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The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) created a new IRS Code which imposes additional requirements on tax-exempt hospitals. Specifically, hospitals must complete a Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) at least once every three years. The CHNA must include input from persons who represent the broad interest of the community with input from persons having public health knowledge or expertise. They then must make the assessment widely available to the public and adopt a written implementation strategy to address identified community needs.

The Public Health Accreditation Board (PHAB) defines public health accreditation as the development of a set of standards, a process to measure health department performance against those standards, and reward or recognition for those health departments who meet the standards. Accreditation also requires a periodic Community Public Health Needs Assessment.

In June-July, 2013, the St. Luke Hospital & Living Center, the Hillsboro Community Hospital, and the Marion County Health Department co-sponsored the Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) Community Health Needs Assessment. The KRHW program is offered through K-State Research and Extension at Kansas State University. A broadly representative group of eighteen Marion County leaders met over the course of three meetings to identify priorities and devise action strategies. After consideration of a host of information, local health-related priorities were established.

Steering Committee Consensus on Overall Priorities for Marion County

Below are the most important issues identified by the Steering Committee following the prioritization process. Specific action plans were developed to address each as Marion County moves forward to improve the local health-related situation.

Priority #1: Promote health, wellness, and chronic disease prevention.
- Emphasize health education from cradle to grave.
- Focus on education relating to healthy lifestyle behaviors that can be carried throughout life. e.g. hygiene, nutrition, exercise, etc.
- Help adults achieve healthier lifestyle, e.g. weight loss, tobacco cessation, responsible alcohol use.
- Focus on youth through healthy start and youthful family education.
- Increase awareness and use of existing local services and providers thereby reducing health spending leakages.
- Work with existing local institutions, e.g. school district, local governments, etc. to collaborate with health and wellness education.
- Recruit providers across a range of essential basic health care services, including dental and mental health care.
**Priority #2**: Improve communication and collaboration between health care providers, other essential local institutions, between providers and the community, and within the community.

- Enhance communication and collaboration across health service providers to ensure more complete case management.
- Providers planning strategically to support the widest possible spectrum of services for county residents and avoid unnecessary duplication.
- Enhance access to health service providers by ensuring community awareness of locally-available services and access to information/assistance to support appropriate and responsible provider usage.
- Support options for access to care for the medically underserved through a collaborative initiative that considers potential access needs and solutions in a dynamic health care environment.

**Priority #3**: Enhance access to health resources and assistance for all county citizens.

- Transportation needs to be accessible, affordable, and meet the needs of residents who currently find transportation a challenge.
- Consider the needs of the elderly who need transportation for regular treatment both within the county and across county lines.
- Improve awareness of existing county-based services and providers among providers as well as the community at large.
- Ensure that all eligible citizens in need of assistance are able to access appropriate resources.
- Create a comprehensive and dynamic information portal to enhance and promote access to information resources the foster health and wellness and prevent chronic conditions.
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The contents of this file document participation, discussion and information resources developed through the course of the Marion County Community Health Needs Assessment. These documents and resources were compiled with the assistance of the Office of Local Government located in the Department of Agricultural Economics at Kansas State University. The process used to compile information, establish health-related priorities, and develop action plans employed the Kansas Rural Health Works Community Engagement Process.

The Community Engagement Process provides a way in which community members can evaluate their health care system through the analysis of information reports. The process is community-driven with input from health care providers. It helps the community identify, brainstorm, and solve problems related to local health care. As a result, the process leads to the identification of priority local health-related issues and mobilizes the community to improve the relative situation. A major element of the program was the development of action plans to address priority issues.

The full Community Engagement Process consists of a series of three public meetings over three weeks. The geographic scope of the program typically reflects the extent of the local hospital's market area identified based on the residential zip codes of inpatients from the previous calendar year.

A broad-based community Steering Committee is formed to analyze the information resources included in this packet to determine relevant issues and propose an action plan to improve local circumstances. The Steering Committee then presents their action plan to the community for review and possible implementation.

What follows are the work products developed by the Steering Committee through the course of the program. The Priorities and Action Plans records participants' thoughts and concerns about local issues and unmet needs. In the first meeting, participants identify all of their thoughts and ideas. Broader themes are identified and validated by the Steering Committee to begin building consensus about priorities in the second meeting. Finally, the Steering Committee develops action plans in response to the priority issues during the final meeting. The priorities identified and the action plans developed leads this compilation of information resources. The full Meeting Schedule follows this introduction.

Examining the composition of the Meeting Participants reveals that a priority of the program is to solicit input from a broad cross section of the community, not simply members of the local healthcare sector. The meeting participants refine their ideas about the local priorities going forward through the development of a variety of local information resources that follow.

The Community Identification page documents determinants of the geographic scope of the program.
The **Economic Contribution** report illustrates the relative importance of the health care sector to rural community economic viability. The estimates contained therein typically include a complete local census of current health care employment in the market area. Health care will generally be found to be among the top contributors to local economic wellbeing in most rural areas.

The **Data and Information** reports compile a wide variety of published data to show the current situation and trends affecting the local health-related situation. Data reflect conditions related to demographic, economic, social and behavioral, education, traffic, crime, and public health trends. These data represent objective indicators to help validate perceptions of the local situation. Further, these data have continuing utility to various local institutions seeking grants and funding support to work on local problems.

The **Community Survey** presents an effort to solicit input from the broader community. While the initiative is informal and non-representative, it does contribute considerable input from the broader community. The survey inquires about respondent’s perceptions related to the most important local health concerns and their general satisfaction with various community attributes. At the end, an open-ended question queries respondents' views about local health-related issues and concerns.

The health **Asset Inventory** represents a comprehensive listing of local health providers and services. The broad distribution of the directory helps ensure that community members are aware of full extent of locally-available services. Further, it can help to identify any gaps that may exist in the current local inventory of health services and providers.

The **Presentations** display the information considered during the course of the health needs assessment, and describes the processes used to reach consensus and develop action plans.

Finally, the **CHNA Requirements** summarize the Affordable Care Act's requirements for affected hospitals and the requirements for health department accreditation. The **IRS Reporting** section details what information the hospital should provide to the IRS.

All of the information presented here is available for public access at the **Kansas Rural Health Works Website: www.krhw.net**. Local health care institutions are welcome to disseminate these information resources freely provided they are in their full and unaltered form.

Taken as a whole, the Community Engagement Process and these information resources fulfill most requirements for the community health needs assessment requirements for tax-exempt hospitals. The final requirement is that the governing board of the hospital or its designee must then formally declare its own strategic action priorities for the three-year period going forward until a new periodic review of community health-related needs is again required.

Questions about the Rural Health Works program can be directed to John Leatherman, Office of Local Government, Department of Agricultural Economics, K-State Research and Extension. Phone: 785-532-2643/4492; E-mail: jleather@k-state.edu. The Kansas Rural Health Works Website can be found at: www.krhw.net.
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Meeting Schedule

Meeting 1: Local Data
Tuesday, June 25th, 2013
11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. Lunch service begins at 11:15 a.m.
The Marion Family Physicians Clinic basement, 537 S Freeborn, Marion

11:30 a.m. Introduction and Purpose
11:40 a.m. Economic Contribution Report
11:55 a.m. Preliminary Needs Identification
  • Issue Identification Cards
  • Discussion
12:15 p.m. Secondary Data Reports
12:35 p.m. Group Discussion
12:45 p.m. Community Survey
  • Discussion
1:00 p.m. Local Health Services Directory
1:05 p.m. Preparation for Prioritization
1:15 p.m. Discussion
1:30 p.m. Adjourn

Meeting 2: Issue Prioritization
Thursday, July 2nd, 2013
11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. Lunch begins at 11:15 a.m.
Hillsboro Community Hospital, 701 S. Main, Hillsboro

11:30 a.m. Introduction and Review
11:40 a.m. Review of Data
11:45 a.m. Service Gap Analysis
11:50 a.m. Survey Results
12:00 p.m. Focus group formation and instruction
12:15 p.m. Focus Group Discussion
12:45 p.m. Group Summaries
1:00 p.m. Prioritization
1:20 p.m. Action Committee Formation
1:25 p.m. Committee Charge
1:30 p.m. Adjourn

Meeting 3: Action Planning
Thursday, July 9th, 2013
11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m. Lunch begins at 11:15 a.m.
The Marion Family Physicians Clinic basement, 537 S Freeborn, Marion

11:30 a.m. Introduction and Review
11:40 a.m. Action Planning
  • Objectives and Input
  • Instruction
  • Organization
12:00 p.m. Action Planning Workgroups Begin
1:00 p.m. Review and Commitments
1:10 p.m. Organization and Next Steps
1:20 p.m. Summary
1:25 p.m. Program Evaluation
1:30 p.m. Adjourn
Marion County

Community Health Priorities
Action Plans and
Issue Identification
Identification of Marion County Health Needs and Priorities

The purpose of the second meeting of the Kansas Rural Health Works Community Health Needs Assessment is to identify the overall health-related priorities that would be the focus of future efforts to improve the community health environment. Following a review of the community secondary data, health services directory, and community survey results, Steering Committee participants form small groups for the purpose of discussing local health related needs and issues.

To facilitate the discussion, the groups are asked to consider the following questions:

- **What is your vision for a healthy community?**
- **What are the top 3-4 things that need to happen to achieve your vision?**
  - What’s right? What could be better?
  - Consider acute needs and chronic conditions
  - Discrete local issues, not global concerns
  - Consider the possible, within local control and resources, something to rally the community
- **What can the hospital do to help?**
- **What can the health department do to help?**

Each group comes to a consensus regarding the top two-four health-related issues they recommend as the focus to the overall Steering Committee. After each group reports, an effort is made to identify the top two-four issues across all of the groups. These, then, become the focus for action planning going forward. Below are the most important issues identified by the Steering Committee following the prioritization process. On the pages that follow are the notes taken by Steering Committee members participating in the small group discussions leading to the overall prioritization.

**Steering Committee Consensus on Overall Priorities for Marion County**

**Priority #1: Promote health, wellness, and chronic disease prevention.**

- Emphasize health education from cradle to grave.
- Focus on education relating to healthy lifestyle behaviors that can be carried throughout life. e.g. hygiene, nutrition, exercise, etc.
- Help adults achieve healthier lifestyle, e.g. weight loss, tobacco cessation, responsible alcohol use.
- Focus on youth through healthy start and youthful family education.
- Increase awareness and use of existing local services and providers thereby reducing health spending leakages.
- Work with existing local institutions, e.g. school district, local governments, etc. to collaborate with health and wellness education.
- Recruit providers across a range of essential basic health care services, including dental and mental health care.
**Priority #2:** Improve communication and collaboration between health care providers, other essential local institutions, between providers and the community, and within the community.

- Enhance communication and collaboration across health service providers to ensure more complete case management.
- Providers planning strategically to support the widest possible spectrum of services for county residents and avoid unnecessary duplication.
- Enhance access to health service providers by ensuring community awareness of locally-available services and access to information/assistance to support appropriate and responsible provider usage.
- Support options for access to care for the medically underserved through a collaborative initiative that considers potential access needs and solutions in a dynamic health care environment.

**Priority #3:** Enhance access to health resources and assistance for all county citizens.

- Transportation needs to be accessible, affordable, and meet the needs of residents who currently find transportation a challenge.
- Consider the needs of the elderly who need transportation for regular treatment both within the county and across county lines.
- Improve awareness of existing county-based services and providers among providers as well as the community at large.
- Ensure that all eligible citizens in need of assistance are able to access appropriate resources.
- Create a comprehensive and dynamic information portal to enhance and promote access to information resources the foster health and wellness and prevent chronic conditions.
Focus Group 1 Discussion
July 2, 2013

Discussion Questions

What is your vision for a healthy community?
- What's right?
- What could be better
- Consider acute needs and chronic conditions
- Discrete local issues, not global concerns
- Consider the possible, within local control and resources, something to rally the community

What can the hospital do to help?
What can the health department do to help?

Response

What is the vision?
All citizens will have access to health care.
Health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.
Education of the public and providers.
A communication network between providers and local government institutions.
Providing affordable and timely health care that promotes the health and wellness of county citizens.
All citizens will have access to adequate health care and will be knowledgeable about health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.
Accessible and affordable health care for all county residents.

What are 3-4 things to achieve?
A centralized portal for information access.
Increase awareness of the range of existing services.
Raising awareness for community health related challenges and needs through meetings and displays.
Identifying and projecting county health related needs and developing proactive plans and strategies to respond to those needs.
Educate the public about the need to support and sustain local providers to avoid potentially loosing them.
Collaboration between major health service providers.
Increase public awareness of the range of existing local services.
Find creative ways to expand access to services and assistance.
Identify alternative sources of funding and financial support for health promotion.
Expand educational programming focusing on local health-related needs.
Accessing funding resources to support local health-related initiatives.  
Provide transportation assistance to those who face transportation challenges.  
Enhance assess through expanded hours, services and alternative service provision.

**What can the hospital do to help?**
- Increase awareness of the availability of services and specialized treatment.
- Become an active participant in community groups that promote health, wellness, and community sustainability.
- Sponsor and organize public meetings and events to enhance awareness of health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.
- Work collaboratively with other providers to enhance the continuity of care for county citizens.
- Build collaborative relationships with other providers and local institutions.
- Promote and provide educational programming focusing on local health care needs.
- Open training programs to expand access to information and education.
- Organize an expansive annual county health fair.
- Promote health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.

**What can the health department do to help?**
- Initial screening for appropriate referral.
- Emphasize prevention programs and initiatives.
- Increase accessibility of services.
- Become an active participant in community groups that promote health, wellness, and community sustainability.
- Sponsor and organize public meetings and events to enhance awareness of health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.
- Work collaboratively with other providers to enhance the continuity of care for county citizens.
- Build collaborative relationships with other providers and local institutions.
- Enhancing wages for nursing positions.
Focus Group 2 Discussion
July 2, 2013

Discussion Questions

What is your vision for a healthy community?

- What's right?
- What could be better
- Consider acute needs and chronic conditions
- Discrete local issues, not global concerns
- Consider the possible, within local control and resources, something to rally the community

What can the hospital do to help?
What can the health department do to help?

Response

What is the vision?

Accessible and affordable health care for all citizens.
Enhance general awareness of existing local health providers and services.
Local people working collaboratively to create sustainable and responsive strategies to promote health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.

What are 3-4 things to achieve?

Enhanced collaboration between county health care providers.
Greater emphasis on public education related to health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.
Enhance access to services by those with limited resources.
Collaboration between the hospitals and other health care providers.
Enhance marketing and educational programming.
Collaborative efforts to promote health, wellness and chronic disease prevention.
Programs to encourage and enhance fitness.
Focus efforts targeting young people to encourage active, healthy lifestyles.
Promote nutrition and activity to enhance fitness.
Increase awareness and knowledge of existing local services.
Create a group/organizational initiative to sustain collaborative efforts to promote and foster health, wellness, and chronic disease prevention.
What can the hospital do to help?
   Pursue active collaboration between health service providers.
   Lead and support public education initiatives.

What can the health department do to help?
   Pursue active collaboration between health service providers.
   Lead and support public education initiatives.
Marion County Community Health Action Plans

The final step in the Rural Health Works Community Health Needs Assessment is to devise action plans to guide future implementation efforts. A primary emphasis of the program is to devise specific, action-oriented plans so the momentum of the community health initiative is not lost following the needs assessment.

To accomplish this, Steering Committee members break into work groups to focus on a specific priority. Their effort is to apply elements of the Logic Model planning process to craft action strategies. Following are the questions workgroup participants considered in drafting action plans. Given time constraints within the formal program setting, the resulting action plans are currently in draft form. It's recognized that crafting a detailed and effective action plan requires time and ongoing commitment. Program participants now have a template and a start in their efforts to create a road map guiding their way forward.

Community Health Planning Process

Getting Started
To start, we need to articulate the change we would like to see take place. To do so, we need to recognize the existing situation we believe can be improved. Consideration of the many data and information resources generated through the program can bolster the case for needed action. We can't accomplish everything at once, so we need a sense of priority about what we should do now rather than later. Finally, we need to articulate the goal or intended outcome we would like to see achieved.

- What's the Situation you'd like to see changed? What are the needs or problems to be addressed?
- What should the Priorities for attention, effort, and investment be? What are the most important things that need to be done to address the situation?
- What are the Intended Outcomes you'd like to see achieved? What will be the situation or condition when the goal has been achieved?

Filling in the Plan
- Now that we've established what we would like to achieve, we need to figure out how to do it. We can create an effective action plan by carefully considering what resources we need to invest into the effort, what activities we need to do to make progress, who we need to reach and involve, identify the milestones we'll need to see in order to know we're making progress, and, finally, the ultimate impact we would like to see achieved.
- What Resources are needed to take action? Who's available to work on the problem? How much time will it take? Is money or other resources needed? Who can we partner with to make progress?
- What Activities need to take place? Do we need to conduct regular meetings? Do we need to have special public meetings or events? Do products or information resources need to be developed? How should the media be involved? How do we foster needed partnerships and alliances?
- Who needs to **Participate** in order to make progress? Who are we trying to reach and influence? Who are the targets of our effort? Who needs to be involved?
- What are the **Short-Term Results** (6-12 months) you'd like to see? What would we like people to learn? What are the changes in awareness, knowledge, attitudes, or skills we'd like to see people exhibit? How will we measure this?
- What are the **Intermediate-Term Results** (1-2-3 years) you'd like to see? What are the behaviors, actions, decisions, or policies we'd like to see in place? How will we measure this?
- What is the desired **Ultimate Impact** (long-term) on the community? What are the social, economic, or other conditions we'd like to see in place in order to effect the kind of change the would be desired? How will we measure this?
Marion County Community Health Needs Assessment Action Planning
July 9, 2013

Priority #1: Promote health, wellness, and chronic disease prevention.
- Emphasize health education from cradle to grave.
- Focus on education relating to healthy lifestyle behaviors that can be carried throughout life. e.g. hygiene, nutrition, exercise, etc.
- Help adults achieve healthier lifestyle, e.g. weight loss, tobacco cessation, responsible alcohol use.
- Focus on youth through healthy start and youthful family education.
- Increase awareness and use of existing local services and providers thereby reducing health spending leakages.
- Work with existing local institutions, e.g. school district, local governments, etc. to collaborate with health and wellness education.
- Recruit providers across a range of essential basic health care services, including dental and mental health care.

Action Committee Members

Diedra Serene, RN, BSN, Administration; Marion County Health Department; Marion County; dserene@marioncoks.net; 620-382-2550 to coordinate county coalition efforts.

Action Plan

Getting Started
Situation
- Need for greater emphasis on public education about numerous health-related issues and the promotion of healthy lifestyle choices for people of all ages.

Priorities
- Identify what currently is being done and determine how to collaborate and coordinate efforts to bolster their success.
- Enhance communication between various entities to avoid duplication of services and efforts.
- Establish new preventative services to address unhealthy behaviors that need improvement among county citizens.

Intended Outcomes
- Eliminate duplication of services and efforts.
- Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of current programs and services.
- Decrease Marion County's percentage/rates of unhealthy behaviors and activities.
Filling in the Plan

Resources
- Individuals who are knowledgeable about existing services and initiatives ongoing in the county.
- Media cooperation.
- Money and resources for promotion of activities.
- Commitment of time by individuals to help with the initiative.

Activities
- Inventory prevention services and assistance programs.
- Recruit providers to cooperate and collaborate with coordination initiative.
- Create communication strategy/mechanisms to deliver information to community residents.

Participate
- Health services agencies, schools, police, all fire departments, insurance agencies, businesses, restaurants, grocery stores, banks, city offices, libraries, etc.

Short-term Results
- Formulate a plan and begin meeting.
- Identify what programs currently exist.
- Formulate strategies for improvement of efforts.
- Publicize availability of program and assistance.
- Increase participation in programs.
- Provider buy-in to investing time.
- Foster an attitude and culture to encourage life-long change in lifestyles and behaviors.

Intermediate-term Results
- Incidence of chronic disease (diabetes, hypertension, obesity) reduced.
- Immunization rates increase.
- Physical activity levels increase.
- Metrics to monitor are Marion County health data.

Long-term Results
- Healthier community overall.
- Decreased mortality rates; reduce health costs.
- Increased availability and decrease cost of healthy foods.
Marion County Community Health Needs Assessment Action Planning
July 9, 2013

Priority #2: Improve communication and collaboration between health care providers, other essential local institutions, between providers and the community, and within the community.

- Enhance communication and collaboration across health service providers to ensure more complete case management.
- Providers planning strategically to support the widest possible spectrum of services for county residents and avoid unnecessary duplication.
- Enhance access to health service providers by ensuring community awareness of locally-available services and access to information/assistance to support appropriate and responsible provider usage.
- Support options for access to care for the medically underserved through a collaborative initiative that considers potential access needs and solutions in a dynamic health care environment.

Action Committee Members

Diedra Serene, RN, BSN, Administration; Marion County Health Department; Marion County; dserene@marioncoks.net; 620-382-2550 to coordinate county coalition efforts.
Roger Holter, Director of Economic Development; City of Marion; roger@marionks.net; 620-382-3703.
Steven L. Smith, Director; Marion County EMS; Marion County; amb@marioncoks.net.
Sarah Gill, Bookkeeper/Office Manager; Marion County Health Department; sgill@marioncoks.net; 620-382-2550.
Cindy Reeh, Immunization/Investigation Nurse; Marion County Health Department; creeh@marioncoks.net.
Lori Soo Hoo, Coordinator/Educator; Marion County Parents as Teachers; Marion County; lori.soohoo@usd410.net.

Action Plan

Getting Started

Situation
- Improve communication and collaboration between health care providers, other essential local institutions, between providers and the community, and within the community.

Priorities
- Gain cooperation of health care providers for collaboration of resources and programs.
- Establish an annual calendar designating each month to highlight a specific program or service, e.g. January – dental.
- Use the local media to educate the public about services and events. Use local television, Websites, Facebook, text messaging, blogs, e-mail, and newspapers.

Intended Outcomes
- Bringing health care providers to pull together as a coordinated and unified effort, and eliminate turf-consciousness and competition between them.

Filling in the Plan

Resources
- Create a 501(c)3 organization for the purpose of soliciting grants and conducting fund raisers.
- Each provider contributing time, talent, financial resources, etc.
- Belief in the value and benefits of a collaborative approach.

Activities
- Monthly or quarterly meetings to share information, plans, and to keep the momentum going.

Participate
- All local health care providers.
- Local groups.
- City staff.
- Local businesses.
- Schools and the local college.
- Financial institutions.
- The general public.

Short-term Results
- A coalition of providers forms the group to start the program information deposition (Website).
- An inter-county referral system is established.

Intermediate-term Results
- An educational calendar is created and used by providers.
- County hospitals are coordinating services to minimize duplication and expand overall service provision.
- The Website is being used and updated.

Ultimate Impact
- The communities are using the available resources in the county.
- More services are available to keep health care spending in the county.
- The county health care system is working together in a collaborative and coordinated manner.
Marion County Community Health Needs Assessment Action Planning
July 9, 2013

Priority #3: Enhance access to health resources and assistance for all county citizens.

- Transportation needs to be accessible, affordable, and meet the needs of residents who currently find transportation a challenge.
- Consider the needs of the elderly who need transportation for regular treatment both within the county and across county lines.
- Improve awareness of existing county-based services and providers among providers as well as the community at large.
- Ensure that all eligible citizens in need of assistance are able to access appropriate resources.
- Create a comprehensive and dynamic information portal to enhance and promote access to information resources the foster health and wellness and prevent chronic conditions.

Action Committee Members

Roger Holter, Director of Economic Development; City of Marion; roger@marionks.net; 620-382-3703 to coordinate county coalition efforts.

Action Plan

Getting Started

Situation
- Enhance access to health resources and assistance focusing on needed transportation.

Priorities
- Develop a plan to ensure access to transportation assistance for all county residents.
- Recruit and coordinate county entities who have vans or vehicles to provide transportation, including Bethesda, Salem Home, Marion Assisted Living, St. Luke Living Center, Parkside, Department on Aging, churches.
- Establish a central place to receive requests and coordinate transportation assistance.
- Improve awareness of existing local resources and assistance.
- Ensure information and access to available assistance and resources from state and federal sources, and provide assistance in making application.
Intended Outcomes
- All county residents will have the ability to get to health provider appointments and access financial assistance and resources to seek preventive care.

Filling in the Plan

Resources
- Inventory existing public and private transportation assistance.
- Secure financial sponsorships.
- Secure IT capacity for dispatching service.
- Recruit an organization to provide leadership and coordination for transportation.
- Identify potential resource center to provide information and application assistance for people eligible and in need of assistance.

Activities
- Identify what types of transportation assistance is currently available.
- Bring entities together to evaluate the feasibility and interest in a collaborative initiative.
- Determine what type a financial or other assistance is available for KDOT and other state and federal assistance providers.
- Recruit local, regional, and state resource provider involvement.
- Establish a schedule of semi-annual provider meetings to share information and learn about available services, resources and assistance.

Participate
- Leadership by major health care providers, county health department, and the Department for Aging and Disability Services.
- Service recipients – elderly and low income.
- Groups to provide volunteer assistance.
- At least one location in each community where people can go to obtain applications for assistance and help completing them.
- Involvement from the hospitals, Ministerial Alliance, schools, county EMS, etc.

Short-term Results
- Provider buy in – measured by commitment.
- Establish meetings to set priorities – measured by scheduling.
- Sponsors secured – measured by commitments.
- Plans solidified and finalized – measured by a written and approved document.
Intermediate-term Results
- Continuing provider meetings – measured by regular attendance.
- Establish a call-in/dispatch center – measured by having a working center in place.
- A resource person in every community to provide information and assistance with applications – measured by an increase in the number of people receiving assistance.

Ultimate Impact
- Increased access to health services, including preventive and tertiary, by all county residents as evidenced by community surveys showing higher levels of local satisfaction, improving health indicators, and increased local provider usage.
Kansas Rural Health Works
Action Planning Worksheet

This worksheet is intended to help Rural Health Works program participants build an effective action plan for improving conditions in the community.

Getting Started
To start, we need to articulate the change we would like to see take place. To do so, we need to recognize the existing situation we believe can be improved. Consideration of the many data and information resources generated through the program can bolster the case for needed action. We can't accomplish everything at once, so we need a sense of priority about what we should do now rather than later. Finally, we need to articulate the goal or intended outcome we would like to see achieved.

What's the Situation you'd like to see changed? What are the needs or problems to be addressed?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

What should the Priorities for attention, effort, and investment be? What are the most important things that need to be done to address the situation?

1st: _________________________________________________________________________
2nd: ________________________________________________________________________
3rd: ________________________________________________________________________

What are the Intended Outcomes you'd like to see achieved? What will be the situation or condition when the goal has been achieved?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Filling in the Plan
Now that we've established what we would like to achieve, we need to figure out how to do it. We can create an effective action plan by carefully considering what resources we need to invest into the effort, what activities we need to do to make progress, who we need to reach and involve, identify the milestones we'll need to see in order to know we're making progress, and, finally, the ultimate impact we would like to see achieved.
What **Resources** are needed to take action? Who's available to work on the problem? How much time will it take? Is money or other resources needed? Who can we partner with to make progress?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

What **Activities** need to take place? Do we need to conduct regular meetings? Do we need to have special public meetings or events? Do products or information resources need to be developed? How should the media be involved? How do we foster needed partnerships and alliances?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

Who needs to **Participate** in order to make progress? Who are we trying to reach and influence? Who are the targets of our effort? Who needs to be involved?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

What are the **Short-Term Results** (6-12 months) you'd like to see? What would we like people to learn? What are the changes in awareness, knowledge, attitudes, or skills we'd like to see people exhibit? How will we measure this?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

What are the **Intermediate-Term Results** (1-2-3 years) you'd like to see? What are the behaviors, actions, decisions, or policies we'd like to see in place? How will we measure this?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

What is the desired **Ultimate Impact** (long-term) on the community? What are the social, economic, or other conditions we'd like to see in place in order to effect the kind of change the would be desired? How will we measure this?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________
## Marion County Rural Health Works Program
### Steering Committee Participants
#### 25-Jun-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Schroeder</td>
<td>Marketing Director</td>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org">jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Ensey</td>
<td>Chief Nursing Officer</td>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org">jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven L. Smith</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Marion County EMS</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amb@marioncoks.net">amb@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayla Ratzlaff</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Marion County Department on Aging</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aging@marioncoks.net">aging@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gill</td>
<td>Bookkeeper/Office Manager</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgill@marioncoks.net">sgill@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Mayfield</td>
<td>Healthy Start Home Visitor</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smayfield@marioncoks.net">smayfield@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Haslett</td>
<td>P.E./Health Teacher</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeff.haslett@usd410.net">jeff.haslett@usd410.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Johnson</td>
<td>RT &amp; RM</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjohnson@hchks.com">kjohnson@hchks.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Huffman</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Marion County Economic Development</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thuffman@marioncoks.net">thuffman@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-8830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Ogden</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Circles of Marion County</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linda.ogden702@gmail.com">linda.ogden702@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diedre Serene</td>
<td>RN, BSN, Administration</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dserene@marioncoks.net">dserene@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Reeh</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dreeh@mooemail.com">dreeh@mooemail.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diedre Serene</td>
<td>RN, BSN, Administration</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dserene@marioncoks.net">dserene@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Reeh</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Independent Practice</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:creeh@marioncoks.net">creeh@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Holub</td>
<td>County Commissioner</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan-navord@hotmail.com">dan-navord@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>620-381-1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Regier</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mregier@hchks.com">mregier@hchks.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Holter</td>
<td>Director of Economic Developer</td>
<td>City of Marion</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roger@marioncoks.net">roger@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-3703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth C. Johnson</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjohnson@hchks.com">kjohnson@hchks.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayla Ratzlaff</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Marion County Department on Aging</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aging@marioncoks.net">aging@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Ensey</td>
<td>Chief Nursing Officer</td>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org">jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Soo Hoo</td>
<td>Coordinator/Educator</td>
<td>Marion County Parents as Teachers</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lori.soooho@usd410.net">lori.soooho@usd410.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Steering Committee Participants
#### 2-Jul-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gill</td>
<td>Bookkeeper/Office Manager</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgill@marioncoks.net">sgill@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Mayfield</td>
<td>Healthy Start Home Visitor</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smayfield@marioncoks.net">smayfield@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Reeh</td>
<td>Immunization/Investigation Nurse</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:creeh@marioncoks.net">creeh@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Boaldin</td>
<td>CNO</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gboaldin@hchks.com">gboaldin@hchks.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diedre Serene</td>
<td>RN, BSN, Administration</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dserene@marioncoks.net">dserene@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Reeh</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Independent Practice</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drreeh@mooemail.com">drreeh@mooemail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Holub</td>
<td>County Commissioner</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan-navord@hotmail.com">dan-navord@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>620-381-1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Regier</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mregier@hchks.com">mregier@hchks.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Holter</td>
<td>Director of Economic Developer</td>
<td>City of Marion</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roger@marioncoks.net">roger@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-3703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth C. Johnson</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjohnson@hchks.com">kjohnson@hchks.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayla Ratzlaff</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Marion County Department on Aging</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aging@marioncoks.net">aging@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Ensey</td>
<td>Chief Nursing Officer</td>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org">jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Soo Hoo</td>
<td>Coordinator/Educator</td>
<td>Marion County Parents as Teachers</td>
<td>Marion County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lori.soooho@usd410.net">lori.soooho@usd410.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Steering Committee Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Gill</td>
<td>Bookkeeper/Office Manager</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgill@marioncoks.net">sgill@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Reeh</td>
<td>Immunization/Investigation Nurse</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:creeh@marioncoks.net">creeh@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-3703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Holter</td>
<td>Director of Economic Development</td>
<td>City of Marion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roger@marionks.net">roger@marionks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Mayfield</td>
<td>Healthy Start Home Visitor</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smayfield@marioncoks.net">smayfield@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Soo Hoo</td>
<td>Coordinator/Educator</td>
<td>Marion County Parents as Teachers</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lori.soo@usd410.net">lori.soo@usd410.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Schroeder</td>
<td>Marketing Director</td>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roger@marionks.net">roger@marionks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Ensey</td>
<td>Chief Nursing Officer</td>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org">jeremy.ensey@slhmarion.org</a></td>
<td>620-382-2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diedre Serene</td>
<td>RN, BSN, Administration</td>
<td>Marion County Health Department</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dserene@marioncoks.net">dserene@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td>620-382-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth C. Johnson</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kjohnson@hchks.com">kjohnson@hchks.com</a></td>
<td>620-947-1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven L. Smith</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Marion County EMS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amb@marioncoks.net">amb@marioncoks.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basis for the Organization of the Marion County Community Health Needs Assessment

### Hillsboro Community Hospital Share of Inpatient Discharges from Marion County Zip Code, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital - KS</td>
<td>67063</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital - KS</td>
<td>66861</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Community Hospital - KS</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marion County Share: 100.0%
Marion County Share: 86.2%

### Saint Luke Hospital & Living Center Share of Inpatient Discharges from Marion County Zip Code, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Luke Hospital &amp; Living Center - KS</td>
<td>66861</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Luke Hospital &amp; Living Center - KS</td>
<td>66866</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Luke Hospital &amp; Living Center - KS</td>
<td>66851</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Luke Hospital &amp; Living Center - KS</td>
<td>67063</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Luke Hospital &amp; Living Center - KS</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marion County Share: 100.0%
Marion County Share: 86.1%
Marion County CHNA Steering Committee
Preliminary Community Health Issues List
6/25/2013

Collective Themes

1. Promotion of health and wellness; chronic disease prevention.
2. Recruitment and retention of primary and specialty services and providers.
3. Providing transportation assistance for those finding transportation a challenge.
4. Accessibility and affordability of health care services for all, but especially the elderly and those with limited financial resources.
5. Need for improved communication, coordination and collaboration between county health care providers and between providers and the community.
6. Concern over the long-term sustainability of the local health care system in the face of economic and demographic trends and an environment of health system reform.

Responses

What are the major health-related concerns in Marion County?

1. Providing specialty care for the elderly and reducing the need for out-of-county transportation.
2. Availability of specialty services and providers.
3. Larger regional hospitals fostering health spending leakages from the county.
4. The long-term viability of rural health care providers.
5. Providing timely and quality urgent and emergency services throughout the county.
6. Cost of health care services.
7. Cost of insurance coverage.
8. The dearth of health services within the county.
9. Transportation needs and challenges.
10. Educating the public about health-related issues and life choices.
11. Inappropriate and inefficient use of the health care system resulting in increased health care cost.
12. Recruiting and retaining primary and specialty providers.
13. Transportation challenges for many residents.
14. Home-based health services available throughout the county.
15. Low rates of immunization.
16. Accessing health care by those of limited resources.
17. Transportation challenges.
18. Sustaining and enhancing existing hospitals and providers to provide locally-accessible services.
19. Recruiting and retaining primary and specialty providers.
20. Poor immunization rates and the number of provider providing immunization services.
21. Medicare reform and accessing preventative services.
22. Sustaining existing providers.
23. Geographic population distribution.
24. Transportation challenges for many county residents.

What needs to be done to improve the local healthcare system?

