

April 2005

Too Many California Adults Are Tipping the Scales at an Unhealthy Weight

Carolyn A. Mendez-Luck, Hongjian Yu, Ying-Ying Meng, Mona Jhawar and Steven P. Wallace

Over half of all California adults age 18 and older are either overweight or obese, according to the 2003 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS 2003). For adults, obesity is defined as a body mass index (BMI, a ratio of weight to height) of 30 kg/m² or more and overweight as a BMI of 25 kg/m² or more. Rates of overweight and obesity are climbing in California and are consistent with national trends. The consequences of being overweight and obese include increased risks from a host of preventable conditions, such as high blood pressure, high cholesterol, Type 2 diabetes, heart disease and stroke.

This policy brief provides new data about the prevalence of overweight and obesity among adults age 18 and older for California legislative and Congressional districts, as well as for counties. The first of its kind sub-county data in this policy brief are estimates created by a small-area methodology, based on rates from CHIS 2003 that are applied to population data from the 2000 Census and 2003 California Department of Finance.

The Overall Weight Problem in Legislative and Congressional Districts

As much as 71% of adult residents age 18 and older in California Assembly districts are at an unhealthy weight because they are either overweight or obese (Exhibit 1). A similar situation is found in state Senate districts (Exhibit 2) and Congressional districts (Exhibit 3). Legislative and Congressional districts with the highest rates of unhealthy weight among adult residents are found primarily in the state's Central Valley, Sierras and Inland Empire, and in parts of Los Angeles County. In these areas, two-thirds or more of adults are overweight or obese—about four in every 10 adults are overweight and another three in 10 are obese. Even in the legislative and Congressional districts with the lowest

rates of overweight and obesity combined, 40% of district residents tip the scales at an unhealthy weight. These districts are primarily located along California's coast in the counties of Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles and San Diego. The parts of Los Angeles County that have among the lowest overall rates of unhealthy weight include the cities of Beverly Hills, Bel Air, Brentwood and Santa Monica.

Overall Weight Problem Due to Being Overweight More Than Obese

The problem of unhealthy weight among California adults appears to come mostly from being overweight rather than obese. When looking at overweight rates and obesity rates separately, we find that the ranges in either rate are similar for California Assembly, Senate and Congressional districts (Exhibits 1-3). However, we also find that the overweight rates for adults are uniformly higher compared to obesity rates for the majority of California's local communities. In fact, when comparing overweight rates to obesity rates, we find that overweight rates are up to three times higher than obesity rates—the overweight rates range from about 30 to 40%, whereas

(Continued on page 4)



THE CALIFORNIA ENDOWMENT

The California Endowment funded the research and development of this policy brief.



