Note to Reviewers

This is a working draft presentation and analysis of a set of community indicators defined by the Community Indicators Team since last fall.

We have incorporated features to make the document more accessible:

- There is a list of all the indicators and page numbers in the front of the report for reference.
- The data is organized in seven categories and there are lists of the indicators included at the front of each category.
- Each indicator is presented on a separate page, each with a key point at the top, a few bulleted Headlines to get you started in thinking about the data, and then the data itself. Some indicators have longer discussions of the implications of the data for those who want to dig deeper.

This is a work in progress. Every effort has been made to correct any technical inaccuracies, but some may remain. If you have any issues questions regarding the data or the way the data is presented or described, please bring those to the attention of the Indicators Team. The Indicators Team will be reviewing and enhancing this report to incorporate comments.

A Note on Defining the Region:

- Most of the tables include 15 towns—the 12 COMPASS towns plus the rest of the South Central Connecticut Council of Governments towns (Meriden, Milford, and Wallingford). We did this because much of the data was already processed on this basis and also to expand the context and make the analysis useful to a wider audience (e.g. COG members).
- Many tables also analyze the data by the zones that the Data Analysis Work Group developed for grouping the COMPASS study region towns:
  - New Haven,
  - Inner Ring (East Haven, Hamden, and West Haven) and
  - Outer Ring (Bethany, Branford, Guilford, Madison, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, Woodbridge)

As we go forward, if there is other data you would like to see, please bring that forward to the Team to see if it is available.

If you have any questions about the data, you can contact Carol Cangiano at the United Way (772-2010, x232; ccangiano@uwgnh.org) or Jim Farnam at Holt, Wexler & Farnam, LLP (203-772-2050 x13; farnam@hwfco.com).
Community Indicators Report
COMMUNITY COMPASS

Introduction
This is the draft report of the Community Indicators Team, which has guided the collection of existing data to provide an objective measurement of a wide variety of community conditions, patterns and trends in support of the Community COMPASS process.

Categories
The Community Indicators Team identified indicators of community well-being in the following categories identified in conjunction with the COMPASS Partners. The report is organized by these categories.

1. Demographics
2. Basic and Special Needs
3. Economic Health
4. Health and Safety
5. Education and Children/Youth
6. Engagement (Civic and Philanthropic)
7. Environment (Natural and Constructed)

Process
Drawing on extensive work with data both in the Greater New Haven community and nationally, the Community Indicators Team identified a set of indicators for each domain that can be analyzed to answer critical questions about the region. All the indicator data included here as well as additional data will be stored and updated on the DataHaven web site, a collaborative community project to make a wide range of community information available on-line (www.ctdatahaven.org).

Regional Definition
Community COMPASS is working to engage leaders and residents of a 12-town Greater New Haven region composed of the nine-town United Way of Greater New Haven region and the three shoreline towns of Branford, Guilford, and Madison that are closely connected to the remainder of the region.

The 15-town South Central Connecticut Planning Region of the South Central Regional Council of Governments includes these towns plus the communities of Meriden, Milford, and Wallingford. The COG region is also used by the Regional Growth Partnership for economic development planning and execution.

The remaining towns of the COG region are served by two other United Ways—United Way of Milford and United Way of Meriden-Wallingford.

Other common regional definitions include the 20 town region served by the Community Foundation for Greater New Haven and the 34 town South Central Unified Service Region used by most State agencies.

The analysis of community indicators incorporates all 15 towns of the South Central Connecticut Regional Planning Area to provide a wider context for the data and increase its utility across various planning processes. This 15-town region is the primary regional definition for the purposes of unified government action and regional economic development.

The Indicators
The agreed list of indicators developed by the Committee in consultation with the COMPASS Partners is contained on the cover of each section.
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What are the major safety issues in the home and community?
4.8 Family Violence Incident Rate
4.9 Substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect
4.10 Crime Rates
4.11 Juvenile Violent Crime Rate

5. Education and Children/Youth

What is the level of economic and care support for pre-school aged children?
5.1 Non-adequate prenatal care
5.2 Percentage of children under 5 years living below the poverty level
5.3 Percentage of students receiving free/reduced price meals
5.4 Child care supply versus demand

What is the level of preparedness of children entering schools?
5.5 Percentage of Kindergarteners who attended preschool, nursery school or Head Start
5.6 Percentage of K-12 students with non-English home language

What is the level of academic success in school?
5.7 Percentage of 4th and 8th grade students meeting state goal on CMT in reading
5.8 Cumulative 4-year drop-out rate for graduating class

What are the major challenges for young people as they become adults?
5.9 Percentage of students passing all 4 physical fitness tests
5.10 Teen pregnancy rate (ages 15-17)

What level of education do we attain?
5.11 Percentage below high school graduate of population 25 years and over
5.12 Percentage with bachelor’s degree or above of population 25 years and over

6. Engagement (Civic and Philanthropic)

What is our level of civic and philanthropic engagement?
6.1 Percentage of total eligible voters who voted in elections
6.2 Philanthropic giving (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)
6.3 Volunteerism (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)

7. Environment (Natural and Constructed)

Is our region a pleasant place to live?
7.1 Air Quality Indicators

Are cultural attractions, parks, and recreational opportunities available?
7.2 Cultural attraction availability (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)
7.3 Recreational services/facilities availability (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)

What are the strengths and weaknesses of our transportation system?
7.4 Commuters driving to work by means other than driving self
7.5 Travel time to work (percentage over 30 minutes)
COMPASS Community Indicators

1. Demographics

Introduction

Discussion of population change, migration, household structure, density, and household mobility

What is the structure of families in our region?

1.1 Percentage of single parent households
1.2 Percentage of family households with grandparents as primary caregivers
1.3 Percentage of families with a single parent or both parents in the labor force

What is the demographic composition of our region?

1.4 Racial and Ethnic distribution
1.5 Percentage of population that is foreign born (total and arrived in last 10 years)
Demographic Trends: A Changing Region

Introduction

- The South Central Connecticut region has become a complex, interdependent social and economic unit in which the well-being of each community is increasingly tied to regional patterns and public policies.
- While New Haven remains a dynamic center, the majority of population and jobs are located in the surrounding communities that have a diverse pattern of land use and development.
- There are many definitions of the region within South Central Connecticut (see below). The United Way of Greater New Haven serves nine towns, but has reached out to engage three additional shoreline towns in the COMPASS process. The South Central Connecticut Council of Governments and the Regional Growth Partnership each include 15 towns, those twelve towns plus Milford, Wallingford, and Meriden. A total of 22 towns are included in the DataHaven web site project, the COG towns plus the Lower Naugatuck Valley and Clinton.
- Most of the analyses in this indicator report include all 15 towns of the Council of Governments region in order to provide a full context for the region and data that is useful to a slightly wider area than those towns involved in COMPASS.

Selected Regional Definitions in South Central Connecticut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ansonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Before expansion of the RWDB region in July 2003.

- For the purposes of analysis, the COMPASS project has grouped municipalities in South Central Connecticut into three zones in accordance with socio-economic and demographic characteristics:
- **New Haven** – New Haven, the region’s central city, has a higher concentrations of minority and low-income households and lower ability to support needed services through local property taxes. Meriden, part of the COG region, shares many characteristics with New Haven.
• **Inner Ring Suburbs** – This group includes West Haven, Hamden, and East Haven. Though a diverse group, these are municipalities that are witnessing some of the same fiscal and social stresses as the central cities. West Haven and Hamden in particular are markedly more diverse and contain more assisted housing than the remaining towns in the region.

• **Outer Ring Suburbs** – This group includes the relatively affluent communities of Bethany, Branford, Guilford, Madison, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, Woodbridge. These towns generally have higher incomes, are less racially diverse, and have higher equalized grand lists on a per capita basis and thus a greater ability to finance municipal services through the property tax. While the towns at the lower economic levels within this group (e.g., Branford) have begun to see an increase in poverty and attendant social issues, the rest remain relatively unaffected by those issues.

This analysis also includes data on two additional communities outside the COMPASS region that are part of the SCRCOG region:

• **Smaller Cities** – These communities, Wallingford and Milford, are historically independent economic units that have grown strong economic bases that are integrated in the regional economy.

**Population Trends**

**Urban-Suburban Population Shifts Characterize the Region**

• Population shifts from New Haven to suburban towns continue unabated. Beginning in the 1920s, with the advent of the automobile and an improved road network, the region’s population began shifting to the suburbs. The trend accelerated in the era following World War II with the result that fully two-thirds of the COG 15-town region’s residents now live in suburban areas.

• Population in the COMPASS region grew by 2% (6,610) between 1990 and 2000. This was considerably less than state (4%) or nation (13%). There was wide variation within the region (see table) with New Haven posting a 5% decline, while Madison was the fastest growing community with a 15% increase. In absolute terms, Hamden led the way with a 4,479-population increase, while New Haven had the greatest loss at -6,848.

---

1 The equalized grand list is a measure developed by the State Office of Policy and Management which adjusts the taxable grand list of each municipality to account for the timing of property revaluations in order to produce a comparable figure.
Migration

- Migration out of New Haven, Net Population Loss in the Region between 1990-2000. The COMPASS region as a whole had an out-migration of 2.5% of its 1990 population, losing a net total of 9,749 residents through migration by 2000.
- New Haven, showing a net out-migration of 15,196 residents, or 11.6% of its 1990 population (compared to a drop in overall population of 6,848).\(^2\) This is followed by losses of 4,730 in Meriden, and 4,036 in West Haven.
- Three towns gained significant population through migration: Woodbridge, which saw a net in-migration of 942 residents (11.9% of their 1990 population), Madison, which experienced a net in-migration of 1,797 (11.6% of their 1990 population), and Hamden, which had a net in-migration of 3,959 new residents (7.6% of their 1990 population). The other 9 towns in the region experienced relatively little change.

Aging Population with Younger Populations in the Urban Core

- The region, like the state, has an aging population with shrinking youth and younger worker cohorts. Specifically, the number of people in the 19-24 year age group declined by 14% (4,974) between 1990 and 2000. Although this shift is not unique to the New Haven region, it does present a significant challenge to workforce planners and policymakers, and represents a significant competitive disadvantage for area businesses. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that an increasing share of younger working age people are found in the inner-city and are more likely to be at risk for a variety of social problems. In addition, with high school drop-out rates, they are more likely to lack the basic skills necessary to fill many entry-level jobs.
- The median age for the COG region is 36.7 years (with the COMPASS region likely at a similar level), yet the range of median ages varies greatly between communities. The median age of New Haven residents, 29.3, is dramatically lower than the rest of the region.
- Meriden, West Haven, and Hamden have median ages that are comparable with the region’s median and considerably younger than the remaining towns, all of which have median ages that are higher than the region’s median.

\(^2\) Net in- and out-migration can be measured by adjusting total population gains and loses for gains or losses from births and deaths.
Population Density

- Population density varies greatly by town and zone (see chart).

Household Structure

- Household structure continued to change between 1990 and 2000 (see table below). The average household size in the region continued to decline in every town (from 2.66 to 2.57), reflecting the aging of the population and choices of living arrangements.

- New Haven, like other cities, showed a much higher percentage of households in one-person households and fewer family households.

- The number and percent of families with children headed by single parents increased significantly over the decade, from 26% to 33% of all families in the region, with an 80% increase in the Inner Ring (from 18% to 30% of all families with children) (see Indicator 1.1).

- Households on the move. Households within the region demonstrate fairly high household mobility rates, defined as the percentage of households that has moved within the town or into that town over the past 5 years. In nearly half of the region’s towns (Milford, Hamden, West Haven, Orange, East Haven, Branford, and Woodbridge) 40% or more of the residents moved into their current home within the last 5 years. Milford, in particular has seen nearly 61% of its residents move into or within their town in the past 5 years.
## Household and Family Structure, 1990 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Family Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Single Parent Households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>11,663</td>
<td>12,543</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>11,219</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>7,181</td>
<td>8,151</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>20,641</td>
<td>22,408</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>5,572</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>23,240</td>
<td>22,951</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>18,851</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>48,986</td>
<td>47,094</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>7,983</td>
<td>8,597</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>15,167</td>
<td>16,697</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>21,284</td>
<td>21,090</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, COG Region</td>
<td>203,828</td>
<td>212,894</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,230,479</td>
<td>1,301,670</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* change in percentage points
Indicator 1.1: Percentage of Single Parent Families

Why is this important? Mothers and fathers both play important roles in the growth and development of children. Both the number and the type of parents (i.e. biological, step) in a child's household can have strong effects on their well-being. Single-parent families tend to have much lower incomes than two-parent families, but recent research indicates that the income differential accounts for only about one-half of the negative effects of parent absence on many areas of child and youth well-being, including health, educational attainment and assessment, behavior problems and psychological well-being.\(^3\)

Children who live absent their biological fathers are, on average, at least two to three times more likely to be poor, to use drugs, to experience educational, health, emotional and behavioral problems, to be victims of child abuse, and to engage in criminal behavior than their peers who live with their married, biological (or adoptive) parents. Children with involved, loving fathers are significantly more likely to do well in school, have healthy self-esteem, exhibit empathy and pro-social behavior, and avoid high-risk behaviors such as drug use, truancy, and criminal activity compared to children who have uninvolved fathers.\(^4\)

Headlines

- In 2000, 15,062 (33%) of the COMPASS region’s families with children were headed by single parents, up from 11,450 (26%) in 1990. 28% of families in the region were headed by single women and 5% by single men in 2000 (up from 24% and 2% in 1990).
- The number of single parent families in the Inner Ring jumped 80% (from 18% to 30% of all families), a major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families with Own Children under 18, by Type</th>
<th>All Families</th>
<th>Single Parent Families with own Children under 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>391,925</td>
<td>419,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>14,289</td>
<td>13,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td>14,417</td>
<td>15,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td>14,801</td>
<td>16,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Region</td>
<td>43,507</td>
<td>45,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Region</td>
<td>61,784</td>
<td>64,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>3,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>5,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>6,291</td>
<td>6,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>2,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns</td>
<td>7,575</td>
<td>7,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>6,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>5,393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

\(^3\) [http://www.childtrendsdatabank.org/demo/family/59FamilyStructure.htm](http://www.childtrendsdatabank.org/demo/family/59FamilyStructure.htm)
While 58% of families with children in New Haven are headed by single parents (up from 52%), the number of such families grew by only 9%.

