

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 22, 2011

33 Whitney Avenue
New Haven, CT 06510
Voice: 203-498-4240
Fax: 203-498-4242
www.ctkidslink.org

Contacts: Jamey Bell, Executive Director, (203) 498-4240 x108
Wade Gibson, Senior Policy Fellow, (203) 498-4240 x113 (on poverty & income)
Mary Alice Lee, Senior Policy Fellow, (203) 498-4240, x104 (on the uninsured)

Poverty Rising and Income Falling in Connecticut, Census Data Indicate

City poverty, income, and uninsured estimates reported; fewer uninsured children; Connecticut Voices calls for state economic plan

New Census data from the American Community Survey indicate that poverty has continued to rise in Connecticut due to the economic downturn. In 2010, 10.1% of Connecticut residents (350,145) had incomes under the Federal Poverty Level, up from 9.4% in 2009. Among Connecticut children under age 18, 12.8% (103,498 children) lived in families with incomes under the Federal Poverty Level in 2010. (For a two-parent household with two children, the poverty level was \$22,113 in 2010.)

Median household income also fell statewide, declining from an estimated \$68,174 in 2009 to \$64,032 in 2010. Connecticut experienced one of the largest declines in income (6.1%), second only to Nevada.

Connecticut Voices for Children, a research-based think tank that analyzed the Census data, stated that poverty trends reflect the continued impact of the economic recession, which began in the state in March 2008. Connecticut had already experienced the largest increase in poverty of any state between 2007 and 2008, growing from 7.9% to 9.3%. There was a significant increase in poverty among all Connecticut residents over the decade, rising from 7.3% in 2001 to 10.1% in 2010.

In response to the findings, Connecticut Voices called upon state policymakers to reinvigorate job growth in the state during the upcoming special legislative session on jobs by creating a comprehensive economic plan, investing in education and physical infrastructure, and reducing the high costs of living and doing business in the state.

“Connecticut’s rising poverty, falling income, and high unemployment reinforce the need for state policymakers to develop a statewide plan to create good-paying jobs and to restart our economic engine,” said **Jamey Bell, Executive Director at Connecticut Voices for Children.**

Connecticut Voices praised the creation of a state Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) this year by the Connecticut lawmakers and Governor Malloy. The federal version of the EITC, started by President Nixon and greatly expanded by President Reagan, lifts more children out of poverty

than any other federal program, according to a report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. The state version of this credit for low-income workers is intended to help offset Connecticut's greater cost of living and to reward work.

“The new state EITC will provide a significant boost for low-income families and put more money directly into the hands of people working hard to reach the middle class,” said **Wade Gibson, Senior Policy Fellow at Connecticut Voices for Children.**

Estimates of poverty rates varied significantly across Connecticut's cities: Bridgeport (23.1%), Danbury (11.6%), Hartford (31.2%), New Britain (22.0%), New Haven (29.7%), Norwalk (7.3%), Stamford (12.1%), and Waterbury (21.0%). The percentage of children under 18 in poverty in Connecticut cities was also reported for Bridgeport (31.2%), Danbury (9.9%), Hartford (44.5%), New Britain (26.5%), New Haven (43.7%), Norwalk (11.4%), Stamford (11.9%), and Waterbury (31.7%). Poverty estimates are only available for cities with populations over 65,000. The poverty rate for children in the city of New Haven increased significantly from 2009 to 2010. The estimate of poverty among residents of Norwalk significantly decreased from 15.1% in 2009 to 7.3% in 2010. (However, the 2008 poverty estimate for Norwalk was 9.6%, so year-to-year changes in these Norwalk estimates should be interpreted with caution.) Median household income fell between 2009 and 2010 in Stamford, from \$77,340 to \$66,617.

The American Community Survey also provided poverty estimates for Connecticut's counties and Congressional districts. There were declines in median household income in Fairfield, Hartford, and New Haven counties. There were also significant income declines in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Congressional districts (represented by Reps. DeLauro, Himes, and Murphy, respectively.) (See attached fact sheet for details.)

Statewide, the poverty rate for Hispanics (23.6%) and African Americans (22.1%) was significantly higher than the rate for White, non-Hispanic residents (5.9%).