Exhibit 1

Rates of Obesity and Overweight by Assembly District, California, 2003

Obese or Overweight California Residents, Age 18 and Older							
District	County Location of Assembly District	Obesity		Overweight		Obesity and Overweight Combined	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	21	5,375,000	35	8,959,000	56	14,334,000
01	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma, Trinity	22	71,000	34	110,000	56	181,000
02	Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo	25	80,000	37	120,000	61	200,000
03	Butte, Lassen, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sierra, Yuba	21	67,000	35	114,000	55	181,000
04	Alpine, El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento	18	60,000	40	135,000	57	195,000
05	Placer, Sacramento	19	62,000	35	114,000	54	176,000
06	Marin, Sonoma	13	41,000	32	104,000	45	145,000
07	Napa, Solano, Sonoma	20	66,000	37	122,000	57	188,000
08	Solano, Yolo	22	68,000	40	121,000	62	189,000
09	Sacramento	23	80,000	34	117,000	57	197,000
10	Amador, El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin	21	68,000	35	114,000	56	182,000
11	Contra Costa	24	77,000	34	108,000	59	185,000
12	San Francisco, San Mateo	12	42,000	31	106,000	43	148,000
13	San Francisco	11	39,000	29	104,000	39	143,000
14	Alameda, Contra Costa	18	61,000	33	115,000	50	176,000
15	Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin	18	56,000	34	108,000	52	164,000
16	Alameda	21	68,000	33	109,000	54	177,000
17	Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus	29	88,000	35	107,000	63	195,000
18	Alameda	21	65,000	35	110,000	56	175,000
19	San Mateo	17	55,000	36	116,000	53	171,000
20	Alameda, Santa Clara	15	50,000	33	105,000	48	155,000
21	San Mateo, Santa Clara	15	50,000	35	113,000	50	163,000
22	Santa Clara	13	42,000	34	112,000	47	154,000
23	Santa Clara	23	69,000	35	104,000	58	173,000
24	Santa Clara	18	56,000	35	111,000	53	167,000
25	Calaveras, Madera, Mariposa, Mono, Stanislaus, Tuolumne	22	72,000	40	128,000	62	200,000
26	San Joaquin, Stanislaus	28	88,000	36	116,000	64	204,000
27	Monterey, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	18	57,000	32	103,000	51	160,000
28	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	28	82,000	34	101,000	62	183,000
29	Fresno, Madera, Tulare	23	70,000	37	114,000	60	184,000
30	Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare	31	91,000	37	106,000	68	197,000
31	Fresno, Tulare	31	93,000	36	111,000	67	204,000
32	Kern, San Bernardino	25	77,000	38	118,000	63	195,000
33	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara	20	61,000	37	113,000	56	174,000
34	Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare	30	89,000	35	107,000	65	196,000
35	Santa Barbara, Ventura	18	60,000	31	104,000	49	164,000
36	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	27	77,000	38	107,000	66	184,000
37	Los Angeles, Ventura	18	55,000	31	96,000	48	151,000
38	Los Angeles, Ventura	19	60,000	34	105,000	53	165,000
39	Los Angeles	26	77,000	36	105,000	62	182,000
40	Los Angeles	20	66,000	34	110,000	54	176,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the "95% range." The "95% range" (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Assembly district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/leg-obesity.html.

**The numbers of obese and overweight persons in each Assembly district for 2003 are based on Department of Finance population projections of 2000 Census data.

Source: 2003 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys and the 2000 Census.

Exhibit 1

Rates of Obesity and Overweight by Assembly District, California, 2003 (continued)

Obese or Overweight California Residents, Age 18 and Older							
District	County Location of Assembly District	Obesity		Overweight		Obesity and Overweight Combined	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	21	5,375,000	35	8,959,000	56	14,334,000
41	Los Angeles, Ventura	15	54,000	32	116,000	47	170,000
42	Los Angeles	11	42,000	32	129,000	43	171,000
43	Los Angeles	17	56,000	33	107,000	50	163,000
44	Los Angeles	17	57,000	34	110,000	51	167,000
45	Los Angeles	20	58,000	34	100,000	54	158,000
46	Los Angeles	25	72,000	35	101,000	61	173,000
47	Los Angeles	19	64,000	33	112,000	52	176,000
48	Los Angeles	24	68,000	33	93,000	58	161,000
49	Los Angeles	20	65,000	32	105,000	52	170,000
50	Los Angeles	27	72,000	38	102,000	66	174,000
51	Los Angeles	29	91,000	36	113,000	65	204,000
52	Los Angeles	29	69,000	36	85,000	65	154,000
53	Los Angeles	14	56,000	33	131,000	47	187,000
54	Los Angeles	19	71,000	34	125,000	53	196,000
55	Los Angeles	27	87,000	35	116,000	62	203,000
56	Los Angeles, Orange	22	68,000	37	113,000	59	181,000
57	Los Angeles	26	75,000	36	101,000	62	176,000
58	Los Angeles	25	76,000	38	113,000	63	189,000
59	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	22	70,000	36	111,000	58	181,000
60	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino	17	53,000	34	110,000	51	163,000
61	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	29	89,000	36	111,000	66	200,000
62	San Bernardino	33	104,000	38	119,000	71	223,000
63	Riverside, San Diego	24	76,000	36	114,000	60	190,000
64	Orange	22	74,000	38	127,000	59	201,000
65	Orange	25	83,000	40	130,000	65	213,000
66	Orange	23	72,000	38	119,000	61	191,000
67	Orange	15	49,000	35	117,000	50	166,000
68	Orange	16	55,000	34	115,000	50	170,000
69	Orange	21	66,000	37	113,000	58	179,000
70	Orange	11	37,000	33	114,000	44	151,000
71	Orange, Riverside	17	54,000	36	113,000	53	167,000
72	Orange	18	54,000	36	113,000	54	167,000
73	Orange, San Diego	16	52,000	37	116,000	53	168,000
74	San Diego	17	53,000	36	117,000	53	170,000
75	San Diego	12	43,000	34	115,000	46	158,000
76	San Diego	15	52,000	34	119,000	49	171,000
77	San Diego	19	59,000	36	114,000	55	173,000
78	San Diego	20	64,000	35	114,000	55	178,000
79	San Diego	24	77,000	37	117,000	61	194,000
80	Imperial, Riverside	27	91,000	39	131,000	66	222,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the "95% range." The "95% range" (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Assembly district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/leg-obesity.html.

