Community Profile and Livelihood Baseline Assesment

Trinityville St. Thomas, Jamaica









SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION Building Communities...Building Jamaica

Acknowledgements

The Social Development Commission uses this opportunity to thank all the stakeholders whose input and contribution made the completion of this profile possible. Special thanks to the residents of the Trinityville community who participated in the data collection process, the technical support team, data collectors, administrative staff and other members of staff -especially the Development Area Coordinators and Community Development Officers. The paramount contribution made by the Research Department is also greatly valued as well as the input made by the community facilitators.

Special thanks for the technical and financial support given by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) through the Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund (CDRFF) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for the completion of the Livelihood Baseline Assessment done in Trinityville. The assistance of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) is also duly noted for the editing and publication of the final reports.

Mention must also be made of the special SDC team that conducted data collection activities in June 2019, to inform the Livelihood Baseline Assessment presented in Section 4. Thank you all for your contribution towards the success of this process.

Suggested citation: CDB (2022). *Preparation of Revised Livelihood Baseline Assessment Report: Trinityville, Jamaica.* Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund. Caribbean Development Bank. St. Michael, Barbados.

Prepared by: Donovan Campbell and Marc James, Department of Geography & Geology, The University of the West Indies, Kingston, Jamaica.

Pictorial Overview



Trinityville Primary School



Trinityville Anglican Church





Trinityville Health Center



Summary

Pre-disaster information is always a key resource in post disaster response (which includes post disaster assessments). When disaster strikes, it is critical to know how many people are likely to have been affected by the event and how. This requires knowledge of the demographic breakdown of the population and the likely vulnerability of different people to the disaster. Vulnerability will determine how badly they will be affected, how quickly they can be expected to recover and what kinds of assistance they are likely to need.

In many instances however, pre-disaster planning focuses on immediate response and action to protect human life and infrastructure, but without giving sufficient attention to damage and loss to livelihoods. Yet in the post-disaster period, if people are to recover, they need to restore their livelihoods as quickly as possible. This can only happen if detailed and quantitative information has been collected in advance of potential disasters so that <u>livelihood</u> <u>based contingency plans</u>, can be created and planned for.

In 2019, the Livelihood Based Assessment (LBA) and Contingency Planning approach was applied in Jamaica to provide pre-disaster livelihood information for five of the communities being supported through community projects funded by the Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund (CDRRF) of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). These communities included:

- 1. Trinityville in St. Thomas;
- 2. Llandewey in St. Thomas;
- 3. Peckham and its surrounding communities in Clarendon;
- 4. Jeffery Town in St. Mary; and
- 5. Savanna La Mar in Westmoreland.

This report presents the information that was collected for the LBA exercise done in Trinityville, St. Thomas.

NEED FOR THE ASSESSMENT

The Social Development Commission (SDC) an agency within the Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports has a mandate to facilitate community development in 783 communities and 4,417 districts in Jamaica.

It does this through:

- 1. Improving local governance, and
- 2. Establishing and maintaining community profiles and assessments, as the basis for
- 3. Facilitating community planning actions that lead to local development and priority actions.¹

The rationale for this profile is therefore to provide current, relevant information to inform development plans at the local levels in the communities, parochially and nationally.

¹ Social Development Commission Six Month Review – April to September 2009. Social Development Commission, 2010

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Initial data was collected in a dwelling count and socio-economic household survey conducted over a month from February to March 2009. The dwelling count facilitated the development of a community map that formed the basis of the sample frame used to select 10% of all dwellings in the community. It was from these dwellings that households were surveyed. Later, in 2019, wide community consultations and focus group sessions, observation and a convenience sample survey were used to collect primary data during the Livelihood-Based Assessment process.

Secondary data was obtained from reports and publications done by other agencies, ministries and departments, as well as a previous community profile.

DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative data analysis was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), KOBO Toolbox and Microsoft Excel applications.

Elementary occupations, in the context of this document, refers, inter alia, to those employed as street vendors, peddlers, door to door and telephone sales persons, domestic helpers and office cleaners, messengers, watchmen, garbage collectors, and labourers on building construction, mining, manufacturing and transport sites.

COMMUNITY AT A GLANCE

Trinityville is a rural community located approximately 20km away from the parish capital of Morant Bay. There is an estimated 1,881 individuals living in the community.

Trinityville is comprised of three (3) districts; they are Coley Lot, Trinityville Proper and Georgia. The major economic activity in the community is agriculture/farming but the community suffers immensely from poor farming practices which negatively affect the soil composition of the area and thus result in a number of environmental issues such as land slippages.

There are six educational institutions within the community: one high school, one primary school and four basic schools. The Robert Lightbourne High School was formerly known as the Trinityville Secondary School.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Trinityville has an estimated population of 1881 individuals and an average household size of 3.3 persons.

Unconventionally, women were primarily the head of the household in Trinityville, accounting for 56% of all household heads. Within these households, it is the persons aged 35-39and those over 60 who account for the majority. Among male-headed households, persons 60 years and over accounted for the majority. Overall however, the majority (54.3%) of household heads in the community are between 30-54 years of age.

Within the general population, the distribution of males to females was 44.1% to 55.9% with 54.8% of all persons being of working age (15-64 years). Of these working age persons 42% were of prime working age (20-59 years).

The population of Trinityville can be considered to be a relatively youthful one since persons aged 0-19 account for 43.8%. Of all males, those aged 10-14 and 15-19 years account for a 5.9% majority each while among females those in the 5-9 and 10-14 age cohorts account for a 6.9% majority each.

The majority (49.1%) of household heads is single but the most predominant family structure is the nuclear family indicating that for many of the households while both parents are presents, there is not a legal bond between them.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING DATA

The highest educational attainment met by heads of household was equal at the primary and secondary levels, each accounting for 38.6% of persons. However as it relates to distribution within individual levels of education, more females had primary level education as their highest while more males had secondary level education as their highest.

With regards to school enrollment for other members of the household, the data on Cedar Valley indicates that approximately 56% of all household members were enrolled in an educational institution with the majority (38.5%) being at the primary/prep school level.

The data on academic qualifications of household heads reveal that the majority (87.7%) of household heads have no academic qualification; however, of those having, the majority, 7%, held basic CXC, JSC or SSC qualifications or a vocational certificate.

Data on academic qualifications of other members of the households indicates that most members (75%) are without any academic qualification. Approximately 15% of members surveyed had subjects at the CXC general proficiency level or at the General Certificate of Examinations Ordinary Level.

TRAINING IN SPECIFIC OCCUPATION OR TRADE

Approximately 60% of all heads of households have training in a specific occupation or trade with 32.4% indicating this is in the area of agriculture. Interestingly, this is the area in which both males and females are highly trained. For males however, the only other significant finding in relation to training is that construction and cabinet making skills are very predominant while for females apparel and sewn products is the other significant area of training received.

HEALTH INDICATORS

Most (56.1%) of households in Trinityville use health centres. Fifty-nine percent of all household members, including heads, suffered from a long-standing health problem, the most common of which is hypertension. Twenty-one percent of households had members who suffered from a disability – hearing-related disabilities being the most common.

The most common method of garbage disposal was collection by the designated. However a relatively high percentage (64.9%) of households also indicated burning their garbage, creating an environmental concern for the community and possible contributes to many of the issues so highlighted.

TENURE STATUS OF HOUSE AND LAND

The majority of household heads (82.5%) own the house they reside in while 64.9% also own the land. Renting and living for free are other tenure options for houses while renting, living on family-owned lands and leasing are options engaged in for land.

HOUSING STOCK

The material of outer walls of dwellings is indicative of the quality and longevity of housing stock. Board was observed as the main material used in the construction of dwellings in Trinityville accounting for 52.7% of all dwellings. The majority of the houses (45%) in the community were deemed to be in fair condition, meaning there is need for minor repairs.

HOUSING AMENITIES

Pit latrines are used by a 49.1% majority of households, these facilities were however likely to be used alongside other forms of toilet facilities as respondents had the option of indicating all such facilities used.

Access to domestic water is another major indicator that can be used to measure the quality of life and well being of people. The majority (38.6%) of households in Trinityville indicated that they had a private water source piped into their dwellings. The availability of piped water in the community (publicly and privately piped into dwelling/ yard) does not compare favourably with the national situation in Other Towns where 83.5% of households have access to piped water (JSLC, 2007) as in this community is a mere 46%.

Household lighting is provided by electricity for 98% of households, which is higher than the overall national percentage of 90.3% reported in the Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007. Food is prepared by 91.2% of households using Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG). However, a relatively high percentage of households (38.6%) use charcoal for cooking as well.

EMPLOYMENT, OCCUPATION AND SKILLS

Most households (46.4%) in the community have only one employed member. Like household heads, the majority of other members are self-employed. Interestingly, seasonal employment among females is almost equal to that among males at 4.5% and 4.6%, respectively.

Consistent with all other findings, the data indicates that the majority of household members, 43.7%, have agricultural and farming skills with more of such persons being males. Within each sex, agricultural and farming skills were also the most dominantly found skill.

HOUSEHOLD HEAD EMPLOYMENT

In Trinityville, 61% of household heads were employed at the time of the survey. Agriculture is the main form of occupation held by household heads with approximately 35.1% of all heads being so occupied. Self-employment on a full-time basis is the most common employment status among household heads.

INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Not surprisingly, approximately 53% of household heads did not state their income, however, among the remaining 47% a 11.3% majority pointed to earning between \$20000-\$29000. Most households benefitted from state assistance as an additional source of income.

LIVELIHOOD ACTIVITIES

The main economic livelihoods for residents of Trinityville are farming, small business operation, and trade/skilled work. Among the activities carried out as small business operation are shop-keeping and food preparation. Trade/ craft workers include plumbers, carpenters and electricians.

IMPACT OF HAZARDS ON LIVELIHOOD

The environmental profile on Trinityville indicates flooding, bushfires, droughts and landslides as natural hazards more regularly and likely to impact the livelihood activities within the community. Hazards have varying impacts on the residents and their livelihood and as such strategies are employed to cope during these times. Some strategies include borrowing cash from family members, planting alternative crops, and use of alternate lands. Required responses to hazards include clearing of debris, the provision of food supplies and the provision of farm supplies.

PERCEPTION OF SAFETY AND LEVELS OF CRIME IN THE COMMUNITIES

No household reported having a member who was a victim of crime within their lifetime. This possibly accounted for approximately 65% of respondents being of the view that they were either unlikely to become victims of crime in the twelve-month period after the survey or that such a possibility didn't exist.

