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**Project and Organization Background**

The Food Access and Pantry Services survey was initiated by Food for People, Humboldt County’s Food Bank to evaluate the services at its various pantry sites, assess the food security status of clients and additional needs. Food for People also included other questions regarding health care and other social service needs at the request of other community organizations.

The Community Benefits Department of St. Joseph Health – Humboldt County generously provided funding for the survey administration and analysis. The Community Benefits Department of St. Joseph Health – Humboldt County sponsors, develops, manages, and sustains healthy community initiatives for vulnerable populations of Humboldt County.

The California Center for Rural Policy at Humboldt State University (CCRP) consulted on its administration and performed survey analysis and summary results. CCRP’s mission is to conduct research that informs policy, builds community, and promotes the health and well-being of rural people and environments.

Food for People’s goal is to eliminate hunger and improve the health and well-being of the community through access to healthy and nutritious foods, community education and advocacy. Food for People has piloted innovative programs such as a Choice Pantry at their main Eureka site, procuring fresh fruits and vegetables from local farmers, and working with funders and farmers’ market managers to provide a Market Match for CalFresh and WIC (Women, Infants, and Children) recipients.

**Research Team**

Anne Holcomb, Executive Director of Food for People

Martha Shanahan, Director of Community Benefits at St. Joseph Health

Connie Stewart, Executive Director of CCRP

Dawn Arledge, Director of Health Research at CCRP

Sarah Williams, Research Technician at CCRP

Larissa May Wilcox, Research Analyst at CCRP
**Methods**

**Study Design and Sample**

The Food Access and Pantry Services survey was designed collaboratively by Food for People, CCRP, and St. Joseph’s Health, with input from other community health and human services organizations (questions 34-45 are from the USDA Household Food Security Short Form). Two dollars were offered as incentive to participants who completed the survey, thanks to a generous donation from the Community Benefits Department of St. Joseph Health – Humboldt County.

The survey was administered at 15 pantry sites in Humboldt County in September and October, 2014. Because the food boxes are offered to households on a monthly basis, each pantry site was surveyed during only one month to reduce the chance of respondents taking it more than once. The survey was administered by food pantry volunteers that did not work at the pantry site surveyed and by CCRP staff. Survey participants were not randomly selected, volunteers invited clients to take the survey and offered assistance to those that were unable to complete analysis independently. Spanish speaking volunteers were available for those who needed to take the survey in Spanish. This survey was preceded by a similar survey administered in 2011, since that time purchasing increased dramatically by a partnership with Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

The 15 food pantry sites included were:

1. Arcata: Campbell Creek Connexion
2. Arcata: Seniors
3. Blue Lake: Community Resource Center/Mad River Grange
4. Bridgeville: Community Center
5. Eureka: Food for People
6. Eureka: Humboldt Senior Resource Center
7. Ferndale: Community Church
8. Fortuna: St. Joseph’s Pantry Shelf
9. Garberville: Presbyterian Church
10. Loleta: Community Church
11. McKinleyville: Food Pantry Family Resource Center
12. Orick: Community Resource Center
13. Scotia: Bread for Life/ Rio Dell Community Resource Center
14. Trinidad: Lions Club
15. Willow Creek: Community Resource Center Pantry

**Analysis**

Surveys were scanned in using SNAP Survey and cleaned on a case by case basis. For further analysis raw data was exported into SPSS, where data frequencies and odds ratios were analyzed, graphed, and/or put into tables.
Qualitative data was analyzed using ATLAS.ti, a qualitative analysis program. Codes were then created to identify the common themes that emerged in the responses.

Six food security questions taken directly from a USDA Food Security (questions 34-45) were scored and analyzed following USDA methodology to assess each respondent’s food security status.

**Limitations**

This survey provided a snapshot of information from pantry clients during the months of either September or October in 2014. The participants were not randomly selected; all clients who attended on the days that volunteers were surveying were asked to participate. The survey results reflect only the responses of those who chose to participate and do not necessarily describe the entire clientele that the pantry site serves.
Results:

Response Rates and Demographics

A total of 696 surveys were completed by clients, representing 27.2% of the food pantry households served in September and October 2014. Surveys were administered in such a way that each survey should represent one household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity (n = 673)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race (n = 660)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (n = 687)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (n = 683)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34 years</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45 years</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-54 years</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years or older</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a fairly even distribution of men and women, with 332 men and 349 women participating.

