AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

University of Connecticut
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources

2012 Community Food Security in Connecticut:

An Evaluation and Ranking of 169 Towns

Authors:

Adam N. Rabinowitz
Jiff Martin

20 DECEMBER 12
REVISED

A joint Study by the
Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy and the
Cooperative Extension System at the **University of Connecticut**

The College of Agriculture and Natural Resources strives for excellence in teaching, research, and outreach education serving the people of Connecticut, the nation and the world as a premier land-grant institution. Signature programs focus on educating a diverse body of students; advancing and disseminating knowledge of the physical and social sciences of natural resource utilization, agriculture, food processing and distribution, nutrition, and human health and development; and addressing needs of citizens, communities and governmental agencies.

A website supplement to this report including a PDF version and additional maps based on town size is available at http://www.zwickcenter.uconn.edu/CFS.

Acknowledgements

Funding for the *2012 Community Food Security in Connecticut: An Evaluation and Ranking of 169 Towns* was provided by the University of Connecticut Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy via USDA-NIFA Grant No. 2010-306-34178-20766, the Cooperative Extension System via Smith Lever funds, and the State of Connecticut Food Policy Council.

The following students assisted with research and data collection for the study: Kendall Erskine, Xun Li, Wesley Nichols, and Lingqiao Qi.

Special thanks to Rigoberto A. Lopez, Professor and Head of the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics at University of Connecticut's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Director of the Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy for his encouragement and support throughout the project. The authors are also grateful to the following reviewers and advisors: Linda Drake, Chair of the CT Food Policy Council, Nutritionist and Program Director of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program at the University of Connecticut; Joshua Berning, Assistant Professor in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, and Hadley Rosen, Marketing and Communications Manager for the Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy.

The University of Connecticut Center for Land Use Education and Research provided additional web and map development support. Special thanks to Cary Chadwick for her assistance.

NO KID HUNGRY SHARE OUR STRENGTH

Graphic Design by: Sue Schadt, University of Connecticut
Photos by: No Kid Hungry Campaign: Cover, pgs. 5, 16; Flickr pgs. 5, 6, 7; Manisha Bicchieri: pg. 8, back cover; Sue Schadt, pgs. cover, 4, 5, 8, 18, back cover.

About the authors

For the Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy:

Adam N. Rabinowitz is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics at the University of Connecticut. He teaches food policy and conducts research on policy issues including milk pricing, geographic food access, and marketing to children. He obtained bachelor's and master's degrees in Economics from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in 1999 and 2002, respectively. He has worked as the primary research assistant in the Food Marketing Policy Center and the Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy since 2002. **adam.rabinowitz@uconn.edu, 860-486-2826**

For the Department of Extension:

Jiff Martin is the Sustainable Food System Associate for University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension System. She has ten years of experience working on food and agriculture issues in Connecticut. Her recent work includes outreach education regarding farmland leasing, connecting consumers to local farm products through buyctgrown.com, developing beginner farmer extension programs, and fostering collaboration through state and regional food system networks. She was the State Director for American Farmland Trust (2006-2010) and the Food Policy Director at Hartford Food System (2002-2005). She received a M.S. in Food Policy and Applied Nutrition from Tufts University and an M.A. from the Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy. **jiff.martin@uconn.edu, 860-870-6932**

For more information about the results reported here, visit: **www.zwickcenter.uconn.edu/CFS**

How to Cite This Report:

Rabinowitz, A.N. and Martin, J. (2012) *2012 Community Food Security in Connecticut: An Evaluation and Ranking of 169 Towns*. Zwick Center Outreach Report #12, Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut. Retrieved from http://www.zwickcenter.uconn.edu/CFS.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Most residents in Connecticut have consistent, dependable access to enough food for active, healthy living. Yet each year there are households that experience limited access to food due to a lack of money or other resources. USDA's definition of household food security - access by all members at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life – is a complex measurement of food needs, choices, preferences, and options.[1] Although it is extremely difficult to pinpoint each household that is struggling with food insecurity, a community-wide lens can help policy makers make smart decisions with broad impact on the food options residents enjoy and their ability to access food assistance if needed.