Inadequate street lights, reported by 38.6% of respondents, and overgrown lots, reported by 29.8% of respondents, were the most dominant public safety issues noted for the community. Notwithstanding these issues 93% of respondents felt at least safe within Trinityville with a similar percentage indicating that they felt crime in the community was low. These findings give credence to reports by 96.5% of household heads that crime had no effect on their lifestyle at the time the survey was conducted.

COMMUNITY CHALLENGES

The respondents in the household survey identified the following as the top five development priority/challenges:

- 1. Low water pressure/no water supply
- 2. No roads
- 3. Low skill levels
- 4. Highs levels of high school drop-outs
- 5. High levels of unemployment (youth and adult)

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
PICTORIAL OVERVIEW	iv
SUMMARY	V
ACRONYMS	xii
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	3



1 GEOGRAPHIC DATA

Description of Community Boundary
 Physical Features



2 SOCIAL DATA

- 2.1 Demographics
- 2.2 Education & Training

6

6

- 2.3 Housing2.4 Health & Sanitation
- 2.5 Social Services
- 2.5 Social Service



3 ECONOMIC DATA

7

8

11

17 17 22

3.1	Employment Data	24
3.2	Unemployment Data	27
3.3	Main Economic Activities	30
3.4	Involvement in Farming	30
3.5	Financial Services	31
3.6	Involvement in Social Safety Net	31
	Programmes	

x Community Profile and Livelihood Baseline Assessment - Trinityville, St. Thomas, Jamaica

23



4 LIVELIHOOD & 33 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DATA

4.1	Livelihood Profile	34
4.2	Environmental Profile	35
4.3	Hazard Analysis	37
4.4	Seasonal Calendar	39
4.5	Coping Strategies	39
4.6	Response Typology	41



5 SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

45

46

5.1 Crime & Public Safety



6 GOVERNANCE 48 DATA 48

6.1	Political Directorate	49
6.2	Social/Civic Organisations	49

REFERENCES

xi

52

Acronyms

AEB	Associate Examination Board
BMC	Borrowing Member Country
СВО	Community Based Oganisation
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDC	Community Development Committee
CDMC	Community Disaster Management Committee
CDRMP	Community Disaster Risk Reduction Plan
CDRRF	Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund
CXC	Caribbean Examinations Council
DAC	Development Area Committee
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ESSJ	Economic and Social Survey of Jamaica
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GCE	General Certificate of Examination
HH	Household
ILO	International Labour Organization
JADEP	Jamaica Drug for the Elderly Programme
JSLC	Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions
LBA	Livelihood Baseline Analysis
MHH	Male Headed Household
МОН	Ministry of Health
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NHF	National Health Fund
ODPEM	Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PATH	Programme of Advancement Through Health and Education
PDC	Parish Development Committee
PIOJ	Planning Institute of Jamaica
PTA	Parents and Teachers' Associations
RADA	Rural Agricultural Development Agency
SDC	Social Development Commission
SESP	Social and Economic Support Programme
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SSN	Social Safety Net
STATIN	Statistical Institute of Jamaica
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

Introduction

THE NEED FOR A LIVELIHOOD BASELINE AND CONTINGENCY PLAN

Pre-disaster information is always a key resource in post disaster response (which includes post disaster assessments). When disaster strikes, it is critical to know how many people are likely to have been affected and how. This requires knowledge of the demographic breakdown of the population and the likely vulnerability of different people to the disaster. Vulnerability will determine how badly they will be affected, how quickly they can be expected to recover and what kinds of assistance they are likely to need. In many instances however, pre-disaster planning focuses on immediate response and action to protect human life and infrastructure, but without giving sufficient attention to damage and loss to livelihoods. Yet in the post-disaster period, if people are to recover, they need to restore their livelihoods as quickly as possible. This can only happen if detailed and quantitative information has been collected in advance of potential disasters so that livelihood based contingency plans, can be created and planned for.

In 2019, the Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund (CDRRF) of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) partnered with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to introduce Borrowing Member Countries (BMC) in the region to the Livelihood Baseline Assessment (LBA) process which was pioneered by FAO and the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

The Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit² provides welldefined guidelines for the preparation of baselines that can be used to:

- analyse and respond to the impacts of disasters on the livelihoods;
- develop and update contingency plans.

In February 2019, a one-week training and capacity building session was held in Belize and introduced persons from Belize, the British Virgin Islands, Jamaica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines on the use of the LBA methodology for their own planning purposes.

OBJECTIVES OF THE LBA PROCESS

The objectives of the LBA approach are:

- a) To make it possible for countries to compare the livelihood context and activities for residents in the communities and local economies before and after a disaster
- b) To establish a robust basis for making estimates of the impact of disasters on livelihoods, in particular vulnerable groups, that can feed into various appeals for aid required for reconstruction and rehabilitation of the sector(s) affected.
- c) To provide a reliable basis for immediate postdisaster assessments including the initial Livelihood Impact Appraisal (Volume 3 of the Toolkit) and the more in-depth detailed Livelihood Assessment of the impact of disasters on livelihoods and identify opportunities and recovery capacities at the local, community and household levels (Volume 4).

² The Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit was published by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations and the International Labour Organisation in April 2009.

THE LBA PROCESS IN JAMAICA

Following the February 2019 capacity building, the Social Development Commission (SDC) conducted a total of five (5) Community Profiles and Livelihood Assessment reports to provide pre-disaster livelihood information for the communities being supported through projects funded by the Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund (CDRRF) of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). These communities included:

- 1. Trinityville in St. Thomas;
- 2. Llandewey in St. Thomas;
- Peckham and its surrounding communities in Clarendon;
- 4. Jeffery Town in St. Mary; and
- 5. Savanna La Mar in Westmoreland.

This report presents the LBA findings for the community of Trinityville, St. Thomas.

Methodology

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Primary and secondary data were used in the compilation of this community profile. Primary data was collected using data collectors doing a 10% sample survey. This was facilitated by the use of a map on which all land marks were identified. The whole process was supervised by a team leader under the direction of a Community Development Officer.

PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION METHODS

A dwelling count and socio-economic household survey were conducted during the February to July 2009 period. The dwelling count provided an opportunity for the verification of community boundary descriptions.

The dwelling count facilitated the development of a community map that formed the basis of the sample frame used to select 10% of all dwellings in the community. A systematic approach was used to select all dwellings for the survey. Simple random sampling was used to select participating households. Single households were self-selected. The head of household was identified as the respondent to the questionnaire. In the absence of the head of household another individual who could speak on matters of the household was selected.

Informal rap sessions were used to collect historical information of the community from residents.

LIVELIHOOD BASELINE ASSESSMENT

- Wide community and focus group sessions to define livelihoods and assess impacts and response needs to hazards.
- Observation/ completion of a Community Asset Inventory
- Convenience Sample survey conducted with members of the community examining the impact of hazards on their livelihood

SECONDARY DATA COLLECTION

Secondary data were gleaned from reports and publications provided by various agencies, ministries and departments, as well as from a previously completed profile on the community.

DATA ANALYSIS

With regard to the household survey, quantitative data analysis was conducted through the use of Microsoft Excel and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Data collected through the convenience sample was entered and analyzed utilizing KOBO Toolbox and Excel.

COMPILATION

This profile was compiled by the Social Development Commission.

³ KoBo Toolbox is a free open-source tool for mobile data collection. It allows users to collect data in the field using mobile devices such as mobile phones or tablets, as well as with paper or computers



Trinityville got its name from the Anglican (Holy Trinity) Church. It is assumed that the area known as Coley Lot got its name from Robert Lightbourne's parents, one of whom is famous for saying "If you think a so Lightbourne get Coley..." Cane farming was predominant from 1953-1969. A banana depot was established in 1940 and the tobacco industry was strong from the 1980's to 1996. Hurricane Charlie caused significant damage in 1951.

Figure 1: Development Area Map highlighting community's position⁴



⁴ A detailed map of the community may be available at the Social Development Commission's head office.

1.1 DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY BOUNDARY

From the point where Sommerset intersects with Cedar Valley main road at Sommerset cross roads:

Easterly and along Sommerset road to the bridge, then Southerly downstream Negro River to the border of Serge Island Property, then

Westerly across the Ackee factory to Georgia crossing; further westerly along Georgia main road to Copper River, further westerly along the foot of the hill and along the interior road leading to Guinep Tree, then Northerly to the point, where Jones Pen road, intersects with the Trinityville main road and then further northerly across the hill to the starting point.

DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY BORDERS

North: Sommerset South: Font Hill East: Seaforth West: Jones Pen

COMMUNITY DISTRICTS

- Trinityville Proper
- Coley Lot
- Georgia



CLIMATE PREDOMINANTLY







POPULATION AND AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The estimated total population for the community of Trinityville was 1881. The total estimated number of dwellings was 570 and the average household size was 3.3 persons which corresponded to the National and Rural Areas' averages of 3.3 and 3.4 persons respectively (The Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions (JSLC), 2007).

AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

The sex composition of household heads in the community was opposite to the trends across Jamaica, where the man is primarily reported as the head of the household. Figure 2.1 shows that only forty four percent 44% of the households in Trinityville were headed by males; this was significantly lower than the national average of 53.4% (JSLC, 2007).

Figure 2.1: Percentage Distribution of household heads by Sex in Trinityville



Approximately sixty one percent (61.3%) of household heads in Trinityville were between ages 30-59 years (Table 2.1); 29.9% of whom were males. Approximately thirty percent (29.9%) of households were headed by the elderly (aged 60 years and over). Approximately 19.3% of female headed households were headed by the elderly (aged 60 and over). **Table 2.1:** Age and Sex Distribution of the HouseholdHeads

Age Cohort (years)	% Male	% Female	% Total
15-29	3.5	5.4	8.9
30-34	7.0	3.5	10.5
35-39	1.8	10.5	12.3
40-44	5.3	5.3	10.5
45-49	7.0	3.5	10.5
50-54	7.0	3.5	10.5
55-59	1.8	5.3	7.0
60-65+	10.5	19.3	29.9
Total	43.9	56.1	100.0

Just below ten percent (8.9%) of households in Trinityville were headed by persons under 30 years of age (15-29 years) with females accounting for 5.4%.

AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION

An examination of the age and sex structure (Table 2.2) indicates that the community could be considered a youthful community as more than half (57.1%) of the population was under 35 years. Males in the community accounted for 24.6% of this age group and females accounted for 32.5%. The community had a higher percentage distribution (32.0%) of children (0-14 years) in the population than in the national population where children accounted for 28.3% (ESSJ, 2007).

