



## NEWS RELEASE

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**  
**August 28, 2007**

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

Contacts: Sharon Langer, J.D., Senior Policy Fellow (health insurance)  
(203) 498-4240, Cell: (860) 490-5441  
Doug Hall, Ph.D, Associate Research Director (poverty)  
(203) 498-4240, Cell: (860) 655-7198

### **Census data reveal nearly one in ten CT residents uninsured; more than one in ten CT children in poverty**

***CT Voices calls on Congressional delegation to continue support for State Children's Health Insurance Program and oppose President's cuts***

Data released today from two national surveys by the U.S. Census Bureau reveal that nearly one in ten Connecticut residents are uninsured and more than one in ten Connecticut children live in poverty. The data are released as the President threatens to veto a bill that provides funding for Connecticut's HUSKY health insurance program, which has been successful in reducing the number of uninsured children in Connecticut.

#### **Health insurance**

Census data from the Current Population Survey reveal that an estimated 9.4% (325,000) of Connecticut residents in 2006 were without health insurance for the entire year. Among Connecticut children under age 18, 6.0% (49,000) lacked insurance for the entire year. These state uninsurance rates have not significantly improved in recent years. Nationally, the number of uninsured has increased. In 2006, 15.8% of Americans were uninsured (47 million), a significant increase over the 2005 rate (15.3%). Among children in the U.S., 11.7% (8.7 million) were uninsured, significantly higher than the 2005 rate (10.9%).

The health insurance figures are of particular significance given the looming showdown between Congress and the President over children's health insurance. This summer, both the U.S. House and Senate passed bills to renew the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), which helps to fund the HUSKY health insurance program in Connecticut. Both bills would extend coverage to millions of additional children. All members of Connecticut's Congressional delegation voted in support of the bills.

However, President Bush has threatened to veto the SCHIP legislation. In addition, the President has issued new restrictions on the use of federal SCHIP funds that could put health coverage at risk for more than 3,500 low-income Connecticut children currently enrolled in HUSKY, as well as many newly uninsured children seeking coverage.

-- MORE--

“Despite American families’ continued struggle to afford health insurance for their children, the President has pledged to veto legislation Congress passed this summer that would extend health insurance to millions of uninsured children. Given the sobering new data concerning children lacking health insurance, the Connecticut delegation must continue to strongly support this legislation and force the President to rethink his position,” said Sharon Langer, Senior Policy Fellow at Connecticut Voices for Children.

Connecticut voters expressed strong support for expanding children’s health insurance coverage in a poll released by Connecticut Voices in March 2007:

- 89% of registered voters supported expanding the HUSKY health care program to cover *every* uninsured child.
- Voters in the state want to increase funding for HUSKY at the state and federal levels. Seven in ten (70%) voters want Congress to increase funding to expand SCHIP, and only seven percent favor the current level of funding, which would result in children being dropped from the program. Also, 85% of voters favor increasing *state* funds for HUSKY.

“Connecticut residents, the Governor, and our state legislative leaders have all expressed a commitment to cover uninsured children,” said Shelley Geballe, President of Connecticut Voices for Children. “Congress has voted to support Connecticut in covering its children, but the President proposes to undo this progress. Our kids need our Congressional delegation to stand up to the President’s cruel proposal.”

“We know how to make the HUSKY program more successful in reducing the uninsured,” said Sharon Langer. “Along with adequate federal funding, we must reduce bureaucratic hurdles for parents enrolling their children in the program and expand outreach into every community in the state so people know that HUSKY is there to cover uninsured children.”

### **Poverty & income**

The Census Bureau also released new poverty and income data. According to the Current Population Survey, 8.0% of Connecticut residents (275,000) had incomes under the Federal Poverty Level (\$20,615 for a family of four in 2006). The American Community Survey shows that 10.7% of related Connecticut children under age 18 (85,906 children) lived in families with incomes under the Federal Poverty Level. (“Related children” are those related to the head of household; the measure does not include foster children or children living in group settings, such as juvenile justice facilities, group homes, and hospitals.)

