

For more information contact: Utah Department of Health
Office of Public Health Assessment
Center for Health Data
288 North 1460 West
Box 142101
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-2101
Phone: (801) 538-6108
FAX: (801) 538-9346
Email: chdata@utah.gov

This report is also available on the Internet at:
http://ibis.health.utah.gov/home/opha_publications_chron.html

Overview of the 2005 Health Status Survey - Statewide Findings

Utah Department of Health
Office of Public Health Assessment
Center for Health Data

September 2006

This report may be reproduced and distributed without permission.

Suggested citation

Utah Department of Health Office of Public Health Assessment.
(2006). *Overview of the 2005 Health Status Survey* (2005 Utah Health
Status Survey Report). Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Department of Health.

Acknowledgments



The 2005 Utah Health Status Survey was funded by the Utah Legislature. The Center for Health Data, Office of Public Health Assessment, under the direction of Lois M. Haggard, Ph.D., provided general oversight for the project. It is the mission of the Office of Public Health Assessment to facilitate, coordinate, and assure the appropriate collection, analysis, and interpretation of accurate health data for purposes of surveillance, policy development, and program planning and evaluation.

2005 Utah State Health Surveys Advisory Committee, Voting Members

Co-Chair: Kimberly Partain McNamara, MS, Utah Health Status Survey Coordinator, Office of Public Health Assessment, Utah Department of Health

Co-Chair: Kathie Marti, RN, MPH, Utah BRFSS Coordinator, Office of Public Health Assessment, Utah Department of Health

Voting Members:

Association for Utah Community Health: Ilan Hurvita

Center for Health Data, UDOH: Barry E. Nangle, PhD, Director; Lois M. Haggard, PhD, Director of Office of Public Health Assessment

Child Health Insurance and Access Initiatives, UDOH: John Strong

Division of Community and Family Health Services, UDOH: Claudia Bohner, MPH, Tobacco Prevention and Control Program; Richard Bullough, PhD, Arthritis Program; Michael Friedrichs, MStat, Bureau of Health Promotion; Rebecca Giles, Asthma and Genomics Program; Patricia Keller, MPH, RN, Violence and Injury Prevention Program; Brenda Ralls, PhD, Diabetes Prevention and Control Program; Robert Satterfield, MS, Children With Special Health Care Needs; Shelly Wagstaff, MStat, Bureau of Health Promotion; Karen Zinner, MPH, Maternal and Child Health Bureau

Division of Health Care Financing, UDOH: Michael Deily, Director

Division of Health Systems Improvement, UDOH: Don Beckwith

Division of Epidemiology & Laboratory Services, UDOH: Teresa A. Garrett, RN, MS, Director; Robert T. Rolfs, MD, MPH, State Epidemiologist

Intermountain Health Care: David Larsen, Director of Quality Improvement

Kids Count: Terry Haven, MA, Kids Count Project Coordinator

Local Health Departments: Gary L. Edwards, MS, CHES, Director, Southwest Utah Public Health Department; Sally Kershnik, MPA, RN, Nursing Director, Davis County Health Department; Judy Kregel, Health Educator, Davis County Health Department

University of Utah: Sandie Edwards, MA, Department of Family and Preventive Medicine; Ken Smith, PhD, Department of Family and Consumer Studies

The report was developed and prepared by:

Kimberly Partain McNamara, MS, Office of Public Health Assessment

Michael Sanderson, MS, Office of Public Health Assessment

Kim Neerings, Office of Public Health Assessment

The following individuals reviewed earlier drafts of this report:

Lois M. Haggard, PhD, Director, Office of Public Health Assessment

Barry E. Nangle, PhD, Director, Center for Health Data

The Utah Department of Health would like to thank the citizens of Utah who participated in the 2005 Health Status Survey.



	Page
Acknowledgments	ii
List of Figures and Tables	v
Preface	ix
Introduction	xi
Executive Summary	xiii
Guide to This Report.....	xv
Health Status Survey Findings	
Utah's 12 Local Health Districts	3
General Health Status	4
Health Insurance Coverage	10
Access to Health Care	19
Health Care Utilization	22
Chronic Medical Conditions	35
Lifestyles	41
Immunizations	49
Technical Notes	53
Appendix A: Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 HSS Results	61
Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns	67
Bibliography	77



	Figure Page Numbers	Reference Table Page
General Health Status		
Table 1. General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	4	5-6
Table 2. General Health Status: Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents Aged 18 and Over, 2005	7	8-9
Health Insurance Coverage		
Table 3a. Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	10	11-12
Table 3b. Health Insurance Carrier: Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance Coverage by Poverty Status, Utahns With Health Insurance, 2005	13	14-15
Table 3c. Reasons for Lack of Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons Who Gave Each Reason as a Reason That They Lacked Health Insurance by Poverty Status, Utahns Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage, 2005	16	17-18
Access to Health Care		
Table 4. Access to Health Care: Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	19	20-21
Health Care Utilization		
Table 5. Health Care Utilization: Average Number of Medical Visits in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	22	23-24
Table 6. Preventive Medical Visit: Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	25	26-27
Table 7. Place of Care: Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	28-29	30-31



	Figure Page Numbers	Reference Table Page
Health Care Utilization (continued)		
Table 8. Point of Access to Medical Care: Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Center by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	32	33-34
Chronic Medical Conditions		
Table 9. Asthma: Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	35	36-37
Table 10. Diabetes: Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	38	39-40
Lifestyles		
Table 11. Exposure to Cigarette Smoke: Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home, Utah Children Aged 17 or Less, 2005	41	42-43
Table 12. Obesity: Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents Aged 18 and Over, 2005	44	45-46
Table 13. Obesity: Percentage of Children Who Were Described as Slightly or Very Overweight by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Children Aged 6 to 11, 2005	47	48
Immunizations		
Table 14. Immunizations: Percentage of Persons Who Had Received a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005	49	50-51
Appendix A: Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report		
Table 1. General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health	--	63
Table 2. General Health Status: Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor	--	63
Table 3a. Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage	--	63



	Figure Page Numbers	Reference Table Page
Appendix A: Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report (continued)		
Table 3b. Health Insurance Carrier: Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance Coverage	--	63-64
Table 3c. Reasons for Lack of Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons Who Gave Each Reason as a Reason That They Lacked Health Insurance	--	64
Table 4. Access to Health Care: Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care in the Previous 12 Months	--	65
Table 5. Health Care Utilization: Average Number of Medical Visits in the Previous 12 Months.	--	65
Table 6. Preventive Medical Visit: Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months	--	65
Table 7. Place of Care: Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care	--	65
Table 8. Point of Access to Medical Care: Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Center	--	65
Table 9. Asthma: Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma	--	65
Table 10. Diabetes: Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes	--	66
Table 11. Exposure to Cigarette Smoke: Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home	--	66
Table 12. Obesity: Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese	--	66
Table 13. Obesity: Percentage of Children Who Were Described as Slightly or Very Overweight	--	66
Table 14. Immunizations: Percentage of Persons Who Had Received a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series	--	66
Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns		
Table A-1. Utah Population Estimates by Sex, Age, and Local Health District, 1996 and 2001-2008	--	69



	Figure Page Numbers	Reference Table Page
Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns (continued)		
Table A-2. Utah Population Estimates by Sex and Local Health District, 1996 and 2001-2008	--	70
Table A-3. Utah Population Estimates by Age Group and Local Health District, 1996 and 2001-2008	--	71-72
Table A-4. Persons Living in Poverty by County, Utah, 2003	--	73
Table A-5. Persons Living in Poverty, Aged 0-17 by County, Utah, 2003	--	74
Table A-6. Persons Aged 5-17 in Families in Poverty by County, Utah, 2003	--	75
Table A-7. Median Household Income in Dollars by County, Utah, 2003	--	76



The information in this report is based on data collected in the first year of the 2005–2006 Utah Health Status Survey. The survey represents the sixth in a series, with previous surveys conducted in 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2003–2004. It provides information on a variety of topics related to health status and health care access at statewide and health district levels. The Utah Health Status Survey is important because it provides information for Utah’s local health districts and children. Additional topics will be presented in separate reports due to be released in 2006 under the headings listed below.

2005 Health Insurance Coverage, Statewide Findings

Brief: 2005 A Clustered Approach to Understanding Lack of Health Insurance in Utah

Brief: 2005 Problems With Access to Health Care

Brief: 2005 Health Care Utilization and Usual Source of Care

Brief: 2005 Immunizations in Utah

Additional information will be available at the end of 2006 when the 2005–2006 Utah Health Status Survey is complete. After completion, further reports are due to be released in 2007 under the headings listed below.

2005–2006 Health Insurance Coverage, Local Health District Findings

2005–2006 Overview Report, Local Health District Findings

Brief: 2005–2006 Children’s Health Status

Brief: 2005–2006 Racial and Ethnic Health Status

Brief: 2005–2006 Health Status of Older Utahns

The survey was funded by a legislative appropriation and was designed, analyzed, and reported by the Utah Department of Health, Center for Health Data. The survey sample was designed to be representative of non-institutionalized Utahns living in households with telephones. It is best described as a weighted probability sample of consisting of 2,978 households disproportionately stratified by twelve local health districts which collectively cover the entire state.

The Utah Department of Health Survey Center in Salt Lake City conducted the telephone interviews using computer-assisted random digit dial techniques. In each household, one adult (aged 18 or older) was randomly selected to respond to survey questions about themselves, about the household as a unit, and with regard to each household member. The survey results were weighted to reflect the age, sex, geographic distribution, and Hispanic ethnicity of the population. Interviews were conducted over a 13-month period from January 2005 to January 2006. A detailed description of the methodology can be found in the Technical Notes section of this report. The entire survey questionnaire may be found online at http://health.utah.gov/opha/publications/2005hss/2005_6HSS.pdf.



The Health Status Survey Overview Report provides information on 14 health measures from the 2005 Health Status Survey. The 14 health measures represent most of the content areas covered in the 2005 survey.

The report is intended to provide a brief overview of each measure. More detailed analysis of the data may be accomplished online using the custom query option at <http://ibis.health.utah.gov>

For the purposes of presentation, the measures have been simplified such that only one level is reported. For instance, each respondent's general health status was originally reported on a five-point scale (excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor). The simplified measure reports only one level, those with fair or poor health.

For each measure, an attempt was made to report information in a meaningful manner. For instance, in Table 1, "percentage of persons who were in fair or poor health," the reported category is only for those who were reported to have fair or poor health. The original question was asked as follows, "In general, would you say your health is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor?" For health program purposes, it was decided that the most meaningful way to report the data would be to report the percentage of Utahns who had either fair or poor health, rather than reporting for all response options of the original question.

It is also common for a measure to be reported for only a sub-population of Utahns. For instance, Table 3c reports reasons for lacking health insurance. The questions used to create this table were only asked of Utahns who reported no health insurance coverage. For clarification, the population of inference is always indicated at the end of the title of the figure or table.

Each measure is depicted on two pages. Reference tables for the measures typically report an overall percentage for the entire relevant Utah population, and for that population by sex, age group, age group by sex, local health district, annual household income, poverty status, education level (for adults 18 or older), employment status (for adults 18 or older), Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, and marital status (for adults 18 or older).

By presenting the information this way, it is not meant to imply that differences in a measure are caused by a person's sex, age, area of residence, or any other variable in the survey. Data collected in a single-point-in-time survey will never provide sufficient evidence of a cause and effect relationship between two variables. For instance, a relationship between obesity and overall ill health has been observed. The data do not suggest whether being obese causes ill health, being ill causes one to be obese, or whether some third variable, such as a chronic condition, causes a person to be obese and to experience overall ill health.

It should be noted that this report is an overview of the Health Status Survey results, and not a complete overview of the health status of Utahns. Other relevant information should be taken into account in order to gain a perspective on Utahns' overall health status, such as leading causes of death, trends in hospitalization for various conditions, infectious disease rates, characteristics of mothers and newborns, injury deaths and hospitalizations, and many other factors. Much of this information can be found in other Center for Health Data publications and on Utah's Indicator-Based Information System for Public Health (IBIS-PH) at <http://ibis.health.utah.gov>. In addition, the Behavioral Risk Factors Surveillance System is a source for additional survey information on adult Utahns' health behaviors.



Major findings include the following:

- Problems with health
 - Table 1. General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health, Males 8.7%, Females 10.7%
 - Table 2. General Health Status: Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor (Adults), Males 1.9 days, Females 3.4 days, statistically significant
 - Table 9. Asthma: Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma, Males 8.7%, Females 9.4%
 - Table 10. Diabetes: Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes, Males 4.1%, Females 4.2%
 - Table 12. Obesity: Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese, Males 20.7%, Females 17.8%
 - Table 13. Obesity: Percentage of Children (Aged 6-11) Who Were Described as Slightly or Very Overweight, Males 8.7%, Females 10.5%
- Problems with access to health care:
 - Table 3a. Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage, Males 12.2%, Females 10.9%
 - Table 4. Access to Health Care: Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care in the Previous 12 Months, Males 14.4%, Females 18.2%, statistically significant
 - Table 6. Preventive Medical Visit: Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months, Males 67.9%, Females 74.5%, statistically significant
 - Table 7. Place of Care: Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care, Males 12.8%, Females 8.3%, statistically significant
 - Table 8. Point of Access to Medical Care: Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or Urgent Care Center, Males 5.6%, Females 5.2%
- As age increased physical health declined with 30.2% of Utahns 65 years and older reporting fair or poor health, compared with 9.7% overall. The prevalence of chronic conditions such as asthma and diabetes also increased with age.
- As age increased the number of days of poor mental health decreased.
- There was a positive association between household income and health.
 - People who had lower incomes were more likely to report fair or poor health.
 - Adults with lower incomes reported more days of poor mental health.
 - People with lower incomes were less likely to have some kind of health insurance.
 - People with lower incomes were more likely to report some kind of problem accessing health care.

Trend Summary, Changes in Health Status and Access to Care

- Overall, the percentage of the population reporting fair or poor health has increased significantly since 1996 (8.6%) to 2005 (9.7%).
- The percentage of the population reporting that they had no health insurance has been increasing since 2001 (8.7%) to 2005 (11.6%).




- The percentage of the population reporting problems accessing health care has decreased slightly from 2003 (18.0%) to 2005 (16.3%).
- Overall, the percentage of the population reporting that they had received a routine medical visit in the past 12 months has increased from 1996 (55.7%) to 2005 (71.3%).
- The percentage of the population reporting that they had been diagnosed with diabetes has increased from 1996 (2.9%) to 2005 (4.1%).
- The percentage of children 17 and under who were exposed to cigarette smoke in the home has decreased from 2001 (6.0%) to 2005 (2.8%).




General Health Status

Figure 1.1 Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health, Utah, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005



This graph displays data for Utah over time (when available).

Figure 1.2 Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



This graph displays the measure by selected demographic subgroups (usually age and sex).

- Overall, the percentage of Utahns who reported that they had fair or poor physical health increased from 9.4% in 2004 to 9.7% in 2005.
- Across all age groups, females were more likely than males to report fair or poor health. These differences increased with age and were statistically significant for those aged 35 to 49, 50 to 64, and 65 and over.

4

2005 Utah Health Status Survey, Utah Department of Health

This bulleted text summarizes demographic differences for the measure using data from the table.



3. These columns include the survey estimates and the 95% confidence bounds for the measure. In this table, for example, for the total population of Utah, 9.7% reported they had fair or poor health. The 95% confidence interval ranges from 8.9% to 10.7%.

4. This column reports the estimated number of Utahns at risk, according to the measure. It is calculated by multiplying the survey estimate by the number of people in the population. In this example, the estimated number of males reporting fair or poor health is 111,400 (8.7% x 1,275,758). This number is always rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2. The second and third columns provide estimates of the population size and distribution across the subgroups in column 1. For example, in this table, males make up 50.4% of the total population and account for 1,275,758 of the total 2,528,926 estimated Utah population.

1. The first column identifies the subgroups for which the measure was calculated.

5. This column provides an estimate of how the Utahns at risk are distributed across the population subgroups in column 1. It is not a distribution of the total population, only those Utahns at risk, according to the measure. This number is calculated by dividing the number of persons in the subgroup who are at risk by the total number of persons at risk. For example, in this table, among the total population reporting fair or poor health, 45.3% were male (111,400/245,900) and 54.7% were female (134,400/245,900).

General Health Status

Table 1. General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Were in Fair/Poor Health			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons in Fair/Poor Health by Subgroup ⁴
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	95% Confidence Bounds	Lower	Upper		
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.4%	1,275,758	8.7%	7.7%	9.9%	111,400	45.3%
Female	49.6%	1,253,168	10.7%	9.6%	12.0%	134,400	54.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.2%	788,452	2.6%	1.9%	3.6%	20,400	8.3%
18 to 34	29.2%	737,965	6.6%	5.3%	8.2%	48,900	20.0%
35 to 49	18.4%	465,964	11.4%	9.5%	13.5%	52,900	21.6%
50 to 64	12.8%	323,963	18.0%	15.5%	20.7%	58,200	23.8%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	30.2%	26.6%	34.1%	64,300	26.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.0%	404,656	2.4%	1.6%	3.6%	9,600	3.9%
Males, 18 to 34	14.9%	376,364	6.3%	4.6%	8.6%	23,800	9.7%
Males, 35 to 49	9.4%	237,941	9.4%	7.2%	12.3%	22,400	9.2%
Males 50 to 64	6.4%	161,253	15.6%	12.5%	19.3%	25,200	10.3%
Males, 65 and Over	3.8%	95,544	30.3%	25.4%	35.7%	28,900	11.8%
Females, 17 and Under	15.2%	383,796	2.8%	1.8%	4.4%	10,700	4.4%
Females, 18 to 34	14.3%	361,601	7.0%	5.2%	9.2%	25,100	10.3%
Females, 35 to 49	9.0%	228,023	13.4%	10.8%	16.5%	30,600	12.5%
Females 50 to 64	6.4%	162,710	20.2%	16.9%	23.9%	32,900	13.5%
Females, 65 and Over	4.6%	117,038	30.2%	25.7%	35.2%	35,400	14.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Local Health District²							
Bear River	5.9%	149,705	6.1%	4.2%	8.9%	9,200	3.7%
Central	2.8%	71,046	13.2%	10.2%	16.8%	9,300	3.8%
Davis	10.9%	276,374	6.9%	4.9%	9.6%	19,100	7.8%
Salt Lake	38.4%	970,748	10.6%	9.1%	12.4%	103,300	42.1%
Southeastern	2.1%	52,832	14.6%	11.5%	18.3%	7,700	3.1%
Southwest	7.2%	182,295	9.5%	7.0%	12.8%	17,300	7.0%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	6.3%	4.2%	9.4%	2,300	0.9%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	10.8%	8.2%	14.1%	5,600	2.3%
TriCounty	1.7%	42,327	12.7%	9.8%	16.3%	5,400	2.2%
Utah County	18.0%	453,977	8.6%	6.6%	11.2%	39,000	15.9%
Wasatch	0.8%	20,138	8.2%	5.8%	11.3%	1,600	0.7%
Weber-Morgan	8.7%	221,232	11.6%	8.8%	15.2%	25,800	10.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	9.2%	8.4%	10.1%	206,000	83.4%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	14.0%	10.8%	17.9%	40,900	16.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	21.5%	17.1%	26.7%	55,200	24.4%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	11.6%	10.0%	13.6%	81,000	35.8%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	6.8%	5.5%	8.5%	41,100	18.2%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	5.0%	4.0%	6.3%	49,100	21.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Several tables in this report span two pages, as seen here. In those instances, the table name and column headings are repeated at the top for clarification. All footnotes for tables appear only once at the bottom of the table.

