# York Public Health District District Public Health Improvement Plan 2017 – 2019



## York District Coordinating Council for Public Health



Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention An Office of the poortment of Health and Human Services

Paul R. LePage, Governor

Mary C. Mayhew, Commissioner



## Vision

## We envision a comprehensive, well-coordinated, accessible, and equitable public health system for all in York County.

## Mission

Our mission is to promote, improve, sustain, and advocate for the delivery of the essential public health services in York County. We strive to: collaborate, communicate, and advance partnerships at all levels of the public health system; engage York District partners in public health planning, assessment, evaluation, and quality improvement.

## **Maine's Public Health Districts**



## York Public Health District

York Public Health District includes York County, the most south western county in Maine. The district covers 1,271 square miles, with a population of 201,169 (United States Census Bureau, estimated 2015). The district encompasses 29 cities and towns, with its largest municipalities being Biddeford, Saco, and Sanford. 52.8% of residents in the district live in areas classified as rural.

## **York District Coordinating Council**

Our mission is to promote, improve, sustain, and advocate for the delivery of the essential public health services in York County. We strive to: collaborate, communicate, and advance partnerships at all levels of the public health system; engage York District partners in public health planning, assessment, evaluation, and quality improvement.

Leaders	Leadership: Executive Committee for 2016 - 2017						
Name	Leadership	Organization					
Clay Graybeal	Chair	University of New England					
Sarah Breul	Vice Char	University of New England/Coastal Healthy Communities Coalition					
Betsy Kelly	State Coordinating Council Representative	Southern Maine Health Care					
Jackie Tselikis	Member	N/A					
Ted Trainer	Member	Kennebunkport Rotary					
Meaghan Arzberger	Member	York County Community Action Council					
Sue Patterson	Member	York Hospital					
Diane Gerry	Member	York County Shelter Program					
Adam Hartwig	District Liaison	Maine State CDC					

Council Members as of 2016 who contributed to this plan						
Greg Zinser Laurie Trenholm Tessa Mazza						
Amber HarrisonGretchen LitchfieldDawn Gray						
Donna DeBlois	Renee Longarini	Barbara Wentworth				
Deb Erickson-Irons	Kate Meredith	Kristen Garvin				
Paul Weiss	Nik Charov	John Leighton				

### Table of Contents

Cover Page	1
York District Coordinating Council Mission and Vision	2
Maine Public Health Districts	3
York Public Health District	3
York District Coordinating Council	4
Table of Contents	5
Maine's District Public Health Infrastructure	6
District Public Health Planning Process	5
York District Public Health Improvement Plan Summary	11
Implementation Plan Design	12
Priority Area 1: Nutrition and Obesity	13
Priority Area 2: Oral Health	14
Priority Area 3: Substance Misuse	15
Appendices and Contact Information	16
Appendix 1: York District Health Profile 2015-2016	17

## Maine's District Public Health Infrastructure

## **Public Health Districts and District Coordinating Councils**

The Public Health Districts were formed in 2008 as part of Maine's Statewide Public Health System Development Initiative called for in the 2007 Public Health Work Group Recommendations (22 MRSA §412). The Tribal Public Health District was established as Maine's ninth Public Health District in 2011, with the Act to Amend the Laws Regarding Public Health Infrastructure (22 MRSA §411). The establishment of the nine Districts was designed to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of public health services and resources.

According to Maine law, the Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention "shall maintain a district coordinating council for public health (DCC) in each of the nine districts as resources permit (22 MRSA §412). This is a representative district wide body of local public health stakeholders working toward collaborative public health planning and coordination to ensure effectiveness and efficiencies in the public health system." (22 MRSA §411)

The statutory language further states:

"A district coordinating council for public health shall:

- (1) participate as appropriate in district-level activities to help ensure the state public health system in each district is ready and maintained for accreditation; and
- (2) ensure that the essential public health services and resources are provided for in each district in the most efficient, effective and evidence-based manner possible." (22 MRSA §412)

## **District Public Health Planning Process**

The District Public Health Improvement Plan (DPHIP) identifies the individual district's public health priorities in order to create a multi-year plan of objectives, strategies, and outcomes for district action. The DPHIP also informs partners of the district work and is used to inform the State Health Improvement Plan (SHIP).

The purpose and importance of creating and implementing a DPHIP is based on the ten essential public health services through assessment, policy development, and assurance. Through the DPHIP, the DCC is working locally and regionally to meet public health accreditation and national public health standards through a community-based, multi-sector partnership to improve the public's health.