With the establishment of the Child Poverty Council by state legislation in 2004, Connecticut became the first state in the nation to set a goal of reducing child poverty -- by half by 2014. In 2003 (the baseline year for the Council), 10.8% of Connecticut's children in families (“related children”) had incomes below the poverty line. The state set a goal of reducing the poverty rate to only 5% of children in 2014. Connecticut's poverty rate for children in families (12.7% in 2010) has significantly worsened over the last decade (the 2001 rate was 9.7%). To meet the goal of reducing child poverty by half, Connecticut must reverse course dramatically, according to Connecticut Voices.

Nationwide, the American Community Survey estimated that 15.3% of all Americans (46.2 million) live in poverty, an increase from 14.3% in 2009. Among children under 18, 21.6% (15.7 million) live in poverty, up from 20.0% in 2009. Median household income also decreased nationally, dropping from \$51,190 in 2009 to \$50,046 in 2010.

“We still need to move ahead on a number of fronts to ensure a fair playing field for working families. The EITC will help, but there have to be enough jobs, and work has to pay a sustaining wage. We have to be investing in both our supply of educated workers, and the demand for them in the form of jobs with responsible employers,” said **Jim Horan, Executive Director of the Connecticut Association for Human Services.**

The 2010 poverty figures do not surprise Connecticut's twelve Community Action Agencies (CAAs) who saw over 350,000 customers last year: The CAAs are the state's federally designated anti-poverty agencies. "The numbers of individuals and families coming through our doors who have never before requested assistance have skyrocketed since the beginning of the recession," said **Edith Pollock Karsky, Executive Director of the Connecticut Association for Community Action**. "Last year we saw a 5% increase in customers asking for heating assistance and, when combined with a 40% increase since 2007/2008, the numbers tell the story - a 45% increase in energy assistance in 3 years is dramatic."

"The rate of child poverty in Bridgeport is alarming. We are deeply concerned about the impact poverty has on children's health, school performance, family stability and safety. Affordable, quality health care, a strong education system, affordable housing and jobs that move families out of poverty are critical to help offset the effects of child poverty," remarked **Mary Pat Healy, Executive Director of the Bridgeport Child Advocacy Coalition**.

For the third year, the U.S. Census Bureau released state-, city-, county- and Congressional district-level estimates for health insurance coverage in Connecticut from the American Community Survey. In Connecticut, 9.1% (an estimated 320,133 persons) of all people in Connecticut were without health insurance at the time of the survey. This was not significantly different from the 2009 rate. An estimated 3.0% of children under 18 (24,144) were uninsured at the time of the 2010 survey, a significant decrease from the 3.8% rate in 2009. Estimates for Connecticut city residents who were uninsured at the time they were surveyed for the American Community Survey in 2010 range from 10.0% in Norwalk to 24.0% in Stamford. Estimates for uninsured children range from 2.1% in New Britain to 9.9% in Stamford. There were no statistically significant changes in city, county, or Congressional district uninsured rates between 2009 and 2010.

Connecticut Voices pointed to the lower uninsured rates for children as evidence of the state's success in enrolling uninsured children in the state's HUSKY health insurance program, and called on federal lawmakers to avoid cuts to Medicaid that would reduce funding for HUSKY in Connecticut. In 2007 and 2008, income eligibility was increased for parents and pregnant women in the program. As a result of these eligibility expansions and the growing need for the program, enrollment of children, parents, and pregnant women in HUSKY increased by about 95,000 between July 2007 and July 2010. However, Connecticut Voices warned that this progress in enrollment could be reversed if federal lawmakers make severe cuts to the Medicaid program, which helps to fund HUSKY in Connecticut.

"HUSKY is helping to decrease the numbers of uninsured children in Connecticut during difficult economic times, as parents lose their jobs and private health insurance coverage" said **Mary Alice Lee at Connecticut Voices**. "The threat of severe federal cuts to Medicaid could undo that progress."

Statewide, the uninsured rate for Hispanics (21.7%) and African Americans (13.8%) was significantly higher than the rate for White, non-Hispanic residents (5.9%).

