

UCLA

Recent Work

Title

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/18m0t7px>

Authors

Mendez-Luck, Carolyn A.

Yu, Hongjian

Meng, Ying-Ying

et al.

Publication Date

2004-12-01



Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

CAROLYN A. MENDEZ-LUCK, HONGJIAN YU, YING-YING MENG, MONA JHAWAR AND STEVEN P. WALLACE

December 2004

Uninsured Californians report serious health problems that are complicated by their lack of having health insurance. One in five Californians without insurance coverage for all or part of the year reports that their health is fair or poor and one in 14 reports having asthma symptoms. Additionally, one in four uninsured adults (age 45 or older) reports being diagnosed with hypertension. Self-reported health, a reliable measure of current health, is also widely used as a proxy for future health outcomes. Therefore, poor overall health, asthma and hypertension are each problems that require regular medical monitoring and treatment—medical care that is likely to be hindered by having no health insurance.

This policy brief provides data for California counties and legislative districts that highlight the variations in the rates of self-reported fair or poor health, asthma and hypertension for children and adults without health insurance coverage for all or part of the year. The rates reported in this policy brief are estimates created by a small-area methodology, based on data from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS 2001) that are applied to population data from the 2000 Census and 2002 California Department of Finance.

Self-Reported Fair or Poor Health Among Uninsured Californians Across State Legislative and Congressional Districts

Approximately 1.4 million uninsured Californians reported being in fair or poor health. The rates of fair or poor health ranged from 11 to 32% in Assembly districts and from 13 to 31% in Senate districts (Exhibits 1 and 2). The majority of legislative districts had rates similar to the statewide average of 22%, although some legislative districts across the state fared better and worse than the statewide average. The legislative districts with the highest rates of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured were primarily located in parts of Los Angeles County. High rates were also found in legislative districts located along an interior corridor of the state

extending from Alameda and Contra Costa counties in the north to Kern County in the south. Assembly and Senate districts with rates better than the statewide average were primarily located in the greater San Francisco Bay region, in Southern California and in the northern Sierra counties.

The variation in rates of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured in Congressional districts was similar to our findings on state legislative districts, and ranged from 12 to 30% (Exhibit 3). Congressional districts with rates worse than the statewide average were primarily located in the same regions of the state as legislative districts.

Self-Reported Fair or Poor Health Across Counties

The rates of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured ranged from 10 to 31% in California counties (Exhibit 4). Tulare and Napa counties had the highest rates of uninsured residents with fair/poor health status, where almost one in every three uninsured residents reported having fair or poor health. In contrast, uninsured residents of the northern Sierra counties—such as Placer and El Dorado—reported having fair or poor health at rates almost half that of the statewide average.

Self-Reported Fair or Poor Health in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas

Over one-half million Los Angeles County residents without health insurance reported having fair or poor health (Exhibit 4). The rates of self-reported fair or poor health ranged from 16 to 28% in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas (LA SPAs). Half of the LA SPAs were near the statewide average, with the highest rate in LA SPA Metro—that includes the downtown, midtown and northeast areas of the City of Los Angeles. The lowest rate of self-reported fair or poor health among the uninsured was found in LA SPA West—that includes West Los Angeles, and the cities of Bel Air, Beverly Hills, Culver City and Santa Monica.

(Continued on page 2)

Exhibit 1:
Chronic Condition Rates
Among the Uninsured by
Assembly District

Source: 2001 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys, and the 2000 Census.

