COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2006

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

National Public Health Week: April 3-9, 2006

COUNTY HEALTH STATUS

PROFILES

2006

California Department of Health Services
Mark B. Horton, M.D., M.S.P.H.
State Public Health Officer

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

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

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

In collaboration with
California Conference of Local Health Officers
Glennah Trochet, M.D.
President

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor
State of California

S. Kimberly Belshé
Secretary
California Health & Human Services Agency

Sandra Shewry
Director
Department of Health Services

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SANDRA SHEWRY
Director

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
Governor

California
Department of
Health Services

April 3, 2006

Dear Colleague:

We are pleased to present the fourteenth edition of California's *County Health Status Profiles 2006* for National Public Health Week, April 3 - 9, 2006. This report contains selected health status indicators recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service for monitoring state and local progress toward achieving the goals set forth in *Healthy People 2010*. The Healthy People 2010 National Objectives challenge public health professionals to increase the span of healthy life, reduce health disparities, and ensure access to preventive services for all Americans.

The *County Health Status Profiles* report is updated each year and amended according to priorities developed by the California Department of Health Services and the California Conference of Local Health Officers. This year's health indicators are identical to those presented last year. However, California Department of Finance population data were updated, effective May 2004. Therefore, caution should be exercised in comparing rates published by the California Center for Health Statistics in previous publications.

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

Sandra Shewry
Director

Glennah Trochet, M.D.
President, California Conference of Local Health Officers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

Del Norte

Siskiyou

Modoc

Trinity

Shasta

Lassen

Humboldt

Tehama

Plumas

Mendocino

Glenn

Butte

Sierra

Nevada

Yuba

Placer

Lake

Colusa

Sutter

El Dorado

Yolo

Sacramento

Alpine

Sonoma

Napa

Amador

Solano

Calaveras

Tuolumne

Mono

Marin

Contra Costa

San Joaquin

San Francisco

Alameda

Stanislaus

Mariposa

San Mateo

Santa Clara

Merced

Madera

Santa Cruz

San Benito

Fresno

Inyo

Monterey

Tulare

Kings

San Luis Obispo

Kern

San Bernardino

Santa Barbara

Ventura

Los Angeles

Riverside

Orange

San Diego

Imperial

INTRODUCTION

County Health Status Profiles has been published annually for the State of California since 1993. The purpose of this report is to present public health data that can be directly compared with clearly established benchmarks, such as national standards, and populations of similar composition. Appendix A (page 78) provides a table of the selected health indicators showing California's rates compared with the target rates established for Healthy People 2010 National Objectives and the United States rates where available.

In keeping with the goal of using national standards, mortality causes of death data were coded using the International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision and age-adjusted rates were calculated using the 2000 Standard Population. Please note that some of the Healthy People 2010 (HP 2010) Objective target rates in this report have been changed in accordance with midcourse review recommendations. For additional information on the HP 2010 recommendations, see the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention website at http://wonder.cdc.gov/data2010/obj.htm

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

The "Highlights" and the explanatory "Notes" are adjacent to each of the tables. The explanatory "Notes" as well as the "Technical Notes" (pages 68-77) are provided to assist the reader with information on data limitations and qualifications for correctly interpreting and comparing these data among the counties. Counties are ranked by rates or percentages based on the methodology described in the notes for each table. For those who may want to learn more about the problems associated with analysis of vital events involving small numbers, small area analysis, and age-adjusted death rates, references to relevant statistical publications are located in the bibliography.

The following California Department of Health Services' offices provided data for this report: Center for Health Statistics, Division of Communicable Disease Control, Genetic Disease Branch, Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Branch, and the Office of AIDS. In addition, the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance provided 2003 race/ethnicity population estimates by county with age and sex detail, May 2004. Estimates of persons under age 18 in 2003 who were below poverty are from the U.S. Census Bureau (http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/).

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

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

<div align="center">

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

</div>

Should you wish additional copies of County Health Status Profiles, an order form and instructions for placing your order appear at the end of this report (page 80).

TABLE 1: DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from all causes for California was 654.0 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 153 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 235,011.7 from 2002 to 2004, and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 1,264.2 in Lake County to 364.5 in Mono County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.5 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from all causes for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 704.5 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 969.4 in Yuba County to 513.5 in Mono County.

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

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable."   The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 1
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CAUSES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: NONE ESTABLISHED							
1	MONO	13,443	49.0	364.5	513.5	350.4	676.6
2	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	8,583.3	497.9	590.9	578.3	603.5
3	MARIN	250,252	1,798.3	718.6	599.1	571.2	627.1
4	SAN MATEO	712,772	4,671.7	655.4	617.1	599.4	634.9
5	SAN BENITO	56,605	258.0	455.8	637.0	558.0	716.1
6	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	59,939.0	596.6	640.9	635.7	646.0
7	VENTURA	799,114	4,894.0	612.4	667.7	648.9	686.5
8	SOLANO	416,406	2,659.0	638.6	671.4	645.6	697.2
9	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	2,036.7	791.1	673.2	643.8	702.6
10	ORANGE	3,001,146	16,954.7	564.9	673.7	663.5	683.9
11	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	2,899.7	703.7	675.2	650.5	699.9
12	MONTEREY	418,842	2,387.7	570.1	676.9	649.6	704.2
13	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	6,108.7	776.2	683.8	666.5	701.1
14	LASSEN	34,633	207.0	597.7	685.8	591.6	780.0
15	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	1,653.0	637.7	687.0	653.5	720.6
16	MADERA	133,965	917.0	684.5	689.8	644.8	734.8
17	PLUMAS	21,181	219.7	1,037.1	702.0	606.1	797.9
18	PLACER	285,336	2,223.3	779.2	702.8	673.5	732.1
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**235,011.7**	**654.0**	**704.5**	**701.6**	**707.3**
19	SONOMA	473,274	3,811.0	805.2	708.8	686.0	731.6
20	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	6,902.0	687.7	709.8	693.0	726.6
21	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	9,530.7	637.3	723.7	709.1	738.3
22	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	19,640.3	657.0	725.9	715.7	736.1
23	EL DORADO	168,227	1,213.0	721.0	728.6	687.1	770.2
24	MARIPOSA	17,886	168.3	941.1	730.0	617.0	843.1
25	NAPA	130,920	1,275.0	973.9	733.6	692.4	774.9
26	TEHAMA	58,665	608.3	1,037.0	740.2	679.1	801.3
27	IMPERIAL	153,673	908.7	591.3	740.9	691.4	790.3
28	CALAVERAS	43,566	414.7	951.8	741.5	667.7	815.3
29	NEVADA	96,923	955.7	986.0	756.0	707.3	804.8
30	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	13,321.7	757.5	757.8	744.9	770.7
31	COLUSA	20,026	140.7	702.4	768.8	641.4	896.2
32	SIERRA	3,563	40.3	1,132.0	769.3	519.1	1,019.4
33	AMADOR	37,074	375.7	1,013.3	769.7	690.2	849.2
34	TRINITY	13,579	145.7	1,072.7	776.4	646.7	906.1
35	INYO	18,617	224.7	1,206.8	783.5	675.4	891.6
36	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	9,652.0	724.9	786.3	770.6	802.1
37	SHASTA	175,421	1,867.0	1,064.3	794.0	756.8	831.3
38	TUOLUMNE	57,120	615.7	1,077.8	800.7	736.4	865.0
39	YOLO	183,602	1,141.7	621.8	806.8	759.7	853.9
40	KERN	717,332	5,282.3	736.4	811.2	789.1	833.3
41	GLENN	27,626	237.3	859.1	812.3	708.4	916.2
42	SISKIYOU	45,081	509.7	1,130.6	813.9	740.9	886.9
43	MODOC	9,541	107.0	1,121.5	815.8	657.8	973.8
44	FRESNO	855,469	5,824.0	680.8	823.8	802.5	845.0
45	BUTTE	212,473	2,210.3	1,040.3	832.9	797.6	868.3
46	ALPINE	1,268	9.7	762.4 *	834.4 *	300.7	1,368.0
47	KINGS	138,763	778.7	561.1	835.5	775.6	895.5
48	STANISLAUS	489,491	3,647.0	745.1	850.2	822.5	877.9
49	MERCED	230,696	1,466.0	635.5	859.4	814.9	903.9
50	MENDOCINO	89,156	842.7	945.2	863.3	804.5	922.1
51	SUTTER	84,978	710.0	835.5	864.2	800.5	927.9
52	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	11,909.7	637.1	889.3	873.1	905.5
53	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	4,554.0	727.8	897.1	870.9	923.4
54	TULARE	392,989	2,681.3	682.3	899.0	864.7	933.4
55	DEL NORTE	28,192	264.3	937.6	908.7	798.7	1,018.6
56	LAKE	62,359	788.3	1,264.2	937.6	870.7	1,004.6
57	HUMBOLDT	129,515	1,238.7	956.4	944.6	891.7	997.4
58	YUBA	63,979	538.3	841.4	969.4	886.9	1,051.8

TABLE 2: DEATHS DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from motor vehicle crashes for California was 12.1 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 8,291 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 4,334.3 from 2002 to 2004 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 28.2 in Sutter County to 6.6 in San Francisco County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.3 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from motor vehicle crashes for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 12.1 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 28.4 in Sutter County to 6.3 in San Francisco County.

Five counties (3 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 8.0 age-adjusted deaths due to motor vehicle crashes per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for motor vehicle crashes did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable."   The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 2
DEATHS DUE TO MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,268	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	MARIN	250,252	15.0	6.0 *	6.1 *	2.9	9.4
3	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	51.7	6.6	6.3	4.5	8.1
4	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	121.7	7.1	7.3	6.0	8.6
5	SAN MATEO	712,772	56.0	7.9	7.9	5.8	10.0
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					8.0		
6	ORANGE	3,001,146	248.0	8.3	8.5	7.4	9.6
7	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	127.0	8.5	8.6	7.1	10.1
8	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	921.7	9.2	9.4	8.8	10.0
9	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	26.3	10.2	9.8	6.0	13.5
10	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	41.7	10.1	9.9	6.8	12.9
11	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	99.7	9.9	10.2	8.2	12.2
12	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	315.3	10.5	10.4	9.2	11.5
13	VENTURA	799,114	81.0	10.1	10.5	8.2	12.8
14	YOLO	183,602	21.0	11.4	11.6	6.5	16.7
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**4,334.3**	**12.1**	**12.1**	**11.8**	**12.5**
15	SOLANO	416,406	52.0	12.5	12.6	9.2	16.0
16	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	36.0	14.0	13.0	8.7	17.4
17	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	174.3	13.1	13.2	11.2	15.1
18	SONOMA	473,274	62.7	13.2	13.2	9.9	16.5
19	PLACER	285,336	37.3	13.1	13.6	9.1	18.0
20	NAPA	130,920	18.7	14.3 *	14.1 *	7.7	20.6
21	EL DORADO	168,227	23.3	13.9	14.6	8.5	20.7
22	MONTEREY	418,842	62.0	14.8	14.9	11.1	18.6
23	PLUMAS	21,181	4.3	20.5 *	16.7 *	0.5	33.0
24	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	307.3	16.4	17.0	15.0	18.9
25	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	303.3	17.2	17.4	15.5	19.4
26	SAN BENITO	56,605	10.0	17.7 *	18.2 *	6.7	29.7
27	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	113.3	18.1	18.4	15.0	21.9
28	NEVADA	96,923	17.7	18.2 *	19.1 *	9.9	28.4
29	STANISLAUS	489,491	93.7	19.1	19.1	15.2	23.0
30	BUTTE	212,473	43.3	20.4	19.8	13.7	25.8
31	KINGS	138,763	27.7	19.9	20.1	12.4	27.8
32	SHASTA	175,421	36.0	20.5	20.2	13.5	26.9
33	KERN	717,332	144.7	20.2	20.6	17.2	24.0
34	MENDOCINO	89,156	18.7	20.9 *	20.9 *	11.3	30.5
35	IMPERIAL	153,673	32.0	20.8	21.3	13.8	28.8
36	FRESNO	855,469	186.7	21.8	22.3	19.0	25.5
37	GLENN	27,626	6.3	22.9 *	22.6 *	4.8	40.3
38	LASSEN	34,633	8.3	24.1 *	22.7 *	7.1	38.3
39	MONO	13,443	3.3	24.8 *	23.0 *	0.0	47.8
40	HUMBOLDT	129,515	31.3	24.2	23.6	15.2	32.0
41	SISKIYOU	45,081	9.3	20.7 *	24.0 *	7.6	40.5
42	COLUSA	20,026	5.0	25.0 *	24.3 *	2.6	46.0
43	AMADOR	37,074	9.7	26.1 *	24.5 *	8.6	40.3
44	MERCED	230,696	56.0	24.3	24.7	18.1	31.4
45	YUBA	63,979	16.3	25.5 *	24.8 *	12.7	37.0
46	TULARE	392,989	93.3	23.7	25.0	19.9	30.2
47	MADERA	133,965	34.3	25.6	25.8	17.1	34.4
48	LAKE	62,359	17.3	27.8 *	26.3 *	13.4	39.3
49	INYO	18,617	5.7	30.4 *	27.3 *	3.7	50.9
50	SUTTER	84,978	24.0	28.2	28.4	17.0	39.8
51	DEL NORTE	28,192	8.3	29.6 *	28.5 *	9.1	48.0
52	TEHAMA	58,665	18.0	30.7 *	29.7 *	15.5	43.9
53	TUOLUMNE	57,120	18.7	32.7 *	33.2 *	17.6	48.7
54	CALAVERAS	43,566	16.3	37.5 *	34.7 *	16.9	52.6
55	TRINITY	13,579	5.7	41.7 *	40.7 *	5.2	76.2
56	MARIPOSA	17,886	8.0	44.7 *	45.6 *	12.6	78.7
57	MODOC	9,541	5.0	52.4 *	51.9 *	4.7	99.1
58	SIERRA	3,563	3.0	84.2 *	85.2 *	0.0	188.2

TABLE 3: DEATHS DUE TO UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from unintentional injuries for California was 28.7 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 3,481 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 10,322.0 from 2002 to 2004 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 73.1 in Humboldt County to 19.1 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from unintentional injuries for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 29.3 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 72.9 in Humboldt County to 20.1 in Santa Clara County.

One county (with an unreliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 17.1 age-adjusted deaths due to unintentional injuries per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for unintentional injuries did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 3
DEATHS DUE TO UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,268	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				17.1		
2	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	329.7	19.1	20.1	17.9	22.3
3	MARIN	250,252	56.0	22.4	20.7	15.2	26.3
4	SAN MATEO	712,772	163.3	22.9	22.2	18.7	25.6
5	ORANGE	3,001,146	657.7	21.9	23.2	21.4	25.0
6	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	2,270.3	22.6	23.3	22.3	24.2
7	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	377.7	25.3	25.8	23.2	28.5
8	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	226.7	28.8	25.9	22.4	29.3
9	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	70.3	27.1	26.9	20.5	33.2
10	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	269.7	26.9	27.0	23.8	30.2
11	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	820.0	27.4	27.7	25.8	29.6
12	SOLANO	416,406	116.3	27.9	28.2	23.0	33.3
13	VENTURA	799,114	225.7	28.2	29.2	25.4	33.1
14	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	122.0	29.6	29.3	24.1	34.5
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**10,322.0**	**28.7**	**29.3**	**28.7**	**29.8**
15	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	509.7	27.3	29.8	27.2	32.5
16	SAN BENITO	56,605	17.0	30.0 *	31.8 *	16.4	47.3
17	EL DORADO	168,227	53.7	31.9	32.6	23.6	41.7
18	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	91.3	35.5	32.7	25.9	39.5
19	SONOMA	473,274	164.7	34.8	33.3	28.2	38.5
20	MONTEREY	418,842	134.3	32.1	33.5	27.8	39.3
21	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	437.3	32.8	33.7	30.5	36.9
22	NAPA	130,920	48.3	36.9	34.0	24.2	43.7
23	PLACER	285,336	101.0	35.4	34.5	27.7	41.3
24	YOLO	183,602	57.3	31.2	36.0	26.5	45.5
25	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	618.3	35.2	36.0	33.2	38.9
26	KINGS	138,763	47.7	34.4	36.8	26.0	47.7
27	IMPERIAL	153,673	61.7	40.1	37.3	27.2	47.5
28	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	230.0	36.8	39.2	34.0	44.3
29	COLUSA	20,026	8.0	39.9 *	40.5 *	12.0	69.1
30	PLUMAS	21,181	11.0	51.9 *	40.9 *	14.8	66.9
31	KERN	717,332	300.3	41.9	43.9	38.9	48.8
32	FRESNO	855,469	359.7	42.0	45.0	40.3	49.8
33	GLENN	27,626	12.7	45.9 *	45.8 *	20.4	71.2
34	STANISLAUS	489,491	223.3	45.6	47.7	41.4	54.0
35	LASSEN	34,633	16.7	48.1 *	47.8 *	24.4	71.1
36	MADERA	133,965	62.7	46.8	47.8	35.9	59.7
37	MERCED	230,696	98.7	42.8	47.8	38.1	57.4
38	SUTTER	84,978	40.0	47.1	47.8	33.0	62.7
39	NEVADA	96,923	50.7	52.3	49.4	35.2	63.6
40	AMADOR	37,074	20.0	53.9	49.6 *	27.1	72.1
41	TULARE	392,989	187.3	47.7	52.3	44.7	60.0
42	BUTTE	212,473	117.7	55.4	52.6	42.8	62.3
43	MONO	13,443	7.0	52.1 *	53.4 *	10.2	96.5
44	CALAVERAS	43,566	25.0	57.4	53.8	31.4	76.2
45	TEHAMA	58,665	34.7	59.1	54.5	35.6	73.3
46	SHASTA	175,421	103.0	58.7	56.6	45.3	67.9
47	YUBA	63,979	35.7	55.7	57.7	38.6	76.8
48	MENDOCINO	89,156	54.7	61.3	60.3	44.0	76.5
49	SISKIYOU	45,081	27.3	60.6	61.1	36.4	85.8
50	DEL NORTE	28,192	18.0	63.8 *	61.4 *	33.0	89.8
51	INYO	18,617	13.3	71.6 *	61.5 *	25.7	97.3
52	LAKE	62,359	43.3	69.5	64.3	44.2	84.4
53	TUOLUMNE	57,120	40.7	71.2	67.9	46.3	89.5
54	TRINITY	13,579	11.0	81.0 *	69.9 *	25.9	113.9
55	HUMBOLDT	129,515	94.7	73.1	72.9	58.0	87.7
56	MARIPOSA	17,886	14.3	80.1 *	79.2 *	36.1	122.4
57	MODOC	9,541	9.0	94.3 *	89.6 *	28.7	150.5
58	SIERRA	3,563	4.0	112.3 *	104.6 *	0.0	214.5

TABLE 4: DEATHS DUE TO FIREARM INJURIES, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from firearm injuries for California was 9.4 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,604 persons. This rate was based on the three-year average number of deaths from 2002 to 2004 of 3,388.7 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 15.4 in Humboldt County to 4.1 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from firearm injuries for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 9.4 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 14.6 in Humboldt County to 4.2 in Santa Clara County.

One county (with an unreliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 3.6 age-adjusted deaths due to firearm injuries per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for firearm injuries did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable."   The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 4
DEATHS DUE TO FIREARM INJURIES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	SAN BENITO	56,605	1.7	2.9 *	3.2 *	0.0	8.2
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				3.6		
2	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	71.0	4.1	4.2	3.2	5.2
3	MARIN	250,252	13.0	5.2 *	4.3 *	1.9	6.7
4	COLUSA	20,026	1.0	5.0 *	5.1 *	0.0	15.2
5	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	21.0	5.1	5.1	2.9	7.3
6	NAPA	130,920	7.3	5.6 *	5.2 *	1.4	9.1
7	IMPERIAL	153,673	8.0	5.2 *	5.8 *	1.7	9.8
8	ORANGE	3,001,146	168.3	5.6	5.8	4.9	6.7
9	SAN MATEO	712,772	42.0	5.9	6.0	4.2	7.8
10	YOLO	183,602	10.3	5.6 *	6.0 *	2.2	9.8
11	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	15.7	6.0 *	6.2 *	3.1	9.3
12	KINGS	138,763	8.0	5.8 *	6.4 *	1.8	11.1
13	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	18.7	7.3 *	6.6 *	3.6	9.7
14	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	218.7	7.3	7.2	6.2	8.1
15	VENTURA	799,114	55.7	7.0	7.2	5.3	9.1
16	SIERRA	3,563	0.3	9.4 *	7.5 *	0.0	32.9
17	NEVADA	96,923	8.3	8.6 *	8.1 *	2.3	13.8
18	PLACER	285,336	23.3	8.2	8.1	4.8	11.4
19	AMADOR	37,074	4.0	10.8 *	8.2 *	0.0	16.9
20	SOLANO	416,406	34.0	8.2	8.3	5.5	11.1
21	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	61.3	7.8	8.4	6.1	10.7
22	SONOMA	473,274	42.0	8.9	8.5	5.9	11.1
23	MADERA	133,965	11.3	8.5 *	8.6 *	3.5	13.6
24	TEHAMA	58,665	5.7	9.7 *	8.6 *	1.2	16.0
25	STANISLAUS	489,491	43.3	8.9	9.1	6.4	11.8
26	MONTEREY	418,842	39.3	9.4	9.2	6.3	12.1
	CALIFORNIA	35,934,967	3,388.7	9.4	9.4	9.1	9.7
27	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	126.3	9.5	9.5	7.8	11.1
28	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	164.7	9.4	9.5	8.1	11.0
29	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	153.7	10.3	10.2	8.5	11.8
30	EL DORADO	168,227	17.3	10.3 *	10.3 *	5.3	15.2
31	KERN	717,332	71.7	10.0	10.4	8.0	12.8
32	FRESNO	855,469	89.7	10.5	10.5	8.3	12.7
33	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	65.3	10.4	10.7	8.1	13.3
34	LAKE	62,359	8.0	12.8 *	10.8 *	3.1	18.4
35	MONO	13,443	1.3	9.9 *	10.8 *	0.0	29.2
36	BUTTE	212,473	24.7	11.6	10.9	6.5	15.3
37	TULARE	392,989	42.0	10.7	11.0	7.6	14.4
38	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	106.7	10.6	11.0	8.9	13.1
39	MERCED	230,696	25.3	11.0	11.3	6.8	15.7
40	DEL NORTE	28,192	3.3	11.8 *	11.6 *	0.0	24.0
41	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	217.7	11.6	12.0	10.3	13.6
42	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	1,210.3	12.0	12.0	11.4	12.7
43	LASSEN	34,633	4.0	11.5 *	12.3 *	0.1	24.5
44	MARIPOSA	17,886	2.0	11.2 *	12.6 *	0.0	30.8
45	MENDOCINO	89,156	11.7	13.1 *	12.7 *	5.3	20.1
46	MODOC	9,541	1.3	14.0 *	13.1 *	0.0	36.9
47	SHASTA	175,421	24.0	13.7	13.6	8.0	19.1
48	SUTTER	84,978	12.3	14.5 *	14.5 *	6.4	22.6
49	HUMBOLDT	129,515	20.0	15.4	14.6	8.1	21.0
50	CALAVERAS	43,566	7.0	16.1 *	15.8 *	3.4	28.1
51	YUBA	63,979	9.3	14.6 *	15.9 *	5.7	26.2
52	PLUMAS	21,181	4.0	18.9 *	16.6 *	0.0	34.3
53	TUOLUMNE	57,120	10.7	18.7 *	16.8 *	6.4	27.2
54	SISKIYOU	45,081	8.3	18.5 *	17.7 *	4.9	30.6
55	GLENN	27,626	5.3	19.3 *	18.3 *	2.6	34.0
56	INYO	18,617	4.3	23.3 *	19.9 *	0.1	39.7
57	TRINITY	13,579	2.7	19.6 *	21.7 *	0.0	48.6
58	ALPINE	1,268	0.3	26.3 *	30.5 *	0.0	133.8

TABLE 5: DEATHS DUE TO HOMICIDE, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from homicide for California was 6.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 14,512 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2002 to 2004 of 2,476.3 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 10.9 in Los Angeles County to 2.6 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 4.2 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from homicide for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 6.7 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 10.8 in Los Angeles County to 2.6 in Santa Clara County.

