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About Northwell Health

Northwell Health is New York State’s largest healthcare provider that cares for over two million people annually in the New York metropolitan region. Northwell operates 21 hospitals across 13 campuses, 830 outpatient facilities and has more than 16,600 affiliated physicians on its medical staff, 4,200+ of which are members of Northwell’s multi-specialty physician’s group. Northwell is also home to the Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research, and we train the next generation of medical professionals at the innovative Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, and the Hofstra Northwell School of Nursing and Physician Assistant Studies.

Northwell has a long-standing commitment to providing exceptional care and investing in our most vulnerable and underrepresented communities. We have developed an extensive network of community partnerships to impact the health and well-being of the diverse communities we serve.

Our goal is to measurably improve health and wellness in the communities we serve and to provide the highest quality of care for all regardless of race, ethnicity, cultural background, language proficiency, literacy, age, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, disability, geographic location, or socioeconomic status. Northwell’s integrated community and population health strategy includes data-driven approaches to screening for and addressing non-medical factors (social determinants of health). In doing so, our purpose is to empower the communities we serve to eliminate disparities and create sustainable change. This work is aligned with the Surgeon General’s National Prevention strategy, and we believe is fundamental to delivering the highest quality of care to all.

The following section details the efforts of our needs assessment process for the CHNA 2022-2024 cycle. Northwell conducted both primary and secondary analysis efforts and actively engaged in efforts to listen to our communities, so as to better understand and identify their significant health needs. This report was prepared to better inform our leaders, partners, and stakeholders across the communities we serve on our approach to identify the significant health needs of our communities and alignment with the New York State Prevention Agenda Priority and Focus Areas.

Northwell Health is committed to serving our vulnerable populations to improve our communities and meet the New York State Prevention Agenda Objectives.
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Methodology and Analysis

The purpose of the CHNA is to understand the significant health needs and priorities of those who live, play and work in the communities we serve. The Northwell Health CHNA Steering Committee began the needs assessment process for the CHNA 2022-2024 cycle in February of 2022. Our process was guided by the framework we adapted from the American Hospital Association’s Community Health Improvement, Health Needs Assessment Toolkit.

Our assessment incorporated information through both primary and secondary sources. Primary analysis efforts consisted of a series of focus groups conducted with 80 community leaders across our service area. In partnership with the Greater New York Hospital Association, we also designed and implemented a health survey which was released to our community members, patients, and families through various points of care across our health system.

A secondary analysis was also collected to understand the demographics and health outcomes of each of the counties that make up our service area. The type of data that was collected and analyzed were measures of incidence, prevalence, rates of hospitalizations mortality, trends in health behaviors, the use and access of healthcare resources, and other relevant social determinants of health factor, all of which contributed to the identification of significant health needs of the communities we serve and Northwell’s alignment with the NYSDOH Prevention Agenda.

The sources utilized for the secondary analysis of the CHNA are publicly available. A brief list of the resources are as follows:

- NYSDOH Community Health Indicator Reporting System (NYS CHIRS),
- NYSDOH Prevention Agenda (NYSDOHPA)
- NYSDOH Perinatal Data Profile
- NYSDOH Statewide Planning and Research Cooperative System (SPARCS)
- NYSDOH Leading Causes of Death
- CDC/NVSS Life Expectancy Tables
- NYSDOH Cancer Registry
- CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)
Throughout the Needs Assessment process, special attention was given to vulnerable communities. This report synthesizes our efforts and our findings that inform the significant health needs we identified and prioritized in alignment with the New York State Prevention Agenda. Our prioritization and related efforts to address these health needs based on the findings in this appendix are documented in other aspects of our CHNA Report, namely the Northwell Health 2022-2024 Community Health Needs Assessment Summary Report, our Northwell Health Community Service Plans for each of our hospitals, and our Northwell Health 2022-2024 Community Health Needs Assessment Implementation Plan.
Northwell CHNA 2022-2024
Primary Analysis
CHNA 2022 – 2024 Focus Group Discussions

In the Spring of 2022, the Northwell CHNA Steering Committee conducted a series of focus group discussions (FGDs) to gain a better understanding of what the most significant health needs are for the service area. A total of six FGDs were conducted with a total of 80 community leaders across our service area. This research was designed to produce primary data to inform the Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) process and subsequent implementation plans for each Northwell hospital.