The *2012 Community Food Security in Connecticut: An Evaluation and Ranking of 169 Towns* focuses on a town-level assessment of community food security in Connecticut. This study defines a community according to the geographic boundaries of the 169 towns in the state of Connecticut. We have developed three rankings of all 169 towns to inform and guide policy leaders and stakeholders that are interested in addressing hunger and food insecurity in their community. These include:

- Population At-Risk Ranking – an evaluation of populations at-risk for food insecurity
- Food Retail Ranking – an evaluation of retail food proximity and options
- Food Assistance Ranking – an evaluation of how well towns are responding to needs

New approach to evaluating and ranking 169 towns:

In September 2005 the Connecticut Food Policy Council, University of Connecticut, and Hartford Food System published a joint report titled "Community Food Security in Connecticut: An Evaluation and Ranking of 169 Towns." That report provided the first look at town level community food security in Connecticut and was received with great interest. After seven years, this report offers a new assessment of town-level food security in Connecticut with a simpler approach to looking at the same issue. We develop a three pronged approach that identifies towns with populations more likely to be food insecure, and then focus on two general areas that improve food security. We also eliminate some of the political town boundaries and now look at issues such as access to retail food with consideration of traveling to nearby neighboring towns. We hope this new approach will spur further discussion of this issue in a means that can help address food security in Connecticut.

[1] For more detail on USDA data and definitions of food security see: http://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-nutrition-assistance/food-security-in-the-us/definitions-of-food-security.aspx



The rankings presented in this study are based on a statistical method of combining multiple variables into a single indicator. Each town ranking can be used to evaluate the need and performance relative to all other towns in Connecticut. Maps of the three rankings are displayed for an easier visual picture where each town can quickly compare its performance relative to other towns in the state. Finally, since the needs and resources of towns of different sizes can vary, we have created five categories of town size (based on population) and evaluated each of the three rankings for each town within its given cohort to aid readers in evaluating towns of a similar size. Appendix A displays all of the rankings in alphabetical order by town name. Appendix B displays all of the rankings based on the town size category for each town. Maps of the town size rankings are available at http//www.zwickcenter.uconn.edu/CFS.

The study authors hope these results will be used to stimulate town-level discussion and considerations, and may even help prioritize further analysis and commitment to strategies that will strengthen community food security.

Between 2008 and 2010, 12.7 percent of residents in Connecticut were living in food insecure households (38% of which were living in 'households with very low food insecurity').

INTRODUCTION

Most residents in Connecticut have consistent, dependable access to enough food for active, healthy living. Yet each year there are households that experience limited access to food due to a lack of money or other resources. Between 2008 and 2010, 12.7 percent of residents in Connecticut were living in food insecure households (38% of which were living in 'households with very low food insecurity').[2] Approximately one in seven CT households reported there had been times in the past year when they did not have enough money to buy food that they needed.[3]

Although it is extremely difficult to pinpoint where these food insecure households are located, one can look at certain town-level variables of food insecurity and draw comparisons on a town by town basis. For example, what towns have a population mix that are generally considered more likely to be food insecure? Are there some towns where proximity and thus geographic access to retail food is a particular challenge? Are food assistance eligible households accessing public programs to improve their food budgets? This report provides a picture of how towns in Connecticut compare to each other under three separate conditions:

- What is the likelihood that a resident in a particular town is food insecure?
- What is the geographic proximity from town population centers to food retailers?
- How well are town residents being served through public food assistance services and public bus transportation?

[2]Coleman-Jensen, Alisha, Mark Nord, Margaret Andrews, and Steven Carlson. *Household Food Security in the United States in 2010.* ERR-125, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Econ. Res. Serv. September 2011.

[3]*Food Hardship in America 2011*, Food Research and Action Center, February 2012.

What is Food Security?

Two commonly used definitions of food security are as follows:

"Food security is access by all people at all times to enough nutritious food for an active, healthy life." [United States Department of Agriculture]

"Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." [United Nations Food & Agriculture Organization]

What is Community Food Security?

As a concept, community food security unites many strategies and goals of nutrition education, public health, sustainable agriculture, social justice, and anti-hunger.

"Community food security is a condition in which all community residents obtain a safe, culturally acceptable, nutritionally adequate diet through a sustainable food system that maximizes community self-reliance and social justice." [Mike Hamm and Anne Bellows from Community Food Security Coalition]

In this report, we examine community food security using the geographic boundaries of the 169 towns in the state of Connecticut with the expressed interest in providing town leaders and stakeholders with information about how towns compare with one another and potentially highlighting issues to address in regards to strengthening community food security.

Study Goals:

The goals of this 2012 study are to:

- Provide a ranking of towns based on income and socioeconomic characteristics that contribute to the risk for food insecurity;
- Provide a ranking of towns based on food options using location data, GIS technology, and roadways to measure relative proximity to food retail establishments;
- Provide a ranking of towns based on how well public food assistance programs are being accessed by eligible individuals;
- Provide a map of Connecticut for each ranking;
- Provide resources to help guide policy makers and leaders toward evaluating and responding to community food security needs; and
- Develop results that are easy to interpret at the town level for municipal policy makers, regional planners, anti-hunger advocates, and community groups working to enhance food security and support fresh, local food and agriculture.