Twenty-four counties (1 with a reliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 2.8 age-adjusted deaths due to homicide per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for homicide did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 5
DEATHS DUE TO HOMICIDE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	COLUSA	20,026	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
2	MARIPOSA	17,886	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
3	MONO	13,443	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
4	MODOC	9,541	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
5	SIERRA	3,563	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
6	ALPINE	1,268	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
7	AMADOR	37,074	0.7	1.8 *	0.9 *	0.0	4.1
8	GLENN	27,626	0.3	1.2 *	1.0 *	0.0	4.3
9	PLACER	285,336	4.3	1.5 *	1.5 *	0.1	2.8
10	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	6.3	1.5 *	1.6 *	0.3	2.8
11	MARIN	250,252	4.3	1.7 *	1.7 *	0.0	3.3
12	YOLO	183,602	3.7	2.0 *	1.9 *	0.0	3.9
13	NEVADA	96,923	2.0	2.1 *	2.3 *	0.0	5.5
14	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	5.7	2.2 *	2.3 *	0.3	4.2
15	EL DORADO	168,227	3.7	2.2 *	2.3 *	0.0	4.7
16	DEL NORTE	28,192	0.7	2.4 *	2.3 *	0.0	7.8
17	SAN BENITO	56,605	1.3	2.4 *	2.5 *	0.0	7.0
18	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	44.7	2.6	2.6	1.9	3.4
19	NAPA	130,920	3.3	2.5 *	2.7 *	0.0	5.5
20	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	7.3	2.8 *	2.7 *	0.7	4.7
21	TEHAMA	58,665	1.3	2.3 *	2.7 *	0.0	7.4
22	LASSEN	34,633	1.0	2.9 *	2.7 *	0.0	8.1
23	BUTTE	212,473	6.0	2.8 *	2.8 *	0.5	5.1
24	INYO	18,617	0.7	3.6 *	2.8 *	0.0	9.6
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				2.8		
25	ORANGE	3,001,146	86.3	2.9	2.9	2.3	3.5
26	TRINITY	13,579	0.3	2.5 *	3.3 *	0.0	14.6
27	SONOMA	473,274	18.3	3.9 *	3.8 *	2.0	5.5
28	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	123.3	4.1	3.9	3.2	4.5
29	SAN MATEO	712,772	26.7	3.7	4.0	2.5	5.6
30	KINGS	138,763	6.0	4.3 *	4.2 *	0.7	7.8
31	VENTURA	799,114	33.0	4.1	4.3	2.8	5.8
32	PLUMAS	21,181	1.0	4.7 *	4.4 *	0.0	13.5
33	TUOLUMNE	57,120	2.7	4.7 *	4.4 *	0.0	9.9
34	SHASTA	175,421	7.3	4.2 *	4.5 *	1.2	7.8
35	YUBA	63,979	3.0	4.7 *	4.5 *	0.0	9.6
36	IMPERIAL	153,673	6.3	4.1 *	4.6 *	0.9	8.3
37	CALAVERAS	43,566	2.0	4.6 *	4.7 *	0.0	11.4
38	LAKE	62,359	3.0	4.8 *	4.9 *	0.0	10.6
39	SISKIYOU	45,081	2.0	4.4 *	5.3 *	0.0	12.8
40	MADERA	133,965	8.0	6.0 *	5.8 *	1.8	9.9
41	STANISLAUS	489,491	30.0	6.1	6.0	3.8	8.1
42	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	105.7	6.0	6.0	4.9	7.2
43	SOLANO	416,406	25.7	6.2	6.2	3.8	8.7
44	MONTEREY	418,842	29.0	6.9	6.3	4.0	8.6
45	TULARE	392,989	25.7	6.5	6.3	3.8	8.8
46	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	88.3	6.6	6.5	5.1	7.8
47	SUTTER	84,978	5.7	6.7 *	6.6 *	1.1	12.0
	CALIFORNIA	35,934,967	2,476.3	6.9	6.7	6.5	7.0
48	MENDOCINO	89,156	5.7	6.4 *	6.8 *	1.1	12.5
49	KERN	717,332	50.7	7.1	7.1	5.1	9.0
50	FRESNO	855,469	66.3	7.8	7.5	5.7	9.3
51	MERCED	230,696	18.0	7.8 *	7.6 *	4.0	11.1
52	HUMBOLDT	129,515	10.3	8.0 *	7.8 *	3.0	12.7
53	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	78.3	7.8	8.2	6.4	10.0
54	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	59.3	7.5	8.4	6.1	10.7
55	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	165.3	8.8	8.5	7.2	9.8
56	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	134.3	9.0	8.6	7.1	10.0
57	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	57.0	9.1	8.9	6.6	11.2
58	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	1,094.3	10.9	10.8	10.1	11.4

TABLE 6: DEATHS DUE TO SUICIDE, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from suicide for California was 9.2 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,813 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2002 to 2004 of 3,323.3 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 19.8 in Humboldt County to 7.1 in Los Angeles County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from suicide for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 9.4 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 19.2 in Humboldt County to 7.4 in Los Angeles County.

Neither the counties, nor California as a whole, met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.8 age-adjusted deaths due to suicide per 100,000 population.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 6
DEATHS DUE TO SUICIDE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
		HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			4.8		
1	IMPERIAL	153,673	9.0	5.9 *	6.6 *	2.2	11.0
2	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	716.7	7.1	7.4	6.8	7.9
3	SIERRA	3,563	0.3	9.4 *	7.5 *	0.0	32.9
4	COLUSA	20,026	1.3	6.7 *	7.6 *	0.0	20.5
5	MADERA	133,965	9.7	7.2 *	7.8 *	2.8	12.7
6	SAN MATEO	712,772	58.3	8.2	7.8	5.8	9.8
7	NAPA	130,920	11.0	8.4 *	8.0 *	3.2	12.8
8	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	138.7	8.0	8.1	6.8	9.5
9	ORANGE	3,001,146	246.3	8.2	8.5	7.4	9.5
10	SAN BENITO	56,605	4.7	8.2 *	8.5 *	0.7	16.3
11	SOLANO	416,406	35.0	8.4	8.5	5.7	11.3
12	VENTURA	799,114	66.7	8.3	8.5	6.5	10.6
13	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	128.3	8.6	8.6	7.1	10.1
14	FRESNO	855,469	70.3	8.2	8.8	6.7	10.9
15	TULARE	392,989	33.0	8.4	9.0	5.9	12.1
16	MERCED	230,696	18.7	8.1 *	9.1 *	4.9	13.3
17	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	38.3	9.3	9.2	6.3	12.2
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**3,323.3**	**9.2**	**9.4**	**9.1**	**9.7**
18	YOLO	183,602	16.0	8.7 *	9.5 *	4.7	14.2
19	MONTEREY	418,842	38.3	9.2	9.7	6.6	12.8
20	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	166.7	9.5	9.8	8.3	11.3
21	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	100.0	10.0	9.9	8.0	11.9
22	KINGS	138,763	13.7	9.8 *	10.4 *	4.7	16.1
23	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	61.7	9.9	10.6	7.9	13.3
24	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	315.0	10.5	10.6	9.4	11.8
25	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	93.7	11.9	10.7	8.5	13.0
26	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	180.7	9.7	10.8	9.2	12.4
27	KERN	717,332	73.0	10.2	10.9	8.4	13.5
28	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	31.0	12.0	11.4	7.3	15.4
29	MARIN	250,252	33.7	13.5	11.7	7.7	15.8
30	STANISLAUS	489,491	54.3	11.1	11.7	8.6	14.9
31	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	158.0	11.9	12.0	10.1	13.9
32	EL DORADO	168,227	21.7	12.9	12.1	6.9	17.3
33	SONOMA	473,274	63.7	13.5	12.8	9.6	16.0
34	TEHAMA	58,665	8.3	14.2 *	13.2 *	3.9	22.5
35	SUTTER	84,978	11.0	12.9 *	13.2 *	5.4	21.0
36	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	34.0	13.1	13.2	8.7	17.7
37	MONO	13,443	1.7	12.4 *	13.3 *	0.0	33.6
38	PLACER	285,336	38.3	13.4	13.4	9.1	17.8
39	LASSEN	34,633	5.0	14.4 *	14.7 *	1.6	27.8
40	NEVADA	96,923	15.3	15.8 *	15.3 *	7.3	23.4
41	AMADOR	37,074	6.3	17.1 *	15.5 *	2.9	28.1
42	BUTTE	212,473	36.3	17.1	16.5	11.0	22.0
43	TRINITY	13,579	2.3	17.2 *	17.6 *	0.0	40.9
44	SHASTA	175,421	31.7	18.1	17.7	11.4	24.1
45	LAKE	62,359	12.0	19.2 *	17.7 *	7.3	28.2
46	MENDOCINO	89,156	17.0	19.1 *	17.9 *	9.3	26.6
47	GLENN	27,626	5.0	18.1 *	18.3 *	2.1	34.5
48	CALAVERAS	43,566	8.3	19.1 *	18.4 *	4.9	31.8
49	MODOC	9,541	2.0	21.0 *	18.6 *	0.0	45.8
50	YUBA	63,979	11.0	17.2 *	18.7 *	7.6	29.8
51	HUMBOLDT	129,515	25.7	19.8	19.2	11.7	26.8
52	DEL NORTE	28,192	6.0	21.3 *	20.1 *	4.0	36.2
53	SISKIYOU	45,081	10.0	22.2 *	20.2 *	6.7	33.7
54	MARIPOSA	17,886	3.7	20.5 *	21.0 *	0.0	43.5
55	TUOLUMNE	57,120	14.0	24.5 *	21.5 *	9.9	33.0
56	INYO	18,617	5.0	26.9 *	25.9 *	1.8	50.0
57	PLUMAS	21,181	5.7	26.8 *	26.2 *	2.9	49.4
58	ALPINE	1,268	0.3	26.3 *	30.5 *	0.0	133.8

TABLE 7: DEATHS DUE TO ALL CANCERS, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from all cancers for California was 150.2 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 666 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2002 to 2004 of 53,980.3 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 310.0 in Plumas County to 98.9 in San Benito County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.1 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from all cancers for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 164.1 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 226.4 in Yuba County to 136.6 in San Benito County.

Thirteen counties (11 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 158.6 age-adjusted deaths due to all cancers per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for all cancers did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 7
DEATHS DUE TO ALL CANCERS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	13,443	10.3	76.9 *	105.8 *	33.1	178.4
2	SAN BENITO	56,605	56.0	98.9	136.6	100.3	173.0
3	ALPINE	1,268	1.7	131.4 *	136.7 *	0.0	348.4
4	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	2,134.0	123.8	143.6	137.4	149.7
5	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	13,517.0	134.5	149.2	146.7	151.8
6	MODOC	9,541	20.0	209.6	149.8	83.5	216.2
7	MADERA	133,965	195.0	145.6	152.1	130.7	173.6
8	CALAVERAS	43,566	95.7	219.6	153.0	121.7	184.3
9	COLUSA	20,026	27.7	138.2	154.6	96.9	212.3
10	MONTEREY	418,842	543.7	129.8	155.7	142.6	168.9
11	VENTURA	799,114	1,147.0	143.5	156.3	147.2	165.4
12	ORANGE	3,001,146	4,018.0	133.9	157.7	152.8	162.6
13	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	656.7	159.4	158.1	146.0	170.3
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				**158.6**		
14	MARIPOSA	17,886	40.0	223.6	159.8	109.9	209.6
15	MARIN	250,252	487.3	194.7	161.6	147.1	176.0
16	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	384.0	148.1	163.5	146.9	180.2
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**53,980.3**	**150.2**	**164.1**	**162.7**	**165.5**
17	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	499.3	194.0	164.6	150.1	179.1
18	SAN MATEO	712,772	1,228.3	172.3	164.6	155.4	173.9
19	SOLANO	416,406	633.7	152.2	164.9	151.9	177.8
20	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	1,459.0	185.4	166.4	157.8	174.9
21	IMPERIAL	153,673	206.3	134.3	166.9	143.9	190.0
22	FRESNO	855,469	1,158.0	135.4	167.6	157.9	177.3
23	LASSEN	34,633	49.7	143.4	168.3	121.2	215.4
24	GLENN	27,626	49.0	177.4	169.4	121.7	217.0
25	INYO	18,617	48.0	257.8	169.6	120.4	218.9
26	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	2,997.3	170.4	170.3	164.2	176.4
27	KERN	717,332	1,066.7	148.7	171.4	161.0	181.7
28	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	2,252.0	150.6	172.3	165.1	179.5
29	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	4,643.3	155.3	173.4	168.4	178.4
30	KINGS	138,763	161.0	116.0	174.2	146.8	201.5
31	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	1,686.0	168.0	174.3	165.9	182.7
32	SONOMA	473,274	914.0	193.1	176.0	164.4	187.5
33	MERCED	230,696	307.0	133.1	177.7	157.7	197.8
34	EL DORADO	168,227	314.3	186.9	178.6	158.6	198.6
35	YOLO	183,602	254.0	138.3	179.2	157.0	201.4
36	TEHAMA	58,665	138.0	235.2	179.8	149.1	210.4
37	BUTTE	212,473	470.7	221.5	181.1	164.6	197.6
38	NEVADA	96,923	235.7	243.1	181.5	158.1	204.9
39	PLACER	285,336	575.3	201.6	181.9	167.0	196.8
40	SISKIYOU	45,081	120.7	267.7	183.5	150.4	216.7
41	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	2,226.0	167.2	183.9	176.2	191.5
42	STANISLAUS	489,491	768.0	156.9	184.0	171.0	197.1
43	SUTTER	84,978	152.0	178.9	184.1	154.8	213.4
44	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	2,520.3	134.8	185.9	178.6	193.2
45	TULARE	392,989	554.7	141.1	186.8	171.2	202.4
46	TRINITY	13,579	38.3	282.3	189.2	128.9	249.5
47	TUOLUMNE	57,120	151.0	264.4	189.3	158.8	219.8
48	SHASTA	175,421	430.3	245.3	190.6	172.3	209.0
49	NAPA	130,920	315.3	240.9	191.2	169.7	212.6
50	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	984.7	157.4	193.2	181.1	205.3
51	AMADOR	37,074	101.7	274.2	194.8	156.7	232.9
52	MENDOCINO	89,156	198.7	222.8	197.5	169.8	225.2
53	PLUMAS	21,181	65.7	310.0	203.5	153.3	253.6
54	HUMBOLDT	129,515	277.7	214.4	210.2	185.3	235.0
55	SIERRA	3,563	11.3	318.1 *	218.1 *	87.8	348.3
56	LAKE	62,359	192.7	309.0	219.8	188.5	251.2
57	DEL NORTE	28,192	63.7	225.8	220.7	166.3	275.0
58	YUBA	63,979	127.0	198.5	226.4	186.9	266.0

TABLE 8: DEATHS DUE TO LUNG CANCER, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from lung cancer for California was 37.8 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 2,643 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths from 2002 to 2004 of 13,597.3 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 110.1 in Lake County to 28.9 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from lung cancer for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 41.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 76.4 in Lake County to 33.9 in Santa Clara County.

Sixteen counties (12 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) and California as a whole met the Healthy People National Objective of no more than 43.3 age-adjusted deaths due to lung cancer per 100,000 population.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	MONO	13,443	3.0	22.3 *	25.8 *	0.0	57.0
2	SAN BENITO	56,605	11.0	19.4 *	27.6 *	11.1	44.1
3	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	497.3	28.9	33.9	30.9	36.8
4	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	3,090.0	30.8	34.7	33.5	36.0
5	LASSEN	34,633	10.3	29.8 *	35.7 *	13.8	57.7
6	ORANGE	3,001,146	963.7	32.1	38.4	36.0	40.8
7	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	158.7	38.5	38.5	32.5	44.5
8	VENTURA	799,114	277.3	34.7	38.5	33.9	43.0
9	SAN MATEO	712,772	291.0	40.8	39.4	34.8	43.9
10	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	345.7	43.9	39.6	35.4	43.7
11	MONTEREY	418,842	138.0	32.9	40.1	33.4	46.8
12	MARIN	250,252	121.3	48.5	40.5	33.3	47.8
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**13,597.3**	**37.8**	**41.8**	**41.1**	**42.6**
13	IMPERIAL	153,673	51.7	33.6	42.0	30.4	53.5
14	MADERA	133,965	53.0	39.6	42.1	30.7	53.4
15	COLUSA	20,026	7.7	38.3 *	42.6 *	12.4	72.8
16	MERCED	230,696	74.3	32.2	42.9	33.1	52.7
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				43.3		
17	GLENN	27,626	12.7	45.9 *	43.5 *	19.4	67.5
18	SOLANO	416,406	163.3	39.2	43.5	36.8	50.3
19	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	560.7	37.5	43.6	40.0	47.3
20	FRESNO	855,469	297.3	34.8	43.7	38.8	48.7
21	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	1,160.7	38.8	43.8	41.3	46.3
22	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	99.7	38.4	44.1	35.3	52.8
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	136.3	53.0	44.7	37.2	52.3
24	INYO	18,617	13.3	71.6 *	45.0 *	20.6	69.4
25	EL DORADO	168,227	80.3	47.8	45.7	35.6	55.8
26	MARIPOSA	17,886	11.7	65.2 *	45.7 *	19.3	72.1
27	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	439.7	43.8	45.9	41.5	50.2
28	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	823.3	46.8	46.4	43.2	49.6
29	SONOMA	473,274	238.3	50.4	47.1	41.0	53.1
30	NEVADA	96,923	63.0	65.0	47.4	35.7	59.1
31	CALAVERAS	43,566	32.0	73.5	47.5	30.8	64.2
32	MENDOCINO	89,156	48.7	54.6	48.1	34.5	61.7
33	TULARE	392,989	142.7	36.3	48.1	40.2	56.1
34	KINGS	138,763	43.7	31.5	48.6	34.1	63.2
35	YOLO	183,602	68.0	37.0	48.7	37.1	60.4
36	PLACER	285,336	156.0	54.7	49.3	41.6	57.0
37	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	661.0	35.4	49.4	45.6	53.2
38	NAPA	130,920	81.3	62.1	50.0	39.0	61.0
39	KERN	717,332	309.7	43.2	50.7	45.1	56.4
40	SUTTER	84,978	42.0	49.4	50.8	35.4	66.2
41	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	611.3	45.9	51.0	47.0	55.1
42	TUOLUMNE	57,120	42.3	74.1	51.7	36.1	67.4
43	MODOC	9,541	7.0	73.4 *	52.4 *	12.9	92.0
44	SISKIYOU	45,081	35.7	79.1	52.6	35.3	69.9
45	AMADOR	37,074	28.7	77.3	52.9	33.5	72.4
46	STANISLAUS	489,491	222.3	45.4	54.2	47.0	61.3
47	SIERRA	3,563	3.0	84.2 *	54.7 *	0.0	116.9
48	BUTTE	212,473	144.7	68.1	55.8	46.7	65.0
49	PLUMAS	21,181	19.0	89.7	57.4 *	31.5	83.2
50	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	290.7	46.5	57.5	50.9	64.2
51	TEHAMA	58,665	44.3	75.6	58.2	40.7	75.6
52	HUMBOLDT	129,515	82.7	63.8	62.2	48.7	75.7
53	SHASTA	175,421	140.7	80.2	62.8	52.3	73.4
54	TRINITY	13,579	13.0	95.7 *	63.4 *	28.8	98.0
55	DEL NORTE	28,192	20.3	72.1	71.0	40.1	101.9
56	ALPINE	1,268	1.0	78.9 *	73.1 *	0.0	219.7
57	YUBA	63,979	42.7	66.7	75.2	52.6	97.8
58	LAKE	62,359	68.7	110.1	76.4	58.2	94.5

TABLE 9: DEATHS DUE TO FEMALE BREAST CANCER, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from female breast cancer for California was 23.2 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 4,316 females. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 4,170.0 from 2002 to 2004 and a female population of 17,996,548 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 35.7 in Marin County to 19.3 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from female breast cancer for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 22.8 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 28.7 in Merced County to 16.9 in Butte County.

Seventeen counties (5 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 21.3 age-adjusted deaths due to female breast cancer per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for female breast cancer did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 9
DEATHS DUE TO FEMALE BREAST CANCER
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 FEMALE POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	DEL NORTE	12,741	1.7	13.1 *	9.6 *	0.0	24.3
2	COLUSA	9,867	1.0	10.1 *	10.2 *	0.0	30.3
3	BUTTE	108,301	23.0	21.2	16.9	9.8	24.1
4	LASSEN	12,964	2.7	20.6 *	18.2 *	0.0	40.4
5	KINGS	59,531	9.3	15.7 *	18.9 *	6.7	31.0
6	SANTA CLARA	848,137	163.7	19.3	19.4	16.4	22.4
7	CALAVERAS	21,915	6.0	27.4 *	19.4 *	3.6	35.2
8	TRINITY	6,684	2.0	29.9 *	19.4 *	0.0	46.4
9	YOLO	93,851	16.0	17.0 *	19.7 *	10.0	29.5
10	GLENN	13,639	3.0	22.0 *	20.1 *	0.0	43.5
11	NEVADA	49,251	14.3	29.1 *	20.2 *	9.7	30.6
12	SAN LUIS OBISPO	125,537	34.0	27.1	20.2	13.3	27.1
13	SONOMA	239,431	59.7	24.9	20.6	15.3	25.9
14	MADERA	69,633	14.0	20.1 *	20.7 *	9.8	31.7
15	TEHAMA	29,640	9.3	31.5 *	21.0 *	7.1	35.0
16	MONTEREY	202,193	40.7	20.1	21.1	14.6	27.6
17	HUMBOLDT	65,279	15.3	23.5 *	21.1 *	10.5	31.7
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					21.3		
18	SANTA BARBARA	205,403	48.0	23.4	21.5	15.3	27.6
19	ORANGE	1,507,071	317.7	21.1	21.6	19.2	24.0
20	MARIPOSA	8,791	2.7	30.3 *	21.6 *	0.0	48.2
21	MODOC	4,723	1.3	28.2 *	21.8 *	0.0	59.1
22	SOLANO	205,739	46.7	22.7	21.8	15.5	28.2
23	LOS ANGELES	5,056,090	1,095.3	21.7	21.8	20.5	23.1
24	INYO	9,512	3.7	38.5 *	22.1 *	0.0	45.3
25	SAN BENITO	27,936	4.7	16.7 *	22.1 *	1.9	42.4
26	YUBA	31,847	6.7	20.9 *	22.2 *	5.3	39.0
27	FRESNO	423,668	83.7	19.7	22.2	17.4	27.0
28	IMPERIAL	73,324	15.0	20.5 *	22.4 *	11.0	33.7
29	VENTURA	400,523	93.3	23.3	22.6	18.0	27.2
30	SAN FRANCISCO	386,224	107.0	27.7	22.7	18.3	27.1
31	PLACER	145,547	39.3	27.0	22.7	15.6	29.8
	CALIFORNIA	**17,996,548**	**4,170.0**	**23.2**	**22.8**	**22.1**	**23.5**
32	SAN MATEO	359,008	97.3	27.1	23.1	18.5	27.7
33	KERN	350,854	78.7	22.4	23.7	18.4	29.0
34	SUTTER	42,754	10.7	24.9 *	23.7 *	9.4	38.0
35	RIVERSIDE	883,465	222.0	25.1	23.7	20.6	26.9
36	ALAMEDA	761,021	181.7	23.9	23.8	20.3	27.3
37	NAPA	65,340	20.7	31.6	23.9	13.2	34.6
38	SHASTA	89,174	28.3	31.8	24.2	15.1	33.4
39	SACRAMENTO	680,022	168.7	24.8	24.6	20.9	28.4
40	SISKIYOU	23,016	8.0	34.8 *	24.7 *	7.0	42.4
41	SAN BERNARDINO	935,144	194.7	20.8	24.8	21.3	28.3
42	SAN DIEGO	1,488,817	373.0	25.1	24.9	22.4	27.5
43	EL DORADO	84,384	24.7	29.2	25.3	15.2	35.4
44	SANTA CRUZ	129,553	33.7	26.0	25.3	16.6	34.1
45	STANISLAUS	247,364	58.3	23.6	25.6	19.0	32.1
46	SAN JOAQUIN	311,337	73.0	23.4	25.7	19.8	31.6
47	TUOLUMNE	27,000	10.0	37.0 *	25.9 *	9.3	42.5
48	TULARE	196,124	43.7	22.3	26.3	18.5	34.1
49	CONTRA COSTA	513,572	147.7	28.8	26.4	22.1	30.6
50	MARIN	125,884	45.0	35.7	26.5	18.6	34.4
51	AMADOR	16,714	6.7	39.9 *	26.9 *	6.0	47.7
52	MENDOCINO	44,743	15.0	33.5 *	27.1 *	13.2	41.0
53	PLUMAS	10,604	4.3	40.9 *	27.3 *	0.6	54.0
54	LAKE	31,617	12.7	40.1 *	28.5 *	12.6	44.4
55	MERCED	115,574	27.7	23.9	28.7	18.0	39.5
56	MONO	6,093	1.7	27.4 *	39.9 *	0.0	106.6
57	SIERRA	1,764	1.3	75.6 *	49.0 *	0.0	133.9
58	ALPINE	614	0.3	54.3 *	67.9 *	0.0	298.6

TABLE 10: DEATHS DUE TO CORONARY HEART DISEASE, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from coronary heart disease for California was 151.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 658 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 54,582.7 from 2002 to 2004 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 322.3 in Inyo County to 90.7 in San Benito County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.6 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from coronary heart disease for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 164.7 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 228.6 in San Bernardino County to 108.3 in Plumas County.