Methodology

The FGDs were conducted following a scripted, semi-structured discussion guide. One FGD was held for five of our six county service area: Queens, Nassau, Suffolk, New York, and Richmond. The FGDs were held both in-person and virtually through the use of a Zoom platform. Each FGD lasted for approximately 90 minutes, and two members of Northwell’s CHNA Steering Committee served as the primary facilitators for each FGD. For Westchester County, we convened two in-person “listening tours” at Northern Westchester Hospital. The listening tours were similar to a series of key-informant interviews with community leaders. The questions asked and information gathered about community health needs during the listening tour with community leaders in Westchester County, were similar to those of the FGDs with community leaders in the remaining five counties.

Participants were recruited through snowball sampling. For each FGD, one or two initial ‘seed’ participants who are community leaders within each county were identified. These participants then identified additional participants within their network who are also community leaders in the service area. This part of the sampling process was repeated until the desired range of 9-12 participants per group was achieved for most of the FGDs.

The criteria for participation in the FGD were:

- Age 18 or older
- Identified as a ‘community leader’ within the county
- Willing to participate in an audio (for in-person sessions) or video (for virtual sessions) recorded focus group discussion.

In order to hear a range of perspectives, the Northwell CHNA Steering Committee strove to include participants from a diverse cross-section of professional and demographic groups. Community participation and input through the FGDs were drawn from all sectors serving our communities. These included:

- Leaders of various community-based organizations
- Leaders from faith-based organizations
- County public health department officials and other public health leaders
- Federally Qualified Health Centers (serving low income and medically underserved populations)
- School-system administrative leadership (i.e.: superintendents)
- Community activists
- Law Enforcement Officials
- Business Leaders
Following a round of introductions, the Northwell CHNA Steering Committee led each discussion with the following open question:

“What do you see as the most pressing health concerns of the communities you serve?”

Each FGD was video- or audio-recorded and transcribed by a professional transcription service for accuracy. The transcript was then uploaded to a web-based data management and analysis software program called Dedoose, to facilitate analysis by the research team.

In order to analyze the transcript and its data systematically, we developed a comprehensive and thematic “codebook” of 54 items. The codes were drawn from the New York State Prevention Agenda Priority Areas followed by a grounded theory approach to generate additional codes based on the discussion itself.

The integrity of the data analysis was ensured in the following ways:

- Use of trained qualitative researchers
- Double-coding of each transcript
- Convening to discuss coding experiences and arrive to consensus of code applications.

To improve coding consistency, two team members blind coded the transcripts without conferring with their partner until their coding process was completed. The coding team for each transcript convened and resolved any discrepancies to produce a final version of the codebook for application and interpretation of the transcript. Consensus was reached by referring back to codebook.

Focus Group Considerations

We conducted one focus group discussion in each county of our service area. Taken together, these discussions revealed numerous thematic convergences across our highly diverse service area. Additionally, participants in each county FGD raised concerns that were heightened for, or specific to, their county. We intentionally recruited participants who worked in various sectors and were socio-demographically diverse. However, the information obtained was necessarily limited by the knowledge and opinion of the participants. Several participants served primarily poor or homeless clients. This may explain, in part, why the negative SDOH affecting poor communities were discussed extensively, including food insecurity, housing insecurity, and lack of transportation. Conducting more focus groups, perhaps with participants from the same neighborhoods, could have produced a broader and more nuanced understanding of the health needs of the diverse communities of Nassau County.
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Suffolk County

In the Spring of 2022, the Northwell CHNA Steering Committee conducted a series of focus group discussions (FGDs) to gain a better understanding of what the most significant health needs are for the service area. A total of six FGDs were conducted with a total of 80 community leaders across our service area. This research was designed to produce primary data to inform the Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) process and subsequent implementation plans for each Northwell hospital.

