



**National Report Prepared for Feeding America**

*January 2010*



**Chapter 15 – Changes in Client and Agency Characteristics:  
2005 to 2009**

**(Excerpted from Hunger in America 2010)**

**[www.feedingamerica.org](http://www.feedingamerica.org)**

**Prepared by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.**

Mathematica Reference No.: 06251-600

## 15. CHANGES IN CLIENT AND AGENCY CHARACTERISTICS: 2005 TO 2009

From 2005 to 2009 there were notable changes in many factors that traditionally have been associated with food security and hunger. The economy entered into a recession following the 2007 financial crisis; the housing market plummeted amid increasing variable interest rates and widespread foreclosures; and energy prices surged, particularly in the oil and gas markets. As a common indicator of labor market strength, the increase in the national unemployment rate from 5.2% to 8.7% reflects deteriorating economic conditions across this period.<sup>59</sup>

Concurrent with the economic downturn, participation in federal food and nutrition assistance programs increased, with some programs, such as SNAP, reaching record levels. For SNAP, the structure of the program was also evolving, as states were given the flexibility from the federal government to implement policies that eased program access and expanded program eligibility and outreach in an effort to increase the enrollment of low-income individuals in need of services. From 2005 to 2009, the number of participants increased from 25.4 million to 33.5 million.<sup>60</sup>

These changes may have affected the types of clients seeking emergency food services by altering the ways in which clients and their households allocate resources across categories of goods and services such as food, apparel, housing, and transportation. Some events, such as the decrease in household income associated with the loss of a job, can weaken a client's ability to make purchases across all categories. Other events, such as an increase in gas prices can force clients to cut back on specific categories, such as transportation and home heating or cooling.

---

<sup>59</sup> This is estimated over the HIA survey period of February through May of 2005 and 2009 using seasonally adjusted monthly national unemployment rates.

<sup>60</sup> These counts represent the number of individuals (not households) in all 50 states, and include the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The counts are estimated over the HIA survey period of February through May of 2005 and 2009 (see <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/34SNAPmonthly.htm>).

These events may even encourage tradeoffs between food and non-food purchases. For very poor clients who are already consuming near-subsistence levels of food, the effects of these tradeoffs on individual well-being and health can be dire.

The changes in economic and policy factors between 2005 and 2009 may also affect the number and types of agencies in the FA network and the programs they operate. More agencies or programs might be needed to respond to the potentially greater numbers of clients seeking emergency food services. In addition, agencies and programs may differ in the ways in which they respond to this elevated need, causing the composition of agencies in the FA network to change. For instance, more programs may shift resources across service areas or provide utility bill assistance, short-term financial assistance, or budget and credit counseling. Others might be forced to reduce meal portions or the quantity of food in food packages because of a lack of food to distribute. Finally, the intimate connection between the strength of the economy and the sources of funding for agencies and programs may not only shift funding across faith-based nonprofit, other nonprofit, and government sources, but may lead to changes in day-to-day operations and the sets of services that agencies and programs offer.

In this chapter we expand a subset of tables presented in chapters 5 through 14 to examine how client and agency characteristics have changed between 2005 and 2009. The 2005 estimates are taken from the 2006 Hunger in America report and the 2009 estimates are taken directly from tables presented in prior chapters of the current study. The 2005 and 2009 estimates in this chapter are directly comparable across years due to the close correspondence in survey methodology between the two studies.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Each table in this chapter contains a footnote indicating the number of the original table that presented the estimates in chapters 5 through 14. The percentage of missing, don't know, or refusal responses corresponding to the 2009 estimates for each table in this chapter can be found in this original set of tables.

## 15.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

In this section, we examine changes in the composition of clients seeking emergency food services through tabulations of household composition, employment, education, housing, income, and other characteristics. Table 15.1.1 estimates changes in a set of demographic characteristics including age, household size, and residential location.

TABLE 15.1.1  
CHANGES IN DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Pantry		Kitchen		Shelter		All Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
<b>Age</b>								
Households with children (under 18)	39.2%	39.7%	23.5%	25.1%	16.5%	19.7%	36.4%	37.7%
Households with children (0-5)	8.8%	8.8%	5.1%	6.2%	5.2%	6.3%	8.2%	8.5%
Households with elderly	10.5%	8.0%	9.0%	7.7%	2.4%	2.0%	10.0%	7.9%
<b>Race and Ethnicity</b>								
Non-Hispanic white	40.0%	40.5%	37.5%	39.5%	42.4%	40.2%	39.8%	40.3%
Non-Hispanic black	37.1%	32.2%	42.0%	39.6%	36.0%	39.1%	37.9%	33.6%
Hispanic	17.9%	21.8%	15.8%	15.2%	15.5%	14.0%	17.4%	20.5%
<b>Household Size</b>								
Households with 1 member	32.8%	30.6%	60.2%	59.7%	81.7%	82.8%	40.7%	37.4%
Households with more than 1 member	67.2%	69.4%	39.8%	40.3%	18.3%	17.2%	59.3%	62.6%
Households with single parents	17.3%	14.9%	6.5%	6.7%	6.7%	6.9%	14.8%	13.3%
Households with U.S. citizen	92.4%	87.8%	94.6%	94.0%	94.7%	96.4%	93.0%	89.1%
Clients in suburban/rural areas	47.9%	52.5%	24.9%	29.3%	27.2%	24.7%	42.6%	47.8%
Less than high school	39.6%	35.5%	30.6%	30.0%	32.0%	28.9%	37.5%	34.3%
<b>Clients that live in a House</b>								
Mobile home/trailer	11.4%	12.3%	3.3%	4.4%	1.4%	0.7%	9.3%	10.6%
Apartment	37.9%	36.9%	31.7%	32.8%	4.9%	6.2%	34.6%	34.7%

