional research would be beneficial to further strengthen the contributions of soup kitchens within the state.

Nutrient Analysis

There are several issues revolving around the amount of food served, i.e., the Calories derived from the soup kitchen meal, and the nutrients provided in that meal. The nutrient and food group analyses performed were limited to those foods distributed at the 19 sites observed on a single day. This data was further restrained by our inability to make exact measurements due to the complexity and cost of doing so, e.g., weighing and measuring all foods and querying the kitchen staff for exact ingredients and cooking methods, etc., while additionally recording all foods served and interviewing site personnel and patrons.

Recommendation: The nutrient analysis work done in this study should be confirmed or amended through a much more comprehensive analysis. Meals served on several days in different seasons should be thoroughly documented, and then averaged in the analysis process. Further, food preparation techniques, e.g., baking, frying, etc. should be noted. In the soup kitchen setting, all of the foods served should be weighed and measured objectively using multiple sample plates for each day observed, and ingredients should be logged as the food is prepared. In this way inaccurate estimations can be minimized, if not eliminated, and the nutrient values can be more accurately determined.

Caloric Content of Meals

The caloric content of the soup kitchen meals may fill a critical need for some patrons and present potentially harmful health implications for others. The total Calories in the meals served averaged to 1,424 Calories per meal, which is approaching the recommended range of 1600 to 2600 Calories for a full day’s food intake for adults ages 19 through 50. This may be an excessive amount for those soup kitchen users who have the resources to have one or two additional meals in the day, but it is certainly advantageous for those soup kitchen patrons for whom this is their main or only daily meal.
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Recommendation: Soup kitchens should be encouraged to find creative ways to offer different portion sizes so that individuals get amounts of food appropriate for their situation. For example, this could be done by plating different size portions or by providing supplemental foods to adjust the Calories as needed. Site personnel could be trained or advised by local dietitians or nutrition students from the community who volunteer their time and expertise. Another possible approach would be to educate patrons about the caloric content of frequently served foods, so that they themselves can help make better choices about how much of the food served they should eat. This could be done by posting nutrient facts for dishes commonly prepared in places where patrons can easily see them. Decisions about the way meal service is organized can also be a factor in promoting portions suited to the individual; i.e., pre-plated meals, buffet line with service by site personnel, and buffet line where the patron serves himself/herself each provide a different means of controlling the amount of food served to the patron.

Support New Soup Kitchens in Areas of Need

Clearly, the non-existence of soup kitchens in some areas in the state prohibits meeting the needs of food insecure individuals in those regions. More information is now available in other sections of this report to help determine where there is need, but lack of resources.

Recommendation: Seed money should be provided as an incentive for agencies or other organizations such as faith-based groups to set up soup kitchen operations in areas where they do not currently exist. Growth in the availability of these services would be beneficial to those in need, particularly those at the most extreme end of poverty.

Addressing Cultural Issues in the Community

In some regions, particularly those more rural areas of New Jersey, cultural morays may thwart successful soup kitchen operations. Facilities and services must be adaptable to community needs and acceptable to potential users within the population.

Recommendation: Soup kitchens, or those who seek to establish them, should be encouraged to find creative ways to offer services so as to be culturally acceptable. In areas where cultural reservations to the use of soup kitchens are identified, modeling facilities after cafes, or in a more restaurant-like style, may expedite community acceptance.

Soup Kitchen Awareness

Nearly one-third of the food insecure people interviewed in the final phase of this study did not know what a soup kitchen was. Almost all of them had not been to a soup kitchen, or did not know where to find one. Vital resources that could assist families to have enough food are not well enough known to the population in need.
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Recommendation: Education should be provided to ensure that food insecure individuals and families are proactively made aware of New Jersey soup kitchens when they are available, as many do not know of soup kitchens and would therefore not ask the appropriate entities for a location or a referral.

Improving Nutrient Content of Meals

The low levels of dairy and other foods rich in calcium and Vitamin D may represent a missed opportunity for intake of these nutrients for the health benefits they provide. This may be particularly of relevance in that minority groups are over-represented in low-income populations, likely increasing their participation in accessing emergency food sources. Adequate dietary intake of vitamin D is particularly important to minority and elderly populations, as their skin absorption of vitamin D from sunlight is less efficient. An additional benefit to patrons’ health may be a reduction in the amount of sodium in the soup kitchen meals served, which significantly exceeded the daily recommended intake for adults. Flavoring is important to make the foods served at soup kitchens appealing to patrons, but could be accomplished, at least in part, by means other than using foods and compounds that have a high sodium content.

Recommendation: Plans should be initiated to increase the availability of foods rich in calcium and Vitamin D. In addition, means of decreasing sodium content while maintaining the flavor of foods patrons enjoy should be explored.

Soup Kitchen Best Practices

Investigators observed that some soup kitchen directors had questions regarding management and expansion issues pertaining to their operations. The capacity and efficiency of the soup kitchens visited varied widely, along with the funding and access to food resources. Knowledge of some of the practices used by the biggest and the best of New Jersey’s soup kitchens for sustenance and growth would be beneficial to others who are seeking options to improve or expand their operation. A wealth of knowledge exists among the directors of soup kitchens across the state that could benefit others if shared.

Recommendation: The sharing of best practices among soup kitchen personnel was identified as a need in discussions with soup kitchen directors, particularly those from smaller kitchens. The discussion of best practices, along with opportunities for mentoring among soup kitchen staff, should be initiated to maximize the resources and the knowledge needed to provide excellence in soup kitchens throughout the state.
Data Collection Methods

Overview

To meet the objectives defined for this research, a sequence of data collection methods was employed, with data collected between July 10, 2003 and September 26, 2005. A total of 761 individuals were interviewed for this work, using a series of survey questionnaires designed to refine the information requested to attain the answers to the research questions posed. All of these individuals, whether emergency feeding system patrons or not, were classified as food insecure, as defined by their responses according to the Short Form of the 12-month Food Security Scale, a 6-item version of the USDA Food Security Survey Module.\(^1\) (Please see Appendix A for this questionnaire and its scoring instructions.) In addition, 40 individuals who were involved in the management of emergency feeding programs were interviewed, 21 from food pantry operations and 19 from soup kitchens.

All of the data collected for this study has been grouped for the purposes of this report into an Investigation Phase and a Follow-up Phase, as described below. The information contained in this report is limited to that which pertains to soup kitchens, their patrons, and their operation.

1. The Investigation Phase

The initial efforts of this research examined New Jersey soup kitchens via a sample consisting of one soup kitchen from each of 19 of New Jersey’s 21 counties. Interviews were not implemented in Gloucester County where there were no soup kitchens, or in Somerset County where the only soup kitchen identified declined to participate in this study. Each assessment gleaned information from key informants. “Needs” were assessed in terms of the perceived food quantity, quality, and type. The information gathered during this initial investigation included the following:

- interviews with soup kitchen management and site personnel (Appendix B);
- logs of the foods served on the day the pantries were visited (Appendix B); and
- surveys conducted with select clients, numbering two to seven patrons from each location (Appendix C).

A semi-structured survey was used to garner impressions of how well clients’ needs were met by these soup kitchens (Appendix C). Ultimately, the food and nutrient sufficiency of meals provided via New Jersey’s soup kitchens were assessed in a variety of ways, including analyses based on these observations combined with impressions obtained via interviews performed with soup kitchen clientele throughout all phases of this work.

Next, this study employed a modified survey interview to amass similar information as that collected from patrons at soup kitchens, this time from a larger number of self-identified food-insecure soup kitchen users in three of the urban centers within the state (Appendix D). Surveyants were recruited from the Board of Social Services/Department of Citizen Services.

---
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offices in the cities of Newark, Camden, and Vineland. This interviewing opportunity was also used to ascertain information from food insecure individuals who did not use soup kitchens, to determine why they did not use soup kitchens to improve their food sufficiency.

Since there were great similarities between the structured surveys used at soup kitchens and those used in the three urban centers, the majority of the data collected during these two efforts have been combined for analysis and reporting purposes, under the heading entitled Information Phase.

Data collected that is included under the Information Phase heading included:
• 141 surveys of individuals who use soup kitchens;
• 133 surveys of individuals who do not use soup kitchens;
• 19 interviews with soup kitchen directors; and
• 19 logs of the foods served at soup kitchens.

2. The Follow-up Phase
Following the Information Phase of this work, another more structured survey was administered with an even larger sample of food insecure individuals from Camden, Cumberland, and Essex counties, focused around the same three urban centers as the surveys in the previous phase. This follow-up survey was administered via two data collection methods, i.e., telephone and intercept interviews. These interviews were conducted:
• to provide additional clarity to previously attained information, and
• to obtain a modest amount of additional information, as needed.

Data collected during this phase included:
• 72 surveys of individuals who use soup kitchens; and
• 335 surveys of individuals who do not use soup kitchens.

Investigation Phase Data Collection

1. Surveys Conducted at Soup Kitchens
Data collection at soup kitchens occurred between July 10, 2003 and February 26, 2005, during which a convenience sample of one soup kitchen per county was visited in each of 19 of New Jersey’s 21 counties. Interviews were not implemented in Gloucester County where there were no soup kitchens, or in Somerset County where the only soup kitchen identified declined to participate in this study. This research was limited to one soup kitchen per county because travel to multiple locations throughout New Jersey was outside this project’s scope due to the high cost of time and human resources involved in such an undertaking.

To identify interview sites, initial lists of soup kitchens, organized by county, were obtained from several of the regional food banks. Additional soup kitchen names and locations were solicited, on an as needed basis, from individuals and agencies knowledgeable of New Jersey’s emergency food resources. From these lists, soup kitchen providers were approached by telephone until contact was made with a provider who agreed to allow study participation to take place at their location.
Interviews were conducted with:

- one soup kitchen director and/or staff member per site (n=19), and
- a small convenience sample of patrons.

The convenience sample was composed of the first individuals approached who: spoke English; were over age 18; were willing to complete an interview with the research staff; and, were deemed food insecure when screened. Although the patron sample size was small (n=77), it was appropriate for the primary objectives for this portion of the research, i.e., to test the viability of particular survey questions, as well as to make initial observations to inform new survey questions to be developed and administered to a larger population of food insecure individuals during the next part of this work at the three urban centers described below.

Please see Appendices B and C for the text of the survey tools used with soup kitchen directors and soup kitchen participants.

2. Topics Included in Investigation Phase Questionnaires at Soup Kitchens

Since this interview opportunity took place at soup kitchens, it was used to make several queries of interest that were not appropriate for any other part of this study. These lines of questioning asked:

- How did you hear about this soup kitchen?
- Which of the following describes how you get here? (walk, drive, carpool, public transportation, bike, etc.); and,
- What rules does the soup kitchen have about how often you can come here?

The latter question was also asked of the directors/staff, so responses could be compared to those made by the patrons.

Other questions were asked of soup kitchen patrons regarding:

- if distance or transportation were problematic for patrons, in terms of their ability to get to a soup kitchen;
- if their food needs were greater at particular times of the month or of the year; and
- if patrons had knowledge of programs and opportunities that could be accessed to improve their food sufficiency.

These questions held up well on the survey administered to soup kitchen patrons and therefore were continued with only minor adjustments for the next set of surveys implemented.

3. Foods Served at Soup Kitchens

Data collection at soup kitchens was also used as an opportunity to observe the foods being served to patrons on the day of each site visit. The contents of meals were subsequently analyzed using Nutritionist Pro, a nutrient analysis software package used regularly for this purpose. The foods were analyzed with regard to their nutrient and food group sufficiency.
In addition, eight soup kitchens (42%) offered some optional food items that patrons could serve themselves, in amounts as desired. In those cases, optional foods chosen by a referent individual were added to the served foods documented for the site.

Nutrient content of the typical meal served on the day of the site visit were analyzed:
- by individual nutrients, as compared to the Dietary Reference Intakes (government daily recommended intake amounts), using average amounts served; and
- by food groups, as compared to the daily servings recommended for adults based on the 1992 Food Guide Pyramid.

This information, in total, served as a representation of the nutrient and food group data for the foods available to soup kitchen patrons.

4. Surveys Conducted at Urban Centers

The next series of interviews were conducted with soup kitchen patrons (users) and individuals who did not obtain food from a soup kitchen (non-users) in Camden, Essex, and Cumberland counties, between November 24, 2004 and September 9, 2005. These counties were chosen for data collection because they were home to very large numbers of Food Stamp Program participants, and because they represented geographically diverse regions of the state. All of these interviews were conducted in waiting rooms of Board of Social Services or Department of Citizen Services offices located in the cities of Camden, Newark, and Vineland.

The information about soup kitchen use was collected as part of a larger survey that also evaluated the impact of food pantries on the food supply and dietary intake of food insecure individuals. A goal was set to collect data from 68 individuals in each of the three data collection locations (total n=204); and for the data set from each location to include, at a minimum, 17 food pantry users, 17 food pantry non-users, 17 soup kitchen users, and 17 soup kitchen non-users. This recruitment classification scheme was employed to ensure a reasonably-sized, and geographically-varied sample. This data collection goal of 68 surveys was met in Newark and Camden, however, the surveys collected in Vineland were eight surveys shy of this goal. It was determined that the costs associated with returning to Vineland for these additional interviews outweighed the benefits of obtaining them, since a sufficiently large sample of food pantry users and soup kitchen users had already been collected, as described below.

Prospective survey participants in each city who indicated a willingness to participate in the study were screened based on their age and their use of food pantries and soup kitchens. Qualifying surveyants were then queried to determine their food security status. Those who were food secure were thanked for their time, but were not surveyed.

It was predicted that some of the food pantry users and non-users were also likely to be soup kitchen patrons, and hence would also be asked to complete the soup kitchen portion of the survey. Therefore the sample size of soup kitchen users surveyed at the three urban centers would actually become larger than the minimum of required. This turned out to be true, as
64 of the individuals surveyed in this part of the study completed the survey questions relating to soup kitchen use.

Please see Appendix D for the text of the survey tool used with individuals interviewed at urban centers.

5. Topics Included in Questionnaires at Urban Centers
The individuals who indicated they used soup kitchens were queried regarding:
- how well and in what ways their food needs were met by supplementing their food supply with meals served at soup kitchens;
- the benefits and difficulties they associated with using a soup kitchen; and
- how they felt about using soup kitchens to acquire food.

As a result of observation and discussions with soup kitchen personnel, three questions were added to the survey to be used in the urban center interviews. These questions addressed patrons’ degree of unmet need, including:
- how far into the month people could typically make it without running out of food;
- feelings associated with being a patron of a soup kitchen; and
- how people managed when they ran out of food and could not get one at a soup kitchen.

Additionally, data was also collected from non-users, with a varied line of questioning aimed at determining why, since they were food insecure, they did not use soup kitchens to supplement their food supply.

In Newark, the first urban center where these surveys were conducted, it was noted that a number of survey respondents did not know what a soup kitchen was. Consequently, when surveys were initiated in Vineland, non-users were specifically asked if they knew what a soup kitchen was. Many of those interviewed in Vineland who did not use soup kitchens (n=19; 41%) said they did not know what a soup kitchen was. Thus, an additional line of inquiry for the Follow-up Phase of this study was established.

6. Total Sample Size for the Investigation Phase
Soup kitchen directors and staff were interviewed at each of the 19 soup kitchens that participated in this study.

The individual participants who completed surveys during the Investigation Phase are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soup Kitchen Pantry Users</th>
<th>Soup Kitchen Non-users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at Soup Kitchens</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at Urban Centers</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up Phase Data Collection

1. The Follow-up Survey Protocol
The Follow-up Phase was conducted to follow-up on a smaller number of particular questions that arose from the Investigation Phase. These included:
   - specific questions of interest to the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, based on an oral report presented to them on August 11, 2005, regarding the Investigation Phase work; and
   - additional queries to clarify information gained in the previous data, e.g., if food insecure people who did not use soup kitchens even knew what “soup kitchens” were.

During the Follow-up Phase, 407 surveys were completed between August 30, 2005 and September 26, 2005, with food insecure individuals from the same three urban centers sampled in the Investigation Phase. The survey was administered to a broad audience of food insecure individuals, i.e., recruitment was not based on initial inquiries regarding soup kitchen use. As such, the survey percentages from this phase are perhaps better reflective of the percentage of food insecure people who use food pantries, soup kitchens, both, or neither in limited-resource urban areas of New Jersey.