"Racial and ethnic health disparities and the growing poverty rate in Connecticut raise concerns about the health status of Connecticut's poor, unserved and underserved populations, who are disproportionately African-Americans and Hispanics. The health disparities that exist in these

populations will likely only increase with rising poverty, thus creating poorer health outcomes. Addressing the factors that contribute to racial and ethnic health disparities can ensure a healthier Connecticut,” said **Patricia Baker, President and CEO of the Connecticut Health Foundation.**

“As a one-day snap shot, the ACS data provides us with some interesting insights to the plight of the uninsured in Connecticut,” said **Juan A. Figueroa, president of Universal Health Care Foundation of Connecticut.** “That an average of 9.1 percent of Connecticut residents are without insurance coverage is hard enough to swallow, but the numbers in some cities when coupled with the disparities among people of color show that a good many of those hardest hit by the lack of insurance coverage also happen to be small business owners and employers in those communities. We need this sector to play a vital role in creating jobs and reinvigorating the economy, yet they remain hobbled by health care.”

In 2010, 15.5 % (47.2 million) of Americans were uninsured at the time they were surveyed, according to the American Community Survey, a statistically significant increase from the 2009 rate of 15.1%. Among children in the U.S., an estimated 8.0% (5.9 million) were uninsured, a significant decrease from the 8.6% who were uninsured in 2009.

Connecticut Voices for Children is a research-based think tank that works to advance policies that benefit the state’s children, youth and families (ctkidslink.org).

More about these data

For the third year, the US Census Bureau has included a question in its annual American Community Survey (ACS) on health insurance coverage. The question asks whether the person is currently covered by any type of insurance. The results are not directly comparable to data from the Current Population Survey (CPS), which asks whether respondents were uninsured for the entire previous year. The sample size for the ACS is much larger than the CPS, so estimates of insurance status are available through the ACS for cities and counties with population greater than 65,000. CPS estimates of the uninsured are available only at the national and state levels.

This news release and fact sheet, along with links to additional national, state, and local data on demographic, social, and housing indicators from the American Community Survey are available through the CT Voices site at www.ctkidslink.org/censuspoverty.html. **See the attached CT Voices fact sheet for detailed survey results for Connecticut, its counties, Congressional districts, and cities; evaluation of the statistical significance of changes in local, state, and national estimates; and background on the measures.** Note: **Unless a change in Census estimates over time is statistically significant, it is not accurate to say that poverty has increased or declined in a city, county, or state.**

-END-



Poverty, Median Income, and Health Insurance in Connecticut: Summary of 2010 American Community Survey Census Data

September 22, 2011

Connecticut and the Nation – Poverty, Income, & Uninsured

Poverty in Connecticut

Poverty Indicator	Connecticut 2010 % and #	Connecticut 2009 % and #	Connecticut 2007 (pre-recession) % and #	Connecticut 2001 % and #
Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level*	10.1% (350,145) Significant increase from 2009, 2007 and 2001	9.4% (320,554)	7.9% (268,880)	7.3% (242,421)
All children under 18 under Federal Poverty Level**	12.8% (103,498) Significant increase from 2007 and 2001 No significant change from 2009	12.1% (96,893)	11.1% (89,373)	10.2% (81,583)
Related children under 18 under Federal Poverty Level	12.7% (101,791) Significant increase from 2007 and 2001 No significant change from 2009	11.9% (94,650)	10.6% (85,530)	9.7% (77,251)
All Children with income under 200% Federal Poverty Level ***	28.1% (226,074) Significant increase from 2007 No significant change in % from 2009	26.1% (208,902)	25.1% (202,579)	Not available
Families with income below Federal Poverty Level	7.2% (63,695) Significant increase from 2007 and 2001 No significant change from 2009	6.7% (59,484)	5.7% (50,353)	5.3% (46,935)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. One-year comparisons are valid for ACS data. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2010 data to other years are not statistically significant.**

Historical data reflect revised estimates by the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result, data listed here may not match previously published Census data.

* In 2010, the federal poverty level was set to \$22,113 for a two-parent household with two children.