Assembly Districts

| District Number | County Location of Assembly District | UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| | | Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages | | Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages | | Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+ | |
| | | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** |
| | CALIFORNIA | 22 | 1,465,000 | 7 | 469,000 | 28 | 307,000 |
| 01 | Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma, Trinity | 14 | 11,000 | 10 | 8,000 | 32 | 6,000 |
| 02 | Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo | 19 | 14,000 | 10 | 8,000 | 26 | 4,000 |
| 03 | Butte, Lassen, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sierra, Yuba | 13 | 9,000 | 10 | 7,000 | 26 | 4,000 |
| 04 | Alpine, El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento | 12 | 7,000 | 13 | 7,000 | 37 | 4,000 |
| 05 | Placer, Sacramento | 17 | 10,000 | 12 | 7,000 | 26 | 3,000 |
| 06 | Marin, Sonoma | 17 | 9,000 | 8 | 4,000 | 24 | 3,000 |
| 07 | Napa, Solano, Sonoma | 24 | 15,000 | 13 | 8,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 08 | Solano, Yolo | 21 | 10,000 | 10 | 5,000 | 32 | 2,000 |
| 09 | Sacramento | 17 | 13,000 | 12 | 9,000 | 25 | 3,000 |
| 10 | Amador, El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin | 16 | 9,000 | 9 | 5,000 | 23 | 3,000 |
| 11 | Contra Costa | 15 | 7,000 | 11 | 5,000 | — [†] | — |
| 12 | San Francisco, San Mateo | 15 | 10,000 | 6 [†] | 4,000 | 26 | 4,000 |
| 13 | San Francisco | 16 | 13,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 30 | 5,000 |
| 14 | Alameda, Contra Costa | 16 | 8,000 | 12 | 6,000 | 26 [†] | 2,000 |
| 15 | Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin | 16 | 6,000 | 11 | 4,000 | 22 | 2,000 |
| 16 | Alameda | 28 | 18,000 | 8 | 5,000 | — [†] | — |
| 17 | Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus | 24 | 23,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 29 | 4,000 |
| 18 | Alameda | 29 | 15,000 | 7 [†] | 4,000 | 19 [†] | 2,000 |
| 19 | San Mateo | 11 [†] | 4,000 | — [†] | — | — [†] | — |
| 20 | Alameda, Santa Clara | 24 | 10,000 | 6 | 2,000 | 20 | 2,000 |
| 21 | San Mateo, Santa Clara | 14 | 5,000 | 6 [†] | 2,000 | 22 | 1,000 |
| 22 | Santa Clara | 20 | 9,000 | 5 [†] | 3,000 | 35 | 3,000 |
| 23 | Santa Clara | 27 | 20,000 | 4 [†] | 3,000 | 33 | 4,000 |
| 24 | Santa Clara | 21 | 9,000 | 6 [†] | 3,000 | 32 | 3,000 |
| 25 | Calaveras, Madera, Mariposa, Mono, Stanislaus, Tuolumne | 22 | 15,000 | 8 | 5,000 | 35 | 5,000 |
| 26 | San Joaquin, Stanislaus | 25 | 20,000 | 7 | 5,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 27 | Monterey, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz | 17 | 11,000 | 6 | 4,000 | 25 | 3,000 |
| 28 | Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz | 25 | 26,000 | 3 | 3,000 | 31 | 4,000 |
| 29 | Fresno, Madera, Tulare | 23 | 17,000 | 13 | 10,000 | 28 | 3,000 |
| 30 | Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare | 29 | 36,000 | 7 | 8,000 | 29 | 5,000 |
| 31 | Fresno, Tulare | 28 | 33,000 | 12 | 14,000 | 30 | 5,000 |
| 32 | Kern, San Bernardino | 18 | 14,000 | 8 | 6,000 | 23 | 3,000 |
| 33 | San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara | 20 | 18,000 | 8 | 7,000 | 30 | 4,000 |
| 34 | Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare | 26 | 24,000 | 8 | 7,000 | 33 | 5,000 |
| 35 | Santa Barbara, Ventura | 25 | 23,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 36 | Los Angeles, San Bernardino | 25 | 19,000 | 14 | 11,000 | 38 | 5,000 |
| 37 | Los Angeles, Ventura | 23 | 15,000 | 9 | 6,000 | 32 | 4,000 |

(Continued)

Asthma Symptom Rates Among Uninsured Californians—Legislative and Congressional Districts

Approximately 469,000 uninsured California children and adults who were previously diagnosed with asthma had at least one asthma symptom during the year. The rates of asthma symptoms for uninsured children and adults ranged from 3 to 14% in Assembly districts and from 4 to 12% in Senate districts (Exhibits 1 and 2). The majority of legislative districts had asthma symptom rates for the uninsured population similar to the statewide average of 7%, although some legislative districts across the state fared better or worse than the

statewide average. The legislative districts with higher asthma symptom rates for uninsured children and adults were found throughout California, primarily in interior regions of the state—such as the Central Valley and the Inland Empire. Assembly and Senate districts with lower asthma symptom rates among the uninsured were primarily located in parts of Southern California and along the central coast.