The original data collection protocol planned for this survey’s implementation via telephone interviews to maximize the reach of the survey, while minimizing the resources necessary for its administration. Initially, calls were placed to approximately 1,000 telephone numbers, and only 19 surveys were completed. A combination of problems was experienced, such as:
   - a large number of non-working numbers in the data set purchased;
   - many individuals reached who did not qualify for study participation due to the fact that they measured “food secure;” and
   - individuals refusing participation.

It was therefore determined that a different data collection protocol need be employed. Thus, an additional 388 intercept interviews were completed, and performed with a convenience sample of food insecure individuals reached, predominantly in the Newark environs, where program staff were available to assist and interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish. Locations in Newark used for participant recruitment included: The Adult Learning Center, Templo Roca de Mi Salvacion, Jewish Vocational Services, The Apostle House, St. James Community Outreach Center, Work Force Advantage, New Community Corporation, Kintock, The North Ward Center, The Wise Women Center, Montclair Food Pantry, Renaissance House, La Casa de Don Pedro, East Orange Community Outreach, the Irvington Development Center, Newark Housing Authority. In Cumberland County, participants were once again recruited from the Board of Social Services’ waiting room in Vineland.

Please see Appendix E for the text of the survey tool used in the Follow-up Phase.

2. Topics Included in the Follow-up Questionnaire
Questions were developed to clarify information gathered earlier in this study, including:
questions designed to determine if food insecure individuals identified at locations other than soup kitchens knew what the term “soup kitchen” meant. Further, the query was made in such a way so as to be able to determine if some used soup kitchens, but simply did not know what they were called;

• questions designed to ascertain if individuals considered that the addition of food obtained from a soup kitchen constituted the reason they were able to make it through the entire month with enough food.

Pursuant to a question from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee, questions were included to clarify what was meant when individuals said they go to a “church program” as a means of acquiring food.

3. **Total Sample Size for the Follow-up Phase**
The individual participants who completed surveys during the Follow-up Phase are described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soup Kitchen Users</th>
<th>Soup Kitchen Non-users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total of Individuals Surveyed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Study Limitations**

While this report provides a great deal of information, and a baseline for additional investigations, there are limitations associated with this research that the reader should consider in reviewing the findings presented within.

First, the nutrient and food group analyses performed were limited to those foods distributed at the 19 sites observed on a single day. This data was further restrained by our inability to make exact measurements due to the complexity and cost of doing so, e.g., weighing and measuring all foods and querying the kitchen staff for exact ingredients and cooking methods, etc., while additionally recording all foods served and interviewing site personnel and patrons. It is important to note, however, that the person providing these estimates had completed degree requirements for a master’s degree in nutrition, had completed all requirements for eligibility to sit for the exam administered for certification of Registered Dietitians, and came to this project with a great deal of experience, both in research and food service. Still, some portions recorded were estimated, and were therefore inexact.

Another limitation associated with the Investigation Phase of the work conducted at soup kitchens was the small number of sites observed. Although a substantial subject pool of soup kitchen users was queried in the later segments of this project, as a result of the small number of sites visited a small number of site directors and/or staff were interviewed for their impressions. Therefore, the site characteristics provided in this report serve only to detail for the reader the types of sites we assessed, as opposed to providing an accurate portrait of the characteristics of New Jersey soup kitchens. Additional information regarding a larger number of soup kitchens, however, is provided in the summary report regarding the survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers, wherein a survey mailed to all New Jersey Soup Kitchen sites identified is presented.

The findings from surveys conducted at urban centers, as well as those from the Follow-up Phase of this work, were additionally limited by the lack of geographical diversity reflected in the findings. In fact, whereas food pantries in all 21 counties were able to be assessed for the food pantry report, neither Gloucester nor Somerset soup kitchens were able to be included in this report as none were available for participation. Vineland was intentionally included in both Phases, although to a lesser extent in the Follow-up Phase, to ensure that responses from New Jersey soup kitchen patrons who hailed from a more rural setting were reflected. Despite this assurance, it is important to note that a strong potential exists that non-users with extreme transportation challenges were likely not available at the sites surveyed. Had we been successful in our ability to administer the final survey via a telephone interview protocol, as originally planned, the lack of telephone service would have limited study findings, but geographical diversity and inclusion of those with more extreme transportation challenges would have been alleviated. However, due to the transient nature, as well as the economic instability of the study population, the telephone number data purchased, which was nearly two years old, was largely invalid. The telephone numbers that were operational tended to belong to people who were not eligible for study participation, i.e., they were food secure, and their telephone numbers were likely operational due to their lesser degree of transience and higher degree of economic stability. As such, the intended method of data collection proved ineffective and impractical;
and, the change in study protocol to effectively and practically collect a larger data set, introduced the aforementioned biases to the study results.

Presentation of the interviews in English to those for whom English was not their first language represented another study limitation. In such cases, it appeared that particular questions were more frequently left unanswered. Interviews conducted at soup kitchens in the Investigation Phase were only performed in English; Information Phase interviews at urban centers, and Follow-up Phase interviews were largely performed in English, with some administered in Spanish, when Spanish-speaking staff were available to assist. Additionally, it should be noted that some findings may be less valid when applied to audiences who were unable to be interviewed due to language barriers.

Of course both phases of this research were plagued with those limitations common to the use of convenience sampling, e.g., the bias that is introduced by the nature of the site participant characteristics. For example, it is likely that those who were present at the sites where data were collected likely had some access to transportation since they were able to get there. Further, those at sites where interviews were performed were usually there to access some type of benefits, and were therefore at least aware of some services available for low-income individuals. If more low-income people had been able to be accessed from different locations, it is likely there would have been some who were even worse off and less informed.

There were also biases introduced into the data collected due to using self-reported information. Issues affiliated with this data collection method are often related to social desirability, e.g., participants providing responses they believe the interviewer wishes to hear, or individuals interviewed at soup kitchens making more positive comments about soup kitchens, generally. However, convenience sampling and self-report are the best means of obtaining large amounts of information in short amounts of time, and it is predicted the enhanced sample size available through the utilization of these methods decreases the error introduced by these factors.
Results

Overview
During the Investigation Phase observations, vast similarities and distinctions among soup kitchens were evident in their size, their organization, and the methods used to provide meals for patrons. Observations were made at huge kitchens with formal job functions assigned to full-time personnel, as well as at tiny soup kitchens where food is brought in by volunteers on a pot-luck basis. Many of the soup kitchens were staffed entirely by volunteers. Modes of meal service ranged from pre-plated meals, to buffet-style operations served by volunteers or site personnel, to patrons serving themselves from a buffet of hot and cold foods. What they all had in common was their need to garner sufficient foods economically, with the best quality possible, to serve the needs of their communities. Volunteers were the backbone of almost every facility surveyed.

Soup kitchens have demonstrated many successes in meeting the needs of their communities’ food insecure populations. Some of these include:

- Most of the soup kitchen patrons (n=113; 80%) described the amount of food they were served at the soup kitchen as just right or more than they could eat.

- The food meals served by soup kitchens were considered good or very well liked by 115 (82%) of the Investigation Phase survey participants. Slightly more of the participants (n=123; 87%) thought that the nutritional quality of the food they were served at the soup kitchen was good or excellent.

- When patrons were asked how much of the food they were served at the soup kitchen were items they and their families were willing to eat:
  - Most people (n=63; 45%) indicated they ate almost all of the food items they were served;
  - An additional 59 people (42%) said they ate half or more of the food items served at the soup kitchen.

- The high degree of food acceptability and usability expressed by soup kitchen patrons suggested the food served at soup kitchens in New Jersey was largely culturally acceptable, at least with regard to those served who participated in this research.

- The soup kitchens were most effective at providing:
  - protein-rich foods; and
  - fruits and vegetables.

However, the nutrient analysis of the foods served at soup kitchens should not be considered definitive due to some limitations in the scope of this study. For example, for each site, meal observation included only a single day; and exact measurements of foods and cooking techniques could not be established within the constraints of one visit, so contents and amounts were estimated.
The total Calories in the meals served varied widely; most soup kitchens served meals with an average number of Calories far more than one-third of the recommended intake per day for adults ages 19 through 50. This may be excessive for those participants who have the resources to have one or two additional meals in the day, but it is certainly advantageous for those soup kitchen patrons for whom this is their main or only daily meal.

Still, soup kitchens and their patrons face many challenges:

- Although the Investigation Phase surveys indicated that the food eaten by patrons at soup kitchens helped them make it through the month with enough food for themselves and their families, the help was often not enough. Follow-up surveys with soup kitchen users in the Follow-up Phase found that when users were asked if the food in their household generally lasted all month, only 9 (12%) answered that it did. Thus, despite the positive contributions soup kitchens make to patrons food sufficiency, clearly need remains.

- When asked about the quantity of food served at the soup kitchen, a few patrons indicated the amount of food they were served at the soup kitchen was not nearly enough (n=13; 9%) or was less than they needed (n=5; 4%).

- Food group analysis showed that fats and sweets were served in much higher amounts than is recommended for good health. In addition, milk group servings did not meet 1/3 of the minimum daily dietary recommendations.

- The fat content of the average soup kitchen meal was almost twice the recommended range for a whole day. However, there was less than half the daily recommended amount for fiber. Vitamin D levels were low, falling short of 33% of daily requirements. The mineral of greatest concern was sodium, which significantly exceeded the daily recommended intake for adults.

- People sometimes expressed negative emotions about using the resources of a soup kitchen. Of those interviewed at offices in Newark, Camden, and Vineland, 17 soup kitchen users (12%) and 21 non-users (16%) indicated they were embarrassed, uncomfortable, or felt bad about going to a soup kitchen. Several more people stated they would rather manage without going to a soup kitchen, be self-sufficient, or find other sources of help rather than go to a soup kitchen for meals. Eight individuals mentioned the crowds at soup kitchens as a reason they did not go there.

- Some patrons interviewed made random comments expressing difficulties associated with going to soup kitchens for meals. Comments were made to the interview staff suggesting:
  - problems associated with the location of soup kitchens. Patrons indicated they have to walk long distances or spend money on “expensive” bus fare which they could ill afford.
• problems associated with special dietary needs. In some cases, patrons with medical conditions requiring low salt, diabetic, or other special diets found it difficult to get enough food of the appropriate content for their meal when attempting to adhere to necessary restrictions.

In the Follow-up Phase, 407 food insecure individuals were surveyed. Most respondents (n=278, 68%) did not utilize soup kitchens, and 138 or 34% used neither food pantries nor soup kitchens to improve their food security. This study identified some potential reasons why food insecure people do not use soup kitchens.

• The mean monthly incomes of the people who do not use soup kitchens interviewed in the Follow-up Phase was considerably higher, $875±$875* than the mean incomes reported by soup kitchen patrons, $429±$419. This likely explains the higher percentage who were able to make it through the month with enough food, or with ample food stamps, and may also explain, in part, why some were not using soup kitchen resources.

• A total of 101 people, which is 32% of the 407 respondents to queries regarding if they knew what a soup kitchen was, were unfamiliar with the term. Many of participants stated they had never heard of a soup kitchen after the interviewer defined the term for them.

• A variety of negative attitudes regarding the use of soup kitchens were expressed by participants. However, most were named by fewer than 10% of the non-users, suggesting that negativity was not substantially affecting patronage. Some negative comments made included: embarrassment, finding soup kitchen were not open at convenient times, or were difficult to get to.

• When asked in the Follow-up survey to select the primary reason they were food insufficient, non-user responses were the same as those chosen by soup kitchen patrons, but were ranked quite differently. The reasons most cited by those who do not use soup kitchens were: I live on a fixed income, and it is too low (n=48; 26%); I’m working, but not making enough money (n=43; 24%); I’ve been unemployed a long time (n=21; 12%); and, I’m on public assistance, but it is not enough (n=18; 3%). These responses were consistent with expectations drawn from the patron income and benefit data, which suggested more of the non-users had been working

---

* Standard deviation is a measure of the spread of the data above and below the mean, or average, value. It is expressed next to the mean or average after a “±” sign.
Soup Kitchen Characteristics

Hours of operation of the 19 soup kitchens assessed were:

- five days a week for 9 of the soup kitchens (47%); and
- six or seven days a week for 4 kitchens (21%).

The remaining six soup kitchens (32%) were only open from one day a week to one day a month.

None of the soup kitchens limited how frequently patrons were permitted to come to the kitchen for a meal, within the stated operating times.

The soup kitchen directors indicated the number of meals they served per week ranged from 5 to 1500, with a mean of 496±490 meals.

Many soup kitchens were located in or supported by faith-based organizations. This was the case for 17 (90%) of the 19 soup kitchens surveyed in this project. Patrons surveyed at soup kitchens and urban centers often mentioned using church programs as a strategy to obtain food. Inquiry from the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee suggested the need for clarification to determine whether individuals were referring to having used church programs that were, in fact, food pantries, or if they were referring to accessing church soup kitchen meals, or simply attending church events during which food was served. To better understand patrons’ use of the term “church programs,” the Follow-up Phase survey specifically asked about the type or types of church programs accessed. Fifty-two (74%) soup kitchen patrons responded, indicating:

- 33 (63%) used a faith-based organizations’ food pantry;
- 22 (42%) took advantage of soup kitchen availability; and
- 17 (33%) said they attended events or functions offered more generally to the faith-based community to which they belonged.

The strong role faith-based organizations play in New Jersey’s emergency feeding system should be noted.

Soup Kitchen Clientele Characteristics

Surveys were obtained from a total of 213 soup kitchen users during the course of this study. The distribution of these participants follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at Food Pantries</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals Surveyed at government offices, community centers, and faith-based organizations in Newark, Camden, and Vineland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the Investigation Phase, all soup kitchen patrons surveyed were food insecure and had eaten at a soup kitchen at least three times within the six months prior to their interview. Food insecure soup kitchen patrons in the Follow-up Phase also reported they had eaten a meal at a soup kitchen within 6 months of the interview date.

Personal characteristics of the soup kitchen patrons who participated in these surveys included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- age range</td>
<td>19 to 71 years</td>
<td>19 to 79 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- average age</td>
<td>43±11 years</td>
<td>37±12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- female</td>
<td>57 (40%)</td>
<td>45 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- male</td>
<td>83 (59%)</td>
<td>23 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household size</strong></td>
<td>2±2 people</td>
<td>3±2 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>70 (50%)</td>
<td>55 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>43 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hispanic</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statewide figures from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey for 2002-2003 indicate that the racial breakdown for those living under the poverty threshold in New Jersey were as follows: Black, non-Hispanic (15%); White, non-Hispanic (5%); and Hispanic (15%).²

Employment and financial information provided by soup kitchen users interviewed included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number Employed</strong></td>
<td>22 (16%)</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of Wages</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Hourly: 10 (24% of those employed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average hourly rate: $7.46±$3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits Received</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TANF/General Assistance</td>
<td>38 (27%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social Security</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SSI/SSD</td>
<td>16 (11%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidized Housing</strong></td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average monthly household income from wages or benefits</strong></td>
<td>$429±$599 (n=138)</td>
<td>$429±$419 (n=51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Patrons’ average reported incomes were below the 2005 Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines\(^3\) for even a single person, which was $798 per month. When considering the mean household size for soup kitchen participants was three, for which the Guidelines are $1,341 per month, these findings are further worrisome.

One of the primary ways soup kitchen patrons ensured their food supply, other than eating at soup kitchens, was through participation in the food stamp program. However, despite their efforts most still ran out of food prior to the month’s end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Stamp Program Participants</th>
<th>Investigation Phase</th>
<th>Follow-up Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portion of Month Food Stamps Last</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All month</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three weeks</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two weeks</td>
<td>31 (22%)</td>
<td>17 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two weeks</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Investigation Phase interviews, most survey participants indicated they went to a soup kitchen for a meal more than once a week (n=89; 63%). A additional 23 participants (11%) said they went to a soup kitchen once a week, and 15 participants (11%) said they went once every two or three weeks.

Investigation Phase soup kitchen patrons interviewed at the three urban centers were asked how they felt about going to a soup kitchen. Most patrons had positive feelings, i.e., 45 (32%) indicated they felt fine or were grateful that the soup kitchen meals were available to them:

While most patrons had positive comments regarding their use of soup kitchens, some negative comments were also heard. Some patrons indicated
- they were uncomfortable going to a soup kitchen (n=17; 12%); or
- they did not like the crowds at the soup kitchen (n=8; 6%).

Other users and non-users stated they would rather manage without going to a soup kitchen, be self-sufficient, or find other sources of help rather than go to a soup kitchen for meals.

Other negative attitudes expressed related to transportation issues, and dissatisfaction with the food provided, however such comments were each made by fewer than 10% of the study population.