There were increases of at least 50% in single female-headed households with children in eight suburbs between 1990-2000.

**Definition** Children in single parent families is the percentage of children (persons under age 18) who live in families headed by a person – male or female – without a spouse present in the home. These numbers include “own children” defined as never-married children under 18 who are related to the family head by birth, marriage or adoption.

Indicator 1.2: Percentage of Families with Grandparents as Primary Caregivers

Why is this important?  Many grandparents do not plan to take on care-giving responsibilities (having already raised their families) and often end up making personal sacrifice to their own physical, emotional and financial health to take on the role of primary caregiver.

Headlines
- Since 1980, there has been a marked increase in the number of children living in the homes of their grandparents nationally (In 1970, it was 3%; in 1999, this had increased to 5% of all children).\(^5\)
- In absolute terms, grandparents were primary caregivers in 2,700 families across the COMPASS region according to the 2000 Census.
- In percentage terms, grandparents were primary caregivers in 6% of New Haven families, 3% of East Haven, West Haven, and Bethany families. All other towns had rates of 2% or less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families with Grandparents as Primary Caregivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Region and Other COG Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trends  
Not available: The 1990 U.S. Census did not capture this indicator. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 mandated that the decennial census collect data on this subject. Data from the 2000 U.S. Census will serve as a baseline.

Definition  
Grandparent caregivers have financial responsibility for the basic needs (food, shelter, clothing, day care, etc.) for any or all grandchildren living in the household.

Data Source  

**Children under age 6 with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force**

**Indicator 1.3: Children under age 6 with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force**

**Why is this important?** As an increasing number of two-parent families have both parents in the labor force, the demand for early child care and after school care has grown. Challenges that dual-working parents or single working parents face include lack of time spent at home with youth and keeping older youth occupied productively after school in order to avoid risky behaviors. The increased stress on families is also a contributing factor to poorer nutrition and other health issues.

**Headlines**

- 17,400 children under six in the region (63%) have working parents. The figure in the Inner Ring is 67%.
- The number of children in single parent families with their parent in the labor force grew 71% (107% in the Inner Ring).
- 74% of children under 6 in the region in single parent families have their parent in the labor force (up from 44%), and nine towns have over 80%.
- Nine of 12 towns across the region have seen increases in the percentage of children with a single parent or both parents in the labor force.


- Children with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force grew 71% (107% in the Inner Ring).
- Children living with a Single Parent who is in labor force grew 37% (24% in the Inner Ring).


- Of children living with a Single Parent who is in labor force, 74% of children under 6 in the region in single parent families have their parent in the labor force.
- Nine of 12 towns across the region have seen increases in the percentage of children with a single parent or both parents in the labor force.

**Children under age 6 with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force - Town Detail**

**Data point**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner Haven</th>
<th>East Haven</th>
<th>West Haven</th>
<th>Branford</th>
<th>Guilford</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>North Haven</th>
<th>Meriden</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Woodbridge</th>
<th>Milford</th>
<th>Wallingford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>2283</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children living with a Single Parent who is in labor force</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children living with a Single Parent who is in labor force</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2000 Data**

- Children with a Single Parent or Both Parents in the Labor Force grew 71% (107% in the Inner Ring).
- Children living with a Single Parent who is in labor force grew 37% (24% in the Inner Ring).

**Definitions:**

- Children in families where all parents are in labor force (one parent for single parent families, both for married couple families)

Indicator 1.4: Racial and Ethnic Distribution

**Why is this important?** The degree of racial and ethnic separation in South Central Connecticut is high. Diversity is a strength in an increasingly global economy.

**Headlines**

- Connecticut and the South Central Region are becoming far more diverse places and the trend is expected to continue. Across the COMPASS region, the percentage increase in population other than non-Hispanic White was 10%; and this group made up a total of 27% of the total population in 2000. Despite these changes, the region remains highly segregated.

- Although every community in the South Central Connecticut region saw an increase in their minority population between 1990 and 2000, the actual changes in the internal population distribution by race were quite small. In no community in the Outer Ring did the African American proportion of the population increase by more than 0.7% and the African American percentage actually fell in three communities.

- The white, non-Hispanic population declined by more than 27,000 in the COMPASS Region—a 7.6 percent loss between 1990 and 2000. People of Hispanic ethnicity increased by 17,822 during the decade, the largest absolute increase for any group. During the same period, the Asian population nearly doubled, up 81 percent from its 1990 base of 7,642.

---

*Census data for people of races other than White, Black or Asian saw a substantial increase in 2000 because the count allowed people to classify themselves as two races and people who did that are classified as other in this and the next chart.*

---

6 In the 2000 Census, people were given the option to designate two or more races for the first time making comparisons to earlier years more difficult. 2.3% of respondents chose two or more races in the region.
Regional towns differ widely in their ethnic and racial composition. New Haven has the most diverse population mix of any regional town with the white, non-Hispanic share of total population accounting for 36 percent—the city’s population is now predominantly minority. This is in marked contrast to Madison where almost 98 percent of the population is white, non-Hispanic. The town with the second highest minority population is West Haven where minorities account for about 30% of the population. In absolute terms, about 80 percent of the region’s ethnic and minority populations reside in New Haven and the Inner Ring.

The table at right documents the Index of Minority Concentration for 1990 – 2000. All towns with the exceptions of Bethany and New Haven increased their proportion of the regional minority population, although changes in most cases were slight. New Haven, Hamden, Meriden, and West Haven all have significantly higher percentage of minority residents than the region as a whole.


---

The index of minority concentration is the percentage of minorities in a town divided by the percentage of minorities in the region.
**Percentage of population that is foreign born and that arrived in the last ten years, is increasing in all towns in region**

**Indicator 1.5: Percentage of Population that is Foreign-Born (total and arrived in the last ten yrs)**

*Why is this important?* This indicator can reflect growing diversity in the overall population of a community. A large foreign-born population enriches community but also increases the need for specific services within the community, especially schools.

**Headlines**

- The foreign-born population in the COMPASS region totaled 42,943 in 2000, a 39% increase since 1990. Largest numbers came from Latin America (31%), Southern Europe (12%), Eastern Asia (12%), and Eastern Europe (11%) (See next page).
- Nineteen percent of the region’s foreign-born population has arrived in the past 10 years.
- Woodbridge (13%), New Haven (12%), and West Haven (11%) were home to the highest percentages of the foreign born population at the town level in 2000. All other towns were under 10%.
- Woodbridge (+72%), Milford (+62%), Branford (+60%) led the region growth between 1990 and 2000.
- Woodbridge (+4), New Haven (+4), and West Haven (+3) had the largest percentage point increases. Only Madison (-0.1) had a percentage point decrease.

**Definition** The foreign-born population includes all people who were not U.S. citizens at birth. Foreign-born people are those who indicated they were either a U.S. citizen by naturalization or they were not a citizen of the United States. Note: Census 2000 does not ask about immigration status. The population includes all people who indicated that the United States was their usual place of residence. The foreign-born population includes: immigrants (legal permanent residents), temporary migrants (e.g., students), humanitarian migrants (e.g., refugees), and unauthorized migrants (people illegally residing in the U. S.).

**Data Source** U.S. Census, 2000.
### Foreign Born, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>% of Regional Total</th>
<th>Total by zone</th>
<th>% of Region Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>36575</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>13,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BY CONTINENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Regional Total</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>% of Region Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe:</td>
<td>12872</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>25% 39% 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas:</td>
<td>12351</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>57% 31% 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia:</td>
<td>9695</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>3,699</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>35% 38% 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa:</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>34% 48% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania:</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63% 9% 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Top 15 REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Regional Total</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>% of Region Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin America:</td>
<td>11299</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>60% 32% 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Europe:</td>
<td>4387</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>16% 51% 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Asia:</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>42% 24% 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe:</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>37% 30% 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central Asia:</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>27% 42% 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Europe:</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>21% 38% 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern Asia:</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>31% 59% 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe:</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>28% 30% 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Asia:</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>34% 48% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America:</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>26% 26% 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa:</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>34% 53% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa:</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25% 43% 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa:</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30% 39% 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New Zealand:</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63% 9% 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa:</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37% 56% 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOP 20 COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of Regional Total</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>% of Region Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3124</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>13% 52% 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79% 17% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>46% 22% 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, excluding Hong Kong</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>47% 20% 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59% 39% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>21% 46% 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>23% 36% 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>37% 25% 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>24% 31% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>70% 17% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>31% 25% 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>25% 26% 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>36% 53% 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>41% 29% 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central America:</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63% 35% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>22% 58% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>18% 48% 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Eastern Europe</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>39% 34% 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28% 63% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40% 36% 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>24% 56% 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 50% of region’s population from this place in this zone
Plurality of population in this zone
COMPASS Community Indicators

2. Basic and Special Needs

How adequate is the amount of affordable housing in our region?

2.1 Percentage of homeowners or renters paying over 30 percent of annual household income on housing

What percentage of housing is owned?

2.2 Owner-occupancy rate

How many households receive public assistance?

2.3 Percentage of households receiving public assistance

What is available in the areas of subsidized housing and housing shelters?

2.4 Annual shelter clients
2.5 Percentage of housing units that are subsidized

Are people getting the food they need?

2.6 Percentage of households experiencing food insecurity

How large is the disabled population in the region?

2.7 Number of persons with disabilities
**Context: Housing**

- The Urban Core communities have older, denser housing stock and are home to nearly all of the Region’s publicly-assisted housing units.

- Housing rents, prices and occupancy rates, among other trends, are driven by the age and diversity of housing stock located in the region. New Haven, Meriden, Milford, and West Haven have the highest percentage of pre-1950's housing stock. These structures tend to have a larger percentage of multi-family dwellings and be placed more densely together than newer construction.

- New Haven, Meriden, Hamden and West Haven have 74% of the region’s units located in buildings of four or more units. These communities also are among the most densely populated in the region, with between 716 and 2,809 households per square mile.

- Fully 43% of the 13,020 permits for new housing development in the 1990’s were concentrated in three communities—Wallingford, Milford, and Hamden—while another 20% were in the rapidly growing outer suburbs of Guilford, Madison, and North Branford.

- During this same period 1,807 demolitions took place in the region, with 75% of those demolitions taking place in New Haven and Meriden.
Across region, renters more likely to pay over 30 percent of household income on housing than homeowners

Indicator 2.1: Percentage of Homeowners or Renters Paying over 30 Percent of Household Income on Housing

Why is this important? This indicator measures housing affordability. Families or individuals who pay more than 30% of their annual income for housing are considered cost-burdened under federal and state housing policy based on research on household income and preferences. At housing costs over this level, households may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care. The continued increase in affordable housing demand coupled with the diminishing supply of affordable units is increasing the challenge of finding housing for 30% or less of a household’s income.

Headlines

- Across the region, 60,622 households (31,787 or 41% of households that rent, and 28,835 or 26% of homeowner households) expended over 30% of their income on housing in 2000. (See chart and table). This represents an overall 6% increase compared to 1990, almost all on the homeowner side of the equation.
- Although occasionally families choose to spend more than 30 percent of their incomes on housing, the fact that the average American household in 1999 devoted only about 20 percent of income for housing suggests that many families spend more than 30 percent out of necessity not choice (U.S. Millennial Housing Commission report). Homeowners in the region are much less likely than renters to pay more than 30% of their income on housing.
- Although changes across the region for each category of community were mixed, Bethany, Woodbridge, and Orange all experienced double-digit increases in the number of renters who spend more than 30% of their income to live in those towns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Paying above 30% of Income on Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters, 30%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Owners, 30%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition  Percentage of households in which over 30% of the household income is used to pay costs associated with housing occupancy.

