

A close-up photograph of several bright yellow California poppies (Eschscholzia californica) in full bloom, set against a background of dark green, finely textured foliage. The flowers are the central focus, with their petals showing some natural creases and variations in yellow hue. The overall lighting is soft, highlighting the texture of the petals and the intricate details of the flower centers.

COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2005

**California Department of
Health Services and
California Conference
of Local Health Officers**

National Public Health Week: April 4-10, 2005

COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2005

California Department of Health Services
Richard J. Jackson, M.D., M.P.H.
State Public Health Officer

California Department of Health Services
Health Information and Strategic Planning
Gregory Franklin, M.H.A.
Deputy Director

California Department of Health Services
Center for Health Statistics
Michael L. Rodrian, Chief

California Department of Health Services
Office of Health Information and Research
Michael Quinn, Chief

California Department of Health Services
Planning and Data Analysis Section
Karen Flannigan, Chief

In collaboration with
California Conference of Local Health Officers
Scott Morrow, M.D., M.P.H.
President



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor
State of California



S. Kimberly Belshé
Secretary
California Health & Human Services Agency

Sandra Shewry
Director
Department of Health Services

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Steven Shippen, Research Program Specialist, and **Cheryl Wilson**, Research Analyst, with the Center for Health Statistics, Planning and Data Analysis Section, prepared this report. The principal authors would like to extend their appreciation to the following people for their contribution to the publication and website production.

Janet Ciarcia and **Tina Smith** (Office of Health Information and Research) assisted with the processing and distribution of the publication.

Roberto Garcia (Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Branch) provided breastfeeding initiation data collected by Newborn Screening Program, Genetic Disease Branch.

Denise Gilson (Division of Communicable Disease Control) provided syphilis and chlamydia case incidence data.

Mary Heim (Department of Finance) provided the 2002 race/ethnic population estimates by county with age and sex detail, May 2004.

Marie Jungkeit (Office of Health Information and Research) matched the birth and infant death records from the separate Birth and Death Statistical Master Files to create the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files of linked births and deaths.

Ann Nakamura (Office of AIDS) provided AIDS case incidence data.

Shu Sebesta (Division of Communicable Disease Control) provided hepatitis C case incidence data.

Rina Shaikh (Division of Communicable Disease Control) provided measles case incidence data.

Janice Westenhause (Tuberculosis Control Program) provided tuberculosis case incidence data.

Kamal Bindra (Office of Health Information and Research) prepared the Web page and data links for the Internet version of the report and county summary tables.

Staff of the Office of Vital Records collected, coded, and edited birth and death certificates, which form the basis of the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files.

Cover Photography: California Poppies, Napa by **Steve Appel**, Director, Appel Gallery at <http://www.appelgallery.com>

State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
Department of Health Services



SANDRA SHEWRY
Director



ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
Governor

April 4, 2005

Dear Colleague:

We are pleased to present the thirteenth edition of California's **County Health Status Profiles 2005** for National Public Health Week, April 4 - 10, 2005. This report contains selected health status indicators recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service for monitoring state and local progress toward achieving the goals set forth in **Healthy People 2010**. The Healthy People 2010 National Objectives challenge public health professionals to increase the span of healthy life, reduce health disparities, and ensure access to preventive services for all Americans.

The **County Health Status Profiles** report is updated each year and amended according to priorities developed by the California Department of Health Services and the California Conference of Local Health Officers. This year's health indicators are identical to those presented last year. However, California Department of Finance population data were updated, effective May 2004. Therefore, data previously published by the California Center for Health Statistics may not agree with statistics in this publication.

We believe this report is an important tool to evaluate the health of Californians. The health status indicators are based on significant and readily available data to help guide the course of health promotion and preventive services.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sandra Shewry'.

Sandra Shewry
Director

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scott Morrow MD'.

Scott Morrow, M.D., M.P.H.
President, California Conference of Local Health Officers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1-2
--------------------	-----

TABLES WITH HIGHLIGHTS	3-63
------------------------------	------

TABLES

HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS

1 – 13 MORTALITY INDICATORS PER 100,000 POPULATION

1	All Causes of Death	3-4
2	Motor Vehicle Crashes	5-6
3	Unintentional Injuries	7-8
4	Firearm Injuries	9-10
5	Homicide	11-12
6	Suicide	13-14
7	All Cancer Deaths	15-16
8	Lung Cancer	17-18
9	Female Breast Cancer	19-20
10	Coronary Heart Disease	21-22
11	Cerebrovascular Disease (Stroke)	23-24
12	Drug-induced Deaths	25-26
13	Diabetes	27-28

14 – 19 MORBIDITY INDICATORS PER 100,000 POPULATION

14	Hepatitis C	29-30
15	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS)	31-32
16	Tuberculosis	33-34
17	Chlamydia	35-36
18	Syphilis	37
19	Measles	38

20A – 20E BIRTH COHORT INFANT MORTALITY UNDER ONE YEAR OF AGE PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS

20A	All Race/Ethnic Groups Infant Mortality	39-40
20B	Asian/Pacific Islander Race Group Infant Mortality	41-42
20C	Black Race Group Infant Mortality	43-44
20D	Hispanic Ethnic Group Infant Mortality	45-46
20E	White Race Group Infant Mortality	47-48

21 – 23B NATALITY INDICATORS PER 100 LIVE BIRTHS OR 1,000 POPULATION

21	Low Birthweight Infants	49-50
22	Births to Adolescent Mothers, 15-19 Years Old Per 1,000 Live Births	51-52
23A	Prenatal Care Not Begun During the First Trimester	53-54
23B	Adequate/Adequate Plus Prenatal Care (APNCU Index)	55-56

BREASTFEEDING INITIATION RATES PER 100 LIVE BIRTHS

24	Breastfeeding Initiation During Early Postpartum	57-58
----	--	-------

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<u>TABLES</u>	<u>HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS</u>
	2002 CENSUS POPULATION HEALTH INDICATOR
25	Persons Under 18 Below Poverty 59-60
	A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE DATA
26	A comparison of three-year average data among selected indicators 61-63
TECHNICAL NOTES 64-74	
APPENDIX A	
	Comparison of California's Health Status Profiles 2005 Rates With U.S. Rates and Healthy People 2010 National Objectives 75
BIBLIOGRAPHY 76	
ORDER FORM 77	
NOTES (blank page) 78	



CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

INTRODUCTION

County Health Status Profiles has been presented annually for the State of California since 1993. The purpose of this report is to present public health data that can be directly compared with clearly established benchmarks, such as national standards, and populations of similar composition. Appendix A (page 75) provides a table of the selected health indicators showing California's rates compared with the target rates established for Healthy People 2010 (HP 2010) National Objectives and the United States (U. S.) rates.

In keeping with the goal of using national standards, two major changes were implemented beginning with the 2001 report:

- Mortality causes of death data were coded using the *International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision* (reports prior to 2001 used the *International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision*).
- Age-adjusted rates were computed using the 2000 Standard Population (reports prior to 2001 used the 1940 Standard Population).

This report presents vital statistics and morbidity tables that show the population, number of events, percentages, crude rates, and age-adjusted death rates by county. Also shown on these tables are the upper and lower 95 percent confidence limits, which provide a means for assessing the degree of stability of the estimated rates and percentages. Vital statistics rates and percentages are also subject to random variation, which is inversely related to the number of events (e.g., deaths) used to calculate the rates and percentages. Therefore, standard errors and relative standard errors (coefficients of variation) are calculated to measure the reliability of the rates and percentages. Estimated rates and percentages that are categorized as unreliable (relative standard error \geq 23 percent) are marked on these tables with an asterisk (*). The counties on these tables are ranked by the rates or percentages, regardless of their reliability, in ascending order. Those with identical rates or percentages are ranked next by the county's population size in descending order.

For purposes of comparison, each county table includes statewide data and the HP 2010 National Objective if one exists. The "Highlights" and the explanatory "Notes" are adjacent to each of the tables. The explanatory "Notes" as well as the "Technical Notes" (pages 64-74) are provided to assist the reader with information on data limitations and qualifications for correctly interpreting and comparing these data among the counties. For those who may want to learn more about the problems associated with analysis of vital events involving small numbers, small area analysis, and age-adjusted death rates, references to relevant statistical publications are located in the Bibliography.

The following California Department of Health Services' offices provided data for this report: Center for Health Statistics; Division of Communicable Disease Control; Genetic Disease Branch; Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Branch; and the Office of AIDS. In addition, the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance provided 2002 race/ethnicity population estimates by county with age and sex detail, May 2004. Estimates of persons under age 18 in 2002 who were below poverty are from the U.S. Census Bureau (<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/>).

You may access this report and prior reports online at the California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics' Web page using the following address:
<http://www.dhs.ca.gov/ohir>

If you have questions about this report, or desire additional state or county health status data and statistics (either hard copy reports or electronic media), please write or phone:

California Department of Health Services
Center for Health Statistics
1616 Capitol Avenue, Suite 74.165
MS 5103
P.O. Box 997410
Sacramento, CA 95899-7410
Telephone (916) 552-8095
Fax (916) 650-6889

Should you wish additional copies of County Health Status Profiles, the order form and instructions for placing your order appear on page 77 of this report.

TABLE 1: DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from all causes for California was 665.3 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 150 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 235,120.3 from 2001 to 2003, and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 1,303.4 in Lake County to 372.0 in Mono County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from all causes for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 729.0 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 997.8 in Yuba County to 557.6 in Mono County.

A Healthy People 2010 National Objective for deaths due to all causes has not been established.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 1
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED							
1	MONO	13,441	50.0	372.0	557.6	381.1	734.0
2	MARIN	250,179	1,850.7	739.7	609.3	581.3	637.4
3	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	8,681.7	505.6	612.2	599.2	625.1
4	SAN MATEO	711,793	4,736.7	665.5	626.5	608.7	644.4
5	SAN BENITO	55,955	265.0	473.6	671.1	588.9	753.3
6	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	60,144.0	608.2	675.8	670.4	681.3
7	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	2,902.3	710.5	679.7	654.9	704.6
8	VENTURA	788,282	4,854.0	615.8	681.6	662.3	700.8
9	SOLANO	411,498	2,627.0	638.4	682.7	656.3	709.0
10	ORANGE	2,959,646	16,948.3	572.6	685.0	674.7	695.4
11	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	2,043.3	799.9	686.8	656.9	716.8
12	PLUMAS	21,117	213.0	1,008.7	695.1	598.9	791.3
13	MONTEREY	413,819	2,420.7	585.0	698.4	670.5	726.4
14	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	1,692.0	652.9	709.4	675.2	743.6
15	PLACER	273,338	2,122.7	776.6	711.5	681.2	741.9
16	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	6,304.0	799.7	714.6	696.8	732.4
17	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	6,925.7	699.7	725.5	708.3	742.6
18	ALPINE	1,292	8.0	619.2 *	726.0 *	215.9	1,236.0
19	SONOMA	470,723	3,895.0	827.5	727.1	704.0	750.3
20	CALAVERAS	42,524	398.0	935.9	728.5	654.4	802.5
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	235,120.3	665.3	729.0	726.1	732.0
21	MARIPOSA	17,589	166.7	947.6	733.6	619.8	847.3
22	EL DORADO	165,463	1,188.3	718.2	736.9	694.5	779.3
23	LASSEN	34,129	199.3	584.1	739.4	635.2	843.6
24	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	19,697.0	668.9	741.9	731.5	752.3
25	IMPERIAL	149,360	894.3	598.8	747.4	697.0	797.9
26	NAPA	128,966	1,277.7	990.7	748.1	706.2	789.9
27	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	9,683.3	650.7	748.4	733.4	763.4
28	MADERA	129,585	924.7	713.6	753.1	704.4	801.7
29	SIERRA	3,524	41.3	1,172.9	762.2	516.9	1,007.6
30	NEVADA	96,045	961.0	1,000.6	770.1	720.6	819.5
31	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	13,022.0	774.0	784.5	771.0	798.0
32	COLUSA	19,635	141.3	719.8	792.2	661.4	923.0
33	INYO	18,456	222.3	1,204.7	796.9	687.6	906.2
34	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	9,565.0	734.3	798.6	782.6	814.6
35	TRINITY	13,271	140.7	1,060.0	800.7	663.8	937.5
36	TEHAMA	57,649	621.7	1,078.4	804.2	739.5	868.8
37	AMADOR	36,637	388.3	1,059.9	807.0	725.5	888.6
38	SHASTA	172,130	1,830.7	1,063.5	809.6	771.6	847.7
39	GLENN	26,969	230.0	852.8	809.7	704.7	914.7
40	TUOLUMNE	56,545	612.7	1,083.5	819.6	753.6	885.7
41	SISKIYOU	44,628	515.3	1,154.7	836.2	762.1	910.4
42	FRESNO	836,207	5,747.7	687.3	836.3	814.6	858.0
43	MODOC	9,400	106.7	1,134.8	841.9	678.7	1,005.1
44	YOLO	180,193	1,167.7	648.0	842.5	793.9	891.1
45	KINGS	135,123	759.7	562.2	850.7	788.8	912.5
46	KERN	697,856	5,154.7	738.6	852.5	829.1	875.9
47	BUTTE	209,770	2,231.0	1,063.5	856.9	820.7	893.0
48	STANISLAUS	477,919	3,681.7	770.4	882.3	853.7	911.0
49	MENDOCINO	88,353	843.3	954.5	882.6	822.6	942.6
50	SUTTER	82,696	706.3	854.1	884.4	819.1	949.7
51	MERCED	223,904	1,470.0	656.5	885.8	840.0	931.6
52	TULARE	383,164	2,698.7	704.3	908.2	873.7	942.7
53	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	11,733.7	646.0	910.9	894.1	927.6
54	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	4,564.7	750.9	918.3	891.5	945.1
55	DEL NORTE	27,982	265.3	948.2	938.1	825.0	1,051.2
56	HUMBOLDT	128,492	1,252.3	974.6	967.3	913.5	1,021.1
57	LAKE	61,352	799.7	1,303.4	973.4	904.4	1,042.4
58	YUBA	62,788	531.7	846.8	997.8	912.2	1,083.3

TABLE 2: DEATHS DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from motor vehicle crashes for California was 11.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 8,436 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 4,189.0 from 2001 to 2003 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 28.6 in Madera County to 6.7 in San Francisco County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.3 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from motor vehicle crashes for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 12.0 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 28.9 in Madera County to 6.5 in San Francisco County.

Seven counties (5 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 9.2 age-adjusted deaths due to motor vehicle crashes per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for motor vehicle crashes did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 2
DEATHS DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,292	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	52.7	6.7	6.5	4.7	8.4
3	MARIN	250,179	17.0	6.8 *	6.6 *	3.4	9.9
4	SAN MATEO	711,793	53.0	7.4	7.5	5.4	9.5
5	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	129.7	7.6	7.8	6.4	9.1
6	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	118.3	8.0	8.1	6.6	9.6
7	ORANGE	2,959,646	242.7	8.2	8.5	7.4	9.6
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:						9.2	
8	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	902.7	9.1	9.3	8.7	9.9
9	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	40.3	9.9	9.5	6.5	12.5
10	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	95.7	9.7	10.0	8.0	12.0
11	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	303.0	10.3	10.1	9.0	11.3
12	YOLO	180,193	19.0	10.5	10.2 *	5.5	15.0
13	VENTURA	788,282	78.3	9.9	10.3	8.0	12.6
14	NAPA	128,966	14.7	11.4 *	11.0 *	5.3	16.7
15	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	30.0	11.6	11.0	7.0	15.0
16	SOLANO	411,498	45.3	11.0	11.2	7.9	14.4
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	4,189.0	11.9	12.0	11.6	12.3
17	SONOMA	470,723	57.7	12.3	12.1	8.9	15.2
18	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	33.0	12.9	12.5	8.1	16.8
19	EL DORADO	165,463	21.0	12.7	13.1	7.4	18.8
20	PLACER	273,338	35.0	12.8	13.1	8.7	17.6
21	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	176.7	13.6	13.6	11.6	15.7
22	MONTEREY	413,819	57.7	13.9	14.0	10.4	17.7
23	NEVADA	96,045	15.0	15.6 *	16.2 *	7.7	24.7
24	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	287.3	15.8	16.4	14.5	18.3
25	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	275.0	16.3	16.5	14.6	18.5
26	IMPERIAL	149,360	25.7	17.2	17.8	10.8	24.9
27	LASSEN	34,129	6.3	18.6 *	18.2 *	3.7	32.7
28	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	110.7	18.2	18.5	15.0	21.9
29	SISKIYOU	44,628	7.7	17.2 *	18.5 *	4.5	32.4
30	BUTTE	209,770	40.7	19.4	18.5	12.7	24.4
31	PLUMAS	21,117	4.7	22.1 *	20.2 *	0.7	39.6
32	STANISLAUS	477,919	96.7	20.2	20.3	16.2	24.4
33	COLUSA	19,635	4.0	20.4 *	20.5 *	0.1	40.8
34	SHASTA	172,130	36.3	21.1	20.9	13.9	27.8
35	KERN	697,856	144.3	20.7	21.2	17.7	24.7
36	SAN BENITO	55,955	11.3	20.3 *	21.6 *	8.8	34.3
37	HUMBOLDT	128,492	29.0	22.6	21.9	13.8	29.9
38	FRESNO	836,207	181.3	21.7	22.6	19.2	25.9
39	LAKE	61,352	15.0	24.4 *	23.1 *	10.8	35.3
40	MENDOCINO	88,353	20.7	23.4	23.6	13.3	33.9
41	TULARE	383,164	88.7	23.1	24.0	18.9	29.1
42	TEHAMA	57,649	15.0	26.0 *	24.2 *	11.5	36.9
43	MERCED	223,904	53.7	24.0	24.3	17.7	31.0
44	INYO	18,456	5.7	30.7 *	25.2 *	3.7	46.7
45	KINGS	135,123	33.7	24.9	25.4	16.5	34.2
46	YUBA	62,788	16.7	26.5 *	26.0 *	13.4	38.6
47	SUTTER	82,696	21.7	26.2	26.5	15.3	37.7
48	AMADOR	36,637	10.3	28.2 *	26.6 *	9.9	43.3
49	MADERA	129,585	37.0	28.6	28.9	19.6	38.3
50	MONO	13,441	4.0	29.8 *	29.5 *	0.0	59.7
51	GLENN	26,969	8.0	29.7 *	30.2 *	9.2	51.3
52	TUOLUMNE	56,545	16.7	29.5 *	30.6 *	15.5	45.7
53	DEL NORTE	27,982	9.3	33.4 *	32.8 *	11.7	53.8
54	MARIPOSA	17,589	6.3	36.0 *	36.0 *	6.6	65.4
55	CALAVERAS	42,524	16.3	38.4 *	37.3 *	18.0	56.7
56	SIERRA	3,524	1.3	37.8 *	37.7 *	0.0	102.7
57	TRINITY	13,271	5.0	37.7 *	39.1 *	2.6	75.7
58	MODOC	9,400	4.7	49.6 *	43.2 *	2.9	83.5

TABLE 3: DEATHS DUE TO UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from unintentional injuries for California was 27.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 3,579 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 9,875.3 from 2001 to 2003 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 85.8 in Del Norte County to 18.3 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.7 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from unintentional injuries for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 28.6 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 83.3 in Del Norte County to 19.3 in Santa Clara County.

One county (with an unreliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 17.5 age-adjusted deaths due to unintentional injuries per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for unintentional injuries did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 3
DEATHS DUE TO UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,292	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					17.5		
2	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	313.7	18.3	19.3	17.1	21.5
3	SAN MATEO	711,793	155.7	21.9	21.1	17.8	24.5
4	MARIN	250,179	58.3	23.3	21.1	15.6	26.7
5	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	2,185.0	22.1	23.0	22.0	23.9
6	ORANGE	2,959,646	639.3	21.6	23.0	21.2	24.8
7	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	361.7	24.3	25.1	22.5	27.7
8	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	251.3	25.4	25.6	22.4	28.7
9	SOLANO	411,498	104.3	25.4	25.6	20.6	30.5
10	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	69.0	26.6	26.3	20.0	32.6
11	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	771.3	26.2	26.5	24.6	28.4
12	VENTURA	788,282	210.3	26.7	27.8	24.0	31.5
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	9,875.3	27.9	28.6	28.1	29.2
13	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	247.0	31.3	28.8	25.1	32.5
14	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	481.3	26.5	29.1	26.5	31.8
15	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	121.3	29.7	29.2	24.0	34.4
16	NAPA	128,966	42.3	32.8	29.4	20.4	38.5
17	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	393.3	30.2	31.0	27.9	34.1
18	SONOMA	470,723	156.3	33.2	31.6	26.6	36.6
19	MONTEREY	413,819	126.3	30.5	32.2	26.5	37.8
20	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	87.7	34.3	32.7	25.7	39.6
21	COLUSA	19,635	6.3	32.3 *	32.9 *	7.0	58.7
22	IMPERIAL	149,360	59.7	39.9	33.4	23.5	43.2
23	YOLO	180,193	53.7	29.8	33.5	24.4	42.7
24	PLACER	273,338	94.7	34.6	33.7	26.9	40.6
25	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	554.0	32.9	33.8	31.0	36.6
26	SAN BENITO	55,955	17.3	31.0 *	34.2 *	17.8	50.7
27	EL DORADO	165,463	55.7	33.6	34.4	25.2	43.6
28	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	225.0	37.0	39.1	33.9	44.3
29	LASSEN	34,129	13.3	39.1 *	40.6 *	18.3	63.0
30	KINGS	135,123	53.0	39.2	42.2	30.4	53.9
31	PLUMAS	21,117	11.0	52.1 *	43.3 *	15.5	71.1
32	FRESNO	836,207	339.7	40.6	44.0	39.2	48.7
33	KERN	697,856	299.0	42.8	45.2	40.0	50.4
34	NEVADA	96,045	48.0	50.0	45.9	32.4	59.3
35	AMADOR	36,637	18.0	49.1 *	46.1 *	24.1	68.0
36	SUTTER	82,696	37.7	45.5	46.3	31.5	61.1
37	MERCED	223,904	93.7	41.8	46.5	36.9	56.1
38	TEHAMA	57,649	31.3	54.4	49.2	31.4	67.1
39	TULARE	383,164	173.7	45.3	49.2	41.8	56.7
40	STANISLAUS	477,919	228.0	47.7	50.1	43.5	56.6
41	BUTTE	209,770	113.0	53.9	50.7	41.1	60.3
42	MADERA	129,585	68.0	52.5	53.8	41.0	66.6
43	YUBA	62,788	33.0	52.6	54.6	35.7	73.4
44	SHASTA	172,130	97.7	56.7	54.8	43.6	66.0
45	MONO	13,441	7.0	52.1 *	54.8 *	9.7	99.9
46	SISKIYOU	44,628	25.3	56.8	54.9	31.9	77.8
47	CALAVERAS	42,524	25.7	60.4	58.0	33.9	82.2
48	INYO	18,456	13.0	70.4 *	58.8 *	24.5	93.2
49	GLENN	26,969	15.7	58.1 *	59.0 *	29.6	88.5
50	TUOLUMNE	56,545	37.7	66.6	64.1	43.0	85.3
51	MENDOCINO	88,353	58.0	65.6	64.7	47.9	81.6
52	MARIPOSA	17,589	11.7	66.3 *	65.1 *	25.7	104.4
53	LAKE	61,352	42.3	69.0	65.5	44.7	86.2
54	TRINITY	13,271	10.0	75.4 *	66.1 *	22.2	110.0
55	HUMBOLDT	128,492	92.3	71.9	71.2	56.5	85.9
56	SIERRA	3,524	3.7	104.0 *	78.4 *	0.0	162.8
57	DEL NORTE	27,982	24.0	85.8	83.3	50.0	116.7
58	MODOC	9,400	9.0	95.7 *	84.0 *	27.6	140.4

TABLE 4: DEATHS DUE TO FIREARM INJURIES, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from firearm injuries for California was 9.6 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,469 persons. This rate was based on the three-year average number of deaths from 2001 to 2003 of 3,375.7 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 17.4 in Humboldt County to 3.8 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.6 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from firearm injuries for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 9.6 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 16.3 in Humboldt County to 3.9 in Santa Clara County.

