

County Health Rankings

Mobilizing Action Toward Community Health

2010

Oregon



Robert Wood Johnson Foundation



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Population Health Institute

Translating Research into Policy and Practice


Introduction

Where we live matters to our health. The health of a community depends on many different factors, including quality of health care, individual behavior, education and jobs, and the environment. We can improve a community's health through programs and policies. For example, people who live in communities with ample park and recreation space are more likely to exercise, which reduces heart disease risk. People who live in communities with smoke-free laws are less likely to smoke or to be exposed to second-hand smoke, which reduces lung cancer risk.


The problem is that there are big differences in health across communities, with some places being much healthier than others. And up to now, it has been hard to get a standard way to measure how healthy a county is and see where they can improve.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute are pleased to present the 2010 *County Health Rankings*, a collection of 50 reports that reflect the overall health of counties in every state across the country. For the first time, counties can get a snapshot of how healthy their residents are by comparing their overall health and the factors that influence their health, with other counties in their state. This will allow them to see county-to-county where they are doing well and where they need to improve. Everyone has a stake in community health. We all need to work together to find solutions. The *County Health Rankings* serve as both a call to action and a needed tool in this effort.

All of the *County Health Rankings* are based upon this model of population health improvement:



In this model, health outcomes are measures that describe the current health status of a county. These health outcomes are influenced by a set of health factors. These health factors and their outcomes may also be affected by community-based programs and policies designed to alter their distribution in the community. Counties can improve health outcomes by addressing all health factors with effective, evidence-based programs and policies.




Institute of Medicine, 2002

To compile the *Rankings*, we built on our prior work in Wisconsin, worked closely with staff from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Dartmouth College, and obtained input from a team of expert advisors. Together we selected a number of population health measures based on scientific relevance, importance, and availability of data at the county level. For a more detailed explanation of the choice of measures, see www.countyhealthrankings.org.

The Rankings

This report ranks Oregon counties according to their summary measures of **health outcomes** and **health factors**, as well as the components used to create each summary measure. The figure below depicts the structure of the *Rankings* model. Counties receive a rank for each population health component; those having high ranks (e.g., 1 or 2) are estimated to be the “healthiest.”

Our summary **health outcomes** rankings are based on an equal weighting of mortality and morbidity measures. The summary **health factors** rankings are based on weighted scores of four types of factors: behavioral, clinical, social and economic, and environmental. The weights for the factors (shown in parentheses in the figure) are based upon a review of the literature and expert input but represent just one way of combining these factors.




County Health Rankings model ©2010 UWPHI


The maps on this page display Oregon's counties divided into groups by health rank. The lighter colors indicate better performance in the respective summary rankings. The green map shows the distribution of summary health outcomes. The blue displays the distribution of the summary rank for health factors.

Maps help locate the healthiest and least healthy counties in the state. The health factors map appears similar to the health outcomes map, showing how health factors and health outcomes are closely related.

HEALTH OUTCOMES



HEALTH FACTORS



Summary Health Outcomes & Health Factors Rankings

Counties receive two summary ranks:

- Health Outcomes
- Health Factors

Each of these ranks represents a weighted summary of a number of measures.

Health outcomes represent how healthy a county is while health factors are what influences the health of the county.

Rank	Health Outcomes	Rank	Health Factors
1	Benton	1	Benton
2	Washington	2	Deschutes
3	Clackamas	3	Washington
4	Polk	4	Hood River
5	Hood River	5	Clackamas
6	Deschutes	6	Wallowa
7	Grant	7	Polk
8	Wasco	8	Yamhill
9	Wallowa	9	Multnomah
10	Marion	10	Tillamook
11	Union	11	Columbia
12	Columbia	12	Union
13	Jackson	13	Jackson
14	Crook	14	Baker
15	Morrow	15	Curry
16	Umatilla	16	Wasco
17	Lane	17	Lane
18	Yamhill	18	Grant
19	Clatsop	19	Clatsop
20	Harney	20	Marion
21	Multnomah	21	Crook
22	Malheur	22	Morrow
23	Tillamook	23	Linn
24	Coos	24	Malheur
25	Curry	25	Lincoln
26	Linn	26	Klamath
27	Josephine	27	Josephine
28	Lincoln	28	Coos
29	Baker	29	Harney
30	Douglas	30	Umatilla
31	Lake	31	Lake
32	Klamath	32	Douglas
33	Jefferson	33	Jefferson

Not Ranked: Gilliam, Sherman, Wheeler

Health Outcomes Rankings

The summary health outcomes ranking is based on measures of mortality and morbidity. Each county's ranks for mortality and morbidity are displayed here. The mortality rank, representing length of life, is based on a measure of premature death: the years of potential life lost prior to age 75.