RANKINGS

Three Rankings of Community Food Security

This study defines a community according to the geographic boundaries of the 169 towns in the State of Connecticut. We have developed three rankings to inform and guide policy leaders and stakeholders that are interested in addressing hunger and food insecurity in their community. They are:

1. Population At-Risk Ranking - In this analysis we rank towns based on an examination of each town's particular population mix of income and socioeconomic characteristics to determine the likelihood that a resident in a particular town is food insecure.

2. Food Retail Ranking - In this analysis we rank towns based on an examination of the geographic proximity from town population centers to food retailers and the number of food retail options for consumers. Recognizing a resident's ability to shop for food in neighboring towns, we have ignored political town boundaries for conventional food-at-home retailers such as supermarkets, grocery, wholesale clubs, and mass merchandisers in determining the food options available for a resident of a particular town.

3. Food Assistance Ranking - In this analysis we rank towns based on an examination of participation in public food assistance programs and availability of public bus transportation to determine how well town residents are being served.

These rankings are useful for evaluating relative need and performance between towns. For an easier visual presentation we provide maps with the results divided up into quartiles. It is important to keep in mind that this approach necessitates that one quarter of the towns will rank in the bottom quartile. A town which ranks in the bottom quartile, therefore, may be performing poorly relative to other towns *in the state*, but our study makes no attempt to measure how a town is performing relative to the region or nation.

We acknowledge and recognize that strategies to address food insecurity do not always restrict themselves within town boundaries. Nor do towns or residents have a great deal of control over where or how food is produced, sold, priced, prepared or consumed. Nevertheless, we hope these results will be used to stimulate town-level discussion and considerations, and may even help prioritize further analysis and commitment to strategies that will strengthen community food security.

Population At-Risk Ranking

Measuring the likelihood a resident is at-risk for food insecurity



How to Interpret the Population At-Risk Ranking

A resident in a town with a ranking of 1 has the least risk of being food insecure, relative to other towns. By contrast, a resident in a town with a ranking of 169 has the greatest risk of being food insecure, relative to other towns. This population at-risk ranking is general to the entire population of a town and cannot be interpreted as a measure of household food insecurity.

Data Used for the Population At-Risk Ranking:

We have ranked towns based on an examination of income and socioeconomic characteristics, such as income, education, age, vehicle ownership, and the presence of children in the household. The town's overall poverty rate and unemployment rate are included in this analysis.

Considerations for Interpreting the Population At-Risk Ranking:

- Poverty and unemployment rates in the town create a higher risk for food insecurity.
- Households that lack private vehicles may find it more difficult to find affordable, nutritious, healthy food.
- The educational attainment of town residents positively impacts population at-risk rankings and thus helps reduce the risk of food insecurity.
- The population at-risk ranking does not consider the racial composition of the town residents.
- Supplemental income, such as retirement benefits or other support, are not considered in this ranking.

Top 10 and Bottom 10 Population At-Risk Rankings

Rank	Town	Rank	Town
1	Weston	160	Norwich
2	Darien	161	North Canaan
3	New Canaan	162	East Hartford
4	Wilton	163	New London
5	Easton	164	Waterbury
6	Westport	165	Windham
7	Ridgefield	166	Bridgeport
8	Redding	167	New Britain
9	Madison	168	New Haven
10	Simsbury	169	Hartford

Food Retail Ranking

Measuring the proximity and food retail options for consumers



How to Interpret the Food Retail Ranking

A ranking of 1 means this town has the best geographic proximity to food retailers relative to other towns. With easier geographic access and/or a greater number of cumulative opportunities to access food sold at retail, a higher ranking means this population has readily available food for purchase. Keep in mind that a town's ranking in this category provides no information about the affordability or quality of food available through food retail establishments.

Data Used for the Food Retail Ranking:

We have ranked towns based on an examination of food retail options (see box) and geographic proximity from town population centers. We do not include convenience stores in this analysis. In this ranking we have eliminated the town boundaries in determining the majority of food options available for a resident of a particular town.

Considerations for Interpreting the Food Retail Ranking:

- Rankings were developed with consideration of where people live in the town and the roads available for travel.
- When looking at food retail options it is important to consider not just the closest food retailer but all of the food retail options within a 10 minute drive from the town population centers.
- Locally grown food, such as farmers markets, farm stands, CSAs, and food co-ops provide for additional opportunities for residents to purchase accessible and nutritious food.
- For towns with limited retail food options within their town boundaries, proximity to towns with more retail food options has a positive impact on their ranking.
- A town's food retail ranking provides no information about the price, freshness, or nutritional quality of the food available through retail food establishments.

Food Retailer Definitions

Supermarkets - full-line grocery stores and supercenters with annual sales → $2 million.

Grocery Stores - smaller food stores with annual sales ← $2 million or offering a limited selection of items or primarily natural/organic/gourmet foods.