Investigation Phase soup kitchen users were asked about when they most often did not have enough food for themselves or their families.
- Forty-eight participants (34%) indicated they most often did not have enough food at the end of the month, or the 2\(^{nd}\) half of the month.

• Fifty-three (38%) said that this could happen to them any time during the month, or that it happened all the time.
• Most people (n=94; 67%) reported that the season was not a factor in when they didn’t have enough food.
• Yet 26% (n=18) said they were more likely to not have enough food in winter.
• A few people (n=7; 5%) said they experienced more difficulty having enough food during the summer because their children were home more of the time, and they did not have the support of the free or reduced-price school meal programs to feed their children.

When asked how they managed when the soup kitchen ran out of food and they were thus unable to get a meal, the majority of Investigation Phase respondents indicated they ate with family or friends, went to another soup kitchen, stretched what they had, or went without food.

A list of the primary reasons people gave for their inability to maintain food sufficiency was developed in the Investigation Phase of this work. As a follow-up, those interviewed in the Follow-up Phase were asked to indicate which was their primary reason. Those reasons selected by 10% or more of the patrons who responded to this survey item were:

• I’m on public assistance, but it is not enough (n=19; 37%);
• I live on a on a fixed income, and it is too low (n=7; 14%);
• I’ve been unemployed a long time (n=6; 12%); and
• I’m working, but not making enough money (n=6; 12%).

It is not surprising that low income would be the driving force in the top four responses, recognizing the low average income and benefit levels of this population described above.

In response to queries regarding how patrons had heard about the soup kitchen in which they were interviewed, most indicated they learned about it from:

• a friend (n=29; 38%),
• word of mouth on the street (n=13; 17%), or
• various other sources, e.g., at church or through a family member.

Patrons at food pantries indicated their primary means of getting to the pantry was walking (n=59; 77%).

Some patrons interviewed made random comments expressing difficulties associated with going to soup kitchens for meals. Comments were made to the interview staff suggesting:

• problems associated with the location of soup kitchens. Patrons indicated they have to walk long distances or spend money on “expensive” bus fare which they could ill afford.
• problems associated with special dietary needs. In some cases, patrons with medical conditions requiring low salt, diabetic, or other special diets found it difficult to get enough food of the appropriate content for their meal when attempting to adhere to necessary restrictions.
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**Soup Kitchen Strengths**

1. **Needs Met**
   Frequent comments from patrons indicted that soup kitchens succeed at providing for the needs of the homeless population and those who live in shelters. These individuals who have no place to store food, nor access to cooking facilities, and may not even have somewhere to stay until nightfall, have limited ways in which to meet their food and nutrient needs. Soup kitchens are filling this need, to a large extent where they are available. In addition, the Calories contained in the meals served by many of the soup kitchens surveyed are abundant, which helps people in this group satisfy more of their food needs at a single meal, lessening the need to find other means of acquiring additional food.

   Additionally, many individuals and families who were not homeless or living in shelters commented that soup kitchens provide the help they need to eat decently when they are struggling with paying other bills.

   Another strength identified was strong and effective communications between soup kitchen staff and the patrons of the soup kitchen. When asked about any rules regarding how often patrons can come to the soup kitchen for a meal, patron responses correlated significantly with those provided by their soup kitchen directors \((r=0.3969; p<0.0007)\).

2. **Food Quantity**
   According to soup kitchen patrons interviewed in the Investigation Phase, the majority \((n=103; 73\%)\) indicated they ate lunch at the soup kitchen. In addition, 16 patrons \((11\%)\) ate breakfast at a soup kitchen, and 42 patrons \((30\%)\) ate dinner there.

   Most of the soup kitchen patrons \((n=113; 80\%)\) described the amount of food they were served at the soup kitchen as just right or more than they could eat.

3. **Food Quality**
   The food meals served by soup kitchens were considered good or very well liked by 115 \((82\%)\) of the Investigation Phase survey participants. Slightly more of the participants \((n=123; 87\%)\) thought that the nutritional quality of the food they were served at the soup kitchen was good or excellent.

   When patrons were asked how much of the food they were served at the soup kitchen were items they and their families were willing to eat:
   - Most people \((n=63; 45\%)\) indicated they and their families ate almost all of the food items they received;
   - An additional 59 people \((42\%)\) said they ate half or more of the food items served at the soup kitchen.

   The high degree of food acceptability and usability expressed by soup kitchen patrons suggested the food served at soup kitchens in New Jersey was largely culturally acceptable, at least with regard to those served who participated in this research.
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All of the soup kitchen directors believed that, in general, their patrons liked the meals served and considered them to be of good to excellent nutritional quality. The directors also reported that, overall, patrons ate almost all (84%) or most (16%) of the food they were served at the soup kitchen.

Food group analysis revealed that the minimum daily recommendations for vegetables and meat groups were met, or nearly met, in the soup kitchen meals. Fruit group servings constituted more than 1/3 of daily minimum requirements, and bread group servings, more than 2/3.

The total Calories in the meals served ranged widely, with an average of 1,423.5 Calories per meal. This may be excessive for those participants who have the resources to have one or two additional meals in the day, but it is certainly advantageous for those soup kitchen patrons for whom this is their main or only daily meal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>Dietary Reference Intake recommended Calories per day for adults ages 19 through 50</th>
<th>Amount of Calories per meal provided by soup kitchens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calories</td>
<td>1600 – 2600 Calories</td>
<td>Range: 705 to 2,088 Average: 1424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Qualities Most Appreciated

The majority of soup kitchen users surveyed in the urban center Investigation Phase interviews expressed positive sentiments when asked how they felt about going to a soup kitchen (n=45; 32%) They indicated that:
- it was a good experience; or
- they were grateful this assistance was available.

Among those who did not get meals from a soup kitchen, many (n=45; 34%) said they would be willing to go if it became necessary, but they were not needy enough yet. Twelve respondents (6%) felt that other people needed the help of a soup kitchen more than they did.

Soup Kitchen Challenges

1. Unmet Needs

Investigation Phase surveys indicated that the food eaten by patrons at soup kitchens helped them make it through the month with enough food for themselves and their families. Yet, when soup kitchen users were asked if the food in their household generally lasted all month in the follow-up Follow-up Phase survey, only 9 (12%) answered that it did. Thus, despite the positive contributions soup kitchens make to patrons food sufficiency, clearly need remains.
Some patrons indicated that they did not go to a soup kitchen for food often. This may be personal choice or personal need, or may be associated with difficulty in accessing the soup kitchen, such as transportation problems or problems going there within the kitchen’s hours of operation.

- Ten individuals (7%) reported going to a soup kitchen once a month, and
- Four individuals (3%) indicated they usually went to a soup kitchen only once every other month.

Eight of the soup kitchens surveyed (41%) were not able to address the ethnic or religious food customs of their patrons. Directors indicated this occurred for a variety of reasons, from not perceiving a need, e.g., believing there was no need in the area, or the community was happy with whatever it could get, to lacking the capacity to address those needs, e.g., distributions governed by the donations received. As a result, most of the soup kitchens tried to have some alternate foods on hand for those patrons for whom particular some part of the meal was not acceptable.

2. Food Quantity
A few soup kitchen patrons indicated the amount of food they were served at the soup kitchen was not nearly enough (n=13; 9%) or was less than they needed (n=5; 4%). Soup kitchen directors, on the other hand, believed that their patrons regarded the amount of food distributed as just right to more than enough (n=19; 100%) to meet their needs.

3. Food Quality
A small number of soup kitchen patrons indicated they did not like the food they were served at the soup kitchen (n=16; 11%). Eight patrons (6%) thought the nutritional quality of the food was poor. Nine patrons (6%) said they were willing to eat only a little of the food they received.

Soup kitchen directors reported no negative feelings among their patrons concerning the meals they served; that is, they believed the patrons liked the food, ate most of it, and felt the nutritional quality of the food was good.

Although, overall, study findings suggested patron satisfaction and cultural acceptability of foods distributed via New Jersey soup kitchens, in reviewing these findings one should recall that interviews were typically performed in English, with some done in Spanish when possible. It stands to reason that food quality may be less favorably assessed by those patrons who were not able to be interviewed as part of this work.

Foods from the fats and sweets food group were served in much higher amounts than may be advisable for an individual to consume in an entire day. In addition, milk group servings did not meet 1/3 of the minimum daily recommendations.

The fat content of the average soup kitchen meal was almost twice the recommended range for a whole day. However, there was less than half the daily recommended amount for fiber.

Of special note were the low vitamin D levels detected, which fell short of 33% of daily requirements. This may be particularly of relevance in that minority groups are over-
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represented in low-income populations, likely increasing their participation in accessing emergency food sources. Adequate dietary intake of vitamin D is particularly important to minority and elderly populations, as their skin absorption of vitamin D from sunlight is less efficient.

The mineral of greatest concern was sodium, which significantly exceeded the daily recommended intake for adults.

4. Qualities Most Disliked
Seventeen soup kitchen users (12%) and 21 non-users (16%) interviewed at urban centers during the Investigation Phase indicated they were embarrassed, uncomfortable, or felt bad about going to a soup kitchen. Other users and non-users stated they would rather manage without going to a soup kitchen, be self-sufficient, or find other sources of help rather than go to a soup kitchen for meals. Eight individuals mentioned the crowds at soup kitchens as a reason they did not go there.

Some patrons interviewed made random comments expressing difficulties associated with going to soup kitchens for meals. Comments were made to the interview staff suggesting:

- problems associated with the location of soup kitchens. Patrons indicated they have to walk long distances or spend money on “expensive” bus fare which they could ill afford.
- problems associated with special dietary needs. In some cases, patrons with medical conditions requiring low salt, diabetic, or other special diets found it difficult to get enough food of the appropriate content for their meal when attempting to adhere to necessary restrictions.

Potential Reasons Food Insecure People Do Not Use Soup Kitchens
In the Follow-up Phase, 407 food insecure individuals were surveyed. Only a small number of these used emergency food services to increase their food sufficiency:

- 72 of these participants (18%) indicated they had obtained meals from a soup kitchen,
- 140 (35%) indicated they had obtained food from a food pantry, and
- 57 (14%) indicated they had accessed both food pantries and soup kitchens in the past 6 months prior to their interview.

Thus, 278 respondents (68%) did not utilize this resource, and 138 (34%) used neither food pantries, nor soup kitchens to improve their food security. This begs the question, “Why?”

This study identified some potential reasons why food insecure people do not use soup kitchens.

- Non-users were demographically similar to soup kitchen patrons; yet, the mean monthly incomes of the people who do not get meals at a soup kitchens interviewed in the Follow-up Phase was considerably higher, $875±$875, than the mean incomes reported by soup kitchen patrons, $429±$419. This likely explains the higher percentage who were able to make it through the month with enough food, or with ample food stamps, and may also explain, in part, why some were not using soup kitchen resources.
The Follow-up Phase respondents were asked if they knew what a soup kitchen was. A total of 101 people (32%) were unfamiliar with the term. Many of participants stated they had never heard of a soup kitchen, even after the interviewer had defined the term for them.

A variety of negative attitudes regarding the use of food pantries were expressed by participants. However, most were named by fewer than 10% of the non-users, suggesting that negativity was not substantially affecting patronage. Some negative comments made included:
- being embarrassed;
- finding them too crowded;
- finding soup kitchens were not open at convenient times; and
- preferring other means of getting by.

Aside from financial considerations, there are other personal reasons that those in need choose not to frequent soup kitchens.
- It goes without saying, in regions where no soup kitchens are available in low-income communities, or in the immediate environment of those in need, distance and lack of transportation make soup kitchen patronage prohibitive.
- The majority of meals served at soup kitchen are at lunch time. For some, particularly the working poor, the time these meals are available excludes them from partaking of available meals.
- Some, for either personal or cultural reasons, refrain from taking advantage of emergency feeding opportunities such as those provided by soup kitchens due to social restraints.

When asked in the Follow-up survey to select the primary reason they were food insufficient, non-user responses were the same as those chosen by soup kitchen patrons, but were ranked quite differently. The reasons most cited by those who do not use soup kitchens were:
- I live on a fixed income, and it is too low (n=48; 26%);
- I’m working, but not making enough money (n=43; 24%);
- I’ve been unemployed a long time (n=21; 12%); and,
- I’m on public assistance, but it is not enough (n=18; 3%).

These responses were consistent with expectations drawn from the patron income and benefit data, which suggested more of the non-users had been working. It is interesting to note that the total number of respondents for this particular question was only 181 of the 260 participants who completed this survey. This reflected that many people were unable to state the primary cause for their inability to maintain food sufficiency, due to its multi-factorial nature, i.e., utility costs, medical costs, inability to work, high utility costs, etc., all played a strong role in their dilemma.
Appendix A: Short Form of the 12-month Food Security Scale

1. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN true, SOMETIMES true, or NEVER true for you in the last 12 months.

   The first statement is: "The food that I bought just didn't last, and I didn't have money to get more." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true   (2) Sometimes true   (3) Never true   (4) Don't know   (5) Refused

2. "I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true   (2) Sometimes true   (3) Never true   (4) Don't know   (5) Refused

3. In the last 12 months, since last August did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

   (1) Yes   (2) No (GO TO 10)   (4) Don't know (GO TO 10)   (5) Refused (GO TO 10)

4. If YES. How often did this happen --- almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

   (1) Almost every month   (2) Some months but not every month   (3) Only 1 or 2 months   (4) Don't know   (5) Refused   (X) Question not asked because question 8 was NO or missing

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

   (1) Yes   (2) No   (4) Don't know   (5) Refused

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

   (1) Yes   (2) No   (4) Don't know   (5) Refused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The individual is food secure or undetermined if:
  - there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or,
  - (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.

In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions. Circle DOESN'T QUALIFY on the front of this survey form to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

- Otherwise, continue with the next survey question.
Appendix B: Questionnaire for Soup Kitchen Directors

CMP

City of interview: ______________________  ID #: ____________

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SOUP KITCHEN DIRECTORS/MANAGERS

1. What meals are served at this facility?
   - Breakfast
   - Lunch
   - Dinner
   - Other
   - Depends on: ________________________________

2. Are there rules about how often a patron can get a meal here? If so, what are they?
   __________________________________________________________

3. When is this facility open to patrons?
   - ____ days/week; specify: ________________________________
   - ____ days/month; specify: ________________________________
   - Other _____________________________________________

4. How many patrons are served?
   - _________ per week
   - _________ per month
   - Other _____________________________________________

5. Do you ever run out of food so that you can’t give people the meal that they are expecting?
   - What do you do? ________________________________
   - How frequently does this happen? ________________________________

6. Does the soup kitchen attempt to address the ethnic or religious food customs of patrons?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Why or why not? ________________________________

7. What alternatives can you provide if the meal served is not acceptable/the patron will not eat what is served?

8. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not nearly enough,
   - 3 is just the right amount, and
   - 5 is more than you can use
   how satisfied do you think patrons are with the amount of food they get here? __________

9. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   - 1 is not at all,
   - 3 is good, and
   - 5 is like it very much
   how much do you think patrons like the food they get here? __________
10. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   1 is very bad,
   3 is good, and
   5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food patrons get here is? ___________

11. How much of the foods patrons get here do you think are items they are willing to eat? (Read list.)
   □ Almost all of it
   □ Most of it
   □ About half of it
   □ A little of it
   □ Almost none of it

12. What foods or types of foods that they get here do think they do not eat?

13. What food or types of foods do you think patrons would like to be served more often?

14. What do you think patrons do if the soup kitchen runs out of food and they can't get a meal here?
   ____________________________________________________________________________

15. How often do people say that they are still hungry when they finish a meal here?
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   What happens when they do? ____________________________________________________________________________________

16. Do you ever provide food that patrons can take home with them?
   How often? __________________________________________________________________________
   What kind(s) of foods? __________________________________________________________________________

17. Do you have a computer with internet access?

18. If we were to provide handouts on a web site, for example, “Stretching Your Food Stamp Dollars”, or
   “Economical Ways to Use and Prepare Foods Frequently Available at Food Pantries”, would you print
   them and make them available to your patrons?

19. Would you like to be put on a list-serv where handouts like those just mentioned would be sent as
   links to a website?
Foods and Serving Sizes of Meal Served on _____(date)___________
Appendix C: Questionnaire for Soup Kitchen Patrons

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SOUP KITCHEN PATRONS

1. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN, SOMETIMES, or NEVER true for (you/you or the other members of your household) in the last 12 months.