The Maine CDC is required to create and implement a State Health Improvement Plan (SHIP), designed to improve the health of all Maine people. The previous versions of the DPHIPs and SHIP were developed simultaneously, and partially aligned. In 2017, a new SHIP will be developed. In order to better coordinate health improvement efforts and resources between the state, districts, and Maine's people, priorities selected for the DPHIPs will inform this new SHIP. This is the third York District Public Health Improvement Plan with previous versions created in 2008 and 2012.

In 2015-2016, a collaborative process called the Shared Health Needs Assessment and Planning Process (SHNAPP) was created by Maine's four largest health-care systems – Central Maine Healthcare, Eastern Maine Healthcare Systems (EMHS), MaineGeneral Health, MaineHealth – and Maine CDC to integrate public health and health care needs assessment and community engagement. The SHNAPP serves as a platform for developing the current DPHIPs.

The graphic below shows the planning process over the past year portraying a four phase approach—collection of quantitative (health indicator statistics) and qualitative (survey of professionals and community organizations of field knowledge) data, creating a "Shared Community Health Needs Assessment (Shared CHNA)" for each district, partnering with hospitals to facilitate community input, and then creating implementation strategies (hospital community plans) and district public health improvement plans (public health districts).



The data in the Shared CHNA (see Appendix 1 for district data summary) provides a starting point for discussing the health issues that face Maine people. The indicators chosen for the Shared CHNA cover a broad range of topics, but are not intended to be an exhaustive analysis of all available data on any single health issue. District-shared CHNAs can be used to compare a health indicator in the district, in the counties making up the district, in the State of Maine, and to the national values.

Qualitative data were collected through a statewide stakeholder survey conducted in May and June 2015 with 1,639 people representing more than 80 organizations and businesses in Maine. The survey was developed using a collaborative process that included Maine SHNAPP partners, Market Decisions Research and Hart Consulting, and a number of other stakeholders and health experts. In York County, a total of 86 stakeholders responded to the survey.

During 2015-2016, a community engagement process was used to bring the numbers to life. Thirty-four community forums and fifty-two smaller events with more narrow audiences such as business leaders, or healthcare providers were held across the state, with over 3,000 attendees. A selection of the data from the SHNAPP was presented at each event, and participants discussed their priorities, assets and resources to address the issues, community needs and barriers, and next steps and solutions. The discussions were captured by facilitators and recorders and compiled for each district. Summaries from the community engagement events provided support for the next planning steps.

On September 12, 2016, the York District Coordinating Council met to vote on the top health priorities for the district. Prior to voting, the Council was presented with information on the top five health disparities in the district, data from the SHNAPP, and data from MYIHS to inform the decision making process. Council members were given four stickers to vote on the priorities that Executive Committee had categorized based on a list of approved topics from the Maine State CDC. Council members who were not present were given an electronic survey, and a week to complete their votes. The voting process led to three final proprities for this plan: Nutrition and Obesity, Oral Health, and Substance Abuse.

York District used the following criteria from the Collective Impact Framework:

- Maximize impact and optimize limited resources: District partners should first assess existing work being done in the district and determine how best to enhance and not duplicate these efforts. This criterion also speaks to collaboration across district partners, bringing the priority home to the specific organization, and leveraging existing resources.
- Use evidence-based strategies and population-based interventions: Districts should invest time in doing research on evidence-based strategies used successfully for

a specific disease area. For example, the Guide to Community Preventive Services (<u>http://www.thecommunityguide.org/</u>) provides recommendations for best practices for prevention services by a national task force of subject matter experts at the federal CDC.

- Best addressed at the district level: In Maine, many community actions are very local. However, some issues may be better addressed at a district level. The district should consider whether it can provide a platform for collaboration of non-typical partners; or be an avenue for policy and environmental change that ismore difficult to achieve at the local community level.
- Involve multiple sectors: District coordinating councils require active recruitment of multiple sectors across the public health continuum. Districts need to actively engage all partners that have the value of health as their mission. Districts should consider those health issues that can best be addressed by involving multiple sectors.
- Address district health disparities: The district should consider whether they can reduce health disparities between their district and the state or within their population by addressing a specific issue. Populations to consider as having potential health disparities include racial and ethnic minorities, immigrants, migrant farm workers, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people, people at low income levels, people with veteran's status, people with lower levels of educational attainment, people with physical impairments (including deafness, blindness and other physical disabilities), people with mental impairments (including those with developmental disabilities and mental illness), people over sixty years old, and youth.
- Strengthen/Assure Accountability: The district should consider whether change can be meaningfully measured and whether they can hold themselves accountable for changes in outcomes.
- Focus on Prevention: While some issues may be addressed through treatment in the health care system, for the Public Health Improvement plans districts should focus on whether outcomes can be prevented. This may include primary prevention (focus on the entire population), secondary prevention (focus on those at highest risk), or tertiary prevention (focus on those with existing conditions). Social determinants of health (social and physical environmental factors impacting health) should also be considered.
- Data driven: Based on the planned three-year cycle for health improvement plans, districts should be able to track short-term and long-term changes using data indicators. Although some data indicators may not change substantially in a short time

Aroostook District Coordinating Council DPHIP 2017 – 2019 Approved December 2016

frame, being able to consistently use these data to measure change is important. However, shorter-term impacts and intermediate outcomes may also provide important information on determining if specific actions will lead to population health improvement.