Forty counties (36 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 162.0 age-adjusted deaths due to coronary heart disease per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for coronary heart disease did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 10
DEATHS DUE TO CORONARY HEART DISEASE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	TRINITY	13,579	17.3	127.6 *	86.7 *	44.9	128.4
2	SIERRA	3,563	5.3	149.7 *	92.4 *	13.4	171.4
3	PLUMAS	21,181	34.7	163.7	108.3	71.5	145.0
4	MARIN	250,252	344.3	137.6	112.6	100.6	124.6
5	SAN MATEO	712,772	936.7	131.4	122.6	114.7	130.5
6	MONO	13,443	10.7	79.3 *	122.9 *	39.4	206.4
7	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	1,748.0	101.4	124.4	118.5	130.2
8	SOLANO	416,406	492.7	118.3	124.9	113.7	136.1
9	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	406.0	157.7	131.4	118.6	144.2
10	SAN BENITO	56,605	51.3	90.7	131.6	95.2	168.0
11	TEHAMA	58,665	116.0	197.7	131.8	107.2	156.4
12	MONTEREY	418,842	454.7	108.6	132.7	120.4	144.9
13	ALPINE	1,268	1.7	131.4 *	133.2 *	0.0	339.3
14	NAPA	130,920	240.7	183.8	133.3	116.1	150.5
15	SONOMA	473,274	747.3	157.9	135.5	125.6	145.3
16	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	1,320.3	131.5	135.9	128.5	143.3
17	DEL NORTE	28,192	40.0	141.9	136.8	94.3	179.4
18	SISKIYOU	45,081	90.0	199.6	137.2	108.5	165.9
19	SHASTA	175,421	339.7	193.6	137.3	122.3	152.2
20	YOLO	183,602	191.7	104.4	138.1	118.4	157.7
21	GLENN	27,626	40.7	147.2	138.1	95.5	180.6
22	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	329.3	127.0	139.0	123.8	154.2
23	NEVADA	96,923	183.0	188.8	140.1	119.7	160.5
24	PLACER	285,336	457.0	160.2	142.3	129.2	155.3
25	EL DORADO	168,227	239.0	142.1	145.5	126.9	164.2
26	COLUSA	20,026	26.7	133.2	145.8	90.4	201.3
27	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	1,332.7	169.3	146.8	138.9	154.7
28	VENTURA	799,114	1,075.7	134.6	148.0	139.1	156.9
29	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	647.0	157.0	148.3	136.9	159.8
30	TUOLUMNE	57,120	119.7	209.5	149.6	122.7	176.5
31	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	1,965.0	131.4	152.2	145.4	159.0
32	LASSEN	34,633	45.7	131.9	153.5	108.7	198.2
33	HUMBOLDT	129,515	202.3	156.2	154.2	132.9	175.5
34	MENDOCINO	89,156	152.7	171.2	154.3	129.7	178.9
35	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	4,148.7	138.8	155.3	150.6	160.1
36	MARIPOSA	17,886	38.3	214.3	156.9	107.0	206.9
37	BUTTE	212,473	438.3	206.3	158.1	143.1	173.1
38	IMPERIAL	153,673	182.0	118.4	158.3	135.0	181.7
39	CALAVERAS	43,566	90.3	207.3	158.9	125.6	192.2
40	AMADOR	37,074	78.3	211.3	158.9	123.4	194.5
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					162.0		
41	MADERA	133,965	219.0	163.5	163.1	141.4	184.9
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**54,582.7**	**151.9**	**164.7**	**163.3**	**166.1**
42	KINGS	138,763	144.0	103.8	166.1	138.7	193.5
43	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	15,974.3	159.0	170.4	167.7	173.0
44	LAKE	62,359	150.3	241.1	170.9	143.3	198.4
45	ORANGE	3,001,146	4,222.0	140.7	171.8	166.6	177.0
46	FRESNO	855,469	1,214.7	142.0	176.3	166.3	186.2
47	MODOC	9,541	25.3	265.5	180.9	110.4	251.5
48	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	2,206.0	165.7	181.1	173.6	188.7
49	INYO	18,617	60.0	322.3	185.8	138.0	233.6
50	SUTTER	84,978	158.0	185.9	193.3	163.1	223.5
51	TULARE	392,989	560.0	142.5	197.2	180.8	213.6
52	MERCED	230,696	322.7	139.9	199.8	177.8	221.7
53	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	3,528.7	200.6	200.9	194.3	207.6
54	YUBA	63,979	109.7	171.4	204.0	165.6	242.4
55	KERN	717,332	1,365.7	190.4	208.1	196.9	219.2
56	STANISLAUS	489,491	943.3	192.7	222.3	208.1	236.6
57	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	1,113.7	178.0	228.0	214.5	241.4
58	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	2,884.0	154.3	228.6	220.1	237.0

TABLE 11: DEATHS DUE TO CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE (STROKE), 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from cerebrovascular disease for California was 48.3 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 2,068 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 17,373.7 from 2002 to 2004 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 95.6 in Nevada County to 31.5 in Kings County, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.0 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from cerebrovascular disease for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 52.4 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 72.8 in Merced County to 40.8 in Madera County.

Twenty-one counties (10 with reliable age-adjusted death rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 50.0 age-adjusted deaths due to cerebrovascular disease per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate due to cerebrovascular disease did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 11
DEATHS DUE TO CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
						LOWER	UPPER
1	SIERRA	3,563	1.7	46.8 *	28.3 *	0.0	72.0
2	MONO	13,443	3.0	22.3 *	28.8 *	0.0	62.4
3	TRINITY	13,579	6.3	46.6 *	33.1 *	7.2	58.9
4	LASSEN	34,633	10.3	29.8 *	35.2 *	13.7	56.8
5	GLENN	27,626	11.0	39.8 *	38.4 *	15.6	61.1
6	DEL NORTE	28,192	11.7	41.4 *	40.5 *	17.2	63.9
7	MADERA	133,965	56.3	42.1	40.8	30.1	51.6
8	INYO	18,617	14.0	75.2 *	41.7 *	19.7	63.7
9	PLUMAS	21,181	14.3	67.7 *	44.0 *	21.2	66.9
10	VENTURA	799,114	320.7	40.1	44.5	39.6	49.4
11	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	4,180.3	41.6	44.6	43.3	46.0
12	SHASTA	175,421	120.3	68.6	45.9	37.5	54.4
13	MARIPOSA	17,886	11.0	61.5 *	46.3 *	18.8	73.9
14	EL DORADO	168,227	74.0	44.0	46.5	35.8	57.1
15	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	656.7	38.1	47.2	43.5	50.8
16	COLUSA	20,026	8.7	43.3 *	47.5 *	15.8	79.1
17	MARIN	250,252	145.0	57.9	47.5	39.8	55.3
18	KERN	717,332	316.7	44.1	48.4	43.0	53.8
19	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	117.3	45.3	48.7	39.8	57.6
20	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	153.7	59.7	49.2	41.4	57.0
21	SAN BENITO	56,605	18.7	33.0 *	49.7 *	27.0	72.4
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:					50.0		
22	KINGS	138,763	43.7	31.5	50.8	35.6	66.0
23	SISKIYOU	45,081	33.7	74.7	51.0	33.6	68.4
24	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	229.7	55.7	51.9	45.1	58.6
25	TUOLUMNE	57,120	41.3	72.4	52.0	36.1	68.0
	CALIFORNIA	35,934,967	17,373.7	48.3	52.4	51.6	53.2
26	STANISLAUS	489,491	223.3	45.6	52.5	45.6	59.4
27	SAN MATEO	712,772	406.3	57.0	52.7	47.6	57.9
28	SOLANO	416,406	213.3	51.2	53.1	45.9	60.4
29	TEHAMA	58,665	50.0	85.2	53.2	38.0	68.4
30	MONTEREY	418,842	183.3	43.8	53.5	45.7	61.2
31	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	1,467.7	49.1	54.8	52.0	57.6
32	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	971.0	55.2	55.1	51.6	58.6
33	ORANGE	3,001,146	1,376.0	45.8	56.3	53.3	59.3
34	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	709.0	37.9	57.1	52.9	61.4
35	HUMBOLDT	129,515	74.7	57.7	57.2	44.2	70.2
36	CALAVERAS	43,566	32.3	74.2	57.7	37.5	77.8
37	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	561.0	55.9	57.9	53.1	62.7
38	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	748.3	50.0	58.1	53.9	62.2
39	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	532.7	67.7	58.1	53.2	63.1
40	AMADOR	37,074	28.7	77.3	58.2	36.7	79.7
41	LAKE	62,359	52.0	83.4	58.6	42.6	74.6
42	MODOC	9,541	8.0	83.8 *	58.9 *	18.0	99.8
43	BUTTE	212,473	171.7	80.8	59.8	50.8	68.8
44	IMPERIAL	153,673	66.7	43.4	60.3	45.6	75.0
45	SUTTER	84,978	49.3	58.1	60.7	43.7	77.7
46	YUBA	63,979	32.7	51.1	61.3	40.1	82.5
47	SONOMA	473,274	345.0	72.9	61.4	54.8	68.0
48	PLACER	285,336	202.7	71.0	63.2	54.5	71.9
49	MENDOCINO	89,156	61.3	68.8	63.3	47.4	79.2
50	NAPA	130,920	120.7	92.2	63.4	51.8	74.9
51	TULARE	392,989	181.0	46.1	63.7	54.4	73.0
52	YOLO	183,602	88.0	47.9	64.0	50.6	77.4
53	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	795.3	59.7	65.2	60.7	69.8
54	FRESNO	855,469	461.0	53.9	66.7	60.6	72.8
55	NEVADA	96,923	92.7	95.6	70.7	56.3	85.2
56	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	350.0	55.9	72.3	64.7	79.8
57	MERCED	230,696	116.3	50.4	72.8	59.5	86.2
58	ALPINE	1,268	1.7	131.4 *	159.0 *	0.0	400.4

TABLE 12: DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from drug-induced deaths for California was 9.9 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 10,112 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 3,553.7 from 2002 to 2004 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 29.9 in Humboldt County to 5.7 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 5.2 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from drug-induced deaths for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 10.0 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 29.8 in Humboldt County to 5.5 in Santa Clara County.

One county (with an unreliable age-adjusted death rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 1.2 age-adjusted drug-induced deaths per 100,000 population. The statewide age-adjusted death rate for drug-induced deaths did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 12
DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	ALPINE	1,268	0.0	0.0 +	0.0 +	-	-
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				1.2		
2	MONO	13,443	0.3	2.5 *	2.6 *	0.0	11.5
3	COLUSA	20,026	0.7	3.3 *	3.5 *	0.0	11.9
4	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	98.3	5.7	5.5	4.4	6.6
5	IMPERIAL	153,673	9.0	5.9 *	6.3 *	2.1	10.5
6	SUTTER	84,978	5.3	6.3 *	6.4 *	0.9	11.8
7	YUBA	63,979	4.0	6.3 *	6.7 *	0.1	13.2
8	SAN MATEO	712,772	52.0	7.3	6.8	4.9	8.7
9	SIERRA	3,563	0.3	9.4 *	7.5 *	0.0	32.9
10	SOLANO	416,406	32.0	7.7	7.7	5.0	10.4
11	YOLO	183,602	13.0	7.1 *	7.9 *	3.6	12.1
12	ORANGE	3,001,146	237.3	7.9	7.9	6.9	8.9
13	MERCED	230,696	16.0	6.9 *	8.1 *	4.1	12.0
14	SAN BENITO	56,605	4.7	8.2 *	8.3 *	0.8	15.8
15	INYO	18,617	1.0	5.4 *	8.4 *	0.0	24.8
16	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	838.3	8.3	8.5	7.9	9.1
17	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	90.3	9.0	8.6	6.8	10.4
18	KINGS	138,763	11.3	8.2 *	9.0 *	3.7	14.3
19	VENTURA	799,114	73.3	9.2	9.0	7.0	11.1
20	NAPA	130,920	12.0	9.2 *	9.1 *	3.9	14.3
21	PLACER	285,336	27.3	9.6	9.2	5.7	12.6
22	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	144.7	9.7	9.2	7.7	10.7
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	25.7	10.0	9.6	5.8	13.4
24	MARIN	250,252	28.0	11.2	10.0	6.2	13.8
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**3,553.7**	**9.9**	**10.0**	**9.6**	**10.3**
25	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	175.0	9.4	10.1	8.6	11.6
26	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	308.0	10.3	10.3	9.2	11.5
27	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	169.7	9.6	10.4	8.8	11.9
28	MONTEREY	418,842	43.3	10.3	10.9	7.6	14.1
29	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	29.3	11.3	10.9	6.9	14.8
30	TEHAMA	58,665	6.0	10.2 *	11.2 *	2.1	20.3
31	MADERA	133,965	14.0	10.5 *	11.4 *	5.4	17.4
32	TULARE	392,989	39.3	10.0	11.5	7.8	15.1
33	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	46.3	11.2	11.5	8.2	14.9
34	SONOMA	473,274	60.0	12.7	12.0	9.0	15.1
35	FRESNO	855,469	92.0	10.8	12.1	9.6	14.5
36	LASSEN	34,633	4.7	13.5 *	12.3 *	1.1	23.5
37	EL DORADO	168,227	23.0	13.7	12.6	7.3	17.9
38	GLENN	27,626	3.3	12.1 *	12.7 *	0.0	26.4
39	MODOC	9,541	1.3	14.0 *	13.8 *	0.0	37.6
40	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	181.7	13.6	14.0	12.0	16.1
41	CALAVERAS	43,566	6.3	14.5 *	14.5 *	2.4	26.7
42	PLUMAS	21,181	2.7	12.6 *	14.6 *	0.0	33.4
43	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	85.0	13.6	14.6	11.5	17.7
44	TRINITY	13,579	2.0	14.7 *	14.8 *	0.0	36.6
45	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	138.0	17.5	15.5	12.8	18.1
46	KERN	717,332	103.7	14.5	15.7	12.7	18.8
47	MARIPOSA	17,886	3.0	16.8 *	15.8 *	0.0	34.3
48	NEVADA	96,923	17.0	17.5 *	15.9 *	8.0	23.8
49	AMADOR	37,074	6.7	18.0 *	17.0 *	3.7	30.3
50	SISKIYOU	45,081	8.3	18.5 *	18.4 *	5.0	31.7
51	STANISLAUS	489,491	86.7	17.7	19.1	15.0	23.1
52	MENDOCINO	89,156	17.0	19.1 *	19.2 *	9.8	28.5
53	DEL NORTE	28,192	6.0	21.3 *	20.2 *	4.0	36.5
54	LAKE	62,359	13.3	21.4 *	20.4 *	9.1	31.8
55	BUTTE	212,473	43.3	20.4	21.0	14.6	27.4
56	TUOLUMNE	57,120	13.0	22.8 *	22.1 *	9.7	34.6
57	SHASTA	175,421	41.0	23.4	24.4	16.8	32.0
58	HUMBOLDT	129,515	38.7	29.9	29.8	20.3	39.4

TABLE 13: DEATHS DUE TO DIABETES, 2002-2004

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

The crude death rate from diabetes for California was 19.5 per 100,000 population, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one death for every 5,136 persons. This rate was based on a three-year average number of deaths of 6,996.7 from 2002 to 2004 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude rate ranged from 37.5 in Kings County to 12.5 in El Dorado and Santa Cruz Counties, a difference in rates by a factor of 3.0 to 1.

The age-adjusted death rate from diabetes for California for the three-year period from 2002 to 2004 was 21.3 per 100,000 population. Reliable age-adjusted death rates ranged from 58.2 in Kings County to 10.7 in Marin County.

The Healthy People 2010 National Objective for diabetes mortality is based on both underlying and contributing causes of death. Multiple causes of death data for 2004 are not yet available for California. Therefore, California's progress in meeting this objective will not be addressed in this report.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-adjusted death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-adjusted death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 13
DEATHS DUE TO DIABETES
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE)	CRUDE DEATH RATE	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
			HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:		SEE COMMENT		
1	MONO	13,443	0.7	5.0 *	4.7 *	0.0	16.1
2	MARIN	250,252	32.3	12.9	10.7	6.9	14.4
3	CALAVERAS	43,566	6.7	15.3 *	11.1 *	2.5	19.6
4	EL DORADO	168,227	21.0	12.5	11.9	6.7	17.1
5	AMADOR	37,074	6.3	17.1 *	12.5 *	2.7	22.2
6	NEVADA	96,923	17.0	17.5 *	13.0 *	6.8	19.3
7	SAN MATEO	712,772	98.0	13.7	13.1	10.5	15.7
8	LAKE	62,359	12.0	19.2 *	13.5 *	5.8	21.1
9	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	32.3	12.5	13.7	8.9	18.5
10	SAN BENITO	56,605	5.3	9.4 *	13.8 *	2.0	25.5
11	MARIPOSA	17,886	3.3	18.6 *	13.8 *	0.0	28.7
12	PLACER	285,336	45.3	15.9	14.3	10.1	18.4
13	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	45.0	17.5	14.7	10.4	19.0
14	TUOLUMNE	57,120	12.0	21.0 *	14.7 *	6.4	23.0
15	INYO	18,617	4.7	25.1 *	15.1 *	1.3	29.0
16	SHASTA	175,421	35.7	20.3	15.4	10.2	20.5
17	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	138.0	17.5	15.4	12.8	18.0
18	LASSEN	34,633	5.0	14.4 *	15.9 *	1.9	30.0
19	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	284.3	16.2	16.2	14.3	18.1
20	PLUMAS	21,181	5.0	23.6 *	16.5 *	1.5	31.5
21	ORANGE	3,001,146	439.3	14.6	17.5	15.9	19.2
22	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	254.3	14.8	17.5	15.4	19.7
23	MENDOCINO	89,156	17.3	19.4 *	17.6 *	9.3	25.9
24	SONOMA	473,274	94.0	19.9	18.0	14.3	21.7
25	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	76.3	18.5	18.3	14.1	22.4
26	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	501.7	16.8	18.8	17.2	20.4
27	MODOC	9,541	2.7	27.9 *	18.9 *	0.0	41.5
28	DEL NORTE	28,192	5.7	20.1 *	19.6 *	3.4	35.7
29	TEHAMA	58,665	16.3	27.8 *	20.0 *	10.1	29.9
30	BUTTE	212,473	52.0	24.5	20.1	14.5	25.6
31	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	194.3	19.4	20.1	17.3	22.9
32	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	248.0	18.6	20.4	17.9	23.0
33	VENTURA	799,114	149.7	18.7	20.8	17.5	24.2
34	MONTEREY	418,842	73.0	17.4	21.0	16.2	25.9
35	NAPA	130,920	35.0	26.7	21.2	14.0	28.3
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**6,996.7**	**19.5**	**21.3**	**20.8**	**21.8**
36	SOLANO	416,406	82.7	19.9	21.7	17.0	26.4
37	SISKIYOU	45,081	13.7	30.3 *	21.7 *	9.8	33.6
38	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	288.0	19.3	22.1	19.5	24.6
39	YUBA	63,979	12.3	19.3 *	22.5 *	9.9	35.1
40	TRINITY	13,579	4.3	31.9 *	22.7 *	0.6	44.9
41	COLUSA	20,026	4.3	21.6 *	23.7 *	1.4	46.1
42	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	2,168.0	21.6	23.9	22.9	24.9
43	YOLO	183,602	34.3	18.7	24.6	16.4	32.9
44	SUTTER	84,978	21.0	24.7	25.5	14.6	36.4
45	MADERA	133,965	33.3	24.9	26.1	17.2	35.0
46	STANISLAUS	489,491	114.7	23.4	27.7	22.6	32.7
47	KERN	717,332	175.3	24.4	28.0	23.9	32.2
48	SIERRA	3,563	1.7	46.8 *	29.1 *	0.0	73.9
49	FRESNO	855,469	203.0	23.7	29.4	25.4	33.5
50	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	403.0	21.6	30.1	27.1	33.1
51	GLENN	27,626	9.0	32.6 *	30.1 *	10.4	49.9
52	ALPINE	1,268	0.3	26.3 *	30.5 *	0.0	133.8
53	HUMBOLDT	129,515	40.7	31.4	31.2	21.6	40.8
54	IMPERIAL	153,673	37.7	24.5	31.4	21.3	41.6
55	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	161.7	25.8	31.8	26.9	36.8
56	TULARE	392,989	101.0	25.7	34.3	27.6	41.0
57	MERCED	230,696	65.0	28.2	38.2	28.8	47.5
58	KINGS	138,763	52.0	37.5	58.2	42.2	74.2

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

TABLE 14: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS C, 2002-2004

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of newly reported hepatitis C cases for California was 0.13 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one newly reported hepatitis C case for every 769,980 persons. This rate was based on the 2002 to 2004 average reported number of new cases of 46.67 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. There were 22 counties with no new incidence of hepatitis C reported during the three-year period.

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

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

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Infectious Diseases Branch.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	KERN	717,332	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	STANISLAUS	489,491	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	MARIN	250,252	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	BUTTE	212,473	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
6	YOLO	183,602	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
7	IMPERIAL	153,673	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
8	KINGS	138,763	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
9	MADERA	133,965	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
10	NAPA	130,920	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
11	LAKE	62,359	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
12	SAN BENITO	56,605	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
13	CALAVERAS	43,566	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
14	AMADOR	37,074	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
15	LASSEN	34,633	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
16	PLUMAS	21,181	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
17	INYO	18,617	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
18	MARIPOSA	17,886	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
19	MONO	13,443	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
20	MODOC	9,541	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
21	SIERRA	3,563	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
22	ALPINE	1,268	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
23	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	0.33	0.01 *	0.00	0.05
24	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	0.33	0.03 *	0.00	0.15
25	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	0.67	0.04 *	0.00	0.13
26	FRESNO	855,469	0.33	0.04 *	0.00	0.17
27	VENTURA	799,114	0.33	0.04 *	0.00	0.18
28	SAN MATEO	712,772	0.33	0.05 *	0.00	0.21
29	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	5.33	0.05 *	0.01	0.10
30	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	0.33	0.05 *	0.00	0.23
31	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	1.33	0.07 *	0.00	0.19
32	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	1.00	0.08 *	0.00	0.22
33	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	1.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.21
34	SOLANO	416,406	0.33	0.08 *	0.00	0.35
35	ORANGE	3,001,146	2.67	0.09 *	0.00	0.20
36	PLACER	285,336	0.33	0.12 *	0.00	0.51
37	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	0.33	0.13 *	0.00	0.57
38	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	2.00	0.13 *	0.00	0.32
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**46.67**	**0.13**	**0.09**	**0.17**
39	SONOMA	473,274	0.67	0.14 *	0.00	0.48
40	MERCED	230,696	0.33	0.14 *	0.00	0.64
41	MONTEREY	418,842	0.67	0.16 *	0.00	0.54
42	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	1.00	0.24 *	0.00	0.72
43	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	2.00	0.25 *	0.00	0.61
44	SUTTER	84,978	0.33	0.39 *	0.00	1.72
45	TULARE	392,989	2.00	0.51 *	0.00	1.21
46	NEVADA	96,923	0.67	0.69 *	0.00	2.34
47	MENDOCINO	89,156	0.67	0.75 *	0.00	2.54
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			1.00		
48	DEL NORTE	28,192	0.33	1.18 *	0.00	5.20
49	GLENN	27,626	0.33	1.21 *	0.00	5.30
50	HUMBOLDT	129,515	1.67	1.29 *	0.00	3.24
51	EL DORADO	168,227	2.67	1.59 *	0.00	3.49
52	COLUSA	20,026	0.33	1.66 *	0.00	7.32
53	SHASTA	175,421	3.00	1.71 *	0.00	3.65
54	TUOLUMNE	57,120	1.33	2.33 *	0.00	6.30
55	TRINITY	13,579	0.33	2.45 *	0.00	10.79
56	TEHAMA	58,665	3.00	5.11 *	0.00	10.90
57	SISKIYOU	45,081	3.00	6.65 *	0.00	14.19
58	YUBA	63,979	5.00	7.82 *	0.96	14.67

TABLE 15: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS
AMONG POPULATION AGES 13 YEARS AND OVER, 2002-2004

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported AIDS cases for Californians aged 13 years and older was 13.72 cases per 100,000 population aged 13 years and over or approximately one reported AIDS case for every 7,291 persons. This rate was based on a 2002 to 2004 three-year average reported number of cases of 3991.00 and a population of 29,098,181 as of July 1, 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 67.01 in San Francisco County to 5.68 in Ventura County, a difference in rates by a factor of 11.8 to 1. Seven counties reported no new incidence of AIDS during the three-year period for this age group.