Age Cohort (years)	% Male	% Female	% Total
0-4	2.7	5.3	8.0
5-9	4.3	6.9	11.2
10-14	5.9	6.9	12.8
15-19	5.9	5.9	11.8
20-24	1.6	3.7	5.3
25-29	2.1	1.1	3.2
30-34	2.1	2.7	4.8
35-39	3.7	3.7	7.4
40-44	3.7	3.7	7.4
45-49	2.7	2.7	5.4
50-54	2.1	2.7	4.8
55-59	1.6	2.1	3.7
60 – 64	0.5	0.5	1.0
65+	5.2	8.0	13.2
Total	44.1	55.9	100.0

Table 2.2: Age and Sex Distribution of the Population

Approximately 54.8% of the population was of working age (15-64 years old). The proportion of persons in the working age was below the overall national figure where the working age constitutes 63.4% of the population (ESSJ, 2007). Of the male population, 26% were of working age when compared to 28.8% of females. A total of 14.2% were elderly (60 years and over) in the community, which was slightly above the national percentage of 12.2% (ESSJ 2007). Females accounted for most of elderly (8.5%) compared to males (5.7%).

UNION STATUS

Most (49.1%) of the head of households in Trinityville were single, 31.6% were married, 12.3% were in common law union and 7.0% were widowed. (Fig. 2.2)



A look at union status by sex (Table 2.3) reveals that of the 49.1% household heads who were single, males represented 22.8% and females represented 26.3%. Among the 31.6% of household heads who were married, males represented 14.0% and females represented 17.5% while of 12.3% of household heads were in common-law relationships, males represented 7.0% and females represented 5.3%.

Table 2.3: Union Status of Household Heads by Sex

Union Status	% Male	% Female	% Total
Married	14.1	17.5	31.6
Common Law	7.0	5.3	12.3
Single	22.8	26.3	49.1
Widowed	0.0	7.0	7.0
Total	43.9	56.1	100.0

Figure 2.2: Union Status of Household Heads

FAMILY STRUCTURE

The main type of family structure that existed in the Trinityville community was the nuclear family (28.1%), followed by the extended family structure and single parent (female headed) with 22.8%each, single member accounted for (21.1%) and single parent (male headed) with 3.5%. The All Siblings family structure accounted for 1.8% (Fig. 2.3).



Figure 2.3: Union Status of Household Heads

Figure 2.4: Percentage Distribution of Households by

Size



HOUSEHOLD SIZE DISTRIBUTION

Figure 2.4 shows that (29.8%) of the households have two members. Another 21.1% of the households have one member; there were 12.3% of the households with five members; 10.5% of the households with three and four members each. There were also 8.8% of the households with six members and 1.8% of households with seven, eight, nine and eleven members each.

MIGRATION PATTERNS

Figure 2.5 indicates that a significant number (84.2%) of the household heads were born in St. Thomas. Over three percent (3.5%) of the household heads were born in Kingston, and approximately two percent (1.8%) were born in the remaining parishes each.



Figure 2.5: Parish of Birth of Household Head



EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

There are six educational institutions in the Trinityville community

- Ebenezer Basic School
- Georgia Basic School
- Trinityville Baptist Basic School
- Trinityville Seventh Day Adventist Basic School
- Trinityville Primary School
- Robert Lightbourne High School



Figure 2.6: Performance of Trinityville Primary School in GSAT 2010

ENROLLMENT

Fifty six percent (56.0%) of the households have members who were currently enrolled in an educational institution (Fig 2.7)

Figure 2.7: Percentage Distribution of Households with Members Currently Enrolled In Educational Institution



Table 2.4 shows that household members in Trinityville were enrolled in various types of educational institutions. The majority (38.5%) of the household members was enrolled at the primary/prep level; males accounted for 20% and females 18.5%. Approximately twenty-five percent (24.6%) were enrolled at the secondary/high level males accounted for 10.8% and females 13.8%. Over twenty-one percent (21.6%) of the members in the community were enrolled at the basic/ infant level: males accounted for 6.2% and females 15.4%. Approximately twelve percent (12.3%) were enrolled at the junior high level; males accounted for 3.1% and females 9.2%. Less than two percent (1.5%) were each enrolled in vocational training institutions and post-secondary institutions; all of whom were males.

The Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007 classifies enrollment under four (4) levels of education. These are early childhood, primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Enrolment at the Early Childhood Level accounted for 13.60%, Primary Level enrolment accounted for 32.7% while enrolment at the secondary and tertiary levels accounted for 25.8% and 2.1%, respectively. Compared to these national statistics on enrolment, the early childhood and primary enrolment levels were higher for Trinityville, while its secondary enrolment levels were lower. There was no tertiary level enrolment within Trinityville.

Table 2.4:	Educational	Institution	Enrollment
------------	-------------	-------------	------------

	Percentage Enrollment levels within Trinityville by sex		
Educational Institutions	Male %	Female %	Total %
Basic/infant school	6.2	15.4	21.6
Primary/prep school	20.0	18.5	38.5
All-Age	0.0	0.0	0.0
Junior High	3.1	9.2	12.3
Secondary/high school	10.8	13.8	24.6
Tertiary	0.0	0.0	0.0
Vocational Training programme	1.5	0.0	1.5
Post Secondary Inst.	1.5	0.0	1.5
Other types	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	43.1	56.9	100.0

ATTAINMENT

The majority of the household heads have attained either secondary or primary education (38.6% each). Over ten percent (10.5%) have attained All-Age education; this was followed by vocational education with 7.0%. All the remaining levels of educational attainment were less than two percent each. See Fig. 2.8. Of the total percentage of household heads that have attained secondary level education, males represented 22.8% and females 15.8%. Of the total percentage of household heads that have attained primary level education, males represented 14.0% and females 24.6% and of the total percentage of household heads that have attained all-age level education, males represented 3.5% and females 7.0% (Table 2.5).



Figure 2.8: Highest level of Education Attained by Household Head

Of the total percentage of household heads that have attained secondary level education, males represented 22.8% and females 15.8%. Of the total percentage of household heads that have attained primary level education, males represented 14.0% and females 24.6% and of the total percentage of household heads that have attained all-age level education, males represented 3.5% and females 7.0% (Table 2.5).

 Table 2.5: Highest level of education attained by household head by Sex

Level Attainment	% Male	% Female	% Total
Primary	14.0	24.6	38.6
Secondary	22.8	15.8	38.6
Elementary	0.0	1.8	1.8
All Age	3.5	7.0	10.5
Vocational	0.0	7.0	7.0
Other Tertiary	1.8	0.0	1.8
Other	1.8	0.0	1.8
Total	43.9	56.1	100.0

Figure 2.9 shows that the majority of the household heads in the community have not passed any examination (87.7%). The highest level of certification obtained by household heads was vocational certificate and CXC Basic, JHSC, JSC, JSCE or 3rd JLCL, SSC, JC 3.5% each. All the remaining examinations passed recorded 1.8% each.





Of the (87.7%) of household heads that did not passed any examination 38.6% were males and 49.1% were females. Of the (3.5%) of household heads that have acquired CXC Basic, JHSC, JSC, JSCE or 3rd JLCL,SSC, JC, 1.8% were males and 1.8% were females and of the 3.5%) of household heads that have acquired vocational certificate, all were males (Table 2.6). Table 2.6: Highest examination passed by the head of the household by Sex

Highest examination passed	% Male	% Female	% Total
None	38.6	49.1	87.7
CXC Basic, JHSC, JSC, JSCE or 3rd JLCL, SSC, JC	1.8	1.8	3.5
CXC General, GCE"O", AEB 1-2 Subjects	1.8	0.0	1.8
CXC General, GCE"O", AEB 3-4 Subjects	0.0	1.8	1.8
Vocational (Certificate	0.0	3.5	3.5
Associate Degree/Diploma/Other Certificates/Degrees	1.8	0.0	1.8
Total	43.9	56.1	100.0

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

Most of the household heads (75%) have no academic qualifications. Of this total, males represented 44.1% and females represented 30.9%. Approximately nine percent (8.8%) of the household heads have acquired

CXC General, GCE 'O' and AEB 1-2 Subjects; of that total males represented 2.9% and females represented 5.9%. Approximately 6% of the household heads have acquired vocational (certification); of this total males represented 1.5% and females represented 4.4% (Table 2.7).

Table 2.7: Academic Qualifications by Sex

Level of Academic Qualifications Attained	Percentage (%) Attainment by Sex		
	Male %	Female %	Total %
None	44.1	30.9	75.0
CXC General, GCE 'O', AEB 1-2 Subjects	2.9	5.9	8.8
CXC General, GCE 'O' , AEB 3-4 Subjects	1.5	2.9	4.4
CXC Gen, GCE 'O', AEB 5+ Subjects	1.5	0.0	1.5
Vocational (Certificate)	1.5	4.4	5.9
Not Stated	2.9	1.5	4.4
Total	54.4	45.6	100.0

TRAINING

Approximately 60% of household heads have received formal training in a specific activity, occupation or trade (Fig. 2.10).

Figure 2.10: Percentage Distribution of Household Heads that have received Training



Of the 59.6% of household heads that has received training for a specific activity, occupation or trade, males represented 31.6% and females 28.1%. (Table 2.8)

Table 2.8: Household head has received training for aspecific activity, occupation or trade by Sex

	% Male	% Female	% Total
Yes	31.6	28.1	59.6
No	12.3	28.1	40.4
Total	43.9	56.1	100.0

Figure 2.11 indicates that the majority of household heads (32.4%) were trained in agriculture or farming. Approximately fifteen percent (14.7%) were trained in apparel and sewn product and construction and cabinet-making each. Close to twelve percent (11.8%) of household heads were each trained in professional and technical skills, as well as hospitality skills. The least percentage of household heads was trained in beauty care and service (2.9%).

Figure 2.11: Specific Areas in which Household Head Received Training



Of those household heads trained in agriculture/ farming, males accounted for 17.6% and females 14.7%. Construction and cabinet making skills and apparel and sewn product skills recorded the similar percent (14.7%) each, all the percentage reported trained in the area of construction and cabinet making were males. Approximately three percent (2.9%) of males were trained in apparel and sewn product and 11.8% were females. The least percentage of household heads 2.9% were trained in beauty care service all of which were females (Table 2.9). Table 2.9: Area in which household head was trained by sex

Areas	% Male	% Female	% Total
Beauty care and services	0.0	2.9	2.9
Hospitality skills	8.8	2.9	11.8
Construction and cabinet making skills	14.7	0.0	14.7
Computing and information technology	0.0	5.9	5.9
Apparel and sewn product skills	2.9	11.8	14.7
Professional and technical skills	8.8	2.9	11.8
Agriculture/farming	17.6	14.7	32.4
Skills not stated	0.0	5.9	5.9
Total	52.9	47.1	100.0

The majority of the households received training by learning from a more experienced person (22.8%); this was followed by on-the-job training accounting for 17.5% of responses; vocational with certification, 10.5%; professional and technical training with certification, 8.8% and professional and technical training without certification, 1.8% (Table 2.10).