1. Improve community awareness of existing county health services and providers.
2. Enhance ability to attract and retain specialty services and providers.
3. Increase public awareness of existing county services and providers.
4. Accessing financial resources needed to keep up with state-of-the-art treatment technologies.
5. Develop and long-range and coordinated plan to provide for the full range of county health care needs.
7. Enhance communication and collaboration between providers and with the community.
8. Increase priority and dedicate more resources to health-related needs.
9. Enhancing health and wellness, and chronic disease prevention.
10. Greater emphasis on health, wellness, and chronic disease prevention education.
11. Enhance public understanding and support for county providers and the local health care system.
12. Increase access to immunization services.
13. Improve coordination and cooperation between communities and providers throughout the county.

What should be the over-arching health care goals of the community?

1. All county residents accessing needed health care.
2. To provide accessible and affordable care for all county residents.
3. Improve collaboration across the county to enhance the overall health care system.
4. To provide quality health care for people of all ages in Marion County.
5. Promoting life-long health and wellness.
6. Provide accessible, quality health care for all county residents.
7. To sustain a quality health care system over the long-term in Marion County.
8. Enhance quality and efficiency of the county health care system through coordination and collaboration.

What are the greatest barriers to achieving health care goals?

1. Declining population trends.
2. Financial constraints.
3. Financial resources.
4. Recruiting and retaining specialty services and providers.
5. The geographic distribution of the county's population.
6. The cost of health services for people of limited resources.
7. Transportation challenges, especially for families and the elderly.
9. Lack of capacity, priority, and resources to promote health and wellness.
10. Transportation challenges.
11. The lack of educational emphasis targeting both patients and providers.
13. Fragmentation of services and providers.
14. Transportation challenges for many.
15. Population out-migration and the aging of the local population.
16. The stigma of mental health assistance.
17. Unhealthy choices and lifestyles.
18. The number of households with limited resources.
The Importance of the Health Care Sector to the Economy of Marion County

Kansas Rural Health Options Project
December 2010
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The Economics of Rural Health Care

The organization and delivery of health care services have undergone rapid evolution in recent years. For many Americans, the cost of services and access to care are important issues. This certainly is true in many rural areas where communities have struggled to maintain affordable, quality health care systems. As economic forces and technical advances continue to change health care, it is more important than ever for rural community leaders and health care providers to work together to ensure affordable, sustainable health care systems.

In an effort to provide useful information resources to rural community and health care leaders, the Kansas Rural Health Options Project (KRHOP) has teamed with the Office of Local Government, a unit of the Department of Agricultural Economics and K-State Research and Extension, to develop this report as a component of the Kansas Rural Health Works program. KRHOP is a partnership of the Office of Local and Rural Health at the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, the Kansas Hospital Association, the Kansas Board of Emergency Medical Services and the Kansas Medical Society. KRHOP is dedicated to assuring quality health care delivery in rural Kansas through the promotion of collaborative systems of care. Kansas Rural Health Works is supported by a federal grant to KRHOP (No. 5 H54 RH 00009-03) from the Health Resources and Services Administration, Office of Rural Health Policy.

The purpose of this report is to provide information resources that may be used to communicate to community leaders and concerned citizens the relative importance of health care to the local economy.

Much of this information draws on the national Rural Health Works program sponsored by the Office of Rural Health Policy, an initiative led by Cooperative Extension Service specialists at Oklahoma State University. Many persons knowledgeable about the Kansas health care system also contributed to this report, including specialists at the Kansas Hospital Association, the Office of Local and Rural Health, and hospital administrators from across the state who cooperated in the development of these resources.

The Office of Local Government welcomes any questions, comments or suggestions about this report or any of their other services. Contact your county Extension office or:

Dr. John Leatherman  
Office of Local Government  Phone: 785-532-2643  
Department of Agricultural Economics  10E Umberger Hall  
K-State Research and Extension  Fax: 785-532-3093  
Manhattan, KS 66506-3415  E-mail: jleather@ksu.edu
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The Economic Contribution of the Health Care Sector  
In Marion County, Kansas

Introduction

The rapidly changing delivery of health services in rural counties has the potential to greatly impact the availability of health care services in the future. These changes include:

- Insufficient Medicare and Medicaid payments to hospitals and providers may force a reduction in the provision of health care services.
- Although Kansas rural health networks are already fairly strong, creation of provider networks may substantially change the delivery of, and access to, local health care services.
- Use of telemedicine could increase access to primary, consultative and specialty health care services at the county level.
- Development of critical access hospitals could help health care services remain in rural counties. Kansas currently has over 80 critical access hospitals.

As a result, the health care sector can have a large impact on the local economy. All of these changes make it imperative that decision makers in Marion County become proactive in maintaining high quality local health care services.

Health care facilities such as hospitals and nursing homes provide jobs and income to people in the community. As these employees spend their income in the community, a ripple spreads throughout the economy, creating additional jobs and income in other economic sectors. To help understand this important connection between the health sector and the local economy, this report will:

- Discuss the role of the health sector in rural development.
- Measure the employment, income, and retail sales impact of the health sector on the Marion County economy.

This report will not make any recommendations.
Health Care Changes and Their Effects on Rural Communities

The changes occurring in the health care sector have had a substantial impact on many rural communities. Many people have found it more difficult to get health care coverage, insurance premiums have increased, and rural health care providers have been reimbursed at rates less than their urban counterparts for doing the same work. Concurrently, changes in urban health systems have had impact on rural health care delivery with the result that some rural communities have lost their ability to make decisions about their local health care.

Rapid increases in health care costs have driven these changes. In 1990, a person spent an average of $2,239 (2008$) on health care expenditures. By 2008, health care expenditures rose to $3,486 per person. Additionally, the average person spent $1,415 (2008$) for insurance premiums and $824 on out-of-pocket expenses such as deductibles and co-payments in 1990. In 2008, those figures rose to $2,573 for insurance premiums and $913 for out-of-pocket expenses. Table 1 shows the trend of increasing health care expenses from 1970 through 2008. Because of the increases in the demand for and cost of health care, the major purchasers of health care services – employers and government (through Medicare, Medicaid and other programs) – must search for ways to slow the rapid growth in health care expenditures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
<td>$708</td>
<td>$598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$2,239</td>
<td>$1,415</td>
<td>$824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$2,786</td>
<td>$1,957</td>
<td>$829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$2,915</td>
<td>$2,081</td>
<td>$834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$3,114</td>
<td>$2,251</td>
<td>$863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$3,291</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$3,376</td>
<td>$2,476</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$3,460</td>
<td>$2,547</td>
<td>$912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$3,492</td>
<td>$2,586</td>
<td>$906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$3,530</td>
<td>$2,603</td>
<td>$926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$3,486</td>
<td>$2,573</td>
<td>$913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services; data are inflation adjusted to 2008 dollars
Typically, rural community residents pay little attention to their local health care system until it is needed. Consequently, many rural people have little idea of the overall importance of the health care sector to their community’s economy, such as the number of jobs it currently provides and its potential to provide more jobs. To ensure that health care services remain available locally, rural communities need to understand these economic relationships. First, rural communities need to learn about their own local health care needs and take stock of their local health care system. While the emphasis at the national level is on controlling costs and eliminating duplication and overcapacity in the system (de-licensing unused hospital beds, for example), the issues are very different in rural communities.

One of the issues that underlies differences between health care systems in rural and urban areas is demographics. In rural areas, there are proportionately more elderly, more children living in poverty, higher unemployment and lower incomes. Rural people report poorer health and have more chronic health conditions. Rural people are more likely to be uninsured and have fewer health services available in the town where they live. Finally, people in rural communities are more likely to derive part of their income from the health care industry (either directly or indirectly).

Another issue that underlies the differences between urban and rural health care is the structure of the systems. In general, there are fewer providers and hospitals in rural areas, and they operate on very thin profit margins. In fact, many rural hospitals operate at a loss, with too few patients to cover daily costs. Also, until recently, most rural health care systems had been locally operated and controlled.

Pressures outside of the health care system also come into play in rural communities, creating stresses not applicable to urban systems. Cyclical commodity prices cause a periodic farm financial crisis, undermining the financial viability of family farms and business, such as farm implement manufacturers and dealers. Businesses located in rural areas tend to be small, often do not provide health insurance, and are highly vulnerable to changing economic conditions. Although these stresses can lead to mental and physical health problems, many people do not seek help for their health problems. Some will say they have too little time to seek out health care services, especially if they are working two jobs to make ends meet. For others, the strong sense of pride and self-reliance inherent among rural people may preclude many from seeking care, especially if they cannot afford it.

What is the ultimate impact of these changes and stresses on rural communities? Will it be a net gain or net loss, or will it all balance out in the end?

On the positive side, urban-based specialists may set up periodic office hours in rural clinics, health centers and hospitals; an urgent care center may open; and air medivac helicopters and other emergency medical services may be strategically located in a rural community. These services, while provided by many urban health systems, are convenient for rural residents, and otherwise would not be available to rural communities.
On the negative side, ties with financially strong urban health care providers can be detrimental to rural providers if the rural providers lose decision-making ability. Rural providers may also find themselves aligned with an organization that does not share their mission and values, or the rural provider may be unable to meet the expectations of the larger provider.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the downsides can be significant and potentially devastating for a rural community. In some instances, urban or other outside interests have purchased rural clinics and hospitals and then closed them because they did not provide sufficient profit. Employers have signed contracts with insurance plans that push patients to the city for their health care, bypassing local, more convenient services. Emergency medical service providers have changed their service areas or closed their doors. When urban health organizations encourage insured rural residents to spend their health care dollars in the city rather than to purchase equivalent services locally, it can have a significant negative economic impact and result in a loss of health dollars within the local community. In addition, out of town trips to obtain health care naturally offer opportunities to spend dollars out of town that may have been spent locally. These out-migrated dollars are missed opportunities and can significantly impact the local economic base.

Rural communities need to overcome inertia and take stock of local health care. Rural providers should be challenged to organize, whether through formal or informal mechanisms, so that they can compete with urban systems. In general, regional strategies will probably work better than local ones. Providers must be willing to take risks and coordinate services.

Well-positioned rural health systems can meet these challenges. Fragmentation is a big problem in health systems, but smaller, independent rural systems have more opportunity to create linkages. The scarce resources available to rural health services have engendered innovation and efficiencies as a matter of survival. Strong local leadership helps sustain these systems. Many rural health organizations are committed to fiscal accountability, expressed as quality health care at low cost. It should not be too difficult to remind rural residents of the long-term commitment these rural providers have made in the communities they serve. In time, rural providers need to offer sustainable health care services that best meet community need.

Success in meeting these challenges can be measured in terms of increased local services, more spending on locally-available health care, local control of health resources, negotiation of good reimbursement rates for providers, and high levels of community satisfaction with local health care.

If rural health providers do not act, they will face the prospect of losing jobs; rural communities could lose health care services; and everybody may lose local control of their health care.
Health Services and Rural Development

Though the connections between health care services and rural development are often overlooked, at least three primary areas of commonality exist. A strong health care system can help attract and maintain business and industry growth, attract and retain retirees, and also create jobs in the local area.

Health Services and Community Industry

Studies have found that quality of life factors play a dramatic role in business and industry location decisions. Health care services represent some of the most significant quality of life factors for at least three reasons. First, good health and education services are imperative to industrial and business leaders as they select a community for location. Employees and participating management may offer strong resistance if they are asked to move into a community with substandard or inconvenient health services. Secondly, when a business or industry makes a location decision, it wants to ensure that the local labor force will be productive, and a key productivity factor is good health. Thus, investments in health care services can be expected to yield dividends in the form of increased labor productivity. The third factor that business and industry consider in location decisions is cost of health care services. A 1990 site selection survey concluded that corporations looked carefully at health care costs, and sites that provided health care services at a low cost sometimes received priority. In fact, 17 percent of the respondents indicated that their companies used health care costs as a tie-breaking factor between comparable sites (Lyne, 1990).

Health Services and Retirees

A strong and convenient health care system is important to retirees, a special group of residents whose spending and purchasing can provide a significant source of income for the local economy. Many rural areas have environments (for example, moderate climate and outdoor activities) that enable them to attract and retain retirees. Retirees represent a substantial amount of spending, including the purchasing power associated with pensions, investments, Social Security, Medicare and other transfer payments. Additionally, middle and upper income retirees often have substantial net worth. Although the data are limited, several studies suggest health services may be a critical variable that influences the location decision of retirees. For example, one study found that four items were the best predictors of retirement locations: safety, recreational facilities, dwelling units, and health care. Another study found that nearly 60 percent of potential retirees said health services were in the “must have” category when considering a retirement community. Only protective services were mentioned more often than health services as a “must have” service.
Health Services and Job Growth

Job creation represents an important goal for most rural economic development programs. National employment in health care services increased 70 percent from 1990 to 2008. In rural areas, employment in health-related services often accounts for 10 to 15 percent of total employment. This reflects the fact that the hospital is often the second largest employer in a rural community (local government including schools typically being the largest employer).

Another important factor is the growth of the health sector. Health services, as a share of gross domestic product (GDP), has increased over time. In 1990, Americans spent $1.1 trillion on health care (2008$), which accounted for 12.3 percent of the GDP. In 2005, health care costs increased to $2.0 trillion, or 15.7 percent of the GDP. If current trends continue, projections indicate that Americans will spend 19.3 percent of GDP on health care by 2019. Capturing a share of this economic growth can only help a rural community.

Understanding Today’s Health Care Impacts and Tomorrow’s Health Care Needs

A strong health care system represents an important part of a community’s vitality and sustainability. Thus, a good understanding of the community’s health care system can help leaders and citizens fully appreciate the role and contributions of the health care system in maintaining community economic viability. In addition, a community should also examine the future health care needs of its residents in order to position itself so that it can respond to those needs. This report is designed to provide the kind of information that a community can use to understand its health care system and some possible indicators of current and future health care needs of its residents. The report begins with an examination of demographic, economic and health indicators and culminates with an illustration of the full economic impact of the health care sector in the county’s economy.
Marion County Demographic Data

Table 2 presents population trends for Marion County. In 2010, an estimated 12,034 people live in the county. Between 1990 and 2010, the population decreased 6.5 percent and also decreased 10.0 percent between 2000 and 2010. Population projections indicate that 11,885 people will live in the county by 2015. The state of Kansas population increased 8.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and an additional 5.5 percent through 2010.

Table 2. Current Population, Population Change and Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count Year</th>
<th>Count County</th>
<th>Count State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>12,875</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13,377</td>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>11,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12,034</td>
<td>1990-2010</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>11,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Census Bureau; population projections from Woods and Poole Economics, Inc.

Figure 1. Population by Age and Gender

Figure 1 shows a breakdown of the population by age and by gender. Here, people aged 35 to 54 made up the largest portion of the population, with 26.3 percent. People aged 65 and older represented 21.3 percent of the population. Of those 65 and older, 41.3 percent were male and 58.7 percent were female. Age range can indicate the future health care needs of a county’s population. A growing population of older adults has a different set of health care needs than a population with more young people.
Race can also play a role in assessing the health needs of the community. In the case of Hispanic immigrants, lack of English speaking skills may prevent them from using health care services within the county or from using health care services at all. Figure 2 shows the racial and ethnic composition of the county. Whites made up 95.9 percent of the county’s population, while Native Americans represented 0.7 percent, African Americans made up 0.8 percent, Asians were 0.2 percent and Hispanics were 2.5 percent of the population. In Kansas, whites make up 80.5 percent of the population, Native Americans represent one percent, African Americans 6.3 percent, Asians 2.5 percent and Hispanics 9.6 percent.

Figure 2. Population by Race (2010)

Woods and Poole Economics, Inc. Native American includes American Indians and Alaska Natives; Asian or Pacific Islander includes Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders; Hispanic population is persons of Hispanic origin regardless of race.

Economic Indicators

An important question for health care providers is how people will pay for services. In rural areas, the likelihood of poverty, lack of insurance and chronic health conditions increases. Additionally, rural areas tend to have higher numbers of elderly, for whom supplemental income becomes a proportionally larger source of income. Such supplemental income comes in the form of transfer payments such as Social Security and other retirement benefits, disability, medical payments like Medicare and Medicaid, unemployment insurance, and veterans’ benefits. The elderly, major consumers of health care services, receive much of this income, and a large portion of this assistance is available only to those who make the effort to apply. In order to maximize the income resources available in the county, one strategy is to ensure that every person receives all of the financial assistance from broader levels of government for which they are eligible.
Figure 3. Total Per Capita Personal Income (2008$)

Figure 3 shows the change in total per capita personal income, adjusted for inflation from 2005 through 2008. Per capita personal income has increased in Kansas and the United States. In Marion County, personal income has increased from $28,718 in 2005 to $32,243 in 2008.

Figure 4. Transfer Income as a Percent of Total Income (2008$)

Figure 4 shows how the relative proportion of transfer income to total income has changed during the same four years. In the U.S., transfer payments have increased as a percentage of total income by 6.6 percent, while transfer payments in Kansas have increased by 2.5 percent. In the county, the proportion of income stemming from transfer payments has increased from 21.0 percent in 2005 to 21.8 in 2008.
Table 3 shows personal income data by source for Marion County, Kansas and the nation. Within the county, 53.7 percent of all earnings come from wages and salaries, compared to 69.4 percent in Kansas and 71.6 percent for the entire United States. Retirement and disability make up 44.4 percent of transfer payments in the county, with another 43.9 percent coming from medical payments. In Kansas, 39.0 percent of all transfers come from retirement and disability, while medical payments represent 42.2 percent. For the U.S., medical payments make up the largest portion of transfers at 44.0 percent.

Table 3. 2008 Personal Income Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>County Total</th>
<th>County Per Capita</th>
<th>County Percent</th>
<th>State Percent</th>
<th>U.S. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earnings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$109,155,000</td>
<td>$9,021</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Labor Income</td>
<td>$28,621,000</td>
<td>$2,365</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor’s Income</td>
<td>$65,357,000</td>
<td>$5,401</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Earnings</strong></td>
<td>$203,133,000</td>
<td>$16,788</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Payments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement and Disability</td>
<td>$37,737,000</td>
<td>$3,119</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Payments</td>
<td>$37,343,000</td>
<td>$3,086</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$9,937,000</td>
<td>$821</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfer Payments</strong></td>
<td>$85,017,000</td>
<td>$7,026</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings by Place of Residence</td>
<td>$249,326,000</td>
<td>$20,605</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends, Interest, and Rent</td>
<td>$54,378,000</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Payments</td>
<td>$85,017,000</td>
<td>$7,026</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personal Income</strong></td>
<td>$388,721,000</td>
<td>$32,126</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bureau of Economic Analysis
Per capita estimates based on 2009 Woods and Poole Economics, Inc. estimates.
Due to rounding error, numbers may not sum to match total.
Health Indicators and Health Sector Statistics

The following health indicators and statistics provide information from which communities may infer several things about local health care needs. While some items provide an indication of need by type of service, other items suggest the amount and source of resources available to pay for health services. Health care planners can use this information to arrange for necessary services and anticipate the administrative requirements needed to support such services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Health Services, Medicare, and Medicaid Funded Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitals (2009)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beds¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions per bed¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Care Homes (2009)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beds²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisted Living Facilities (2009)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beds²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicare (2007)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibles³,⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicaid Funded Programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamp Beneficiaries (2009)⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Families (FY 2009)⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Hospital Association; Kansas Department on Aging; Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services; Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services

¹Rate per 1,000 population.
²Number of beds per 1,000 people 65 years and older.
³Annual average number of original Medicare eligibles—individuals who are either currently or formerly entitled or enrolled in either part A or part B original Medicare.
⁴Percent of total 2007 estimated population.

Table 4 shows the availability of certain types of health services in Marion County as well as usage of some health care-related government programs. The county has 27 available hospital beds, with a rate of 1.3 admissions per bed per 1,000 people. Additionally, the county has 247 adult care home beds, or 96.7 beds per 1,000 older adults, and 101 assisted living beds, or 39.6 beds per 1,000 older adults. Medicare users make up 22.7 percent of the county’s total population and 3.6 percent of the county’s population receive food stamp benefits.
Table 5. Maternity and Children’s Health Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Number</th>
<th>County Percent/Rate</th>
<th>State Percent/Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty (2008)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons in Poverty(^1)</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty(^2)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Births</strong>(^3) (2008)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births to Mothers without High-School Diploma(^4) (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births with Adequate Prenatal Care(^5) (2008)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Weight Births(^6) (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization(^7) (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality(^7) (2008)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Deaths(^8) (2008)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Subsidies(^9) (2008)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Census Bureau; 2008 Kansas Kids Count Data Book, Kansas Department of Health and Environment
\(^1\) Percent of total population.
\(^2\) Percent of children younger than 18 years in families below poverty level.
\(^3\) Percent of live births to all mothers who received adequate or better prenatal care.
\(^4\) Rate of live births per thousand females.
\(^5\) Percent of live births in a calendar year.
\(^6\) Percent of total kindergarteners who received all immunizations by age two.
\(^7\) Number of infant deaths younger than one year per thousand live births.
\(^8\) Number of deaths from all causes per 100,000 children ages 1-14.
\(^9\) Average monthly number of children participating in the Kansas Child Care Assistance program.

Table 5 gives information which can indicate the situation for young children and mothers. Within the county, 12.9 percent of children live in poverty, while 14.6 percent of children statewide live in poverty. Births to school age mothers occurred at a rate of 16.5 births per thousand teenage females, while school age mothers gave birth at a rate of 18.2 births per thousand teens statewide. Low weight births occurred in 3.7 percent of all live births in the county, while statewide low weight births occurred in 7.1 percent of all live births.
The Economic Impact of the Health Care Sector  
An Overview of the Marion County Economy, Highlighting Health Care

Table 6 presents employment, income and sales data for Marion County for 2008. Health care income and sales data were estimated using state average data. Data for all other economic sectors come from various government statistics and published data sources.

The table aggregates the economic sectors into broad categories, and the employment numbers indicate “average” jobs in each sector, including full- and part-time employment. Labor income represents local wages and proprietary income. Total income is the broadest measure of income generated within the local economy, and includes labor income plus dividend, interest, rents, corporate profits, etc.

Table 6. Direct Employment, Income and Sales by Economic Sector and Health Services Relative Shares Compared to the State and U.S., 2008 ($thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Labor Income</th>
<th>Total Income</th>
<th>Total Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>$20,835</td>
<td>$60,682</td>
<td>$153,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$5,963</td>
<td>$15,619</td>
<td>$27,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>$5,362</td>
<td>$5,860</td>
<td>$18,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>$28,567</td>
<td>$43,746</td>
<td>$239,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Information, Public Utilities</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$5,349</td>
<td>$10,628</td>
<td>$27,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Services</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>$16,555</td>
<td>$27,112</td>
<td>$42,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>$70,106</td>
<td>$109,708</td>
<td>$221,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services^1</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>$21,273</td>
<td>$23,607</td>
<td>$43,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$1,534</td>
<td>$2,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$544</td>
<td>$598</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Care Services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$452</td>
<td>$572</td>
<td>$781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and Dentists</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$2,859</td>
<td>$3,305</td>
<td>$5,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ambulatory Health Care</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$652</td>
<td>$1,133</td>
<td>$1,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$7,558</td>
<td>$7,936</td>
<td>$19,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>$8,233</td>
<td>$8,530</td>
<td>$12,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>$40,012</td>
<td>$46,269</td>
<td>$58,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>$192,748</td>
<td>$319,624</td>
<td>$788,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health Services as a Percent of Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minnesota IMPLAN Group; Due to rounding error, numbers may not sum to match total.

^1In some Kansas counties, various health services are consolidated within a single entity in the classification system shown here. In such cases, it may not be possible to break apart employment, income or sales information. If you have questions regarding the organization of health care services in your county, contact your local hospital administrator.
Health services are separated from the service and retail trade sectors but not double counted in the totals. The numbers for each sector include not only the professionals in the sector (the doctors, dentists, etc.) but also support staff (assistants, clerks, receptionists, etc.) employed by the business. In the health sector, the Health and Personal Care stores category includes pharmacies, while the Doctors and Dentists category includes chiropractors, optometrists, and other health care practitioners. Other Ambulatory Health Care Services includes services such as medical and diagnostic labs and outpatient care centers.

Health Services employs 717 people, 10.3 percent of all job holders in the county. Health Services for the state of Kansas employs 8.7 percent of all job holders, while 8.1 percent of all job holders in the United States work in Health Services. Health Services in the county has a number 4 ranking in terms of employment (Figure 5). Health Services is number 4 among payers of wages to employees (Figure 6) and number 6 in terms of total income (Figure 7). As with most rural areas, the health sector plays an important role in the economy.

![Figure 5. Employment by Sector (2008)](image)

Minnesota IMPLAN Group
Figure 6. Labor Income by Sector (2008)

- Agriculture: 11%
- Mining: 3%
- Construction: 3%
- Manufacturing: 15%
- TIPU: 3%
- Trade: 9%
- Services: 25%
- Health Services: 11%
- Government: 21%
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Figure 7. Total Income by Sector (2008)

- Agriculture: 19%
- Mining: 5%
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- Manufacturing: 14%
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Minnesota IMPLAN Group
Health Sector Impact and Economic Multipliers

The previous section detailed the direct contributions of the Health Services sector within the Marion County economy, but the full impact of the sector goes beyond the number of people employed and the wages they receive. The employment and income levels in the health sector have a significant impact on employment and income throughout other industries in the market area. This secondary impact or “ripple effect” comes from local businesses buying and selling to each other and from area workers spending their income for household goods and services; the ripple effect spreads the economic impact of the health sector throughout the community economy.

As dollars are spent locally, they are, in turn, re-spent for other goods and services. Some of these goods are produced locally while others are imports (the portion of the dollar spent on imports leaves the community as leakage). This spending and re-spending occurs over multiple rounds until it is finally exhausted.

Graphically, we can illustrate the round-by-round relationships modeled as shown in Figure 8. The direct effect of spending is shown in the far left-hand side of the figure (the first bar (a)). For simplification, the direct effects of a $1.00 change in the level of spending plus the indirect effects spillover into other sectors and create an additional 66 cents of activity. In this example, the multiplier is 1.66. A variety of multipliers can be calculated using these analysis techniques.

Figure 8. Multipliers and the round-by-round impacts
Tables 7 and 8 illustrate the ripple effect in the county. As an example, Table 7 shows that the hospital sector employs 220 people and has an employment multiplier of 1.28. This means that for each job created in the hospital sector, another 0.28 jobs are created in other businesses and industries in the county’s economy. The direct impact of the 220 hospital employees results in an indirect impact of 61 jobs (220 x 0.28 = 61) throughout all businesses and industries in the market area. Thus, the hospital sector employment had a total impact on area employment of 281 jobs (220 x 1.28 = 281).

**Table 7. Health Sector Impact on Employment, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sectors</th>
<th>Direct Employment</th>
<th>Economic Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Care Services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and Dentists</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ambulatory Health Care</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>717</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>852</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most data obtained from secondary sources; some data unavailable or extrapolated
Minnesota IMPLAN Group

Similarly, multiplier analysis can estimate the total impact of the estimated $7,936,000 direct income for hospital employees shown in Table 8. The hospital sector had an income multiplier of 1.22, which indicates that for every one dollar of income generated in the hospital sector, another $0.22 is generated in other businesses and industries in the county’s economy. Thus, the hospital sector had an estimated total impact on income throughout all businesses and industries of $9,712,000 ($7,936,000 x 1.22 = $9,712,000).

**Table 8. Health Sector Impact on Income and Retail Sales, 2008 (thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sectors</th>
<th>Direct Income</th>
<th>Economic Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
<th>Retail Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$1,534</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>$1,772</td>
<td>$355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>$598</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$718</td>
<td>$144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Care Services</td>
<td>$572</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>$643</td>
<td>$129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and Dentists</td>
<td>$3,305</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>$3,776</td>
<td>$756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ambulatory Health Care</td>
<td>$1,133</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>$1,331</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>$7,936</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>$9,712</td>
<td>$1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>$8,530</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>$9,566</td>
<td>$1,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,607</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$27,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,510</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most data obtained from secondary sources; some data unavailable or extrapolated
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In this manner, the total employment and income impacts of all the health services sectors can be estimated. In Table 7, the total employment impact of the health services sector results in an estimated 852 jobs in the local economy. In Table 8, the total income impact of health services results in an estimated $27,517,000 for the economy.

The last column in Table 8 shows the retail sales that the health sector helps to generate. To estimate this, this study incorporates a retail sales capture ratio (retail sales to total personal income). Marion County had retail sales of $77,841,248 and $388,721,000 in total personal income. Thus, the estimated retail sales capture ratio equals 20.0 percent. Using this as the retail sales capture ratio for the county, this says that people spent 20.0 percent of their income on retail goods and services within the market. By taking all the household income associated with health sector activities and multiplying by the retail sales capture ratio, we can estimate the impacts of the health sector on area retail sales. Thus, the total retail sales generated by the retail sector equals $5,510,000 ($27,517,000 x 20.0% = $5,510,000). This is a conservative estimate, as this method does not consider the impact of any local purchases made by the health services businesses.
Summary and Conclusions

The Health Services sector of Marion County, Kansas, plays a large role in the area’s economy. Health Services represents one of the largest employers in the area and also serves as one of the largest contributors to income. Additionally, the health sector has indirect impacts on the local economy, creating additional jobs and income in other sectors. The health sector also contributes substantially to retail sales in the region. All of this demonstrates the importance of the health care sector to the local economy.

While the estimates of economic impact are themselves substantial, they are only a partial accounting of the benefits to the county. Health care industries in rural counties help to preserve the population base, invigorating the communities and school systems. Similarly, many hospitals and nursing care facilities have active community outreach programs that enhance community services and the quality of life for community residents.

A vigorous and sustainable health care system is essential not only for the health and welfare of community residents, but to enhance economic opportunity as well. Health-related sectors are among the fastest growing in economy. Given demographic trends, this growth is likely to continue. The attraction and retention of new business and retirees also depends on access to adequate health care services.

While industry trends related to health care are positive overall, many rural communities have significant challenges. The economics of health care are rapidly changing. As health care costs escalate and government funding becomes tighter, rural markets may become less attractive to many providers. This will lead to the continued restructuring of rural health care services in many areas.

If a community wants to maintain the benefits associated with accessible and affordable health care, it must actively work to meet these challenges. The challenges cannot be met by those directly responsible for health care administration alone. They require a community-wide response involving government, business and civic leaders, and they frequently incorporate outside assistance from professional resources providers, such as the Kansas Hospital Association, the Office of Local and Rural Health, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment, and others.

In meeting current and future challenges, health care and community leaders can engage in an ongoing process of strategic health planning. This is continuous effort to maintain and enhance the community’s health care situation. The strategic health planning process helps local communities identify their health care needs; examine the social, economic, and political realities affecting the local delivery of health care; determine what is wanted and what realistically can be achieved to meet their identified health care needs; and develop and mobilize an action plan based on their analysis and planning.
Strategic health planning involves cooperation among people and organizations to pursue common goals. The process is designed to answer three questions:

(1) Where is the community now?
(2) Where does the community want to go?
(3) How will the community get there?

For the strategic health planning process to be most effective, it must be based in the community and driven by the community. Local residents and their leaders must participate; a current knowledge of the health care industry is not necessary. This process is about local people solving local problems. The local hospital and health care providers should have input into the decision-making and should support and trust the outcomes, but, the community must provide the energy and commitment.
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Glossary of Terms

**Doctors and Dentists Sector**: includes physicians, dentists, chiropractors, optometrists, other health care professionals, and all support staff employed by these professionals.

**Employment**: annual average number of full and part-time jobs, including self-employed for a given economic sector.

**Employment Economic Multiplier**: indicates the total jobs in the economy closely tied, in this case, to one job in the health sector.

**Employee Compensation**: total payroll (wages, salaries and certain benefits) paid by local employers.

**Government Sector**: includes all federal, state and local government enterprises; federal, state and local electric utilities; state and local government passenger transit; state and local government education and non-education; and federal military and non-military.

**Gross Domestic Product (GDP)**: the total value of output of goods and services produced by labor and capital investment in the United States.

**Health and Personal Care Stores**: pharmacies.

**Income Economic Multiplier**: indicates total income generated in the economy due to one dollar of income, in this case, in the health sector.

**Indirect Business Taxes**: sales, excise fees, licenses and other taxes paid during normal operation. All payments to the government except for income taxes.

**Multipliers**: Its calculation is based on the structure of the local economy. All of the buying and selling relationships between businesses and consumers are charted in an economic transactions table. When a dollar is spent in one area of the economy, all of the economic interconnections are stimulated as the effect “ripples” to other areas of the economy. The effect is caused by businesses buying and selling goods or services to each other and by local labor who use their income to purchase household goods and services. Over successive rounds of spending and re-spending, the effect of the original dollar is multiplied to some new, larger level of activity. Eventually, the economic “leakages” associated with the purchase of imported goods and non-local taxes and investments causes the ripple effect to finally run out. Multipliers are derived through algebraic calculations of the economic transactions table of the local economy.

**Other Ambulatory Health Care Services**: medical and diagnostic labs and other outpatient care services and all of their employees.

**Other Property Income**: corporate income, rental income, interest and corporate transfer payments.
**Proprietor Income**: income from self-employment (farmers and business proprietors, for example).

**Personal Income**: income received by individuals from all sources (employment, Social Security, et cetera).

**Total Income**: employee compensation plus proprietor income plus other property income plus indirect business taxes.

**Total Sales**: total industry production for a given year (industry output).
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Introduction

Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Background Data Summary
Following are a variety of data and statistics about background demographic, economic and health conditions in Marion County that may have implications related to local health care needs. Most of the data only is available at a county scale and reflects the Marion County boundaries.

- Between 1990 and 2010, the population decreased by 6.5 percent in Marion County, and is projected to decreased slightly.
- People aged 35 to 54 made up the largest portion of the population, with 26.3 percent.
- In general, the county has less per capita personal income that the state and nation, and is more dependent of transfer income such Social Security and other retirement benefits, disability, medical payments like Medicare and Medicaid, unemployment insurance, and veterans’ benefits.
- Medicare users make up 22.7 percent of the county’s total population and 3.6 percent of the county’s population receive food stamp benefits.
- Within the county, 12.9 percent of children live in poverty, while 14.6 percent of children statewide live in poverty.
Table 1 presents population trends for Marion County. In 2010, 12,034 people live in the county. Between 1990 and 2010, the population decreased 6.5 percent after having increased 3.9 percent between 1990 and 2000. Population projections indicate that 11,885 people will live in the county by 2015. The state of Kansas population increased 8.5 percent between 1990 and 2000 and an additional 5.5 percent through 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Population</th>
<th>Percent Change in Population</th>
<th>Population Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>12,875</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13,377</td>
<td>2000-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12,034</td>
<td>1990-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Census Bureau; population projections from Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.

Figure 1 shows a breakdown of the population by age and by gender. Here, people aged 35 to 54 made up the largest portion of the population, with 26.3 percent. Of those between 35 and 54, 49.6 percent were male and 50.4 percent were female. Age range can indicate the future health care needs of a county’s population. A growing population of younger adults has a different set of health care needs than a population with more older people.
Marion County Rural Health Works

Race can also play a role in assessing the health needs of the community. In the case of Hispanic immigrants, lack of English speaking skills may prevent them from using health care services within the county or from using health care services at all. Figure 2 shows the racial and ethnic composition of the county. Whites made up 95.9 percent of the county’s population, while Native Americans represented 0.7 percent, African Americans made up 0.8 percent, Asians were 0.2 percent and Hispanics were 2.5 percent of the population. In Kansas, whites make up 80.5 percent of the population, Native Americans represent one percent, African Americans 6.3 percent, Asians 2.5 percent and Hispanics 9.6 percent.