The variation in asthma symptom rates for uninsured children and adults in Congressional districts was similar to our findings on state legislative districts, and ranged from 4 to 12% (Exhibit 3). Since Congressional districts encompass larger geographic areas than state legislative districts,

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

| UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| District Number | County Location of Assembly District | Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages | | Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages | | Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+ | |
| | | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** |
| CALIFORNIA | | 22 | 1,465,000 | 7 | 469,000 | 28 | 307,000 |
| 38 | Los Angeles, Ventura | 17 | 10,000 | 8 | 5,000 | 27 | 3,000 |
| 39 | Los Angeles | 21 | 29,000 | 4 | 6,000 | 26 | 5,000 |
| 40 | Los Angeles | 21 | 21,000 | 5 | 5,000 | 28 | 4,000 |
| 41 | Los Angeles, Ventura | 20 | 13,000 | 7 | 4,000 | 30 | 4,000 |
| 42 | Los Angeles | 14 | 11,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 32 | 5,000 |
| 43 | Los Angeles | 18 | 18,000 | 4 | 4,000 | 35 | 7,000 |
| 44 | Los Angeles | 20 | 14,000 | 7 | 5,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 45 | Los Angeles | 27 | 46,000 | 6 | 10,000 | 27 | 7,000 |
| 46 | Los Angeles | 32 | 60,000 | 5 | 9,000 | 27 | 7,000 |
| 47 | Los Angeles | 20 | 19,000 | 7 | 7,000 | 33 | 5,000 |
| 48 | Los Angeles | 30 | 45,000 | 6 | 9,000 | 32 | 7,000 |
| 49 | Los Angeles | 27 | 25,000 | 4† | 4,000 | 22 | 4,000 |
| 50 | Los Angeles | 26 | 32,000 | 4 | 6,000 | 28 | 5,000 |
| 51 | Los Angeles | 24 | 26,000 | 6 | 7,000 | 30 | 5,000 |
| 52 | Los Angeles | 26 | 35,000 | 6 | 8,000 | 35 | 5,000 |
| 53 | Los Angeles | 17 | 11,000 | 6 | 4,000 | 25 | 3,000 |
| 54 | Los Angeles | 20 | 17,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 26 | 4,000 |
| 55 | Los Angeles | 24 | 25,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 25 | 4,000 |
| 56 | Los Angeles, Orange | 21 | 18,000 | 6 | 5,000 | 29 | 4,000 |
| 57 | Los Angeles | 24 | 21,000 | 6 | 5,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 58 | Los Angeles | 24 | 22,000 | 5 | 5,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 59 | Los Angeles, San Bernardino | 20 | 12,000 | 9 | 5,000 | 26 | 3,000 |
| 60 | Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino | 17 | 9,000 | 7 | 4,000 | 26 | 3,000 |
| 61 | Los Angeles, San Bernardino | 26 | 26,000 | 5 | 5,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 62 | San Bernardino | 26 | 28,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 27 | 4,000 |
| 63 | Riverside, San Diego | 22 | 16,000 | 6 | 5,000 | 27 | 3,000 |
| 64 | Orange | 16 | 14,000 | 11 | 9,000 | 22 | 3,000 |
| 65 | Orange | 20 | 17,000 | 12 | 10,000 | 26 | 4,000 |
| 66 | Orange | 18 | 14,000 | 10 | 8,000 | 23 | 3,000 |
| 67 | Orange | 16 | 11,000 | 8 | 5,000 | 29 | 4,000 |
| 68 | Orange | 21 | 20,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 30 | 5,000 |
| 69 | Orange | 24 | 36,000 | 4 | 7,000 | 31 | 5,000 |
| 70 | Orange | 13 | 7,000 | 8 | 5,000 | 32 | 3,000 |
| 71 | Orange, Riverside | 14 | 9,000 | 9 | 5,000 | 25 | 3,000 |
| 72 | Orange | 21 | 19,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 32 | 4,000 |
| 73 | Orange, San Diego | 16 | 11,000 | 8 | 6,000 | 30 | 3,000 |
| 74 | San Diego | 19 | 14,000 | 6 | 4,000 | 29 | 4,000 |
| 75 | San Diego | 13 | 8,000 | 6 | 4,000 | 28 | 3,000 |
| 76 | San Diego | 16 | 14,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 30 | 4,000 |
| 77 | San Diego | 17 | 12,000 | 7 | 5,000 | 30 | 4,000 |
| 78 | San Diego | 17 | 15,000 | 6 | 5,000 | 30 | 4,000 |
| 79 | San Diego | 21 | 25,000 | 4 | 5,000 | 29 | 5,000 |
| 80 | Imperial, Riverside | 22 | 26,000 | 7 | 9,000 | 29 | 6,000 |

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/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each Assembly district are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

† Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

the asthma symptom rates for the uninsured population are distributed more broadly across the state. Thus, asthma symptom rates worse than the statewide average were found in larger areas within the same counties that were already mentioned for legislative districts.