One county (with a reliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.1 age-adjusted deaths due to firearm injuries per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for firearm injuries did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 4
DEATHS DUE TO FIREARM INJURIES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	65.3	3.8	3.9	2.9	4.8
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:						4.1	
2	IMPERIAL	149,360	6.0	4.0 *	4.3 *	0.8	7.8
3	MARIN	250,179	13.3	5.3 *	4.6 *	2.1	7.1
4	MODOC	9,400	0.7	7.1 *	4.8 *	0.0	16.2
5	NAPA	128,966	7.3	5.7 *	5.2 *	1.4	9.1
6	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	22.0	5.4	5.4	3.1	7.6
7	KINGS	135,123	7.0	5.2 *	5.5 *	1.3	9.8
8	SAN MATEO	711,793	40.3	5.7	5.6	3.9	7.4
9	ORANGE	2,959,646	161.7	5.5	5.7	4.8	6.5
10	SIERRA	3,524	0.3	9.5 *	6.0 *	0.0	26.3
11	MARIPOSA	17,589	1.3	7.6 *	6.0 *	0.0	16.5
12	YOLO	180,193	11.7	6.5 *	6.8 *	2.8	10.9
13	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	18.0	6.9 *	7.2 *	3.8	10.5
14	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	54.3	6.9	7.3	5.2	9.3
15	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	220.0	7.5	7.4	6.4	8.4
16	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	20.7	8.1	7.6	4.3	10.9
17	SAN BENITO	55,955	4.0	7.1 *	7.6 *	0.0	15.3
18	VENTURA	788,282	59.7	7.6	7.9	5.9	9.9
19	SONOMA	470,723	40.3	8.6	8.3	5.7	10.8
20	PLACER	273,338	22.7	8.3	8.3	4.9	11.8
21	AMADOR	36,637	3.3	9.1 *	8.3 *	0.0	17.8
22	STANISLAUS	477,919	38.3	8.0	8.3	5.7	11.0
23	MONTEREY	413,819	37.3	9.0	8.9	6.0	11.8
24	SOLANO	411,498	35.7	8.7	8.9	6.0	11.8
25	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	119.7	9.2	9.2	7.5	10.8
CALIFORNIA		35,338,807	3,375.7	9.6	9.6	9.2	9.9
26	COLUSA	19,635	1.7	8.5 *	9.6 *	0.0	24.3
27	NEVADA	96,045	11.0	11.5 *	10.1 *	3.8	16.3
28	PLUMAS	21,117	2.0	9.5 *	10.1 *	0.0	25.1
29	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	154.3	10.4	10.1	8.5	11.7
30	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	168.3	10.0	10.2	8.7	11.8
31	KERN	697,856	69.3	9.9	10.4	7.9	12.8
32	FRESNO	836,207	85.0	10.2	10.4	8.1	12.6
33	MADERA	129,585	13.0	10.0 *	10.5 *	4.8	16.2
34	MERCED	223,904	22.3	10.0	10.5	6.0	14.9
35	DEL NORTE	27,982	3.0	10.7 *	10.6 *	0.0	22.6
36	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	101.3	10.2	10.7	8.6	12.7
37	TULARE	383,164	39.7	10.4	10.8	7.4	14.3
38	TEHAMA	57,649	7.3	12.7 *	10.8 *	2.7	19.0
39	BUTTE	209,770	24.0	11.4	10.9	6.4	15.4
40	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	65.3	10.7	11.0	8.3	13.6
41	MENDOCINO	88,353	10.3	11.7 *	11.7 *	4.4	18.9
42	EL DORADO	165,463	19.3	11.7	11.8 *	6.4	17.2
43	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	205.7	11.3	11.8	10.2	13.5
44	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	1,242.7	12.6	12.5	11.8	13.2
45	LAKE	61,352	9.0	14.7 *	13.0 *	4.2	21.9
46	MONO	13,441	1.7	12.4 *	13.2 *	0.0	33.4
47	SISKIYOU	44,628	6.0	13.4 *	13.2 *	2.1	24.3
48	YUBA	62,788	7.7	12.2 *	13.3 *	3.8	22.8
49	TUOLUMNE	56,545	9.0	15.9 *	13.5 *	4.4	22.6
50	CALAVERAS	42,524	5.7	13.3 *	13.9 *	1.6	26.2
51	LASSEN	34,129	4.7	13.7 *	14.9 *	1.1	28.7
52	SUTTER	82,696	12.3	14.9 *	15.0 *	6.6	23.4
53	SHASTA	172,130	26.7	15.5	15.3	9.3	21.2
54	HUMBOLDT	128,492	22.3	17.4	16.3	9.5	23.1
55	INYO	18,456	4.0	21.7 *	17.1 *	0.0	34.1
56	GLENN	26,969	5.3	19.8 *	18.6 *	2.7	34.5
57	TRINITY	13,271	4.0	30.1 *	31.4 *	0.0	63.2
58	ALPINE	1,292	0.7	51.6 *	51.5 *	0.0	176.1

TABLE 5: DEATHS DUE TO HOMICIDE, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from homicide for California was 6.8 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 14,641 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2001 to 2003 of 2,413.7 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 11.2 in Los Angeles County to 2.4 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.7 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from homicide for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 6.7 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 10.9 in Los Angeles County to 2.4 in Santa Clara County.

Twenty-one counties (2 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 3.0 age-adjusted deaths due to homicide per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for homicide did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 5
DEATHS DUE TO HOMICIDE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	AMADOR	36,637	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	MARIPOSA	17,589	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
3	MONO	13,441	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
4	MODOC	9,400	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
5	SIERRA	3,524	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
6	ALPINE	1,292	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
7	GLENN	26,969	0.3	1.2 *	1.1 *	0.0	4.8
8	PLUMAS	21,117	0.3	1.6 *	1.2 *	0.0	5.4
9	PLACER	273,338	4.0	1.5 *	1.5 *	0.0	3.0
10	EL DORADO	165,463	2.7	1.6 *	1.7 *	0.0	3.7
11	MARIN	250,179	4.3	1.7 *	1.7 *	0.1	3.4
12	NAPA	128,966	2.3	1.8 *	1.8 *	0.0	4.1
13	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	8.3	2.0 *	2.0 *	0.6	3.3
14	COLUSA	19,635	0.3	1.7 *	2.0 *	0.0	8.9
15	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	5.3	2.1 *	2.1 *	0.3	3.9
16	YOLO	180,193	4.0	2.2 *	2.1 *	0.0	4.3
17	DEL NORTE	27,982	0.7	2.4 *	2.3 *	0.0	7.7
18	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	41.0	2.4	2.4	1.7	3.2
19	CALAVERAS	42,524	1.0	2.4 *	2.5 *	0.0	7.5
20	ORANGE	2,959,646	81.0	2.7	2.7	2.1	3.3
21	INYO	18,456	0.7	3.6 *	2.9 *	0.0	9.7
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					3.0		
22	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	9.0	3.5 *	3.3 *	1.1	5.5
23	LASSEN	34,129	1.3	3.9 *	3.4 *	0.0	9.3
24	SAN MATEO	711,793	23.7	3.3	3.5	2.1	4.9
25	SONOMA	470,723	16.7	3.5 *	3.5 *	1.8	5.2
26	TUOLUMNE	56,545	2.0	3.5 *	3.5 *	0.0	8.5
27	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	110.3	3.7	3.5	2.9	4.2
28	TEHAMA	57,649	2.0	3.5 *	3.8 *	0.0	9.1
29	KINGS	135,123	5.3	3.9 *	3.8 *	0.5	7.2
30	NEVADA	96,045	3.7	3.8 *	4.0 *	0.0	8.3
31	LAKE	61,352	2.3	3.8 *	4.0 *	0.0	9.4
32	YUBA	62,788	2.7	4.2 *	4.1 *	0.0	9.0
33	VENTURA	788,282	31.3	4.0	4.1	2.7	5.6
34	SHASTA	172,130	7.0	4.1 *	4.4 *	1.1	7.7
35	BUTTE	209,770	8.7	4.1 *	4.5 *	1.4	7.6
36	SISKIYOU	44,628	2.0	4.5 *	4.7 *	0.0	11.5
37	IMPERIAL	149,360	7.0	4.7 *	5.2 *	1.3	9.1
38	SOLANO	411,498	22.0	5.3	5.4	3.1	7.6
39	SAN BENITO	55,955	3.0	5.4 *	5.5 *	0.0	11.8
40	STANISLAUS	477,919	27.0	5.6	5.6	3.5	7.8
41	MERCED	223,904	13.3	6.0 *	5.7 *	2.6	8.9
42	MONTEREY	413,819	27.3	6.6	6.0	3.8	8.3
43	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	81.0	6.2	6.1	4.7	7.4
44	SUTTER	82,696	5.3	6.4 *	6.3 *	0.9	11.7
45	MADERA	129,585	8.7	6.7 *	6.6 *	2.2	11.0
46	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	110.3	6.6	6.6	5.4	7.9
47	MENDOCINO	88,353	5.7	6.4 *	6.6 *	1.1	12.2
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	2,413.7	6.8	6.7	6.4	6.9
48	TULARE	383,164	26.7	7.0	6.9	4.2	9.5
49	KERN	697,856	50.0	7.2	7.1	5.1	9.1
50	FRESNO	836,207	62.0	7.4	7.3	5.4	9.1
51	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	70.3	7.1	7.5	5.7	9.2
52	TRINITY	13,271	0.7	5.0 *	7.7 *	0.0	26.5
53	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	58.0	7.4	7.8	5.6	9.9
54	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	150.3	8.3	8.0	6.7	9.3
55	HUMBOLDT	128,492	10.7	8.3 *	8.2 *	3.2	13.3
56	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	131.7	8.8	8.3	6.9	9.7
57	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	54.0	8.9	8.8	6.4	11.1
58	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	1,104.3	11.2	10.9	10.3	11.5

TABLE 6: DEATHS DUE TO SUICIDE, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from suicide for California was 9.3 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,750 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2001 to 2003 of 3,287.3 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 20.8 in Humboldt County to 7.5 in Los Angeles and Santa Clara Counties, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from suicide for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 9.5 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 20.0 in Shasta County to 7.2 in San Mateo County.

Neither the counties, nor California as a whole, met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 5.0 age-adjusted deaths due to suicide per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 6
DEATHS DUE TO SUICIDE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					5.0		
1	IMPERIAL	149,360	7.0	4.7 *	5.1 *	1.3	9.0
2	SIERRA	3,524	0.3	9.5 *	6.0 *	0.0	26.3
3	SAN MATEO	711,793	54.0	7.6	7.2	5.3	9.2
4	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	129.0	7.5	7.6	6.3	8.9
5	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	738.7	7.5	7.8	7.2	8.3
6	MODOC	9,400	1.0	10.6 *	7.9 *	0.0	23.4
7	NAPA	128,966	11.7	9.0 *	8.3 *	3.4	13.1
8	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	120.7	8.1	8.3	6.8	9.8
9	ORANGE	2,959,646	240.0	8.1	8.4	7.3	9.5
10	TULARE	383,164	30.3	7.9	8.8	5.6	12.0
11	FRESNO	836,207	70.0	8.4	9.0	6.9	11.1
12	VENTURA	788,282	70.7	9.0	9.2	7.1	11.4
13	SOLANO	411,498	37.0	9.0	9.2	6.2	12.2
14	MONTEREY	413,819	36.7	8.9	9.3	6.3	12.4
15	KINGS	135,123	12.3	9.1 *	9.4 *	4.0	14.8
16	YOLO	180,193	15.7	8.7 *	9.4 *	4.7	14.2
17	SAN BENITO	55,955	5.0	8.9 *	9.5 *	1.0	17.9
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	3,287.3	9.3	9.5	9.2	9.9
18	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	95.0	9.6	9.6	7.7	11.6
19	MERCED	223,904	19.7	8.8	10.0	5.5	14.4
20	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	41.7	10.2	10.2	7.1	13.3
21	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	168.0	10.0	10.4	8.8	12.0
22	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	59.3	9.8	10.5	7.8	13.2
23	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	171.3	9.4	10.6	9.0	12.3
24	KERN	697,856	70.0	10.0	10.9	8.3	13.4
25	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	316.0	10.7	10.9	9.7	12.1
26	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	96.0	12.2	10.9	8.7	13.2
27	STANISLAUS	477,919	49.7	10.4	11.1	8.0	14.2
28	SONOMA	470,723	56.0	11.9	11.4	8.4	14.4
29	COLUSA	19,635	2.0	10.2 *	11.5 *	0.0	27.4
30	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	147.3	11.3	11.5	9.6	13.3
31	MARIN	250,179	33.3	13.3	11.7	7.6	15.8
32	MADERA	129,585	14.3	11.1 *	11.9 *	5.7	18.0
33	MARIPOSA	17,589	2.7	15.2 *	12.6 *	0.0	27.9
34	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	33.0	12.7	13.0	8.5	17.6
35	SUTTER	82,696	10.7	12.9 *	13.3 *	5.3	21.3
36	PLUMAS	21,117	2.7	12.6 *	13.4 *	0.0	30.4
37	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	35.7	14.0	13.4	9.0	17.9
38	PLACER	273,338	37.0	13.5	13.6	9.2	18.0
39	TEHAMA	57,649	9.3	16.2 *	14.4 *	4.9	23.9
40	AMADOR	36,637	5.7	15.5 *	14.8 *	2.0	27.6
41	EL DORADO	165,463	25.3	15.3	15.0	9.0	20.9
42	SISKIYOU	44,628	7.0	15.7 *	15.5 *	3.3	27.8
43	CALAVERAS	42,524	6.3	14.9 *	15.6 *	2.4	28.8
44	NEVADA	96,045	16.7	17.4 *	15.8 *	7.9	23.8
45	BUTTE	209,770	34.0	16.2	15.9	10.4	21.3
46	MENDOCINO	88,353	14.3	16.2 *	16.0 *	7.6	24.4
47	YUBA	62,788	10.0	15.9 *	17.4 *	6.6	28.2
48	GLENN	26,969	5.0	18.5 *	18.3 *	2.1	34.4
49	LASSEN	34,129	6.0	17.6 *	18.3 *	3.4	33.3
50	TUOLUMNE	56,545	12.3	21.8 *	18.6 *	7.9	29.2
51	DEL NORTE	27,982	5.7	20.3 *	19.6 *	3.4	35.7
52	HUMBOLDT	128,492	26.7	20.8	19.7	12.2	27.3
53	SHASTA	172,130	35.0	20.3	20.0	13.2	26.7
54	MONO	13,441	2.7	19.8 *	20.5 *	0.0	45.4
55	LAKE	61,352	14.0	22.8 *	21.5 *	9.7	33.3
56	INYO	18,456	5.0	27.1 *	23.9 *	2.2	45.6
57	TRINITY	13,271	4.3	32.7 *	34.2 *	1.1	67.4
58	ALPINE	1,292	0.7	51.6 *	51.5 *	0.0	176.1

TABLE 7: DEATHS DUE TO ALL CANCERS, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from all cancers for California was 152.8 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 654 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2001 to 2003 of 54,013.0 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 312.4 in Lake County to 104.3 in San Benito County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.0 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from all cancers for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 169.6 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 226.0 in Yuba County to 145.3 in San Benito County.

Ten counties (8 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 159.9 age-adjusted deaths due to all cancers per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for all cancers did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 7
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CANCERS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	13,441	11.0	81.8 *	113.8 *	39.2	188.4
2	ALPINE	1,292	1.3	103.2 *	120.2 *	0.0	326.2
3	SAN BENITO	55,955	58.3	104.3	145.3	107.5	183.2
4	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	2,112.7	123.0	146.3	140.0	152.5
5	CALAVERAS	42,524	92.7	217.9	149.2	118.4	180.0
6	LASSEN	34,129	42.3	124.0	155.1	108.0	202.3
7	MONTEREY	413,819	538.0	130.0	156.9	143.6	170.2
8	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	13,581.0	137.3	157.0	154.3	159.6
9	MARIN	250,179	474.7	189.7	157.0	142.7	171.2
10	MADERA	129,585	191.3	147.7	158.8	136.3	181.3
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					159.9		
11	MARIPOSA	17,589	39.0	221.7	160.1	109.5	210.7
12	MODOC	9,400	20.0	212.8	160.3	88.4	232.2
13	VENTURA	788,282	1,148.7	145.7	160.8	151.5	170.2
14	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	664.3	162.6	161.3	149.0	173.6
15	COLUSA	19,635	28.7	146.0	162.3	102.9	221.8
16	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	377.7	145.7	163.2	146.5	179.9
17	ORANGE	2,959,646	4,081.3	137.9	163.4	158.4	168.5
18	SAN MATEO	711,793	1,228.3	172.6	164.9	155.6	174.1
19	GLENN	26,969	46.7	173.0	166.2	118.4	214.0
20	IMPERIAL	149,360	199.3	133.5	166.4	143.0	189.7
21	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	494.7	193.6	166.4	151.7	181.1
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	54,013.0	152.8	169.6	168.2	171.1
22	FRESNO	836,207	1,146.0	137.0	170.0	160.1	179.9
23	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	1,472.0	186.7	170.3	161.6	179.1
24	SOLANO	411,498	644.3	156.6	172.2	158.8	185.6
25	TRINITY	13,271	33.3	251.2	173.5	113.9	233.0
26	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	2,905.3	172.7	174.7	168.3	181.1
27	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	4,655.0	158.1	177.1	172.0	182.2
28	INYO	18,456	49.0	265.5	177.3	126.4	228.1
29	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	1,690.3	170.8	177.9	169.3	186.4
30	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	2,290.7	153.9	179.1	171.7	186.5
31	KINGS	135,123	158.0	116.9	179.6	151.2	208.0
32	KERN	697,856	1,062.0	152.2	181.2	170.3	192.1
33	SONOMA	470,723	934.3	198.5	182.2	170.4	194.1
34	TULARE	383,164	543.3	141.8	184.0	168.5	199.5
35	PLACER	273,338	551.3	201.7	184.1	168.7	199.5
36	EL DORADO	165,463	314.0	189.8	184.2	163.6	204.8
37	MERCED	223,904	311.3	139.0	185.1	164.4	205.8
38	SHASTA	172,130	407.7	236.8	186.7	168.4	205.1
39	YOLO	180,193	257.7	143.0	187.1	164.1	210.0
40	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	2,223.7	170.7	187.9	180.1	195.8
41	SISKIYOU	44,628	120.3	269.6	188.2	154.3	222.2
42	STANISLAUS	477,919	767.3	160.6	188.8	175.4	202.2
43	SIERRA	3,524	9.7	274.3 *	190.3 *	66.7	313.9
44	NEVADA	96,045	243.0	253.0	191.2	166.9	215.5
45	BUTTE	209,770	486.7	232.0	191.7	174.5	208.9
46	SUTTER	82,696	154.3	186.6	191.8	161.5	222.1
47	NAPA	128,966	311.3	241.4	193.5	171.7	215.3
48	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	2,531.3	139.4	193.6	186.0	201.2
49	TEHAMA	57,649	145.7	252.7	193.7	161.8	225.5
50	AMADOR	36,637	100.7	274.8	197.0	158.3	235.7
51	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	982.7	161.7	197.5	185.1	209.9
52	MENDOCINO	88,353	195.3	221.1	197.9	169.9	225.8
53	PLUMAS	21,117	63.7	301.5	198.8	149.6	247.9
54	DEL NORTE	27,982	58.3	208.5	206.7	153.6	259.8
55	TUOLUMNE	56,545	161.3	285.3	207.1	174.8	239.4
56	HUMBOLDT	128,492	286.0	222.6	220.5	194.8	246.1
57	LAKE	61,352	191.7	312.4	223.8	191.7	255.8
58	YUBA	62,788	122.3	194.8	226.0	185.7	266.2

TABLE 8: DEATHS DUE TO LUNG CANCER, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from lung cancer for California was 39.0 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 2,564 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2001 to 2003 of 13,783.0 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 106.5 in Lake County to 28.8 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.7 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from lung cancer for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 43.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 74.5 in Lake County to 34.8 in Santa Clara County.

Sixteen counties (12 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) and California as a whole met the Healthy People National Objective of no more than 44.9 age-adjusted deaths due to lung cancer per 100,000 population.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 8
DEATHS DUE TO LUNG CANCER
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	13,441	2.7	19.8 *	21.8 *	0.0	49.4
2	LASSEN	34,129	9.3	27.3 *	34.1 *	12.1	56.1
3	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	495.0	28.8	34.8	31.7	37.9
4	SAN BENITO	55,955	14.3	25.6 *	36.6 *	17.4	55.7
5	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	3,155.7	31.9	37.1	35.8	38.4
6	COLUSA	19,635	6.7	34.0 *	38.1 *	9.2	67.1
7	MARIN	250,179	120.7	48.2	40.5	33.2	47.8
8	VENTURA	788,282	285.0	36.2	40.5	35.8	45.2
9	IMPERIAL	149,360	48.3	32.4	40.6	29.1	52.2
10	MONTEREY	413,819	137.7	33.3	40.7	33.9	47.5
11	ORANGE	2,959,646	1,005.7	34.0	40.8	38.3	43.3
12	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	167.3	41.0	41.0	34.8	47.2
13	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	354.0	44.9	41.1	36.8	45.4
14	SAN MATEO	711,793	307.0	43.1	41.5	36.9	46.2
15	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	95.0	36.7	42.7	34.0	51.4
16	FRESNO	836,207	288.0	34.4	43.4	38.4	48.4
CALIFORNIA		35,338,807	13,783.0	39.0	43.8	43.1	44.5
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				44.9			
17	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	1,174.3	39.9	45.1	42.5	47.6
18	MARIPOSA	17,589	11.3	64.4 *	45.7 *	18.9	72.5
19	INYO	18,456	13.3	72.2 *	45.9 *	21.1	70.8
20	MERCED	223,904	78.0	34.8	46.3	36.0	56.6
21	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	437.7	44.2	46.3	42.0	50.7
22	MADERA	129,585	55.7	43.0	46.4	34.2	58.6
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	138.7	54.3	46.4	38.7	54.1
24	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	790.7	47.0	47.2	43.9	50.5
25	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	597.3	40.1	47.5	43.7	51.4
26	CALAVERAS	42,524	31.0	72.9	48.0	30.9	65.2
27	NEVADA	96,045	63.7	66.3	48.4	36.5	60.3
28	KINGS	135,123	42.0	31.1	48.6	33.8	63.4
29	SOLANO	411,498	177.3	43.1	48.6	41.4	55.8
30	SIERRA	3,524	2.7	75.7 *	48.7 *	0.0	107.2
31	TULARE	383,164	145.3	37.9	49.2	41.2	57.2
32	EL DORADO	165,463	85.3	51.6	50.1	39.4	60.8
33	NAPA	128,966	79.7	61.8	50.2	39.1	61.4
34	SONOMA	470,723	253.0	53.7	50.3	44.1	56.6
35	PLACER	273,338	150.7	55.1	50.4	42.4	58.5
36	GLENN	26,969	14.3	53.1 *	50.9 *	24.5	77.2
37	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	660.7	36.4	51.3	47.3	55.2
38	MENDOCINO	88,353	51.7	58.5	52.1	37.8	66.3
39	YOLO	180,193	71.3	39.6	52.6	40.4	64.9
40	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	619.3	47.5	52.8	48.7	57.0
41	KERN	697,856	305.0	43.7	52.8	46.9	58.8
42	SUTTER	82,696	43.0	52.0	53.5	37.5	69.6
43	MODOC	9,400	7.0	74.5 *	53.8 *	13.4	94.2
44	STANISLAUS	477,919	216.0	45.2	53.9	46.7	61.1
45	TUOLUMNE	56,545	43.7	77.2	54.5	38.2	70.8
46	ALPINE	1,292	0.7	51.6 *	55.2 *	0.0	189.7
47	SISKIYOU	44,628	36.0	80.7	55.3	37.2	73.4
48	TRINITY	13,271	11.0	82.9 *	56.4 *	22.9	90.0
49	BUTTE	209,770	144.7	69.0	57.0	47.6	66.3
50	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	290.7	47.8	58.8	52.0	65.6
51	PLUMAS	21,117	19.3	91.6	59.7	33.0	86.3
52	AMADOR	36,637	31.7	86.4	59.7	38.9	80.5
53	SHASTA	172,130	135.3	78.6	62.0	51.5	72.6
54	HUMBOLDT	128,492	84.0	65.4	64.5	50.6	78.3
55	TEHAMA	57,649	52.0	90.2	69.5	50.4	88.6
56	DEL NORTE	27,982	20.0	71.5	71.5	40.1	102.8
57	YUBA	62,788	40.3	64.2	73.7	50.9	96.5
58	LAKE	61,352	65.3	106.5	74.5	56.4	92.7

TABLE 9: DEATHS DUE TO FEMALE BREAST CANCER, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from female breast cancer for California was 23.5 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 4,256 females. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 4,161.7 from 2001 to 2003 and a female population of 17,710,995 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 36.0 in Marin County to 19.9 in Tulare County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from female breast cancer for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 23.4 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 26.9 in Contra Costa and Humboldt Counties to 20.5 in Santa Clara and San Luis Obispo Counties.