The majority of respondents (n = 489) indicated “white” as their race. The second largest population of respondents (n = 68) were Hispanic/Latino. The third largest population of respondents (n = 61) were American Indian/Alaskan Native. Fifty-seven (57) respondents were of two or more races and thirty-seven (37) participants declined to state.

The majority of respondents (n = 416), ranged from 35-64 years, 111 respondents were at or over 65 years and 156 respondents were between 18 and 34 years old.
Education

1. (Q5) What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

Forty-six percent (46%) of food pantry respondents reported either some high school, high school degree, or GED / certificate equivalent. Forty-eight (48%) percent of respondents reported either some college, an AA degree, or a Bachelor’s degree. Six percent (6%) of respondents reported having been to Graduate school or some post graduate training.

CalFresh

2. (Q7) Do you currently receive CalFresh (food stamps) each month?

Thirty-four percent (34%) of respondents reported participating in CalFresh. Nearly 6000 people in Humboldt County received CalFresh in 2014, which is about 4.5% of the total population.¹
3. **(Q8) If not, have you applied for CalFresh (food stamps) in the past year?**

23% of respondents who answered this question reported that they had applied for CalFresh in the last year.

4. **(Q9) If you have not applied, please explain why (check all that apply):**

Of the respondents who have not applied, roughly 42.9% are on SSI and are not eligible. Another 14.6% of participants stated that they are ineligible because their income is too high.

California is the only state that excludes participation in CalFresh for individuals who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI), a federally funded program which provides income support for individuals aged 65 or older, blind or disabled. Instead of allowing SSI participants to qualify for CalFresh, the state has a program called State Supplementary Payment (SSP) which offers cash payment to supplement SSI.²
36% of respondents reported receiving CalFresh. 47% of respondents were not eligible to receive CalFresh. Of those not eligible 133 respondents reported that they had applied but did not qualify, 23 respondents reported that their income is too high to receive CalFresh, and 150 respondents reported that they receive SSI and thus cannot qualify for CalFresh.

17% of respondents were found to be possibly eligible for CalFresh, reporting that they need more help with paperwork, that they are planning on applying soon, or that they don’t want to apply. Thus, nearly 1 in 5 people who attend the pantry may be eligible for, but not receiving, CalFresh.

For more CalFresh analysis see Appendix A.

**Employment**

5. (Q10) How would you describe your ability to work (check all that apply)?

35% of respondents report that they are able to work, 37% of respondents report that they are not able to work, and 28% of respondents are either retired or staying home to take care of others.
6. (Q11) Does anyone in your household have a job?

77% of respondents reported living in a jobless household.

7. (Q12) Do you currently have a job or jobs?

85% of respondents reported not currently having a job.

8. (Q13) Which of the following describes your job or jobs (check all that apply)?

25% of respondents report that they have full time employment.
9. (Q14) How likely would you say it is that you will become unemployed in the next 12 months?

124 respondents, who answered this question, reported that they feel secure in their employment.

For more employment analysis see Appendix B.

**Pantry**

10. (Q17) Which pantry do you go to most often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pantry</th>
<th>Households Served</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of served who filled out survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arcata: Campbell Creek Connexion</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcata: Arcata Seniors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lake: Blue Lake Community Resource Center/Mad River Grange</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeville: Community Center</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka: Food for People</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka: Humboldt Senior Resource Center</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferndale: Community Center</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortuna: St. Joseph’s Pantry Shelf</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garberville: Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loleta: Community Church</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinleyville: Food Pantry Family Resource Center</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orick: Community Resource Center</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotia: Bread for Life/Rio Dell Community Resource Center</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad: Lions Club</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek: Community Resource Center Pantry</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2375</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. (Q18) I receive food from the pantry:

The majority of respondents are attending their food pantry once a month.