With the establishment of the Child Poverty Council in 2004, Connecticut was the first state in the nation to set a goal of reducing child poverty -- by 50% by 2014. In 2004, 10.1% of Connecticut’s children had incomes below the poverty line. To achieve the goal set, only 5% of children can be in poverty in 2014. Connecticut’s 2006 poverty rate for children in families (10.7%) has not significantly improved over the last five years (indeed, the 2001 rate was 9.7%). To meet the goal of reducing child poverty by half, Connecticut must make significant and rapid progress; this is not occurring.

-- MORE--

“Connecticut took a tremendously positive step in setting an ambitious, but attainable goal of reducing child poverty by half in 10 years. Unfortunately, three years into the effort, we have not made the kind of progress necessary to significantly reduce child poverty,” said Associate Research Director Doug Hall. “We know what we need to do as a state to achieve our goal. For example, a state-level Earned Income Tax Credit would help to make work pay and is a proven way to lift working families from poverty to self-sufficiency.”

Nationwide, the data from the Current Population Survey estimated that 12.3% of all residents (36.5 million) live in poverty, while the data from the American Community Survey found that 17.9% of related children (12.9 million) live in poverty. As one of the wealthiest states in the nation, Connecticut’s rate compares favorably to national estimates.

For the second year, the American Community Survey provided poverty, median income and other estimates for Connecticut’s counties, Congressional districts and for several cities. Poverty rates varied significantly across Connecticut’s cities: Bridgeport (20.6%), Danbury (3.5%), Hartford (30.3%), New Britain (20.2%), New Haven (21.0%), Norwalk (6.4%), Stamford (8.3%), and Waterbury (19.7%). The percentage of children under 18 in poverty in Connecticut cities was also reported: Bridgeport (29.5%), Danbury (3.6%), Hartford (43.4%), New Britain (34.4%), New Haven (27.6%), Norwalk (9.9%), Stamford (9.2%), and Waterbury (33.5%).

"Child poverty rates for our largest cities vary slightly from year to year," said James Horan, Executive Director of the Connecticut Association for Human Services. "But they remain extraordinarily high compared to the state as a whole, and the gap appears to be growing. This argues for strategies that foster opportunity and prosperity for children and families in our poorest cities."

“National and state trends in both poverty rates and health care coverage are disturbing. The national statistics show that the poverty rate is still higher than it was in 2001, the year the last recession hit bottom,” commented Jane McNichol, Executive Director of the Legal Assistance Resource Center. “Increased numbers of people without health insurance mean more families struggling to meet their basic needs with reduced resources. We need to focus on these issues at the national and state level to make progress for working families.”

“For Connecticut to succeed in the global economy, we need *all* children to grow and learn in environments where they have a chance to achieve their full potential,” said Shelley Geballe, President of CT Voices for Children. “Children in poverty are robbed of that opportunity. As a state, we have a moral obligation to help lift children and their families from poverty. It is also in the state’s economic interest to do so. Luckily, Connecticut has the economic means to do this. The question is whether we have the political will.”

National and state-level data on poverty, income, and health insurance coverage are available on the U.S. Census Web site at [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov). Data are drawn from the Current Population Survey (CPS) and American Community Survey (ACS). CT Voices has cited ACS data for child poverty and income figures and CPS for overall poverty and health insurance figures. **See the attached fact sheet for detailed survey results and background on its measures.** This news

-- MORE--

release and fact sheet are also available on the CT Voices Web site at [www.ctkidslink.org](http://www.ctkidslink.org). A summary of the Connecticut HUSKY and SCHIP public opinion poll is available at [http://www.ctkidslink.org/announcement\\_64.html](http://www.ctkidslink.org/announcement_64.html).