   The first statement is, "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true    (4) Don't know
   (2) Sometimes true (5) Refused
   (3) Never true

2. "(I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true    (4) Don't know
   (2) Sometimes true (5) Refused
   (3) Never true

3. In the last 12 months, since (date 12 months ago) did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

   (1) Yes     (4) Don't know (GO TO 5)
   (2) No (GO TO 5)    (5) Refused (GO TO 5)

4. If YES. How often did this happen---almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

   (1) Almost every month   (4) Don't know
   (2) Some months but not every month (5) Refused
   (3) Only 1 or 2 months

   (X) Question not asked because of negative or missing response to question 3

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

   (1) Yes     (4) Don't know
   (2) No     (5) Refused

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

   (1) Yes     (4) Don't know
   (2) No     (5) Refused
Score the first six questions:
Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual is food secure or undetermined if:
- there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or
- (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.

In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions. Circle DQ on the front of this survey to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

Otherwise, continue with the survey questions.

7. How did you hear about this soup kitchen?

8. Which of the following describes how you get here? (Read list.)
   - Walk
   - Carpool with friends/relatives
   - Some other way ________
   - Drive
   - Take a bus or other public transportation

9. Is distance or transportation a problem in getting here? Describe:
   _______________________________________________________

10. What rules does the Soup Kitchen have about how often you can come here?

11. How often do you come here? (Do not read list.)
    - more than once a week
    - every 2 to 3 weeks
    - every other month
    - once a week
    - once a month
    - other __________________

   (Prompt for variations)
   - Is there a time during the month that you tend to come here more often than at other times? If so, when: ______________________________________________
   - Do you come more or less often during different seasons of the year? If so, when?
     __________________________________________________

12. How many people live in your household?
    ____ Adults (not counting yourself)
    ____ Children living with you or eating meals at your house five or more days a week

13. How many members of your household come here with you for meals?

14. I'm going to read you a list of reasons why some people run out of food. Tell me which of these describes why you run out of food. (Read one category at a time.)

   Benefits
   - Ran out of Food Stamps
   - Food Stamps cut off
   - Didn't qualify for food stamps
   - Lost subsidized housing
   - Unemployment benefits ran out
   - Public Assistance is not enough
   - Cash welfare (TANF) was cut off
   - Didn't qualify for TANF
   - SSI/SSD was cut off
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Expenses

- Unusual recent expenses
- Health/medical costs
- High Child care costs
- High rent/mortgage costs
- High utility costs
- Fixed income is too low

Employment

- Unemployed a long time
- Working, but do not make enough money
- Recent job loss
- Seasonal worker

Personal Factors

- Too sick to work (chronic illness, disability, mental problems)
- Caring for ill family member
- Recent divorce or separation
- Alcohol or drug use
- Domestic abuse/threat of violence
- Lack of child support

Are there any other reasons you can think of that describe why you run out of food?

__________________________________________________

15. I’m going to read you a list of some ways you might get food. Which of the following have you used in the last 12 months?

- Another Soup Kitchen
- Food Pantry
- Shelter meals
- Church program
- Meals on Wheels
- Senior meal site
- Farmers’ Market
- Home or Community garden
- Hunting or fishing
- Commodities or government surplus food like you would get at food pantries
- Food Stamps
- WIC
- School breakfast
- School lunch
- Head Start/day care meals
- Summer meal program
- Relative
- Friend or Neighbor
- Scavenging (dumpster, road kill)

16. Which meal(s) do you usually eat here? ______________________________

17. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   1 is not nearly enough,
   3 is just the right amount, and
   5 is more than you can use
   how would you describe the amount of food you get here? __________

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   1 is not at all,
   3 is good, and
   5 is like it very much
   how do you like the food you get here? __________

19. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   1 is very bad,
   3 is good, and
   5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food you get here is? __________
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20. How much of the foods you get here are items that you, or other members of your household, are willing to eat? *(Read list.)*
   - □ Almost all of it
   - □ Most of it
   - □ About half of it
   - □ A little of it
   - □ Almost none of it

21. What foods or types of foods that you get here do you or your family not eat?

22. What food or types of foods would you like to be served more often?

23. What happens if you or a member of your household is still hungry when you finish a meal here?

24. What do you do if the soup kitchen runs out of food and you can’t get a meal here?

25. Your age: __________

26. Gender:  □ Male  □ Female

27. Which group do you most closely identify yourself with?
   - □ American Indian
   - □ Asian/Pacific Islander
   - □ Black (non-Hispanic)
   - □ Hispanic
   - □ White (non-Hispanic)
   - □ Other: _____________

28. Which of the following describes your household?
   - □ Single parent, female with children under 18
     - Is this the primary residence of the children?  □ Yes  □ No
   - □ Single parent, male with children under 18
     - Is this the primary residence of the children?  □ Yes  □ No
   - □ Single person, no children
   - □ Single person with adult roommates
   - □ Two parents/adults with children
   - □ Two adults, no children
   - □ Grandparent(s) caring for children
   - □ Multigenerational
   - □ Other  ________________________________________________

29. Are you employed?  □ Yes  □ No

30. Does your household currently get food stamps?  □ Yes  □ No
    If yes, how long do they usually last? *(Read list.)*
    - □ They last all month  □ 3 weeks  □ 2 weeks  □ less than 2 weeks

31. Do you receive *(read list and check all that apply)*:
   - □ Medicaid  □ NJ Kid Care  □ Subsidized housing
   - □ Social Security  □ TANF/Welfare  □ SSI or SSD
   - □ Retirement or pension  □ Unemployment  □ Worker’s compensation
   - □ Alimony  □ Child support
   - □ Other: ________________________

32. Have you applied for any of these public assistance programs and been denied?
   - □ Yes  □ No
   If yes, which one(s)?__________________________________________

Section V - 34
33. What is your monthly household income: ___________________

If the interview is completed, circle CMP on the front of this survey.
Appendix D: Questionnaires for Interviews at Urban Centers

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AGENCY CLIENTS

1. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN, SOMETIMES, or NEVER true for (you/you or the other members of your household) in the last 12 months.

The first statement is, "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

(1) Often true    (4) Don't know
(2) Sometimes true   (5) Refused
(3) Never true

2. "(I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

(1) Often true    (4) Don't know
(2) Sometimes true   (5) Refused
(3) Never true

3. In the last 12 months, since (date 12 months ago) did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

(1) Yes    (4) Don't know (GO TO 5)
(2) No (GO TO 5)    (5) Refused (GO TO 5)

4. If YES. How often did this happen---almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

(1) Almost every month   (4) Don't know
(2) Some months but not every month   (5) Refused
(3) Only 1 or 2 months

(X) Question not asked because of negative or missing response to question 3

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

(1) Yes    (4) Don't know
(2) No    (5) Refused

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

(1) Yes    (4) Don't know
(2) No    (5) Refused
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Score the first six questions:

Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual is food secure or undetermined if:

- there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or,
- (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.

In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions. Circle DQ on the front of this survey form to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

Otherwise, continue with the survey questions.

7. Do you sometimes not have enough food for yourself or your family?
   □ Yes    □ No
   - Is there a time during the month that this tends to happen more often than at other times? If so, when:
   ____________________________________________
   - Does this happen more or less often during different seasons of the year? If so, when:
   ____________________________________________

8. I'm going to read you a list of reasons why some people run out of food. Tell me which of these describe why you run out of food. (Read one category at a time.)

   Benefits
   □ Ran out of Food Stamps          □ Public Assistance is not enough
   □ Food Stamps cut off             □ Cash welfare (TANF) was cut off
   □ Didn't qualify for food stamps  □ Didn't qualify for TANF
   □ Lost subsidized housing         □ SSI/SSD was cut off
   □ Unemployment benefits ran out

   Expenses
   □ Unusual recent expenses         □ High rent/mortgage costs
   □ Health/medical costs            □ High utility costs
   □ High child care costs           □ Fixed income is too low

   Employment
   □ Unemployed a long time           □ Recent job loss
   □ Working, but do not make enough money □ Seasonal worker

   Personal Factors
   □ Too sick to work (chronic illness, disability, mental problems)
   □ Caring for sick family member
   □ Recent divorce or separation    □ Alcohol or drug use
   □ Domestic abuse/threat of violence □ Lack of child support

Are there any other reasons you can think of that describe why you run out of food?
______________________________________________________________

Section V - 37
9. I'm going to read you a list of ways you might get food. Which ones do you know about, and which ones do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>DQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church program</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior meal site</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter meals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or Neighbor</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' Market</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/Community garden</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School breakfast</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School lunch</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start/day care meals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer meal program</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scavenging (dumpster, road kill)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting or fishing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If individual uses a food pantry, ask: How often do you go to a food pantry?
   - more than once a week
   - once every week
   - every 2 to 3 weeks
   - once a month
   - every other month
   - other _____________________

11. If individual uses a soup kitchen, ask: How often do you go to a soup kitchen?
   - more than once a week
   - once every week
   - every 2 to 3 weeks
   - once a month
   - every other month
   - other _____________________

12. How do you feel about going to a food pantry for food? Why do you feel this way?
   - don't know a location
   - not eligible
   - not worth the trouble
   - embarrassed
   - don't like the food
   - don't get food my family will eat
   - others need the food more
   - other _____________________

13. If you don't use a food pantry, why don't you go when you don't have enough food? (Do not read list.)
   - don't know a location
   - not eligible
   - not worth the trouble
   - embarrassed
   - don't like the food
   - don't get food my family will eat
   - others need the food more
   - other _____________________

14. How do you feel about going to a soup kitchen for food? Why do you feel this way?
   - don't know a location
   - not eligible
   - not worth the trouble
   - embarrassed
   - don't like the food
   - don't get food my family will eat
   - others need the food more
   - other _____________________

15. If you don't use a soup kitchen, why don't you go when you don't have enough food? (Do not read list.)
   - don't know a location
   - not eligible
   - not worth the trouble
   - embarrassed
   - don't like the food
   - don't get food my family will eat
   - others need the food more
   - other _____________________

16. Is distance or transportation a problem in getting to a food pantry or soup kitchen? Describe:

   _______________________________________________________

If the individual does not use food pantries or soup kitchens, skip to question # 36.

If the individual uses soup kitchens, but not food pantries, skip to question # 27.

For food pantry users, continue with the next question.
17. How much food/how many bags of food do you get when you go to a food pantry? 

(Prompt)
- □ Always the same amount? How much? ________________
- □ Amount varies? Describe: ____________________________

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   28. 1 is not nearly enough,
   29. 3 is just the right amount, and
   30. 5 is more than you can use
   how would you describe the amount of food you get at the food pantry? __________

19. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   31. 1 is not at all,
   32. 3 is good, and
   33. 5 is like it very much
   how do you like the food you get there? __________

20. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   34. 1 is very bad,
   35. 3 is good, and
   36. 5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food you get there is? __________

21. When you add the food you get at the food pantry to the rest of the food you buy, are you able to get through the month with enough food? □ Yes  □ No

22. How much of the foods you get at the food pantry are items that you, or other members of your household, are willing to eat? (Read list.)
   □ Almost all of it
   □ Most of it
   □ About half of it
   □ A little of it
   □ Almost none of it

23. What foods or types of foods that you get there do you or your family not eat?

24. What happens if the food in the bag provided includes items you are not willing to eat? Would you say: (Read list.)
   □ You can choose something else
   □ You can say no and not take it
   □ You take the food anyway and find a way to use it
   □ You take the food anyway and give it away
   □ You take the food anyway and throw it away
   □ Other ____________________________

25. What foods or types of foods would you like to be able to get more of or get more often?

26. What do you do if the food pantry runs out of food and you can't get a bag of food?

   If the individual does not use soup kitchens, skip to question # 36.
27. Which meal(s) do you usually eat at a soup kitchen? _____________________________

28. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   37. 1 is not nearly enough,
   38. 3 is just the right amount, and
   39. 5 is more than you can use
   how would you describe the amount of food you get at the soup kitchen? _________

29. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   40. 1 is not at all,
   41. 3 is good, and
   42. 5 is like it very much
   how do you like the food you get there? ___________

30. On a scale of 1 to 5, where:
   43. 1 is very bad,
   44. 3 is good, and
   45. 5 is excellent
   how good do you think the nutritional quality of food you get there is? __________

31. How much of the foods you get at the soup kitchen are items that you, or other members of your household, are willing to eat? (Read list.)
   - Almost all of it
   - Most of it
   - About half of it
   - A little of it
   - Almost none of it

32. What foods or types of foods that you get there do you or your family not eat?

33. What food or types of foods would you like to be served more often?

34. What happens if you or a member of your household is still hungry when you finish a meal at the soup kitchen?

35. What do you do if the soup kitchen runs out of food and you can't get a meal there?

36. Your age: __________

37. Gender:  ☐ Male        ☐ Female

38. Which group do you most closely identify yourself with?
   - American Indian        ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander        ☐ Black (non-Hispanic)
   - Hispanic              ☐ White (non-Hispanic)          ☐ Other: _____________

39. How many people live in your household?
   _____ Adults (not counting yourself)
   _____ Children living with you or eating meals at your house five or more days a week
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40. Which of the following describes your household?
   - Single parent, female with children under 18
   - Single parent, male with children under 18
   - Single person, no children
   - Single person with adult roommates
   - Two parents/adults with children
   - Two adults, no children
   - Grandparent(s) caring for children
   - Multigenerational
   - Other

41. Are you employed?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

42. Does your household currently get food stamps?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, how long do they usually last?
   - They last all month  ☐ 3 weeks  ☐ 2 weeks  ☐ less than 2 weeks

43. Do you receive (check all that apply):
   - Medicaid
   - Social Security
   - Retirement or pension
   - Alimony
   - Other

44. Have you applied for any of these public assistance programs and been denied?
   - Yes  ☐ No

45. What is your monthly household income: ___________________

If the interview is completed, circle CMP on the front of this survey.
Appendix E: Questionnaires for Interviews in the Follow-up Phase

Telephone Survey

Interviewer: ____________

Interviewer: circle as appropriate, according to directions:

DOESN’T QUALIFY

Telephone Number Called: ____________________________

COMPLETE

Screening Script

Good morning/afternoon. I am _________________ from Rutgers University.

I am working with a group of researchers who know that many people living in New Jersey sometimes have a difficult time being able to afford enough food to feed themselves and their families, and that sometimes people need help. We are doing a study to try to figure out how to better help others when they are in need.

This survey will take less than 10 minutes of your time, if you are willing to participate. Results from the survey will be used to recommend ways that emergency programs can do a better job of helping people.

1. In order to figure out who to interview, could you tell me, of the people who are 18 years old or older who live in your household who had the most recent birthday? I don’t mean who is the youngest, but who had the last birthday.

   A. Person who answered the phone had the most recent birthday ----- Ask: Would you be willing to answer a few questions?
      
      If YES ----- skip to question 5
      
      If NO ----- skip to question 4

   B. Someone else had the most recent birthday; record person’s name ___________ ----- then skip to question 3

   C. Person does not know all of the birthdays of household ----- skip to question 2.

   D. Person does not know any birthdays other than their own --- Ask: Would you be willing to answer a few questions?

      If YES ----- skip to question 5
      
      If NO ----- skip to question 4

   E. Person offers to do the survey, but is not 18 years old: say:

      For this study I need to talk to people who are at least 18. Are there other people in your household who are 18 years old or older?”

      If YES: record person’s name ________________ ----- then skip to question 3

   F. Person refuses to participate ----- skip to question 4
2. Of the birthdays you do know, who had the most recent birthday?
   A. Person who answered the phone ---- Ask: **Would you be willing to answer a few questions?**
      If YES ---- skip to question 5
      If NO ---- skip to question 4
   B. Someone else; record person’s name ____________________________  ----- then go to question 3

3. Ask to speak to that person
   A. If that person is not at home, ask: **When could I call back to talk to him/her?**
      Record answer: ____________________________________________
      Thank you. I will call back ________________.
   B. If that person comes to the phone, repeat the introduction; say:
      Good morning/afternoon. I am ________________ from Rutgers University.
      I am working with a group of researchers who know that many people living in New Jersey sometimes have a difficult time being able to afford enough food to feed themselves and their families, and that sometimes people need help. We are doing a study to try to figure out how to better help others when they are in need.
      This survey will take less than 10 minutes of your time, if you are willing to participate.
      Results from the survey will be used to recommend ways that emergency programs can do a better job of helping people. Would you be willing to answer a few questions?
      If YES ---- skip to question 5
      If NO ---- go to question 4

4. The survey only takes about ten minutes, and we would really appreciate your help and cooperation. Is there another time that would be better for us to talk with you?
   A. If YES, record answer: ________________________________
   B. If NO, say: Thank you for your time.

