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The Rural Health Information Survey (RHIS)

Purpose:

– To identify issues impacting health & access to health care in Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity & Mendocino Counties.

– To provide Information for planning & policy development

* Conducted in Summer/ Fall 2006 by CCRP
* 4 page written survey
* Quantitative and Qualitative Questions
Sampled U.S. Post Offices & ZCTA Population Density
(People per sq. mile by ZCTA)
- Sampled Post Offices (Labeled)
- Post Offices
- Less than 11
- 11-50
- Greater than 50

Data Sources: U.S. Postal Service, U.S. Census Bureau (2000)
## Response Rates & Sample Sizes by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>RHIS Response Rate</th>
<th>RHIS Sample Size</th>
<th>CHIS 2007 Sample Size</th>
<th>CHIS Percent of Total Population Sampled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CHIS combines the counties of Del Norte, Trinity, Siskiyou, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas and Sierra*
Respondents Who Reported Mendocino as Their Primary County of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Mendocino Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukiah</td>
<td>95482</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laytonville</td>
<td>95454</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covelo</td>
<td>95428</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptche</td>
<td>95427</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little River</td>
<td>95456</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td>95432</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopland</td>
<td>95449</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leggett</td>
<td>95585</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville</td>
<td>95494</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laytonville-Branscomb</td>
<td>95417</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
<td>95488</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderpoint</td>
<td>95511*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent City</td>
<td>95531*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad River</td>
<td>95552*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>95556*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitethorn</td>
<td>95589*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing ZIP Code</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>705</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*these are zip codes to which surveys were sent. They were returned by individuals who indicated Mendocino was their primary county of residence.
### Race/Ethnicity of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mendocino Sample</th>
<th>U.S. Census, 2000 Mendocino County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>598*</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Latina</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Race alone
Federal Poverty Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Poverty Level</th>
<th>Mendocino Sample</th>
<th>U.S. Census, 2000 Mendocino County % of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤99% FPL</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%-199% FPL</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200%-299% FPL</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥300% FPL</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>626</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty Thresholds obtained from U.S. Census Bureau, “Poverty Thresholds 2006”
http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/thresh06.html
Access to Health Care

Within the past 12 months, were you able to get the healthcare (including mental healthcare) you needed? If no, please explain why.

No = 17.6% in Mendocino County

Primary Reasons:
• lack of health insurance
• cost of health care
• lack of health care providers
• poverty
Mendocino County: Unable to Get Needed Health Care
(n = 540)
Study Methods: The Rural Health Information Survey (RHIS) was conducted by the California Center for Rural Policy in the fall of 2006. A total of 23,806 surveys were mailed to a random sample of post office box holders in the four counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity and Mendocino. The total number of returned surveys was 3,003 for an overall response rate of 12.7%.

Percent of Respondents Without Adequate Health Care Access, 2006

- 30 - 40
- 25 - 29
- 20 - 24
- 15 - 19
- 10 - 14
- 0 - 9
- Low sample size

Public Lands
- National Forests, National & State Parks

Data derived from RHIS survey question (4): Within the past 12 mo, were you able to get the health care (incl. mental health care) you needed? Percentages are shown for survey respondents of each sampled post office.

Post offices with less than 20 survey responses were not included in analysis due to statistical instability.

Facilities shown are those classified as either 'General Acute Care Hospital' or 'Free or Community Clinics' in OSHPD's database.

1 Data Sources: ESRI, OSHPD, U.S. Postal Service, CCRP Rural Health Information Survey 2006

2 GIS and Cartography: B. Dugger (2007)
Quotes from Mendocino County Respondents

Within the past 12 months, were you able to get the healthcare (including mental healthcare) you needed? If no, please explain why.

• “Lack of funds, distance, doctors retirement.”
• “Cannot afford it for myself, my children come 1st w/ healthcare.”
• “No insurance. Can’t afford to go to the Dr. our income puts us over Medi-Cal.”
• “Very limited medical providers.”
Access to Health Care for Children

Within the past 12 months, were you able to get your children the healthcare (including mental healthcare) they needed? If no, please explain why.

No = 12.3% in Mendocino County

Primary Reasons:
• Difficulties finding and receiving oral & mental health services
• Quality of care
• Insurance issues
• Having to leave local area for care
Mendocino County:
Unable to Get Needed Health Care for Children
(n = 112)
Health Insurance and Use of the Emergency Department

What types of health insurance do you have?

During the past 12 months did you visit a hospital emergency room for your own health?
## No Health Insurance by County (age 18-64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>RHIS No Insurance</th>
<th>CHIS, 2007 No Insurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>23.0 (19.5-26.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17.1 (14.2-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.0 (11-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>25.3 (22.1-28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>21.0 (19.3-22.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CHIS combines the counties of Del Norte, Trinity, Siskiyou, Lassen, Modoc, Plumas and Sierra
Mendocino County: No Health Insurance by Poverty Level (age 18-64) \((n = 498)\)

- \(\leq 99\%\): 36.6%
- 100\%-199\%: 36.4%
- 200\%-299\%: 17.8%
- \(\geq 300\%\): 10.8%
Mendocino County: Use of ER for Health Care in Past Year by Income Status ($n = 624$)

