# 2010 COUNTY NUTRITION AND FOOD INSECURITY PROFILES

## Data Sources and Methodology

CALIFORNIA FOOD POLICY ADVOCATES

## DEMOGRAPHICS

### TOTAL POPULATION

**Source:** US Census Bureau, Populations Estimates Program, 2008 Population Estimates
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en
**Notes:** This statistic estimates population by county for July 2008.

### TOTAL POPULATION IN POVERTY

**Source:** US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates
**Publication Date:** November 2009
**Location:** http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/county.html
**Notes:** This statistic is defined as the number of people with income at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines in 2008.

### % OF TOTAL POPULATION IN POVERTY

**Source:** US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates
**Publication Date:** November 2009
**Location:** http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/county.html
**Notes:** This statistic is defined as the percentage of people whose household income was at or below 100 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines in 2008.

### CHILD POPULATION (0-18)

**Source:** Kidsdata.org from State of California, Department of Finance, Race/Ethnic Population with Age and Sex Detail, 1990-1999, 2000-2050.
**Publication Date:** June 2009
**Location:** http://www.kidsdata.org
**Notes:** This statistic is defined as the number of individuals under the age of 18 in 2008.

### CHILD POPULATION IN POVERTY

**Source:** US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates
**Publication Date:** November 2009
**Location:** http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/county.html
**Notes:** This statistic is defined as the number of individuals between the ages of 0-18 living in households with income at or below 100 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines in 2008.

### % OF CHILDREN IN POVERTY

**Source:** US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates
**Publication Date:** November 2009
**Location:** http://www.census.gov/did/www/saipe/county.html
**Notes:** This statistic is defined as the percentage of children between the ages of 0-18 living in households with income at or below 100 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines in 2008.

**# OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FREE/REDUCED PRICED (FRP) MEALS**

**Source:** California Department of Education (CDE) – School Fiscal Services Division, Free/Reduced Meals Program & CalWORKS Data Files

**Publication Date:** December 2009

**Location:** http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/cw/filesafdc.asp

**Notes:** These data quantify the number of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals in October 2008. A data disclaimer provided on the CDE website categorizes these data as "enrollment" information for Free and Reduced Price meals. However, CDE staff from the School Fiscal Services Division and the Nutrition Services Division have confirmed that these data reflect the number of children who are *eligible* to receive Free and Reduced Price schools meals regardless of whether those students are enrolled or participate in the school meal programs.

**# PARTICIPATING IN WIC PROGRAM**

**Source:** California Department of Health Services, WIC Program

**Publication Date:** November 2009

**Location:** Available by contacting WIC Program at the California Department of Health Services.

**Notes:** These data show the number of certified WIC participants in each county for November 2009. Counties can be served by more than one WIC agency within the county and each of these agencies is included in the participation for that county. Counties denoted by an asterisk ("*") are served by WIC agencies that serve multiple counties. As such, the monthly participation of that agency is applied to each county it serves.

## FOOD INSECURITY AND HEALTH INDICATORS

**#/% OF ADULTS IN FOOD INSECURE HOUSEHOLDS**

**Source:** California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), University of California Los Angeles, Center for Health Policy Research

**Publication Date:** 2009

**Location:** http://www.chis.ucla.edu/

**Notes:** These data show food insecurity rates for 2007. Adults whose incomes are below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) were interviewed on food insecurity and hunger status. Due to the small sample size of some counties, food insecurity data were combined for the following county regional groups:

- Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine
- Del Norte, Siskiyou, Lassen, Trinity, Modoc, Plumas, Sierra
- Tehama, Glenn, Colusa

In the counties grouped by regions, the regional group data was applied to the respective individual counties. As such, the number and percentage of adults in food insecure households in the individual counties listed in the above regional groups will not reflect the county percentage; instead, the respective regional group percentage was applied to individual counties.

**COUNTY RANK FOR % OF ADULTS IN FOOD INSECURE HOUSEHOLDS**

**Notes:** For this food insecurity indicator, counties are ranked from 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the lowest number of adults in food insecure households while the county ranked 58th has the highest number of adults in food insecure households.