![Figure 2. Population by Race (2010)](image)

Woods and Poole Economics, Inc. Native American includes American Indians and Alaska Natives; Asian or Pacific Islander includes Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, Pacific Islanders; Hispanic population is persons of Hispanic origin regardless of race.

**Economic Indicators**

An important question for health care providers is how people will pay for services. In rural areas, the likelihood of poverty, lack of insurance and chronic health conditions increases. Additionally, rural areas tend to have higher numbers of elderly, for whom supplemental income becomes a proportionally larger source of income. Such supplemental income comes in the form of transfer payments such as Social Security and other retirement benefits, disability, medical payments like Medicare and Medicaid, unemployment insurance, and veterans’ benefits. The elderly, major consumers of health care services, receive much of this income, and a large portion of this assistance is available only to those who make the effort to apply. In order to maximize the income resources available in the county, one strategy is to ensure that every person receives all of the financial assistance from broader levels of government for which they are eligible.
Figure 3 shows the change in total per capita personal income, adjusted for inflation from 2005 through 2008. Per capita personal income has increased in Kansas and the United States. In Marion County, personal income has increased from $28,718 in 2005 to $32,243 in 2008.

Figure 4. Transfer Income as a Percent of Total Income (2008 $)

Bureau of Economic Analysis; data are inflation adjusted to 2008.
Figure 4 shows how the relative proportion of transfer income to total income has changed during the same four years. In the U.S., transfer payments have increased as a percentage of total income by 6.6 percent, while transfer payments in Kansas have increased by 2.5 percent. In the county, the proportion of income stemming from transfer payments have remained constant from 21.0 percent in 2005 to 21.8 percent in 2008, with a two percent increase in 2006 and 2007.

Table 2 shows personal income data by source for Marion County, Kansas and the nation. Within the county, 53.7 percent of all earnings come from wages and salaries, compared to 69.4 percent in Kansas and 71.6 percent for the entire United States. Retirement and disability make up 44.4 percent of transfer payments in the county, with another 43.9 percent coming from medical payments. In Kansas, 39.0 percent of all transfers come from retirement and disability, while medical payments represent 42.2 percent. For the U.S., medical payments make up the largest portion of transfers at 44.0 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>County Total</th>
<th>County Per Capita</th>
<th>County Percent</th>
<th>State Percent</th>
<th>U.S. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earnings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$109,155,000</td>
<td>$9,021</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Labor Income</td>
<td>$28,621,000</td>
<td>$2,365</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor's Income</td>
<td>$65,357,000</td>
<td>$5,401</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Earnings</td>
<td>$203,133,000</td>
<td>$16,788</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Payments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement and Disability</td>
<td>$37,737,000</td>
<td>$3,119</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Payments</td>
<td>$37,343,000</td>
<td>$3,086</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$9,937,000</td>
<td>$821</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transfer Payments</td>
<td>$85,017,000</td>
<td>$7,026</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings by Place of Residence</td>
<td>$249,326,000</td>
<td>$20,605</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends, Interest, and Rent</td>
<td>$54,378,000</td>
<td>$4,494</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Payments</td>
<td>$85,017,000</td>
<td>$7,026</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal Income</td>
<td>$388,721,000</td>
<td>$32,126</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bureau of Economic Analysis

Per capita estimates based on 2009 Woods and Poole Economics, Inc. estimates.

Due to rounding error, numbers may not sum to match total.
Health Indicators and Health Sector Statistics

The following health indicators and statistics provide information from which communities may infer several things about local health care needs. While some items provide an indication of need by type of service, other items suggest the amount and source of resources available to pay for health services. Health care planners can use this information to arrange for necessary services and anticipate the administrative requirements needed to support such services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Health Services, Medicare, and Medicaid Funded Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitals (2009)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beds&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions per bed&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Care Homes (2009)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beds&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assisted Living Facilities (2009)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beds&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicare (2007)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibles&lt;sup&gt;3,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicaid Funded Programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamp Beneficiaries (2009)&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Families (FY 2009)&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Hospital Association; Kansas Department on Aging; Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services; Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services

<sup>1</sup>Rate per 1,000 population.

<sup>2</sup>Number of beds per 1,000 people 65 years and older.

<sup>3</sup>Annual average number of original Medicare eligibles—individuals who are either currently or formerly entitled or enrolled in either part A or part B original Medicare.

<sup>4</sup>Percent of total 2007 estimated population.

Table 3 shows the availability of certain types of health services in Harvey County as well as usage of some health care-related government programs. The county has 27 available hospital beds, with a rate of 16 admissions per bed per 1,000 people. Additionally, the county has 247 adult care home beds, and 101 assisted living beds. Medicare users make up 22.7 percent of the county’s total population and 3.6 percent of the county’s population receive food stamp benefits.
### Table 4. Maternity and Children's Health Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>County Number</th>
<th>County Percent/Rate</th>
<th>State Percent/Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons in Poverty¹</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Poverty²</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Births³ (2008)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births to Mothers without High-School Diploma⁴ (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births with Adequate Prenatal Care³ (2008)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Weight Births⁵ (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization⁶ (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality⁷ (2008)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Deaths⁸ (2008)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Subsidies⁹ (2008)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Census Bureau; 2008 Kansas Kids Count Data Book, Kansas Department of Health and Environment

¹ Percent of total population.
² Percent of children younger than 18 years in families below poverty level.
³ Percent of live births to all mothers who received adequate or better prenatal care.
⁴ Rate of live births per thousand females.
⁵ Percent of live births in a calendar year.
⁶ Percent of total kindergarteners who received all immunizations by age two.
⁷ Number of infant deaths younger than one year per thousand live births.
⁸ Number of deaths from all causes per 100,000 children ages 1-14.
⁹ Average monthly number of children participating in the Kansas ChildCare Assistance program.

Table 4 gives information which can indicate the situation for young children and mothers. Within the county, 12.9 percent of children live in poverty, while 14.6 percent of children statewide live in poverty. Births to mothers without high school diplomas occurred at a rate of 16.5 births per thousand teenage females, while mothers without high school diplomas gave birth at a rate of 18.2 births per thousand teens statewide. Low weight births occurred in 3.7 percent of all live births in the county, while statewide low weight births occurred in 7.1 percent of all live births.

This information was prepared by the Office of Local Government, K-State Research and Extension. For questions or other information, call 785-532-2643.
Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Economic Data Summary
Following are data and statistics about the economic and demographic characteristics of Marion County that may have implications related to local health care needs. Some of the data only is available at a county scale and reflects the Marion County boundaries.

- Total population in Marion County will decrease by an estimated 4.6% between 2000 and 2018.
- The proportion of the total population over 65 years is rising slowly, and the oldest of the old, those 85 years and older is steady at about 4%.
- Thirty-five percent of the population may live alone, making individual acute and chronic care management challenging.
- Over 12% of households live on less than $15,000 income per year.
- Transfer income to persons is among the fastest growing sources of income. In 2013, nearly $85 million in transfer income was paid to Marion County residents, about 23.5% of total personal income.
- Within transfer income, government assistance such as Medicare, income maintenance, and veterans pension and disability benefits are growing most strongly.
- The county poverty rate increased according to the most recent available data, but likely has continued to decrease in 2009 along with the unemployment rate.

Source: Claritas, Inc. 2012.
The population in Marion County has shown steady decline. The trend is expected to continue into the near-term future. The implications of this trend are that there are that as local economic markets are strengthening, less people are able to support local public services, and a less robust local labor market. All of these create lesser opportunities for businesses, local governments and communities.

![Figure 1. Total Population Projection in the Marion County Health Area](image)

Claritas, Inc., 2012

The number of people 65 years and older is increasing steadily. The oldest of the old, persons 85 years and older, are constant among the elderly, with women commonly outliving men. The implications of these trends are that the proportion of the population with special health care needs, especially community and home health care assistance, will increase.

| Table 1. Percent of Aging Population in the Marion County Health Area |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                       | 2000            | 2013            | 2018            |                 |
|                       | Percent  | Population | Percent  | Population | Percent  | Population |
| 65+ Years old         | 21.1%    | 2,824      | 22.0%    | 2,720       | 23.9%    | 2,890      |
| 75+ Years old         | 11.8%    | 1,578      | 11.2%    | 1,390       | 11.7%    | 1,417      |
| 85+ Years old         | 4.2%     | 566        | 4.0%     | 490         | 4.1%     | 493        |

Claritas, Inc., 2013
The racial composition of Marion County is somewhat homogenous like many rural Kansas counties. Whites make up almost 96 percent of the population. Five hundred twenty-six persons in Marion County identify themselves as non-white. It’s not uncommon for non-whites to have specific health care needs that are very different than the white population. As is the case almost everywhere, the Hispanic and Latino population is increasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. 2013 Estimated Population by Single Race Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claritas, Inc., 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. 2013 Estimated Population Hispanic or Latino by Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claritas, Inc., 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Marion County Health Area Hispanic and Latino Population Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic and Latino Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claritas, Inc., 2013
About 61.8 percent of the adult population reported living as a married individual with a spouse present. Conversely, around 35 percent are in households without a spouse present. Many of these individuals probably live in some other cohabitation arrangement. Still, it raises a question about the number of people living alone. Within the context of community health care needs, people living alone face sometimes tremendous challenges should illness arise or injury occur. Most often, there are only informal support structures in place to assist such individuals in times of need.

**Table 5. 2013 Estimated Population Age 15+ by Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, Never Married</td>
<td>1,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, Spouse present</td>
<td>6,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, Spouse absent</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males, Never Married</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Married</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females, Never Married</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Married</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claritas, Inc., 2013

**Table 6. 2013 Estimated Population Age 25+ by Educational Attainment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School, no diploma</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate (or GED)</td>
<td>3,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, no degree</td>
<td>2,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Degree</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claritas, Inc., 2013
Marion County Rural Health Works

The income and wealth resources of many Marion County residents are relatively modest. Almost 23 percent of households report an annual income of less than $25,000, and over half of that group lives on less than $15,000 per year. As represented by housing values, the wealth resources of many individuals and households also is relatively moderate. Over 15 percent of the housing stock is valued at less than $40,000. The implications of such income and wealth characteristics in the context of increasing longevity and rising health care costs raises questions as to whether all who need it can afford health insurance and health care services.

Table 7. 2013 Estimated Households by Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Less than $15,000</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $150,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $200,000 - $499,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income $500,000 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Households</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Average Household Income $54,548
Estimated Median Household Income $46,677
Estimated Per Capita Income -

Claritas, Inc., 2013

Table 8. 2013 Estimated All Owner-Occupied Housing Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Less than $20,000</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $20,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $40,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $60,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $80,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $150,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $200,000 - $299,999</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $300,000 - $399,999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $400,000 - $499,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $500,000 - $749,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $750,000 - $999,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value $1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,878</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claritas, Inc., 2013
As with most rural areas, Marion County is relatively more dependent on transfer income, such as retirement and disability insurance benefits, medical benefits, and income maintenance. That dependence is increasing and is likely to continue as more of the population ages. From an economic perspective, these payments help support the local economy. Every person legitimately entitled to receive them should have access to this assistance.
### Table 9. Marion County Personal Income by Major Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Earnings (Millions 2005$)</td>
<td>$162.88</td>
<td>$180.29</td>
<td>$176.74</td>
<td>$159.70</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
<td>$203.27</td>
<td>$188.86</td>
<td>$204.77</td>
<td>$210.88</td>
<td>$203.95</td>
<td>$182.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Earnings</td>
<td>$23.38</td>
<td>$35.35</td>
<td>$37.33</td>
<td>$18.32</td>
<td>$22.15</td>
<td>$50.42</td>
<td>$40.90</td>
<td>$41.66</td>
<td>$43.35</td>
<td>$41.48</td>
<td>$38.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
<td>$3.09</td>
<td>$3.83</td>
<td>$3.72</td>
<td>$3.64</td>
<td>$3.55</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$3.21</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
<td>$5.64</td>
<td>$5.57</td>
<td>$5.78</td>
<td>$5.57</td>
<td>$4.38</td>
<td>$4.30</td>
<td>$4.82</td>
<td>$5.27</td>
<td>$6.22</td>
<td>$6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$13.52</td>
<td>$13.29</td>
<td>$12.77</td>
<td>$13.48</td>
<td>$15.43</td>
<td>$24.21</td>
<td>$19.68</td>
<td>$36.03</td>
<td>$40.96</td>
<td>$42.76</td>
<td>$23.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>$5.07</td>
<td>$5.28</td>
<td>$5.77</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
<td>$5.91</td>
<td>$8.29</td>
<td>$8.81</td>
<td>$8.08</td>
<td>$7.31</td>
<td>$6.34</td>
<td>$6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$10.75</td>
<td>$10.12</td>
<td>$9.41</td>
<td>$9.65</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$7.28</td>
<td>$7.91</td>
<td>$8.37</td>
<td>$9.07</td>
<td>$9.35</td>
<td>$9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance &amp; Real Estate</td>
<td>$7.18</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
<td>$6.56</td>
<td>$6.38</td>
<td>$6.10</td>
<td>$7.53</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
<td>$8.29</td>
<td>$8.84</td>
<td>$8.31</td>
<td>$6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Civilian Government</td>
<td>$3.91</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$3.77</td>
<td>$3.77</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$3.66</td>
<td>$3.69</td>
<td>$3.67</td>
<td>$3.72</td>
<td>$3.41</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Military Government</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
<td>$2.01</td>
<td>$2.31</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$2.04</td>
<td>$2.13</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
<td>$2.44</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Government</td>
<td>$30.81</td>
<td>$30.26</td>
<td>$30.18</td>
<td>$30.60</td>
<td>$30.88</td>
<td>$31.07</td>
<td>$31.23</td>
<td>$30.51</td>
<td>$30.30</td>
<td>$27.77</td>
<td>$28.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income (Millions 2005$)</td>
<td>$325.87</td>
<td>$334.25</td>
<td>$332.48</td>
<td>$322.41</td>
<td>$339.55</td>
<td>$388.12</td>
<td>$369.35</td>
<td>$383.15</td>
<td>$389.72</td>
<td>$376.28</td>
<td>$360.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$96.35</td>
<td>$99.79</td>
<td>$95.05</td>
<td>$96.43</td>
<td>$98.76</td>
<td>$102.58</td>
<td>$99.89</td>
<td>$97.94</td>
<td>$96.13</td>
<td>$95.76</td>
<td>$104.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Labor Income</td>
<td>$26.58</td>
<td>$27.22</td>
<td>$25.90</td>
<td>$26.03</td>
<td>$25.90</td>
<td>$27.42</td>
<td>$27.54</td>
<td>$27.44</td>
<td>$27.19</td>
<td>$27.07</td>
<td>$24.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor Income</td>
<td>$39.95</td>
<td>$53.29</td>
<td>$55.79</td>
<td>$37.23</td>
<td>$40.34</td>
<td>$73.27</td>
<td>$61.43</td>
<td>$79.39</td>
<td>$87.56</td>
<td>$81.12</td>
<td>$53.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends, Interest &amp; Rent</td>
<td>$56.29</td>
<td>$50.08</td>
<td>$46.26</td>
<td>$47.41</td>
<td>$56.65</td>
<td>$64.90</td>
<td>$55.52</td>
<td>$55.27</td>
<td>$57.18</td>
<td>$57.36</td>
<td>$55.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Payments To Persons</td>
<td>$70.20</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
<td>$69.75</td>
<td>$74.68</td>
<td>$76.97</td>
<td>$77.71</td>
<td>$85.91</td>
<td>$86.59</td>
<td>$84.37</td>
<td>$84.69</td>
<td>$86.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Social Insurance Contributions</td>
<td>$17.01</td>
<td>$17.68</td>
<td>$17.22</td>
<td>$17.65</td>
<td>$18.06</td>
<td>$19.09</td>
<td>$18.80</td>
<td>$19.65</td>
<td>$18.91</td>
<td>$20.50</td>
<td>$18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Adjustment</td>
<td>$53.52</td>
<td>$54.05</td>
<td>$56.95</td>
<td>$58.27</td>
<td>$58.99</td>
<td>$61.34</td>
<td>$57.86</td>
<td>$56.17</td>
<td>$55.21</td>
<td>$50.77</td>
<td>$54.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Historical employment, earnings, and income data 1969-2002, and total population data 1969-2003, are from the U.S. Dept of Commerce (USDoC); employment and earnings data by private non-farm SIC industry for 2001 and 2002 are estimated from private non-farm NAICA industry data.
### Table 10. Personal Current Transfer Receipts for Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal current transfer receipts ($000)</td>
<td>93,072</td>
<td>95,367</td>
<td>97,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transfer receipts of individuals from governments</td>
<td>90,490</td>
<td>92,453</td>
<td>94,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement and disability insurance benefits</td>
<td>40,263</td>
<td>41,195</td>
<td>41,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) benefits</td>
<td>38,556</td>
<td>39,433</td>
<td>39,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad retirement and disability benefits</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ compensation</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other government retirement and disability insurance benefits</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical benefits</td>
<td>37,365</td>
<td>37,756</td>
<td>40,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare benefits</td>
<td>23,636</td>
<td>24,412</td>
<td>25,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance medical care benefits</td>
<td>13,444</td>
<td>13,022</td>
<td>14,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>12,973</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>14,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other medical care benefits</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military medical insurance benefits</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income maintenance benefits</td>
<td>4,681</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental security income (SSI) benefits</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family assistance</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income maintenance benefits</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>3,933</td>
<td>4,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment insurance compensation</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>2,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State unemployment insurance compensation</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment compensation for Fed. civilian employees (UCFE)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment compensation for railroad employees</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment compensation for veterans (UCX)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unemployment compensation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans benefits</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans pension and disability benefits</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans readjustment benefits</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans life insurance benefits</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assistance to veterans</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
<td>(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training assistance</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transfer receipts of individuals from governments</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transfer receipts of nonprofit institutions</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>1,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from the Federal government</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from state and local governments</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from businesses</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current transfer receipts of individuals from businesses</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2013
Notes for Table 10:
1. Consists largely of temporary disability payments and black lung payments.
2. Consists of medicaid and other medical vendor payments.
3. Consists of payments made under the TriCare Management Program (formerly called CHAMPUS) for the medical care of dependents of active duty military personnel and of retired military personnel and their dependents at nonmilitary medical facilities.
4. Through 1995, consists of emergency assistance and aid to families with dependent children. For 1998 forward, consists of benefits—generally known as temporary assistance for needy families—provided under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. For 1996-97, consists of payments under all three of these programs.
5. Consists largely of general assistance, refugee assistance, foster home care and adoption assistance, earned income tax credits, and energy assistance.
6. Consists of trade readjustment allowance payments, Redwood Park benefit payments, public service employment benefit payments, and transitional benefit payments.
7. Consists largely of veterans readjustment benefit payments, educational assistance to spouses and children of disabled or deceased veterans, payments to paraplegics, and payments for autos and conveyances for disabled veterans.
8. Consists of State and local government payments to veterans.
9. Consists largely of federal fellowship payments (National Science Foundation fellowships and traineeships, subsistence payments to State maritime academy cadets, and other federal fellowships) interest subsidy on higher education loans, basic educational opportunity grants, and Job Corps payments.
11. Consists of State and local government educational assistance payments to nonprofit institutions, and other State and local government payments to nonprofit institutions.
12. Consists largely of personal injury payments to individuals other than employees and other business transfer payments.

- All state and local area dollar estimates are in current dollars (not adjusted for inflation).
- Less than $50,000, but the estimates for this item are included in the totals.
## Table 11. Employment by Major Industry for Marion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>6.001</td>
<td>5.911</td>
<td>5.837</td>
<td>5.844</td>
<td>5.850</td>
<td>5.793</td>
<td>5.716</td>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>5.408</td>
<td>5.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Employment</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Services, Other</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, Comm. &amp; Public Utility</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance &amp; Real Estate</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Civilian Government</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Military Government</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Local Government</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woods and Poole, Inc., 2013

Note: Employment in number of jobs includes proprietors and part-time jobs.
Marion County Rural Health Works

As with most rural areas, the way people in Marion County earn a living is changing. Employment in traditional industries, such as agriculture, has been falling, but extractive industries and manufacturing has seen increases over the last 10 years. Also, a greater proportion of people are earning a living working in the manufacturing and construction industries. Employment in government also declined. While increasing, Marion County unemployment rate consistently remains below the state average.

Figure 6. Unemployment Rate for Marion County and Kansas, 2002-2012

![Graph showing unemployment rate for Marion County and Kansas from 2002 to 2012.](image)

Kansas Department of Labor, 2011

Figure 7. Percent of People in Poverty in Marion County and Kansas, 2001-2011

![Graph showing percent of people in poverty for Marion County and Kansas from 2001 to 2011.](image)

U.S. Census Bureau, 2010

This information was prepared by the Office of Local Government, K-State Research and Extension. For questions or other information, call 785-532-2643.
Health and Behavioral Data

Introduction

Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Health and Behavioral Data Summary

Following are a variety of data and statistics about health and behavioral characteristics in Marion County that may have implications for local health care needs. The data is reported by county.

- Over time, the trend in nursing home occupancy may suggest the need to evaluate for community-based services being provided.

- The trend in childhood immunization rates have been increasing lately. 12-13 percent of fetuses had not had adequate prenatal care.

- The rates of youth tobacco use and binge drinking are about the same as the state rate.

- Data related to persons served by selected publicly-funded services suggest a number of individuals and families in the county are experiencing economic distress.

- Recent trends in hospital usage suggest a fairly steady level of demand at the Saint Luke Hospital and Living Center and Hillsboro Community Hospital.
The number of nursing home beds combines all licensed nursing home beds in long-term care nursing facilities in Marion County. It excludes any nursing care beds that may exist in a hospital nursing unit.

Over time, the average number of beds has declined from over 360 in 2001 to 180 in 2011. Despite the reduction in available beds, the overall trend in occupancy has been downward. This may be an indication of preferences for community-based alternatives for advanced elder care.

Table 1. Average Marion County Occupancy of Nursing Home Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Nursing Beds</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Nursing Occupancy Rate</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services, semi-annual reports
The proportion of children receiving necessary immunizations have generally improved from 2005 to 2010 and are about the same as the state overall. About 12-13 percent of fetuses had not had adequate prenatal care. The rates of youth tobacco use and binge drinking are about 10-12 percent.

Table 2. Indicators of Children’s Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicators</th>
<th>Trend Data</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>KS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal Care</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Babies</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Violent Deaths (per 100,000 15-19 year-olds)</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>209.0</td>
<td>215.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>209.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Tobacco Use</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Binge Drinking</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma (per 1,000)</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health (per 1,000)</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas KIDSCOUNT, 2011

Table 3 contains information about persons served by state and federally-funded assistance programs. Across the service categories reported, food and energy assistance has increased, indicating increasing economic distress among county households. The need for mental health assistance also is evident.
### Table 3. Persons Served by Selected Public Assistance Programs in Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Services</th>
<th>Persons Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Assistance for Families</td>
<td>Avg. monthly persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF Employment Services</td>
<td>Avg. monthly adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Assistance</td>
<td>Avg. monthly children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Assistance</td>
<td>Avg. monthly persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Assistance</td>
<td>Annual persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assistance</td>
<td>Avg. monthly persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Services</td>
<td>Avg. monthly persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Preservation</td>
<td>Annual persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration/Foster Care</td>
<td>Avg. monthly children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Support</td>
<td>Avg. monthly children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Home and Community Based Services

| Physical Disability                           | Annual consumers | 25     | 24     | 22     |
| Traumatic Brain Injury                        | Annual consumers | 0      | 0      | 1      |
| Developmental Disability                      | Annual consumers | 22     | 22     | 175    |
| Autism                                       | Annual consumers | 0      | 0      | 0      |

### Managed Behavioral Health Services

| Substance Abuse (PIHP)                        | Annual consumers | 11     | 12     | 21     |
| Mental Health (PAHP)                          | Annual consumers | 274    | 271    | 274    |

### Institutional Services

| Intermediate Care Facility (ICF-MR)           | Average daily census | 0      | 0      | 0      |
| State Hospital - Developmental Disability    | Average daily census | 0      | 0      | 0      |
| State Hospital - Mental Health               | Average daily census | 0      | 0      | 0      |
| Nursing Facility - Mental Health             | Average daily census | 56     | 55     | 57     |

Kansas Department for Children and Families, 2010

In considering the selected vital statistics in Table 4, about 12 percent of newborns received less than adequate prenatal care. Even a single teenage pregnancy sets a young person on a difficult life path. And, about one-half of all marriages end in dissolution.

In the recent past, usage of Hillsboro Community Hospital in Hillsboro and the Saint Luke Hospital and Living Center in Marion appears to have been fairly stable (Table 5). Overall trends in health care are for reduced inpatient services and more outpatient services. While some of the data are unreported, both Medicare and Medicaid recipients appear to be an important component of the patient base, but have also been decreasing according to available information.
## Table 4. Selected Vital Statistics for Marion County, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Births by Age-Group of Mother</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Prenatal Care by Number and Percentage</td>
<td>Adequate Plus</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Pregnancies</td>
<td>Live Births</td>
<td>10-14 yrs, 15-19 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stillbirths</td>
<td>10-14 yrs, 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>44-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abortions</td>
<td>10-14 yrs, 15-19 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Pregnancies</td>
<td>10-14 yrs, 15-19 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths by Age Group</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>44-54</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>65-84</td>
<td>85 &amp; Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriages by Number and Rate per 1,000 Population</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriages Dissolutions by Number and Rate per 1,000 Population</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Department of Health and Environment, 2010
### Table 5. Hospital Data for Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Practicing Physicians (county)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Physician (county)</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>3,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hillsboro Community Hospital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Acute Beds</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Swing Beds</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffed Beds-Hospital</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffed Beds-Nursing Home Unit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Hospital</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Nursing Home Unit</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Swing Beds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Days - Hospital</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Days - Nursing Home Unit</td>
<td>18,471</td>
<td>13,366</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Days - Swing-beds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Room Visits</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Visits</td>
<td>17,763</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>6,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Surgical Operations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Surgical Operations</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Inpatient Discharges</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Inpatient Days</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Inpatient Discharges</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Inpatient Days</td>
<td>9,590</td>
<td>8,682</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kansas Hospital Association STAT Report, 2008, 2009, 2010*
*Kansas Statistical Abstract, 2010*
# Table 6. Hospital Data for Marion County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Practicing Physicians (county)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persons per Physician (county)</strong></td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>3,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Luke Hospital and Living Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Acute Beds</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Swing Beds</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffed Beds-Hospital</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffed Beds-Nursing Home Unit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Hospital</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Nursing Home Unit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions-Swing Beds</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Days - Hospital</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Days - Nursing Home Unit</td>
<td>11,596</td>
<td>11,579</td>
<td>11,534</td>
<td>10,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Days - Swing-beds</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Room Visits</strong></td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient Visits</strong></td>
<td>42,041</td>
<td>16,246</td>
<td>17,743</td>
<td>20,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient Surgical Operations</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient Surgical Operations</strong></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicare Inpatient Discharges</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicare Inpatient Days</strong></td>
<td>675</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicaid Inpatient Discharges</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicaid Inpatient Days</strong></td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>6,277</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>4,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kansas Hospital Association STAT Report, 2008, 2009, 2010*

*Kansas Statistical Abstract, 2010*

---

This information was prepared by the Office of Local Government, K-State Research and Extension. For questions or other information, call 785-532-2643.
Introduction

Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Education Data Summary

Following are a variety of data and statistics about the K-12 school system in Marion County that may have implications related to local health care needs. The data in this case reflects information reported by the school districts located in Marion County.

- Total student enrollment in Marion County K-12 school districts has steadily decreased since 2000.

- The ratio of about 13 students per teacher permits fairly close attention for each of the students.

- The trend in the Marion County student dropout rate has been stable even with the decreasing enrollment numbers.

- Student-on-student violence and student-on-faculty violence has been steadily declining since 1996-97.

ZIP codes within the Marion County Health Market Area. Source: Claritas, Inc. 2012.
Total student enrollment in Marion County K-12 school districts has steadily decreased since 2000. Enrollment was 2,055 in the 2012-2013 school year, down from 2,573 in 2000-2001.

As the student population has grown, the student-to-teacher ratio also has declined. This generally means that as the school-age population declined, the district has retained staffing. The ratio of about 13 students per teacher permits fairly close attention for each of the students.
The trend in the Marion County student dropout rate has been stable even with the decreasing enrollment numbers.
Violence in the school is extremely disruptive to learning. The trend in student-on-student violence had been decreasing over the past decade. Student-on-faculty violence has been decreasing from the 1996-97 spike.

Figure 4. Incidents of Student-on-Student Violence

Kansas Department of Education, 2012

Figure 5. Incidents of Student-on-Faculty Violence

Kansas Department of Education, 2012

Prepared by the Office of Local Government, K-State Research and Extension. For questions or other information, call 785-532-2643.
Crime Data

Introduction

Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Crime Data Summary
Following are a variety of data and statistics about criminal activity in Marion County that may have implications related to local health care needs. Most of the data only is available at a county scale and reflects the Marion County boundaries.

Marion County Primary Health Market Area

- The incidence of crime in Marion County is below the state rates between 2008 to 2011 and has generally been stable.
- Both property crime and violent crime remained about the same between 2008 to 2011.
- The number of adult arrests has been increasing since 2009.
- The number of full-time law enforcement officials per 1,000 population in Marion County has been consistently below the state rate.
- Overall crime data submitted to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation are often incomplete.

Source: Claritas, Inc. 2012.
The incidence of crime in Marion County has been relatively constant while the state average has decreased slightly from 2008 to 2011. Both the incidence of property crime and the incidence of violent crime have been relatively stable.

Table 1. Crime Statistics for Marion County and Kansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Rate per 1,000</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>101,344</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>90,585</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>98,507</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87,658</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>98,354</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>10,428</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>87,926</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>96,596</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>10,091</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>86,505</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Bureau of Investigation, 2012

Index crimes include violent crimes (murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault/battery) plus property crime (burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft).
Marion County Rural Health Works

Figure 1. Crime Index Offenses for Marion County and Kansas

Kansas Bureau of Investigation, 2012
Crime data may be partial and incomplete.

Index crimes include violent crimes (murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault/battery) plus property crime (burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft).

Figure 2. Crime Index Arrests for Marion County and Kansas

Kansas Bureau of Investigation, 2012
Crime data may be partial and incomplete.
Figure 3. Number of Adult and Juvenile Arrests in Marion County, 2006-2011

Kansas Bureau of Investigation, 2012
Crime data may be partial and incomplete.

The number of full-time law enforcement officials per 1,000 persons in Marion County has been consistently below the state rate.

Figure 4. Number of Law Enforcement Officials per 1,000 Population

Kansas Statistical Abstract, 2010

This information was prepared by the Office of Local Government, K-State Research and Extension. For questions or other information, call 785-532-2643.
Traffic Data

Introduction

Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Traffic Data Summary

Following are a variety of data and statistics about traffic accidents in Marion County. The data is reported by county.

Marion County Primary Health Market Area

- The rate of traffic accidents in Marion County has generally declined between 2000 and 2009.

In 2009, there were 256 total vehicle crashes in Marion County, with deer-vehicle collisions accounting for many of the accidents.

The declining trend is positive, but may, in part, be explained by the declining population.

In 2009, the most recent year for which data were available, there were 51 accidents causing 90 injuries and 5 fatalities.

ZIP codes within the Marion County Health Market Area.

Source: Claritas, Inc. 2012.
Marion County Rural Health Works

The rate of traffic accidents in Marion County has generally declined between 2000 and 2009. In 2009, there were 256 total vehicle crashes in Marion County, with deer-vehicle collisions accounting for many of the accidents. The declining trend is positive, but may, in part, be explained by the declining population. In 2009, the most recent year for which data were available, there were 51 accidents causing 90 injuries and 5 fatalities.

Table 1. 2009 Traffic Accident Facts for Marion County and Kansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accidents</th>
<th>Marion</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>61,173</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Accidents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Accidents</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13,925</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>46,900</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Involved</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9,631</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Related</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6,116</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19,674</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Restraint Use</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Department of Transportation, 2013
* Population from Woods and Poole

Table 2. Marion County Traffic Accident Facts, 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deer Involved</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Related</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accidents</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kansas Department of Transportation, 2013
Figure 1. Total Accidents in Marion County, 2000-2009

Kansas Department of Transportation, 2013

Figure 3. Fatalities in Marion County, 2000-09

Kansas Department of Transportation, 2013
Figure 3. Fatalities in Marion County, 2000-09

Kansas Department of Transportation, 2013

Figure 4. Property Damage Only Accidents in Marion County, 2000-2009
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Figure 5. Other Crashes in Marion County, 2000-2008
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This information was prepared by the Office of Local Government, K-State Research and Extension. For questions or other information, call 785-532-2643.
Kansas Health Matters Data Compilation

Introduction

Kansas Rural Health Works (KRHW) is dedicated to helping rural communities build affordable and sustainable local health care systems. The Office of Local Government at K-State Research and Extension is supporting Community Health Needs Assessments. These needs assessments bring a broad-based group of community leaders together to assess local needs, establish priorities, and develop strategic action plans to improve the local health situation. This is an opportunity for the community to rally together to address high-priority local needs and to make the community a better place to live, work, and raise a family. No one can do it for us unless we do it ourselves. The resources presented here support that process. The opportunity is now.

Kansas Health Matters

The ‘Kansas Health Matters’ Web site is intended to help hospitals, health departments, community members and policy makers learn about the health of the community and how to improve it. It provides local health data, resources, promising best practices, news articles and information about community events related to important community health issues. The site specifically aims at supporting the development of community health assessments and community health improvement plans by hospitals and local health departments, but its content also is relevant for anyone interested in how assess and improve the health of communities.

The Kansas Health Matters Website can be found at: www.kansashealthmatters.org

Data Summary

A host of county-level data have been posted to the Health Matters Website, including:

- Access to Health Services
- Children's Health
- Immunizations and Infectious Disease
- Maternal, Fetal and Infant Health
- Mortality Data
- Prevention and Safety
- Substance Abuse
- Wellness and Lifestyle
- Economic Conditions
- Poverty
- Education
- Environment
- Public Safety

It should be noted, however, that some places with too few events of a given type may display no results, or may show multi-county regional values.
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Access to Health Services

Average Monthly WIC Participation

Value: 20.4 average cases per 1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS state value
Categories: Health / Access to Health Services

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the average monthly number of women and children participating in WIC per 1,000 population.

Why this is important: WIC is a nutrition program that provides nutrition and health education, healthy food and other services to Kansas families who qualify. WIC stands for Women, Infants and Children. WIC’s goal is to help keep pregnant and breastfeeding women, new moms, and kids under age 5 healthy.

National Studies have documented WIC benefits:

- WIC reduces fetal deaths and infant mortality.
- WIC reduces low birth weight rates and increases the duration of pregnancy.
- WIC improves the growth of nutritionally at-risk infants and children.
- WIC decreases the incidence of iron deficiency anemia in children.
- WIC improves the dietary intake of pregnant and postpartum women and improves weight gain in pregnant women.
- Pregnant women participating in WIC receive prenatal care earlier.
- Children enrolled in WIC are more likely to have a regular source of medical care and have more up to date immunizations.
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- WIC helps get children ready to start school: children who receive WIC benefits demonstrate improved intellectual development.
  WIC significantly improves children's diets.

