



## HEALTHY FOOD ACCESS

# Central Minnesota Food Access Profile

### Introduction

The Food Access Profile for Central Minnesota was conducted in December 2012 and was updated in March 2013. Similar datasets were compiled for five other regions in Minnesota by University of Minnesota Extension Educators as part of the statewide Community Transformation initiative for Healthy Eating. For more information on the Food Access Profiles and for the other regions' profiles, visit our website at [z.umn.edu/rfap](http://z.umn.edu/rfap).

For more information, including school and district-level data and copies of the Food Access Profile, contact Extension Educator Laura Perdue ([perdu001@umn.edu](mailto:perdu001@umn.edu), 320-203-6105).

### Data Overview

Data were collected at the county level. Data sources are outlined in "Introduction to Regional Food Access Profiles," available at [z.umn.edu/rfap](http://z.umn.edu/rfap). Definitions and explanations of individual variables are provided in this document. When available or calculable, state and regional totals or averages are included in each table.

Data are color-coded to provide a visual representation of the variation in food access across the region. This was done by dividing the 14 counties into 5 groups:

Group 1: The 2 highest values

Group 2: The next 3 highest values

Group 3: The next 3 highest values

Group 4: The next 3 highest values

Group 5: The 3 lowest values

---

*Updated March 2013, revised August 2013. The Food Access Profile for Central Minnesota is supported by the Statewide Health Improvement Program, Minnesota Department of Health, and University of Minnesota Extension, and made possible with funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*

## 1. Socio-Demographic Data for Counties in Central Minnesota (2010)

County	Population	Population Density (people/sq mile)	% White	% Black/African-American	% American Indian	% Asian/Pacific Islander	% Two or More Races	% Hispanic / Latino	% Foreign Born
Benton	38,451	94.2	94.5	1.9	0.4	1.1	1.6	1.6	1.6
Cass	28,567	14.1	85.9	0.2	11.2	0.3	2.2	1.2	1.1
Chisago	53,887	129.9	95.8	1.2	0.6	0.9	1.2	1.5	1.6
Crow Wing	62,500	62.6	96.6	0.5	0.8	0.4	1.5	1.0	1.1
Isanti	37,816	86.8	96.0	0.6	0.5	0.9	1.6	1.5	1.4
Kanabec	16,239	31.1	97.0	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.5	1.3	0.8
Mille Lacs	26,097	45.6	91.1	0.4	6.0	0.3	1.9	1.4	1.4
Morrison	33,198	29.5	97.7	0.4	0.2	0.3	1.1	1.2	1.0
Pine	29,750	21.1	91.9	2.0	3.1	0.5	1.9	2.4	1.5
Sherburne	88,499	204.4	94.0	1.9	0.5	1.3	1.7	2.2	2.5
Stearns	150,642	112.2	91.8	3.1	0.3	2.0	1.6	2.8	3.9
Todd	24,895	26.3	95.3	0.4	0.3	0.6	1.3	5.2	3.4
Wadena	13,843	25.8	96.7	0.8	0.5	0.3	1.5	1.3	1.0
Wright	124,700	188.5	95.0	1.1	0.3	1.2	1.5	2.4	2.7
<b>Central Region</b>	<b>729,084</b>	<b>61.6</b>	<b>94.0%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>5,303,925</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>86.9%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>7.1%</b>

