

CATHOLIC CONFERENCE OF OHIO
DEPARTMENT ON SOCIAL CONCERNS

1987 EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE SURVEY
SUMMARY
APRIL, 1988

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE SURVEY - AGENCY PARTICIPATION (by Diocese)

Cincinnati

Catholic Social Services - Cincinnati
Catholic Social Services - Springfield
Catholic Social Services - Urbana
Catholic Social Services - Bellefontaine
St. John Social Service Center
The Society of St. Vincent dePaul

Columbus

Catholic Social Service - Columbus
Catholic Social Service - Zanesville
Catholic Social Service - Portsmouth
Catholic Social Service - Newark
JOIN
St. Aloysius Family Service Center

Toledo

St. Mary's Food Pantry - Toledo
St. Vincent dePaul Food Pantry - Lima
St. Vincent dePaul Clothing Store - Lima
Catholic Social Services - Mansfield
St. Vincent dePaul Society Store

Cleveland

People To People - Wooster
Catholic Community Services - Lorain
Lake Co. Service Bureau - Food Force
Capilla Cristo Rey
Epiphany
Martin dePorres
A.C.C.E.S.S.
Holy Trinity
W.S.E.M. (West Side Ecumenical Ministry)

Steubenville

Diocesan Information & Referral - Steubenville
Samaritan House - Steubenville

Youngstown

Catholic Community League - Youngstown
Catholic Service League - Youngstown
Catholic Service League - Ashtabula
Family & Community Services of
Catholic Charities - Youngstown
Catholic Community Services, Inc. - Warren
Family & Community Services - Lisbon

Highlights of the Data Included:

- 1) People Served: Proportionally about the same number of clients were served in test week as last year. Thirty-five Catholic-sponsored emergency assistance programs served 4,531 in 1987 (3,908 were reported from 30 programs in 1986).
- 2) Employment: About the same number of employed clients were served this year as last (around 19%). However, this was almost double the figures for 1984 and 1985. Slightly more had part-time jobs (10% vs. 9.6%). Less had full-time jobs (8.9% vs. 9.4%).
- 3) Unemployment: Fewer unemployed clients were served this year than last (61.8% vs. 66.2%). This continues a four year trend.

Of those unemployed, more suffered from long-term unemployment (over 2 years) than anytime in the past (66.4% vs. 63% in 1986, '85, and '84).

Clients served with short-term unemployment (less than 1 year) declined (17.1% from 27.6% in 1986).

A significantly fewer number of clients served received unemployment compensation this year (4.1% vs. 11.4%).

Among all clients served, blacks tended to suffer more from long-term unemployment (over 2 years) than whites (58% (b) vs. 32% (w)).

Among all black clients, 81% were long-term unemployed.

Among all white clients, 53% were long-term unemployed.

Among all clients served, the shorter term unemployment (less than 1 year) tended to be white.

- 4) Income: Vast majority of clients served this year (91.1%) had household incomes under \$6,000 per year. This is about the same as previous years.

The average income was \$2,757 per year, up slightly over 1986 (\$2,612).

More clients than last year reported having no income (40.1% vs. 33.9%), however, this was fewer than in 1984 and 1985.

The major sources of income were:

- a) ADC - 32.9% of all clients received.

This was up from last year, but more female clients were served this year than last (73% vs. 44%).

- b) GR - 12% of all clients received.

Down from last year.

- c) Social Security - 8.6%... about the same as previous years.

- d) SSI - 7.2%...about same as 1986, but up from 1984 and 1985 (3.5%, 5.9%).

- e) Wages - 6.3%... down from last year (8.6%).

- f) Pension, Unemployment Compensation and Worker Compensation were less than 2% each...similar to 1986.

- 5) Age:

The average age of clients served appears to be getting younger. This year 36.2 years was the average age, while in 1984 it was almost 39 years. The largest single age group served this year was 26 year olds (mode) vs. 36 year olds in 1985.