12. (Q19) I am happy with the amount of food I receive from the pantry:

Nearly 7 out of 10 respondents agree that they are happy with the amount of food they receive from the pantry.
13. (Q20) I am happy with the quality of food I receive from the pantry:

![Figure 13. Happy with the quality of food (N = 602):](image)

3 out of 4 respondents agree that they are happy with the quality of food that they receive from the pantry.

14. (Q21) I can choose healthy food at the pantry:

![Figure 14. Can choose healthy food (N = 649):](image)

8 out of 10 respondents agree that they can choose healthy food at the pantry.

15. (Q22) The food I receive from the pantry meets my dietary needs:

![Figure 15. Food meets dietary needs (N = 647):](image)

6 out of 10 respondents agree that the food they receive from the pantry meets their dietary needs.
16. (Q23) I am able to access the food pantry as much as I need:

More than 5 out of 10 respondents report that they agree that they are able to access the pantry as much as they need to.

17. (Q24) If you are not able to access the food pantry as much as you need to, what are the challenges that prevent you (check all that apply):

43% of respondents reported transportation as an obstacle in pantry access. 28% of respondents reported that the pantry is not open enough for them to access it as much as they need.

For more pantry access analysis see Appendix C.
18. (Q25) I would like information on the following to be available at the pantry (check all that apply):

Many respondents requested information on dental care (150), housing (148), community gardens (135), and community events (131). Information on transportation (121), CalFresh (117), and employment (116) were also frequently requested by respondents.
19. (Q26) What other services or activities would help you or your family?

Many residents report that they would benefit from more food services (24) like the food pantry as well as transportation services (17).

‘Other’ category included wanting a counselor or someone to talk to, social workers, and someone to explain available services and help fill out forms.
20. (Q27) Please list 3 kinds of food you would like to see more of at the pantry:

Top 3 requests were: proteins (n=299), such as meat and beans, dairy products (n = 270), and produce (n = 262).

Other Food Items Requested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast foods</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condiments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courgette</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jams and Jellies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shampoo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby food</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booze</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chips &amp; crackers &amp; snacks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Foods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene items</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toddler foods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-perishable food</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Butter</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Products</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staples</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Food</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household Food Security

25. (Q32) The months when money is tight, I sometimes have to choose between food and... (check all that apply):

Two hundred and forty (240) respondents reported that transportation competes with food as an expense in months when money is tight. One hundred and ninety-seven (197) respondents reported that rent competes with food as an expense in months when money is tight.

Figure 21. Competing expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transportation</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilities</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medications</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dental care</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health care</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two hundred and forty (240) respondents reported that transportation competes with food as an expense in months when money is tight. One hundred and ninety-seven (197) respondents reported that rent competes with food as an expense in months when money is tight.
27. (Q34 – 44) Food Security Status:

Questions 34-44 of the Food Access and Pantry Services survey are from the US Household Food Security survey. They include questions such as “In the last 12 months did you ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn’t enough money for food?” and “In the last 12 months, did you ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn’t enough money for food?”

56% of respondents were experiencing very low food security and 21% of respondents were experiencing low food security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Food Security</td>
<td>No reported indications of food-access problems or limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Food Security</td>
<td>One or two reports of food-access problems or limitations, typically of anxiety over food sufficiency or shortage of food. Little or no indication of changes in diet or intake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Food Security</td>
<td>Reports of reduced quality, variety, or desirability of diet. Little or no indication of reduced food intake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Food Security</td>
<td>Reports of multiple indications of disrupted eating patterns and reduced food intake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more food security analysis see Appendix D.
Local Circumstances

28. (Q50) In general, has your local area become a better or worse place to live in the past year?

Respondents reported in nearly equal numbers that their local area better, worse, or remained the same.

29. (Q51) Is the following statement true: “In my local area, children and older people feel free to move about safely”:

69% of respondents reported that children and older people feel free to move about safely in their local areas.

30. (Q52) To what extent do you feel that people in your local area help one another? (n = 607):

21% of people report that people in their local area always help each other.
31. (Q53) In the past 12 months, have you been a victim of a crime?