Twenty-two counties (7 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 22.3 age-adjusted deaths due to female breast cancer per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for female breast cancer did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 9
DEATHS DUE TO FEMALE BREAST CANCER
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 FEMALE POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	DEL NORTE	12,620	1.0	7.9 *	6.6 *	0.0	19.4
2	COLUSA	9,672	1.0	10.3 *	10.5 *	0.0	31.3
3	SAN BENITO	27,608	3.0	10.9 *	14.1 *	0.0	30.2
4	LASSEN	12,744	2.0	15.7 *	14.5 *	0.0	34.6
5	MODOC	4,651	0.7	14.3 *	14.7 *	0.0	50.5
6	CALAVERAS	21,388	5.0	23.4 *	15.5 *	1.8	29.1
7	MADERA	67,448	11.7	17.3 *	18.0 *	7.7	28.4
8	YOLO	92,105	15.7	17.0 *	19.8 *	10.0	29.7
9	TRINITY	6,529	2.0	30.6 *	20.2 *	0.0	48.3
10	SANTA CLARA	846,443	169.3	20.0	20.5	17.4	23.5
11	SAN LUIS OBISPO	124,519	32.7	26.2	20.5	13.4	27.7
12	YUBA	31,234	6.0	19.2 *	20.6 *	4.1	37.1
13	SIERRA	1,745	0.7	38.2 *	20.9 *	0.0	72.0
14	NEVADA	48,731	14.3	29.4 *	21.1 *	9.9	32.3
15	SANTA BARBARA	203,762	47.3	23.2	21.2	15.1	27.3
16	IMPERIAL	71,335	13.7	19.2 *	21.4 *	10.0	32.7
17	BUTTE	106,950	27.7	25.9	21.4	13.2	29.6
18	TEHAMA	29,137	9.3	32.0 *	21.8 *	7.5	36.2
19	SANTA CRUZ	129,625	29.0	22.4	22.0	13.9	30.2
20	LAKE	31,086	9.7	31.1 *	22.1 *	8.0	36.1
21	MONTEREY	199,729	41.7	20.9	22.1	15.4	28.9
22	LOS ANGELES	4,985,080	1,072.3	21.5	22.2	20.9	23.5
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					22.3		
23	FRESNO	415,239	83.7	20.1	22.6	17.7	27.4
24	SAN FRANCISCO	386,878	105.7	27.3	22.6	18.2	27.0
25	KINGS	57,764	10.7	18.5 *	22.6 *	9.0	36.3
26	VENTURA	395,100	91.3	23.1	22.7	18.0	27.4
27	AMADOR	16,507	5.7	34.3 *	22.8 *	3.6	42.0
28	PLACER	139,364	38.0	27.3	23.0	15.7	30.4
29	ORANGE	1,486,601	331.7	22.3	23.0	20.5	25.5
30	SHASTA	87,696	26.7	30.4	23.0	14.1	32.0
31	TULARE	191,368	38.0	19.9	23.1	15.7	30.4
32	SOLANO	203,477	47.7	23.4	23.1	16.5	29.7
33	SAN MATEO	358,856	97.3	27.1	23.2	18.6	27.9
34	MENDOCINO	44,358	12.7	28.6 *	23.3 *	10.4	36.2
CALIFORNIA		17,710,995	4,161.7	23.5	23.4	22.7	24.2
35	STANISLAUS	241,801	53.3	22.1	23.6	17.2	30.0
36	NAPA	64,427	20.3	31.6	23.9	13.1	34.6
37	EL DORADO	82,970	22.3	26.9	24.1	14.0	34.2
38	SONOMA	238,311	68.7	28.8	24.3	18.4	30.1
39	GLENN	13,315	3.7	27.5 *	24.3 *	0.0	49.5
40	SISKIYOU	22,762	7.7	33.7 *	24.6 *	6.5	42.6
41	ALAMEDA	758,304	184.0	24.3	24.7	21.1	28.3
42	SACRAMENTO	665,557	168.0	25.2	25.1	21.3	28.9
43	RIVERSIDE	844,882	224.0	26.5	25.3	22.0	28.6
44	KERN	340,866	79.7	23.4	25.5	19.9	31.1
45	SAN BERNARDINO	908,939	196.7	21.6	25.9	22.3	29.6
46	SAN DIEGO	1,465,595	380.7	26.0	26.0	23.4	28.6
47	MERCED	112,230	24.3	21.7	26.0	15.7	36.3
48	TUOLUMNE	26,730	10.0	37.4 *	26.4 *	9.4	43.4
49	SUTTER	41,650	11.7	28.0 *	26.5 *	11.2	41.7
50	MARIN	125,942	45.3	36.0	26.5	18.7	34.4
51	SAN JOAQUIN	302,636	74.7	24.7	26.8	20.7	32.8
52	CONTRA COSTA	506,573	147.3	29.1	26.9	22.5	31.2
53	HUMBOLDT	64,838	19.3	29.8	26.9	14.9	39.0
54	MARIPOSA	8,626	3.3	38.6 *	27.2 *	0.0	56.8
55	MONO	6,067	1.3	22.0 *	27.7 *	0.0	76.5
56	INYO	9,437	4.7	49.5 *	34.1 *	0.2	68.1
57	PLUMAS	10,566	5.7	53.6 *	35.9 *	5.7	66.2
58	ALPINE	622	0.3	53.6 *	59.8 *	0.0	262.8

TABLE 10: DEATHS DUE TO CORONARY HEART DISEASE, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from coronary heart disease for California was 159.1 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 629 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 56,216.3 from 2001 to 2003 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 308.8 in Inyo County to 88.8 in San Benito County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from coronary heart disease for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 175.9 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 240.7 in San Bernardino County to 112.2 in Plumas County.

Thirty-four counties (30 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 166.0 age-adjusted deaths due to coronary heart disease per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for coronary heart disease did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 10
DEATHS DUE TO CORONARY HEART DISEASE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	TRINITY	13,271	17.7	133.1 *	92.2 *	48.2	136.1
2	SIERRA	3,524	6.0	170.3 *	103.7 *	20.1	187.3
3	PLUMAS	21,117	35.0	165.7	112.2	74.1	150.2
4	MARIN	250,179	378.7	151.4	122.0	109.6	134.4
5	ALPINE	1,292	1.3	103.2 *	124.1 *	0.0	337.4
6	SAN MATEO	711,793	965.0	135.6	126.5	118.5	134.5
7	SAN BENITO	55,955	49.7	88.8	132.4	95.2	169.6
8	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	1,844.7	107.4	134.5	128.3	140.6
9	SOLANO	411,498	516.7	125.6	134.8	123.0	146.5
10	MONO	13,441	9.0	67.0 *	134.8 *	36.6	233.0
11	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	416.0	162.9	136.9	123.7	150.1
12	SONOMA	470,723	762.3	161.9	137.6	127.7	147.5
13	GLENN	26,969	40.7	150.8	140.7	97.4	184.0
14	MONTEREY	413,819	478.0	115.5	141.7	129.0	154.4
15	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	334.0	128.9	141.8	126.4	157.2
16	NAPA	128,966	260.3	201.9	145.6	127.5	163.6
17	SISKIYOU	44,628	94.3	211.4	147.4	117.3	177.5
18	DEL NORTE	27,982	42.0	150.1	148.8	103.7	193.9
19	TEHAMA	57,649	120.3	208.7	149.1	122.1	176.2
20	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	1,433.3	144.8	150.2	142.4	158.0
21	PLACER	273,338	453.3	165.9	150.2	136.4	164.1
22	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	654.0	160.1	150.5	138.9	162.1
23	EL DORADO	165,463	239.3	144.6	150.5	131.2	169.8
24	SHASTA	172,130	358.3	208.2	150.7	134.8	166.6
25	VENTURA	788,282	1,063.0	134.9	150.8	141.7	159.9
26	YOLO	180,193	205.7	114.1	150.9	130.2	171.6
27	MENDOCINO	88,353	148.7	168.3	154.0	129.1	178.9
28	NEVADA	96,045	203.0	211.4	158.3	136.4	180.2
29	HUMBOLDT	128,492	205.3	159.8	158.6	136.8	180.3
30	TUOLUMNE	56,545	123.0	217.5	158.8	130.7	187.0
31	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	1,426.7	181.0	159.0	150.7	167.3
32	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	2,055.7	138.1	162.0	155.0	169.0
33	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	4,313.0	146.5	164.6	159.7	169.5
34	CALAVERAS	42,524	91.3	214.8	165.2	130.7	199.6
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					166.0		
35	IMPERIAL	149,360	183.7	123.0	166.3	142.0	190.7
36	LASSEN	34,129	44.7	130.9	170.3	119.9	220.6
37	MARIPOSA	17,589	40.7	231.2	170.5	117.8	223.2
38	BUTTE	209,770	464.3	221.4	170.9	155.2	186.6
CALIFORNIA		35,338,807	56,216.3	159.1	175.9	174.4	177.4
39	AMADOR	36,637	84.7	231.1	176.0	138.1	213.9
40	KINGS	135,123	147.3	109.0	177.9	148.9	206.9
41	LAKE	61,352	154.0	251.0	178.6	150.2	207.0
42	ORANGE	2,959,646	4,325.0	146.1	178.9	173.5	184.2
43	MODOC	9,400	24.3	258.9	181.7	109.4	254.1
44	COLUSA	19,635	32.7	166.4	184.5	121.2	247.9
45	INYO	18,456	57.0	308.8	186.2	137.3	235.1
46	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	16,484.3	166.7	186.2	183.3	189.0
47	MADERA	129,585	228.7	176.5	186.6	162.4	210.8
48	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	2,239.3	171.9	188.4	180.6	196.2
49	FRESNO	836,207	1,290.0	154.3	192.4	181.9	202.9
50	TULARE	383,164	561.0	146.4	196.6	180.3	212.9
51	SUTTER	82,696	166.0	200.7	208.4	176.6	240.1
52	MERCED	223,904	331.7	148.1	210.6	187.8	233.4
53	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	3,558.7	211.5	214.6	207.6	221.7
54	YUBA	62,788	112.7	179.4	218.3	177.7	259.0
55	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	1,083.7	178.3	226.1	212.6	239.5
56	KERN	697,856	1,358.0	194.6	226.1	214.0	238.1
57	STANISLAUS	477,919	983.0	205.7	238.2	223.2	253.1
58	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	2,915.7	160.5	240.7	231.9	249.5

TABLE 11: DEATHS DUE TO CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE (STROKE), 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from cerebrovascular disease for California was 50.3 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 1,988 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 17,771.7 from 2001 to 2003 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 98.9 in Nevada County to 35.0 in Kings County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from cerebrovascular disease for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 55.6 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 79.9 in San Joaquin County to 45.8 in El Dorado County.

Eight counties (2 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 48.0 age-adjusted deaths due to cerebrovascular disease per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for cerebrovascular disease did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

* Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 11
DEATHS DUE TO CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	SIERRA	3,524	1.7	47.3 *	27.8 *	0.0	70.9
2	MONO	13,441	3.0	22.3 *	33.1 *	0.0	74.2
3	COLUSA	19,635	6.3	32.3 *	35.4 *	7.8	63.0
4	PLUMAS	21,117	12.7	60.0 *	39.3 *	17.6	60.9
5	LASSEN	34,129	11.3	33.2 *	44.4 *	18.3	70.4
6	DEL NORTE	27,982	12.7	45.3 *	44.9 *	20.1	69.7
7	EL DORADO	165,463	70.7	42.7	45.8	35.0	56.5
8	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	4,226.3	42.7	47.7	46.3	49.2
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					48.0		
9	TRINITY	13,271	8.7	65.3 *	48.2 *	15.9	80.5
10	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	116.0	44.8	48.5	39.6	57.5
11	MADERA	129,585	60.3	46.6	48.8	36.5	61.1
12	VENTURA	788,282	346.0	43.9	49.4	44.2	54.6
13	GLENN	26,969	14.3	53.1 *	49.8 *	24.0	75.7
14	TUOLUMNE	56,545	38.7	68.4	50.1	34.2	65.9
15	INYO	18,456	16.0	86.7 *	50.4 *	25.6	75.3
16	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	694.0	40.4	50.9	47.1	54.7
17	KERN	697,856	309.7	44.4	51.6	45.8	57.4
18	SHASTA	172,130	127.3	74.0	51.9	42.7	61.1
19	MARIN	250,179	162.3	64.9	52.1	44.0	60.2
20	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	161.3	63.2	52.4	44.3	60.5
21	SAN BENITO	55,955	19.7	35.1	53.6	29.7	77.5
22	MARIPOSA	17,589	12.7	72.0 *	53.9 *	24.0	83.8
23	SISKIYOU	44,628	34.3	76.9	54.0	35.6	72.3
24	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	239.0	58.5	54.1	47.2	60.9
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	17,771.7	50.3	55.6	54.8	56.4
25	SAN MATEO	711,793	428.0	60.1	55.7	50.4	61.0
26	HUMBOLDT	128,492	71.7	55.8	55.7	42.8	68.6
27	ORANGE	2,959,646	1,351.0	45.6	56.2	53.2	59.2
28	SOLANO	411,498	219.3	53.3	56.3	48.8	63.8
29	KINGS	135,123	47.3	35.0	58.1	41.4	74.8
30	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	1,532.0	52.0	58.3	55.4	61.2
31	STANISLAUS	477,919	242.0	50.6	58.3	51.0	65.7
32	TEHAMA	57,649	49.7	86.2	58.6	42.0	75.1
33	MONTEREY	413,819	198.3	47.9	58.7	50.5	66.9
34	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	979.3	58.2	58.8	55.1	62.4
35	SUTTER	82,696	47.0	56.8	59.6	42.5	76.7
36	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	542.7	68.8	59.9	54.8	64.9
37	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	571.7	57.8	60.1	55.1	65.0
38	CALAVERAS	42,524	33.3	78.4	60.4	39.6	81.2
39	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	722.3	39.8	60.5	56.0	64.9
40	SONOMA	470,723	341.7	72.6	61.0	54.4	67.5
41	PLACER	273,338	184.0	67.3	61.0	52.2	69.8
42	IMPERIAL	149,360	66.3	44.4	61.1	46.2	76.0
43	BUTTE	209,770	173.0	82.5	61.3	52.1	70.5
44	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	806.7	54.2	63.6	59.2	68.0
45	MODOC	9,400	8.3	88.7 *	64.5 *	20.4	108.6
46	YOLO	180,193	87.7	48.7	64.6	51.1	78.2
47	AMADOR	36,637	32.3	88.3	66.1	43.2	89.1
48	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	798.0	61.3	67.0	62.4	71.7
49	FRESNO	836,207	451.0	53.9	67.2	61.0	73.4
50	NAPA	128,966	126.3	98.0	68.1	56.0	80.2
51	LAKE	61,352	59.3	96.7	68.6	51.1	86.1
52	TULARE	383,164	197.3	51.5	69.2	59.5	78.8
53	YUBA	62,788	35.0	55.7	69.3	46.1	92.4
54	MENDOCINO	88,353	66.7	75.5	70.0	53.2	86.9
55	NEVADA	96,045	95.0	98.9	74.2	59.2	89.2
56	MERCED	223,904	120.7	53.9	77.9	63.9	91.9
57	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	380.7	62.6	79.9	71.8	87.9
58	ALPINE	1,292	1.0	77.4 *	97.5 *	0.0	288.5

TABLE 12: DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from drug-induced deaths for California was 9.2 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,839 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 3,260.3 from 2001 to 2003 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 30.1 in Humboldt County to 4.6 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 6.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from drug-induced deaths for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 9.4 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 29.6 in Humboldt County to 4.5 in Santa Clara County.

One county (with an unreliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 1.0 age-adjusted drug-induced death per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for drug-induced deaths did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 12
DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,292	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					1.0		
2	COLUSA	19,635	0.7	3.4 *	3.9 *	0.0	13.1
3	MONO	13,441	0.7	5.0 *	4.5 *	0.0	15.3
4	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	79.3	4.6	4.5	3.5	5.5
5	YUBA	62,788	2.7	4.2 *	4.6 *	0.0	10.1
6	SAN BENITO	55,955	2.7	4.8 *	4.8 *	0.0	10.6
7	IMPERIAL	149,360	7.7	5.1 *	5.4 *	1.5	9.2
8	SAN MATEO	711,793	49.3	6.9	6.5	4.7	8.3
9	SUTTER	82,696	5.3	6.4 *	6.7 *	1.0	12.4
10	MERCED	223,904	14.0	6.3 *	7.3 *	3.5	11.2
11	KINGS	135,123	9.0	6.7 *	7.4 *	2.5	12.3
12	SOLANO	411,498	31.0	7.5	7.5	4.8	10.1
13	ORANGE	2,959,646	220.7	7.5	7.5	6.5	8.5
14	SIERRA	3,524	0.3	9.5 *	7.7 *	0.0	33.6
15	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	80.7	8.1	7.8	6.1	9.5
16	PLUMAS	21,117	1.3	6.3 *	7.9 *	0.0	21.8
17	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	787.3	8.0	8.2	7.6	8.8
18	PLACER	273,338	23.3	8.5	8.2	4.8	11.6
19	INYO	18,456	1.0	5.4 *	8.3 *	0.0	24.7
20	YOLO	180,193	13.7	7.6 *	8.4 *	4.0	12.9
21	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	134.3	9.0	8.8	7.3	10.3
22	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	153.7	8.5	9.1	7.7	10.6
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	3,260.3	9.2	9.4	9.0	9.7
23	MARIN	250,179	26.7	10.7	9.4	5.8	13.1
24	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	149.0	8.9	9.5	8.0	11.0
25	MONTEREY	413,819	37.3	9.0	9.5	6.5	12.6
26	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	282.0	9.6	9.6	8.5	10.8
27	TULARE	383,164	32.3	8.4	9.7	6.3	13.0
28	VENTURA	788,282	77.3	9.8	9.7	7.5	11.9
29	NAPA	128,966	14.0	10.9 *	10.4 *	4.9	16.0
30	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	27.0	10.6	10.6	6.5	14.6
31	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	42.7	10.4	10.8	7.5	14.0
32	FRESNO	836,207	80.3	9.6	10.8	8.4	13.1
33	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	29.3	11.3	10.9	6.9	14.9
34	SONOMA	470,723	54.3	11.5	11.0	8.0	13.9
35	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	140.0	10.7	11.1	9.2	12.9
36	LASSEN	34,129	4.3	12.7 *	11.3 *	0.6	21.9
37	TEHAMA	57,649	6.3	11.0 *	11.7 *	2.5	21.0
38	GLENN	26,969	3.0	11.1 *	11.9 *	0.0	25.5
39	AMADOR	36,637	4.7	12.7 *	12.0 *	0.9	23.1
40	MADERA	129,585	14.7	11.3 *	12.1 *	5.9	18.3
41	EL DORADO	165,463	21.7	13.1	12.7	7.2	18.2
42	MODOC	9,400	1.3	14.2 *	12.9 *	0.0	35.4
43	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	74.0	12.2	13.1	10.1	16.0
44	CALAVERAS	42,524	5.3	12.5 *	13.8 *	1.2	26.5
45	KERN	697,856	97.7	14.0	15.3	12.2	18.3
46	MARIPOSA	17,589	3.0	17.1 *	15.7 *	0.0	34.2
47	NEVADA	96,045	16.7	17.4 *	16.1 *	8.1	24.2
48	TRINITY	13,271	2.0	15.1 *	16.3 *	0.0	39.7
49	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	143.0	18.1	16.4	13.6	19.1
50	STANISLAUS	477,919	79.7	16.7	18.0	14.1	22.0
51	MENDOCINO	88,353	16.0	18.1 *	18.3 *	9.1	27.4
52	SISKIYOU	44,628	7.7	17.2 *	18.5 *	4.6	32.4
53	TUOLUMNE	56,545	11.0	19.5 *	19.2 *	7.6	30.9
54	BUTTE	209,770	40.0	19.1	20.0	13.7	26.3
55	LAKE	61,352	13.3	21.7 *	21.4 *	9.5	33.2
56	SHASTA	172,130	36.3	21.1	21.8	14.6	29.0
57	HUMBOLDT	128,492	38.7	30.1	29.6	20.1	39.0
58	DEL NORTE	27,982	9.0	32.2 *	30.5 *	10.6	50.5

TABLE 13: DEATHS DUE TO DIABETES, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Adjusted Death Rate

The crude death rate from diabetes for California was 19.2 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 5,215 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 6,776.0 from 2001 to 2003 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 37.3 in Kings County to 12.1 in El Dorado County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.1 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from diabetes for California for the three-year period from 2001 to 2003 was 21.3 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 59.1 in Kings County to 10.4 in Marin County.

The Healthy People 2010 National Objective for diabetes mortality is based on both underlying and contributing causes of death. Multiple causes of death data for 2003 are not yet available for California. Therefore, California's progress in meeting this objective will not be addressed in this report.

Notes:

Death rates are per 100,000 population. The crude death rate is the actual risk of dying. The age-adjusted rate is the hypothetical rate that the State/County would have if its population were distributed by age in the same proportions as the 2000 United States population.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 13
DEATHS DUE TO DIABETES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: SEE COMMENT							
1	ALPINE	1,292	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	MARIPOSA	17,589	1.7	9.5 *	6.7 *	0.0	17.0
3	DEL NORTE	27,982	2.3	8.3 *	8.2 *	0.0	18.7
4	CALAVERAS	42,524	5.3	12.5 *	8.8 *	1.2	16.3
5	MARIN	250,179	31.7	12.7	10.4	6.8	14.1
6	SAN BENITO	55,955	4.3	7.7 *	11.1 *	0.5	21.7
7	INYO	18,456	3.3	18.1 *	12.0 *	0.0	24.9
8	EL DORADO	165,463	20.0	12.1	12.0	6.7	17.3
9	TUOLUMNE	56,545	10.7	18.9 *	13.4 *	5.3	21.4
10	NEVADA	96,045	16.7	17.4 *	13.4 *	6.8	19.9
11	PLUMAS	21,117	4.0	18.9 *	13.4 *	0.0	27.0
12	SAN MATEO	711,793	103.7	14.6	13.8	11.2	16.5
13	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	44.7	17.5	14.8	10.4	19.1
14	AMADOR	36,637	7.3	20.0 *	14.8 *	4.0	25.6
15	PLACER	273,338	45.0	16.5	15.1	10.7	19.5
16	MONO	13,441	1.3	9.9 *	15.4 *	0.0	45.5
17	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	36.3	14.0	16.0	10.7	21.2
18	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	141.3	17.9	16.1	13.4	18.7
19	SHASTA	172,130	36.7	21.3	16.4	11.0	21.7
20	COLUSA	19,635	3.0	15.3 *	16.8 *	0.0	35.7
21	TRINITY	13,271	3.3	25.1 *	16.8 *	0.0	34.8
22	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	278.7	16.6	16.8	14.8	18.8
23	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	239.7	14.0	17.0	14.8	19.2
24	LASSEN	34,129	4.7	13.7 *	17.2 *	1.4	32.9
25	LAKE	61,352	15.0	24.4 *	17.2 *	8.5	26.0
26	SONOMA	470,723	90.7	19.3	17.4	13.8	21.0
27	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	73.0	17.9	17.6	13.5	21.6
28	ORANGE	2,959,646	433.3	14.6	17.6	15.9	19.2
29	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	173.7	17.5	18.4	15.7	21.2
30	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	488.3	16.6	18.6	17.0	20.3
31	MONTEREY	413,819	66.7	16.1	19.6	14.9	24.4
32	BUTTE	209,770	51.0	24.3	19.9	14.4	25.5
33	SISKIYOU	44,628	12.0	26.9 *	20.2 *	8.3	32.1
34	NAPA	128,966	32.7	25.3	20.3	13.3	27.4
35	MENDOCINO	88,353	20.0	22.6	20.6	11.5	29.7
36	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	246.3	18.9	20.8	18.2	23.4
37	SOLANO	411,498	77.7	18.9	21.1	16.4	25.8
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	6,776.0	19.2	21.3	20.8	21.8
38	VENTURA	788,282	149.3	18.9	21.5	18.1	25.0
39	TEHAMA	57,649	16.3	28.3 *	21.8 *	11.0	32.6
40	MODOC	9,400	3.0	31.9 *	21.8 *	0.0	46.5
41	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	290.3	19.5	22.8	20.1	25.4
42	SIERRA	3,524	1.3	37.8 *	23.1 *	0.0	63.1
43	YUBA	62,788	12.7	20.2 *	23.6 *	10.6	36.7
44	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	2,064.0	20.9	23.8	22.8	24.9
45	YOLO	180,193	33.7	18.7	24.6	16.3	33.0
46	SUTTER	82,696	20.3	24.6	25.5	14.4	36.5
47	KERN	697,856	159.0	22.8	27.2	23.0	31.5
48	STANISLAUS	477,919	113.3	23.7	28.2	23.0	33.4
49	GLENN	26,969	8.3	30.9 *	28.7 *	9.2	48.2
50	FRESNO	836,207	194.0	23.2	28.8	24.7	32.9
51	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	394.3	21.7	30.6	27.5	33.6
52	MADERA	129,585	37.0	28.6	30.8	20.9	40.7
53	HUMBOLDT	128,492	40.7	31.6	31.7	21.9	41.4
54	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	157.0	25.8	31.8	26.8	36.8
55	IMPERIAL	149,360	38.0	25.4	32.8	22.2	43.3
56	TULARE	383,164	103.7	27.1	35.3	28.5	42.1
57	MERCED	223,904	63.3	28.3	38.1	28.7	47.5
58	KINGS	135,123	50.3	37.3	59.1	42.6	75.6

Comment: HP2010 objective based on both underlying and contributing causes of death. This report excludes multiple/contributing causes of death.