Findings

Major keywords identified from participant feedback
Worsening mental health & substance use

The most prominent theme to emerge from the FGDs was the urgent need to address worsening mental health in recent years. Several participants acknowledged that they raised mental health concerns in their communities for several years. However, there was consensus that the stress and social isolation of the COVID-19 pandemic rapidly accelerated these negative mental health trends. The FGD participants were particularly concerned about worsening mental health crises among children and adolescents. Several specified that cases were not being identified early enough, leading to more serious consequences. FGD participants also emphasized that they were seeing acute crises in children at a younger age than they ever had before the pandemic.

The FGDs participants also stressed that current resources within their communities were inadequate to meet the mental health needs of those they serve. Mental health resources were insufficient for not just the youth, but also for other vulnerable populations such as members of immigrant communities and backgrounds with limited English proficiency.

Community leaders also perceived an increased addiction to drugs and alcohol within their communities, largely exacerbated by the pandemic. While the participants identified alcohol and drug use as a problem, they also addressed the stigma of alcohol and substance use as being a factor that reduces access to healthcare resources by community members.

Disruptions to care for chronic conditions

In addition to the harm from COVID-19 itself, participants noted that preventative care and regular vaccinations fell off during the pandemic and have yet to fully rebound. Ongoing relationships with providers were disrupted as a result of the pandemic which disproportionately affected communities of color that have been burdened by chronic illnesses such as diabetes. Disruptions to routine visits to pediatricians, vaccinations, and connections to schools also particularly affected children.

Poverty is a driver of poor health

Participants—several of whom work with low-income clients—named poverty as a fundamental cause for poor health and health inequities. Community leaders drew connections between a constellation of unmet social needs and their negative community health consequences. In particular, they named housing insecurity, food insecurity, financial instability, and lack of transportation as persistent barriers to wellbeing, especially among individuals who struggle to get by on low incomes. All of these adverse social determinants of health were linked to poverty.

Significant need for access to healthy & nutritious food

Participants acknowledged that food insecurity has been widespread and worsening within their communities. With inflation and rising food prices, the demand for food assistance has considerably increased within the service area.

Housing

Lack of adequate housing and homelessness was repeatedly raised as an unmet health related social need within the series of FGDs. The challenges of substandard housing or severe housing problems, such as overcrowding, unaffordability, inadequate basic utilities such as cooking gas for extended periods of time, paired with rising costs, all worsened health conditions.
Transportation

The lack of transportation also came up as a common factor contributing to poor health and worsening access issues. Participants acknowledged that access to health services and healthy & nutritious foods were even more difficult to achieve due to poor public transportation infrastructure. Affordability challenges for car ownership or cab fares, paired with poor public transportation networks made it difficult to find adequate treatment and social services.

Undocumented communities

In addition to challenges faced generally by low-income communities, participants shared that individuals and families who were undocumented had a particularly hard time of obtaining health care and getting other basic needs met. This was largely due to a lack of necessary documentation such as medical insurance cards, work permits, or drivers’ licenses. Many undocumented immigrants were also afraid to reach out and ask for health insurance because they were concerned it would affect their ability to remain in the country.

Technological challenges

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated a trend towards telehealth visits for certain non-urgent care. In theory, conducting visits remotely via telehealth platforms could solve for lack of transportation to visits. However, participants raised concerns that poor digital literacy and lack of technological resources could also contribute to health inequities.

The following section highlights relevant quotations from our participants. The feedback is color-coded to reflect themes identified in alignment with the New York State Prevention Agenda Priority Areas.
“Transportation is a major concern. When you do not make that kind of money, how do you get places? The bus routes do not bring you everywhere in our town. People can’t afford to pay for a cab or even get an Uber.”

“I see malnutrition as a concern because of the lack of access to healthy foods. This also leads to obesity, hypertension, and diabetes as major health concerns that we come across a lot.”

“Since COVID, preventative care screening numbers are down tremendously, especially with the kids and the mommies. Those numbers are down.”
CHNA 2022 – 2024 Community Health Survey

In collaboration with the Greater New York Hospital Association (GNYHA) and its member hospitals across the New York Metropolitan region, Northwell Health participated in the 2022 Community Health Survey. The purpose of the survey was to learn from members of the community about the health issues that are important to them in order to improve the health services that are available in their neighborhoods.