**% OF OVERWEIGHT OR OBESE ADULTS**

**Source:** California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), University of California Los Angeles, Center for Health Policy Research
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** http://www.chis.ucla.edu/
**Notes:** These data are from 2007. For adults, "overweight or obese" is defined as a Body Mass Index (BMI) of 25 or greater. Due to the small sample size from some counties, adult overweight or obesity data were combined for the following county regional groups:

- Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine
- Del Norte, Siskiyou, Lassen, Trinity, Modoc, Plumas, Sierra
- Tehama, Glenn, Colusa

In the counties grouped by regions, the regional group data was applied to the respective individual counties. As such, the percentage of overweight or obese adults in the individual counties listed in the above regional groups will not reflect the county percentage; instead, the respective regional group percentage was applied to individual counties.

**COUNTY RANK FOR % OF OVERWEIGHT OR OBESE ADULTS**

**Notes:** For this health indicator, counties are ranked from 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the lowest percentage of overweight or obese adults while the county ranked 58th has the highest percentage of overweight or obese adults.

**% OF CHILDREN OVERWEIGHT FOR AGE**

**Source:** California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), University of California Los Angeles, Center for Health Policy Research
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** http://www.chis.ucla.edu/
**Notes:** These data are from 2007. This variable, "children overweight for age," is constructed using sex, age (in months) and height. Due to the small sample size from some counties, child overweight data were combined for the following county regional groups:

- Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine
- Del Norte, Siskiyou, Lassen, Trinity, Modoc, Plumas, Sierra
- Tehama, Glenn, Colusa

In the counties grouped by regions, the regional group data was applied to the respective individual counties. As such, the percentage of children overweight for age in the individual counties listed in the above regional groups will not reflect the county percentage; instead, the respective regional group percentage was applied to individual counties.

**COUNTY RANK FOR % OF CHILDREN OVERWEIGHT FOR AGE**

**Notes:** For this health indicator, counties are ranked from 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the lowest percentage of children overweight for age while the county ranked 58th has the highest percentage of children overweight for age.

**# OF INDIVIDUALS WITH TYPE II DIABETES**

**Source:** California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), University of California Los Angeles, Center for Health Policy Research
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** http://www.chis.ucla.edu/

**Notes:** These data show the number of individuals with Type II diabetes in 2007. Results are based on questions asked of respondents who have been told by a doctor that they have diabetes (excluding while pregnant) and what type of diabetes (Type 1 or Type 2). Due to the small sample size from some counties, Type II Diabetes data were combined for the following county regional groups:

- Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono, Alpine
- Del Norte, Siskiyou, Lassen, Trinity, Modoc, Plumas, Sierra
- Tehama, Glenn, Colusa

In the counties grouped by regions, the regional group data was applied to the respective individual counties. As such, the percentage of individuals with Type II diabetes in the individual counties listed in the above regional groups will not reflect the county percentage; instead, the respective regional group percentage was applied to individual counties.

**BREASTFEEDING RATES**

**Source:** County Health Status Profiles 2009, California Department of Health Services and California Conference of Local Health Officers
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** http://www.cdph.ca.gov/pubsforms/Pubs/OHIRProfiles2009.pdf.
**Notes:** This percentage is based on the number of infants who were breastfed during early postpartum and is derived from a three-year average, 2005-2007.

**COUNTY RANK FOR BREASTFEEDING RATES**

**Notes:** For this health indicator, counties are ranked 1-58. The county ranked 1st has the highest number of infants who were breastfed during early postpartum while the 58th ranked county has the lowest number of infants who were breastfed during early postpartum.

## FOOD AND NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

## FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

**# PARTICIPATING**

**Source:** California Department of Social Services, *Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report (DFA 256)*
**Publication Date:** 2008 and 2009
**Location:** http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/research/PG352.htm)
**Notes:** These data are from the 2008 calendar year. The number of individuals participating in the Food Stamp Program (FSP) is calculated as a monthly average over the course of one calendar year as shown in the formula below. A monthly average is used to account for seasonal fluctuation in FSP participation. No emergency food stamp benefits (disaster assistance) were issued in 2008.

**(Annual Count of FSP Participants – Emergency Food Stamp Recipients)÷ 12=**
**Monthly Average of Individuals Participating in FSP**

**# INCOME-ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS**

**Source:** California Food Policy Advocates, *Measuring County Food Stamp Performance 2008: The Program Access Index*

**Publication Date:** 2010

**Location:** http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/PAI.html

**Notes:** These data are from the 2008 calendar year. The number of individuals who are income-eligible for FSP is calculated according to the formula below. This statistic was calculated for CFPA's 2008 Program Access Index (PAI) analysis. While this particular statistic is not published in the PAI report cited above, the report's methodology does include full details for generating the components of the formula below.