**The numbers of obese and overweight persons in each Assembly district for 2003 are based on Department of Finance population projections of 2000 Census data.

Source: 2003 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys and the 2000 Census.

the obesity rates range from just over 10% to just over 30%. In addition, in districts with lower overall rates of unhealthy weight, only 10 to 15% of the adult population is obese, compared to over 30% in districts with the highest overall rates.

Weight is a Serious Problem in California Counties

Not surprisingly, the weight problem among California adults is also evident in the state's counties; the overall rates of unhealthy weight for adults age 18 and older—40 to 70%—are similar to the rates for state legislative and Congressional districts (Exhibit 4). Imperial County has an especially high overall rate, in addition to the other counties previously mentioned. We also find a similar situation to state legislative and Congressional districts when we compare overweight rates to obesity rates. The ranges in overweight rates—29 to 41%—are more than two times higher than the ranges in obesity rates, 10 to 32%. Placer, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Solano counties have especially high overweight rates among adult residents, and Tulare, Imperial and Kings counties have especially high obesity rates. San Francisco and Marin counties have among the lowest overweight and obesity rates, separately or combined, among their adult residents.

Policy Implications

Over 14 million California adults age 18 and older have a significant weight problem. Being overweight or obese has myriad potential serious health consequences. Failure to address this health risk will drive health care costs higher in the future and further complicate the problems of persons with inadequate access to health care. Overweight and obesity may soon cause as much preventable disease and death as cigarette smoking. Obese individuals also may suffer from social stigmatization, discrimination and lowered self-esteem. Obesity should be considered a priority health risk of the same severity as hypertension and high cholesterol, given the numerous health problems associated with it.

One of the national health objectives for the year 2010 is to reduce the prevalence of obesity among adults to less than 15%, and many areas in California have a long way to go to reach this goal. However, the perceived causes of and solutions to unhealthy weight fail to address the underlying obesogenic environment we live in. Our current food and activity environments are the result of industry practices and government policies that perversely promote the behaviors and environmental conditions that increase overweight and inactivity. Transportation policies that encourage the use of cars rather than footpaths or public transport, and environmental policies that do not promote the creation and sustainability of green spaces, car-free areas or recreational facilities are only a few of the policy opportunities that can move us toward a healthier and leaner California.

Promoting healthy weight requires an ecological solution to address access to high-quality nutritious foods and safe spaces for physical activity. Low-income and communities of color especially do not often have access to fresh fruits and vegetables, or safe sidewalks to take walks or to exercise. These policy solutions require the involvement of industry and government at state and local levels. The continuing increase in overweight and obesity in our country, and in California, make it imperative that we act now.

Data Sources and Methods

This policy brief is based on findings from the 2003 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS 2003), 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys (CPS), 2000 Census and the California State Senate Office of Demographics' file of legislative districts. The estimates of obesity prevalence were created using a small-area methodology of the multiple data sources listed here. A detailed description of the methodology used in this study is available from the authors.