Asthma Symptom Rates Across Counties and Los Angeles Service Planning Areas

The rates of asthma symptoms for the uninsured population ranged from 4 to 17% in California counties and from 5 to 17% in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas (Exhibit 4). Notably high rates of asthma symptoms for the uninsured in California counties were found in the northern Sierra counties

*Exhibit 1: (continued)
Chronic Condition Rates
Among the Uninsured by
Assembly District*
Source: 2001 California Health
Interview Survey, 2000-2002
Current Population Surveys,
and the 2000 Census.

*Assembly
Districts*

as well as some interior regions of the state. However, low rates were also found in the central valley counties of Madera and San Joaquin, as well as Santa Clara County. The majority of LA SPAs had asthma symptom rates for the uninsured population near the statewide average (Exhibit 4). However, one LA SPA (Antelope Valley) had a notably high rate of 17%, more than two times the statewide average.

Hypertension Among Uninsured Adults Age 45 and Older Across California Legislative and Congressional Districts

The data presented in this section are for uninsured adults age 45 and older because high blood pressure continues to be more common in older age groups despite being on the rise among people at younger ages. In 2002, over 300,000 uninsured adults age 45 and older had high blood pressure that was diagnosed by a doctor at some time in their lives. Hypertension affects from 19 to 38% of people age 45 and older in California's 80 Assembly districts, and from 21 to 37% in the state's 40 Senate districts (Exhibits 1 and 2). The majority of legislative districts had high blood pressure rates similar to or worse than the statewide average of 28% for this population. The legislative districts with the highest rates of diagnosed high blood pressure among this uninsured population were located primarily in parts of Los Angeles County and in counties east and south of the state's capitol. The legislative districts with the lowest rates of diagnosed high blood pressure among uninsured adults age 45 and older were primarily located in the greater San Francisco Bay region.

The 18 to 33% variation in hypertension rates among uninsured adults age 45 and older for Congressional districts is similar to our findings on state legislative districts. The majority of California's 53 Congressional districts had rates similar to or worse than the statewide average (Exhibit 3). Since Congressional districts cover larger geographic areas and represent bigger populations than either Assembly or Senate districts, the Congressional districts with higher rates of diagnosed hypertension among the uninsured adult population include many of the same counties as those mentioned for state legislative districts, as well as the northern Sierra counties, and the greater Southern California region.

Hypertension Among Uninsured Adults in California Counties

The rates of diagnosed hypertension among uninsured adults age 45 and older ranged from 15 to 42% for California counties (Exhibit 4). In Imperial and El Dorado counties, almost one in every two uninsured adults age 45 or older had been diagnosed with high blood pressure at some time in their lives. However, several counties had notably low hypertension rates, including Santa Cruz with

the lowest hypertension rate among this uninsured age group (15%).

Hypertension Among Uninsured Adults in Los Angeles Service Planning Areas

The rates of diagnosed hypertension among uninsured adults age 45 and older ranged from 25 to 45% for Los Angeles Service Planning Areas (Exhibit 4). The majority of LA SPAs had rates at or near the statewide average, however, two LA SPAs had notably high hypertension rates; LA SPA Antelope Valley had the highest rate among this uninsured age group (45%).

Conclusion

The data in this policy brief provide legislators and program planners the opportunity to improve the health of the uninsured. Although one Senate district (SD8) and one Congressional District (CD12), both located in parts of San Francisco and San Mateo counties, had uniformly good rates of self-reported fair or poor health, asthma symptoms and diagnosed hypertension, this was generally not the case for most of California. The Central Valley had the most locations where uninsured residents reported multiple health problems, but the significant geographic variations in the rates of two major chronic conditions and overall poor health for uninsured Californians suggest that the health needs of the uninsured vary widely throughout the state.

The frequent reporting of chronic conditions by those without health insurance throughout the state documents their need for appropriate access to medical care. Local communities have a number of strategies that can expand health insurance coverage and thereby promote regular access to health care professionals. First, communities can redouble local outreach efforts to enroll every uninsured individual who currently qualifies for public health insurance, without any changes to programmatic eligibility criteria. Second, communities can expand the eligibility criteria for local indigent health insurance programs to include currently ineligible groups of uninsured individuals. A related strategy involves advocating for more generous eligibility criteria for state public insurance programs. Third, communities can work with local employers to bolster employer-based health insurance where most Californians continue to get their coverage.

Each of these strategies would likely redistribute existing public tax expenditures for the uninsured in a more cost-effective manner. Moreover, such a redistribution to expand access to medical care would relieve the chronic burden on safety-net providers. Public and private efforts that extend health insurance coverage to all Californians are key public health steps in dealing with the problems of chronic illness and improving their health and wellbeing.