General Health Status



Table 1 (continued). General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Were in Fair/Poor Health			
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²		Percentage Distribution of Persons in Fair/Poor Health by Subgroup ⁴	
			95% Confidence Bounds		Number of Persons ^{3,4}	
			Lower	Upper		
Poverty Status						
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	13.2%	10.1%	17.1%	35,500 15.6%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	12.7%	10.4%	15.3%	70,900 31.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	6.5%	5.3%	7.8%	62,400 27.5%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	7.9%	6.6%	9.5%	58,100 25.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900 100.00%
Education Level						
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	24.6%	19.4%	30.6%	28,800 13.0%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	15.0%	13.5%	16.7%	141,300 63.7%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	9.0%	6.7%	12.1%	15,700 7.1%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	7.1%	5.8%	8.7%	36,100 16.3%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.8%	14.1%	224,400 100.00%
Employment Status						
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	8.3%	7.1%	9.7%	72,900 32.7%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	7.1%	5.3%	9.3%	20,600 9.2%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	29.0%	25.1%	33.2%	55,700 25.0%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	10.1%	7.7%	13.1%	20,100 9.0%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	8.6%	4.1%	17.2%	4,600 2.1%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	39.3%	33.6%	45.4%	48,900 21.9%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.8%	14.1%	224,400 100.00%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity						
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	13.9%	10.1%	18.8%	38,000 15.7%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	9.1%	8.3%	10.0%	204,700 84.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900 100.00%
Marital Status						
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	12.1%	10.8%	13.4%	145,900 65.4%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	8.0%	6.0%	10.8%	26,900 12.1%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	25.5%	22.0%	29.4%	50,200 22.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.8%	14.1%	224,400 100.00%

¹ Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

² Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

³ Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

⁴ Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

⁵ These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- Utahns who lacked any kind of health insurance were significantly more likely than Utahns with insurance coverage to report that they were in fair or poor health (14.0% and 9.2% respectively).
- Hispanic/Latino persons were also significantly more likely to report fair or poor health than others (13.9% and 9.1% respectively).


Relevant bullet points are also found after tables where space allows.

Health Status Survey Findings





Utah's 12 Local Health Districts



In the tables that follow, data are presented for each of Utah's 12 local health districts. There are six single-county and six multi-county health districts, as shown above.



Figure 1.1 Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health, Utah, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005





Figure 1.2 Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



- Overall, the percentage of Utahns who reported that they had fair or poor physical health increased from 9.4% in 2004 to 9.7% in 2005.
- Across all age groups, females were more likely than males to report fair or poor health.



Table 1. General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Were in Fair/Poor Health				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons in Fair/Poor Health by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.4%	1,275,758	8.7%	7.7%	9.9%	111,400	45.3%
Female	49.6%	1,253,168	10.7%	9.6%	12.0%	134,400	54.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.2%	788,452	2.6%	1.9%	3.6%	20,400	8.3%
18 to 34	29.2%	737,965	6.6%	5.3%	8.2%	48,900	20.0%
35 to 49	18.4%	465,964	11.4%	9.5%	13.5%	52,900	21.6%
50 to 64	12.8%	323,963	18.0%	15.5%	20.7%	58,200	23.8%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	30.2%	26.6%	34.1%	64,300	26.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.0%	404,656	2.4%	1.6%	3.6%	9,600	3.9%
Males, 18 to 34	14.9%	376,364	6.3%	4.6%	8.6%	23,800	9.7%
Males, 35 to 49	9.4%	237,941	9.4%	7.2%	12.3%	22,400	9.2%
Males, 50 to 64	6.4%	161,253	15.6%	12.5%	19.3%	25,200	10.3%
Males, 65 and Over	3.8%	95,544	30.3%	25.4%	35.7%	28,900	11.8%
Females, 17 and Under	15.2%	383,796	2.8%	1.8%	4.4%	10,700	4.4%
Females, 18 to 34	14.3%	361,601	7.0%	5.2%	9.2%	25,100	10.3%
Females, 35 to 49	9.0%	228,023	13.4%	10.8%	16.5%	30,600	12.5%
Females, 50 to 64	6.4%	162,710	20.2%	16.9%	23.9%	32,900	13.5%
Females, 65 and Over	4.6%	117,038	30.2%	25.7%	35.2%	35,400	14.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	5.9%	149,705	6.1%	4.2%	8.9%	9,200	3.7%
Central	2.8%	71,046	13.2%	10.2%	16.8%	9,300	3.8%
Davis	10.9%	276,374	6.9%	4.9%	9.6%	19,100	7.8%
Salt Lake	38.4%	970,748	10.6%	9.1%	12.4%	103,300	42.1%
Southeastern	2.1%	52,832	14.6%	11.5%	18.3%	7,700	3.1%
Southwest	7.2%	182,295	9.5%	7.0%	12.8%	17,300	7.0%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	6.3%	4.2%	9.4%	2,300	0.9%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	10.8%	8.2%	14.1%	5,600	2.3%
TriCounty	1.7%	42,327	12.7%	9.8%	16.3%	5,400	2.2%
Utah County	18.0%	453,977	8.6%	6.6%	11.2%	39,000	15.9%
Wasatch	0.8%	20,138	8.2%	5.8%	11.3%	1,600	0.7%
Weber-Morgan	8.7%	221,232	11.6%	8.8%	15.2%	25,800	10.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	9.2%	8.4%	10.1%	206,000	83.4%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	14.0%	10.8%	17.9%	40,900	16.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	21.5%	17.1%	26.7%	55,200	24.4%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	11.6%	10.0%	13.6%	81,000	35.8%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	6.8%	5.5%	8.5%	41,100	18.2%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	5.0%	4.0%	6.3%	49,100	21.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 1 (continued). General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Were in Fair/Poor Health				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons in Fair/Poor Health by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	13.2%	10.1%	17.1%	35,500	15.6%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	12.7%	10.4%	15.3%	70,900	31.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	6.5%	5.3%	7.8%	62,400	27.5%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	7.9%	6.6%	9.5%	58,100	25.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.00%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	24.6%	19.4%	30.6%	28,800	13.0%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	15.0%	13.5%	16.7%	141,300	63.7%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	9.0%	6.7%	12.1%	15,700	7.1%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	7.1%	5.8%	8.7%	36,100	16.3%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.8%	14.1%	224,400	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	8.3%	7.1%	9.7%	72,900	32.7%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	7.1%	5.3%	9.3%	20,600	9.2%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	29.0%	25.1%	33.2%	55,700	25.0%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	10.1%	7.7%	13.1%	20,100	9.0%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	8.6%	4.1%	17.2%	4,600	2.1%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	39.3%	33.6%	45.4%	48,900	21.9%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.8%	14.1%	224,400	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	13.9%	10.1%	18.8%	38,000	15.7%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	9.1%	8.3%	10.0%	204,700	84.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	12.1%	10.8%	13.4%	145,900	65.4%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	8.0%	6.0%	10.8%	26,900	12.1%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	25.5%	22.0%	29.4%	50,200	22.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.8%	14.1%	224,400	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- Utahns who lacked any kind of health insurance were significantly more likely than Utahns with insurance coverage to report that they were in fair or poor health (14.0% and 9.2% respectively).
- Hispanic/Latino persons were also significantly more likely to report fair or poor health than others (13.9% and 9.1% respectively).



Figure 2.1 Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor by Age and Sex, Utah Adults, 2005





Figure 2.2 Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor by Education, Utah Adults, 2005



- Mental health is an important component of overall well-being. Regardless of age, women in Utah who were 18 or older on average reported more days of poor mental health in the past 30 days than men (3.4 and 1.9 days, respectively).



Table 2. General Health Status: Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor
by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents Aged 18 and Over, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Number of Days in Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Adults ¹	Avg. Number of Days ²			Total Number of Days ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Number of Days by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.0%	871,102	1.9	1.6	2.3	1,693,300	36.5%
Female	50.0%	869,372	3.4	3.0	3.8	2,952,100	63.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Age Group							
18 to 34	42.4%	737,965	2.9	2.4	3.4	2,152,700	44.6%
35 to 49	26.8%	465,964	3.2	2.6	3.8	1,493,000	30.9%
50 to 64	18.6%	323,963	2.6	2.1	3.1	837,700	17.3%
65 and Over	12.2%	212,582	1.6	1.2	2.1	345,500	7.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 18 to 34	21.6%	376,364	1.9	1.3	2.4	706,500	15.0%
Males, 35 to 49	13.7%	237,941	2.1	1.5	2.7	497,000	10.5%
Males 50 to 64	9.3%	161,253	2.4	1.6	3.1	381,900	8.1%
Males, 65 and Over	5.5%	95,544	1.1	0.4	1.7	101,000	2.1%
Females, 18 to 34	20.8%	361,601	3.8	3.0	4.6	1,374,900	29.1%
Females, 35 to 49	13.1%	228,023	4.3	3.4	5.2	981,300	20.8%
Females 50 to 64	9.3%	162,710	2.8	2.1	3.4	449,400	9.5%
Females, 65 and Over	6.7%	117,038	2.0	1.4	2.6	231,500	4.9%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	5.8%	101,710	2.9	2.0	3.8	295,200	6.2%
Central	2.8%	49,249	2.4	1.6	3.2	119,300	2.5%
Davis	10.7%	186,183	2.4	1.7	3.1	446,400	9.4%
Salt Lake	39.1%	680,155	2.6	2.1	3.0	1,749,500	36.9%
Southeastern	2.2%	37,604	3.4	2.5	4.4	129,200	2.7%
Southwest	7.5%	130,527	3.1	2.1	4.0	398,400	8.4%
Summit	1.5%	26,547	2.3	1.4	3.2	61,400	1.3%
Tooele	2.0%	34,392	3.2	2.3	4.1	109,600	2.3%
TriCounty	1.7%	28,971	3.4	2.4	4.3	97,300	2.1%
Utah County	17.1%	297,244	2.5	1.9	3.1	737,700	15.6%
Wasatch	0.8%	13,719	2.6	1.8	3.5	36,100	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	154,173	3.6	2.4	4.8	562,200	11.9%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.3%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	87.0%	1,514,800	2.7	2.4	3.0	4,053,900	84.2%
Uninsured	13.0%	225,600	3.4	2.5	4.2	758,800	15.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	11.5%	200,000	4.0	3.1	5.0	806,500	17.1%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.8%	484,700	3.7	3.1	4.3	1,773,200	37.5%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.1%	402,000	2.6	2.0	3.2	1,056,700	22.4%
\$65,000 and Over	37.6%	653,700	1.7	1.3	2.0	1,088,200	23.0%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 2 (continued). General Health Status: Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents Aged 18 and Over, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Number of Days in Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Adults ¹	Avg. Number of Days ²			Total Number of Days ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Number of Days by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.0%	173,300	3.9	3.0	4.9	682,100	13.9%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.2%	351,300	3.6	2.9	4.3	1,262,800	25.7%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	34.2%	594,400	2.8	2.3	3.4	1,693,700	34.4%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	35.7%	621,500	2.1	1.7	2.4	1,279,700	26.0%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	4.3	2.9	5.8	508,700	10.6%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	3.1	2.7	3.5	2,928,400	60.8%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	2.5	1.8	3.2	432,700	9.0%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	1.8	1.5	2.2	942,900	19.6%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	2.6	2.2	3.0	2,256,300	47.1%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	2.6	2.0	3.2	760,400	15.9%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	1.8	1.3	2.3	349,100	7.3%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	2.5	1.8	3.3	505,600	10.6%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	2.3	1.3	3.2	121,900	2.5%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	6.4	5.0	7.8	798,500	16.7%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	9.5%	164,600	3.3	1.9	4.8	551,100	11.7%
Not Hispanic or Latino	90.5%	1,575,900	2.6	2.4	2.9	4,160,400	88.3%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	2.1	1.8	2.4	2,546,400	55.0%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	3.5	2.7	4.4	1,178,800	25.5%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	4.6	3.8	5.4	903,000	19.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Symmetric confidence bounds.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- As a percentage of the total number of poor mental health days reported, 63.5% were reported by women.
- Those who reported higher than average days of poor mental health were also more likely to: live in poverty, have lower levels of education, be unemployed, lack health insurance, and be of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity.



Figure 3a.1 Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage, Utah, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005





Figure 3a.2 Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

- Overall, the proportion of the population that lacks any kind of health insurance in Utah has been increasing. In 2005, 11.6% of Utahns did not have any kind of insurance coverage.



Health Insurance Coverage

Table 3a. Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With No Health Insurance Coverage				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons With No Health Insurance by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	12.2%	10.6%	14.1%	156,100	53.3%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	10.9%	9.3%	12.8%	136,800	46.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	8.5%	6.6%	11.0%	67,200	22.9%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	18.2%	15.4%	21.2%	134,000	45.6%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	13.6%	11.3%	16.4%	63,500	21.6%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	8.6%	6.7%	11.1%	28,000	9.5%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	***	***	***	***	***
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	7.6%	5.5%	10.4%	30,800	10.5%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	20.3%	17.1%	24.0%	76,400	26.0%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	14.9%	12.0%	18.4%	35,500	12.1%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	8.3%	5.8%	11.8%	13,400	4.6%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	***	***	***	***	***
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	9.5%	7.0%	12.7%	36,400	12.4%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	15.9%	13.1%	19.3%	57,600	19.6%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	12.3%	9.8%	15.3%	28,000	9.5%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	9.0%	6.7%	11.9%	14,600	5.0%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	***	***	***	***	***
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	9.9%	6.1%	15.9%	14,900	5.1%
Central	2.9%	71,046	14.6%	10.1%	20.7%	10,400	3.5%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	8.4%	5.2%	13.1%	23,200	7.9%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	11.4%	8.8%	14.6%	110,500	37.7%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	12.5%	8.7%	17.7%	6,600	2.3%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	14.7%	10.3%	20.6%	26,800	9.1%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	12.7%	7.7%	20.2%	4,600	1.6%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	8.1%	5.1%	12.7%	4,200	1.4%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	11.8%	8.1%	17.0%	5,000	1.7%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	11.8%	8.7%	15.8%	53,500	18.3%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	9.9%	6.4%	15.0%	2,000	0.7%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	14.2%	8.3%	23.2%	31,400	10.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	32.8%	25.8%	40.6%	84,100	29.4%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	17.9%	14.4%	21.9%	124,300	43.4%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	6.6%	4.8%	9.1%	39,900	13.9%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	3.9%	2.6%	5.7%	37,900	13.2%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	36.4%	28.5%	45.0%	97,700	33.9%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	17.0%	13.5%	21.2%	95,200	33.1%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	7.5%	5.8%	9.8%	72,900	25.3%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	3.0%	2.1%	4.2%	22,000	7.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 3a (continued). Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With No Health Insurance Coverage				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons With No Health Insurance by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	35.6%	27.1%	45.2%	41,800	18.7%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	15.1%	13.1%	17.3%	141,700	63.3%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	10.7%	7.7%	14.5%	18,600	8.3%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	4.3%	3.1%	5.8%	21,800	9.7%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	13.0%	11.4%	14.7%	225,600	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	12.7%	10.6%	15.1%	111,700	50.0%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	15.3%	12.3%	18.8%	44,600	19.9%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	1.5%	0.7%	3.4%	3,000	1.3%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	13.1%	10.0%	16.9%	26,100	11.7%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	16.7%	10.8%	25.0%	8,900	4.0%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	23.6%	18.4%	29.6%	29,300	13.1%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	13.0%	11.4%	14.7%	225,600	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	37.4%	28.8%	46.8%	102,400	34.7%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	8.5%	7.4%	9.8%	192,300	65.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	10.8%	9.1%	12.8%	131,000	58.4%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	18.9%	15.4%	23.0%	63,200	28.2%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	15.2%	12.3%	18.8%	30,000	13.4%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	13.0%	11.4%	14.7%	225,600	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.


5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

- Utahns aged 18 to 34 made up nearly one-half (45.6%) of all Utahns who were uninsured.
- Household income was negatively associated with health insurance coverage. Only 3.9% of those living in households with incomes \$65,000 or over were uninsured, compared to 32.8% of those in households with incomes under \$20,000.
- As a proportion of all uninsured Utahns, those living in households at or below 200% poverty made up (67.0%).
- For adults 18 years and over, those who had less than a high school education were the most likely to lack health insurance (35.6%). However, adults who had completed at least a high school education accounted for most uninsured adults (81.3%).
- An estimated 10.8% of Utah's population is Hispanic or Latino, however this group makes up 34.7% of all uninsured Utahns.



Figure 3b.1 Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance, Utah Insured Population, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005



* Children's Health Insurance Program.

** "Another government plan" includes Military, Tricare, or the V.A.

Note: Bars are not mutually exclusive, both by definition, and because a person may be covered by more than one type of plan.

- The most common type of insurance coverage for Utahns was provided through a current or former employer or union (77.5%), however, the proportion of insured Utahns receiving this type of insurance has decreased by 5.4% since 2001.