28% (or 28,000 per 100,000) of respondents reported that they have been the victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

Eureka’s crime rate is 498.8 per 100,000 (~0.50%) residents, Arcata’s is 262.7 per 100,000 (~0.26%) residents, and Fortuna’s is 305.1 per 100,000 (~0.31%) residents; the national average crime rate is 301.1 per 100,000 (~0.30%).3,4,5

For more local circumstances analysis see Appendix E.

Health

32. (Q15) Do you have diabetes?

14% of respondents reported that they have diabetes. This rate is higher than the reported Humboldt County diabetes rate (8%) as well as both the average California diabetes rate (8.6%) and the average national diabetes rate (8.3%).6,7

For more diabetes analysis see Appendix F.
33. (Q16) Does anyone in your household have diabetes?

18% of respondents have or live with people who have diabetes.

34. (Q54) Do you or anyone in your house smoke (check all that apply)?

59% of respondents report that either they or someone in their household, or both, smoke.

Approximately 19% of adults in Humboldt County are smokers.⁶

For more smoking analysis see Appendix G.
35. **(Q55) Timing of last doctor visit of respondent or members of their household:**

Three hundred and nineteen (319) respondents reported having been or having a household member have been to the doctor in the last 3 months.

For more doctor visit analysis see Appendix H.

36. **(Q56) Timing of last dentist visit of respondent or members of their household:**

Three hundred and fifteen (315) respondents reported having not been and not having a household member been to the dentist in more than a year.

For more dentist visit analysis see Appendix I.
37. (Q57) Timing of last emergency room visit of respondent or members of their household:

One hundred eighteen (118) respondents reported having been, or having a household member been, to the emergency room in the last 3 months.

For more emergency room visit analysis see Appendix J.
Transportation

31% of respondents reported having sporadic or rare transportation to the pantry.

36% of respondents reported having sporadic or rare transportation to health care services.

34% of respondents reported having sporadic or rare transportation to the grocery store.
39% of respondents reported having sporadic or rare transportation to social services.

Table 4. Rare Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Rare Transportation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never marked rare transportation</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once marked rare transportation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice marked rare transportation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three marked times rare transportation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four marked times rare transportation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always marked rare transportation</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 5 questions concerning transportation, respondents who marked ‘rare’ consistently were quantified. 352 (68.5%) respondents reported never having rare transportation. 66 (12.8%) respondents reported always having rare transportation.

For more transportation analysis see Appendix K.

47% of respondents reported having sporadic or rare transportation to where you want to go.
Respondents were asked to complete the following questions if they had children living with them.

**Children**

44. (Q60) Are there children under the age of 18 living in your household?

![Figure 38. Children in household (N = 319):](image)

One hundred and forty-six (146) respondents reported that they had children living in their household.

For more transportation analysis see Appendix L.

45. (Q61) How many children under the age of 18 are living in your household?

![Figure 39. How many children (N = 159):](image)

One hundred and eight (108) respondents reported having only 1 or 2 children in their household. Thirty-two (32) respondents reported having four or more children.
46. (Q62) In what school districts do your children attend school (check all that apply)?

Thirty-five (35) respondents reported that their children attend school in Eureka.
47. (Q63) What types of services have the child/children in your household used (check all that apply)?

Figure 41. Types of services child/children in household use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free and reduced meals at school</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school snack</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpack's-weekend food program</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer lunch</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family resource centers and play groups</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized child care</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred and fifteen (n = 115) respondents listed the service utilized by their children as free and reduced meals at school.

WIC, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, was the second most utilized service for children of survey respondents (n = 59).
48. (Q64) What is your relationship with the child/children in your household (check all that apply)?

One hundred and twenty-one (121) respondents reported that they were parents of the children living in their household.

49. Are you a single parent living with your child/children?

Fifty-four (54) respondents reported that they were single parents. Nationally 29.5% of parents were single in 2008. 9
50. Are you a grandparent living with and raising your grandchild/grandchildren?