**(Total Income-Eligible Population) – (SSI Participants) – (FDPIR Participants) = # of Income-Eligible Individuals**

SSI =Supplemental Security Income; FDPIR = Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations

**# INCOME-ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPANTS**

**Source:** California Food Policy Advocates, *Measuring County Food Stamp Performance 2008: The Program Access Index*

**Publication Date:** 2010

**Location:** http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/PAI.htm

**Notes:** These data are from the 2008 calendar year. The number of individuals who are income-eligible but not participating in FSP is calculated according to the formula below. This statistic was calculated for CFPA's 2008 Program Access Index (PAI) analysis. While this particular statistic is not published in the PAI report cited above, the report's methodology does include full details for generating the components of the formula below.

**(# of Income-Eligible Individuals) - (Monthly Average of Individuals Participating in FSP) = # of Income-Eligible Non-Participants**

**2007 PROGRAM ACCESS INDEX (PAI)**

**Source:** California Food Policy Advocates, *Measuring County Stamp Performance 2007: Using the Program Access Index to Analyze California's 58 Counties*

**Publication Date:** 2009

**Location:** http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/PAI.htm

**Notes:** These data are from the 2007 calendar year. The Program Access Index (PAI) estimates FSP participation among income-eligible individuals, not including FDPIR participants or SSI recipients. The PAI is a method of measuring Food Stamp Program access and participation at the county level. Please see the report cited above for a full description of this data and the associated methodology.

SSI =Supplemental Security Income; FDPIR = Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations

**2008 PROGRAM ACCESS INDEX (PAI)**

**Source:** California Food Policy Advocates, *Measuring County Stamp Performance 2008: The Program Access Index*

**Publication Date:** 2010

**Location:** http://www.cfpa.net/foodstamps/PAI.htm

**Notes:** These data are from the 2008 calendar year. The Program Access Index (PAI) estimates FSP participation among income-eligible individuals, not including FDPIR participants or SSI recipients. The PAI is a method of measuring Food Stamp Program access and participation at the county level. Please see the report cited above for a full description of this data and the associated methodology.

SSI =Supplemental Security Income; FDPIR = Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations

**COUNTY RANK FOR 2008 PROGRAM ACCESS INDEX**

**Notes:** The Program Access Index ranks counties from 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the highest number of income-eligible individuals participating in the Food Stamp Program (FSP) while the county ranked 58th has the lowest number of income-eligible individuals participating in FSP.

**ADDITIONAL ECONOMIC ACTIVITY GENERATED WITH FULL PARTICIPATION**

**Source:** (1) California Food Policy Advocates, *Lost Dollars, Empty Plates*
(2) United States Department of Agriculture, *Effects of Changes in Food Stamp Expenditures Across the U.S. Economy*

**Publication Date:** (1) 2009
(2) 2006

**Location:** (1) http://cfpa.net/ldep/ldep2009.pdf
(2) http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/fanrr26/fanrr26-6/fanrr26-6.pdf

**Notes:** According to the USDA, every federal dollar spent on FSP expenditures generates $1.84 in economic activity by "shifting cash income previously spent on food to nonfood spending" (USDA, 2006). Applying this premise, the following formula estimates the additional economic activity that would be generated if all income-eligible individuals participated in FSP. Please see the report cited above for full methodological details.

**(# of Income-Eligible Individuals Not Participating in FSP) x (Average FSP Benefit) x (1.84) = Additional Economic Activity Generated with Full Participation**

## NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM (NSLP)

**# STUDENTS EATING FREE/REDUCED PRICED (FRP) LUNCH**

**Source:** California Department of Education, Nutrition Services Division

**Publication Date:** August 2009

**Location:** Data provided directly to CFPA from CDE upon request

**Notes:** These data quantify the average daily number of students who ate a free or reduced-price school lunch through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) from October 2008 through May 2009. These data only include meal participation in public school districts.

The California Department of Education provided CFPA with district-level data describing monthly NSLP meal counts categorized according to reimbursement status (free, reduced-

price, paid). CDE also provided data quantifying the number of NLSP operating days for each district. Average daily participation rates for free and reduced-price NSLP meals were calculated with the following formula.