TABLE 15.1.1 (continued)

Clients that are homeless	3.0%	2.8%	26.1%	23.8%	80.4%	83.0%	12.1%	9.9%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 2, 3, 5, 6, 6a, 6b, 10, 11, 11a, 12, and 16 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Tables 5.2.1, 5.3.1, 5.5.1, 5.6.1, and 5.9.1.1.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of non-Hispanic white clients increased from 39.8% to 40.3%. The percentage of non-Hispanic black clients decreased from 37.9% to 33.6%.
- The percentage of client households with single parents decreased by 14.8% to 13.3%.
- The percentage of adult clients living in suburban or rural areas increased from 42.6% to 47.8%.
- The percentage of adult clients with less than a high school education decreased from 37.5% to 34.3%.
- The percentage of adult clients that are homeless decreased from 12.1% to 9.9% across all program sites and increased from 80.4% to 83.0% at shelters.

Table 15.1.2 describes changes in the employment status of all adults in client households and changes in the characteristics of the income distribution.

TABLE 15.1.2  
CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME CHARACTERISTICS

	Pantry Client Households		Kitchen Client Households		Shelter Client Households		All Client Households	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Current employment status of all adults in client households								
Full-time	14.5%	13.1%	15.9%	11.7%	12.9%	9.1%	14.6%	12.8%
Part-time	13.4%	13.6%	12.8%	13.7%	10.4%	13.3%	13.2%	13.6%
Unemployed	72.1%	73.3%	71.3%	74.6%	76.7%	77.6%	72.2%	73.6%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>65,773</b>	<b>77,335</b>	<b>14,882</b>	<b>19,530</b>	<b>4,647</b>	<b>5,647</b>	<b>85,302</b>	<b>102,512</b>
Percentage of client households with one or more adults employed	37.3%	37.9%	35.1%	30.3%	24.3%	22.8%	36.0%	36.0%
Percentage of households with incomes below the official federal poverty level during previous month	68.3%	70.5%	66.8%	71.4%	73.9%	81.1%	68.5%	71.2%
Monthly income among valid responses (in 2009 dollars) <sup>a</sup>								
Average	979	990	902	810	605	530	946	940
Median	825	800	704	670	275	220	825	770
Percentage of client households receiving Unemployment Compensation	3.4%	7.7%	2.7%	6.6%	1.9%	5.7%	3.2%	7.4%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 6 and 27 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Tables 5.2.1, 5.7.2, and 5.8.2.1.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup> For the calculation of the average and the median, responses given as a range were recoded to be the midpoint of the range.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of unemployed members of client households increased from 72.2% to 73.6%.
- The percentage of members of client households employed full-time decreased from 14.6% to 12.8%.
- The percentage of households with incomes below the federal poverty level during the previous month increased from 68.5% to 71.2%.
- The average monthly income level for client households decreased from \$946 to \$940 and the median monthly income level for client households decreased from \$825 to \$770.
- The percentage of households receiving unemployment compensation increased from 3.2% to 7.4%.

## 15.2 FOOD INSECURITY

In this section, we examine changes in household food security and changes in the relationship between household food security and household structure, SNAP participation and eligibility status, and trade-offs between food and other necessities. Table 15.2.1 begins by presenting the proportion of households that are food insecure for clients at pantries, kitchens, and shelters.

TABLE 15.2.1  
CHANGES IN FOOD SECURITY

	Pantry Client Households		Kitchen Client Households		Shelter Client Households		All Client Households	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Food secure	29.8%	24.0%	30.7%	27.5%	26.1%	24.5%	29.7%	24.5%
Food insecure with low food security	39.1%	41.0%	29.9%	31.6%	30.2%	31.1%	36.9%	39.2%
Food insecure with very low food security	31.1%	35.0%	39.4%	40.8%	43.7%	44.5%	33.3%	36.3%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 6.1.1.1.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of client households that had low food security increased from 36.9% to 39.2%.
- The percentage of client households that had very low food security increased from 33.3% to 36.3%.



Changes in food security levels between 2005 and 2009 may differ according to household composition. Table 15.2.2 presents these estimates.