Methodology

Recruitment

The Community Health Survey was open to community participation between April 11th—June 30th, 2022. Inviting community members to participate in the survey was a collective effort undertaken by GNYHA members. At Northwell, we took a multi-pronged approach to seek participation among community members across our service area:

- **Patient Experience**: We emailed a participation request and the Community Health Survey link to all 48,000+ Northwell patients who completed our Press-Ganey Patient Experience survey from January 1st, 2022 through June 30th 2022.
- **Go Health**: We texted a participation request with the survey link to all 17,000+ patients seen in our network of Go Health urgent care practices during the survey period.
- **Innovare Kiosks**: We created an advertisement requesting participation with a QR code linking to the survey. The advertisement ran several times daily during the survey period on the 33 Innovare advertising and phone-charging kiosks located throughout the health system.
- **CBO Partnerships**: We reached out to over 180 community leaders with whom we partner to request that they distribute the survey to the communities they serve in our service area. They included leaders of community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, schools, and businesses, among others.
- **Community Events**: We distributed quarter-sheet flyers requesting participation with a QR code link to the survey at community events held by the OCPH during the survey period. These events included a health career fair, cancer screenings, food distributions, among others.
- **Website**: We posted a link to the survey on our public-facing Northwell Health website for the duration of the survey period.

Eligibility

Any community member living in our six-county hospital service area age 18 or older was eligible to participate. Respondents were asked to report their zip code on the survey. No personally identifying information (e.g., names, addresses, phone numbers, or email) were collected.
Sampling

The 2022 GNYHA CHNA Survey used a non-probability convenience sample. A web-based survey tool and a
paper-based tools were used to collect the survey data. Participants who completed the survey online could use
any Internet-enabled device. Surveys were available in the 11 most widely spoken languages in the New York
Metropolitan area: English, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Yiddish, Bengali, Korean, Haitian Creole, Italian, Arabic,
and Polish. All data collected were self-reported by respondents.

Analysis

Initial summary data analysis was completed by GNYHA. Northwell conducted sub-analyses at the county level
and for certain neighborhoods within our service area, in collaboration with GNYHA, in order to gain finer insight
into the needs of our diverse communities.

Survey Considerations

The survey used a non-probability convenience strategy to recruit participants. Anyone who was 18+ years of
age and lived within the survey area was eligible to participate. As a result, respondents differed from the
general population in certain characteristics.

Among those who provided their demographic data, respondents were older, more female, predominantly
white, more highly educated, and wealthier (households that made more than $100,000 last year), than the
average for the six-county service area. The survey respondents’ demographics should be kept in mind when
interpreting these findings.
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Survey Findings

The information below reflects the survey findings of all respondents within our six-county service area:

**Respondent Demographics**

- A total of 11,647 qualified respondents who were ages 18+ and lived within our six-county service area participated in the survey.
- Older individuals made up the majority of respondents. 85% (n=5,423) of respondents who reported their ages were 45 or older. However, 45% (n=5,299) of respondents did not report their age.
- The majority (67%) of respondents who reported their gender were women. 34% of respondents (n=3,943) did not indicate their gender or preferred not to say.
- Most (71%) respondents who reported their race/ethnicity indicated that they were White and non-Hispanic. 34% of respondents (n=3,909) did not indicate their race/ethnicity at all.
- College graduates comprised 67% of the respondents who chose to indicate the highest level of school they had completed.
- 44% (n=2,937) of those who specified their household income in the last year indicated that it was $100,000 or more. 44% of all respondents did not respond to the income question. 47% (n=3,626) of those who indicated their current employment status were retired; 31% (n=2,347) were employed full-time for wages or salary.

The survey asked respondents to consider 21 different health issues and indicate how important each issue was to them on a five-point scale, ranging from ‘Not at all’ to ‘Extremely’. Respondents were also asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the current services in their neighborhood to address each of the 21 health issues. Issues that were above average for respondents in terms of importance, yet below average in terms of respondents’ satisfaction with current services to address the issue were designated as “Needs Attention”. Based on the survey responses (issues ranked as above average importance but below average satisfaction), the following three conditions were determined to be needing attention for the six-county service area:

1. Violence (including gun violence)
2. Stopping falls among the elderly
3. Mental health/depression

The top 10 most important issues for respondents were as follows:

- Dental care
- Violence (including gun violence)
Respondents were also asked to indicate whether or not in the last 12 months they had experienced any of a series of SDOH-related issues. 49% (n=3,940) of those who answered the question said that their household expenses had increased. 39% (n=3,161) had experienced anxiety or depression. 29% (n=2,362) said that their medical expenses had increased.