Wholesale Clubs - membership club stores offering bulk food packages.

Mass Merchandisers - primarily offering general merchandise with a secondary food section.

Local Foods - farmers market, community farms, CSAs, and farm stands.

Fast Food Restaurants - major national fast food chains.

Visit the website for more detailed definitions.

Top 10 and Bottom 10 Food Retail Rankings

Rank	Town	Rank	Town
1	East Hartford	160	Thompson
2	Manchester	161	Woodstock
3	Bridgeport	162	Sterling
4	West Haven	163	East Haddam
5	Hartford	164	Norfolk
6	New Haven	165	Eastford
7	Waterbury	166	Salisbury
8	Milford	167	Corwall
9	Stratford	168	Sharon
10	Ridgefield	169	Union

Food Assistance Ranking

Measuring how well residents are being served through selected public services



How to Interpret the Food Assistance Ranking

A ranking of 1 means eligible town residents are participating in more public food assistance services and the town has available public bus transportation to gain access to food resources. A town's ranking for food assistance participation provides no information about the quality of food assistance programming.

Data Used for the Food Assistance Ranking:

We have ranked towns based on an examination of participation in public food assistance programs and the availability of public bus transportation. This includes the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), and federal school meal programs (School Breakfast Program, National School Lunch Program, Summer Meals). Unfortunately we were unable to include private food assistance (e.g. soup kitchens, pantries) in this analysis due to data inconsistencies.

Considerations for Interpreting the Food Assistance Ranking:

- To control for varying levels of eligibility across town populations we standardized the participation in public food assistance programs by the eligible town population.
- Low levels of participation in public assistance programs may be a result of various obstacles in accessing these programs, such as lack of knowledge, difficulty navigating program enrollment, uncertainty about eligibility, and stigma associated with identification of receiving benefits.
- Optional programs such as National School Breakfast and Summer Feeding Program have a positive impact on this ranking.
- Public bus transportation is a form of assistance in reaching food retail options and positively impacts rankings.
- A town's ranking for food assistance provides no information about the quality of food assistance programming.

Top 10 and Bottom 10 Food Assistance Rankings

Rank	Town	Rank	Town
1	New Haven	160	Washington
2	Hartford	161	East Granby
3	New Britain	162	Simsbury
4	Waterbury	163	Marlborough
5	New London	164	Sherman
6	Norwich	165	Hartland
7	Bridgeport	166	Bethany
8	Ansonia	167	Weston
9	Windham	168	Union
10	Meriden	169	Easton

How to Collectively Interpret Rankings

An alternative examination of community food security comes from looking at the three rankings in combination. For example:

A town with a high Population At-Risk ranking (at the extreme 169) is a population that is generally viewed as being more likely to be food insecure, assuming that resources are not available. Given a high Population Food Security ranking it is then necessary to determine how well a town is providing for the population, through both geographic access to retail food opportunities and through food assistance programs. A town with a low Food Retail or Food Assistance ranking is providing higher levels of food security for the population. Thus a town with a Population Food Security ranking of 169 combined with a Food Retail and Food Assistance ranking of 1 is providing a relatively greater amount of food resources for its population. As the Food Retail and Food Assistance rankings increase this signals a potential need to focus on expanding retail options and/or improving participation rates in food assistance programs for a given town population. For more specific examples, let's take a closer look at a couple of specific towns.

A Closer Look at the Rankings for 7 CT Towns				
Town	**Total Population**	**Population At-Risk**	**Food Retail**	**Food Assistance**
Brooklyn	8,093	136	94	26
Killingly	17, 347	155	110	14
New Britain	72,954	167	72	3
New Haven	128,885	168	6	1
North Canaan	3,354	161	135	64
Willington	6,068	147	137	109
Windham	25,036	165	30	9

Examples of How to Collectively Interpret Rankings

New Haven, CT has a population with 128,885 residents. The Population At-Risk ranking for this town is 168 out of 169. This ranking is high and indicates a relatively greater likelihood of food insecurity for residents of this town. This town also ranks low in the Food Retail ranking (6 out of 169) and Food Assistance ranking (1 out of 169), thus providing higher levels of food security for its population. Taken together, New Haven, CT has a population that is more likely to be food insecure, however, these residents have access to and are taking advantage of a relatively greater amount of food resources.

Killingly, CT has a population with 17,347 residents. The Population At-Risk ranking for this town is 155 out of 169. This ranking is high and indicates a relatively greater likelihood of food insecurity for residents of this town. This town also ranks high in the Food Retail ranking (110 out of 169), thus providing a lower level of food security related to opportunities to purchase food at retail. Conversely, this town ranks low in the Food Assistance ranking (14 out of 169), thus providing higher levels of food security related to food assistance programs. Taken together, residents in Killingly are more likely to be food insecure but are successfully accessing a relatively greater amount of food assistance resources, however, there is a relative concern about the level of food retail opportunities available for this population.