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

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 15
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS AMONG POPULATION AGES 13 YEARS AND OVER
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION AGED 13 AND OVER	2002-2004 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
1	COLUSA	15,907	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	MARIPOSA	15,622	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	TRINITY	11,835	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	MONO	11,417	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	MODOC	8,170	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
6	SIERRA	3,135	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
7	ALPINE	1,100	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			1.00		
8	NEVADA	84,003	1.00	1.19 *	0.00	3.52
9	TEHAMA	48,806	0.67	1.37 *	0.00	4.64
10	SISKIYOU	38,815	0.67	1.72 *	0.00	5.84
11	YUBA	49,887	1.00	2.00 *	0.00	5.93
12	SHASTA	146,962	3.00	2.04 *	0.00	4.35
13	PLACER	235,649	5.33	2.26 *	0.34	4.18
14	SUTTER	68,439	1.67	2.44 *	0.00	6.13
15	EL DORADO	141,028	3.67	2.60 *	0.00	5.26
16	CALAVERAS	37,834	1.00	2.64 *	0.00	7.82
17	TUOLUMNE	49,804	1.33	2.68 *	0.00	7.22
18	SAN BENITO	43,981	1.67	3.79 *	0.00	9.54
19	MENDOCINO	74,547	3.00	4.02 *	0.00	8.58
20	AMADOR	32,689	1.33	4.08 *	0.00	11.00
21	INYO	15,961	0.67	4.18 *	0.00	14.20
22	YOLO	151,651	6.67	4.40 *	1.06	7.73
23	LAKE	52,614	2.33	4.43 *	0.00	10.13
24	GLENN	22,127	1.00	4.52 *	0.00	13.38
25	NAPA	109,337	5.00	4.57 *	0.56	8.58
26	MERCED	177,183	9.00	5.08 *	1.76	8.40
27	TULARE	300,978	15.33	5.09 *	2.54	7.64
28	LASSEN	30,106	1.67	5.54 *	0.00	13.94
29	VENTURA	645,924	36.67	5.68	3.84	7.51
30	BUTTE	180,934	11.67	6.45 *	2.75	10.15
31	HUMBOLDT	109,555	7.33	6.69 *	1.85	11.54
32	SAN LUIS OBISPO	222,569	15.00	6.74 *	3.33	10.15
33	FRESNO	675,523	45.67	6.76	4.80	8.72
34	STANISLAUS	387,079	26.33	6.80	4.20	9.40
35	MONTEREY	336,140	23.00	6.84	4.05	9.64
36	DEL NORTE	23,951	1.67	6.96 *	0.00	17.52
37	SAN MATEO	592,081	42.33	7.15	5.00	9.30
38	SANTA CRUZ	216,946	15.67	7.22 *	3.65	10.80
39	SANTA CLARA	1,397,056	102.00	7.30	5.88	8.72
40	SANTA BARBARA	340,662	25.33	7.44	4.54	10.33
41	MADERA	106,314	8.00	7.52 *	2.31	12.74
42	SACRAMENTO	1,082,033	83.00	7.67	6.02	9.32
43	KINGS	110,293	8.67	7.86 *	2.63	13.09
44	ORANGE	2,421,917	195.00	8.05	6.92	9.18
45	SAN BERNARDINO	1,473,952	124.67	8.46	6.97	9.94
46	PLUMAS	18,459	1.67	9.03 *	0.00	22.74
47	IMPERIAL	122,436	12.00	9.80 *	4.26	15.35
48	SAN JOAQUIN	492,955	50.00	10.14	7.33	12.95
49	CONTRA COSTA	819,359	84.33	10.29	8.10	12.49
50	SONOMA	396,491	46.67	11.77	8.39	15.15
51	MARIN	214,163	25.67	11.98	7.35	16.62
52	SOLANO	337,015	46.00	13.65	9.70	17.59
53	RIVERSIDE	1,402,605	192.00	13.69	11.75	15.63
	CALIFORNIA	29,098,181	3,991.00	13.72	13.29	14.14
54	KERN	560,122	80.67	14.40	11.26	17.54
55	ALAMEDA	1,232,191	202.00	16.39	14.13	18.65
56	SAN DIEGO	2,481,678	421.33	16.98	15.36	18.60
57	LOS ANGELES	8,018,796	1,521.00	18.97	18.01	19.92
58	SAN FRANCISCO	699,395	468.67	67.01	60.94	73.08

TABLE 16: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS, 2002-2004

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported tuberculosis cases for California was 8.71 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported tuberculosis case for every 11,487 persons. This rate was based on a 2002 to 2004 three-year average reported number of cases of 3,128.33 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 18.76 in San Francisco County to 3.51 in San Bernardino County, a difference in rates by a factor of 5.3 to 1. Eleven counties reported no new incidence of tuberculosis during the three-year period.

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

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Division of Communicable Disease Control.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 16
REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	SISKIYOU	45,081	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
2	CALAVERAS	43,566	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
3	AMADOR	37,074	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
4	LASSEN	34,633	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
5	PLUMAS	21,181	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
6	MARIPOSA	17,886	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
7	TRINITY	13,579	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
8	MONO	13,443	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
9	MODOC	9,541	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
10	SIERRA	3,563	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
11	ALPINE	1,268	0.00	0.00 +	-	-
12	TUOLUMNE	57,120	0.33	0.58 *	0.00	2.56
13	NEVADA	96,923	0.67	0.69 *	0.00	2.34
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			**1.00**		
14	DEL NORTE	28,192	0.33	1.18 *	0.00	5.20
15	EL DORADO	168,227	2.00	1.19 *	0.00	2.84
16	COLUSA	20,026	0.33	1.66 *	0.00	7.32
17	BUTTE	212,473	3.67	1.73 *	0.00	3.49
18	PLACER	285,336	5.67	1.99 *	0.35	3.62
19	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	5.33	2.07 *	0.31	3.83
20	LAKE	62,359	1.33	2.14 *	0.00	5.77
21	TEHAMA	58,665	1.33	2.27 *	0.00	6.13
22	KINGS	138,763	4.00	2.88 *	0.06	5.71
23	SHASTA	175,421	5.33	3.04 *	0.46	5.62
24	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	8.00	3.09 *	0.95	5.22
25	HUMBOLDT	129,515	4.00	3.09 *	0.06	6.12
26	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	65.67	3.51	2.66	4.36
27	INYO	18,617	0.67	3.58 *	0.00	12.18
28	SONOMA	473,274	17.00	3.59 *	1.88	5.30
29	GLENN	27,626	1.00	3.62 *	0.00	10.71
30	YOLO	183,602	7.00	3.81 *	0.99	6.64
31	STANISLAUS	489,491	19.33	3.95	2.19	5.71
32	SAN BENITO	56,605	2.33	4.12 *	0.00	9.41
33	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	72.67	4.13	3.18	5.08
34	SUTTER	84,978	4.00	4.71 *	0.09	9.32
35	TULARE	392,989	18.67	4.75 *	2.60	6.90
36	NAPA	130,920	6.67	5.09 *	1.23	8.96
37	MENDOCINO	89,156	4.67	5.23 *	0.49	9.98
38	MARIN	250,252	14.00	5.59 *	2.66	8.52
39	MERCED	230,696	13.33	5.78 *	2.68	8.88
40	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	24.33	5.91	3.56	8.25
41	KERN	717,332	46.67	6.51	4.64	8.37
42	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	71.33	7.11	5.46	8.76
43	MADERA	133,965	10.33	7.71 *	3.01	12.42
44	ORANGE	3,001,146	234.00	7.80	6.80	8.80
45	SOLANO	416,406	32.67	7.84	5.15	10.54
46	SAN MATEO	712,772	58.33	8.18	6.08	10.28
47	YUBA	63,979	5.33	8.34 *	1.26	15.41
48	MONTEREY	418,842	35.67	8.52	5.72	11.31
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**3,128.33**	**8.71**	**8.40**	**9.01**
49	VENTURA	799,114	70.67	8.84	6.78	10.90
50	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	62.00	9.91	7.44	12.38
51	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	1,039.67	10.35	9.72	10.98
52	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	139.33	10.46	8.73	12.20
53	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	320.67	10.73	9.55	11.90
54	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	179.33	11.99	10.24	13.75
55	FRESNO	855,469	105.00	12.27	9.93	14.62
56	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	227.67	13.21	11.49	14.92
57	IMPERIAL	153,673	28.33	18.44	11.65	25.23
58	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	147.67	18.76	15.74	21.79

TABLE 17: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF CHLAMYDIA, 2002-2004

California Counties Ranked by Three-Year Average Crude Case Rate

The crude case rate of reported chlamydia cases for California was 324.31 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported chlamydia case for every 308 persons. This rate was based on a 2002 to 2004 three-year average reported number of cases of 116,539.67 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 561.99 in Fresno County to 72.69 in Calaveras County, a difference in rates by a factor of 7.7 to 1.

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

Notes:

Case rates are per 100,000 population.

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing case rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the crude case rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated case rate. Precision of the case rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the crude case rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Division of Communicable Disease Control.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			SEE COMMENT		
1	SIERRA	3,563	0.67	18.71 *	0.00	63.63
2	MONO	13,443	8.33	61.99 *	19.90	104.08
3	PLUMAS	21,181	14.67	69.24 *	33.81	104.68
4	CALAVERAS	43,566	31.67	72.69	47.37	98.00
5	AMADOR	37,074	28.33	76.42	48.28	104.56
6	MODOC	9,541	8.00	83.85 *	25.74	141.95
7	MARIPOSA	17,886	15.67	87.59 *	44.22	130.97
8	DEL NORTE	28,192	26.67	94.59	58.69	130.49
9	NAPA	130,920	128.67	98.28	81.30	115.26
10	TRINITY	13,579	13.67	100.65 *	47.29	154.01
11	ALPINE	1,268	1.33	105.15 *	0.00	283.64
12	NEVADA	96,923	111.00	114.52	93.22	135.83
13	PLACER	285,336	332.67	116.59	104.06	129.12
14	EL DORADO	168,227	210.33	125.03	108.13	141.93
15	TUOLUMNE	57,120	72.00	126.05	96.93	155.17
16	INYO	18,617	23.67	127.12	75.91	178.34
17	LASSEN	34,633	44.67	128.97	91.15	166.79
18	COLUSA	20,026	26.00	129.83	79.93	179.74
19	MARIN	250,252	332.67	132.93	118.65	147.22
20	SONOMA	473,274	664.33	140.37	129.70	151.04
21	LAKE	62,359	108.00	173.19	140.53	205.85
22	GLENN	27,626	49.67	179.78	129.78	229.78
23	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	481.00	186.83	170.13	203.53
24	VENTURA	799,114	1,521.33	190.38	180.81	199.94
25	ORANGE	3,001,146	5,746.33	191.47	186.52	196.42
26	SUTTER	84,978	167.67	197.31	167.44	227.17
27	SAN MATEO	712,772	1,440.33	202.07	191.64	212.51
28	SISKIYOU	45,081	92.00	204.08	162.38	245.78
29	YOLO	183,602	379.33	206.61	185.81	227.40
30	MENDOCINO	89,156	185.33	207.88	177.95	237.80
31	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	3,750.33	213.24	206.42	220.07
32	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	560.00	216.03	198.14	233.93
33	TEHAMA	58,665	127.67	217.62	179.87	255.37
34	SAN BENITO	56,605	124.00	219.06	180.50	257.62
35	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	1,034.00	250.93	235.63	266.22
36	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	2,569.00	255.95	246.05	265.85
37	HUMBOLDT	129,515	332.00	256.34	228.77	283.92
38	BUTTE	212,473	563.67	265.29	243.39	287.19
39	IMPERIAL	153,673	414.67	269.84	243.86	295.81
40	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	4,862.00	282.05	274.12	289.98
41	MONTEREY	418,842	1,210.00	288.89	272.61	305.17
42	STANISLAUS	489,491	1,560.00	318.70	302.88	334.51
43	YUBA	63,979	205.33	320.94	277.04	364.84
44	SOLANO	416,406	1,350.00	324.20	306.91	341.50
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**116,539.67**	**324.31**	**322.45**	**326.17**
45	SHASTA	175,421	576.67	328.73	301.90	355.56
46	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	5,074.67	339.36	330.02	348.70
47	MERCED	230,696	803.33	348.22	324.14	372.30
48	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	10,520.67	351.96	345.23	358.68
49	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	6,809.00	364.27	355.62	372.92
50	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	39,571.33	393.85	389.97	397.73
51	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	2,464.67	393.90	378.35	409.46
52	KINGS	138,763	563.67	406.21	372.67	439.74
53	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	5,417.33	406.84	396.01	417.67
54	MADERA	133,965	561.33	419.01	384.35	453.68
55	TULARE	392,989	1,674.67	426.14	405.73	446.55
56	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	3,432.00	436.10	421.51	450.69
57	KERN	717,332	3,334.00	464.78	449.00	480.55
58	FRESNO	855,469	4,807.67	561.99	546.11	577.88

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

TABLE 18: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SYPHILIS, 2002-2004

RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
25	EL DORADO	168,227	0.33	0.20 *	0.00	0.87
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			0.20		
26	PLACER	285,336	0.67	0.23 *	0.00	0.79
27	MADERA	133,965	0.33	0.25 *	0.00	1.09
28	HUMBOLDT	129,515	0.33	0.26 *	0.00	1.13
29	SANTA BARBARA	412,069	1.67	0.40 *	0.00	1.02
30	TULARE	392,989	1.67	0.42 *	0.00	1.07
31	IMPERIAL	153,673	0.67	0.43 *	0.00	1.48
32	KINGS	138,763	0.67	0.48 *	0.00	1.63
33	VENTURA	799,114	4.00	0.50 *	0.01	0.99
34	NAPA	130,920	0.67	0.51 *	0.00	1.73
35	LAKE	62,359	0.33	0.53 *	0.00	2.35
36	YOLO	183,602	1.00	0.54 *	0.00	1.61
37	FRESNO	855,469	5.00	0.58 *	0.07	1.10
38	KERN	717,332	4.33	0.60 *	0.04	1.17
39	SOLANO	416,406	2.67	0.64 *	0.00	1.41
40	SAN LUIS OBISPO	257,452	1.67	0.65 *	0.00	1.63
41	MONTEREY	418,842	3.33	0.80 *	0.00	1.65
42	SAN BERNARDINO	1,869,219	15.00	0.80 *	0.40	1.21
43	SAN JOAQUIN	625,702	6.33	1.01 *	0.22	1.80
44	MARIN	250,252	2.67	1.07 *	0.00	2.34
45	MENDOCINO	89,156	1.00	1.12 *	0.00	3.32
46	SACRAMENTO	1,331,563	15.33	1.15 *	0.58	1.73
47	ORANGE	3,001,146	37.67	1.26	0.85	1.66
48	CONTRA COSTA	1,003,704	13.67	1.36 *	0.64	2.08
49	STANISLAUS	489,491	6.67	1.36 *	0.33	2.40
50	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	5.00	1.93 *	0.24	3.62
51	SAN MATEO	712,772	16.33	2.29 *	1.18	3.40
52	SONOMA	473,274	12.00	2.54 *	1.10	3.97
53	SANTA CLARA	1,723,819	46.67	2.71	1.93	3.48
54	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	47.33	3.17	2.26	4.07
55	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	95.00	3.18	2.54	3.82
	CALIFORNIA	35,934,967	1,232.00	3.43	3.24	3.62
56	RIVERSIDE	1,758,719	71.00	4.04	3.10	4.98
57	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	478.00	4.76	4.33	5.18
58	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	333.00	42.31	37.77	46.86

The crude case rate of reported primary and secondary syphilis cases for California was 3.43 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported syphilis case for every 29,168 persons. This rate was based on a 2002 to 2004 three-year average reported number of cases of 1,232.00 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003.

Table 18 shows only those counties where at least one case was reported. Among counties with "reliable" rates, the crude case rate ranged from 42.31 in San Francisco County to 1.26 in Orange County, a difference in rates by a factor of 33.6 to 1.

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

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

TABLE 19: REPORTED INCIDENCE OF MEASLES, 2002-2004

RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE CRUDE CASE RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 POPULATION	2002-2004 CASES (AVERAGE)	CRUDE CASE RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
					LOWER	UPPER
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			0.00		
50	LOS ANGELES	10,047,236	0.67	0.01 *	0.00	0.02
51	SAN DIEGO	2,989,178	0.33	0.01 *	0.00	0.05
	CALIFORNIA	**35,934,967**	**5.33**	**0.01 ***	**0.00**	**0.03**
52	ORANGE	3,001,146	0.67	0.02 *	0.00	0.08
53	VENTURA	799,114	0.33	0.04 *	0.00	0.18
54	ALAMEDA	1,495,367	0.67	0.04 *	0.00	0.15
55	KERN	717,332	0.33	0.05 *	0.00	0.20
56	SAN MATEO	712,772	0.33	0.05 *	0.00	0.21
57	SANTA CRUZ	259,220	0.33	0.13 *	0.00	0.57
58	SAN FRANCISCO	786,980	1.67	0.21 *	0.00	0.53

The crude case rate of reported measles cases for California was 0.01 cases per 100,000 population or approximately one reported measles case for every 6,742,020 persons. Table 19 shows only those counties where at least one case was reported. This rate was based on a 2002 to 2004 three-year average reported number of cases of 5.33 and a population of 35,934,967 as of July 1, 2003. Of the 58 counties, none had a "reliable" rate.

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

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

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

TABLE 20A: INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS, 2001-2003

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

The birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.3 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 188 births. This rate was based on the 2,835.0 infant deaths among 532,506.3 live births, the three-year average for the years 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 7.4 in San Bernardino County to 3.8 in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.9 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and is grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2001-2003.

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LIVE BIRTHS	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE INFANT DEATHS	BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	MODOC	73.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	23.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	12.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	NEVADA	824.0	1.3	1.6 *	0.0	4.4
5	SUTTER	1,276.0	3.7	2.9 *	0.0	5.8
6	TUOLUMNE	449.7	1.3	3.0 *	0.0	8.0
7	SISKIYOU	443.7	1.3	3.0 *	0.0	8.1
8	COLUSA	331.7	1.0	3.0 *	0.0	8.9
9	NAPA	1,604.0	5.0	3.1 *	0.4	5.8
10	GLENN	415.0	1.3	3.2 *	0.0	8.7
11	MARIN	2,822.7	9.3	3.3 *	1.2	5.4
12	SAN MATEO	10,178.3	39.0	3.8	2.6	5.0
13	SAN FRANCISCO	8,417.3	32.3	3.8	2.5	5.2
14	SANTA CLARA	27,042.3	105.0	3.9	3.1	4.6
15	PLUMAS	170.0	0.7	3.9 *	0.0	13.3
16	SAN BENITO	922.3	3.7	4.0 *	0.0	8.0
17	CONTRA COSTA	13,217.3	52.7	4.0	2.9	5.1
18	SANTA CRUZ	3,419.3	14.0	4.1 *	1.9	6.2
19	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,475.0	10.7	4.3 *	1.7	6.9
20	SONOMA	5,742.7	25.0	4.4	2.6	6.1
21	PLACER	3,409.0	15.0	4.4 *	2.2	6.6
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			**4.5**		
22	SANTA BARBARA	5,703.0	26.0	4.6	2.8	6.3
23	ORANGE	45,216.7	206.3	4.6	3.9	5.2
24	EL DORADO	1,739.0	8.0	4.6 *	1.4	7.8
25	IMPERIAL	2,723.0	12.7	4.7 *	2.1	7.2
26	ALAMEDA	21,802.7	103.7	4.8	3.8	5.7
27	MARIPOSA	139.3	0.7	4.8 *	0.0	16.3
28	AMADOR	274.3	1.3	4.9 *	0.0	13.1
29	SAN DIEGO	44,363.7	217.0	4.9	4.2	5.5
30	CALAVERAS	328.0	1.7	5.1 *	0.0	12.8
31	YOLO	2,379.7	12.7	5.3 *	2.4	8.3
	CALIFORNIA	**532,506.3**	**2,835.0**	**5.3**	**5.1**	**5.5**
32	LOS ANGELES	152,310.3	823.0	5.4	5.0	5.8
33	SOLANO	5,811.0	32.0	5.5	3.6	7.4
34	MADERA	2,209.0	12.3	5.6 *	2.5	8.7
35	VENTURA	11,647.3	65.3	5.6	4.2	7.0
36	SACRAMENTO	19,530.7	111.7	5.7	4.7	6.8
37	MONTEREY	7,239.0	42.0	5.8	4.0	7.6
38	KINGS	2,270.0	13.3	5.9 *	2.7	9.0
39	RIVERSIDE	26,699.7	158.0	5.9	5.0	6.8
40	KERN	12,273.0	74.0	6.0	4.7	7.4
41	BUTTE	2,321.3	14.3	6.2 *	3.0	9.4
42	TRINITY	107.7	0.7	6.2 *	0.0	21.1
43	MERCED	4,086.3	26.3	6.4	4.0	8.9
44	TULARE	7,447.3	48.0	6.4	4.6	8.3
45	FRESNO	14,818.3	96.7	6.5	5.2	7.8
46	TEHAMA	702.0	4.7	6.6 *	0.6	12.7
47	SHASTA	1,989.0	13.3	6.7 *	3.1	10.3
48	MONO	148.7	1.0	6.7 *	0.0	19.9
49	LAKE	643.0	4.3	6.7 *	0.4	13.1
50	YUBA	1,124.0	7.7	6.8 *	2.0	11.6
51	HUMBOLDT	1,454.7	10.0	6.9 *	2.6	11.1
52	SAN JOAQUIN	10,143.0	72.3	7.1	5.5	8.8
53	STANISLAUS	7,845.3	57.0	7.3	5.4	9.2
54	SAN BERNARDINO	29,913.3	220.0	7.4	6.4	8.3
55	MENDOCINO	1,080.7	8.3	7.7 *	2.5	12.9
56	DEL NORTE	287.3	2.3	8.1 *	0.0	18.5
57	LASSEN	282.0	2.3	8.3 *	0.0	18.9
58	INYO	183.7	1.7	9.1 *	0.0	22.9

TABLE 20B: ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER INFANT MORTALITY, 2001-2003

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

The Asian/Pacific Islander birth cohort infant death rate for California was 4.1 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 242 births. This rate was based on the 262.3 infant deaths among 63,572.0 live births, the three-year average for the years 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 5.1 in San Diego County to 2.6 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.0 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and is grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2001-2003.