Table 2.10: Training received by household

Training Received	%
Learning from more experienced person	22.8
On the job training	17.5
Professional or Technical training with certificate	8.8
Vocational: with certificate	10.5
Vocational: without certificate	0.0
Professional or Technical training: without certificate	1.8
Other training	0.0

Figure 2.12 shows that 58% of household heads were employed using the training received. This was more than half of the household heads the community. **Figure 2.12:** Percentage Distribution of Head of Households Employed using Training Received.



Of the (58.1%) household heads that were employed using the training they received 41.9% were males and 16.1% were females (Table 2.11).

Table 2.11: Household currently employed using thetraining received by Sex

	% Male	% Female	% Total
Yes	41.9	16.1	58.0
No	12.9	29.1	42.0
Total	54.8	45.2	100.0



HOUSING MATERIALS

Approximately fifty three percent (52.7%) of the houses in the community materials of outer walls were made out of boards; another 27.6% were made out of blocks, 19.5% were made out of blocks and boards and a mere 0.2% outer made of woods (Table 2.12).

Table 2.12: Material of Outer Wall of houses

Material of Outer Walls	%
Wood	0.2
Board	52.7
Block	27.6
Blocks and Board	19.5
Total	100

HOUSING CONDITION

Table 2.13 shows that most 45% of the houses in the community were in fair condition, 25.5% were in good condition, 16.3% were in very good condition, 12.1% were in poor condition and 1.1% was in very poor condition.

Table 2.13: Housing Condition

Housing condition	%
Very Good	16.3
Good	25.5
Fair	45.0
Poor	12.1
Very poor	1.1
Total	100

 Very good
 Sound physical structure, freshly painted and doors and windows are intact

 Good
 Structure sound, may not be freshly painted but is in good physical condition

 Fair
 May or may not need painting, however, may have need for minor repairs

 Poor
 Damages to the structure, cracked / missing window panes / blades / doors

Very poor Not fit for human habitation

LAND AND BUILDING TENURE

Approximately sixty five percent (64.9%) of the households heads in Trinityville stated that they owned the land, 15.8% stated that they live on family owned land, 10.5% of the household heads said that they rented the land and 8.8% stated that they leased the land.

For building tenure, 82.5% of the heads of households said they owned the house that they lived in, while 14.0% rented the building and 3.5% lived for free (Table 2.14). Ownership of building in Trinityville was significantly higher than the national figure reported (59.8%); while the percentage for those who lived for free and those who rent/lease in Trinityville was lower than the national figure of 19% and 20.7%, respectively (The Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions, 2007).

Table 2.14: Types of Tenure for Land and Buildings inTrinityville

Types of Tenure	Land Tenure	Building Tenure
Own	64.9	82.5
Rent	10.5	14.0
Lease	8.8	-
Live for Free	-	3.5
Live on Family owned land	15.8	-
Have ownership pending for	-	-
Others	-	-

2.4 HEALTH AND SANITATION

HEALTH CARE SERVICES

There is only one healthcare facility in the community and this facility is at the primary healthcare level. For secondary health care (hospital services), residents have to travel to Lyssons to the Princess Margaret Hospital which is approximately 24km away. Table 2.15: Health Care Institutions (Clinics/Centres)

Name of Facility	Туре	Services Offered	Condition of Building
Trinityville	II	Maternal and Child Health (antenatal, postnatal, family planning, child health); curative and medical services; environmental health services	Fair

USE OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Approximately 56.1% of the households in Trinityville utilized health centers, 52.6% utilized hospitals, 26.3% utilized private health service and health clinics each and 15.8% used home remedy (Table 2.16).

The national figure indicated that 49.7% used public health care services (JSLC, 2007). When compared to the use of public health care in Trinityville, Trinityville reported a significantly higher percentage of use. This included a combination of health centers, health clinics and hospitals. The use of private healthcare in Trinityville was significantly lower than the national figure of 43.3% (Jamaica Survey of Living Condition 2007.) This shows that majority of the persons in the community utilized public health care facilities.

Table 2.16: Health Care Services Used by HouseholdMembers

Health Care Services	%
Private Health Services	26.3
Health Centers	56.1
NGO Health Services	0.0
Health Clinics	26.3
Hospitals	52.6
Home Remedy	15.8

OBSTACLES IN ACCESSING HEALTH CARE SERVICES

A significant percentage (68.4%) of the respondents experienced no obstacles in obtaining health services. However, where stated, the main obstacle experienced was that of having to wait too long for services (21.1%). Poor transportation was next with 14.0%, followed by financial constraint with 3.5 % (Table 2.17).

Findings in Trinityville were similar to that of the Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007, which reported that the main reason for not seeking health care was due to financial reasons as 39.9% of the households surveyed cited that they "Can't afford it". Only 3.5% of the households in Trinityville reported that financial constraint was a challenge. The difference in findings can be attributed to the free healthcare system that was introduced by the government in 2007.

Table 2.17: Main Obstacles Experienced in ObtainingHealth Services

Obstacles	%
Poor Transportation	14.0
Health Facilities too far from Home	0.0
Financial Constraints	3.5
Have to Wait too Long for Services	21.1
None	68.4

HEALTH PROBLEMS

Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the households heads in Trinityville indicated that they had members who were affected by a long standing health problem, while two (2%) didn't know if any members of the household were affected by any long standing health problem (Fig. 2.13).

Figure 2.13: Members of the Household Affected by a Long Standing Problem



Over twenty one percent (21.1%) of the heads of households were affected by hypertension. Seven percent (7%) were affected by sinusitis and arthritis each and over five percent (5.3%) were affected by diabetes and asthma each and (3.5%) suffer from heart diseases. All the other illnesses reported were under two percent (2%) of the household heads.

Of the other family members who suffer from any long standing health problem, hypertension and asthma recorded similar percent 10.5% each; this was followed by sinusitis 5.3%. All the other illnesses reported were under two percent 2% (Table 2.18).

Hypertension was the dominant long standing health problem in the community of Trinityville as shown in (Table 2.12) by the total number of household members. In addition hypertension was seen as the major health problem affecting the population. The Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007 reports that (50.9%) of all illnesses were recurring chronic illnesses specifically diabetes, hypertension, asthma and arthritis. In Rural Areas asthma accounted for (8.2%), hypertension (22.6%), diabetes, (10.8%) and arthritis (9.3%). The problems associated with asthma, hypertension and arthritis in Trinityville exceeded the national figure, while the problems associated with diabetes in the community was lower than the national figure.

Table 2.18: Type of Health Problems Affecting Heads of Household and other Family Member

Turner (Discourse)	Percent Distribution (%)			
Types of Diseases	Head of Household	Other Family Members	# of Household Members	
Hypertension	21.1	10.5	29.8	
Hypotension	1.8	0.0	1.8	
Heart Disease	3.5	0.0	3.5	
Kidney Disease	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Asthma	5.3	10.5	12.3	
Diabetes	5.3	1.8	7.0	
Arthritis	7.0	1.8	8.8	
Glaucoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Sickle cell	1.8	1.8	3.5	
Sinusitis	7.0	5.3	10.5	
Other diseases	1.8	100.0	3.5	

HOUSEHOLD DISABILITY

The majority (79%) of the households did not have any member who suffered from any disabilities. Twenty one percent (21%) of the households had members who suffered from disabilities. (Fig 2.14)

Figure 2.14: Members of household suffer from disability



Of the households with persons who suffered from disabilities, hearing only was dominant at 7.0%, this was followed by physical disabilities 3.5%, mental retardation and speech only recorded 1.8% each. See Table 2.19.

Table 2.19: Types of Disabilities by PercentageDistribution of Households

Types of Disability	%
Sight Only	0.0
Hearing Only	7.0
Speech Only	1.8
Physical disability	3.5
Multiple Disability	0.0
Slowness of Learning	0.0
Mental retardation	1.8
Mental Illness	0.0

WATER SUPPLY

The main water source in the community was private supply piped into dwelling (38.6%). This was followed by water trucked into community (31.6%), then spring/river/stream 21.1%, public pipe into dwelling 17.5% and public stand pipe 10.5% (Table 2.20).

The use of public stand pipe in the community (10.5%) was slightly lower the national figure (11.3%) for Rural Areas reported by the Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007.

Table 2.20: Household Main Water Source

Source of water supply	%
Private catchments (tanks/well/drums)	3.5
Public Catchments (wells)	0.0
Public piped into yard	3.5
Purchase water (e.g. Rapid response)	0.0
Public Piped into dwelling	17.5
Private piped into dwelling	38.6
Public Stand Pipe	10.5
Spring/River/Stream	21.1
Water trucked to community	31.6

TOILET FACILITIES

Pit latrines were the main toilet facility used by the majority (49.1%) of the households. This was followed by sewer/WC not linked to sewer (35.1%) and the least facility used was sewer/WC linked to sewer (17.7%). See Table 2.21.

The use of pit toilet in the community was higher than the national figure of 34.6% reported by the Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007.

Table 2.21: Types of Toilet Facility

Турез	%
Sewer/WC linked to sewer	17.5
Sewer/WC not linked to	35.1
sewer	49.1
Pit latrine	0.0
Soak away	

*This question allowed for multiple responses.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Table 2.22 indicates that households engaged in only two methods of garbage disposal across the community. Those whose garbage was picked up by truck amounted to 82.5% while those who had their garbage burnt amounted to 64.9%.

Table 2.22: Household Garbage Disposal

Methods of Garbage Disposal	%
Bury	0.0
Picked up by truck	82.5
Dump in sea/river/pond/gully	0.0
Burn	64.9
Recycle	0.0
Dump on a site	0.0
No response	0.0

ENERGY SOURCES

Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the households in the Trinityville community had electricity (Figure 2.15); this figure was higher than the national figure of (90.3%). Kerosene lamps (2.0%) were the only other source of energy utilized in the community. The use of kerosene lamp was lower than the national figure (6.3%) reported by the Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions 2007.