**Survey Findings for Suffolk County**

This section details the summary of findings for respondents from Suffolk County. This is followed by a detailed analysis of responding feedback.

**Summary:** Survey respondents for Suffolk County were mainly white and female. More than half of the respondents were highly educated, 65 years or older, retired, and over 4 out of 10 respondents had a household income of $100,000 or more. Over half of the survey respondents indicated experiencing financial challenges with rising expenses to meet basic needs (i.e.: households, rent/mortgage, medical bills). Survey respondents also reported challenges accessing medical care when needed, largely due to the lack of timely appointments available. The top three health concerns identified as being important to respondents but with inadequate resources to address them were related to violence, including gun violence, falls among the elderly and worsening mental health.

**Demographics**

- **Language:** Approximately 3% of survey respondents spoke a primary language at home other than English; The non-English language primarily spoken at home the most among the survey respondents was Spanish.

- **Race/Ethnicity:** Survey respondents from this county were predominantly White (86%). The proportion of survey respondents that were non-White were split between Hispanic (6%), Black (4%), AAPI (2%) with 3% as Other.

- **SOGI:** Survey respondents from the county predominantly identified as female (67%); 89% of respondents identified as Straight, 3% identified as gay, lesbian or bisexual, and 7% preferred not to say.

- **Age:** Survey respondents skewed toward older age groups with approximately 55% aged 65 or older, followed by 35% in the 45-65 age range.
• **Insurance Coverage:** Survey respondents were primarily insured by Medicare (49%); 42% were commercially insured.

• **Education and Income:** Survey respondents of the county skewed towards highly educated with 61% having a college degree or higher; 44% of the survey respondents had a household income greater than or equal to $100,000.

• **Employment Status:** Over half of survey respondents were retired (51%), and 29% of respondents were employed full time; approximately 3% of survey respondents were unemployed at the time they took the survey.

**Health Status & Needs Identified:**

• **Overall Health of Neighborhood:** Approximately 36% of survey respondents identified the overall health of their neighborhood as very good or excellent.

• **Physical Health:** About 18% of survey respondents identified their physical health as being ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’.

• **Mental Health:** About 13% of survey respondents identified their physical health as being ‘Fair’ or ‘Poor’.

• **Health-Related Social Needs:** Over half of survey respondents (53.4%) indicated they experienced an increase in their household expenses within the last year; 8.5% indicated difficulties in paying their rent or mortgage. Similarly, 33.1% indicated experiencing higher medical expenses in the last year. Additionally, over a third of respondents (39.7%) indicated experiencing anxiety or depression.

• **COVID-19 Needs:** Half of survey respondents identified the need for at-home COVID-19 tests (50.0%) and access to boosters for COVID-19 (46.0%). Almost half of survey respondents (47.8%) also identified the need for reliable sources of information on COVID-19.

• **Access to Care:** Approximately 18% of survey respondents in the county indicated they were unable to access medical care in-person when they needed it. The top reason identified was that ‘There were no available appointments, or I couldn’t get an appointment soon enough’. Additionally, 6% of the respondents indicated they were unable to get medical care virtually (video or phone), the primary reason being ‘There were no available appointments, or I couldn’t get an appointment’.

• **Health Needs Identified:** The three main health needs that survey respondents ranked as having the highest importance but the lowest satisfaction of services within their neighborhood were related to 1) violence (including gun violence), 2) stopping falls among the elderly, and 3) mental health and depression.
Suffolk County

Survey Respondent Demographics
Total Qualified Respondents: 2,085

Primary language you speak at home

- English: 97%
- Other than English: 3%

No response: 689

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Language</th>
<th>Respondents #</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race & Ethnicity

- White: 86%
- Black: 4%
- Hispanic: 6%
- A&PI: 2%

No response: 687

Asian Heritage or Ancestry

- Asian Indian: 9 (33%)
- Chinese: 7 (26%)
- Filipino: 5 (19%)
- Japanese: 2 (7%)
- Korean: 1 (4%)
- Other: 3 (11%)