5. Your answers will be confidential and will be combined with the answers from all the people who have been part of this project. Your name will not be linked with any information we report. By answering these questions today you will be agreeing to let us include your answers in our combined results. Any questions about this survey may be directed to Audrey Adler at (732) 932-0532 or The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (732) 932-0150 ext. 2104.

Begin the survey at question 6; ask survey questions in the order listed.
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Telephone Survey

Section 1

6. I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was OFTEN true, SOMETIMES true, or NEVER true for you in the last 12 months.

   The first statement is: "The food that I bought just didn't last, and I didn't have money to get more." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true (2) Sometimes true (3) Never true (4) Don't know (5) Refused

7. "I couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for you in the last 12 months?

   (1) Often true (2) Sometimes true (3) Never true (4) Don't know (5) Refused

8. In the last 12 months, since last August did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

   (1) Yes (2) No (GO TO 10) (4) Don't know (GO TO 10) (5) Refused (GO TO 10)

9. If YES. How often did this happen --- almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

   (1) Almost every month (2) Some months but not every month (3) Only 1 or 2 months (X) Question not asked because question 8 was NO or missing

10. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

    (1) Yes (2) No (4) Don't know (5) Refused

11. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

    (1) Yes (2) No (4) Don't know (5) Refused

---

Score the first six questions:

Circle the number corresponding to the answers given to each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(1), (2)</td>
<td>(3), (X), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2), (4), (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The individual is food secure or undetermined if:

- there are only zero or one affirmative answers, or,
- (4) or (5) are circled three or more times.

In either case, thank him or her for their time; do not continue with the survey questions.

Circle DOESN'T QUALIFY on the front of this survey form to indicate that this individual does not qualify for this study.

Otherwise, continue with survey question 12.
Section 2

12. Can you tell me what a food pantry is? Yes No

If the respondent says YES move on to question 13.

If the respondent says NO, define a food pantry as follows (then move on to question 13):

A food pantry is a place where people who are hungry or in need of food can receive some free groceries. At many food pantries people are given a bag or more of food, but at some food pantries people take food off of shelves like you do in a grocery store. Food pantries are sometimes found in church buildings or the building of another religious or private organization, but some may be located in their own space or in a space in a bigger building. Depending on the rules at the food pantry, sometimes people are not allowed to get food unless they have a referral or proof that they are in need; while at other pantries anyone is allowed to get food there.

13. In the past 6 months have you gotten food from a food pantry? Yes No

If the answer is NO, go to question 16.
If the answer is YES, go to question 14.

14. Do you use all of the foods you get at the food pantry?

If the answer is YES, go to question 15.
If the answer is NO, ask: Which ones don’t you use?

Record each food mentioned in the “Food Items” column in the table below. Probe for details on each food; for example, if they say a food that comes in many forms, such as corn, ask if it is fresh, frozen, canned, etc. Record the details with the food items in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Items</th>
<th>Reasons (include all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next ask: For each food you just mentioned, please tell me if any of these reasons describe why you don’t use it. Record the letters corresponding to their answers in the “Reasons” column in the table above.

a. Not enough flavor
b. Don’t like the taste
c. Don’t like the texture
d. Too salty
e. Too much fat
f. Don’t know how to fix them so they taste good
g. Get too many of them
h. Kids don’t like them
i. Don’t fit in with the foods from my culture
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15. Do you get any foods at the food pantry that you don’t know how to use?

If the answer is NO, go to question 16.
If the answer is YES, ask: Which ones don’t you know how to use?

16. Can you tell me what a soup kitchen is? Yes No

If they say YES move on to question 17.
If they say NO, define a food pantry as follows (then move on to question 17):

A soup kitchen is a place where people who are hungry or in need of food can receive free meals. They do not just serve soup, they serve whole meals. Soup kitchens are sometimes found in church buildings or the building of another religious or private organization, but some may be located in their own space or in a space in a bigger building.

17. In the past 6 months have you had a meal at a soup kitchen? Yes No

18. Does your household currently receive food stamps? Yes No

If the answer to question 18 is YES, go to question 19.
If the answer to question 18 is NO, go to question 21.

19. Would you say that the food stamps usually last:

☐ 1 week
☐ 2 weeks
☐ 3 weeks
☐ all month

If necessary, tell the participant: Please pick the ONE answer that is most often true for you.

If the answer to question 19 was ALL MONTH, and the answer to either question 13 or question 17 was YES (the individual has gone to a food pantry or has had a meal at a soup kitchen), ask:

20. Are you able to make your food stamps last all month because you:

☐ get food from a food pantry
☐ eat meals at soup kitchens (or)
☐ both get food from a food pantry and eat meals at soup kitchens or
☐ some other reason (explain) ________________________________

If the participant answered questions 19 and 20, skip to question 23.
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21. Would you say that the food in your household generally lasts:

- [ ] 1 week
- [ ] 2 weeks
- [ ] 3 weeks
- [ ] all month

If necessary, tell the participant: Please pick the ONE answer that is most often true for you.

If the answer to question 21 was ALL MONTH, and the answer to either question 13 or question 17 was YES (the individual has gone to a food pantry or has had a meal at a soup kitchen), ask:

22. Are you able to make your food last all month because you:

- [ ] get food from a food pantry
- [ ] eat meals at soup kitchens (or)
- [ ] both get food from a food pantry and eat meals at soup kitchens or
- [ ] some other reason (explain) ____________________________________

Section 3

23. Some people have told us that when they are hungry or need food, they go to a church or to another religious organization. Is this true for you?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If the answer to question 23 was NO, go to question 25.
If the answer to question 23 was YES, ask:

24. I am going to read a list of ways people obtain food from a church or other religious organization when they are hungry or need food. Please say yes to ALL of the answers that apply to you:

- [ ] the church or other religious organization gives out bags of food to people in need; I have received food in this way.
- [ ] the church or other religious organization serves meals especially for people who are in need or hungry; I have gone to those.
- [ ] the church or other religious organization has events or special times when there are meals available for members and others (not especially for people who are hungry or in need); I have gone to those.
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25. I am going to read you the top reasons why people tell us they have trouble getting through the month with enough food. Please listen carefully, and tell me which of these reasons makes getting through the month with enough food MOST difficult for you. If you need me to, I can read the list several times.

Check only the ONE answer the participant indicates as the reason that makes having enough food most difficult.

- [ ] On a fixed income, but it is too low
- [ ] Unemployed a long time
- [ ] Public assistance is not enough
- [ ] Can’t work due to illness, accident, or disability
- [ ] Didn’t qualify for TANF or welfare
- [ ] Can’t work because of alcohol or drug use
- [ ] Ran out of food stamps
- [ ] High utility costs
- [ ] Didn’t qualify for food stamps
- [ ] High rent, mortgage, or property taxes
- [ ] Working but not making enough money
- [ ] High health or medical costs

Section 4

26. How old are you? _________

27. How old are the other people who live in your household? ________________________________________

28. What is your gender?  [ ] Male  [ ] Female

29. Which ethnic group do you most closely identify yourself with?
   [ ] American Indian  [ ] Asian/Pacific Islander  [ ] Black (non-Hispanic)
   [ ] Hispanic  [ ] White (non-Hispanic)  [ ] Other: ________________

30. Are you currently employed?  Yes  No

   If the answer to question 30 was NO, go to question 32.
   If the answer to question 30 was YES, ask:

31. Do you get paid by the hour?  Yes  No

   If the answer is yes, ask: What is your hourly rate? __________

   If the answer is no, ask: How much do you make? (record in their own words) __________________

32. What is your monthly household income? ________________

Thank you for your time. I appreciate your help in completing this survey.

Interviewer: Please circle COMPLETE on the front of this survey.
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New Jersey’s Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Expansion of Nutrition Education Services at and for Emergency Feeding Agencies

I. Nutrition Education for Vulnerable Populations

In the strictest sense, nutrition education is the action or process of teaching or of being taught the science of food and nourishment. However, the aim of federal programmatic efforts directed toward vulnerable populations is to provide educationally sound and culturally appropriate learner-driven nutrition education to encourage behavior change, as opposed to offering knowledge-based education aimed at learning the various nutrients and how they are used in the body. Those behaviors addressed are those that will most positively impact food intake among those taught. For programmatic efforts directed toward the poor, the primary aim of nutrition education is to enhance food security.

Food security is the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, and an assured ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways (e.g. scavenging, or other coping strategies). Enhanced food security is taught through practical education aimed toward improving:

- dietary quality;
- access opportunities for food and other available assistance programs;
- food safety; and,
- shopping/resource management behaviors.
II. General Nutrition Education Recommendation, Based on the Rutgers Study Findings

Food security is not a dichotomous concept. People’s food security status tends more toward a continuous scale whereby the most vulnerable populations, who have no means to reliably obtain food, nor to cook or store it, are the most food insecure with the primary goal for educating this population being education to improve their ensured access to food, i.e., ample Calories to ensure survival and eliminate hunger. Once reliable food access is ensured, higher goals aim to improve food variety, e.g., access to nutrient-rich fruits and vegetables. The highest of goals of nutrition education, the aim of education usually directed toward the general public, for whom ensured access to balanced and nutritious meals characterized by variety is assumed, is to teach balance, to encourage variety, and to emphasize appropriate Caloric intake and energy expenditure through increased physical activity.

Optimal nutrition education evaluates individuals’ current needs, and then designs a course of action that the individuals are willing to initiate, with the understanding on the parts of both the teacher and the learner that behavior changes with regards to changing people’s eating behaviors is a gradual process, typically requiring small changes over time, and requiring science-based advice and a willingness on the part of the learner to make needed changes.

Since the expense and time necessary for this type of optimal nutrition education to be offered in food pantries and soup kitchens is prohibitive, and impractical; yet a desire exists to improve the food security of those participating in New Jersey emergency feeding programs, one of the aims of this research project was to investigate potential nutrition education opportunities.

Data collected during the course of this investigation suggested programming could be reasonably made available to emergency feeding sites. When asked if they would like to receive nutrition education print materials that could be distributed to their clients nearly all food pantry directors (n=19; 90%) and all soup kitchen directors (n=19; 100%), indicated that they would. Most directors (n=15; 71% - food pantry directors; and, n=17; 90% - soup kitchen directors) had computers with internet access; and, all with access indicated they would like to be put on a listserv where nutrition education handouts would be sent via links to a website. In fact, three additional directors, who had indicated they did not have on-site internet access, said they too would use this opportunity.

Recommendation: Computers and internet access should be made available and training should be provided to as many food pantries as possible, especially those with lesser resources, so materials made available through this project, as well as others aimed at enhancing food security among low-income New Jersey residents can be easily accessed. Also, educational provisions for pantries in the areas of grant writing and best practices should be supported to improve their service potential. Additionally, educational materials for social services workers should be created and distributed to encourage
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*them to take a more proactive role in directing clients to emergency feeding opportunities, when possible*

Questions were asked during interviews, to assess what foods people obtained from food pantries but did not use, and which foods they received that they did not know how to prepare in ways their families deemed acceptable. These questions were asked in order to determine what educational content might be most useful to emergency food system users. Some universal needs were identified. Those foods most frequently named as going unused were beans, cereals, powdered milk, and rice.

- Taste and not knowing tasty preparation methods appeared to inhibit bean consumption;
- Excess distribution of cereals kids did not readily consume contributed to leftover cereal;
- Lack of appreciation for the taste and texture of powdered milk, made children and their parents less likely to use it; and,
- Lack of flavor and excessive distribution kept rice from being used.

*Recommendation: Nutrition education through the provision of recipes and cooking instruction is likely to enhance bean, powdered milk, and rice use, and should be developed and distributed to emergency feeding system clientele. More information regarding cereals distributed and not used is needed, but again, its likely that education regarding how to use them other than for breakfast, e.g., trail mix snacks or breading for chicken or fish, may increase their use.*

As is evidenced in the section of this report entitled: New Jersey Food Pantries: An Overview of Their Strengths and Challenges, nutritional analyses suggested that emergency feeding sites failed to meet clientele needs in terms of adequate fruit, vegetable, and calcium-rich food intake. Further, the amount of fat and Calories provided was questionable.

*Recommendation: Educational materials and programs aimed toward increasing abilities to obtain calcium-rich foods and fresh fruits and vegetables, e.g., through the use of education regarding access to farmer’s market programs, should be developed. Finally, education directly applicable to the caloric and fat content of foods in food packages distributed and client energy needs may be warranted.*

During this investigation, observations suggested that many people failed to take advantage of benefits for which they would likely be eligible. For example, despite the fact that all 761 people interviewed were food insecure, only 345 (45%) were currently receiving food stamps. This suggests that emergency feeding site patrons would benefit from education regarding available programs that are available to assist them in accessing available food, health care, or other resources, e.g., energy assistance. Educational opportunities regarding access to online applications or pertinent resources and programs would be valuable.
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Recommendation: Education regarding access to online applications or pertinent resources and programs should be provided to volunteers and staff who work at emergency feeding sites, so they can assist patrons in applying for benefits for which they may be eligible.
III. EFNEP and FSNEP: An Introduction

The New Jersey Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the New Jersey Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) are two nutrition education programs for low-income audiences, run out of Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension, under the direction of Dr. Debra Palmer Keenan, and Associate Professor housed in the Department of Nutritional Sciences at Cook College. As part of the contract for this research, Dr. Keenan was asked to provide a summary of how these programs might better assist in the provision of nutrition education through collaboration with New Jersey emergency feeding providers. The following sections of this report will further define these programs in terms of their outreach capabilities, as well as their constraints. It will additionally outline ways, through the work described in this report, EFNEP and FSNEP are responding to the need for enhanced outreach through and collaboration with emergency food providers.

New Jersey EFNEP

EFNEP is a federally funded program, initiated in 1968 though an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935. It is funded, and federally operated though the United States Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (CREES). EFNEP operates within every state and U.S. Territory through land grant Universities. Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey is New Jersey’s land grant college, and EFNEP is operated there through Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension, under the direction of Dr. Debra Palmer Keenan.

EFNEP’s mission is to provide nutrition education to low-income families with young children to assist them in making behavior changes necessary for the maintenance of nutritionally sound diets. Trained paraprofessionals help families meet these objectives through group lessons.

For more than 35 years, EFNEP has provided nutrition education to New Jersey youth and families. EFNEP programming in New Jersey follows the USDA’s Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) teaching model, i.e., it provides nutrition education through paraprofessionals (Community Assistants) who are peer educators who are indigenous to the target population.

In New Jersey, adult education in the EFNEP program is accomplished through classes that meet all of the following criteria; they are:

- Comprised of 4-15 people;
- Groups have at least 50% of the individuals hailing from low income families with children;
- Groups meet at least 6 times;
- Classes last a minimum of one hour per session; and,
- Programming is delivered over a minimum of 6 weeks.
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To receive a graduation certificate from our program, adults must attend at least 6 classes as outlined above.

Youth programming, in New Jersey has the same requirements as adult programming, with two exceptions. Classes can contain up to 30 children per Community Assistant in pre-organized youth groups, and may meet for a minimum of 30 minutes, rather than one hour, when a full hour is not available. Pre-school programs may meet 15-20 minutes.

EFNEP provides services in the following counties:

- Camden,
- Cape May,
- Cumberland,
- Essex,
- Gloucester,
- Hudson,
- Mercer,
- Middlesex, and
- Passaic.

The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program serves audiences not served by the NJ Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP). In fiscal year 2004 EFNEP delivered classes to 4,663 adults and 7,787 youth. Racial breakdowns for adults and youth, respectively, were: 50% and 51% African American; 37% and 30% Hispanic; 10% and 17% Caucasian; 2% and 1% Asian or Pacific Islanders; and, 1% and 1% Native American Indian. For census purposes, 100% of New Jersey is categorized as urban. 83% of our education efforts occurred in central cities of over 50,000; 0% occurred in suburbs of over 50,000 people; and 15% occurred in towns and cities of 10,000 - 50,000 people.

Again, EFNEP hires paraprofessionals and follows ethnic staffing patterns that mimic that of our participants with 25% of our paraprofessionals being African American, 63% being Hispanic, and 8% Caucasian.