TABLE 14: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS C, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of newly reported hepatitis C cases for California was 0.19 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one newly reported hepatitis C case for every 517,179 persons. This rate was based on the 2001 to 2003 average reported number of new cases of 68.33 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. There were 21 counties with no new incidence of hepatitis C reported during the three-year period.

Forty-five counties (none with a reliable case rate) and California as a whole met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of 1.00 case per 100,000 population.

The data in this table are not comparable to the hepatitis C data reported in County Health Status Profiles 2001 and 2002 reports. Data in those reports were based on total number of reported cases, not new cases. As with other morbidity data, undercounts may occur in many counties.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the case rate is based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Disease Investigation and Surveillance Branch.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 14
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS C
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	KERN	697,856	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	PLACER	273,338	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	BUTTE	209,770	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
6	YOLO	180,193	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
7	IMPERIAL	149,360	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
8	KINGS	135,123	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
9	MADERA	129,585	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
10	NAPA	128,966	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
11	MENDOCINO	88,353	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
12	CALAVERAS	42,524	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
13	AMADOR	36,637	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
14	LASSEN	34,129	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
15	PLUMAS	21,117	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
16	INYO	18,456	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
17	MARIPOSA	17,589	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
18	MONO	13,441	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
19	MODOC	9,400	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
20	SIERRA	3,524	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
21	ALPINE	1,292	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
22	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	0.33	0.01 *	0.00	0.05
23	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	0.33	0.03 *	0.00	0.15
24	VENTURA	788,282	0.33	0.04 *	0.00	0.19
25	STANISLAUS	477,919	0.33	0.07 *	0.00	0.31
26	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	7.33	0.07 *	0.02	0.13
27	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	1.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.21
28	SOLANO	411,498	0.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.36
29	SAN MATEO	711,793	0.67	0.09 *	0.00	0.32
30	ORANGE	2,959,646	3.33	0.11 *	0.00	0.23
31	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	0.33	0.13 *	0.00	0.57
32	MARIN	250,179	0.33	0.13 *	0.00	0.59
33	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	2.00	0.13 *	0.00	0.32
34	MERCED	223,904	0.33	0.15 *	0.00	0.65
35	MONTEREY	413,819	0.67	0.16 *	0.00	0.55
36	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	0.67	0.16 *	0.00	0.55
37	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	1.00	0.16 *	0.00	0.49
38	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	3.33	0.18 *	0.00	0.38
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	68.33	0.19	0.15	0.24
39	FRESNO	836,207	1.67	0.20 *	0.00	0.50
40	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	3.00	0.38 *	0.00	0.81
41	SUTTER	82,696	0.33	0.40 *	0.00	1.77
42	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	6.00	0.46 *	0.09	0.83
43	SONOMA	470,723	2.33	0.50 *	0.00	1.13
44	LAKE	61,352	0.33	0.54 *	0.00	2.39
45	SAN BENITO	55,955	0.33	0.60 *	0.00	2.62
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			1.00		
46	HUMBOLDT	128,492	1.33	1.04 *	0.00	2.80
47	SHASTA	172,130	2.00	1.16 *	0.00	2.77
48	DEL NORTE	27,982	0.33	1.19 *	0.00	5.24
49	TULARE	383,164	5.00	1.30 *	0.16	2.45
50	NEVADA	96,045	1.33	1.39 *	0.00	3.74
51	COLUSA	19,635	0.33	1.70 *	0.00	7.46
52	TUOLUMNE	56,545	1.00	1.77 *	0.00	5.23
53	SISKIYOU	44,628	1.00	2.24 *	0.00	6.63
54	TRINITY	13,271	0.33	2.51 *	0.00	11.04
55	TEHAMA	57,649	1.67	2.89 *	0.00	7.28
56	EL DORADO	165,463	5.33	3.22 *	0.49	5.96
57	GLENN	26,969	1.33	4.94 *	0.00	13.34
58	YUBA	62,788	10.33	16.46 *	6.42	26.49

TABLE 15: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS AMONG POPULATION AGES 13 YEARS AND OVER, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported AIDS cases for Californians aged 13 years and older was 14.73 cases per 100,000 population aged 13 years and over or approximately one reported AIDS case for every 6,791 persons. This rate was based on a 2001 to 2003 three-year average reported number of cases of 4,198.00 and a population of 28,508,621 as of July 1, 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 68.45 in San Francisco County to 5.00 in Ventura County, a difference in rates by a factor of 13.7 to 1. Seven counties reported no new incidence of AIDS during the three-year period for this age group.

Seven counties (none with reliable case rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 1.00 AIDS case per 100,000 population aged 13 years and older. The statewide AIDS crude case rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the case rate is based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 15
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS AMONG POPULATION AGES 13 YEARS AND OVER
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION AGED 13 AND OVER	2001-2003 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	TEHAMA	47,528	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	COLUSA	15,509	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	MARIPOSA	15,253	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	TRINITY	11,503	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	MODOC	7,955	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
6	SIERRA	3,079	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
7	ALPINE	1,113	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				1.00		
8	SHASTA	143,371	2.00	1.39 *	0.00	3.33
9	SUTTER	66,317	1.00	1.51 *	0.00	4.46
10	SISKIYOU	38,164	0.67	1.75 *	0.00	5.94
11	INYO	15,668	0.33	2.13 *	0.00	9.35
12	NEVADA	82,692	2.00	2.42 *	0.00	5.77
13	PLACER	224,734	6.00	2.67 *	0.53	4.81
14	MONO	11,373	0.33	2.93 *	0.00	12.88
15	AMADOR	32,124	1.00	3.11 *	0.00	9.21
16	CALAVERAS	36,720	1.33	3.63 *	0.00	9.79
17	NAPA	107,420	4.33	4.03 *	0.24	7.83
18	TUOLUMNE	49,076	2.00	4.08 *	0.00	9.72
19	YUBA	48,905	2.00	4.09 *	0.00	9.76
20	EL DORADO	137,707	5.67	4.12 *	0.73	7.50
21	DEL NORTE	23,601	1.00	4.24 *	0.00	12.54
22	TULARE	292,102	14.00	4.79 *	2.28	7.30
23	YOLO	148,265	7.33	4.95 *	1.37	8.53
24	VENTURA	633,371	31.67	5.00	3.26	6.74
25	SAN BENITO	43,155	2.33	5.41 *	0.00	12.34
26	LASSEN	29,421	1.67	5.66 *	0.00	14.27
27	BUTTE	177,439	10.33	5.82 *	2.27	9.37
28	STANISLAUS	375,823	22.33	5.94	3.48	8.41
29	MERCED	170,603	10.33	6.06 *	2.36	9.75
30	SANTA BARBARA	336,717	21.33	6.34	3.65	9.02
31	HUMBOLDT	108,483	7.00	6.45 *	1.67	11.23
32	KINGS	107,106	7.00	6.54 *	1.69	11.38
33	SANTA CRUZ	216,123	15.67	7.25 *	3.66	10.84
34	MONTEREY	331,728	25.00	7.54	4.58	10.49
35	SAN MATEO	590,682	46.00	7.79	5.54	10.04
36	SANTA CLARA	1,401,169	112.67	8.04	6.56	9.53
37	SACRAMENTO	1,055,392	85.67	8.12	6.40	9.84
38	MENDOCINO	73,616	6.00	8.15 *	1.63	14.67
39	IMPERIAL	117,989	9.67	8.19 *	3.03	13.36
40	SAN LUIS OBISPO	219,601	18.00	8.20 *	4.41	11.98
41	FRESNO	653,815	54.67	8.36	6.14	10.58
42	ORANGE	2,378,474	199.67	8.39	7.23	9.56
43	LAKE	51,482	4.33	8.42 *	0.49	16.34
44	SAN BERNARDINO	1,417,574	123.00	8.68	7.14	10.21
45	PLUMAS	18,300	1.67	9.11 *	0.00	22.93
46	CONTRA COSTA	804,665	80.33	9.98	7.80	12.17
47	GLENN	21,477	2.33	10.86 *	0.00	24.80
48	SAN JOAQUIN	476,377	52.00	10.92	7.95	13.88
49	MADERA	102,614	12.00	11.69 *	5.08	18.31
50	SONOMA	392,538	46.33	11.80	8.40	15.20
51	MARIN	213,877	31.00	14.49	9.39	19.60
52	RIVERSIDE	1,332,499	193.33	14.51	12.46	16.55
	CALIFORNIA	28,508,621	4,198.00	14.73	14.28	15.17
53	KERN	542,186	83.00	15.31	12.01	18.60
54	SOLANO	331,396	56.33	17.00	12.56	21.44
55	ALAMEDA	1,227,488	214.00	17.43	15.10	19.77
56	SAN DIEGO	2,424,665	429.33	17.71	16.03	19.38
57	LOS ANGELES	7,866,468	1,649.00	20.96	19.95	21.97
58	SAN FRANCISCO	704,129	482.00	68.45	62.34	74.56

TABLE 16: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported tuberculosis cases for California was 9.18 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported tuberculosis case for every 10,898 persons. This rate was based on a 2001 to 2003 three-year average reported number of cases of 3,242.67 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 20.72 in San Francisco County to 3.91 in San Bernardino County, a difference in rates by a factor of 5.3 to 1. Ten counties reported no new incidence of tuberculosis during the three-year period.

Thirteen counties (none with reliable case rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 1.00 tuberculosis case per 100,000 population. The statewide tuberculosis crude case rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the case rate is based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Division of Communicable Disease Control.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 16
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	SISKIYOU	44,628	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	AMADOR	36,637	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	LASSEN	34,129	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	PLUMAS	21,117	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	MARIPOSA	17,589	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
6	MONO	13,441	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
7	TRINITY	13,271	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
8	MODOC	9,400	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
9	SIERRA	3,524	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
10	ALPINE	1,292	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
11	TUOLUMNE	56,545	0.33	0.59 *	0.00	2.59
12	NEVADA	96,045	0.67	0.69 *	0.00	2.36
13	CALAVERAS	42,524	0.33	0.78 *	0.00	3.44
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				1.00		
14	DEL NORTE	27,982	0.33	1.19 *	0.00	5.24
15	EL DORADO	165,463	2.67	1.61 *	0.00	3.55
16	LAKE	61,352	1.00	1.63 *	0.00	4.82
17	BUTTE	209,770	4.00	1.91 *	0.04	3.78
18	PLACER	273,338	6.00	2.20 *	0.44	3.95
19	TEHAMA	57,649	1.33	2.31 *	0.00	6.24
20	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	7.33	2.83 *	0.78	4.88
21	SONOMA	470,723	13.33	2.83 *	1.31	4.35
22	SHASTA	172,130	5.33	3.10 *	0.47	5.73
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	8.33	3.26 *	1.05	5.48
24	INYO	18,456	0.67	3.61 *	0.00	12.28
25	GLENN	26,969	1.00	3.71 *	0.00	10.98
26	NAPA	128,966	5.00	3.88 *	0.48	7.28
27	YOLO	180,193	7.00	3.88 *	1.01	6.76
28	HUMBOLDT	128,492	5.00	3.89 *	0.48	7.30
29	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	71.00	3.91	3.00	4.82
30	STANISLAUS	477,919	19.00	3.98	2.19	5.76
31	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	69.67	4.14	3.17	5.11
32	TULARE	383,164	16.67	4.35 *	2.26	6.44
33	KINGS	135,123	6.67	4.93 *	1.19	8.68
34	COLUSA	19,635	1.00	5.09 *	0.00	15.08
35	MENDOCINO	88,353	5.00	5.66 *	0.70	10.62
36	MARIN	250,179	14.67	5.86 *	2.86	8.86
37	YUBA	62,788	4.00	6.37 *	0.13	12.61
38	SAN BENITO	55,955	3.67	6.55 *	0.00	13.26
39	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	27.00	6.61	4.12	9.10
40	SUTTER	82,696	5.67	6.85 *	1.21	12.49
41	MERCED	223,904	15.67	7.00 *	3.53	10.46
42	KERN	697,856	51.00	7.31	5.30	9.31
43	SOLANO	411,498	30.33	7.37	4.75	9.99
44	VENTURA	788,282	64.00	8.12	6.13	10.11
45	ORANGE	2,959,646	252.00	8.51	7.46	9.57
46	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	85.00	8.59	6.76	10.41
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	3,242.67	9.18	8.86	9.49
47	SAN MATEO	711,793	65.67	9.23	6.99	11.46
48	MONTEREY	413,819	39.00	9.42	6.47	12.38
49	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	57.33	9.43	6.99	11.87
50	MADERA	129,585	12.33	9.52 *	4.21	14.83
51	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	129.00	9.90	8.19	11.61
52	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	1,078.67	10.91	10.26	11.56
53	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	324.67	11.03	9.83	12.23
54	FRESNO	836,207	103.67	12.40	10.01	14.78
55	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	199.33	13.40	11.54	15.25
56	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	231.67	13.49	11.75	15.23
57	IMPERIAL	149,360	26.33	17.63	10.90	24.36
58	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	163.33	20.72	17.54	23.90

TABLE 17: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF CHLAMYDIA, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported chlamydia cases for California was 310.28 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported chlamydia case for every 322 persons. This rate was based on a 2001 to 2003 three-year average reported number of cases of 109,650.67 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 549.11 in Fresno County to 72.90 in Calaveras County, a difference in rates by a factor of 7.5 to 1.

Prevalence data are not available in California to evaluate the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 3 percent testing positive in the population aged 15 to 24 years.

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

- * Case rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the case rate is based on no (zero) cases.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero cases.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Division of Communicable Disease Control.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 17
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF CHLAMYDIA
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				SEE COMMENT		
1	MONO	13,441	6.33	47.12 *	10.42	83.82
2	PLUMAS	21,117	12.67	59.98 *	26.95	93.02
3	SIERRA	3,524	2.33	66.21 *	0.00	151.17
4	MARIPOSA	17,589	11.67	66.33 *	28.27	104.39
5	TRINITY	13,271	9.33	70.33 *	25.21	115.45
6	CALAVERAS	42,524	31.00	72.90	47.24	98.56
7	AMADOR	36,637	28.00	76.43	48.12	104.73
8	MODOC	9,400	8.00	85.11 *	26.13	144.08
9	NAPA	128,966	118.67	92.01	75.46	108.57
10	PLACER	273,338	277.33	101.46	89.52	113.40
11	TUOLUMNE	56,545	58.67	103.75	77.20	130.30
12	INYO	18,456	19.33	104.75	58.06	151.45
13	NEVADA	96,045	103.67	107.94	87.16	128.71
14	DEL NORTE	27,982	30.33	108.40	69.83	146.98
15	LASSEN	34,129	37.00	108.41	73.48	143.34
16	EL DORADO	165,463	182.33	110.20	94.20	126.19
17	MARIN	250,179	279.00	111.52	98.43	124.61
18	ALPINE	1,292	1.67	129.00 *	0.00	324.85
19	COLUSA	19,635	26.33	134.11	82.89	185.34
20	SONOMA	470,723	641.33	136.24	125.70	146.79
21	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	426.33	166.90	151.05	182.74
22	SISKIYOU	44,628	76.33	171.04	132.67	209.41
23	GLENN	26,969	48.33	179.22	128.69	229.74
24	VENTURA	788,282	1,415.67	179.59	170.23	188.94
25	SAN BENITO	55,955	101.33	181.10	145.84	216.36
26	LAKE	61,352	111.67	182.01	148.25	215.77
27	YOLO	180,193	330.00	183.14	163.38	202.90
28	TEHAMA	57,649	106.67	185.03	149.91	220.14
29	SAN MATEO	711,793	1,337.00	187.84	177.77	197.90
30	SUTTER	82,696	163.67	197.91	177.59	228.24
31	ORANGE	2,959,646	5,932.00	200.43	195.33	205.53
32	MENDOCINO	88,353	178.33	201.84	172.22	231.47
33	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	561.00	216.47	198.55	234.38
34	BUTTE	209,770	460.33	219.45	199.40	239.49
35	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	3,785.67	225.01	217.85	232.18
36	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	961.67	235.43	220.55	250.31
37	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	2,449.33	247.46	237.66	257.26
38	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	4,382.67	255.24	247.69	262.80
39	HUMBOLDT	128,492	329.33	256.31	228.62	283.99
40	SHASTA	172,130	494.33	287.19	261.87	312.50
41	STANISLAUS	477,919	1,375.67	287.85	272.63	303.06
42	MONTEREY	413,819	1,192.67	288.21	271.85	304.57
43	MERCED	223,904	662.00	295.66	273.14	318.19
44	IMPERIAL	149,360	445.67	298.38	270.68	326.09
45	MADERA	129,585	393.67	303.79	273.78	333.80
46	YUBA	62,788	193.00	307.38	264.02	350.75
47	SOLANO	411,498	1,267.67	308.06	291.10	325.02
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	109,650.67	310.28	308.45	312.12
48	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	4,934.00	331.57	322.32	340.82
49	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	9,874.67	335.35	328.74	341.96
50	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	6,139.67	338.01	329.56	346.47
51	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	4,819.67	369.99	359.54	380.44
52	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	2,287.33	376.27	360.85	391.69
53	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	37,565.33	379.86	376.02	383.70
54	KINGS	135,123	525.33	388.78	355.54	422.03
55	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	3,236.00	410.51	396.36	424.65
56	TULARE	383,164	1,588.67	414.62	394.23	435.01
57	KERN	697,856	3,021.33	432.95	417.51	448.38
58	FRESNO	836,207	4,591.67	549.11	533.22	564.99

Comment: Prevalence data for specified age groups are not available in California.

**TABLE 18: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SYPHILIS, 2001-2003**

**RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
25	BUTTE	209,770	0.33	0.16 *	0.00	0.70
26	EL DORADO	165,463	0.33	0.20 *	0.00	0.89
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				0.20		
27	VENTURA	788,282	1.67	0.21 *	0.00	0.53
28	MADERA	129,585	0.33	0.26 *	0.00	1.13
29	NAPA	128,966	0.33	0.26 *	0.00	1.14
30	TULARE	383,164	1.00	0.26 *	0.00	0.77
31	SAN LUIS OBISPO	255,449	1.00	0.39 *	0.00	1.16
32	SOLANO	411,498	1.67	0.41 *	0.00	1.02
33	IMPERIAL	149,360	0.67	0.45 *	0.00	1.52
34	PLACER	273,338	1.33	0.49 *	0.00	1.32
35	SANTA BARBARA	408,471	2.00	0.49 *	0.00	1.17
36	YUBA	62,788	0.33	0.53 *	0.00	2.33
37	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	9.67	0.53 *	0.20	0.87
38	YOLO	180,193	1.00	0.55 *	0.00	1.64
39	FRESNO	836,207	5.00	0.60 *	0.07	1.12
40	SAN JOAQUIN	607,896	4.00	0.66 *	0.01	1.30
41	MERCED	223,904	1.67	0.74 *	0.00	1.87
42	MONTEREY	413,819	3.33	0.81 *	0.00	1.67
43	SACRAMENTO	1,302,647	10.67	0.82 *	0.33	1.31
44	STANISLAUS	477,919	4.00	0.84 *	0.02	1.66
45	KERN	697,856	6.67	0.96 *	0.23	1.68
46	ORANGE	2,959,646	36.00	1.22	0.82	1.61
47	KINGS	135,123	1.67	1.23 *	0.00	3.11
48	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	13.67	1.38 *	0.65	2.11
49	SANTA CRUZ	259,164	3.67	1.41 *	0.00	2.86
50	MARIN	250,179	4.33	1.73 *	0.10	3.36
51	SANTA CLARA	1,717,059	31.33	1.82	1.19	2.46
52	SAN MATEO	711,793	13.33	1.87 *	0.87	2.88
53	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	58.33	1.98	1.47	2.49
54	SONOMA	470,723	9.33	1.98 *	0.71	3.25
55	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	40.00	2.69	1.86	3.52
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	960.00	2.72	2.54	2.89
56	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	49.33	2.93	2.11	3.75
57	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	380.00	3.84	3.46	4.23
58	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	262.00	33.24	29.21	37.26

The crude case rate of reported primary and secondary syphilis cases for California was 2.72 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported syphilis case for every 36,811 persons. This rate was based on a 2001 to 2003 three-year average reported number of cases of 960.00 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002.

Table 18 shows only those counties where at least one case was reported. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 33.24 in San Francisco County to 1.22 in Orange County, a difference in rates by a factor of 27.2 to 1.

Twenty-six counties (none with reliable case rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than .20 syphilis cases per 100,000 population. Twenty-four counties (not shown on Table 18) had no reported cases during the three-year period. The statewide syphilis crude case rate did not meet the national objective.

(See Table 16 for Notes and Data Sources footnote.)

TABLE 19: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF MEASLES, 2001-2003

**RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 POPULATION	2001-2003 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				0.00		
47	SAN BERNARDINO	1,816,398	0.33	0.02 *	0.00	0.08
48	RIVERSIDE	1,682,408	0.33	0.02 *	0.00	0.09
49	LOS ANGELES	9,889,170	3.33	0.03 *	0.00	0.07
	CALIFORNIA	35,338,807	16.67	0.05 *	0.02	0.07
50	ALAMEDA	1,488,074	1.00	0.07 *	0.00	0.20
51	CONTRA COSTA	989,807	0.67	0.07 *	0.00	0.23
52	SAN DIEGO	2,944,585	2.00	0.07 *	0.00	0.16
53	ORANGE	2,959,646	2.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.18
54	MONTEREY	413,819	0.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.35
55	VENTURA	788,282	0.67	0.08 *	0.00	0.29
56	SAN MATEO	711,793	0.67	0.09 *	0.00	0.32
57	MARIN	250,179	0.67	0.27 *	0.00	0.91
58	SAN FRANCISCO	788,292	4.33	0.55 *	0.03	1.07

The crude case rate of reported measles cases for California was 0.05 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported measles case for every 2,119,904 persons. Table 19 shows only those counties where at least one case was reported. This rate was based on a 2001 to 2003 three-year average reported number of cases of 16.67 and a population of 35,338,807 as of July 1, 2002. Of the 58 counties, none had a "reliable" rate.

The Healthy People 2010 National Objective for incidence of reported measles cases is zero cases, which is equivalent to a case rate of 0.00 per 100,000 population.

Forty-six counties (not shown on Table 19) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no reported cases of measles during the three-year period. Many of the remaining counties were so close to zero, that for all practical purposes, these counties have met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective as well.

(See Table 16 for Notes and Data Sources footnote.)

TABLE 20A: INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS, 2000 to 2002

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.5 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 183 births. This rate was based on the 2,890.0 infant deaths among 529,339.0 live births, the three-year average for the years 2000 to 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 7.5 in San Bernardino County to 4.0 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.9 to 1.

Twenty counties (5 with reliable rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births. The statewide infant death rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's first listed race. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2000 to 2002.