WIC also offers immunization screening and referral, breastfeeding support, and nutrition and health classes on a variety of topics including meal planning, maintaining a healthy weight, picky eaters, caring for a new baby, shopping on a budget and more.

An average of 17,747 women, 18,863 infants and 36,629 children received services each month. Total Average: 76,239.

The percent of eligible women, infants and children (up to age 5), served by WIC is estimated to be 72.23%.

Unduplicated number of WIC participants served in Calendar Year 2008 is 128,407
WIC services are provided at 109 County Health Department clinic sites.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source:  http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data:  http://www.kdheks.gov/nws-wic/

Ratio of Population to Primary Care Physicians

Value: 4,295 population per physician
Measurement Period: 2010
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Access to Health Services

![Ratio of Population to Primary Care Physicians](image-url)
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What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the ratio of population to one primary care physician FTE.

Why this is important: Primary care is the backbone of preventive health care, and a strong primary care workforce is essential to health of our country. Primary care physicians play a key role in providing and coordinating high-quality health care. Adequate access to primary care can improve care coordination and reduce the frequency of avoidable hospitalizations. The Association of American Medical Colleges estimated that the nation would have a shortage of approximately 21,000 primary care physicians in 2015. Without action, experts project a continued primary care shortfall due to the needs of an aging population, and a decline in the number of medical students choosing primary care.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment

Staffed Hospital Bed Ratio

Value: 2.2 beds per 1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Access to Health Services

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the ratio of the number of staffed hospital beds to 1,000 population.
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Why this is important: Staffed Hospital Bed Ratio Staffed Hospital Bed Ratio Staffed Hospital Bed Ratio is the average complement of beds fully staffed during the year, or those beds that are set-up, staffed, and equipped, and in all respects, ready for use by patients remaining in the hospital overnight.

The exploding demand for healthcare in the U.S. is nothing new. But the growing critical shortage of staffed hospital beds, fueled primarily by the historic growth of an aging population that requires increasing hospitalization, that looms as a possible crisis. In Kansas, 13.2 percent of the population in 2010 was 65 years or older.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: Kansas Hospital Association
URL of Source: http://www.kha-net.org/
URL of Data: http://www.kha-net.org/communications/annualstatreport/de...
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Children's Health

Percent of WIC Mothers Breastfeeding Exclusively

Value: 14.1 percent
Measurement Period: 2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Children's Health; Health / Access to Health Services

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of babies on WIC whose mothers reported breast-feeding exclusively at age 6 months.

Why this is important: Babies who are breastfed are generally healthier and achieve optimal growth and development compared to those who are fed formula milk.

If the vast majority of babies were exclusively fed breast milk in their first six months of life - meaning only breast milk and no other liquids or solids, not even water - it is estimated that the lives of at least 1.2 million children would be saved every year. If children continue to be breastfed up to two years and beyond, the health and development of millions of children would be greatly improved.

Infants who are not breastfed are at an increased risk of illness that can compromise their growth and raise the risk of death or disability. Breastfed babies receive protection from illnesses through the mother's milk.

Baseline: 43.5 percent of infants born in 2006 were breastfed at 6 months as reported in 2007-09. Target: 60.6 percent
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Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source:  http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data:  http://www.kdheks.gov/nws-wic/
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Diabetes

Percentage of Adults with Diagnosed Diabetes

Value: 12.6 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Diabetes

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults that have ever been diagnosed with diabetes. Women who were diagnosed with diabetes only during the course of their pregnancy were not included in this count.

Why this is important: In 2007, diabetes was the seventh leading cause of death in the United States. In 2010, an estimated 25.8 million people or 8.3% of the population had diabetes. Diabetes disproportionately affects minority populations and the elderly and its incidence is likely to increase as minority populations grow and the U.S. population becomes older. Diabetes can have a harmful effect on most of the organ systems in the human body; it is a frequent cause of end-stage renal disease, non-traumatic lower-extremity amputation, and a leading cause of blindness among working age adults. Persons with diabetes are also at increased risk for ischemic heart disease, neuropathy, and stroke. In economic terms, the direct medical expenditure attributable to diabetes in 2007 was estimated to be $116 billion.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
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Exercise, Nutrition & Weight

Percentage of Adults Consuming Fruits & Vegetables 5 or More Times Per Day

Value: 20.2 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Exercise, Nutrition, & Weight

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults who consume fruits and vegetables five or more times per day.

Why this is important: It is essential to eat a fresh, healthy and balanced diet in order to maintain a healthy weight and prevent chronic disease. Numerous studies have shown a clear link between the amount and variety of fruits and vegetables consumed and rates of chronic diseases, especially cancer. According to the World Cancer Research Fund International, about 35 percent of all cancers can be prevented through increased fruit and vegetable consumption. The USDA currently recommends four and one-half cups (nine servings) of fruits and vegetables daily for a 2,000-calorie diet, with higher or lower amounts depending on the caloric level. Despite the benefits, many people still do not eat recommended levels of fruits and vegetables. This is particularly true of consumers with lower incomes and education levels.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
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Percentage of Adults Participating in Recommended Level of Physical Activity

Value: 41.6 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Exercise, Nutrition, & Weight

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults 18 years and older who engage in moderate physical activity for at least 30 minutes on five days per week, or vigorous physical activity for at least 20 minutes three or more days per week.

Why this is important: Active adults reduce their risk of many serious health conditions including obesity, heart disease, diabetes, colon cancer, and high blood pressure. In addition, physical activity reduces the symptoms of anxiety and depression, improves mood and feelings of well-being, and promotes healthy sleep patterns. More than 60 percent of adults in the United States do not engage in the recommended amount of activity, and about 25 percent of adults are not active at all. The American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) recommends that active adults perform physical activity three to five times each week for 20 to 60 minutes at a time to improve cardiovascular fitness and body composition. In addition to reducing the risk of multiple chronic diseases, physical activity helps maintain healthy bones, muscles, joints, and helps to control weight, develop lean muscle, and reduce body fat. The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to increase the proportion of adults who engage in aerobic physical activity of at least moderate intensity for at least 150 minutes/week, or 75 minutes/week of vigorous intensity, or an equivalent combination to 47.9%.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
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URL of Source:  http://www.kdheks.gov/

Percentage of Adults Who are Obese

Value: 26.7 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Exercise, Nutrition, & Weight

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults (ages 18 and older) who are obese based on the Body Mass Index (BMI). The BMI is calculated by taking a person's weight and dividing it by their height squared in metric units. (BMI = Weight (Kg)/[Height (cm) ^ 2]) A BMI >=30 is considered obese.

Why this is important: The obesity is an indicator of the overall health and lifestyle of a community. Obesity increases the risk of many diseases and health conditions including heart disease, Type 2 diabetes, cancer, hypertension, stroke, liver and gallbladder disease, respiratory problems, and osteoarthritis. Losing weight and maintaining a healthy weight help to prevent and control these diseases. Obesity leads to significant economic costs due to increased healthcare spending and lost earnings. The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to reduce the proportion of adults (ages 20 and up) who are obese to 30.6%.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source:  http://www.kdheks.gov/
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Percentage of Adults Who are Overweight

Value: 44.6 percent  
Measurement Period: 2009  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health / Exercise, Nutrition, & Weight

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults who are overweight according to the Body Mass Index (BMI). The BMI is calculated by taking a person's weight and dividing it by their height squared in metric units. \( \text{BMI} = \frac{\text{Weight (Kg)}}{[\text{Height (cm)}]^2} \) A BMI between 25 and 29.9 is considered overweight.

Why this is important: The percentage of overweight adults is an indicator of the overall health and lifestyle of a community. Being overweight affects quality of life and puts individuals at risk for developing many diseases, especially heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and cancer. Losing weight helps to prevent and control these diseases. Being overweight or obese also carries significant economic costs due to increased healthcare spending and lost earnings.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
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Heart Disease and Stroke

Congestive Heart Failure Hospital Admission Rate

Value: 182.44 per 100,000 population
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Heart Disease & Stroke; Health / Access to Health Services; Health / Wellness & Lifestyle

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of admissions for congestive heart failure per 100,000 population in an area.

Why this is important: Prevention of congestive heart failure admissions is an important role for all health care providers. Providers can help individuals stay healthy by preventing disease, and they can prevent complications of existing disease by helping patients live with their illnesses.

While these indicators use hospital inpatient data, their focus is on outpatient health care. Prevention Quality Indicators (PQIs) assess the quality of the health care system as a whole, and especially the quality of ambulatory care, in preventing medical complications. As a result, these measures are likely to be of the greatest value when calculated at the population level and when used by public health groups, State data organizations, and other organizations concerned with the health of populations. Serving as a screening tool, these indicators can provide initial information about potential problems in the community that may require further, more in-depth analysis.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Heart Disease Hospital Admission Rate

Value: 250.61 per 100,000 population
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Heart Disease & Stroke; Health / Access to Health Services; Health / Wellness & Lifestyle

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of admissions for heart disease (ICD9 diagnoses 402, 410-414 or 429) per 100,000 population in an area.

Why this is important: Heart disease has consistently been a public health concern and is the leading cause of death in the United States. For coronary heart disease alone, the estimated direct and indirect costs for the overall U.S. population are approximately $165.4 billion for 2009. According to the national hospital discharge survey, hospitalizations for heart disease accounted for 4.2 million hospitalizations in 2006. Approximately 62% of these short-stay hospitalizations occurred among people ages 65 years and older. There is also evidence that heart disease hospitalization rates vary among racial and ethnic groups.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/
Marion County Rural Health Works

Percentage of Adults with High Cholesterol

Value: 28.1 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Heart Disease & Stroke

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults who have had their blood cholesterol checked and have been told that it was high.

Why this is important: High blood cholesterol is one of the major risk factors for heart disease. Studies show that the higher your blood cholesterol level, the greater your risk for developing heart disease or having a heart attack. Heart disease is the number one killer of men and women in the United States. Every year about 785,000 Americans have a first heart attack. Another 470,000 who have already had one or more heart attacks have another attack. In 2006, over 630,000 Americans died from heart disease. High blood cholesterol does not cause symptoms, so it is important to find out what your cholesterol numbers are. Lowering cholesterol levels lessens the risk for developing heart disease and reduces the chance of having a heart attack. Lowering high cholesterol levels is important for people of all ages, both men and women.

The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to reduce the proportion of adults aged 20 years and older with high total blood cholesterol levels to 13.5%.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
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Percentage of Adults with Hypertension

Value: 31.4 percent  
Measurement Period: 2009  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health / Heart Disease & Stroke

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults who have been told they have high blood pressure. Normal blood pressure should be less than 120/80 mm Hg for an adult. Blood pressure above this level (140/90 mm Hg or higher) is considered high (hypertension).

Why this is important: High blood pressure is the number one modifiable risk factor for stroke. In addition to stroke, high blood pressure also contributes to heart attacks, heart failure, kidney failure, and atherosclerosis. The higher your blood pressure, the greater your risk of heart attack, heart failure, stroke, and kidney disease. In the United States, one in three adults has high blood pressure, and nearly one-third of these people are not aware that they have it. Because there are no symptoms associated with high blood pressure, it is often called the "silent killer." The only way to tell if you have high blood pressure is to have your blood pressure checked. High blood pressure can occur in people of any age or sex; however, it is more common among those over age 35. It is particularly prevalent in African Americans, older adults, obese people, heavy drinkers, and women taking birth control pills. Blood pressure can be controlled through lifestyle changes including eating a heart-healthy diet, limiting alcohol, avoiding tobacco, controlling your weight, and staying physically active.

The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to reduce the proportion of adults aged 18 years and older with high blood pressure to 26.9%.
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Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/
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Immunizations & Infectious Diseases

Bacterial Pneumonia Hospital Admission Rate

**Value:** 218.97 per 100,000 population  
**Measurement Period:** 2007-2009  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** KS State Value  
**Categories:** Health / Immunizations & Infectious Diseases; Health / Other Conditions; Health / Access to Health Services

![Bacterial Pneumonia Hospital Rate per 100,000 Population](chart)

**What is this Indicator?**
This indicator shows the number of admissions for bacterial pneumonia per 100,000 population in an area.

**Why this is important:** Prevention of bacterial pneumonia is an important role for all health care providers. Providers can help individuals stay healthy by preventing disease, and they can prevent complications of existing disease by helping patients live with their illnesses. While these indicators use hospital inpatient data, their focus is on outpatient health care. Prevention Quality Indicators (PQIs) assess the quality of the health care system as a whole, and especially the quality of ambulatory care, in preventing medical complications. As a result, these measures are likely to be of the greatest value when calculated at the population level and when used by public health groups, State data organizations, and other organizations concerned with the health of populations. Serving as a screening tool, these indicators can provide initial information about potential problems in the community that may require further, more in-depth analysis.

**Technical Note:** The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.  
**Source:** Kansas Department of Health and Environment
Percent of Infants Fully Immunized at 24 Months

Value: 69.2 percent  
Measurement Period: 2011-2012  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health / Immunizations & Infectious Diseases; Health / Children's Health; Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percent of infants who were immunized with the 4 DTaP, 3 Polio, 1 MMR, 3 Haemophilus influenzae type b,, and 3 Hepatitis B vaccines (the 4:3:1:3:3 series) by 24 months of age.

Why this is important: Vaccine coverage is of great public health importance. By having greater vaccine coverage, there is an increase in herd immunity, which leads to lower disease incidence and an ability to limit the size of disease outbreaks. In 2006, a widespread outbreak of mumps occurred in Kansas and across the United States. Prior to the outbreak, the incidence of mumps was at a historical low, and even with the outbreak, the mumps disease rates were still lower than pre-vaccination era. Due to high vaccination coverage, tens or hundreds of thousands of cases were possibly prevented. However, due to unvaccinated and under-vaccinated individuals, the United States has seen a rise in diseases that were previously present at low levels, specifically measles and pertussis.

Technical Note: The county value is compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
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Value: 59.3 percent
Measurement Period: 2009-2010
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Immunizations & Infectious Diseases

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults 18 years and older who received the influenza vaccination (flu shot or flu spray) in the past year.

Why this is important: Influenza is a contagious disease caused by the influenza virus. It can lead to pneumonia and can be dangerous for people with heart or breathing conditions. Infection with influenza can cause high fever, diarrhea and seizures in children. It is estimated that 226,000 people are hospitalized each year due to influenza and 36,000 die - mostly the elderly. The seasonal influenza vaccine can prevent serious illness and death. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends annual vaccinations to prevent the spread of influenza.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
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Sexually Transmitted Disease Rate

Value: 1.6 cases/10,000 population
Measurement Period: 2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Immunizations & Infectious Diseases

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the crude incidence rate per 1,000 population due to sexually transmitted diseases.

Why this is important: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that there are approximately 19 million new STD infections each year—almost half of them among young people ages 15 to 24.3 The cost of STDs to the U.S. health care system is estimated to be as much as $15.9 billion annually.4 Because many cases of STDs go undiagnosed—and some common viral infections, such as human papillomavirus (HPV) and genital herpes, are not reported to CDC at all—the reported cases of chlamydia, gonorrhea, and syphilis represent only a fraction of the true burden of STDs in the United States.

Untreated STDs can lead to serious long-term health consequences, especially for adolescent girls and young women. CDC estimates that undiagnosed and untreated STDs cause at least 24,000 women in the United States each year to become infertile.

In 2008, 13,500 cases of primary and secondary syphilis were reported in the United States, a 17.7 percent increase from 2007. The rate of primary & secondary syphilis in the United States was 18.4% higher in 2008 than in 2007.

Chlamydia, the most frequently reported bacterial sexually transmitted disease in the United States, is caused by the bacterium, Chlamydia trachomatis. Under-reporting of chlamydia is substantial because most people with chlamydia are not aware of their infections and do not
Marion County Rural Health Works

seek testing.

Healthy People 2020 has set 18 objectives to reduce STD rates in the United States.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://www.kdheks.gov/std/std_reports.html
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Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health

Infant Mortality Rate

Value: 20.7 deaths/ 1,000 live births
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health; Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the rate of infant deaths (prior to one year of age) per 1,000 live births.

Why this is important: One of the basic indicators of the health of a community or state is infant mortality, the death of an infant before one year of age. The calculated infant mortality rate (IMR), while not a true measure of population health, serves as one proxy indicator of population health since it reflects the apparent association between the causes of infant mortality and other factors that are likely to influence the health status of the whole population such as economic development, general living conditions, social wellbeing where basic needs are met, rates of illness such as diabetes and hypertension, and quality of the environment.

The number of infant deaths to Kansas residents dropped from 290 in 2009 to 253 in 2010. The number of Kansas resident births in 2010 was 40,439. This resulted in an infant mortality rate of 6.28 per 1,000 live births compared to 7.01 in 2009. Although the one year decline was not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level, the number of infant deaths is the lowest in Kansas since recordkeeping began in 1912. The infant mortality rate is the lowest recorded. Over the last 22 years Kansas has experienced a statistically significant declining trend in the annual infant mortality rate (with a lot of ups and downs in between).

The 2010 infant mortality rate represents a 28.4 percent decrease from the 1989 IMR of 8.77. That change is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.
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The Healthy People 2020 target is 6.0 infant deaths per 1,000 live births. The leading causes of death among infants are birth defects, pre-term delivery, low birth weight, Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS), and maternal complications during pregnancy.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Number of Births per 1,000 Population

Value: 11.4 births/1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of births per 1,000 population.

Why this is important: The birth rate is an important measure of population health. The birth rate is usually the dominant factor in determining the rate of population growth; however, it depends on both the level of fertility and the age structure of the population.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

25
Percent of all Births Occurring to Teens (15-19 years)

Value: 14 percent  
Measurement Period: 2009-2011  
Location: County : Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health; Health / Teen & Adolescent Health

What is this Indicator?  
This indicator shows the percentage of births in which mothers were 15-19 years of age.

Why this is important: For many women, a family planning clinic is the entry point into the health care system and one they consider their usual source of care. Each year, publicly funded family planning services prevent 1.94 million unintended pregnancies, including 400,000 teen pregnancies. These services are cost-effective, saving nearly $4 in Medicaid expenditures for pregnancy-related care for every $1 spent.

In Kansas, 4,265 births occurred to women 10-19 years of age, representing 10.3 percent of the births in 2009.

Births resulting from unintended pregnancies can have negative consequences including birth defects and low birth weight. Children from unintended pregnancies are more likely to experience poor mental and physical health during childhood, and have lower educational attainment and more behavioral issues in their teen years.

The negative consequences associated with unintended pregnancies are greater for teen parents and their children. Eighty-two percent of pregnancies to mothers ages 15 to 19 are unintended. One in five unintended pregnancies each year is among teens. Teen mothers are less likely to graduate from high school or attain a GED by the time they reach age 30; earn an
average of approximately $3,500 less per year, when compared with those who delay childbearing until their 20s; and receive nearly twice as much Federal aid for nearly twice as long.

Unintended pregnancies are associated with many negative health and economic consequences. Unintended pregnancies include pregnancies that are reported by women as being mistimed or unwanted. Almost half of all pregnancies in the United States are unintended. The public costs of births resulting from unintended pregnancies were $11 billion in 2006. (This figure includes costs for prenatal care, labor and delivery, post-partum care, and 1 year of infant care).

Technical Note: Births with unknown values are excluded from the denominator for this calculation. The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.

Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)

### Percent of Births Occurring to Unmarried Women

**Value:** 51.3 percent  
**Measurement Period:** 2009-2011  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** KS State Value  
**Categories:** Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health; Health / Family Planning

**What is this Indicator?**  
This indicator shows the percentage of all births to mothers who reported not being married.
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Why this is important: Non-marital births reflect the number of children born to unmarried women and includes both planned and unplanned pregnancies as well as women who were living with a partner at the time of birth. In previous decades, the term was often used to describe births to teen mothers; however, in recent decades, the average age of unmarried women having children has increased and less than one quarter of non-marital births were to teenaged women. Despite the older age of unmarried mothers, health concerns remain for the children of unmarried women. Studies have found that infants born to non-married women are at greater risk of being born preterm, having a low birth weight, dying in infancy and living in poverty than babies born to married women. In 2007, nearly 4 in 10 births in the U.S. were to unmarried women, according to CDC.

Technical Note: Births with unknown values are excluded from the denominator for this calculation. The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making the comparison with the state. Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/ URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Percent of Births where Mother Smoked During Pregnancy

Value: 29.4 percent
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health; Health / Other Chronic Diseases

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of births in which the mothers reported smoked during their pregnancy.
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Why this is important: Smoking is a major public health problem. Smokers face an increased risk of lung cancer, stroke, cardiovascular diseases, and multiple other disorders. Smoking during pregnancy adversely affects the health of both the mother and her baby. Maternal smoking can result in miscarriages, premature delivery, and sudden infant death syndrome. Smoking during pregnancy nearly doubles a woman’s risk of having a low birth weight baby, and low birth weight is a key predictor for infant mortality. In addition, smoking also increases the risk of preterm delivery. Low birth weight and premature babies face an increased risk of serious health problems during the infant period, as well as chronic lifelong disabilities such as cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and learning problems.

Technical Note: Births with unknown values are excluded from the denominator for this calculation. The county and regional values is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)

Percent of Births Where Prenatal Care began in First Trimester

Value: 77 percent
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of births in which mothers received prenatal care in the first trimester.
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Why this is important: Babies born to mothers who do not receive prenatal care are three times more likely to have a low birth weight and five times more likely to die than those born to mothers who do get care. Early prenatal care (i.e., care in the first trimester of a pregnancy) allows women and their health care providers to identify and, when possible, treat or correct health problems and health-compromising behaviors that can be particularly damaging during the initial stages of fetal development. Increasing the number of women who receive prenatal care, and who do so early in their pregnancies, can improve birth outcomes and lower health care costs by reducing the likelihood of complications during pregnancy and childbirth.

Technical Note: Births with unknown values are excluded from the denominator for this calculation. The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making the comparison with the state.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Percent of Births with Inadequate Birth Spacing

Value: 14.6 percent
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health; Health / Children's Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of live births in which a sibling was born less than 18 months prior.

Why this is important: Birth Spacing refers to the time interval from one child's birth date until the next child's birth date. There are many factors to consider in determining what is an optimal
time interval between pregnancies. However, researchers agree that 2 ½ years to 3 years between births is usually best for the well being of the mother and her children. When births are spaced 2½ years to 3 years apart there is less risk of infant and child death. There is also lower risk of the baby being underweight. Short intervals between births can also be bad for mother’s health. There is a greater risk of bleeding in pregnancy, premature rupture of the bag of waters and increased risk of maternal death. A time interval of six months or more after finishing breastfeeding is also recommended before becoming pregnant again for the mother to be able to rebuild her nutritional stores.

Technical Note: Births with unknown values are excluded from the denominator for this calculation. The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.

Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Percent of Births with Low Birth Weight

Value: 6.8 percent
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of all births in which the newborn weight is less than 2,500 grams (5 pounds, 8 ounces).

Why this is important: Babies born with a low birth weight are more likely than babies of normal weight to require specialized medical care, and often must stay in the intensive care unit.
Low birth weight is often associated with premature birth. While there have been many medical advances enabling premature infants to survive, there is still risk of infant death or long-term disability. The most important things an expectant mother can do to prevent prematurity and low birth weight are to take prenatal vitamins, stop smoking, stop drinking alcohol and using drugs, and most importantly, get prenatal care.

Technical Note: Births with unknown values are excluded from the denominator for this calculation. The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.

Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Percent of Premature Births

Value: 6.8 percent
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Maternal, Fetal & Infant Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of births to resident mothers in which the baby had less than 37 weeks of completed gestation.

Why this is important: Babies born premature are likely to require specialized medical care, and oftentimes must stay in intensive care nurseries. While there have been many medical advances enabling premature infants to survive, there is still risk of infant death or long-term disability. The most important things an expectant mother can do to prevent prematurity and very low birth weight are to take prenatal vitamins, stop smoking, stop drinking alcohol and
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using drugs, and most importantly, get prenatal care.

The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to reduce the proportion of infants who are born preterm to 11.4%.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State Value. Total live births excludes births for which the gestational length of the baby was unknown. The trend is a comparison between the most recent and previous measurement periods. Confidence intervals were not taken into account in determining the direction of the trend.

Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source:  http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data:  http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html
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Mental Health & Mental Disorders

Percentage of Adults who Reported Their Mental Health Was Not Good on 14 or More Days in the Part 30 Days.

Value: 7.9 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mental Health & Mental Disorders

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults who stated that they experienced fourteen or more days of poor mental health in the past month.

Why this is important: Psychological distress can affect all aspects of our lives. It is important to recognize and address potential psychological issues before they become critical. Occasional days of feeling "down" or emotional are normal, but persistent mental or emotional health problems should be evaluated and treated by a qualified professional.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas State value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
**Marion County Rural Health Works**

**Mortality Data**

**Age-adjusted Alzheimer's Disease Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population**

**Value:** 30.6 deaths/100,000 population  
**Measurement Period:** 2009-2011  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** KS State Value  
**Categories:** Health / Mortality Data; Health / Older Adults & Aging

![Graph showing the age-adjusted Alzheimer's Disease Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population from 2000-2011 for Marion County and Kansas.](image)

**What is this Indicator?**
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to Alzheimer's disease.

**Why this is important:** Dementia is the loss of cognitive functioning--thinking, remembering, and reasoning--to such an extent that it interferes with a person's daily life. Dementia is not a disease itself, but rather a set of symptoms. Memory loss is a common symptom of dementia, although memory loss by itself does not mean a person has dementia. Alzheimer's disease is the most common cause of dementia, accounting for the majority of all diagnosed cases.

Nationally, Alzheimer's disease is the 6th leading cause of death among adults aged 18 years and older. In Kansas, 963 people died from Alzheimer's, the 6th leading cause of death in the state. The age-adjusted mortality rate was 28.4 deaths per 100,000 population. Estimates vary, but experts suggest that up to 5.1 million Americans aged 65 years and older have Alzheimer's disease. These numbers are predicted to more than double by 2050 unless more effective ways to treat and prevent Alzheimer's disease are found.

Dementia affects an individual's health, quality of life, and ability to live independently.

People living with dementia are at greater risk for general disability and experience frequent injury from falls. Older adults with dementia are 3 times more likely to have preventable
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hospitalizations. As their dementia worsens, people need more health services and, oftentimes, long-term care. Many individuals requiring long-term care experience major personal and financial challenges that affect their families, their caregivers, and society.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)

Age-adjusted Cancer Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 177.5 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to all cancers.

Why this is important: Cancer has been the second leading cause of death in the United States. In Kansas 5,304 persons died of cancer in 2009. With an age-adjusted mortality rate of 173.3 deaths per 100,000 population, Cancer temporarily bumped heart disease from the number one cause of death in Kansas.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)
Age-adjusted Cerebrovascular Disease Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 46.1 deaths/100,000 population  
Measurement Period: 2009-2011  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to cerebrovascular disease.

Why this is important: Stroke is the third leading cause of death among Americans, accounting for nearly 1 out of every 17 deaths. It is also the leading cause of serious long-term disability. Risk factors for stroke include inactivity, obesity, high blood pressure, cigarette smoking, high cholesterol, and diabetes.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.  
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment  
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/  
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Age-adjusted Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 49 deaths/100,000 population  
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to chronic lower respiratory disease.

Why this is important: Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease (CLRD) is the fourth leading cause of death in the United States but the third leading cause of death in Kansas. It is projected to be third nationwide by 2020.

Approximately 124,000 people die each year in the United States from CLRD. This estimate is considered low, however, because CLRD is often cited as a contributory, not underlying, cause of death on the death certificate. In Kansas in CLRD accounted for 1,577 deaths in 2009, producing an age-adjusted mortality rate of 50.9 deaths per 100,000 population.

CLRD comprises three major diseases: chronic bronchitis, emphysema, and asthma. Approximately $42.7 billion is spent annually on direct and indirect health care costs due to CLRD.

Tobacco smoking is the most important risk factor for chronic bronchitis and emphysema, accounting for about 80% of cases. Cigarette smokers are 10 times more likely to die from these diseases than nonsmokers. The remaining 20% of cases are attributable to environmental exposures and genetic factors. Asthma appears to have a strong genetic basis, with 30% to 50% of all cases due to an inherited predisposition.

A direct association between secondhand smoke and lower respiratory disease has been documented by the Environmental Protection Agency. Smoking cessation in the single most effective way to reduce the risk of CLRD and its progression.
Lower respiratory disease deaths increased in the United States by 163% between 1965 and 1998. This trend reflects smoking patterns initiated 30 to 50 years ago.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Age-adjusted Diabetes Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 33.3 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to Diabetes.

Why this is important: In 2007, diabetes was the seventh leading cause of death in the United States. In 2010, an estimated 25.8 million people or 8.3% of the population had diabetes. Diabetes disproportionately affects minority populations and the elderly and its incidence is likely to increase as minority populations grow and the U.S. population becomes older.

Diabetes can have a harmful effect on most of the organ systems in the human body; it is a frequent cause of end-stage renal disease, non-traumatic lower-extremity amputation, and a leading cause of blindness among working age adults. Persons with diabetes are also at increased risk for ischemic heart disease, neuropathy, and stroke. In economic terms, the direct medical expenditure attributable to diabetes in 2007 was estimated to be $116 billion.
Age-adjusted Heart Disease Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 224.8 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to heart disease.

Why this is important: Heart disease in the number one cause of death in the U.S. and Hawaii. Physical inactivity, overweight, and obesity are considered cardiovascular risk determinants. Regular physical activity and a diet low in unhealthy fats and high in fruits and vegetables may help reduce the risk for cardiovascular disease. In 2009, the U.S. spent an estimated $68.9 billion on costs associated with stroke, including health care, medicine, and lost productivity.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html
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Age-adjusted Homicide Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 0 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to homicide.

Why this is important: A violent crime is a crime in which the offender uses or threatens to use violent force upon the victim. Violent crimes include homicide, assault, rape, and robbery. Violence negatively impacts communities by reducing productivity, decreasing property values, and disrupting social services. Homicides in Kansas totaled 127 in 2009. The age-adjusted mortality rate was 4.6 deaths per 100,000 population. The 2007 National age-adjusted mortality rate was 6.11 per 100,000 population. The national target is 5.5 homicides per 100,000 population.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)

Age-adjusted Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 938.6 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to all causes.

Why this is important: Mortality or death rates are often used as measures of health status for a population. Many factors affect the risk of death, including age, race, gender, occupation, education, and income. By far the strongest of these factors affecting the risk of death is age. Populations often differ in age composition. A "young" population has a higher proportion of persons in the younger age groups, while an "old" population has a higher proportion in the older age groups. Therefore, it is often important to control for differences among the age distributions of populations when making comparisons among death rates to assess the relative risk of death. Age-adjusted mortality rates are valuable when comparing two different geographic areas, causes or time periods.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Age-adjusted Nephritis, Nephrotic Syndrome, Nephrosis Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 36.1 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mortality Data
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to nephritis, nephrotic syndrome, nephrosis.

Why this is important: Chronic kidney disease (CKD) -- called kidney disease here for short -- is a condition in which the small blood vessels in the kidneys are damaged, making the kidneys unable to do their job. Waste then builds up in the blood, harming the body. Nephritis, nephrotic syndrome, and nephrosis are diseases associated with the kidney and as a group represented the 9th leading cause of death in Kansas, claiming 556 lives in 2009.

Kidney disease is most often caused by diabetes or high blood pressure. Diabetes and high blood pressure damage the blood vessels in the kidneys, so the kidneys are not able to filter the blood as well as they used to. Usually this damage happens slowly, over many years. As more and more blood vessels are damaged, the kidneys eventually stop working.

Other risk factors for kidney disease are cardiovascular (heart) disease and a family history of kidney failure.

Chronic nephritis is a chronic inflammation of the tissues of the kidney. It is caused by a wide variety of etiological factors. The disease is frequently associated with a slow, progressive loss of kidney function. It is usually discovered accidentally, either by routine urinalysis (tests done to check kidney function) or during a routine physical checkup when anemia, hypertension, or laboratory findings (elevated serum creatinine and blood urea nitrogen) are discovered. Its course is long and the prognosis (expectancy of cure) is poor.

CKD and end-stage renal disease (ESRD) are significant public health problems in the United States and a major source of suffering and poor quality of life for those afflicted. They are responsible for premature death and exact a high economic price from both the private and public sectors. CKD and ESRD are very costly to treat. Nearly 25 percent of the Medicare budget is used to treat people with CKD and ESRD.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Marion County Rural Health Works

Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Age-adjusted Suicide Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 18.5 deaths/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to suicide.

Why this is important: Suicide results in the tragic loss of human life as well as agonizing grief, fear, and confusion in families and communities. Its impact is not limited to an individual person or family, but extends across generations and throughout communities. The breadth of the problem and the complexity of its risk factors make suicide prevention well suited to a community-based public health approach that engages multiple systems and reaches all citizens. Depression and suicide are significant public health issues. Depression is one of the most common mental disorders experienced by elders, but fortunately is treatable by a variety of means.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html
Age-adjusted Traffic Injury Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 31.9 deaths/100,000 population  
Measurement Period: 2009-2011  
Location: County : Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health / Mortality Data

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the death rate per 100,000 population due to on- or off-road accidents involving a motor vehicle. Deaths resulting from boating accidents and airline crashes are not included in this measure.

Why this is important: Motor vehicle-related injuries kill more children and young adults than any other single cause in the United States. More than 41,000 people in the United States die in motor vehicle crashes each year, and crash injuries result in about 500,000 hospitalizations and four million emergency department visits annually. Increased use of safety belts and reductions in driving while impaired are two of the most effective means to reduce the risk of death and serious injury of occupants in motor vehicle crashes.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.  
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment  
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/  
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html

Age-adjusted Unintentional Injuries Mortality Rate per 100,000 Population

Value: 57.9 deaths/100,000 population  
Measurement Period: 2009-2011
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the total age-adjusted death rate per 100,000 population due to unintentional injuries.

Why this is important: Injuries are one of the leading causes of death for Americans of all ages, regardless of gender, race, or economic status. For ages 15 to 24 years, injury deaths exceed deaths from all other causes combined and account for nearly four out of five deaths in this age group. Intentional injuries are those resulting from purposeful human action directed at oneself or others. Major risk factors for intentional injuries from interpersonal or self-inflicted violence include firearms, alcohol abuse, mental illness, and poverty. Unintentional injuries refer to those that are unplanned and include motor-vehicle accidents, falls, fires and burns, and drownings.

In Kansas, unintentional injuries accounted for 1,301 deaths making it the fourth leading cause of death. The age-adjusted mortality rate was 43.8 deaths per 100,000 population. In the US, one death out of every 17 results from injury. In 2006, unintentional injuries were the fifth leading cause of death overall in the U.S, and increased 1.4% from 2005 to 2006. In 2006, 121,599 people died from unintentional injuries.