- 6) Sex:

A significantly larger number of females were served this year than last (73.2% vs. 44%). Fewer couples were served than in previous years (1.9% vs. 4.3%, 6.7%, 5.9%).

The fluctuation may be due to differences in participating agencies.

7) Race/Ethnicity:

We continued the trend of serving slightly more blacks than whites (48.2% (b) vs. 43.4% (w)).

Our Hispanic clients (5.5%) were double that of 1986, but remained fewer than in 1984 and 1985 (7.6%, 6.1%).

8) Religious:

We continued the trend of having the vast majority of clients being non-Catholic (79.5%).

9) Marital Status:

As in the past, the majority of clients were not married (79.6%... up slightly from last year). Most of these were single (42.5%), followed by divorced/separated (26.2%...up from last year's 24.8%), widowed (6.7%), and living together (4.2%...almost double that of previous years).

10) Education:

This was a new question this year. Over 1/2 of the clients served did not finish high school (51%). Another 1/3 were high school graduates.

11) Education by Gender:

The male clients tended to have gone further with their education than females. 41% of the males completed high school, compared to 31% of the females.

12) Income, Race, and Gender:

There were few income differences by race, but major income differences by gender. More males than females report having no income, and more report having lower levels of income. (21% of males reported having less than \$2,500 year, compared to 6% of females.) ADC was suggested as a factor in this.

13) Household Size:

This year clients with children living with them were asked to break down their ages. 47% had children under seven, 35% had children between 7-12, and 23% had children 12-18. (100%+ due to multiple age siblings)

14) Health Coverage:

These were new questions this year. Overall, 68.9% of clients served indicated having some sort of health coverage. 17.2% reported having no coverage.

15) Profile of Client Needs:

- A. Food: As with previous survey results, food remained the most requested need (81.4%). Again, as over the last two years, about 60% of those needing food had enough for only one meal or less. Perhaps significant is the rather large percentage drop in our agencies' ability to respond to such food requests. (84% given assistance in 1987 compared to 95-96-97% responses since 1984).
- B. Food Stamps: The number of clients receiving food stamps has been declining since 1974. Currently, 59.1% of our clients received food stamps, compared to 61.9% in 1986 (it was 73% in 1984, 74.3% in 1985).
- C. Shelter: This year a few more demographic questions were asked: 62% of respondents indicated they live in an urban setting, 6% in rural. 35% indicated they rent, 5% own their dwelling, and 5% live with friends/relatives.

6.6% (301 persons) of all requests were for housing assistance. This was the lowest % of such requests received, going back as far as 1984. (Previously 8-9% of our requests were for housing assistance). Over half (50.2%) of such requests were due to homelessness, 18.6% had been evicted, 11.3% had inadequate housing, and 7.6% were in an abusive situation.

Agency ability to respond to requests for housing assistance also dropped this year. Since 1984 we had been able to respond to over 80% of such requests, this year it was 71.8%.

- D. Utilities: 8% (348 households) of clients requested aid with utilities. A high percentage of clients (70.4% of those requesting home energy assistance) indicated they received shut-off notices. This was compared to a 35.9% rate for 1986. Perhaps the time of year, Fall vs. Spring, in which the survey was conducted, accounts for some of this.

Unlike food and shelter assistance, agency level of response remained similar to 1986 (74% requests granted), although down from 1985 level of 82%.

- E. Other Types of Aid: 20.3% of clients applied for various types of aid.

Those requesting clothing increased over the previous years (66.2% vs. 45% the previous two years) as did those requesting health care assistance and transportation. A slight drop in ability to meet such requests also occurred (83.9% compared to 90.7% and 91% in 1986 and 1985).

CATHOLIC CONFERENCE OF OHIO

GOVERNMENT CUTBACKS HURTING

CATHOLIC-SPONSORED EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

A survey of recipients of assistance from 35 Catholic agencies in Ohio shows that the need for poverty relief continues, but that funding problems are making aid unavailable to many who need it (see enclosed Survey results).