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

| District Number | County Location of Senate District | UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| | | Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages | | Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages | | Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+ | |
| | | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** |
| | CALIFORNIA | 22 | 1,465,000 | 7 | 469,000 | 28 | 307,000 |
| 01 | Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra | 13 | 14,000 | 11 | 12,000 | 30 | 8,000 |
| 02 | Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Solano, Sonoma | 19 | 25,000 | 12 | 15,000 | 30 | 9,000 |
| 03 | Marin, San Francisco, Sonoma | 16 | 22,000 | 7 | 10,000 | 27 | 8,000 |
| 04 | Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Nevada, Placer, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba | 16 | 22,000 | 10 | 15,000 | 27 | 8,000 |
| 05 | Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Yolo | 20 | 26,000 | 6 | 8,000 | 22 | 5,000 |
| 06 | Sacramento | 17 | 24,000 | 12 | 17,000 | 25 | 6,000 |
| 07 | Contra Costa | 13 | 10,000 | 11 | 8,000 | —† | — |
| 08 | San Francisco, San Mateo | 13 | 14,000 | 5 | 6,000 | 21 | 5,000 |
| 09 | Alameda, Contra Costa | 24 | 29,000 | 10 | 11,000 | 22† | 4,000 |
| 10 | Alameda, Contra Costa | 27 | 26,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 21 | 4,000 |
| 11 | San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz | 17 | 15,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 24 | 4,000 |
| 12 | Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, Stanislaus | 27 | 53,000 | 6 | 12,000 | 37 | 10,000 |
| 13 | Santa Clara | 25 | 32,000 | 5† | 6,000 | 34 | 7,000 |
| 14 | Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne | 21 | 29,000 | 11 | 15,000 | 29 | 8,000 |
| 15 | Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz | 20 | 28,000 | 7 | 9,000 | 29 | 8,000 |
| 16 | Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare | 29 | 71,000 | 9 | 22,000 | 30 | 10,000 |
| 17 | Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura | 23 | 33,000 | 11 | 16,000 | 32 | 8,000 |
| 18 | Inyo, Kern, San Bernardino, Tulare | 22 | 35,000 | 9 | 14,000 | 29 | 8,000 |
| 19 | Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Ventura | 21 | 29,000 | 8 | 11,000 | 28 | 7,000 |
| 20 | Los Angeles | 21 | 54,000 | 4 | 11,000 | 27 | 9,000 |
| 21 | Los Angeles | 19 | 31,000 | 6 | 9,000 | 31 | 11,000 |
| 22 | Los Angeles | 31 | 106,000 | 5 | 17,000 | 27 | 13,000 |
| 23 | Los Angeles, Ventura | 20 | 29,000 | 7 | 10,000 | 30 | 9,000 |
| 24 | Los Angeles | 26 | 52,000 | 5 | 11,000 | 25 | 8,000 |
| 25 | Los Angeles | 23 | 47,000 | 7 | 14,000 | 31 | 9,000 |
| 26 | Los Angeles | 25 | 62,000 | 7 | 16,000 | 33 | 13,000 |
| 27 | Los Angeles | 23 | 44,000 | 6 | 11,000 | 29 | 8,000 |
| 28 | Los Angeles | 21 | 35,000 | 6 | 10,000 | 25 | 8,000 |
| 29 | Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino | 19 | 21,000 | 7 | 8,000 | 25 | 6,000 |
| 30 | Los Angeles | 25 | 53,000 | 5 | 11,000 | 27 | 8,000 |
| 31 | Riverside, San Bernardino | 19 | 31,000 | 8 | 13,000 | 24 | 7,000 |
| 32 | Los Angeles, San Bernardino | 26 | 55,000 | 6 | 12,000 | 28 | 8,000 |
| 33 | Orange | 15 | 19,000 | 8 | 10,000 | 32 | 7,000 |
| 34 | Orange | 24 | 62,000 | 5 | 13,000 | 31 | 10,000 |
| 35 | Orange | 15 | 19,000 | 8 | 10,000 | 29 | 8,000 |
| 36 | Riverside, San Diego | 16 | 20,000 | 8 | 10,000 | 28 | 7,000 |
| 37 | Riverside | 18 | 31,000 | 11 | 19,000 | 23 | 7,000 |
| 38 | Orange, San Diego | 18 | 26,000 | 7 | 10,000 | 29 | 7,000 |
| 39 | San Diego | 15 | 26,000 | 6 | 11,000 | 30 | 8,000 |
| 40 | Imperial, Riverside, San Diego | 21 | 51,000 | 5 | 13,000 | 30 | 10,000 |

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/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each Senate district are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

† Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

*Exhibit 2:
Chronic Condition Rates
Among the Uninsured by
Senate District*
Source: 2001 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys, and the 2000 Census.