Seventeen (17) respondents reported that they were grandparents raising their grandchildren.
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All included cross tabulations were found to be significant.
Appendix A: CalFresh Cross Tabulations

CalFresh x Age

59% of respondents in the 18-25 age group are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who are in the 18-25 age group are 4.259 times more likely to be possibly eligible but not receiving CalFresh than respondents who are not in the 18-25 age group.

38% of respondents in the 26-34 age group are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who are in the 26-34 age group are 1.713 times more likely to be possibly eligible but not receiving CalFresh than respondents who are not in the 26-34 age group.

22% of respondents in the 35-45 age group are possibly eligible for CalFresh.
21% of respondents in the 46-54 age group are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

19% of respondents in the 55-64 age group are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who are in the 55-64 age group are 1.886 times more likely to be receiving or ineligible for CalFresh than respondents who are not in the 55-64 age group.

32% of respondents in the 65+ age group are possibly eligible for CalFresh.
38% of respondents with high food security are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who have high food security are 1.679 times more likely to be possibly eligible for CalFresh than respondents who do not have high food security.

39% of respondents with marginal food security are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who have marginal food security are 1.727 times more likely to be possibly eligible for CalFresh than respondents who do not have marginal food security.

27% of respondents with low food security are possibly eligible for CalFresh.
25% of respondents with very low food security are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who have very low food security are 1.494 times more likely to be receiving or ineligible for CalFresh than respondents who do not have very low food security.

**CalFresh x Diabetes**

16% of respondents who receive or are ineligible for CalFresh report having diabetes.

8% of respondents who are possibly eligible but do not receive CalFresh report having diabetes.

- Respondents who report having diabetes are 2.137 times more likely to be receiving CalFresh or ineligible for CalFresh, than respondents who report not having diabetes.
25% of respondents who reported having been, or having a family member have been, to the Dr. in the last 12 months are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who have been, or have a household member who have been, to the Dr. in the last 12 months are 1.686 times more likely to be receiving or ineligible for CalFresh than respondents who have not been, and have not household member who has been, to the Dr. in the last 12 months.

36% of respondents who reported having not been, and not having a family member have been, to the Dr. in the last 12 months are possibly eligible for CalFresh.
87% of respondents who reported having been, or having a family member have been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who have been, or who’s household members have been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months are 1.702 times more likely to be receiving or ineligible for CalFresh than respondents who have not been, and who’s household members have not been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

74% of respondents who reported having not been, and not having a family member have been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months are possibly eligible for CalFresh.
CalFresh x Transportation to Healthcare

33% of respondents who receive or are ineligible for CalFresh have transportation to healthcare sometimes or rarely.

- Respondents who receive or are not eligible for CalFresh are 1.550 times more likely to have transportation to healthcare always or most of the time than respondents who are possibly eligible but do not receive CalFresh.

CalFresh x Jobless Household

43% of respondents who are possibly eligible for CalFresh have transportation to healthcare sometimes or rarely.
35% of respondents who report having at least one job in their household are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

- Respondents who report that someone in their household have a job are 1.672 times more likely to be possibly eligible, but not receiving, CalFresh than respondents who report living in jobless households.

24% of respondents who report having no jobs in their household are possibly eligible for CalFresh.

**Appendix B: Employment Cross Tabulations**

**Jobless Household x Food Security**

76% of respondents who have high food security report having no jobs in their household.
74% of respondents who have marginal food security report having no jobs in their household.

66% of respondents who have low food security report having no jobs in their household.

- Respondents with low food security are 2.006 times more likely to have a job in their household than respondents who do not have low food security.

81% of respondents who have very low food security report having no jobs in their household.

Respondents who have very low food security are 1.828 times less likely to have a job in their household than respondents who do not have very low food security.
Appendix C: Reasons for not Accessing Pantry as Often as Necessary cross Tabulations

Current Job Status x Reason for not Accessing Pantry as Often as Necessary (N = 393):

- Location
- Transportation
- Embarrassed
- Can't get there during hours of operation
- Not open often enough

Ability to Work x Reason for not Accessing Pantry as Often as Necessary (N = 369):

- Location
- Transportation
- Embarrassed
- Can't get there during hours of operation
- Not open often enough
Appendix D: Food Security Cross Tabulations

Food Security x Age

60% of respondents in the 18-25 age group have very low food security.