No response: 1

Heritage or Ancestry in addition to being Black

- African American: 41 (67%)
- A recent immigrant or the child of recent immigrants from Africa: 28 (33%)
- Caribbean or West Indian: 19 (31%)

Hispanic/LatinX Origin or Ancestry

- Puerto Rican: 31 (39%)
- Other Central American: 9 (11%)
- Other South American: 8 (10%)
- Colombian: 7 (9%)
- Mexican: 6 (8%)
- Dominican: 5 (6%)
- Ecuadorian: 4 (5%)
- Cuban: 4 (5%)
- Other: 6 (8%)

No response: 3
Suffolk County

Survey Respondent Demographics
Total Qualified Respondents: 2,085

Age

- 18 - 24: 1%
- 25 - 29: 2%
- 30 - 44: 8%
- 45 - 64: 35%
- 65 - 74: 34%
- 75+: 21%

No response: 959

Insurance Coverage

- Medicare: 49%
- Commercial: 38%
- Medicaid: 7%
- Uninsured: 0.5%
- Other, 6%

No response: 663

Sexual Orientation

- Straight: 89%
- Gay, Lesbian, or Bisexual: 3%
- Other: 1%
- Prefer not to say: 7%

No response: 689

Gender Identity

- Male: 31%
- Female: 67%
- Non-binary: 0.2%
- Prefer not to say: 1%

No response: 677
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Survey Respondent Demographics
Total Qualified Respondents: 2,085

Housing

- 1 person: 21%
- 2 people: 48%
- 3 people: 14%
- 4 people: 10%
- 5 or more people: 6%

No response: 761

Education

- Less than high school: 1%
- High school graduate: 11%
- Some college/technical school: 26%
- College graduate: 61%

No response: 699

Household Income

- $100,000 or more: 44%
- $75,000 to $99,999: 17%
- $60,000 to $74,999: 13%
- $50,000 to $59,999: 6%
- $30,000 to $49,999: 9%
- $20,000 to $29,999: 7%
- Less than $20,000: 5%

No response: 891

Employment Status

- Retired, 51%
- Employed - Full Time, 29%
- Employed - Part Time, 6%
- Self - Unemployed and unable to work, 4%
- Unemployed, 3%
- Homemaker, 3%
- Student, 0.3%

No response: 695
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Survey Results
Total Qualified Respondents: 2,085

In general, how is your ...

...overall health?

...physical health?

...mental health?
# Suffolk County Survey Results

Total Qualified Respondents: 2,085

## What are your COVID-19 needs?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-home COVID-19 tests</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable source(s) of information on COVID-19</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boosters for COVID-19</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person testing for COVID-19 (e.g., doctor’s office, pharmacy, mobile van)</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal protective equipment (e.g., masks, hand sanitizer, face shields, gloves)</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment for COVID-19</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 vaccination</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No response: 614*

## In the last 12 months, have you experienced any of the following?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased household expenses</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety or depression</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased medical expenses</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty paying utilities or other monthly bills</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty paying your rent/mortgage</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger or skipped meals because you did not have enough money to buy food</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No response: 644*

Note: * indicates multi-select questions with non-exclusive responses, therefore percentages may not add up to 100%  
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Survey Results
Total Qualified Respondents: 2,085

In the last 12 months, was there a time when you needed medical care in-person but did not get it?

- Yes: 263 (18%)
- No: 1,188 (82%)

In the last 12 months, was there a time when you needed medical care by video or phone but could not get it?