From a survey administered to 2,494 of the adults who completed an EFNEP program in 2004, it was noted that:

- 40% more often planned meals in advance
- 37% more often compared prices when shopping
- 36% less often ran out of food at the end of the month
- 39% more often used a grocery list when shopping
- 41% more often thought about healthy food choices when deciding what to feed their families
- 38% more often prepared food without adding salt
- 50% more often used the "Nutrition Facts" on food labels to make healthy choices
- 34% reported that their children ate breakfast more often
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- 33% more often followed the recommended practices of not allowing meat and diary foods to sit out for more than two hours
- 47% more often followed the recommended practice of not thawing foods at room temperature.

**EFNEP Expansion Efforts**

Although EFNEP is proud of its impact, and EFNEP does currently provide some educational outreach at some emergency feeding sites, it is difficult to plan for expanded efforts as the program has been fairly level funded since its inception, i.e., the same amount of federal money has been dedicated to the program for nearly 40 years. As a result, program paraprofessional staff has been reduced from numbers in the forties, to the current 20 functioning lines; and, EFNEP’s geographic outreach has been reduced from eleven counties to its current efforts in only eight, with plans for further reductions, focusing the program in the areas of highest need and reducing service to those with lesser need, in years to come.

**New Jersey FSNEP**

FSNEP is a program funded as part of the State’s Food Stamp Program, by USDA’s Food and Nutrition Service. This program was initiated in New Jersey in May 1997, and is annually contracted to Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, from the New Jersey Department of Human Services. Dr. Debra Palmer Keenan is the Principal Investigator to whom the contract is awarded. She oversees the program through the Department of Nutritional Sciences and Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension. FSNEP’s mission is to provide nutrition education to food stamp program participants, i.e., limited-resource adults, seniors, and children in school systems that have 50% or more of the children enrolled receiving free or reduced price school lunches.

The desired outcomes of FSNEP education are as follows:

- Improved diets and nutritional welfare;
- Increased knowledge of the essentials of human nutrition;
- Increased ability to select and buy food that satisfies nutritional needs;
- Improved practices in food production, preparation, storage, safety and sanitation; and,
- Increased ability to manage food budgets and related resources such as food stamps.

The majority of FSNEP programming in New Jersey follows the USDA’s Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) teaching model, i.e., it provides nutrition education through paraprofessionals (Community Assistants) who are peer educators, indigenous to the target population.
In New Jersey, adult education in the FSNEP program is accomplished through classes that meet all of the following criteria; they are:

- Comprised of 4-15 people;
- Groups include at a minimum 50% participation by individuals participating in the Food Stamp Program, or eligible to receive Food Stamps;
- Groups meet at least 6 times (Department of Labor (DOL) job training program groups can meet 4 times);
- Classes last a minimum of one hour per session; and,
- Programming is delivered over a minimum of 6 weeks, excepting again the DOL job training programs, for a maximum of one year.

To receive a graduation certificate from our program, adults must attend at least 6 classes as outlined above.

Youth programming, in New Jersey has the same requirements as adult programming, with two exceptions. Classes can contain up to 30 children per Community Assistant in pre-organized youth groups, and may meet for a minimum of 30 minutes, rather than one hour when a full hour is not available. Pre-school programs may meet 15-20 minutes.

New Jersey FSNEP serves audiences that do not qualify for EFNEP, or do not have EFNEP available to them. FSNEP is currently available in the following areas:

- Burlington County
- Cumberland County
- Essex County
- Gloucester County
- Hunterdon County
- Mercer County
- Middlesex County
- Monmouth County
- Ocean County
- Passaic County
- Salem County
- Union County
- Warren County

Again, FSNEP is run as a collaboration among the Department of Nutritional Sciences at Rutgers University, RCRE departments (i.e., Family and Community Health Sciences, 4H), and the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey’s School of Health Related Professions. The program is very successful. In fiscal year 2004, FSNEP delivered classes to 3,406 adults and 14,900 youth. Racial breakdowns for adults and youth, respectively, were: 39% and 34% African American; 29% and 45% Hispanic; 29% and 20% Caucasian; 1% and 2% Asian or Pacific Islanders; and, 2% and 0% Native American Indian. For census purposes, 100% of New Jersey is categorized as urban.
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48% of our education efforts occurred in central cities of over 50,000; 1% occurred in suburbs of over 50,000; and 46% occurred in towns and cities of 10,000 - 50,000 people.

Most of the State’s FSNEP projects hire paraprofessionals and follow ethnic staffing patterns that mimic that of our participants with 13% of our paraprofessionals being African American, 47% being Hispanic, 33% Caucasian, and 1% Asian. In addition to the paraprofessional model, FSNEP also deliver nutrition education via other means, for example, through theatre, urban ecology, farmer’s market programs, and school cafeteria programs taught by professionals, interns, and student employees.

From a survey administered in 2004 to 1,862 of the adults who completed a FSNEP program, it was noted that:

- 43% more often planned meals in advance
- 33% more often compared prices when shopping
- 29% less often ran out of food at the end of the month
- 35% more often used a grocery list when shopping
- 42% more often thought about healthy food choices when deciding what to feed their families
- 34% more often prepared food without adding salt
- 49% more often used the "Nutrition Facts" on food labels to make healthy choices
- 32% reported that their children ate breakfast more often
- 27% more often followed the recommended practices of not allowing meat and diary foods to sit out for more than two hours
- 39% more often followed the recommended practice of not thawing foods at room temperature.

**FSNEP Expansion Efforts**

Throughout the course of this work, the research team observed services provided through New Jersey’s emergency feeding sites, i.e., Food Pantries and Soup Kitchens, in terms of their viability for increased Food Stamp Nutrition Education (FSNEP) programming. Through a review of these observations, and queries made to the directors and staff of the emergency feeding sites visited, it became apparent that there were many instances in which increases in nutrition education programming could not feasibly be instituted via traditional educational means currently employed by FSNEP, i.e., small group educational series for intact groups delivered via Rutgers staff whose salary needs require matching contributions originating from municipal, county, and/or state sources.

Regarding community at large, future educational endeavors that may be expanded through FSNEP resources could include the recruitment of nutrition professionals to act as educational liaisons for food pantries and promote education among pantry clients, provide support for nutrition education volunteers, or to do direct teaching.
Finally, website links with all information from this project, including educational materials made available in the future on the FSNEP website (www.fsnep.rutgers.edu), and be made for easy access my multiple users.

However, some sites, particularly those affiliated with faith-based organizations, did appear to have: 1) potential access to intact groups; 2) facilities appropriate for small group programming; and, 3) volunteers willing and able to facilitate nutrition education. In consideration of these factors, the fiscal year 2006 NJ FSNEP (October 1, 2005 – September 30, 2006) plan was submitted with a financial support commitment from the Nicholson Foundation and human and space resource commitments from the Churches in Collaboration and Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension, requesting additional federal funds to support the development of a faith-based curricula, targeted toward congregates of low-income Black Churches to be taught by volunteers, with plans to expand to low-income Hispanic communities in the future. Once this curriculum has been developed and tested, it will be made available on the NJ FSNEP website. The plan additionally includes support for hiring an individual to organize, train, and provide support to volunteers in faith-based venues to deliver nutrition education programming and measure program impacts, as well as to assist with the development of additional food pantries in faith-based venues. This program is scheduled to be implemented in 12 faith-based organizations in Essex County in fiscal year 2006, again, with plans for future expansion to other locations throughout the state if it is successful.

Were space and seed money to be provided to FSNEP, it could be matched to federal funds to further expand FSNEP into areas not currently served, e.g., Atlantic County.
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SYNOPSIS

"New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act;" appropriates up to $5,000,000 in unexpended federal TANF funds.

CURRENT VERSION OF TEXT

As introduced.

(Sponsorship Updated As Of: 3/9/2001)

AN ACT concerning emergency food programs, supplementing Title 30 of the Revised Statutes and making an appropriation.

BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the "New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act.

2. There is established in the Department of Human Services, the New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program.

   The purpose of the program is to: improve the health and nutritional status of State residents in need of food assistance, supplement the efforts of emergency food programs in the State to reduce hunger, and enable families and individuals to become food secure and self-sufficient.

   a. The Commissioner of Human Services shall establish the program in conjunction with the regional food banks in the State.

   b. The goals of the program are to:

      (1) enhance the accessibility and availability of safe, nutritious food and food-related resources;

      (2) develop and provide comprehensive nutrition education programs;

      (3) periodically conduct assessments of the needs of persons requesting food assistance and hunger-related issues to ensure program funds are used effectively; and
(4) empower persons requesting food assistance or at risk of needing food assistance to increase their independence from emergency food assistance programs.

3. a. Within the limits of funds appropriated for the program and such other funds as are made available to the program, the program shall provide grants to emergency food programs in the State to carry out the goals of the program.

An emergency food program shall submit an application for grant funds to the Department of Human Services in a form and manner prescribed by the Commissioner of Human Services. The commissioner, in consultation with the Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 4 of this act, shall award grants to emergency food programs that:

(1) address an unmet need for emergency food services;

(2) offer services that meet the goals of the program, particularly with respect to providing nutrition education services to persons in the service area of the emergency food program;

(3) provide for referral or outreach services to other public and private social services programs that serve the emergency food program's target population;

(4) demonstrate culturally competent services, including recognizing food preferences and traditions of the community, that are appropriate to the target population of the emergency food program; and

(5) demonstrate an ability to document how the grant funds are used and to meet the reporting requirements of the program.

b. In addition to considering the criteria for awarding grants provided in subsection a. of this section, upon completion of the needs assessment conducted pursuant to section 5 of this act, the commissioner and advisory committee shall take into consideration the findings of the needs assessment in determining how grant funds shall be allocated in the State.

c. Grant recipients shall report quarterly to the Department of Human Services on the use of the grant funds, including the number of persons served by the emergency food program, the type of services received and such other information as required by the commissioner.
4. There is established a 13-member Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee in the Department of Human Services. The advisory committee shall assist the Commissioner of Human Services in the implementation of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program established pursuant to this act and shall oversee the needs assessment that shall be conducted pursuant to section 5 of this act.

a. The advisory committee shall consist of:

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture, the Commissioner of Human Services, and the Commissioner of Community Affairs, or their designees, who shall serve ex officio; and

(2) 10 public members appointed by the Governor who shall include: two representatives of emergency food programs in the State; two representatives of programs serving homeless individuals in the State; the Executive Directors of the County Welfare Directors Association of New Jersey, the Municipal Welfare Association of New Jersey and the Association for Children of New Jersey, or their designees; a nutritionist; and two members of the public who are knowledgeable about emergency food programs. The public members other than the executive directors shall serve during the term of office of the Governor who shall have appointed them, at the pleasure of that Governor.

b. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner provided for the original appointments.

c. The committee shall organize as soon as practicable following the appointment of its members and shall select a chairperson and vice-chairperson from among the members. The chairperson shall appoint a secretary who need not be a member of the committee.

d. The committee shall be entitled to call to its assistance and avail itself of the services of the employees of any State, county or municipal department, board, bureau, commission or agency as it may require and as may be available to it for its purposes.

5. The Commissioner of Human Services shall contract with Rutgers, the State University to conduct a Statewide needs assessment to:

a. identify and quantify, at all steps in the State's food delivery system, wholesome and nutritious food that goes to waste before it can be made available to those in need of such food;
b. identify and quantify the need for emergency or supplemental feeding for families and individuals in the State;

c. identify strategies and structures for minimizing spoilage of food resources;

d. develop a fiscally judicious plan to secure food from loss to deterioration or waste and to transport and apportion that food to emergency feeding programs throughout the State;

e. develop strategies for behaviorally focused educational outreach with at-risk families and individuals; and

f. analyze nutritional sufficiencies and deficiencies in existing emergency food programs and develop solutions to generating nutritionally complete, culturally acceptable diets.

6. The Commissioner of Human Services shall report annually to the Governor and the Legislature on the activities of the program. The report shall include a listing of the grants awarded under the program, the number of persons served through the grants and such other information as the commissioner deems appropriate.

7. Upon certification by the Director of the Division of Budget and Accounting in the Department of the Treasury that federal funds not to exceed $5,000,000 are available to support the expenditure, such funds are appropriated from unexpended federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Family funds to the Department of Human Services to carry out the purposes of this act.

Of this appropriation, the department shall allocate up to $250,000 to conduct the needs assessment pursuant to section 5 of this act and up to $4,750,000 for the purpose of making grants to emergency food programs in the State pursuant to section 3 of this act.

8. This act shall take effect immediately.

STATEMENT

This bill, the "New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program Act," establishes the New Jersey Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program in the Department of Human Services. The purpose of the program is to: improve the health and nutritional status of State residents in need of food assistance; supplement the
efforts of emergency food programs in the State to reduce hunger; and enable families and individuals to become food secure and self-sufficient.

The Commissioner of Human Services is to establish the program in conjunction with the regional food banks in the State. The goals of the program are to:

1. enhance the accessibility and availability of safe, nutritious food and food-related resources;

2. develop and provide nutrition education programs;

3. assess the needs of persons requesting food assistance and hunger-related issues to ensure program funds are used effectively; and

4. increase the independence from emergency food assistance programs of those who rely on such assistance.

The bill provides that the program will make grants to emergency food programs in the State that offer emergency food services, nutrition education, and referral or outreach services to other programs serving the same population. Grant recipients will be required to report quarterly to the Department of Human Services on the use of the grant funds.

The bill establishes a 13-member Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee in the Department of Human Services to assist the commissioner in the implementation of the program and to oversee a needs assessment to be conducted by Rutgers University. The advisory committee shall consist of:

- the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commissioners of Human Services and Community Affairs, or their designees; and

- 10 public members appointed by the Governor who shall include: two representatives of emergency food programs in the State; two representatives of programs serving homeless individuals in the State; the Executive Directors of the County Welfare Directors Association of New Jersey, the Municipal Welfare Association of New Jersey and the Association for Children of New Jersey, or their designees; a nutritionist; and two members of the public who are knowledgeable about emergency food programs.

To maximize available food resources in the State and ensure that limited food resources and State funding are allocated in the most effective and efficient manner, the bill directs the Commissioner of
Human Services to contract with Rutgers University to conduct a Statewide needs assessment to:

- identify and quantify "lost" food in the State's food system, identify ways to minimize food spoilage, and develop a plan to "rescue" such food for transport to the State's emergency feeding programs;

- identify and quantify the need for emergency or supplemental feeding for families and individuals in the State;

- develop strategies for behaviorally focused educational outreach with at-risk families and individuals; and

- analyze nutritional sufficiencies and deficiencies in existing emergency food programs and assist in developing nutritionally complete, culturally acceptable diets.

The commissioner and the advisory committee will use the information obtained from the needs assessment in determining the future allocation of grant funds under the program.

The bill directs the commissioner to report annually to the Governor and the Legislature on the activities of the program. The report shall include a listing of the grants awarded under the program, the number of persons served through the grants and such other information as the commissioner deems appropriate.

This bill appropriates up to $5,000,000 from unexpended federal temporary assistance to needy family (TANF) funds to the Department of Human Services. Of this appropriation, the department shall allocate up to $250,000 to fund the conduct of the needs assessment and up to $4,750,000 to fund grants to emergency food programs in the State.
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I. Gap Analysis Toolkit

Overview

The Gap Analysis Toolkit can aid decision makers and geographic information systems (GIS) professionals in analyzing where “gaps” may exist between the populations in need of food assistance and the food resources that are available. Through the use of GIS software and datasets, the Toolkit allows the manipulation of numerous food assistance and population databases to visually illustrate the “gaps” in hunger relief efforts.

The potential to direct the power of this Toolkit lies in the ability of hunger relief decision makers and GIS professionals to cooperate and create maps with customized geography, and datasets in response to the particular needs of an organization, a program, or a territory. This section outlines the different components of the Toolkit. With the large amount of data included and the ability to append additional data, the usefulness of the Toolkit is only bound by the creativity of those using it.

The review of datasets in the following sections provides a GIS-knowledgeable person with an introduction to the database CD of the Toolkit. Datasets were selected in collaboration with the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee. They include:

- New Jersey Emergency Food Providers; this list originates from the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers (n=1,114).
- Teaching sites of two State-wide nutrition education programs, Expanded Food and Nutrition Education program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP), (n=509 for both programs).
- New Jersey Schools where 20% or more of enrolled students are eligible for free and reduced lunch and breakfast (where offered) programs (n=1,095).
- New Jersey-based Women Infant Children (WIC) administrative centers and local offices (n=217).
- WIC Authorized farmers’ markets, farm stands, and youth farm stands (n=250).
- Food Stamp use (raw use data by NJ municipality)
- Census poverty data at the census tract level in New Jersey.