**(# of Free and Reduced-Price Meals Served from October through May) ÷ (# of Operating Days from October through May) = Average Daily Participation in FRP Lunch**

**#/% OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FRP MEAL BUT NOT PARTICIPATING IN NSLP**

**Notes:** The number of students eligible for free or reduced-price school (FRP) meals but not participating in NSLP during the 2008-09 school year was calculated according to the following formula.

**(# of Students Eligible for FRP Meals) – (Average Daily Participation in FRP Lunch) = Average Daily # of FRP-Eligible Students Not Participating in NSLP**

The percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price school (FRP) meals but not participating in NSLP during the 2008-09 school year was calculated according to the following formula.

**(Average Daily # of FRP-Eligible Students Not Participating in NSLP) ÷ (# of Students Eligible for FRP Meals) = % FRP-Eligible Students Not Participating in NSLP**

The data sources and calculations required to quantify student eligibility for FRP meals and student participation in FRP lunch are detailed elsewhere in this methodology.

**COUNTY RANK FOR % OF STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR FRP MEALS BUT NOT PARTICIPATING IN NSLP**

**Notes:** Counties are ranked 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the lowest percentage of FRP-eligible students who are not participating in NSLP while the county ranked 58th has the highest percentage of FRP-eligible students who are not participating in NSLP.

FRP-eligible = eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; NSLP = National School Lunch Program

**ADDITIONAL FEDERAL MEAL REIMBURSEMENT WITH FULL FRP PARTICIPATION**

**Notes:** This is an estimate of the federal dollars school districts would have received in 2008-09 if all FRP-eligible students in public schools participated in school lunch through the Nation School Lunch Program (NSLP). This calculation assumes that the proportions of free and reduced-price (FRP) meals would be the same if participation in FRP meals increased for NSLP. This calculation used reimbursement rates applicable to schools in the contiguous states that served less than 60 percent FRP lunches in the 2006-07 school year.

**(% Free Meals of Total FRP Meals Served through NSLP) x (Average Daily # of FRP-Eligible Students Not Participating in NSLP) x (Federal Reimbursement Rate for Free Meals) x (180 School Days) = Federal Dollars School Districts Would Have Received in 2008-09 if All Students Eligible for Free Meals Participated in NSLP**

**(% Reduced-Price Meals of Total FRP Meals Served through NSLP) x (Average Daily # of FRP-Eligible Students Not Participating in NSLP) x (Federal Reimbursement Rate for Reduced-Price Meals) x (180 School Days) = Federal Dollars School Districts Would Have Received in 2008-09 if All Students Eligible for Reduced-Price Meals Participated in NSLP**

The typical academic year for California public schools includes 180 school days.

The federal reimbursement rates used in these calculations are available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/notices/naps/NAPsHistorical.htm

The data sources and calculations associated with NSLP participation (meals served) and student eligibility are detailed elsewhere in this methodology.

## SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM (SBP)

**# STUDENTS EATING FRP BREAKFAST**

**Source:** California Department of Education, Nutrition Services Division
**Publication Date:** August 2009
**Location:** Data provided directly to CFPA from CDE upon request
**Notes:** These data quantify the average daily number of students who ate a free or reduced-price school breakfast through the School Breakfast Program (SBP) from October 2008 through May 2009. These data only include meal participation in public school districts.

The California Department of Education provided CFPA with district-level data describing monthly SBP meal counts categorized according to reimbursement status (free, reduced-price, paid). CDE also provided data quantifying the number of SBP operating days for each district. Average daily participation rates for free and reduced-price NSLP meals were calculated with the following formula.

**(# of Free and Reduced-Price Meals Served from October through May) ÷ (# of Operating Days from October through May) = Average Daily Participation in FRP Breakfast**

**#/% STUDENTS EATING FRP LUNCH BUT NOT FRP BREAKFAST**

**Notes:** The number of students eating a free or reduced-price (FRP) school lunch but not FRP school breakfast during the 2008-09 school year was calculated according to the following formula.

**(Average Daily Participation in FRP Lunch) – (Average Daily Participation in FRP Breakfast) = Average Daily # of Students Eating FRP Lunch but Not FRP Breakfast**

The percent of students eating FRP lunch but not eating FRP breakfast during the 2008-09 school year was calculated according to the following formula.