Jim Tobin, associate director for the Department on Social Concerns of the Catholic Conference of Ohio, reported that the latest version of the survey, conducted annually in cooperation with the Catholic poverty relief programs of all six dioceses of Ohio, showed that food, clothing and shelter, the basic needs, were not always readily available to the poor in Ohio.

During 1987, we were collectively serving over 4,500 persons weekly. Sixty-seven percent of our clients were women with minor children and 90% of our clients had annual incomes of under \$6,000 - in fact, the average was only \$2,757.

"The clients' median age was 26 years," Tobin stated, "over 61% were unemployed and 81% of all the people were seeking food. Nearly two-thirds reported they had only enough food on hand for one meal or less."

The survey indicated a 4-year decline in food stamp recipients. "Only 59% of the 1987 clients were getting food stamps, compared to 78% in 1984."

(MORE) 5

Tobin said the number of persons seeking aid who were employed had grown, suggesting that Ohio's working poor were growing as a class. Almost 20% of the 1987 clients were employed compared to only 10% in 1985.

Funding problems resulted in the Catholic agencies being able to serve only between 70-80% of those who asked for help, compared to nearly 90% in earlier years.

Tobin said the recent round of federal and state aid cuts was one of the major reasons for the agencies' inability to serve all who were in need.

"As much as we want to, our agencies and programs are simply not able to pick up where the government programs have cut back. The so-called safety net has too many tears for voluntary agencies to repair -- there are lots of people, including many children, falling through the net," Tobin stated.

He quoted a report by the Washington, D.C. based Center on Budget and Policy Priorities as stating that the federal allocations for fiscal year 1988 low-income entitlement programs are less than half the allocations given in 1981 (after inflation).

Tobin also lamented phase-outs in the federal Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), which supplied many Church-sponsored emergency assistance programs with surplus food such as rice, honey, dry milk and cheese.

"In addition, the Ohio legislature's action to cut Title XX social service monies by \$8-million will have a profound impact when it takes effect this July 1," he said. "Franklin County will lose \$2.3-M; Cuyahoga \$1.4M; Hamilton \$780,000; and Lucas \$600,000. Athens, Lake, Lorain, Portage, Summit and Trumbull counties will each lose over \$100,000. Belmont, Butler, Clark, Clermont, Coshocton, Greene, Jackson, Jefferson, Lawrence, Licking, Marion, Muskingum and Ross will each lose over \$50,000.

"These cuts do trickle-down and hit both the low income person and the service provider -- in the end, the main victims are women and children, often the helpless members of our society," Tobin added.

For more information, contact Mr. James Tobin, at the Catholic Conference of Ohio, or:

Rev. Theodore C. Kosse
Director of Communication
Archdiocese of Cincinnati
513-421-3131

Rev. Gerald F. Calovini
Director of Communication
Diocese of Steubenville
614-282-6293

Rev. Michael G. Dimengo
Director of Communication
Diocese of Cleveland
216-696-6525

Mr. James Richards
Director of Communication
Diocese of Toledo
419-255-1935

Rev. Thomas Holahan
Director of Communication
Diocese of Columbus
614-464-1334

Miss Jean Nero
Director of Communication
Diocese of Youngstown
216-744-8451

(END)

CATHOLIC CONFERENCE OF OHIO

WOMEN WITH CHILDREN REQUEST THE MOST HELP FROM CATHOLIC EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN OHIO

According to the results of a 1987 survey formally released today by the Catholic Conference of Ohio, women with children under the age of 18 requested the most assistance from the 35 Catholic-sponsored poverty relief programs in Ohio.

Jim Tobin, Associate Director for Social Concerns of the Catholic Conference of Ohio, explained that an annual survey has been conducted since 1984 of the various Catholic-sponsored emergency assistance programs throughout Ohio. Clark Jones, Inc., a marketing firm in Columbus, has helped the Poverty Task Force of the Catholic Conference to coordinate this project. Findings from this survey have been used for education and promotion, as well as incorporated into various public testimonies of the Conference.