** “All persons” and “children in poverty” are more inclusive groups than “related children under 18” in poverty. All persons and children in poverty include some people living in “group quarters.” “Related children,” who might also be considered “children in families,” are those related to the head of household.

*** The 200% federal poverty level roughly corresponds to Connecticut’s Self-Sufficiency Standard -- a measure, created by the state of Connecticut, of the income necessary for a family to meet basic needs. (The Standard for some regions of the state is considerably higher than 200% of the poverty level.)

Poverty in the Nation in 2010

Poverty Indicator	United States	
	2010 % and #	2009 % and #
Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level	15.3% (46.2 million) Significant increase	14.3% (42.9 million)
All Children under 18 with income under Federal Poverty Level	21.6% (15.7 million) Significant increase	20.0% (14.7 million)
Related children under 18 with income under Federal Poverty Level	21.2% (15.4 million) Significant increase	19.7% (14.4 million)
All Children with income under 200% Federal Poverty Level	44.0% (32.2 million) Significant increase	41.9% (30.7 million)
Families with income below Federal Poverty Level	11.3% (8.6 million) Significant increase	10.5% (8.0 million)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2010 data to other years are not statistically significant.** “Related children,” who might also be considered “children in families,” are those related to the head of household.

Poverty Rates by Race/Ethnicity in Connecticut in 2010

	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level
White, non-Hispanic	5.9% (146,727)
African American, non-Hispanic	22.1% (75,389) Significantly higher than White, non-Hispanic
Hispanic	23.6% (110,433) Significantly higher than White, non-Hispanic

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS); calculations by Connecticut Voices for Children.

Income Estimates for Connecticut and the Nation

Income Indicator	Connecticut			United States	
	2010	2009	2007 (pre-recession)	2010 % and #	2009 % and #
Median household income in 2010 dollars (ACS)	\$64,032 Significant decrease from 2009 and 2007	\$68,174	\$69,486	\$50,046 Significant decrease	\$51,190

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, changes in median income estimates between 2009 and 2010 are not statistically significant.**

Uninsured Estimates for Connecticut

Uninsured Indicator	Connecticut		
	2010 % and #	2009 % and #	2008 % and #
All persons uninsured (point in time estimate)	9.1% (320,133) No significant change from previous years	8.8% (305,210)	8.8% (302,413)
All children under 18 uninsured (point in time estimate)	3.0% (24,144) Significant decrease from 2009 and 2008	3.8% (30,433)	4.6% (37,355)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. The Census began gathering uninsured estimates through the American Community Survey in 2008. The Census revised some of its initial 2008 uninsured ACS estimates, so data listed here may not match Census data published earlier.

Uninsured Estimates for the Nation

Uninsured Indicator	United States	
	2010 % and #	2009 % and #
All persons uninsured (point in time estimate)	15.5% (47.2 million) Significant increase	15.1% (45.7 million)
All children under 18 uninsured (point in time estimate)	8.0% (5.9 million) Significant decrease	8.6% (6.4 million)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children.

Uninsured Rates by Race/Ethnicity in Connecticut in 2010

	All persons uninsured (point in time estimate)
White, non-Hispanic	5.9% (146,772)
African American, non-Hispanic	13.8% (47,746) Significantly higher than rate for White, non-Hispanic
Hispanic	21.7% (102,764) Significantly higher than rate for White, non-Hispanic

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS); calculations by Connecticut Voices for Children. Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. Estimated number of uninsured is less than statewide total because other racial/ethnic groups are not reported here.

Connecticut's Large Cities – Poverty, Income & the Uninsured

Poverty Rates and Median Income in Connecticut Cities in 2010

Estimate and range included. Range is estimate +/- the margin of error.