**(Average Daily # of Students Eating FRP Lunch but Not FRP Breakfast) ÷ (Average Daily Participation in FRP Lunch) = % Students Eating FRP Lunch but Not FRP Breakfast**

The data sources and calculations required to quantify student eligibility for FRP meals and student participation in FRP meals are detailed elsewhere in this methodology.

**COUNTY RANK FOR % OF STUDENTS EATING FRP LUNCH BUT NOT FRP BREAKFAST**

**Notes:** Counties are ranked from 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the lowest percentage of students who eat free or reduced-price (FRP) school lunch but not FRP breakfast while the county ranked 58th has the highest percentage of students who eat FRP lunch but not FRP breakfast.

**ADDITIONAL FEDERAL MEAL REIMBURSEMENT**

**Notes:** This is an estimate of the federal dollars school districts would have received in 2008-09 if all FRP-eligible students in public schools who participated in NSLP also participated in school breakfast through SBP. This calculation assumes that the proportions of free and reduced-price meals would be the same if participation in FRP meals increased for SBP. This calculation used reimbursement rates applicable to non-severe need schools in the contiguous states.

**(% Free Meals of Total FRP Meals Served through SBP) x (Average Daily # of Students Eating FRP Lunch but Not FRP Breakfast) x (Federal Reimbursement Rate for Free Meals) x (180 School Days) = Federal Dollars School Districts Would Have Received in 2008-09 if All Students Eating Free School Lunches Also Participated in SBP**

**(% Reduced-Price Meals of Total FRP Meals Served through SBP) x (Average Daily # of Students Eating FRP Lunch but Not FRP Breakfast) x (Federal Reimbursement Rate for Reduced-Price Meals) x (180 School Days) = Federal Dollars School Districts Would Have Received in 2008-09 if All Students Eating Reduced-Price School Lunches Also Participated in SBP**

The typical academic year for California public schools includes 180 school days.

Federal reimbursement rates are available at:
http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/notices/naps/NAPsHistorical.htm

The data sources and calculations associated with NSLP participation (meals served) and student eligibility are detailed elsewhere in this methodology.

## SUMMER NUTRITION PROGRAMS

**AVERAGE DAILY PARTICIPATION IN ALL SUMMER NUTRITION PROGRAMS, JULY 2007**

**Source:** California Department of Education, Nutrition Services Division
**Publication Date:** 2008
**Location:** Data provided directly to CFPA from CDE upon request
**Notes:** These data show the combined average daily participation rate for the three federal summer nutrition programs in July 2007. The three programs included in this calculation are the National School Lunch Program (free and reduced-price meals only), the Seamless Summer Feeding Option (SSFO), and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). SSFO allows schools where more than 50 percent of the children are certified eligible for free or reduced-price meals to serve summer meals using the same administrative procedures as NSLP. SFSP operates in areas where more than 50% of the children attending local schools are certified as eligible for free or reduced price meals.

These data were originally published in the CFPA report *School's Out…Who Ate* (2008), available at: http://www.cfpa.net/press/sowa2008/SOWA2008.pdf.

**AVERAGE DAILY PARTICIPATION IN ALL SUMMER NUTRITION PROGRAMS, JULY 2008**

**Source:** California Department of Education, Nutrition Services Division
**Publication Date:** March 2009
**Location:** Data provided directly to CFPA from CDE upon request
**Notes:** These data show the combined average daily participation for the three federal summer nutrition programs in July 2008. The three programs included in this calculation are the National School Lunch Program (free and reduced-price meals only), the Seamless Summer Feeding Option (SSFO), and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). SSFO allows schools where more than 50 percent of the children are certified eligible for free or reduced-price meals to serve summer meals using the same administrative procedures as NSLP. SFSP operates in areas where more than 50% of the children attending local schools are certified as eligible for free or reduced price meals.

These data were originally published in the CFPA report *School's Out…Who Ate* (2009), available at: http://cfpa.net/summerfood/sowa2009.pdf.