Indicator 2.2: Owner Occupancy Rate (Percentage of Owner-Occupied to Total Occupied Housing Units)

**Why is this important?** Increasingly, public officials, community leaders, and academics are looking to housing policy and the promotion of homeownership in particular, as a cornerstone strategy in fostering sustained community revitalization. Research is demonstrating that home ownership can help stabilize and maintain the vitality of a neighborhood or area, stimulating positive social and economic growth. In addition, high rates of homeownership in a neighborhood promote community involvement, increase resident satisfaction and raise the neighborhood’s image. According to Census data, buyers live in a community four times longer than renters. Since homeowners are typically more invested in a community, social and political networks are more easily established, as are stable environments for children’s development.

**Headlines**
- Homeownership rates are far higher in suburban areas where homeownership rates increased between 1990 and 2000, while the homeownership rate in New Haven decreased from 32% to 30% despite extensive efforts to encourage expanded homeownership. (A more relevant measure for New Haven given its housing stock of 2-4 unit buildings is the number of units in structures occupied by the owner. This number is thought to be as high as 70% although no agency tracks it in a consistent fashion).
- Owner occupancy rate among African-American Households is below that of White households in all COMPAS analysis zones, with the discrepancy greater in New Haven and the Inner Ring.

**Definition**  
Owner occupancy is defined as the percentage of existing housing units that are occupied by the owner. A housing unit is considered owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit even if it is mortgaged or not fully paid.


---
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Indicator 2.3: Percentage of Households Receiving Public Assistance

**Why is this important?** The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF) provides income support predominantly to women with young children. It was designed to give states flexibility to operate programs that provide income and other supports to poor families with children so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of their relatives. TANF promotes job preparation and work. With the imposition of time limits, households living in extreme poverty with young children are under pressure to get and keep a job while balancing the other demands of family life. This has increased the demand for services and the stress on families and children.

**Headlines**

- The number of TANF cases dropped 39% from 1998 to 2001, with the largest percentage reductions in the suburbs.
- Between 1998 and 2001, the proportion of TANF recipient cases in the COMPASS Region residing in New Haven increased from 73% to 77%.
- Many of those remaining in the program have multiple barriers to employment. 727 of the 2005 TANF clients associated with the New Haven area office subject to time limits have jobs with an average wage of $7.91 per hour and average monthly earned income of $786. Only 14% of the 2005 are employed for more than 24 hours per week.\(^{13}\)

**Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data point</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>COG Region</th>
<th>East Haven</th>
<th>Hamden</th>
<th>West Haven</th>
<th>Bethany</th>
<th>Branford</th>
<th>Guilford</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>North Branford</th>
<th>North Haven</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Woodbridge</th>
<th>Meriden</th>
<th>Milford</th>
<th>Wallingford</th>
<th>(%) of Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANF: Total Cases</td>
<td>(4,335)</td>
<td>(1,157)</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>(5,704)</td>
<td>(6,844)</td>
<td>(28,053)</td>
<td>(190)</td>
<td>(313)</td>
<td>(654)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(873)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank 2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TANF: Total cases - rate per population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>(49.0)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>(40.7)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>(35.1)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>(33.2)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Number: \(2,877\) to \(1,532\) (\(-46\%\))
- Rate per 1,000 Persons: \(4.0\) to \(2.2\) (\(-45\%\))


- % Change: \(-46\%\)

**Definition**

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program (TANF) was signed into law in August 22, 1996. This federal legislation provides block grants to states to fund programs that provide services and benefits to needy families.

**Data Source**

CT Dept of Social Services (http://www.dss.state.ct.us)

\(^{13}\) CT Department of Social Services, Temporary Family Assistance Program Summary Report, January 7, 2003
http://www.dss.state.ct.us/pubs/
Increasing demand for available bed nights in homeless shelters across region; available temporary housing exceeds need

Indicator 2.4: Demand for Available Bed Nights in Homeless Shelters

Why is this important? Lack of stable housing arrangements interferes with employment, health care, mental health and substance abuse treatment, and social connection.

Headlines

- 2,851 Clients (unduplicated) used regional shelters in 2001. There are seven shelters in the region with a total of 199 beds.
- Demand for Columbus House was 111% of supply in 2001, part of an increase in demand that has continued through 2002 and 2003. The demand for bed nights in the region’s homeless shelters is increasing with total demand exceeding supply at Columbus House since 2000 (see table).

Demand for Available Nights in Homeless Shelters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Demand*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now (Meriden)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth El (Milford)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven (New Haven)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA (New Haven)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus (New Haven)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Haven (New Haven)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford Shelter (Wallingford)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demand* demand is defined as total nights used plus turnaways divided by total bed nights available.

Definition

Unduplicated count of persons using homeless shelters in South Central Connecticut. Demand for beds is total bed nights used plus the total number of people turned away due to lack of space or for other causes divided by the total available bed nights (# of beds x 365).

Data Source

Indicator 2.5: Percentage of Housing Units that are Subsidized

**Why is this important?** Housing assistance can have a significant impact on the economic stability and well-being of low-income families. Individuals and households may require government assistance as a result of unemployment/low wages, disabilities, or other factors that impair self-sufficiency. Assisted housing has grown rapidly as a supportive housing arrangement for many frail individuals who need help with activities of daily living but do not need constant skilled nursing.

**Headlines**

- Assisted and affordable housing continues to be concentrated in the urban core, few resources are directed to affordable housing development, and the pace of development is slow.

- Affordable Housing is highly concentrated in the more urban communities. The result of the last 70 years of public intervention in the housing market to address housing affordability is reflected in the current distribution of publicly assisted housing units for low- and moderate-income households in the region.

- Assisted housing units make up 16% of the COG region’s total housing units, yet 86% of the assisted units are located in the communities of New Haven (57%), Meriden (15%), West Haven (9%), and Hamden (6%). This concentration of assisted housing increases the demand for local services, accentuates economic segregation across local school districts and, depending on the response to assisted housing by other homeowners, may threaten the tax base of these communities.

**Definition** The proportion of housing units that receive any form of subsidy from the government that is not otherwise available to any person as of right (e.g. the mortgage interest deduction)

**Data Source** CT Department of Economic and Community Development, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Municipal Housing Authorities.
Food security remains an issue in Connecticut

Indicator 2.6: Percentage of Households Experiencing Food Insecurity

**Why is this important?** Food security is the most basic of needs. Lack of food impairs functioning at school, at work, and in the family.

**Headlines**

- Connecticut ranked 43rd in its level of food insecurity as measured by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with 8% of households with 280,000 persons experiencing food insecurity, 96,000 of them with hunger.
- 34,906 persons in the South Central COG region received Food Stamps in 2000, 80% of them reside in New Haven and its inner ring suburbs.

**Connecticut Food Security, Average 1998-2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Food Insecure</th>
<th>Food Insecure with Hunger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Households (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households (thousands)</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of People in Households (thousands)</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (out of 51)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* tied ranking


**Definitions**

The USDA's Food Security Core Module (FSCM) is the first official household measure of food insecurity and hunger in the United States. It provides a consistent basis for comparing food insecurity and hunger prevalence over time and across different populations.

- **Food security** refers to assured access to enough food at all times for an active and healthy life. At a minimum, food security means having available nutritionally adequate and safe foods, and being able to acquire these foods in socially acceptable ways - without resorting to emergency food banks, scavenging, or stealing, for example.

- **Food insecurity** occurs whenever the availability of nutritionally adequate and safe food, or the ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways, is limited or uncertain.

- **Hunger** is defined as the uneasy or painful sensation caused by a recurrent or involuntary lack of food and is a potential, although not necessary, consequence of food insecurity. Over time, hunger may result in malnutrition.

**Data Source**

Nearly 100,000 persons in region reported having a disability

Why is this important? With the passage if the Americans with Disabilities Act, community awareness of the rights and needs of persons with disabilities has expanded greatly. Many people who may have previously had lower-quality lives are now able to enjoy more of the freedoms that fully-abled people take for granted. As a community we are still coming to terms with what it means to be disabled.

Headlines

- In 2000, 71,762 persons in the region reported having a total of 116,407 discrete disabilities.
- Of the total number of working age people with disabilities (aged 16-64), 27,673 had an employment disability.
- Disabled persons tend to reside in more urbanized areas where services and transportation are more convenient.

Definition

“People with Disabilities” includes all people who reported a disability on the long Census survey form (1-in-6 sample survey). The “total disabilities tallied” includes all disabilities for all people, i.e. if one person has two disabilities; the tally is two (this is also interpolated from the 1-in-6 sample).

Data Source

2000 U.S. Census.
COMPASS Community Indicators

3. Economic Health

What is the state of the regional economy?

Introductory discussion drawn from Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS of the Regional Growth Partnership)

What is the income/poverty gap?

3.1 Prosperity Index
3.2 Median family (and household) income
3.3 Percentage of population living in poverty

What is the state of the regional workforce?

3.4 Percentage of workers making less than self-sufficiency wages
3.5 Unemployment Rate

What is the local capacity to support services?

3.6 Net Equalized Grand List per capita
What is the state of the regional economy?

The following data is derived from the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) recently prepared by the Regional Growth Partnership with the assistance of Mt Auburn Associates and the Connecticut Economic Resource Center (CERC).

- **During the 1990s, the regional economy grew at a slower rate than both the state and the nation.** Total gross regional product (GRP) growth during the decade was slightly less than 20 percent in contrast to the state (33 percent) and the U.S. (38 percent). This relatively slow growth rate creates a host of challenges for regional economic development efforts.

- Employment growth in the city of New Haven and the balance of the region has been moving in opposite directions over the past few decades. Since the early 1980s, the rate of new job formation in the city has lagged behind that of the state. While the suburban towns have outperformed the state average, New Haven has yet to evidence any sign of job recovery and today still remains mired in a 10-year job slump. While jobs in other towns in the region have increased by almost 30 percent since 1980, New Haven has lost more than 10 percent of its 1980 job base, resulting in a 40 percentage point job growth difference between the urban center and the suburban towns.

- Since 1993, New Haven and the Inner and Outer Rings have all grown slowly (see table).

### Employment by Zone, 1993-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>74,920</td>
<td>75,830</td>
<td>76,150</td>
<td>73,450</td>
<td>72,040</td>
<td>75,510</td>
<td>74,670</td>
<td>76,550</td>
<td>77,920</td>
<td>77,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td>40,220</td>
<td>40,760</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>41,950</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>43,130</td>
<td>43,940</td>
<td>44,410</td>
<td>43,930</td>
<td>44,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td>59,490</td>
<td>60,160</td>
<td>61,030</td>
<td>61,330</td>
<td>62,520</td>
<td>64,320</td>
<td>64,910</td>
<td>65,510</td>
<td>65,170</td>
<td>67,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Region</td>
<td>174,630</td>
<td>176,750</td>
<td>177,480</td>
<td>176,750</td>
<td>178,060</td>
<td>182,960</td>
<td>183,520</td>
<td>186,470</td>
<td>187,020</td>
<td>188,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>6,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>18,860</td>
<td>18,640</td>
<td>18,250</td>
<td>19,110</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td>19,970</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>19,710</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>19,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>15,630</td>
<td>15,810</td>
<td>15,710</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>17,730</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>18,280</td>
<td>17,740</td>
<td>17,440</td>
<td>17,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>12,180</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td>13,490</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>13,920</td>
<td>14,040</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>13,890</td>
<td>13,640</td>
<td>13,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td>6,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>5,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>4,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>22,840</td>
<td>22,660</td>
<td>22,910</td>
<td>21,650</td>
<td>22,180</td>
<td>22,090</td>
<td>21,670</td>
<td>21,490</td>
<td>21,540</td>
<td>22,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>8,370</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>9,540</td>
<td>9,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>3,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Connecticut Department of Labor, June Reports
The region demonstrates large and growing disparities of prosperity between its suburban and urban communities.

Indicator 3.1: Prosperity Index

Why is this important? An important indicator of an urban area’s social health is the gap between the incomes of urban and suburban communities. Some urban analysts have argued that regions where the gap between urban and suburban incomes is small have greater economic progress as an entire metropolitan area. In particular, regions with closely equivalent incomes between cities and suburbs experience greater job increases and higher per-capita incomes.