Each dataset in the Toolkit CD includes the file name, the dataset source, a description of the data, and a description of the variable. The following section provides a written description of what can be found on the CD.
Dataset Limitations

The datasets are limited to those points that can be mapped. The dataset for emergency food providers, for example, does not include those sites that do not have a regular “store front” that welcomes all potential clients. Some datasets should not be created because of their confidential nature. A case in point are domestic violence shelters that will share only a post office box address.

The interpretation of most of the maps in this report must take into consideration that the poverty data from the 2000 US Census are already six years old. These data are being compared against the newest sources of other data sets, for example, the 2004-2005 data on eligibility for free and reduced price school meals and the 2005 list of farm retailers participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program. The necessity to adjust the interpretation of maps according to the age of the data will continue as datasets are updated and added. Care should be taken when reporting these figures and any limitations or suspected inaccuracies should be noted.

Recommendations for Future Use

As stated earlier, the applications for the Gap Analysis Toolkit are only constrained by the creativity of its users and the data available. The Toolkit can provide hunger relief organizations with the data and analysis they need in order to better serve their target populations, track the effectiveness of their programs and initiatives, and to leverage the funding and resources necessary to remain successful in battling food insecurity in New Jersey.

To remain accurate and useful, the data for this Toolkit must be updated regularly. During the data collection period for this report, we found many incongruities when we ground tested some of the addresses in lists given to us. By “ground tested” I mean that we called owners, occasionally visited, and compared lists to internet addresses. Some addresses were no longer valid or had changed. While continual updating of these datasets would be labor intensive, an “update schedule” should be designed to keep data relevant and collection efforts reasonable. Using the sources provided below, future users of this Toolkit will be able to contact the appropriate agencies or organizations to request updated data.

Examples of additional datasets that might be considered for future inclusion are:

- More detailed Census data on population and poverty. In addition to the Census Tract level provided in the Toolkit, the U.S. Census Bureau provides this data at the Census Block Group level, allowing a much finer level of detail and analysis. Also, custom datasets can be developed by the U.S. Census Bureau for a fee, allowing hunger relief organizations to purchase more detailed and specific datasets to fit their needs.

- Common transportation routes, especially at the local level. Considering that transportation limitations can confound the ability of both urban and rural populations
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to access hunger relief resources, knowledge of what mass transit opportunities exist in different regions of the state may aid in making these resources available.

While this report provides general analyses of emergency food resources in the state and its counties, future use of the Toolkit might focus on sub-regional and local level analysis. The ability to analyze where gaps may exist within municipalities or regions within a county will assist in developing future strategies and resource allocations to more effectively meet the needs of low-income populations. Given the limited financial and personnel resources of many hunger relief organizations, the capability to easily locate near-by hunger relief resources and guide clients to them efficiently might be a considerable asset.

An additional benefit to local and sub-regional use of this Toolkit is the ability for hunger relief organizations to identify other organizations that may be willing to combine efforts to address a common concern in a given area. Through the creation of partnerships, hunger relief and nutrition education organizations may be able more effectively to integrate and focus their efforts to address pressing issues, while sharing the financial and personnel costs of such initiatives. Facilitating this process entails the integrated use of the Gap Report Toolkit and survey data from the Survey of New Jersey Emergency Food Providers, as well as, the engagement of staff and volunteers from interested EFPs.

The Gap Analysis Toolkit can be a powerful resource if it is made available to the individuals and organizations that need it. With respect for the need to keep some of the data confidential (e.g., EFPs that do not want a public profile), with respect for the confidentiality for EFPs that elect not to be publicly known, we highly recommend that this Toolkit be made publicly available. This can be done in two ways:

- Resources might be devoted for GIS software and staff training at Food Banks and/or other locations to expand the proper use of the Toolkit. Food Bank Areas, for example, may want to dedicate staff to provide analysis on request to emergency food providers in their region. ESRI provides a free GIS map viewing software package called ArcReader, which would allow local sites with limited resources to view and manipulate maps created with the Gap Analysis Toolkit by parent and regional organizations.
- A website might be developed to broaden access and use of much of the Gap Analysis data to a broader public who would not require GIS capabilities to engage with the information. For example:
  - Hunger relief providers could use an easy-to-use publicly-available website to counsel clients on where to go for additional local available emergency food resources (Food Stamps, farmers markets, WIC offices, sites that offer EFNEP and FSNEP education, etc.)
  - Hunger relief providers who are willing to be publicly listed could have discrete access to the website in order to update information on their operations (hours of operation, services, referral requirements, request for volunteers, etc.).
  - Selective website entrance might also serve to link interested hunger relief providers to promote regional cooperation and communication.
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Gap Analysis Toolkit Datasets

Emergency Food Providers

DATASET SOURCES
This dataset was created with assistance from the members of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Council including members from the New Jersey Department of Agriculture, New Jersey Regional Food Bank System, and Linden Department of Community Social Services, as well as the Rutgers Department of Nutritional Sciences. All data was collected between June and December 2004.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of Emergency Food Providers (EFPs) in New Jersey. A list of Emergency Food Providers in the state was generated with help from the members of the New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Council. The data was then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- efp.shp
- efp.shx
- efp.dbf
- efp.prj
- efp.sbn
- efp.sbx
- efp.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
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- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **ID** – Assigned identification number for Emergency Food Provider
- **County** - County of EFP
- **FdBank** – New Jersey Food Bank Area ID number
  - 1 = Community Food Bank of New Jersey Area
  - 2 = Community Food Bank of New Jersey Southern Branch Area
  - 3 = Mercer Street Friends Food Cooperative Area
  - 4 = Northwest New Jersey Community Action Program (NORWESCAP)
    Food Bank Area
  - 5 = Food Bank of Monmouth and Ocean Counties Area
  - 6 = Food Bank of South Jersey
- **EFPName1** – Primary name of Emergency Food Provider
- **EFPName2** – Secondary name of Emergency Food Provider
- **Address** - Street address of EFP
- **City** – Geographic City of EFP
- **Zip** – Geographic Zip Code of EFP
- **MailAddr** – Mailing address of EFP
- **MailCity** – Mailing City of EFP
- **MailZip** – Mailing Zip Code of EFP
- **Phone** – Phone number of EFP
- **Fax** – Fax number of EFP
- **Email** – Email address of EFP
- **Website** – Website address of EFP

Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) Teaching Sites

**DATASET SOURCE**
This dataset was created with assistance from Debra Palmer Keenan, New Jersey State EFNEP Coordinator and Director of New Jersey FSNEP programs, and her staff. EFNEP and FSNEP County Projects are administered out of Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension Program. All data were collected between December 2004 and February 2005.

**DESCRIPTION OF DATA**
This dataset provides the geographic location of sites in New Jersey that provide education programming from the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) and the Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP). The list of the teaching sites was generated with help from New Jersey State EFNEP Coordinator and Director of New Jersey FSNEP County Projects. The data were
then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

Education provided to sites by EFNEP and FSNEP offers nutrition information on safe and healthy ways to maximize food quantity and quality, as well as, information on how to increase participation in programs that will improve participants’ food security.

EFNEP operates in all 50 U.S. States on a fixed budget. It has been in existence for over 30 years. EFNEP programming is available to any low-income children and low-income adult groups where 50% or more of the participants are caregivers of young children or pregnant. “Low-income” is loosely defined, but typically interpreted as those at or below 185% of the poverty level.

FSNEP began in 1992 with participating State agencies. New Jersey has been a participating state since the mid-1990s. FSNEP programming is available at sites that serve Food Stamp program eligible individuals exclusively, or sites that provide a good means of reaching Food Stamp eligibles and that can document that at least 50 percent of those reached will have gross incomes at or below 185% of the poverty threshold.

FILE NAMES

- EFFSNEP.shp
- EFFSNEP.shx
- EFFSNEP.dbf
- EFFSNEP.prj
- EFFSNEP.sbn
- EFFSNEP.sbx
- EFFSNEP.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
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- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **County** - County of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **LegDist** – Legislative District number of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Type** – Type of education site (EFNEP or FSNEP)
- **Name** – Name of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Address** - Street address of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **City** – Geographic City of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Zip** – Geographic Zip Code of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Phone** – Phone number of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Fax** – Fax number of EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Contact** – Contact person for EFNEP/FSNEP site
- **Email** – Email address of EFNEP/FSNEP site

**Schools with 20% or More of Students with Free or Reduced Lunch**

**DATASET SOURCE**

This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Education. Data are for the 2004-2005 academic year and were collected in May 2005.

**DESCRIPTION OF DATA**

This dataset provides the geographic location of schools with 20% or more of their students eligible for free or reduced meals in New Jersey. Students from households at less than 130% of poverty are eligible for free lunches. Students from households between 130% and 185% of poverty are eligible for reduced price lunches. Eligibility should not be confused with participation. Participation data are available upon request, but could not be secured for the 2004-2005 academic year during the period of this research project. A list of schools meeting this criterion in the state was provided by the New Jersey Department of Education. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

**FILE NAMES**

- schools.shp
- schools.shx
- schools.dbf
- schools.prj
- schools.sbn
VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **CO** – NJ Department of Education County Code
- **COUNTY** – County of school
- **DIST** – NJ Department of Education School District Code
- **DISTRICT** – School District of school
- **SCH** – NJ Department of Education School Code
- **SCHOOLS** – School name
- **TENROLL** – Total enrollment of students
- **COLOC** – NJ Department of Education County of Location Code
- **PCTPOV** – Percent of enrolled students eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch Program
- **Address1** – Street address of school
- **Address2** – Secondary or additional address information for school
- **CITY** – City of school
- **ZIP** – Zip Code of school
- **schttype** – Type of school (Elementary School, Middle School, etc.)
- **Phone** – Phone number of school

**Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC)**

**Program Centers and Local Offices**

**DATASET SOURCE**

This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Data were collected in the Fall 2004.
DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of WIC Program Centers and Local Offices in New Jersey. A list of centers was provided by the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- wicoff.shp
- wicoff.shx
- wicoff.dbf
- wicoff.prj
- wicoff.sbn
- wicoff.sbx
- wicoff.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **County** - County of WIC Program Center
- **Name** – Name of WIC Program Center
- **Address** - Street address of WIC Program Center
- **Address2** - Secondary or additional address information for WIC Program Center
- **City** – Geographic City of WIC Program Center
- **Zip** – Geographic Zip Code of WIC Program Center
- **Contact** – Contact person for WIC Program Center
- **Phone** – Phone number of WIC Program Center
- **Fax** – Fax number of WIC Program Center
- **Email** – Email address of WIC Program Center
- **Type** – Type of location (Program Center or Local Office)
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Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC)-
Authorized Farm Retailers Participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP)

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Data were collected in the Fall 2004.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of WIC-authorized Farmers’ Markets in New Jersey that participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) and are authorized by WIC to accept FMNP vouchers. The list of farmers’ markets was provided by the WIC office in the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- farmmarket.shp
- farmmarket.shx
- farmmarket.dbf
- farmmarket.prj
- farmmarket.sbn
- farmmarket.sbx
- farmmarket.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
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- Y – Y coordinate of point
- ARC_Street – Geocoded street address
- ARC_Zone – Geocoded zip code
- County - County of farmers’ market
- Name – Name of farmers’ market
- Address - Street address of farmers’ market
- City – Geographic City of farmers’ market
- Zip – Geographic Zip Code of farmers’ market
- Contact – Contact person for farmers’ market
- Phone – Phone number of contact person

Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infant, and Children (WIC) Authorized Farm Stands and Youth Farm Stands

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created with assistance from the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Data were collected in the Fall 2004.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides the geographic location of WIC-authorized Farm Stands and Youth Farm Stands in New Jersey that participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program (FMNP), and are authorized by WIC to accept FMNP vouchers. The list of Farm Stands and Youth Farm Stands was provided by the WIC office in the New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services. The data were then geocoded using 2002 Census Tiger Road files distributed by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- wicfarm.shp
- wicfarm.shx
- wicfarm.dbf
- wicfarm.prj
- wicfarm.sbn
- wicfarm.sbx
- wicfarm.shp.xml
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VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **Status** – Geocoding status
  - M = matched
  - U = unmatched
  - T = tied
- **Score** – Geocoding accuracy score (percent accurate)
- **Side** – Side of street segment for geocoded location
- **X** – X coordinate of point
- **Y** – Y coordinate of point
- **ARC_Street** – Geocoded street address
- **ARC_Zone** – Geocoded zip code
- **County** – County of farm stand
- **TrName** – Trade Name of farm stand
- **Address** – Street address of farm stand
- **City** – Geographic City of farm stand
- **St** – State of farm stand
- **Zip** – Geographic Zip Code of farm stand
- **Phone** – Phone number of owner of farm stand
- **Owner** – Owner of farm stand
- **HrsOper** – Hours of operation of farm stand
- **TLGS** – Tailgate Stand affiliation
- **Type** – Type of farm stand (Farm Stand or Youth Farm Stand)

Municipal Food Stamp Use Data

DATASET SOURCE

This dataset was created from data provided by New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Family Services and GIS data made publicly available by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Data were collected in May 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA

This dataset provides the number of individuals using Food Stamps by New Jersey municipality. The data were broken down to show both the number of adults and the number of children using Food Stamps. Data on the number of individuals using Food Stamps were provided by the New Jersey Department of Human Services. The data were then joined to a municipal GIS shape file provided by the
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New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- munfs.shp
- munfs.shx
- munfs.dbf
- munfs.prj
- munfs.sbn
- munfs.sbx
- munfs.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS
- FID – File identification number
- Shape – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- AREA – Area of the municipality in square feet
- PERIMETER – Perimeter of the municipality in feet
- FIPSSTCO – Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the state and county of the municipality
- FIPSCO - Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the county of the municipality
- FIPS - Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the county and municipality
- SSN – Social Security Number Area
- MUN – Name of municipality
- COUNTY – County of municipality
- MUNCOUNTY – Name of municipality and its county
- ACRES – Area of the municipality in acres
- SQ_MILES – Area of the municipality in square miles
- POP2000 – U.S. Census reported population for the year 2000
- POP1990 – U.S. Census reported population for the year 1990
- POP1980 – U.S. Census reported population for the year 1980
- POPDEN2000 – U.S. Census reported population density for the year 2000
- POPDEN1990 – U.S. Census reported population density for the year 1990
- POPDEN1980 – U.S. Census reported population density for the year 1980
- FSChild – Number of children using Food Stamps
- FSAult – Number of adults using Food Stamps
- FSTot – Total number of individuals using Food Stamps
U.S. Census Poverty Data by Census Tract

DATASET SOURCE
This dataset was created from data obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau and GIS data made publicly available by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. Data were from the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and was collected in the Spring of 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA
This dataset provides various measures of poverty and population statistics in New Jersey at the census tract level. The data were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau’s “American Fact Finder” Data Query Tool. These data were then transformed to meet the needs of this project and joined to a census tract GIS shape file provided by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection by the Food Policy Institute using ESRI’s ArcGIS software.