City	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level	Children under 18 under Federal Poverty Level	Median household income in 2010 dollars
STATEWIDE	10.1% (9.6%-10.6%)	12.8% (11.9%-13.7%)	\$64,032 (\$62,940-\$65,124)
Bridgeport	23.1% (19.5%-26.7%)	31.2% (24.5%-37.9%)	\$38,919 (\$34,261-\$43,577)
Danbury	11.6% (7.9%-15.3%)	9.9% (4.6%-15.2%)	\$58,124 (\$52,388-\$63,860)
Hartford	31.2% (26.5%-35.9%)	44.5% (36.7%-52.3%)	\$26,499 (\$23,547-\$29,451)
New Britain	22.0% (17.3%-26.7%)	26.5% (16.5%-36.5%)	\$36,784 (\$32,276-\$41,292)
New Haven	29.7% (25.1%-34.3%)	43.7% (35.4%-52.0%) Significant increase from 2009*	\$35,122 (\$29,027-\$41,217)
Norwalk	7.3% (4.6%-10.0%) Significant decrease from 2009*	11.4% (3.7%-19.1%)	\$67,848 (\$61,650-\$74,046)
Stamford	12.1% (9.6%-14.6%)	11.9% (6.7%-17.1%)	\$66,617 (\$61,353-\$71,881) Significant decrease from 2009*
Waterbury	21.0% (17.3%-24.7%)	31.7% (24.0%-39.4%)	\$38,672 (\$34,099-\$43,245)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2009 and 2010 city data are not statistically significant.** Single year estimates are only available for cities with populations greater than 65,000.

* Indicates change over time in the poverty rate was statistically significant:

- In Norwalk, the percentage of all people in poverty decreased from 15.1% in 2009 to 7.3% in 2010. However, the poverty estimate for Norwalk was 9.6% in 2008, so year-to-year changes in these Norwalk estimates should be interpreted with caution.
- In New Haven, the percentage of children in poverty increased from 31.2% in 2009 to 43.7% in 2010.
- In Stamford, the median household income decreased from \$77,340 in 2009 to \$66,617 in 2010.

The numbers reported in ACS surveys are estimates because only a sample of the entire population is surveyed. The margin of error estimates the range of values within which the population's actual uninsured rate is likely to fall. Because sample sizes for a survey at the city level (and particularly for subgroups like children) can be small, the margins of error can be quite wide, and differences between cities should be interpreted with caution.

Uninsured in Connecticut Cities in 2010

Estimate and range included. Range is estimate +/- the margin of error.

	Uninsured	
	All persons uninsured (point in time estimate)	All children under 18 uninsured (point in time estimate)
Connecticut	9.1% (8.8%-9.4%)	3.0% (2.6%-3.4%)
Bridgeport	18.6% (16.4%-20.8%)	4.4% (2.6%-6.2%)
Danbury	20.0% (16.4%-23.6%)	7.6% (3.4%-11.8%)
Hartford	16.9% (14.1%-19.7%)	5.3% (2.5%-8.1%)
New Britain	12.5% (9.6%-15.4%)	2.1% (0.0%-4.3%)
New Haven	13.0% (10.4%-15.6%)	6.2% (2.6%-9.8%)
Norwalk	10.0% (7.7%-12.3%)	7.2% (2.8%-11.6%)
Stamford	24.0% (20.2%-27.8%)	9.9% (4.6%-15.2%)
Waterbury	12.1% (10.4%-13.8%)	5.3% (2.7%-7.9%)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2009 and 2010 city data are not statistically significant.** Single year estimates are available only for cities with populations greater than 65,000.

The numbers reported in ACS surveys are estimates because only a sample of the entire population is surveyed. The margin of error estimates the range of values within which the population's actual uninsured rate is likely to fall. Because sample sizes for a survey at the city level (and particularly for subgroups like children) can be small, the margins of error can be quite wide, and differences between cities should be interpreted with caution.

Connecticut Counties – Poverty, Income & Uninsured

Poverty Rates and Median Income in Connecticut Counties in 2010

Estimate and range included. Range is estimate +/- the margin of error.