*Senate
Districts*

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

Exhibit 3:
Chronic Condition Rates Among the Uninsured by Congressional District
Source: 2001 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys, and the 2000 Census.

Congressional Districts

| District Number | County Location of Congressional District | UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| | | Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages | | Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages | | Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+ | |
| | | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** |
| | CALIFORNIA | 22 | 1,465,000 | 7 | 469,000 | 28 | 307,000 |
| 01 | Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Napa, Sonoma, Yolo | 18 | 19,000 | 11 | 12,000 | 32 | 7,000 |
| 02 | Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yolo, Yuba | 17 | 19,000 | 11 | 12,000 | 27 | 6,000 |
| 03 | Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Sacramento, Solano | 15 | 12,000 | 11 | 9,000 | 27 | 5,000 |
| 04 | Butte, El Dorado, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Sierra | 12 | 10,000 | 11 | 9,000 | 31 | 6,000 |
| 05 | Sacramento | 17 | 19,000 | 12 | 13,000 | 25 | 5,000 |
| 06 | Marin, Sonoma | 18 | 15,000 | 10 | 8,000 | 21 | 4,000 |
| 07 | Contra Costa, Solano | 18 | 13,000 | 11 | 8,000 | 31 | 4,000 |
| 08 | San Francisco | 16 | 20,000 | 6† | 8,000 | 29 | 7,000 |
| 09 | Alameda | 27 | 25,000 | 9 | 9,000 | – | – |
| 10 | Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, Solano | 17 | 10,000 | 12 | 7,000 | 26 | 3,000 |
| 11 | Alameda, Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Santa Clara | 18 | 14,000 | 5 | 4,000 | 19 | 3,000 |
| 12 | San Francisco, San Mateo | 12 | 8,000 | 5† | 3,000 | 19† | 3,000 |
| 13 | Alameda | 28 | 21,000 | 6† | 5,000 | 18† | 3,000 |
| 14 | San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz | 16 | 11,000 | 6 | 4,000 | 24 | 3,000 |
| 15 | Santa Clara | 21 | 14,000 | 6† | 4,000 | 32 | 4,000 |
| 16 | Santa Clara | 26 | 24,000 | 5† | 4,000 | 33 | 5,000 |
| 17 | Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz | 22 | 31,000 | 4 | 5,000 | 29 | 6,000 |
| 18 | Fresno, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus | 26 | 37,000 | 7 | 10,000 | 31 | 7,000 |
| 19 | Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Stanislaus, Tuolumne | 24 | 26,000 | 10 | 11,000 | 33 | 7,000 |
| 20 | Fresno, Kern, Kings | 27 | 52,000 | 9 | 16,000 | 29 | 7,000 |
| 21 | Fresno, Tulare | 28 | 40,000 | 10 | 15,000 | 32 | 7,000 |
| 22 | Kern, Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo | 18 | 19,000 | 10 | 10,000 | 28 | 6,000 |
| 23 | San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura | 25 | 39,000 | 7 | 10,000 | 29 | 7,000 |
| 24 | Santa Barbara, Ventura | 24 | 23,000 | 9 | 9,000 | 30 | 6,000 |
| 25 | Inyo, Los Angeles, Mono, San Bernardino | 22 | 23,000 | 11 | 12,000 | 32 | 6,000 |
| 26 | Los Angeles, San Bernardino | 21 | 17,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 25 | 4,000 |
| 27 | Los Angeles | 19 | 26,000 | 5 | 7,000 | 28 | 7,000 |
| 28 | Los Angeles | 20 | 37,000 | 4 | 8,000 | 28 | 7,000 |
| 29 | Los Angeles | 20 | 23,000 | 5 | 6,000 | 30 | 7,000 |
| 30 | Los Angeles | 13 | 11,000 | 7 | 7,000 | 30 | 6,000 |
| 31 | Los Angeles | 30 | 81,000 | 5 | 14,000 | 26 | 11,000 |
| 32 | Los Angeles | 26 | 39,000 | 5 | 8,000 | 25 | 6,000 |
| 33 | Los Angeles | 25 | 44,000 | 7 | 12,000 | 33 | 10,000 |
| 34 | Los Angeles | 29 | 63,000 | 5 | 11,000 | 28 | 9,000 |
| 35 | Los Angeles | 25 | 43,000 | 7 | 11,000 | 33 | 8,000 |
| 36 | Los Angeles | 22 | 27,000 | 6 | 7,000 | 25 | 6,000 |
| 37 | Los Angeles | 22 | 38,000 | 7 | 11,000 | 29 | 7,000 |
| 38 | Los Angeles | 24 | 35,000 | 6 | 8,000 | 26 | 6,000 |
| 39 | Los Angeles | 23 | 34,000 | 6 | 8,000 | 29 | 6,000 |
| 40 | Orange | 19 | 24,000 | 7 | 9,000 | 32 | 7,000 |
| 41 | Riverside, San Bernardino | 21 | 26,000 | 9 | 11,000 | 28 | 7,000 |
| 42 | Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino | 16 | 14,000 | 7 | 6,000 | 26 | 4,000 |
| 43 | San Bernardino | 26 | 42,000 | 5 | 9,000 | 27 | 6,000 |
| 44 | Orange, Riverside | 17 | 21,000 | 10 | 12,000 | 22 | 4,000 |
| 45 | Riverside | 19 | 29,000 | 10 | 15,000 | 22 | 6,000 |
| 46 | Los Angeles, Orange | 16 | 16,000 | 8 | 8,000 | 28 | 6,000 |
| 47 | Orange | 24 | 51,000 | 5 | 10,000 | 31 | 8,000 |
| 48 | Orange | 13 | 12,000 | 8 | 7,000 | 31 | 5,000 |
| 49 | Riverside, San Diego | 18 | 22,000 | 9 | 11,000 | 26 | 5,000 |
| 50 | San Diego | 16 | 16,000 | 6 | 6,000 | 29 | 5,000 |
| 51 | Imperial, San Diego | 19 | 30,000 | 5 | 7,000 | 33 | 8,000 |
| 52 | San Diego | 16 | 15,000 | 7 | 7,000 | 29 | 5,000 |
| 53 | San Diego | 18 | 29,000 | 6 | 9,000 | 30 | 6,000 |