FILE NAMES
- census.shp
- census.shx
- census.dbf
- census.prj
- census.sbn
- census.sbx
- census.shp.xml

VARIABLE DESCRIPTIONS

Geographic Variables
- **FID** – File identification number
- **Shape** – Type of shape (polygon, point, etc.)
- **FIPSSTCO** – Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the state and county of the census tract
- **TRACT** – Federal Information Processing Standards identification number for the census tract
- **STFID** – 11-digit census tract identifier key
- **TRACTID** – Census tract identification number
- **COUNTY** – County of census tract
- **NAME** – Verbose name of census tract
- **Area** – Area of census tract in square feet
- **Perimeter** – Perimeter of census tract in feet
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- **Acres** – Area of census tract in acres
- **Hectares** – Area of census tract in hectares
- **Sq_Miles** – Area of census tract in square miles

**General Race and Age Population Variables**

- **Totpop** – Total population
- **White** – White population
- **Black** – Black or African American population
- **AIAN** – American Indian and Alaskan Native population
- **Asian** – Asian population
- **NHOPI** – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population
- **Other** – Other Race population
- **TorMR** – Two or More Races population
- **NotHisp** – Non-Hispanic population
- **NHWhite** - Non-Hispanic White population
- **NHitBlack** - Non-Hispanic Black population
- **NHAIAN** - Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaskan Native population
- **NHAsian** - Non-Hispanic Asian population
- **NHNHOPI** - Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population
- **NHOOther** - Non-Hispanic Other Race population
- **NHTorMR** - Non-Hispanic Two or More Races population
- **Hisp** – Hispanic population
- **HWhite** – Hispanic White population
- **HBlack** – Hispanic Black population
- **HAIAN** – Hispanic American Indian and Alaskan Native population
- **HAsian** – Hispanic Asian population
- **HNNHOPI** – Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population
- **HOther** – Hispanic Other Race population
- **HTorMR** – Hispanic Two or More Races population
- **PU18** – Population under the age of 18
- **P1864** – Population between the ages of 18 and 64
- **PO65** – Population 65 years of age and older
- **Male** – Male population
- **MU18** – Males under the age of 18
- **M1864** – Males between the ages of 18 and 64
- **M65O** – Males 65 years of age and older
- **Female** – Female population
- **FU18** – Females under the age of 18
- **F1864** – Females between the ages of 18 and 64
- **F65O** – Females 65 years of age and older
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Household Poverty Variables

- **TotalHH** - Total number of households
- **MHHI** – Median household income
- **TPovHH** – Total number of households for which poverty status is determined
- **HU150** – Households under 150% of poverty level
- **HU150MC** – Households under 150% of poverty level with married couple
- **HU150FMH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with families with male householder only
- **HU150FFH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with families with female householder
- **HU150NMH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with non-family male households only
- **HU150NFH** - Households under 150% of poverty level with non-family households
- **HO150** – Households over 150% of poverty level
- **HO150MC** - Households over 150% of poverty level with married couple
- **HO150FMH** - Households over 150% of poverty level with families with male householder only
- **HO150FFH** – Households over 150% of poverty level with families with female householder only
- **HO150NMH** – Households over 150% of poverty level with non-family male householder only
- **HO150NFH** – Households over 150% of poverty level with non-family female householder only

Family Poverty Variables

- **TotFam** – Total number of families
- **FBPL** – Families below poverty level
- **FBMC** – Families below poverty level with married couple
- **FBMCCU18** - Families below poverty level with married couple and children under the age of 18
- **FBMCNC** - Families below poverty level with married couple and no children
- **FBMH** - Families below poverty level with male householder only
- **FBMHCU18** - Families below poverty level with male householder only and children under the age of 18
- **FBMHNC** - Families below poverty level with male householder only and no children
- **FBFH** - Families below poverty level with female householder only
- **FBFHCU18** - Families below poverty level with female householder only and children under the age of 18
- **FBFHNC** - Families below poverty level with female householder only and no children
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- **FAPL** - Families above poverty level
- **FAMC** - Families above poverty level with married couple
- **FAMCCU18** - Families above poverty level with married couple with children under the age of 18
- **FAMCNC** - Families above poverty level with married couple with no children
- **FAMH** - Families above poverty level with male householder only
- **FAMHCU18** - Families above poverty level with male householder only and children under the age of 18
- **FAMHNC** - Families above poverty level with male householder only with no children
- **FAFH** - Families above poverty level with female householder only
- **FAFHCU18** - Families above poverty level with female householder only and children under the age of 18
- **FAFHNC** - Families above poverty level with female householder only and no children

**Individual Poverty by Age and Sex Variables**

- **TPovPop** – Total population for which poverty status is determined
- **BPL** – Population below poverty level
- **BPLU18** – Population under the age of 18 below poverty level
- **BPL18-64** – Population between the ages of 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **BPL65O** – Population 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **BM** – Males below poverty level
- **BMU18** – Males under the age of 18 below poverty level
- **BM18-64** – Males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **BM65O** – Males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **BF** – Females below poverty level
- **BFU18** – Females under the age of 18 below poverty level
- **BF18-64** – Females between the age 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **BF65O** – Females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **APL** – Population above poverty level
- **APLU18** - Population under the age of 18 above poverty level
- **APL18-64** - Population between the ages of 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **APL65O** - Population 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **AM** - Males above poverty level
- **AMU18** - Males under the age of 18 above poverty level
- **AM18-64** - Males between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AM65O** - Males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **AF** - Females above poverty level
- **AFU18** - Females under the age of 18 above poverty level
- **AF18-64** - Females between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AF65O** - Females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
**Ratio of Income to Poverty Variables (Percent of Poverty Level)**

- **U50PL** - Population under 50% of poverty level
- **U75PL** - Population under 75% of poverty level
- **U100PL** - Population under 100% of poverty level
- **U125PL** - Population under 125% of poverty level
- **U130PL** - Population under 130% of poverty level
- **U150PL** - Population under 150% of poverty level
- **U175PL** - Population under 175% of poverty level
- **U185PL** - Population under 185% of poverty level
- **U200PL** - Population under 200% of poverty level
- **O200PL** - Population at or over 200% of poverty level
- **U50U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 50% poverty level
- **U75U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 75% poverty level
- **U100U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 100% poverty level
- **U125U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 125% poverty level
- **U130U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 130% poverty level
- **U150U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 150% poverty level
- **U175U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 175% poverty level
- **U185U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 185% poverty level
- **U200U18** - Population under the age of 18 under 200% poverty level
- **O200U18** - Population under the age of 18 at or over 200% poverty level
- **U501864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 50% poverty level
- **U751864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 75% poverty level
- **U1001864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 100% poverty level
- **U1251864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 125% poverty level
- **U1301864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 130% poverty level
- **U1501864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 150% poverty level
- **U1751864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 175% poverty level
- **U1851864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 185% poverty level
- **U2001864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 under 200% poverty level
- **O2001864** - Population between the ages 18 and 64 at or over 200% poverty level
- **U5065O** - Population 65 years of age and older under 50% poverty level
- **U7565O** - Population 65 years of age and older under 75% poverty level
- **U10065O** - Population 65 years of age and older under 100% poverty level

---
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- U12565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 125% poverty level
- U13065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 130% poverty level
- U15065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 150% poverty level
- U17565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 175% poverty level
- U18565O - Population 65 years of age and older under 185% poverty level
- U20065O - Population 65 years of age and older under 200% poverty level
- O20065O - Population 65 years of age and older at or over 200% poverty level

White Race Poverty Variables

- WBPL – White population below poverty level
- WMBPL – White males below poverty level
- WMU18B – White males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- WM1864B - White males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- WM65OB - White males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- WFBPL – White females below poverty level
- WFU18B - White females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- WF1864B – White females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- WF65OB - White females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- WAPL - White population above poverty level
- WMAPL – White males above poverty level
- WMU18A - White males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- WM1864A - White males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- WM65OA - White males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- WFBPL – White females below poverty level
- WFU18A - White females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- WF1864A - White females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- WF65OA - White females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

Black or African American Race Poverty Variables

- BBPL – Black population below poverty level
- BMBPL – Black males below poverty level
- BMU18B – Black males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- BM1864B - Black males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BM65OB - Black males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- BFBPL – Black females below poverty level
- BFU18B - Black females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- BF1864B – Black females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- BF65OB - Black females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- BAPL - Black population above poverty level
- BMAPL – Black males above poverty level
- BMU18A - Black males under 18 years of age above poverty level
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- **BM1864A** - Black males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **BM65OA** - Black males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **BFAPL** - Black females above poverty level
- **BFU18A** - Black females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **BF1864A** - Black females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **BF65OA** - Black females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

**American Indian and Alaskan Native Race Poverty Variables**

- **AABPL** - American Indian and Alaskan Native population below poverty level
- **AAMBPL** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males below poverty level
- **AAMU18B** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **AAM1864B** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **AAM65OB** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **AAFBPL** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females below poverty level
- **AAFU18B** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **AAF1864B** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **AAF65OB** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **AAAPL** - American Indian and Alaskan Native population above poverty level
- **AAMAPL** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males above poverty level
- **AAMU18A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **AAM1864A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AAM65OA** - American Indian and Alaskan Native males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **AAFAPL** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females above poverty level
- **AAFU18A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **AAF1864A** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **AAF65OA** - American Indian and Alaskan Native females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
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Asian Race Poverty Variables

- ASBPL – Asian population below poverty level
- ASMBPL – Asian males below poverty level
- ASMU18B – Asian males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- ASM1864B - Asian males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- ASM65OB - Asian males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- ASFBPL – Asian females below poverty level
- ASFU18B - Asian females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- ASF1864B – Asian females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- ASF65OB - Asian females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- ASAPL - Asian population above poverty level
- ASMAPL – Asian males above poverty level
- ASM1864A - Asian males between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- ASM65OA - Asian males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- ASFAPL – Asian females above poverty level
- ASFU18A - Asian females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- ASF1864A - Asian females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- ASF65OA - Asian females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Race Poverty Variables

- NPBPL – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population below poverty level
- NPMBPL – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males below poverty level
- NPMU18B – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- NPM1864B - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- NPM65OB - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- NPFFBPL – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females below poverty level
- NPFU18B - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- NPF1864B - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- NPF65OB - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- NPAAPL - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population above poverty level
• NPMAPL – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males above poverty level
• NPMU18A - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males under 18 years of age above poverty level
• NPM1864A - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
• NPM65OA - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
• NPFAPL – Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females above poverty level
• NPFU18A - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females under 18 years of age above poverty level
• NPF1864A - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
• NPF65OA - Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

Other Race Poverty Variables
• ORBPL – Other Race population below poverty level
• ORMBPL – Other Race males below poverty level
• ORMU18B – Other Race males under 18 years of age below poverty level
• ORM1864B - Other Race males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
• ORM65OB - Other Race males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
• ORFBPL – Other Race females below poverty level
• ORFU18B - Other Race females under 18 years of age below poverty level
• ORF1864B – Other Race females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
• ORF65OB - Other Race females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
• ORAPL - Other Race population above poverty level
• ORMAPL – Other Race males above poverty level
• ORMU18A - Other Race males under 18 years of age above poverty level
• ORM1864A - Other Race males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
• ORM65OA - Other Race males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
• ORFAPL – Other Race females above poverty level
• ORFU18A - Other Race females under 18 years of age above poverty level
• ORF1864A - Other Race females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
• ORF65OA - Other Race females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
Two or More Races Poverty Variables

- TRBPL – Two or More Races population below poverty level
- TRMBPL – Two or More Races males below poverty level
- TRMU18B – Two or More Races males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- TRM1864B - Two or More Races males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- TRM65OB - Two or More Races males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- TRFBPL – Two or More Races females below poverty level
- TRFU18B - Two or More Races females under 18 years of age below poverty level
- TRF1864B – Two or More Races females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- TRF65OB - Two or More Races females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- TRAPL - Two or More Races population above poverty level
- TRMAPL – Two or More Races males above poverty level
- TRMU18A - Two or More Races males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- TRM1864A - Two or More Races males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- TRM65OA - Two or More Races males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- TRFAPL – Two or More Races females above poverty level
- TRFU18A - Two or More Races females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- TRF1864A - Two or More Races females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- TRF65OA - Two or More Races females 65 years of age and older above poverty level

Hispanic Poverty Variables

- HBPL – Hispanic population below poverty level
- HMBPL – Hispanic males below poverty level
- HMU18B – Hispanic males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- HM1864B - Hispanic males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- HM65OB - Hispanic males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- HFBPL – Hispanic females below poverty level
- HFU18B - Hispanic females under 18 years of age below poverty level
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- **HF1864B** – Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **HF65OB** - Hispanic females 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **HAPL** - Hispanic population above poverty level
- **HMAPL** – Hispanic males above poverty level
- **HMU18A** - Hispanic males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **HM1864A** - Hispanic males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **HM65OA** - Hispanic males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **HFAPL** – Hispanic females above poverty level
- **HFU18A** - Hispanic females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **HF1864A** - Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **HF65OA** - Hispanic females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **NHBPL** – Non-Hispanic population below poverty level
- **NHMBPL** – Non-Hispanic males below poverty level
- **NHMU18B** – Non-Hispanic males under 18 years of age below poverty level
- **NHM1864B** - Non-Hispanic males between the ages 18 and 64 below poverty level
- **NHM65OB** - Non-Hispanic males 65 years of age and older below poverty level
- **NHFAPL** – Non-Hispanic females above poverty level
- **NHFU18B** - Non-Hispanic females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NHFAPL** – Non-Hispanic females above poverty level
- **NHFU18A** - Non-Hispanic females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NHF1864B** - Non-Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NHF65OB** - Non-Hispanic females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **NHAPL** - Non-Hispanic population above poverty level
- **NHMAPL** – Non-Hispanic males above poverty level
- **NHMU18A** - Non-Hispanic males under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NHM1864A** - Non-Hispanic males between the age 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NHM65OA** - Non-Hispanic males 65 years of age and older above poverty level
- **NHFAPL** – Non-Hispanic females above poverty level
- **NHFU18A** - Non-Hispanic females under 18 years of age above poverty level
- **NHF1864A** - Non-Hispanic females between the ages 18 and 64 above poverty level
- **NHF65OA** - Non-Hispanic females 65 years of age and older above poverty level
Custom Variables Created for Report

- **WP130200** – Working Poor (population between 130% and 200% poverty level)
- **PctChU185** – Percent of children under 185% poverty level
## New Jersey Hunger Prevention Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Accomando, CEO</td>
<td>Apostle House &amp; St. James Community Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Bryrd-Bredbenner, Assistant Director of Rutgers Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen DiChiara, CEO</td>
<td>Community Food Bank of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Holland (for Secretary Kuperus)</td>
<td>New Jersey Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Kunzman, Director</td>
<td>Somerset County Board of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaques Lebel, Assistant Director (for Commissioner Bass-Levin)</td>
<td>New Jersey Department of Community Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedzaida Mendez, Executive Director</td>
<td>Food Bank of South Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Page-Hawkins, Director (for Commissioner Davy)</td>
<td>Division of Family Development, New Jersey Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Presser (for C. Zalkind)</td>
<td>Association for Children of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Reilly-Tobin, Committee Co-Chair Director of Emergency Food and Nutrition Network</td>
<td>Catholic Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ellen Tango, President, Municipal Welfare Directors Association</td>
<td>Linden Department of Community Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Williams, Committee Chair Vice President, Housing &amp; Supportive Services.</td>
<td>Volunteers of America Delaware Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rutgers Research Team

Anne C. Bellows, Ph.D., Principle Investigator, is a geographer and planner who works as a Research Associate at the Food Policy Institute, Rutgers University and as an Adjunct Professor at Cook College, Rutgers and the John C. Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Seton Hall University. Dr. Bellows specializes in research on community activisms and human rights related to food security, environmental management, and health. Her research in the U.S., Poland, and other countries looks, i.a., at health benefits and risks of urban agriculture and community food security. She is the author of over 50 project reports and published articles and chapters and has been invited to lecture at over 25 academic and organizational events. In New Jersey, she serves as a member of the Health Task Force of the Healthier New Brunswick 2010 Initiative and the Board of Directors of the Rutgers Community Health Foundation.

Brian Schilling, Co-Principle Investigator, is Associate Director of the Food Policy Institute and Adjunct Instructor in the Department of Agricultural, Food and Resource Economics at Cook College, Rutgers University. Much of his research has been focused on New Jersey farm viability and agricultural economic development at the urban-rural fringe. In recent years, his research focus has broadened to also include food system security and bioterrorism, and other policy issues in the food system. Throughout his career Mr. Schilling has worked closely with the agricultural and food industries and has served on a number of industry and government task forces and working groups. He is the author of 80 papers and briefings on various issues relating to the food and agricultural system and has given more than 40 invited lectures to academic, business, government, and industry groups.

Lucas Marxen, Co-Author, is a Research Analyst at the Food Policy Institute. Mr. Marxen received a Masters in City and Regional Planning from the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy in 2003, where he specialized in land use issues and physical planning. Much of his research involves the use of analytical tools such as GIS technology and multivariate analysis to address planning and policy issues in New Jersey. In recent years, his research and publications have focused on such areas as agricultural viability and economic development, food security, and biosecurity issues involving the food supply.

Debra Palmer Keenan, Ph.D., Co-Author, is an Associate Professor/Extension Specialist in Community Nutrition residing in the Departments of Nutritional Sciences and Extension Specialist at Rutgers University. She wears many hats at Rutgers, including: Associate Director of the Nutrition and Food Security Program at the Food Policy Institute; Director of the NJ Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program; and, State Coordinator for the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program. Dr. Keenan also is also active in teaching and research specifically geared toward household food security and educational issues encountered when delivering nutrition education to the public, most specifically limited resource urban populations.

Audrey Adler, Co-Author, currently conducts and coordinates many community-based nutrition studies at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey working on projects sponsored by both government and private organizations. Before coming to nutrition and academia, Audrey worked for twenty years in the business sector, where she designed and managed computer software projects, among many other things; and, also worked in the food service industry as a chef at the corporate headquarters of an international company. Audrey has completed the educational requirements to become a Registered Dietitian, and will have completed her Masters of Science in Nutrition by the end of 2005.