County	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level	Children under 18 under Federal Poverty Level	Median household income in 2010 dollars
STATEWIDE	10.1% (9.6%-10.6%)	12.8% (11.9%-13.7%)	\$64,032 (\$62,940-\$65,124)
Fairfield	9.4% (8.5%-10.3%)	10.9% (9.4%-12.4%)	\$74,831 (\$72,024-\$77,638) Significant decrease from 2009*
Hartford	11.4% (10.4%-12.4%)	15.1% (13.0%-17.2%)	\$60,041 (\$58,109-\$61,973) Significant decrease from 2009*
Litchfield	6.5% (5.3%-7.7%)	8.3% (5.5%-11.1%)	\$66,307 (\$61,425-\$71,189)
Middlesex	7.4% (5.4%-9.4%)	6.8% (3.6%-10.0%)	\$69,566 (\$63,805-\$75,327)
New Haven	11.7% (10.8%-12.6%)	16.5% (14.4%-18.6%)	\$57,056 (\$55,401-\$58,711) Significant decrease from 2009*
New London	8.8% (7.2%-10.4%)	10.8% (6.9%-14.7%)	\$62,349 (\$59,269-\$65,429)
Tolland	5.4% (3.9%-6.9%)	3.8% (1.2%-6.4%)	\$75,626 (\$71,242-\$80,010)
Windham	12.3% (9.6%-15.0%)	16.0% (10.4%-21.6%)	\$60,026 (\$54,258-\$65,794)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2009 and 2010 county data are not statistically significant.**

* Indicates change over time in the poverty rate that was statistically significant:

- In Fairfield County, median household income decreased from \$80,452 in 2009 to \$74,831 in 2010.
- In Hartford County, median household income decreased from \$62,821 in 2009 to \$60,041 in 2010.
- In New Haven County, median household income decreased from \$61,553 in 2009 to \$57,056 in 2010.

Uninsured in Connecticut Counties in 2010

Estimate and range included. Range is estimate +/- the margin of error.

	Uninsured	
	All persons uninsured (point in time estimate)	All children under 18 uninsured (point in time estimate)
Connecticut	9.1% (8.8%-9.4%)	3.0% (2.6%-3.4%)
Fairfield County	11.7% (10.9%-12.5%)	3.9% (2.9%-4.9%)
Hartford County	8.5% (7.8%-9.2%)	2.5% (1.8%-3.2%)
Litchfield County	6.9% (5.8%-8.0%)	2.4% (1.2%-3.6%)
Middlesex County	7.6% (6.2%-9.0%)	3.7% (1.7%-5.7%)
New Haven County	8.8% (8.2%-9.4%)	3.0% (2.2%-3.8%)
New London County	8.1% (7.1%-9.1%)	2.2% (0.5%-3.9%)
Tolland County	5.1% (4.0%-6.2%)	0.7% (0%-1.4%)
Windham County	8.5% (6.7%-10.3%)	2.6% (0.4%-4.8%)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2009 and 2010 county data are not statistically significant.**

Connecticut Congressional Districts – Poverty, Income & Uninsured

Poverty Rates and Median Income in Connecticut Congressional Districts in 2010

Estimate and range included. Range is estimate +/- the margin of error.

Congressional District	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level	Children under 18 under Federal Poverty Level	Median household income in 2010 dollars
STATEWIDE	10.1% (9.6-10.6%)	12.8% (11.9-13.7%)	\$64,032 (\$62,940-65,124) Significant decrease from 2009*
1 st Congressional District (Rep. Larson)	11.1% (10.0%-12.2%)	15.3% (13.1%-17.5%)	\$59,321 (\$57,175-61,467)
2 nd Congressional District (Rep. Courtney)	7.5% (6.5%-8.5%)	8.5% (6.3%-10.7%)	\$68,952 (\$66,878-71,026)
3 rd Congressional District (Rep. DeLauro)	11.5% (10.3%-12.7%)	16.1% (13.8%-18.4%)	\$57,676 (\$55,617-59,735) Significant decrease from 2009*
4 th Congressional District (Rep. Himes)	9.8% (8.8%-10.8%)	11.3% (9.5%-13.1%)	\$77,074 (\$74,108-80,040) Significant decrease from 2009*
5 th Congressional District (Rep. Murphy)	10.6% (9.6%-11.6%)	13.2 (10.9%-15.5%)	\$60,460 (\$58,536-62,384) Significant decrease from 2009*

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2009 and 2010 Congressional district data are not statistically significant.**

* Indicates change over time in the poverty rate that was statistically significant:

- In the 3rd Congressional District, median household income decreased from \$62,746 in 2009 to \$57,676 in 2010.
- In the 4th Congressional District, median household income decreased from \$83,121 in 2009 to \$77,074 in 2010.
- In the 5th Congressional District, median household income decreased from \$66,058 in 2009 to \$60,460 in 2010.