TABLE 20B
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LIVE BIRTHS	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE INFANT DEATHS	BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	MARIN	213.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SANTA CRUZ	105.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	IMPERIAL	29.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	SAN BENITO	23.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	MENDOCINO	17.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	LAKE	13.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	NEVADA	12.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	DEL NORTE	11.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	SISKIYOU	9.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	CALAVERAS	5.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	AMADOR	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	TUOLUMNE	4.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
13	COLUSA	4.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
14	INYO	4.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
15	TEHAMA	4.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
16	TRINITY	2.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
17	MONO	2.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
18	MARIPOSA	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
19	MODOC	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
20	PLUMAS	0.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
21	ALPINE	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
22	SIERRA	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
23	STANISLAUS	394.0	1.0	2.5 *	0.0	7.5
24	SANTA CLARA	9,064.7	23.3	2.6	1.5	3.6
25	SAN FRANCISCO	2,719.0	7.7	2.8 *	0.8	4.8
26	YUBA	108.0	0.3	3.1 *	0.0	13.6
27	SAN MATEO	2,663.3	9.0	3.4 *	1.2	5.6
28	ALAMEDA	5,867.0	21.0	3.6	2.0	5.1
29	ORANGE	6,751.0	26.0	3.9	2.4	5.3
30	SAN LUIS OBISPO	86.0	0.3	3.9 *	0.0	17.0
31	CONTRA COSTA	1,759.0	7.0	4.0 *	1.0	6.9
	CALIFORNIA	**63,572.0**	**262.3**	**4.1**	**3.6**	**4.6**
32	SAN JOAQUIN	1,430.7	6.0	4.2 *	0.8	7.5
33	SANTA BARBARA	237.0	1.0	4.2 *	0.0	12.5
34	SOLANO	936.7	4.0	4.3 *	0.1	8.5
35	LOS ANGELES	15,928.3	68.3	4.3	3.3	5.3
36	NAPA	75.0	0.3	4.4 *	0.0	19.5
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			**4.5**		
37	SACRAMENTO	2,972.0	14.3	4.8 *	2.3	7.3
38	SAN DIEGO	4,830.3	24.7	5.1	3.1	7.1
39	BUTTE	130.3	0.7	5.1 *	0.0	17.4
40	SAN BERNARDINO	1,547.3	8.0	5.2 *	1.6	8.8
41	SONOMA	319.7	1.7	5.2 *	0.0	13.1
42	FRESNO	1,303.3	7.0	5.4 *	1.4	9.3
43	VENTURA	697.7	4.0	5.7 *	0.1	11.4
44	YOLO	226.3	1.3	5.9 *	0.0	15.9
45	RIVERSIDE	1,122.0	7.0	6.2 *	1.6	10.9
46	MONTEREY	380.7	2.7	7.0 *	0.0	15.4
47	KINGS	83.7	0.7	8.0 *	0.0	27.1
48	MERCED	241.3	2.0	8.3 *	0.0	19.8
49	SUTTER	190.3	1.7	8.8 *	0.0	22.1
50	KERN	417.3	3.7	8.8 *	0.0	17.8
51	HUMBOLDT	36.7	0.3	9.1 *	0.0	40.0
52	SHASTA	70.3	0.7	9.5 *	0.0	32.2
53	EL DORADO	66.3	0.7	10.1 *	0.0	34.2
54	TULARE	206.0	2.3	11.3 *	0.0	25.9
55	MADERA	28.7	0.3	11.6 *	0.0	51.1
56	PLACER	190.7	2.3	12.2 *	0.0	27.9
57	GLENN	14.0	0.3	23.8 *	0.0	104.6
58	LASSEN	7.7	0.7	87.0 *	0.0	295.7

TABLE 20C: BLACK INFANT MORTALITY, 2001-2003

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

The Black birth cohort infant death rate for California was 11.2 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 89 births. This rate was based on the 354.3 deaths among the 31,594.3 live births, the three-year average for the years 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate for Blacks ranged from 15.2 in San Bernardino County to 10.3 in Alameda County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.5 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and is grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2001-2003.

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE		BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	INFANT DEATHS		LOWER	UPPER
1	YOLO	50.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SHASTA	24.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	SAN LUIS OBISPO	21.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	SUTTER	17.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	HUMBOLDT	15.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	LAKE	14.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	EL DORADO	8.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	MENDOCINO	5.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	SAN BENITO	5.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
10	SISKIYOU	5.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
11	TEHAMA	4.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
12	LASSEN	3.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
13	CALAVERAS	3.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
14	GLENN	2.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
15	NEVADA	1.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
16	DEL NORTE	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
17	TUOLUMNE	1.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
18	AMADOR	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
19	MARIPOSA	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
20	MONO	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
21	PLUMAS	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
22	COLUSA	0.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
23	ALPINE	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
24	INYO	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
25	MODOC	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
26	SIERRA	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
27	TRINITY	0.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
28	SAN MATEO	246.7	0.7	2.7 *	0.0	9.2
29	SANTA BARBARA	78.0	0.3	4.3 *	0.0	18.8
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				**4.5**		
30	MONTEREY	124.3	0.7	5.4 *	0.0	18.2
31	SANTA CLARA	576.0	3.3	5.8 *	0.0	12.0
32	VENTURA	165.3	1.0	6.0 *	0.0	17.9
33	MADERA	50.0	0.3	6.7 *	0.0	29.3
34	STANISLAUS	170.3	1.3	7.8 *	0.0	21.1
35	CONTRA COSTA	1,232.3	9.7	7.8 *	2.9	12.8
36	MERCED	117.3	1.0	8.5 *	0.0	25.2
37	SOLANO	809.7	7.0	8.6 *	2.2	15.1
38	SAN FRANCISCO	692.7	6.3	9.1 *	2.0	16.3
39	RIVERSIDE	1,457.0	14.3	9.8 *	4.7	14.9
40	ALAMEDA	2,950.0	30.3	10.3	6.6	13.9
41	PLACER	32.3	0.3	10.3 *	0.0	45.3
42	MARIN	61.3	0.7	10.9 *	0.0	37.0
43	FRESNO	816.7	9.0	11.0 *	3.8	18.2
44	LOS ANGELES	12,167.0	135.7	11.2	9.3	13.0
	CALIFORNIA	**31,594.3**	**354.3**	**11.2**	**10.0**	**12.4**
45	SACRAMENTO	2,140.0	24.3	11.4	6.9	15.9
46	ORANGE	518.3	6.0	11.6 *	2.3	20.8
47	TULARE	82.3	1.0	12.1 *	0.0	36.0
48	KERN	699.7	9.0	12.9 *	4.5	21.3
49	SAN DIEGO	2,433.0	31.3	12.9	8.4	17.4
50	IMPERIAL	25.7	0.3	13.0 *	0.0	57.1
51	KINGS	119.3	1.7	14.0 *	0.0	35.2
52	BUTTE	47.7	0.7	14.0 *	0.0	47.6
53	SANTA CRUZ	22.3	0.3	14.9 *	0.0	65.6
54	SAN BERNARDINO	2,699.0	41.0	15.2	10.5	19.8
55	YUBA	40.0	0.7	16.7 *	0.0	56.7
56	SAN JOAQUIN	735.3	14.0	19.0 *	9.1	29.0
57	SONOMA	79.7	1.7	20.9 *	0.0	52.7
58	NAPA	15.3	0.3	21.7 *	0.0	95.5

TABLE 20D: HISPANIC INFANT MORTALITY, 2001-2003

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

The Hispanic birth cohort infant death rate for California was 5.1 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 195 births. This rate was based on the 1,357.7 deaths among 264,572.7 live births, the three-year average for the years 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 6.6 in San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties to 3.9 in Alameda County, a difference in rates by a factor of 1.7 to 1.

Twenty-six counties (3 with a reliable rate) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births. The statewide Hispanic infant death rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and is grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2001-2003.

TABLE 20D
HISPANIC INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LIVE BIRTHS	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE INFANT DEATHS	BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	NEVADA	115.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SISKIYOU	75.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	CALAVERAS	42.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	PLUMAS	12.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
5	MODOC	11.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
6	TRINITY	7.7	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
7	ALPINE	2.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
8	SIERRA	1.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
9	COLUSA	217.0	0.3	1.5 *	0.0	6.8
10	GLENN	184.7	0.3	1.8 *	0.0	7.9
11	HUMBOLDT	173.3	0.3	1.9 *	0.0	8.5
12	SUTTER	460.0	1.0	2.2 *	0.0	6.4
13	MARIN	636.0	2.0	3.1 *	0.0	7.5
14	TEHAMA	204.3	0.7	3.3 *	0.0	11.1
15	CONTRA COSTA	4,001.0	14.0	3.5 *	1.7	5.3
16	SANTA CRUZ	1,790.3	6.7	3.7 *	0.9	6.6
17	SAN BENITO	602.7	2.3	3.9 *	0.0	8.8
18	ALAMEDA	6,424.3	25.0	3.9	2.4	5.4
19	SAN MATEO	3,328.3	13.0	3.9 *	1.8	6.0
20	SONOMA	2,138.7	8.7	4.1 *	1.4	6.8
21	EL DORADO	323.3	1.3	4.1 *	0.0	11.1
22	SAN DIEGO	19,640.7	83.0	4.2	3.3	5.1
23	NAPA	768.7	3.3	4.3 *	0.0	9.0
24	YUBA	305.0	1.3	4.4 *	0.0	11.8
25	SANTA BARBARA	3,473.7	15.3	4.4 *	2.2	6.6
26	SACRAMENTO	5,003.0	22.7	4.5	2.7	6.4
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			**4.5**		
27	SOLANO	1,758.0	8.0	4.6 *	1.4	7.7
28	IMPERIAL	2,386.0	11.3	4.7 *	2.0	7.5
29	SANTA CLARA	9,378.3	44.7	4.8	3.4	6.2
30	KERN	6,976.7	33.7	4.8	3.2	6.5
31	MADERA	1,516.7	7.3	4.8 *	1.3	8.3
32	KINGS	1,263.0	6.3	5.0 *	1.1	8.9
33	ORANGE	22,335.0	112.3	5.0	4.1	6.0
34	MONO	66.0	0.3	5.1 *	0.0	22.2
35	LOS ANGELES	95,372.3	485.7	5.1	4.6	5.5
	CALIFORNIA	**264,572.7**	**1,357.7**	**5.1**	**4.9**	**5.4**
36	PLACER	574.7	3.0	5.2 *	0.0	11.1
37	YOLO	1,010.7	5.3	5.3 *	0.8	9.8
38	SAN FRANCISCO	1,812.0	9.7	5.3 *	2.0	8.7
39	TUOLUMNE	62.3	0.3	5.3 *	0.0	23.5
40	MONTEREY	5,175.7	28.7	5.5	3.5	7.6
41	RIVERSIDE	15,031.0	83.3	5.5	4.4	6.7
42	VENTURA	5,953.0	34.0	5.7	3.8	7.6
43	FRESNO	8,926.0	54.3	6.1	4.5	7.7
44	TULARE	5,199.7	31.7	6.1	4.0	8.2
45	SAN BERNARDINO	16,405.3	105.0	6.4	5.2	7.6
46	MERCED	2,590.7	17.0	6.6 *	3.4	9.7
47	SAN JOAQUIN	4,704.7	31.0	6.6	4.3	8.9
48	STANISLAUS	3,980.7	26.3	6.6	4.1	9.1
49	SAN LUIS OBISPO	787.7	5.3	6.8 *	1.0	12.5
50	BUTTE	427.3	3.0	7.0 *	0.0	15.0
51	MENDOCINO	377.7	2.7	7.1 *	0.0	15.5
52	LASSEN	40.7	0.3	8.2 *	0.0	36.0
53	LAKE	149.3	1.3	8.9 *	0.0	24.1
54	AMADOR	34.7	0.3	9.6 *	0.0	42.3
55	SHASTA	212.3	2.3	11.0 *	0.0	25.1
56	DEL NORTE	56.0	0.7	11.9 *	0.0	40.5
57	INYO	54.3	0.7	12.3 *	0.0	41.7
58	MARIPOSA	12.7	0.3	26.3 *	0.0	115.7

TABLE 20E: WHITE INFANT MORTALITY, 2001-2003

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

The White birth cohort infant death rate for California was 4.7 deaths per 1,000 live births, a risk of dying equivalent to approximately one infant death for every 214 births. This rate was based on the 776.0 deaths among 166,108.0 live births, the three-year average for the years 2001 to 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the birth cohort infant death rate ranged from 8.3 in Stanislaus County to 3.1 in Santa Clara County, a difference in rates by a factor of 2.7 to 1.

Thirty counties (6 with reliable rates) met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of no more than 4.5 infant deaths per 1,000 birth cohort live births. The statewide White infant death rate did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing birth cohort death rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. Infant mortality data by race/ethnicity is based on the mother's race/ethnicity reported on the birth record, and is grouped according to the methodology used by the Demographic Research Unit of the Department of Finance to compile population estimates. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the birth cohort death rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated death rate. Precision of the death rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the death rate would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files, 2001-2003.

TABLE 20E
WHITE INFANT MORTALITY
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2001-2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LIVE BIRTHS	THREE-YEAR AVERAGE INFANT DEATHS	BIRTH COHORT INFANT DEATH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS UPPER
1	MODOC	58.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
2	SIERRA	22.0	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
3	ALPINE	6.3	0.0	0.0 +	-	-
4	NAPA	730.7	1.0	1.4 *	0.0	4.1
5	SUTTER	596.0	1.0	1.7 *	0.0	5.0
6	NEVADA	687.7	1.3	1.9 *	0.0	5.2
7	SAN FRANCISCO	3,142.0	8.0	2.5 *	0.8	4.3
8	TUOLUMNE	373.0	1.0	2.7 *	0.0	7.9
9	MARIPOSA	119.3	0.3	2.8 *	0.0	12.3
10	SANTA CLARA	7,328.3	22.7	3.1	1.8	4.4
11	GLENN	209.7	0.7	3.2 *	0.0	10.8
12	SAN LUIS OBISPO	1,552.3	5.0	3.2 *	0.4	6.0
13	MARIN	1,882.3	6.3	3.4 *	0.7	6.0
14	SAN MATEO	3,825.7	13.3	3.5 *	1.6	5.4
15	CONTRA COSTA	5,594.0	19.7	3.5	2.0	5.1
16	PLACER	2,584.7	9.3	3.6 *	1.3	5.9
17	SONOMA	3,115.3	11.3	3.6 *	1.5	5.8
18	ALAMEDA	6,167.7	23.0	3.7	2.2	5.3
19	IMPERIAL	262.7	1.0	3.8 *	0.0	11.3
20	ORANGE	15,250.0	59.3	3.9	2.9	4.9
21	SISKIYOU	327.3	1.3	4.1 *	0.0	11.0
22	SANTA CRUZ	1,432.0	6.0	4.2 *	0.8	7.5
23	SAN DIEGO	16,672.3	70.3	4.2	3.2	5.2
24	LOS ANGELES	28,077.0	121.3	4.3	3.6	5.1
25	VENTURA	4,301.3	18.7	4.3 *	2.4	6.3
26	YOLO	1,069.3	4.7	4.4 *	0.4	8.3
27	PLUMAS	151.0	0.7	4.4 *	0.0	15.0
28	AMADOR	226.0	1.0	4.4 *	0.0	13.1
29	SANTA BARBARA	1,859.7	8.3	4.5 *	1.4	7.5
30	LASSEN	221.7	1.0	4.5 *	0.0	13.4
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				4.5		
31	EL DORADO	1,318.3	6.0	4.6 *	0.9	8.2
32	SAN BENITO	286.3	1.3	4.7 *	0.0	12.6
	CALIFORNIA	166,108.0	776.0	4.7	4.3	5.0
33	SACRAMENTO	9,201.3	46.0	5.0	3.6	6.4
34	MERCED	1,118.7	6.0	5.4 *	1.1	9.7
35	RIVERSIDE	8,840.0	47.7	5.4	3.9	6.9
36	SOLANO	2,249.7	12.3	5.5 *	2.4	8.5
37	KINGS	782.7	4.3	5.5 *	0.3	10.7
38	BUTTE	1,670.7	9.3	5.6 *	2.0	9.2
39	SHASTA	1,601.7	9.7	6.0 *	2.2	9.8
40	TULARE	1,856.0	11.3	6.1 *	2.6	9.7
41	LAKE	435.7	2.7	6.1 *	0.0	13.5
42	CALAVERAS	270.3	1.7	6.2 *	0.0	15.5
43	INYO	104.7	0.7	6.4 *	0.0	21.7
44	COLUSA	104.0	0.7	6.4 *	0.0	21.8
45	FRESNO	3,629.7	23.7	6.5	3.9	9.1
46	SAN JOAQUIN	3,165.0	20.7	6.5	3.7	9.3
47	KERN	4,102.3	27.0	6.6	4.1	9.1
48	MONTEREY	1,509.7	10.0	6.6 *	2.5	10.7
49	SAN BERNARDINO	9,064.7	62.3	6.9	5.2	8.6
50	HUMBOLDT	1,091.7	7.7	7.0 *	2.1	12.0
51	TRINITY	93.0	0.7	7.2 *	0.0	24.4
52	DEL NORTE	185.7	1.3	7.2 *	0.0	19.4
53	MENDOCINO	594.3	4.3	7.3 *	0.4	14.2
54	MADERA	589.3	4.3	7.4 *	0.4	14.3
55	YUBA	653.0	5.3	8.2 *	1.2	15.1
56	STANISLAUS	3,196.3	26.7	8.3	5.2	11.5
57	TEHAMA	473.0	4.0	8.5 *	0.2	16.7
58	MONO	74.7	0.7	8.9 *	0.0	30.4

TABLE 21: LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS, 2002-2004

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

The percentage of low birthweight infants for California was 6.6 per 100 live births, a percent equivalent to one in 15 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of low birthweight infants of 35,333.0 and a three-year average total number of live births of 538,239.0 from 2002 to 2004.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of low birthweight infants ranged from 7.3 in Siskiyou County to 4.1 in Tuolumne County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 1.8 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of low birthweight infants (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2002-2004 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		LIVE BIRTHS	LOW BIRTHWEIGHT NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	11.0	0.3	3.0 *	0.0	13.3
2	COLUSA	327.3	13.3	4.1 *	1.9	6.3
3	TUOLUMNE	462.3	19.0	4.1	2.3	6.0
4	DEL NORTE	290.7	12.0	4.1 *	1.8	6.5
5	GLENN	412.3	18.3	4.4 *	2.4	6.5
6	SAN BENITO	891.7	42.7	4.8	3.3	6.2
7	MARIPOSA	138.3	6.7	4.8 *	1.2	8.5
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			5.0		
8	SONOMA	5,828.7	299.3	5.1	4.6	5.7
9	AMADOR	273.7	14.3	5.2 *	2.5	7.9
10	SANTA CRUZ	3,395.3	182.0	5.4	4.6	6.1
11	LASSEN	300.7	16.3	5.4 *	2.8	8.1
12	YOLO	2,407.0	133.3	5.5	4.6	6.5
13	PLACER	3,640.0	203.3	5.6	4.8	6.4
14	IMPERIAL	2,810.3	157.7	5.6	4.7	6.5
15	NAPA	1,617.0	92.0	5.7	4.5	6.9
16	BUTTE	2,334.7	134.0	5.7	4.8	6.7
17	SUTTER	1,319.0	76.0	5.8	4.5	7.1
18	INYO	195.0	11.3	5.8 *	2.4	9.2
19	SHASTA	2,023.0	117.7	5.8	4.8	6.9
20	MENDOCINO	1,101.3	64.3	5.8	4.4	7.3
21	TULARE	7,659.3	450.0	5.9	5.3	6.4
22	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,560.7	151.7	5.9	5.0	6.9
23	NEVADA	820.7	49.0	6.0	4.3	7.6
24	HUMBOLDT	1,457.7	87.3	6.0	4.7	7.2
25	MONTEREY	7,312.3	441.0	6.0	5.5	6.6
26	ORANGE	45,074.0	2,743.3	6.1	5.9	6.3
27	TEHAMA	723.0	44.7	6.2	4.4	8.0
28	SAN DIEGO	45,025.7	2,805.7	6.2	6.0	6.5
29	RIVERSIDE	28,087.7	1,755.3	6.2	6.0	6.5
30	KINGS	2,408.3	152.0	6.3	5.3	7.3
31	MARIN	2,798.0	177.7	6.3	5.4	7.3
32	MADERA	2,261.0	144.3	6.4	5.3	7.4
33	CALAVERAS	327.7	21.0	6.4	3.7	9.2
34	SIERRA	26.0	1.7	6.4 *	0.0	16.1
35	VENTURA	11,856.0	764.0	6.4	6.0	6.9
36	SANTA CLARA	26,864.0	1,733.7	6.5	6.1	6.8
37	MERCED	4,201.3	272.7	6.5	5.7	7.3
38	STANISLAUS	8,003.7	520.3	6.5	5.9	7.1
39	CONTRA COSTA	13,268.0	868.0	6.5	6.1	7.0
40	SANTA BARBARA	5,902.3	389.3	6.6	5.9	7.3
41	SAN MATEO	10,119.7	669.0	6.6	6.1	7.1
42	SACRAMENTO	20,167.7	1,336.3	6.6	6.3	7.0
	CALIFORNIA	538,239.0	35,333.0	6.6	6.5	6.6
43	EL DORADO	1,804.3	120.7	6.7	5.5	7.9
44	PLUMAS	178.7	12.0	6.7 *	2.9	10.5
45	LAKE	668.7	45.0	6.7	4.8	8.7
46	SAN JOAQUIN	10,542.0	714.7	6.8	6.3	7.3
47	FRESNO	15,354.3	1,045.3	6.8	6.4	7.2
48	KERN	12,850.3	876.7	6.8	6.4	7.3
49	SAN FRANCISCO	8,533.0	583.3	6.8	6.3	7.4
50	SOLANO	5,785.7	399.0	6.9	6.2	7.6
51	ALAMEDA	21,431.3	1,478.7	6.9	6.5	7.3
52	SAN BERNARDINO	30,808.7	2,148.0	7.0	6.7	7.3
53	LOS ANGELES	151,615.0	10,577.7	7.0	6.8	7.1
54	YUBA	1,169.7	82.0	7.0	5.5	8.5
55	TRINITY	107.0	7.7	7.2 *	2.1	12.2
56	SISKIYOU	457.0	33.3	7.3	4.8	9.8
57	MONO	149.0	11.0	7.4 *	3.0	11.7
58	MODOC	80.3	6.0	7.5 *	1.5	13.4

TABLE 22: BIRTHS TO ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD, 2002-2004

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

The age-specific birth rate to adolescents, aged 15 to 19, in California was 39.2 per 1,000 female population, a rate equivalent to approximately one birth for every 25 adolescent females. This rate was based on the 2002 to 2004 average of 49,756.0 births and a female population for the same age group of 1,268,519 as of July 1, 2003.

Among counties with "reliable" rates, the age-specific rate ranged from 70.2 in Kings County to 11.0 in Marin County, a difference in rates by a factor of 6.4 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing age-specific birth rate (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the population. For purposes of this report, rates with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the age-specific birth rate at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated birth rate. Precision of the birth rate decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the birth rate probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.
Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.