Table 3b. Health Insurance Carrier: Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance Coverage by Poverty Status, Utahns With Health Insurance, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Survey Estimates of Insured Utahns With Each Type of Plan			
	Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Plan ^{1,2}			Number of Persons With Each Type of Plan ³
	95% Confidence Bounds			
	Lower	Upper		
Type of Plan				
Current or Former Employer or Union	77.5%	75.4%	79.4%	1,732,900
Purchased Directly From an Insurance Company	12.6%	11.1%	14.4%	282,200
Through Someone Not Living in Household	3.3%	2.6%	4.2%	74,100
Medicaid	8.7%	7.6%	9.9%	193,800
Medicare	10.6%	9.6%	11.6%	236,400
CHIP (Ages 17 and Under) ⁴	5.9%	4.4%	8.0%	42,800
Other Government Plan ⁵	4.1%	3.3%	5.0%	91,100

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Insured Utahns With Each Type of Plan				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Insured Persons ⁶	Percentage of Insured Persons ¹			Number of Insured Persons ^{3,7}	Percentage Distribution of Insured Persons by Subgroup ⁷
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Current or Former Employer or Union by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	7.5%	166,800	30.9%	23.0%	40.2%	51,600	3.0%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.9%	466,900	68.9%	63.3%	73.9%	321,600	18.4%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	40.1%	896,600	83.9%	80.2%	87.0%	751,900	43.0%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	31.6%	705,700	88.2%	85.5%	90.5%	622,700	35.6%
Total, All Insured Utahns	100.0%	2,236,100	77.5%	75.4%	79.4%	1,732,900	100.0%
Purchased Directly From an Insurance Company by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	7.5%	166,800	16.9%	10.7%	25.8%	28,200	10.4%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.9%	466,900	11.9%	8.7%	16.1%	55,700	20.5%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	40.1%	896,600	13.2%	10.3%	16.8%	118,400	43.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	31.6%	705,700	9.8%	7.8%	12.4%	69,400	25.5%
Total, All Insured Utahns	100.0%	2,236,100	12.6%	11.1%	14.4%	282,200	100.0%
Through Someone Not Living in Household by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	7.5%	166,800	7.8%	4.7%	12.5%	12,900	16.2%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.9%	466,900	5.1%	3.2%	8.1%	23,900	30.0%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	40.1%	896,600	3.6%	2.3%	5.6%	32,200	40.5%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	31.6%	705,700	1.5%	0.9%	2.4%	10,600	13.3%
Total, All Insured Utahns	100.0%	2,236,100	3.3%	2.6%	4.2%	74,100	100.0%
Medicaid by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	7.5%	166,800	46.6%	38.3%	55.1%	77,700	39.6%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.9%	466,900	14.9%	11.6%	19.0%	69,600	35.5%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	40.1%	896,600	3.6%	2.6%	5.0%	32,300	16.5%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	31.6%	705,700	2.4%	1.7%	3.4%	16,700	8.5%
Total, All Insured Utahns	100.0%	2,236,100	8.7%	7.6%	9.9%	193,800	100.0%
Medicare by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	7.5%	166,800	10.8%	7.8%	14.8%	18,000	9.1%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.9%	466,900	12.2%	9.9%	15.0%	57,000	28.9%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	40.1%	896,600	5.2%	4.2%	6.4%	46,700	23.7%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	31.6%	705,700	10.7%	9.0%	12.6%	75,500	38.3%
Total, All Insured Utahns	100.0%	2,236,100	10.6%	9.6%	11.6%	236,400	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 3b (continued). Health Insurance Carrier: Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance Coverage by Poverty Status, Utahns With Health Insurance, 2005


Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Insured Utahns With Each Type of Plan				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Insured Persons ⁶	Persons ¹ 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Insured Persons ^{3,7}	Percentage Distribution of Insured Persons by Subgroup ⁷
			Lower	Upper			
CHIP⁴ by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	9.5%	68,500	17.0%	10.1%	27.3%	11,700	26.3%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	25.1%	181,200	14.8%	9.7%	22.0%	26,800	60.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	49.3%	355,200	1.6%	0.8%	3.3%	5,600	12.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	16.1%	116,300	***	***	***	***	***
Total, All Insured Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	721,200	5.9%	4.4%	8.0%	42,800	100.0%
Other Government Plan⁵ by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	7.5%	166,800	2.0%	0.9%	4.7%	3,400	4.3%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.9%	466,900	3.2%	2.0%	5.0%	14,700	18.4%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	40.1%	896,600	3.0%	1.9%	4.8%	26,800	33.5%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	31.6%	705,700	5.0%	3.6%	6.8%	35,100	43.9%
Total, All Insured Utahns	100.0%	2,236,100	4.1%	3.3%	5.0%	91,100	100.0%

1 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.
 2 Because individuals could have more than one plan, figures in this column do not sum to 100%.
 3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons
 4 Children's Health Insurance Program.
 5 "Other government plan" includes Military, Tricare, or the V.A.
 6 Population estimates based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.
 7 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.
 *** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.
 Note: Estimates are not mutually exclusive, both by definition, and because a person may be covered by more than one type of plan.

- For insured Utahns, as income (as a percentage of the federal poverty level) increased, the likelihood of having insurance through an employer or union also increased.
- 39.6% of insured Utahns who had Medicaid lived at or below 100% of poverty.



Figure 3c.1 Percentage of Persons Who Gave Each Reason as a Reason That They Lacked Health Insurance, Utahns Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005



* Reasons an insurance company would refuse to cover an individual included 1) a pre-existing condition, 2) the individual exceeded lifetime benefits, or 3) some other reason.

Note: Because individuals could choose more than one reason, figures sum to greater than 100%.

- The reasons for lacking health insurance (as measured by the Health Status Survey) are not mutually exclusive or exhaustive.
- Over half (58.6%) of uninsured Utahns reported they could not afford health insurance as a reason for being uninsured.
- 32.8% of uninsured Utahns reported that an employer did not offer health insurance as a reason for lacking health insurance.



Table 3c. Reasons for Lack of Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons Who Gave Each Reason as a Reason That They Lacked Health Insurance by Poverty Status, Utahns Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Survey Estimates of Utahns Without Health Insurance by Reason Uninsured			
	Percentage of Persons by Reason Uninsured ^{1,2}			Number of Persons Reporting Each Reason ³
	95% Confidence Bounds			
	Lower	Upper		
Reasons for Lack of Health Insurance				
Cannot Afford Insurance	58.6%	50.9%	66.0%	171,600
Employer Does Not Offer Insurance	32.8%	26.2%	40.2%	96,200
Lost Job	27.3%	21.5%	33.9%	79,900
Don't Need/Don't Want Insurance	27.3%	20.6%	35.1%	79,800
Employed Part Time	15.9%	12.0%	20.8%	46,600
Lost Eligibility	10.8%	7.5%	15.4%	31,700
Insurance Company Refused to Cover ⁴	6.8%	4.8%	9.7%	20,000

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Without Health Insurance by Reason Uninsured				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Uninsured Persons ⁵	Percentage of Uninsured Persons ¹			Number of Uninsured Persons ^{3,6}	Percentage Distribution of Uninsured Persons by Subgroup ⁶
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Cannot Afford Insurance by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	58.2%	40.8%	73.7%	56,800	33.6%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	50.2%	37.8%	62.6%	49,300	29.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	69.1%	53.7%	81.2%	51,700	30.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	49.3%	32.3%	66.4%	11,000	6.5%
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	58.6%	50.9%	66.0%	171,600	100.0%
Employer Does Not Offer Insurance by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	32.3%	18.7%	49.7%	31,500	31.5%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	38.4%	26.7%	51.6%	37,600	37.6%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	30.2%	19.4%	43.7%	22,600	22.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	37.0%	22.2%	54.6%	8,200	8.2%
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	32.8%	26.2%	40.2%	96,200	100.0%
Lost Job by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	25.3%	14.5%	40.3%	24,700	28.6%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	29.6%	19.9%	41.7%	29,100	33.7%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	31.4%	19.9%	45.6%	23,500	27.2%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	40.6%	25.4%	57.9%	9,100	10.5%
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	27.3%	21.5%	33.9%	79,900	100.0%
Don't Need/Don't Want Insurance by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	33.1%	18.7%	51.5%	32,300	43.8%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	16.7%	9.5%	27.7%	16,400	22.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	24.0%	14.4%	37.2%	18,000	24.4%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	31.6%	17.5%	50.1%	7,100	9.6%
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	27.3%	20.6%	35.1%	79,800	100.0%
Employed Part Time by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	16.1%	9.2%	26.6%	15,700	36.2%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	14.2%	7.9%	24.1%	13,900	32.0%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	13.5%	7.7%	22.5%	10,100	23.3%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	16.8%	7.9%	32.1%	3,700	8.5%
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	15.9%	12.0%	20.8%	46,600	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 3c (continued). Reasons for Lack of Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons Who Gave Each Reason as a Reason That They Lacked Health Insurance by Poverty Status, Utahns Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Without Health Insurance by Reason Uninsured				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Uninsured Persons ⁵	Percentage of Uninsured Persons ¹			Number of Uninsured Persons ^{3,6}	Percentage Distribution of Uninsured Persons by Subgroup ⁶
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Lost Eligibility by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	16.2%	8.9%	27.7%	15,800	47.3%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	13.8%	7.9%	22.9%	13,500	40.4%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	4.7%	1.1%	17.5%	3,500	10.5%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	***	***	***	***	***
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	10.8%	7.5%	15.4%	31,700	100.0%
Insurance Company Refused to Cover⁴ by Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	33.3%	97,600	1.6%	0.5%	4.6%	1,600	8.1%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	33.5%	98,100	10.5%	5.7%	18.5%	10,300	52.0%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	25.5%	74,800	8.2%	4.1%	15.7%	6,200	31.3%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	7.6%	22,300	7.7%	3.0%	18.6%	1,700	8.6%
Total, All Uninsured Utahns	100.0%	292,800	6.8%	4.8%	9.7%	20,000	100.0%

1 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

2 Because individuals could have cited more than one reason, figures in this column do not sum to 100%.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons

4 Reasons an insurance company would refuse to cover an individual included 1) a pre-existing condition, 2) the individual exceeded lifetime benefits, or 3) some other reason.

5 Population estimates based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

6 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.


*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

Note: Estimates are not mutually exclusive, both by definition, and because a person may have reported more than one reason why uninsured.

- The proportion of uninsured Utahns who reported that they did not need/did not want insurance as a reason for lacking health insurance increased by 26.5% between 2001 and 2005.



Figure 4.1 Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care* in the Previous 12 Months by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



*An individual was defined as unable to get care if they indicated that they delayed or were unable to obtain care because (1) their insurance would not cover the service, (2) the service was not available in their area, or (3) they could not afford to pay for the service.

- Both the number and percent of Utahns who were unable to get needed medical, dental, or mental health care in the past 12 months decreased slightly from 2004 to 2005 (2004: 16.9% and 2005: 16.3%).
- Females aged 35 to 49 were the most likely age and gender group to report difficulties getting needed care (24.9%).



Table 4. Access to Health Care: Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care* in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With an Access Problem				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Unable to Get Care
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	14.4%	13.0%	15.8%	183,400	44.6%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	18.2%	16.6%	19.9%	227,900	55.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	8.0%	6.4%	9.9%	62,900	15.2%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	21.7%	19.3%	24.3%	160,200	38.8%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	23.1%	20.3%	26.0%	107,500	26.0%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	18.4%	15.9%	21.1%	59,500	14.4%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	10.9%	8.6%	13.7%	23,200	5.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	6.6%	5.0%	8.7%	26,900	6.5%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	19.7%	16.8%	23.0%	74,200	18.0%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	21.3%	18.0%	24.9%	50,600	12.3%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	15.6%	12.7%	19.1%	25,200	6.1%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	8.6%	6.1%	12.0%	8,200	2.0%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	9.4%	7.0%	12.5%	36,000	8.7%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	23.7%	20.6%	27.1%	85,800	20.8%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	24.9%	21.6%	28.6%	56,800	13.8%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	21.0%	17.7%	24.7%	34,200	8.3%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	12.9%	9.8%	16.7%	15,000	3.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	16.0%	12.1%	20.8%	24,000	5.8%
Central	2.9%	71,046	20.1%	15.5%	25.7%	14,300	3.5%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	12.6%	9.4%	16.7%	34,900	8.5%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	15.7%	13.6%	18.1%	152,500	37.0%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	29.0%	24.1%	34.4%	15,300	3.7%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	18.3%	14.4%	23.0%	33,300	8.1%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	11.4%	8.0%	16.1%	4,200	1.0%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	20.8%	16.7%	25.6%	10,800	2.6%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	17.4%	13.4%	22.2%	7,400	1.8%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	18.1%	15.1%	21.5%	82,200	20.0%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	13.2%	9.9%	17.4%	2,700	0.7%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	13.7%	10.3%	18.2%	30,400	7.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	13.9%	12.7%	15.2%	310,000	73.1%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	38.9%	33.3%	44.8%	114,000	26.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	27.7%	22.9%	33.0%	71,000	16.8%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	23.7%	21.1%	26.5%	164,800	39.0%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	17.1%	14.5%	20.0%	102,500	24.3%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	8.6%	6.9%	10.8%	84,200	19.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 4 (continued). Access to Health Care: Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care* in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With an Access Problem				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Unable to Get Care
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	26.5%	21.5%	32.2%	71,100	16.9%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	23.1%	20.2%	26.2%	128,900	30.6%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	14.9%	12.7%	17.3%	143,800	34.1%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	10.6%	9.0%	12.6%	78,100	18.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	26.3%	20.7%	32.8%	30,800	8.8%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	20.8%	18.8%	22.8%	194,800	55.5%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	22.0%	18.1%	26.5%	38,300	10.9%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	17.1%	14.9%	19.5%	87,200	24.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	20.1%	18.7%	21.6%	349,700	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	19.0%	17.2%	21.0%	167,300	47.6%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	23.5%	20.4%	26.8%	68,400	19.5%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	10.8%	8.4%	13.9%	20,800	5.9%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	21.0%	17.4%	25.1%	42,000	12.0%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	15.0%	9.7%	22.4%	8,000	2.3%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	36.1%	30.4%	42.2%	44,900	12.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	20.1%	18.7%	21.6%	349,700	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	16.6%	11.9%	22.6%	45,500	11.1%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	16.2%	15.0%	17.4%	364,300	88.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	19.4%	17.7%	21.2%	234,700	67.2%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	16.0%	13.1%	19.5%	53,500	15.3%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	30.9%	27.0%	35.2%	60,900	17.4%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	20.1%	18.7%	21.6%	349,700	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.


5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

*An individual was defined as unable to get care if they indicated that they delayed or were unable to obtain care because (1) their insurance would not cover the service, (2) the service was not available in their area, or (3) they could not afford to pay for the service.

- Although Utahns with some kind of health insurance were much less likely than uninsured Utahns to report difficulties getting care (13.9% and 38.9% respectively), Utahns with insurance made up 73.1% of all those who reported access problems.
- As household income increased the likelihood of reporting difficulties getting needed care decreased.
- Southeastern Health District had the highest proportion of residents reporting difficulties getting needed care (29.0%).



Figure 5.1 Average Number of Medical Visits in the Previous 12 Months by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



Note: Does not include overnight hospital stays.

- The average number of medical visits in the previous 12 months was positively associated with age. As age increased, the average number of medical visits also increased.
- Males and females aged 65 and over had the highest average number of medical visits compared to other age and gender groups.



Table 5. Health Care Utilization: Average Number of Medical Visits in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Number of Medical Visits in Previous 12 Months				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Avg. Number of Visits ²	95% Confidence Bounds		Total Number of Medical Visits ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Medical Visits by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	2.9	2.7	3.0	3,658,600	40.3%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	4.3	4.1	4.5	5,421,200	59.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	3.0	2.8	3.1	2,338,700	25.7%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	3.5	3.2	3.7	2,560,100	28.1%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	3.5	3.2	3.8	1,622,700	17.8%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	4.4	4.1	4.8	1,441,000	15.8%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	5.4	4.9	5.8	1,141,100	12.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	2.9	2.7	3.1	1,182,800	13.0%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	2.0	1.8	2.2	764,900	8.4%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	2.5	2.1	2.8	589,500	6.5%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	3.7	3.3	4.1	591,600	6.5%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	5.5	4.9	6.1	525,400	5.8%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	3.0	2.7	3.3	1,155,900	12.7%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	5.0	4.5	5.5	1,793,800	19.7%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	4.5	4.0	5.1	1,034,900	11.4%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	5.2	4.6	5.8	843,400	9.3%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	5.3	4.6	5.9	615,300	6.8%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	3.1	2.8	3.4	468,100	5.2%
Central	2.9%	71,046	3.8	3.4	4.2	270,100	3.0%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	4.0	3.6	4.4	1,108,300	12.2%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	3.5	3.3	3.7	3,386,600	37.3%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	4.1	3.7	4.6	217,900	2.4%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	3.5	3.1	3.9	637,300	7.0%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	3.5	3.1	3.9	127,700	1.4%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	4.1	3.6	4.5	211,700	2.3%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	3.7	3.3	4.2	158,100	1.7%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	3.3	3.1	3.6	1,518,400	16.7%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	3.9	3.5	4.3	78,400	0.9%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	4.1	3.5	4.7	903,200	9.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	3.8	3.7	4.0	8,573,500	93.7%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	2.0	1.7	2.3	578,500	6.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	4.0	3.4	4.6	1,024,400	11.3%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	3.9	3.6	4.1	2,685,700	29.7%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	3.7	3.4	3.9	2,199,300	24.3%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	3.2	3.0	3.4	3,131,800	34.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 5 (cont.). Health Care Utilization: Average Number of Medical Visits in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Number of Medical Visits in Previous 12 Months				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Avg. Number of Visits ²	95% Confidence Bounds		Total Number of Medical Visits ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Medical Visits by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	3.5	2.9	4.0	927,700	10.2%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	3.6	3.3	3.9	2,014,900	22.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	3.3	3.1	3.5	3,226,400	35.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	3.9	3.7	4.2	2,889,500	31.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	4.0	3.0	5.1	474,900	7.0%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	3.8	3.6	4.0	3,578,100	52.6%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	3.9	3.4	4.5	685,800	10.1%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	4.0	3.7	4.3	2,058,500	30.3%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	3.9	3.7	4.1	6,777,900	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	3.0	2.8	3.2	2,654,000	38.9%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	3.2	2.9	3.5	936,200	13.7%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	5.5	5.0	6.0	1,051,200	15.4%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	5.5	4.9	6.1	1,107,800	16.2%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	3.3	2.4	4.1	173,400	2.5%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	7.3	6.0	8.5	903,300	13.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	3.9	3.7	4.1	6,777,900	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	3.1	2.4	3.7	838,300	9.3%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	3.6	3.5	3.8	8,223,500	90.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	4.0	3.8	4.2	4,800,300	70.9%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	2.8	2.3	3.2	922,900	13.6%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	5.3	4.6	6.0	1,046,400	15.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	3.9	3.7	4.1	6,777,900	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Symmetric confidence bounds.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

Note: Does not include overnight hospital stays.



Figure 6.1 Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months, Utah, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005





Figure 6.2 Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



- The proportion of Utahns who had a routine annual check-up varied by age with those aged 18 to 34 being the least likely (59.5%) and those aged 65 and over being the most likely (84.0%).