Headlines

- In the South Central Connecticut Region, there are great disparities between the prosperity of communities in the urban core and those in the suburbs.
- In the Mumford Prosperity Index of selected metropolitan areas, the New Haven-Meriden Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) ranked 27th in 1990 and dropped to 53rd in 2000.
- The central city areas (New Haven and Meriden) dropped in rank from 142nd to 262nd respectively (Table 1). Thus, the prosperity level of the region and central city fell in relation to the rest of the nation and the disparity in this region between the suburbs and the central city areas grew slightly, with the suburban areas ranking nearly 12 times higher than the central city areas.
- The New Haven-Meriden region had the seventh greatest city-suburban disparity in the nation by this measure in 2000, up from 12th in 1990. At the same time, Hartford improved from 11th down to 17th most disparate, largely because of a decline in the suburban ranking—the Hartford central city ranked 311 out of 331 metro area central cities. Bridgeport was the second most disparate in the nation. Detail on selected regions is outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Urban / Suburban Disparity in Overall Prosperity
As Measured by Mumford Prosperity Index, 1990 and 2000, Selected Metropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2000 Overall Prosperity Ranking</th>
<th>2000 Ratio of City Rank to Suburban Rank</th>
<th>1990 Overall Prosperity Ranking</th>
<th>1990 Ratio of City Rank to Suburban Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro City Suburban</td>
<td>Metro City Suburban Disparity Index: City to Suburban</td>
<td>National Disparity Rank</td>
<td>Metro City Suburban Disparity Index: City to Suburban</td>
<td>National Disparity Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>30 291 10 29.10 2 25 250 10 25.00 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven-Meriden</td>
<td>53 262 22 11.91 7 27 142 12 11.83 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>129 255 30 8.50 12 66 169 25 6.76 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>35 311 48 6.48 17 16 282 23 12.26 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford-Norwalk</td>
<td>1 4 1 4.00 28 1 1 1 1.00 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London-Norwich, CT-RI</td>
<td>66 187 94 1.99 69 57 189 73 2.59 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>165 198 135 1.47 100 129 188 94 2.00 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 It is important to note, however, that the structure of town boundaries in Connecticut creates units of analysis that are not comparable to regions in which the central city has historically annexed adjacent areas as they grew. For instance, to make a true comparison between Phoenix, Arizona and New Haven, one might have to aggregate New Haven and its adjacent suburban areas to create a comparable unit of economic analysis.
This Index was also calculated for the towns in South Central Connecticut, which provides a relative measure of prosperity within the region (see table below). The more urban communities both ranked lowest and fell in prosperity over the decade. The Outer Ring suburbs had constant high scores over the decade.

### Prosperity Index for South Central CT Towns, 1990-2000

**Sorted by Degree of Change, 1990-2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>Rank 2000</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**  
The “Prosperity Index” (developed by the Lewis Mumford Center at the State University of New York in Albany) compares the center cities, suburbs, and regions in all 331 U.S. metropolitan areas on this measure. The Prosperity Index includes measures of % of population with bachelor degree, median household income, % owner occupied housing units, poverty, vacancy status, Per Capita income, management and professional occupations, and unemployment. For data and methodology, go to the Lewis Mumford Center web site at: [http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/CityProfiles/Citiesstate.htm](http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/CityProfiles/Citiesstate.htm). The purpose was to determine the difference in prosperity between the central cities compared to their suburbs and regions as a whole.

**Data Source**  
State University of New York, Albany, Lewis Mumford Center.  
([http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/CityProfiles/Citiesstate.htm](http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/CityProfiles/Citiesstate.htm))
**Indicator 3.2: Median household income**

**Why is this important?** While this measure is considered a good indicator of general economic health, it does not distinguish between family and non-family households. Furthermore, it does not differentiate between one and two-earner families. Also, the changing “typical” household nature renders time-series comparisons inadequate; for example, between 1960 and 1996, the share of non-family households grew from 15 percent to 30 percent of all households. Race of households affects median household income and should be considered: the median household income of black households is about 63% of white households. [NOTE: CONSIDER ADDING MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME as WELL].

### Headlines

- Real Incomes fell in the Urban Core: Table above shows that between 1989 and 1999, real median incomes (as adjusted for inflation) fell in New Haven, West Haven, Meriden, and Hamden. New Haven, West Haven, Meriden, East Haven, Hamden, Wallingford, and Branford have median incomes that fall below the regional median income. Milford, North Branford, North Haven, Bethany, Guilford, Orange, Madison, and Woodbridge have median incomes higher than the regional median.

- The median income for households in the outer-ring suburbs (North Branford, North Haven, Bethany, Guilford, Orange, Madison, and Woodbridge) ranges from $64,438 to $102,121.

![Median Household Income in South Central Connecticut, 1999](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Household Income, $</th>
<th>29,604</th>
<th>42,393</th>
<th>44,327</th>
<th>47,930</th>
<th>52,931</th>
<th>55,734</th>
<th>58,009</th>
<th>61,183</th>
<th>64,438</th>
<th>67,843</th>
<th>76,843</th>
<th>79,365</th>
<th>87,497</th>
<th>102,121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. $58,500 - Median Income for the New Haven/Meriden MSA; 2. $46,800 - Low Income standard (80% of MSA median); 3. $29,250 - 50% of MSA median (qualifies for Sec-8)

- The median household in New Haven earns a small fraction of that, or $ 29,604. (Table above). Twenty percent of New Haven households have incomes of less than $10,000, and 44.1 percent have incomes of less than $25,000.\(^{16}\)

- The figure above illustrates how the communities of South Central Connecticut compare to three income measures (not adjusted for family size): (1) the median income for the New Haven/Meriden MSA; (2) the low income standard (defined as 80% of the median income for the MSA); and (3) The qualifying income for Housing Assistance through HUD’s section 8

\(^{16}\) Bay Area Economics Draft Market Analysis for Market-Rate Units in the Quinnipiac Terrance Redevelopment Community (2002) pp. 2
Draft program (50% of the Median income for the MSA), which is also often referred to as “very low income.”

### Regional Incomes 1989 - 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1989 Median Income (adjusted)</th>
<th>1999 Median Income</th>
<th>% of Regional Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>$32,377</td>
<td>$29,604</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>$44,810</td>
<td>$42,393</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>$45,423</td>
<td>$43,237</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>$46,688</td>
<td>$47,930</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>$52,451</td>
<td>$52,351</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>$53,666</td>
<td>$57,308</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>$54,664</td>
<td>$58,009</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>$55,371</td>
<td>$61,183</td>
<td>104.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>$63,721</td>
<td>$64,438</td>
<td>110.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>$61,651</td>
<td>$65,703</td>
<td>112.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>$71,897</td>
<td>$76,843</td>
<td>131.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>$70,390</td>
<td>$76,843</td>
<td>131.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$77,799</td>
<td>$79,365</td>
<td>135.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>$77,610</td>
<td>$87,497</td>
<td>149.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>$88,648</td>
<td>$102,121</td>
<td>174.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census 2000

**Definition** The median divides incomes of all households into two equal parts: one-half of the cases falling below and another half above the median household income. Household income is the sum of all household members’ income. Each individual’s income encompasses wage or salary income; net self-employment income; interest, dividends, or net rental or royalty income; social security or railroad retirement income; supplemental security income; public assistance or welfare payments; retirement or disability income; and all other income.

Indicator 3.3: Percentage Population Living in Poverty

**Why is this important?** Individuals and households living in poverty have difficulty securing basic needs such as housing, clothing and shelter. Poverty not only affects stability in a household, but children who grow up in poverty are more likely to have unmet nutritional needs, live in substandard housing, be victims of crime and violence, and have unequal access to educational opportunities. Growing up in poverty is associated with lower occupational status and a lower wage rate as an adult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City / Town</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% Change 1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>217,347</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>259,514</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>25,481</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27,613</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10,085</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Region</td>
<td>35,318</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41,430</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Region</td>
<td>42,858</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>51,203</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6,306</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Headlines**

- Following one of the most prosperous decades in memory, the poverty rate in the region increased during the 1990-2000 period. Perhaps more than any other metric, the disparate poverty rates in the region tell of growing inequity.
- Between 1990 and 2000, the number of individuals that live in poverty in the region increased from 35,318 (10%) to 41,430 (11%) (The 2003 Federal Poverty Rate is set at $15,260 for a family of 3).
- Poverty is concentrated in the urban core. In 2000, nearly two-thirds of the population in poverty lived in New Haven.
- Other pockets of poverty were found in Meriden (11%), West Haven (9%), and Hamden (8%). The interregional differences in poverty rates approach a 20-fold gap—New Haven, at 24.4%, has a rate almost 20 times that of Madison at 1.3%.
- Poverty increased most significantly in the Inner Ring communities of Hamden (+89%) and West Haven (+40%).
- For Child poverty, see section on Education and Children / Youth.
Definition
The poverty level was developed by the Social Security Administration during the 1960’s to create a measure of poverty. The threshold is calculated by taking the minimum food budget as stated by the US Department of Agriculture and multiplied by three. Many feel this estimate is biased against working families because it considers only a family’s before-tax money income, ignoring the cost of childcare, social security, taxes, and transportation.

Data Source
Indicator 3.4: Percentage of Workers Making Less than Self-Sufficiency Wages

**Why is this important?** Individuals who are not making “self-sufficient” wages have difficulty meeting basic living needs such as housing, clothing, food and shelter. This percentage of the population is also at greater risk of living in poverty. Training and education are key to moving individuals from lower wage jobs to occupations and workplaces that will eventually, if not immediately pay “self-sufficiency” wages.

**Headlines**

- Almost one-third of households make an annual income of less than $40,000.
- A worker would need to earn $17.03 per hour (yearly about $35,000) to afford a two-bedroom apartment in Connecticut.  

**Definition**

Income based on private projections from Census data. An income of $40,000 annual household income was used as a proxy for “Self-sufficiency” wages based on the Connecticut Self-Sufficiency Standard developed for the Office of Policy and Management. That standard measures how much individuals and families must earn to cover housing, childcare, transportation, food, and other expenses if they do not receive any public or private subsidies.

**Data Source**

CEDS Plan (based on commercial income estimates).

---

High rates of unemployment (higher than national rate) are concentrated in certain towns of the region.

Indicator 3.5: Unemployment Rate

Why is this important? The unemployment rate is usually considered a good general indicator of economic health. An unemployment rate from 4% to 6% is considered healthy. A lower rate is seen as inflationary due to the upward pressure on salaries, while a higher rate might decrease consumer spending. Three caveats associated with this measure are: 1) the rate does not include underemployed individuals; 2) it usually differs substantially by race; 3) the rate does not reflect the changes in the size of the total labor force.

Headlines

- Generally, the region’s unemployment rate has tracked with the national rate.
- Certain towns in the region: New Haven, East Haven and West Haven have generally higher rates of unemployment while the rest of the towns in the region have lower rates of unemployment than the national rate.
- The unemployment rate in the City of New Haven has consistently been two to three percentage points higher than both the region and the state throughout much of the past decade.

**Figure 2: Urban Areas had Higher Unemployment than the Suburban Towns**

Definition The unemployment rate is the percentage of the civilian labor force that actively seeks work but is unable to find it at a given time. The rate is determined in a monthly survey by the CT Department of Labor.

Data Source State: CT Department of Labor (http://www.ctdol.state.ct.us/ldi/lmi/lmau.htm)
**Indicator 3.6: Net Equalized Grand List Per Capita**

*Why is this important?* A region’s property tax base and the income of its residents are major indicators of town’s financial wealth. This figure also provides a measure of a community’s ability to pay for infrastructure and education. It is a result of land use, housing, and economic development markets and policies.

**Headlines**

- A large range in Net Equalized Grand List Per Capita was apparent throughout the region: it varied from $152,049 in Madison to $35,165 in New Haven in 1999.
- The significant disparity between the urban and suburban communities in the region widened between 1995 to 1999, with the top figure growing from 3.6 to 4.3 times New Haven’s figure.

### Equalized Net Grand List per Capita (sorted by 1999 values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>116,293</td>
<td>122,159</td>
<td>125,662</td>
<td>123,359</td>
<td>152,049</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>121,848</td>
<td>123,283</td>
<td>121,146</td>
<td>141,727</td>
<td>151,202</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>122,768</td>
<td>120,452</td>
<td>129,046</td>
<td>133,945</td>
<td>145,376</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>114,344</td>
<td>112,843</td>
<td>118,106</td>
<td>125,963</td>
<td>130,201</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>98,555</td>
<td>99,967</td>
<td>110,263</td>
<td>117,922</td>
<td>128,466</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>89,870</td>
<td>92,826</td>
<td>97,774</td>
<td>101,486</td>
<td>110,492</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>86,219</td>
<td>87,280</td>
<td>90,814</td>
<td>99,852</td>
<td>109,560</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>95,158</td>
<td>104,353</td>
<td>103,464</td>
<td>117,816</td>
<td>107,423</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>76,079</td>
<td>76,012</td>
<td>83,870</td>
<td>87,192</td>
<td>90,589</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>66,842</td>
<td>68,711</td>
<td>69,584</td>
<td>72,417</td>
<td>78,062</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>56,824</td>
<td>56,485</td>
<td>58,034</td>
<td>61,159</td>
<td>68,311</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>49,914</td>
<td>52,332</td>
<td>50,886</td>
<td>51,600</td>
<td>58,515</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td>46,063</td>
<td>43,912</td>
<td>48,192</td>
<td>51,485</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>32,597</td>
<td>31,761</td>
<td>30,929</td>
<td>33,912</td>
<td>35,165</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition** The reported taxable grand list adjusted to reflect differing dates of reassessment across towns using real estate sales data.

**Data Source** State of Connecticut, Office of Policy Management
COMPASS Community Indicators

4. Health and Safety

What are the major health issues?

4.1 Infant mortality rate
4.2 Low birth weight rate
4.3 Cumulative AIDS cases
4.4 Child asthma hospitalization rate
4.5 Leading Causes of Death
4.6 Healthy Lifestyles

Do residents of the region have access to health care?

4.7 Number of HUSKY enrollees

What are the major safety issues in the home and community?

4.8 Family violence rate
4.9 Substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect
4.10 Crime Rates
4.11 Juvenile Violent Crime Rate

NOTE on Health Data: The COMPASS Data Analysis Work Group recognizes the need to compile additional data and work with public health officials to collect data to track chronic diseases and conditions which contribute to disease, disability, and premature death that may be preventable through efforts to encourage more healthy lifestyles among persons of all ages.