Uninsured in Connecticut Congressional Districts – 2010

Estimate and range included. Range is estimate +/- the margin of error.

Congressional District	All persons uninsured (point in time estimate)	All children under 18 uninsured (point in time estimate)
Connecticut	9.1% (8.8%-9.4%)	3.0% (2.6%-3.4%)
1 st Congressional District (Rep. Larson)	8.7% (7.9%-9.5%)	2.7% (1.9%-3.5%)
2 nd Congressional District (Rep. Courtney)	7.0% (6.5%-7.5%)	2.0% (1.0%-3.0%)
3 rd Congressional District (Rep. DeLauro)	9.2% (8.5%-9.9%)	3.2% (2.3%-4.1%)
4 th Congressional District (Rep. Himes)	11.3% (10.3%-12.3%)	3.7% (2.6%-4.8%)
5 th Congressional District (Rep. Murphy)	9.2% (8.6%-9.8%)	3.2% (2.4%-4.0%)

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). Analysis of statistical significance of estimate changes by CT Voices for Children. **Unless specifically noted, comparisons between 2009 and 2010 Congressional district data are not statistically significant.**

Technical Notes on the Data

Data Source. The United States Census Bureau released poverty estimates from the American Community Survey (ACS) on September 22, 2011.

Comparing Data Over Time. Unless specifically noted in the comparison charts above, there were no statistically significant changes in Census estimates between 2010 data and other years as calculated at the 90% confidence interval. The numbers reported in ACS surveys are estimates because only a sample of the entire population is surveyed. For this reason, estimates reported by the ACS are published with additional data that allow us to estimate the range of values within which the population's actual poverty or uninsured rate is likely to fall. This enables us to determine whether or not the change in an estimate from one time period to the next is large enough to conclude that a change in the population has occurred, or whether the change in the estimate may have been due to random chance. For example, in the field of opinion polling, the "margin of error" of a poll helps to assess whether there has been a significant change in polling results over time. **A change in Census estimates is called "statistically significant" if it is unlikely to have occurred by chance** (this term describes the statistical evidence of change, not whether it is important or meaningful). **Unless a change in Census estimates over time is statistically significant, it is not accurate to say, for example, that poverty rates have increased or declined.** Statistical significance tests were conducted for poverty and uninsured rates, rather than numbers of people in poverty or numbers uninsured.

Household Income Comparisons. ACS data for median household income is comparable over time. Median income figures are in 2010 dollars (inflation adjusted), so they would not match estimates in earlier reports.

Health Insurance Coverage. In 2008, the US Census Bureau began including a question in its annual American Community Survey (ACS) on health insurance coverage. The question asks whether the person is **currently covered** by any type of insurance. The results are not directly comparable to data from the Current Connecticut Voices for Children

Population Survey (CPS), which asks whether respondents were uninsured for the **entire previous year**. The sample size for the ACS is much larger than the CPS, so estimates of insurance status are available through the ACS for counties, Congressional Districts, and cities with population greater than 65,000. CPS estimates of the uninsured are available only at the national and state levels. See the table below for comparisons of these estimates.

Understanding Census Bureau Estimates of the Uninsured		
	American Community Survey (ACS)	Current Population Survey (CPS)
When are 2010 estimates are released?	September 22, 2011	September 13, 2011
What does the survey measure?	Uninsured at time of survey	Uninsured for entire previous year
Are comparisons possible over time?	Yes, comparing one-year estimates for 2008, 2009 and 2010	Yes, by using two-year averages (not single-year estimates)
Are national and state level estimates available?	Yes	Yes
Are estimates available for counties, Congressional districts, and cities with populations greater than 65,000?	Yes	No

CT Voices' use of ACS data is informed by the guidance of analysts at the Census Bureau, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and Coalition on Human Needs.