54% of respondents in the 26-34 age group have very low food security.

69% of respondents in the 35-45 age group have very low food security.

- Respondents in the 35-45 age group are 2.172 times more likely to have low food security or very low food security than those not in the 35-45 age group.
65% of respondents in the 46-54 age group have very low food security.

- Respondents in the 46-54 age group are 1.781 times more likely to have low food security or very low food security than those not in the 46-54 age group.

60% of respondents in the 55-64 age group have very low food security.

25% of respondents in the 65+ age group have very low food security.

- Respondents in the 65+ age group are 1.781 times more likely to have high food security or marginal food security than those not in the 65+ age group.
Appendix E: Local Conditions

Local Safety x Race/Ethnicity

38% of American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents report that children and older people in their local area do not feel that they can move about safely in their local areas.

22% of Hispanic respondents report that children and older people in their local area do not feel that they can move about safely in their local areas.

28% of white respondents report that children and older people in their local area do not feel that they can move about safely in their local areas.

- White respondents are 1.726 time more likely to report that children and older people in their local area feel they can move about safely.
Local Help x Race/Ethnicity

22.0% of American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents reported that people in their local area rarely help each other.

12.3% of Hispanics respondents reported that people in their local area rarely help each other.

12.7% of White respondents reported that people in their local area rarely help each other.

- White respondents are 1.98 times more likely to report that people in their local area always or sometimes help each other than non-white respondents.
Victim of a Crime x Age

35.2% of respondents in the 18-25 age group reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

25.0% of respondents in the 26-34 age group reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

31.6% of respondents in the 35-45 age group reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.
28.6% of respondents in the 46-54 age group reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

30.8% of respondents in the 55-64 age group reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

19.1% of respondents in the 65+ age group reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

- Respondents in the 65+ age group are 1.80 times less likely to have been a victim of a crime than respondents not in the 65+ age group.
38% of American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

- American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents are 1.716 times more likely to have been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months than respondents who are not American Indian or Alaskan Native.

23% of Hispanic/Latino respondents reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.

26% of Whites respondents reported that they had been a victim of a crime in the last 12 months.
Appendix F: Diabetes Cross Tabulations

Diabetes x Age

5.6% of respondents in the 18-25 age group report that they have diabetes.

3.2% of respondents in the 26-34 age group report that they have diabetes.
- Respondents in the 26-34 age group are 5.625 times less likely to have diabetes than those not in the 26-34 age group.

7.9% of respondents in the 35-45 age group report that they have diabetes.
- Respondents in the 35-45 age group are 2.08 times less likely to have diabetes than those not in the 35-45 age group.
14.6% of respondents in the 46-54 age group report that they have diabetes. Most cases of type 2 diabetes are diagnosed is between the ages of 46-64.\textsuperscript{8}

20.1% of respondents in the 55-64 age group report that they have diabetes.

- Respondents in the 55-64 age group are 1.815 times less likely to have diabetes than those not in the 55-64 age group.

25.7% of respondents in the 65+ age group report that they have diabetes.

- Respondents in the 65+ age group are 2.595 times less likely to have diabetes than those not in the 65+ age group.
14.7% of respondents with high food security report that they have diabetes.

10.4% of respondents with marginal food security report that they have diabetes.

20.4% of respondents with low food security report that they have diabetes.

- Respondents who report having diabetes are 1.802 times more likely to have low food security than respondents who report not having diabetes.
12.4% of respondents with very low food security report that they have diabetes.

**Diabetes x Current job status**

7% of respondents who report having diabetes also report currently having a job.

- Respondents who reported having diabetes were 2.902 times less likely to have a job than respondents who report not having diabetes.

17% of respondents who report having not diabetes also report currently having a job.
Appendix G: Smoking Cross Tabulations

Smoking x Age

Figure 29-1. Age 18-25 years

61.5% of respondents in the 18-25 age group either are smokers, live with smokers or both.