- Community Support: Districts should be aware of the local priorities within the district, and seek common ground across the community, as well as in different sectors in the districts. Even when communities within the same county may not necessarily agree on specific strategies, there may be agreement on what the priorities are.
- Gaps in prevention services: The district should consider if a health issue has not been adequately addressed across the district or in some parts of the district. An appropriate discussion on root causes, barriers to services, or gap analysis may be an appropriate way to address this.

#### York District Public Health Improvement Plan

#### **Community Health Improvement Priories**

The top public health priority areas chosen by the York District Coordinating Council for focused district wide community health improvement efforts over the next three years (2017 – 2019) include:

- Nutrition and Obesity
- > Oral Health
- Substance Abuse

The remainder of this plan provides more in-depth information about each of the public health priority areas listed above and plans for improvement. Through district and community based workgroups, council partners have identified goals, objectives and strategies, and will develop detailed work plans to meet their outcomes.

## **Implementation Plan Design**

Once priority areas were identified, objectives were created and strategies selected.

Objectives are based on the SMART model: Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic or Relevant, and Time-limited. SMART objectives are used to provide a structured approach to systematically monitor progress toward a target and to succinctly communicate intended impact and current progress to stakeholders.

Strategies or action steps were identified and designed to meet the outcomes of the objective. They may lead to short term impacts or intermediate outcomes that are clearly linked to the objectives. Not all possible strategies are able to be addressed within the DPHIP. The DCC considered possible strategies and selected one that met criteria such as those used in selecting the priority areas:

- > Does it maximize impact and use of limited resources?
- ➢ Is it evidence-based?
- ➢ Is it population-based?
- ➢ Is it feasible at the district level?
- Does it involve multiple sectors and partners?
- Does it address district disparities?
- > Can the DCC hold itself accountable for achieving the impact or outcome?
- ➢ Is it prevention-focused?
- > Does the data support the use of the strategy?
- > Is there adequate community support, or can this be built?
- Is there an organization that is willing to take the lead?
- Does it fill a gap?

## Priority Area 1: Nutrition and Obesity

[	Priority: Nutrition and Ob	esity		
	Description/Rationale/Crit weight are essential for an developing numerous healt diabetes and cancer. They a According to the 2015 SHN	eria: Eating a healthy diet, b individual's overall health. T th conditions, including high also can help prevent existin	eing physically active and m 'hese three factors can help l cholesterol, high blood pres g health conditions from wo County are eating fewer frui in York County are 28.4%	ower the risk of sure, heart disease, stroke, rsening over time.
ĺ	Goal	Objectives	Strategies	District Partners
I	<ol> <li>Promote health and reduce chronic disease risk through the consumption of healthful diets</li> </ol>	1.1 By 2020, increase fruit and vegetable consumption for all by implementing Fruit and Vegetable Prescription Program	<ul> <li>1.1.A Engage Wholesome Wave for technical assistance</li> <li>1.1.B. Build capacity by creating partnership with one large super market in York County to accept FVRx vouchers</li> <li>1.1.C. Build capacity by engaging health care providers and encouraging them to give FVRx vouchers to patients</li> </ul>	TBD
l		Increase proportion of physician office visits that include education related to nutrition or weight by 2020	<ul> <li>1.2.A. Providers will educate patients by distributing nutrition education information at visit, targeting only dentists and OBGYNs to broaden Let's Go Strategies.</li> <li>1.2.B Providers will refer patients to community based nutrition resources (SNAP-ED Classes, WIC workshops, UMaine: Eat Well Nutrition Program)</li> </ul>	
		1.3 Increase participation in WIC by 2020	1.3.A. Collaborate with WIC to increase enrollment in program.	
		1.4 Increase participation in Market Bucks by 2020	1.4.A. Participating health care providers will include information on how to use Market Bucks with their FVRx vouchers	

## **Priority Area 2: Oral Health**

#### Priority: Oral Health

Description/Rationale/Criteria: Access to timely, appropriate, high-quality and regular oral health care and preventive oral health services is a key component of maintaining health. Good access to oral health care can be limited by financial, structural, and personal barriers. Access to oral health care is affected by location of and distance to dental clinics, limited number of providers, availability of transportation and the cost of obtaining the services – including the availability of insurance, the ability to understand and act upon information regarding services, the cultural competency of oral health care providers and a host of other characteristics of the system and its clients. According to the 2015 SHNAPP, 51.5% of MaineCare members in York County under 18 visited the dentist in the past year, compared to the state rate of 55.1%.