TABLE 22
BIRTHS AMONG ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	2003 FEMALE POPULATION 15-19 YRS OLD	2002-2004 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE)	AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE	95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS LOWER	UPPER
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			**NONE ESTABLISHED**		
1	MARIN	6,693	73.7	11.0	8.5	13.5
2	SIERRA	143	2.0	14.0 *	0.0	33.4
3	NEVADA	3,665	58.7	16.0	11.9	20.1
4	PLACER	10,622	195.3	18.4	15.8	21.0
5	EL DORADO	6,728	126.3	18.8	15.5	22.1
6	ALPINE	52	1.0	19.2 *	0.0	56.9
7	MONO	389	8.0	20.6 *	6.3	34.8
8	PLUMAS	791	16.7	21.1 *	11.0	31.2
9	YOLO	9,346	197.7	21.1	18.2	24.1
10	MARIPOSA	618	13.3	21.6 *	10.0	33.2
11	SAN LUIS OBISPO	10,168	220.7	21.7	18.8	24.6
12	TRINITY	489	10.7	21.8 *	8.7	34.9
13	CALAVERAS	1,590	35.3	22.2	14.9	29.5
14	CONTRA COSTA	35,507	836.7	23.6	22.0	25.2
15	TUOLUMNE	1,852	44.0	23.8	16.7	30.8
16	SAN MATEO	20,212	480.3	23.8	21.6	25.9
17	SAN FRANCISCO	14,545	349.0	24.0	21.5	26.5
18	AMADOR	1,124	29.0	25.8	16.4	35.2
19	SANTA CLARA	51,993	1,391.7	26.8	25.4	28.2
20	SONOMA	16,328	448.3	27.5	24.9	30.0
21	HUMBOLDT	5,180	145.3	28.1	23.5	32.6
22	ALAMEDA	45,830	1,301.7	28.4	26.9	29.9
23	NAPA	4,317	127.3	29.5	24.4	34.6
24	BUTTE	9,146	271.7	29.7	26.2	33.2
25	MODOC	368	11.0	29.9 *	12.2	47.6
26	ORANGE	99,599	3,099.7	31.1	30.0	32.2
27	INYO	682	21.3	31.3	18.0	44.6
28	SISKIYOU	1,761	56.0	31.8	23.5	40.1
29	SANTA CRUZ	9,436	302.3	32.0	28.4	35.7
30	SOLANO	15,289	491.7	32.2	29.3	35.0
31	LASSEN	1,108	36.3	32.8	22.1	43.5
32	VENTURA	28,935	1,000.3	34.6	32.4	36.7
33	LAKE	2,309	83.7	36.2	28.5	44.0
34	SAN DIEGO	102,219	3,720.7	36.4	35.2	37.6
35	SAN BENITO	2,233	84.0	37.6	29.6	45.7
36	SACRAMENTO	48,824	1,841.0	37.7	36.0	39.4
37	MENDOCINO	3,438	133.3	38.8	32.2	45.4
	CALIFORNIA	**1,268,519**	**49,756.0**	**39.2**	**38.9**	**39.6**
38	SANTA BARBARA	15,132	598.7	39.6	36.4	42.7
39	SHASTA	6,645	267.7	40.3	35.5	45.1
40	LOS ANGELES	337,457	14,229.7	42.2	41.5	42.9
41	SUTTER	3,416	145.0	42.4	35.5	49.4
42	GLENN	1,182	51.7	43.7	31.8	55.6
43	RIVERSIDE	69,972	3,090.3	44.2	42.6	45.7
44	COLUSA	894	39.7	44.4	30.6	58.2
45	SAN BERNARDINO	80,804	3,706.7	45.9	44.4	47.3
46	STANISLAUS	20,714	955.0	46.1	43.2	49.0
47	DEL NORTE	1,066	51.0	47.8	34.7	61.0
48	TEHAMA	2,293	110.7	48.3	39.3	57.3
49	SAN JOAQUIN	26,080	1,285.3	49.3	46.6	52.0
50	MERCED	10,653	570.3	53.5	49.1	57.9
51	MONTEREY	15,047	864.0	57.4	53.6	61.2
52	FRESNO	37,032	2,163.7	58.4	56.0	60.9
53	IMPERIAL	6,995	413.0	59.0	53.3	64.7
54	YUBA	2,622	164.0	62.5	53.0	72.1
55	KERN	29,583	1,905.3	64.4	61.5	67.3
56	MADERA	5,071	335.7	66.2	59.1	73.3
57	TULARE	17,405	1,197.0	68.8	64.9	72.7
58	KINGS	4,927	346.0	70.2	62.8	77.6

TABLE 23A: PRENATAL CARE NOT BEGUN DURING THE FIRST TRIMESTER OF PREGNANCY, 2002-2004

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

The percentage of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care for California was 13.0 per 100 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care of 68,957.7 and a three-year average total number of live births of 528,816.0 from 2002 to 2004.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care ranged from 34.7 in Merced County to 5.3 in Marin County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 6.5 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of births to mothers with late or no prenatal care (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.

TABLE 23A
PRENATAL CARE NOT BEGUN DURING THE FIRST TRIMESTER OF PREGNANCY
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE LATE / NO PRENATAL CARE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

| RANK ORDER | COUNTY | 2002-2004 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE) | | | 95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS | |
| | | TOTAL NUMBER | LATE/NO PRENATAL CARE | | | |
			NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
1	MARIN	2,794.0	147.0	5.3	4.4	6.1
2	ORANGE	44,936.7	3,818.3	8.5	8.2	8.8
3	SANTA CRUZ	3,375.0	314.3	9.3	8.3	10.3
4	ALAMEDA	21,150.3	1,980.7	9.4	9.0	9.8
5	LOS ANGELES	149,201.0	14,118.7	9.5	9.3	9.6
6	VENTURA	11,841.7	1,170.3	9.9	9.3	10.4
HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:				10.0		
7	TUOLUMNE	461.3	46.7	10.1	7.2	13.0
8	PLACER	3,629.7	370.7	10.2	9.2	11.3
9	SHASTA	2,013.7	217.7	10.8	9.4	12.2
10	CONTRA COSTA	13,192.7	1,448.0	11.0	10.4	11.5
11	SAN MATEO	10,087.7	1,149.0	11.4	10.7	12.0
12	AMADOR	271.7	32.3	11.9	7.8	16.0
13	SAN FRANCISCO	8,487.3	1,016.0	12.0	11.2	12.7
14	SONOMA	5,814.3	706.3	12.1	11.3	13.0
15	EL DORADO	1,795.3	225.0	12.5	10.9	14.2
16	SAN DIEGO	44,166.3	5,558.3	12.6	12.3	12.9
17	SANTA CLARA	25,938.3	3,290.3	12.7	12.3	13.1
CALIFORNIA		528,816.0	68,957.7	13.0	12.9	13.1
18	FRESNO	15,296.0	2,047.0	13.4	12.8	14.0
19	NEVADA	818.0	114.0	13.9	11.4	16.5
20	PLUMAS	178.3	25.0	14.0	8.5	19.5
21	STANISLAUS	7,840.0	1,175.7	15.0	14.1	15.9
22	TRINITY	106.3	16.3	15.4 *	7.9	22.8
23	SIERRA	26.0	4.0	15.4 *	0.3	30.5
24	RIVERSIDE	27,695.7	4,292.7	15.5	15.0	16.0
25	KERN	11,247.0	1,807.7	16.1	15.3	16.8
26	MONTEREY	6,362.3	1,039.0	16.3	15.3	17.3
27	SAN BERNARDINO	30,248.3	5,032.0	16.6	16.2	17.1
28	MODOC	76.3	13.0	17.0 *	7.8	26.3
29	DEL NORTE	289.3	49.7	17.2	12.4	21.9
30	MADERA	2,239.3	385.0	17.2	15.5	18.9
31	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,523.0	435.7	17.3	15.6	18.9
32	HUMBOLDT	1,436.3	250.7	17.5	15.3	19.6
33	CALAVERAS	327.0	57.7	17.6	13.1	22.2
34	TULARE	7,615.7	1,347.3	17.7	16.7	18.6
35	SACRAMENTO	20,085.0	3,601.7	17.9	17.3	18.5
36	SANTA BARBARA	5,859.7	1,054.0	18.0	16.9	19.1
37	LASSEN	299.7	55.3	18.5	13.6	23.3
38	TEHAMA	721.3	136.7	18.9	15.8	22.1
39	SAN BENITO	882.3	170.0	19.3	16.4	22.2
40	NAPA	1,598.3	314.3	19.7	17.5	21.8
41	MARIPOSA	134.7	30.3	22.5	14.5	30.5
42	SISKIYOU	454.3	105.0	23.1	18.7	27.5
43	IMPERIAL	2,740.0	646.3	23.6	21.8	25.4
44	YOLO	2,395.7	567.7	23.7	21.7	25.6
45	MONO	148.3	36.3	24.5	16.5	32.5
46	BUTTE	2,325.3	575.0	24.7	22.7	26.7
47	ALPINE	10.7	2.7	25.0 *	0.0	55.0
48	SOLANO	5,705.3	1,432.3	25.1	23.8	26.4
49	COLUSA	326.3	83.0	25.4	20.0	30.9
50	LAKE	663.7	170.7	25.7	21.9	29.6
51	KINGS	2,404.7	642.7	26.7	24.7	28.8
52	SAN JOAQUIN	10,372.7	2,872.7	27.7	26.7	28.7
53	INYO	194.7	59.3	30.5	22.7	38.2
54	GLENN	406.7	124.0	30.5	25.1	35.9
55	SUTTER	1,318.3	423.0	32.1	29.0	35.1
56	YUBA	1,166.3	384.0	32.9	29.6	36.2
57	MENDOCINO	1,092.3	371.7	34.0	30.6	37.5
58	MERCED	4,027.7	1,397.0	34.7	32.9	36.5

TABLE 23B: "ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE (ADEQUACY OF PRENATAL CARE UTILIZATION INDEX), 2002-2004

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

The percentage of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care for California was 78.3 per 100 live births. This percentage was based on a three-year average number of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care of 407,731.7 and a three-year average total number of live births of 520,587.7 from 2002 to 2004.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care ranged from 90.8 in Marin County to 57.2 in Merced County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 1.6 to 1.

One county with a reliable percentage met the Healthy People 2010 National Objective of at least 90.0 percent of all live births to mothers who received "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care according to the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization Index. The statewide percentage of mothers who received "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care did not meet the national objective.

Notes:

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

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

Counties were rank ordered first by decreasing percentage of births to mothers with "adequate/adequate plus" prenatal care (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of live births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of births at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

Department of Health Services: Birth Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004.

TABLE 23B
"ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE (ADEQUACY OF PRENATAL CARE UTILIZATION INDEX)
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE "ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS" PRENATAL CARE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

| RANK ORDER | COUNTY | 2002-2004 LIVE BIRTHS (AVERAGE) | | | 95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS | |
| | | TOTAL NUMBER | ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS CARE | | | |
			NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
1	MARIN	2,792.3	2,535.7	90.8	87.3	94.3
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			90.0		
2	FRESNO	15,271.7	13,083.0	85.7	84.2	87.1
3	ORANGE	44,852.3	38,144.0	85.0	84.2	85.9
4	SAN MATEO	10,084.3	8,453.0	83.8	82.0	85.6
5	LOS ANGELES	145,409.3	119,991.7	82.5	82.1	83.0
6	VENTURA	11,811.7	9,673.7	81.9	80.3	83.5
7	SANTA CRUZ	3,368.0	2,725.7	80.9	77.9	84.0
8	SAN FRANCISCO	8,446.7	6,788.3	80.4	78.5	82.3
9	ALAMEDA	20,893.0	16,762.3	80.2	79.0	81.4
10	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,504.7	2,002.0	79.9	76.4	83.4
11	PLACER	3,627.3	2,870.7	79.1	76.2	82.0
12	CONTRA COSTA	13,117.0	10,374.3	79.1	77.6	80.6
13	GLENN	400.7	316.3	79.0	70.3	87.7
	CALIFORNIA	520,587.7	407,731.7	78.3	78.1	78.6
14	ALPINE	10.7	8.3	78.1 *	25.1	100.0
15	SANTA BARBARA	5,844.7	4,545.7	77.8	75.5	80.0
16	MONTEREY	6,266.3	4,854.7	77.5	75.3	79.7
17	LASSEN	299.0	231.3	77.4	67.4	87.3
18	SAN BERNARDINO	29,486.7	22,466.0	76.2	75.2	77.2
19	MONO	148.3	112.7	76.0	61.9	90.0
20	KERN	9,655.7	7,331.0	75.9	74.2	77.7
21	DEL NORTE	289.0	219.3	75.9	65.8	85.9
22	TUOLUMNE	461.0	348.7	75.6	67.7	83.6
23	SHASTA	2,012.0	1,520.0	75.5	71.7	79.3
24	SANTA CLARA	25,884.7	19,524.3	75.4	74.4	76.5
25	RIVERSIDE	27,591.3	20,764.3	75.3	74.2	76.3
26	BUTTE	2,317.0	1,735.7	74.9	71.4	78.4
27	SACRAMENTO	20,045.7	14,914.0	74.4	73.2	75.6
28	MADERA	2,232.3	1,660.7	74.4	70.8	78.0
29	TEHAMA	720.0	532.3	73.9	67.7	80.2
30	AMADOR	271.3	200.3	73.8	63.6	84.1
31	SUTTER	1,317.7	971.0	73.7	69.1	78.3
32	SIERRA	26.0	19.0	73.1	40.2	100.0
33	SAN DIEGO	43,676.7	31,908.0	73.1	72.3	73.9
34	COLUSA	326.3	237.7	72.8	63.6	82.1
35	TULARE	7,592.0	5,483.7	72.2	70.3	74.1
36	MODOC	76.3	55.0	72.1	53.0	91.1
37	CALAVERAS	325.7	232.7	71.4	62.3	80.6
38	NAPA	1,584.0	1,128.7	71.3	67.1	75.4
39	YUBA	1,165.7	829.0	71.1	66.3	76.0
40	EL DORADO	1,789.0	1,264.7	70.7	66.8	74.6
41	YOLO	2,393.3	1,678.0	70.1	66.8	73.5
42	NEVADA	816.7	570.7	69.9	64.1	75.6
43	SONOMA	5,805.0	4,055.3	69.9	67.7	72.0
44	SOLANO	5,661.0	3,933.3	69.5	67.3	71.7
45	SISKIYOU	450.3	312.3	69.4	61.7	77.0
46	KINGS	2,402.3	1,665.7	69.3	66.0	72.7
47	STANISLAUS	7,586.0	5,239.3	69.1	67.2	70.9
48	MENDOCINO	1,086.7	749.0	68.9	64.0	73.9
49	PLUMAS	178.3	121.7	68.2	56.1	80.3
50	MARIPOSA	131.7	89.7	68.1	54.0	82.2
51	IMPERIAL	2,563.3	1,692.0	66.0	62.9	69.2
52	HUMBOLDT	1,426.3	939.3	65.9	61.6	70.1
53	LAKE	657.7	431.3	65.6	59.4	71.8
54	INYO	194.3	125.0	64.3	53.0	75.6
55	SAN JOAQUIN	10,310.3	6,447.7	62.5	61.0	64.1
56	SAN BENITO	880.3	543.7	61.8	56.6	66.9
57	TRINITY	105.3	63.7	60.4	45.6	75.3
58	MERCED	3,944.7	2,254.7	57.2	54.8	59.5

TABLE 24: BREASTFEEDING INITIATION DURING EARLY POSTPARTUM, 2002-2004

Ranked by Three-Year Average Breast Feeding Initiation Percentage

The average number of breastfed infants for California was 83.7 per 100 births where the feeding method was known. This percentage was based on the 426,543.7 breastfed infants among 509,847.3 births with a known feeding method, the three-year average from 2002 to 2004.

Among counties with "reliable" percentages, the percent of breastfed infants ranged from 94.4 in Marin and Nevada Counties to 69.8 in Kings County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 1.4 to 1.

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

Notes:

Breastfeeding initiation includes: exclusively breastfed infants; and combination breastfed and formula fed infants. The average number of total births excludes those of unknown feeding type.

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

County of residence is derived from the patient's zip code. When the zip code was not present the county of hospital was substituted. Counties were rank ordered first by decreasing percentage of breastfed infants (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the total number of hospital births. For purposes of this report, percentages with a relative standard error greater than or equal to 23 percent are considered "unreliable." The upper and lower limits of the percent of breastfed infants at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage would probably occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

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

TABLE 24
BREASTFEEDING INITIATION DURING EARLY POSTPARTUM
RANKED BY THREE-YEAR AVERAGE BREASTFEEDING INITIATION PERCENTAGE
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2002-2004

| RANK ORDER | COUNTY | 2002-2004 BIRTHS (AVERAGE) WITH KNOWN FEEDING METHOD | | | 95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS | |
| | | TOTAL NUMBER | BREASTFED | | | |
			NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
1	ALPINE	13.7	13.0	95.1 *	43.4	100.0
2	NEVADA	741.0	699.7	94.4	87.4	100.0
3	MARIN	2,733.3	2,580.3	94.4	90.8	98.0
4	SIERRA	15.0	14.0	93.3 *	44.4	100.0
5	SAN MATEO	9,867.0	9,170.7	92.9	91.0	94.8
6	SONOMA	5,494.7	5,105.0	92.9	90.4	95.5
7	MONO	135.0	124.7	92.3	76.1	100.0
8	MODOC	56.3	52.0	92.3	67.2	100.0
9	SANTA CRUZ	3,519.0	3,247.7	92.3	89.1	95.5
10	TRINITY	87.7	80.7	92.0	71.9	100.0
11	SANTA BARBARA	5,649.3	5,178.0	91.7	89.2	94.2
12	DEL NORTE	306.7	281.0	91.6	80.9	100.0
13	SAN LUIS OBISPO	2,477.3	2,269.7	91.6	87.8	95.4
14	PLUMAS	137.7	125.3	91.0	75.1	100.0
15	NAPA	1,508.0	1,366.3	90.6	85.8	95.4
16	MARIPOSA	123.3	111.7	90.5	73.7	100.0
17	MONTEREY	6,898.7	6,231.0	90.3	88.1	92.6
18	SHASTA	1,901.0	1,712.7	90.1	85.8	94.4
19	EL DORADO	1,775.7	1,598.0	90.0	85.6	94.4
20	MENDOCINO	1,058.7	951.0	89.8	84.1	95.5
21	INYO	194.7	174.7	89.7	76.4	100.0
22	PLACER	2,937.0	2,634.7	89.7	86.3	93.1
23	SISKIYOU	325.7	292.0	89.7	79.4	99.9
24	TUOLUMNE	453.0	405.3	89.5	80.8	98.2
25	HUMBOLDT	1,363.0	1,219.0	89.4	84.4	94.5
26	SANTA CLARA	26,274.0	23,415.7	89.1	88.0	90.3
27	SAN DIEGO	39,524.7	35,218.7	89.1	88.2	90.0
28	SAN FRANCISCO	8,224.3	7,325.7	89.1	87.0	91.1
29	LASSEN	200.7	177.3	88.4	75.4	100.0
30	CONTRA COSTA	13,018.0	11,487.7	88.2	86.6	89.9
31	VENTURA	11,421.3	10,047.3	88.0	86.2	89.7
32	ALAMEDA	20,887.7	18,289.0	87.6	86.3	88.8
33	YOLO	2,310.0	2,021.7	87.5	83.7	91.3
34	GLENN	388.3	337.7	87.0	77.7	96.2
35	SAN BENITO	854.0	741.3	86.8	80.6	93.1
36	TEHAMA	656.7	567.3	86.4	79.3	93.5
37	AMADOR	267.7	229.3	85.7	74.6	96.8
38	CALAVERAS	319.0	271.0	85.0	74.8	95.1
39	BUTTE	2,199.0	1,859.0	84.5	80.7	88.4
40	LAKE	610.3	515.3	84.4	77.1	91.7
41	SOLANO	5,453.0	4,599.0	84.3	81.9	86.8
42	ORANGE	43,809.7	36,791.0	84.0	83.1	84.8
	CALIFORNIA	**509,847.3**	**426,543.7**	**83.7**	**83.4**	**83.9**
43	MERCED	3,862.0	3,194.7	82.7	79.9	85.6
44	MADERA	2,167.7	1,784.7	82.3	78.5	86.2
45	FRESNO	14,147.7	11,585.0	81.9	80.4	83.4
46	SACRAMENTO	18,909.3	15,424.3	81.6	80.3	82.9
47	SUTTER	1,183.0	962.7	81.4	76.2	86.5
48	STANISLAUS	7,674.3	6,218.7	81.0	79.0	83.0
49	SAN JOAQUIN	9,795.0	7,907.7	80.7	79.0	82.5
50	LOS ANGELES	146,686.7	118,164.3	80.6	80.1	81.0
51	COLUSA	304.3	244.7	80.4	70.3	90.5
52	RIVERSIDE	25,938.3	20,558.3	79.3	78.2	80.3
53	TULARE	7,099.7	5,624.7	79.2	77.2	81.3
54	KERN	12,178.3	9,625.7	79.0	77.5	80.6
55	IMPERIAL	2,684.0	2,098.3	78.2	74.8	81.5
56	SAN BERNARDINO	28,180.3	21,571.3	76.5	75.5	77.6
57	YUBA	1,008.3	764.3	75.8	70.4	81.2
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			**75.0**		
58	KINGS	1,837.7	1,282.3	69.8	66.0	73.6

TABLE 25: PERSONS UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY, 2003

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

The percentage of persons under age 18 who were below poverty in California was 19.6 per 100 population under age 18. This percentage was based on the 2000 Census projected to year 2003 population.

All 58 counties had "reliable" percentages of persons less than 18 years of age below poverty. The percents ranged from 31.6 in Tulare County to 7.9 in Placer County, a difference in percentages by a factor of 4.0 to 1.

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

Notes:

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

Counties were rank ordered first by increasing percentage of persons under 18 in poverty (calculated to 15 decimal places), second by decreasing size of the same age group population. The upper and lower limits of the percent of persons under 18 years of age in poverty at the 95 percent confidence level indicate the precision of the estimated percentage. Precision of the percentage decreases as the interval widens. The upper and lower limits define the range within which the percentage probably would occur in 95 out of 100 independent sets of data similar to the present set. (For additional information see the Technical Notes, pages 68 through 77.)

DATA SOURCES

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

TABLE 25
PERSONS UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY
RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF CENSUS POPULATION UNDER 18 BELOW POVERTY
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 2003

RANK ORDER	COUNTY	UNDER 18			95% CONFIDENCE LIMITS	
		2003 POPULATION	IN POVERTY NUMBER	PERCENT	LOWER	UPPER
	HEALTHY PEOPLE 2010 NATIONAL OBJECTIVE:			NONE ESTABLISHED		
1	PLACER	72,453	5,707	7.9	7.7	8.1
2	MARIN	50,491	4,043	8.0	7.8	8.3
3	SAN MATEO	164,364	13,522	8.2	8.1	8.4
4	EL DORADO	41,525	3,927	9.5	9.2	9.8
5	CONTRA COSTA	260,799	25,738	9.9	9.7	10.0
6	NAPA	30,715	3,163	10.3	9.9	10.7
7	SANTA CLARA	438,071	47,366	10.8	10.7	10.9
8	NEVADA	20,611	2,246	10.9	10.4	11.3
9	MONO	2,930	321	11.0	9.8	12.2
10	SONOMA	110,370	12,530	11.4	11.2	11.6
11	SOLANO	111,851	12,784	11.4	11.2	11.6
12	AMADOR	7,205	850	11.8	11.0	12.6
13	SAN BENITO	17,560	2,171	12.4	11.8	12.9
14	SIERRA	712	94	13.2	10.5	15.9
15	VENTURA	216,771	28,887	13.3	13.2	13.5
16	SAN LUIS OBISPO	52,263	6,978	13.4	13.0	13.7
17	CALAVERAS	9,179	1,243	13.5	12.8	14.3
18	PLUMAS	4,296	591	13.8	12.6	14.9
19	ALAMEDA	359,869	51,919	14.4	14.3	14.6
20	ORANGE	792,689	114,868	14.5	14.4	14.6
21	YOLO	45,665	6,657	14.6	14.2	14.9
22	SANTA CRUZ	59,849	8,799	14.7	14.4	15.0
23	INYO	4,017	625	15.6	14.3	16.8
24	TUOLUMNE	11,250	1,786	15.9	15.1	16.6
25	SAN DIEGO	722,687	115,035	15.9	15.8	16.0
26	MARIPOSA	3,555	572	16.1	14.8	17.4
27	LASSEN	6,839	1,127	16.5	15.5	17.4
28	SAN FRANCISCO	117,613	19,939	17.0	16.7	17.2
29	SANTA BARBARA	100,179	17,530	17.5	17.2	17.8
30	ALPINE	260	46	17.7	12.6	22.8
31	RIVERSIDE	507,291	91,155	18.0	17.9	18.1
32	SUTTER	23,633	4,428	18.7	18.2	19.3
33	COLUSA	5,904	1,120	19.0	17.9	20.1
	CALIFORNIA	**9,536,260**	**1,872,095**	**19.6**	**19.6**	**19.7**
34	SHASTA	41,994	8,271	19.7	19.3	20.1
35	MONTEREY	114,425	22,552	19.7	19.5	20.0
36	STANISLAUS	146,104	29,231	20.0	19.8	20.2
37	SACRAMENTO	353,681	71,791	20.3	20.1	20.4
38	SAN JOAQUIN	188,583	38,561	20.4	20.2	20.7
39	HUMBOLDT	28,943	5,946	20.5	20.0	21.1
40	TRINITY	2,754	574	20.8	19.1	22.5
41	BUTTE	47,571	10,339	21.7	21.3	22.2
42	LAKE	14,752	3,215	21.8	21.0	22.5
43	MENDOCINO	21,505	4,689	21.8	21.2	22.4
44	GLENN	7,829	1,745	22.3	21.2	23.3
45	SAN BERNARDINO	571,050	130,100	22.8	22.7	22.9
46	TEHAMA	14,511	3,421	23.6	22.8	24.4
47	SISKIYOU	9,723	2,296	23.6	22.6	24.6
48	KINGS	39,161	9,290	23.7	23.2	24.2
49	YUBA	19,670	4,819	24.5	23.8	25.2
50	LOS ANGELES	2,766,304	694,193	25.1	25.0	25.2
51	DEL NORTE	6,455	1,623	25.1	23.9	26.4
52	MODOC	2,129	537	25.2	23.1	27.4
53	KERN	219,040	57,578	26.3	26.1	26.5
54	MERCED	75,782	19,940	26.3	25.9	26.7
55	MADERA	38,090	10,562	27.7	27.2	28.3
56	IMPERIAL	45,813	12,943	28.3	27.8	28.7
57	FRESNO	258,198	79,437	30.8	30.6	31.0
58	TULARE	128,727	40,677	31.6	31.3	31.9

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates: http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/saipe/
Note: Persons under 18 below poverty may not add due to rounding.