Figure 2.15: Energy use in Trinityville



COOKING FUEL

The main source of fuel used for cooking was gas (91.2%). A large percentage of persons in the community used charcoal 38.6% and fourteen percent (14.0%) used wood (Table 2.23).

Table 2.23: Cooking Fuel Used by Households

Sources	%
Gas	91.2
Wood	14.0
Charcoal	38.6
Other fuel	0.0

TRANSPORTATION & ROAD NETWORK

The data indicates that households in the community utilized more than one form of transportation. Of the forms utilized licensed taxi was the dominant one (91.2%), second was the use of robot (unlicensed taxi) (35.1%); followed by the use of bus (29.8%) and the least type utilized was bicycle with 1.8% (Table 2.24). **Table 2.24:** Main form of Transportation amongHouseholds

Transportation	%
Bus	29.8
Robot	35.1
Motor Cycle	0.0
Licensed Taxi	91.2
Bicycle	1.8
Motor Car	3.5

COMMUNICATIONS

Ninety six (96%) of the households in Trinityville have telephone service (Fig. 2.16).

Figure 2.16: Households with Telephone Service



The majority of the households in the community have cellular telephone (75%) and the remaining twenty five percent (25%) have both landlines and cellular telephones (Fig 2.17).

Figure 2.17: Types of telephone service



None of the households surveyed had internet services at the time.



Table 2.25 indicates the various social services that were existent in Trinityville at the time of the survey.

Table 2.25:	Social	Services	Present	within	the
Community					

Туреѕ	#	Location (District)
Health Centres	1	Coley Lot
Schools	6	Coley Lot, Trinityville Proper, Georgia
Post Office/Agency	1	Trinityville Proper
Police Station	1	Trinityville Proper
Community Centre	1	Trinityville Proper

3 Economic Data





HOUSEHOLD HEAD EMPLOYMENT

Sixty one percent (61%) of the household heads in Trinityville indicated that they were employed at the time of the survey (Fig. 3.1).

Figure 3.1: Household head employed



Approximately thirty five percent (35.1%) of the employed household heads were males and 26.3% were females (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1: Employment Status of Heads by Sex

Employment Status	% Male	% Female	Total
Yes	35.1	26.3	61.4
No	8.8	29.8	38.6
Total	43.9	56.1	100.0

HOUSEHOLD OCCUPATIONS

Table 3.2 shows the occupations of household heads, 35.1% of the household heads were skilled in agriculture and fishery; this was followed by service workers and shop and market sales workers 8.8%. Seven percent (7.0%) of household heads were employed as professionals and approximately (5.3%) were employed as craft and related trade workers and in elementary occupation each.

Table 3.2: Occupation of household heads

Occupations of household heads	%
Legislators	0.0
Professional	7.0
Technicians and associate professionals	0.0
Clerks	0.0
Service workers and shop and market sales workers	8.8
Skilled agricultural and fishery	35.1
Craft and related trades workers	5.3
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	0.0
Elementary occupations	5.3

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS

The majority (55.9%) of the household heads were self employed full time. Approximately twenty one percent (20.6%) of the household heads were employed full time, 14.7% were self employed part time, 5.9% were employed seasonally and 2.9% were employed part time. (Figure 3.2)



Figure 3.2: Employment Status of household heads
INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Figure 3.3 shows that approximately four percent (3.8%) of household heads indicated that they earned \$80,000 - \$129,999 per month, (5.7%) of household heads earned an income of \$5,999 and under per month, (9.5%) of household heads indicated that they earned \$6,000 - \$19,999 per month, (11.3%) of household heads earned an income of \$20,000 - \$29,999 per month and (13.2%) earns an income of \$30,000 - \$79,999 per month each. It is however, notable that approximately (52.8%) of household heads provided no response and (3.8%) not applicable to the question regarding their monthly income.





ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INCOME

The main source of additional income for the households head in the community was state assistance (36.8%). A significant percentage (31.6%) of the household heads in the community received no additional income, while 21.1% received support by local network of family members and friends. Approximately nineteen percent (19.3%) of the household heads in the community received remittances and 3.5% of households heads additional source of income from rental of property. (Table 3.3)

Figure 3.3: Additional Sources of Income

Sources	%
State Assistance	36.8
Remittances	19.3
SESP	0.0
Support by local network of family members and friends	21.1
Rental of property	3.5
Interest from financial investment	0.0
Other avenues	0.0
No additional source	31.6

*This question allowed for multiple responses.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

Approximately 56.9% of the persons within the labourforce of Trinityville were employed while 43.1% were unemployed (Fig. 3.4).

Figure 3.4: Percentage Distribution of Persons Employed and Unemployed



The average number of employed persons per household was one person (mean 1.18). The data below (Figure 3.4a) represents the percentage distribution of employed members per household. It reveals that most (46.4%) of the households in the community had one household member employed, while 23.2% had no member employed and two members employed each. Approximately 5.4% had three members employed, while 1.8% had five employed.



Figure 3.4a: Number of Household Members Employed

Table 3.4: Status of Employment by Age Group and Sex

Table 3.4 indicates that the majority (61.5%) of the employed persons in the community were self-employed; most of these persons were males (35.9%). A large percentage (24.9%) of the residents of the community was employed on a full-time basis with males dominating (13.7%). The level of self-employment in the community exceeded the national situation where self-employment was 35.8% (The Economic and Social Survey of Jamaica (ESSJ), 2007).

Seasonal employment accounted for 9.1% with the males almost equivalent to the females 4.6% and 4.5% respectively. No females were employed part time and no contractual employment was recorded. Based on the data presented, more males (58.7%) were employed in the community than females (41.3%).

Age Group	Self- Employ	/ed	Seaso	nal	Full Ti	me	Part Ti	ime	Contra	actual	Total
	М	F	М	F	м	F	М	F	м	F	
14-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5
20-24	1.5	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6
25-29	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7
30-34	4.5	1.5	00	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5
35-39	7.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	3	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18
40-44	4.5	4.5	1.5	1.5	0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.5
45-49	1.5	1.5	1.6	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.6
50-54	1.5	3	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.2
55-59	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1
60+	10.4	4.5	1.5	1.5	0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.6
Total	35.9	25.6	4.6	4.5	13.7	11.2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100



Of the unemployed labour force; 32% were males and 68% were females (Table 3.5). This data supports the national trend where female unemployment rate in the country exceeds that for male.

The unemployment level was highest among persons sixty years and over; this was indicated among 30% of household members surveyed (Table 3.5). This was followed by the 14-19⁵ years age group with its unemployment level at a high of 16.%, divided equally among males and females. Next was the group 20-24 years with unemployment level at 12.0%, males represented 2.0% and females 10.0%. The level of unemployment was lowest among the 50-54 years indicated by 2.0% all of which was represented by females.

The data also indicates that youths (14-24) accounted for 18.0% of the unemployed labour force, which was lower than the national figure of 23.6% (ESSJ, 2007). In total far more females (68.0%) were unemployed compared to males (32.0%)

Age group	Unemployed			
	Male	Female	Total	
14 – 19	8.0	8.0	16.0	
20 – 24	2.0	10.0	12.0	
25 – 29	4.0	0.0	4.0	
30 – 34	2.0	8.0	10.0	
35 – 39	0.0	4.0	4.0	
40 - 44	4.0	4.0	8.0	
45 – 49	2.0	6.0	8.0	
50 – 54	0.0	2.0	2.0	
55 – 59	2.0	4.0	6.0	
60 +	8.0	22.0	30.0	
Total	32.0	68.0	100.0	

Table 3.5: The Unemployed by Age Group and Sex

REASONS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

The main reasons for unemployment among household heads were retirement (12.3%) and trying to find work and illness (reported by 7% each). Other reasons reasons are presented in Table 3.6. The main reasons for unemployment of other family members were retirement and trying to find work (21.1% each); illnesses, 12.3; no reason (would accept if offered), 10.5% and cannot find work, 8.8%. All the other reasons for unemployment among other family members were below 6.0%. See Table 3.6 for additional information.

Table 3.6: Main Reasons for Unemployment

Reasons for not	% Distr	ibution
Wanting to Work	Head of the Household	Other Family Members
There is no reason for my unemployment (would accept if offered)	3.5	10.5
Awaiting a promised job	1.8	3.5
Currently attending school	1.8	3.5
Trying to find work	7.0	21.1
Amount of pay	0.0	3.5
Illness	7.0	12.3
Retired	12.3	21.1
Have to stay with sick relative	5.3	3.5
Have qualification but cannot find suitable work	5.3	5.3
Do not have skills or qualification	0.0	3.5
Just don't want to work	0.0	1.8
Trying to start a business	1.8	5.3
Cannot find work	5.3	8.8

⁵ Persons attending school on a full-time basis were excluded

PERIOD OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The majority (46%) of household members was unemployed for 5 years or more, males represented 8% and females represented 36%. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the unemployed members in the households never worked in their adult life, males represented 12% and females represented 10%. Sixteen percent (16%) of household members were unemployed for 3-4 years; males represented 4% and females represented 12%. Twelve percent (12%) of household members were unemployed for 1-2 years; males represented 4% and females represented 8%. Four percent (4%) of the households members who were unemployed for less than 12 months; males represented 2.0% and females represented 2.0%. See Table 3.7.

 Table 3.7:
 Percentage Distribution of Periods of

 Unemployment by Gender among Households

Time Frame	% Male	% Female	% Total
Never worked in my adult life	12.0	10.0	22.0
Less than 12 months	2.0	2.0	4.0
1-2 years	4.0	8.0	12.0
3-4 years	4.0	12.0	16.0
5 years or more	8.0	38.0	46.0
TOTAL	30.0	70.0	100.0

SOURCES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Approximately thirty percent (29.8%) of the unemployed heads of the households in Trinityville received financial support from state assistance and support from local network of family and friends each. Other financial support came from remittances 14%; salaries from other members of the household 10.5% and savings and/loans from commercial banks or credit union 7% (Table 3.8).

Table 3.8: Main Sources of Financial Support Receivedby Unemployed Heads of Household

Main Sources of Financial Support	%
State Assistance	29.8
Remittances	14.0
SESP	0.0
Support from local network of family and friends	29.8
Salaries from other members of the household	10.5
Savings and/loans from commercial banks or Credit Union	7.0
Other avenues	0.0

HOUSEHOLD OCCUPATIONS

The main occupation in the community was skilled agricultural and fisheries worker (47.7%) which comprised of 29.2% males and 18.5% females. This was followed by elementary occupation (18.3%) which comprised of 6.1% males and 12.2% females. Service workers, shop and market sales workers amounted to 12.4% which comprised of 6.2% males and 6.2% females. The lowest prevalence of workers was plant and machine operators and assemblers (3.1%) which comprised of only males (Table 3.9).