Figure 29-2. Age 26-34 years

69.9% of respondents in the 26-34 age group either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

- Respondents in the 26-34 age group are 1.772 times more likely to either be a smoker or live with a smoker than respondents not in the 26-34 age group.

Figure 29-3. Age 35-45 years

65.0% of respondents in the 35-45 age group either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.
64.6% of respondents in the 46-54 age group either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

58.1% of respondents in the 55-64 age group either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

30.7% of respondents in the 65+ age group either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

- Respondents in the 65+ age group are 3.963 times more likely to **not** be a smoker or live with a smoker than respondents not in the 65+ age group.
Smoking x Race/Ethnicity

65.6% of American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

44.6% of Hispanic/Latino respondents either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

- Hispanic/Latino respondents are 1.96 times less likely to be or live with smokers than non-Hispanic/Latino respondents.

58.1% of White respondents either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.
Smoking x Food Security

28.9% of respondents with high food security either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

- Respondents who are not smokers and who don’t have any smokers living in their household are 3.918 times more likely to have high food security than respondents who smoke or have smokers living in their household.

50.0% of respondents with marginal food security either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

53.0% of respondents with low food security either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.
66.0% of respondents with very low food security either are smokers, live with smokers, or both.

- Respondents who are smokers or who have any smokers living in their household are 2.139 times more likely to have very low food security than respondents who don’t smoke and have no smokers living in their household.

**Appendix H: Timing of Dr. Visit Cross Tabulations**

**Dr. Visit x Age**

25.0% of respondents in the 18-25 age group haven’t been to the doctor in the last 12 months.

- Respondents in the 18-25 age group were 2.131 times more likely to report that they had **not** been to the Dr. in the last 12 months not in the 18-25 age group.
16.9% of respondents in the 26-34 age group haven’t been to the doctor in the last 12 months.

13.3% of respondents in the 35-45 age group haven’t been to the doctor in the last 12 months.

13.3% of respondents in the 46-54 age group haven’t been to the doctor in the last 12 months.
14.8% of respondents in the 35-45 age group haven’t been to the doctor in the last 12 months.

9.0% of respondents in the 35-45 age group haven’t been to the doctor in the last 12 months.
12% of respondents who report having transportation to healthcare either always or most of the time have not been to the doctor, and who have no family members who have been to the doctor, in the last year.

- Respondents who report having transportation to healthcare services always or most of the time are 1.962 times more likely to not have been to the Dr. in the last 12 months than respondents who report having transportation to healthcare sometimes or rarely.

21% of respondents who report having transportation to healthcare either sometimes or rarely have not been to the doctor, and who have no family members who have been to the doctor, in the last year.
Appendix I: Timing of Dentist Visit Cross Tabulations

**Dentist x Age**

50.9% of respondents in the 18-25 age group haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.

39.6% of respondents in the 26-34 age group haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.

- Respondents who are in the 26-34 age group are 1.750 times more likely to have been to the dentist in the last 12 months than respondents not in the 26-34 age group.

48.5% of respondents in the 35-45 age group haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.
56.3% of respondents in the 46-54 age group haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.

56.8% of respondents in the 55-64 age group haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.

51.5% of respondents in the 65+ age group haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.
Dentist x Transportation to Healthcare

46% of respondents who report having transportation to healthcare either always or most of the time have not been to the dentist, and who have no family members who have been to the dentist, in the last year.

64% of respondents who report having transportation to healthcare either sometimes or rarely have not been to the dentist, and who have no family members who have been to the dentist, in the last year.

- Respondents who reported having transportation to healthcare always or most of the time are 2.129 times more likely to have not been to the dentist in the last 12 months than respondents who reported having transportation to healthcare services sometimes or rarely.
51.1% of respondents with high food security haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months

- Respondents who have high food security are 1.881 times more likely to have been to the dentist in the last 12 months than respondents who do not have high food security.

54.0% of respondents with marginal food security haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.