Rates of Obesity and Overweight by Senate District, California, 2003

Exhibit 2

Obese or Overweight California Residents, Age 18 and Older							
District	County Location of Senate District	Obesity		Overweight		Obesity and Overweight Combined	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	21	5,375,000	35	8,959,000	56	14,334,000
01	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra	18	116,000	38	249,000	55	365,000
02	Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Solano, Sonoma	21	135,000	36	234,000	57	369,000
03	Marin, San Francisco, Sonoma	12	80,000	30	207,000	42	287,000
04	Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Nevada, Placer, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba	22	148,000	36	238,000	59	386,000
05	Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Yolo	25	158,000	36	222,000	61	380,000
06	Sacramento	22	149,000	34	228,000	56	377,000
07	Contra Costa	20	129,000	34	218,000	53	347,000
08	San Francisco, San Mateo	14	96,000	33	223,000	48	319,000
09	Alameda, Contra Costa	20	132,000	33	222,000	53	354,000
10	Alameda, Contra Costa	18	112,000	34	214,000	51	326,000
11	San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	16	103,000	34	221,000	50	324,000
12	Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, Stanislaus	27	167,000	37	228,000	64	395,000
13	Santa Clara	19	119,000	35	216,000	54	335,000
14	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne	24	150,000	38	238,000	61	388,000
15	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	19	120,000	35	220,000	54	340,000
16	Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare	32	187,000	36	215,000	68	402,000
17	Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura	24	145,000	37	217,000	61	362,000
18	Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare	27	165,000	37	227,000	64	392,000
19	Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Ventura	16	101,000	31	190,000	47	291,000
20	Los Angeles	24	146,000	35	212,000	59	358,000
21	Los Angeles	17	111,000	33	218,000	50	329,000
22	Los Angeles	22	126,000	34	199,000	56	325,000
23	Los Angeles, Ventura	14	108,000	32	241,000	47	349,000
24	Los Angeles	25	147,000	35	204,000	60	351,000
25	Los Angeles	28	166,000	35	212,000	63	378,000
26	Los Angeles	20	124,000	33	209,000	53	333,000
27	Los Angeles	22	142,000	35	228,000	58	370,000
28	Los Angeles	18	135,000	34	250,000	52	385,000
29	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino	18	116,000	34	219,000	52	335,000
30	Los Angeles	27	152,000	39	219,000	65	371,000
31	Riverside, San Bernardino	24	150,000	37	233,000	60	383,000
32	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	31	193,000	37	229,000	68	422,000
33	Orange	14	90,000	36	225,000	50	315,000
34	Orange	20	126,000	36	224,000	56	350,000
35	Orange	13	87,000	34	233,000	47	320,000
36	Riverside, San Diego	18	115,000	37	232,000	55	347,000
37	Riverside	23	156,000	39	263,000	62	419,000
38	Orange, San Diego	17	109,000	36	230,000	54	339,000
39	San Diego	15	107,000	33	235,000	49	342,000
40	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego	26	164,000	37	239,000	63	403,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the "95% range." The "95% range" (commonly called a confidence interval) provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Senate district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/leg-obesity.html.

**The numbers of obese and overweight persons in each Senate district for 2003 are based on Department of Finance population projections of 2000 Census data.

Source: 2003 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys and the 2000 Census.

Exhibit 3 Rates of Obesity and Overweight by Congressional District, California, 2003