Goal	Objectives	Strategies	District Partners
1. Increase availability of treatment options available to residents	1.1 By 2020, increase percent of low income children and adolescents in York County who received any preventative oral health or dental services in the past year to align with state averages	<ul> <li>1.1.A Expand school based oral health care partnership with the University of New England from one school to four schools</li> <li>1.1.B Increase the number elementary schools to offer oral health education at schools, including preventative oral health services, such as dental screenings, to children and adolescents</li> </ul>	TBD
	1.2 Increase awareness for parents about the importance of oral health by 2020	1.2.A. Develop and implement a comprehensive public education/parent education campaign on the benefits of good oral health	
	1.3 Increase the number of schools that have oral health education included in health policies that include oral health screenings to ensure that all students have access to at least one screening per year by 2020	<ul> <li>1.3.A. Conduct gap analysis to understand which schools in York County need comprehensive oral health care policies</li> <li>1.3.B. Work with PTO/PTA and school nurses to help schools develop policies that do not already have them in place</li> </ul>	

### **Priority Area 3: Substance Misuse**

#### Priority: Substance Misuse

Description/Rationale/Criteria: Substance misuse and dependence are preventable health risks that lead to increased medical costs, injuries, related diseases, cancer and even death. Substance misuse also adversely affects productivity and increases rates of crime and violence. According to the 2015 SHNAPP, in York County, past-30-day marijuana use for high school students in York county is at 22.7%, as compared with the state rate of 21.6%. Past 30-day-day marijuana use for adults is at 8.8%. Drug induced mortality rates are slightly higher in York County than the State rates, similarly with emergency medical service overdose response rates.

	DI I I D		
Goal	Objectives	Strategies	District Partners
1. Reduce substance use	1.1 Increase awareness	1.1.A. Complete	TBD
rates to protect the	of available community	inventory of existing	
health, safety, and	resources for prevention,	community resources	
quality of life for all	treatment, and recovery	and gap analysis of	
	by 2020	community resources	
	by 2020	5	
		(211, asset map, SAMHS,	
		etc.)	
		1.1.B. Increase public	
		awareness and use of	
		community resources by	
		compiling information	
		and developing an	
		electronic resource guide	

## Appendices

1. York District 2015-2016 Health Profile: this is a health profile of the district using a set of <u>quantitative</u> indicators established by the Maine CDC Data Work Group and <u>qualitative</u> input. The <u>quantitative</u> indicators come from sources that Maine CDC uses to report disease incidence and prevalence data, including the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, Maine Health Data Organization (hospitalization data), US Census, and other health surveillance systems. The <u>qualitative</u> stakeholder input on the first page is a summary of the top five health issues and top five health factors in the district determined from a survey instrument that was distributed electronically to partners in each district.

**For more information on Maine's Public Health Districts,** please visit the Maine CDC website at <a href="http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/mecdc/">http://www.maine.gov/dhhs/mecdc/</a> and choose *District Public Health* from the menu.

For more information on the Aroostook District Coordinating Council, please contact Adam Hartwig, District Liaison, at <u>Adam.Hartwig@maine.gov</u> or Clay Graybeal, Chair, at <u>cgraybeal@une.edu</u>