Table 6. Preventive Medical Visit: Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With a Routine Exam				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons With a Routine Exam by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	67.9%	65.8%	70.0%	866,200	48.1%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	74.5%	72.5%	76.5%	934,000	51.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	77.4%	74.6%	80.0%	610,200	34.2%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	59.5%	56.1%	62.7%	438,800	24.6%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	65.2%	61.7%	68.5%	303,800	17.0%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	78.7%	75.5%	81.5%	254,800	14.3%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	84.0%	80.6%	86.9%	178,500	10.0%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	78.3%	75.1%	81.3%	317,000	17.9%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	50.1%	45.2%	54.9%	188,500	10.6%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	55.0%	49.9%	60.0%	130,900	7.4%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	77.7%	73.4%	81.5%	125,300	7.1%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	85.0%	80.5%	88.6%	81,200	4.6%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	76.3%	72.4%	79.9%	293,000	16.5%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	67.5%	63.4%	71.4%	244,200	13.8%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	73.7%	69.6%	77.4%	168,000	9.5%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	79.5%	75.6%	82.9%	129,400	7.3%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	83.1%	78.8%	86.6%	97,200	5.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	67.9%	62.4%	73.0%	101,700	5.6%
Central	2.9%	71,046	70.0%	63.0%	76.2%	49,800	2.8%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	74.2%	69.4%	78.5%	205,100	11.4%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	73.5%	70.5%	76.3%	713,400	39.6%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	67.8%	61.8%	73.3%	35,800	2.0%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	69.7%	64.4%	74.5%	127,100	7.1%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	79.6%	73.8%	84.5%	29,000	1.6%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	72.4%	67.0%	77.2%	37,500	2.1%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	67.9%	62.0%	73.3%	28,700	1.6%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	67.3%	63.1%	71.3%	305,700	17.0%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	73.0%	67.5%	77.8%	14,700	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	69.5%	62.5%	75.7%	153,700	8.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	72.6%	70.8%	74.2%	1,622,400	90.6%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	57.8%	51.2%	64.1%	169,300	9.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	66.7%	60.3%	72.5%	171,000	9.5%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	69.3%	66.0%	72.4%	482,000	26.9%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	70.2%	66.4%	73.7%	421,800	23.5%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	73.7%	71.0%	76.3%	719,600	40.1%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 6 (continued). Preventive Medical Visit: Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With a Routine Exam				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons With a Routine Exam by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	67.0%	60.8%	72.6%	179,900	10.0%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	69.9%	65.7%	73.8%	391,200	21.8%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	69.4%	66.4%	72.2%	671,400	37.4%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	75.1%	72.3%	77.7%	551,100	30.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	69.1%	61.2%	76.0%	81,100	6.8%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	68.2%	65.7%	70.7%	640,800	53.8%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	68.2%	62.9%	73.1%	118,700	10.0%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	68.9%	65.7%	71.9%	351,500	29.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	68.5%	66.6%	70.3%	1,191,900	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	66.5%	63.8%	69.1%	584,700	49.2%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	65.0%	60.5%	69.2%	189,500	16.0%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	82.3%	78.7%	85.5%	158,100	13.3%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	70.6%	65.9%	74.9%	140,900	11.9%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	59.1%	47.9%	69.3%	31,500	2.7%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	66.5%	59.9%	72.5%	82,700	7.0%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	68.5%	66.6%	70.3%	1,191,900	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	76.6%	69.4%	82.6%	210,100	11.6%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	70.8%	69.1%	72.4%	1,596,400	88.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	70.8%	68.6%	72.8%	855,800	72.2%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	56.9%	51.6%	62.1%	190,300	16.1%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	70.6%	65.7%	75.1%	138,900	11.7%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	68.5%	66.6%	70.3%	1,191,900	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- 71.3% of Utahns reported that they had received a routine medical check-up in the previous 12 months.
- Females were significantly more likely to have had a check-up than males (74.5% and 67.9% respectively).
- Only 57.8% of Utahns with no health insurance reported having had a check-up in the past 12 months compared with 72.6% of those with health insurance.



Figure 7.1 Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care, Utah, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005






Figure 7.2 Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care by Age Group, Utah, 2005



- The proportion of Utahns who had no usual place of care is increasing. In 2005, 10.6% of Utahns reported that they had no usual place of care compared to 9.8% in 2004 and 7.9% in 2003.
- Half of all Utahns with no usual place of care were aged 18–34.



Figure 7.3 Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



- College aged males (18 to 34 years) were the most likely to report having no usual place of care compared to other age and gender groups (23.2%). This group made up one-third (32.8%) of all Utahns with no usual place of care.



Table 7. Place of Care: Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With No Usual Place of Medical Care				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons With No Usual Place of Care by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	12.8%	11.3%	14.5%	163,300	61.1%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	8.3%	7.0%	9.8%	103,800	38.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	5.3%	3.8%	7.3%	41,800	15.7%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	18.2%	15.7%	20.9%	134,100	50.4%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	12.1%	9.9%	14.7%	56,300	21.1%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	8.2%	6.5%	10.4%	26,600	10.0%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	3.5%	2.2%	5.4%	7,400	2.8%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	4.5%	3.2%	6.4%	18,300	6.9%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	23.2%	19.8%	27.0%	87,300	32.8%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	16.3%	13.2%	20.1%	38,900	14.6%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	9.4%	7.1%	12.5%	15,200	5.7%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	4.4%	2.6%	7.6%	4,200	1.6%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	6.1%	4.0%	9.1%	23,400	8.8%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	13.0%	10.5%	15.9%	46,900	17.6%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	7.6%	5.7%	10.1%	17,400	6.5%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	7.0%	5.2%	9.6%	11,500	4.3%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	2.7%	1.5%	4.7%	3,100	1.2%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	9.3%	6.3%	13.6%	13,900	5.2%
Central	2.9%	71,046	5.7%	3.0%	10.6%	4,000	1.5%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	8.2%	5.1%	12.9%	22,600	8.5%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	12.8%	10.5%	15.6%	124,300	46.6%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	11.2%	8.0%	15.6%	5,900	2.2%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	11.8%	8.0%	17.2%	21,500	8.1%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	11.7%	7.7%	17.5%	4,300	1.6%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	9.8%	6.8%	14.1%	5,100	1.9%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	8.2%	5.4%	12.1%	3,500	1.3%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	8.3%	6.0%	11.3%	37,500	14.1%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	10.1%	6.7%	14.9%	2,000	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	9.9%	6.1%	15.7%	22,000	8.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	7.4%	6.4%	8.6%	166,200	64.1%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	31.8%	26.4%	37.8%	93,200	35.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	21.6%	16.3%	28.0%	55,400	21.7%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	11.9%	9.5%	14.9%	82,900	32.5%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	7.2%	5.2%	9.8%	43,000	16.9%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	7.5%	5.9%	9.7%	73,600	28.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 7 (continued). Place of Care: Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns With No Usual Place of Medical Care				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons With No Usual Place of Care by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	22.1%	16.1%	29.6%	59,400	23.5%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	9.6%	7.3%	12.5%	53,700	21.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	8.3%	6.6%	10.4%	80,100	31.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	8.2%	6.4%	10.4%	60,000	23.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	23.7%	16.9%	32.1%	27,800	12.5%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	12.6%	10.9%	14.6%	118,700	53.6%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	12.4%	9.4%	16.0%	21,500	9.7%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	10.5%	8.7%	12.7%	53,600	24.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.4%	14.4%	223,700	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	13.9%	12.0%	16.1%	122,700	55.7%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	13.7%	10.9%	17.0%	39,900	18.1%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	4.7%	3.1%	7.2%	9,100	4.1%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	9.5%	6.9%	12.9%	18,900	8.6%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	19.4%	12.1%	29.6%	10,300	4.7%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	15.5%	11.3%	20.9%	19,300	8.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.4%	14.4%	223,700	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	19.8%	14.0%	27.3%	54,300	20.3%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	9.5%	8.3%	10.7%	213,300	79.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	11.0%	9.6%	12.7%	133,500	59.5%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	20.4%	16.8%	24.5%	68,200	30.4%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	11.4%	8.6%	15.0%	22,500	10.0%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	12.9%	11.4%	14.4%	223,700	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- Utahns living at or below 100% of the federal poverty level were over twice as likely to report having no usual place of medical care than any other poverty level.
- Uninsured persons (31.8%) were more likely to have no usual source of medical care than those with insurance coverage (7.4%).
- Among adults, those who had not finished high school were more likely to have no usual place of care (23.7%).



Figure 8.1 Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Facility, Utah, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005





Figure 8.2 Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Facility by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



- The use of an emergency department or urgent care facility as a place of access to medical care is expensive for the individual and the health care system. It also prevents continuity in health care.
- An estimated 136,600 Utahns (5.4%) reported that their usual point of access for medical care was an emergency department or urgent care center.



Table 8. Point of Access to Medical Care: Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Center by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Accessed Care in ED or Urgent Care Center				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Accessed Care in ED or Urgent Care Center by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	5.6%	4.6%	6.9%	72,000	52.7%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	5.2%	4.0%	6.6%	64,600	47.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	4.4%	2.9%	6.7%	34,700	25.2%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	8.1%	6.3%	10.2%	59,400	43.1%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	5.1%	3.7%	6.9%	23,600	17.1%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	3.6%	2.5%	5.2%	11,600	8.4%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	4.0%	2.5%	6.3%	8,400	6.1%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	3.7%	2.4%	5.6%	14,800	10.8%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	8.9%	6.7%	11.7%	33,500	24.3%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	5.8%	4.1%	8.2%	13,900	10.1%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	3.9%	2.4%	6.0%	6,200	4.5%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	4.3%	2.4%	7.4%	4,100	3.0%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	5.2%	2.9%	9.0%	19,900	14.5%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	7.2%	5.4%	9.4%	25,900	18.8%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	4.2%	2.9%	6.2%	9,600	7.0%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	3.3%	2.0%	5.4%	5,400	3.9%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	3.7%	2.2%	6.3%	4,300	3.1%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	1.0%	0.4%	3.0%	1,600	1.2%
Central	2.9%	71,046	2.2%	0.7%	7.2%	1,600	1.2%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	6.0%	3.4%	10.3%	16,600	12.1%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	5.7%	4.0%	8.2%	55,700	40.7%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	3.9%	1.8%	8.3%	2,100	1.5%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	5.2%	2.7%	9.9%	9,500	6.9%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	4.9%	2.6%	8.9%	1,800	1.3%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	5.4%	3.0%	9.3%	2,800	2.0%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	6.6%	3.6%	11.8%	2,800	2.0%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	4.0%	2.4%	6.5%	17,900	13.1%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	2.7%	1.4%	5.2%	600	0.4%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	10.7%	6.7%	16.7%	23,700	17.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	4.9%	3.9%	6.1%	109,300	79.8%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	9.5%	6.2%	14.1%	27,700	20.2%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	5.7%	3.3%	9.4%	14,500	10.4%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	6.0%	4.0%	8.9%	41,900	30.1%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	4.2%	2.7%	6.4%	25,200	18.1%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	5.9%	4.1%	8.5%	57,700	41.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 8 (continued). Point of Access to Medical Care: Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Center by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Accessed Care in ED or Urgent Care Center				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Accessed Care in ED or Urgent Care Center by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	6.0%	3.5%	10.2%	16,100	11.5%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	5.5%	3.4%	8.8%	31,000	22.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	5.1%	3.3%	7.7%	49,200	35.2%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	5.9%	4.3%	8.1%	43,500	31.1%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	11.1%	6.7%	17.8%	13,000	12.5%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	5.7%	4.5%	7.2%	53,200	51.4%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	6.8%	4.4%	10.3%	11,900	11.5%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	5.0%	3.6%	6.8%	25,500	24.6%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	5.9%	4.9%	7.1%	103,100	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	6.8%	5.4%	8.4%	59,600	58.2%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	5.4%	3.7%	7.7%	15,700	15.3%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	4.4%	2.7%	7.0%	8,400	8.2%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	4.0%	2.5%	6.4%	8,000	7.8%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	***	***	***	***	***
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	7.6%	4.5%	12.5%	9,400	9.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	5.9%	4.9%	7.1%	103,100	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	9.1%	4.9%	16.4%	25,000	18.4%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	4.9%	4.0%	6.0%	110,800	81.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	5.5%	4.4%	6.8%	66,100	63.9%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	6.6%	4.5%	9.6%	22,000	21.3%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	7.8%	5.4%	11.1%	15,300	14.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	5.9%	4.9%	7.1%	103,100	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.


5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

- Nearly ten percent (9.5%) of uninsured Utahns reported that their usual point of access to care was an emergency department or urgent care center.
- Young adults (18 to 34 years) were the most likely group to report that their usual point of access was an emergency department or urgent care center (8.1%).



Figure 9.1 Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



- The proportion of the population who reported being diagnosed with asthma increased with age.
- The highest rates for asthma were reported by women 35 years and over.
- Southwest health district had the highest percentage of Utahns who reported being diagnosed with asthma (12.4%).



Table 9. Asthma: Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Ever Diagnosed With Asthma by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	8.7%	7.6%	9.8%	110,700	48.4%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	9.4%	8.4%	10.5%	117,800	51.6%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	8.2%	7.0%	9.5%	64,300	28.0%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	8.9%	7.5%	10.7%	65,900	28.7%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	9.5%	8.0%	11.3%	44,400	19.3%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	10.1%	8.3%	12.2%	32,700	14.2%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	10.6%	8.5%	13.2%	22,600	9.8%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	9.7%	8.1%	11.7%	39,300	17.1%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	9.4%	7.3%	12.0%	35,400	15.4%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	6.6%	4.9%	8.7%	15,600	6.8%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	8.3%	6.2%	11.1%	13,400	5.8%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	8.0%	5.5%	11.5%	7,700	3.3%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	6.5%	5.2%	8.2%	25,000	10.9%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	8.4%	6.6%	10.7%	30,500	13.3%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	12.7%	10.2%	15.6%	28,900	12.6%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	11.7%	9.3%	14.7%	19,100	8.3%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	12.8%	9.8%	16.6%	15,000	6.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	5.8%	3.9%	8.5%	8,700	3.8%
Central	2.9%	71,046	10.8%	8.2%	14.2%	7,700	3.4%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	8.2%	6.0%	11.0%	22,600	9.9%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	8.9%	7.5%	10.6%	86,700	37.9%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	11.5%	9.0%	14.7%	6,100	2.7%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	12.4%	9.5%	16.0%	22,500	9.8%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	7.5%	5.3%	10.4%	2,700	1.2%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	11.8%	9.6%	14.5%	6,100	2.7%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	7.4%	5.4%	10.0%	3,100	1.4%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	8.4%	6.7%	10.4%	38,000	16.6%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	9.0%	6.8%	11.8%	1,800	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	10.2%	7.5%	13.7%	22,600	9.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	9.3%	8.5%	10.3%	208,800	91.3%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	6.8%	5.1%	9.0%	19,900	8.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	9.8%	7.2%	13.0%	25,000	10.8%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	9.5%	8.1%	11.3%	66,400	28.7%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	9.8%	7.9%	12.1%	59,000	25.5%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	8.3%	7.0%	9.7%	80,800	34.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 9 (continued). Asthma: Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Ever Diagnosed With Asthma by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	8.4%	6.2%	11.3%	22,600	9.9%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	8.5%	6.7%	10.8%	47,500	20.8%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	9.1%	7.8%	10.7%	88,500	38.8%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	9.5%	8.0%	11.2%	69,500	30.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	9.0%	6.0%	13.2%	10,600	6.4%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	9.7%	8.5%	11.0%	90,800	54.5%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	9.6%	7.2%	12.7%	16,700	10.0%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	9.5%	7.9%	11.4%	48,500	29.1%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	9.5%	8.6%	10.5%	165,600	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	8.5%	7.3%	9.8%	74,700	44.9%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	9.2%	7.2%	11.6%	26,800	16.1%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	10.2%	8.0%	12.9%	19,600	11.8%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	10.6%	8.2%	13.7%	21,200	12.7%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	14.4%	8.6%	23.2%	7,700	4.6%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	13.1%	9.8%	17.5%	16,300	9.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	9.5%	8.6%	10.5%	165,600	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	3.3%	2.0%	5.4%	9,100	4.0%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	9.8%	8.9%	10.7%	221,100	96.0%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	9.3%	8.3%	10.5%	112,900	68.3%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	8.4%	6.3%	11.0%	28,000	16.9%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	12.5%	9.8%	15.6%	24,500	14.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	9.5%	8.6%	10.5%	165,600	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.


4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- Nine percent of Utahns reported that they had at some point been diagnosed with asthma.
- The prevalence of asthma among non-Hispanic persons was nearly three times more than for Hispanic persons (9.8% and 3.3% respectively).
- Insured Utahns were significantly more likely than the uninsured to report having been diagnosed with asthma. However, it is possible that the prevalence of asthma is higher for the uninsured because lack of insurance is a major barrier to care, and uninsured individuals would be less likely to have gone to a physician and be diagnosed with asthma.




Figure 10.1 Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes, Utah, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005



Note: Does not include gestational diabetes.

Figure 10.2 Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Diabetes by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

Note: Does not include gestational diabetes.

- In 2005, 4.1% of all Utahns had been diagnosed with diabetes.
- As is typical for the disease, diabetes affects older Utahns more. For Utahns aged 18 and over 5.9% had diabetes and for those aged 65 and over, 20.7% reported having been diagnosed with diabetes.