Obese or Overweight California Residents, Age 18 and Older							
District	County Location of Congressional District	Obesity		Overweight		Obesity and Overweight Combined	
		Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
	CALIFORNIA	21	5,375,000	35	8,959,000	56	14,334,000
01	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Yolo	21	103,000	35	172,000	57	275,000
02	Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yolo, Yuba	24	116,000	36	179,000	60	295,000
03	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Sacramento, Solano	20	94,000	36	173,000	56	267,000
04	Butte, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra	17	90,000	38	196,000	56	286,000
05	Sacramento	22	116,000	34	174,000	56	290,000
06	Marin, Sonoma	14	67,000	33	163,000	47	230,000
07	Contra Costa, Solano	26	126,000	37	181,000	62	307,000
08	San Francisco	11	59,000	29	155,000	40	214,000
09	Alameda	19	96,000	33	164,000	52	260,000
10	Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Solano	19	93,000	35	169,000	55	262,000
11	Alameda, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Santa Clara	23	110,000	33	159,000	56	269,000
12	San Francisco, San Mateo	15	76,000	34	173,000	50	249,000
13	Alameda	17	85,000	34	165,000	51	250,000
14	San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz	14	72,000	34	170,000	49	242,000
15	Santa Clara	16	78,000	34	164,000	50	242,000
16	Santa Clara	22	98,000	35	159,000	56	257,000
17	Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz	23	109,000	33	153,000	56	262,000
18	Fresno, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus	28	132,000	37	172,000	65	304,000
19	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Stanislaus, Tuolumne	23	109,000	39	184,000	62	293,000
20	Fresno, Kern, Kings	31	140,000	37	162,000	68	302,000
21	Fresno, Tulare	29	132,000	36	162,000	65	294,000
22	Kern, Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo	24	111,000	38	178,000	62	289,000
23	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura	19	98,000	33	164,000	52	262,000
24	Santa Barbara, Ventura	18	82,000	31	141,000	48	223,000
25	Inyo, Los Angeles, Mono, San Bernardino	24	108,000	37	162,000	61	270,000
26	Los Angeles, San Bernardino	20	96,000	34	167,000	54	263,000
27	Los Angeles	20	99,000	34	168,000	54	267,000
28	Los Angeles	21	103,000	35	165,000	56	268,000
29	Los Angeles	17	83,000	32	161,000	49	244,000
30	Los Angeles	11	67,000	32	188,000	43	255,000
31	Los Angeles	20	88,000	34	150,000	54	238,000
32	Los Angeles	25	111,000	35	155,000	60	266,000
33	Los Angeles	20	96,000	34	161,000	54	257,000
34	Los Angeles	26	113,000	37	162,000	63	275,000
35	Los Angeles	29	129,000	35	157,000	64	286,000
36	Los Angeles	18	100,000	34	191,000	52	291,000
37	Los Angeles	27	122,000	34	157,000	61	279,000
38	Los Angeles	27	118,000	37	159,000	64	277,000
39	Los Angeles	24	103,000	37	164,000	61	267,000
40	Orange	17	80,000	36	170,000	52	250,000
41	Riverside, San Bernardino	25	120,000	37	178,000	62	298,000
42	Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino	17	81,000	35	166,000	52	247,000
43	San Bernardino	32	152,000	38	178,000	70	330,000
44	Orange, Riverside	22	108,000	37	180,000	59	288,000
45	Riverside	24	122,000	39	205,000	63	327,000
46	Los Angeles, Orange	14	77,000	35	186,000	49	263,000
47	Orange	21	97,000	36	170,000	57	267,000
48	Orange	12	58,000	34	173,000	46	231,000
49	Riverside, San Diego	21	101,000	38	179,000	59	280,000
50	San Diego	14	72,000	35	176,000	50	248,000
51	Imperial, San Diego	25	118,000	37	174,000	62	292,000
52	San Diego	18	83,000	36	172,000	54	255,000
53	San Diego	17	87,000	33	176,000	50	263,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the "95% provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each Congressional district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/leg-obesity.html.

**The numbers of obese and overweight persons in each Congressional district for 2003 are based on Department of Finance population projections of 2000 Census data.

Source: 2003 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys and the 2000 Census.

Rates of Obesity and Overweight by County, County-Group and Los Angeles Service Planning Area (LA SPA), California, 2003