Considerable attention is now focused on the “obesity epidemic” in Connecticut because obesity and lack of physical activity is a major contributor to rising rates of diabetes and to heart disease, the leading cause of death. Efforts to reduce smoking continue but the rate of youth smoking remains high. More than one in seven children was overweight in the United States in 1999-2000; triple the rate of the 1960s. Children who are overweight are at an increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular problems, orthopedic abnormalities, gout, arthritis, and skin problems. Children and adolescents who are overweight are at risk for becoming overweight adults. (See www.childtrendsdatabank.org)
The infant mortality rate decreased in most towns

Indicator 4.1: Infant Mortality Rate (3-Year Average)

Why is this important? This rate is often used as an indicator of the level of overall child wellbeing in a region reflecting economic, environmental and social conditions/disparities or the quality of prenatal and postnatal health care for mothers and infants. Disparities in birth outcomes by income, race, and ethnicity persist.

Headlines
- The 1997-1999 was 6.4 per 1,000 live births for the COG region; it declined 1.3 or 11 deaths from the 1994-96 average.
- New Haven and West Haven had the highest rates in 1996, 12.2 and 10.6 respectively, but both saw significant drops in the 1999.
- East Haven saw the greatest increase in 1999, 300%, or 9 deaths. Note: There were 8 infant deaths in 1999 in East Haven, 3 in 1998 and 1 in 1997; this could be a statistical anomaly.
- For the 1999 average, the top five cities accounted for 80% of the regional total (43.7) of infant deaths: New Haven – 18.3, Milford – 5.3, East Haven – 4.0, West Haven – 4.0, Meriden 3.3.
- Significant racial disparities existed in 1999, although these have been reduced since then through efforts such as New Haven Healthy Start.

Definition
The number of infant deaths for the period divided by the total number of births; this number is multiplied by 1000 to get infant deaths/1000 live births. An infant death occurs within the first year of life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infant Mortality Rate, 3yr Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (1997-1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Deaths 3yr Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (1994-1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Deaths 3yr Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends ABSOLUTE CHANGE (1996, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Deaths 3yr Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends PERCENTAGE CHANGE (1996, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 A three year rolling average is used due to the low number of deaths which skew annual figures. Even with this, rates for smaller areas can vary great due to the randomness of infant deaths, requiring careful interpretation of infant death rate data.
Indicator 4.2: Low birth weight Infants

Why is this important? An infant's birth weight is a critical factor in his or her survival, growth, and development. Babies who are very low in birth weight (less than 1500 grams, or 3 pounds 4 ounces) have a 25 percent chance of dying before age one. Mortality among heavier, but still low birth weight, babies (between 1500 and 2499 grams) are much lower at around two percent, though still higher than those who are born above that weight (about one-quarter of one percent).

Infants born at a low birth weight are also at increased risk of long-term disability and impaired development. Infants born under 2500 grams are more likely than heavier infants to experience delayed motor and social development. Children aged 4-17 who were born at a low birth weight were more likely to be enrolled in special education classes, to repeat a grade, or to fail school than children who were born at a normal birth weight.

Nationally, the percentage of infants who were low birth weight (under 2,500 grams, or 5 lb. 8 oz.) declined between 1970 and 1980, but has been increasing since that time to 7.8 percent by 2002 (preliminary estimate). Research indicates that this increase is in part the result of the increase in multiple births during this time. [www.childtrendsdatabank.org](http://www.childtrendsdatabank.org) The strongest indicators of low birth weight are the mother’s age – a larger percentage of births to women under age 15 or over age 44 occur. The use of alcohol and tobacco also greatly increase the likelihood of delivering a low birth weight baby. The number of low birth weight infants reflects the availability and quality of prenatal and postnatal health care for mothers and infants.

**Headlines**

- Overall, rates for the region increased by 8%, 60% faster than the state, which increased by 5%.
- Racial disparity evident: In every population, the rate of low birth weight infants born to black mothers was significantly higher than those for white mothers, ranging from 70% higher (Hamden) to 287% higher (New Haven).

### Definition

Low birth weight is less than 2,500kg or about 5lb. 8oz. Race and ethnicity are the mother’s and are not reported for every birth. Low birth weight rate is calculated as the number of infants per 1,000 births.

### Data Source

Connecticut Department of Health: Registration Reports.

---

**Low Birth Weight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPASS Zones</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>COG Region</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data (1997-1999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birthweight Infants 3yr Total</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>9,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birthweight Rate 3yr Average</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>124.9</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data (1994-1996)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birthweight Infants 3yr Total</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>9,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birthweight Rate 3yr Average</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends ABSOLUTE CHANGE (1996, 1999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birthweight Rate 3yr Average</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends PERCENTAGE CHANGE (1996, 1999)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birthweight Infants 3yr Total</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vast majority of cumulative AIDS cases are in New Haven

Indicator 4.3: Cumulative AIDS Cases

Why is this important? In 2001, there were 40 million people worldwide living with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. The cumulative number of AIDS cases indicates the prevalence of the epidemic in that region (how many individuals are infected) as well as the medical needs surrounding treatment. Both households and communities are affected by the number of individuals with AIDS. In order for a community to combat the spread of AIDS, it must address a matrix of its medical, economic and basic social needs.

Headlines

- New Haven has had 71.9% of all AIDS cases arising in the region; West Haven is second largest with 7.3% of cases.
- Newly reported AIDS cases in New Haven went down during the 1990’s (see chart)

[NOTE TO REVIEWERS: This indicator is under development]

Cumulative AIDS Cases by Town of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Residence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Region</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition

This indicator includes the total number of AIDS cases that have been reported; statewide, 49.2% of these AIDS patients have died.

Data Source

Connecticut Department of Public Health.
Asthma rate and severity has worsened; more serious in urban areas

Indicator 4.4: Child Asthma Hospitalization Rate

Why is this important?

Nationally one in ten children in families receiving welfare had asthma in 2001, nearly twice the national average. The Connecticut Department of Public Health recently released its Statewide Asthma Plan to mobilize communities to combat increasing rates of asthma in both children and adults.

Asthma is the most common chronic illness affecting children. At least one-third of the 24.7 million people diagnosed with asthma are children under the age of 18. Asthma is a leading cause of hospitalization among children under age 15 and leads to 10 million days of missed school each year. This condition can also negatively affect children's academic performance because of doctor's visits during school hours, lack of concentration while at school because of nighttime attacks, and decreased attentiveness or involvement at school because of the side effects of some medications.

While most cases of childhood asthma are mild or moderate, asthma can cause serious and sometimes life-threatening health risks when it is not controlled. The illness can be controlled by using medication and avoiding "attack triggers" like: cigarette smoke; allergens such as pollen, mold, animal dander, feathers, dust, food and cockroaches; respiratory infections and colds; and exposure to cold air or sudden temperature change. With the proper treatment and care, most children with asthma can have active and healthy childhoods.

Trend: The percentage of children with asthma nationally has increased over the past two decades, from three percent in 1981 to six percent in 2001.

Differences by Race and Ethnicity: Non-Hispanic black children are somewhat more likely than non-Hispanic white and Hispanic children to have asthma. Nearly eight percent of non-Hispanic black children had asthma in 2001, compared to six percent of non-Hispanic whites and four percent of Hispanics.

Differences by Age: Asthma varies little with age. In 2001, five percent of children ages 0 to 4, seven percent of children ages 5 to 10, and a little under six percent of children ages 11 to 17 had asthma. (See Table 1)

Differences by Poverty Status: The percentage of children with asthma does not vary by poverty status (around six percent in 2001). (National data and discussion based on www.ChildtrendsDatabank.org)

Headlines

- Rates of hospitalization for asthma were considerably higher in New Haven and West Haven than in other towns. Rates were also considerably higher in 2000 than in 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospitalizations of Children for Asthma</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000</th>
<th>Number of Hospitalizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CT Department of Public Health
Heart Disease remains the major cause of death in New Haven

Indicator 4.5: Leading Causes of Death

Why is this important? Understanding the leading causes of death in the community and the differential rates of death between groups and areas supports planning for preventive health initiatives.

NOTE: This Indicator is under development. Through a partnership with COMPASS Partners and other health providers, a fuller analysis of the causes of death in the region will be conducted.

Headlines
- Heart disease remains by far the leading cause of death in New Haven.
- Cancer was consistently the second highest cause of death

Leading Cause of Death in New Haven, 1997-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Death</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diseases of the Heart</td>
<td>275.1</td>
<td>250.6</td>
<td>225.3</td>
<td>237.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignant Neoplasms</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>179.3</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>177.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrovascular Disease</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal Failure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes Mellitus</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septicemia</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents *</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Haven Health Department, Annual Reports of Vital Statistics.
* Rate per 100,000 persons

Definition
The primary cause of death as listed on the death certificate.

Data Source
Connecticut Department of Public Health, Registration Reports; New Haven Health Department, Annual Reports of Vital Statistics
Healthy Lifestyles Reduce the Risk and Cost of Disease

Indicator 4.6: Healthy Lifestyles Indicator Needed

Why is this important? Many chronic diseases are either preventable or can be managed to minimize their impact on a person’s quality of life and on the cost of health care. Personal behaviors like smoking, alcohol and other substance abuse, overeating, and lack of physical activity are major contributors to health problems.

NOTE: In this place, the COMPASS Indicators Team will seek to develop regional and local indicators of healthy lifestyles to assess and track our progress in this area.

See also Indicator 5.9 Percentage of students passing all 4 physical fitness tests for a related indicator.
**Indicator 4.7: Number of Children under 19 on HUSKY A**

*Why is this important?* Children without health insurance are less likely to have a regular health care provider; less likely to have a regular dentist or to have had a dental visit in the last year; and more likely to be in fair or poor health than low-income, privately-insured children.

**Headlines**

- As of 2002, there were 29,382 children under 19 on HUSKY A—a 15% increase since 1998.
- In absolute terms, New Haven (+1,758), Meriden (+928) and Hamden (+617) led the region.
- In percentage terms, Bethany (+178%), Orange (+94%) and Madison (+70%) led the region.
- New Haven is home to 65% of the COMPASS region’s total HUSKY A enrollees. West Haven holds a 11% share. All other towns have a 6% or less share of the regional total.

**Number of Children Under 19 Enrolled in HUSKY A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPASS Zones</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>COG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data (2002) Number</td>
<td>19,243</td>
<td>7,958</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>29,382</td>
<td>37,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data (1998)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>17,485</th>
<th>6,524</th>
<th>1,451</th>
<th>25,460</th>
<th>32,652</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1,758</th>
<th>1,434</th>
<th>730</th>
<th>3,922</th>
<th>5,330</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As % of Region Change</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Children Under 19 Enrolled in HUSKY A-Town Detail**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>Other COG Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>17,935</th>
<th>1,876</th>
<th>2,091</th>
<th>29,382</th>
<th>37,982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

The HUSKY Plan is Connecticut’s Medicaid program to provide very low-income children of Connecticut under the age of 19 with basic health insurance.

**Data Source**


---

*In all towns across region, number of children under 19 on HUSKY A is increasing.*
Indicator 4.8: Family Violence Incident Rate

Why is this important? Family violence affects all communities and cuts across racial, ethnic, and economic lines. National surveys of mothers indicate that 87% of children have witnessed abuse in homes where there is domestic violence. Children who experience this in their homes suffer trauma even if they, themselves are not physically harmed. This exposure can limit children’s cognitive development and their ability to form close attachments. They may also experience anxiety, fear, sleep disruption, and have problems in school. They are also much more likely to become abusive partners or victims of abuse in adolescence and/or adulthood.

Headlines

- Reported family violence incidents declined in the mid-1990's but have increased in the last three years. It is not possible to know whether this is due to increased outreach by agencies that results in more reports or to increased violence.
- In 2001, the COG region has a somewhat higher rate (26 per 1,000) of family violence than the state of Connecticut (22 per 1000). Because many cases go unreported, it is difficult to gauge accuracy.
- New Haven had the highest percentages of family violence in the region (54 per 1,000). All other towns in the COMPASS region had fewer than 25 cases per 1,000.
- The Inner Ring communities were more affected by family violence than the Outer Ring and have seen a fairly consistent number of reports over the last nine years (see figure).

Family Violence - Reported Incidents and Rate, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMPASS Zones</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>COG Region</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>20,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition

The family violence rate consists of the reported cases of domestic violence divided by the total number of households with two or more members and multiplied by 1000 to get a rate of crimes per 1000 people. Family violence crimes include: murder, manslaughter, forcible rape, forcible sodomy, forcible fondling, aggravated assault, aggravated stalking (1996-present), simple assault, simple stalking, threat/intimidation & arson (1992-1995).

Data Source

Connecticut Department of Public Safety.
Substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect declined across the region and the state in the last decade

Indicator 4.9: Substantiated Cases of Child Abuse/Neglect

**Why is this important?** Abuse increases the chances that a child will have poor social, emotional and academic outcomes. Abused children that reach adolescence are more likely to participate in risky behaviors such as delinquency, crime, early and unprotected sexual activity, and drug and alcohol use. Adult victims of child abuse may suffer emotional and mental health disorders, and are more likely rather than other adults to abuse their own children.