The morbidity rank is based on measures that represent health-related quality of life and birth outcomes. We combine four morbidity measures: self-reported fair or poor health, poor physical health days, poor mental health days, and the percent of births with low birthweight.

Rank	Mortality	Morbidity
1	Benton	Grant
2	Washington	Benton
3	Polk	Wasco
4	Clackamas	Clackamas
5	Deschutes	Polk
6	Hood River	Hood River
7	Morrow	Washington
8	Wallowa	Deschutes
9	Union	Marion
10	Columbia	Curry
11	Lane	Jackson
12	Marion	Clatsop
13	Crook	Malheur
14	Yamhill	Wallowa
15	Harney	Umatilla
16	Umatilla	Crook
17	Multnomah	Columbia
18	Jackson	Yamhill
19	Grant	Union
20	Wasco	Tillamook
21	Clatsop	Josephine
22	Tillamook	Multnomah
23	Linn	Lane
24	Malheur	Harney
25	Coos	Coos
26	Lincoln	Lincoln
27	Douglas	Lake
28	Baker	Morrow
29	Josephine	Linn
30	Curry	Baker
31	Klamath	Jefferson
32	Jefferson	Douglas
33	Lake	Klamath

Health Factors Rankings

The summary health factors ranking is based on four factors: health behaviors, clinical care, social and economic, and physical environment factors. In turn, each of these factors is based on several measures. Health behaviors include measures of smoking, diet and exercise, alcohol use, and risky sex behavior. Clinical

care includes measures of access to care and quality of care. Social and economic factors include measures of education, employment, income, family and social support, and community safety. The physical environment includes measures of environmental quality and the built environment.

Rank	Health Behaviors	Rank	Clinical Care	Rank	Social & Economic Factors	Rank	Physical Environment
1	Deschutes	1	Hood River	1	Benton	1	Wallowa
2	Benton	2	Multnomah	2	Washington	2	Curry
3	Washington	3	Deschutes	3	Clackamas	2	Jefferson
4	Wallowa	4	Clackamas	4	Hood River	4	Hood River
5	Hood River	5	Benton	5	Columbia	5	Deschutes
6	Clackamas	6	Washington	6	Deschutes	6	Morrow
7	Yamhill	7	Jackson	7	Tillamook	7	Josephine
8	Curry	8	Baker	8	Polk	8	Jackson
9	Union	9	Crook	9	Wallowa	9	Umatilla
10	Jackson	10	Marion	10	Clatsop	10	Douglas
11	Multnomah	11	Linn	11	Yamhill	11	Tillamook
12	Lane	12	Polk	12	Lane	12	Wasco
13	Polk	13	Columbia	13	Union	13	Columbia
14	Harney	14	Wasco	14	Wasco	14	Multnomah
15	Grant	15	Josephine	15	Morrow	15	Union
16	Baker	16	Klamath	16	Multnomah	16	Coos
17	Lake	17	Grant	17	Baker	17	Crook
18	Malheur	18	Douglas	18	Grant	18	Klamath
19	Tillamook	19	Yamhill	19	Marion	19	Benton
20	Klamath	20	Lane	20	Jackson	20	Lincoln
21	Crook	21	Malheur	21	Umatilla	21	Linn
22	Wasco	22	Lincoln	22	Linn	22	Baker
23	Marion	23	Curry	23	Lincoln	23	Clackamas
24	Clatsop	24	Clatsop	24	Coos	24	Malheur
25	Josephine	25	Union	25	Curry	25	Polk
26	Morrow	26	Coos	26	Lake	26	Washington
27	Columbia	27	Tillamook	27	Crook	27	Grant
28	Linn	28	Jefferson	28	Harney	28	Yamhill
29	Lincoln	29	Umatilla	29	Douglas	29	Lake
30	Coos	30	Wallowa	30	Malheur	30	Harney
31	Jefferson	31	Morrow	31	Josephine	31	Marion
32	Umatilla	32	Harney	32	Klamath	32	Clatsop
33	Douglas	33	Lake	33	Jefferson	33	Lane