Table 3.9: Main Occupations by Gender

Occupation Group	Percentage (%)			
(Categorizations Taken from STATIN Labour Force Survey)	Male	Female	Total	
Professionals	6.2	4.6	10.8	
Technicians and associate profession	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clerk	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Service Workers, Shop and Market Sales Workers	6.2	6.2	12.4	
Skilled Agricultural and Fisheries Workers	29.2	18.5	47.7	
Craft and related trade workers	7.7	0.0	7.7	
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	3.1	0.0	3.1	
Elementary	6.1	12.2	18.3	
Total	58.5	41.5	100.0	

EXISTING SKILLS

The three top skills found in the community were agriculture/farming skills, 43.7%, of which males represented 28.1% and females 15.6%. Apparel and sewn products skills (12.5%) and construction and cabinet making skills (10.9%) completed the top three. See Table 3.10

Type of Skill	% Male	% Female	Overall %
Beauty care and service skills	1.6	3.1	4.7
Office Clerk skills	0.0	1.6	1.6
Hospitality skills	1.6	6.3	7.9
Art and craft skills	0.0	0.0	0
Construction and cabinet making skills	10.9	0.0	10.9
Machine and appliance skills	4.7	0.0	4.7
Computing and Information Technology skills	0.0	3.1	3.1
Apparel and sewn product skills	1.6	10.9	12.5
Commercial and sales skills	0.0	0.0	0
Professional and technical skills	1.6	3.1	4.7
Agricultural/farming skills	28.1	15.6	43.7
Not specified	1.6	4.6	6.2
Total	51.7	48.3	100.0



3.3 MAIN ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

The main economic activities in the community are:



LAND USES

Agricultural and residential uses were the two main uses of land in Trinityville.

Table 3.11: Use of land in Trinityville

Activities	%
Agricultural	45
Commercial	10
Social (green spaces, institutions)	5
Residential	40

3.4 INVOLVEMENT IN FARMING

Fifty six percent 56% of the households in the community were engaged in farming activity (Fig. 3.5).

Figure 3.5: Percentage Distribution of Households engaging in Farming



Table 3.12 shows that the main farming activities done in the community was the cultivation of green bananas (43.9%), ground provisions (38.6%), sugar cane (14.0%), cash crop and fruits (12.3%) each and poultry rearing 5.3%.

Table 3.12: Main Farming Activities in Trinityville

Main Farming Activities	%
Ground provision	38.6
Sugar cane	14.0
Poultry Rearing	5.3
Cash Crop	12.3
Green Banana	43.9
Live stock rearing	0.0
Fish Breeding	0.0
Bee Keeping	0.0
Fruits	12.3

Sixty nine percent (69%) of the land utilized for farming was in the community (Fig. 3.6)

Figure 3.6: Land utilized for farming



Figure 3.7 shows that 53.1% of the land that was used for farming in the community was family owned, 25% of the land was leased and 21.9% of the land used for farming was squatted on.





Figure 3:8 indicates the ways in which the farming products were disposed of in the community. The farming products in Trinityville were disposed of in three ways through home use and local market 56.3%, home use only 40.6% and home and export 3.1%.

Table 3.13: Financial Institutions use by Residents

Financial Entities	%
Commercial banks	47.0
Merchant banks	0.0
Local government loan agencies	0.0
Credit Unions	3.5
PC Banks	3.5
Partners	1.8
No institution	45.6
Other institution	0.0

3.6 BENEFICIARIES SOCIAL SAFETY NET PROGRAMMES

Forty percent (40%) of households in the community benefited from social safety net programmes (Fig. 3.9).

Figure 3.9: Involvement in Social Safety Net Programmes by Households



Figure 3.8: Disposal of Farm Produce





FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS USED

Forty six percent (47%) of the households used commercial banks, 45.6% of the households used no financial institution, 3.5% used credit unions and PC banks each and 1.8% used partners (Table 3.13).

Approximately thirty-two percent (31.6%) were beneficiaries of PATH, 3.5% benefited from other social safety net programmes and 1.8% benefited from the National Health Fund. PATH beneficiaries in the community were lower than the national figure (43.7%) of persons in rural areas accepted by PATH (JSLC 2007).

Table 3.14: Types of Social Safety

Types of Social Safety	%
PATH	31.6
Poor Relief	0.0
National Health Fund	1.8
JaDEP	0.0
Others	3.5

When the respondents were questioned about the main challenges faced when accessing the PATH programme, the information in Table 3.15 shows that 28.1% of the respondents said that they experienced no challenges, while 3.5% each said the response from the programme was slow and 1.8% said that they encountered difficulty in keeping up with the requirements of the programme. See Table 3.15.

Table 3.15: Challenges Faced when Accessing thePATH

Challenges	%
Response is slow	3.5
Accessing the programme is difficult	0.0
Distance	0.0
Poor customer service	0.0
Difficulty in keeping up with the requirements of the programme	1.8
None	28.1

4 Livelihood and Environmental Assessment Data

This section explains the livelihood coping and recovery strategies of the people of Trinityville in the wake of natural hazards. This information is a key resource for post disaster response as it is critical to know how many people are likely to be affected and what response is needed.

The key elements of this section include hazard information and analysis, livelihood exposure and vulnerability profiling, and a contingency plan which outlines the livelihood support needed and institutions for livelihood support.

The data herein presented was collected via mixed methodology. The quantitative approach took the form of a quantitative survey which was administered to 31 individuals within the communities of Trinityville, Font Hill, Mount Lebanus, Somerset and Danvers Pen using convenience sampling. Additionally, an Observation Sheet which captured existing assets and businesses, and an assessment of the vulnerability of natural and man-made resources was completed. The qualitative approach involved informal interviews with a cross-section of the residents (youths, elderly, men and women) and a community wide meeting.



Livelihoods consist of the capabilities, assets (both material and social resources), and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide net benefits to other livelihoods locally and more widely, both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base. (The Livelihood Assessment Tool-Kit) To plan for and evaluate the possible impact hazards may have on the livelihoods within a community, an understanding of the types of livelihoods present, the resources needed, the susceptibility of these livelihoods to hazards (natural and man-made) and the existing and required response mechanisms, is fundamental.

In keeping with the data found by the household survey as presented in Table 3.5, the qualitative engagement with the community in 2019 identified three main types of livelihood in Trinityville. This is supported by the findings of the accompanying convenience sample, across all the areas aforementioned, where 48.4% were involved in farming, 25.8% in small business operation, 12.9% in trade/craft industry and the remaining 12.9 in other areas of work. The types of livelihood are presented in Figure 4.1.

Figure 24: Main Livelihoods present in Jeffery Town



FARMING



SMALL BUSINESS



Table 4.1: Profile of Main Livelihoods

Types of Livelihoods	Skills Needed	Tools & Equipment Needed	Natural Resources Utilized/needed
Farming	 Knowledge of: How to take care of stock How to clean the coops How to keep the area sanitized (appropriate footwear, etc) How to maintain resources received. 	• Tractors • Machete • Forks • Spray Pans	Utilized: • Rivers • Land Needed resources • Irrigation system • Good farm roads • Bridges • Low credit facilities
 Small business operation: Pillow-making Shop-keeping Mechanic shops Cook shops 	Customer service	 Igloo/refrigerator Sanitation area (basin, hand towels, soap) 	• Water
Trade/craft: Carpenters Electricians Plumbers Refrigerator technicians	• Technical skills associated with the type of trade	 Electric saws Showels Drills Mixers Ax-saws 	

4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROFILE

The majority (82.5%) of household respondents stated that flooding was the main environmental issue faced by the community. Approximately 12% stated that landslides/falling rocks were another environmental issue faced by the community while 7% of the heads of households stated that were no environmental issues by the community (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Environmental Issues Faced by Community

Environmental Issues	%
Landslides/rock falls	12.3
Water pollution	5.3
Flooding	82.5
Wild fire	0.0
Deforestation	0.0
Wind damage	5.3
Blocked drains	5.3
Illegal dumping of garbage	3.5
Noise pollution	0.0
Air pollution	3.5
None	7.0

VULNERABILITY TO NATURAL HAZARDS/ DISASTER

Ninety one percent (91%) of the heads of households stated that the community was susceptible to natural disasters (Fig 4.2).

Figure 4.2: Community susceptibility to natural disasters



Flooding was the main disaster against which the community was felt to be vulnerable; this was reported by 87.7% of households. This was followed by hurricanes (50.9%), freak storms (5.3%), and storm surges (1.8%). See Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Types of Natural Hazards

Environmental Issues	%
Flooding	87.7
Earthquakes	0.0
Mudslides/Landslides	5.3
Storm Surges	1.8
Hurricanes	50.9
Freak Storms	0.0

The Livelihood Baseline Assessment further details how these and other hazards impact the livelihood of residents and the response mechanisms that are already in place, as well as those needed to sustain livelihoods.

Linked to the responsiveness of residents to hazards is their knowledge of the location of disaster shelters and their willingness to access them. With regard to knowledge, the vast majority (91%) was aware of the location of the emergency shelter in the community. See Figure 4.3.





In the event of natural disasters 47.4% of respondents indicated that they did not know if the shelters were accessible, 36.8% of respondents indicated that the shelters were accessible and they were willing to go to the community shelters; while 5.3% of respondents indicated that the shelters were accessible but they were unwilling to leave home/personal belongings and 3.5% indicated that the shelters were not accessible, terrains prevents easy access to disaster facilities. See Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Accessibility of Emergency Shelters

Perception Of Shelter Accessibility	%
Do not know	47.4
Not accessible and is limited by the absence of transport to go to the facility	0.0
Not accessible, terrain prevents easy access to disaster facility	3.5
Not accessible, unable to cross internal community borders	0.0
Accessible, willing to go in event of natural disasters	36.8
Accessible, unwilling to leave home/ personal belongings	5.3

.3 HAZARD ANALYSIS

One function of the fieldwork for the compilation of the livelihood baseline is to get consensus from key stakeholders on the frequency, severity and geographical impact of hazards within the district. Consistent with the findings of the household survey (as presented in Table 4.3 above), the community consultation indicated three (3) hazards against which the main livelihoods in Trinityville, and the five other communities benefitting from the CDB's funding, were most vulnerable. They are:

- 1. Flooding
- Landslides
- 3. Drought
- 4. Bushfires

Flooding has the greatest significant physical and financial impact on Mount Lebanus while Somerset, Jones Pen and also Mount Lebanus suffer the greatest physical impact from landslides. All areas suffer high overall/financial loss; the overall impact of these hazards ranges from medium to high across the six communities. The community believed that "change of climate" was causing flooding to take place outside of the normal season of May/June. The erection of a bridge leading into the district of Georgia (Trinityville community) has, however, resulted in the reduction of the flooding and its impact as roadways would have previously been rendered impassable. The physical characteristics of all six communities make them very vulnerable to flooding since all feature rivers of varying nature. However, it is the absence of river training that was deemed a major contributor to flooding.