TABLE 15.2.2  
CHANGES IN FOOD SECURITY, BY PRESENCE OF ELDERLY OR CHILDREN

	All Households		Households with Seniors		Households with Children		One-Person Households with Neither Children Nor Seniors		Households with Two or More People but with Neither Children Nor Seniors	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Food secure	29.7%	24.5%	48.0%	41.3%	26.9%	21.5%	23.2%	21.4%	24.7%	20.4%
Food insecure with low food security	36.9%	39.2%	35.8%	39.9%	41.8%	44.3%	32.5%	34.2%	38.2%	36.8%
Food insecure with very low food security	33.4%	36.3%	16.2%	18.8%	31.3%	34.2%	44.2%	44.4%	37.1%	42.8%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>52,041</b>	<b>60,085</b>	<b>11,536</b>	<b>11,946</b>	<b>15,987</b>	<b>20,934</b>	<b>16,598</b>	<b>19,820</b>	<b>7,920</b>	<b>9,805</b>

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 2, 3, 4, 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 6.1.1.1 and 6.1.1.4.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. In calculating percentages and sample sizes, we excluded item nonresponses to all variables involved.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of client households with seniors that had low food security increased from 35.8% to 39.9%. The corresponding increase for those with very low food security was from 16.2% to 18.8%.
- The percentage of client households with children that had low food security increased from 41.8% to 44.3%. The corresponding increase for those with very low food security was from 31.3% to 34.2%.

Between 2005 and 2009, there was a sizable national increase in the number of SNAP participants. Although we examine in the next section the extent to which the magnitude of this increase was mirrored by the population of emergency food clients, in Table 15.2.3 we describe food security levels for client households that are currently participating in SNAP, that appear eligible but are not currently participating, and that are ineligible.

TABLE 15.2.3

CHANGES IN FOOD SECURITY, BY SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AND ELIGIBILITY STATUS

	SNAP Benefit Receipt Status of Households							
	All Client Households		Receiving SNAP Benefits		Eligible, Not Receiving <sup>a</sup>		Ineligible Because of Income, Not Receiving <sup>a</sup>	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Food secure	28.7%	23.6%	25.3%	21.1%	27.6%	21.4%	47.6%	46.3%
Food insecure with low food security	37.0%	39.3%	38.4%	40.4%	37.3%	39.3%	30.0%	34.6%
Food insecure with very low food security	34.3%	37.0%	36.3%	38.5%	35.1%	39.3%	22.4%	19.1%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>48,852</b>	<b>56,960</b>	<b>19,107</b>	<b>25,354</b>	<b>24,975</b>	<b>26,177</b>	<b>4,770</b>	<b>5,429</b>

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Questions 42, 43, 44, 44a, 45, and 46 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 6.1.5.

NOTES: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. In calculating percentages and sample sizes, we excluded item nonresponses to all variables involved.

<sup>a</sup>Eligibility was estimated based on the previous month's income alone.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of client households participating in SNAP that had low food security increased from 38.4% to 40.4%. The corresponding increase for eligible nonparticipants was from 37.3% to 39.3%.

- The percentage of client households participating in SNAP that had very low food security increased from 36.3% to 38.5%. The corresponding increase for eligible nonparticipants was from 35.1% to 39.3%.

Deteriorating economic conditions between 2005 and 2009 may have encouraged trade-offs among food and other household necessities. Table 15.2.4 examines changes in the proportions of client households making these trade-offs and tabulates these results by food security status.

TABLE 15.2.4  
CHANGES IN HOUSEHOLD TRADE-OFFS BETWEEN FOOD AND NECESSITIES,  
BY FOOD SECURITY

	Food Security Status of Client Households									
	All Client Households		Food Secure		Food Insecure		Food Insecure with Low Food Security		Food Insecure with Very Low Food Security	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Choose between food and medical care										
Yes	31.7%	34.1%	10.5%	9.8%	40.7%	42.2%	31.4%	32.2%	51.0%	52.5%
No	68.3%	65.9%	89.5%	90.2%	59.3%	57.8%	68.6%	67.8%	49.0%	47.5%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>51,402</b>	<b>59,333</b>	<b>15,206</b>	<b>15,473</b>	<b>36,196</b>	<b>43,860</b>	<b>19,103</b>	<b>22,278</b>	<b>17,093</b>	<b>21,582</b>
Choose between food and utilities or heating fuel										
Yes	41.5%	46.1%	13.8%	16.6%	53.2%	55.9%	44.3%	45.7%	63.1%	66.5%
No	58.5%	53.9%	86.2%	83.4%	46.8%	44.1%	55.7%	54.3%	36.9%	33.5%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>51,390</b>	<b>59,281</b>	<b>15,200</b>	<b>15,459</b>	<b>36,190</b>	<b>43,822</b>	<b>19,084</b>	<b>22,262</b>	<b>17,106</b>	<b>21,560</b>
Choose between food and rent or mortgage										
Yes	35.0%	39.5%	9.8%	12.7%	45.6%	48.4%	35.0%	36.7%	57.4%	60.5%
No	65.0%	60.5%	90.2%	87.3%	54.4%	51.6%	65.0%	63.3%	42.6%	39.5%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>51,356</b>	<b>59,154</b>	<b>15,184</b>	<b>15,420</b>	<b>36,172</b>	<b>43,734</b>	<b>19,083</b>	<b>22,220</b>	<b>17,089</b>	<b>21,514</b>

TABLE 15.2.4 (continued)

SOURCE: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Questions 44, 44a, 45, 46, 52 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 6.5.2.