## Appendix 1: York District Health Profile 2015-2016

Maine Shared Community Health Needs Asse County Summary: 2015	sment			York C	ounty
				Updated	October 20
Qualitative Stakeholder Input					
A survey of 86 health professionals and community stakeh	olders in York	County pro	vided in	nsight into t	he most
critical health issues and determinants impacting the lives	of those living	in the area	Accor	ding to thes	e
stakeholders, the following five health issues and health fa	ctors have the	most imp	act on Y	ork County	resulting
in poor health outcomes for residents.					
Top five health issues					
Mental health	Top five hea	ith factors			
	<ul> <li>Poverty</li> </ul>				
Drug and alcohol abuse	<ul> <li>Transporta</li> </ul>	tion			
Obesity	<ul> <li>Access to b</li> </ul>	ehavioral o	are/me	ntal health	care
<ul> <li>Physical activity and nutrition</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Health liter</li> </ul>	acy			
Tobacco use	<ul> <li>Housing sta</li> </ul>	ability			
Maine Shared CHNA Health Indicators	Year	York	Trend	Maine	U.S.
Demographics	rear	TOTA	menia	manie	0.5
Total Population	2013	199,431		1,328,302	319 Mil
Population – % ages 0-17	2013	20.1%		19.7%	23.3%
Population – % ages 18-64	2013	62.6%		62.6%	62.6%
Population – % ages 65+	2013	17.3%		17.7%	14.1%
Population – % White	2013	96.3%		95.2%	77.7%
Population – % Black or African American	2013	0.7%		1.4%	13.2%
Population – % American Indian and Alaska Native	2013	0.3%		0.7%	1.2%
Population – % Asian	2013	1.2%		1.1%	5.3%
Population – % Hispanic	2013	1.5%		1.4%	17.1%
Population – % with a disability	2013	13.8%		15.9%	12.1%
Population density (per square mile)	2013	199.0		43.1	87.4
Socioeconomic Status Measures			_		
Adults living in poverty	2009-2013	9.5%	NA	13.6%	15.4%
Children living in poverty	2009-2013	11.5%	NA	18.5%	21.6%
High school graduation rate	2013-2014	89.0%	NA	86.5%	81.0%
Median household income	2009-2013	\$57,348	NA	\$48,453	\$53,046
Percentage of people living in rural areas	2013	52.8%	NA	66.4%	NA
Single-parent families	2009-2013	30.1%	NA	34.0%	33.2%
Unemployment rate	2014	5.3%	NA	5.7%	6.2%
65+ living alone General Health Status	2009-2013	41.1%	NA	41.2%	37.7%
	2011-2013	47.4W		AT CN	46.70/
Adults who rate their health fair to poor Adults with 14+ days lost due to poor montal health	2011-2013	13.4% 11.7%	<u> </u>	15.6% 12.4%	16.7% NA
Adults with 14+ days lost due to poor mental health Adults with 14+ days lost due to poor physical health	2011-2013	11.7%	<u> </u>	12.4%	NA
Adults with 14+ days lost due to poor physical health Adults with three or more chronic conditions	2011-2013	27.2%	<u> </u>	27.6%	NA
Adults with three or more chronic conditions Mortality	2012, 2013	21.270		27.070	MA
Life expectancy (Female)	2012	82.3	NA	81.5	81.2
Life expectancy (Male)	2012	77.8	NA	76.7	76.4
Overall mortality rate per 100,000 population	2009-2013	683.9	NA	745.8	731.9
Access					
Adults with a usual primary care provider	2011-2013	89.9%		87.7%	76.6%
Individuals who are unable to obtain or delay obtaining	2014 2012	44.79		44.0%	45.394
necessary medical care due to cost	2011-2013	11.3%		11.0%	15.3%
MaineCare enrollment	2015	21.2%	NA	27.0%	23.0%
Percent of children ages 0-19 enrolled in MaineCare	2015	33.8%	NA	41.8%	48.0%
Percent uninsured	2009-2013	9.1%	NA	10.4%	11.7%
Health Care Quality					
Ambulatory care-sensitive condition hospital admission rate per	2011	1 261 0	+	1 400 2	1457.5
100,000 population	2011	1,261.0	+	1,499.3	1457.

