



Food Bank/Home Delivered Meals

2010 Service Area Review Summary

HRSA Support Service

Essential Service—
Continuum of Care

Comprehensive Plan—YES

Food Bank/Home Delivered Meals – includes the provision of actual food or meals. It does not include finances to purchase food or meals. The provision of essential household supplies such as hygiene items and household cleaning supplies should be included in this item. Includes vouchers to purchase food. Includes the following service activities:

- A. Food Shelf - Allows for the purchase of food and non-food items, office expense and salaries for the operation of a food shelf. Distributions should provide a minimum of two (2) days worth of food items for eligible individuals.
- B. Food Vouchers - Provision of supermarket or grocery store vouchers for the purchase of food and personal care items.
- C. Home-Delivered Meals - Meals are delivered to people who are home bound and unable to prepare meals due to HIV/AIDS illness. Meals must be nutritionally balanced and the menu must be reviewed and approved by a registered dietician.
- D. On Site Meals - Meals are provided in a communal setting. Meals must be nutritionally balanced and reviewed/approved by a registered dietician. Agencies must comply with all state and local health laws and ordinances concerning preparation, handling and serving of food.

There are currently 5 contracts with metro providers and 1 contract with greater MN providers to serve 1,600 & 692 clients respectively.

DATA SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS

In the 2010 Comprehensive Needs Assessment of Minnesotans Living with HIV Disease, 47% of the respondents (n=326) indicated that they had not received food/groceries from a food shelf. Of those who had not received food/groceries from a food shelf in the past year (n=152), 23 people (15%) indicated that they needed to receive food/groceries from a food shelf. The barriers or reasons listed by those people included transportation issues (10), not enough info (5), denial/ashamed (5), distance to carry bags (4), not enough resources (3), and didn't like the food choices (2).

In the same assessment, 68% of the respondents (n=326) indicated that they had not received vouchers to pay for food/groceries. Of those who had not received vouchers to pay for food/groceries (n=223), 44 people (20%) indicated that they needed to receive vouchers to pay for food/groceries. The barriers or reasons listed by those people included unavailable when I needed it (17), did not know where to go (10), do not qualify (7), and cumbersome application process (4).

In the same assessment, 74% of the respondents (n=326) indicated that they had not received home-delivered meals. Of those who had not received vouchers to pay for food/groceries (n=241), 18 people (7%) indicated that they needed to receive home-delivered meals. The barriers or reasons listed by those people included not available in area (5), did not know where to go (4), do not qualify (3), not available in rural MN (2), and too busy (2).

In the same assessment, 65% of the respondents (n=325) indicated that they had not received hot meals in a community setting. Of those who had not received hot meals in a community setting (n=209), 11 people (5%) indicated that they needed to receive hot meals in a community setting in the past year. The barriers or reasons listed by those people who needed to but were unable to receive hot meals in a community setting during the past year included did not know where to go (3), do not feel comfortable in that setting (3), not available in rural MN/my area (2), transportation issues (2), and not available in rural MN (2).

In the same assessment, 18% of the respondents (n=329) indicated that, in the past 30 days, they didn't get anything or barely anything to eat for 2 or more days. Twenty-four percent indicated that they had at one time used nutritional supplements as a food replacement to make food last longer.

In FY 2010, \$20,900 and \$10,000 were set aside for Greater MN services in food vouchers and home-delivered meals respectively.

CURRENT RANKINGS

| COUNCIL (2008) | CONSUMERS (2010) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 5 out of 24 service areas | 7 out of 25 service areas |

ALLOCATIONS HISTORY

| FY | ALLOCATION | % CHANGE | SPENT | % UTILIZED |
|------|------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 2010 | \$603,700 | -4% | | |
| 2009 | \$631,899 | 3% | \$630,293 | 99% |
| 2008 | \$482,100 | 0% | \$480,833 | 99% |

UTILIZATION HISTORY

| FY | # Accessing Service Area or Activity | % of All HIV/AIDS Cases | % of Unduplicated RW Clients |
|------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2009 | 1,222 | 19% (n=6,552) | 33% (n=3,700) |
| 2008 | 1,520 | 24% (n=6,221) | 32% (n=4,713) |
| 2007 | 1,163 | 20% (n=5,950) | 29% (n=4,038) |

ASSESSMENT OF NEED

| 2010 COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT (SELF ASSESSMENT BY CLIENTS n=326) | | |
|---|---|--|
| Accessed Service (Last 12 Months) n=174 | Didn't Access (Last 12 Months) n=152 | Didn't Access but Needed to (Last 12 Months) n=23 |
| 53% | 47% | 15% |