Rankings by Population Size

It is important to recognize that Connecticut has towns of varying size that range from Union, CT with a population of 865 to Bridgeport, CT with a population of 142,576. The needs and resources of towns with vastly different sizes can vary and needs to be considered in any analysis. Therefore, we have created five population cohorts and evaluated each of the three rankings for each town within a given cohort to aid readers in evaluating towns of a similar size. The rankings by population size are interpreted in the same way as previously discussed with recognition that the relative ranking is based on the total number of towns in a particular population cohort.

A table of rankings by population size groups can be found in the appendix of this report. Maps of each size group are also available for download at: **http://www.zwickcenter.uconn.edu/CFS**

Website Supplement of Community Food Security in Connecticut

As part of this report we have developed a website that is available at **http://www.zwickcenter.uconn.edu/CFS.** Here you will find the research methodology, a PDF version of this report, additional maps, and further information on community food security in Connecticut.

Community Food Security Strategies - Next Steps

If you are reading this report, then you are probably wondering if there are any strategies or best practices to strengthen your own community's food security. Although there are numerous innovative models and approaches, each community must first embark on its own process of evaluation, dialogue, and planning to arrive at a community-based strategy to improve access and availability of food. Community-focused strategies should be highly engaging and participatory, including municipal officials, non-profits, private businesses, and residents. An important tool to consider is a Community Food Assessment, which serves as a mechanism to foster a community planning process and respond to community food security needs (see resources on next page).

In reality, communities have little control over where or how food is produced, sold, priced, prepared or consumed. While many municipalities may be concerned about food waste, food is rarely high on the agenda of most town planners, economic development commissions, civic or environmental groups. Anti-hunger organizations play an important role in meeting the short-term needs of food insecure residents, but readily acknowledge their work does not alter underlying socioeconomic challenges. On the other hand, the public's growing interest in safe and healthy food is fertile ground for creative and dynamic leaders as well as considerable local energy focused on the goals of community food security. In recent years there have been many groups in CT that are concerned with food and/or agriculture related issues (food policy councils, town agriculture commissions, farmers market associations, school wellness committees, and community kitchen advocates) who aim to promote healthy, fresh, local food and support viable agriculture. These types of organizations can help form a backbone to community food security strategies.

Community food security strategies tend to focus less on emergency food access and more on availability of affordable and healthy food that will meet long-term needs. Some examples of community food security strategies are:

- Creating incentives for a new neighborhood retail food store
- Encouraging the use of abandoned structures and brownfields for the construction of food hubs, food processing centers, or urban agriculture enterprises
- Adding bus transportation to public food assistance agency offices
- Creating better meal options in school cafeterias to address child obesity
- Offering community garden plots and gardening assistance so residents can grow their own food
- Launching a new farmers market to bring local farm products closer to residents
- Creating a composting program to reduce food waste and provide affordable soil amendments for gardening purposes

RESOURCES

The USDA published the Community Food Assessment Toolkit, which provides a series of standardized measurement tools for assessing food security within a community. It includes a general guide to community assessment and focused materials for examining six basic assessment components related to community food security. These include guides for profiling general community characteristics and community food resources as well as materials for assessing household food security, food resource accessibility, food availability and affordability, and community food production resources. Available at: **http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/efan-electronic-publications-from-the-food-assistance-nutrition-research-program/efan02013.aspx**

The Food Security Learning Center with World Hunger Year is an advocate for innovative, community based solutions to hunger and poverty. The Center provides information on community food security strategies such as CFAs and community supported agriculture program assessments (CSAs), community gardens, Food Policy Councils, and land use planning. Available at: **http://www.whyhunger.org/fslc**

The Community Food Security Coalition has a number of publications regarding community security strategies, programs, and assessments that can be downloaded for free. Available at **http://www.foodsecurity.org/publications/**

The following publications in particular may be of use:

- *What's Cooking in Your Food System? A Guide to Community Food Assessment*
- *Whole Measures for Community Food Systems: Stories from the Field*
- *Good Laws, Good Food: Putting Local Food Policy to Work for Our Communities*

The Community Food Security Coalition also maintains a website clearing house for food assessment-related tools and resources, including reports and information from numerous past and current assessments. Available at: **http://www.foodsecurity.org/cfa_home.html**