- Low-Income (<200% FPL): 25.6%
- Non Low-Income (≥200% FPL): 17.6%
Mendocino County:
Use of ER for Health Care in Past Year
by Insurance Status ($n = 584$)
Primary and Secondary Prevention
Mendocino County: Meeting Recommendations* for Moderate or Vigorous Activity by Income Status (n = 621)

* Respondents were considered to be meeting recommendations if they reported 30 min of moderate activity at least 5 days a week and/or 20 minutes of vigorous activity at least 3 days a week (CDC Recommendations).
Mendocino County:
Daily Cigarette Smoking by Income Status ($n = 623$)
Mendocino County: Teeth Cleaned in Past 2 Years by Income Status
\((n = 590)\)

Income Status of Respondent

- Low-Income (<200% FPL): 63.3%
- Non Low-Income (≥200% FPL): 85.7%
Mendocino County: Screening for Diabetes in Past 5 Years by Income Status (age >45) (n = 389)

Analysis excludes respondents who indicated they had a diagnosis of diabetes.
Mendocino County:
Mammogram in Past 2 years by Income Status
(women age 40-64) (n = 250)

Income Status of Respondent

- Low-Income (<200% FPL): 50.4%
- Non Low-Income (≥200% FPL): 73.7%
Mendocino County: Recommended Colorectal Cancer Screening* by Income Status (age 50-64) (n = 281)

*Colonoscopy/Sigmoidoscopy in past 10 years and/or Fecal Occult Blood Test in past year

Income Status of Respondent

- Low-Income (<200% FPL): 42.0%
- Non Low-Income (≥200% FPL): 60.5%
Mendocino County:
Pap Test in Past 5 Years by Income Status (women age 18-64) \(n = 328\)

- Low-Income (<200% FPL): 78.9%
- Non Low-Income (≥200% FPL): 95.5%
Food Security

“In the last 12 months were you or people living in your household ever hungry because you couldn’t afford enough food?”
Very Low Food Security by County of Residence
(n = 2,906)

Estimates of very low food security:
Nation 4.0%
California 3.7%
Mendocino County:
Very Low Food Security by Poverty Level of Respondent ($n = 618$)

- $\leq 99\%$: 26.2%
- 100\%-199\%: 9.6%
- 200\%-299\%: 3.5%
- $\geq 300\%$: 0.8%
CCRPRural Health Information Survey:
Percent of Respondents With Very Low Food Security¹, 2006

Study Methods: The Rural Health Information Survey (RHIS) was conducted by the California Center for Rural Policy in the fall of 2006. A total of 23,006 surveys were mailed to a random sample of post office box holders in the four counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity and Mendocino. The total number of returned surveys was 3,003 for an overall response rate of 12.7%.

Percent of Respondents With Very Low Food Security
- Low sample size²

16 - 25
11 - 15
9 - 10
6 - 8
3 - 5
2

Total Population Below Poverty Level
Percent by Census Tract

29 - 44
23 - 28
17 - 22
14 - 16
9 - 13
5 - 8

Data Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

¹Data derived from RHIS survey question (31): In the last 12 mo. were you or people living in your household ever hungry because you couldn’t afford enough food?
²Percentages are shown for survey respondents of each sampled post office.
³Post offices with less than 20 survey responses were not included in analysis due to statistical instability.


http://www.humboldt.edu/~ccrp/
Transportation

Is transportation a problem in meeting the health needs of you or your family?
Mendocino County: Transportation as a Problem Meeting Health Needs

\[ n = 622 \]

- 32.4% ≤ 99%
- 19.5% 100%-199%
- 8.7% 200%-299%
- 7.0% ≥ 300%

Federal Poverty Level of Respondent

- 24.6% Low-Income (<200% FPL)
- 7.5% Non Low-Income (≥200% FPL)

Income Status of Respondent
Study Methods: The Rural Health Information Survey (RHIS) was conducted by the California Center for Rural Policy in the fall of 2006. A total of 23,686 surveys were mailed to a random sample of post office box holders in the four counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Trinity and Mendocino. The total number of returned surveys was 3,003 for an overall response rate of 12.7%.

Percent of Respondents With Transportation Impacting Health Needs

- 35 - 45
- 30 - 34
- 25 - 29
- 20 - 24
- 10 - 19
- 6 - 9

**Low sample size**

Public Lands

- National Forests, National & State Parks

---

1 Data derived from RHIS survey question (49): Is transportation a problem in meeting the health needs of you or your family? Percentages are shown for survey respondents of each sampled post office.

2 Post offices with less than 20 survey responses were not included in analysis due to statistical instability.
Phones, Computers & Internet Access

In your home do you have:
A Phone?
A Computer?
Internet Access?
Mendocino County: No Phone, Computer or Internet Access in the Home

Federal Poverty Level of Respondent

- No Phone
- No Computer
- No Internet
Percent of Respondents Without In-Home Internet Access, 2006

- 60 - 70
- 50 - 59
- 40 - 49
- 30 - 39
- 20 - 29
- 14 - 20

Low sample size

Public Lands
- National Forests, National & State Parks

1 Data derived from RHIS question (37): In your home, do you have Internet access? Percentages are shown for survey respondents of each sampled post office.
2 Post offices with less than 20 survey responses were not included in analysis due to statistical instability.
Next Steps

• Continue dissemination of results (reports, briefs, meetings)

• Policy recommendations

• Repeat survey over time to measure trends (resource dependent)
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