Technical Note: The County / Region values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)
**Marion County Rural Health Works**

**Oral Health**

**Dentist Rate**

**Value:** 22 dentists/100,000 population  
**Measurement Period:** 2011-2012  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** U.S. Counties  
**Categories:** Health/Oral Health

---

**What is this Indicator?**
This indicator shows the rate of dentists per 100,000 population.

**Why this is important:** Oral health has been shown to impact overall health and well-being. Nearly one-third of all adults in the United States have untreated tooth decay, or tooth caries, and one in seven adults ages 35 to 44 years old has periodontal (gum) disease. Tooth decay is the most prevalent chronic infectious disease affecting children in the U.S., and impacts more than a quarter of children ages 2 to 5 and more than half of children ages 12 to 15. Given these serious health consequences, it is important to maintain good oral health. It is recommended that adults and children see a dentist on a regular basis. Professional dental care helps to maintain the overall health of the teeth and mouth, and provides for early detection of pre-cancerous or cancerous lesions. People living in areas with low rates of dentists may have difficulty accessing the dental care they need.

**Technical Note:** The distribution is based on data from 3,054 U.S. counties and county equivalents.  
**Source:** County Health Rankings  
**URL of Source:** [http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/](http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/)  
**URL of Data:** [http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/rankings/data](http://www.countyhealthrankings.org/rankings/data)
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Percentage of Screened 3-12 Grade Students with No Dental Sealants

Value: 64.4 percent
Measurement Period: 2011-2012
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health/Oral Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of children with no dental sealants present on any tooth grades 3-12, who participated in dental screenings by calibrated licensed dentists and hygienists at their schools.

Why this is important: Children with untreated oral disease often experience persistent pain, the inability to eat comfortably or chew well, embarrassment at discolored and damaged teeth, and distraction from play and learning. Nationally more than 51 million school hours are lost each year because of dental-related illness. Oral health screenings provide schools with an opportunity to focus on the importance of good oral health. Screenings also identify children with untreated dental disease and assist schools with appropriate referrals to dental professionals.

Technical Note: The data are from a convenience sample. Only those schools that participated in the statewide oral health screening program implemented by the Bureau of Oral Health to satisfy the Kansas State Statute for Annual Dental Inspection (K.S.A. 72-5201) are entered into the database.

Regarding a US Value comparison and a HP2020 target, there is no direct comparison that can be made to Kansas 'No Dental Sealant' data. The national and HP2020 values are from a survey of age groups 6 to 9 and 13 to 15 years of age based on the National Health & Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), CDC, and NCHS criteria. The Kansas criteria for its data are school grade levels 3 -12.
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The national value and HP2020 target for 'No Dental Sealants' of age group 6 to 9 is 25.5 percent and 28.1 percent respectively and 19.9 percent and 21.9 percent respectively for age group 13 to 15.

Source: KDHE Bureau of Oral Health
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://www.kdheks.gov/ohi/screening_program.htm

Percentage of Screened K-12 Grade Students with Obvious Dental Decay

Value: 15.5 percent
Measurement Period: 2011-2012
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health/Oral Health

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of obvious dental decay found in children grades K-12, who participated in dental screenings by calibrated licensed dentists and hygienists at their schools.

Why this is important: Children with untreated oral disease often experience persistent pain, the inability to eat comfortably or chew well, embarrassment at discolored and damaged teeth, and distraction from play and learning. Nationally more than 51 million school hours are lost each year because of dental-related illness. Oral health screenings provide schools with an opportunity to focus on the importance of good oral health. Screenings also identify children with untreated dental disease and assist schools with appropriate referrals to dental professionals.

Technical Note: The data are from a convenience sample. Only those schools that participated in the statewide oral health screening program implemented by the Bureau of Oral Health to satisfy the Kansas State Statute for Annual Dental Inspection (K.S.A. 72-5201) are entered into the database.
Regarding a US Value comparison and a HP2020 target, there is no direct comparison that can be made to Kansas 'Obvious Dental Decay' data. The national and HP2020 values are from a survey of age groups 6 to 9 and 13 to 15 years of age based on the National Health & Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), CDC, and NCHS criteria. The Kansas criteria for its data are school grade levels K -12.

The national value and HP2020 target for 'Obvious Dental Decay' of age group 6 to 9 is 28.8 percent and 25.9 percent respectively and 17.0 percent and 15.3 percent respectively for age group 13 to 15.

Source: KDHE Bureau of Oral Health
URL of Source:  http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data:  http://www.kdheks.gov/ohi/screening_program.htm
**Marion County Rural Health Works**

**Prevention & Safety**

**Injury Hospital Admission Rate**

**Value:** 704.96 Per 100,000 population  
**Measurement Period:** 2007-09  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** KS State Value  
**Categories:** Health/Prevention & Safety

![Injury Hospital Admission Rate per 100,000 Population](image)

**What is this Indicator?**  
This indicator shows the number of hospital admissions for unintentional and intentional injury (secondary ICD 9CM diagnoses of E800-E928 excluding E870-E879) per 100,000 population in an area.

**Why this is important:** Injuries are the leading cause of death for Americans ages 1 to 44, and a leading cause of disability for all ages, regardless of sex, race/ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. More than 180,000 people die from injuries each year, and approximately 1 in 10 sustains a nonfatal injury serious enough to be treated in a hospital emergency department. Beyond their immediate health consequences, injuries and violence have a significant impact on the well-being of Americans by contributing to: Premature death, disability, poor mental health, high medical costs and lost productivity. The effects of injuries and violence extend beyond the injured person or victim of violence to family members, friends, coworkers, employers, and communities. Injuries are not tracked systematically unless they result in hospitalization or death. Hospital admission data only represent the most serious injuries.

**Technical Note:** The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value.  
**Source:** Kansas Department of Health and Environment  
**URL of Source:** [http://www.kdheks.gov/](http://www.kdheks.gov/)  
**URL of Data:** [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)
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Respiratory Diseases

Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) Hospital Admission Rate

Value: 286.28 Per 100,000 population
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health/Respiratory Diseases

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of admissions for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease per 100,000 population in an area.

Why this is important: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease is a leading cause of death in Kansas. Preventing hospital admissions is an important role for all health care providers. Providers can help individuals stay healthy by preventing disease, and they can prevent complications of existing disease by helping patients live with their illnesses.

While these indicators use hospital inpatient data, their focus is on outpatient health care. Prevention Quality Indicators (PQIs) assess the quality of the health care system as a whole, and especially the quality of ambulatory care, in preventing medical complications. As a result, these measures are likely to be of the greatest value when calculated at the population level and when used by public health groups. Serving as a screening tool, these indicators can provide initial information about potential problems in the community that may require further, more in-depth analysis.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
URL of Data: http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html
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Substance Abuse

Percentage of Adults Who are Binge Drinkers

Value: 15.8 percent  
Measurement Period: 2009  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Health/Substance Abuse

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults 18 years and older who reported binge drinking at least once during the 30 days prior to the survey. Male binge drinking is defined as five or more drinks on one occasion, and female binge drinking is four or more drinks on one occasion.

Why this is important: Binge drinking is an indicator of excessive alcohol use in the United States. Binge drinking can be dangerous and may result in vomiting, loss of sensory perception, and blackouts. The prevalence of binge drinking among men is twice that of women. In addition, it was found that binge drinkers are 14 times more likely to report alcohol-impaired driving than non-binge drinkers. Alcohol abuse is associated with a variety of negative health and safety outcomes including alcohol-related traffic accidents and other injuries, employment problems, legal difficulties, financial loss, family disputes and other interpersonal problems. The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to reduce the proportion of adults aged 18 years and older engaging in binge drinking during the past 30 days to 24.3%.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.

Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment  
URL of Data: [http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html](http://kic.kdhe.state.ks.us/kic/index.html)
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Percentage of Adults Who Currently Smoke Cigarettes

Value: 19.3 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health/Substance Abuse

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults 18 years and older who currently smoke cigarettes.

Why this is important: Tobacco use is one of the most preventable causes of illness and death in America today. Tobacco use causes premature death to almost half a million Americans each year, and it contributes to profound disability and pain in many others. Approximately one-third of all tobacco users in this country will die prematurely because of their dependence on tobacco. Areas with a high smoking prevalence will also have greater exposure to secondhand smoke for non-smokers, which can cause or exacerbate a wide range of adverse health effects, including cancer, heart disease, respiratory infections, and asthma. The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to reduce the proportion of adults aged 18 years and older who smoke cigarettes to 12%.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
Marion County Rural Health Works

Wellness & Lifestyle

Percentage of Adults with Fair or Poor Self-Perceived Health Status

Value: 23.1 percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Health/Wellness & Lifestyle

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of adults 18 years and older answering poor or fair to the question: "how is your general health?"

Why this is important: People's subjective assessment of their health status is important because when people feel healthy they are more likely to feel happy and to participate in their community socially and economically. Areas with unhealthy populations lose productivity due to lost work time. Healthy residents are essential for creating a vibrant and successful community.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value. Confidence intervals were not taken into account while making this comparison.
Source: Kansas Department of Health and Environment
URL of Source: http://www.kdheks.gov/
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Economic Climate

Uninsured Adult Population Rate

Value: 18.2 Percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Economy/Poverty

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the estimated percent of persons ages 18-64 who are uninsured.

Why this is important: Access to health services encompasses four components: coverage, services, timeliness, and workforce.

Health insurance coverage helps patients get into the health care system. Uninsured people are:

Less likely to receive medical care
More likely to die early
More likely to have poor health status

Lack of adequate coverage makes it difficult for people to get the health care they need and, when they do get care, burdens them with large medical bills. Current policy efforts focus on the provision of insurance coverage as the principal means of ensuring access to health care among the general population. Other factors, described below, may be equally important to removing barriers to access and utilization of services.

Access to health care services in the United States is regarded as unreliable; many people do not receive the appropriate and timely care they need. The U.S. health care system, which is
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already strained, will face an influx of patients in 2014, when 32 million Americans will have health insurance for the first time. All of these issues, and others, make the measurement and development of new strategies and models essential.

In 2009-2010, the percentage of Kansans without health insurance rose to 13%, the highest rate of the decade, 2000-2010. This percentage climbed from 11.3% in 2005-2006 and 12.7% in 2008-2009. Approximately 357,500 Kansas residents - children and adults - lacked insurance in 2009-2010, also the highest number in the decade and an increase of about 10,000 people from 347,400 during 2008-2009. The percentage of Kansans (13) who were uninsured in 2009-2010 compared favorably with the United States percentage of 16.5%.

Healthy People 2020 has set a target of 100% coverage for medical insurance Increase the proportion of persons with health insurance. The national baseline for comparison was 83.2 percent of persons had medical insurance in 2008.

Technical Note: The County / Region value is compared to the Kansas state value.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/
URL of Data: http://www.census.gov/did/www/sahie/
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Employment

Unemployed Workers in Civilian Labor Force

Value: 4.6 Percent
Measurement Period: 2012, November
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Employment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator describes the civilians, 16 years of age and over, who are unemployed as a percent of the U.S. civilian labor force.

Why this is important: The unemployment rate is a key indicator of the local economy. Unemployment occurs when local businesses are not able to supply enough and/or appropriate jobs for local employees and/or when the labor force is not able to supply appropriate skills to employers. A high rate of unemployment has personal and societal effects. During periods of unemployment, individuals are likely to feel severe economic strain and mental stress. Unemployment is also related to access to health care, as many individuals receive health insurance through their employer. A high unemployment rate places strain on financial support systems, as unemployed persons qualify for unemployment benefits and food stamp programs.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on non-seasonally adjusted data from 3,141 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
URL of Source: http://www.bls.gov/
URL of Data: http://data.bls.gov/PDQ/outside.jsp?survey=la
Household with Public Assistance

Value: 1.3 Percent  
Measurement Period: 2007-2011  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: U.S. Counties  
Categories: Economy/Government Assistance Programs

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of households receiving cash public assistance income.

Why this is important: Public assistance income includes general assistance and Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). It does not include Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or noncash benefits such as Food Stamps. Areas with more households on public assistance programs have higher poverty rates.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.  
Source: American Community Survey  
URL of Source: [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)  
URL of Data: [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)
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Home Ownership

Foreclosure Rate

Value: 3.9 Percent
Measurement Period: 2008
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Home Ownership

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of mortgages that ended in foreclosure.

Why this is important: Foreclosure rate is a measure of economic stability. A foreclosure is the repossessing of a home and/or property by a lender in the event that the borrower defaults on a loan or is unable to meet the agreement of the mortgage. Unfortunately, foreclosures have become commonplace in many American cities and towns. Following a period of rising housing prices in the U.S., prices began to decline steeply and the years 2006 and 2007 saw unprecedented numbers of foreclosures among homeowners, the majority of whom had subprime mortgages. The ensuing "subprime mortgage crisis" was the first major indicator of the U.S. financial crisis.

Individuals and families who lose their homes to foreclosure are often left homeless or in precarious financial situations. Studies show that both the stress and forced relocation following home foreclosure have negative impacts on the health and well-being of individuals and families.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,137 U.S. counties.
Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
URL of Source: http://www.huduser.org/portal/
URL of Data: http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/nsp_foreclosure_data.html
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**Homeowner Vacancy Rate**

**Value:** 2.1 Percent  
**Measurement Period:** 2007-2011  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** U.S. Counties  
**Categories:** Economy/Homeownership

---

**What is this Indicator?**  
This indicator shows the percentage of vacant home property.

**Why this is important:** The homeowner vacancy rate is the proportion of property that is vacant "for sale." It is computed by dividing the number of vacant units "for sale only" by the sum of the owner-occupied units, vacant units that are "for sale only," and vacant units that have been sold but not yet occupied. Vacancy status is often used as a basic indicator of the housing market. It is used to identify turnover and assess the demand for housing. It provides information on the stability and quality of housing for a particular geographic region.

**Technical Note:** The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.  
**Source:** American Community Survey  
**URL of Source:** [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)  
**URL of Data:** [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)

---

**Homeownership**
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**Value:** 68.6 Percent  
**Measurement Period:** 2007-2011  
**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** U.S. Counties  
**Categories:** Economy/Homeownership

---

**What is this Indicator?**  
This indicator shows the percentage of housing units that are occupied by homeowners.

**Why this is important:** Homeownership has many benefits for both individuals and communities. Homeowners are more likely to improve their homes and to be involved in civic affairs, both of which benefit the individual and the community as a whole. In addition, homeownership provides tax benefits.

**Technical Note:** The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.  
**Source:** American Community Survey  
**URL of Source:** [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)  
**URL of Data:** [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)
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Housing Affordability & Supply

Renters Spending 30% or More of Household Income on Rent

Value: 35.1 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Housing Affordability & Supply

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of renters who are paying 30% or more of their household income in rent.

Why this is important: Spending a high percentage of household income on rent can create financial hardship, especially for lower-income renters. With a limited income, paying a high rent may not leave enough money for other expenses, such as food, transportation and medical. Moreover, high rent reduces the proportion of income a household can allocate to savings each month.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
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Income

Median Household Income

Value: 45,941 Dollars
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Income

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the median household income. Household income is defined as the sum of money received over a calendar year by all household members 15 years and older.

Why this is important: Median household income reflects the relative affluence and prosperity of an area. Areas with higher median household incomes are likely to have more educated residents and lower unemployment rates. Higher employment rates lead to better access to healthcare and better health outcomes, since many families get their health insurance through their employer. Areas with higher median household incomes also have higher home values and their residents enjoy more disposable income.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/

Per Capita Income
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Value: 21,847 Dollars  
Measurement Period: 2007-2011  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: U.S. Counties  
Categories: Economy/Income

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the per capita income.

Why this is important: Per capita income, or income per person, is the total income of the region divided by the population. It is an aggregate measure of all sources of income and therefore is not a measure of income distribution or wealth. Areas with higher per capita incomes are considered to be more prosperous; however, median income is a more accepted measure of the economic well-being of a region because median income is not skewed by extremely high or low outliers.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/  
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
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Poverty

Children Living Below Poverty Level

Value: 13.2 Percent  
Measurement Period: 2007-2011  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: U.S. Counties  
Categories: Economy/Poverty

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people under the age of 18 who are living below the federal poverty level.

Why this is important: Family income has been shown to affect a child's well-being in numerous studies. Compared to their peers, children in poverty are more likely to have physical health problems like low birth weight or lead poisoning, and are also more likely to have behavioral and emotional problems. Children in poverty also tend to exhibit cognitive difficulties, as shown in achievement test scores, and are less likely to complete basic education.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,142 U.S. counties and county equivalents.  
Source: American Community Survey  
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/  
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/

Families Living Below Poverty Level

Value: 5.9 Percent
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Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of families living below the federal poverty level.

Why this is important: Federal poverty thresholds are set every year by the Census Bureau and vary by size of family and ages of family members. A high poverty rate is both a cause and a consequence of poor economic conditions. A high poverty rate indicates that local employment opportunities are not sufficient to provide for the local community. Through decreased buying power and decreased taxes, poverty is associated with lower quality schools and decreased business survival.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/

Low-Income Persons who are SNAP Participants

Value: 11 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of low-income persons who participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Low-income persons are defined as people living in a household with an income at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level.

Why this is important: SNAP, previously called the Food Stamp Program, is a federal-assistance program that provides low-income families with electronic benefit transfers (EBTs) that can be used to purchase food. The purpose of the program is to assist low-income households in obtaining adequate and nutritious diets.

The number of Americans receiving SNAP benefits reached 39.68 million in February 2010, the highest number since the Food Stamp Program began in 1939. As of June 2009, the average monthly benefit was $133.12 per person and as of November 2009, one in eight Americans and one in four children were using SNAP benefits.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,141 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

People 65+ Living Below Poverty Level
Value: 7.4 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people aged 65 and over living below the federal poverty level.

Why this is important: Federal poverty thresholds are set every year by the Census Bureau and vary by size of family and ages of family members. Seniors who live in poverty are an especially vulnerable group due to increased physical limitations, medical needs, and social isolation. Seniors often live on a fixed income from pensions or other retirement plans and social security. If this income is insufficient in the face of increasing prescription costs and other costs of living, most seniors have no way to supplement their income. Retirement plans may be vulnerable to fluctuations in the stock market as well; the increasing reliance of retirees on stock market based retirement plans may explain why more seniors nationwide are now slipping into poverty.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,142 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/

People Living 200% Above Poverty Level

Value: 65.8 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of residents living 200% above the federal poverty level in the community.

Why this is important: Federal poverty thresholds are set every year by the Census Bureau and vary by size of family and ages of family members. A high poverty rate is both a cause and a consequence of poor economic conditions. A high poverty rate indicates that local employment opportunities are not sufficient to provide for the local community. Through decreased buying power and decreased taxes, poverty is associated with lower quality schools and decreased business survival.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/

People Living Below Poverty Level

Value: 10.2 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people living below the federal poverty level.

Why this is important: Federal poverty thresholds are set every year by the Census Bureau and vary by size of family and ages of family members. A high poverty rate is both a cause and a consequence of poor economic conditions. A high poverty rate indicates that local employment opportunities are not sufficient to provide for the local community. Through decreased buying power and decreased taxes, poverty is associated with lower quality schools and decreased business survival.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)
URL of Data: [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)

Poverty Status by School Enrollment

Value: 10.2 Percent
Measurement Period: 2006-2010
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Economy/Poverty
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of school-aged children, aged 5 to 19, who are living below the federal poverty level and enrolled in school.

Why this is important: Family income has been shown to affect a child's well-being in numerous studies. Compared to their peers, children in poverty are more likely to have physical health problems like low birth weight or lead poisoning, and are also more likely to have behavioral and emotional problems. Children in poverty also tend to exhibit cognitive difficulties, as shown in achievement test scores, and are less likely to complete basic education.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 105 Kansas counties.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/

Students Eligible for the Free Lunch Program

Value: 28.9 Percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of students eligible to participate in the Free Lunch Program under the National School Lunch Program.

Why this is important: The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) is a federally assisted meal program operating in public and nonprofit private schools and residential child care institutions. The Free Lunch Program (FLP) under the NSLP has been providing nutritionally balanced lunches to children at no cost since 1946. Families who meet the income eligibility requirements or who receive Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits can apply through their children’s school to receive free meals. The FLP ensures that students who may otherwise not have access to a nutritious meal are fed during the school day. This helps students remain focused and productive in school. Moreover, the lunches help students meet their basic nutritional requirements when their families may not be able to consistently provide a balanced and varied diet.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,122 U.S. counties.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

Uninsured Adult Population Rate

Value: 18.2 Percent
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Economy/Poverty
**What is this Indicator?**
This indicator shows the estimated percent of persons ages 18-64 who are uninsured.

**Why this is important:** Access to health services encompasses four components: coverage, services, timeliness, and workforce.

Health insurance coverage helps patients get into the health care system. Uninsured people are:

- Less likely to receive medical care
- More likely to die early
- More likely to have poor health status

Lack of adequate coverage makes it difficult for people to get the health care they need and, when they do get care, burdens them with large medical bills. Current policy efforts focus on the provision of insurance coverage as the principal means of ensuring access to health care among the general population. Other factors, described below, may be equally important to removing barriers to access and utilization of services.

Access to health care services in the United States is regarded as unreliable; many people do not receive the appropriate and timely care they need. The U.S. health care system, which is already strained, will face an influx of patients in 2014, when 32 million Americans will have health insurance for the first time. All of these issues, and others, make the measurement and development of new strategies and models essential.

In 2009-2010, the percentage of Kansans without health insurance rose to 13%, the highest rate of the decade, 2000-2010. This percentage climbed from 11.3% in 2005-2006 and 12.7% in 2008-2009. Approximately 357,500 Kansas residents - children and adults - lacked insurance in 2009-2010, also the highest number in the decade and an increase of about 10,000 people from 347,400 during 2008-2009. The percentage of Kansans (13) who were uninsured in 2009-2010 compared favorably with the United States percentage of 16.5%.
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Healthy People 2020 has set a target of 100% coverage for medical insurance. Increase the proportion of persons with health insurance. The national baseline for comparison was 83.2 percent of persons had medical insurance in 2008.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau
URL of Source: [http://www.census.gov/](http://www.census.gov/)

Young Children Living Below Poverty Level

Value: 11.7 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Economy/Poverty

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people under the age of 5 who are living below the federal poverty level.

Why this is important: Family income has been shown to affect a child's well-being in numerous studies. Compared to their peers, children in poverty are more likely to have physical health problems like low birth weight or lead poisoning, and are also more likely to have behavioral and emotional problems. Children in poverty also tend to exhibit cognitive difficulties, as shown in achievement test scores, and are less likely to complete basic education.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,140 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
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Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source:  http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data:  http://factfinder2.census.gov/
High School Graduation

Value: 90.6 Percent  
Measurement Period: 2011  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Education/Educational Attainment in Adult Population

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of students who graduate high school within four years of their first enrollment in 9th grade.

Why this is important: Individuals who do not finish high school are more likely than people who finish high school to lack the basic skills required to function in an increasingly complicated job market and society. Adults with limited education levels are more likely to be unemployed, on government assistance, or involved in crime.

The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to increase the proportion of students who graduate high school within four years of their first enrollment in 9th grade to 82.4%.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 105 Kansas counties.  
Source: The Annie E. Casey Foundation  
URL of Source: http://datacenter.kidscount.org/  
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People 25+ with a High School Degree or Higher

Value: 89.2 Percent  
Measurement Period: 2007-2011  
Location: County : Marion  
Comparison: U.S. Counties  
Categories: Education/Educational Attainment in Adult Population

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people over age 25 who have completed a high school degree or the equivalent.

Why this is important: Graduating high school is an important personal achievement and is essential for an individual's social and economic advancement. Graduation rates are also an important indicator of the performance of the educational system.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source:  http://www.census.gov/acs/www/  
URL of Data:  http://factfinder2.census.gov/
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Higher Education

People 25+ with a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher

Value: 20.6 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Education/Higher Education

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people 25 years and older who have earned a bachelor's degree or higher.

Why this is important: For many, having a bachelor's degree is the key to a better life. The college experience develops cognitive skills, and allows learning about a wide range of subjects, people, cultures, and communities. Having a degree also opens up career opportunities in a variety of fields, and is often the prerequisite to a higher-paying job. It is estimated that college graduates earn about $1 million more per lifetime than their non-graduate peers.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
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School Environment

Student-to-Teacher Ratio

Value: 11.9 students/teacher
Measurement Period: 2010-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Education/School Environment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the average number of public school students per teacher in the county. It does not measure class size.

Why this is important: The student-teacher ratio gives a rough idea of the amount of individualized attention from teachers that is available to each student. Although it is not the same as class size, the student-teacher ratio is often a reasonable alternative on which to base estimates of class size. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, larger schools tend to have higher student-teacher ratios.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties.
Source: National Center for Education Statistics
URL of Source: http://nces.ed.gov/
URL of Data: http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/bat/
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Built Environment

Farmers Market Density

Value: 0.16 markets/1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2012
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Value
Categories: Environment/Build Environment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of farmers markets per 1,000 population. A farmers market is a retail outlet in which vendors sell agricultural products directly to customers.

Why this is important: Farmers markets provide a way for community members to buy fresh and affordable agricultural products while supporting local farmers. Farmers markets often emphasize good nutrition and support consumers to cook healthier meals and maintain good eating habits. A diet comprised of nutritious foods, in combination with an active lifestyle, can reduce the incidence of heart disease, cancer and diabetes and is essential to maintain a healthy body weight and prevent obesity.

Technical Note: The regional value is compared to the median value of 3,141 U.S. counties. Market data is from 2009 and the population estimates are from 2008.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

Fast Food Restaurant Density
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Value: 0.42 restaurants/1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Environment/Build Environment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of fast food restaurants per 1,000 population. These include limited-service establishments where people pay before eating.

Why this is important: Fast food is often high in fat and calories and lacking in recommended nutrients. Frequent consumption of these foods and an insufficient consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables increase the risk of overweight and obesity. Individuals who are overweight or obese are at increased risk for serious health conditions, including coronary heart disease, type-2 diabetes, multiple cancers, hypertension, stroke, premature death and other chronic conditions. Fast food outlets are more common in low-income neighborhoods and studies suggest that they strongly contribute to the high incidence of obesity and obesity-related health problems in these communities.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,141 U.S. counties.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

Grocery Store Density

Value: 0.5 stores/1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009
Marion County Rural Health Works

Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Environment/Build Environment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of supermarkets and grocery stores per 1,000 population. Convenience stores and large general merchandise stores such as supercenters and warehouse club stores are not included in this count.

Why this is important:
There are strong correlations between the density of grocery stores in a neighborhood and the nutrition and diet of its residents. The availability and affordability of healthy and varied food options in the community increase the likelihood that residents will have a balanced and nutritious diet. A diet comprised of nutritious foods, in combination with an active lifestyle, can reduce the incidence of heart disease, cancer and diabetes and is essential to maintain a healthy body weight and prevent obesity. Low-income and under-served communities often have limited access to stores that sell healthy food, especially high-quality fruits and vegetables. Moreover, rural communities often have a high number of convenience stores, where healthy and fresh foods are less available than in larger, retail food markets.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,141 U.S. counties.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

Households without a Car and >1 Mile from a Grocery Store

Value: 1.6 Percent
Measurement Period: 2010
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of housing units that are more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store and do not have a car.

Why this is important: The accessibility, availability and affordability of healthy and varied food options in the community increase the likelihood that residents will have a balanced and nutritious diet. A diet comprised of nutritious foods, in combination with an active lifestyle, can reduce the incidence of heart disease, cancer and diabetes and is essential to maintain a healthy body weight and prevent obesity. Low-income and under-served areas often have limited numbers of stores that sell healthy foods. People living farther away from grocery stores and who do not have personal transportation to access the grocery stores are less likely to access healthy food options on a regular basis and thus more likely to consume foods which are readily available at convenience stores and fast food outlets.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,109 U.S. counties. Store data are from 2006 and household data are from 2000.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

Liquor Store Density

Value: 23.7 stores/100,000 population
Measurement Period: 2010
**Marion County Rural Health Works**

**Location:** County: Marion  
**Comparison:** U.S. Counties  
**Categories:** Environment/Build Environment

---

**What is this Indicator?**

This indicator shows the number of liquor stores per 100,000 population. A liquor store is defined as a business that primarily sells packaged alcoholic beverages, such as beer, wine, and spirits.

**Why this is important:** Studies have shown that neighborhoods with a high density of alcohol outlets are associated with higher rates of violence, regardless of other community characteristics such as poverty and age of residents. High alcohol outlet density has been shown to be related to increased rates of drinking and driving, motor vehicle-related pedestrian injuries, and child abuse and neglect. In addition, liquor stores frequently sell food and other goods that are unhealthy and expensive. Setting rules that mandate minimum distances between alcohol outlets, limiting the number of new licenses in areas that already have a high number of outlets, and closing down outlets that repeatedly violate liquor laws can all help control and reduce liquor store density.

**Technical Note:** The distribution is based on data from 2,378 U.S. counties and county equivalents. Population estimates are from the U.S. Census Bureau.  
**Source:** U.S. Census - County Business Patterns  
**URL of Source:** [http://www.census.gov/econ/cbp/index.html](http://www.census.gov/econ/cbp/index.html)  
**URL of Data:** [http://factfinder2.census.gov/main.html](http://factfinder2.census.gov/main.html)

---

**Low-Income and >1 Mile from a Grocery Store**

**Value:** 8.3 Percent  
**Measurement Period:** 2010
Marion County Rural Health Works

Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Environment/Build Environment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of the total population in a county that is low income and living more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store.

Why this is important: The accessibility, availability and affordability of healthy and varied food options in the community increase the likelihood that residents will have a balanced and nutritious diet. A diet comprised of nutritious foods, in combination with an active lifestyle, can reduce the incidence of heart disease, cancer and diabetes and is essential to maintain a healthy body weight and prevent obesity. Low-income and under-served areas often have limited numbers of stores that sell healthy foods. People living farther away from grocery stores are less likely to access healthy food options on a regular basis and thus more likely to consume foods which are readily available at convenience stores and fast food outlets.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,109 U.S. counties. Store data are from 2006 and household data are from 2000.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

Recreation and Fitness Facilities

Value: 0 facilities/1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Value
Marion County Rural Health Works

Categories: Environment/Build Environment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of fitness and recreation centers per 1,000 population.

Why this is important: People engaging in an active lifestyle have a reduced risk of many serious health conditions including obesity, heart disease, diabetes, and high blood pressure. In addition, physical activity improves mood and promotes healthy sleep patterns. The American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) recommends that active adults perform physical activity three to five times each week for 20 to 60 minutes at a time to improve cardiovascular fitness and body composition. People are more likely to engage in physical activity if their community has facilities which support recreational activities, sports and fitness.

Technical Note: The regional value is compared to the median value of 3,141 U.S. counties.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas

SNAP Certified Stores

Value: 0.8 stores/1,000 facilities
Measurement Period: 2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: U.S. Counties
Categories: Environment/Build Environment
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the number of stores certified to accept Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits per 1,000 population. SNAP stores include: supermarkets; grocery stores and convenience stores; super stores and supercenters; warehouse club stores; specialized food stores (retail bakeries, meat and seafood markets, and produce markets); and meal service providers that serve eligible persons.

Why this is important: SNAP, previously called the Food Stamp Program, is a federal-assistance program that provides low-income families with electronic benefit transfers (EBTs) that can be used to purchase food. The purpose of the program is to assist low-income households in obtaining adequate and nutritious diets.

The number of Americans receiving SNAP benefits reached 39.68 million in February 2010, the highest number since the Food Stamp Program began in 1939. As of June 2009, the average monthly benefit was $133.12 per person and as of November 2009, one in eight Americans and one in four children were using SNAP benefits.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,137 U.S. counties.
Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture - Food Environment Atlas
Marion County Rural Health Works

Toxic Chemicals

Increased Lead Risk in Housing Rate

Value: 48.35 Percent  
Measurement Period: 2000  
Location: County: Marion  
Comparison: KS State Value  
Categories: Environment/Toxic Chemicals

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of housing units, built before 1950 and at an elevated risk for lead exposure.

Why this is important: Lead poisoning is a preventable pediatric health problem affecting Kansas’ children. Lead is a toxic metal that produces many adverse health effects. It is persistent and cumulative. Childhood lead poisoning occurs in all population groups and income brackets. There is no safe level of lead. Early identification and treatment of lead poisoning reduces the risk that children will suffer permanent damage. A blood lead test is the only way to tell if a child has an elevated blood level.

Lead-based paint can be found in most homes built before 1950-and many homes built before 1978. Lead can also be found on walls, woodwork, floors, windowsills, eating and playing surfaces or in the dirt outside the home. In addition, renovation or maintenance projects that disturb lead-based paint can create a lead dust hazard that can be inhaled or can settle on toys, walls, floors, tables, carpets or fingers. Parents whose hobby or occupation involves working with or around lead can unknowingly bring lead dust home. Individuals should avoid "take-home" exposures by utilizing personal protection and hygiene after leaving the workplace. Wash your hands after working in the yard. Wash children's hands and faces after playing outside. Wash all fruits and vegetables before consuming them. Remove shoes before entering your home, and clean dust and tracked-in soil.

Lead poisoning can be difficult to recognize and can damage a child's central nervous system,
Marion County Rural Health Works

brain, kidneys, and reproductive system. When lead is present in the blood it travels through every organ in the body. Lead interferes with the development of the brain. When lead enters the bloodstream it collects in soft tissues of the body and it also settles in the bones and teeth, where it is stored for many years.

Technical Note: The regional value is compared to the Kansas State value.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/
URL of Data: http://keap.kdhe.state.ks.us/epht/portal/ContentArea.aspx
Voter Turnout

Value: 70 Percent
Measurement Period: 2012
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS Counties
Categories: Government & Politics/Elections & Voting

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of registered voters who voted in the previous presidential general election.

Why this is important: Voting is one of the most fundamental rights of a democratic society. Exercising this right allows a nation to choose elected officials and hold them accountable. Voting ensures that all citizens have the opportunity to voice their opinions on issues such as the use of tax dollars, civil rights and foreign policy. By voting, individuals shape their communities and influence the next generation of society. A high level of turnout indicates that citizens are involved in and interested in who represents them in the political system.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 105 Kansas counties.
Source: Kansas Secretary of State
URL of Source: http://www.kssos.org/
URL of Data: http://www.kssos.org/elections/elections_statistics.html
Marion County Rural Health Works

Crime & Crime Prevention

Rate of Violent Crime per 1,000 population

Value: 1.2 per 1,000 population
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS state value
Categories: Public Safety/Crime & Crime Prevention

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the rate of violent crimes like assault and robbery per 1,000 population.

Why this is important: Social support and good social relations make an important contribution to health. Social cohesion - defined as the quality of social relationships and the existence of trust, mutual obligations and respect in communities or in the wider society - helps to protect people and their health. Inequality is corrosive of good social relations. Societies with high levels of income inequality tend to have less social cohesion and more violent crime.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value. Under reporting of crime by some public safety jurisdictions may result in lower rates.
Source: Kansas Bureau of Investigation
URL of Source: http://www.accesskansas.org/kbi/
URL of Data: http://www.accesskansas.org/kbi/stats/stats_crime.shtml
Marion County Rural Health Works

Demographics

Ratio of Children to Adults

Value: 29.1 children per 100 adults
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Social Environment/Demographics

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the ratio of adolescent dependent persons (under 15 years of age) per 100 persons aged 15-64.

Why this is important: The age structure of a population is important in planning for the future of a community, particularly for schools, community centers, health care, and child care. A population with more youth will have greater education and child care needs, while an older population may have greater health care needs. Older people are also far more likely to vote, making them an important political force.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/
URL of Data: http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/

Ratio of Elderly Persons and Children to Adults

Value: 64 elderly & children per 100 adults
Measurement Period: 2009
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the ratio of all dependent persons (ages 0-14 and 65 and over) per 100 persons aged 15-64.