According to Tobin, the survey indicated that the Church-sponsored emergency assistance programs continued to serve some of the poorest of the poor. In 1987, such programs were serving an average of over 4,500 people per week. Sixty-seven percent of these people were women with children under age 18. Over 90% of the clients had yearly incomes below \$6,000 - the average being \$2,757.

Eighty-five percent rented; a little over half were minorities; 80% were non-Catholic.

The majority were undereducated, with over half not finishing high school.

The male clients tended to have gone further in their education than female.

The median age was 26 years with a four year trend toward younger clients.

The number of people served who were unemployed dropped somewhat from previous years, but still comprised over 60% of our clientele. The majority of these unemployed people (66%) had been unemployed for over two years. Race seemed to play an important factor in the duration of unemployment. Long-term unemployed tended to be Black; short term unemployed tended to be White.

The number of employed clients doubled since 1984. In 1987, one out of every five clients (20%), were unemployed but needed help, perhaps an indication of the growing number of working poor.

The major request for help was for food assistance, followed by utility help, shelter, clothing, health care assistance and transportation.

The need for food assistance was extremely high (81% of all clients). Over 60% indicated that they only had enough food for one meal or less. Equally distressing was the finding that the number of clients receiving food stamps continued its 4-year drop (only 59% compared to 78% in 1984).

According to Tobin, among the more troubling of the findings was the substantial drop in the agencies' ability to give the assistance needed.

In the past, Catholic-sponsored emergency assistance programs were able to respond in a positive manner to over 80-90% of the requests. In 1987, this dropped to between 70-80%.

DEPARTMENT ON SOCIAL CONCERNS
PRESS RELEASE
APRIL 4, 1988
Page #3

Members of the Poverty Task Force and Survey Committee of the Department on Social Concerns for the Catholic Conference of Ohio involved in this survey included:

Mr. Scott Miller (Chairperson), Diocese of Youngstown [216] 678-3911
Mr. Brian Corbin, Diocese of Youngstown [216] 744-8451
Reverend Charles Ritter, Diocese of Toledo [419] 244-6711
Ms. Kathy Donnellan, Diocese of Toledo [419] 244-6711
Ms. Donna Therkelson, Diocese of Toledo [419] 244-6711
Mr. Carl Brauner, Diocese of Columbus [614] 274-0049
Ms. Mary Evelyn Ruetty, Diocese of Columbus [614] 221-5891
Ms. Aggie Hoskin, Diocese of Cleveland [216] 696-6525
Ms. Cathy Stienecker, formerly Diocese of Cleveland [614] 466-0378
Mr. Thomas Allio, Diocese of Cleveland [216] 773-0436
Sr. Rose Ann Van Buren, Diocese of Cleveland [216] 263-6176
Mr. Keith Warner, Archdiocese of Cincinnati [513] 241-2186
Mr. Rod Huber, Archdiocese of Cincinnati [513] 421-3131
Reverend Gerald Calovini, Diocese of Steubenville [614] 282-6293

For more information, please refer to the attached comparative summary, or call Jim Tobin at the Catholic Conference. You may also want to contact any of the previously named Task Force members.

(END)

STATEWIDE EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE SURVEYDEMOGRAPHICS

<u>SURVEY QUESTIONS</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
I. NUMBERS SERVED				
A. Number of Agencies participating in Survey	39	46	30	35
B. Number of persons served in typical week	5,481	5,800	3,908	4,531
C. Projected number of persons served in year	285,000	301,600	203,216	235,612