2010 County Health Rankings: Measures, Data Sources, and Years of Data

	Measure	Data Source	Years of Data
HEALTH OUTCOMES			
Mortality	Premature death	National Center for Health Statistics	2004-2006
Morbidity	Poor or fair health	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	2002-2008
	Poor physical health days	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	2002-2008
	Poor mental health days	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	2002-2008
	Low birthweight	National Center for Health Statistics	2000-2006
HEALTH FACTORS			
HEALTH BEHAVIORS			
Tobacco	Adult smoking	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	2002-2008
Diet and Exercise	Adult obesity	National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion	2006-2008
Alcohol Use	Binge drinking	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	2002-2008
	Motor vehicle crash death rate	National Center for Health Statistics	2000-2006
High Risk Sexual Behavior	Chlamydia rate	National Center for Health Statistics	2007
	Teen birth rate	National Center for Health Statistics	2000-2006
CLINICAL CARE			
Access to Care	Uninsured adults	Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, U.S. Census	2005
	Primary care provider rate	Health Resources & Services Administration	2006
Quality of Care	Preventable hospital stays	Medicare/Dartmouth Institute	2005-2006
	Diabetic screening	Medicare/Dartmouth Institute	2003-2006
	Hospice use	Medicare/Dartmouth Institute	2001-2005
SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS			
Education	High school graduation	National Center for Education Statistics ¹	2005-2006
	College degrees	U.S. Census/American Community Survey	2000/2005-2007
Employment	Unemployment	Bureau of Labor Statistics	2008
Income	Children in poverty	Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, U.S. Census	2007
	Income inequality	U.S. Census/American Community Survey ²	2000/2005-2007
Family and Social Support	Inadequate social support	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	2005-2008
	Single-parent households	U.S. Census/American Community Survey	2000/2005-2007
Community Safety	Violent crime ³	Uniform Crime Reporting, Federal Bureau of Investigation	2005-2007
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT			
Air Quality⁴	Air pollution-particulate matter days	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency / Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	2005
	Air pollution-ozone days	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency / Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	2005
Built Environment	Access to healthy foods	Census Zip Code Business Patterns	2006
	Liquor store density	Census County Business Patterns	2006

¹ State data sources for KY, NH, NC, PA, SC, and UT (2007-2008).

² Income inequality estimates for 2000 were calculated by Mark L. Burkey, North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University, www.ncat.edu/~burkeym/Gini.htm.

³ Homicide rate (2000-2006) from National Center for Health Statistics for AK, AZ, AR, CO, CT, GA, ID, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, MN, MS, MT, NE, NH, NM, NC, ND, OH, SD, UT, and WV. State data source for IL.

⁴ Not available for AK and HI.

CREDITS

Report Editors

University of Wisconsin-Madison
 School of Medicine and Public Health
 Population Health Institute
 Bridget Booske, PhD, MHSA
 Jessica Athens, MS
 Patrick Remington, MD, MPH

This publication would not have been possible without the following contributions:

Conceptual Development

David Kindig, MD, PhD
 Paul Peppard, PhD
 Patrick Remington, MD, MPH

Technical Advisors

Amy Bernstein, ScD, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
 Michele Bohm, MPH, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
 Vickie Boothe, MPH, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
 Ethan Burke, MD, MPH, Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice

Research Assistance

Clare O'Connor
 Karen Odegaard
 Hyojun Park
 Matthew Rodock

Production and Editing

Chuck Alexander
 Alex Field
 Joan Fischer
 Irene Golembiewski
 Jennifer Robinson

Design

Forum One, Alexandria, VA
 Media Solutions, UW School of Medicine and Public Health

Metrics Advisory Group

Yukiko Asada, PhD, Associate Professor, Community Health and Epidemiology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
 Tom Eckstein, MBA, Principal, Arundel Street Consulting Inc, St. Paul, MN
 Elliott Fisher, MD, MPH, Director, Center for Population Health, Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy and Clinical Practice, and
 Professor of Medicine and Community and Family Medicine, Dartmouth Medical School, Lebanon, NH
 Howard Frumkin, MD, MPH, Dr. PH, Director of the National Center for Environmental Health, ATSDR, CDC, Atlanta, GA
 Thomas Kottke, MD, MSPH, Medical Director for Evidence-Based Health, HealthPartners, Minneapolis, MN
 Ali Mokdad, PhD, Professor of Global Health, Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA
 Roy Gibson Parrish, MD, Consultant in Population Health Information Systems, Peacham, VT
 Robert M. (Bobby) Pestronk, MPH, Executive Director, National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO),
 Washington, DC
 Tom Ricketts, PhD, Professor of Health Policy and Administration, University of North Carolina
 Steven Teutsch, MD, MPH, Chief Science Officer, Los Angeles County Public Health, Los Angeles, CA
 Julie Willems Van Dijk, PhD, RN, former Marathon County, WI Health Officer

Suggested citation: University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute. *County Health Rankings 2010*.



County Health Rankings

Mobilizing Action Toward Community Health

countyhealthrankings.org