APPENDIX A Total Population and Rankings by Town

		CT State Ranking		
Town	Total Population	Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
Andover	3,246	69	132	92
Ansonia	19,163	156	21	8
Ashford	4,320	114	159	58
Avon	17,678	32	25	144
Barkhamsted	3,781	43	120	121
Beacon Falls	5,909	82	91	65
Berlin	19,591	78	17	105
Bethany	5,467	13	119	166
Bethel	18,377	64	55	90
Bethlehem	3,595	61	134	106
Bloomfield	20,334	141	51	19
Bolton	5,023	56	105	131
Bozrah	2,590	109	126	82
Branford	28,194	116	52	85
Bridgeport	142,576	166	3	7
Bridgewater	1,708	54	46	35
Bristol	60,466	148	80	20
Brookfield	16,214	22	74	89
Brooklyn	8,093	136	94	26
Burlington	9,103	16	102	142
Canaan	1,161	142	152	72
Canterbury	5,091	101	140	59
Canton	10,037	53	27	124
Chaplin	2,362	115	130	97
Cheshire	29,183	24	65	129
Chester	3,976	75	144	101
Clinton	13,316	90	88	74
Colchester	15,849	48	145	84
Colebrook	1,361	93	154	133
Columbia	5,425	58	92	73
Cornwall	1,589	42	167	107
Coventry	12,354	68	115	48
Cromwell	13,888	80	40	93
Danbury	79,371	132	35	18
Darien	20,414	2	31	153
Deep River	4,644	118	124	108
Derby	12,826	153	16	31
Durham	7,293	17	129	120
East Granby	5,161	52	39	161
East Haddam	9,038	74	163	112
East Hampton	12,891	70	133	118
East Hartford	50,974	162	1	11

		CT State Ranking		
Town	Total Population	Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
East Haven	29,074	150	38	41
East Lyme	19,067	76	73	57
East Windsor	10,921	131	60	39
Eastford	1,626	72	165	111
Easton	7,403	5	111	169
Ellington	15,228	59	87	96
Enfield	44,794	130	70	37
Essex	6,686	50	104	146
Fairfield	58,727	21	26	114
Farmington	25,067	65	12	104
Franklin	1,924	81	128	135
Glastonbury	33,984	31	11	110
Goshen	2,950	84	153	78
Granby	11,124	34	29	98
Greenwich	60,809	18	67	94
Griswold	11,774	144	96	40
Groton	40,254	149	48	34
Guilford	22,222	30	93	80
Haddam	8,185	45	138	148
Hamden	60,293	125	33	33
Hampton	1,864	107	141	52
Hartford	124,760	169	5	2
Hartland	2,009	41	14	165
Harwinton	5,618	85	98	138
Hebron	9,571	11	139	137
Kent	2,981	123	157	103
Killingly	17,347	155	110	14
Killingworth	6,487	25	151	42
Lebanon	7,253	73	131	79
Ledyard	15,023	38	116	70
Lisbon	4,306	89	101	71
Litchfield	8,512	91	114	113
Lyme	2,323	36	148	86
Madison	¨18,229	9	109	134
Manchester	57,650	138	2	15
Mansfield	25,855	145	89	56
Marlborough	6,287	27	53	163
Meriden	60,484	159	18	10
Middlebury	7,390	29	64	132
Middlefield	4,413	44	90	127
Middletown	47,349	152	54	23
Milford	52,753	102	8	53

		CT State Ranking		
Town	Total Population	Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
Monroe	19,316	23	100	128
Montville	19,469	127	103	38
Morris	2,461	86	143	69
Naugatuck	31,746	143	41	32
New Britain	72,954	167	72	3
New Canaan	19,564	3	81	123
New Fairfield	13,800	26	112	145
New Hartford	6,868	57	62	119
New Haven	128,885	168	6	1
New London	27,496	163	19	5
New Milford	28,159	51	50	66
Newington	30,361	122	36	76
Newtown	26,957	15	83	122
Norfolk	1,669	46	164	139
North Branford	14,331	63	97	125
North Canaan	3,354	161	135	64
North Haven	23,927	77	42	77
North Stonington	5,252	62	155	49
Norwalk	84,611	128	23	25
Norwich	39,843	160	57	6
Old Lyme	7,589	49	108	136
Old Saybrook	10,326	100	68	60
Orange	13,831	20	22	149
Oxford	12,192	35	107	159
Plainfield	15,384	151	117	22
Plainville	17,625	133	37	63
Plymouth	12,213	117	95	83
Pomfret	4,197	105	136	62
Portland	9,422	79	76	44
Preston	4,721	129	125	102
Prospect	9,282	66	79	95
Putnam	9,564	157	69	13
Redding	8,945	8	15	158
Ridgefield	24,299	7	10	147
Rocky Hill	19,418	103	47	115
Roxbury	2,239	39	150	151
Salem	4,107	37	146	143
Salisbury	3,810	119	166	81
Scotland	1,771	33	142	140
Seymour	16,367	111	59	61
Sharon	2,837	121	168	99
Shelton	39,061	99	58	50