## 2. Socio-Economic Data for Counties in Central Minnesota

County	Median Household Income (2007-2011)	% Unemployed (2006-2010)	% Poverty (2010)	% Children in Poverty (2010)	Average Household Size (2011)	% High School Graduates, age 25+ (2007-2011)	% Bachelors or Higher, age 25+ (2007-2011)	% Female-Headed Households (2011)
Benton	\$ 50,848	6.5	11.8	12.7	2.5	90.0	19.6	16
Cass	\$ 42,445	5.4	13.1	27.0	2.5	89.6	20.2	13
Chisago	\$ 64,726	4.7	7.1	9.4	2.6	91.0	17.0	11
Crow Wing	\$ 44,659	5.2	11.5	17.7	2.2	91.3	22.0	13
Isanti	\$ 57,260	6.2	8.9	11.9	2.6	90.8	16.0	11
Kanabec	\$ 45,672	7.2	12.5	20.4	2.5	87.1	13.9	11
Mille Lacs	\$ 45,273	6.8	12.4	18.3	2.3	87.7	14.8	15
Morrison	\$ 47,085	5.6	13.1	18.4	2.3	86.6	14.5	13
Pine	\$ 43,938	5.8	14	21.7	2.4	85.9	12.9	14
Sherburne	\$ 71,704	5.3	7.3	8.4	2.8	93.0	24.2	10
Stearns	\$ 51,779	4.8	12.9	13.0	2.4	89.9	23.6	11
Todd	\$ 42,927	4.8	14.9	25.3	2.4	85.8	12.2	8
Wadena	\$ 34,686	3.7	16.8	24.1	2.2	87.7	14.8	15
Wright	\$ 28,454	4.8	5.5	7.2	2.6	93.0	23.8	11
<b>Central Region</b>			<b>10.3%</b>					
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>\$ 58,476</b>	<b>4.9% (07-11)</b>	<b>11.8% (2011)</b>	<b>15.3% (2011)</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>91.6%</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	

### Notes and definitions

For more information on how poverty rates are calculated and defined (including poverty thresholds), see <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/about/overview/measure.html>

*Female-Headed Households* are family households with a female householder and no husband present.

### 3. Chronic Disease Data for Counties in Central Minnesota (2009)

	<i>% of Adults w/ Diabetes (2009)</i>	<i>% Adult Obesity (2009)</i>	<i>% Low- income Preschool Obesity (2006-2008)</i>	<i>Heart Disease Mortality Rate, age 35+, per 100,000 (2007-2009)</i>	<i>Heart Disease Hospitalization Rate, 65+, per 1,000 Beneficiaries (2005-07)</i>
Benton	8.4	27.3	13.0	359.6	75.4
Cass	6.8	27.5	15.7	303.4	71.5
Chisago	7.9	26.7	10.0	274.3	89.6
Crow Wing	6.4	24.8	8.0	276.4	81.1
Isanti	7.6	28.6	11.1	239.5	110.0
Kanabec	7.4	28.2	10.1	276.2	67.7
Mille Lacs	7.1	26.5	13.5	279.7	85.4
Morrison	6.8	28.3	9.0	312.9	51.0
Pine	7.0	27.1	9.3	290.5	63.9
Sherburne	7.9	30.4	8.6	282.2	79.7
Stearns	7.6	28.4	9.6	223.3	60.7
Todd	7.4	30.0	11.8	243.1	47.7
Wadena	7.8	30.7	11.6	324.4	47.9
Wright	6.2	24.4	9.9	234.9	75.2
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>6.1% (2011)</b>	<b>25.7% (2011)</b>		<b>245.0</b>	<b>48.2 (2007-09)</b>

#### Notes and definitions

Adults are defined in this data as  $\geq 20$  years old

*Obesity:* An adult who has a body mass index of 30 or higher is considered obese

Diabetes and Obesity rates are *age-adjusted* percentages. According to the data source, “The age-adjusted percentage is an artificial estimate that minimizes the effects of different age distributions and allows comparisons between different populations. It represents what the crude percentage would have been in the study population if that population had the same age distribution as a standard population. For example, that is a population in which the age composition is known precisely as a result of a census.”

*Low-Income Preschool Obesity:* “Prevalence of obesity among children 2-4 years of age in households with income up to 200% of the poverty threshold based on family size. For children 2-4 years of age, obesity is defined as BMI-for-age > 95th percentile based on the 2000 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) sex-specific growth charts.”

#### 4. Food Access Data for Counties in Central Minnesota (2006)

	<i>% Low Income &amp; &gt;1 Mile to Store</i>	<i>% Low Income &amp; &gt;10 Miles to Store</i>	<i>% Households with No Car &amp; &gt;1 Mile to Store</i>	<i>% Households with No Car &amp; &gt;10 Miles to Store</i>
Benton	12.4	0.8	3.5	0.1
Cass	29.4	3.9	3.9	0.4
Chisago	11.2	0.0	1.9	0.0
Crow Wing	20.1	1.5	4.0	0.2
Isanti	23.7	4.6	3.9	0.5
Kanabec	22.4	2.6	2.6	0.3
Mille Lacs	20.5	1.3	3.2	0.3
Morrison	23.1	7.2	3.3	1.0
Pine	24.1	6.6	3.7	1.0
Sherburne	10.6	0.0	2.0	0.0
Stearns	12.4	0.9	1.9	0.2
Todd	29.6	11.2	4.2	1.6
Wadena	27.8	12.6	4.0	2.1
Wright	10.0	0.0	1.8	0.0