Exhibit 4

Obese or Overweight California Residents, Age 18 and Older						
County, County-Group or Los Angeles Service Planning Area	Obesity		Overweight		Obesity and Overweight Combined	
	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**	Percent*	Number**
CALIFORNIA	21	5,375,000	35	8,959,000	56	14,334,000
Alameda	18	201,000	34	372,000	52	573,000
Alpine, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono	19	27,000	40	56,000	59	83,000
Butte	23	36,000	35	56,000	58	92,000
Colusa, Glenn, Tehama	25	19,000	41	31,000	65	50,000
Contra Costa	21	155,000	34	247,000	55	402,000
Del Norte, Humboldt	22	25,000	32	36,000	54	61,000
El Dorado	16	20,000	40	50,000	56	70,000
Fresno	27	154,000	37	214,000	63	368,000
Imperial	32	33,000	37	38,000	70	71,000
Kern	27	128,000	38	180,000	65	308,000
Kings	30	25,000	36	31,000	66	56,000
LA SPA Antelope Valley	26	53,000	38	78,000	64	131,000
LA SPA East	26	230,000	38	345,000	64	575,000
LA SPA Metro	17	150,000	34	295,000	51	445,000
LA SPA San Fernando	19	289,000	34	508,000	53	797,000
LA SPA San Gabriel	21	269,000	34	429,000	55	698,000
LA SPA South	28	155,000	35	195,000	64	350,000
LA SPA South Bay	23	282,000	35	421,000	58	703,000
LA SPA West	13	77,000	31	184,000	45	261,000
Lake, Mendocino	26	29,000	35	40,000	62	69,000
Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, Trinity	24	17,000	36	25,000	60	42,000
Madera	24	21,000	38	33,000	62	54,000
Marin	10	19,000	30	57,000	41	76,000
Merced	27	41,000	37	56,000	63	97,000
Monterey, San Benito	25	83,000	33	108,000	58	191,000
Napa	20	19,000	37	35,000	57	54,000
Nevada, Plumas, Sierra	17	16,000	33	31,000	50	47,000
Orange	16	338,000	35	764,000	51	1,102,000
Placer	16	33,000	41	86,000	57	119,000
Riverside	24	287,000	39	469,000	62	756,000
Sacramento	21	201,000	34	329,000	56	530,000
San Bernardino	28	350,000	37	464,000	65	814,000
San Diego	18	387,000	35	770,000	53	1,157,000
San Francisco	11	70,000	29	191,000	40	261,000
San Joaquin	28	120,000	33	140,000	62	260,000
San Luis Obispo	18	34,000	37	70,000	56	104,000
San Mateo	17	93,000	36	191,000	53	284,000
Santa Barbara	18	51,000	33	97,000	50	148,000
Santa Clara	17	218,000	34	432,000	52	650,000
Santa Cruz	18	34,000	33	62,000	50	96,000
Shasta	27	36,000	34	44,000	61	80,000
Solano	25	71,000	41	116,000	65	187,000
Sonoma	16	56,000	35	125,000	51	181,000
Stanislaus	25	85,000	40	134,000	65	219,000
Sutter/Yuba	21	21,000	37	38,000	58	59,000
Tulare	32	83,000	34	89,000	67	172,000
Ventura	20	111,000	30	173,000	50	284,000
Yolo	19	24,000	38	49,000	57	73,000

Note: The total of individual numbers may not add up to the state number due to rounding.

* The numbers presented here are the midpoint of the "95% provides a more reliable estimate of the rates for persons in the population group, and the range for each county, county-group, and LA SPA can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/leg-obesity.html.

**The numbers of obese and overweight persons in each county, county-group, and LA SPA for 2003 are based on Department of Finance population projections of 2000 Census data.

Source: 2003 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys and the 2000 Census.



The UCLA Center
for Health Policy Research
is affiliated with the
UCLA School of Public Health
and the UCLA School of Public Affairs

The views expressed in this policy brief
are those of the authors and do not
necessarily represent the UCLA Center for
Health Policy Research, the Regents of the
University of California, or collaborating
organizations or funders.

PB2005-4

Copyright © 2005 by the Regents of the
University of California

Editor-in-Chief: E. Richard Brown, PhD
Director of Communications: Valerie Steiner
Communications Assistant: Celeste Maglan
Editing Services: Sheri Penney
Design/Production: Ikkanda Design Group

Phone: 310-794-0909
Fax: 310-794-2686
Email: chpr@ucla.edu
Web Site: www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu

Author Information

Carolyn A. Mendez-Luck, PhD, MPH, is a Senior Researcher at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and the project director for this study. Hongjian Yu, PhD, is Associate Director of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and the senior statistician for this study. Ying-Ying Meng, DrPH, is a Senior Researcher at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. Mona Jhawar, MPH, is a Research Associate at the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. Steven P. Wallace, PhD, is Associate Director of the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and Professor at the UCLA School of Public Health.

Acknowledgements

The authors appreciate the valuable contributions of reviewers Sue Babey, Marty Martinez and Ellen Wu.

Citation

CA Mendez-Luck, H Yu, YY Meng, M Jhawar, SP Wallace. *Too Many California Adults Are Tipping the Scales at an Unhealthy Weight*. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2005.

UCLA Center for Health Policy Research

10911 Weyburn Avenue, Suite 300
Los Angeles, California 90024

First Class
Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
UCLA