II. UNEMPLOYMENT**A. Among All Persons Served:**

1. Percentage (%) where chief wage earner of household unemployed	74.3%	71.9%	66.2%	61.8%
2. Percentage (%) where chief wage earner of household unemployed over 2 years	43.7%	49.6%	38.1%	41.1%
3. Percentage (%) where chief wage earner of household received unemployment compensation	7.3%	5.8%	6.0%	2.6%
4. Percentage (%) where chief wage earner of household ineligible for unemployment compensation	32.8%	53.2%	40.0%	49.4%
5. Percentage (%) where unemployment benefits have ended for chief wage earner of household	24.1%	9.1%	6.4%	1.7%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
II. B. Among chief wage earners unemployed:				
1. Percentage (%) unemployed over 2 years	63.3%	63.1%	63.0%	66.4%
2. Percentage (%) unemployed 12-24 months	12.8%	11.6%	9.4%	8.8%
3. Percentage (%) unemployed less than 1 year	23.9%	25.3%	27.6%	17.1%
4. Percentage (%) receiving unemployment compensation	10.6%	7.6%	11.4%	4.1%
5. Percentage (%) ineligible for unemployment compensation	51.4%	78.4%	76.4%	79.9%
6. Percentage (%) unemployment compensation benefits ended	37.8%	13.4%	12.2%	2.8%
II. C. Among chief wage earner unemployed for over 2 years:				
1. Percentage (%) employed full or part-time in past	86.3%	86.7%	86.2%	69.7%
a) percentage (%) full time	N/A	N/A	59.3%	47.3%
b) percentage (%) part-time	N/A	N/A	26.9%	31.1%
2. Percentage (%) previously employed (full or part-time) for over 1 year	N/A	55.6%	51.0%	54.5%
3. Percentage (%) previously employed (full or part-time) for 7-12 months	N/A	18.0%	17.3%	13.7%
4. Percentage (%) previously employed (full or part-time) for less than 6 months	N/A	26.1%	31.7%	31.8%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
II. C. 5. Percentage (%) previously <u>full time</u> employed for over 1 year	N/A	N/A	N/A	72.2%
6. Percentage (%) previously <u>full time</u> employed from 7-12 months	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.0%
7. Percentage (%) previously <u>full time</u> employed less than 6 months	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.3%

III. EMPLOYMENT

A. Among All Persons Served:

1. Percentage (%) chief wage earner employed	11.8%	10.0%	19.0%	18.9%
a) Percentage (%) employed full time	5.1%	5.5%	9.4%	8.9%
b) Percentage (%) employed part-time	4.4%	4.5%	9.6%	10.0%
2. Percentage (%) Disabled	9.9%	11.4%	7.8%	10.3%
3. Percentage (%) Retired	9.9%	11.4%	7.8%	10.3%

IV. INCOME

A. Among all persons served:

1. Average household income per year	N/A	N/A	\$ 2,612	\$ 2,757
2. Percentage (%) having household income below \$6,000.	93.8%	91.1%	90.2%	91.1%
3. Percentage (%) households reporting no income*	56.5%	50.4%	33.9%	40.1%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
IV. A. 4. Sources of Family Income **				
a) Percentage (%) wages	4.4%	6.7%	8.6%	6.3%
b) Percentage (%) unemployment compensation	3.6%	1.3%	1.0%	1.0%
c) Percentage (%) workers' compensation	.3%	1.9%	.6%	.7%
d) Percentage (%) ADC	20.7%	36.7%	21.9%	32.9%
e) Percentage (%) Social Security	8.8%	9.8%	8.6%	8.6%
f) Percentage (%) SSI	3.5%	5.9%	7.8%	7.2%
g) Percentage (%) pension	1.5%	3.3%	1.9%	1.7%
h) Percentage (%) GR	10.4%	17.6%	19.2%	12.0%

V. AGE

A. Among all persons served:

1. Average age (years)	38.8	37.9	37.9	36.2
2. Largest single age group served	27 (4.5% of sample)	36 (4.9% of sample)	30 (5.5% of sample)	26 (4.6% of sample)
3. Percentage (%) over age 65	5.5%	11.0%	6.0%	4.0%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
VI. SEX				
A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) Male only	38.7%	29.8%	52.0%	25.0%
2. Percentage (%) Female only	55.3%	63.5%	44.0%	73.2%
3. Percentage (%) of Couples	5.9%	6.7%	4.3%	1.9%