TABLE 26

A COMPARISON OF THREE-YEAR AVERAGE RATES AND PERCENTAGES
AMONG SELECTED HEALTH STATUS INDICATORS
CALIFORNIA COUNTIES, 1999-2004

COUNTY	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES MOTOR VEHICLE CRASHES (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES FIREARM INJURIES (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**10.4**	**12.1**	**27.5**	**29.3**	**9.3**	**9.4**
ALAMEDA	7.6	8.6	24.4	25.8	9.0	10.2
ALPINE	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	27.5 *	30.5 *
AMADOR	17.6 *	24.5 *	36.7 *	49.6 *	17.3 *	8.2 *
BUTTE	13.4	19.8	41.0	52.6	10.5	10.9
CALAVERAS	34.6 *	34.7 *	62.2	53.8	17.3 *	15.8 *
COLUSA	7.9 *	24.3 *	28.5 *	40.5 *	24.4 *	5.1 *
CONTRA COSTA	7.4	10.2	22.6	27.0	9.7	11.0
DEL NORTE	15.6 *	28.5 *	60.5 *	61.4 *	8.3 *	11.6 *
EL DORADO	11.2 *	14.6	36.9	32.6	11.0 *	10.3 *
FRESNO	20.9	22.3	40.4	45.0	9.4	10.5
GLENN	32.5 *	22.6 *	54.9 *	45.8 *	13.9 *	18.3 *
HUMBOLDT	15.7	23.6	56.2	72.9	14.5 *	14.6
IMPERIAL	14.2 *	21.3	39.6	37.3	6.5 *	5.8 *
INYO	11.2 *	27.3 *	25.0 *	61.5 *	8.6 *	19.9 *
KERN	17.4	20.6	43.3	43.9	10.9	10.4
KINGS	21.4	20.1	43.0	36.8	3.6 *	6.4 *
LAKE	16.0 *	26.3 *	62.9	64.3	12.8 *	10.8 *
LASSEN	8.9 *	22.7 *	21.8 *	47.8 *	13.6 *	12.3 *
LOS ANGELES	8.9	9.4	22.3	23.3	12.0	12.0
MADERA	23.5	25.8	47.6	47.8	9.4 *	8.6 *
MARIN	5.4 *	6.1 *	20.8	20.7	4.5 *	4.3 *
MARIPOSA	18.1 *	45.6 *	54.1 *	79.2 *	4.2 *	12.6 *
MENDOCINO	13.5 *	20.9 *	46.4	60.3	12.7 *	12.7 *
MERCED	22.8	24.7	45.5	47.8	9.2 *	11.3
MODOC	10.3 *	51.9 *	44.0 *	89.6 *	9.8 *	13.1 *
MONO	29.7 *	23.0 *	42.0 *	53.4 *	6.6 *	10.8 *
MONTEREY	10.9	14.9	30.1	33.5	8.5	9.2
NAPA	12.3 *	14.1 *	30.1	34.0	6.0 *	5.2 *
NEVADA	10.0 *	19.1 *	35.3	49.4	12.1 *	8.1 *
ORANGE	7.7	8.5	22.2	23.2	5.5	5.8
PLACER	8.1	13.6	28.0	34.5	7.4 *	8.1
PLUMAS	25.9 *	16.7 *	46.3 *	40.9 *	7.9 *	16.6 *
RIVERSIDE	14.2	17.4	32.6	36.0	10.4	9.5
SACRAMENTO	10.4	13.2	27.5	33.7	9.6	9.5
SAN BENITO	15.7 *	18.2 *	35.0 *	31.8 *	6.6 *	3.2 *
SAN BERNARDINO	14.9	17.0	28.6	29.8	12.6	12.0
SAN DIEGO	8.7	10.4	26.3	27.7	7.3	7.2
SAN FRANCISCO	6.7	6.3	34.2	25.9	6.0	8.4
SAN JOAQUIN	16.6	18.4	39.2	39.2	10.2	10.7
SAN LUIS OBISPO	10.6	13.0	33.1	32.7	6.7 *	6.6 *
SAN MATEO	5.5	7.9	19.8	22.2	4.5	6.0
SANTA BARBARA	7.4	9.9	32.5	29.3	6.1	5.1
SANTA CLARA	7.9	7.3	20.1	20.1	4.2	4.2
SANTA CRUZ	7.9	9.8	25.5	26.9	7.4 *	6.2 *
SHASTA	16.4	20.2	54.2	56.6	16.0	13.6
SIERRA	7.3 *	85.2 *	53.0 *	104.6 *	26.1 *	7.5 *
SISKIYOU	18.9 *	24.0 *	51.9	61.1	10.3 *	17.7 *
SOLANO	8.7	12.6	24.4	28.2	8.9	8.3
SONOMA	9.6	13.2	28.0	33.3	6.2	8.5
STANISLAUS	17.0	19.1	44.2	47.7	7.9	9.1
SUTTER	15.5 *	28.4	45.8	47.8	11.8 *	14.5 *
TEHAMA	19.7 *	29.7 *	48.0	54.5	13.0 *	8.6 *
TRINITY	29.1 *	40.7 *	69.1 *	69.9 *	27.5 *	21.7 *
TULARE	20.6	25.0	49.5	52.3	9.2	11.0
TUOLUMNE	17.2 *	33.2 *	45.8	67.9	10.2 *	16.8 *
VENTURA	10.3	10.5	28.5	29.2	7.6	7.2
YOLO	7.7 *	11.6	27.1	36.0	8.7 *	6.0 *
YUBA	20.0 *	24.8 *	56.2	57.7	12.7 *	15.9 *

COUNTY	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES	
	HOMICIDE (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		SUICIDE (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		ALL CANCERS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**6.1**	**6.7**	**9.6**	**9.4**	**180.4**	**164.1**
ALAMEDA	7.1	8.6	7.7	8.6	189.1	172.3
ALPINE	0.0 +	0.0 +	27.5 *	30.5 *	153.7 *	136.7 *
AMADOR	2.6 *	0.9 *	18.3 *	15.5 *	178.6	194.8
BUTTE	4.5 *	2.8 *	16.6	16.5	205.7	181.1
CALAVERAS	2.2 *	4.7 *	19.8 *	18.4 *	176.4	153.0
COLUSA	12.6 *	0.0 +	15.2 *	7.6 *	215.1	154.6
CONTRA COSTA	6.5	8.2	8.6	9.9	179.5	174.3
DEL NORTE	6.2 *	2.3 *	15.1 *	20.1 *	205.8	220.7
EL DORADO	2.0 *	2.3 *	13.9	12.1	189.4	178.6
FRESNO	5.7	7.5	9.3	8.8	180.1	167.6
GLENN	2.3 *	1.0 *	15.2 *	18.3 *	217.8	169.4
HUMBOLDT	5.7 *	7.8 *	19.0	19.2	225.3	210.2
IMPERIAL	4.3 *	4.6 *	7.6 *	6.6 *	168.5	166.9
INYO	0.0 +	2.8 *	14.1 *	25.9 *	184.6	169.6
KERN	7.0	7.1	10.9	10.9	194.5	171.4
KINGS	2.4 *	4.2 *	8.1 *	10.4 *	169.6	174.2
LAKE	2.5 *	4.9 *	18.1 *	17.7 *	206.9	219.8
LASSEN	4.3 *	2.7 *	17.5 *	14.7 *	161.9	168.3
LOS ANGELES	10.0	10.8	8.2	7.4	173.8	149.2
MADERA	7.3 *	5.8 *	10.5 *	7.8 *	176.2	152.1
MARIN	1.5 *	1.7 *	11.1	11.7	156.1	161.6
MARIPOSA	2.8 *	0.0 +	7.9 *	21.0 *	196.6	159.8
MENDOCINO	6.6 *	6.8 *	17.9 *	17.9 *	209.7	197.5
MERCED	4.8 *	7.6 *	10.8	9.1 *	188.0	177.7
MODOC	0.0 +	0.0 +	18.6 *	18.6 *	146.2 *	149.8
MONO	2.2 *	0.0 +	7.0 *	13.3 *	134.9 *	105.8 *
MONTEREY	6.8	6.3	7.0	9.7	168.0	155.7
NAPA	2.1 *	2.7 *	8.3 *	8.0 *	192.6	191.2
NEVADA	4.3 *	2.3 *	16.6 *	15.3 *	190.4	181.5
ORANGE	2.7	2.9	8.3	8.5	171.4	157.7
PLACER	1.8 *	1.5 *	10.1	13.4	195.0	181.9
PLUMAS	0.0 +	4.4 *	13.8 *	26.2 *	214.0	203.5
RIVERSIDE	5.9	6.0	11.5	9.8	184.4	170.3
SACRAMENTO	5.8	6.5	11.0	12.0	196.2	183.9
SAN BENITO	4.8 *	2.5 *	5.4 *	8.5 *	181.4	136.6
SAN BERNARDINO	7.5	8.5	10.9	10.8	197.3	185.9
SAN DIEGO	3.3	3.9	11.3	10.6	185.6	173.4
SAN FRANCISCO	6.7	8.4	10.9	10.7	181.1	166.4
SAN JOAQUIN	7.9	8.9	10.5	10.6	195.4	193.2
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1.7 *	2.3 *	12.6	11.4	171.1	164.6
SAN MATEO	2.6 *	4.0	7.7	7.8	175.1	164.6
SANTA BARBARA	2.4 *	1.6 *	11.2	9.2	163.2	158.1
SANTA CLARA	2.2	2.6	7.3	8.1	157.0	143.6
SANTA CRUZ	3.3 *	2.7 *	11.9	13.2	157.3	163.5
SHASTA	4.4 *	4.5 *	20.3	17.7	193.2	190.6
SIERRA	9.9 *	0.0 +	16.1 *	7.5 *	180.3 *	218.1 *
SISKIYOU	1.4 *	5.3 *	18.4 *	20.2 *	199.6	183.5
SOLANO	5.2	6.2	10.0	8.5	191.7	164.9
SONOMA	2.4 *	3.8 *	9.9	12.8	193.1	176.0
STANISLAUS	5.3	6.0	9.3	11.7	197.8	184.0
SUTTER	3.9 *	6.6 *	13.5 *	13.2 *	178.8	184.1
TEHAMA	4.3 *	2.7 *	18.5 *	13.2 *	231.4	179.8
TRINITY	10.1 *	3.3 *	26.2 *	17.6 *	194.1	189.2
TULARE	5.6	6.3	8.9	9.0	181.1	186.8
TUOLUMNE	2.0 *	4.4 *	14.2 *	21.5 *	199.5	189.3
VENTURA	3.6	4.3	9.4	8.5	174.0	156.3
YOLO	3.0 *	1.9 *	11.5 *	9.5 *	193.8	179.2
YUBA	4.0 *	4.5 *	16.7 *	18.7 *	236.1	226.4

COUNTY	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES LUNG CANCER (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES FEMALE BREAST CANCER (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES CORONARY HEART DISEASE (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**47.1**	**41.8**	**25.0**	**22.8**	**198.8**	**164.7**
ALAMEDA	51.4	43.6	26.0	23.8	183.8	152.2
ALPINE	64.6 *	73.1 *	0.0 +	67.9 *	64.6 *	133.2 *
AMADOR	49.8	52.9	24.2 *	26.9 *	184.0	158.9
BUTTE	62.7	55.8	25.4	16.9	169.8	158.1
CALAVERAS	62.1	47.5	20.8 *	19.4 *	162.2	158.9
COLUSA	62.7 *	42.6 *	15.5 *	10.2 *	203.6	145.8
CONTRA COSTA	46.2	45.9	25.3	26.4	161.8	135.9
DEL NORTE	68.1 *	71.0	13.9 *	9.6 *	152.5	136.8
EL DORADO	51.8	45.7	22.9	25.3	166.3	145.5
FRESNO	45.8	43.7	23.2	22.2	206.4	176.3
GLENN	72.8	43.5 *	31.9 *	20.1 *	165.4	138.1
HUMBOLDT	54.4	62.2	41.8	21.1 *	160.1	154.2
IMPERIAL	42.5	42.0	23.3 *	22.4 *	179.6	158.3
INYO	54.8 *	45.0 *	30.2 *	22.1 *	185.5	185.8
KERN	56.1	50.7	25.8	23.7	265.7	208.1
KINGS	40.1	48.6	24.2 *	18.9 *	193.2	166.1
LAKE	69.6	76.4	21.5 *	28.5 *	207.6	170.9
LASSEN	54.9 *	35.7 *	17.3 *	18.2 *	181.2	153.5
LOS ANGELES	42.0	34.7	24.3	21.8	226.7	170.4
MADERA	50.5	42.1	14.4 *	20.7 *	205.3	163.1
MARIN	37.1	40.5	29.3	26.5	130.8	112.6
MARIPOSA	53.6 *	45.7 *	38.8 *	21.6 *	160.7	156.9
MENDOCINO	60.9	48.1	25.8 *	27.1 *	161.6	154.3
MERCED	47.5	42.9	28.2	28.7	193.4	199.8
MODOC	43.4 *	52.4 *	22.1 *	21.8 *	127.8 *	180.9
MONO	27.6 *	25.8 *	12.2 *	39.9 *	104.7 *	122.9 *
MONTEREY	44.4	40.1	22.2	21.1	150.1	132.7
NAPA	53.8	50.0	22.9 *	23.9	157.6	133.3
NEVADA	51.3	47.4	22.8 *	20.2 *	155.6	140.1
ORANGE	43.6	38.4	22.8	21.6	197.8	171.8
PLACER	57.8	49.3	26.2	22.7	165.3	142.3
PLUMAS	67.4	57.4 *	38.8 *	27.3 *	136.3	108.3
RIVERSIDE	50.0	46.4	26.9	23.7	237.5	200.9
SACRAMENTO	54.8	51.0	27.5	24.6	201.5	181.1
SAN BENITO	45.2 *	27.6 *	27.0 *	22.1 *	132.9	131.6
SAN BERNARDINO	53.4	49.4	27.2	24.8	254.3	228.6
SAN DIEGO	48.8	43.8	27.1	24.9	184.5	155.3
SAN FRANCISCO	44.7	39.6	21.2	22.7	177.2	146.8
SAN JOAQUIN	56.9	57.5	27.4	25.7	219.4	228.0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	46.5	44.7	22.1	20.2	165.2	131.4
SAN MATEO	45.6	39.4	24.9	23.1	139.1	122.6
SANTA BARBARA	41.4	38.5	20.1	21.5	158.5	148.3
SANTA CLARA	36.7	33.9	22.6	19.4	161.5	124.4
SANTA CRUZ	38.9	44.1	21.6	25.3	156.5	139.0
SHASTA	61.3	62.8	26.1	24.2	171.6	137.3
SIERRA	49.8 *	54.7 *	9.1 *	49.0 *	95.9 *	92.4 *
SISKIYOU	55.5	52.6	21.9 *	24.7 *	135.8	137.2
SOLANO	56.1	43.5	27.0	21.8	165.4	124.9
SONOMA	48.7	47.1	28.5	20.6	158.7	135.5
STANISLAUS	58.1	54.2	24.6	25.6	243.1	222.3
SUTTER	57.0	50.8	25.8 *	23.7 *	220.2	193.3
TEHAMA	79.6	58.2	26.3 *	21.0 *	188.0	131.8
TRINITY	73.7 *	63.4 *	32.5 *	19.4 *	144.0	86.7 *
TULARE	49.2	48.1	22.9	26.3	200.6	197.2
TUOLUMNE	57.2	51.7	25.5 *	25.9 *	169.4	149.6
VENTURA	46.2	38.5	27.0	22.6	163.7	148.0
YOLO	54.0	48.7	29.3	19.7 *	154.4	138.1
YUBA	85.2	75.2	27.4 *	22.2 *	241.9	204.0

COUNTY	AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE (STROKE) (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2]		AGE-ADJUSTED DEATH RATES DIABETES (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[1,2,3]	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**62.6**	**52.4**	**8.5**	**10.0**	**21.2**	**21.3**
ALAMEDA	69.9	58.1	8.3	9.2	22.9	22.1
ALPINE	41.5 *	159.0 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	30.5 *
AMADOR	68.3	58.2	5.0 *	17.0 *	11.0 *	12.5 *
BUTTE	67.7	59.8	10.4	21.0	17.7	20.1
CALAVERAS	56.2	57.7	11.3 *	14.5 *	9.1 *	11.1 *
COLUSA	43.0 *	47.5 *	7.9 *	3.5 *	13.8 *	23.7 *
CONTRA COSTA	69.8	57.9	6.7	8.6	17.1	20.1
DEL NORTE	60.2 *	40.5 *	25.4 *	20.2 *	17.2 *	19.6 *
EL DORADO	50.1	46.5	9.0 *	12.6	16.9	11.9
FRESNO	66.9	66.7	8.5	12.1	29.3	29.4
GLENN	76.0	38.4 *	2.8 *	12.7 *	20.7 *	30.1 *
HUMBOLDT	66.1	57.2	22.9	29.8	29.1	31.2
IMPERIAL	53.8	60.3	9.6 *	6.3 *	26.9	31.4
INYO	48.8 *	41.7 *	3.0 *	8.4 *	13.8 *	15.1 *
KERN	64.6	48.4	13.7	15.7	25.3	28.0
KINGS	68.7	50.8	8.5 *	9.0 *	49.5	58.2
LAKE	81.8	58.6	19.0 *	20.4 *	22.3 *	13.5 *
LASSEN	55.5 *	35.2 *	6.3 *	12.3 *	15.2 *	15.9 *
LOS ANGELES	58.0	44.6	7.8	8.5	24.3	23.9
MADERA	53.4	40.8	8.1 *	11.4 *	28.9	26.1
MARIN	62.6	47.5	9.4	10.0	9.1	10.7
MARIPOSA	52.8 *	46.3 *	9.0 *	15.8 *	14.6 *	13.8 *
MENDOCINO	70.2	63.3	13.3 *	19.2 *	23.1	17.6 *
MERCED	71.7	72.8	8.1 *	8.1 *	33.0	38.2
MODOC	80.2 *	58.9 *	10.9 *	13.8 *	18.2 *	18.9 *
MONO	43.3 *	28.8 *	2.2 *	2.6 *	18.9 *	4.7 *
MONTEREY	62.1	53.5	7.6	10.9	19.2	21.0
NAPA	77.1	63.4	6.4 *	9.1 *	19.0	21.2
NEVADA	73.9	70.7	7.4 *	15.9 *	11.1 *	13.0 *
ORANGE	58.4	56.3	7.2	7.9	17.4	17.5
PLACER	60.7	63.2	5.3 *	9.2	13.8	14.3
PLUMAS	42.9 *	44.0 *	5.3 *	14.6 *	13.2 *	16.5 *
RIVERSIDE	60.7	55.1	9.0	10.4	17.4	16.2
SACRAMENTO	69.4	65.2	7.4	14.0	20.3	20.4
SAN BENITO	60.0	49.7 *	5.1 *	8.3 *	18.2 *	13.8 *
SAN BERNARDINO	63.1	57.1	9.5	10.1	31.0	30.1
SAN DIEGO	62.9	54.8	9.2	10.3	17.9	18.8
SAN FRANCISCO	65.9	58.1	18.2	15.5	16.2	15.4
SAN JOAQUIN	80.7	72.3	11.5	14.6	28.7	31.8
SAN LUIS OBISPO	57.4	49.2	11.1	9.6	14.8	14.7
SAN MATEO	64.8	52.7	6.7	6.8	14.4	13.1
SANTA BARBARA	61.0	51.9	9.8	11.5	16.0	18.3
SANTA CLARA	58.3	47.2	4.1	5.5	17.9	17.5
SANTA CRUZ	53.0	48.7	10.0	10.9	18.7	13.7
SHASTA	54.0	45.9	16.4	24.4	21.4	15.4
SIERRA	31.3 *	28.3 *	7.3 *	7.5 *	13.5 *	29.1 *
SISKIYOU	54.5	51.0	11.2 *	18.4 *	18.8 *	21.7 *
SOLANO	72.7	53.1	6.9	7.7	21.3	21.7
SONOMA	67.7	61.4	9.1	12.0	16.5	18.0
STANISLAUS	67.0	52.5	14.3	19.1	26.0	27.7
SUTTER	76.6	60.7	5.7 *	6.4 *	13.4 *	25.5
TEHAMA	66.3	53.2	11.7 *	11.2 *	29.7	20.0 *
TRINITY	62.3 *	33.1 *	8.6 *	14.8 *	23.2 *	22.7 *
TULARE	69.2	63.7	10.4	11.5	30.4	34.3
TUOLUMNE	49.1	52.0	9.7 *	22.1 *	10.8 *	14.7 *
VENTURA	62.2	44.5	8.8	9.0	22.0	20.8
YOLO	68.8	64.0	7.3 *	7.9 *	22.4	24.6
YUBA	94.3	61.3	13.2 *	6.7 *	30.3 *	22.5 *

COUNTY	MORBIDITY RATE REPORTED INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS C (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[4]		MORBIDITY RATE REPORTED INCIDENCE OF AIDS (AGED 13 AND OVER) (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[4]		MORBIDITY RATE REPORTED INCIDENCE OF TUBERCULOSIS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[4]	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**0.4**	**0.1**	**16.5**	**13.7**	**10.0**	**8.7**
ALAMEDA	0.0 *	0.1 *	19.0	16.4	16.0	12.0
ALPINE	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
AMADOR	0.0 +	0.0 +	9.7 *	4.1 *	0.9 *	0.0 +
BUTTE	1.8 *	0.0 +	6.6 *	6.4 *	2.1 *	1.7 *
CALAVERAS	0.0 +	0.0 +	3.8 *	2.6 *	0.8 *	0.0 +
COLUSA	3.5 *	1.7 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	5.3 *	1.7 *
CONTRA COSTA	0.0 +	0.0 *	10.7	10.3	9.8	7.1
DEL NORTE	1.2 *	1.2 *	8.7 *	7.0 *	1.2 *	1.2 *
EL DORADO	2.7 *	1.6 *	4.4 *	2.6 *	2.1 *	1.2 *
FRESNO	0.2 *	0.0 *	9.7	6.8	12.0	12.3
GLENN	6.2 *	1.2 *	7.9 *	4.5 *	1.2 *	3.6 *
HUMBOLDT	2.6 *	1.3 *	7.2 *	6.7 *	5.5 *	3.1 *
IMPERIAL	0.5 *	0.0 +	7.1 *	9.8 *	20.7	18.4
INYO	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	4.2 *	1.8 *	3.6 *
KERN	0.0 +	0.0 +	15.4	14.4	8.0	6.5
KINGS	10.5 *	0.0 +	5.9 *	7.9 *	7.4 *	2.9 *
LAKE	1.1 *	0.0 +	11.6 *	4.4 *	3.4 *	2.1 *
LASSEN	0.0 +	0.0 +	9.2 *	5.5 *	2.0 *	0.0 +
LOS ANGELES	0.4	0.1 *	22.8	19.0	12.3	10.3
MADERA	0.0 +	0.0 +	11.9 *	7.5 *	9.1 *	7.7 *
MARIN	0.1 *	0.0 +	20.3	12.0	4.8 *	5.6 *
MARIPOSA	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	3.9 *	0.0 +
MENDOCINO	0.4 *	0.7 *	10.7 *	4.0 *	2.7 *	5.2 *
MERCED	0.2 *	0.1 *	5.7 *	5.1 *	5.7 *	5.8 *
MODOC	0.0 +	0.0 +	4.2 *	0.0 +	7.0 *	0.0 +
MONO	0.0 +	0.0 +	6.1 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
MONTEREY	0.7 *	0.2 *	8.6	6.8	10.0	8.5
NAPA	0.0 +	0.0 +	4.5 *	4.6 *	2.1 *	5.1 *
NEVADA	1.4 *	0.7 *	5.1 *	1.2 *	1.4 *	0.7 *
ORANGE	0.2 *	0.1 *	10.2	8.1	9.0	7.8
PLACER	0.4 *	0.1 *	3.1 *	2.3 *	0.9 *	2.0 *
PLUMAS	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	9.0 *	1.6 *	0.0 +
RIVERSIDE	0.2 *	0.0 *	15.5	13.7	4.6	4.1
SACRAMENTO	0.5 *	0.1 *	11.9	7.7	9.4	10.5
SAN BENITO	1.2 *	0.0 +	3.2 *	3.8 *	8.1 *	4.1 *
SAN BERNARDINO	0.2 *	0.1 *	9.2	8.5	5.8	3.5
SAN DIEGO	0.0 +	0.0 *	19.2	17.0	10.9	10.7
SAN FRANCISCO	0.3 *	0.3 *	77.3	67.0	25.0	18.8
SAN JOAQUIN	0.1 *	0.1 *	11.9	10.1	11.6	9.9
SAN LUIS OBISPO	0.0 +	0.0 +	10.4	6.7 *	3.5 *	2.1 *
SAN MATEO	0.0 *	0.0 *	9.9	7.1	8.7	8.2
SANTA BARBARA	0.2 *	0.2 *	6.5	7.4	6.2	5.9
SANTA CLARA	0.0 *	0.1 *	9.0	7.3	13.7	13.2
SANTA CRUZ	0.0 +	0.1 *	9.5	7.2 *	3.2 *	3.1 *
SHASTA	1.0 *	1.7 *	3.0 *	2.0 *	2.8 *	3.0 *
SIERRA	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
SISKIYOU	0.7 *	6.7 *	6.2 *	1.7 *	1.5 *	0.0 +
SOLANO	0.1 *	0.1 *	21.6	13.6	7.9	7.8
SONOMA	0.4 *	0.1 *	9.9	11.8	3.1 *	3.6 *
STANISLAUS	0.4 *	0.0 +	6.1	6.8	5.1	3.9
SUTTER	0.0 +	0.4 *	2.6 *	2.4 *	6.3 *	4.7 *
TEHAMA	3.0 *	5.1 *	1.5 *	1.4 *	3.0 *	2.3 *
TRINITY	0.0 +	2.5 *	3.0 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +
TULARE	3.6 *	0.5 *	4.1 *	5.1 *	4.9 *	4.7 *
TUOLUMNE	3.0 *	2.3 *	4.9 *	2.7 *	1.8 *	0.6 *
VENTURA	0.0 +	0.0 *	6.8	5.7	7.0	8.8
YOLO	0.0 +	0.0 +	5.8 *	4.4 *	4.5 *	3.8 *
YUBA	22.6 *	7.8 *	5.0 *	2.0 *	9.4 *	8.3 *