NOTES: Item nonresponses to all variables involved were excluded in calculating percentages and sample sizes.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of client households that had to choose between paying for food and paying for medical care increased from 31.7% to 34.1%. The percentage of client households that had to choose between paying for food and paying for utilities increased from 41.5% to 46.1%. The percentage of client households that had to choose between paying for food and paying for rent or a mortgage increased from 35.0% to 39.5%.
- The percentage of client households with very low food security that had to choose between paying for food and paying for utilities increased from 63.1% to 66.5%. For food secure households, the increase was from 13.8% to 16.6%.
- The percentage of client households with very low food security that had to choose between paying for food and paying for a rent or mortgage increased from 57.4% to 60.5%. For food secure households, the increase was from 9.8% to 12.7%.

### 15.3 USE OF FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

There were numerous changes between 2005 and 2009 to the structure of SNAP at the state level. For example, states were given more flexibility from the federal government to simplify the treatment of income in determining eligibility and the reporting of changes in income to maintain eligibility. Changes to the WIC program related to the food packages offered and to school certification procedures in the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program also occurred.<sup>62</sup>

The tables in this section explore changes in participation and eligibility in federal food assistance among emergency food clients. We focus on SNAP because it is the largest program in terms of program caseloads and cost. Table 15.3.1 describes these participation rates and, for SNAP, the length of time receiving benefits.

TABLE 15.3.1  
CHANGES IN THE USE OF FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

	Pantry Client Households		Kitchen Client Households		Shelter Client Households		All Client Households	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Client or anyone in the household had ever applied for SNAP benefits	67.1%	70.8%	70.2%	73.4%	71.4%	77.3%	67.9%	71.5%
Client or anyone in the household currently receiving SNAP benefits	35.9%	40.7%	35.0%	42.3%	31.1%	42.0%	35.4%	41.0%
Client or anyone in the household currently not receiving but received SNAP benefits during the previous 12 months	7.3%	6.2%	11.2%	8.8%	13.1%	13.5%	8.3%	7.0%

<sup>62</sup> The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 mandated direct certification of children in SNAP households for free school meals without application, to be phased in over three years beginning with school year 2006-2007.

TABLE 15.3.1 (continued)

	Pantry Client Households		Kitchen Client Households		Shelter Client Households		All Client Households	
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>
Among clients who are currently receiving SNAP benefits:								
Average number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits	203.2	196.2	157.4	156.4	69.1	87.4	187.2	184.3
Median number of weeks clients or their households have currently been receiving SNAP benefits	104	104	52	52	26	26	78	52
Average number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last <sup>a</sup>	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.8	3.4	2.5	2.7
Median number of weeks during the month over which SNAP benefits usually last <sup>a</sup>	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>14,028</b>	<b>17,440</b>	<b>3,557</b>	<b>5,659</b>	<b>1,598</b>	<b>2,395</b>	<b>19,183</b>	<b>25,494</b>
Percentage of households with children ages 0 to 3 years that participate in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	50.4%	54.3%	59.8%	52.2%	46.6%	51.0%	51.0%	54.1%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>4,547</b>	<b>5,506</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>5,288</b>	<b>6,562</b>
Percentage of households with school-aged children that participate in:								
National School Lunch program	62.4%	62.3%	59.7%	57.2%	53.1%	61.8%	62.0%	61.9%
School Breakfast Program	51.7%	53.9%	48.8%	48.4%	43.2%	57.5%	51.3%	53.6%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>15,756</b>	<b>17,972</b>	<b>1,518</b>	<b>2,094</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>868</b>	<b>18,019</b>	<b>20,934</b>

TABLE 15.3.1 (*continued*)

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 39, and 41 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 7.1.1 and 7.4.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup> Most SNAP households (67 percent) receive less than the maximum SNAP benefit with the expectation that they can contribute some of their own funds for food purchases. In other words, program benefits are not designed to last the full month in all households.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of clients or household members that were currently participating in SNAP increased from 35.4% to 41.0%. The increase among shelter clients was largest, from 31.1% to 42.0%.
- The median number of weeks clients or their households have been receiving SNAP benefits decreased from 78 weeks to 52 weeks. The median number of weeks that benefits last increased from 2 weeks to 3 weeks.
- Among households with at least one child age 0 to 3, the percentage that participate in WIC increased from 51.0% to 54.1%. Among households with at least one school-aged child, the percentage that participate in the National School Lunch Program decreased from 62.0% to 61.9%; the percentage that participate in the School Breakfast Program increased from 51.3% to 53.6%.



TABLE 15.3.2

CHANGES IN THE REASONS WHY CLIENTS OR THEIR HOUSEHOLDS ARE NOT CURRENTLY RECEIVING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS, FOR THOSE WHO HAVE APPLIED