**Headlines**

- Between 1997 and 2002, the number and rate of substantiated cases of child abuse/neglect fell dramatically. It should be noted that in this period, the number of substantiated cases declined faster than the number of reports of child abuse. Some of this change may be attributed to the fact that the Connecticut Department of Children and Families changed its criteria for substantiating cases.
- Notable declines in substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect were seen in West Haven (66%), New Haven (62%), Branford (62%), and Hamden (59%).

### Children Substantiated as Abused, Neglected or Uncared For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPASS Zones</th>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>East Haven</th>
<th>Hamden</th>
<th>West Haven</th>
<th>Bethany</th>
<th>Branford</th>
<th>Guilford</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>North Branford</th>
<th>North Haven</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Wooden Ridge</th>
<th>Meriden</th>
<th>Middletown</th>
<th>Wallingford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>2002 Data</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>11,861</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Reg</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1997 Data     | Number         | 2,291       | 903        | 310       | 3,414  | 4,487      | 21,508  | 134      | 251      | 518     | N/A            | N/A        | N/A    | N/A           | N/A    | N/A        | 665         |
|               | % of Reg       | 64%         | 26%        | 9%        | 100%   | 30%        | 5.6%    | 11.5%    | 1.5%     | 1.1%    | 0.3%           | 0.6%       | 0.6%   | 0.4%          | 0.4%   | 0.5%        | 202         |
|               | Rate           | 67.6        | 33.5       | 25.1      | 21.5   | 21.4        | 41.7    | 8.7      | 18.5     | 8.8     | 5.4            | 5.1        | 9.4    | 6.7           | 8.3    | 6.7         | 19.5        |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(225)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,133)</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,525)</td>
<td>(13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9,645)</td>
<td>(27.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-62%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-73%</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-56%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-66%</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62%</td>
<td>-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition**

A child is considered a victim if an investigation by the state child welfare agency classifies his/her case as either "substantiated" or "indicated" child maltreatment. Substantiated cases are those in which an allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment was supported or founded according to state law or policy. Indicated cases are those in which an allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment could not be substantiated, but there was reason to suspect maltreatment or the risk of maltreatment.

**Data Source**

CT Department of Children and Families: Town Reports.
Over the past decade, national, state and regional crime rates have declined significantly but crime is still concentrated in certain cities of the region

Indicator 4.10: Crime Rates

Why is this important? Crime rates are an indicator of the safety of a community and its quality of life. Many crimes go unreported and many are not resolved with an arrest. The youth crime rate is associated with poor community relationships, parental neglect, family dysfunction, criminality in the family, substance abuse by youth, and family poverty.

Headlines

- From 1990 to 2001, the region witnessed significant declines in overall crime rates (-46%), violent crime (-47%) and property crime (-45%). The state of Connecticut also had declines of about 42-46% in all three categories. The national crime rate declined by 18% overall, violent crime declined by 21% and property crime declined by 18%.

- Going against regional, state and national trends from 1990 to 2001, Branford displayed increases in overall crime (52%), violent crime (235%), and property crime (47%). Guilford (433%) and East Haven (24%) also displayed significant increases in violent crime rates.

- In 2001, New Haven had a 53% reduction in crime, with its rate falling from 16,104 to 7,983 (still far higher than the rest of the region).

- From 1994-1999 Connecticut witnessed a decline in juvenile arrest rates (5%). New Haven’s juvenile arrest rate remains more than four times the state rate.

- Going against state trends, Branford/East Haven/Guilford/Madison/North Branford (47%), Milford/Orange/West Haven (24%) and New Haven (13%) all had significant percentage increases in juvenile arrests in this period, though relatively low absolute arrest increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Rates (Reported crime incidents per 100,000 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends PERCENTAGE CHANGE (1990, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, % Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime, % Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime, % Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juvenile Arrests for Violent Crime, 3yr. Annual Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Decreasing</th>
<th>Increasing or Otherwise Noteworthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>Milford, Orange, Wallingford</td>
<td>Branford, East Haven, Guilford, Madison, North Branford, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (1998-1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3yr. Annual Average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3yr. Rate</td>
<td>1024.4</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (1992-1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3yr. Annual Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3yr. Rate</td>
<td>1890.5</td>
<td>233.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends PERCENTAGE CHANGE (1994, 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3yr. Annual Average</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends ABSOLUTE CHANGE (1994, 1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3yr. Annual Average</td>
<td>-33.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Crime Rates (Reported crime incidents per 100,000 people)-Town Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Points</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>Other COG Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>Guilford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>North Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>Meriden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2001 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>833</th>
<th>1,600</th>
<th>2,325</th>
<th>952</th>
<th>353</th>
<th>156</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>627</th>
<th>414</th>
<th>2,329</th>
<th>2,078</th>
<th>845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>1,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1990 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>1,022</th>
<th>2,884</th>
<th>3,255</th>
<th>628</th>
<th>569</th>
<th>421</th>
<th>240</th>
<th>906</th>
<th>881</th>
<th>3,142</th>
<th>2,649</th>
<th>1,505</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>8,867</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>3,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Rate</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Rate</td>
<td>3,691</td>
<td>5,304</td>
<td>5,633</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>3,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trends PERCENTAGE CHANGE (1990, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crime, % Change</th>
<th>Violent Crime, % Change</th>
<th>Property Crime, % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime, % Change</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime, %</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime,</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-46%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Definition

A municipality’s crime rate is generally defined as the number of crimes per unit of population.

- **Violent Crimes** – Violent crime includes reported incidents of Murder and Non-negligent Manslaughter, Forcible Rape, Robbery, and Aggravated Assault.
- **Property Crimes** – Property Crime includes reported incidents of Burglary, Larceny/Theft and Motor Vehicle Theft.
- **Crimes** – Total crime includes the property crime total and the violent crime total.
- **Crime Rates** – Rates are incidents per 100,000 people.
- **Juvenile Arrests for Violent Crime, 3yr. Annual Average** – The number of youths ages 10-17 arrested for a violent crime (see above). The rate is per 100,000 youths ages 10-17.

### Data Source

- **Juvenile Arrests** – Connecticut Department of Public Safety Reports and Unpublished Data as reported in Kids Count Data Book
COMPASS Community Indicators

5. Education and Children/Youth

What is the level of economic and care support for pre-school aged children?

5.1 Non-adequate prenatal care
5.2 Percentage of children under 5 years living below the poverty level
5.3 Percentage of students receiving free/reduced price meals
5.4 Child care supply versus demand

What is the level of preparedness of children entering schools?

5.5 Percentage of Kindergarteners who attended preschool, nursery school or Head Start
5.6 Percentage of K-12 students with non-English home language

What is the level of academic success in school?

5.7 Percentage of 4th and 8th grade students meeting state goal on CMT in reading
5.8 Cumulative 4-year drop-out rate for graduating class

What are the major challenges for young people as they become adults?

5.9 Percentage of students passing all 4 physical fitness tests
5.10 Teen pregnancy rate (ages 15-17)

What level of education do we attain?

5.11 Percentage below high school graduate of population 25 years and over
5.12 Percentage with bachelor’s degree or above of population 25 years and over
Mothers with non-adequate pre-natal care decreased more in the region (26%) than in the state (17%) between 1994 and 1999

Indicator 5.1: Non-Adequate Pre-natal Care

*Why is this important?* Prenatal care, which consists of a risk assessment, treatment for medical conditions and education, contributes to reductions in illness, disability, and death by identifying and mitigating potential risks and helping women to address behavioral factors, such as smoking and alcohol use that contribute to poor birth outcomes. Prenatal care is more likely to be effective when started early in pregnancy.

*Headlines*
- In 1999, 587 mothers in the COMPASS region received non-adequate pre-natal care. Changes in the definition of this indicator prevent comparisons over time.
- In 1999, New Haven with 311 (39%), Meriden with 119 (15%) and West Haven with 83 (10%) had the most mothers receiving non-adequate pre-natal care.
- In 1999, the racial/ethnic breakdown across the region was 36% White, 21% Hispanic, 26% Black, and 5% Other. Compared to the statewide racial/ethnic breakdown, the region had 14% fewer White, 3% fewer Hispanic, and 12% more Black mothers experiencing non-adequate care.

| Non-Adequate Prenatal Care, 1999 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | COMPASS Zones   |                 |                  |                 |
|                 | New Haven       | Inner Ring      | Outer Ring       | COMPASS Region  |
| Number          | 311             | 177             | 59              | 567             |
| % of Region     | 53%             | 30%             | 17%             | 100%            |
| White           | 52              | 84              | 78              | 214             |
| Hispanic        | 97              | 17              | 7               | 121             |
| Definition      | Non-adequate pre-natal care is based on timing of the first prenatal visit, total number of prenatal visits and length of gestation. Women with non-adequate prenatal care are those beginning in the second or third trimester of pregnancy or receiving none at all. Data on Non-Adequate Prenatal Care released from the Connecticut Department of Health is based on a modified Kessner Index. 1999 data reflects a change in the measuring system for non-adequate prenatal care; data is now based on the adequacy of prenatal care utilization. The sum of racial/ethnic subtotals does not equal the total number as some mothers choose not to report race/ethnicity. |
| Data Source     | CT Department of Public Health. |
Percentage of children under 5 living below the poverty level is decreasing for the region, but there are mixed trends at the town level

Indicator 5.2: Children under 5 Living Below the Poverty Level

Why is this important? Being raised in poverty ($15,260 in 2003 for a family of three) puts children at increased risk for a wide range of problems. For young children, growing up in poverty is associated with lower cognitive abilities and school achievement and with impaired health and development. For adolescents, growing up in poverty is associated with a lower probability of graduating from high school. Poor children are also more likely than other children to have behavioral and emotional problems. Finally, growing up in poverty is associated with lower occupational status and a lower wage rate as an adult. The problems associated with being raised in severe poverty (less than 50 percent of the poverty threshold) are correspondingly worse.

Indicator 5.3, Percentage of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch, collected annually through school districts, provides a means to track trends in poverty between Census surveys. (Research references available at http://www.childtrendsdatabank.org/income/poverty/4Poverty.htm)

Headlines

- In 2000, there were 3,787 children under five years old in poverty in the region, an 8% decrease since 1990.
- Both the inner Ring and Outer Ring saw increases (21% and 33% respectively) while New Haven saw a 15% decrease. Very few young poor children live in the Outer Ring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>Above Poverty Level</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>6,304</td>
<td>9,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>8,103</td>
<td>8,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>7,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Region</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>21,549</td>
<td>25,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Region</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>31,202</td>
<td>36,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>1,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>3,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3,388</td>
<td>3,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>3,988</td>
<td>4,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>3,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>2,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition

Families are considered to be in poverty if their pre-tax money income is less than a money income threshold that varies by family size and composition (In 2003, the level is an annual income of $15,260 for a family of 3).

Data Source

**Towns across region demonstrating mixed trends in the percentage of students receiving free/reduced-price meals**

**Indicator 5.3: Percentage of Students of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals**

*Why is this important?* This is an indicator of poverty that is available on an annual basis. Children attending public schools qualify for free meals if their families’ incomes are at or below 130% of the federal poverty level. Reduced-price meals are available to students whose families have incomes above this amount but below 185% of the federal poverty level. The is a better indicator of the number of families that are challenged to meet their needs than the poverty level which is set arbitrarily low. (See Indicator 5.2 for brief discussion of importance of poverty as a correlate with many social issues).

**Headlines**

- More than or nearly half of all students were eligible for free/reduced-price meals in three districts-- New Haven (58%), Meriden (49%), and West Haven (43%). All other towns in the region were below 24% (2001 data). The smallest percentages occurred in Madison (1%), Bethany (2%), and Orange (2%).
- Between 1999 and 2001, the largest percentage increases occurred in North Branford (+62%), North Haven (+49%), and Guilford (+18%).
- Over the same time period, the largest percentage decreases occurred in Woodbridge (-88%), Bethany (-61%), and Madison (-44%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Trends (1999, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition** The percentage of students who were identified as meeting the income criteria for federal free or reduced-priced meal or milk programs. Districts not participating in these programs were required to report students meeting the eligibility criteria. Figures are not comparable to the percentage of students receiving free/reduced-priced meals reported in profiles prior to 1999-2000.

**Data Source** Connecticut Department of Education, Strategic School Profiles.
Indicator 5.4: Available Child Care Slots per 1,000 Children (Ages 0-2 and Ages 3-4)

**Why is this important?** Access to quality child care is an issue of importance to the growing number of dual-income families and single parents in the region. It is also a major barrier for women transitioning from welfare to work. In Connecticut, the cost of infant and toddler care ranges from $7,000 to $15,000 annually and the cost of care for three and four-year olds ranges from $6,800 to $10,000. If child care is too expensive, families may be forced to make do with inadequate or poor quality care. (This indicator does not reflect the quality of child care being offered). Research has shown that children’s successful social and emotional development is related to the presence of consistent, nurturing caregivers. Child care professionals, meanwhile, struggle to provide the best possible care in a system that is burdened by low wages and high turnover rates. With the passage of the federal No Child Left Behind act, schools and communities are putting increased focus on high quality pre-school experience as a proven method that is critical to closing the achievement gaps in our state and preparing children to succeed in school.