Why this is important: The age structure of a population is important in planning for the future of a community, particularly for schools, community centers, health care, and child care. A population with more youth will have greater education and child care needs, while an older population may have greater health care needs. Older people are also far more likely to vote, making them an important political force.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/
URL of Data: http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/

Ratio of Elderly Persons to Adults

Value: 35 elderly per 100 adults
Measurement Period: 2009
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: KS State Value
Categories: Social Environment/Demographics
What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the ratio of elderly dependent persons (65 and over) per 100 persons aged 15-64.

Why this is important: The age structure of a population is important in planning for the future of a community, particularly for schools, community centers, health care, and child care. A population with more youth will have greater education and child care needs, while an older population may have greater health care needs. Older people are also far more likely to vote, making them an important political force.

Technical Note: The county and regional values are compared to Kansas State value / US value.
Source: U.S. Census Bureau
URL of Source: [http://www.census.gov/](http://www.census.gov/)
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Neighborhood/Community Attachment

People 65+ Living Alone

Value: 26.2 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: US Counties
Categories: Social Environment/Neighborhood/Community Attachment

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of people 65 and over who live alone.

Why this is important: People over age 65 who live alone may be at risk for social isolation, limited access to support, or inadequate assistance in emergency situations. Older adults who do not live alone are most likely to live with a spouse, but they may also live with a child or other relative, a non-relative, or in group quarters. The Commonwealth Fund Commission on the Elderly Living Alone indicated that one third of older Americans live alone, and that one quarter of those living alone live in poverty and report poor health. Rates of living alone are typically higher in urban areas and among women. Older people living alone may lack social support, and are at high risk for institutionalization or losing their independent life style. Living alone should not be equated with being lonely or isolated, but many older people who live alone are vulnerable due to social isolation, poverty, disabilities, lack of access to care, or inadequate housing.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,142 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
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Commute to Work

Mean Travel Time to Work

Value: 19.3 Minutes
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: US Counties
Categories: Transportation/Commute to Work

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the average daily travel time to work in minutes for workers 16 years of age and older.

Why this is important: Lengthy commutes cut into workers' free time and can contribute to health problems such as headaches, anxiety, and increased blood pressure. Longer commutes require workers to consume more fuel which is both expensive for workers and damaging to the environment.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)
URL of Data: [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)

Workers who Drive Alone to Work

Value: 74.2 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Marion County Rural Health Works

Location: County : Marion
Comparison: US Counties
Categories: Transportation/Commute to Work

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of workers 16 years of age and older who get to work by driving alone in a car, truck, or van.

Why this is important: Driving alone to work consumes more fuel and resources than other modes of transportation, such as carpooling, public transportation, biking and walking. Driving alone also increases traffic congestion, especially in areas of greater population density.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source:  http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data:  http://factfinder2.census.gov/

Workers who Walk to Work

Value: 7.5 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County : Marion
Comparison: US Counties
Categories: Transportation/Commute to Work
Marion County Rural Health Works

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of workers 16 years of age and older who get to work by walking.

Why this is important: Walking to work is a great way to incorporate exercise into a daily routine. In addition to the health benefits, walking helps people get in touch with their communities, reduces commute costs and helps protect the environment by reducing air pollution from car trips. Furthermore, studies have shown that walking to work improves employees overall attitude and morale and reduces stress in the workplace.

The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to increase the proportion of workers who walk to work to 3.1%.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
Households without a Vehicle

Value: 3.3 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: US Counties
Categories: Transportation/Commute to Work

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of households that do not have a vehicle.

Why this is important: Vehicle ownership is directly related to the ability to travel. In general, people living in a household without a car make fewer than half the number of journeys compared to those with a car. This limits their access to essential local services such as supermarkets, post offices, doctors’ offices and hospitals. Most households with above-average incomes have a car while only half of low-income households do.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: http://www.census.gov/acs/www/
URL of Data: http://factfinder2.census.gov/
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Workers Commuting by Public Transportation

Value: 0.1 Percent
Measurement Period: 2007-2011
Location: County: Marion
Comparison: US Counties
Categories: Transportation/Public Transportation

What is this Indicator?
This indicator shows the percentage of workers aged 16 years and over who commute to work by public transportation.

Why this is important: Public transportation offers mobility to U.S. residents, particularly people without cars. Transit can help bridge the spatial divide between people and jobs, services, and training opportunities. Public transportation is also beneficial because it reduces fuel consumption, minimizes air pollution, and relieves traffic congestion.

The Healthy People 2020 national health target is to increase the proportion of workers who take public transportation to work to 5.5%.

Technical Note: The distribution is based on data from 3,143 U.S. counties and county equivalents.
Source: American Community Survey
URL of Source: [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)
URL of Data: [http://factfinder2.census.gov/](http://factfinder2.census.gov/)
Marion County Community Health Care Survey

Survey Highlights

• 485 total responses
• 80% saw Dr. past year; +16% w/in two yrs.
• 58% used a hospital last year; Marion County captured half
• 63% had St. Luke experience; 97% satisfied/ somewhat satisfied
• 37% had Hillsboro experience; 86% satisfied/ somewhat satisfied
• 60% had health dept. experience; 98% satisfied/somewhat satisfied
• 43% had kids/grand kids in county school
  • Health education: 56% Yes; 36% Don’t Know
  • Healthy food/snacks: 63% Yes; 30% Don’t Know
  • 15% have children < 5 years old
  • 95%+ had/will have all vaccinations
• Getting health information
  • 58% doctor’s office
  • 23% Internet
  • 13% family/friends
• Skipped treatment due to cost
  • 24% medical
  • 36% dental
  • 17% prescriptions
  • 7% mental health assistance
• 63% eat out 1-2 times; 23% zero times
• 62% eat at home w. others 5+ times; 25% live alone
• 20% need monthly medical treatment
• 46% of them have transportation challenges
• Adequate prenatal care
  • 18% Yes; 23% No; 59% Don’t Know

Are the following a problem in Marion County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug use</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage drinking</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen pregnancy</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal Abuse</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder Abuse</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 25% 65 years or older
• 94% live independently
• 15% are facing challenges
• 34% say home health assistance adequate
• 45% say assisted living adequate
• 9% take care of an elder
• 30% are facing challenges

General health concerns
• Health care costs
• More health care providers (doctors, mid-level, dentists, eye care, pediatrics, OB/GYN)
• Health, wellness, chronic disease prevention
• Transfers to other hospitals
• Facility conditions
• Elder care: nursing care, home health, community services
• Customer service
### Marion County Community Survey Results

#### 1. Home Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66838</td>
<td>66838</td>
<td>Burdick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66840</td>
<td>66840</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66843</td>
<td>66843</td>
<td>Cedar Point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66851</td>
<td>66851</td>
<td>Florance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66858</td>
<td>66858</td>
<td>Lincolnville</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66859</td>
<td>66859</td>
<td>Lost Springs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66861</td>
<td>66861</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66866</td>
<td>66866</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67053</td>
<td>67053</td>
<td>Goessel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67063</td>
<td>67063</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67073</td>
<td>67073</td>
<td>Lehigh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67114</td>
<td>67114</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67117</td>
<td>67117</td>
<td>North Newton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67147</td>
<td>67147</td>
<td>Valley Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67151</td>
<td>67151</td>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67204</td>
<td>67204</td>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67428</td>
<td>67428</td>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67438</td>
<td>67438</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67449</td>
<td>67449</td>
<td>Herington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67475</td>
<td>67475</td>
<td>Ramona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67483</td>
<td>67483</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68504</td>
<td>68504</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Live in County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Last time you saw your doctor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last time you saw your doctor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year ago</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2 years ago</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 5 years ago</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years ago</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never - doesn’t have a doctor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>482</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. City of your doctor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of your doctor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton/North Newton</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita/Wichita Area</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesston</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moundridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herington</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t require service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>479</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Other City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Falls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Riley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haviland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wamego</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5a. Used Services of a Hospital in Past 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5b. Hospital Services Received in past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke Hospital</td>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Hospital</td>
<td>Moundridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson Regional</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Medical</td>
<td>Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Community</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina Regional</td>
<td>Salina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herington Municipal</td>
<td>Herington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman Memorial</td>
<td>Emporia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hospitals (see below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5b. Other Hospitals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Hospitals</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Heart Hospital, Wichita</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Heart, El Dorado</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Spine Hospital</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS Surgery &amp; Recovery Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU Medical Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Regional - Manhattan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Surgical Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Specialty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormont Vail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgicare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan B. Allen, El Dorado</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Care Clinic - Wichita</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Christi St. Francis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley - St. Joseph</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Orthopedic Surgery Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Health - Newton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6a. Ever Used Services of St. Luke Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ever Used Services</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6b. Service Obtained at St. Luke Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Obtained</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6c. Satisfaction with Last St. Luke Hospital Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6d. Why?

St. Luke Satisfied
1. Clean, friendly, efficient, professional.
2. They were welcoming and easy to work with.
3. Good service.
4. They were willing to help and answer all questions.
5. Caring nurses.
6. Capable, efficient, polite, careful, considerate personnel.
7. No problems.
8. They treated me real good.
9. Clerical person misspelled name.
10. Had very good care.
11. Physical therapy department was great.
12. I just was.
13. People tend to be friendly and very helpful.
15. They did their work fine.
16. The Dr. and nurses took very good care of me.
17. Competent and caring staff
18. Good care.
20. Took good care of me.
22. Competent, efficient.
24. They were so helpful.
25. Pleased with doctor on call.
26. Friendly and helpful.
27. Good care.
28. I was satisfied.
29. Efficient, capable care by efficient personnel.
30. Professional – efficient – near home.
31. Very quick; comfortable for an emergency room.
32. Love the walk in feature.
33. The nursing staff was helpful.
34. Really nice people.
35. Great personal care.
36. Nice staff always concerned about giving the best care.
37. Proper care, polite.
38. Friendly service.
39. Very professional and prompt.
40. Excellent staff – knowledgeable, caring.
41. Great nursing staff.
42. Lab work was efficiently completed and processed.
43. Great one-on-one care. Quick to respond to needs.
44. Good care given.
45. Caring, capable staff.
46. They were able to get me to the right people I needed.
47. Good service. Much better than Hillsboro.
48. Everyone very helpful and caring.
49. We / I received the care needed properly.
50. I love the 8:00-9:00. No appointment/get it quick
51. They did what they were supposed to do.
52. More individual care, although some rude nurses (20+ years ago).
54. My daughter was treated appropriately for a concussion.
55. Procedure was well done.
56. Took a while to acknowledge I was waiting for lab work.
57. Caring staff.
58. Very clean, friendly environment.
59. They were all very helpful and courteous.
60. Courteous staff, quick response to those on call.
61. Daughter was seen right away. Nice people.
62. Results were not as I expected.
63. They seem to care.
64. Were treated in a very professional manner.
65. Excellent care and follow up.
66. Thoroughness of exam and friendliness of staff.
67. Verified I was the patient and completed the blood work with a professional and friendly manner.
68. The service was very good and the equipment was excellent.
69. They were very helpful and very good with my child.
70. Good service. Prompt.
71. Caring and competent services.
72. They were nice.
73. Good staff. Excellent care.
74. Emergency services took too long.
75. Care from the staff.
76. Prompt personal care.
77. Good care.
78. Fast, accurate, great staff.
79. Taken care of promptly and professionally.
80. The staff was friendly and rooms clean.
81. They were O.K. I don’t know.
82. Satisfied with the service but dissatisfied that it was more expensive than Newton Medical.
83. Competent service.
84. It was for my 3 yr. old son. The staff was kind, supportive, accommodating, loving and efficient.
85. Do a great job / friendly.
86. Good care.
87. Quick, efficient medical help.
88. Good service.
89. Just labs.
90. The ease of getting in and being seen. Courteous staff.
91. Kindness and good care.
92. Efficient, pleasant staff.
93. Everyone was very nice and good food.
94. Daughter treated in ER for ankle. 1.5 years later, still hurting bad. Got no answers. (Staff) was not was not concerned. Not friendly.
95. Very nice people. They care about their patients.
96. They know what they are doing.
97. Nice, clean, and very personal.
98. Nurses and doctors were knowledgeable.
99. They all were very professional.
100. Glad we have a hospital close.
101. Good care – great nurses and doctors.
102. Very efficient / knowledgeable staff.
103. Doctor was excellent in answering all questions and seemed to be compassionate.
104. Not enough personal care, like shave and bed bath because you have IV's in arms.
105. Received excellent care plus doctor made contact with VA doctors.
106. Excellent care; kind, caring nurses.
107. Doctors and nurses were thorough and approachable.
108. Very professional and knowledgeable staff.
109. Quality health care providers.
110. They got the job done.
111. Very caring and concerned.
114. Good care.
115. Staff was very informative.
116. Everyone did their jobs very well.
117. Lovely facility. Well equipped and staffed. The home health aides and supervisors were fantastic.
118. Personal, caring staff.
119. Prompt service; friendly staff.
120. Excellent nursing service department, lab and radiology.
121. Good service. Friendly, knowledgeable staff.
122. Customer service.
123. Service was attentive, prompt and thorough.
124. The staff was wonderful and caring.
125. Friendly staff.
126. The staff was friendly and caring.
127. Quality care.
128. Very caring staff, updated facility.
129. Convenience of immediate care.
130. Treated with respect and dignity.
131. I received excellent care.
132. They provided excellent care.
133. Excellent service. Quality care.
134. Kind staff.
136. Received excellent customer service from everyone.
137. Good nurses.
138. Very nice personnel.
139. Prompt service.
140. Employees very informative and helpful. Very caring.
141. Friendly, efficient.
142. Service.
143. Changed rooms when disturbed by noise.
144. Able to stay in town.
145. Professional, kind staff.
146. The staff was nice.
147. Clean and friendly.
148. No problems encountered.
149. Received expected or needed care.
150. Happy to have ER close to home.
151. Quality staff and facilities.
152. Great staff, excellent facilities, up-to-date equipment.
154. Good care, but seemed to wait a while to get it.
155. Quality of care received in a polite, helpful and understanding way.
156. Very friendly and efficient.
157. The amount of care given.
158. Quick, efficient, experienced.
159. Good care.
160. Seemed caring and through.
161. Everything was done good and my questions were answered.
162. The emergency doctor was excellent.
163. My visit was short and the staff was professional.
164. They have an outstanding, caring, very professional staff.
165. Good service, very professional.
166. Stitches, CT scans, x-rays.
167. Timeliness and saved trip out of county.
168. Great facility – nurses so nice, really care.
169. Clean nice nurses.
170. I received fast and caring service.
171. I receive my physical therapy; very helpful.
173. They were nice but acted as I was stupid.
174. The lab billed our insurance properly.
175. Fast service and friendly.
176. Great care.
177. Treated successfully.
178. Good people, good care.
179. Staff was nice and knowledgeable.
180. Have always liked the care received here.
181. They were very helpful and seemed to care about me.
182. Fast and thorough.
183. Great hospital and doctor.
184. Quality care, quick service, and friendly staff.
185. Pleasant personalities.
186. Met my needs.
187. Very efficient and kind care.

6d. Why?

**St. Luke Dissatisfied**
1. Felt like they didn't know what they were doing.
2. St. Luke is awful transfer station.
3. Mammogram – results weren't accurate. Had to redo the test.
4. We had to supply the vice grips (from the dirty truck) to take the barb wire out of my foot.
5. The staff were rude and I had to pay for a doctor when one never looked at my daughter.
6. Emergency room – had torn meniscus, doctor did not seem knowledgeable.
7. They didn’t have an antibiotic for my daughter's ear infection due to her being allergic to penicillin.
8. Didn’t like the doctor.
9. Didn’t feel I had the help I needed.
10. Inept doctor and care. Tests were performed without consent. The list goes on.
11. Did not find cause of discomfort and pain.
12. Doctor didn’t have nurse clean wound very well.

### 7a. Used Services of the Hillsboro Community Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7b. Service Obtained at Hillsboro Community Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7c. Satisfaction with Last Hillsboro Community Hospital Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7d. Why?

#### Hillsboro Satisfied
1. Well taken care of.
2. No problems noted.
3. They gave me the care that was needed.
4. Good timely service
5. I just saw a doctor there.
6. People tend to be friendly and very helpful.
7. Love the staff and doctor's services
8. Work with people no insurance. Discount for cash.
9. Took good care of me.
10. Friendly and helpful.
11. They sent me on to Newton Medical.
12. Personal care.
15. Efficient, capable care by caring personnel.
16. They were quick.
17. They were polite and took care of problem.
18. Nice nursing staff.
19. Needed to do lab work. Did O.K.
20. Care was very prompt and good.
21. They did what they were supposed to do.
23. They knew my husband's record.
24. Prompt attention, professional, attention to needs.
25. I had a concussion and brain bleed, but no one assisted me in or out of bed to use
the restroom. I was never told not to get out of bed unassisted until the next morning.
27. The lab does a nice job with INR routine.
28. Procedure was well done.
29. Daughter was treated fine.
30. Prompt service. Appropriate care was given.
31. Prompt, friendly service.
32. Long time waiting for attending physician – over an hour.
33. Stitched up fingers.
34. Got in quickly, services could happen locally.
35. The nurses and doctor were available and knowledgeable during the emergency and
we didn't have to drive very far when time was critical.
36. Prescribed antibiotics. Treated infection.
37. Took forever.
38. Inpatient care poor. Emergency care adequate, but expensive.
39. They were nice.
40. Caring staff.
41. Staff was very professional.
42. Quality care.
43. Nice – clean.
44. People were friendly and knowledgeable.
45. We got exceptional care, especially in the ER.
46. Good services. Organization of medical records was poor. Communication between
departments also inadequate.
47. Services rendered.
49. Been a while.
50. Great care by nursing staff and doctor.
51. Dr. and staff cared. Ran test and transferred me to KS Heart.
52. I didn't like the tattoo on the woman's arm/wrist as she treated or son. It just doesn't seem sanitary or professional.
53. Good care.
54. Facilities were adequate. Staff good.
55. Long ago - good care.
56. Helpful.
57. Friendly, efficient.
58. Excellent physical therapy.
59. Service.
60. Prompt and professional.
61. Prompt service.
62. Didn't have to go to Newton.
63. Excellent, well-trained staff. Nurses are wonderful.
64. The night shift staff is awesome!
65. Friendly staff.
66. Prompt, good care.
67. Easy to get in. Quick service.
68. Professional, caring, timely, convenient, friendly.
69. Good care, staff was kind and explained what was going on.
70. Years ago. Unfamiliar with recent care.
71. Received expected or needed care.
72. Some staff seemed confused about procedures and were rude.
73. Thorough, quick and friendly.
74. (Staff) very thorough, pleasant and polite.
75. We were worked through the E.R. quickly and the staff was nice.
76. They were a lot friendlier.
77. Stone passed and pain subsided.
78. Doctors are not pediatricians - not many good with small children.
79. I got done what needed to be done.
80. Got out quickly.
81. They helped with bandaging me up and cleaning me up.
82. Good care.
83. Caring and thorough.
84. Provided good and friendly care.

7d. Why?

Hillsboro Dissatisfied
1. Four E.R. trips in 15 years. Unclean, inefficient, chaotic, unprofessional, LONG waiting times.
2. Their billing practices definitely need improvement. I have received so many bills in error – I think by now they should have a better grip on billing. I also have had trouble with them not being interested in using my lab provider (Quest).
3. They were unable to care for a 2nd degree burn...costing us two hospital bills rather than only one and an ambulance ride. Next time we will go straight to Wichita/Newton. Would have saved us hundreds of $.
4. Expensive, but not helpful – misdiagnosed.
5. Asked for another doctor to come since I was deathly sick - Refused
6. I hated it. The (staff) was not nice or considerate.
7. They referred us to Wesley since they didn't have a way to do a sonogram.
8. Was sent to Marion.
10. I didn't trust some of the (staff).
11. They were not able to do much. Just manage pain. Sent on to Newton.
12. The service was slow and a member of the staff was rude.
13. Care was terrible. Night nurse did not want to disturb doctor on call.
14. Issue was not taken seriously at first. Ended up being a serious issue (15 years ago).
15. Nurse was very controlling and disrespectful.
16. (Staff) is a HUGE JERK.
17. Did not care for the (staff).
18. Inpatient care poor. Emergency care adequate, but expensive.
19. Slow service/staff seemed distracted.
20. Charges for care – lack of organization.
21. Care was terrible.
22. Lack of medicine prescribed.
23. Nurse forgot to send MRI with ambulance to St. Francis for emergency neck surgery.

8a. Used Services of the County Health Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8b. Satisfaction with County Health Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8c. Why?  
Health Department Satisfied  
1. Efficient, friendly, professional  
2. I didn't have to go out of the county for routine immunizations.  
3. They were friendly & professional.  
5. They know you by name. They help in any way.  
6. Could answer all my questions.  
7. Walk KS – helped start me on the road to becoming healthy.  
8. Routine immunizations done properly.  
9. Personal service.  
10. Routine vaccinations quick and efficient.  
11. No problems.  
12. Years ago for flu injection.  
13. Our son does not have a (unreadable) & they come to his house, etc.  
14. Flu shot many years ago, OK.  
15. Vaccinations.  
16. Very satisfied with service. People in Marion tend to be very friendly.  
17. Took care of us.  
18. Quick service.  
19. They were kind to my children.  
20. They took care of my needs.  
21. Good service.  
22. Helpful, quick and efficient.  
23. Near home – efficient – professional  
24. To help me out since I had another baby and helping me with how to take care of a baby and my 4 year old.  
25. Staff very nice.  
27. They gave us the shots I needed and take care of the insurance claim. Did weight checks on my son.  
28. Speed of service.  
29. Always polite and treat you real well.  
30. Very knowledgeable with vaccines.  
31. Went for a shot needed for work. Received it in adequate time.  
32. Had TB test needed for work.  
33. Just for flu shots – satisfied.  
34. Convenient to get flu shot/immunizations for children.  
35. Immunizations were given.  
36. Got done what we needed done in a timely fashion.  
37. Good service.  
38. Very helpful.  
39. Received what we needed.  
40. Disorganized.
41. Met my needs. Weight checks/vaccinations.
42. Friendly and quick.
43. Great, quick service.
44. Crowded, long wait, weird hours.
45. Files insurance claim for me.
46. Met expectations.
47. They helped me with car seat installation.
49. Close to home.
50. Received the shots needed.
51. Prompt, friendly and informative.
52. Efficient, friendly.
53. Got shots there.
54. Friendly and very clean.
55. Appropriate care was given.
56. Convenience.
57. Good service.
58. It was O.K.
59. The staff are pleasant and the experience was good.
60. Quick, inexpensive, convenient, kind staff.
61. Kind personnel.
62. It was for screening (preschool) = kind.
63. Several years ago, courteous staff, no issues.
64. Friendly and helpful.
65. Our questions were answered – very helpful.
66. The shot was effective.
67. Very friendly.
68. They are sweet people and will help however they can.
69. Cared.
70. Helpful staff.
71. Everyone is friendly.
72. Very helpful and efficient.
73. Ease of getting routine shots without scheduling appointments like you would at the doctor's office and no office visit payment.
74. Immunizations provided locally, friendliness of staff.
75. The staff were friendly and helpful, especially for my child.
76. Great resources!
77. Very friendly and helpful.
78. They have been helpful in giving us information on nutrition.
80. Lower cost and high quality.
81. Good quality services.
82. Very helpful.
83. Always great service and they helped me any time I needed it.
84. Because of the excellent service.
85. Short wait.
86. Quick services and welcoming staff.
87. Received the services that I needed here, at home.
88. Pleasant service/great with kids.
89. Friendly and efficient.
90. Have only received shots. They were very prompt and painless.
91. All the girls are so nice.
92. Professional treatment, low cost.
93. Obtained vaccines.
94. Competent service.
95. I went for immunization and it went quickly and simply.
96. The staff is wonderful. They are eager to help & show love to me and my kids.
97. Friendly / Do a great job.
98. Good service.
99. They know the answers to everything and were very nice people.
100. Professional.
101. Close for shots.
102. Great care.
103. Care excellent.
104. No wait and very friendly.
105. Quality service.
106. Everything was taken care of in a timely manner.
107. For vaccine shots for children.
109. Very helpful. Took time to answer questions and work with me.
110. Immunization and help with kids shots.
111. Very professional.
112. We got tetanus shots.
113. Good service. Vaccinations received.
114. Friendly; efficient.
115. Good job.
116. Had to wait forever for a vaccination. Over 1-2 hours.
117. Did good job.
118. Short waiting time. Good care.
119. O.K.
120. Pleasant, quick. Love they are in Marion.
121. Small town – don't have to wait.
122. Immunization given as requested.
123. This was only for vaccination of children – good care.
124. Good service.
125. Staff is courteous, knowledgeable and friendly.
126. Did a great job. with immunizations.
127. Complete childhood vaccinations.
128. Appeared to be a little bit unorganized.
129. Helpful, kind staff.
130. Easy to get to. Low cost.
131. They were helpful and friendly.
132. Convenient.
133. Competent workers.
134. Quick service. Nice personnel.
135. Prompt service.
136. Friendly.
137. Prompt, friendly.
138. Quick and nice.
139. Satisfied because immunizations were affordable.
140. Good service.
141. They were good.
142. Friendly, caring, usually no wait, professional.
143. Prairie View in Hillsboro very good!
144. Unhappy they don't seem to offer same services as other places, i.e. McPherson.
145. So many friendly nurses and helpers.
146. Friendly, quick service.
147. Efficient staff.
148. Someone not always available to perform service.
149. Very helpful employees.
150. They were helpful without being condescending.
151. Helpful in answering questions and giving me resources and referrals for other helpful agencies in the area.
152. Very friendly staff.
153. Fast and good care.
154. Flu shots given.
155. Shots.
156. I received some shots before traveling to Mexico.
157. We like flu shots.
158. WIC and shots not open enough hours.
159. Rented child seat for years needed.
160. Great care.
161. Flu shot successful.
162. They care about you, they listen to what you are saying.
163. Service as needed.
164. Used for child vaccinations, however sometimes the wait was long with small children in tow.
165. People at WIC are great.
166. Friendly and explained all services.
167. Pleasant personalities.
168. Met my needs.
8c. Why?

Health Department Dissatisfied

1. Couldn't get immunizations on time.
2. Homebound after surgery, somewhat incompetent nurse. OT services were good.
3. Not very courteous.
4. Dissatisfied with length of wait time, limited hours.
5. Nurse was incompliant.

9a. Used Services of the Health Ministries Clinic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9b. Satisfaction with Health Ministries Clinic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9c. Why?

Health Ministries Satisfied

1. They were professional.
2. Good care – immunizations.
3. Was for grandchild – cost and ease of obtaining an appointment.
4. They are great people to deal with.
5. Dr. is one of the best children's doctors and they are very helpful with any questions.
6. Routine visit. Did what they needed to.
7. Quick.
9. They took time – really cared.
10. Very good.
11. They helped me with food I couldn’t afford.
12. They helped me a lot.
9c. Why?
Health Ministries Dissatisfied
1. Difficult appt., but could have been the foster kids with me.
2. Not as accommodating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10a. Children or Grandchildren attend School in Marion County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10b. Children receive health education in Marion County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10c. Children receive healthy food snacks in Marion County schools</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11a. Children under Age of 5 in household</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11b. Children already received all recommended vaccinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11c. Children will receive all recommended vaccinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Where do you get the most health information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s Office</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Clinic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Friends</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Librarian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not need information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see below)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12. Other Information Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Information Sources</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMT, paramedic, RN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Medical books</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical programs on PBS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers/magazines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department on Aging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritionist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural healer/muscle tester</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Remedies Book</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home health care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse in family</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13a. Skipped Medical Treatment because of Cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13b. Skipped Dental Care because of Cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13c. Skipped Filling a Prescription because of Cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13d. Skipped Mental Health Assistance because of Cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>456</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**13d. Skipped mental health due to cost**  
Not applicable. (Applies to most, but not all, responses.)

### 14a. How many times does your household eat out each week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero times</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two times</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to four times</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to ten times</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten or more times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14a. Eat out each week**  
Many elderly eat daily at the Senior Center.

### 14b. How many times does your household eat a meal together each week?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero times</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two times</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to four times</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to ten times</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten or more times</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td>464</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14b. Eat in each week.**  
About one-quarter of respondents live alone.
### 15a. Seek Regular Medical Treatment at least Once a Month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>477</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15b. Transportation to Regular Medical Treatment is a Challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>462</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. Adequate Prenatal Care Available in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>466</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17a. Is Obesity a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>472</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17b. Is Diabetes a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>476</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 17c. Is Illegal Drug Use a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17d. Is Alcohol Abuse a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17e. Is Underage Drinking a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17f. Is Teenage Pregnancy a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17g. Is Mental Health a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 17h. Is Suicide a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17i. Is Child Abuse a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17j. Is Spousal Abuse a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17k. Is Elder Abuse a Problem in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 18a. Are you 65 years or older?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18b. Currently living independently in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18c. Is independent living a challenge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19a. Adequate home health assistance in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19b. Adequate assisted living care in your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20a. Primary caregiver for a person who is 65 years or older?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20b. Experiencing challenges providing care for an older person?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. General Health Concerns
1. I'm insured, but the cost of health care is still very high. I know of many people in the county in need of dental care, but they can't afford it. If there is a low income dental care facility/plan, there needs to be more education about it- people don't know about it.
2. I work in health care – outside of Marion Co. – Most all of our services are outside of MN County. Not sure I know too much specifically on the health concerns.
3. Lack of child care centers.
4. I'm sure that everything in questions 16-20 are happening. Just do not believe that they are major issues or at an epidemic level.
5. Marion Kansas needs more family practice physicians AND dentists AND optometrists.
6. None at this time.
7. We don't know what or needs will be yet. We still are able to meet our bills – barely.
8. O.K.
9. I need help cooking and light house keeping, but can't afford it.
10. If a person seek or inquire they will find these items available.
11. Don't have any.
12. St. Luke is nothing more than a transfer station.
13. We need another doctor in Marion.
14. Possible loss of health care due to budget cuts, i.e. home health.
15. No concerns.
16. I would like to see more dental and eye care physicians in Marion.
17. Don't have any at this time.
18. I personally do not trust our local hospitals, so I always go to Newton.
19. None at this time. Wish we had all services available at one facility instead of having to travel with the price of gas.
20. We used to offer prenatal care in Marion County. All my sons were born at St. Luke's – WONDERFUL CARE. Maybe promote weight loss program.
21. Recently had a parent in the Hillsboro Hospital. The facility and equipment needs to be updated. The beds were terrible. The best care was given by PRN staff. There was a nurse or aide that was a hire of the hospital that was very rude and didn't seem to care about the type of care being given. VERY TROUBLING. I told my husband to never take mw to Hillsboro hospital for ANYTHING!
22. Not enough doctors.
23. A lot of people do not get health care because of cost and insurance is too expensive.
24. My husband has no insurance and I know many others who don't. Health care is very pricey so he doesn't go to the doctor unless and emergency – waiting on Medicare to kick in.
25. I think the school lunches may be "healthy," but not enough food is offered for lunch.
26. It would be nice to have a hospital that is a county hospital located somewhere between Hillsboro and Marion that would deliver babies and offer pediatric checkups and such. If you want people to live in this county, provide the services and don't make them drive to Newton, Salina, McPherson, Hutch, etc.
27. Need knowledgeable doctors and nurses that care about the health of people and not just money! Need current update equipment in hospitals. More services provided at hospitals/clinics.
28. Keep primary doctor care by consistent providers.
29. First-rate physicians are not available.
30. Hard to locate info on home health care services.
31. Service providers (individual and institutional) should support and speak positively about our services and providers and not discount others' abilities or knowledge base.
32. BC-BS is too high! We pay $850/month with $1,500 deductible.
33. I am concerned that some people are not receiving the mental health care they need. Not sure if it is lack of funds or not willing to admit they have a problem.
34. I believe there are not enough options to get health care for those who cannot afford health insurance or even health care at a reduced rate.
35. I do not believe the court system in Marion Co. effectively deals with child neglect and truancy issues!
36. At this time, I'm not experiencing health care concerns.
37. Prenatal care – lack of.
38. I know that for families in poverty, transportation to medical appointments is a challenge due to not having all KanCare covered services being readily available in Marion County.
39. Lack of a pediatrician in our county – families wanting a pediatrician have to travel out of county.
40. Consistency in health information across the county.
41. Having all health care services available and affordable in our community.
42. I think that the WIC program should increase their wage allowances to help out families that are needing a little help.
43. I would like a break sometimes. (Care giver for elderly person.)
44. None. I personally feel adequately served.
45. The distance Home Health travels hinders us using them.
46. Just wish that we could be taken care of in Marion hospital instead of transferred to Wichita all the time.
47. Concerned about the lack of professionalism shown by (a health service provider).
48. Don't live here, but it's quite a distance to Wichita for major medical emergencies.
49. Like most of the U.S., people are not exercising enough. A lot of obese people. Very happy Marion has a hospital – a HUGE asset to our community!
50. I think we should be more worried about the old people and the real young ones that need the health care they really need but aren't getting because of our President. And the physical, mental abuse people get daily.
51. Rising cost of everything. Health insurance is not affordable to everyone in family and income tax time is going to hurt.
52. Health care needs to be more affordable for everyone.
53. Access to information / services. In addition, lack of local resources in the community.
54. Food served in cafeteria – to me ketchup is not a vegetable and long johns don't count as a whole grain.
55. I think the health care is very good. People would rather go outside the county for health care because of mistakes made in years past are aren't willing to give it a try because of that. The county needs more healthy activities for older people besides watching ball games and golf.
56. Some of these were hard to answer because I do not know about all of the county, just particular towns / areas. Maybe make questions more toward individual towns.
57. Need good doctors that want to practice in rural Kansas. We need to get the hospital built in Hillsboro, but building the hospital alone won't be the answer without attracting good doctors.
58. Aging hospital facilities.
59. Thankful for what we have.
60. Need more providers.
61. My husband passed away last year. I found the application process for Medicaid funding for his nursing home care to be very frustrating and time consuming.
62. Do not like going to St. Luke for reasons of lack of respect and privacy.
63. Limited nursing home beds in Marion.
64. Medicaid patients need to use the clinics instead of coming to ER's for minor complaints / concerns.
65. I think poverty is a problem here with an unusually large number of people on assistance. ER department is overused by people on Medicaid for things that could be seen in the physician clinic.
66. Marion needs more nursing home beds.
67. Transportation.
68. Health care costs too much.
69. None at this time. There are good facilities and care givers available here or close to our community.
70. Quality of doctors is a concern. Have anecdotal evidence that serious illness and disease goes undiagnosed. It's my perception.
71. The qualifications of doctors.
72. We want to keep the services we have!
73. We need both medical centers to cover Marion County.
74. Rural health at this time means a person in need may or may not get the specialist they need because the specialists do not want to accept the patient from here.
75. Teen pregnancy needs to be address more in school.
76. Education about health care – when to seek / how to treat things at home (e.g. fever, minor cuts, abrasions) / medications.
77. There are not good resources for children / young adults with mental health needs. It would be nice to have ambulance 24 hours a day available.
80. We need more physicians and mid-levels for our area.
81. Hillsboro needs a hospital. Hillsboro needs a surgeon.
82. No OB/GYN in Marion.
83. Even with insurance, costs are too high.
84. Am concerned with the loss of full-time staffed ambulance crews across the county, and the lack of new capable replacements for those that quit or retire.
85. It would be nice to have a pediatrician (more knowledgeable about kid issues) available closer that Newton / McPherson who can also give shots and the wellness check-ups and not have to schedule them at the health department.
86. 17A-H I think there are a number of problems in these areas but I don't know if this is considered a high percentage in our county. Underage drinking and drugs is a concern.
87. It would be nice to get general medical care for kids (ear infection, etc.) on a Saturday.
88. Dissatisfied with Newton Medical, despite many calls, cannot get an answer. Cannot get an appointment as a new patient.
89. No dentists take KanCare for adults. Only 21 and under.
90. It is so very expensive.
91. 17J&K – some.
92. For me personally I have a handicapped sister and it was impossible to get her home health services. My step-father was handicapped as well so made it even harder for her care.
93. Too many people with no health insurance.
94. I believe the elderly who try to care for their spouse are challenged to the point of depression and loss of their own health and death. There is need in our county to have help for the caregivers also.
95. 20a&b – care for a disabled person and am facing challenges providing care for them.
96. 17A to 17H – Most of these are issues world-wide – I put don’t know because you specified Marion County.
97. I reside in Chase County so I have no idea (of any general concerns in Marion County).
98. Health care providers in Marion County need more education in dealing with children with autism and other disabilities.
100. 17H&I – If you don’t know, how should I?
101. 17A&B – It’s universal.
102. I have no dental care and that makes problems to my health.
103. 19B – Not affordable assisted living.
104. Need more physicians in Marion.
105. 17G – Adequate mental health services
106. 17C – Meth is a problem.
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<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage Therapy</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage Therapy</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Emergency Numbers