Reasons Why Clients or Their Households Are Not Currently Receiving SNAP Benefits, for Those Who Have Applied for SNAP Benefits <sup>a</sup>	Pantry Client Households		Kitchen Client Households		Shelter Client Households		All Client Households	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
<b>Ineligibility</b>								
Ineligible income level	44.2%	44.5%	35.2%	32.3%	22.4%	20.3%	40.7%	41.3%
Change of household makeup	3.7%	2.7%	4.3%	2.7%	5.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.9%
Time limit for receiving the help ran out	5.5%	4.3%	9.5%	5.9%	8.3%	8.4%	6.5%	4.8%
Citizenship status	1.0%	1.3%	0.1%	1.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	1.3%
<b>SUBTOTAL<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>40.9%</b>	<b>34.6%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>48.5%</b>
<b>Inconvenience</b>								
Too much hassle	16.1%	12.4%	16.4%	16.8%	12.0%	15.0%	15.8%	13.1%
Hard to get to SNAP office	5.9%	4.3%	5.4%	4.9%	7.2%	8.5%	5.9%	4.6%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>15.3%</b>	<b>19.9%</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>16.2%</b>
<b>No Need</b>								
No need for benefits	5.4%	4.1%	9.1%	8.6%	6.0%	8.3%	6.1%	5.0%
Others need benefits more	2.2%	2.4%	5.1%	3.1%	3.3%	2.8%	2.8%	2.5%
Need is only temporary	3.6%	3.6%	5.9%	3.0%	5.9%	8.1%	4.2%	3.8%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
<b>Other</b>								
Other reasons <sup>c</sup>	24.0%	26.3%	26.9%	33.1%	31.1%	44.7%	25.2%	28.3%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>12,553</b>	<b>13,467</b>	<b>3,824</b>	<b>4,307</b>	<b>1,589</b>	<b>1,746</b>	<b>17,966</b>	<b>19,520</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 33 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 7.3.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses were accepted.

<sup>b</sup>The subtotal in this table indicates the percentage of people that provided one or more component items as their responses; thus it may differ from the sum of component items.

<sup>c</sup>This includes “waiting” and “in progress.”

We find that the percentage of clients that believe they are not receiving SNAP benefits because they are not eligible decreased from 49.8% to 48.5%. In addition, the percentage of clients that are not receiving SNAP benefits because it is too much hassle or is hard to get to the office decreased from 19.2% to 16.2%.

## 15.4 HEALTH STATUS

Job loss can affect one's health through the loss of health insurance that was either provided through an employer or purchased privately. The associated decrease in earned income can also lead to changes in health through changes in the amount and quality of food consumed. Table 15.4.1 examines changes in health status and the ability to pay medical bills between 2005 and 2009.

TABLE 15.4.1  
CHANGES IN HEALTH STATUS

	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry		Adult Clients at a Kitchen		Adult Clients at a Shelter		Adult Clients at All Program Sites	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Percentage of clients that indicated their health was poor	17.4%	16.8%	12.8%	11.6%	15.0%	8.7%	16.4%	15.6%
Percentage of clients that indicated someone else in the household was in poor health								
Yes	19.9%	21.4%	9.8%	10.8%	3.7%	3.4%	17.1%	19.0%
No	46.6%	47.2%	28.9%	28.7%	13.0%	12.7%	41.3%	42.8%
Live alone	33.5%	31.4%	61.3%	60.5%	83.3%	84.0%	41.6%	38.2%
Households with at least one member reported to be in poor health	31.7%	32.3%	20.3%	20.0%	17.9%	11.5%	28.8%	29.5%
Percentage of clients that had unpaid medical bills	41.8%	46.9%	38.2%	42.8%	45.3%	49.7%	41.4%	46.5%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 20, 21, 22a-f, 23, and 24 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Tables 8.1.1 and 8.1.2.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of clients at all program sites that are in poor health decreased from 16.4% to 15.6%; however, the percentage of clients that indicated someone else in the household was in poor health increased from 17.1% to 19.0%.
- The percentage of clients that had unpaid medical bills increased from 41.4% to 46.5%. The magnitude of the increase was similar for pantries, kitchens, and shelters.

## 15.5 SERVICES RECEIVED AT FOOD PROGRAMS

In this section, we examine how changes to the economy and federal food assistance policies between 2005 and 2009 may have changed clients' use of emergency food services and the satisfaction with these services. Table 15.5.1 examines changes in the number of kitchens and pantries that households used over this period.

TABLE 15.5.1  
CHANGES IN THE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT PANTRIES OR KITCHENS USED

	Pantry Client Households		Kitchen Client Households		Shelter Client Households		All Client Households	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Percentage of clients not using any food pantries during the previous month	n.a	n.a.	54.8%	49.9%	72.2%	72.5%	14.0%	10.7%
Percentage of clients using 1 food pantry during the previous month	82.0%	79.7%	28.6%	29.2%	16.3%	16.1%	68.6%	69.4%
Percentage of clients using 2 or more different food pantries during the previous month	18.0%	20.3%	16.6%	20.8%	11.5%	11.4%	17.4%	19.9%
Percentage of clients not using any soup kitchens during the previous month	85.4%	87.0%	n.a.	n.a.	50.4%	48.8%	68.6%	72.9%
Percentage of clients using 1 soup kitchen during the previous month	10.2%	8.9%	76.6%	73.9%	27.1%	29.6%	22.5%	19.0%
Percentage of clients using 2 or more different soup kitchens during the previous month	4.4%	4.1%	23.5%	26.1%	22.5%	21.6%	8.9%	8.1%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 56 and 57a of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 9.1.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

n.a. = not applicable.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of pantry clients that used more than one food pantry during the previous month increased from 18.0% to 20.3%. Among all clients, this percentage increased from 17.4% to 19.9%.
- The percentage of kitchen clients that used more than one kitchen during the previous month increased from 23.5% to 26.1%. Among all clients, this percentage decreased from 8.9% to 8.1%.

Table 15.5.2 examines changes in the degree of satisfaction that respondents felt with the food services they were receiving from providers in the FA network.