As it relates to landslides, heavy rains lead to land slippages which have resulted in houses being covered with silt in the Somerset community. Landslides are thus more frequent during periods of heavy rainfall; this, and the anticipation of other hazards, is said to create high levels of emotional and mental stresses upon residents. While not suffering the extent of landslide, periods of heavy rainfall cause residents in Moffat district of Jones Pen to have to relocate from their homes. In addition to the loss of crops, landslides impact the livelihood of farmers in that their produce is unable to reach to markets. Small business operators who rely on the delivery of products from outside the community also suffer economic losses due to being unable to maintain stock levels particularly of basic food items. Notably, outside of periods of heavy rainfall, the main road from the Danvers Pen Bridge to Font Hill intersection suffers from falling rocks. These have the potential of both hindering the passage of farm produce as well as endangering the lives and property of road users.

The dry season brings not only agricultural losses but also impacts the housing stock. As conditions get drier the earth shifts resulting in severe cracks in the walls. Periods of drought are believed to be more commonplace than in former years but still difficult to determine. The year 2015, for example, saw very minimal rainfall while 2016 had rainfall the entire year. Generally speaking, droughts occur twice per year for varying lengths of time. This hazard results in increased food prices and an inability to plant many crops.

While not highlighted as a major hazard impacting livelihoods, residents indicate that the pollution of rivers via the over-use or poor use of chemicals in and around these water bodies is of growing concern. Rivers also become polluted as persons often dispose of garbage and animal carcasses in them. The frequency of events impacting the community formed part of the household survey. As indicated in Figure 4.4, 68.4% of the respondents stated that the community was last affected by a natural disaster 7-12 months prior to the survey. Approximately 16% stated that the community was last affected 19-24 months prior and 3.5% do not know when.

Table 4.5 presents the three hazards along with their yearly frequency and season, the geographic areas usually affected and the severity of physical and financial losses. The scores assigned to physical and financial losses were assessed on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being most severe. In determining the overall impact both physical and financial losses were collectively taken into consideration.

Do not know **3.5**%

Figure 4.4: Time last impacted by natural disaster



Talala	4 5.		Matuit
laple	4.5:	Hazard	Matrix

Types	Frequency	Season	Geography	Total Physical Damage	Total Loss Score	Overall Impact on Livelihood
Flooding	Twice per year	May, June	Font Hill Sommerset Trinityville Jones Pen Hillside Mount Lebanus	3 2 1 1 2 5	3 2 1 1 2 5	Medium
Landslide	Twice per year (based on weather)	June - November	Somerset Hillside Jones Pen Mount Lebanus Danvers Pen Font Hill	5 3 5 5 3 4	4-5 (all areas)	High
Drought	Twice per year at a minimum (difficult to track)	No set season (March/April traditional period)	All areas		5	High

The findings of the community discussion are supported by that of the convenience sample. The findings of the latter indicate that farmers were primarily affected by a combination of flooding and landslides while small businesses were primarily affected by landslides. Trade/skilled workers were primarily affected by drought. The loss of earnings was reported as the major impact of hazards on small business operators while loss of crops was reported at highest distribution among farmers.



A wide variety of crops are produced in Trinityville and under normal conditions just about any crop is prosperous. The main crops planted in the area are ackee, plantain, banana, coffee and carrot. The carrot is of very high quality and is supplied to top-ranked agro-processing/manufacturing company, Grace. Coffee is also of premium quality as it is planted in the Blue Mountain Range. Other crops planted include irish potato, onion, ginger, pineapple, callaloo, hot and sweet peppers, gungo peas, plantain, bananas, yam, pumpkin, sorrel, sweet potato, cabbage, peanut and sugar cane. Irish potato and ginger are, of note, were recently introduced at a wide level to the community. Irish potato does not do well in drought conditions and as with other crops, if the conditions for planting and growth are not favourable then farmers will not plant them. Cocoa, on the other hand, is able to withstand drought and has a stable price.

Understandably, different crops have varying seasons for planting and reaping. Farmers must therefore be knowledgeable of what crops are best suited at different times of the year and based on varying weather conditions.

Table 4.6 indicates the various activities carried out by farmers during a normal year; that is, when there is no hazard impacting the area.

4.5 COPING STRATEGIES

In order to meet their food and income needs, households must employ a number of strategies to sustain themselves or continue with their livelihoods when such livelihoods are affected by natural hazards. Some strategies are deemed to be positive while others are negative. Among the positive strategies is the engagement of alternative livelihoods such as participation in an income-generating revolving entertainment scheme called Round Robin. In this scheme, members contribute a set amount of funding with each member being able to obtain a 'draw' (access the sum of what would he/she would have contributed over the life-cycle of the scheme) and host the event based on the nature of the scheme. With Trinityville, the Round Robin event takes place in the form of 'chicken back or chicken neck' parties; that is, parties at which this protein is the main food item served.

In addition to alternate livelihoods, some farmers are able to access additional lands that can be used to plant different crops during periods of drought. Where farmers do not have this opportunity, their livelihood suffers.

Table 4.7 presents the three main hazards most regularly affecting livelihoods in Trinityville and accompanying project communities; attendant strategies at coping are also presented. Strategies presented relate primarily to farming which is the most susceptible to natural hazards. As seen in the table, a range of coping strategies are employed.

Table 4.6: Seasonal Calendar of Activities during a Normal

Description of Activities	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Effects of Hazards
Occurrence of hazards			D	D	F	F							Crops rotated during drought
Land preparation (highland)	~												The time of year to do activities depends on the temperature in the area
Land preparation (lowlands)						\checkmark	~						
Planting in highlands	lrish, carrot, ginger	lrish, carrot, ginger	Irish, carrot, ginger, drought- resistant crops	Irish, carrot, ginger, drought- resistant crops	lrish, carrot, ginger								Outside of the normal practice, planting in highlands is done during periods of drought to access cooler temperature
Planting in lowlands	Cash crops	Cash crops	Cash crops, onion	Cash crops, onion	Cash crops, ackee	Cash crops, ackee (H)	Carrot, cash crops, onion, ackee (H),	Carrot, cash crops, onion, ackee,	Carrot, cash crops, onion, ackee, irish potato	Cash crops, irish potato	Cash crops, irish potato, onion	Cash crops, irish potato	
Reaping from highlands					Carrot	Carrot	Carrot	Carrot					
Reaping from lowland									Onion	Onion	Onion	Onion	
Prepare fire-line using crops	X	x	х									X	Crops planted are used as fire lines serve as a mitigating mechanism against bushfires
Engagement in supplemental earning activities	~	~	Х	×	Х	×	~	~	~	~	~	~	Higher engagement of other skills (baking & wine-making)

Key: H – high season D – Drought F- Flooding

Table 4.7: Coping strategies in response to hazards

Likely Climate Impact	Positive Coping Strategies & Practices	Negative/harmful Coping Strategies & Practices
Flooding	 Start tilling the soil for later use Buy seeds to plant other crops Pray Concentrate on other existing income sources (e.g. some farmers are also shopkeepers) "Tun han mek fashion" – start new job initiatives (production of wines, pastries, chocolate) Obtain work outside of the community Obtain other skills Ask for assistance from family members and government agencies 	 Borrow money Take goods on credit from shops Worry
Drought	 Utilize water transported by the truck Store water Use less produce; buy less Rotate crops Obtain technical training and assistance Plant drought resilient crops Utilize higher lands (cooler temperatures) Use of existing water harvesting techniques (not widespread; only few can afford to do this) 	 Increase the price of produce 'Marrying' of goods; that is, tying the purchase of a particular produce to the purchase of another Do nothing (no planting at all)

The convenience sample found that the predominant coping strategy employed among farmers interviewed was that of utilizing savings; remittances and help from the Government of Jamaica were equally reported. Among small business operators, the primary coping strategy was that of the use of alternate income and therefore suggests a lower level of financial vulnerability as opposed to farmers.

It is important to note that based on the convenience sampling exercise carried out across all six communities of this Project Area, 62.5% and 45.5% of farmers and small business operators, respectively, indicated they were registered.

4.6 **RESPONSE TYPOLOGY**

Table 4.8 indicates recommended immediate responses to the various hazards affecting Trinityville. Critical agencies that would be required to support response efforts include the Rural Agricultural Development Authority, the police, the Jamaica Defence Force and the Ministry of Labour and Social Security.