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 Congressional district can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each Congressional district are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

† Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement

| | UNINSURED CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| | Uninsured with Fair or Poor Health Status, All Ages | | Uninsured with Asthma Symptoms, All Ages | | Uninsured with Diagnosed Hypertension, Age 45+ | |
| | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** | Percent* | Number** |
| CALIFORNIA | 22 | 1,465,000 | 7 | 469,000 | 28 | 307,000 |
| Alameda | 27 | 48,000 | 8 | 15,000 | 20 [†] | 7,000 |
| Alpine, Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, Inyo, Mariposa, Mono | 13 | 4,000 | – [†] | – | 32 | 3,000 |
| Butte | 11 | 4,000 | 9 | 3,000 | 33 | 2,000 |
| Colusa, Glenn, Tehama | 25 | 5,000 | 11 | 2,000 | 23 | 1,000 |
| Contra Costa | 14 | 12,000 | 11 | 10,000 | – [†] | – |
| Del Norte, Humboldt | 13 | 3,000 | 11 | 3,000 | 34 | 2,000 |
| El Dorado | 11 | 3,000 | 12 [†] | 3,000 | 41 | 3,000 |
| Fresno | 25 | 43,000 | 14 | 24,000 | 29 | 7,000 |
| Imperial | 21 | 7,000 | 4 [†] | 2,000 | 42 | 2,000 |
| Kern | 23 | 34,000 | 7 | 11,000 | 23 | 5,000 |
| Kings | 27 | 7,000 | 8 | 2,000 | 37 | 1,000 |
| Los Angeles | 24 | 534,000 | 6 | 136,000 | 29 | 103,000 |
| LA SPA Antelope Valley | 25 | 13,000 | 17 | 9,000 | 45 [†] | 4,000 |
| LA SPA East | 25 | 75,000 | 5 | 16,000 | 28 | 13,000 |
| LA SPA Metro | 28 | 124,000 | 6 | 27,000 | 27 | 20,000 |
| LA SPA San Fernando | 19 | 80,000 | 5 | 21,000 | 29 | 21,000 |
| LA SPA San Gabriel | 24 | 74,000 | 6 | 18,000 | 25 | 13,000 |
| LA SPA South | 27 | 77,000 | 6 | 18,000 | 36 | 13,000 |
| LA SPA South Bay | 23 | 75,000 | 6 | 21,000 | 26 | 14,000 |
| LA SPA West | 16 | 16,000 | – [†] | – | 29 | 5,000 |
| Lake, Mendocino | 13 | 4,000 | 9 | 3,000 | 37 | 3,000 |
| Lassen, Modoc, Siskiyou, Trinity | 20 | 3,000 | 7 [†] | 1,000 | 36 | 2,000 |
| Madera | 29 | 9,000 | 5 | 1,000 | 33 | 2,000 |
| Marin | 18 | 5,000 | – [†] | – | 30 [†] | 2,000 |
| Merced | 27 | 12,000 | 9 | 4,000 | 37 | 3,000 |
| Monterey, San Benito | 21 | 23,000 | – [†] | – | 35 | 5,000 |
| Napa | 31 | 6,000 | 17 [†] | 3,000 | 32 [†] | 2,000 |
| Nevada, Plumas, Sierra | – [†] | – | 7 [†] | 1,000 | – [†] | – |
| Orange | 19 | 108,000 | 7 | 37,000 | 31 | 28,000 |
| Placer | 10 [†] | 2,000 | 14 [†] | 3,000 | 36 [†] | 2,000 |
| Riverside | 18 | 62,000 | 10 | 35,000 | 22 | 13,000 |
| Sacramento | 17 | 31,000 | 12 | 22,000 | 25 | 8,000 |
| San Bernardino | 24 | 83,000 | 6 | 22,000 | 28 | 15,000 |
| San Diego | 18 | 96,000 | 6 | 33,000 | 29 | 26,000 |
| San Francisco | 16 | 22,000 | 6 [†] | 9,000 | 29 | 8,000 |
| San Joaquin | 20 | 21,000 | 4 [†] | 4,000 | 18 [†] | 3,000 |
| San Luis Obispo | 14 | 6,000 | 10 | 4,000 | 35 | 3,000 |
| San Mateo | 12 [†] | 8,000 | – [†] | – | – [†] | – |