Table 10. Diabetes: Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Had Diabetes				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Had Diabetes by Subgroup ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	4.1%	3.4%	4.8%	51,900	49.8%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	4.2%	3.5%	5.0%	52,300	50.2%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	***	***	***	***	***
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	1.6%	1.0%	2.5%	11,700	11.2%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	3.5%	2.6%	4.8%	16,500	15.8%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	9.5%	7.7%	11.6%	30,800	29.6%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	20.7%	17.5%	24.3%	44,100	42.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	***	***	***	***	***
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	1.0%	0.5%	2.1%	3,700	3.6%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	3.6%	2.3%	5.5%	8,500	8.2%
Males, 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	9.8%	7.3%	13.0%	15,800	15.2%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	24.8%	20.2%	30.1%	23,700	22.8%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	***	***	***	***	***
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	2.2%	1.3%	3.7%	8,000	7.7%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	3.5%	2.2%	5.4%	8,000	7.7%
Females, 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	9.2%	6.9%	12.1%	15,000	14.4%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	17.3%	13.5%	22.0%	20,300	19.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	3.1%	2.0%	4.7%	4,700	4.5%
Central	2.9%	71,046	4.9%	3.3%	7.2%	3,500	3.4%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	3.3%	2.0%	5.1%	9,000	8.6%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	4.7%	3.7%	5.8%	45,400	43.6%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	4.3%	2.8%	6.7%	2,300	2.2%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	5.1%	3.6%	7.2%	9,200	8.8%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	2.0%	1.1%	3.6%	700	0.7%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	4.0%	2.8%	5.8%	2,100	2.0%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	4.7%	3.2%	6.8%	2,000	1.9%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	2.5%	1.8%	3.6%	11,500	11.0%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	2.5%	1.6%	3.9%	500	0.5%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	6.0%	4.0%	8.8%	13,200	12.7%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	4.4%	3.9%	5.1%	99,400	94.6%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	2.0%	1.1%	3.6%	5,700	5.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	5.9%	4.0%	8.6%	15,000	15.6%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	4.8%	3.8%	6.1%	33,300	34.5%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	3.8%	2.8%	5.2%	23,100	24.0%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	2.6%	2.0%	3.3%	25,000	25.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 10 (continued). Diabetes: Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Had Diabetes				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Had Diabetes by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	3.2%	1.8%	5.7%	8,600	8.9%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	3.7%	2.8%	5.0%	20,800	21.4%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	2.9%	2.3%	3.8%	28,400	29.3%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	5.3%	4.3%	6.7%	39,200	40.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	6.5%	4.1%	10.1%	7,600	7.5%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	6.7%	5.7%	7.9%	63,300	62.1%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	7.1%	5.0%	10.1%	12,400	12.2%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	3.7%	2.8%	4.8%	18,700	18.3%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	5.9%	5.2%	6.7%	103,200	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	4.3%	3.4%	5.3%	37,500	35.9%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	2.8%	1.8%	4.3%	8,000	7.7%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	18.2%	15.1%	21.7%	34,900	33.4%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	4.0%	2.7%	6.1%	8,100	7.8%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	***	***	***	***	***
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	12.4%	9.0%	16.9%	15,400	14.7%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	5.9%	5.2%	6.7%	103,200	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	5.0%	3.0%	8.4%	13,700	13.2%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	4.0%	3.5%	4.5%	90,100	86.8%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	5.6%	4.8%	6.5%	68,100	65.8%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	3.2%	2.1%	5.0%	10,800	10.4%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	12.5%	9.9%	15.7%	24,600	23.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	5.9%	5.2%	6.7%	103,200	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

Note: Does not include gestational diabetes.

*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

- The prevalence of diabetes has been increasing over the past several years. Since 1996, the Utah Health Status Survey has measured a 41.6% increase in diabetes.
- Utahns in households with less than \$20,000 annual income (5.9%) and those in Weber-Morgan health district (6.0%) had higher rates of diabetes prevalence.



Figure 11.1 Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home, Utah Children Aged 17 and Under, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005





Figure 11.2 Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home by Age Group, Utah Children Aged 17 and Under, 2005



- In 2005, 2.8% of children had been exposed to cigarette smoke in the home. Overall there has been a 53.0% decline in cigarette smoke exposure in the home for children from 2001 to 2005.
- Some of this decrease is probably due to anti-tobacco campaigns such as those organized by the Utah Department of Health Tobacco Prevention and Control Program.



Table 11. Exposure to Cigarette Smoke: Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home Utah Children Aged 17 or Less, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Children ¹	Percentage of Children ² 95% Confidence Bounds			Number of Children ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Children Exposed to Cigarette Smoke by Category ⁴
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population, Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,452	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%
Age Group							
5 and Under	37.7%	297,212	1.7%	0.7%	3.8%	5,000	22.8%
6 to 12	37.0%	291,362	3.1%	1.8%	5.4%	9,100	41.6%
13 to 17	25.4%	199,878	3.9%	2.4%	6.3%	7,800	35.6%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,452	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%
Local Health District ⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	47,995	***	***	***	***	***
Central	2.8%	21,797	***	***	***	***	***
Davis	11.4%	90,191	***	***	***	***	***
Salt Lake	36.9%	290,593	4.1%	2.1%	7.7%	11,800	53.6%
Southeastern	1.9%	15,228	6.8%	3.0%	14.8%	1,000	4.5%
Southwest	6.6%	51,768	***	***	***	***	***
Summit	1.3%	9,870	***	***	***	***	***
Tooele	2.2%	17,443	3.9%	1.6%	9.6%	700	3.2%
TriCounty	1.7%	13,356	12.7%	7.1%	21.5%	1,700	7.7%
Utah County	19.9%	156,733	***	***	***	***	***
Wasatch	0.8%	6,419	***	***	***	***	***
Weber-Morgan	8.5%	67,059	5.3%	1.8%	14.5%	3,600	16.4%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,452	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	91.5%	721,200	2.7%	1.7%	4.3%	19,500	88.2%
Uninsured	8.5%	67,200	3.8%	1.5%	9.1%	2,600	11.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,500	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	7.2%	57,100	15.2%	7.3%	28.9%	8,700	38.5%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	26.8%	211,000	2.5%	1.1%	5.6%	5,300	23.5%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	25.2%	198,600	1.9%	0.8%	4.4%	3,800	16.8%
\$65,000 and Over	40.8%	321,800	1.5%	0.5%	4.2%	4,800	21.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,500	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	11.9%	93,900	6.5%	2.7%	14.5%	6,100	27.0%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	26.1%	205,500	2.5%	1.1%	5.7%	5,100	22.6%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	47.1%	371,000	2.8%	1.4%	5.4%	10,300	45.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	15.0%	118,000	0.9%	0.3%	3.1%	1,100	4.9%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,500	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	13.6%	107,400	5.3%	2.1%	12.6%	5,700	29.2%
Not Hispanic or Latino	86.4%	681,100	2.0%	1.3%	3.2%	13,800	70.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,500	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 11 (continued). Exposure to Cigarette Smoke: Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home Utah Children Aged 17 or Less, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Children ¹	Percentage of Children ²			Number of Children ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Children Exposed to Cigarette Smoke by Category ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Asthma							
Under Medical Care for Asthma	8.2%	64,300	4.3%	1.9%	9.7%	2,800	12.7%
Not Under Medical Care for Asthma	91.8%	724,100	2.7%	1.7%	4.0%	19,300	87.3%
Total, All Utahns Aged 17 and Under	100.0%	788,500	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%

1 Population estimates of age groups and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of missing values on the grouping variables.


5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

*** Insufficient sample size for calculation of population estimates.

- For Utah children who were exposed to cigarette smoke in the home, the prevalence increased with age. Those aged 13 to 17 had the highest rate (3.9%) compared to other age groups.
- In the TriCounty health district 12.7% of children had been exposed to cigarette smoke in the home. This was the highest rate amongst all local health districts in Utah with enough cases to report.
- Household income and poverty status were both negatively associated with cigarette smoke exposure. Among Utah children living in households with incomes under \$20,000 or less than 100% poverty 15.2% and 6.5% were exposed to cigarette smoke (respectively).
- Hispanic children were significantly more likely than non-Hispanic children to be exposed to cigarette smoke in the home (5.3% and 2.0%, respectively).
- Of all children exposed to cigarette smoke in the home, 12.7% had been diagnosed with asthma, compared with 8.2% of all children statewide.




Figure 12.1 Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese, Utah Adults Aged 18 and Over, Utah, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2003-2005



Note: Obesity was defined as a BMI of >30 or more. BMI is calculated by dividing weight in kilograms by the square of height in meters. For example, a male or female who is 5'8" is considered obese if he or she weighs 197.5 or more pounds.

Figure 12.2 Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese by Age and Sex, Utah Adults Aged 18 and Over, 2005



Note: Obesity was defined as a BMI of >30 or more. BMI is calculated by dividing weight in kilograms by the square of height in meters. For example, a male or female who is 5'8" is considered obese if he or she weighs 197.5 or more pounds.

- In 2005, 19.3% of adult Utahns (aged 18 and over) were obese. This represents an estimated 335,300 persons.



Table 12. Obesity: Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese
by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents Aged 18 and Over, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utah Adults Who Were Obese				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Adults ¹	Percentage of Adults ²			Number of Adults ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Adults Who Were Obese by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population, Adults Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.0%	871,102	20.7%	18.8%	22.7%	180,200	53.8%
Female	50.0%	869,372	17.8%	16.1%	19.5%	154,500	46.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Age Group							
18 to 34	42.4%	737,965	14.6%	12.7%	16.8%	107,800	32.2%
35 to 49	26.8%	465,964	20.9%	18.4%	23.6%	97,300	29.0%
50 to 64	18.6%	323,963	26.5%	23.7%	29.5%	85,800	25.6%
65 and Over	12.2%	212,582	20.9%	17.9%	24.2%	44,400	13.2%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 18 to 34	21.6%	376,364	16.6%	13.8%	19.8%	62,500	18.7%
Males, 35 to 49	13.7%	237,941	23.0%	19.7%	26.8%	54,800	16.4%
Males 50 to 64	9.3%	161,253	28.2%	24.3%	32.5%	45,500	13.6%
Males, 65 and Over	5.5%	95,544	18.4%	14.5%	22.9%	17,500	5.2%
Females, 18 to 34	20.8%	361,601	12.5%	10.2%	15.2%	45,000	13.4%
Females, 35 to 49	13.1%	228,023	18.5%	15.4%	22.1%	42,200	12.6%
Females 50 to 64	9.3%	162,710	24.7%	21.1%	28.8%	40,200	12.0%
Females, 65 and Over	6.7%	117,038	23.1%	18.9%	28.0%	27,000	8.1%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	5.8%	101,710	15.5%	11.8%	20.1%	15,800	4.7%
Central	2.8%	49,249	23.3%	18.8%	28.3%	11,500	3.4%
Davis	10.7%	186,183	20.8%	16.8%	25.5%	38,700	11.5%
Salt Lake	39.1%	680,155	18.8%	16.5%	21.4%	127,900	38.2%
Southeastern	2.2%	37,604	19.0%	15.2%	23.6%	7,200	2.1%
Southwest	7.5%	130,527	23.1%	18.7%	28.1%	30,100	9.0%
Summit	1.5%	26,547	10.1%	6.7%	14.8%	2,700	0.8%
Tooele	2.0%	34,392	21.6%	17.4%	26.5%	7,400	2.2%
TriCounty	1.7%	28,971	25.0%	20.0%	30.9%	7,200	2.1%
Utah County	17.1%	297,244	17.3%	14.3%	20.8%	51,400	15.3%
Wasatch	0.8%	13,719	17.0%	13.3%	21.3%	2,300	0.7%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	154,173	21.3%	16.7%	26.9%	32,900	9.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.1%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	87.0%	1,514,800	19.4%	18.0%	20.9%	294,100	87.0%
Uninsured	13.0%	225,600	19.5%	15.6%	24.0%	44,000	13.0%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	11.5%	200,000	18.1%	13.9%	23.3%	36,200	10.7%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.8%	484,700	23.2%	20.4%	26.2%	112,400	33.2%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.1%	402,000	18.9%	16.3%	21.8%	76,000	22.4%
\$65,000 and Over	37.6%	653,700	17.5%	15.2%	20.0%	114,300	33.7%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 12 (continued). Obesity: Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents Aged 18 and Over, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utah Adults Who Were Obese				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Adults ¹	Percentage of Adults ²			Number of Adults ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Adults Who Were Obese by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.0%	173,300	16.0%	12.0%	20.9%	27,700	8.1%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	20.2%	351,300	24.5%	20.9%	28.5%	86,100	25.2%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	34.2%	594,400	18.6%	16.2%	21.2%	110,600	32.3%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	35.7%	621,500	19.0%	16.8%	21.4%	117,800	34.4%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	25.6%	19.9%	32.3%	30,100	9.0%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	19.5%	17.7%	21.4%	183,000	54.6%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	22.4%	18.5%	26.9%	39,000	11.6%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	16.3%	14.3%	18.5%	83,100	24.8%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	21.0%	19.2%	23.1%	185,000	55.0%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	13.4%	10.7%	16.6%	38,900	11.6%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	21.4%	18.3%	25.0%	41,200	12.2%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	18.9%	15.5%	22.9%	37,700	11.2%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	8.1%	4.0%	15.6%	4,300	1.3%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	23.6%	19.0%	28.8%	29,300	8.7%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	9.5%	164,600	22.1%	16.4%	29.1%	36,400	10.9%
Not Hispanic or Latino	90.5%	1,575,900	18.9%	17.6%	20.3%	298,200	89.1%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	20.2%	18.7%	21.8%	244,200	72.9%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	14.5%	11.6%	17.9%	48,400	14.5%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	21.5%	18.1%	25.3%	42,300	12.6%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.


5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

Note: Obesity was defined as a BMI of 30 or more. BMI is calculated by dividing weight in kilograms by the square of height in meters. For example, a male or female who is 5'8" is considered obese if he or she weighs 197.5 or more pounds.

- The prevalence of obesity has been increasing steadily over the past twenty years. From 1986 (7.0%) to 2005 (19.3%), the prevalence of obesity in Utah adults increased by 175%.
- Males were significantly more likely to be obese than females (20.7% vs. 17.8% respectively).
- Males aged 50 to 64 were the most likely to be obese (28.2%) compared to other age and gender groups.



Figure 13.1 Percentage of Children Who Were Described as Slightly or Very Overweight by Poverty Status, Utah Children Aged 6 to 11, 2005



- The Utah Health Status Survey asked about weight for children aged 6 to 11 in 2005. Respondents were asked how they would describe the weight of the children in the household. Respondents reported that nearly ten percent of these children (9.6%) were either slightly or very overweight.
- Females aged 6 to 11 were more likely to be reported as overweight than males (10.5% vs. 8.7%).
- Uninsured children (aged 6 to 11) were more likely to be reported as overweight than insured children (14.0% vs. 9.4%).
- Children living in poverty were more likely than other children to be reported as overweight.
- Hispanic or Latino children were significantly more likely than non-Hispanic children (aged 6 to 11) to be reported as overweight.



Table 13. Obesity: Percentage of Children Who Were Described as Slightly or Very Overweight by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Children Aged 6 to 11, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utah Children Who Were Overweight				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Children ¹	Percentage of Children ²			Number of Children ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Children Who Were Overweight by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population, Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,712	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%
Sex							
Male	51.4%	129,459	8.7%	6.2%	12.1%	11,200	46.7%
Female	48.6%	122,253	10.5%	7.5%	14.6%	12,800	53.3%
Total, All Utah Children Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,712	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	6.0%	15,085	8.1%	3.3%	18.3%	1,200	5.0%
Central	2.8%	7,169	13.9%	7.6%	23.9%	1,000	4.1%
Davis	11.6%	29,211	9.5%	4.3%	19.7%	2,800	11.6%
Salt Lake	37.0%	93,189	7.7%	4.3%	13.4%	7,200	29.8%
Southeastern	1.9%	4,868	14.3%	7.0%	26.9%	700	2.9%
Southwest	6.4%	16,203	15.5%	7.1%	30.5%	2,500	10.3%
Summit	1.2%	3,103	10.2%	4.3%	22.3%	300	1.2%
Tooele	2.4%	5,926	8.3%	3.7%	17.7%	500	2.1%
TriCounty	1.6%	4,079	15.9%	8.9%	26.8%	600	2.5%
Utah County	19.5%	49,180	8.6%	5.0%	14.2%	4,200	17.4%
Wasatch	0.8%	2,006	8.2%	3.5%	17.9%	200	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	8.6%	21,693	13.9%	7.4%	24.6%	3,000	12.4%
Total, All Utah Children Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,712	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	90.2%	227,000	9.4%	7.2%	12.2%	21,300	85.9%
Uninsured	9.8%	24,800	14.0%	7.0%	26.0%	3,500	14.1%
Total, All Utah Children Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,700	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	5.5%	13,800	21.3%	11.1%	37.2%	2,900	11.9%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	25.4%	63,900	9.3%	5.4%	15.6%	6,000	24.6%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	27.5%	69,200	11.6%	7.8%	17.0%	8,000	32.8%
\$65,000 and Over	41.7%	104,900	7.2%	4.2%	12.1%	7,500	30.7%
Total, All Utah Children Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,700	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.9%	27,400	12.8%	7.4%	21.3%	3,500	14.4%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	27.7%	69,700	11.4%	7.3%	17.5%	8,000	32.9%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	48.8%	122,800	8.9%	5.8%	13.3%	10,900	44.9%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	12.6%	31,800	6.1%	2.8%	12.7%	1,900	7.8%
Total, All Utah Children Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,700	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	13.1%	33,100	18.4%	10.1%	31.3%	6,100	27.1%
Not Hispanic or Latino	86.9%	218,700	7.5%	5.8%	9.8%	16,400	72.9%
Total, All Utah Children Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,700	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age group, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.


3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.



Figure 14.1 Percentage of Persons Who Had Received a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series by Age and Sex, Utah, 2005



- Hepatitis B is a serious disease caused by a virus that attacks the liver. The virus, which is called hepatitis B virus (HBV), can cause lifelong infection, cirrhosis (scarring) of the liver, liver cancer, liver failure, and death. There is a Hepatitis B vaccine series consisting of three shots. It is recommended that all children aged 0 to 18 get the vaccine series, along with several risk groups. <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/diseases/hepatitis/b/fact.htm>
- Those aged 18 to 34 years were the most likely aged group to have had the complete Hepatitis B vaccine series (68.1%), while those aged 65 and over were the least likely (18.7%).