#### Notes and definitions

*Low Access to Stores:* “Number of people in a county living more than 1 mile from a supermarket or large grocery store if in an urban area, or more than 10 miles from a supermarket or large grocery store if in a rural area.... Stores met the definition of a supermarket or large grocery store if they reported at least \$2 million in annual sales and contained all the major food departments found in a traditional supermarket, including fresh meat and poultry, dairy, dry and packaged foods, and frozen foods.”

*Low Income:* Up to 200% of the poverty threshold based on family size

*No Car & Low Access to Stores:* Percent of housing units in a county without a car and more than 1 mile from a supermarket or large grocery store.

## 5. Food Security and Assistance for Counties in Central Minnesota

	<i>% Food Insecurity (2010)</i>	<i>% Child Food Insecurity (2010)</i>	<i>SNAP Participation (% of population) (2010)</i>	<i>% Students Eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch (2009)</i>
Benton	11.1	17.2	9	34.7
Cass	13.4	20.9	16	63.0
Chisago	10.7	16.5	5	26.0
Crow Wing	11.8	17.9	10	42.4
Isanti	11.0	17.1	8	36.5
Kanabec	14.0	21.3	12	39.3
Mille Lacs	13.9	20.6	9	38.7
Morrison	12.4	18.9	8	44.7
Pine	13.3	20.8	13	47.9
Sherburne	10.0	15.1	5	26.2
Stearns	10.9	15.6	8	34.7
Todd	11.6	19.8	9	58.9
Wadena	13.8	20.1	14	58.1
Wright	9.4	14.3	5	22.8
<b>Minnesota</b>	<b>11.5%</b>		<b>9.5% (2011)</b>	

### Notes and definitions

*Food Insecurity:* "Food-insecure households were unable, at times during the year, to provide adequate food for one or more household members because the household lacked money and other resources for food. For most food-insecure households, inadequacy was in quality and variety of foods; for about a third, amounts were also inadequate."

## 6. Activity and Fitness for Counties in Central Minnesota

	<i>% Adults Not Meeting Activity Guidelines (2009)</i>	<i>% Physically Inactive Adults (Age-Adjusted)</i>	<i>Recreation &amp; Fitness Facilities (per 10,000 people)</i>	<i>ERS Natural Amenity Index (1999)</i>
Benton	21.1	21.6	0.8	2
Cass	22.5	21.0	0.0	2
Chisago	18.9	18.8	1.1	2
Crow Wing	18.6	17.3	1.1	3
Isanti	18.7	18.7	1.9	2
Kanabec	22.4	21.3	1.2	2
Mille Lacs	23.8	22.6	1.1	3
Morrison	21.7	20.6	1.2	2
Pine	20.6	19.7	0.7	2
Sherburne	21.7	22.4	1.0	2
Stearns	19.3	19.0	1.7	2
Todd	27.5	25.8	1.2	2
Wadena	23.8	21.7	0.7	2
Wright	17.6	17.9	1.1	2

### Notes and definitions

*Activity Guidelines:* “At least 150 minutes of moderate physical activity per week, or 75 minutes of vigorous activity per week, or an equivalent combination of moderate and vigorous physical activity.”

*Physically Inactive:* “A person is considered physically inactive if during the past month, other than a regular job, he or she did not participate in any physical activities or exercises such as running, calisthenics, golf, gardening, or walking for exercise.”

*Recreation & Fitness Facilities:* “Establishments primarily engaged in operating fitness and recreational sports facilities featuring exercise and other active physical fitness conditioning or recreational sports activities, such as swimming, skating, or racquet sports.”

*ERS Natural Amenity Index:* “Index of natural amenities constructed by USDA’s Economic Research Service, ranging from 1 to 6, where 1=lowest amenity score and 6=highest amenity score. It is based on the premise that people are drawn to areas with varied topography; lakes, ponds, or oceanfront; warm, sunny winters; and temperate, low-humidity summers. The index measures a county’s natural amenities score as a standard deviation from the all-county mean value.”