**Headlines**

- Statewide, there are 174 available childcare slots per 1,000 children ages 0-2 and an estimated 955 slots for children ages 3-4.
- Child care for children ages 0-2 is in short supply. Seven towns in the COMPASS region are estimated to have greater supply than the statewide average while five have less. This is in part a function of families using centers outside their town, particularly in New Haven.
- Child care for children ages 3-4 is more available. For children ages 3-4, five of the 12 COMPASS towns appear to have more slots than children, again in part because they may be net “importers” of students. This is also related to the higher ability to pay for the cost of pre-school in these communities.
- Branford, North Haven, Orange, and Woodbridge exceed the state slot ratios for both age groups.

**Available Child Care Slots per 1,000 Children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Child Care Slots per 1,000 Children</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>Other COG Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Data, Ages 0-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slots per 1,000 Children</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Connecticut</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Connecticut</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>118%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Data, Ages 3-4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slots per 1,000 Children</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Connecticut</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(355)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus Connecticut</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition** Information on available childcare slots refer to those at licensed facilities (centers, group homes and family day care) serving children below ‘school-age’. Slots for Infants, toddlers, and preschool kids are counted. The source for population data used in the calculation is the 2000 Census.


---

19 CT Voices for Children website: [http://info.med.yale.edu/chldstdy/CTvoiceslink/kidslink2/index.html](http://info.med.yale.edu/chldstdy/CTvoiceslink/kidslink2/index.html)
In 2001, 9 of 15 towns across region have greater rates of children receiving early education than state average (75%).

**Indicator 5.5: Kindergarteners who Attended Preschool, Head Start, or Nursery School**

**Why is this important?** Quality child care is an especially important factor in early development: children from all backgrounds who have received high quality child care score higher on tests of both cognitive and social skills in their early school years than children in poor quality care. Low-income children who receive high quality early education score significantly higher on tests of reading and math from primary grades through middle adolescence. The quality and stability of childcare is also a critical factor to a parent’s ability to work. Preschool also offers screening for health, behavioral, developmental and related issues that can facilitate early intervention when problems are discovered.

**Headlines**

- From 1997-2001, 8 towns demonstrated growing rates of early education and 11 towns had larger rates of increase than the state (7%). Milford (17%) and New Haven (16%) demonstrated the largest rates of increase.
- In 2001, 9 towns across the region had higher rates of children receiving early education than the state average (75%).
- In 2001, 70% or fewer kindergartners had a preschool experience in New Haven (64%), Hamden (63%), West Haven (67%), East Haven (70%) and Meriden (70%).
- In 2001, Madison (95%), Orange, (95%) Milford (91%), Bethany (90%) and North Branford (90%) had the highest rates.
- NOTE: Woodbridge value of 21% for 2001 is from the published school profile but appears to be a data anomaly that may either be an error or a small class with few preschool attendees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarteners who Attended Preschool, Head Start, or Nursery School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inner Ring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Trends (1997-2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition** The percentage of 3- to 5-year-old children (not yet enrolled in kindergarten) whose parents report on their Kindergarten application as having participated in an early childhood care and education program (including day care centers, Head Start programs, preschools, nursery schools, and pre-kindergartens. As self-reported data with no consistent standards across districts, the data is not considered a hard measure.

**Data Source** Connecticut Department of Education, Strategic School Profiles.
Indicator 5.6: Percentage of K-12 Students with Non-English Home Language

Why is this important? In some cases, non-English home language may place both job-seeking adults and young students at a disadvantage as they must gain language skill as at the same time that they learn other skills necessary for work and education. Children from households with adults who report having some difficulty with English are more likely to live in poverty and are also more likely to be concentrated in under-resourced schools in high poverty communities. They are more likely to have academic problems in learning to read and write. Positively, a large non-English home language population can also indicate cultural diversity within a community (including within the student body of the local school system), provided that resources are in place to overcome any lack of English-language ability.

Headlines
- In 2001, there were 31% of students in New Haven and 26% of students in Meriden from families in which English is not the home language. All other towns were under 9%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of K-12 Students with Non-English Home Language, 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inner Ring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition The percentage of students in grades kindergarten through 12 who met at least two of the following criteria: (1) the language that the student learned first was not English; (2) the primary language spoken by the student’s parents, guardians, or other people with whom the student lived was not English; (3) the primary language spoken by the student at home was not English.

Data Source Connecticut Department of Education, Strategic School Profiles.
Student performance is improving, but the urban/suburban gap is large and widening

Indicator 5.7: Percentage of 4th and 8th Grade Students Meeting State Goal on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) in Reading

Why is this important? The Connecticut Mastery Test is administered annually to Connecticut students in grades 4, 6, and 8. This exam measures academic preparation in three areas: reading, writing, and mathematics. Reading skills are critical to a student’s success in school and in the workforce. Parent education, language proficiency, family structure, and the community’s socioeconomic status are strong predictors of student achievement in reading.

Headlines
- Reading scores have been improving across the region, with 10 districts exceeding the state level.
- New Haven scores have increased, especially for 8th graders, but still lag far behind state levels and levels in regional towns. Hamden (53%), East Haven (41%), and West Haven (47%) are the next lowest performance scores and are close to the state level (57%).
- More affluent districts had the highest gains in fourth grade scores from 1997-2001, widening the gap between urban and suburban districts.

### Definition
Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) measures academic preparation in reading, writing and mathematics. The tests are administered annually to Connecticut students in grades 4, 6 and 8. Individual student performance is compared to an absolute standard of specific learning or skills. Mastery standards and goals have been set for each content area of the test.

### Data Source
Connecticut Department of Education, Strategic School Profiles.

### 4th and 8th Grade CMT, % of Students achieving State Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Grade Data (2001)</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Other COG Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Haven</strong></td>
<td><strong>East Haven</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hamden</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade Data (1997)</td>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Haven</strong></td>
<td><strong>East Haven</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade Percent Trends (1997, 2001)</td>
<td><strong>Connecticut</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Haven</strong></td>
<td><strong>East Haven</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Point Change</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Change</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8th Grade Data (2001) | **Connecticut** | **New Haven** | **East Haven** | **Hamden** | **West Haven** | **Bethany** | **Branford** | **Guilford** | **Madison** | **North Branford** | **North Haven** | **Orange** | **Woodbridge** | **Meriden** | **Orange** | **Wallingford** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percentage | 29% | N/A | 61% | 59% | 63% | N/A | 80% | 84% | 89% | 82% | 85% | N/A | N/A | 45% | N/A | 75% |
| Rank | 12 | N/A | 9 | 10 | 8 | N/A | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | N/A | N/A | 11 | N/A | 8 |
| 8th Grade Percent Trends (1997, 2001) | **Connecticut** | **New Haven** | **East Haven** | **Hamden** | **West Haven** | **Bethany** | **Branford** | **Guilford** | **Madison** | **North Branford** | **North Haven** | **Orange** | **Woodbridge** | **Meriden** | **Orange** | **Wallingford** |
| Percentage Point Change | 23% | N/A | 55% | 55% | 63% | N/A | 79% | 79% | 81% | 75% | 75% | N/A | N/A | 55% | N/A | 70% |
| Rank of Change | 12 | N/A | 9 | 9 | 8 | N/A | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | N/A | N/A | 9 | N/A | 8 |
| Percentage Point Change | 6% | N/A | 6% | 4% | 0% | N/A | 1% | 5% | 8% | 7% | 10% | N/A | N/A | -10% | N/A | 5% |
| Rank of Change | 5 | N/A | 6 | 9 | 11 | N/A | 10 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | N/A | N/A | 12 | N/A | 7 |
Declining cumulative drop-out rates across state; only 3 of 15 towns on the rise

Indicator 5.8: 4-Year Cumulative Drop-Out Rate

**Why is this important?** A good education provides the foundation for young people to realize their fullest potential as productive, successful members of the community. Young people who drop out of high school are not likely to have the minimum skills and credentials necessary to function in today's increasingly complex society and technological workplace. The completion of high school is required for accessing post-secondary education and is a minimum requirement for most jobs. High school dropouts are more likely than high school completers to be unemployed. Further, a high school diploma leads to higher income and occupational status. Studies have found that young adults with low education and skill levels are more likely to live in poverty and to receive government assistance. This is partly related to young women dropping out of school and having children and then becoming dependent upon public assistance. High school dropouts are likely to stay on public assistance longer than those with at least a high school degree. Further, high school dropouts are more likely to become involved in crime.

**Headlines**

- In 2001, the state’s cumulative drop-out rate was 11%.
- As a whole, the state witnessed a 29% decline in drop-out rates in the period from 1997-2001.
- In both 1997 and 2001, New Haven, West Haven, and Meriden consistently had the top three highest cumulative drop-out rates in the region and were above the state average. In 2001, Meriden (20%), New Haven (18%) and West Haven (14%) were first, second and third highest in the region, respectively.
- However, New Haven, West Haven and Meriden also witnessed significant improvement in the period from 1997-2001: West Haven decreased from 32% to 14%, New Haven decreased from 30% to 18% and Meriden decreased from 23% to 20%. Other notable decreases in the drop-out rate for this period occurred in Branford (-64%), Guilford (-52%) and North Branford (-48%).
- From 1997-2001, Madison (22%), North Haven (11%) and Wallingford (4%) had the only increasing drop-out rates in the region.

### 4-Year Cumulative Drop-Out Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>Hamden</td>
<td>West Haven</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>East Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (2001)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data (1997)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Trends (1997, 2001)</td>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-64%</td>
<td>-52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition** Percentage of students entering 9th grade that do not graduate high school (finish 12th grade). Measurement period – 4 years.

**Data Source** Connecticut Department of Education, Strategic School Profiles.

---

20 http://www.childtrendsdb.org/eduskills/attendance/1HighSchoolDropout.htm
Following regional and state trends, percentage of students passing all 4 fitness tests increasing in 13 of 15 towns across Region

Indicator 5.9: Percentage of Students Passing All 4 Physical Fitness Tests

Why is this important? The President’s Physical Fitness Test, administered annually throughout the country to children in grades 4, 6, 8, and 10 consists of four parts: sit and reach, sit-ups, pull-ups and a one-mile run. To pass the test, students must meet or exceed the national standards of performance established for boys and girls based on age. Low levels of physical activity are a major contributing factor to the dramatic rise in the number of children who are overweight/obese.

Headlines

- In the period from 1997-2001, both the region and the state witnessed an increase in the percentage of students passing these physical fitness tests.
- In the period from 1997-2001, with the exception of Milford (-6%) and Wallingford (-2%), all cities in the region witnessed an increase in the percentage of children passing all 4 physical fitness tests.
- In both 1997 and 2001, 7 of 15 towns in the region either met or surpassed the state’s percentage of students passing all 4 physical fitness tests (34% in 2001, 28% in 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Fitness / % of students passing all 4 tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data (2001)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven: 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden: 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany: 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford: 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison: 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford: 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange: 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge: 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford: 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford: 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Ring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Ring:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Trends (1997-2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven: 114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven: 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany: 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford: 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford: 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison: 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven: 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge: 104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden: 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford: -6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford: -2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamden: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other COG Towns: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford: 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition  To obtain this percentage, the number of students who met the standards on all four tests was divided by the number of students who took all four tests.

Data Source Connecticut Department of Education, Strategic School Profiles.
**Teen pregnancy rate in decline for 9 of 12 towns across region**

**Indicator 5.10: Teen Pregnancy Rate (live births to teens per 1,000 persons under ages 15-17)**

**Why is this important?** Teen pregnancy and parenting threatens the development of teen parents as well as their children. Teen mothers are less likely to obtain adequate prenatal care and are less likely to have the financial resources, social supports and parenting skills needed for healthy child development. Children born to teen parents are more likely to suffer poor health, experience learning and behavior problems, live in poverty, and become teen parents themselves. Teens that give birth are more likely to come from economically disadvantaged families and communities, and poor academic achievement is a key predictor of teen pregnancy.

**Headlines**

- There were a total of 228 births to teens between ages 15-17 in 1999 across the region.
- From 1996-1999, the state's teen pregnancy rate per 1,000 girls age 15-17 (three year rolling average) declined by 19%. Branford (113%), Guilford (66%) and Meriden (5%) witnessed an increase in teen pregnancy rates over this period.
- In the period from 1996-1999, teen pregnancy rates for each of the different racial groups improved slightly more than the overall teen pregnancy rate. Hispanics improved by 20%, Blacks by 22%, and Whites by 27%. However, there were still some mixed results for these racial groups in towns across the region. Hispanics had a significantly higher rate in New Haven and increasing rates in the inner ring suburbs.
- In 1999, New Haven (59), Meriden (46) and West Haven (30) had the first, second and third highest rates, respectively, of teen pregnancy in the region.