| Santa Barbara | 23 | 20,000 | 6 [†] | 5,000 | 23 | 3,000 |
| Santa Clara | 23 | 45,000 | 5 [†] | 11,000 | 33 | 11,000 |
| Santa Cruz | 22 | 10,000 | 8 | 4,000 | 15 [†] | 1,000 |
| Shasta | 12 | 3,000 | 10 | 3,000 | 19 [†] | 1,000 |
| Solano | 24 | 9,000 | 13 | 5,000 | 37 | 3,000 |
| Sonoma | 18 | 12,000 | 12 | 8,000 | 18 [†] | 3,000 |
| Stanislaus | 30 | 23,000 | 10 [†] | 8,000 | 39 | 5,000 |
| Sutter/Yuba | 24 | 5,000 | 16 | 3,000 | 30 | 1,000 |
| Tulare | 31 | 29,000 | 8 [†] | 7,000 | 34 | 5,000 |
| Ventura | 28 | 39,000 | 8 [†] | 11,000 | 33 | 9,000 |
| Yolo | 18 | 5,000 | 8 [†] | 2,000 | 27 [†] | 1,000 |

*Exhibit 4:
Chronic Condition Rates Among the Uninsured by County, County-Group and Los Angeles Service Planning Area*
Source: 2001 California Health Interview Survey, 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys, and the 2000 Census.

County, County-Group or Los Angeles Service Planning Area

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 county, county-group or LA SPA can be found at www.healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chronic-conditions.html.

** The numbers of uninsured persons with chronic conditions in each County, County-Group and Los Angeles Service Planning Area are based on 2000 Census data updated by 2002 Department of Finance population projections.

†Relative standard error (RSE) for this estimate exceeds 30%. RSEs above 30% are considered unreliable. Data with RSEs above 40% are not reported.

Data Source and Methods

This policy brief is based on findings from the 2001 California Health Interview Survey (CHIS 2001), 2000-2002 Current Population Surveys (CPS), 2000 Census, 2002 Department of Finance population projections, and the file of legislative districts from the California State Senate Office of Demographics. The estimates of chronic conditions among the uninsured 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.

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 Jhavar, 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 Shana Lavarreda, Nady Pourat, E. Richard Brown and Len Finocchio.

Citation

CA Mendez-Luck, H Yu, YY Meng, M Jhavar and SP Wallace. *Health Status of the Uninsured: Opportunities for Improvement*. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 2005.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, the Regents of the University of California, The California Endowment, or other funding agencies.

PB2004-8

Copyright © 2004 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
Production: Ikkanda Design Group*



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

Funder



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

UCLA Center for Health Policy Research

10911 Weyburn Avenue, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90024

First Class
Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
UCLA