VII. RACE

A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) Black	50.1%	45.1%	50.9%	48.2%
2. Percentage (%) White	40.3%	47.9%	45.8%	43.4%
3. Percentage (%) Hispanic	7.6%	6.1%	2.8%	5.5%

VIII. RELIGION

A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) Catholic	24.3%	24.2%	22.9%	20.5%
2. Percentage (%) Non-Catholic	75.7%	75.8%	77.1%	79.5%
a) Protestant	47.3%	37.8%	37.5%	47.1%
b) Christian	11.1%	12.2%	8.7%	15.9%
c) Jewish	.6%	.3%	2.1%	N/A
d) Other	16.8%	25.5%	28.8%	16.5%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
IX. MARITAL STATUS				
A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) not married	65.0%	71.5%	76.2%	79.6%
a) Single	30.9%	36.3%	43.2%	42.5%
b) Divorced/Separated	22.0%	24.7%	24.8%	26.2%
c) Widowed	8.8%	7.9%	6.0%	6.7%
d) Living Together	2.6%	2.5%	2.2%	4.2%

X. EDUCATION

A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) did not finish high school	N/A	N/A	N/A	51.1%
2. Percentage (%) High School graduate	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.3%
3. Percentage (%) received G.E.D.	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.1%
4. Percentage (%) completed Trade School	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.0%
5. Percentage (%) went to college	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.3%

XI. HOUSEHOLD SIZE

A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) having 2-3 adults <u>over 18</u> years (including self)	N/A	N/A	31.5%	36.8%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
XI. A. 2. Percentage (%) having 4 or more adults over 18 yrs. (including self) living in household	N/A	N/A	3.4%	7.2%
3. Percentage (%) where client is only adult in household	N/A	N/A	65.0%	56.0%
4. Percentage (%) having children under 18 yrs. living in household	62.7%	61.9%	47.1%	66.7%
a) Percentage (%) having only 1 child	14.3%	15.0%	12.8%	15.6%
b) Percentage (%) having 2 children	18.6%	19.6%	14.9%	21.0%
c) Percentage (%) having three or more children	29.8%	27.2%	23.0%	30.1%
5. Percentage (%) having no children under 18 yrs. living in household	37.3%	38.1%	52.8%	33.3%
6. Percentage (%) having children under 7 yrs. old	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.0%
7. Percentage (%) having children 7-12 yrs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	35.0%
8. Percentage (%) having children 12-18 yrs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	23.0%
9. Percentage (%) having three or more children	N/A	N/A	N/A	30.1%
B. Among clients having children under 18 yrs. living in household:				
1. Percentage (%) having children under 7 yrs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	70.4%
2. Percentage having children 7-12 yrs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	53.3%
3. Percentage (%) having children 12-18 yrs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	34.0%
4. Percentage (%) having three or more children.	N/A	N/A	N/A	45.1%

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

1984 1985 1986 1987

XII. HEALTH COVERAGE ***

A. Among all persons served:

1. Percentage (%) had medical bills covered	N/A	N/A	N/A	68.9% (80% pro- jection)
2. Percentage (%) did not have medical bills covered	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.2% (20% projection)
3. Percentage (%) not asked the question	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.9%

B. Among clients who had medical bills covered:

1. Percentage (%) covered by insurance	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.4%
2. Percentage (%) covered by other means	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.5%
3. Percentage (%) not asked question	N/A	N/A	N/A	74.1%

C. Among clients who had medical bills covered other than by insurance:

1. Percentage (%) covered by Medicare/Medicaid	N/A	N/A	N/A	75.6%
2. Percentage (%) covered by ADC	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.6%
3. Percentage (%) covered by medical/health card	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.9%
4. Percentage (%) covered by welfare	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.7%

[MORE]

<u>SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)</u>		<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
XII. D.	Among clients who did not have medical bills covered:				
1.	Percentage (%) lost coverage in the past year	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.6%