Table 4.8: Responses required by hazard type (Trinityville)

Type of Hazard	Geographic Area	Extent of Impact	Type of Response Needed	Quantity	Cost	Duration	Responsibility
Landslides	All areas	5	Clearing of debris from roads	 2 dumper trucks @ \$6600 per hour per truck @ 10 hours 2 back hoes for 10 hours @ \$6000 per hour 	264,000.00 240,000.00	2 days	• NWA • Citizens • JDF • Police
			Food and other basic commodities to shopkeepers	3 shops across both communities	250,000.00	Dependent on how quickly debris is cleared	• JDF • Police • Lasco Foods • Distributors
			Access to low interest credit facilities	As necessary	Minimum of \$150,000.00	One month	Financial entitiesGovernment entities
			Seedlings/plants: • Lemon grass • Matte grass/vetiver • Pine	 100 HH @ 400 plants per HH @ \$20 per plant 120 HH @ 10 bags each @\$250 per bag 100 HH @ 50 per HH 	800,000.00 300,000.00 375,000.00	Two weeks	• RADA • JAS
			Creation of foot path to allow access to surrounding areas	N/A	N/A	N/A	• Citizens
			Transportation support for emergency and routine travel	N/A	N/A	2 days	• Taxi (local) • Police • MOH/SERHA

Type of Hazard	Geographic Area	Extent of Impact	Type of Response Needed	Quantity	Cost	Duration	Responsibility
Drought	All areas	5	Provision of drought resistant seeds/crop plants: • Pumpkin, corn, red peas, cassava	320 HH • 200 HH @ 250 coco suckers @ \$80 per sucker • 120 HH @ 11b pumpkin seeds per HH @ \$1500 per pound	4,000,000.00 180,000.00	One month	• RADA • JAS
			Fertilizer	320 HH • (Average 110lbs per household @ \$3000)	960,000.00	One month	
			Pesticide	320 HH • 250ml container per HH for 200 HH @ \$1200ea • 500ml container per HH for 120 HH @ \$3000ea	240,000.00 360,000.00	One month	-
			Trucking of water to community	2 truckloads twice per week @ \$20000 per load	1,280,000.00	6 months	
Flooding	Trinityville	4	Building temporary bridges	2	1,000,000.00	2 months	Municipal Corporation
			• Food supplies • Relief personal supplies	200НН	5,000,000.00		 Ministry of Agriculture MOH NWC Red Cross ODPEM SDC Elected Representatives Ministry of Labour Food for the Poor

RECOMMENDED MITIGATION STRATEGIES

In recognizing their vulnerability to landslides, farmers have employed mitigation techniques such as contouring and crop-diversification. As mentioned before, fire barriers are also constructed utilizing crops such as potatoes and carrots. Small business operators and trade/skill workers also employed their own mitigation strategies. Notably, despite the vulnerability of farmers' livelihood to the occurrence of natural hazards, the convenience sampling exercise found that it was among small business operators that the majority of respondents (60%) carried out preparatory activities prior to a hazard. Among all trade/skilled workers, those who carried out preparatory activities amounted to 40% while among farmers only 25% did so. Preparatory activities were primarily that of security property/livelihood.

Other needed strategies as identified by the community are:

- Clearing of overhanging trees
- Implementation of an irrigation system
- Construction of bridges to create greater access
 lands in all sections of the community

5 Social Environment



VICTIMS OF CRIME

No household member in the community was reported to be a victim of crime in their lifetime.

PERCEPTION OF BEING VICTIMS OF CRIME

Approximately thirty-five percent (35.1) thought that it was unlikely for them to be a victim of crime in the next 12 months; 29.8% thought that it was impossible for them to be the victim of crime in the same period while 10.3% thought that it was inevitable or very likely (Fig. 5.1)

Figure 5.1: Views on Being a Victim of Crime over the next Twelve Months



PUBLIC SAFETY ISSUES

The majority (38.6%) of the households reported that inadequate street light was the main public safety issues affecting the community; however 35.1% of the households indicated that there were no public safety issues affecting the community. Approximately thirty percent (29.8%) of the households reported overgrown lots and 19.3% failed infrastructure. All the remaining public safety issues were below 11% see Table 5.1. Table 5.1: Public safety issues affecting community

Public Safety Issues	%
Gangs and Gang warfare	0.0
Derelict Buildings	1.8
Overgrown Lots	29.8
No Street Lights	5.3
Inadequate Street Lights	38.6
Improper disposal of solid waste	10.5
Raw sewage in the streets	0.0
Failed infrastructure (collapsed bridge or roads, subsidence of land etc)	19.3
None	35.1

PERCEPTION OF BEING SAFE IN THE COMMUNITY

Forty seven percent 47% of the households responded that they felt very safe in the community, 46% said that they felt safe and 7% said that they don't know (Fig. 5.2).

Figure 5.2: Felt Personal Safety in the Community



PERCEPTION OF THE LEVEL OF CRIME IN THE COMMUNITY

Ninety three 93% of heads of households stated that the level of crime in the community was low and seven percent 7% stated that it was moderate (Fig. 5.3).





EFFECTS OF CRIME ON THE COMMUNITY

When asked how the level of crime in the community affected their lifestyle, the majority (96.5%) of the respondents indicated that crime had no effect on their lifestyle. However, a small percent (1.8%) indicated that area stigma affecting chances of getting jobs outside of the community and a similar percent did not state their response. See Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Crime and lifestyle changes

Response	%
Social life is curtailed	0.0
Restriction in movement in and out of the community at late evenings/nights	0.0
Restriction in movement within the community at late evenings/nights	0.0
Fear to go to work and school	0.0
Area stigma affecting chances of getting jobs outside of the community	1.8
Crime has no effect on my lifestyle	96.5
Not stated	1.8

REPORTED CRIME STATISTICS FOR THE COMMUNITY

Table 5.3a: Crime Statistics by Types of CrimesCommitted

Districts	Main Crimes Committed	
All	Housebreaking, domestic, praedial	

* Source: Trinityville Police Station

SECURITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Table 5.3b points to the available human and infrastructural status at the Trinityville Police Station at the time the document was being compiled.

Figure 5.3b: Security Personnel and Infrastructure

Police Station	Communities Served	# of Personnel	# of Vehicles in working order	Condition of Building
Trinityville Police Station	 Trinitville Somerset Jones Pen Mount Vernon Font Hill 	9	0	Fair

6 Governance Data







Constituencies: Western St. Thomas Parish Council Divisions: Trinityville



Member of Parliament: James Robertson Councillor: Lenworth Rawle

6.2 SOCIAL/CIVIC ORGANISATIONS

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

In keeping with its mandate to facilitate the empowerment of citizens in communities through participation, the Social Development Commission has assisted in the establishment of a local governance structure in most communities. This community structure has two basic tiers – CBOs and CDC.

A CBO refers to any club, association or civic body located in a given community and focused on working towards a common vision of future development. There are also referred to as popular, people or social organization, or civics. There are various categories of CBOs and include a combination of youth, citizen associations, Parent Teacher Associations, agricultural groups, sport, neighbourhood watch, senior citizens, environment and health, women groups, men organizations, church groups, NGOs, and other faith based organizations.

On the other hand, a CDC, ideally, is the composition of all base organizations in a community. It represents the interest of all citizens and is the voice of the entire community. A CDC is also a forum for considering broad issues including processes for planning, monitoring, assessing, and implementing actions relevant to the community's development. Its key functions include:

- Promoting volunteerism
- Networking with other communities, service providers, local and central government
- Lobbying for the rights, concerns, views, interests, standards and qualities of service provision, and responsibilities of the community
- Use/Manipulation of statistical and qualitative data for planning interventions and development processes.
- Mobilizing and raising citizen awareness to issues to community issues
- Fund raising

In the wider sphere of local governance, the CDC should fulfill a bridging role between the operations of the CBOs in a community and the DACs through which these base organizations are represented on the PDCs. In short, DACs and PDCs are broader civil society engines, partnering with all relevant stakeholders and representing and advocating for the interests and development of wider geographical areas. Fig 6.1 depicts the basic composition of a CDC.

Figure 6.1: Components of a CDC



Table 6.1: Community Based Organization Listing

Types of CBO	Number of CBOs	Number Participating in the CDC
Youth	2	The CDC was inactive at the time of writing
Parents and Teachers Association	4	
Citizens Association	2	

Table 6.2: Status of CBOs

Type of CBOs	Number of CBOs by Status			
	Active	Partially Active	Dormant	Defunct
Youth	2	1		

AWARENESS OF & PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS)

The majority (43.9%) of the heads of households were aware of church group, 35.1% were aware of youth club and 22.8% were not aware of any community based organization in the community; all the other organization awareness were less than six percent (6%). See Table 6.3. Table 6.3 also shows that the majority (52.6%) of households does not participate in any community based organization, while 36.8% participated in church group. All the other levels of participation were at less than eight percent (8%).

Table 6.3: Awareness and Participation in organisations

Organization	% Awareness	% Participation
Church Group	43.9	36.8
Neighbourhood watch	1.8	0.0
Jamaica Agricultural Society	3.5	1.8
CDC	0.0	0.0
Returning Residents Association	0.0	0.0
Civic Organization	0.0	0.0
Citizens Association	3.5	1.8
Benevolent Society	0.0	0.0
РТА	1.8	1.8
DAC	3.5	3.5
Sports Club	1.8	0.0
Youth Club	35.1	7.0
Strata Society	0.0	0.0
Senior Citizens	5.3	3.5
None	22.8	52.6
Others	0.0	0.0

DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES

Table 6.4 reveals that the most prioritized development challenge in the community was low water pressure or no water supply, the second was no roads, third was low skill level, fourth was high levels of school drop outs, and fifth was high levels of unemployment and youth unemployment. **Table 6.4:** Top Five Development Challenges in the community

D	evelopment Challenges	%
1	Low water pressure/ no water supply	36.1
2	No Roads	29.8
3	Low skills level	24.6
4	High levels of school drop outs	24.6
5	High levels of unemployment and Youth unemployment	17.5

References

Bell, Rohan. September 30, 2016. Baseline Assessment of Trinityville, St Thomas for the TAILMDRRP: Final Report.

Community Disaster Risk Management Plan for Trinityville, St. Thomas. 2012.

Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management (ODPEM) and St. Thomas Parish Council. February 2012.. Community Disaster Risk Management Plan: Trinityville. ODPEM, Kingston.

Project Appraisal Document (PAD). Trinityville Area Integrated Land Management Disaster Risk Reduction Project. Caribbean Development Bank.

Social Development Commission (SDC). 2009. Community Profile of Trinityville, St. Thomas.

Statistical Institute of Jamaica. 2011. Population and Housing Census 2011: Jamaica. General Report. Volume 1. STATIN, Kingston.

Statistical Institute of Jamaica. 2011. Population and Housing Census 2011 - Jamaica Education Volume 4. STATIN, Kingston.

Statistical Institute of Jamaica. 2011. Population and Housing Census 2011 – Jamaica. Housing. Volume 10. Part A. STATIN, Kingston.

Statistical Institute of Jamaica. 2011. Population and Housing Census 2011 – Jamaica. Housing. Volume 10. Part B. STATIN, Kingston.

Statistical Institute of Jamaica. 2011. Population and Housing Census 2011 – Jamaica. Age and Sex. Volume 2. STATIN, Kingston.

Statistical Institute of Jamaica. 2011. Population and Housing Census 2011 – Jamaica. Disability Indicators. Volume 3. STATIN. Kingston.

Vassell, Linnette. October 12, 2016. Gender analysis of the Trinityville Area Integrated Land Management and Disaster Risk Reduction Project (TAILMDRRP).

Climate Risk Profile of Jamaica. <u>https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/climate-risk-profile-jamaica_http://img.static.reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/styles/attachment-large/public/resources-pdf-previews/638886-PDC_Jamaica_Landslide_Susceptibility_02OCT16.png?itok=Uwndr8n_</u>