**Police/Sheriff** 911  
**Fire** 911  
**Ambulance** 911

### Non-Emergency Numbers

- **Marion County Sheriff** 620-382-2144  
- **Marion County Ambulance** 620-382-3271

### Municipal Non-Emergency Numbers

- **Burns** 620-382-2144  
- **Durham** 620-924-5700  
- **Florence** 620-878-4525  
- **Goessel** 620-382-2144  
- **Peabody** 620-983-2111  
- **Ramona** 620-382-2144  
- **Tampa** 620-965-7777  
- **Lost Springs** 620-382-2144  
- **Lincolnville** 620-382-2144  
- **Lehigh** 620-382-2144  
- **Hillsboro** 620-382-2144  
- **Florence** 620-382-2144  
- **Durham** 620-382-2144

### Other Emergency Numbers

- **Kansas Bureau of Investigation (Topeka)** 785-296-8200  
- **Kansas Division of Emergency Management (Topeka)** 785-274-1409  
- **Federal Bureau of Investigation** 1-866-483-5137

### Kansas Arson/Crime Hotline

- **Kansas Arson/Crime Hotline** 1-800-483-1497

### Kansas Bureau of Investigation

- **Kansas Bureau of Investigation (Topeka)** 785-296-8200  
- **Kansas Bureau of Investigation (Topeka)** 785-296-8200

### Other Emergency Numbers

- **Domestic Violence Hotline** 1-800-799-7233  
- **Domestic Violence Hotline** 1-800-799-7233  
- **Domestic Violence Hotline** 1-800-799-7233

### Kansas Child/Adult Abuse and Neglect Hotline

- **Kansas Child/Adult Abuse and Neglect Hotline** 1-800-922-5330
Health Services

St. Luke Hospital Services Include:

- Audiologist
- Cardiology
- Cardiac/Pulmonary Rehabilitation
- CT scan
- Dexascan
- MRI
- Nuclear medicine
- Obstetrics
- Orthopedics
- Radiology
- Sonogram
- Vascular

St. Luke Hospital

Toxic Chemical and Oil Spills

1-800-222-1222

Poison Control Center

1-800-222-1222

Toxic Chemical and Oil Spills

1-800-723-TALK

Suicide Prevention Hotline

1-800-SUICIDE

California Poison Control Center

511

Kansass Road Conditions

1-888-END-ABUSE

Kansass Crisis Hotline (Domestic Violence/Sexual Assault)
Hillsboro Community Hospital Services Include:

- Inpatient Care
- Skilled Swing Bed
- Emergency Department
- General Surgery
- Laboratory
- Nerve Conduction Testing
- Radiology
- Ultrasound (Sonograms)
- Rehabilitation Therapy
- Physical Therapy
- Occupational Therapy
- Speech Therapy
- Respiratory Therapy
- Vascular Lab
- MRI
- CT Scan
- X-Ray
- Ophthalmology
- Cardiology
- Podiatry
- Urology
- Orthopedics
- General Surgery
- Specialty Clinics

Marion County Health Department Services Include:

- Bicycle Helmet Programs
- Car Seat Inspection Station
- Child Care Licensing & Registration
- Child Health Assessments
- Child Health Visits
- Child Find
- CECI
- Immunizations
- Immunization Clinics
- Preventing Childhood Injuries & Accidents
- Parent-Child Relationships
- Healthy Schools
- Family Health Services
- Home Visits

Hillsboro Community Hospital
701 S Main (Hillsboro)
620-947-3114
www.hchks.com

Marion County Health Department
230 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-2550
www.marioncoks.net

Specialty Clinics

- General Surgery
- Orthopedics
- Ophthalmology
- Podiatry
- Urology
- Vascular Lab

Hillsboro Community Hospital
701 S Main (Hillsboro)
620-947-3114
www.hchks.com
Immunizations
Maternal Child Health  Medical Screenings  TB Testing  WIC

Mental Health

Prairie View Incorporated
805 Western Heights Circle (Hillsboro)
620-947-3200
www.prairieview.org

South Central Mental Health
175 W 3rd Street (Florence)
620-452-5570

Medical Professionals

Chiropractors
Bruce M Skiles
537 S Freedom Street, Suite B (Marion)
620-382-3722

Dr. Shauna Kern, D.O. Internal Medicine
Laurie Methvin, APRN
Marion Family Physicians
504 S Roosevelt (Marion)
620-382-3711

Good Health Chiropractic & Diagnostic Center
122 N Main (Hillsboro)
620-947-3157

Panzer Chiropractic Clinic
122 S Main Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-3161
www.goodhealth.medicfusion.com
Dentists
Hillsboro Dental Care
119 E Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)
620-947-0050

Mini Dental Implant Center
615 S Main (Hillsboro) 620-947-5771
www.loewendental.com

Robert D Hague
1332 100th (Peabody)
320-382-3722
537 S Freedom Street (Marion)
Marion Family Physicians

Optometrists
Caleb Abbott
424 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-3113

Mid Kansas Eye Care
701 S Main Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-3114

Mid Kansas Eye Care
424 E Main Street (Marion)
Caleb Abbott
620-382-3113

Physicians
Marion Healthmart Pharmacy Incorporated
620-947-3784
424 E Main Street (Marion)

Don's Drug
620-93-2776
1332 100th (Peabody)

Robert D Hague
620-947-3784
424 E Main Street (Marion)

Marion Healthmart Pharmacy Incorporated
620-947-3784
424 E Main Street (Marion)

Don's Drug
620-93-2776
1332 100th (Peabody)

Pharmacists

Pharmacists

Physicians

Physicians
Rehabilitation Services
Prairie View Incorporated
805 Western Heights Circle (Hillsboro)
620-947-3200
www.prairieview.org

Salem Home
704 S Ash Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-2272
www.salemhomeks.org

St. Luke Hospital
704 S Ash Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-2272
www.slhmarion.org

Other Health Care Services

Assisted Living/Nursing Homes/TLC

Bethesda Home
408 E Main Street (Goessel)
620-367-2291
www.bethesdahome.org

Hill Top Manor
1501 E Lawrence Street (Marion)
620-382-2218
www.marioncoks.net/departments/healthdepartment

Marion County Health Department
535 S Freedom (Marion)
620-382-2177
www.apria.com

Apria Healthcare
620-283-1936
2305 S Kansas Road (Newton)
www.marioncoks.net/departments/healthdepartment

Marion County Health Department
620-947-3200
205 W 7th Street (Hillsboro)
www.marioncoks.net/departments/healthdepartment

St. Luke Hospital
620-947-2272
704 S Ash Street (Hillsboro)
www.marioncoks.net/departments/healthdepartment

Salem Home
620-947-3200
805 Western Heights Circle (Hillsboro)
www.prairieview.org
Marion Assisted Living
200 Eisenhower Drive (Marion)
620-382-3000

Parkside Homes Incorporated
200 Willow Road (Hillsboro)
620-947-2301
www.parksideks.org

Salem Home
704 S Ash (Hillsboro)
620-874-9010
www.salemhomeks.org

St. Luke Living Center
535 S Freeborn (Marion)
620-382-3117

Diabetes Care Club
1-800-375-5137

Arriva Medical
1-888-395-6009

Disability Services
American Disability Group
1-800-622-9072

Disability Services
Kansas Department on Aging
1-800-726-8970

Domestic/Family Violence
Family Crisis Center
(Great Bend)
Hotline: 620-792-1850
Business Line: 620-793-1970
www.familycrisiscenter.org

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)

Family Crisis Center
Family Crisis Center
(1-800-622-9072)
Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence Center
Hotline: 1-800-701-3630 Business Line: 620-663-2522

Educational Training Opportunities
Association of Continuing Education
620-296-4322 or 1-800-432-3535 www.agingkansas.org

Government Healthcare
Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE)
Curtis State Office Building 1000 SW Jackson (Topeka) 785-296-1500 www.kdheks.gov/contact.html

MEDICAID
785-776-3496
1212 E 27th Street (Hays) Social Security Administration
www.ssa.gov

MEDICAID
785-628-1066
3000 Broadway (Hays) Services (SRS) Kansas Department of Social & Rehabilitation Services (SRS)

Medicare
www.gov/hellas.gov/kansascare.org
785-963-2522
1000 SW Jackson (Topeka)
Curtis State Office Building (KSHE)

Kansas Department of Health and Environment

Food Programs
Kansas Food Bank
North Central Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging (KDOA)
4 NW 26th Road (Great Bend) 620-793-7100

Social & Rehabilitation Services (SRS)
3000 Broadway (Hays) 785-628-1066
Health and Fitness Centers

Marion Wellness Center
110 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-2697

Woods Wellness
107 W Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)
620-877-7503
www.woodswellness.com

Home Health

Apria Healthcare
2305 S Kansas Road (Newton)
620-283-1936
www.apria.com

Marion County Home Care
535 S Freeborn (Marion)
620-382-3690

Hospice Care of Kansas
301 N Main Street #107 (Newton)
620-283-2116
www.hospicecareofkansas.com

Hillboro Public Schools - USD 410

ManeStreet Beautique
110 N Walnut Street (Peabody)
620-983-4040
www.manestreetbeautique.com

St. Luke Integrated Health
921 E Main (Marion)
620-382-2998
www.stlukegratedhealth.com

ManeStreet Beautique
110 N Walnut Street (Peabody)
620-983-4040

Massage Therapy

Hillboro Public Schools - USD 410

School Nurses
1-866-637-6803

American Medical Sales and Repair
620-367-2242

Medical Equipment and Supplies
620-382-2998
921 E Main (Marion)

Goessel Public Schools - USD 411

Hospice Care

Goessel
500 E Main Street (Goessel)
620-367-2242

Hillboro Public Schools - USD 410

Hospice

Newton
107 W Grand Avenue (Hillboro)
620-382-2697

Woods Wellness
107 W Grand Avenue (Hillboro)
620-382-2697
www.woodswellness.com

Marion Wellness Center
110 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-2697

Health and Fitness Centers
Local Government, Community, and Social Services

Adult Protection

Adult Protective Services (SRS)
1-800-922-5330
www.srskansas.org/ISD/ees/adult.htm

Elder Abuse Hotline
1-800-842-0078
www.elderabusecenter.org

Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services West Region Protection Reporting Center
1-800-922-5330

Alcohol and Drug Treatment

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services
1-800-586-3690
http://www.srskansas.org/services/alc-drug_assess.htm

Alcohol Detoxification 24-Hour Help line
1-877-403-3387
www.ACenterForRecovery.com

Center for Recovery
1-877-403-6236

G&G Addiction Treatment Center
1-866-439-1807

Road Less Traveled
1-866-486-1812

Seabrook House
www.srskansas.org/ISD/ees/adult.htm
1-800-222-5330

The Treatment Center
1-888-4-33-9609

The Treatment Center
1-800-579-0377

Seabrook House
1-886-486-1812

Road Less Traveled
1-886-439-1807

G&G Addiction Treatment Center
1-877-403-6236

Center for Recovery
1-877-403-3387
Children and Youth

Children's Alliance
627 SW Topeka Boulevard (Topeka) 620-235-5437
www.childally.org

Kansas Children's Service League
1-800-332-6378  www.kcsl.org

Community Centers

Burns Community Center
620-726-5511
301 N Washington Avenue (Burns)
Burns Police Department
620-726-5511
511 Main Street (Florence)
Florence Police Department

Crime Prevention

Marion Police Department
620-382-2177
535 S Freeborn (Marion)
St. Luke Hospital

Day Care Providers – Adult

St. Luke Hospital
535 S Freeborn (Marion)
Peabody Police Department
620-947-3440
112 N 5th Street (Marion)
Peabody Police Department
620-382-2177
535 S Freeborn (Marion)

Day Care Providers – Children

St. Luke Hospital
535 S Freeborn (Marion)
Peabody Police Department
620-947-3440
112 N 5th Street (Marion)
Peabody Police Department
620-382-2177
535 S Freeborn (Marion)

Community Centers

Kansas Children's Service League
1-800-332-6378  www.kcsl.org

Children's Alliance
620-726-5511
301 N Washington Avenue (Burns)
Burns Police Department
620-726-5511
511 Main Street (Florence)
Florence Police Department

Crime Prevention

Marion Police Department
620-382-2177
535 S Freeborn (Marion)
St. Luke Hospital
Marion County Learning Center
107 S Main Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-3210

Sunshine County Preschool
520 S 3rd (Marion)
620-382-2450

Extension Office
Marion County Extension
202 S 3rd Street, Suite A (Marion)
620-382-2325

Funeral Homes
Baker Funeral Home
114 N Sycamore Street (Peabody)
620-983-2144
Zeiner Funeral Home
104 W 5th Street (Florence)
620-878-4255
308 E Main Street (Goessel)
620-367-8181

Head Start
201 E Hawley Street (Herington)
620-258-2787

Housing
Corp Housing Equity
913-261-8067
14482 W 118th Terrace (Olathe)

Hillsboro Housing Authority
620-947-2235
506 W Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)

Grand Oaks Apartments
620-947-2235
506 W Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)

Head Start
205 Eim Street (Marion)
620-878-4255
104 W 5th Street (Florence)

Zieber Funeral Home
620-382-2112
303 E Main Street (Goessel)
Miller Funeral Home
620-382-2450
50 S 3rd (Marion)

Sunshine County Preschool
107 S Main Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-3222
401 S Washington Street (Hillsboro)

Jost Funeral Home
620-382-2255
202 S 3rd Street, Suite A (Marion)

Marion County Extension Office
620-947-2235
202 S 3rd Street, Suite A (Marion)

Hillsboro Housing Authority
620-947-2235
506 W Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)
Peabody Housing Authority
501 N Vine Street, Suite A (Peabody)
620-983-2958

Legal Services
Brookens & Collett
109 S Main Street (Tampa)
620-965-2227

Daniel Baldwin Law Office
318 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-2121

David Marsh
606 150th Street (Hillsboro)
620-367-8176

Karstetter & Klenda
318 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-2186

www.kklawoffices.com

www.lalouettelaw.com

North Central-Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging
401 Houston Street (Manhattan)
785-776-9294

Wise & Reber
www.wisereberlawoffice.com
620-947-8176

Goessel Public Library
101 S Cedar Street (Goessel)
620-878-4649

Florence Public Library
324 Main Street (Florence)
620-726-5717

Burns Public Library
www.burns.mykansaslibrary.org
104 N Washington Avenue (Burns)
620-726-5717

Libraries, Parks and Recreation

Wise & Reber
www.wisereberlawoffice.com
620-947-3956

Daniel Baldwin Law Office
120 N Main (Hillsboro)
620-965-2227

www.danielbaldwinlawoffice.com

Costello Law Office
318 E Main Street (Marion)
620-382-2121

Brookens & Collett
www.brookensandcollett.com
620-947-8176

Legal Services

La Roquette Law
111 S Main Street (Hillsboro)
620-947-2061

Peabody Housing Authority
501 N Vine Street, Suite A (Peabody)
620-983-2958

www.pahousingauthority.com
Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce
111 W Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)  620-947-3506

Lehigh City Hall
110 E Main Street (Lehigh)  620-483-4176

Marion Chamber of Commerce
203 N 3rd Street (Marion)  620-382-3425

Rape
Domestic Violence and Rape Hotline
1-888-874-1499

Families

Kansas Crisis Hotline
1-800-739-1885
1806 12th Street (Great Bend)
Family Crisis Center

1-888-784-1499

Red Cross
American Red Cross
715 S Broadway (Herington)
620-258-2000

Alfred Schroeder Field
Marion Municipal Airport
620-947-3162
620-382-3703

Transportation Department

Transportation

Social Security Administration

Social Security

1-800-772-1213
1-800-325-0778

RedCross.org
620-258-2000
www.redcross.org

Manhattan

Marion Chamber of Commerce
620-483-4176

Lehigh City Hall

110 E Main Street (Lehigh)
620-483-4176

Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce
111 W Grand Avenue (Hillsboro)
620-947-3506
State and National Information, Services, Support

Adult Protection Services
1-800-922-5330
www.srskansas.org/SD/ees/adult.htm

Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (DVACK)
1-800-874-1499
www.dvack.org

Elder Abuse Hotline
1-800-842-0078
www.elderabusecenter.org

Elder and Nursing Home Abuse Legal
www.resource4nursinghomeabuse.com/index.html

Kansas Coalition Against Sexual and Domestic Violence
1-888-END-ABUSE (363-2287)
www.kcsdv.org/ksresources.html

Kansas Department on Aging Adult Care Complaint Program
1-800-842-0078

National Center on Elder Abuse
www.ncea.gov/NCEAroot/Main_Site?Find_Help/Help_Hotline.aspx

National Domestic Violence Hotline
1-888-225-1122
www.ndvh.org

National Sexual Assault Hotline
1-800-994-9662
1-888-220-5416 (TTY)
www.4woman.gov/faq/sexualassault.htm

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline
1-800-273-TALK (8255)
www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org

National Sexual Assault Hotline
1-888-822-5925
www.wisconsinsexoffenderhelpline.com

Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)
1-888-369-4777 (HAYS)
www.srskansas.org

Support
State and National Information, Services,
Veterans Special Issue Help Line
Includes Gulf War/Agent Orange Helpline
1-800-749-8387
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs
Mammography Helpline
1-888-492-7844
Other Benefits
1-800-827-1000
Memorial Program Service
[includes status of headstones and markers]
1-800-697-6947
Telecommunications Device for the Deaf/Hearing Impaired
1-800-829-4833 (TTY)
www.vba.va.gov
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Education (GI Bill)
1-888-442-4551
Health Care Benefits
Income Verification and Means Testing
1-888-442-4551
Veteran Special Issue Help Line
Veterans Administration
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Veterans Administration Benefits
1-800-669-8477
Life Insurance
Kansas Rural Health Works
Community Health Needs Assessment

Marion County
John Leatherman
Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics
Director, Office of Local Government
K-State Research and Extension

Agenda
- CHNA overview
- Economic contribution of local health care
- Preliminary list of community concerns
- Health service area
- Local data reports
- Community health services directory
- Community health care survey
- Proposed schedule of meetings
- Focus group questions
- Next meeting

Local Health Needs Assessment
- Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act
- 501(c)3 (charitable) hospital every 3 years
  - Community Health Needs Assessment
  - Implementation strategy
  - Demonstrable effort for progress
- Public Health Accreditation every 5 years
  - Community Public Health Needs Assessment
  - Public health action planning
  - Strategic plan

KRHW CHNA Objectives
- KRHW Community Engagement Process since 2005
  - Help foster healthy communities
  - Help foster sustainable rural community health care system
  - Identify priority health care needs
  - Mobilize/organize the community
  - Develop specific action strategies with measurable goals

Community-driven Process
- Community-based, not driven by hospital, health care provider, or outside agency
- Local people solving local problems
- Community provides energy and commitment, with input from health care providers
- Public represented by you - community leaders who care enough to participate
- I make no recommendations

Steering Committee Meetings
- 3 two-hour working meetings over 3 weeks
- Examine information resources
  - Economic contribution of health care; health services directory; community health care survey; data and information reports
- Identify priority health-related needs
  - Revisit information; small group discussion; group prioritization; form action teams
- Develop action strategies for priority needs
  - Leadership, measurable goals
Keys to Success

- Our process has a beginning and an end
- Your participation is critical
- Your preparation allows effective participation
- Every community has needs and the capacity to improve its relative situation
- Your ongoing commitment and initiative will determine whether that's true here
- We'll provide discussion forum and tools
- The rest is up to you

Importance of Health Care Sector

- Health services and rural development
  - Major U.S. Growth Sector
    - Health services employment up 70% from 1990-08
    - 10%-15% employment in many rural counties
  - Business location concern
    - Quality of life; productive workforce; ‘tie-breaker’ location factor
  - Retiree location factor
    - 60% called quality health care “must have”

Total Health Care Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sectors</th>
<th>Direct Employment</th>
<th>Economic Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Care Services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and Dentists</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ambulatory Health Care</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health Care Impact ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sectors</th>
<th>Direct Income</th>
<th>Economic Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>$1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>$691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Care Services</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and Dentists</td>
<td>$2,021</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>$2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ambulatory Health Care</td>
<td>$981</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>$1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>$7,558</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>$9,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>$8,557</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>$9,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$20,870</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Health Care Impact ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sectors</th>
<th>Total Impact</th>
<th>Retail Sales</th>
<th>County Sales Tax Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$1,273</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Services</td>
<td>$691</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Care Services</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors and Dentists</td>
<td>$2,309</td>
<td>$462</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ambulatory Health Care</td>
<td>$1,153</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>$9,249</td>
<td>$1,852</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing/Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>$9,597</td>
<td>$1,922</td>
<td>$19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$24,356</td>
<td>$4,877</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary and Conclusions

- Trends and indicators show health care’s economic importance
- Health services among the fastest growing sectors – demographic trends suggest growth will continue
- Attracting/retaining businesses & retirees depends on adequate health care services
- Sustainable health care system essential for local health and economic opportunity

### Initial Community Perceptions

- What are major health-related concerns?
- What needs to be done to improve local health care?
- What should be the over-arching health care goals in the county?
- What are the greatest barriers to achieving those goals?

### Marion Co. Health Care Market

SLH = 86.1%
HCH = 86.2% of Inpatient Discharges in 2011

### Data Fact Sheets
Data Fact Sheets

- Seeking issues/needs in secondary data, i.e. that which is missing, a challenge, or could be improved
- Looking at the negative doesn’t mean there isn’t much that is good
- Data are indicators that require interpretation
- You decide what’s important

Data Fact Sheets

- Economic & demographic data
  - Declining population ~ 6% since 1990 & decline
  - Aging population ~ 22% 65+ & increasing
  - 38% of population without spouse
  - 12% of HH live on <$15,000, 23% <$25,000
  - Transfer income > importance (>86m, 24%)
  - 10% live in poverty (13% of children)

Data Fact Sheets

- Health & behavioral data
  - LTC capacity: community-based alternatives?
  - Youth tobacco use ~11+, > KS & stable
  - Youth binge drinking ~10+, < KS & stable
  - Child immunizations ~ 71%, ~ KS & improving?
  - 12% newborns < than adequate prenatal care
  - 10 out-of-wedlock births to 15-19 y.o.
  - Government food, energy assistance increasing
  - Hospitals short-term trends stable/weakening

Data Fact Sheets

- Crime data
  - Crime 1/2 state rates (incomplete data)
  - # Arrests increasing

Data Fact Sheets

- Health Matters (random impressions)
  - Variability due to sampling
  - Overweight > KS
  - Diabetes, hypertension > KS
  - Adult physical activity < KS
  - Infant mortality considerably > KS
  - 15% teen, 50% unmarried births rising, > KS
  - 30% of pregnant women smoke, > KS

Data Fact Sheets

- Overall mortality rates > KS
- Suicide rate > KS
- Rate of injuries high
- Adult binge drinking high, > KS
- Adults with poor self-perceived health > KS
- People 65+ living alone high
- High lead risk with older housing
Overall Conclusions from Data

- Population trends and income levels are creating challenges
- Accessing state/federal assistance is essential
- Community-based services for those elderly, alone
- Room for improvement in preventable problems – lifestyle and chronic conditions

You look. You decide.

Community Health Care Survey

485 total responses
- 80% saw Dr. past year; +16% w/in two yrs.
- 58% used a hospital last year; Marion County captured half
- 63% had St. Luke experience; 97% satisfied/somewhat satisfied
- 37% had Hillsboro experience; 86% satisfied/somewhat satisfied

Community Health Survey

- 60% had health dept. experience; 98% satisfied/somewhat satisfied
- 43% had kids/grand kids in county school
  - Health education: 56% Yes; 36% Don’t Know
  - Healthy food/snacks: 63% Yes; 30% Don’t Know
  - 15% have children < 5 years old
  - 95%+ had/will have all vaccinations

Community Health Survey

- Getting health information
  - 58% doctor’s office
  - 23% Internet
  - 13% family/friends
- Skipped treatment due to cost
  - 24% medical
  - 36% dental
  - 17% prescriptions
  - 7% mental health assistance
Community Health Survey

- 63% eat out 1-2 times; 23% zero times
- 62% eat at home w. others 5+ times; 25% live alone
- 20% need monthly medical treatment
- 46% of them have transportation challenges
- Adequate prenatal care
  - 18% Yes; 23% No; 59% Don't Know

Community Health Survey

- Obesity 58% Yes 7% No 36% Don't Know
- Diabetes 41% 5% 54%
- Drug use 71% 4% 25%
- Alcohol abuse 63% 4% 33%
- Underage drinking 61% 5% 34%
- Teen pregnancy 32% 11% 57%
- Mental health 36% 9% 55%

Community Health Survey

- Suicide 14% Yes 24% No 61%
- Child Abuse 39% 9% 52%
- Spousal Abuse 28% 7% 64%
- Elder Abuse 12% 15% 73%

Community Health Survey

- 25% 65 years or older
- 94% live independently
- 15% are facing challenges
- 34% say home health assistance adequate
- 45% say assisted living adequate
- 9% take care of an elder
- 30% are facing challenges

Community Health Survey

- General health concerns
  - Health care costs
  - More health care providers (doctors, mid-level, dentists, eye care, pediatrics, OB/GYN)
  - Health, wellness, chronic disease prevention
  - Transfers to other hospitals
  - Facility conditions
  - Elder care: nursing care, home health, community services
  - Customer service
Community Directory

- Comprehensive listing of health and related providers and services
- If they know it’s available locally, they can choose to buy it at home
- Extended description of hospital, county health department, others as justified
- You ensure completeness and accuracy
- Consider the “gaps” that may exist
- Updatable, reproducible

Public Meeting Schedule

- June 25 (Marion): Overview, economic impact report, community concerns, data reports, draft health services directory, survey
- July 2 (Hillsboro): Review data & information; group discussion; issue prioritization; team formation
- July 9 (Marion): Action planning
- After? That’s up to you

Next Meeting

- Introduction and review
- Review of data & survey results
- Service gap analysis
- Focus group formation and charge
- Group summaries
- Prioritization
- Next meeting date

Next Meeting

- Homework: review the information, consider the questions
- Focus Group questions
  - What is your vision for a healthy community?
  - What are the top 3-4 things that need to happen to achieve your vision?
  - What can the hospital do to help?
  - What can the health department do to help?

www.krhw.net

Contact information:
John Leatherman
785-532-4492/2643
jleather@k-state.edu

More info:
www.krhw.net
www.ksu-olg.info
Kansas Rural Health Works
Community Health Needs Assessment
Marion County

John Leatherman
Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics
Director, Office of Local Government
K-State Research and Extension

Agenda
• CHNA overview and review
• Preliminary list of community concerns
• Local data reports
• Community health services gap analysis
• Community health care survey results
• Small group discussion
• Group prioritization
• Next meeting

Local Health Needs Assessment
• Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act creates hospital requirements
• Public Health Department Accreditation
• Both require Community Health Needs Assessment

KRHW CHNA Objectives
• KRHW CHNA
  – Help foster healthy communities and a sustainable rural community health care system
  – Identify priority health care needs
  – Mobilize/organize the community
  – Develop specific action strategies with measurable goals

Community-driven Process
• Community-based, not driven by hospital, health care provider, or outside agency
• Local people solving local problems
• Community provides energy and commitment, with input from health care providers
• Public represented by you
• I make no recommendations
Summary and Conclusions

- Trends and indicators show health care’s economic importance
- Health services among the fastest growing sectors – demographic trends suggest growth will continue
- Sustainable health care system essential for local health and economic opportunity
- Maintaining a sustainable local health care system is a community-wide challenge

Initial Community Perceptions

- What are major health-related concerns?
- What needs to be done to improve local health care?
- What should be the over-arching health care goals in the county?
- What are the greatest barriers to achieving those goals?

Collective Themes

- Health, wellness, chronic disease prevention
- Recruit/retain primary/specialty services & providers
- Transportation assistance
- Communication/collaboration between/within
- Cost/access, especially for low income
- Long-term sustainability of local health care system due to trends, reform & competition
- Your conclusions?

Data Fact Sheets

- Seeking issues/needs in secondary data, i.e. that which is missing, a challenge, or could be improved
- Looking at the negative doesn’t mean there isn’t much that is good
- Data are indicators that require interpretation
- You decide what’s important

Overall Conclusions from Data

- Population trends and income levels are creating challenges
- Accessing state/federal assistance is essential
- Community-based services for those elderly, alone
- Room for improvement in preventable problems – lifestyle and chronic conditions
Your Analysis

- What did you see that you liked?
- What do you see that was troubling?
- What do you think could be improved?
- What do you think is in your collective capacity to make better?

Community Health Care Survey

- 485 responses
- Non-representative, but lots of input
- Local provider use and satisfaction
- Attributes of the community & problems
- Generally positive, educational needs
- Comments suggest needs & challenges
  - Health care costs; more health care providers/specialties; health, wellness, chronic disease prevention; transfers to other hospitals; facility conditions; elder care; nursing care, home health, community services; customer service

Community Directory

- Comprehensive listing of health and related providers and services
- If they know it’s available locally, they can choose to buy it at home
- You ensure completeness and accuracy
- Consider the “gaps” that may exist
- What was missing that you would like to see?

Small Group Discussion

- Discussion leader and note taker
- Everyone contributes
- Time is critical – 30 minutes total
- At 15 minutes start deciding 2-4 priorities
- Consider the question
  - Everyone 30 seconds to respond
  - Seek commonalities/themes/combine concerns
  - Identify 1-2 group responses
  - Report to the group
Discussion Questions

- What is your vision for a healthy community?
- What are the top 3-4 things that need to happen to achieve your vision?
  - What’s right? What could be better?
  - Consider acute needs and chronic conditions
  - Discrete local issues, not global concerns
  - Consider the possible, within local control and resources, something to rally the community
- What can the hospital do to help?
- What can the health department do to help?

Issue Prioritization

- Group reports
- What are the discrete local health concerns?
- What are the chronic health issues of local concern?
- What are the top 2-4 issues that should be the focus of local priority over the next 3-5 years?
- Which priority will you focus on?
- Homework

Next Meeting

- Introduction and Review
- Review of priorities
- Work groups
- Work group reports
- Action group formation and leadership
- Action group meetings
- One-year follow up meeting
- Summary and evaluation

Contact information:
John Leatherman
785-532-4492/2643
jleather@k-state.edu

More info:
www.krhw.net
www.ksu-olg.info
Kansas Rural Health Works
Community Health Needs Assessment
Marion County

John Leatherman
Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics
Director, Office of Local Government
K-State Research and Extension

Agenda
• CHNA overview and review
• Priority community health issues
• Work group formation and instructions
• Action plan development
• Group review
• Next steps
• Evaluation

Local Health Needs Assessment
• Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act creates hospital requirements
• Public Health Department Accreditation
• Both require Community Health Needs Assessment

KRHW CHNA Objectives
• KRHW CHNA
  – Help foster healthy communities and a sustainable rural community health care system
  – Identify priority health care needs
  – Mobilize/organize the community
  – Develop specific action strategies with measurable goals

Community-driven Process
• Community-based, not driven by hospital, health care provider, or outside agency
• Local people solving local problems
• Community provides energy and commitment, with input from health care providers
• Public represented by you
• I make no recommendations
Perceptions: Collective Themes

- Health, wellness, chronic disease prevention
- Recruit/retain primary/specialty services & providers
- Transportation assistance
- Communication/collaboration between/within
- Cost/access, especially for low income
- Long-term sustainability of local health care system due to trends, reform & competition

Data Fact Sheets

- Marion County Health Services Directory

Overall Conclusions from Data

- Population trends and income levels are creating challenges
- Accessing state/federal assistance is essential
- Community-based services for those elderly, alone
- Room for improvement in preventable problems – lifestyle and chronic conditions

Community Health Care Survey

- 485 responses
- Non-representative, but lots of input
- Local provider use and satisfaction
- Attributes of the community & problems
- Generally positive, educational needs
- Comments suggest needs & challenges
  - Health care costs; more health care providers/specialties; health, wellness, chronic disease prevention; transfers to other hospitals; facility conditions; elder care: nursing care, home health, community services; customer service

Issue Prioritization #1

- Health, wellness, chronic disease prevention
  - Emphasize health education
  - Focus on lifestyle behaviors that can be carried throughout life
  - Help adults achieve healthier lifestyle
  - Chronic disease prevention through education and screening
  - Promote awareness of local services
  - Provider recruitment
Issue Prioritization #2

- Communication/collaboration between providers, with the community and within the community
  - Enhance communication and collaboration to ensure more complete case management
  - Enhance access through information and assistance for limited resource, elderly, youthful families
  - Enhance awareness of existing local resources

Issue Prioritization #3

- Enhance access to health resources
  - Accessible transportation for the elderly and others with transportation challenges
  - Improve awareness of existing services and providers
  - Ensure households in need access available services and assistance
  - Comprehensive and dynamic information portal

Action Planning

- This ain’t easy
- This is only the start
- Once you begin, you’ll see more is needed
- If this is important and if you are committed, you’ll know how!
- The rest is up to you. It always has been.