CLIENT NEEDS

I.	DIRECT FOOD ASSISTANCE *				
A.	Among <u>all</u> client need requests:				
1.	Percentage (%) requesting direct food assistance	88.2%	87.0%	79.7%	81.4%
2.	Percentage (%) report having no food left at all	N/A	N/A	32.8%	28.9%
3.	Percentage (%) report not having enough food for one meal	N/A	N/A	14.5%	20.4%
4.	Percentage (%) report having only enough food for a day or less	N/A	N/A	17.9%	18.5%
5.	Percentage (%) report having only enough food for up to one week	N/A	N/A	11.8%	7.5%
6.	Percentage (%) report having enough food for over one week	N/A	N/A	2.4%	3.3%
B.	Among clients requesting food assistance:				
1.	Percentage (%) having no food left at all	58.0%	35.5%	41.3%	35.3%
2.	Percentage (%) not having enough food for one meal	[MORE] 20.5%	24.3%	18.2%	25.0%

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
I. B. 3. Percentage (%) having only enough for a day or less	16.6%	25.0%	22.9%	22.8%
4. Percentage (%) having only enough for up to one week	4.1%	13.5%	15.1%	9.3%
5. Percentage (%) having enough for over one week	1.0%	2.0%	3.0%	4.0%
C. Among clients with two persons over 65 yrs. living in household:				
1. Percentage (%) report having no food	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.9%
2. Percentage (%) report not having enough food for one meal	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.3%
3. Percentage (%) report having only enough food for up to one week	N/A	N/A	N/A	37.9%
D. Among clients with one person over 65 yrs. living in household:				
1. Percentage (%) report having no food	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.0%
2. Percentage (%) report having only enough food for a day or less	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.0%

II. FOOD STAMPS

A. Among all persons served:				
1. Percentage (%) receiving food stamps	78.0%	74.3%	61.9%	59.1%
2. Percentage (%) in process of applying for Food Stamps	9.3%	11.6%	13.1%	11.4%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
II. A. 3. Percentage (%) cut off from Food Stamps	3.3%	3.2%	.04%	.03%

III. FOOD AGENCY ASSISTANCE RESPONSE.

A. Among all households applying for food assistance:

1. Percentage (%) given assistance	95.0%	97.0%	96.0%	84.0%
------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

IV. SHELTER

A. Among all persons served:

1. Percentage (%) living in urban setting	N/A	N/A	N/A	62.0% (91.0% project)
2. Percentage (%) living in rural setting	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.0% (9.0% project)
3. Percentage (%) not asked location question	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.0%
4. Percentage (%) which rent home	N/A	N/A	N/A	85.0%
5. Percentage (%) which own their home	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%
6. Percentage (%) living with friends/relatives	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%
7. Percentage (%) requesting housing assistance	8.7%	9.0%	8.5%	6.6%
8. Percentage (%) reporting being homeless	N/A	6.3%	4.2%	3.4% **

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

1984 1985 1986 1987

IV. B. Among those clients requesting housing assistance:

1. Percentage (%) requesting shelter due to homelessness	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.2%
2. Percentage (%) requesting shelter due to eviction	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.6%
3. Percentage (%) requesting shelter due to abusive situation	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.6%
4. Percentage (%) requesting assistance due to inadequate housing	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.3%
5. Percentage (%) requesting assistance due to other reasons	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.6%
a) Behind in rent payments	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.0%

22

V. AGENCY HOUSING ASSISTANCE RESPONSE

A. Among all households requesting housing assistance:

1. Percentage (%) given assistance	80.9%	85.6%	81.0%	71.8%
------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

VI. UTILITY ASSISTANCE

A. Among all client need requests:

1. Percentage (%) seeking aid with utilities	12.5%	12.0%	10.0%	8.0%
--	-------	-------	-------	------

B. Among clients seeking utility aid:

1. Percentage (%) applying for home energy assistance funds	43.0%	21.9%	12.7%	12.1%
---	-------	-------	-------	-------

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
VI. B. 2. Percentage (%) which received a shut-off notice	60.9%	35.4%	35.9%	70.4%
3. Percentage (%) which had utilities shut-off	12.1%	10.0%	21.1%	29.6%
4. Percentage (%) which had other problems (e.g., high bill)	26.4%	54.6%	43.1%	N/A