TABLE 15.5.2  
CHANGES IN THE SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES AT FOOD PROGRAMS

	Adult Clients Who Pick Up Food at a Pantry		Adult Clients at a Kitchen		Adult Clients at a Shelter		Adult Clients at All Program Sites	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Percentage of adult clients that said they were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the amount of food they received from their FA provider.	92.6%	92.5%	92.7%	92.1%	83.7%	85.6%	92.0%	92.1%
Percentage of adult clients that said they were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the variety of food they received from their FA provider.	90.7%	91.1%	89.4%	89.2%	78.7%	79.0%	89.6%	90.1%
Percentage of adult clients that said they were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the overall quality of food they received from their FA provider.	93.9%	94.0%	91.6%	90.3%	82.9%	81.2%	92.7%	92.7%
Percentage of adult clients that said they were treated with respect by the staff who distribute food either “all of the time” or “most of the time”	91.6%	90.7%	91.0%	89.0%	84.2%	87.2%	91.0%	90.2%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>37,986</b>	<b>42,441</b>	<b>10,667</b>	<b>13,552</b>	<b>4,225</b>	<b>5,092</b>	<b>52,878</b>	<b>61,085</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 53 and 54 of the client survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 9.2.1.

TABLE 15.5.2 (continued)

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of clients that were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the amount of the food they received at the programs remained about the same (92.1%).
- The percentage of clients that were treated with respect by the staff all or most of the time decreased from 91.0% to 90.2%.



## 15.6 AGENCIES AND FOOD PROGRAMS

Starting with this section, we shift the focus from changes in the client characteristics to changes in agency characteristics from 2005 to 2009. Table 15.6.1 describes changes in the distributions of agency types for different agency programs.

TABLE 15.6.1  
CHANGES IN THE TYPES OF AGENCY THAT OPERATE THE PROGRAM

	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs		Agencies with Pantry, Kitchen, or Shelter	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit	73.6%	71.6%	64.7%	61.8%	43.1%	39.2%	68.5%	67.3%
Other private nonprofit	18.3%	19.6%	27.9%	29.1%	50.1%	51.0%	23.4%	23.7%
Governmental	2.3%	2.0%	2.5%	2.3%	1.8%	2.3%	2.4%	2.1%
Community Action Program (CAP)	3.2%	2.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.6%	2.4%	2.9%	2.5%
Other <sup>a</sup>	2.6%	4.2%	3.0%	5.0%	3.4%	5.1%	2.8%	4.4%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>	<b>21,834</b>	<b>27,452</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 27 of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 10.6.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup>This includes various community-based organizations.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of pantries, kitchens, or shelters run by a faith-based or religion-affiliated nonprofit agencies decreased from 68.5% to 67.3%.

- The percentage of pantries, kitchens, or shelters run by private nonprofit agencies that are not faith-based or affiliated with a religion increased from 23.4% to 23.7%.
- The percentage of pantries, kitchens, or shelters run by government-affiliated agencies decreased from 2.4% to 2.1%.
- The percentage of pantries, kitchens, or shelters run by Community Action Programs decreased from 2.9% to 2.5%.

As the composition of clients seeking emergency food services changes, agencies and programs may respond by reallocating resources to provide new services. Table 15.6.2 presents changes in the percentages of food programs that supply the additional services listed.

TABLE 15.6.2

## CHANGES IN AGENCY OR PROGRAM PROVISION OF OTHER SERVICES IN ADDITION TO FOOD DISTRIBUTION

	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Percentage of agencies or programs offering other services in addition to food distribution						
Nutrition counseling	22.7%	24.0%	32.4%	34.4%	40.7%	39.4%
Eligibility counseling for WIC	13.1%	13.3%	7.2%	7.3%	24.8%	27.9%
Eligibility counseling for SNAP benefits	19.2%	22.2%	12.7%	13.8%	36.5%	40.7%
Employment training	8.6%	9.5%	21.1%	20.0%	38.0%	40.6%
Tax preparation help (Earned Income Tax Credit)	5.8%	6.3%	6.2%	7.5%	11.9%	13.6%
Utility bill assistance (Low-Income Heating and Energy Assistance Programs)	20.3%	19.5%	8.2%	9.2%	13.0%	15.0%
Short-term financial assistance	14.2%	13.7%	6.4%	7.3%	18.6%	18.4%
Budget and credit counseling	10.7%	11.0%	7.2%	8.7%	37.7%	40.8%
Transportation	15.0%	15.2%	23.0%	23.2%	63.3%	63.6%
Clothing	46.2%	46.3%	36.9%	37.0%	74.7%	74.9%
Senior programs	12.0%	11.4%	15.2%	14.9%	6.5%	6.5%
No additional services	25.1%	24.9%	17.3%	15.2%	1.9%	3.9%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 4 of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 10.5.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of programs providing nutrition counseling increased from 22.7% to 24.0% for pantries and from 32.4% to 34.4% for kitchens. For shelters, the percentage decreased from 40.7% to 39.4%.
- The percentage of kitchens providing utility bill assistance, such as low-income heating and energy assistance programs, increased from 8.2% to 9.2%. For shelters, the percentage increased from 13.0% to 15.0%.
- The percentage of pantries providing budget and credit counseling increased from 10.7% to 11.0%. For kitchens, the percentage increased from 7.2% to 8.7%. For shelters, the percentage increased from 37.7% to 40.8%.