		CT State Ranking		
Town	Total Population	Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
Sherman	3,604	14	13	164
Simsbury	23,477	10	20	162
Somers	11,378	47	121	157
South Windsor	25,476	40	61	75
Southbury	19,690	95	85	154
Southington	42,491	98	32	100
Sprague	2,990	140	149	28
Stafford	12,046	126	122	46
Stamford	120,907	124	28	21
Sterling	3,727	146	162	36
Stonington	18,497	94	127	43
Stratford	50,821	120	9	30
Suffield	15,357	67	84	117
Thomaston	7,873	108	113	88
Thompson	9,434	137	160	29
Tolland	14,809	19	123	152
Torrington	36,423	158	24	24
Trumbull	35,495	28	56	126
Union	865	60	169	168
Vernon	29,205	139	45	17
Voluntown	2,603	106	158	68
Wallingford	44,786	113	43	51
Warren	1,480	55	156	155
Washington	3,622	97	147	160
Waterbury	109,941	164	7	4
Waterford	19,430	104	44	55
Watertown	22,522	88	71	91
West Hartford	62,898	71	34	47
West Haven	55,070	154	4	12
Westbrook	6,860	110	99	87
Weston	10,088	1	118	167
Westport	26,109	6	63	156
Wethersfield	26,613	112	77	67
Willington	6,068	147	137	109
Wilton	17,874	4	75	150
Winchester	11,221	135	86	16
Windham	25,036	165	30	9
Windsor	28,947	92	66	27
Windsor Locks	12,419	134	78	45
Wolcott	16,446	87	49	54
Woodbridge	9,007	12	82	130
Woodbury	9,909	83	106	141
Woodstock	7,892	96	161	116

APPENDIX B

Total Population and Rankings by Town Population Size in Groups

Town	Total Population	Group Size Ranking: Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
Group I (Population ← 7,500) - 56 Towns				
Union	865	24	56	55
Canaan	1,161	53	42	15
Colebrook	1,361	37	44	40
Warren	1,480	20	46	48
Cornwall	1,589	13	54	30
Eastford	1,626	28	52	33
Norfolk	1,669	16	51	43
Bridgewater	1,708	19	4	2
Scotland	1,771	8	33	44
Hampton	1,864	42	32	6
Franklin	1,924	31	22	41
Hartland	2,009	12	2	53
Roxbury	2,239	11	40	47
Lyme	2,323	9	38	21
Chaplin	2,362	46	24	24
Morris	2,461	35	34	13
Bozrah	2,590	43	21	20
Voluntown	2,603	41	48	12
Sharon	2,837	49	55	25
Goshen	2,950	33	43	17
Kent	2,981	50	47	28
Sprague	2,990	52	39	1
Andover	3,246	27	26	23
North Canaan	3,354	56	28	10
Bethlehem	3,595	25	27	29
Sherman	3,604	3	1	52
Washington	3,622	38	37	49
Sterling	3,727	54	50	3
Barkhamsted	3,781	14	18	36
Salisbury	3,810	48	53	19
Chester	3,976	30	35	26
Salem	4,107	10	36	45
Pomfret	4,197	40	29	9
Lisbon	4,306	36	13	14
Ashford	4,320	45	49	7
Middlefield	4,413	15	8	37
Deep River	4,644	47	19	31
Preston	4,721	51	20	27
Bolton	5,023	21	15	38
Canterbury	5,091	39	31	8
East Granby	5,161	18	3	50
North Stonington	5,252	26	45	5
Columbia	5,425	23	10	16
Bethany	5,467	2	17	54
Harwinton	5,618	34	11	42
Beacon Falls	5,909	32	9	11
Willington	6,068	55	30	32
Marlborough	6,287	6	5	51
Killingworth	6,487	5	41	4
Essex	6,686	17	14	46
Westbrook	6,860	44	12	22
New Hartford	6,868	22	6	34
Lebanon	7,253	29	25	18
Durham	7,293	4	23	35
Middlebury	7,390	7	7	39
Easton	7,403	1	16	56
Group II (Population 7,500-15,000) - 37 Towns				
Old Lyme	7,589	13	23	26
Thomaston	7,873	27	25	15
Woodstock	7,892	25	36	21
Brooklyn	8,093	33	16	3
Haddam	8,185	11	33	31
Litchfield	8,512	24	26	20
Redding	8,945	2	1	35
Woodbridge	9,007	4	13	25
East Haddam	9,038	19	37	19
Burlington	9,103	5	20	29
Prospect	9,282	16	12	17
Portland	9,422	20	10	8
Thompson	9,434	34	35	4
Putnam	9,564	37	9	1
Hebron	9,571	3	34	27
Woodbury	9,909	22	21	28
Canton	10,037	14	4	23
Weston	10,088	1	28	37
Old Saybrook	10,326	26	8	12
East Windsor	10,921	30	7	6
Granby	11,124	9	5	18
Winchester	11,221	32	14	2
Somers	11,378	12	29	34
Griswold	11,774	35	18	7
Stafford	12,046	29	30	10
Oxford	12,192	10	22	36
Plymouth	12,213	28	17	14
Coventry	12,354	17	27	11
Windsor Locks	12,419	31	11	9
Derby	12,826	36	2	5