### Teen Pregnancy Rate, Girls Age 15-17, Three Year Rolling Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connecticat</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>East Haven</th>
<th>Hamden</th>
<th>West Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999 Data (1996-1999 3 year average)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bethany</th>
<th>Branford</th>
<th>Guilford</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>North Branford</th>
<th>North Haven</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Woodbridge</th>
<th>Meriden</th>
<th>Milford</th>
<th>Wallingford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999 Data (1993-1996 3 year average)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |         |          |          |         |                |             |        |             |         |         |             |
| **1996-1999 Trends** |       |          |          |         |                |             |        |             |         |         |             |
| Percent        | -19%    | -22%     | -54%     | -30%    | -18%          | -           | 113%   | 66%         | -40%    | -39%    | -13%        |
| White          | -27%    | -17%     | -52%     | 16%     | -44%          | -           | 139%   | 89%         | -38%    | -52%    | -22%        |
| Black          | -22%    | -21%     | -57%     | -36%    |              | -           | 8%     | -38%        | -52%    | -22%    | -21%        |
| Hispanic       | -20%    | -20%     | 61%      | 32%     | 24%           | -           | 58%    | 66%         | -38%    | -52%    | 4%          |

**Definition**

Given the relatively low incidence of teen births in the general population, the number of births to persons ages 15-17 is given *per thousand* people ages 15-17. Data was rolled into a 3-year average to avoid wide variation in rate produced by an increase of a few births annually.

**Data Source**

Connecticut Department of Public Health, Registration Reports and Appendices.
State and region demonstrate decreasing percentage of population (25 years and over) that are not high school graduates

Indicator 5.11: Percentage below high school graduate of population 25 years and over

Why is this important?  Adults age 25 and over who are not high school graduates have lower earning potentials, as earning potential is directly related to the years of education an individual receives. As a result, students who do not complete high school are at an increased risk of living in poverty and are more likely to have poor social outcomes including delinquency, drug and alcohol abuse and early pregnancy, compared with peers who graduate.

Headlines

- Both the state and regional percentages of high school graduates in the population improved over the period from 1990 to 2000.
- Over the last decade, every city in the region demonstrated improvement.
- In 2000, Meriden, East Haven, and West Haven had the first, second and third highest (respectively) percentages of people without a high school diploma. However, Meriden (-11%), East Haven (-9%) and West Haven (-8%) demonstrated notable improvement between 1990 and 2000.
- Hispanic adults showed less improvement than other groups.

### Percentage below high school graduate of population 25 years and over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>Other COG Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-1990 Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition

Data on educational attainment were derived from answers to Census long-form questionnaire Item 9, which was asked of a sample of the population 25 years old and over. People are classified according to the highest degree or level of school completed.

Data Source

Improvements in state and region overall; racial/ethnic groups demonstrate mixed results in towns across region

Indicator 5.12: Percentage bachelor's degree or above of population 25 years and over

Why is this important? Adults with a bachelor’s degree or above have a higher earning potential over the long-term than their counterparts with only a high school diploma and are at less risk of living in poverty. They are also more likely to become active participants in the community.

Headlines

- In the period from 1990 to 2000, every town across the region except for New Haven (-3%) and Meriden (-1%) demonstrated improvement. The state also improved by 2%.
- The region compared favorably with the state overall. 10 of 15 towns either met or surpassed the state's percentage of the population with a bachelor's degree or above (29%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population 25+ with Bachelor's Degree or higher, by COMPASS Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990 Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990-2000 Trends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Woodbridge (60%), Madison (56%) and Guilford (49%) demonstrated the highest percentage of people with bachelor's degrees or above in the region.

Definition Data on educational attainment were derived from answers to Census long-form questionnaire Item 9, which was asked of a sample of the population 25 years old and over. People are classified according to the highest degree or level of school completed.

6. Engagement
(Civic and Philanthropic)

What is our level of civic and philanthropic engagement?

6.1 Percentage of total eligible voters who voted in elections
6.2 Philanthropic giving (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)
6.3 Volunteerism (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)
Voter registration increased and voter turnout was greater in national elections than local ones

Indicator 6.1: Percentage of total eligible voters who voted in elections

**Why is this important?** Voter turnout is commonly used as an indicator of civic health. Voter participation rates can be directly correlated with the degree to which people are connected with their communities. A basic civic responsibility is voting for the officials who contribute to the daily operation of local and state government. A higher voter turnout rate creates more accountability between citizens and officials, who implement the policy that can lead to increased investment in social capital, like education, and sustainable practices within the community. Because some groups of people tend to be more likely to vote than others (e.g., college graduates, senior citizens, higher income groups), the primary consequence of low voter turnout is that power to influence public policy gets concentrated in the hands of certain groups at the expense of others in the community.

**Data (2000 National Election)**

|                  | New Haven | Inner Ring | Outer Ring | COMPASS Region | COG Region | Connecti
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>37,174</td>
<td>57,546</td>
<td>71,587</td>
<td>166,307</td>
<td>233,187</td>
<td>1,474,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Registered</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Eligible</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>55,590</td>
<td>78,398</td>
<td>88,278</td>
<td>222,266</td>
<td>308,880</td>
<td>1,001,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Eligible</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data (1999 Municipal Election)**

|                  | New Haven | Inner Ring | Outer Ring | COMPASS Region | COG Region | Connecti
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>15,872</td>
<td>35,188</td>
<td>38,158</td>
<td>92,218</td>
<td>131,340</td>
<td>723,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Registered</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Eligible</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>50,582</td>
<td>73,972</td>
<td>83,630</td>
<td>208,184</td>
<td>291,170</td>
<td>1,772,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Eligible</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


|                  | New Haven | Inner Ring | Outer Ring | COMPASS Region | COG Region | Connecti
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>5,008</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>14,082</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td>128,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


|                  | New Haven | Inner Ring | Outer Ring | COMPASS Region | COG Region | Connecti
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter Registration</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Headlines**

- Participation in local elections is very low, ranging from an estimated 20% of eligible voters in New Haven to 39% I the Outer Ring. These numbers doubled in the presidential election.
- From 1999-2000, voter registration increased 7% in the region. New Haven saw the greatest absolute increase in registration, 5,008 voters or 10%.

**Definition** Voter Turnout is the percentage of the number of people who voted in an election over the total eligible (all persons over 18).

**Data Source** CT Secretary of State: Elections Division; Population from Census, 2000
Indicator 6.2: Philanthropic Giving (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)

Indicator 6.3: Volunteerism (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)

Why are these important? Social connectedness is a strong predictor of the perceived quality of life in a community, more closely linked than even the community’s income or educational level. Both philanthropic giving and volunteerism are indicators of an individual’s level of connectedness and concern for others in his/her community. Various aspects of generosity go together; people who are generous with their purse are also generous with their time. In addition to indicating the civic health of a community, philanthropic giving and volunteerism can effect positive and needed change in a community.

For Regional Data on Philanthropic Giving and Volunteerism, see results of COMPASS Household Survey.

COMPASS Community Indicators

7. Environment

(Natural and Constructed)

Is our region a pleasant place to live?

7.1 Air Quality Indicators

Are cultural attractions, parks, and recreational opportunities available?

7.2 Cultural attraction availability (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)

7.3 Recreational services/facilities availability (as collected by COMPASS Household Survey)

What are the strengths and weaknesses of our transportation system?

7.4 Commuters traveling to work by means other than driving self

7.5 Travel time to work (percentage over 30 minutes)
Air pollution in New Haven County is “moderate.”

Indicator 7.1: Air Quality Indicators for New Haven County (ranked nationally)

*Why is this important?* Air quality directly affects human health, ecosystem health, and visibility. The Air Quality of an area is determined from several major pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O3), and particulate matter (PM-10) are among the most serious indicators. Rapid development of a region is directly linked with increases in energy consumption and automobile use, both of which significantly impact air quality. Carbon monoxide (CO) in particular, deprives people of necessary oxygen, and particularly affects children, pregnant women, and those with cardiovascular and pulmonary disease.

**Headlines**
- New Haven County air quality is moderate as measured by the Pollutant Standards Index.
- Air quality in New Haven County is over the 90% percentile in four key pollutants.

### Air Quality in New Haven County

| Percentage of days with good air quality:  | 75 |
| Percentage of days with moderate air quality: | 25 |
| Percentage of days with unhealthful air quality: | 1 |
| Maximum PSI level in 2000 | 133 |
| Median PSI level in 2000 | 39 |
| 90th Percentile PSI level in 2000 | 61 |

#### Pollutant Standards Index

| 0 - 50 | Good |
| 50 - 100 | Moderate |
| 100 - 200 | Unhealthful |
| 200 - 300 | Very Unhealthful |
| 300 - 500 | Hazardous |

### Air Quality Rankings for New Haven County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Cleanest/Best Counties in US</th>
<th>Dirtiest/Worst Counties in US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-days in exceedance of national air quality standard for ozone:</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollutant Standards Index:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone 1-hour average concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10 24-hour average concentration:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-2.5 emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10 emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organic Compound emissions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition** A comparison of Air Quality in New Haven County to the rest of the nation.

**Data Source** Scorecard.org
Indicator 7.2: Cultural Attraction Availability

Indicator 7.3: Recreational Services/Facilities Availability

Regional data indicators will be developed in the COMPASS Household Survey.
Commuters are driving by themselves more.

Indicator 7.4: Commuters Traveling by Means Other Than Driving Self

Why is this important? Commuters who commute by means other than driving themselves help to reduce road congestion and air pollution.

Headlines

- Between 1990 and 2000, the number of commuters not using single-occupancy vehicles (SOVs) (18.8%) declined for the region by 7,943 or 2.0 percentage points, which is approximately the state average.
- Madison was the only city to have an increase in commuters not using SOVs; however, there was a decrease in the percentage of commuters who don’t use SOVs (1.5 percentage points).
- New Haven had the highest percentage of commuters not using SOVs, 42.6%.
- New Haven was the only city to not have a decrease in the percentage of commuters who don’t use SOVs (it had 1.5 percentage point increase).

Commuters Traveling by Means Other Than Driving Single Occupant Vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPASS Zones</th>
<th>New Haven</th>
<th>Inner Ring</th>
<th>Outer Ring</th>
<th>COMPASS Region</th>
<th>COG Region</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data (2000) Commuters</td>
<td>46,592</td>
<td>66,351</td>
<td>65,265</td>
<td>178,208</td>
<td>253,811</td>
<td>1,589,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not commuting in SOV</td>
<td>19,864</td>
<td>11,514</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>37,834</td>
<td>47,275</td>
<td>275,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Commuting in SOV</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Data (1990) Commuters | 54,954 | 67,583 | 64,204 | 186,741 | 263,345 | 1,628,322 |
| Not commuting in SOV | 22,581 | 12,703 | 8,138 | 43,422 | 54,900 | 326,071 |
| % Not Commuting in SOV | 41.1% | 18.8% | 12.7% | 23.3% | 20.8% | 20.0% |
| % of Region | 52.0% | 29.3% | 18.7% | 100.0% | N/A | N/A |

Trends ABSOLUTE CHANGE (1990, 2000)

| Commuters | -8,362 | -1,232 | 1,061 | -8,533 | -9,534 | -38,917 |
| Not commuting in SOV | -2,717 | -1,189 | -1,682 | -5,588 | -7,625 | -50,142 |
| % Not Commuting in SOV | -1.5% | -1.4% | -2.8% | -2.0% | -2.2% | -2.7% |

Trends PERCENTAGE CHANGE (1990, 2000)

| Commuters | -15% | -2% | 2% | -5% | -4% | -2% |
| Not commuting in SOV | -12% | -9% | -21% | -13% | -14% | -15% |

Definition  Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) is any vehicle with one occupant, including motorcycles but not bicycles.

Indicator 7.5: Travel Time to Work

**Why is this important?** This indicator measures the accessibility of jobs relative to the location of population. As a result, commute time is a key factor in measuring job accessibility in a given location. Traffic congestion can be costly in terms of wasted time and fuel in major metropolitan areas, decreasing worker productivity and the delivery of goods. Public transportation can take drivers off the road, thereby improving the commute times of transit riders and automobile users alike.

**Headlines**

- The COMPASS region saw a loss of 7,979 commuters and a stable number traveling 30 minutes or more (only 0.3 percentage point increase).
- From 1990 to 2000, 3 of 15 towns had decreases in commuters traveling 30 minutes or more that outpaced their decreases in commuters. New Haven had a decrease in the number of people traveling 30 minutes or more (-7.4%) but it is overshadowed by the decrease in commuters (-15.2%). No city had an increase in commuters that exceeded (in percentage terms) their increase in commuters traveling 30 minutes or more.
- Meriden had one of the highest drops in both commuters and commuters traveling 30 minutes or more: from 2,638 (9%) in 1990 to 1,326 (19.2%) in 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Time to Work</th>
<th>COMPASS Zones</th>
<th>COG Region</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data (2000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>46,592</td>
<td>68,186</td>
<td>96,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>10,663</td>
<td>18,703</td>
<td>25,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data (1990)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>54,954</td>
<td>68,439</td>
<td>96,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>11,512</td>
<td>16,816</td>
<td>24,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Region</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>(8,362)</td>
<td>(253)</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>1,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuters</td>
<td>-17.9%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling 30 min or more</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Definition** Commuters are people who do not work at home.

**Data Source** US Census, 1990, 2000