Agencies and programs may also respond to economic-driven changes in the client demand for emergency food services by changing internal practices regarding rationing or limiting food in order to provide some food to all clients. Table 15.6.3 shows changes in the varying degrees of frequency with which the food programs stretched food resources.

TABLE 15.6.3  
CHANGES IN THE FREQUENCY OF STRETCHING FOOD RESOURCES

During 2008, How Often Did the Program Have to Reduce Meal Portions or Reduce the Quantity of Food in Food Packages Because of a Lack of Food	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Never	39.4%	34.5%	65.1%	62.2%	73.2%	68.6%
Rarely	42.5%	40.8%	25.6%	26.0%	20.5%	21.3%
SUBTOTAL	81.9%	75.2%	90.6%	88.2%	93.8%	89.9%
Sometimes	17.0%	22.6%	8.7%	11.0%	5.7%	9.3%
Always	1.1%	2.2%	0.7%	0.8%	0.5%	0.8%
SUBTOTAL	18.1%	24.8%	9.4%	11.8%	6.2%	10.1%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 13 of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 12.2.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of programs that never experienced the need to stretch food resources (reduce meal portions or reduce the quantity of food in food packages) decreased from 39.4% to 34.5% for pantries, from 65.1% to 62.2% for kitchens, and from 73.2% to 68.6% for shelters.
- The percentage of programs that sometimes or always experienced the need to stretch food resources increased from 18.1% to 24.8% for pantries, from 9.4% to 11.8% for kitchens, and from 6.2% to 10.1% for shelters.

Changing client demand may also affect the abilities of agencies and programs to obtain resources that are required to operate emergency food programs effectively, including food, staffing, and physical space. Table 15.6.4 examines changes in the sources of food reported by the providers and Table 15.6.5 describes changes in the use of paid staff and volunteer staff.

TABLE 15.6.4  
CHANGES IN THE SOURCES OF FOOD DISTRIBUTED BY PROGRAMS

Sources of Food	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Average percentage of food received from food bank(s)	74.2%	75.5%	49.0%	49.6%	41.5%	41.1%
Percentage of programs receiving food from: <sup>a</sup>						
Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) or The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP/EFAP) or the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR)	68.7%	59.8%	49.4%	41.2%	45.9%	38.1%
Church or religious congregations	76.2%	80.6%	58.7%	64.4%	56.2%	58.1%
Local merchant or farmer donations	40.8%	46.3%	45.8%	48.2%	45.0%	49.0%
Local food drives (e.g., Boy Scouts)	49.9%	54.5%	27.2%	31.9%	40.3%	40.7%
Food purchased by agency	53.9%	58.0%	74.9%	75.1%	81.4%	81.4%
Other <sup>b</sup>	22.4%	21.1%	19.3%	18.7%	24.6%	21.1%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 8, 8a, and 8b of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 13.1.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses were accepted.

<sup>b</sup>This includes individual donations, organization gardens, and donations from other volunteer or civic groups.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of food distributed that comes from food bank(s) increased from 74.2% to 75.5% for pantries. For kitchens, the percentage increased from 49.0% to 49.6%. For shelters, the percentage decreased from 41.5% to 41.1%.
- The percentage of food distributed that comes from CSFP, TEFAP/EFAP, or FDPIR decreased for all types of programs. The percentage decreased from 68.7% to 59.8% for pantries, from 49.4% to 41.2% for kitchens, and from 45.9% to 38.1% for shelters.
- The percentage of food distributed that comes from local merchant or farmer donations increased for all types of programs. The percentage increased from 40.8% to 46.3% for pantries, from 45.8% to 48.2% for kitchens, and from 45.0% to 49.0% for shelters.
- The percentage of food distributed that comes from local food drives increased for all types of programs. The percentage increased from 49.9% to 54.5% for pantries, from 27.2% to 31.9% for kitchens, and from 40.3% to 40.7% for shelters.

TABLE 15.6.5

## CHANGES IN STAFF AND VOLUNTEER RESOURCES DURING PREVIOUS WEEK

Staff and Volunteer Resources	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Percentage of agencies that rely entirely on volunteers	66.2%	67.7%	40.5%	42.0%	10.8%	15.3%
Percentage of agencies that use volunteers	89.1%	92.6%	86.4%	87.1%	71.4%	71.8%
Number of volunteers among valid responses						
Average	9	10	15	16	9	9
Median	5	6	7	8	3	3
Number of volunteer hours among valid responses (hours)						
Average	35	39	58	60	51	49
Median	35	15	58	20	51	12
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to questions 15, 16, and 26 of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 13.2.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of programs that had no paid staff in their workforce during the week prior to this study increased from 66.2% to 67.7% for pantries, from 40.5% to 42.0% for kitchens, and from 10.8% to 15.3% for shelters.
- The average number of volunteer hours increased from 35 hours to 39 hours for pantries and from 58 to 60 hours for kitchens. It decreased from 51 hours to 12 hours for shelters.