**-END-**



**Poverty, Income & Health Insurance in Connecticut:  
Summary of 2006 U.S. Census Data**

**August 28, 2007**

**Health Insurance - Connecticut & Nation – 2005 & 2004**

<b>Uninsured indicator &amp; data source</b>	<b>Connecticut 2006 % and #</b>	<b>United States 2006 % and #</b>	<b>United States 2005 % and #</b>
Children uninsured, entire previous 12 months (CPS)	6.0% (49,000)	11.7% (8.7 million) <b>significant increase</b>	10.9% (8.1 million)
Persons uninsured, previous 12 months (CPS)	9.4% (325,000)	15.8% (47.0 million) <b>significant increase</b>	15.3% (44.8 million)

Data from the U.S. Census Current Population Survey (CPS).

**Change Over Time in Health Insurance – Connecticut**

<b>Uninsured indicator &amp; data source</b>	<b>Connecticut 2005-2006 2-year Average % and #</b>	<b>Connecticut 2004-2005 2-year Average % and #</b>	<b>Connecticut 2000-2001 2-year Average % and #</b>
Children uninsured, entire previous 12 months (CPS)	6.9% (56,500)	7.4% (62,000)	6.8% (56,000)
Persons uninsured, previous 12 months (CPS)	10.2% (353,000)	10.9% (381,000)	9.4% (317,000)

Data from the U.S. Census Current Population Survey (CPS). Two-year averages for uninsured children calculated by CT Voices for Children. **Comparisons to 2005-2006 data are not statistically significant.** Data reflect revised estimates by the US Census Bureau. As a result, data listed here may not match previously published health insurance data from the CPS.

## Poverty & Income – Connecticut & Nation – 2006 & 2005

Poverty/income indicator & data source	Connecticut 2006 % and #	Connecticut 2005 % and #	United States 2006 % and #	United States 2005 % and #
Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level (CPS)	8.0% (275,000)	*	12.3% (36,460,000)	12.6% (36,950,000)
Related children under 18 with income under FPL (ACS)	10.7% (85,906)	11.1% (90,764)	17.9% (12,911,393) <b>significant decrease</b>	18.2% (13,008,489)
All Children in Poverty (ACS)	11.0 (88,582)	**	18.3% (13,285,569)	**
Families with income below FPL (ACS)	5.9% (52,378)	6.2% (55,456)	9.8% (7,282,926) <b>significant decrease</b>	10.2% (7,605,363)
Median household income in 2006 dollars (ACS)	\$63,422	\$62,939	\$48,451 <b>significant increase</b>	\$47,758

Data from the U.S. Census Current Population Survey (CPS) and American Community Survey (ACS). **Unless specifically noted, comparisons to 2006 data are not statistically significant.**

\*CPS data are not comparable on the state level across individual years. Comparisons over time in two-year averages are below.

\*\* 2006 data include children living in group quarters, while 2005 data do not. For this reason, the numbers are not comparable.

## Change Over Time in Poverty & Income – Connecticut

Poverty/income indicator & data source	Connecticut 2005-2006 2-year Average %	Connecticut 2004-2005 2-year Average %	Connecticut 2000-2001 2-year Average %
Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level (CPS)	8.7%	9.7%	7.5%

Data from the U.S. Census Current Population Survey (CPS). CPS sample size requires two-year averaging for comparisons over time. Statistical significance calculated with assistance from Coalition on Human Needs (chn.org). **Unless specifically noted, comparisons to 2005/2006 data are not statistically significant.**

Poverty/income indicator & data source	Connecticut 2006 % and #	Connecticut 2004 % and #	Connecticut 2001 % and #
Related children under 18 with income under FPL (ACS)	10.7% (85,906)	10.1% (83,362)	9.7% (77,251)
Families with income below FPL (ACS)	5.9% (52,378)	6.2% (55,952)	5.3% (46,935)
Median household income in 2006 dollars (ACS)	63,422	\$64,608	\$64,220

Data from the U.S. Census American Community Survey (ACS). One year comparisons are valid for ACS data. Statistical significance calculated with assistance from Coalition on Human Needs (chn.org). **Unless specifically noted, comparisons to 2006 data are not statistically significant.**