Action Plan: Situation

- What is the existing situation you would like to see changed?
- What is the specific need/problem that you would like to see changed?
- Example: Enhance communication across providers and with the community
  - Providers in “silos” to patient detriment
  - Hospital board is insular

Action Plan: Priorities

- What are the top three things that need to happen to change the existing situation?
- Example:
  - Major providers meet periodically to exchange information and seek collaborative initiatives
  - Create a common public access point for information
  - Create an annual event to bring community and providers together

Action Plan: Intended Outcomes

- What will be the situation when you have achieved the goal?
- Example:
  - Patients experience continuum of care; providers are stronger with fewer leakages
  - Single Web-based portal for all provider info
  - Annual county health fair to learn about personal health, provider services, healthy choices, meet providers personally
**Action Plan: Resources**

- What resources are needed: who must be involved, how much time, money, what partnerships
  - Example:
    - Major provider cooperation
    - Significant organizational and public relations capacity
    - IT capacity
    - Financial sponsorships

**Action Plan: Activities**

- What meetings, events, public involvement, information resources, media, partnerships are needed?
  - Examples:
    - Quarterly provider meetings – private sharing
    - Event leadership and planning committee
    - Solicit financial sponsorship
    - Media collaboration
    - State/regional provider involvement
    - Schedule of events

**Action Plan: Participation**

- Who needs to be involved?
  - Examples:
    - Leadership – who is the right person?
    - Who within this group will start?
    - Who outside this group should be involved?
    - Business, education, religious, social, public, customers and the underserved

**Action Plan: Short-term**

- What has to happen in 6-12 months?
- What are the evaluation target metrics (awareness, knowledge, attitudes)?
  - Examples:
    - Providers buy in, establish a regular meeting schedule, identify meeting coordinator
    - Public relations to announce initiatives
    - Work committees recruited and organized
    - Sponsors secured
    - Plans and designs solidified/finalized

**Action Plan: Intermediate-term**

- What has to happen in 1-3 years?
- What are the evaluation target metrics (behaviors, decisions, actions, policies)?
  - Examples:
    - Providers meeting regularly
    - Web-based portal up and updated regularly
    - Annual health fair with broad community participation
    - Expanded community “buy-in” for initiatives

**Action Plan: Ultimate Impact**

- What has to happen in the long-term?
- What are the evaluation target metrics (how will the situation be different)?
  - Examples:
    - Community surveys show high local usage and satisfaction with local providers
    - Data health indicators are improving
    - Annual health fair growth, business outreach and participation, multiple community events
    - Community undertakes new health initiatives
Health Priorities

• Priority #1: Health, wellness, and chronic disease prevention

• Priority #2: Communication/collaboration between, with, and within

• Priority #3: Enhance access to health resources and assistance

Next Meeting

• Yes, there is a next meeting (sorry)

• Overall leadership and monitoring

• Work group leadership and meeting schedule

• Communicating with the community

• One-year follow up meeting open to the community

• Summary and evaluation

www.krw.net

Contact information:

John Leatherman

785-532-4492/2643

jleather@k-state.edu

More info:

www.krw.net

www.ksu-olg.info
Community Health Needs Assessment

Hospital Requirements

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) created a new IRS Code Section 501(r) which imposes additional requirements on tax-exempt hospitals. Specifically:

- All 501(c)3 Hospitals
- Governmental hospitals that have an IRS Determinate (c)3 Letter
- If you have ever applied for and received a letter (for the hospital entity) you have to comply.

Hospitals must Complete Community Needs Assessment

- At least once every three years; first one must be completed by end of tax year beginning after March 23, 2012.
- Include input from persons who represent the broad interest of the community.
- Include input from persons having public health knowledge or expertise.
- Make assessment widely available to the public
- Adopt a written implementation strategy to address identified community needs.*
- Failure to comply results in excise tax penalty of $50,000 per year.

Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Health Care Reform Law March, 2010)

* Notice 2011-52 – must be approved by authorized governing body (board of directors)

Community Health Needs Assessment Written Report Treasury and the IRS intend to require a hospital organization to document a Community Health Needs Assessment for a hospital facility in a written report that includes the following information:

1. A description of the community served by the hospital facility and how it was determined.
2. A description of the process and methods used to conduct the assessment, including a description of the sources and dates of the data and other information used in the assessment and the analytical methods applied to identify community health needs. The report should also describe information gaps that impact the hospital organization’s ability to assess the health needs of the community served by the hospital facility. If a hospital organization collaborates with other organizations in conducting a CHNA, the report should identify all of the organizations with which the hospital organization collaborated. If a hospital organization contracts with one or more third parties to assist it in conducting a CHNA, the report should also disclose the identity and qualifications of such third parties.
3. A description of how the hospital organization took into account input from persons who represent the broad interests of the community served by the hospital facility, including a description of when and how the organization consulted with these persons (whether through meetings, focus groups, interviews, surveys, written correspondence, etc.) If the hospital organization takes into account input from an organization, the written report should identify
the organization and provide the name and title of at least one individual in such organization with whom the hospital organization consulted.

4. A prioritized description of all of the community health needs identified through the CHNA, as well as a description of the process and criteria used in prioritizing such health needs.

5. A description of the existing health care facilities and other resources within the community available to meet the community health needs identified through the CHNA.

CHNA Written Report needs to be:

- Widely available to the public
- On hospital website
- Given to anyone who asks

Implementation Strategy

Treasury and the IRS intend to require a hospital organization to specifically address each of the community health needs identified through a CHNA for a hospital facility in an implementation strategy, rather than in the written report documenting the hospital facility’s CHNA.

An implementation strategy is a written plan that addresses each of the community health needs identified through a CHNA.

An implementation strategy will address a health need identified through a CHNA for a particular hospital facility if the written plan either:

1. describes how the hospital facility plans to meet the health need; or
2. identifies the health need as one the hospital facility does not intend to meet and explains why the hospital facility does not intend to meet the health need.

An Implementation Strategy needs to be:

- Approved by Board of Directors
- Attached to 990, and the 990 has to be widely available to the public

This summary was obtained from the Kansas Health Matters Website (http://www.kansashealthmatters.org/), and can be found here: (https://www.myc_tb.org/wst/kansashealthmatters/hospitals/default.aspx)
Community Health Needs Assessment

Health Department Accreditation

The Public Health Accreditation Board (PHAB) defines public health accreditation as the development of a set of standards, a process to measure health department performance against those standards, and reward or recognition for those health departments who meet the standards.

The PHAB standards were developed through the framework of the 10 Essential Public Health Services:

1. Monitor the health of the community
2. Diagnose and investigate health problems
3. Inform, educate, and empower people
4. Mobilize community partnerships
5. Develop policies
6. Enforce laws and regulations
7. Link to/provide health services
8. Assure a competent workforce
9. Evaluate quality
10. Research for new insights

Accreditation is a mechanism for demonstrating a local health department’s capacity for providing the essential services as well as its ability to do so through a culture of continuous quality improvement. The PHAB Standards and Measures Version 1.0 were released in May 2011.

Local health departments may seek accreditation as an individual agency or as a region, using the multi-jurisdictional approach. Accreditation status lasts for 5 years; at the end of the 5 year cycle, the department must seek reaccreditation.

Health departments must complete three prerequisites prior to applying for accreditation within the past 5 years

1. A community health assessment
2. A community health improvement plan
3. An agency strategic plan

The seven steps of the accreditation process are

1. Pre-application
2. Accreditation Readiness Checklist
3. Online Orientation
4. Statement of Intent
5. Application
6. Documentation Selection and Submission
7. Site Visit
8. Accreditation Decision
9. Reports
10. Reaccreditation

This summary was obtained from the *Kansas Health Matters* Website (http://www.kansashealthmatters.org/), and can be found here: (https://www.mycbt.org/wst/kansashealthmatters/healthdepartments/default.aspx)
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XI. Reporting

Each hospital facility is required to make the community health needs assessment widely available to community members. To accomplish this, the hospital needs to prepare a summary report of the community health needs assessment process and share the results with the community. This could be shared through newspaper articles, articles in the hospital newsletter, at local group meetings, website, etc.

The hospital board will utilize the community health needs assessment report (Example included in Appendix P) to determine the action plan, including the resulting community needs to be addressed, the implementation strategy for each community need, and the responsible person(s) or agency(ies). The hospital will address every need identified by the community. If the hospital is unable to address a particular need, this should also be indicated in the action plan. The hospital’s action plan must also be made available to the community. This could be shared through newspaper articles, articles in the hospital newsletter, at local group meetings, website, etc. The hospital may want to share this report with the community advisory committee through an additional meeting or a report sent to them.

The hospital will also have to submit documentation or proof to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that a community health needs assessment process was completed. For convenience, a suggested outline of a final summary report is presented in the table below to assist in completing the IRS reporting forms. This report outline is also included in Appendix Q.

The final report needs to include information pertaining to:

- Community Members;
- Medical Service Area;
- Community Meetings;
Summary Report Outline
Community Health Needs Assessment

Community Members Involved
Need to include name, organization and contact information for:
- Hospital Administrator
- Steering Committee or Leadership Group
- Facilitator
- Community Advisory Committee Members

Medical Service Area
Describe by county or zip code areas
Include populations and projected populations of medical service area
Include demographics of population of medical service area

Community Meetings #1, #2, and #3 (also any additional meetings)
Date
Agenda
List reports presented with short summary of each

Community Needs and Implementation Strategies
Include community needs and implementation strategies with responsibilities from community group

Hospital Final Implementation Plan
Include which needs hospital can address and the implementation strategies
Include which needs hospital cannot address and reason(s) why

Community Awareness of Assessment
Describe methodology for making assessment widely available to the community
Have Community Advisory Committee Report available to public
Have Hospital Action Plan with each health need addressed available to public
• Community Needs and Implementation Strategies;
• Hospital Final Implementation Plan; and
• Community Awareness of Assessment

The report is intended to include crucial data and not be all inclusive. If the IRS desires more data, they can request documents that were included in the community health needs assessment process, such as the demographic and economic data report, community input summary report, etc.

The summary report will list all community members involved in the assessment, including the hospital administrator, the steering committee or leadership group, the facilitator, and the community advisory committee members. The medical service area of the hospital has been identified and is readily available, as well as population and demographic information of the medical service area and/or county. A summary of the date, agenda, and reports prepared and presented for all community meetings will be summarized. A short summary of each report presented at the community meetings would be beneficial. A summary report of the community needs and suggested implementation strategies from the Community Advisory Committee needs to be prepared; either utilizing the table provided in this document or a similar summary report. The hospital final implementation plan adopted by the hospital should also be included. This report should indicate which community needs the hospital will address and the implementation strategy planned for each. If all identified community needs or issues are not addressed, then the reason why an identified need/issue is not being addressed must be included in the report (e.g., lack of finances or human resources). Each hospital facility is required to make the assessment widely available to the community members. Newspaper reporters are usually available to write articles to share the community health needs assessment with the general public.
IRS Reporting Forms

The hospital is required through the new legislation to disclose any community health needs assessment activities in its annual information report to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). **IRS Form 990** is required to be completed by all organizations exempt from income tax. When completing **IRS Form 990**, additional schedules may be required. Hospitals are required to complete Schedule H. See page 3 of **IRS Form 990, Part IV, Checklist of Required Schedules**, Question 20a, ‘Did the organization operate one or more hospitals? If “Yes,” complete Schedule H.’

Attached in **Appendix Q** are both of these IRS reporting forms (**Form 990** and **SCHEDULE H**).

**IRS SCHEDULE H (Form 990)** is required to be completed by any tax-exempt organization that operates one or more hospitals. **SCHEDULE H** is broken into six major parts with subsections for **Part V**:

- **PART I** - Financial Assistance and Certain Other Community Benefits at Cost
- **PART II** - Community Building Activities
- **PART III** - Bad Debt, Medicare, & Collection Practices
- **PART IV** - Management Companies and Joint Ventures
- **PART V** - Facility Information
  - **Section A. Hospital Facilities**
  - **Section B. Facility Policies and Procedures** (Complete a separate Part V, Section B, for each of the hospital facilities listed in Part V, Section A.)
Community Health Needs Assessment (Optional for 2010)

Financial Assistance Policy
Billing and Collections
Policy Relating to Emergency Medical Cater Charges for Medical Care

Section C. Other Facilities That Are Not Licensed, Registered, or Similarly Recognized as a Hospital Facility

PART VI - Supplemental Information

SCHEDULE H, Part V (Sections A and B) and Part VI address the community health needs assessment process. Part V, Section A, requires a listing of all hospital facilities in order of size from largest to smallest, measured by total revenue per facility.

Part V, Section B, is required to be completed for each facility listed in Section A. Section B is divided into four subsections. The first subsection, Community Health Needs Assessment, is the section that deals with community health needs assessment.
There are seven questions relating to Community Health Needs Assessment shown below. Some questions may require additional information; i.e., Questions 1j, 3, 4, 5c, 6i, and 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Health Needs Assessment (lines 1 through 7 are optional for tax year 2011)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** | During the tax year or any prior tax year, did the hospital facility conduct a community health needs assessment (Needs Assessment)? If “No,” skip to line 8. || \[1\]  
  |  
  | If “Yes,” indicate what the Needs Assessment describes (check all that apply): |  
  | a | A definition of the community served by the hospital facility | \[\]  
  | b | Demographics of the community | \[\]  
  | c | Existing health care facilities and resources within the community that are available to respond to the health needs of the community | \[\]  
  | d | How data was obtained | \[\]  
  | e | The health needs of the community | \[\]  
  | f | Primary and chronic disease needs and other health issues of uninsured persons, low-income persons, and minority groups | \[\]  
  | g | The process for identifying and prioritizing community health needs and services to meet the community health needs | \[\]  
  | h | The process for consulting with persons representing the community’s interests | \[\]  
  | i | Information gaps that limit the hospital facility’s ability to assess the community’s health needs | \[\]  
  | j | Other (describe in Part VI) | \[\]  
| **2** | Indicate the tax year the hospital facility last conducted a Needs Assessment: 20 | \[\]  
| **3** | In conducting its most recent Needs Assessment, did the hospital facility take into account input from persons who represent the community served by the hospital facility? If “Yes,” describe in Part VI how the hospital facility took into account input from persons who represent the community, and identify the persons the hospital facility consulted. | \[\]  
| **4** | Was the hospital facility’s Needs Assessment conducted with one or more other hospital facilities? If “Yes,” list the other hospital facilities in Part VI. | \[\]  
| **5** | Did the hospital facility make its Needs Assessment widely available to the public? | \[\]  
  | If “Yes,” indicate how the Needs Assessment was made widely available (check all that apply): |  
  | a | Hospital facility’s website | \[\]  
  | b | Available upon request from the hospital facility | \[\]  
  | c | Other (describe in Part VI) | \[\]  
| **6** | If the hospital facility addressed needs identified in its most recently conducted Needs Assessment, indicate how (check all that apply): |  
  | a | Adoption of an implementation strategy to address the health needs of the hospital facility’s community | \[\]  
  | b | Execution of the implementation strategy | \[\]  
  | c | Participation in the development of a community-wide community benefit plan | \[\]  
  | d | Participation in the execution of a community-wide community benefit plan | \[\]  
  | e | Inclusion of a community benefit section in operational plans | \[\]  
  | f | Adoption of a budget for provision of services that address the needs identified in the Needs Assessment | \[\]  
  | g | Prioritization of health needs in its community | \[\]  
  | h | Prioritization of services that the hospital facility will undertake to meet health needs in its community | \[\]  
  | i | Other (describe in Part VI) | \[\]  
| **7** | Did the hospital facility address all of the needs identified in its most recently conducted Needs Assessment? If “No,” explain in Part VI which needs it has not addressed and the reasons why it has not addressed such needs. | \[\]  

The supplemental information for these questions (for each separate facility) will need to be included in Part VI, Supplemental Information, Question 1, Required descriptions.
Part VI, Supplemental Information, has six additional questions that must be answered. Most of these questions are related to community health needs assessment:

- **Question 2. Needs assessment.**
- **Question 4. Community information.**
- **Question 5. Promotion of community health.**
- **Question 6. Affiliated health care system.**
- **Question 7. State filing of community benefit report.**

The other questions will need answered but may not directly pertain to community health needs assessment.

For additional information on IRS reporting requirements, consult your tax professional.
Appendix P

Example of Summary Community Health Needs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Need</th>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Responsible Org. or Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Need</td>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Responsible Org. or Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labette Health Center
Parsons, KS
Community Needs Assessment Recommendations
March 25, 2011

- **Cost of Health Care**
  - Market the Community Clinic – Supported by Labette Health
  - Market availability of services and cost comparisons vs. larger communities
  - Education regarding affordable health screening tools
    - Review target of educational tools
    - Education regarding risk factors
    - Build on successful examples
  - Create a Culture of Health
  - Market quality of care vs. stereotyping of rural providers/facilities

- **Smoking/tobacco use** is seen as a significant health issue for the Labette Health Center community
  - Focus on education regarding the effects of tobacco use on health
  - Market Smoking Cessation classes

- **Cardiovascular heart disease and stroke** are seen as significant health problems for the Labette Health Center community
  - Focus education on the benefits of screening and early detection
  - Focus education efforts on behavioral changes proven to help
    - Smoking cessation programs
    - Healthy eating and weight reduction
    - Exercise programs

- **Diabetes** is seen as a significant health problem for the Labette Health Center community
  - Build on success of the Rector Center
  - Market services of the Rector Center

- **Educational programs**
  - Review who we are trying to educate and how we are trying to reach them
  - Focus on improving what we currently have:
    - Hospital newsletter
    - Hospital website
  - Focus on new methods of contacting citizens:
    - Look for more electronic methods of informing citizens
    - Look for more focused communication, i.e.: Facebook, Twitter, text messaging to reach local people
Teen Pregnancy is seen as a significant issue in the community Labette Health Center serves.

- Provide leadership to engage community factors to discuss and work on this issue including:
  - Faith Community
  - Parents groups
  - Community civic leadership
  - Social service agencies
- Discuss parental responsibility and ways to enhance it

Note: This is not a problem that Labette Health Center can solve. This is a problem where Labette Health Center can provide leadership to engage various community groups to understand the problem and engage it as their own.

There was good discussion about the Labette Health Center community and the health problems facing them. The consensus of the group was that Labette Health Center was ‘community conscious’ regarding health issues facing the community. Labette Health Center has a unique opportunity to become more focused in their educational programs as it celebrates fifty years of service to the community. These efforts can become more successful by focusing on the community they are trying to reach and then reviewing different methods to reach them. This can include upgrading current efforts including newsletters and websites and employing other communication methods such as Twitter, Facebook, and e-news for example.
Appendix Q

Example CHNA Reporting
Summary Report Outline

Community Health Needs Assessment

Community Members Involved

- Need to include name, organization and contact information for:
  - Hospital Administrator
  - Steering Committee or Leadership Group
  - Facilitator
  - Community Advisory Committee Members

Medical Service Area

- Describe by county or zip code areas
- Include populations and projected populations of medical service area
- Include demographics of population of medical service area

Community Meetings #1, #2, and #3 (also any additional meetings)

- Date
- Agenda
- List reports presented with short summary of each

Community Needs and Implementation Strategies

- Include community needs and implementation strategies with responsibilities from community group

Hospital Final Implementation Plan

- Include which needs hospital can address and the implementation strategies
- Include which needs hospital cannot address and reason(s) why

Community Awareness of Assessment

- Describe methodology for making assessment widely available to the community
- Have Community Advisory Committee Report available to public
- Have Hospital Action Plan with each health need addressed available to public
Community Engagement and Needs Assessment Process and Report
Guadalupe County Hospital
Santa Rosa, New Mexico
May 7, 2012

Process:

The hospital CEO, representatives from HealthInsight, the New Mexico Office of Rural and Primary Care and consultants conducted three meetings; a variety of community members were invited and in attendance. The group was diverse and represented all segments of the community. Meetings were approximately an hour and a half in length. Consultants prepared and conducted a survey of community attitudes and issues regarding health and health care in the county. Initially, with the hospital staff and with input from HealthInsight staff members, consultants determined the primary service area of Guadalupe County Hospital. Community members from this entire service area participated in these meetings. For example, participants included consumers, community leaders, public health officials, health care officials and experts, economic and community development specialists, education leaders and law enforcement. The meetings were conducted on February 29, March 13, and April 10, 2012.

Economic Impact:

Consultants conducted an economic impact study to indicate the value of health care and specifically the hospital to the community’s economic environment and viability.

In 2011, Guadalupe County Hospital had 50 full and part time employees from hospital operations with a payroll of $2.9 million (wages, salaries and benefits). The hospital also spent $3.4 million on capital improvements for a total of 86 jobs and a $3.4 million payroll. The secondary multiplier for hospital employment was 1.34 meaning that for every job in the hospital an additional 0.34 job or 17 additional jobs were created in the county for a total employment impact from operations of 67 jobs. The construction multiplier was 1.23 creating an additional 20 jobs for a total of 106 jobs. The grand total for employment impact was 173 jobs.

The income multipliers for hospital operations and hospital construction were 1.18 and 1.16 respectively. That resulted in an additional $523,694 from operations and $554,540 from construction activities for a total of $3.4 million from operations and $4.0 million from construction for a grand total income impact of $7.4 million. While construction varies from year to year, the hospital provides a huge economic impact for Guadalupe County.

Health Indicators/Health Outcomes:
Data compiled by the State of New Mexico and various national databases\(^1\) indicated the following information for discussion at the second community meeting:

- Accessibility/availability of primary care physicians (PCPs), county 69 PCPs per 100,000 population
- Births to women under 18, county rate 9.2, peer counties range 4.6-11.0
- A high percentage (77.8% county vs. 57.6% for New Mexico) of pregnant women receive prenatal care in first trimester
- Heart disease #1 leading cause of death, county rate 190.6, state rate 176.0
- Cancer #2 leading cause of death, county rate 174.9, state rate 173.2
- Stroke (cerebrovascular disease) #5 leading cause of death, county rate 90.4, state rate 41.8
- Diabetes #6 leading cause of death high, county rate 36.6, state rate 32.2
- Female breast cancer deaths high, county rate 62, state rate 22.1
- Substantiated child abuse allegations high, county rate 39.4, state rate 18.5
- Youth report caring and supportive family at a very high level, county rate 72.7, state rate 54.1
- Alcohol-related deaths high, county rate 101.8, state rate 52.9
- Uninsured adults high, county rate 30.6, state rate 22.9
- Low birth weight high, county rate 12.7, state rate 8.5
- Adolescent obesity high, county rate 18.7, state rate 13.5
- Motor vehicle traffic crash deaths high, county rate 31.0, state rate 18.3

**Economic and Demographic Data and Information:**

Economic and demographic data and information were compiled from a variety of data sources\(^2\):

- Population flat from 2000 – 2010 (county 0.1% increase)

---

\(^1\) Health Indicators/Health Outcomes data sources include County Health Rankings from University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; Community Health Status Indicators from U. S. Department of Health and Human Services; New Mexico Selected Health Statistics Annual Report from the New Mexico Department of Health; New Mexico Death Certificate Database, Office of Vital Records and Health Statistics from the New Mexico Department of Health; and New Mexico’s Indicator-Based Information System from the New Mexico Department of Health.

\(^2\) Economic and Demographic data and information sources include population data, County Business Patterns, and poverty data from U. S. Census Bureau; employment, earnings, and transfer receipt reports from the U. S. Department of Commerce, Regional Economic Information System, Bureau of Economic Analysis; and employment and unemployment data from the U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
• Population growing in 45+ age group (absolute and percentage), county 2000, 35.7% and 2010, 44.1%, state 2000, 33.9% and 2010, 39.9%
• State demographers predicted 27.2% growth for next decade; cannot explain projected growth from the local perspective
• Health sector is very important to economy, represents 12.2% of total county employment and 19.5% of total county earnings
• Transfer receipts as a percent of total personal income high, county 42.4%, state 21.5%; this indicates a high percentage of income comes from federal and state programs.
• High unemployment, county 10%, state 7.1%
• Poverty all people high, county 23.7%, state 19.8%
• Poverty under age 18 high, county 30.5%, state 28.5%

Potential solutions or approaches to the problems and the information gained from the local survey were discussed at the third community meeting.

• Breast cancer education and screening was seen as a solution to the high death rate for breast cancer. Education must be culturally sensitive and timely presented to local women. Guadalupe County Hospital has received some grant monies in the past for these programs and will consider seeking additional grant funding to expand this program.
• The hospital will assist the community to apply for grant programs to provide grant funding for programs to educate the population regarding
  o Decreasing obesity in all population groups
  o Nutrition education to decrease reliance on fatty, high caloric and high cholesterol foods and food preparation
  o Educational programs must be:
    ▪ Age specific
    ▪ Culturally sensitive
    ▪ Provide options, i.e.; classes, webinars
    ▪ Catered to specific target groups, i.e., Diabetes education, stroke and heart disease education, education regarding prenatal care and childcare, etc.

Guadalupe County Hospital is and will continue to pursue a variety of positive changes for health care and access to health care in the Guadalupe County service area. These include:

• Website development with contact list for updates and e-Newsletters
• Telemedicine services
• Care flight – dedicated helicopter
• Physical therapy/ occupational therapy
• Optometrist
• Chiropractor
• New doctors moving to the area
• Scholarships for nursing and allied health personnel
• Mini health fairs
• Outreach to surrounding communities
• Share patient satisfaction scores on a regular basis

While the hospital has and will continue to provide dynamic leadership for the Guadalupe County community, many health and health related issues involve behavioral choices. The ability to change these issues will of necessity involve the entire community including the hospital.

**Conclusion:**

It should be noted that the population base of the Guadalupe County service area precludes offering a variety of services on site. For instance, a population base of 10,000 to 12,000 people is required as a minimum for a general surgeon. However, Guadalupe County Hospital will continue to work with the community and the hospital board to maximize the array of services available to local consumers. The CEO and the board have already built a new facility that incorporates the county public health office in the same building. They have a state of the art facility that was carefully planned and laid out. They have installed electronic health records systems and have qualified for federal Meaningful Use incentives. The CEO and the board have demonstrated that simply being rural does not mean second-class care or services. By maximizing the service potential of a variety of health and human services, the CEO has demonstrated her connection with and her commitment to this community.
The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) on April 3 released a proposed rule on the community health needs assessment (CHNA) requirement for tax-exempt hospitals created by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Section 501(r) of the Internal Revenue Code). In addition, the proposed rule provides guidance on the consequences if a hospital facility fails to satisfy the requirements of Section 501(r), including the CHNA, financial assistance policy, limitation on charges, and billing and collection provisions.

The CHNA proposed rule largely tracks the guidance that was issued by IRS in 2011 (Notice 2011-52). Several of the modifications respond to concerns raised by hospitals. Importantly, the guidance on how IRS will respond to noncompliance recognizes, as AHA has urged, that not all infractions are of the same significance and takes a calibrated approach.

Highlights of the IRS rule are detailed below.

**CHNA Provisions**

**Identifying community health needs.** In contrast to the 2011 IRS Notice that required all health needs be identified and prioritized, the proposed regulation clarifies that a CHNA may focus only on significant health needs. Similarly, the implementation strategy may address only a few of the significant health needs identified in the CHNA as long as it explains why it does not address the other significant health needs.

**Community input.** The proposed regulation trims back some of the detailed documentation that the Notice required regarding who was consulted and the input received. Summaries, in general terms, of the input will be sufficient, and no names of individuals contacted will be required. The proposed rule adds a requirement to consider input received regarding a CHNA or implementation strategy that has been adopted. Going forward, a hospital would be required to consider input on its existing CHNA or implementation strategy as part of conducting its next required assessment.

**Joint CHNA and joint implementation strategy.** While the Notice focused on hospital facility-specific CHNA reports and implementation strategies, the proposed rule explicitly allows hospitals that collaborate to share joint reports and strategies under certain conditions. Among other conditions, the joint CHNA report must clearly identify each hospital facility to
which it applies, and the authorized body of each facility must adopt the joint report as its own. A joint strategy must include a summary or other tool that helps the reader easily locate those portions of the joint implementation strategy that relate to each hospital facility.

**Making the CHNA widely available.** While the proposed rule continues to allow use of the web to meet this requirement, it includes additional requirements. A complete version of the CHNA must be “conspicuously” posted; the report must remain on the web until two subsequent CHNA reports have been posted; an individual must not be required to create an account or provide personally identifiable information in order to access the report; a paper copy must be available for public inspection without charge.

**Implementation strategy.** In addition to describing the actions intended to address significant health needs, the proposed rule adds several requirements. The anticipated impact of these actions must be included as well as a plan to evaluate the impact. In addition to attaching the strategy to the Form 990, annual updates should be included on the Form 990 describing the actions taken during that tax year to address the needs identified in the strategy or, if no action was taken, the reasons why no action occurred.

**Timing for adoption of strategy.** The proposed rule includes the requirement from the Notice that the strategy be adopted in the same tax year as the hospital facility finishes conducting the CHNA (typically, by making the report widely available to the public). Recognizing the difficulty this will present for some hospitals in completing their first CHNA, it creates transition relief allowing for later adoption in connection with a hospital facility’s first CHNA under certain conditions.

**CONSEQUENCES OF NONCOMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 501 (R) REQUIREMENTS**

The proposed regulations make a distinction between errors and omissions and noncompliance that is willful and egregious.

**Excused noncompliance.** Under the proposed regulations, noncompliance may be excused in two circumstances: (1) when it is minor, inadvertent and due to reasonable cause, and the hospital facility corrects the error or omission as promptly as is reasonable given the nature of the noncompliance; and (2) when noncompliance rises above the level of minor and inadvertent, but is neither willful nor egregious, and the hospital facility corrects and discloses the noncompliance to the government.

**Willful and egregious noncompliance.** If, however, failure to meet Section 501(r) requirements is willful and egregious, it would result in revocation of tax-exempt status. (“Willful” would include gross negligence, reckless disregard or willful neglect.) The IRS would evaluate all facts and circumstances in making its determination, including the relative size, scope, nature, recurrence and significance of the failure, as well as the reasons for the failure and whether it was corrected.
If the offending hospital facility is part of a multi-facility organization, the organization would maintain its tax exemption. Instead, the organization would be subject to unrelated business income tax on the activities of the noncompliant hospital facility for the entire year in which the facility willfully and egregiously failed to meet one or more Section 501(r) requirements.

**Next Steps**

The IRS proposed rule was published in the April 5 *Federal Register*. Comments will be accepted until July 5. Watch for an *AHA Regulatory Advisory* with further details in the coming weeks.
Hospital Requirements and PPACA

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) created a new IRS Code Section 501(r)(3) which imposes four additional requirements for hospitals exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3).

CHARITABLE HOSPITALS MUST:

– Complete Community Needs Assessment
– Meet Financial Assistance Policy Requirements
– Adhere to Limitations on Charges
– Follow Billing and Collection Practices
Community Health Needs Assessment

- At least once every three years; first one must be completed by end of tax year beginning after March 23, 2012
- Include input from persons who represent the broad interest of the community
- Include input from persons having public health knowledge or expertise
- Make assessment widely available to the public
- Adopt a written implementation strategy to address identified community needs *
- Failure to comply results in excise tax penalty of $50,000 per year

* Notice 2011-52 – must be approved by authorized governing body (board of directors)
IRS April 5 Proposed Rule

• Provides guidance to charitable hospital organizations on CHNA and related excise tax and reporting obligations

• The CHNA proposed rule largely tracks the guidance that was issued by IRS in 2011 (Notice 2011-52)

• Several modifications respond to concerns raised in KHA Sept. 22, 2011 comment letter

• KHA comment letter on proposed rule July 5

Internal Revenue Service proposed rule provides guidance to charitable hospital organizations on the community health needs assessment requirements, and related excise tax and reporting obligations, enacted as part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.
Identifying Community Health Needs

• In contrast to the 2011 IRS Notice that required all health needs be identified and prioritized, the proposed regulation clarifies that a CHNA may focus only on significant health needs.

• Similarly, the implementation strategy may address only a few of the significant health needs identified in the CHNA as long as it explains why it does not address the other significant health needs.

A CHNA only needs to identify and prioritize significant health needs. A hospital facility may determine whether a health need is significant based on all of the facts and circumstances present in the community it serves.
In assessing a community’s health needs, hospital facilities must take into account input from, at a minimum:

- At least one state, local, tribal or regional governmental public health department
- Members of medically underserved, low-income and minority populations in the community, or individuals representing their interests
- Written comments received on the hospital facility’s most recently conducted CHNA and implementation strategy
- A list of “who should collaborate” can be found on the KHM Web site.

The CHNA report should:

- Summarizes in general terms the input provided, including how and over what time period such input was provided
- Provides the names of organizations providing input and summarizes the nature and extent of those organizations’ input
- Describes the medically underserved, low-income or minority populations being represented by organizations or individuals providing input
Joint CHNA and Joint Implementation Strategy

- While the Notice focused on hospital facility-specific CHNA reports and implementation strategies, the proposed rule explicitly allows hospitals that collaborate to share joint reports and strategies under certain conditions.
- Among other conditions, the joint CHNA report must clearly identify each hospital facility to which it applies, and the authorized body of each facility must adopt the joint report as its own.
- A joint strategy must include a summary or other tool that helps the reader easily locate those portions of the joint implementation strategy that relate to each hospital facility.

If a hospital facility conducts a joint CHNA process with other hospital facilities, all of the collaborating hospital facilities may produce a joint CHNA report, as long as all of the facilities define their community to be the same. The joint CHNA report must clearly identify each hospital facility to which it applies, and each hospital facility must adopt the joint CHNA report.

Hospital facilities adopting a joint CHNA report also may adopt a joint implementation strategy, provided the joint implementation strategy clearly identifies each hospital facility, its particular role and responsibilities in taking the actions described in the implementation strategy and the programs and resources it plans to commit in taking those actions.

The joint implementation strategy also must include a summary that helps the reader easily locate those portions of the joint implementation strategy that relate to the hospital facility.
Making the CHNA Widely Available

While the proposed rule continues to allow use of the Web to meet this requirement, it includes additional requirements:

• A complete version of the CHNA must be “conspicuously” posted;
• The report must remain on the Web until two subsequent CHNA reports have been posted;
• An individual must not be required to create an account or provide personally identifiable information in order to access the report;
• A paper copy must be available for public inspection without charge.

The proposed regulations require the CHNA report to remain on the Web site of the hospital facility until two subsequent CHNA reports have been posted, so information on trends will be available to the public.
**Implementation Strategy**

In addition to describing the actions intended to address significant health needs, the proposed rule adds several requirements.

- The anticipated impact of these actions must be included as well as a plan to evaluate the impact.
- In addition to attaching the strategy to the Form 990, **annual updates** should be included on the Form 990 describing the actions taken during that tax year to address the needs identified in the strategy or, if no action was taken, the reasons why no action occurred.

In addition to describing the actions intended to address significant health needs, the proposed rule adds several requirements. The anticipated impact of these actions must be included as well as a plan to evaluate the impact.

In addition to attaching the strategy to the Form 990, **annual updates** should be included on the Form 990 describing the actions taken during that tax year to address the needs identified in the strategy or, if no action was taken, the reasons why no action occurred.
Timing for Adoption of Strategy

- The proposed rule includes the requirement from the Notice that the strategy be adopted in the same tax year as the hospital facility finishes conducting the CHNA (typically, by making the report widely available to the public).
- Recognizing the difficulty this will present for some hospitals in completing their first CHNA, it creates transition relief allowing for later adoption in connection with a hospital facility’s first CHNA under certain conditions.

The proposed regulations provide transition relief for the adoption of a hospital facility’s implementation strategy for its first CHNA conducted after March 23, 2010.

In general, a hospital facility’s implementation strategy must be adopted in the same taxable year the CHNA is considered conducted.

However, for the first CHNA conducted, the proposed regulations provide that a hospital facility must adopt a strategy on or before the 15th day of the fifth calendar month following the close of its first taxable year beginning after March 23, 2012. This relief is provided in recognition of the fact that certain hospital facilities may not have a full three years to conduct their first CHNA.