Table 14. Immunizations: Percentage of Persons Who Had Received a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Had a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Had a Complete Hepatitis B Series by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Sex							
Male	50.2%	1,275,758	57.7%	54.9%	60.4%	736,100	51.7%
Female	49.8%	1,253,168	55.0%	52.3%	57.6%	688,900	48.3%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Age Group							
17 and Under	31.5%	788,452	65.2%	61.8%	68.4%	514,000	36.9%
18 to 34	29.1%	737,965	68.1%	63.6%	72.2%	502,200	36.0%
35 to 49	18.8%	465,964	48.0%	43.4%	52.6%	223,600	16.1%
50 to 64	12.1%	323,963	35.0%	30.8%	39.5%	113,500	8.1%
65 and Over	8.4%	212,582	18.7%	15.0%	23.1%	39,800	2.9%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Sex and Age							
Males, 17 and Under	16.2%	404,656	66.0%	62.2%	69.6%	267,100	19.2%
Males, 18 to 34	14.7%	376,364	67.2%	60.2%	73.4%	252,700	18.1%
Males, 35 to 49	9.5%	237,941	46.4%	39.7%	53.3%	110,500	7.9%
Males 50 to 64	6.0%	161,253	36.0%	29.6%	43.0%	58,100	4.2%
Males, 65 and Over	3.7%	95,544	22.6%	16.4%	30.3%	21,600	1.5%
Females, 17 and Under	15.3%	383,796	64.4%	60.1%	68.4%	247,000	17.7%
Females, 18 to 34	14.4%	361,601	68.8%	62.9%	74.2%	248,900	17.9%
Females, 35 to 49	9.3%	228,023	49.5%	43.4%	55.7%	112,900	8.1%
Females 50 to 64	6.1%	162,710	34.3%	28.8%	40.2%	55,800	4.0%
Females, 65 and Over	4.7%	117,038	16.4%	12.0%	21.9%	19,200	1.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Local Health District⁵							
Bear River	6.1%	149,705	58.1%	50.9%	65.0%	87,000	6.1%
Central	2.9%	71,046	46.7%	39.9%	53.6%	33,200	2.3%
Davis	10.7%	276,374	59.2%	52.4%	65.7%	163,700	11.5%
Salt Lake	39.6%	970,748	57.6%	53.7%	61.4%	558,800	39.2%
Southeastern	2.3%	52,832	48.4%	41.3%	55.5%	25,600	1.8%
Southwest	6.5%	182,295	53.2%	46.1%	60.1%	96,900	6.8%
Summit	1.4%	36,417	60.6%	53.3%	67.4%	22,100	1.6%
Tooele	2.0%	51,835	57.8%	51.3%	64.0%	30,000	2.1%
TriCounty	1.8%	42,327	41.2%	35.3%	47.4%	17,400	1.2%
Utah County	17.0%	453,977	59.9%	54.8%	64.8%	271,900	19.1%
Wasatch	0.7%	20,138	54.3%	47.6%	60.9%	10,900	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	8.9%	221,232	48.1%	40.9%	55.5%	106,500	7.5%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,926	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Health Insurance Coverage							
Insured	88.4%	2,236,100	56.4%	54.2%	58.6%	1,261,900	89.0%
Uninsured	11.6%	292,800	53.2%	45.3%	60.9%	155,600	11.0%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Table 14 (continued). Immunizations: Percentage of Persons Who Had Received a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series by Selected Demographic Characteristics, Utah Residents, 2005

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns Who Had a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Series				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons Who Had a Complete Hepatitis B Series by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Bounds				
			Lower	Upper			
Annual Household Income							
Under \$20,000	10.1%	256,400	49.2%	42.4%	56.0%	126,200	8.6%
\$20,000 to <\$45,000	27.5%	695,800	58.8%	54.8%	62.7%	409,000	28.0%
\$45,000 to <\$65,000	23.8%	600,800	59.2%	54.6%	63.7%	355,700	24.4%
\$65,000 and Over	38.6%	975,900	58.4%	54.5%	62.1%	569,500	39.0%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Poverty Status							
<100% Federal Poverty Level	10.6%	268,500	60.2%	52.3%	67.6%	161,600	11.1%
101-200% Federal Poverty Level	22.1%	559,400	59.6%	54.9%	64.1%	333,300	22.9%
201-300% Federal Poverty Level	38.3%	967,500	59.5%	55.7%	63.2%	575,800	39.6%
>300% Federal Poverty Level	29.0%	733,600	52.3%	48.6%	56.0%	384,000	26.4%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Education Level							
Some High School	6.7%	117,300	34.3%	24.7%	45.5%	40,300	4.9%
High School Grad/Some College	53.9%	938,900	43.5%	40.2%	46.9%	408,600	49.8%
Technical/Vocational Degree	10.0%	174,000	48.8%	41.6%	55.9%	84,800	10.3%
4 Year College Degree or More	29.3%	510,300	56.3%	52.0%	60.5%	287,500	35.0%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	47.5%	45.1%	49.9%	826,300	100.0%
Employment Status							
Full Time	50.5%	879,600	52.8%	49.3%	56.4%	464,800	54.8%
Part Time	16.8%	291,600	56.3%	50.1%	62.4%	164,300	19.4%
Retired	11.0%	192,000	22.5%	18.3%	27.4%	43,300	5.1%
Keeping House	11.5%	199,700	43.8%	36.8%	51.0%	87,500	10.3%
Full Time Student	3.1%	53,300	77.1%	61.1%	87.8%	41,100	4.8%
Unemployed/Other	7.1%	124,300	37.5%	29.5%	46.2%	46,600	5.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	47.5%	45.1%	49.9%	826,300	100.0%
Hispanic or Latino Ethnicity							
Hispanic or Latino	10.8%	274,100	60.9%	51.8%	69.3%	166,900	11.8%
Not Hispanic or Latino	89.2%	2,254,800	55.4%	53.2%	57.6%	1,249,800	88.2%
Total, All Utahns	100.0%	2,528,900	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%
Marital Status							
Married	69.5%	1,209,400	49.1%	46.2%	52.0%	594,300	69.7%
Never Married	19.2%	334,300	57.9%	50.7%	64.8%	193,700	22.7%
Divorced/Separated/Widowed	11.3%	196,700	32.6%	27.7%	37.9%	64,100	7.5%
Total, All Utahns Aged 18+	100.0%	1,740,500	47.5%	45.1%	49.9%	826,300	100.0%

1 Population estimates of sex, age groups, and local health district based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the 2005 UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 These rates have not been age-adjusted. Age-adjusted rates are available upon request.

- 56.3% of Utahns reported having received the full series (3 shots) for Hepatitis B.
- Although a slight majority of Utahns had received the complete Hepatitis B series, 43.7% had not received this vaccine series.

Technical Notes





General Technical Background to the 2005 Health Status Survey

Introduction

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with a general methodological overview of the project. Persons interested in obtaining additional or more detailed information may contact:

Office of Public Health Assessment
Center for Health Data
Utah Department of Health
Box 142101
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2101
Phone: (801) 538-6108
E-mail: phdata@utah.gov

Sample Design

The 2005 Utah Health Status Survey represents the sixth such survey: previous surveys were conducted in 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2003–2004. The statistical estimates in this report are based on 2005 Utah Health Status Survey data.

The sample was a complex survey sample designed to be representative of all non-institutionalized Utahns living in households with telephones. It is best described as a weighted probability sample of 2,978 households disproportionately stratified by 12 local health districts that cover the entire state. The sample was stratified so that the survey estimates could be provided for each local health district.

Table with 3 columns: Health District/Small Area, Unweighted Counts (Households, Persons). Rows include 12 health districts and a State Total row.

The Casady-Lepkowski (1993) calling design was used to generate telephone numbers in each local health district. This method begins by building a base sampling frame consisting of all possible telephone numbers from all working prefixes in Utah. Telephone numbers are arranged sequentially into groups of 100 by selecting all telephone numbers within an area code and prefix, plus the first and second digits of the suffix (e.g., 801-538-10XX represents a group that includes all 100 phone numbers between 801-538-1000 and 801-538-1099). Each group of



100 telephone numbers is classified as either high density (at least one residential listing) or low density (no listed residential phone numbers in the group). All low-density groups are removed, and high-density groups are retained. Telephone numbers are randomly selected from the high-density list. This sampling design ensures that both listed and unlisted phone numbers are included in the sample.

The Utah Department of Health Survey Center collected the survey data. The survey interview was conducted with **one randomly selected adult** (aged 18 or older) in each household. A single stage, non-clustered, equal probability of selection sampling design was used to identify survey respondents. First, interviewers collected household membership information from the household contact person (the person who answered the phone). Next, the computer randomly selected an adult household member from the list of all household members aged 18 or over to complete the survey. Survey questions were then asked of the respondent about either 1) all household members, 2) the survey respondent only, 3) a randomly selected adult or child household member (used only in the injuries section), or 4) the household as a whole. Data were collected on all household members through the respondent. Thus, the survey sample varies, depending on the within-household sample that was used for each set of survey questions. Each within-household sample has known probabilities of selection and has been weighted appropriately so it can be generalized to the Utah population.

Questionnaire Construction

The 2005 Utah Health Status Survey was based on previous Utah Health Status Survey questionnaires. For the 2005 questionnaire, some changes were made based on input from the Health Surveys Advisory Committee and the Health Status Survey staff. These changes were made in order to obtain more detailed information and to allow for comparison with large, federal surveys, such as the Current Population Survey (CPS). The entire survey questionnaire may be found online at http://health.utah.gov/opha/publications/2005hss/2005_6HSS.pdf.

Survey Data Collection

The Utah Department of Health Survey Center integrated the survey questionnaire into a **computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI)** software program. Interviews were conducted by trained interviewers in a supervised and monitored environment at the Utah Department of Health Survey Center.

Computer assisted telephone interviewing was chosen as the method of data collection for several reasons. First, it yields high response rates, thus resulting in a more representative sample and reducing the amount of bias inherent in mail survey response rates. Second, it helps reduce non-sampling error by standardizing the data collection process. Data-entry errors are reduced because interviewers are not allowed to enter non-valid codes. It was also efficient because it allowed interviewers to enter responses directly into the database.

Response Rates

The interview process took place over a 13-month period (from January 2005 to January 2006), and resulted in a CASRO (Council of American Survey Research Organizations) response rate of 57.2%. The CASRO cooperation rate was 81.6%. If necessary, up to 15 telephone attempts were made to contact a selected household.

Weighting Methods

Post-survey weighting adjustments were made so that the Health Status Survey findings could be more accurately generalized to Utah's population. Two types of post-survey weighting



adjustments were made: one that adjusted for random sampling variation and one that adjusted for disproportionate sampling (such as the over-sampling of the smaller local health districts across the state). Although the two types of adjustments are distinct conceptually, they are accomplished in a series of steps that does not distinguish between the two types.

The post-survey weighting variables adjusted for the following factors:

1. The number of **phone lines** in the household.
2. The total **number of adults in the household** (for questions that were asked only of the respondent, but were meant to be generalized to all adults in the household).
3. The proportion of **Hispanic persons** in each local health district.
4. The population **age and sex** distribution of each local health district.
5. The probabilities of selection for each **local health district**.

Calculation of Survey Estimates

Population count estimates. Once a percentage was calculated for a variable of interest (e.g., the percentage uninsured) using appropriately weighted 2005 survey data, it was applied to a population count to derive the estimate for the number of Utahns affected. In some cases analyses referenced certain age or sex groups, Hispanic persons, or combinations of Utah counties. The population count estimates for these groups are readily available from the Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget for 2005.

For other groups where population counts were largely unavailable (e.g., analyses that examined the distribution of adult males by marital status), survey data were used to estimate the population counts. This was achieved by multiplying the appropriate 2003 population total for that group (from 2005 GOPB estimates) by a proportion obtained from a frequency distribution or cross tabulation analysis of Utah Health Status Survey data. For instance, to calculate a population count for adult males who were married, the population of adult males from GOPB estimates for 2005 was obtained. The resulting number was multiplied by the percentage of married adult males in the 2005 Utah Health Status Survey sample. Thus, any population count estimates not derived directly from existing age, sex, Hispanic status, or county population estimates were derived from 2005 Health Status Survey data, and were rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

Missing Values. Another consideration that affected the presentation of the population estimates in table format was the inclusion or exclusion of missing values ("don't know" and "refused to answer"). Population percentage estimates were calculated after removing the "don't know" and "refused to answer" responses from the denominator. This, in effect, assumes that persons who gave those answers were distributed identically on the variable of interest to those who gave a valid answer to that variable. For instance, that among those who did not know whether they were insured, we assumed that 88.4% of them were insured and 11.6% were not insured—percentages identical to those found among the sample members who answered the question with a valid response.

Readers may have noticed that the numbers in the last two columns of the reference tables do not always sum to the total as they should. This was unavoidable for two reasons:

- 1) If there were missing values on the demographic grouping variable, the sum of the parts is derived from a slightly different sample than the estimate for the overall number.
- 2) The post-survey weighting adjustments cause certain irregularities in the tables.



Limitations and Other Special Considerations

Estimates developed from the sample may differ from the results of a complete census of all households in Utah due to two types of error, sampling and non-sampling error. Each type of error is present in estimates based on a survey sample. Good survey design and data collection techniques serve to minimize both sources of error.

Sampling error refers to random variation that occurs because only a subset of the entire population is sampled and used to estimate the finding, or parameter, in the entire population. It is often termed “margin of error” in popular use. Sampling error has been expressed in this report as a confidence interval bound. The confidence bounds define the confidence interval, which is a measure of the precision of the survey point estimate. The 95% confidence interval defines a range of scores, (e.g., “24% to 30%”) within which we would expect the observed measure to fall 95 out of 100 times if we were to measure it an infinite number of times with the same sample size from the same population. It is commonly expressed as a symmetric value (e.g., “plus or minus”). But when the point estimate is close to 0% or 100%, it will take on an asymmetric range around the point estimate. That is, for point estimates close to 100%, the upper confidence bound will be smaller, and for point estimates close to 0%, the lower confidence bound will be smaller. The formula that produces asymmetric confidence intervals has been applied to all the survey estimates in this report. Figures in this report include error bars showing this estimated confidence interval around the parameter estimate. Estimates were not computed where the sample denominators were less than $n=50$.

Because the sample was clustered within households, and because local health districts were disproportionately stratified and then weighted to reflect the Utah population, the sample is considered a complex survey sample design. Estimating the sampling error for a complex survey design requires special statistical techniques. SAS software, using “proc surveymeans,” was used to estimate the standard errors of the survey estimates because it employs a statistical routine (Taylor-series expansion) that accounts for the complex survey design.

Non-sampling error also exists in survey estimates. Sources of non-sampling error include idiosyncratic interpretation of survey questions by respondents, variations in interviewer technique, household non-response to questions, coding errors, and so forth. No specific efforts were made to quantify the magnitude of non-sampling error. Non-sampling error was minimized by good questionnaire design, use of standardization in interviewer behavior and frequent, on-site interviewer monitoring and supervision.

Comparability with other surveys is an issue with all surveys. Differences in survey design, survey questions, estimation procedures, the socio-demographic and economic context, and changes in the structure and financing of the health care delivery system may all affect comparison between the 2005 Utah Health Status Survey and other surveys, including those conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System surveys, and previous Utah Department of Health, Health Status Surveys.

Telephone surveys exclude certain population segments from the sampling frame, such as persons in group living quarters (e.g., military barracks, nursing homes) and households without telephones. At the time of the 2000 Decennial Census, only two percent of Utah households were without telephone service. Typically, telephone surveys are biased because telephone households under-represent lower income and certain minority populations. In addition, studies have



shown that non-telephone households tend to have lower rates of health care utilization (especially dental care), poorer health habits and health status, and lower rates of health insurance coverage (Thornberry and Massey, 1988).

Despite these overall disparities between telephone and non-telephone households, the Utah Health Status Survey estimates may be considered adequately representative of all Utah households. Certain research (Keeter, 1995) suggests that a similarity exists between data from non-telephone households and telephone households that experienced an interruption in service over the past 12 months. This similarity exists because many, if not most, households currently without telephones did have service in the recent past, and will have service again in the future. Therefore, certain households with telephones (those that had a recent interruption in service) are representative of “non-phone” households, allowing health status survey estimates to be corrected for telephone non-coverage bias. This correction has typically not been made, and will be clearly indicated when it is used.

Appendix A:

Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report





Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons/ Days/ Visits ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons/Days/ Visits by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Intervals				
			Lower	Upper			

Table 1. General Health Status: Percentage of Persons Who Were in Fair or Poor Health

1996 Utah Population	100.0%	1,991,800	8.6%	8.0%	9.3%	171,300	100.0%
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	9.1%	8.5%	9.6%	207,900	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	8.3%	7.6%	9.2%	196,500	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	9.4%	8.5%	10.3%	231,600	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	9.7%	8.9%	10.7%	245,900	100.0%

Table 2. General Health Status: Average Number of Days in the Previous 30 Days When Mental Health Was Poor

1996-2004 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	2.7	2.5	3.0	4,758,600	100.0%

Table 3a. Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons With No Health Insurance Coverage

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	8.7%	7.9%	9.5%	199,100	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	9.1%	8.0%	10.4%	214,500	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	10.2%	8.9%	11.6%	251,500	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	11.6%	10.1%	13.2%	292,800	100.0%

Table 3b. Health Insurance Carrier: Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance Coverage

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 Utah Insured Population						
Current or Former Employer or Union	2,096,900	81.9%	80.7%	83.0%	1,717,100	
Purchased Directly From an Insurance Co.	2,096,900	11.2%	10.3%	12.2%	234,900	
Through Someone Not Living in Household	2,096,900	3.6%	3.2%	4.2%	76,400	
Medicaid	2,096,900	6.9%	6.2%	7.5%	144,100	
Medicare	2,096,900	10.6%	9.9%	11.3%	221,400	
CHIP (Aged 17 and Under) ⁵	680,700	3.9%	3.1%	4.9%	26,700	
Other Government Plan ⁶	2,096,900	4.2%	3.7%	4.8%	87,900	
2003 Utah Insured Population						
Current or Former Employer or Union	2,140,300	80.1%	78.2%	81.9%	1,714,700	
Purchased Directly From an Insurance Co.	2,140,300	10.8%	9.5%	12.4%	231,900	
Through Someone Not Living in Household	2,140,300	3.6%	2.9%	4.5%	77,900	
Medicaid	2,140,300	8.2%	7.1%	9.5%	175,400	
Medicare	2,140,300	9.6%	8.7%	10.6%	205,700	
CHIP (Aged 17 and Under) ⁵	688,400	3.4%	2.3%	5.0%	23,500	
Other Government Plan ⁶	2,140,300	4.2%	3.5%	5.0%	89,700	
2004 Utah Insured Population						
Current or Former Employer or Union	2,217,800	79.3%	77.4%	81.2%	1,759,400	
Purchased Directly From an Insurance Co.	2,217,800	12.4%	10.9%	14.1%	275,800	
Through Someone Not Living in Household	2,217,800	3.8%	3.1%	4.7%	84,800	
Medicaid	2,217,800	8.5%	7.4%	9.8%	189,100	
Medicare	2,217,800	9.7%	8.7%	10.7%	215,000	
CHIP (Aged 17 and Under) ⁵	708,300	4.1%	2.9%	5.6%	28,800	
Other Government Plan ⁶	2,217,800	4.6%	3.7%	5.7%	101,500	

See footnotes at end of table.



Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report (continued)

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns			
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²		Number of Persons/ Days/ Visits ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons/Days/ Visits by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Intervals Lower	95% Confidence Intervals Upper		

Table 3b (continued). Health Insurance Carrier: Percentage of Persons With Each Type of Health Insurance Coverage

2005 Utah Insured Population	Utah Population Distribution	Percentage of Persons ²	95% Confidence Intervals Lower	95% Confidence Intervals Upper	Number of Persons/ Days/ Visits ^{3,4}
Current or Former Employer or Union	2,236,100	77.5%	75.4%	79.4%	1,732,900
Purchased Directly From an Insurance Co.	2,236,100	12.6%	11.1%	14.4%	282,200
Through Someone Not Living in Household	2,236,100	3.3%	2.6%	4.2%	74,100
Medicaid	2,236,100	8.7%	7.6%	9.9%	193,800
Medicare	2,236,100	10.6%	9.6%	11.6%	236,400
CHIP (Aged 17 and Under) ⁵	721,200	5.9%	4.4%	8.0%	42,800
Other Government Plan ⁶	2,236,100	4.1%	3.3%	5.0%	91,100

Table 3c. Reasons for Lack of Health Insurance: Percentage of Persons Who Gave Each Reason as a Reason That They Lacked Health Insurance

Reason	2001	2003	2004	2005	
1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2001, Persons Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage					
Cannot Afford Insurance	199,100	52.1%	47.4%	56.7%	103,600
Employer Does Not Offer Insurance	199,100	33.1%	28.8%	37.6%	65,800
Lost Job	199,100	29.5%	25.6%	33.6%	58,700
Don't Need/Don't Want Insurance	199,100	21.5%	18.1%	25.4%	42,900
Employed Part Time	199,100	14.6%	12.1%	17.6%	29,100
Lost Eligibility	199,100	6.9%	5.2%	9.1%	13,800
Insurance Company Refused to Cover ⁷	199,100	3.6%	2.6%	5.1%	7,200
2003, Persons Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage					
Cannot Afford Insurance	214,500	66.3%	59.5%	72.5%	142,200
Employer Does Not Offer Insurance	214,500	29.0%	22.8%	36.0%	62,100
Lost Job	214,500	47.5%	40.4%	54.6%	101,800
Don't Need/Don't Want Insurance	214,500	16.6%	12.2%	22.0%	35,500
Employed Part Time	214,500	17.5%	13.0%	23.2%	37,600
Lost Eligibility	214,500	9.6%	6.5%	13.9%	20,600
Insurance Company Refused to Cover ⁷	214,500	7.8%	5.2%	11.6%	16,700
2004, Persons Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage					
Cannot Afford Insurance	251,500	65.0%	57.9%	71.5%	163,400
Employer Does Not Offer Insurance	251,500	33.8%	27.0%	41.4%	85,000
Lost Job	251,500	29.9%	23.8%	36.9%	75,200
Don't Need/Don't Want Insurance	251,500	21.6%	16.4%	27.9%	54,300
Employed Part Time	251,500	17.0%	12.2%	23.2%	42,800
Lost Eligibility	251,500	17.7%	13.0%	23.8%	44,600
Insurance Company Refused to Cover ⁷	251,500	10.8%	7.4%	15.5%	27,100
2005, Persons Who Lacked Health Insurance Coverage					
Cannot Afford Insurance	292,800	58.6%	50.9%	66.0%	171,600
Employer Does Not Offer Insurance	292,800	32.8%	26.2%	40.2%	96,200
Lost Job	292,800	27.3%	21.5%	33.9%	79,900
Don't Need/Don't Want Insurance	292,800	27.3%	20.6%	35.1%	79,800
Employed Part Time	292,800	15.9%	12.0%	20.8%	46,600
Lost Eligibility	292,800	10.8%	7.5%	15.4%	31,700
Insurance Company Refused to Cover ⁷	292,800	6.8%	4.8%	9.7%	20,000

See footnotes at end of table.



Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report (continued)

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons/ Days/ Visits ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons/Days/ Visits by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Intervals				
			Lower	Upper			

Table 4. Access to Health Care: Percentage of Persons Who Were Unable to Get Needed Medical, Dental, or Mental Health Care* in the Previous 12 Months

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	18.0%	16.7%	19.3%	422,700	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	16.9%	15.6%	18.3%	417,400	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	16.3%	15.1%	17.6%	411,600	100.0%

Table 5. Health Care Utilization: Average Number of Medical Visits in the Previous 12 Months

1996 Utah Population	100.0%	1,991,800	3.4	3.0	3.9	6,840,500	100.0%
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	3.7	3.6	3.7	8,406,900	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	3.7	3.6	3.8	8,756,400	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	3.7	3.6	3.8	9,155,200	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	3.6	3.5	3.7	9,086,000	100.0%

Table 6. Preventive Medical Visit: Percentage of Persons Who Received a Routine Medical Check-up in the Previous 12 Months

1996 Utah Population	100.0%	1,991,800	55.7%	50.2%	61.2%	1,110,400	100.0%
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	70.7%	69.6%	71.8%	1,623,300	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	69.4%	67.8%	71.1%	1,635,100	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	71.0%	69.3%	72.6%	1,753,300	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	71.3%	69.7%	72.9%	1,803,800	100.0%

Table 7. Place of Care: Percentage of Persons Who Had No Usual Place of Medical Care

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	8.8%	8.1%	9.6%	202,900	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	7.9%	6.9%	8.9%	184,900	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	9.8%	8.7%	10.9%	240,900	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	10.6%	9.3%	11.9%	266,900	100.0%

Table 8. Point of Access to Medical Care: Percentage of Persons Whose Usual Point of Access to Medical Care Was a Hospital Emergency Department or an Urgent Care Center

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	94,300	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	6.1%	5.2%	7.2%	143,600	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	5.0%	4.2%	6.1%	124,600	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	5.4%	4.4%	6.6%	136,600	100.0%

Table 9. Asthma: Percentage of Persons Who Had Ever Been Diagnosed With Asthma

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	9.8%	9.0%	10.6%	229,600	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	9.0%	8.3%	9.9%	223,000	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	9.0%	8.2%	9.9%	228,500	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



Comparison of Available 1996 to 2005 Health Status Survey Results: Overview Report (continued)

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Distribution		Survey Estimates of Utahns				
	Percentage Distribution	Number of Persons ¹	Percentage of Persons ²			Number of Persons/ Days/ Visits ^{3,4}	Percentage Distribution of Persons/Days/ Visits by Subgroup ⁴
			95% Confidence Intervals				
			Lower	Upper			

Table 10. Diabetes: Percentage of Persons Who Had Been Diagnosed With Diabetes

1996 Utah Population	100.0%	1,991,800	2.9%	2.6%	3.3%	58,000	100.0%
2001 Utah Population	100.0%	2,295,967	3.5%	3.2%	3.8%	79,800	100.0%
2003 Utah Population	100.0%	2,354,775	3.7%	3.2%	4.2%	87,000	100.0%
2004 Utah Population	100.0%	2,469,230	3.8%	3.3%	4.3%	93,500	100.0%
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	4.1%	3.6%	4.7%	104,200	100.0%

Table 11. Exposure to Cigarette Smoke: Percentage of Children Who Had Been Exposed to Cigarette Smoke Inside the Home

1996 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2001 Utah Population, Aged 17 & Under	100.0%	730,417	6.0%	5.0%	7.1%	43,500	100.0%
2003 Utah Population, Aged 17 & Under	100.0%	742,867	4.3%	3.2%	5.7%	31,900	100.0%
2004 Utah Population, Aged 17 & Under	100.0%	771,112	3.3%	2.3%	4.8%	25,800	100.0%
2005 Utah Population, Aged 17 & Under	100.0%	788,452	2.8%	1.9%	4.2%	22,100	100.0%

Table 12. Obesity: Percentage of Adults Who Were Obese**

1986 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,063,391	7.0%	N/A	N/A	74,500	100.0%
1991 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,137,323	13.7%	N/A	N/A	155,800	100.0%
1996 Utah Population, Adults 18+**	100.0%	1,343,195	12.8%	11.9%	13.8%	172,000	100.0%
2001 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,565,550	15.2%	14.4%	16.0%	237,300	100.0%
2003 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,611,908	18.4%	17.1%	19.8%	296,500	100.0%
2004 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,698,118	18.0%	16.7%	19.4%	306,100	100.0%
2005 Utah Population, Adults 18+	100.0%	1,740,474	19.3%	17.9%	20.7%	335,300	100.0%

Table 13. Obesity: Percentage of Children Who Were Described as Slightly or Very Overweight

1996-2004 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005 Utah Population, Aged 6 to 11	100.0%	251,712	9.6%	7.5%	12.2%	24,100	100.0%

Table 14. Immunizations: Percentage of Persons Who Had Received a Complete Hepatitis B Vaccine Se

1996-2004 NOT COMPARABLE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005 Utah Population	100.0%	2,528,926	56.3%	54.1%	58.4%	1,423,000	100.0%

1 Population estimates of overall populations based on 2005 baseline projections, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, REMI model system; all others based on the UHSS and rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

2 Asymmetric confidence bounds were calculated using the logit transformation.

3 Rounded to the nearest 100 persons.

4 Figures in these columns may not sum to the total because of data weighting and missing values on the grouping variables.

5 Children's Health Insurance Program.

6 "Other government plan" includes Military, Tri-Care, or the V.A.

7 Reasons an insurance company would refuse to cover an individual included 1) because of a pre-existing condition, 2) the individual exceeded lifetime benefits, or 3) some other reason.

* An individual was defined as unable to get care if they indicated that they delayed or were unable to obtain care because (1) their insurance would not cover the service, (2) the service was not available in their area, or (3) they could not afford to pay for the service.

** 1996 is the only year which accounts for pregnancy in women when calculating BMI. This information was suppressed so that the data would be comparable with the other years.

Appendix B:

Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns





Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns

**Table A-1. Utah Population Estimates
by Sex, Age, and Local Health District, 2001-2008**

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Totals								Percentage Distribution
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2005
Utah Population Total	2,305,652	2,358,330	2,354,775	2,469,230	2,528,926	2,582,371	2,642,046	2,703,841	100.0%
Sex									
Males	1,157,416	1,185,615	1,181,516	1,244,302	1,275,758	1,303,786	1,335,033	1,367,288	50.4%
Females	1,148,236	1,172,715	1,173,259	1,224,928	1,253,168	1,278,585	1,307,013	1,336,553	49.6%
Total, All Utahns	2,305,652	2,358,330	2,354,775	2,469,230	2,528,926	2,582,371	2,642,046	2,703,841	100.0%
Age Group									
17 and Under	732,208	742,848	742,867	771,112	788,452	504,569	822,524	841,299	31.2%
18 to 34	673,744	692,665	685,764	725,011	737,965	746,638	758,330	770,005	29.2%
35 to 49	440,035	445,629	442,006	457,324	465,964	474,698	483,638	493,507	18.4%
50 to 64	264,608	278,301	285,779	307,863	323,963	339,153	354,330	368,417	12.8%
65 and Over	195,057	198,887	198,359	207,920	212,582	217,313	223,224	230,613	8.4%
Total, All Utahns	2,305,652	2,358,330	2,354,775	2,469,230	2,528,926	2,282,371	2,642,046	2,703,841	100.0%
Sex and Age									
Males, 17 and Under	376,487	381,767	381,882	395,797	404,656	412,974	422,165	431,759	16.0%
Males, 18 to 34	341,629	351,967	347,144	369,486	376,364	380,922	386,969	392,930	14.9%
Males, 35 to 49	222,739	226,092	223,919	233,003	237,941	242,810	247,961	253,650	9.4%
Males 50 to 64	130,681	137,757	141,427	152,892	161,253	169,076	176,788	183,956	6.4%
Males, 65 and Over	85,880	88,032	87,144	93,124	95,544	98,004	101,150	104,993	3.8%
Females, 17 and Under	355,721	361,081	360,985	375,315	383,796	391,595	400,359	409,540	15.2%
Females, 18 to 34	332,115	340,698	338,620	355,525	361,601	365,716	371,361	337,075	14.3%
Females, 35 to 49	217,296	219,537	218,087	224,321	228,023	231,888	235,677	239,857	9.0%
Females 50 to 64	133,927	140,544	144,352	154,971	162,710	170,077	177,542	184,461	6.4%
Females, 65 and Over	109,177	110,855	111,215	114,796	117,038	119,309	122,074	125,620	4.6%
Total, All Utahns	2,305,652	2,358,330	2,354,775	2,469,230	2,528,926	2,582,371	2,642,046	2,663,841	100.0%
Local Health District									
Bear River	138,600	141,322	143,593	146,905	149,705	151,688	154,895	158,272	5.9%
Central	67,721	69,069	69,140	70,295	71,046	71,315	72,684	74,178	2.8%
Davis	246,744	255,099	252,521	268,916	276,374	282,217	287,924	293,434	10.9%
Salt Lake	918,279	927,564	932,365	955,166	970,748	986,073	1,001,098	1,017,501	38.4%
Southeastern	52,817	53,082	53,675	52,842	52,832	52,486	52,400	52,473	2.1%
Southwest	149,308	156,714	154,152	173,230	182,295	190,815	200,283	209,976	7.2%
Summit	31,279	32,236	32,831	35,090	36,417	37,624	39,214	40,890	1.4%
Tooele	44,425	47,019	46,815	50,075	51,835	53,213	56,693	60,136	2.0%
TriCounty	41,639	41,756	42,241	42,111	42,327	42,305	42,633	43,029	1.7%
Utah County	390,447	405,977	400,670	437,627	453,977	470,178	484,992	499,520	18.0%
Wasatch	16,278	17,476	17,179	19,177	20,138	20,974	22,046	23,155	0.8%
Weber-Morgan	208,115	211,016	209,593	217,796	221,232	223,483	227,184	231,277	8.7%
Total, All Utahns	2,305,652	2,358,330	2,354,775	2,469,230	2,528,926	2,582,371	2,642,046	2,703,841	100.0%

Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline Economic and Demographic Projections. Retrieved May 2, 2006 from Utah Department of Health, Center for Health Data, Indicator-Based Information System for Public Health Web site: <http://ibis.health.utah.gov/>



**Table A-2. Utah Population Estimates
by Sex and Local Health District, 2001-2008**

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Totals								Percentage Distribution
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2005
Local Health District and Sex									
Bear River, Male	68,892	70,366	71,489	73,244	74,719	75,746	77,420	79,182	49.9%
Bear River, Female	69,708	70,956	72,104	73,661	74,986	75,942	77,475	79,090	50.1%
Bear River, Total	138,600	141,322	143,593	146,905	149,705	151,688	154,895	158,272	100.0%
Central, Male	34,187	34,898	34,910	35,564	35,965	36,108	36,842	37,628	50.6%
Central, Female	33,534	34,171	34,230	34,731	35,081	35,207	35,842	36,550	49.4%
Central, Total	67,721	69,069	69,140	70,295	71,046	71,315	72,684	74,178	100.0%
Davis, Male	124,083	128,538	127,001	135,950	139,869	142,911	145,857	148,679	50.6%
Davis, Female	122,661	126,561	125,520	132,966	136,505	139,306	142,067	144,755	49.4%
Davis, Total	246,744	255,099	252,521	268,916	276,374	282,217	287,924	293,434	100.0%
Salt Lake, Male	463,626	468,635	470,494	482,999	491,186	499,217	507,055	515,588	50.6%
Salt Lake, Female	454,653	458,929	461,871	472,167	479,562	486,856	494,043	501,913	49.4%
Salt Lake, Total	918,279	927,564	932,365	955,166	970,748	986,073	1,001,098	1,017,501	100.0%
Southeastern, Male	26,033	26,145	26,538	25,938	25,931	25,743	25,692	25,727	49.1%
Southeastern, Female	26,784	26,937	27,137	26,904	26,901	26,743	26,708	26,746	50.9%
Southeastern, Total	52,817	53,082	53,675	52,842	52,832	52,486	52,400	52,473	100.0%
Southwest, Male	74,326	78,289	76,569	87,142	91,980	96,517	101,560	106,702	50.5%
Southwest, Female	74,982	78,425	77,583	86,088	90,315	94,298	98,723	103,274	49.5%
Southwest, Total	149,308	156,714	154,152	173,230	182,295	190,815	200,283	209,976	100.0%
Summit, Male	16,273	16,785	17,001	18,273	18,969	19,603	20,433	21,304	52.1%
Summit, Female	15,006	15,478	15,830	16,817	17,448	18,021	18,781	19,586	47.9%
Summit, Total	31,279	32,263	32,831	35,090	36,417	37,624	39,214	40,890	100.0%
Tooele, Male	22,033	23,428	23,207	25,065	25,988	26,698	28,531	30,353	50.1%
Tooele, Female	22,392	23,591	23,608	25,010	25,847	26,515	28,162	29,783	49.9%
Tooele, Total	44,425	47,019	46,815	50,075	51,835	53,213	56,693	60,136	100.0%
TriCounty, Male	20,926	20,971	21,205	21,103	21,212	21,194	21,364	21,570	50.1%
TriCounty, Female	20,713	20,785	21,036	21,008	21,115	21,111	21,269	21,459	49.9%
TriCounty, Total	41,639	41,756	42,241	42,111	42,327	42,305	42,633	43,029	100.0%
Utah County, Male	194,255	202,626	199,099	219,521	228,116	236,610	244,328	251,870	50.2%
Utah County, Female	196,192	203,351	201,571	218,106	225,861	233,568	240,664	247,650	49.8%
Utah County, Total	390,447	405,977	400,670	437,627	453,977	470,178	484,992	499,520	100.0%
Wasatch, Male	8,287	8,920	8,728	9,820	10,327	10,763	11,328	11,914	51.3%
Wasatch, Female	7,991	8,556	8,451	9,357	9,811	10,211	10,718	11,241	48.7%
Wasatch, Total	16,278	17,476	17,179	19,177	20,138	20,974	22,046	23,155	100.0%
Weber-Morgan, Male	104,495	106,041	105,275	109,683	111,496	112,676	114,623	116,771	50.4%
Weber-Morgan, Female	103,620	104,975	104,318	108,113	109,736	110,807	112,561	114,506	49.6%
Weber-Morgan, Total	208,115	211,016	209,593	217,796	221,232	223,483	227,184	231,277	100.0%

Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline Economic and Demographic Projections. Retrieved May 2, 2006 from Utah Department of Health, Center for Health Data, Indicator-Based Information System for Public Health Web site: <http://ibis.health.utah.gov/>



Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns

**Table A-3. Utah Population Estimates
by Age Group and Local Health District, 2001-2008**

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Totals								Percentage Distribution 2005
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Local Health District and Age Group									
Bear River, 17 and Under	45,020	45,554	46,250	47,060	47,995	48,779	49,904	51,113	32.1%
Bear River, 18 to 34	44,764	46,089	17,446	48,271	49,023	49,195	49,912	50,530	32.7%
Bear River, 35 to 49	23,541	23,635	23,675	23,733	23,955	24,137	24,557	25,106	16.0%
Bear River, 50 to 64	13,850	14,469	15,165	15,905	16,640	17,316	18,073	18,788	11.1%
Bear River, 65 and Over	11,425	11,575	11,741	11,936	12,092	12,261	12,449	12,735	8.1%
Bear River Total	138,600	141,322	114,277	146,905	149,705	151,688	154,895	158,272	100.0%
Central, 17 and Under	22,731	22,550	22,173	21,925	21,797	21,567	21,630	21,794	30.7%
Central, 18 to 34	16,104	17,205	18,031	18,721	19,384	19,742	20,712	21,712	27.3%
Central, 35 to 49	12,122	12,146	12,002	11,822	11,770	11,693	11,743	11,737	16.6%
Central, 50 to 64	8,835	9,130	9,428	9,707	10,011	10,267	10,562	10,898	14.1%
Central, 65 and Over	7,929	8,038	8,097	8,120	8,084	8,046	8,037	8,037	11.4%
Central Total	67,721	69,069	69,731	70,295	71,046	71,315	72,684	74,178	100.0%
Davis, 17 and Under	84,497	85,804	87,011	88,502	90,191	91,469	92,610	93,818	32.6%
Davis, 18 to 34	66,311	70,036	72,837	75,233	77,620	79,107	80,740	82,224	28.1%
Davis, 35 to 49	49,643	50,664	51,327	51,932	52,713	53,408	53,792	54,077	19.1%
Davis, 50 to 64	28,072	29,748	31,505	33,331	35,249	36,931	38,706	40,309	12.8%
Davis, 65 and Over	18,221	18,847	19,358	19,918	20,601	21,302	22,076	23,006	7.5%
Davis Total	246,744	255,099	262,038	268,916	276,374	282,217	287,924	293,434	100.0%
Salt Lake, 17 and Under	277,194	278,424	281,655	285,803	290,593	295,329	300,022	305,104	29.9%
Salt Lake, 18 to 34	266,029	267,186	268,557	269,797	269,998	269,810	269,685	270,098	27.8%
Salt Lake, 35 to 49	190,065	190,673	191,816	193,583	196,189	199,077	201,692	204,447	20.2%
Salt Lake, 50 to 64	111,080	116,585	122,506	128,583	135,008	141,225	146,842	152,223	13.9%
Salt Lake, 65 and Over	73,911	74,696	75,931	77,400	78,960	80,632	82,857	85,629	8.1%
Salt Lake Total	918,279	927,564	940,465	955,166	970,748	986,073	1,001,098	1,017,501	100.0%
Southeastern, 17 and Under	16,701	16,383	15,911	15,612	15,228	14,817	14,519	14,219	28.8%
Southeastern, 18 to 34	11,480	11,970	12,128	12,458	12,773	12,821	13,029	13,362	24.2%
Southeastern, 35 to 49	10,914	10,659	10,268	9,954	9,675	9,384	8,994	8,692	18.3%
Southeastern, 50 to 64	7,621	7,922	8,226	8,536	8,849	9,092	9,429	9,656	16.7%
Southeastern, 65 and Over	6,101	6,148	6,206	6,282	6,307	6,372	6,429	6,544	11.9%
Southeastern Total	52,817	53,082	52,739	52,842	52,832	52,486	52,400	52,473	100.0%
Southwest, 17 and Under	45,421	46,655	47,930	49,797	51,768	53,813	56,127	58,576	28.4%
Southwest, 18 to 34	38,385	41,045	43,777	46,810	49,565	51,982	54,827	57,679	27.2%
Southwest, 35 to 49	24,604	25,715	26,783	28,352	30,025	31,629	33,279	34,958	16.5%
Southwest, 50 to 64	18,987	20,239	21,443	22,868	24,463	25,937	27,534	29,132	13.4%
Southwest, 65 and Over	21,911	23,060	24,147	25,403	26,474	27,454	28,516	29,631	14.5%
Southwest Total	149,308	156,714	164,080	173,230	182,295	190,815	200,283	209,976	100.0%
Summit, 17 and Under	9,109	9,199	9,548	9,631	9,870	10,082	10,378	10,692	27.1%
Summit, 18 to 34	7,330	7,670	8,410	8,785	9,210	9,581	10,116	10,707	25.3%
Summit, 35 to 49	8,620	8,669	8,771	8,759	8,808	8,771	8,829	8,895	24.2%
Summit, 50 to 64	4,643	5,024	5,523	5,933	6,356	6,798	7,242	7,655	17.5%
Summit, 65 and Over	1,577	1,674	1,821	1,982	2,173	2,392	2,649	2,941	6.0%
Summit Total	31,279	32,236	34,073	35,090	36,417	37,624	39,214	40,890	100.0%
Tooele, 17 and Under	15,101	15,887	16,498	16,887	17,443	17,921	19,055	20,155	33.7%
Tooele, 18 to 34	12,682	13,586	14,100	14,287	14,681	14,898	15,966	17,026	28.3%
Tooele, 35 to 49	8,615	9,054	9,426	9,637	10,011	10,320	11,002	11,718	19.3%
Tooele, 50 to 64	4,908	5,260	5,556	5,807	6,133	6,428	6,846	7,209	11.8%
Tooele, 65 and Over	3,119	3,232	3,376	3,457	3,567	3,646	3,824	4,028	6.9%
Tooele Total	44,425	47,019	48,956	50,075	51,835	53,213	56,693	60,136	100.0%
TriCounty, 17 and Under	14,142	13,891	13,615	13,497	13,356	13,203	13,163	13,182	31.6%
TriCounty, 18 to 34	9,479	9,816	9,997	10,451	10,738	10,863	11,159	11,435	25.4%
TriCounty, 35 to 49	8,315	8,101	7,887	7,750	7,582	7,380	7,178	7,003	17.9%
TriCounty, 50 to 64	5,574	5,751	5,857	6,027	6,260	6,458	6,696	6,901	14.8%
TriCounty, 65 and Over	4,129	4,197	4,282	4,386	4,391	4,401	4,437	4,508	10.4%
TriCounty Total	41,639	41,756	41,638	42,111	42,327	42,305	42,633	43,029	100.0%

See footnotes at end of table.



**Table A-3 (continued). Utah Population Estimates
by Age Group and Local Health District, 2001-2008**

Demographic Subgroup	Utah Population Totals								Percentage Distribution 2005
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Local Health District and Age Group									
Utah County, 17 and Under	132,672	138,125	144,454	150,126	156,733	163,288	169,501	175,645	34.5%
Utah County, 18 to 34	141,613	146,747	152,216	155,868	159,488	162,702	165,050	166,535	35.1%
Utah County, 35 to 49	58,697	61,147	63,920	66,267	69,395	72,829	76,107	80,049	15.3%
Utah County, 50 to 64	33,165	35,117	37,308	39,473	41,807	44,103	46,322	48,254	9.2%
Utah County, 65 and Over	24,300	24,841	25,388	25,893	26,554	27,256	28,012	29,037	5.8%
Utah County Total	390,447	405,977	423,286	437,627	453,977	470,178	484,992	499,520	100.0%
Wasatch, 17 and Under	5,404	5,730	6,001	6,171	6,419	6,636	6,943	7,275	31.9%
Wasatch, 18 to 34	4,085	4,548	4,919	5,151	5,527	5,833	6,199	6,579	27.4%
Wasatch, 35 to 49	3,477	3,671	3,836	3,937	4,062	4,159	4,316	4,474	20.2%
Wasatch, 50 to 64	1,976	2,142	2,313	2,452	2,615	2,782	2,966	3,142	13.0%
Wasatch, 65 and Over	1,336	1,385	1,446	1,466	1,515	1,564	1,622	1,685	7.5%
Wasatch Total	16,278	17,476	18,515	19,177	20,138	20,974	22,046	23,155	100.0%
Weber-Morgan, 17 and Under	64,216	64,646	65,118	66,101	67,059	67,665	68,672	69,726	30.3%
Weber-Morgan, 18 to 34	55,482	56,767	57,822	59,179	59,958	60,104	60,935	62,118	27.1%
Weber-Morgan, 35 to 49	41,422	41,495	41,436	41,598	41,779	41,911	42,149	42,351	18.9%
Weber-Morgan, 50 to 64	25,897	26,914	27,987	29,241	30,572	31,816	33,112	34,250	13.8%
Weber-Morgan, 65 and Over	21,098	21,194	21,457	21,677	21,864	21,987	22,316	22,832	9.9%
Weber-Morgan Total	208,115	211,016	223,820	217,796	221,232	223,483	227,184	231,277	100.0%

Source: Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2005 Baseline Economic and Demographic Projections. Retrieved May 2, 2006 from Utah Department of Health, Center for Health Data, Indicator-Based Information System for Public Health Web site: <http://ibis.health.utah.gov/>



Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns

**Table A-4. Persons Living in Poverty
by County, Utah, 2003**

County/Health District	Number	90% Confidence	
		Interval	Percentage Interval
Beaver County	596	452 to 740	10.1% 7.7% to 12.6%
Box Elder County	3,726	2,846 to 4,606	8.4% 6.4% to 10.4%
Cache County	10,903	8,439 to 13,366	11.4% 8.9% to 14.0%
Carbon County	2,601	1,978 to 3,223	13.5% 10.3% to 16.8%
Daggett County	53	39 to 67	6.2% 4.6% to 7.9%
Davis County	19,048	14,849 to 23,247	7.4% 5.7% to 9.0%
Duchesne County	2,113	1,604 to 2,622	14.3% 10.9% to 17.8%
Emery County	1,232	945 to 1,518	11.6% 8.9% to 14.3%
Garfield County	432	327 to 537	10.0% 7.6% to 12.5%
Grand County	1,203	916 to 1,490	13.9% 10.6% to 17.2%
Iron County	5,207	3,969 to 6,444	14.5% 11.1% to 18.0%
Juab County	863	658 to 1,069	9.7% 7.4% to 12.0%
Kane County	550	415 to 685	9.0% 6.8% to 11.1%
Millard County	1,426	1,085 to 1,767	11.7% 8.9% to 14.5%
Morgan County	357	268 to 446	4.7% 3.5% to 5.9%
Piute County	192	144 to 240	13.8% 10.3% to 17.3%
Rich County	158	118 to 198	7.7% 5.8% to 9.7%
Salt Lake County	90,075	71,051 to 109,099	9.8% 7.7% to 11.8%
San Juan County	3,109	2,243 to 3,976	22.6% 16.3% to 28.9%
Sanpete County	3,005	2,318 to 3,693	13.5% 10.4% to 16.6%
Sevier County	2,255	1,721 to 2,789	11.8% 9.0% to 14.6%
Summit County	1,899	1,436 to 2,361	5.6% 4.2% to 7.0%
Tooele County	3,708	2,819 to 4,596	7.7% 5.8% to 9.5%
Uintah County	3,269	2,527 to 4,010	12.4% 9.6% to 15.2%
Utah County	44,333	34,600 to 54,066	11.2% 8.7% to 13.6%
Wasatch County	1,137	853 to 1,420	6.3% 4.7% to 7.9%
Washington County	12,412	9,560 to 15,264	11.4% 8.8% to 14.0%
Wayne County	287	214 to 360	11.5% 8.6% to 14.4%
Weber County	20,490	15,923 to 25,057	9.9% 7.7% to 12.1%
State of Utah	236,637	218,816 to 254,458	10.0% 9.3% to 10.8%

Final release date for these estimates: November 2005

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, Small Area Estimates Branch



Table A-5. Persons Living in Poverty, Aged 0-17 by County, Utah, 2003

County/Health District	Number	90% Confidence	
		Interval	Percentage
Beaver County	256	184 to 328	13.10%
Box Elder County	1,558	1,134 to 1,982	10.60%
Cache County	3,393	2,503 to 4,282	11.30%
Carbon County	932	672 to 1,191	17.80%
Daggett County	13	9 to 17	6.80%
Davis County	7,821	5,790 to 9,851	9.20%
Duchesne County	905	653 to 1,156	18%
Emery County	512	373 to 652	15.60%
Garfield County	171	123 to 220	13.20%
Grand County	453	323 to 583	20.80%
Iron County	1,959	1,420 to 2,498	18%
Juab County	370	266 to 474	11.70%
Kane County	201	144 to 259	12.40%
Millard County	594	425 to 763	14.80%
Morgan County	123	86 to 160	5.30%
Piute County	75	53 to 98	20.30%
Rich County	54	37 to 70	9.30%
Salt Lake County	35,619	26,616 to 44,621	12.90%
San Juan County	1,305	811 to 1,798	26.30%
Sanpete County	1,141	832 to 1,450	16.40%
Sevier County	955	694 to 1,216	15.90%
Summit County	656	467 to 845	7.20%
Tooele County	1,621	1,173 to 2,069	10%
Uintah County	1,330	970 to 1,691	16%
Utah County	16,775	12,425 to 21,125	12.20%
Wasatch County	479	340 to 618	8.20%
Washington County	5,071	3,718 to 6,424	16%
Wayne County	119	82 to 156	15.60%
Weber County	8,150	6,013 to 10,286	13.10%
State of Utah	92,610	81,230 to 103,990	12.50%

Final release date for these estimates: November 2005

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, Small Area Estimates Branch



Appendix B: Selected Demographic Characteristics of Utahns

Table A-6. Persons Aged 5-17 in Families in Poverty by County, Utah, 2003

County/Health District	Number	90% Confidence	
		Interval	Percentage
Beaver County	146	99 to 193	10.6% 7.2% to 14.1%
Box Elder County	865	592 to 1,138	8.1% 5.6% to 10.7%
Cache County	1,865	1,298 to 2,432	9.8% 6.8% to 12.7%
Carbon County	525	356 to 694	14.2% 9.6% to 18.8%
Daggett County	8	5 to 11	5.9% 3.8% to 8.0%
Davis County	4,010	2,800 to 5,220	6.7% 4.7% to 8.7%
Duchesne County	525	356 to 694	15.0% 10.2% to 19.8%
Emery County	300	205 to 395	12.1% 8.3% to 15.9%
Garfield County	100	67 to 133	10.4% 7.0% to 13.8%
Grand County	270	180 to 360	17.4% 11.6% to 23.2%
Iron County	1,130	769 to 1,491	15.9% 10.8% to 20.9%
Juab County	225	152 to 298	9.9% 6.7% to 13.1%
Kane County	122	82 to 162	10.3% 6.9% to 13.7%
Millard County	354	237 to 471	11.5% 7.7% to 15.3%
Morgan County	75	48 to 102	4.1% 2.7% to 5.6%
Piute County	47	31 to 63	18.9% 12.4% to 25.4%
Rich County	34	22 to 46	7.5% 4.9% to 10.1%
Salt Lake County	18,369	12,967 to 23,771	9.8% 6.9% to 12.7%
San Juan County	824	465 to 1,183	22.2% 12.5% to 31.9%
Sanpete County	646	443 to 849	12.9% 8.8% to 16.9%
Sevier County	538	367 to 709	12.5% 8.5% to 16.4%
Summit County	379	253 to 505	5.8% 3.8% to 7.7%
Tooele County	901	613 to 1,189	8.1% 5.5% to 10.7%
Uintah County	751	515 to 987	12.9% 8.8% to 17.0%
Utah County	8,914	6,221 to 11,607	10.2% 7.1% to 13.3%
Wasatch County	272	181 to 363	6.7% 4.5% to 9.0%
Washington County	2,798	1,931 to 3,665	12.9% 8.9% to 16.8%
Wayne County	76	49 to 103	14.0% 9.0% to 19.0%
Weber County	4,424	3,076 to 5,772	10.4% 7.2% to 13.6%
State of Utah	49,493	41,698 to 57,288	9.9% 8.4% to 11.5%

Final release date for these estimates: November 2005

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, Small Area Estimates Branch



**Table A-7. Median Household Income in Dollars
by County, Utah, 2003**

County/Health District	Estimate	90% Confidence Interval
Beaver County	\$ 37,969	\$35,633 to \$40,459
Box Elder County	\$ 47,236	\$44,341 to \$50,321
Cache County	\$ 41,703	\$39,309 to \$44,244
Carbon County	\$ 36,190	\$33,945 to \$38,584
Daggett County	\$ 34,691	\$32,484 to \$37,048
Davis County	\$ 56,760	\$53,615 to \$60,089
Duchesne County	\$ 36,415	\$34,115 to \$38,870
Emery County	\$ 41,207	\$38,697 to \$43,881
Garfield County	\$ 34,847	\$32,690 to \$37,147
Grand County	\$ 31,604	\$29,628 to \$33,711
Iron County	\$ 35,793	\$33,609 to \$38,119
Juab County	\$ 40,125	\$37,691 to \$42,717
Kane County	\$ 36,050	\$33,866 to \$38,374
Millard County	\$ 38,744	\$36,384 to \$41,257
Morgan County	\$ 56,523	\$52,953 to \$60,334
Piute County	\$ 29,145	\$27,334 to \$31,077
Rich County	\$ 43,077	\$40,456 to \$45,867
Salt Lake County	\$ 49,003	\$46,610 to \$51,520
San Juan County	\$ 27,653	\$25,741 to \$29,708
Sanpete County	\$ 34,417	\$32,401 to \$36,558
Sevier County	\$ 37,536	\$35,248 to \$39,972
Summit County	\$ 65,464	\$61,192 to \$70,034
Tooele County	\$ 51,172	\$48,006 to \$54,547
Uintah County	\$ 39,069	\$36,741 to \$41,544
Utah County	\$ 46,399	\$43,841 to \$49,105
Wasatch County	\$ 51,138	\$47,998 to \$54,485
Washington County	\$ 39,738	\$37,330 to \$42,303
Wayne County	\$ 32,383	\$30,389 to \$34,507
Weber County	\$ 46,626	\$43,979 to \$49,433
State of Utah	\$ 49,493	\$41,698 to \$57,288

Final release date for these estimates: November 2005

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division, Small Area Estimates Branch



Casady, R.,J., and J.M., Lepkowski (1993) Stratified telephone survey designs. Survey Methodology, 19 (1) 103-113.

Keeter, S. (1995) Estimating telephone noncoverage bias with a telephone survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 59, 196-217.

Thornberry, O.T., and J.R., Massey (1988) Trends in United States telephone coverage across time and subgroups. In Robert M. Groves, P. Biermer, L. Lyberg, J.

Massey, W. Nichols II, and J. Waksberg (eds.) Telephone Survey Methodology. New York: John Wiley and Sons.