## Poverty & Income – Connecticut Cities - 2006

City	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level (ACS)	Children under 18 in families with income under FPL (ACS)	Median household income in 2006 dollars (ACS)
Bridgeport	20.6%	29.5%	\$35,736
Danbury	3.5%	3.6%	\$68,794
Hartford	30.3%	43.4%	\$29,293
New Britain	20.2%	34.4%	\$40,270
New Haven	21.0%	27.6%	\$36,428
Norwalk	6.4%	9.9%	\$64,895
Stamford	8.3%	9.2%	\$71,030
Waterbury	19.7%	33.5%	\$37,673

Data from the U.S. American Community Survey (ACS).

## Poverty & Income – Connecticut Counties - 2006

County	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level (ACS)	Children under 18 with income under FPL (ACS)	Median household income in 2006 dollars (ACS)
Fairfield	6.6%	8.1%	\$76,671
Hartford	9.9%	14.1%	\$58,666
Litchfield	6.3%	8.3%	\$66,664
Middlesex	7.4%	7.0%	\$68,739
New Haven	9.9%	15.2%	\$56,840
New London	6.2%	6.2%	\$59,719
Tolland	5.4%	3.9%	\$69,862
Windham	9.3%	10.4%	\$55,013

Data from the U.S. American Community Survey (ACS).

## Poverty & Income – Connecticut Congressional Districts - 2006

Congressional District	Persons with income less than Federal Poverty Level (ACS)	Children under 18 with income under FPL (ACS)	Median household income in 2006 dollars (ACS)
1 <sup>st</sup> Congressional District (Rep. Larson)	9.9%	14.3%	\$57,757
2 <sup>nd</sup> Congressional District (Rep. Courtney)	5.9%	5.9%	\$64,708
3 <sup>rd</sup> Congressional District (Rep. DeLauro)	8.9%	13.0%	\$57,845
4 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District (Rep. Shays)	7.8%	9.5%	\$78,014
5 <sup>th</sup> Congressional District (Rep. Murphy)	8.7%	12.4%	\$62,510

Data from the U.S. American Community Survey (ACS).

### Technical note:

*Data Source.* The United States Census Bureau released data from two surveys on August 28: the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Current Population Survey (CPS). The ACS (the newer survey of the two) has a significantly larger sample size than CPS. As a result, ACS can give reliable estimates for counties and for cities as small as 65,000 people and can be compared over time without relying on two-year averages. Given its smaller sample size, CPS state data must be averaged over multiple years to increase its reliability. In coming years, researchers increasingly will rely on ACS data as multiple years of comparative data become available for the first time. Because the surveys use different methodologies, ACS data should not be compared to CPS data. CT Voices' use of CPS and ACS data is informed by the advice and assistance of economists and analysts at the Center for Policy and Budget Priorities, the Economic Policy Institute and the Coalition for Human Needs.

*Poverty, family income comparisons.* In this analysis, CT Voices has used CPS data for estimates of statewide poverty for all residents, because these data can be compared to earlier years and therefore assessed for trends. Because the ACS, for the first time in these 2006 data, is including in its poverty count persons living in group quarters, comparisons to previous years are not possible.

In this analysis, CT Voices has used ACS data for median family income, family poverty and the number of related children in poverty. ACS data for these measures is representative and comparable over time because, by definition, they do not include people living in group quarters. However, for this reason the data also may underestimate poverty's prevalence. When looking at child poverty, for example the ACS data may slightly underestimate the total number of children in poverty, since children in juvenile justice facilities, group homes, hospitals, etc. would not be included in the ACS count.

Unless specifically noted in the comparison charts above, there were no statistically significant changes as calculated at the 90% confidence interval. Median income figures are in 2006 dollars (inflation adjusted) so they would not match estimates in earlier reports.

*Health insurance coverage.* Health insurance coverage data is available only through the CPS.