		Group Size Ranking		
Town	Total Population	Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
East Hampton	12,891	18	32	22
Clinton	13,316	23	15	13
New Fairfield	13,800	8	24	30
Orange	13,831	7	3	32
Cromwell	13,888	21	6	16
North Branford	14,331	15	19	24
Tolland	14,809	6	31	33
Group III (Population 15,000 - 25,000) - 31 Towns				
Ledyard	15,023	11	28	12
Ellington	15,228	13	22	19
Suffield	15,357	15	20	21
Plainfield	15,384	29	29	4
Colchester	15,849	12	31	11
Brookfield	16,214	7	17	16
Seymour	16,367	25	14	8
Wolcott	16,446	19	11	9
Killingly	17,347	30	27	2
Plainville	17,625	27	7	13
Avon	17,678	10	5	28
Wilton	17,874	3	18	26
Madison	18,229	5	26	24
Bethel	18,377	14	13	18
Stonington	18,497	21	30	6
East Lyme	19,067	16	16	10
Ansonia	19,163	31	4	1
Monroe	19,316	8	24	22
Rocky Hill	19,418	23	10	23
Waterford	19,430	24	9	7
Montville	19,469	26	25	5
New Canaan	19,564	2	19	25
Berlin	19,591	18	2	20
Southbury	19,690	22	21	30
Bloomfield	20,334	28	12	3
Darien	20,414	1	6	29
Guilford	22,222	9	23	15
Watertown	22,522	20	15	17
Simsbury	23,477	6	3	31
North Haven	23,927	17	8	14
Ridgefield	24,299	4	1	27
Group IV (Population 25,000 - 45,000) - 25 Towns				
Windham	25,036	25	5	3
Farmington	25,067	8	2	20
South Windsor	25,476	6	18	16
Mansfield	25,855	19	25	13

		Group Size Ranking		
Town	Total Population	Population At-Risk	Food Retail	Food Assistance
Westport	26,109	1	19	25
Wethersfield	26,613	12	23	15
Newtown	26,957	2	24	22
New London	27,496	24	3	1
New Milford	28,159	7	13	14
Branford	28,194	14	14	18
Windsor	28,947	9	21	6
East Haven	29,074	21	8	10
Cheshire	29,183	3	20	24
Vernon	29,205	17	11	4
Newington	30,361	15	7	17
Naugatuck	31,746	18	9	7
Glastonbury	33,984	5	1	21
Trumbull	35,495	4	15	23
Torrington	36,423	22	4	5
Shelton	39,061	11	17	11
Norwich	39,843	23	16	2
Groton	40,254	20	12	8
Southington	42,491	10	6	19
Wallingford	44,786	13	10	12
Enfield	44,794	16	22	9
Group V (Population → 45,000) - 20 Towns				
Middletown	47,349	12	17	13
Stratford	50,821	5	9	15
East Hartford	50,974	15	1	7
Milford	52,753	4	8	18
West Haven	55,070	13	4	8
Manchester	57,650	10	2	9
Fairfield	58,727	2	12	20
Hamden	60,293	7	14	16
Bristol	60,466	11	20	11
Meriden	60,484	14	10	6
Greenwich	60,809	1	18	19
West Hartford	62,898	3	15	17
New Britain	72,954	18	19	3
Danbury	79,371	9	16	10
Norwalk	84,611	8	11	14
Waterbury	109,941	16	7	4
Stamford	120,907	6	13	12
Hartford	124,760	20	5	2
New Haven	128,885	19	6	1
Bridgeport	142,576	17	3	5





Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy

The Charles J. Zwick Center for Food and Resource Policy is driven by excellence in quantitative and policy oriented economic research on problems confronting food and energy markets, the use of natural resources, and the environment. The intent is to provide practical recommendations to improve the functioning of markets and related government policies and to advance and disseminate knowledge that impacts public policies to improve society's welfare.

Department of Extension

Connecticut Cooperative Extension System is recognized as a premier educational network. It is a dynamic organization strengthening individuals, families, and communities in partnership with the USDA and National Extension System.

University of Connecticut
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources

An equal opportunity employer and program provider.