VII. AGENCY UTILITY RESPONSE

A. Among all households requesting utility aid:

1. Percentage (%) given assistance	80.4%	82.7%	73.4%	74.9%
------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

VIII. OTHER TYPES OF AID

A. Among all client requests: ***

1. Percentage (%) requesting other types of assistance	32.8%	30.0%	18.4%	20.3%
a) Percentage (%) requesting clothing	10.8%	11.2%	11.9%	13.5%
b) Percentage (%) requesting health care assistance (e.g., prescriptions)	3.2%	1.8%	2.1%	2.3%
c) Percentage (%) requesting transportation aid	4.3%	3.5%	1.6%	1.4%
d) Percentage (%) requesting misc. assistance	13.0%	8.2%	9.8%	7.5%

[MORE]

SURVEY QUESTIONS (CONT'D)

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>
VIII. B. Among clients requesting other types of assistance:				
1. Percentage (%) requesting clothing	34.6%	45.3%	46.9%	66.2%
2. Percentage requesting health care assistance	10.1%	7.3%	8.4%	11.1%
3. Percentage (%) requesting transportation aid	13.6%	14.3%	6.2%	7.1%
4. Percentage (%) requesting misc. assistance	41.7%	33.2%	38.6%	37.9%

IX. AGENCY RESPONSE TO "OTHER" TYPES OF ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

A. Percentage (%) given assistance	86.5%	91.4%	90.7%	83.9%
------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------

AGENCY - CLIENT CONTACT

I. HOW REQUESTS WERE MADE

A. Among survey week responses gathered:				
1. Percentage (%) which applied in person	79.0%	91.5%	82.0%	84.0%
2. Percentage (%) which came by phone	21.0%	8.4%	18.0%	16.0%

[MORE]

SURVEY CHARTS

CHART #1

RACE BY DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

	<u>Less than one year</u>	<u>1-2 years</u>	<u>two or more years</u>
--	-------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------

Black	30%	32%	58%
White	68%	56%	32%
Hispanic	1%	10%	7%
Other	1%	3%	3%

CHART #2

EDUCATION AND GENDER
 (among all clients)

	<u>Male %</u>	<u>Female %</u>
--	---------------	-----------------

Did not complete high school	44%	54%
High School graduate	41%	31%
GED	5%	4%
Trade School	1%	1%
College	4%	3%
No Response	6%	8%

SURVEY CHARTS (cont'd)

CHART #3

INCOME, RACE AND GENDER

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
Under \$1,000	1%	1%	0	2%
\$1,000-\$2,500	21%	6%	10%	8%
\$2,500-\$5,000	24%	35%	31%	34%
\$5,000-\$10,000	10%	16%	13%	14%
\$10,000-\$15,000	2%	1%	1%	3%
\$15,000-\$20,000	0	1%	1%	1%
\$20,000-\$25,000	0	0	0	1%
No income reported	42%	39%	43%	37%

CHART #4

FOOD ASSISTANCE & FAMILY SIZE

<u>Client Family Size</u>	<u>Percentage (%) Having No Food OR Food for One Day or Less</u>
No Children	35.3%
1-3 Children	21.3%
4 Children	50.0%
5-6 Children	25.0%
More Than 6 Children	61.0%

[MORE]

DEMOGRAPHICS

- * If question left blank, then interpreted as no income. May not be accurate reflection.
- ** Some households receive more than one type of income.
- *** Significant number of questions in this section left unanswered by interviewers, see B-3.

CLIENT NEEDS

- * Section A: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 inferred from data.
- ** Inferred from data.
- *** Section A, questions 1-a, b, c, d inferred from data.