Maine Shared CHNA Health Indicators	Year	York	Trend	Maine	U.S.
Ambulatory care-sensitive condition emergency department rate per 100,000 population	201:	3,989.3	NA	4,258.8	NA
Oral Health		and the spectrum of		- 1	- CALL DEL
Adults with visits to a dentist in the past 12 months MaineCare members under 18 with a visit to the centist in the	2012	58.9% 51.5%	NA	65.3% 55.1%	67.25 NA
past year Respiratory	eto a como	51.5.5	- The second	23.270	1475
Asthma emergency department visits per 10,000 population	2009-2011	61.1		67.3	NA
CCPD diagnosed	2011-2013	8.0%		7.6%	6.5%
CCPD hospitalizations per 100,000 population	2011	165.2		216.3	NA
Current asthma (Adults)	2011-2013	11.2%		11.7%	9.0%
Current asthma (Youth 0-17)	2011-2013	10.2%†	NA	9.1%	NA
Pneumonia emergency department rate per 100,000 population	2011	723.4	32.3	719.9	NA
Pneumonia hospitalizations per 100,000 population	2011	272.0		329.4	NA
Cancer Mortality – all cancers per 100,000 population	2007-2011	178.9	NA	185.5	168.3
Incidence – all cancers per 100,000 population	2007-2011	510.4	NA	500.1	453.4
Bladder concer incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011	31.1	NA	28.3	20.2
Female breast cancer mortality per 100,000 population	2007-2011	19.0	NA	20.0	21.5
Breast cancer late stage incidence (females only) per 100,000	2037-2011	44.0	NA	41.6	43.7
population					
Female breast cancer incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011	132.0	NA	126.3	124.1
Mammograms females age 50+ in past two years Colorectal cancer mortality per 100,000 population	2012	82.0%	NA	82.1%	77.03
Colorectal fate-stage incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011 2007-2011	15.8	NA	16.1	15.1
Colorectal cancer incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011	23.3	NA	22.7	22.9
Colorectal screening	2012	45.6	NA NA	43.5	42.0 NA
Lung cancer mortality per 100,000 population	2012	49.4	NA	54.3	46.0
Lung cancer incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011	69.4	NA	75.5	58.6
Melanoma incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011	27.8	NA	22.2	21.3
Pap smears females ages 21-65 in past three years	2012	86.4%	NA	88.0%	78.09
Prostate cancer mortality per 100,000 population	2007-2011	19.8	NA	22.1	20.8
Prostate cancer incidence per 100,000 population	2007-2011	142.7	NA	133.8	140.8
Tobacco-related neop asms, mortality per 100,000 population	2007-2011	37.0	NA	37.4	34.3
Tobacco-related neoplasms, incidence per 100,000 population	2007 2011	95.9	NA	31.9	81.7
Cardiovascular Elisease	Witness of the Party of	ALC IN COMPANY	Contract we	CONTRACTOR OF	5920
Acute myocare all infarction hospitalizations per 10,000	and the state of the	Manager Street and Street	Street, Street	No. of Concerns	
population	2010-2012	18.5		23.5	NA
Acute myocardial infarction mortality per 100,000 population	2009-2013	25,3	NA	32.2	32.4
Cholesterol checked every five years	2011.2013	82.4%		81.0%	76.4%
Coronary heart disease mortality per 100,000 population	2005-2013	74.5	NA	89.8	102.6
Heart failure hospitalizations per 10,000 population	2010-2012	21.5		21.9	NA
Hypertension prevalence	2011, 2013	33.6%		32.8%	31.4%
High charesterol	2011, 2013	41.0%		40.3%	38.4%
Hypertension hospitalizations per 100,000 population	2011	168		28.0	NA
Stroke hospitalizations per 10,000 population	2010-2012	19.3		20.8	NA
Stroke mortality per 100,000 population	2009-2013	32.3	NA	35.0	36.2
Diabetes	2014 2012	and the second second		0.000	
Diabetes prevalence (ever been told) Pre-diabetes prevalence	2011-2013	9.4%		9.6%	9.7%
Adults with diabetes who have eye exam annually	2011-2013	8.5%	RIA I	6.9%	NA
Adults with diabetes who have eye exam annually Adults with diabetes who have foot exam annually	2011-2013 2011-2013	67.5%	NA	71.2%	NA
	2011-2013	82.5%	NA	83.3%	NA
Adults with diabetes who have had an A1C test twice per year	2011-2013	81.9%	NA	73.2%	N