46.7% of respondents with low food security haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.
65.7% of respondents with very low food security haven’t been to the dentist in the last 12 months.

- Respondents who have very low food security are 1.878 times more likely to have not been to the dentist in the last 12 months than respondents who do not very low high food security.

**Appendix J: Timing of Emergency Room Visit Cross Tabulations**

Emergency Room x Age

- 52.8% of respondents in the 18-25 age group haven't been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

- 39.3% of respondents in the 26-34 age group haven’t been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.
33.7% of respondents in the 35-45 age group haven’t been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

- Respondents in the 35-45 age group are 1.630 times more likely to have been to the emergency room in the last 12 months than respondents who are not in the 35-45 age group.

36.8% of respondents in the 46-54 age group haven’t been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

49.3% of respondents in the 55-64 age group haven’t been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.
52.1% of respondents in the 65+ age group haven’t been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

**Emergency Room x Smoke**

66% of respondents who have been to the emergency room, or have household members who have been to the emergency room, in the last 12 months are either smokers or have smokers living in their household.

- Respondents who are smokers or who live with smokers are 1.877 times more likely to have been to the emergency room, or have had a household member have been to the emergency room, in the last 12 months than respondents who are not smokers and have no smokers in their household.

51% of respondents who have not been to the emergency room, and have no family members who have been to the emergency room, in the last 12 months are either smokers or have smokers living in their household.
Emergency Room x Food Security

39.6% of respondents with high food security have been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

- Respondents who have high food security are 2.134 times more likely to not have been, and not have a household member have been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months than respondents who do not have high food security.

39.1% of respondents with marginal food security have been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

- Respondents who have marginal food security are 2.238 times more likely to not have been, and not have a household member have been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months than respondents who do not have marginal food security.

58.8% of respondents with low food security have been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.
61.6% of respondents with very low food security have been to the emergency room in the last 12 months.

- Respondents who have very low food security are 1.615 times more likely to have been, or have a household member have been, to the emergency room in the last 12 months than respondents who do not have very low food security.
Appendix K: Transportation to Health Care Cross Tabulations

Transportation to Healthcare x Age

22.2% of respondents in the 18-25 age group rarely have transportation to health care services.

23.8% of respondents in the 26-34 age group rarely have transportation to health care services.

- Respondents in the 26-34 age group are 1.612 times more likely to have sporadic or rare transportation to healthcare than respondents not in the 26-34 age group.

28.3% of respondents in the 35-45 age group rarely have transportation to health care services.
21.1% of respondents in the 46-54 age group rarely have transportation to health care services.

16.3% of respondents in the 55-64 age group rarely have transportation to health care services.

8.8% of respondents in the 65+ age group rarely have transportation to health care services.

- Respondents in the 65+ age group are 3.567 times more likely to have reliable transportation to healthcare than respondents in the 65+ age group.
Transportation to Healthcare x Smoke

42.0% of respondents who either are smokers or have smokers living in their household

Respondents who are smokers or live with smokers are 1.845 times more likely to have sporadic or rare transportation to health care services than respondents who are not and do not live with smokers.

Transportation to Healthcare x Food Security

16.3% of respondents with high food security report having transportation to health care services sometimes or rarely.

- Respondents with high food security are 3.072 times more likely to have reliable transportation to healthcare services than respondents who don’t have high food security.
26.8% of respondents with marginal food security report having transportation to health care services sometimes or rarely.

24.6% of respondents with high food security report having transportation to health care services sometimes or rarely.

- Respondents with low food security are 1.940 times more likely to have reliable transportation to healthcare services than respondents who don’t have low food security.

43.7% of respondents with marginal food security report having transportation to health care services sometimes or rarely.

- Respondents with very low food security are 2.496 times more likely to have sporadic or rare transportation to healthcare services than respondents who don’t have very low food security.
Appendix L: Children in Household Cross Tabulations

Children x Current Job Status

21% of respondents who have children living in their household currently have a job.

- Respondents who report having children living in their household are 2.406 times more likely to report currently having a job than respondents who do not have children living in their household.

10% of respondents who have no children living in their household currently have a job.