COUNTY	MORBIDITY RATE REPORTED INCIDENCE CHLAMYDIA (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[4]		MORTALITY RATE INFANT MORTALITY, ALL RACE/ETHNIC GROUPS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[5]		PERCENT LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[6]	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1997 & 1999-2000	2001-2003	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**276.5**	**324.3**	**5.7**	**5.3**	**6.2**	**6.6**
ALAMEDA	331.7	339.4	5.4	4.8	6.8	6.9
ALPINE	80.2 *	105.2 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	0.0 +	3.0 *
AMADOR	44.2 *	76.4	2.6 *	4.9 *	4.7 *	5.2 *
BUTTE	173.3	265.3	5.5 *	6.2 *	5.2	5.7
CALAVERAS	48.1	72.7	2.1 *	5.1 *	4.7 *	6.4
COLUSA	163.8	129.8	8.2 *	3.0 *	5.0 *	4.1 *
CONTRA COSTA	210.5	256.0	4.9	4.0	6.5	6.5
DEL NORTE	104.9	94.6	8.5 *	8.1 *	4.8 *	4.1 *
EL DORADO	67.1	125.0	2.8 *	4.6 *	5.2	6.7
FRESNO	469.6	562.0	7.3	6.5	6.6	6.8
GLENN	141.0	179.8	4.2 *	3.2 *	5.6	4.4 *
HUMBOLDT	262.6	256.3	6.0 *	6.9 *	4.7	6.0
IMPERIAL	259.2	269.8	5.3 *	4.7 *	5.0	5.6
INYO	115.0	127.1	7.3 *	9.1 *	5.0 *	5.8 *
KERN	373.1	464.8	7.1	6.0	6.3	6.8
KINGS	333.3	406.2	6.7 *	5.9 *	6.1	6.3
LAKE	107.0	173.2	6.4 *	6.7 *	5.4	6.7
LASSEN	59.7	129.0	5.7 *	8.3 *	5.3 *	5.4 *
LOS ANGELES	342.6	393.9	5.6	5.4	6.5	7.0
MADERA	252.5	419.0	5.8 *	5.6 *	5.5	6.4
MARIN	112.6	132.9	3.4 *	3.3 *	5.6	6.3
MARIPOSA	64.0 *	87.6 *	15.5 *	4.8 *	7.2 *	4.8 *
MENDOCINO	177.7	207.9	6.4 *	7.7 *	3.8	5.8
MERCED	218.0	348.2	5.0 *	6.4	6.0	6.5
MODOC	80.9 *	83.8 *	8.1 *	0.0 +	4.3 *	7.5 *
MONO	128.8 *	62.0 *	5.5 *	6.7 *	6.0 *	7.4 *
MONTEREY	254.8	288.9	5.3	5.8	5.7	6.0
NAPA	88.6	98.3	3.1 *	3.1 *	5.1	5.7
NEVADA	74.3	114.5	2.6 *	1.6 *	5.3	6.0
ORANGE	177.9	191.5	4.7	4.6	5.6	6.1
PLACER	88.2	116.6	4.8 *	4.4 *	5.4	5.6
PLUMAS	48.0 *	69.2 *	4.5 *	3.9 *	3.7 *	6.7 *
RIVERSIDE	190.2	213.2	6.6	5.9	5.9	6.2
SACRAMENTO	365.6	406.8	6.5	5.7	6.6	6.6
SAN BENITO	137.0	219.1	5.1 *	4.0 *	5.1	4.8
SAN BERNARDINO	296.1	364.3	7.5	7.4	6.5	7.0
SAN DIEGO	297.3	352.0	5.7	4.9	6.0	6.2
SAN FRANCISCO	377.6	436.1	4.3	3.8	6.9	6.8
SAN JOAQUIN	329.4	393.9	6.4	7.1	6.1	6.8
SAN LUIS OBISPO	118.1	186.8	4.8 *	4.3 *	5.1	5.9
SAN MATEO	152.8	202.1	4.7	3.8	5.9	6.6
SANTA BARBARA	209.4	250.9	4.6	4.6	5.7	6.6
SANTA CLARA	225.5	282.0	5.0	3.9	6.1	6.5
SANTA CRUZ	196.6	216.0	5.3 *	4.1 *	5.1	5.4
SHASTA	212.6	328.7	6.9 *	6.7 *	5.6	5.8
SIERRA	73.3 *	18.7 *	0.0 +	0.0 +	2.3 *	6.4 *
SISKIYOU	126.8	204.1	3.8 *	3.0 *	7.2	7.3
SOLANO	274.9	324.2	5.4	5.5	6.8	6.9
SONOMA	118.1	140.4	4.7	4.4	5.6	5.1
STANISLAUS	248.9	318.7	7.5	7.3	6.0	6.5
SUTTER	179.5	197.3	5.7 *	2.9 *	6.0	5.8
TEHAMA	158.8	217.6	6.7 *	6.6 *	5.0	6.2
TRINITY	33.1 *	100.6 *	7.3 *	6.2 *	5.6 *	7.2 *
TULARE	352.2	426.1	6.2	6.4	5.7	5.9
TUOLUMNE	100.1	126.1	10.5 *	3.0 *	5.7	4.1
VENTURA	149.6	190.4	5.7	5.6	5.9	6.4
YOLO	157.0	206.6	5.5 *	5.3 *	5.1	5.5
YUBA	233.4	320.9	9.3 *	6.8 *	7.4	7.0

COUNTY	AGE-SPECIFIC BIRTH RATE BIRTHS AMONG ADOLESCENT MOTHERS, 15 TO 19 YEARS OLD (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)		PERCENT ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS PRENATAL CARE (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)[6]		PERCENT BREASTFED BIRTHS WITH KNOWN FEEDING METHOD (THREE-YEAR AVERAGES)	
	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004	1999-2001	2002-2004
CALIFORNIA	**46.3**	**39.2**	**76.4**	**78.3**	**82.0**	**83.7**
ALAMEDA	35.9	28.4	80.1	80.2	86.6	87.6
ALPINE	6.0 *	19.2 *	75.8 *	78.1 *	94.6 *	95.1 *
AMADOR	29.8	25.8	68.2	73.8	85.2	85.7
BUTTE	31.1	29.7	75.7	74.9	85.4	84.5
CALAVERAS	33.0	22.2	70.5	71.4	85.4	85.0
COLUSA	64.7	44.4	68.5	72.8	82.4	80.4
CONTRA COSTA	30.1	23.6	78.4	79.1	87.6	88.2
DEL NORTE	61.2	47.8	79.6	75.9	89.0	91.6
EL DORADO	25.5	18.8	77.6	70.7	90.0	90.0
FRESNO	69.2	58.4	83.7	85.7	78.5	81.9
GLENN	49.1	43.7	77.4	79.0	86.6	87.0
HUMBOLDT	31.6	28.1	70.3	65.9	89.8	89.4
IMPERIAL	67.8	59.0	65.7	66.0	75.5	78.2
INYO	42.8	31.3	73.2	64.3	88.2	89.7
KERN	71.1	64.4	76.7	75.9	76.1	79.0
KINGS	76.7	70.2	74.5	69.3	71.6	69.8
LAKE	50.3	36.2	64.9	65.6	82.7	84.4
LASSEN	35.0	32.8	81.3	77.4	88.9	88.4
LOS ANGELES	49.7	42.2	79.5	82.5	77.9	80.6
MADERA	72.7	66.2	70.5	74.4	78.0	82.3
MARIN	14.3	11.0	83.6	90.8	93.5	94.4
MARIPOSA	35.7	21.6 *	58.4	68.1	84.5	90.5
MENDOCINO	45.8	38.8	59.8	68.9	88.9	89.8
MERCED	66.0	53.5	56.9	57.2	78.8	82.7
MODOC	23.3 *	29.9 *	63.3	72.1	93.7	92.3
MONO	33.8 *	20.6 *	78.2	76.0	91.4	92.3
MONTEREY	61.0	57.4	73.7	77.5	91.6	90.3
NAPA	30.3	29.5	70.5	71.3	90.8	90.6
NEVADA	22.7	16.0	70.5	69.9	92.1	94.4
ORANGE	38.0	31.1	80.5	85.0	83.9	84.0
PLACER	21.8	18.4	81.1	79.1	90.0	89.7
PLUMAS	23.0 *	21.1 *	65.4	68.2	94.0	91.0
RIVERSIDE	54.1	44.2	71.5	75.3	76.6	79.3
SACRAMENTO	44.3	37.7	74.7	74.4	79.2	81.6
SAN BENITO	48.7	37.6	61.7	61.8	86.7	86.8
SAN BERNARDINO	57.3	45.9	72.9	76.2	74.0	76.5
SAN DIEGO	43.0	36.4	71.5	73.1	87.6	89.1
SAN FRANCISCO	27.9	24.0	76.4	80.4	86.6	89.1
SAN JOAQUIN	57.8	49.3	64.4	62.5	78.6	80.7
SAN LUIS OBISPO	23.2	21.7	81.9	79.9	92.6	91.6
SAN MATEO	29.9	23.8	80.6	83.8	92.2	92.9
SANTA BARBARA	39.9	39.6	75.2	77.8	90.1	91.7
SANTA CLARA	34.8	26.8	73.7	75.4	90.1	89.1
SANTA CRUZ	32.2	32.0	76.2	80.9	93.3	92.3
SHASTA	41.5	40.3	78.0	75.5	89.6	90.1
SIERRA	12.6 *	14.0 *	70.5 *	73.1	87.8 *	93.3 *
SISKIYOU	38.5	31.8	72.6	69.4	88.9	89.7
SOLANO	42.1	32.2	69.4	69.5	83.3	84.3
SONOMA	29.5	27.5	71.7	69.9	92.1	92.9
STANISLAUS	53.0	46.1	66.4	69.1	77.8	81.0
SUTTER	44.3	42.4	70.9	73.7	81.4	81.4
TEHAMA	56.2	48.3	77.9	73.9	85.6	86.4
TRINITY	40.2 *	21.8 *	55.6	60.4	89.7	92.0
TULARE	76.5	68.8	70.4	72.2	77.8	79.2
TUOLUMNE	27.9	23.8	70.5	75.6	86.8	89.5
VENTURA	41.0	34.6	84.3	81.9	86.9	88.0
YOLO	23.6	21.1	64.8	70.1	87.6	87.5
YUBA	74.4	62.5	66.2	71.1	74.2	75.8

TECHNICAL NOTES

DATA SOURCES

The California Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics, Office of Vital Records, was the source for the birth and death data that appear in this report. Data were tabulated from the Birth and Death Statistical Master Files for the years 1999 through 2001 and 2002 through 2004, and from the linked births-deaths in the Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files for the years 1997, 1999, and 2000 through 2003, which are based on the Statistical Master Files. Preliminary Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome File data were used for 2003 and may not be complete because a small number of records could not be resolved in the birth/death linkage process at the time of this publication's development.

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

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

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

DATA DEFINITIONS

Mortality (Tables 1-13):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Due to staffing shortages within the Center for Health Statistics, a birth cohort file was not created for 1998. Therefore, three-year birth cohort averages were created using years 1997, 1999, and 2000 through 2003. Caution should be exercised when using this three-year average infant mortality rate for trend analysis.

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

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

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

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

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

Effective with the 2000 data year, this state began collecting up to three races on birth and death certificates. In order to permit use of the 2001-2003 Birth Cohort-Perinatal Outcome Files for comparison with and analysis of race data from earlier files, the mother's first listed race was used unless Hawaiian appeared as the second or third listed race, in which case Hawaiian would be selected as the first race. This is consistent with methodology used by the NCHS for "bridging" between multiple and single race categories. First listed race is also used in some other California Center for Health Statistics reports.

Natality (Tables 21-23B): The natality data were obtained from the Birth Statistical Master Files from 2002 through 2004. Records with unknown birthweight were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 21. Also, records with unknown prenatal care were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 23A, and records with unknown adequacy of prenatal care were excluded from the total number of live births shown in Table 23B.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CRUDE RATES AND AGE-ADJUSTED RATES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RELIABILITY OF RATES

All vital statistics rates, including morbidity rates, are subject to random variation. This variation is inversely related to the number of events (e.g., death) used to calculate the rate. Small frequency in the occurrence of an event results in the greater the likelihood that random fluctuations will be found within a specified time period. Rare events are relatively less stable in their occurrence from observation to observation. Even present day statewide crude death rates may be interpreted as "rare" events occurring on the average of less than one death in 153 persons in the course of a year. (See Table 1: Deaths Due to All Causes, which shows 654.0 deaths per 100,000 population statewide.)

As a consequence, counties with only a few deaths, or a few cases of morbidity, can have highly unstable rates from year-to-year. The observation and enumeration of rare events is beset with uncertainty. The observation of no vital events is especially hazardous, regardless of the size of the population. This report reduces some year-to-year fluctuation in the occurrence of rare events by basing some rates on three-year average number of vital events (e.g., 2002-2004), divided by the population in the middle year (e.g. 2003). The "standard error" of a death rate and "coefficient of variation" (or relative standard error) provide a rational basis for determining which rates may be considered "unreliable."

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

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

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

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

RANKING OF COUNTIES

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

FORMULAS USED IN THIS REPORT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lower 95% CL = ADR – (1.96 x SE_y)   Upper 95% CL = ADR + (1.96 x SE_y)

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

PROCEDURE FOR CALCULATING AGE-ADJUSTED RATES
BY THE DIRECT METHOD

Age-adjusted rates calculated in this report follow the procedure that was used to set the Year 2010 National Objectives. The standard population was the year 2000 United States population.   The data below were taken from Table 1: Deaths Due to All Causes, 2002-2004 for Alameda County.

ALAMEDA COUNTY					
AGE GROUPS (A)	2002-2004 DEATHS (AVERAGE) (A)	2003 POPULATION (B)	AGE-SPECIFIC RATE/100,000 (C)	2000 U.S. STANDARD MILLION PROPORTIONS (D)	WEIGHTED RATE FACTORS (E)
TOTAL	9,530.7	1,495,367	637.3		
Unknown	3.7				
<1	99.7	20,978	475.1	0.013818	6.6
1-4	14.0	81,656	17.1	0.055317	0.9
5-14	27.3	200,699	13.6	0.145565	2.0
15-24	131.7	192,900	68.3	0.138646	9.5
25-34	193.3	244,908	78.9	0.135573	10.7
35-44	385.0	253,994	151.6	0.162613	24.6
45-54	825.7	213,759	386.3	0.134834	52.1
55-64	1,084.3	135,873	798.0	0.087247	69.6
65-74	1,469.3	75,701	1,941.0	0.066037	128.2
75-84	2,648.0	54,548	4,854.4	0.044842	217.7
>84	2,648.7	20,351	13,014.9	0.015508	201.8
AGE-ADJUSTED RATE---					723.7

STEP 1: Array the data of three-year average number of deaths and population for 11 age groups in columns A and B.

STEP 2: Calculate age-specific rates by dividing the number of deaths in column A (numerator) by the population in column B (denominator). Multiply the result (quotient) by the base of 100,000 to obtain the rates in column C.

STEP 3: Multiply each age-specific rate in column C by the corresponding 2000 U.S. Standard Million proportion in column D and enter the result in column E.

STEP 4: The values for each age group in column E are summed to obtain the Age-Adjusted Death Rate for Alameda County of 723.7 per 100,000 population.

STEP 5: Repeat Steps 1 through 4 for each county and the statewide total. Note that the 2000 U.S. Standard Million proportions remain the same for each county and the state.

STEP 6: Direct comparisons can now be made among the counties, with the removal of the effect that varying county age compositions may have on death rates.

COMPARISON OF CALIFORNIA'S HEALTH STATUS PROFILES 2006 REPORT RATES WITH U.S. RATES				

HP2010 OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR	NATIONAL OBJECTIVE	UNITED STATES[1]	CALIFORNIA[2]	CALIFORNIA vs UNITED STATES (% Difference)
MORTALITY (per 100,000 population)					
	ALL CAUSES OF DEATH	N/E	832.7	704.5	-15.4%
15-15a	MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS	8.0	14.8	12.1	-18.2%
15-13	UNINTENTIONAL INJURIES	17.1	37.3	29.3	-21.4%
15-03	FIREARM INJURIES	3.6	10.3	9.4	-8.7%
15-32	HOMICIDE	2.8	6.0	6.7	11.7%
18-01	SUICIDE	4.8	10.8	9.4	-13.0%
03-01	ALL CANCERS	158.6	190.1	164.1	-13.7%
03-02	LUNG CANCER	43.3	54.1	41.8	-22.7%
03-03	FEMALE BREAST CANCER	21.3	25.3	22.8	-9.9%
12-01	CORONARY HEART DISEASE [3]	162.0	172.0	164.7	-4.2%
12-07	CEREBROVASCULAR DISEASE	50.0	53.5	52.4	-2.1%
26-03	DRUG-INDUCED DEATHS	1.2	9.9	10.0	1.0%
05-05	DIABETES	N/A[1]	25.3	21.3	-15.8%
MORBIDITY (per 100,000 population)					
14-09	HEPATITIS C INCIDENCE	1.0	1.6	0.1	-93.8%
13-01	AIDS INCIDENCE (AGE 13 AND OVER)	1.0	17.6	13.7	-22.2%
14-11	TUBERCULOSIS INCIDENCE	1.0	5.1	8.7	70.6%
25-01	CHLAMYDIA INCIDENCE	N/A[2]	a	324.3	
25-03	SYPHILIS INCIDENCE	0.2	2.5	3.4	36.0%
14-01e	MEASLES INCIDENCE	0.0	a	0.0	
INFANT MORTALITY (per 1,000 live births)					
16-01c	INFANT DEATHS: ALL RACES	4.5	7.0	5.3	-24.3%
16-01c	INFANT DEATHS: ASIAN/PACIFIC ISL.	4.5	4.8	4.1	-14.6%
16-01c	INFANT DEATHS: BLACK	4.5	13.8	11.2	-18.8%
16-01c	INFANT DEATHS: HISPANIC	4.5	5.6	5.1	-8.9%
16-01c	INFANT DEATHS: WHITE	4.5	5.8	4.7	-19.0%
NATALITY (per 100 live births; 1,000 population)					
16-10a	LOW BIRTHWEIGHT INFANTS	5.0	7.9	6.6	-16.5%
16-06a	LATE OR NO PRENATAL CARE	10.0	16.0	13.0	-18.8%
16-06b	ADEQUATE/ADEQUATE PLUS CARE	90.0	75.4	78.3	3.8%
	BIRTHS TO MOTHERS AGED 15-19	N/E	41.6	39.2	-5.8%
BREASTFEEDING (per 100 births)					
16-19a	BREASTFEEDING INITIATION	75.0	68.0	83.7	23.1%
CENSUS 2003					
	PERSONS UNDER 18 IN POVERTY	N/E	17.6	19.6	11.4%

a   Not shown due to incompatible rate methodology.

[1]   2003 mortality, morbidity, and natality; 2002 infant mortality; 2003 teenage births and breastfeeding.

[2]   2002-2004 three-year average. 2001-2003 infant death three-year average.

[3]   Limited to International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes I11, I20-I25.

N/A[1]   National Objective is based on both underlying and contributing cause of death which requires use of multiple cause of death data files. California's data exclude multiple/contributing cause of death.

N/A[2]   Prevalence data is not available in California to evaluate Healthy People 2010 national objective of no more than 3 percent testing positive in the population aged 15 to 24 years.

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

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

Sources: Department of Health Services: Center for Health Statistics, Birth and Death Statistical Master Files, 2002-2004, and Birth Cohort Files, 2001-2003; Division of Communicable Disease Control, Office of Statistics and Surveillance; Office of AIDS, AIDS Case Registry; Genetic Disease Branch, Newborn Screening Program. Department of Finance: 2003 Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, May 2004.
National Center for Health Statistics: Deaths: Preliminary Data for 2003, National Vital Statistics Reports; Vol 53 No. 15, February 2005.
National Center for Health Statistics: Births: Final Data for 2003, National Vital Statistics Reports; Vol 54 No. 2, September 2005.
U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Healthy People 2010, CDC Wonder website at URL: http://wonder.cdc.gov/data2010/obj.htm
U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Breastfeeding website at URL: http://www.cdc.gov/breastfeeding/data/NIS_data/data_2003.htm

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy People 2010 Objectives (Second Edition, in Two Volumes). Washington, D.C., January 2001.*

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

COUNTY HEALTH STATUS PROFILES
PUBLICATION ORDER FORM

MAIL ORDER
FORM TO:

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

Phone #: (916) 552-8095
Fax #: (916) 650-6889

Publication Year (a)	Total Number of Copies (b)	Cost *Per Copy* (c)	Total Cost (b) x (c)
Year 2006:		$10.00	$
	Total Enclosed		**$**

Prior year reports from 1993-2005 may also be ordered. Please call or contact the Center for Health Statistics before placing an order for back issues to determine hardcopy availability. Profiles publications for 1998-2006 are also available in Adobe PDF format at no charge on our website at http://www.dhs.ca.gov/hisp/chs/OHIR/publication/publicationindex.htm Payment for hardcopies must accompany the order. Please do not send cash. Please make your **check or money order** payable to the **"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES."**

Prior Publication Year(s) (Enter Year)	Total Number of Copies (b)	Cost *Per Copy* (c)	Total Cost (b) x (c)
Prior Year:		$10.00	$
Prior Year:		$10.00	$
Prior Year:		$10.00	$
Prior Year:		$10.00	$
	Total Enclosed		**$**

PLEASE MAIL THE ABOVE PUBLICATIONS TO:

Name: _____

Agency: _____

Address: _____

City & State: _____

Zip Code: _____

Telephone: _____

E-Mail: _____