Maine Shared CHNA Health Indicators	Year 🕬	York	Trend	Maine	U.S.
Adults with diabetes who have received formal diabetes education	2011-2013	65.7%	NA	60.0%	55.89
Diabetes emergency department visits (principal diagnosis) per		CONTRACTOR OF IT			
100,000 population	2011	145.2	3	235.9	NA
Diabetes hospitalizations (principal diagnosis) per 10,000	. ann ann an t	and the second second			-
population	2010-2012	9.0		11.7	NA
Diabetes long-term complication hospitalizations	2011	47.2	-	59.1	NA
Diabetes mortality (underlying cause) per 100,000 population	2009-2013	18.0	NA	20.8	21.2
Environmental Itsalth	- Statement	-	-		Companya Sala
Children with confirmed elevated blood lead levels (% among	All and the second second	and the second	1	10.00	1000
those screened)	2009-2013	2.1%	NA	2.5%	NA
Children with unconfirmed elevated blood lead levels (% among					
those screened)	2009-2013	4.5%	NA	4.2%	NA.
Homes with private wells tested for arsenic	2009, 2012	44.5%	NA	43.3%	NA
Lead screening among children age 12-23 months	2009-2013	53.9%	NA	49.2%	NA
Lead screening among children age 24-35 months	2005-2013	31.4%	NA	27.6%	NA
Immun 2 a tion		Contraction of the local distance of the loc		and the second second	194
Adults immunized annually for influenza	2011 2013	41.7%		41.5%	NA
Adults immunized for pneumococcal pneumonia (ages 65 and					
older)	2011-2013	73.8%		72.4%	69.53
Immunization exemptions among kindergarteners for	0.01				- Carlos
philosophical reasons	2015	2.0%	NA	3.7%	NA
Two-year-olds up to date with "Series of Seven Immunizations" 4-	2015				
3-1-3-3-1 4	2015	NA	NA	75.0%	NA
infectious Disease	Security in the owner of the				
lepatilis A (acute) incidence per 100,000 population	2014	0.51	NA	0.5	04
Hepatitis 8 (acute) incidence per 100,000 population	2014	0.51	NA	0.9	0.9
Hepatitis C (acute) incidence per 100,000 population	2014	2.07	NA	2.3	0.7
ncidence of past or present hepatitis C virus (HCV) per 100,000	101.4	77.7			
sopulation	2014	76.2	NA	107.1	NA
ncidence of newly reported chronic hepatitis B virus (HBV) per	2014	4.61	1.000		1.201.4
100,000 population	2014	4.01	NA	8.1	NA
yme disease incidence per 100,000 population	2014	134.0	NA	105.3	10.5
Pertussis incidence per 100,000 population	2014	11.5	NA	41.9	10.3
uberculosis incidence per 100,000 population	2014	1.57	NA	1.1	3.0
TD/HIV				12500	a strate in
AIDS incidence per 100,000 population	2014	3.01	NA	2.1	8.4
hiamydia incidence per 100,000 population	2014	198.8	NA	265.5	452.2
Gonorrhea incidence per 100,000 population	2014	17.4	NA	17.8	109.8
IV incidence per 100,000 population	2014	3.0†	NA	4.4	11.2
IV/AIDS hospitalization rate per 100,000 population	2011	17.7		21.4	NA
yphilis incidence per 100,000 population	2014	1.0+	NA	1.6	19.9
etentional Injury	S CONVERSE			-36, 333L	11.00
omestic assaults reports to police per 100,000 population	2013	554.0	NA	413.0	NA
rearm doaths per 100,000 population	2009-2013	6.7	his		12814
ntentional self-injury (Youth)	2019-2013	9.7	NA	9.2	10.4
ifetime rape/non-consensual sex (among females)		NA	NA	17.9%	NA
Ionfatal child ma treatment per 1,000 population	2013	NA	NA	11.3%	NA
eported rape per 100,000 population	2013	NA 33.4	NA	14.6	9.1
uicide cleaths per 100,000 population		37.1	NA	27.0	25.2
iolence by current or former intimate partners in past 12	2009-2013	17.1	NA	15.2	12.5
nonths (among females)	2013	NA	NA	0.8%	NA
	2013	169.0			
and the second se		1014	NA	125.0	368
iolent crime rate per 100,000 population	2013	100.0	A DECEMBER OF	COLUMN TWO IS NOT	
iolent crime rate per 100,000 population mintentional (hjury Ways wear seatbelt (Aduits)	2013	88.7%		85.2%	NA