**TABLE 20A
 INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS
 RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
 CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2000-2002**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	MODOC	70.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	20.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	10.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	NEVADA	803.3	1.3	1.7 *	0.0	4.5
5	SISKIYOU	416.7	1.0	2.4 *	0.0	7.1
6	GLENN	399.7	1.0	2.5 *	0.0	7.4
7	MARIN	2,820.3	8.0	2.8 *	0.9	4.8
8	TRINITY	101.0	0.3	3.3 *	0.0	14.5
9	SUTTER	1,214.3	4.7	3.8 *	0.4	7.3
10	AMADOR	253.0	1.0	4.0 *	0.0	11.7
11	SANTA CLARA	27,249.0	108.3	4.0	3.2	4.7
12	COLUSA	331.7	1.3	4.0 *	0.0	10.8
13	NAPA	1,544.3	6.3	4.1 *	0.9	7.3
14	SANTA CRUZ	3,437.0	14.3	4.2 *	2.0	6.3
15	SAN BENITO	924.7	4.0	4.3 *	0.1	8.6
16	SAN FRANCISCO	8,416.7	36.7	4.4	2.9	5.8
17	SAN MATEO	10,266.7	45.3	4.4	3.1	5.7
18	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,413.3	10.7	4.4 *	1.8	7.1
19	CONTRA COSTA	13,216.7	59.3	4.5	3.3	5.6
20	SONOMA	5,678.3	25.7	4.5	2.8	6.3
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
21	SANTA BARBARA	5,664.0	27.0	4.8	3.0	6.6
22	ORANGE	45,756.7	220.0	4.8	4.2	5.4
23	ALAMEDA	22,000.7	107.0	4.9	3.9	5.8
24	EL DORADO	1,698.0	8.7	5.1 *	1.7	8.5
25	IMPERIAL	2,601.3	13.3	5.1 *	2.4	7.9
26	VENTURA	11,568.0	59.7	5.2	3.8	6.5
27	SAN DIEGO	43,998.0	233.0	5.3	4.6	6.0
28	BUTTE	2,259.3	12.0	5.3 *	2.3	8.3
29	LOS ANGELES	154,049.0	824.3	5.4	5.0	5.7
30	TUOLUMNE	436.0	2.3	5.4 *	0.0	12.2
CALIFORNIA		529,339.0	2,890.0	5.5	5.3	5.7
31	SOLANO	5,835.7	32.7	5.6	3.7	7.5
32	DEL NORTE	293.0	1.7	5.7 *	0.0	14.3
33	MERCED	3,952.0	22.7	5.7	3.4	8.1
34	KINGS	2,206.0	12.7	5.7 *	2.6	8.9
35	PLACER	3,212.3	18.7	5.8 *	3.2	8.4
36	MONTEREY	7,066.7	41.3	5.8	4.1	7.6
37	TEHAMA	678.0	4.0	5.9 *	0.1	11.7
38	SACRAMENTO	18,788.0	111.7	5.9	4.8	7.0
39	RIVERSIDE	25,635.7	155.7	6.1	5.1	7.0
40	CALAVERAS	323.3	2.0	6.2 *	0.0	14.8
41	YOLO	2,317.0	14.3	6.2 *	3.0	9.4
42	FRESNO	14,440.0	92.7	6.4	5.1	7.7
43	TULARE	7,331.0	47.3	6.5	4.6	8.3
44	MADERA	2,147.0	14.0	6.5 *	3.1	9.9
45	LAKE	609.3	4.0	6.6 *	0.1	13.0
46	KERN	11,872.7	80.7	6.8	5.3	8.3
47	SHASTA	1,911.7	13.0	6.8 *	3.1	10.5
48	HUMBOLDT	1,430.7	10.0	7.0 *	2.7	11.3
49	STANISLAUS	7,585.3	56.3	7.4	5.5	9.4
50	SAN JOAQUIN	9,859.7	73.3	7.4	5.7	9.1
51	SAN BERNARDINO	29,188.0	219.0	7.5	6.5	8.5
52	INYO	173.3	1.3	7.7 *	0.0	20.7
53	YUBA	1,078.0	8.7	8.0 *	2.7	13.4
54	MENDOCINO	1,074.7	8.7	8.1 *	2.7	13.4
55	PLUMAS	160.0	1.3	8.3 *	0.0	22.5
56	MONO	145.0	1.3	9.2 *	0.0	24.8
57	MARIPOSA	136.3	1.3	9.8 *	0.0	26.4
58	LASSEN	269.7	3.0	11.1 *	0.0	23.7

TABLE 20B: ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER INFANT MORTALITY, 2000 to 2002

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The Asian/Pacific Islander birth cohort infant death rate for California was 4.4 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 226 births. This rate was based on the 277.7 infant deaths among 62,626.7 live births, the three-year average for the years 2000 to 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 5.3 in San Diego County to 2.9 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

Thirty-four counties (4 with reliable rates) and California as a whole met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 Asian/Pacific Islander infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's first listed race. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2000 to 2002.

**TABLE 20B
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2000-2002**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	SANTA CRUZ	103.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	IMPERIAL	33.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	SAN BENITO	24.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	NEVADA	16.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	MENDOCINO	15.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	DEL NORTE	11.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	LAKE	10.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	SISKIYOU	6.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	TUOLUMNE	5.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	AMADOR	5.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	TEHAMA	5.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	CALAVERAS	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
13	COLUSA	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
14	INYO	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
15	MONO	3.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
16	TRINITY	1.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
17	MARIPOSA	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
18	PLUMAS	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
19	MODOC	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
20	ALPINE	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
21	SIERRA	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
22	BUTTE	131.0	0.3	2.5 *	0.0	11.2
23	STANISLAUS	385.0	1.0	2.6 *	0.0	7.7
24	SANTA CLARA	8,971.7	26.3	2.9	1.8	4.1
25	SAN FRANCISCO	2,772.0	8.3	3.0 *	1.0	5.0
26	MARIN	212.7	0.7	3.1 *	0.0	10.7
27	TULARE	195.3	0.7	3.4 *	0.0	11.6
28	VENTURA	672.7	2.3	3.5 *	0.0	7.9
29	SOLANO	900.7	3.3	3.7 *	0.0	7.7
30	ALAMEDA	5,827.3	21.7	3.7	2.2	5.3
31	SAN MATEO	2,678.0	10.7	4.0 *	1.6	6.4
32	FRESNO	1,253.7	5.0	4.0 *	0.5	7.5
33	LOS ANGELES	15,954.0	69.7	4.4	3.3	5.4
34	ORANGE	6,576.7	29.0	4.4	2.8	6.0
CALIFORNIA		62,626.7	277.7	4.4	3.9	5.0
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
35	NAPA	67.0	0.3	5.0 *	0.0	21.9
36	SAN JOAQUIN	1,352.0	7.0	5.2 *	1.3	9.0
37	SAN DIEGO	4,690.0	25.0	5.3	3.2	7.4
38	CONTRA COSTA	1,784.3	9.7	5.4 *	2.0	8.8
39	SAN BERNARDINO	1,500.0	8.3	5.6 *	1.8	9.3
40	SACRAMENTO	2,788.0	16.3	5.9 *	3.0	8.7
41	YUBA	109.3	0.7	6.1 *	0.0	20.7
42	YOLO	216.3	1.3	6.2 *	0.0	16.6
43	MONTEREY	378.0	2.3	6.2 *	0.0	14.1
44	SONOMA	295.3	2.0	6.8 *	0.0	16.2
45	SANTA BARBARA	239.3	1.7	7.0 *	0.0	17.5
46	KINGS	83.3	0.7	8.0 *	0.0	27.2
47	RIVERSIDE	1,038.7	8.3	8.0 *	2.6	13.5
48	KERN	404.0	3.3	8.3 *	0.0	17.1
49	MERCED	256.7	2.3	9.1 *	0.0	20.8
50	SUTTER	176.7	1.7	9.4 *	0.0	23.8
51	EL DORADO	69.0	0.7	9.7 *	0.0	32.9
52	HUMBOLDT	34.3	0.3	9.7 *	0.0	42.7
53	PLACER	164.7	2.3	14.2 *	0.0	32.4
54	MADERA	23.3	0.3	14.3 *	0.0	62.8
55	SAN LUIS OBISPO	83.3	1.3	16.0 *	0.0	43.2
56	GLENN	14.0	0.3	23.8 *	0.0	104.6
57	SHASTA	62.3	1.7	26.7 *	0.0	67.3
58	LASSEN	7.7	0.7	87.0 *	0.0	295.7

TABLE 20C: BLACK INFANT MORTALITY, 2000 to 2002

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The Black birth cohort infant death rate for California was 11.6 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 86 births. This rate was based on the 378.7 deaths among the 32,541.7 live births, the three-year average for the years 2000 to 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate for Blacks ranged from 14.7 in San Bernardino County to 10.5 in Alameda County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.4 to 1.

Twenty-nine counties (none with reliable rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births. The statewide Black infant death rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's first listed race. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2000 to 2002.

TABLE 20C
BLACK INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2000-2002

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	MADERA	46.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SHASTA	22.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	SUTTER	21.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	SAN LUIS OBISPO	19.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	LAKE	14.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	EL DORADO	8.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	SAN BENITO	5.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	SISKIYOU	5.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	LASSEN	4.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	MENDOCINO	4.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	CALAVERAS	2.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	TEHAMA	2.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
13	AMADOR	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
14	DEL NORTE	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
15	TUOLUMNE	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
16	GLENN	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
17	MARIPOSA	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
18	NEVADA	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
19	MONO	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
20	PLUMAS	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
21	COLUSA	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
22	INYO	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
23	TRINITY	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
24	ALPINE	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
25	MODOC	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
26	SIERRA	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
27	SAN MATEO	249.3	0.7	2.7 *	0.0	9.1
28	SANTA CLARA	576.0	2.0	3.5 *	0.0	8.3
29	SANTA BARBARA	85.0	0.3	3.9 *	0.0	17.2
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
30	KINGS	111.7	0.7	6.0 *	0.0	20.3
31	YOLO	47.0	0.3	7.1 *	0.0	31.2
32	VENTURA	177.0	1.3	7.5 *	0.0	20.3
33	CONTRA COSTA	1,293.3	10.7	8.2 *	3.3	13.2
34	SOLANO	851.3	8.0	9.4 *	2.9	15.9
35	RIVERSIDE	1,456.0	14.3	9.8 *	4.7	14.9
36	ALAMEDA	3,124.3	32.7	10.5	6.9	14.0
37	SACRAMENTO	2,134.3	23.0	10.8	6.4	15.2
38	MERCED	117.7	1.3	11.3 *	0.0	30.6
39	SAN FRANCISCO	722.7	8.3	11.5 *	3.7	19.4
40	TULARE	86.0	1.0	11.6 *	0.0	34.4
	CALIFORNIA	32,541.7	378.7	11.6	10.5	12.8
41	MARIN	57.0	0.7	11.7 *	0.0	39.8
42	ORANGE	563.0	6.7	11.8 *	2.9	20.8
43	LOS ANGELES	12,708.7	151.3	11.9	10.0	13.8
44	SONOMA	81.3	1.0	12.3 *	0.0	36.4
45	MONTEREY	133.3	1.7	12.5 *	0.0	31.5
46	STANISLAUS	177.0	2.3	13.2 *	0.0	30.1
47	PLACER	24.7	0.3	13.5 *	0.0	59.4
48	SAN DIEGO	2,520.0	34.7	13.8	9.2	18.3
49	FRESNO	809.3	11.3	14.0 *	5.9	22.2
50	SANTA CRUZ	23.0	0.3	14.5 *	0.0	63.7
51	SAN BERNARDINO	2,700.0	39.7	14.7	10.1	19.3
52	KERN	677.3	10.0	14.8 *	5.6	23.9
53	IMPERIAL	22.3	0.3	14.9 *	0.0	65.6
54	SAN JOAQUIN	743.3	11.3	15.2 *	6.4	24.1
55	BUTTE	42.7	0.7	15.6 *	0.0	53.1
56	YUBA	38.0	1.0	26.3 *	0.0	77.9
57	HUMBOLDT	12.3	0.3	27.0 *	0.0	118.8
58	NAPA	11.0	0.3	30.3 *	0.0	133.2

TABLE 20D: HISPANIC INFANT MORTALITY, 2000 to 2002

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The Hispanic birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.2 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 193 births. This rate was based on the 1,351.7 deaths among 260,669.7 live births, the three-year average for the years 2000 to 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 7.0 in San Joaquin County to 4.0 in Alameda County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

Sixteen counties (1 with a reliable rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births. The statewide Hispanic infant death rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's first listed race. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2000 to 2002.

**TABLE 20D
HISPANIC INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2000-2002**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	TUOLUMNE	54.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	CALAVERAS	36.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	MODOC	10.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	TRINITY	8.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	ALPINE	1.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	SIERRA	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	MARIN	612.0	1.0	1.6 *	0.0	4.8
8	GLENN	176.7	0.3	1.9 *	0.0	8.3
9	HUMBOLDT	167.0	0.3	2.0 *	0.0	8.8
10	NEVADA	112.0	0.3	3.0 *	0.0	13.1
11	TEHAMA	190.7	0.7	3.5 *	0.0	11.9
12	SONOMA	2,037.0	7.7	3.8 *	1.1	6.4
13	SACRAMENTO	4,576.0	17.7	3.9 *	2.1	5.7
14	CONTRA COSTA	3,865.0	15.0	3.9 *	1.9	5.8
15	SANTA CRUZ	1,756.7	7.0	4.0 *	1.0	6.9
16	ALAMEDA	6,381.0	25.7	4.0	2.5	5.6
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
17	SAN DIEGO	19,433.3	90.3	4.6	3.7	5.6
18	SUTTER	429.3	2.0	4.7 *	0.0	11.1
19	SANTA BARBARA	3,407.3	16.0	4.7 *	2.4	7.0
20	COLUSA	212.0	1.0	4.7 *	0.0	14.0
21	SOLANO	1,693.3	8.0	4.7 *	1.5	8.0
22	SISKIYOU	69.3	0.3	4.8 *	0.0	21.1
23	SANTA CLARA	9,433.3	46.3	4.9	3.5	6.3
24	LOS ANGELES	96,259.0	476.7	5.0	4.5	5.4
25	IMPERIAL	2,275.3	11.3	5.0 *	2.1	7.9
26	SAN BENITO	596.3	3.0	5.0 *	0.0	10.7
27	NAPA	719.7	3.7	5.1 *	0.0	10.3
28	SAN MATEO	3,325.0	17.0	5.1 *	2.7	7.5
29	ORANGE	22,544.0	116.7	5.2	4.2	6.1
CALIFORNIA		260,669.7	1,351.7	5.2	4.9	5.5
30	YOLO	959.0	5.0	5.2 *	0.6	9.8
31	BUTTE	435.0	2.3	5.4 *	0.0	12.2
32	SAN LUIS OBISPO	735.0	4.0	5.4 *	0.1	10.8
33	MERCED	2,438.3	13.3	5.5 *	2.5	8.4
34	VENTURA	5,779.0	32.0	5.5	3.6	7.5
35	MONO	60.0	0.3	5.6 *	0.0	24.4
36	RIVERSIDE	14,201.0	79.0	5.6	4.3	6.8
37	MADERA	1,465.0	8.3	5.7 *	1.8	9.6
38	KERN	6,655.7	38.0	5.7	3.9	7.5
39	FRESNO	8,622.0	49.3	5.7	4.1	7.3
40	SAN FRANCISCO	1,837.3	10.7	5.8 *	2.3	9.3
41	MONTEREY	4,977.3	29.7	6.0	3.8	8.1
42	TULARE	5,084.7	30.7	6.0	3.9	8.2
43	KINGS	1,227.7	7.7	6.2 *	1.8	10.7
44	INYO	52.0	0.3	6.4 *	0.0	28.2
45	SAN BERNARDINO	15,696.0	101.0	6.4	5.2	7.7
46	EL DORADO	305.0	2.0	6.6 *	0.0	15.6
47	STANISLAUS	3,703.7	24.3	6.6	4.0	9.2
48	SAN JOAQUIN	4,430.7	31.0	7.0	4.5	9.5
49	PLACER	516.7	3.7	7.1 *	0.0	14.4
50	YUBA	273.0	2.0	7.3 *	0.0	17.5
51	MENDOCINO	364.3	3.3	9.1 *	0.0	19.0
52	LASSEN	36.0	0.3	9.3 *	0.0	40.7
53	LAKE	127.3	1.3	10.5 *	0.0	28.2
54	AMADOR	31.0	0.3	10.8 *	0.0	47.3
55	DEL NORTE	56.0	0.7	11.9 *	0.0	40.5
56	SHASTA	194.3	2.3	12.0 *	0.0	27.4
57	PLUMAS	12.0	0.3	27.8 *	0.0	122.1
58	MARIPOSA	11.7	0.3	28.6 *	0.0	125.6

TABLE 20E: WHITE INFANT MORTALITY, 2000 to 2002

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Birth Cohort Infant Death Rate

The White birth cohort infant death rate for California was 4.8 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 209 births. This rate was based on the 804.0 deaths among 167,734.3 live births, the three-year average for the years 2000 to 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 8.1 in Stanislaus County to 3.2 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.5 to 1.

Twenty-eight counties (5 with reliable rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births. The statewide White infant death rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Infant deaths are deaths that occurred during the first year of life. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. The birth cohort infant death rate is based upon births during a calendar year (a cohort) tracked individually for 365 days to determine whether or not death occurred. Thus, the deaths in the numerator of a birth cohort infant death rate are the records of the same infants as the births in the denominator. Birth cohort infant death rates, like population crude death rates, show the true risk of dying, and also, like age-adjusted population death rates, allow direct comparisons between counties.

- * Death rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.
- + Standard error is indeterminate because the death rate is based on no (zero) deaths.
- Upper and lower limits at the 95 percent confidence level are not calculated for zero deaths.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's first listed race. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2000 to 2002.

**TABLE 20E
WHITE INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2000-2002**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	MODOC	56.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	19.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	5.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	NEVADA	667.7	1.0	1.5 *	0.0	4.4
5	GLENN	205.3	0.3	1.6 *	0.0	7.1
6	SUTTER	575.7	1.0	1.7 *	0.0	5.1
7	SISKIYOU	313.0	0.7	2.1 *	0.0	7.2
8	NAPA	735.3	2.0	2.7 *	0.0	6.5
9	MARIN	1,908.7	5.3	2.8 *	0.4	5.2
10	SAN FRANCISCO	3,032.7	8.7	2.9 *	1.0	4.8
11	COLUSA	105.7	0.3	3.2 *	0.0	13.9
12	SANTA CRUZ	1,475.7	4.7	3.2 *	0.3	6.0
13	AMADOR	207.3	0.7	3.2 *	0.0	10.9
14	SANTA CLARA	7,660.3	24.7	3.2	1.9	4.5
15	SAN BENITO	293.7	1.0	3.4 *	0.0	10.1
16	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1,554.3	5.3	3.4 *	0.5	6.3
17	DEL NORTE	193.7	0.7	3.4 *	0.0	11.7
18	SAN MATEO	3,906.3	13.7	3.5 *	1.6	5.4
19	CONTRA COSTA	5,902.3	21.3	3.6	2.1	5.1
20	VENTURA	4,330.7	16.0	3.7 *	1.9	5.5
21	ALAMEDA	6,382.7	24.0	3.8	2.3	5.3
22	TRINITY	87.3	0.3	3.8 *	0.0	16.8
23	LOS ANGELES	28,415.7	116.7	4.1	3.4	4.9
24	ORANGE	15,760.7	66.0	4.2	3.2	5.2
25	SANTA BARBARA	1,883.0	8.0	4.2 *	1.3	7.2
26	SONOMA	3,179.3	13.7	4.3 *	2.0	6.6
27	EL DORADO	1,296.7	5.7	4.4 *	0.8	8.0
28	KINGS	756.3	3.3	4.4 *	0.0	9.1
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
29	SAN DIEGO	16,812.7	77.0	4.6	3.6	5.6
30	MONTEREY	1,526.3	7.0	4.6 *	1.2	8.0
31	MERCED	1,124.0	5.3	4.7 *	0.7	8.8
CALIFORNIA		167,734.3	804.0	4.8	4.5	5.1
32	PLACER	2,480.0	12.0	4.8 *	2.1	7.6
33	BUTTE	1,611.3	8.0	5.0 *	1.5	8.4
34	SOLANO	2,341.3	12.3	5.3 *	2.3	8.2
35	LAKE	423.7	2.3	5.5 *	0.0	12.6
36	MENDOCINO	603.3	3.3	5.5 *	0.0	11.5
37	SHASTA	1,560.3	8.7	5.6 *	1.9	9.3
38	SACRAMENTO	9,092.3	51.0	5.6	4.1	7.1
39	RIVERSIDE	8,725.0	50.7	5.8	4.2	7.4
40	CALAVERAS	273.0	1.7	6.1 *	0.0	15.4
41	TUOLUMNE	366.3	2.3	6.4 *	0.0	14.5
42	IMPERIAL	258.0	1.7	6.5 *	0.0	16.3
43	HUMBOLDT	1,074.0	7.0	6.5 *	1.7	11.3
44	YOLO	1,072.3	7.0	6.5 *	1.7	11.4
45	FRESNO	3,613.0	24.3	6.7	4.1	9.4
46	INYO	96.0	0.7	6.9 *	0.0	23.6
47	PLUMAS	142.0	1.0	7.0 *	0.0	20.8
48	KERN	4,057.7	28.7	7.1	4.5	9.7
49	SAN JOAQUIN	3,251.0	23.3	7.2	4.3	10.1
50	TEHAMA	463.3	3.3	7.2 *	0.0	14.9
51	SAN BERNARDINO	9,101.7	66.0	7.3	5.5	9.0
52	TULARE	1,892.7	14.0	7.4 *	3.5	11.3
53	YUBA	638.3	5.0	7.8 *	1.0	14.7
54	LASSEN	211.7	1.7	7.9 *	0.0	19.8
55	STANISLAUS	3,232.3	26.3	8.1	5.0	11.3
56	MARIPOSA	115.0	1.0	8.7 *	0.0	25.7
57	MADERA	588.0	5.3	9.1 *	1.4	16.8
58	MONO	77.0	1.0	13.0 *	0.0	38.4

TABLE 21: LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Percentage of Three-Year Average Low Birthweight Infants

The percentage of low birthweight infants for California was 6.4 per 100 live births, a percent equivalent to one in 16 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of low birthweight infants of 34,238.0 and a three-year average total number of live births of 532,472.3 from 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of low birthweight infants ranged from 7.4 in Siskiyou County to 4.4 in Tuolumne County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 1.7 to 1.

Six counties (2 with reliable percentages) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of an incidence of no more than 5.0 percent low birthweight infants. The statewide percentage of low birthweight infants did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

Low birthweight includes infants less than 2500 grams at birth. The average number of live births excludes those births of unknown birthweight.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of low birthweight infants (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

TABLE 21
LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LOW BIRTHWEIGHT PERCENTAGE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2001-2003 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	LOW BIRTHWEIGHT NUMBER	LOW BIRTHWEIGHT PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	12.3	0.3	2.7 *	0.0	11.9
2	COLUSA	331.7	11.7	3.5 *	1.5	5.5
3	DEL NORTE	287.3	12.3	4.3 *	1.9	6.7
4	TUOLUMNE	449.7	20.0	4.4	2.5	6.4
5	SAN BENITO	922.3	43.3	4.7	3.3	6.1
6	CALAVERAS	328.0	16.3	5.0 *	2.6	7.4
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				5.0		
7	SONOMA	5,742.7	296.3	5.2	4.6	5.7
8	SANTA CRUZ	3,419.0	178.0	5.2	4.4	6.0
9	GLENN	415.0	21.7	5.2	3.0	7.4
10	HUMBOLDT	1,454.7	77.0	5.3	4.1	6.5
11	MENDOCINO	1,080.3	57.7	5.3	4.0	6.7
12	IMPERIAL	2,722.3	145.3	5.3	4.5	6.2
13	AMADOR	274.3	14.7	5.3 *	2.6	8.1
14	YOLO	2,378.3	127.3	5.4	4.4	6.3
15	NAPA	1,604.0	86.3	5.4	4.2	6.5
16	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,474.7	135.3	5.5	4.5	6.4
17	TEHAMA	701.7	38.7	5.5	3.8	7.2
18	PLACER	3,409.0	188.7	5.5	4.7	6.3
19	NEVADA	824.0	46.3	5.6	4.0	7.2
20	INYO	183.7	10.3	5.6 *	2.2	9.1
21	SIERRA	23.7	1.3	5.6 *	0.0	15.2
22	SHASTA	1,988.3	112.3	5.6	4.6	6.7
23	TULARE	7,446.7	424.3	5.7	5.2	6.2
24	MONTEREY	7,238.7	417.7	5.8	5.2	6.3
25	BUTTE	2,321.3	134.0	5.8	4.8	6.7
26	SUTTER	1,276.0	74.3	5.8	4.5	7.1
27	LASSEN	281.3	16.7	5.9 *	3.1	8.8
28	ORANGE	45,218.0	2,705.7	6.0	5.8	6.2
29	RIVERSIDE	26,700.3	1,613.7	6.0	5.7	6.3
30	SAN DIEGO	44,359.0	2,702.7	6.1	5.9	6.3
31	VENTURA	11,647.7	710.7	6.1	5.7	6.5
32	KINGS	2,270.0	139.0	6.1	5.1	7.1
33	MARIN	2,822.3	174.7	6.2	5.3	7.1
34	SANTA CLARA	27,043.7	1,690.0	6.2	6.0	6.5
35	EL DORADO	1,738.0	109.0	6.3	5.1	7.4
36	SAN MATEO	10,177.3	640.0	6.3	5.8	6.8
37	MERCED	4,086.7	258.0	6.3	5.5	7.1
38	MADERA	2,208.0	141.0	6.4	5.3	7.4
39	SANTA BARBARA	5,703.3	365.0	6.4	5.7	7.1
40	CONTRA COSTA	13,217.0	850.3	6.4	6.0	6.9
	CALIFORNIA	532,472.3	34,238.0	6.4	6.4	6.5
41	STANISLAUS	7,845.3	511.0	6.5	5.9	7.1
42	SACRAMENTO	19,529.7	1,281.3	6.6	6.2	6.9
43	KERN	12,273.7	811.3	6.6	6.2	7.1
44	SAN JOAQUIN	10,142.0	673.3	6.6	6.1	7.1
45	LAKE	643.0	43.0	6.7	4.7	8.7
46	MARIPOSA	139.3	9.3	6.7 *	2.4	11.0
47	FRESNO	14,819.0	992.7	6.7	6.3	7.1
48	SOLANO	5,810.7	390.3	6.7	6.1	7.4
49	SAN BERNARDINO	29,910.3	2,034.3	6.8	6.5	7.1
50	LOS ANGELES	152,290.3	10,409.7	6.8	6.7	7.0
51	MODOC	73.0	5.0	6.8 *	0.8	12.9
52	ALAMEDA	21,801.3	1,524.3	7.0	6.6	7.3
53	SAN FRANCISCO	8,417.7	598.0	7.1	6.5	7.7
54	PLUMAS	170.0	12.3	7.3 *	3.2	11.3
55	YUBA	1,124.7	82.3	7.3	5.7	8.9
56	SISKIYOU	443.7	32.7	7.4	4.8	9.9
57	MONO	148.7	11.0	7.4 *	3.0	11.8
58	TRINITY	107.7	8.0	7.4 *	2.3	12.6

TABLE 22: BIRTHS TO ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Age-Specific Birth Rate

The age-specific birth rate to adolescents, aged 15 to 19, in California was 41.1 per 1,000 female population, a rate equivalent to approximately one birth for every 24 adolescent females. This rate was based on the 2001 to 2003 average of 50,832.3 births and a female population for the same age group of 1,237,282 as of July 1, 2002.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the age-specific rate ranged from 70.0 in Madera County to 11.0 in Marin County, a difference in rates by a factor of 6.4 to 1.