**% CHANGE IN PARTICIPATION, 2007-08**

**Source:** California Department of Education, Nutrition Services Division
**Publication Date:** March 2009
**Location:** Calculated from data provided directly to CFPA from CDE upon request
**Notes:** These data compare average daily participation in the three federal summer nutrition programs for July 2007 and July 2008. The three programs included in this calculation are the National School Lunch Program (free and reduced-price meals only), the Seamless Summer Feeding Option (SSFO), and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). SSFO allows schools where more than 50 percent of the children are certified eligible for free or reduced-price meals to serve summer meals using the same administrative procedures as NSLP. SFSP operates in areas where more than 50% of the children attending local schools are certified as eligible for free or reduced price meals.

These data were originally published in the CFPA report *School's Out…Who Ate* (2009), available at: http://cfpa.net/summerfood/sowa2009.pdf.

**#/% OF STUDENTS EATING FRP LUNCHDURING SCHOOL YEAR WHO DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN SUMMER NUTRITION PROGRAMS**

**Source:** California Department of Education, Nutrition Services Division
**Publication Date:** March 2009
**Location:** Data provided directly to CFPA from CDE upon request
**Notes:** These data compare the combined average daily participation in three summer nutrition programs for July 2008 to average daily participation in free and reduced-priced meals through NSLP for March 2008. The three programs included in this calculation are the National School Lunch Program (free and reduced-price meals only), the Seamless Summer Feeding Option (SSFO), and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). SSFO allows schools where more than 50 percent of the children are certified eligible for free or reduced-price meals to serve summer meals using the same administrative procedures as NSLP. SFSP operates in areas where more than 50% of the children attending local schools are certified as eligible for free or reduced price meals.

These data were originally published in the CFPA report *School's Out…Who Ate* (2009), available at: http://cfpa.net/summerfood/sowa2009.pdf.

**COUNTY RANK FOR % OF STUDENTS EATING FRP LUNCH DURING SCHOOL YEAR WHO DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN SUMMER NUTRITION PROGRAMS**

**Notes:** Counties are ranked from 1 to 58. The county ranked 1st has the lowest percentage of students who eat FRP lunch during the school year but do not participate in a federal summer nutrition program while the county ranked 58th has the highest percentage of students who eat FRP lunch during the school year but do not participate in a federal summer nutrition program.

## CHILD & ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM (CACFP)

**# LICENSED CHILD CARE FACILITIES**

**Source:** 2009 California Child Care Portfolio, California Child Care Resource & Referral Network
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** http://www.rrnetwork.org/our-research/2009-portfolio.html
**Notes:** These data are from 2008 calendar year. The number of licensed child care facilities was determined with the following calculation:

**(Total Number of Licensed Child Care Centers) + (Total Number of Licensed Family Child Care Homes) = Total Number of Child Care Facilities**

**# CHILDREN IN LICENSED CHILD CARE**

**Source:** 2009 California Child Care Portfolio, California Child Care Resource & Referral Network
**Publication Date:** 2009
**Location:** **http://www.rrnetwork.org/our-research/2009-portfolio.html**
**Notes:** These data are from the 2008 calendar year. The total number of children in licensed child care was derived from the "estimated number of licensed child care slots" found in the above-referenced source.

**# OF LICENSED CHILD CARE FACILITIES ENROLLED IN CACFP**

**Source:** County Profile, California Department of Education, Food Programs, Annual Child Nutrition Programs Participation Data, Child and Adult Care Program (CACFP)
**Publication Date:** June 2009
**Location:** **http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/sn/**
**Notes:** These data are from the 2007-2008 school year. This calculation was derived from the number of approved sites detailed in the report, minus adult day care centers, if any.

**% OF LICENSED CHILD CARE FACILITIES ENROLLED IN CACFP**

**Source:** County Profile, California Department of Education, Food Programs, Annual Child Nutrition Programs Participation Data, Child and Adult Care Program (CACFP)
**Publication Date:** June 2009
**Location:** **http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/sn/**
**Notes:** These data are from the 2007-2008 school year. The percentage of licensed child care facilities enrolled in CACFP was derived from the following calculation:

**(Total Number of Licensed Child Care Facilities Enrolled in CACFP) / (Total # of Licensed Child Care Facilities) = % of Licensed Child Care Facilities Enrolled in CACFP**

**For more information about CFPA, please visit www.cfpa.net. For more information about the Nutrition and Food Insecurity Profiles, please contact Evonne Silva, evonne@cfpa.net or Tia Shimada, tia@cfpa.net.**