Maine Shared CHNA Health Indicators	TNI Year the	York	Trend	Maine	U.5.
Traumatic brain injury related emergency department visits (al	2011	75.1	NA	81.4	NA
intents) per 10.000 population	2011	190	RA	01.4	PRA
Unintentional and undetermined intent polsoning deaths per	2009 2013	10.3	NA	11.1	13.2
100,000 population			1200		0.000
Unintentional fall related deaths per 100,000 population Unintentional fall related injury emergency department visits per	2009-2013	8.9	NA	6.8	8.5
10,000 population	2011	326.5	NA	361.3	NA
Unintentional motor vehicle traffic crosh related deaths per		and the second second			
100,000 population	2009-2013	9.6	NA	10.8	10.5
Occupational Health		Concernance in sector	Re Land Town	1000	COLUMN T
Deaths from work-related injuries (number)	2013	NA	NA	19.0	4,585
Nonfatal occupational injuries (number)	2013	1,271.0	NA	13,205.0	NA
Vental Health					
Adults who have ever had anxiety	2011-2013	19.2%		19.4%	NA
Adults who have ever had depression	2011-2013	22.1%		23.5%	18.75
Adults with current symptoms of depression	2011-2013	9.1%		10.0%	NA
Adults currently receiving outpatient mental health treatment	2011-2013	18.0%		17.7%	NA
Co-morbidity for persons with mental illness	2011, 2013	36.1%		35.2%	NA
Mental health emergency department rates per 100,000 population	2311	2,782.0		1,972.1	NA
Sad/hopeless for two weeks in a row (High School Students)	2013	25.1%		24.3%	29.92
Seriously considered suicide (High School Students)	2013	15.7%		14.6%	17.0%
Physical Activity, Nutrition and Weight	2015	43.775		14.0%	17.0%
Fewer than two hours combined screen time (High School Students)	2013	NA	NA	33.9%	NA
Fruit and vegetable consumption (High School Students)	2013	14.8%	NA	16.8%	NA
Fruit consumption among Adults 18+ (less than one serving per		Carl State Charles			INFC
day	2013	31.3%	NA	34.0%	39.2%
Met physical activity recommendations (Adults)	2013	53.2%	-17	53.4%	50.8%
Physical activity for at least 50 minutes per day on five of the			101112-00		Sec. 2
pest seven days (High School Students) Sedentary lifestyle – no leisure-time physical activity in past	2013	42.2%	NA	43.7%	47.3%
month (Adults)	2011-2013	20.7%		22.4%	25.3%
Soda/sports drink consumption (High School Students)	2013	25.5%	NA	26.2%	27.0%
/egetable consumption among Adults 18+ (less than one serving	2013	16.7%	NA	17.9%	22.9%
per day) Deesrty (Adults)					
Desity (High School Students)	2013	28.4%		28.9%	29.4%
Deesny (High School Students)	2013 2013	11.6%		12.7%	13.7%
Overweight (High School Students)	2013	35.7% 16.3%		36.0%	35.4%
regnancy and Birth Outcomes	2013	10.3%		15.0%	16.6%
Dildren with special health care needs	2009-2010	NA	NA	23.6%	19.8%
nfant deaths per 1,000 live births	2003-2010	53	NA	6.0	6.0
ive births for which the mother received early and adequate	2010-2012	87.0%	NA	86.4%	6.0 84.8%
ive births to 15-19 year olds per 1,000 population	2010 2512				
ow birth weight (<2500 grams)	2010-2012 2010-2012	18.1	NA	20.5	26.5
ubstance and Alcohni Abuse	2010/2017	0.270	NA	6.6%	8.0%
Icohol-induced mortality per 100,000 population	2009-2013	6.9	NA	8.0	8.2
Inge drinking of alcoholic beverages (High School Students)	2013	15.1%	90	14.8%	20.8%
inge drinking of alcoholic beverages (Adults)	2011-2013	18.3%		17.4%	
hronic heavy drinking (Adults)	2011-2013	8.5%		17.4%	15.8%
	**************************************	0.375		6.32	6.2%
rug-affected baby referrals received as a percentage of all live irrths	2014	5.2%	NA	7.8%	NA

Maine Shared CHNA Health Indicators	Year	York	Trend	Maine	U.S.
Emergency medical service overdose response per 100,000 population	2014	444.9	NA	391.5	NA
Oplate poisoning (ED visits) per 100,000 population	2009-20:1	26.5		25.1	NA
Opiale poisoning (hospitalizations) per 100,000 population	2009-2011	12.5		13.2	NA
Past-30-day alcohol use (High School Students)	2013	25.6%		26.0%	34.9%
Past-3D-day Inhalant use (High School Students)	2013	3.2%		3.2%	NA
Past-30-day marijuana use (Adults)	2011-2013	8.8%		8.2%	NA
Past 30-day marijuana use (High School Students)	2013	22.7%		21.6%	23.4%
Past-30-day nonmedical use of prescription drugs (Adult)	2011-2013	1.0%†	NA	1.1%	NA
Past-30-day nonmedical use of prescription drugs (High School Students)	2013	7.4%		5.6%	NA
Prescription Monitoring Program opicid prescriptions (days supply/pop)	2014-2015	6.8	NA	6.8	NA
Substance abuse hospital admissions per 100,000 population	2011	316.1		328.1	NA
Tohanca Use	ALC: NO.		di tert		-
Current smoking (Adults)	2011-2013	20.1%		20.2%	19.0%
Current smoking (High School Students)	2013	12.4%		12.9%	15.7%
Current tobacco use (High School Students)	2013	18.5%	NA	18.2%	22.4%
Secondhand smoke exposure (Youth)	2013	36.3%		38.3%	NA

Indicates county is significantly better than state average (using a 55% confidence level). Indicates county is significantly warse (han state overage (using a 95% confidence level). Indicates a positive trend over time of the county level (using a 95% confidence level). Indicates a negative trend over time of the county level (using a 95% confidence level).

Indicates a negative (rend over time at the county level (using a 35% confidence level)
 Results may be statistically unreliable due to small numerator, use coution when interpreting.
 IVA = No data available