Changes in the composition of clients and the overall demand for emergency food services may affect the types and quantities of food that food banks' provide to their agencies and may encourage agencies to alter the purchase of some types of food relative to others for food not obtained from food banks. Table 15.6.6 examines changes in the categories of products that programs purchased with cash from sources other than their food bank resources. Table 15.6.7 presents changes in what products the providers would like to be able to obtain in greater quantity from their food banks.

TABLE 15.6.6

## CHANGES IN PRODUCTS PURCHASED FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN FOOD BANK

Categories of Products Programs Purchased with Cash from Sources Other than the Agency's Food Bank <sup>a</sup>	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Bread, cereal, rice, and pasta	37.7%	45.1%	53.4%	58.8%	59.1%	61.0%
Fresh fruits and vegetables	21.6%	26.0%	59.0%	64.1%	67.8%	67.0%
Canned or frozen fruits and vegetables	29.6%	35.6%	43.1%	49.9%	44.3%	48.9%
Meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts	40.2%	41.3%	69.0%	68.8%	75.2%	71.5%
Milk, yogurt, and cheese	20.3%	24.6%	58.7%	62.9%	73.9%	71.3%
Fats, oils, condiments, and sweets	16.1%	20.6%	51.0%	57.6%	53.6%	56.2%
Cleaning or personal hygiene products, diapers, and toilet-paper	36.0%	39.9%	53.6%	54.7%	81.4%	79.2%
Other <sup>b</sup>	7.9%	7.8%	11.6%	10.4%	11.2%	8.2%
No outside purchases	31.5%	27.6%	7.4%	8.4%	5.0%	6.5%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 22 of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 13.3.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food clients of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses were accepted.

<sup>b</sup>This includes beverages, such as coffee, tea, and juice; paper products, such as plastic utensils, paper plates, and garbage bags; and laundry products.

Between 2005 and 2009, the following changes took place:

- The percentage of pantries and kitchens purchasing products from sources other than food banks increased for nearly all product categories. This was not true for shelters.
- The percentage of programs that purchased bread, cereal, rice, and pasta increased from 37.7% to 45.1% for pantries, from 53.4% to 58.8% for kitchens, and from 59.1% to 61.0% for shelters.
- The percentage of programs that purchased fresh fruits and vegetables increased from 21.6% to 26.0% for pantries and from 59.0% to 64.1% for kitchens. For shelters, it decreased from 67.8% to 67.0%.
- The percentage of programs that purchased canned or frozen fruits and vegetables increased from 29.6% to 35.6% for pantries, from 43.1% to 49.9% for kitchens, and from 44.3% to 48.9% for shelters.

TABLE 15.6.7  
CHANGES IN PRODUCTS NEEDED FROM FOOD BANKS

Categories of Food and Nonfood Products Programs Need or Need More of from Their Food Bank <sup>a</sup>	Pantry Programs		Kitchen Programs		Shelter Programs	
	2005	2009	2005	2009	2005	2009
Bread, cereal, rice, and pasta	42.1%	47.3%	30.8%	36.9%	33.1%	38.7%
Fresh fruits and vegetables	35.0%	41.7%	49.2%	53.0%	51.4%	54.4%
Canned or frozen fruits and vegetables	33.1%	35.4%	33.1%	36.5%	25.7%	31.8%
Meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts	60.9%	56.6%	63.0%	59.7%	62.4%	61.2%
Milk, yogurt, and cheese	37.6%	45.9%	43.0%	48.4%	51.1%	55.1%
Fats, oils, condiments, and sweets	19.9%	24.5%	27.5%	33.2%	27.1%	32.3%
Cleaning or personal hygiene products, diapers, and toilet paper	53.7%	57.7%	37.2%	42.3%	63.1%	64.5%
Other <sup>b</sup>	8.7%	8.0%	9.5%	8.1%	11.3%	7.6%
<b>SAMPLE SIZE (N)</b>	<b>18,436</b>	<b>23,842</b>	<b>4,514</b>	<b>6,064</b>	<b>2,704</b>	<b>3,728</b>

Source: This table was constructed based on usable responses to Question 23 of the agency survey. The 2009 estimates in this table can be found in Table 14.1.1.

Notes: All usable responses were weighted as described in Chapter 3 and in the Technical Appendix volume to represent all emergency food programs of the FA National Network. The sample sizes (N) also include missing data.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple responses were accepted.

<sup>b</sup>This includes paper products, such as plastic utensils, paper plates, and garbage bags; beverages, such as juice, coffee, and tea; and dietary supplements, such as vitamins and Ensure.

Between 2005 and 2009 the percentage of pantries, kitchens, and shelters that need more products from food banks increased for all product categories except for meat, poultry, fish, beans, eggs, and nuts and “other” products such as paper products, beverages, and dietary supplements. Other changes include:

- The percentage of programs that need more bread, cereal, rice, and pasta increased from 42.1% to 47.3% for pantries, from 30.8% to 36.9% for kitchens, and from 33.1% to 38.7% for shelters.
- The percentage of programs that need more fresh fruits and vegetables increased from 35.0% to 41.7% for pantries, from 49.2% to 53.0% for kitchens, and from 51.4% to 54.4% for shelters.

- The percentage of programs that need more canned or frozen fruits and vegetables increased from 33.1% to 35.4% for pantries, from 33.1% to 36.5% for kitchens, and from 25.7% to 31.8% for shelters.