A Healthy People 2010 National Objective for births to adolescents' aged 15 to 19 has not been established.

Notes:

* Age-specific rate unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-specific birth rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-specific birth rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated birth rate. Precision of the birth rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the birth rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 22
BIRTHS AMONG ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002 FEMALE POPULATION 15-19 YRS OLD	2001-2003 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)	AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED						
1	MARIN	6,566	72.0	11.0	8.4	13.5
2	SIERRA	145	2.0	13.8 *	0.0	32.9
3	ALPINE	60	1.0	16.7 *	0.0	49.3
4	NEVADA	3,607	63.0	17.5	13.2	21.8
5	PLACER	10,058	197.7	19.7	16.9	22.4
6	EL DORADO	6,443	135.0	21.0	17.4	24.5
7	SAN LUIS OBISPO	10,154	216.7	21.3	18.5	24.2
8	YOLO	9,109	200.3	22.0	18.9	25.0
9	MARIPOSA	606	13.3	22.0 *	10.2	33.8
10	CALAVERAS	1,522	34.0	22.3	14.8	29.8
11	MODOC	383	9.0	23.5 *	8.1	38.9
12	PLUMAS	794	18.7	23.5 *	12.8	34.2
13	TUOLUMNE	1,821	43.0	23.6	16.6	30.7
14	CONTRA COSTA	34,566	862.0	24.9	23.3	26.6
15	SAN MATEO	20,414	512.3	25.1	22.9	27.3
16	MONO	398	10.0	25.1 *	9.6	40.7
17	SAN FRANCISCO	14,704	383.7	26.1	23.5	28.7
18	AMADOR	1,080	28.7	26.5	16.8	36.3
19	SONOMA	16,008	432.0	27.0	24.4	29.5
20	HUMBOLDT	5,212	141.0	27.1	22.6	31.5
21	NAPA	4,287	123.0	28.7	23.6	33.8
22	LASSEN	1,101	32.0	29.1	19.0	39.1
23	SANTA CLARA	51,888	1,521.0	29.3	27.8	30.8
24	BUTTE	9,010	276.3	30.7	27.1	34.3
25	ALAMEDA	45,428	1,417.0	31.2	29.6	32.8
26	INYO	692	22.0	31.8	18.5	45.1
27	SANTA CRUZ	9,425	303.7	32.2	28.6	35.8
28	ORANGE	96,839	3,193.0	33.0	31.8	34.1
29	TRINITY	484	16.0	33.1 *	16.9	49.3
30	SISKIYOU	1,774	58.7	33.1	24.6	41.5
31	SOLANO	15,113	522.7	34.6	31.6	37.5
32	VENTURA	28,197	1,030.7	36.6	34.3	38.8
33	SAN DIEGO	98,497	3,792.7	38.5	37.3	39.7
34	SACRAMENTO	47,274	1,838.0	38.9	37.1	40.7
35	MENDOCINO	3,446	138.0	40.0	33.4	46.7
36	SANTA BARBARA	15,053	604.7	40.2	37.0	43.4
37	SAN BENITO	2,179	88.0	40.4	31.9	48.8
38	LAKE	2,188	89.3	40.8	32.4	49.3
	CALIFORNIA	1,237,282	50,832.3	41.1	40.7	41.4
39	SHASTA	6,658	281.0	42.2	37.3	47.1
40	LOS ANGELES	331,262	14,685.7	44.3	43.6	45.0
41	GLENN	1,148	51.3	44.7	32.5	56.9
42	SUTTER	3,349	152.0	45.4	38.2	52.6
43	TEHAMA	2,289	105.3	46.0	37.2	54.8
44	RIVERSIDE	65,863	3,105.3	47.1	45.5	48.8
45	STANISLAUS	20,155	960.3	47.6	44.6	50.7
46	COLUSA	876	42.3	48.3	33.8	62.9
47	SAN BERNARDINO	76,782	3,726.0	48.5	47.0	50.1
48	SAN JOAQUIN	25,079	1,269.7	50.6	47.8	53.4
49	DEL NORTE	1,066	56.0	52.5	38.8	66.3
50	MERCED	10,344	579.7	56.0	51.5	60.6
51	MONTEREY	14,942	878.0	58.8	54.9	62.6
52	FRESNO	35,811	2,182.0	60.9	58.4	63.5
53	IMPERIAL	6,703	408.7	61.0	55.1	66.9
54	KERN	28,898	1,852.0	64.1	61.2	67.0
55	YUBA	2,547	172.7	67.8	57.7	77.9
56	KINGS	4,846	336.3	69.4	62.0	76.8
57	TULARE	17,094	1,193.0	69.8	65.8	73.8
58	MADERA	5,045	353.0	70.0	62.7	77.3

TABLE 23A: PRENATAL CARE NOT BEGUN DURING THE FIRST TRIMESTER OF PREGNANCY, 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked by Percentage of Three-Year Average Late/No Prenatal Care

The percentage of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care for California was 13.6 per 100 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care of 71,220.0 and a three-year average total number of live births of 523,236.3 from 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care ranged from 37.0 in Merced County to 7.6 in Marin County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 4.9 to 1.

Six counties with reliable percentages met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 10.0 percent of live births to mothers with late or no prenatal care. The statewide percentage of mother's with late or no prenatal care did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

The average number of live births excludes those births with unknown prenatal care.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

**TABLE 23A
 PRENATAL CARE NOT BEGUN DURING THE FIRST TRIMESTER OF PREGNANCY
 RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LATE / NO PRENATAL CARE
 CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2001-2003 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	LATE/NO PRENATAL CARE		LOWER	UPPER
			NUMBER	PERCENT		
1	MARIN	2,816.0	213.3	7.6	6.6	8.6
2	SANTA CRUZ	3,398.3	302.3	8.9	7.9	9.9
3	ORANGE	45,090.7	4,176.7	9.3	9.0	9.5
4	ALAMEDA	21,472.0	1,996.0	9.3	8.9	9.7
5	VENTURA	11,627.0	1,108.0	9.5	9.0	10.1
6	TUOLUMNE	449.3	45.0	10.0	7.1	12.9
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				10.0		
7	LOS ANGELES	149,282.7	15,323.0	10.3	10.1	10.4
8	CONTRA COSTA	13,164.3	1,393.7	10.6	10.0	11.1
9	PLACER	3,401.7	367.0	10.8	9.7	11.9
10	SHASTA	1,976.0	222.3	11.3	9.8	12.7
11	AMADOR	272.7	31.7	11.6	7.6	15.7
12	SONOMA	5,685.3	685.3	12.1	11.2	13.0
13	EL DORADO	1,730.7	209.0	12.1	10.4	13.7
14	SAN FRANCISCO	8,365.7	1,030.3	12.3	11.6	13.1
15	SAN MATEO	10,150.7	1,302.7	12.8	12.1	13.5
16	SANTA CLARA	26,353.0	3,539.3	13.4	13.0	13.9
17	SAN DIEGO	43,446.7	5,893.3	13.6	13.2	13.9
	CALIFORNIA	523,236.3	71,220.0	13.6	13.5	13.7
18	FRESNO	14,753.7	2,070.7	14.0	13.4	14.6
19	NEVADA	822.0	128.0	15.6	12.9	18.3
20	TRINITY	107.0	16.7	15.6 *	8.1	23.1
21	PLUMAS	169.7	27.0	15.9	9.9	21.9
22	KERN	10,844.0	1,750.0	16.1	15.4	16.9
23	MONTEREY	6,784.3	1,097.7	16.2	15.2	17.1
24	STANISLAUS	7,705.3	1,261.0	16.4	15.5	17.3
25	RIVERSIDE	26,342.0	4,381.0	16.6	16.1	17.1
26	SIERRA	23.7	4.0	16.9 *	0.3	33.5
27	SAN BERNARDINO	29,300.3	5,068.0	17.3	16.8	17.8
28	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,450.0	431.3	17.6	15.9	19.3
29	TULARE	7,405.3	1,305.0	17.6	16.7	18.6
30	CALAVERAS	327.7	58.7	17.9	13.3	22.5
31	HUMBOLDT	1,432.0	258.3	18.0	15.8	20.2
32	SACRAMENTO	19,414.7	3,523.3	18.1	17.5	18.7
33	DEL NORTE	285.3	52.3	18.3	13.4	23.3
34	TEHAMA	699.3	128.7	18.4	15.2	21.6
35	MODOC	70.0	13.0	18.6 *	8.5	28.7
36	MADERA	2,186.0	412.0	18.8	17.0	20.7
37	SANTA BARBARA	5,674.7	1,089.0	19.2	18.1	20.3
38	SAN BENITO	913.0	179.0	19.6	16.7	22.5
39	LASSEN	280.0	55.3	19.8	14.6	25.0
40	SISKIYOU	439.3	97.0	22.1	17.7	26.5
41	NAPA	1,586.0	352.3	22.2	19.9	24.5
42	IMPERIAL	2,666.7	628.0	23.6	21.7	25.4
43	MONO	147.7	36.0	24.4	16.4	32.3
44	SOLANO	5,722.0	1,412.7	24.7	23.4	26.0
45	YOLO	2,363.3	584.3	24.7	22.7	26.7
46	BUTTE	2,315.0	581.0	25.1	23.1	27.1
47	SAN JOAQUIN	9,960.3	2,624.7	26.4	25.3	27.4
48	LAKE	638.3	170.3	26.7	22.7	30.7
49	MARIPOSA	135.7	36.3	26.8	18.1	35.5
50	KINGS	2,267.0	619.7	27.3	25.2	29.5
51	COLUSA	330.7	98.3	29.7	23.9	35.6
52	GLENN	410.3	129.7	31.6	26.2	37.0
53	ALPINE	12.3	4.0	32.4 *	0.6	64.2
54	SUTTER	1,275.3	417.3	32.7	29.6	35.9
55	INYO	183.3	60.3	32.9	24.6	41.2
56	YUBA	1,123.3	382.3	34.0	30.6	37.4
57	MENDOCINO	1,070.0	385.7	36.0	32.4	39.6
58	MERCED	3,917.0	1,451.0	37.0	35.1	38.9

TABLE 23B: "ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE (ADEQUACY OF PRENATAL CARE UTILIZATION INDEX), 2001-2003

California Counties Ranked By Percentage of Three-Year Average "Adequate/Adequate Plus" Prenatal Care

The percentage of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care for California was 77.7 per 100 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care of 399,945.3 and a three-year average total number of live births of 514,848.7 from 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care ranged from 88.7 in Marin County to 56.4 in Merced County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 1.6 to 1.

None of the 58 counties, irrespective of the "reliability" of their percentages, nor California as a whole, met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of at least 90.0 percent of all live births to mothers who received "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care according to the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index.

Notes:

The average total number of live births excludes "unknown" adequacy of prenatal care. The definition of "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care includes mothers who initiated prenatal care by the fourth month of pregnancy and had greater than or equal to 80 percent of the expected number of prenatal care visits recommended by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

Counties were rank ordered first by decreasing percentage of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003.

TABLE 23B
"ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE (ADEQUACY OF PRENATAL CARE UTILIZATION INDEX)
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE "ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2001-2003 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS CARE		LOWER	UPPER
			NUMBER	PERCENT		
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				90.0		
1	MARIN	2,811.0	2,492.3	88.7	85.2	92.1
2	FRESNO	14,729.3	12,511.7	84.9	83.5	86.4
3	ORANGE	44,944.3	37,551.7	83.6	82.7	84.4
4	VENTURA	11,589.0	9,627.7	83.1	81.4	84.7
5	SAN MATEO	10,147.3	8,381.3	82.6	80.8	84.4
6	LASSEN	279.7	228.7	81.8	71.2	92.4
7	LOS ANGELES	145,422.7	118,255.7	81.3	80.9	81.8
8	ALPINE	12.3	10.0	81.1 *	30.8	100.0
9	ALAMEDA	21,180.3	17,077.0	80.6	79.4	81.8
10	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,438.3	1,946.0	79.8	76.3	83.4
11	SAN FRANCISCO	8,314.0	6,621.7	79.6	77.7	81.6
12	PLACER	3,397.3	2,701.0	79.5	76.5	82.5
13	CONTRA COSTA	13,109.0	10,417.0	79.5	77.9	81.0
14	SANTA CRUZ	3,390.0	2,683.7	79.2	76.2	82.2
15	GLENN	405.7	320.0	78.9	70.2	87.5
16	DEL NORTE	285.0	224.0	78.6	68.3	88.9
CALIFORNIA		514,848.7	399,945.3	77.7	77.4	77.9
17	SHASTA	1,972.3	1,522.3	77.2	73.3	81.1
18	KERN	9,287.0	7,111.3	76.6	74.8	78.4
19	TEHAMA	698.7	534.0	76.4	69.9	82.9
20	SANTA BARBARA	5,659.3	4,323.3	76.4	74.1	78.7
21	MONTEREY	6,688.3	5,102.3	76.3	74.2	78.4
22	MONO	147.3	111.7	75.8	61.7	89.8
23	SAN BERNARDINO	28,471.0	21,543.0	75.7	74.7	76.7
24	BUTTE	2,310.7	1,736.0	75.1	71.6	78.7
25	SIERRA	23.7	17.7	74.6 *	39.8	100.0
26	SANTA CLARA	26,305.7	19,635.7	74.6	73.6	75.7
27	RIVERSIDE	26,245.7	19,566.3	74.6	73.5	75.6
28	SACRAMENTO	19,363.0	14,434.0	74.5	73.3	75.8
29	MADERA	2,181.7	1,609.7	73.8	70.2	77.4
30	TUOLUMNE	449.0	327.0	72.8	64.9	80.7
31	SUTTER	1,275.0	928.3	72.8	68.1	77.5
32	EL DORADO	1,723.0	1,249.7	72.5	68.5	76.5
33	SAN DIEGO	42,899.0	31,066.0	72.4	71.6	73.2
34	TULARE	7,390.7	5,337.0	72.2	70.3	74.2
35	COLUSA	330.7	236.0	71.4	62.3	80.5
36	CALAVERAS	326.7	232.3	71.1	62.0	80.3
37	SONOMA	5,636.0	3,962.3	70.3	68.1	72.5
38	NAPA	1,568.7	1,098.7	70.0	65.9	74.2
39	NEVADA	821.7	573.7	69.8	64.1	75.5
40	SOLANO	5,690.7	3,972.3	69.8	67.6	72.0
41	KINGS	2,263.0	1,577.7	69.7	66.3	73.2
42	AMADOR	272.0	189.3	69.6	59.7	79.5
43	YUBA	1,123.0	779.7	69.4	64.6	74.3
44	SISKIYOU	432.7	296.0	68.4	60.6	76.2
45	INYO	183.0	123.7	67.6	55.7	79.5
46	YOLO	2,361.3	1,587.3	67.2	63.9	70.5
47	HUMBOLDT	1,420.7	949.3	66.8	62.6	71.1
48	PLUMAS	169.7	113.3	66.8	54.5	79.1
49	STANISLAUS	7,512.0	5,016.0	66.8	64.9	68.6
50	IMPERIAL	2,523.3	1,680.3	66.6	63.4	69.8
51	MODOC	70.0	46.3	66.2	47.1	85.2
52	MENDOCINO	1,064.0	703.7	66.1	61.2	71.0
53	LAKE	631.0	415.7	65.9	59.5	72.2
54	SAN JOAQUIN	9,882.0	6,314.7	63.9	62.3	65.5
55	MARIPOSA	134.7	83.3	61.9	48.6	75.2
56	TRINITY	106.7	64.3	60.3	45.6	75.1
57	SAN BENITO	910.3	544.3	59.8	54.8	64.8
58	MERCED	3,868.7	2,180.3	56.4	54.0	58.7

TABLE 24: BREASTFEEDING INITIATION DURING EARLY POSTPARTUM, 2001-2003

Ranked by Three-Year Average Breast Feeding Initiation Percentage

The average number of breastfed infants for California was 83.3 per 100 births where the feeding method was known. This percentage was based on the 420,192.3 breastfed infants among 504,255.0 births with a known feeding method, the three-year average from 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of breastfed infants ranged from 94.6 in Modoc County to 70.8 in Kings County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 1.3 to 1.

Fifty-seven counties (55 with reliable percentages) and California as a whole met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of at least 75.0 percent of all infants breastfed during the early postpartum period.

Notes:

Breastfeeding initiation includes: exclusively breastfed infants; and combination breastfed and formula fed infants. The data include births occurring in a California hospital or birthing center. The average number of total births excludes those of unknown feeding type.

* Percentage unreliable, relative standard error is greater than or equal to 23 percent.

County of residence is derived from the patient's zip code. When the zip code was not present the county of hospital was substituted. Counties were rank ordered first by decreasing percentage of breastfed infants (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of hospital births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of breastfed infants at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program; Epidemiology and Evaluation Section, Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Branch.

**TABLE 24
BREASTFEEDING INITIATION DURING EARLY POSTPARTUM
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BREASTFEEDING INITIATION PERCENTAGE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2001-2003 BIRTHS (AVERAGE) WITH KNOWN FEEDING METHOD			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		TOTAL NUMBER	BREASTFED		LOWER	UPPER
			NUMBER	PERCENT		
1	ALPINE	13.0	13.0	100.0 *	45.6	100.0
2	MODOC	49.7	47.0	94.6	67.6	100.0
3	MARIN	2,750.0	2,588.3	94.1	90.5	97.7
4	SIERRA	15.0	14.0	93.3 *	44.4	100.0
5	SANTA CRUZ	3,541.0	3,292.0	93.0	89.8	96.1
6	SAN MATEO	9,864.3	9,161.3	92.9	91.0	94.8
7	SONOMA	5,374.0	4,979.3	92.7	90.1	95.2
8	NEVADA	739.0	684.3	92.6	85.7	99.5
9	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,375.7	2,183.3	91.9	88.0	95.8
10	DEL NORTE	297.3	272.0	91.5	80.6	100.0
11	SANTA BARBARA	5,471.3	4,999.7	91.4	88.8	93.9
12	PLUMAS	138.0	125.3	90.8	74.9	100.0
13	MONTEREY	6,763.0	6,133.3	90.7	88.4	93.0
14	SISKIYOU	306.7	277.7	90.5	79.9	100.0
15	NAPA	1,510.7	1,366.0	90.4	85.6	95.2
16	SANTA CLARA	26,478.0	23,922.3	90.3	89.2	91.5
17	MONO	136.0	122.7	90.2	74.2	100.0
18	SHASTA	1,877.0	1,692.0	90.1	85.8	94.4
19	TRINITY	95.7	86.0	89.9	70.9	100.0
20	EL DORADO	1,725.7	1,550.0	89.8	85.3	94.3
21	PLACER	2,814.0	2,527.3	89.8	86.3	93.3
22	HUMBOLDT	1,366.3	1,225.3	89.7	84.7	94.7
23	MENDOCINO	1,044.3	931.3	89.2	83.5	94.9
24	SAN DIEGO	38,959.3	34,613.3	88.8	87.9	89.8
25	INYO	186.3	165.0	88.6	75.0	100.0
26	TUOLUMNE	443.0	391.7	88.4	79.7	97.2
27	LASSEN	193.0	170.3	88.3	75.0	100.0
28	CONTRA COSTA	12,944.7	11,411.7	88.2	86.5	89.8
29	SAN FRANCISCO	8,229.0	7,234.7	87.9	85.9	89.9
30	VENTURA	11,189.0	9,822.7	87.8	86.1	89.5
31	MARIPOSA	128.3	112.3	87.5	71.3	100.0
32	ALAMEDA	21,285.7	18,629.7	87.5	86.3	88.8
33	YOLO	2,274.0	1,987.0	87.4	83.5	91.2
34	SAN BENITO	865.3	753.7	87.1	80.9	93.3
35	GLENN	388.3	337.7	87.0	77.7	96.2
36	CALAVERAS	311.3	268.3	86.2	75.9	96.5
37	TEHAMA	641.3	546.0	85.1	78.0	92.3
38	AMADOR	266.0	226.3	85.1	74.0	96.2
39	BUTTE	2,195.0	1,861.0	84.8	80.9	88.6
40	ORANGE	43,899.3	37,063.7	84.4	83.6	85.3
41	SOLANO	5,540.7	4,665.3	84.2	81.8	86.6
42	LAKE	596.0	499.0	83.7	76.4	91.1
	CALIFORNIA	504,255.0	420,192.3	83.3	83.1	83.6
43	SUTTER	1,133.3	923.7	81.5	76.2	86.8
44	MERCED	3,717.0	3,029.3	81.5	78.6	84.4
45	COLUSA	311.3	253.3	81.4	71.4	91.4
46	FRESNO	13,842.0	11,240.0	81.2	79.7	82.7
47	SACRAMENTO	18,308.7	14,838.0	81.0	79.7	82.3
48	MADERA	2,115.7	1,714.3	81.0	77.2	84.9
49	STANISLAUS	7,485.3	6,044.0	80.7	78.7	82.8
50	LOS ANGELES	146,853.3	117,131.0	79.8	79.3	80.2
51	SAN JOAQUIN	9,316.7	7,414.3	79.6	77.8	81.4
52	TULARE	6,929.0	5,467.3	78.9	76.8	81.0
53	KERN	11,630.0	9,156.7	78.7	77.1	80.3
54	IMPERIAL	2,592.0	2,031.7	78.4	75.0	81.8
55	RIVERSIDE	24,691.3	19,350.7	78.4	77.3	79.5
56	YUBA	970.3	734.7	75.7	70.2	81.2
57	SAN BERNARDINO	27,297.7	20,649.3	75.6	74.6	76.7
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			75.0		
58	KINGS	1,780.0	1,261.0	70.8	66.9	74.8

TABLE 25: PERSONS UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY, 2002

California Counties Ranked by Percentage of Census Population Under 18 Below Poverty

The percentage of persons under age 18 who were below poverty in California was 19.0 per 100 population under age 18. This percentage was based on the 2000 Census projected to year 2002 population.

All 58 counties had "reliable" percentages of persons less than 18 years of age below poverty. The percents ranged from 32.5 in Imperial County to 6.7 in Marin and Placer Counties, a difference in percentages by a factor of 4.9 to 1.

A Healthy People 2010 National Objective for the percentage of persons under age 18 who are below poverty has not been established.

Notes:

Percentages are based on the population under 18 years of age for which the poverty status was determined and excludes persons of unknown poverty status.

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of persons under 18 in poverty (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the same age group population. The upper and lower limits of the percent of persons under 18 years of age in poverty at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 64 through 74.)

DATA SOURCES

U.S. Census Bureau: Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/>)
Department of Finance: Race/Ethnic Population by County with Age and Sex Detail, May 2004.

**TABLE 25
PERSONS UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF CENSUS POPULATION UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002**

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	UNDER 18			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		2002 POPULATION	IN POVERTY NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			NONE ESTABLISHED		
1	MARIN	50,480	3,362	6.7	6.4	6.9
2	PLACER	70,156	4,683	6.7	6.5	6.9
3	SAN MATEO	163,975	11,163	6.8	6.7	6.9
4	EL DORADO	41,675	3,470	8.3	8.0	8.6
5	NAPA	30,500	2,699	8.8	8.5	9.2
6	CONTRA COSTA	259,056	22,948	8.9	8.7	9.0
7	SONOMA	111,395	10,489	9.4	9.2	9.6
8	MONO	2,967	287	9.7	8.6	10.8
9	NEVADA	20,978	2,058	9.8	9.4	10.2
10	SANTA CLARA	424,965	41,716	9.8	9.7	9.9
11	SOLANO	111,953	11,453	10.2	10.0	10.4
12	AMADOR	7,253	759	10.5	9.7	11.2
13	SAN BENITO	17,552	2,012	11.5	11.0	12.0
14	SIERRA	736	85	11.5	9.1	14.0
15	CALAVERAS	9,175	1,125	12.3	11.5	13.0
16	VENTURA	216,112	26,862	12.4	12.3	12.6
17	SAN LUIS OBISPO	52,877	6,577	12.4	12.1	12.7
18	ALAMEDA	355,719	46,162	13.0	12.9	13.1
19	PLUMAS	4,420	579	13.1	12.0	14.2
20	YOLO	45,161	6,066	13.4	13.1	13.8
21	INYO	4,138	559	13.5	12.4	14.6
22	SANTA CRUZ	60,565	8,382	13.8	13.5	14.1
23	ORANGE	786,768	110,453	14.0	14.0	14.1
24	LASSEN	6,965	1,010	14.5	13.6	15.4
25	TUOLUMNE	11,340	1,707	15.1	14.3	15.8
26	MARIPOSA	3,578	546	15.3	14.0	16.5
27	SAN FRANCISCO	113,961	17,485	15.3	15.1	15.6
28	SAN DIEGO	727,503	113,069	15.5	15.5	15.6
29	SANTA BARBARA	99,637	16,706	16.8	16.5	17.0
30	SUTTER	23,269	4,169	17.9	17.4	18.5
31	RIVERSIDE	491,971	89,657	18.2	18.1	18.3
32	COLUSA	5,895	1,078	18.3	17.2	19.4
33	SHASTA	42,271	7,865	18.6	18.2	19.0
34	ALPINE	276	52	18.8	13.7	24.0
	CALIFORNIA	9,436,475	1,795,674	19.0	19.0	19.1
35	STANISLAUS	144,375	27,600	19.1	18.9	19.3
36	MONTEREY	113,301	21,713	19.2	18.9	19.4
37	HUMBOLDT	29,094	5,618	19.3	18.8	19.8
38	SACRAMENTO	347,863	67,539	19.4	19.3	19.6
39	SAN JOAQUIN	185,112	36,327	19.6	19.4	19.8
40	TRINITY	2,771	564	20.4	18.7	22.0
41	MENDOCINO	21,681	4,454	20.5	19.9	21.1
42	LAKE	14,703	3,038	20.7	19.9	21.4
43	BUTTE	48,050	10,085	21.0	20.6	21.4
44	GLENN	7,866	1,663	21.1	20.1	22.2
45	MODOC	2,195	467	21.3	19.3	23.2
46	SISKIYOU	9,953	2,154	21.6	20.7	22.6
47	SAN BERNARDINO	565,215	122,850	21.7	21.6	21.9
48	TEHAMA	14,737	3,281	22.3	21.5	23.0
49	DEL NORTE	6,615	1,483	22.4	21.3	23.6
50	KINGS	38,311	8,736	22.8	22.3	23.3
51	YUBA	19,337	4,742	24.5	23.8	25.2
52	LOS ANGELES	2,733,364	677,853	24.8	24.7	24.9
53	KERN	215,665	54,514	25.3	25.1	25.5
54	MERCED	74,807	19,646	26.3	25.9	26.6
55	MADERA	37,197	10,389	27.9	27.4	28.5
56	FRESNO	257,413	78,523	30.5	30.3	30.7
57	TULARE	126,412	40,446	32.0	31.7	32.3
58	IMPERIAL	45,196	14,699	32.5	32.0	33.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saie/>

Note: Persons under 18 below poverty may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 26
A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE RATES AND PERCENTAGES
AMONG SELECTED HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2003

COUNTY	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES		MORBIDITY RATE		MORBIDITY RATE	
	ALL CAUSES OF DEATH		REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS (AGES 13 AND OVER)		TUBERCULOSIS CRUDE RATES	
	(THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ^{1, 1A}		(THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ²		(THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ²	
	1998-2000	2001-2003	1998-2000	2001-2003	1998-2000	2001-2003
CALIFORNIA	814.1	729.0	17.8	14.7	10.7	9.2
ALAMEDA	835.1	748.4	20.4	17.4	16.8	13.4
ALPINE	568.9 *	726.0 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
AMADOR	841.0	807.0	11.1 *	3.1 *	1.9 *	0.0 +
BUTTE	899.1	856.9	6.2 *	5.8 *	2.0 *	1.9 *
CALAVERAS	758.5	728.5	2.0 *	3.6 *	0.8 *	0.8 *
COLUSA	797.1	792.2	0.0 +	0.0 +	1.8 *	5.1 *
CONTRA COSTA	770.8	725.5	10.4	10.0	9.9	8.6
DEL NORTE	893.5	938.1	7.3 *	4.2 *	2.4 *	1.2 *
EL DORADO	780.7	736.9	4.8 *	4.1 *	1.7 *	1.6 *
FRESNO	873.2	836.3	10.5	8.4	12.9	12.4
GLENN	848.3	809.7	4.9 *	10.9 *	1.3 *	3.7 *
HUMBOLDT	975.8	967.3	6.6 *	6.5 *	7.6 *	3.9 *
IMPERIAL	801.3	747.4	7.1 *	8.2 *	24.4	17.6
INYO	816.0	796.9	2.2 *	2.1 *	1.9 *	3.6 *
KERN	966.2	852.5	14.9	15.3	8.1	7.3
KINGS	918.2	850.7	13.4 *	6.5 *	9.4 *	4.9 *
LAKE	998.0	973.4	11.2 *	8.4 *	3.5 *	1.6 *
LASSEN	692.2	739.4	15.2 *	5.7 *	2.0 *	0.0 +
LOS ANGELES	818.0	675.8	24.5	21.0	13.4	10.9
MADERA	855.1	753.1	10.5 *	11.7 *	8.2 *	9.5 *
MARIN	696.9	609.3	19.4	14.5	5.6 *	5.9 *
MARIPOSA	868.0	733.6	2.3 *	0.0 +	3.9 *	0.0 +
MENDOCINO	676.1	882.6	7.4 *	8.2 *	3.5 *	5.7 *
MERCED	872.6	885.8	5.4 *	6.1 *	4.7 *	7.0 *
MODOC	951.6	841.9	4.3 *	0.0 +	7.1 *	0.0 +
MONO	513.1	557.6	3.2 *	2.9 *	0.0 +	0.0 +
MONTEREY	746.6	698.4	9.4	7.5	11.0	9.4
NAPA	817.2	748.1	5.6 *	4.0 *	3.0 *	3.9 *
NEVADA	817.1	770.1	5.7 *	2.4 *	1.5 *	0.7 *
ORANGE	754.0	685.0	11.4	8.4	9.4	8.5
PLACER	753.1	711.5	2.7 *	2.7 *	1.2 *	2.2 *
PLUMAS	868.7	695.1	1.9 *	9.1 *	1.6 *	0.0 +
RIVERSIDE	859.1	784.5	17.1	14.5	4.9	4.1
SACRAMENTO	861.7	798.6	12.9	8.1	9.1	9.9
SAN BENITO	786.6	671.1	5.0 *	5.4 *	6.4 *	6.6 *
SAN BERNARDINO	956.9	910.9	9.9	8.7	6.3	3.9
SAN DIEGO	805.3	741.9	20.6	17.7	11.2	11.0
SAN FRANCISCO	814.5	714.6	88.4	68.5	26.6	20.7
SAN JOAQUIN	907.8	918.3	12.0	10.9	12.7	9.4
SAN LUIS OBISPO	780.1	686.8	10.7	8.2 *	4.2 *	3.3 *
SAN MATEO	704.5	626.5	12.1	7.8	8.9	9.2
SANTA BARBARA	751.7	679.7	6.5	6.3	6.8	6.6
SANTA CLARA	717.4	612.2	9.6	8.0	14.6	13.5
SANTA CRUZ	755.7	709.4	10.4	7.2 *	3.9 *	2.8 *
SHASTA	946.3	809.6	2.5 *	1.4 *	2.9 *	3.1 *
SIERRA	758.0	762.2	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
SISKIYOU	850.1	836.2	6.3 *	1.7 *	3.0 *	0.0 +
SOLANO	813.5	682.7	21.7	17.0	9.4	7.4
SONOMA	808.5	727.1	10.5	11.8	3.7 *	2.8 *
STANISLAUS	936.7	882.3	7.8	5.9	5.7	4.0
SUTTER	838.5	884.4	3.2 *	1.5 *	8.1 *	6.9 *
TEHAMA	947.2	804.2	2.2 *	0.0 +	3.0 *	2.3 *
TRINITY	1,011.1	800.7	3.0 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
TULARE	899.0	908.2	5.7 *	4.8 *	6.0	4.3 *
TUOLUMNE	827.3	819.6	6.5 *	4.1 *	6.2 *	0.6 *
VENTURA	768.7	681.6	7.1	5.0	7.3	8.1
YOLO	820.6	842.5	5.9 *	4.9 *	5.2 *	3.9 *
YUBA	1,085.0	997.8	7.2 *	4.1 *	11.6 *	6.4 *

TABLE 26 (continued)
A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE RATES AND PERCENTAGES
AMONG SELECTED HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1996-2003

COUNTY	PERCENT		MORTALITY RATE		PERCENT	
	ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS PRENATAL CARE		INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS		LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS	
	(THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ³		(THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ⁴		(THREE-YEAR AVERAGES) ³	
	1998-2000	2001-2003	1996-1997 & 1999	2000-2002	1998-2000	2001-2003
CALIFORNIA	75.8	77.7	5.8	5.5	6.2	6.4
ALAMEDA	80.0	80.6	5.7	4.9	6.8	7.0
ALPINE	72.2 *	81.1 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	2.7 *
AMADOR	72.4	69.6	4.9 *	4.0 *	5.1 *	5.3 *
BUTTE	74.6	75.1	5.6 *	5.3 *	5.0	5.8
CALAVERAS	72.3	71.1	2.1 *	6.2 *	5.2 *	5.0 *
COLUSA	64.5	71.4	8.5 *	4.0 *	5.9	3.5 *
CONTRA COSTA	77.3	79.5	5.2	4.5	6.4	6.4
DEL NORTE	78.3	78.6	8.4 *	5.7 *	4.6 *	4.3 *
EL DORADO	79.8	72.5	3.6 *	5.1 *	5.3	6.3
FRESNO	83.2	84.9	7.7	6.4	6.5	6.7
GLENN	76.4	78.9	4.8 *	2.5 *	5.0	5.2
HUMBOLDT	66.7	66.8	5.0 *	7.0 *	4.8	5.3
IMPERIAL	65.2	66.6	4.9 *	5.1 *	5.6	5.3
INYO	73.2	67.6	10.0 *	7.7 *	5.4 *	5.6 *
KERN	74.6	76.6	7.5	6.8	6.3	6.6
KINGS	76.3	69.7	8.5 *	5.7 *	5.9	6.1
LAKE	63.8	65.9	5.8 *	6.6 *	5.4	6.7
LASSEN	80.4	81.8	3.3 *	11.1 *	4.6 *	5.9 *
LOS ANGELES	78.5	81.3	5.8	5.4	6.5	6.8
MADERA	70.1	73.8	5.4 *	6.5 *	5.5	6.4
MARIN	80.5	88.7	3.5 *	2.8 *	5.5	6.2
MARIPOSA	60.1	61.9	9.6 *	9.8 *	7.0 *	6.7 *
MENDOCINO	60.1	66.1	6.9 *	8.1 *	4.0	5.3
MERCED	59.1	56.4	5.7	5.7	6.1	6.3
MODOC	66.4	66.2	17.9 *	0.0 +	5.2 *	6.8 *
MONO	80.0	75.8	2.8 *	9.2 *	4.2 *	7.4 *
MONTEREY	73.0	76.3	5.0	5.8	5.6	5.8
NAPA	70.8	70.0	2.9 *	4.1 *	5.2	5.4
NEVADA	69.4	69.8	5.5 *	1.7 *	5.3	5.6
ORANGE	79.3	83.6	4.5	4.8	5.5	6.0
PLACER	81.7	79.5	4.0 *	5.8 *	5.2	5.5
PLUMAS	69.4	66.8	2.3 *	8.3 *	2.9 *	7.3 *
RIVERSIDE	69.8	74.6	6.3	6.1	6.1	6.0
SACRAMENTO	74.6	74.5	6.8	5.9	6.6	6.6
SAN BENITO	60.8	59.8	5.3 *	4.3 *	5.2	4.7
SAN BERNARDINO	71.9	75.7	7.5	7.5	6.4	6.8
SAN DIEGO	72.1	72.4	5.6	5.3	6.0	6.1
SAN FRANCISCO	77.0	79.6	4.3	4.4	6.8	7.1
SAN JOAQUIN	64.4	63.9	6.5	7.4	6.1	6.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	82.7	79.8	5.0 *	4.4 *	5.0	5.5
SAN MATEO	80.4	82.6	4.5	4.4	6.2	6.3
SANTA BARBARA	76.0	76.4	4.2	4.8	5.7	6.4
SANTA CLARA	73.7	74.6	5.2	4.0	6.1	6.2
SANTA CRUZ	75.0	79.2	5.0 *	4.2 *	5.3	5.2
SHASTA	74.5	77.2	6.3 *	6.8 *	5.6	5.6
SIERRA	71.2 *	74.6 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	1.9 *	5.6 *
SISKIYOU	72.6	68.4	4.2 *	2.4 *	5.8	7.4
SOLANO	67.9	69.8	5.9	5.6	6.7	6.7
SONOMA	72.4	70.3	4.5	4.5	5.5	5.2
STANISLAUS	66.8	66.8	7.4	7.4	6.0	6.5
SUTTER	67.2	72.8	6.9 *	3.8 *	6.2	5.8
TEHAMA	76.6	76.4	5.7 *	5.9 *	5.1	5.5
TRINITY	54.6	60.3	6.0 *	3.3 *	7.4 *	7.4 *
TULARE	70.2	72.2	6.1	6.5	5.8	5.7
TUOLUMNE	74.8	72.8	10.9 *	5.4 *	5.9	4.4
VENTURA	84.5	83.1	6.3	5.2	5.7	6.1
YOLO	65.3	67.2	5.9 *	6.2 *	5.3	5.4
YUBA	62.5	69.4	7.3 *	8.0 *	7.2	7.3

TABLE 26 (continued)
A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE RATES AND PERCENTAGES
AMONG SELECTED HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1998-2003

COUNTY	AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE		PERCENT BREASTFED	
	BIRTHS AMONG ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)		BIRTHS WITH KNOWN FEEDING METHOD (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)	
	1998-2000	2001-2003	1998-2000	2001-2003
CALIFORNIA	48.6	41.1	81.1	83.3
ALAMEDA	37.1	31.2	85.3	87.5
ALPINE	18.9 *	16.7 *	90.9 *	100.0 *
AMADOR	32.5	26.5	84.0	85.1
BUTTE	31.3	30.7	84.8	84.8
CALAVERAS	34.6	22.3	83.7	86.2
COLUSA	67.3	48.3	81.2	81.4
CONTRA COSTA	33.7	24.9	86.9	88.2
DEL NORTE	72.1	52.5	89.0	91.5
EL DORADO	29.7	21.0	90.0	89.8
FRESNO	72.9	60.9	77.1	81.2
GLENN	60.1	44.7	85.6	87.0
HUMBOLDT	32.6	27.1	89.7	89.7
IMPERIAL	73.0	61.0	74.2	78.4
INYO	52.8	31.8	87.9	88.6
KERN	76.8	64.1	74.4	78.7
KINGS	82.6	69.4	70.3	70.8
LAKE	61.8	40.8	81.4	83.7
LASSEN	47.9	29.1	89.1	88.3
LOS ANGELES	51.9	44.3	77.4	79.8
MADERA	75.0	70.0	76.2	81.0
MARIN	16.7	11.0	92.6	94.1
MARIPOSA	44.4	22.0 *	86.1	87.5
MENDOCINO	59.9	40.0	88.9	89.2
MERCED	70.0	56.0	76.3	81.5
MODOC	38.8 *	23.5 *	88.5	94.6
MONO	32.8 *	25.1 *	93.0	90.2
MONTEREY	60.9	58.8	91.7	90.7
NAPA	33.8	28.7	91.1	90.4
NEVADA	27.1	17.5	92.6	92.6
ORANGE	39.7	33.0	82.4	84.4
PLACER	24.9	19.7	89.4	89.8
PLUMAS	27.5 *	23.5 *	93.3	90.8
RIVERSIDE	57.4	47.1	75.4	78.4
SACRAMENTO	47.7	38.9	78.7	81.0
SAN BENITO	54.6	40.4	86.4	87.1
SAN BERNARDINO	61.6	48.5	72.8	75.6
SAN DIEGO	43.6	38.5	86.8	88.8
SAN FRANCISCO	27.7	26.1	85.4	87.9
SAN JOAQUIN	60.7	50.6	78.4	79.6
SAN LUIS OBISPO	23.4	21.3	92.5	91.9
SAN MATEO	33.6	25.1	91.5	92.9
SANTA BARBARA	35.7	40.2	89.1	91.4
SANTA CLARA	37.0	29.3	89.5	90.3
SANTA CRUZ	32.1	32.2	92.9	93.0
SHASTA	45.3	42.2	88.5	90.1
SIERRA	24.8 *	13.8 *	91.3 *	93.3 *
SISKIYOU	43.2	33.1	87.9	90.5
SOLANO	46.6	34.6	82.3	84.2
SONOMA	31.6	27.0	91.5	92.7
STANISLAUS	55.7	47.6	75.7	80.7
SUTTER	48.0	45.4	79.7	81.5
TEHAMA	63.7	46.0	84.8	85.1
TRINITY	45.4 *	33.1 *	92.3	89.9
TULARE	82.4	69.8	77.4	78.9
TUOLUMNE	33.5	23.6	87.1	88.4
VENTURA	42.8	36.6	86.5	87.8
YOLO	20.5	22.0	87.5	87.4
YUBA	70.3	67.8	72.2	75.7

¹ Age-adjusted death rates are per 100,000 population.

^{1A} The age-adjusted death rates for years 1998-2000 were calculated using the 2000 Population Standard; thus, rates may not be consistent with previous "Profiles" reports.

² Crude case rates are per 100,000 population.

³ Low birthweight and prenatal care percentages are per 100 live births.

⁴ Birth cohort rates are per 1,000 live births.

* Rate or percent unreliable; relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent.

+ Standard error indeterminate; rate or percent based on no (zero) events.

Sources: Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics: Birth and Death Statistical Master Files, 1998-2003; and Birth Cohort Files, 1996-1997, 1999-2002. Department of Health Services, Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry, Genetic Disease Branch, Maternal and Child Health Branch. Department of Finance: 2002 Race/Ethnic Population by County with Age and Sex Detail, May 2004.

TECHNICAL NOTES

DATA SOURCES

The California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics, Office of Vital Records, was the source for the birth and death data that appear in this report. Data were tabulated from the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files for the years 1998 through 2000 and 2001 through 2003, and from the linked births-deaths in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files for the years 1996, 1997, 1999, and 2000 through 2002, which are based on the Statistical Master Files. Birth Cohort-Perinatal data for 2002 are preliminary.

The California Department of Health Services, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Office of Statistics and Surveillance, was the source for the reported case incidence of measles, tuberculosis, hepatitis C, chlamydia, and primary and secondary syphilis. The California Department of Health Services, Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry provided incidence data of diagnosed AIDS cases. The California Department of Health Services, Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program collected the breastfeeding incidence data and the Epidemiology and Evaluation Section, Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Branch analyzed these data.

The population data are provided on the Internet website of the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. Estimates of persons under age 18 who were below poverty are from the U.S. Census Bureau (<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/>). These data have been updated with the most current estimates available. Population series are referenced in the table footnotes.

Vital event and case data received late or registered after the cutoff date for creation of the data files used in this report may result in small undercounts.

DATA DEFINITIONS

Mortality (Tables 1-13):

A consistent use of the consensus set of health status indicators has been facilitated by reference to the causes of mortality coded according to the International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10). Cause of death coding using ICD-10 began with 1999 mortality data in the 2001 County Health Status Profiles report. "Profiles" reports from 1993 through 2000 used the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9) for coding cause of death. The change to ICD-10 follows a worldwide standard created by the World Health Organization. In the United States, the National Center for Health Statistics sets the standards for implementation of the ICD-10.

Due to these changes, readers and users of these data are cautioned that mortality tables including data prior to 1999 are not necessarily comparable to those including 1999 forward, and should not be used to create trend data.

Following is a list of the mortality tables in this report and the ICD-10 codes used to create these tables.

Table 1:	All Causes of Death	A00-Y89
Table 2:	Motor Vehicle Crashes	V02-V04, V09.0, V09.2, V12-V14, V19.0-V19.2, V19.4-V19.6, V20-V79, V80.3-V80.5, V81.0- V81.1, V82.0-V82.1, V83- V86, V87.0-V87.8, V88.0- V88.8, V89.0, V89.2
Table 3:	Unintentional Injuries	V01-X59, Y85-Y86
Table 4:	Firearm Injuries	U01.4, W32-W34, X72-X74, X93-X95, Y22-Y24, Y35.0
Table 5:	Homicide	U01-U02, X85-Y09, Y87.1
Table 6:	Suicide	U03, X60-X84, Y87.0
Table 7:	All Cancers	C00-C97
Table 8:	Lung Cancer	C33-C34
Table 9:	Female Breast Cancer	C50
Table 10:	Coronary (Ischemic) Heart Disease	I11, I20-I25
Table 11:	Cerebrovascular Disease (Stroke)	I60-I69
Table 12:	Drug-Induced Deaths	F11.0-F11.5, F11.7-F11.9, F12.0-F12.5, F12.7-F12.9, F13.0-F13.5, F13.7-F13.9, F14.0-F14.5, F14.7-F14.9, F15.0-F15.5, F15.7-F15.9, F16.0-F16.5, F16.7-F16.9, F17.0, F17.3-F17.5, F17.7-F17.9, F18.0-F18.5, F18.7-F18.9, F19.0-F19.5, F19.7-F19.9, X40-X44, X60-X64, X85, Y10-Y14
Table 13:	Diabetes	E10-E14

The cardiovascular disease health indicator has been divided into coronary heart disease and cerebrovascular disease (stroke) because Healthy People 2010 National Objectives have been separately established for these two diagnostic groups.

Morbidity (Tables 14-19): In general, the case definition of a disease is in terms of laboratory test results, or in the absence of a laboratory test, a constellation of clearly specified signs and symptoms that meet a series of clinical criteria. Case definitions for acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), chlamydia, hepatitis C, measles, syphilis, and tuberculosis are contained in the "MMWR, Recommendations and Reports," Volume 46, Number RR-10, May 2, 1997.

Due to incomplete reporting of infectious and communicable diseases by many health care providers, caution is advised in interpreting morbidity tables. Many factors contribute to the underreporting of these diseases. These factors include: lack of awareness regarding disease surveillance; lack of follow-up on support staff assigned to report; failure to perform

diagnostic lab tests to confirm or rule out infectious etiology; concern for anonymity of the client; and expedited treatment in lieu of waiting for laboratory results because of time or cost constraints.

All vital events are subject to the vagaries of reporting. This fact forms the basis for the argument supporting the concept of sampling error in vital statistics. The problem of the uncertainty of reporting all events can be especially true for morbidity data. Therefore, the headings of the tables on AIDS, measles, tuberculosis, hepatitis C, chlamydia, and syphilis emphasize that the data show only reported number of cases. For more complete and technical definitions of types of morbidity, contact the Division of Communicable Disease Control or the Office of AIDS.

Birth Cohort Infant Mortality (Tables 20A-20E): The infant mortality rate is the number of deaths among infants under one year of age per 1,000 live births. It is a universally accepted and easily understood indicator, which represents the overall health status of a community.

Studies of infant mortality that are based on information from death certificates alone have been found to underestimate infant death rates for infants of all race/ethnic groups and especially for certain race/ethnic groups. Infant mortality rates in this report are based on linked birth and infant death records in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, which generate more accurate estimates of the total number of infant deaths as well as more accurate race-specific infant mortality rates. The race used on the race-specific infant mortality tables is the race of the mother, thus both the numerator and the denominator used for rate calculations reflect the mother's race only.

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using years 1996, 1997, 1999, and 2000 through 2002. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

Since delayed birth and death certificate data are included in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files after the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files have been closed to further processing, cohort files cannot be as timely as the Statistical Master Files. However, the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files are more likely complete.

Race/Ethnicity: Tables 20A-20E were modified to more closely align with the 1997 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised minimum standards for collecting, maintaining, and presenting data on race and ethnicity. Descriptions of the minimum standards are in the 1997 OMB Directive 15, which may be reviewed at the following website: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/ombdir15.html>

The mother's Hispanic origin was determined first, irrespective of race, and then second, the race categories for the remaining non-Hispanics were determined. The Hispanic ethnic group includes any race, but is made up primarily of the White race. The remaining mother's race data were sorted in single race groups as follows: American Indian/Alaska Native includes Aleut, American Indian, and Eskimo; Pacific Islander includes Guamanian, Hawaiian, Samoan, and Other Pacific Islander; Asian includes Asian Indian, Asian (specified/unspecified), Cambodian, Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Japanese, Korean,

Laotian, Thai, and Vietnamese; Black includes Blacks or African Americans; White includes White and Other (Specified); Not Stated and Unknown includes data for mothers who declined to state their race or for whom the data was not obtainable for other reasons.

Table 20B Asian/Pacific Islander Infant Mortality rates should not be compared with the Asian/Other Infant Mortality table rates in Profiles reports issued prior to 2005 because these data now exclude the Aleut, American Indian, and Eskimo statistics previously reported, which could have an impact on these small numbers. In contrast, although Table 20E White Infant Mortality also excludes the Not Stated and Unknown race/ethnic group data included in previous reports, the relatively small number of these events in this large group may not substantially impact a county's rate. While data for the excluded groups are not reported in Tables 20B-20E, they are included in Table 20A Infant Mortality, All Race Groups.

Effective with the 2000 data year, this state began collecting up to three races on birth and death certificates. In order to permit use of the 2000-2002 Cohort file along with analysis of race from earlier files, the mother's first listed race was used unless Hawaiian appeared as the second or third listed race, in which case Hawaiian would be selected as the first race. This bridging technique may result in slight discontinuity of trends especially for small race groups. First listed race is also used in some other Center for Health Statistics reports.

Nativity (Tables 21-23B): The natality data were obtained from the Birth Statistical Master Files from 2001 through 2003. Records with unknown birthweight were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 21. Also, records with unknown prenatal care were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 23A, and records with unknown adequacy of prenatal care were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 23B.

Low birthweight has been associated with negative birth outcomes, and as an indicator of access problems and/or need for prenatal care services. Prevalence of low birthweight is defined as the percentage of live births weighing less than 2,500 grams (approximately 5.5 pounds). Birth rates to adolescents are also an indicator for other high-risk pregnancy factors. The adolescent birth rate is defined as the number of births to mothers 15-19 years of age per 1,000 female population 15-19 years of age.

The prenatal care indicator, Month Prenatal Care Began, has been associated with access to care. Late prenatal care is defined as the percentage of mothers who did not begin prenatal care in the first trimester. However, the percentage of births in which the mother's prenatal care began in the first trimester, as a health indicator, does not readily permit an unambiguous interpretation. According to some researchers, it fails to document whether or not prenatal care actually continues for the course of the pregnancy. Therefore, in addition to Prenatal Care Not Begun First Trimester of Pregnancy, this *Profiles* includes adequacy of prenatal care based on the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index.

In "Profiles" reports published in 1995 through 1998, the Kessner Index was used to measure the adequacy of prenatal care. The Kessner Index was replaced in the 1999 report by the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index, which is the methodology specified in "Healthy People 2010 Objectives." The Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization

Index developed by Milton Kottlechuck attempts to characterize prenatal care utilization on two independent and distinctive dimensions: Adequacy of Initiation of Prenatal Care and Adequacy of Received Services (once prenatal care has begun). The initial dimension, Adequacy of Initiation of Prenatal Care, characterizes the adequacy of the timing of initiation of care (month prenatal care began). The second dimension, Adequacy of Received Services, characterizes the adequacy of prenatal care visits (number of visits) received during the time the mother was actually in prenatal care (from initiation until the delivery). The adequacy of prenatal visits is based on the recommendations established by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. These two dimensions are then combined into a single summary prenatal care utilization index, which contains the following five categories for adequacy of prenatal care:

- (1) Adequate Plus: Prenatal care begun by the fourth month and 110 percent or more of the recommended visits received.
- (2) Adequate: Prenatal care begun by the fourth month and 80 to 109 percent of the recommended visits received.
- (3) Intermediate: Prenatal care begun by the fourth month and 50 to 79 percent of the recommended visits received.
- (4) Inadequate: Prenatal care begun after the fourth month or less than 50 percent of the recommended visits received.
- (5) Missing Information: Unknown adequacy of prenatal care.

Only “adequate and adequate plus” prenatal care are used in Table 23B to measure the adequacy of prenatal care utilization. Also, please note the two-factor index does not assess the quality of the prenatal care that was delivered, but simply its utilization. For further information on the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index, see the "American Journal of Public Health" article by Kottlechuck listed in the bibliography.

Breastfeeding Initiation During Early Postpartum (Table 24): Extensive research, especially in recent years, demonstrates the diverse and compelling advantages to infants, mothers, families, and society from breastfeeding and the use of human milk for infant feeding. Breastfeeding provides advantages with regard to the general health, growth, and development of infants, while significantly decreasing their risk for a large number of acute and chronic diseases. There are also a number of studies that indicate possible health benefits for mothers such as less postpartum bleeding, rapid uterine involution, and reduced risk of ovarian cancer and post-menopausal breast cancer. In addition to individual health benefits, breastfeeding provides significant social and economic benefits to the nation, including reduced health care costs and reduced employee absenteeism for care attributable to child illness.

The breastfeeding initiation data presented in this report were obtained from the Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program with analyses by the Epidemiology and Evaluation Section, Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Branch. The Newborn Screening Program collects feeding data from all mothers who gave birth in a California hospital, usually within 24 hours of birth.

Data on births that occurred outside of California, at home, or in-transit were not collected through this Program and are not represented in Table 24. These births, however, accounted for less than 1.0 percent of the total resident live births in California.

The feeding data captured by the Newborn Screening Program were compiled into the following four categories:

- (1) Breastfed: Exclusively breastfed.
- (2) Combination: Both breastfed and formula fed.
- (3) Non-Breastfed: Formula fed and other (e.g., line fed).
- (4) Unknown: Feeding choice unknown at the time of hospital discharge.

The breastfeeding initiation data presented in Table 24 are a composite of both “breastfed” and “combination” fed births. Records that were of “unknown” feeding type were excluded from the analyses.

The infant feeding data collected on the Newborn Screening form reflect the intentions of the mother at that time, and no follow-up survey is conducted to validate the accuracy of the information after the mother is discharged from the hospital. Caution should also be taken when analyzing breastfeeding initiation data alone because breastfeeding duration is not taken into consideration. Examination of breastfeeding initiation data along with duration data is recommended to thoroughly measure the effects of breastfeeding. Since appropriate data are not currently available, breastfeeding duration data are not presented in this report.

Childhood Poverty (Table 25): Children under the age of 18 living in families at or below the poverty level define the category of the population under 18 below poverty. The percent of children under 18 in this category is an indicator of global risk factors that have implications for accessibility to health services.

CRUDE RATES AND AGE-ADJUSTED RATES

The numerator data used to compute rates and percentages were three-year averages compiled by county of residence of the decedent for the mortality tables; county of residence of the mother for birth data (including linked birth-death data for infant mortality); and county of occurrence for morbidity data, except for AIDS, which was compiled by county of residence. Three-year averages tend to reduce the year-to-year fluctuations and increase the stability of estimates of vital events compared with data from single years.

The non-standardized rate (or "crude rate") is calculated by dividing the total number of vital events (e.g., deaths) by the total population at risk, then multiplying by some convenient base (e.g., 100,000). Subpopulations (such as counties) with varying age compositions can have highly disparate death rates, since the risk of dying is primarily a function of age. Therefore, counties with a large component of elderly tend to have high death rates. Any unwanted effect of different age compositions among counties can be removed from the county death rates by the process of "age-adjustment." By removing the effect of different age compositions, counties with age-adjusted rates are directly comparable with the Healthy People 2010 National Objectives.

Age-adjusted death rates are hypothetical rates obtained by calculating age-specific rates for each county and multiplying these rates by proportions of the same age categories in a "standard population," then summing the apportioned specific rates to a county total. The "standard population" used in the age-adjusted rates in this report is the

2000 United States (U.S.) Standard Population. The age-adjusted rates put all counties on the same footing with respect to the effect of age and permit direct comparisons among counties. It is important to understand that age-adjusted death rates should be viewed as constructs or index numbers rather than as actual measures of the risk of mortality. Crude death rates, which include the effect of age, are the rates that should be applied when measuring the actual risk of dying in a specific population. For further information on age-adjusted rates, see the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) report by Curtin and Klein on "Direct Standardization," listed in the bibliography.

National objectives established for "Healthy People 2010" use the 2000 U.S. population for age adjusting rates. Therefore, the 2000 U.S. population was used as the "standard population" beginning with the 2001 "Profiles" report. The use of an agreed upon standard population permits direct comparison with both national data and the Healthy People 2010 Objectives.

Data for the morbidity tables were not age-adjusted due to the unavailability of the morbidity data by age. Hence, only crude rates were calculated. Although age and aging do affect morbidity, the effect is not as prominent as its effect on mortality.

Birth cohort infant death rates are not age-adjusted. Since the deaths are linked to the births on a record-by-record basis, these rates are based on a numerator (deaths) and a denominator (births) from the same record. Age adjusting is not applicable to these data. Comparisons among counties reflect the actual risk of dying within the one year of birth in the cohort of births, and at the same time, are unaffected by confounding of different age compositions because the cohorts are all of the same age (under one year).

RELIABILITY OF RATES

All vital statistics rates, including morbidity rates, are subject to random variation. This variation is inversely related to the number of events (e.g., death) used to calculate the rate. Small frequency in the occurrence of an event results in the greater the likelihood that random fluctuations will be found within a specified time period. Rare events are relatively less stable in their occurrence from observation to observation. Even present day statewide crude death rates may be interpreted as "rare" events occurring on the average of less than one death in 150 persons in the course of a year. (See Table 1: Deaths Due to All Causes, which shows 665.3 deaths per 100,000 population statewide.)

As a consequence, counties with only a few deaths, or a few cases of morbidity, can have highly unstable rates from year-to-year. The observation and enumeration of rare events is beset with uncertainty. The observation of no vital events is especially hazardous, regardless of the size of the population. This report reduces some year-to-year fluctuation in the occurrence of rare events by basing some rates on three-year average number of vital events (e.g., 2001-2003), divided by the population in the middle year (e.g. 2002). The "standard error" of a death rate and "coefficient of variation" (or relative standard error) provide a rational basis for determining which rates may be considered "unreliable."

Although reliability of a rate is not either-or/on-off, in this report, counties with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent of the rate or percent are marked with an asterisk (*). This criterion conforms to the standard used by the National Center for Health

Statistics in determining the reliability cut-off for rates and percents. In addition, rates of zero, based on no events, are denoted with a plus sign (+), because the standard error cannot be calculated and is indeterminate. Furthermore, whenever the standard error is indeterminate, the confidence limits are not calculated, and a dash (-) denotes these confidence limits.

The 95 percent confidence limits depict the region within which (if data similar to the present set were independently acquired on 100 separate occasions) the rate would probably occur in 95 of those sets of data. In 5 of those 100 data sets, the rate or percent would fall outside the limits.

Finally, for appropriate statistical methodologies in comparing independent rates or percentages, please see the NCHS reports listed in the bibliography by Curtin and Klein on "Direct Standardization" and by Kleinman on "Infant Mortality."

RANKING OF COUNTIES

Data on each health indicator, except adequacy of prenatal care (Table 23B) and incidence of breastfeeding (Table 24), are displayed with the counties in rank order by increasing rates or percentages (calculated to 15 decimal places); lower rates or percentages are near the top of the table and higher rates or percentages are near the bottom of the table. Data for adequacy of prenatal care and incidence of breastfeeding are displayed with the counties in rank order by decreasing percentages (calculated to 15 decimal places); higher percentages are near the top of the table and lower percentages are near the bottom of the table. For all health indicators, counties with identical rates or percentages are ranked by size of population, with larger counties ahead of smaller counties.

FORMULAS USED IN THIS REPORT

$$CDR = \left(\frac{{}_nD}{N_{pop}} \right) \times B$$

$$ADR = \sum W_a \left(\frac{{}_nD_a}{N_{pop_a}} \right) \times B$$

$$ASDR = \left(\frac{{}_nD_a}{N_{pop_a}} \right) \times B$$

$$SE_x = \left(\frac{CDR}{\sqrt{{}_nD}} \right)$$

$$SE_y = \sqrt{\sum \frac{(W_a \times ASDR)}{{}_nD_a}}^2$$

$$RSE_x = \left(\frac{SE_x}{CDR} \right) \times 100$$

$$RSE_y = \left(\frac{SE_y}{ADR} \right) \times 100$$

$$\text{Lower 95\% CL} = ADR - (1.96 \times SE_y) \quad \text{Upper 95\% CL} = ADR + (1.96 \times SE_y)$$

Where:

- CDR = Crude Death Rate
- ADR = Age-Adjusted Death Rate
- ASDR = Age-Specific Death Rate
- ${}_nD$ = Number of Deaths
- N_{pop} = Population Size
- ${}_nD_a$ = Number of Deaths in an Age Group
- N_{pop_a} = Population Size in Same Age Group
- B = Base (100,000)
- W_a = Age-Specific Weight (Standard Population Proportion)
- SE_x = Standard Error of a Crude Death Rate
- RSE_x = Relative Standard Error of a Crude Death Rate
- SE_y = Standard Error of an Age-Adjusted Death Rate
- RSE_y = Relative Standard Error of an Age-Adjusted Death Rate
- CL = Confidence Limit

PROCEDURE FOR CALCULATING AGE-ADJUSTED RATES BY THE DIRECT METHOD

Age-adjusted rates calculated in this report follow the procedure that was used to set the Year 2010 National Objectives. The standard population was the year 2000 United States population. The data below were taken from Table 1: Deaths Due to All Causes, 2001-2003 for Alameda County.

ALAMEDA COUNTY					
AGE GROUPS	2001-2003 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	2002 POPULATION	AGE-SPECIFIC RATE/100,000	2000 U.S. STANDARD POPULATION PROPORTIONS	WEIGHTED RATE FACTORS
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
TOTAL	9,683.3	1,488,074	650.7		
Unknown	4.3				
<1	107.0	21,479	498.2	0.013818	6.9
1-4	13.7	78,443	17.4	0.055317	1.0
5-14	29.7	200,131	14.8	0.145565	2.2
15-24	130.0	197,731	65.7	0.138646	9.1
25-34	185.3	253,744	73.0	0.135573	9.9
35-44	403.0	252,813	159.4	0.162613	25.9
45-54	810.3	208,737	388.2	0.134834	52.3
55-64	1,063.7	126,375	841.7	0.087247	73.4
65-74	1,492.7	74,213	2,011.3	0.066037	132.8
75-84	2,751.7	54,304	5,067.2	0.044842	227.2
>84	2,692.0	20,104	13,390.4	0.015508	207.7
AGE-ADJUSTED RATE-----					748.4

- STEP 1:** Array the data of three-year average number of deaths and population for 11 age groups in columns A and B.
- STEP 2:** Calculate age-specific rates by dividing the number of deaths in column A (numerator) by the population in column B (denominator). Multiply the result (quotient) by the base of 100,000 to obtain the rates in column C.
- STEP 3:** Multiply each age-specific rate in column C by the corresponding 2000 U.S. Standard Population proportion in column D and enter the result in column E.
- STEP 4:** The values for each age group in column E are summed to obtain the Age-Adjusted Death Rate for Alameda County of 748.4 per 100,000 population.
- STEP 5:** Repeat Steps 1 through 4 for each county and the statewide total. Note that the 2000 U.S. Standard Million proportions remain the same for each county and the state.
- STEP 6:** Direct comparisons can now be made among the counties, with the removal of the effect that varying county age compositions may have on death rates.

COMPARISON OF CALIFORNIA'S HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2005 REPORT RATES WITH U.S. RATES AND HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVES					
HP2010 OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	NATIONAL OBJECTIVE	UNITED STATES	CALIFORNIA ¹	CALIFORNIA vs UNITED STATES (% Difference)
MORTALITY (per 100,000 population)					
15-15a	ALL CAUSES OF DEATH	N/E	845.3	729.0	-13.8%
15-13	MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS	9.2	15.2	12.0	-21.1%
15-03	UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES	17.5	36.9	28.6	-22.5%
15-03	FIREARM INJURIES	4.1	10.4	9.6	-7.7%
15-32	HOMICIDE	3.0	6.1	6.7	9.8%
18-01	SUICIDE	5.0	10.9	9.5	-12.8%
03-01	ALL CANCERS	159.9	193.5	169.6	-12.4%
03-02	LUNG CANCER	44.9	54.9	43.8	-20.2%
03-03	FEMALE BREAST CANCER	22.3	25.6	23.4	-8.6%
12-01	CORONARY HEART DISEASE ²	166.0	180.0	175.9	-2.3%
12-07	CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE	48.0	56.2	55.6	-1.1%
26-03	DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS	1.0	9.0	9.4	4.4%
05-05	DIABETES	N/A ¹	25.4	21.3	-16.1%
MORBIDITY (per 100,000 population)					
14-09	HEPATITIS C INCIDENCE ³	1.0	1.4	0.2	-85.7%
13-01	AIDS INCIDENCE (AGE 13 AND OVER) ⁴	1.0	18.6	14.7	-21.0%
14-11	TUBERCULOSIS INCIDENCE ³	1.0	5.8	9.2	58.6%
25-01	CHLAMYDIA INCIDENCE	N/A ²	a	310.3	
25-03	SYPHILIS INCIDENCE	0.2	2.4	2.7	12.5%
14-01e	MEASLES INCIDENCE	0.0	a	0.0	
INFANT MORTALITY (per 1,000 live births)					
16-01c	INFANT MORTALITY: ALL RACES	4.5	6.8	5.5	-19.1%
16-01c	INFANT MORTALITY: ASIAN/PI	4.5	4.7	4.4	-6.4%
16-01c	INFANT MORTALITY: BLACK	4.5	13.3	11.6	-12.8%
16-01c	INFANT MORTALITY: HISPANIC	4.5	5.4	5.2	-3.7%
16-01c	INFANT MORTALITY: WHITE	4.5	5.7	4.8	-15.8%
NATALITY (per 100 live births; 1,000 population)					
16-10a	LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS	5.0	7.8	6.4	-17.9%
16-06a	LATE OR NO PRENATAL CARE	10.0	16.0	13.6	-15.0%
16-06b	ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS CARE	90.0	75.0	77.7	3.6%
	BIRTHS TO MOTHERS AGED 15-19	N/E	43.0	41.1	-4.4%
BREASTFEEDING (per 100 births)					
16-19a	BREASTFEEDING INITIATION	75.0	70.0	83.3	19.0%
CENSUS 2002					
	PERSONS UNDER 18 IN POVERTY	N/E	16.7	19.0	13.8%

a Available U.S. rate is not comparable.

1 Three-year average 2001-2003; Infant Death three-year average 2000-2002.

2 California rate is limited to International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes I11, I20-I25. United States rate for 2001.

3 U.S. rate for 2001.

4 U.S. rate for 1999.

N/A¹ National Objective is based on both underlying and contributing cause of death which requires use of multiple cause of death data files. California's data exclude multiple/contributing cause of death.

N/A² Prevalence data is not available in California to evaluate Healthy People 2010 national objective of no more than 3 percent testing positive in the population aged 15 to 24 years.

N/E National Objective for the Year 2010 has not been established.

Note: Crude death rates, crude case rates, and age-adjusted death rates are per 100,000 population. Birth cohort infant death rates are per 1,000 live births. Age-specific birth rates are per 1,000 female population.

Sources: Department of Health Services: Center for Health Statistics, Birth and Death Statistical Master Files, 2001-2003, and Birth Cohort Files, 2000-2002; Division of Communicable Disease Control, Office of Statistics and Surveillance; Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry; Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program. Department of Finance: 2002 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

U. S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Health People 2010, CDC Wonder website at URL: <http://wonder.cdc.gov/data2010/obj.htm>
National Center for Health Statistics. Deaths: Final Data for 2002. National Vital Statistics Reports, Vol. 53, No. 5. October 2004.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Pediatrics. Breastfeeding and the Use of Human Milk (RE9729). *Pediatrics*, Vol. 100, No. 6, December 1997: pp. 1035-1039.

Armitage P, Berry G. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, second edition. Boston: Blackwell Scientific Publication, 1987.

Curtin LR, Klein RJ. Direct Standardization (Age-Adjusted Death Rates), *Healthy People 2000 Statistical Notes*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 95-1237, March 1995; No. 6-Revised.

Fleiss JL. *Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions*, second edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1981.

Foster JE. Using Natality Data in Health Planning. *Statistical Notes for Health Planners*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 81-1237, November 1980; No. 12.

Freedman MA. Health Status Indicators for the Year 2000. *Healthy People 2000 Statistical Notes*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 92-1237, Fall 1991; Vol. 1, No. 1.

Institute for Medicine. *The Future of Public Health*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Science Press, 1988; pp. 13-15.

Klein RJ, Schoenborn, CA. *Healthy People 2010 Statistical Notes: Age Adjustment Using the 2000 Projected U.S. Population*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Publication, Number 20, January 2001.

Kleinman JC. Mortality. *Statistical Notes for Health Planners*. National Center for Health Statistics, DHHS Pub. No. (HRA) 77-1237, February 1977; No. 3.

Kottlechuck M. An Evaluation of the Kessner Adequacy of Prenatal Care Index and a Proposed Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index. *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 84, No. 9, September 1994: pp. 1414-1420.

Lilienfeld AM, Lilienfeld DE. *Foundations of Epidemiology*, second edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Tashiro M. A Description of the California Birth Cohort Perinatal File. *Data Matters* #83-11078. Center for Health Statistics, California Department of Health Services, February 1984.

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2000: National Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Objectives for the Nation*. Washington, D.C.: Public Health Service, DHHS Pub. No. (PHS) 91-50212, 1991.

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2010 Objectives (Conference Edition, in Two Volumes)*. Washington, D.C., January 2000.

World Health Organization. *Manual of the International Classification of Diseases, Injuries, and Causes of Death*, tenth revision. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1992.

COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

MAIL ORDER
FORM TO:

Department of Health Services
Office of Health Information and Research
Planning and Data Analysis Section
MS 5103, P.O. Box 997410
Sacramento, CA 95899-7410

Phone #: (916) 552-8095

Fax #: (916) 650-6889

Publication Year (a)	Total Number of Copies (b)	Cost Per Copy (c)	Total Cost (b) x (c)
Year 2005:		\$10.00	\$
	<i>Total Enclosed</i>		\$

Prior year reports from 1993-2004 may also be ordered. Please call or contact the Center for Health Statistics before placing an order for back issues to determine hardcopy availability. Profiles publications for 1998-2005 are also available in Adobe PDF format at no charge on our website at <http://www.dhs.ca.gov/hisp/chs/OHIR> Payment for hardcopies must accompany the order. Please do not send cash. Please make your **check or money order** payable to the "DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES."

Prior Publication Year(s) (Enter Year)	Total Number of Copies (b)	Cost Per Copy (c)	Total Cost (b) x (c)
Prior Year:		\$10.00	\$
Prior Year:		\$10.00	\$
Prior Year:		\$10.00	\$
Prior Year:		\$10.00	\$
	<i>Total Enclosed</i>		\$

PLEASE MAIL THE ABOVE PUBLICATIONS TO:

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Address: _____

City & State: _____

Zip Code: _____

Telephone: _____

E-Mail: _____

NOTES (blank page)