- Yes: 87 (6%)
- No: 1,350 (94%)

For which of the following reasons could not get medical care in-person the last 12 months?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no available appointments, or I couldn’t get an appointment soon enough</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of COVID-19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not get through on the telephone to make the appointment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I got there the wait was too long to see the doctor</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not afford the cost of care (e.g., copay, deductible)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have transportation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have health insurance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have childcare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For which of the following reasons could not get medical care by video or phone in the last 12 months?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no available appointments, or I couldn’t get an appointment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not get through on the telephone to make the appointment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not know how to see the doctor by video or phone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have a computer, phone, or other device to use for the visit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have a private place to have my appointment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not afford the cost of care (e.g., copay, deductible)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have internet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have data or minutes in my phone plan to use for a visit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not have health insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * indicates multi-select questions with non-exclusive responses, therefore percentages may not add up to 100%
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## Suffolk County

### Survey Results

**Importance and Satisfaction Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Condition</th>
<th>Importance Rank*</th>
<th>Importance Score^</th>
<th>Importance Relative to Other Health Conditions</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank**</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score^</th>
<th>Satisfaction Relative to Other Health Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs Attention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence (including gun violence)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping falls among elderly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health/depression</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain Efforts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart disease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to healthy/nutritious foods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High blood pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis/disease of the joints</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and maternal health care</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relatively Lower Priority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity in children and adults</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use disorder/drug addiction (including alcohol use disorder)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette smoking/tobacco use/vaping/e-cigarettes/hookah</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis C/liver disease</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent and child health</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes/elevated sugar in the blood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma/breathing problems or lung disease</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How important is this issue to you?

**How satisfied are you with current services in your neighborhood?

^Rated on a 5-point scale from 1="Not at all" to 5="Extremely"
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Secondary Analysis
### Sociodemographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall County Health Ranking</th>
<th>Quality of Life Ranking</th>
<th>Length of Life Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,481,364</td>
<td>19,514,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10 Year Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sociodemographics

Life Expectancy

80.7 years

Birth Rate

10.1 Birth rate per 1,000 population

Mortality Rate

639.0 Age-adjusted total mortality rate per 100,000

Top Five Leading Causes of Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Incidence Per 100,000 population</th>
<th>Case Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Heart Disease</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>3,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Cancer</td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Unintentional Injury</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  CLRD</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Cerebrovascular Disease</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CDC’s purpose in designing the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) was to provide specific socially and spatially relevant information to help public health officials and local planners, better prepare communities to respond to emergency events such as severe weather, floods, disease outbreaks and chemical exposure.

The SVI identifies relative vulnerability of every U.S. Census tract and ranks census tracts on 15 social factors, including unemployment, minority status, and disability. It groups these measures into four related themes, as well as an overall ranking.

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index
Sociodemographics

**Race**

- **Suffolk**:
  - White: 78.4%
  - Black: 7.7%
  - Asian: 9.8%
  - Other: 4.1%

- **New York State**:
  - White: 55.6%
  - Black: 14.2%
  - Asian: 8.7%
  - Other: 21.5%

**Ethnicity**

- **Suffolk**:
  - Hispanic or Latino: 19.6%
  - Not Hispanic or Latino: 80.4%

- **New York State**:
  - Hispanic or Latino: 19.5%
  - Not Hispanic or Latino: 80.5%

**Language**

- **Languages Spoken at Home Other than English**
  - **Suffolk**:
    - 22.5%
  - **New York State**:
    - 30.0%

- **Speaks English less than "very well"**
  - **Suffolk**:
    - 8.2%
  - **New York State**:
    - 13.0%

**Gender**

- **Suffolk**:
  - Male: 50.8%
  - Female: 49.2%

- **New York State**:
  - Male: 51.5%
  - Female: 48.5%

**Age**

- **Suffolk**:
  - 0 - 17: 13.0%
  - 18 - 44: 27.5%
  - 45 - 64: 24.7%
  - 65+: 34.8%

- **New York State**:
  - 0 - 17: 13.3%
  - 18 - 44: 26.1%
  - 45 - 64: 22.8%
  - 65+: 37.8%
Sociodemographics

**Income**

- **Suffolk**
  - Annual median household income in US dollars: $105,241
- **New York State**
  - Annual median household income in US dollars: $72,038

**Unemployment**

- **Suffolk**
  - Percentage of labor force unemployed: 3.7%
- **New York State**
  - Percentage of labor force unemployed: 4.0%

**Veteran Status**

- **Suffolk**
  - Population that are Veterans: 5.0%
- **New York State**
  - Population that are Veterans: 3.9%

**Medicaid Insured**

- **Suffolk**
  - Population receiving Medicaid: 14.9%
- **New York State**
  - Population receiving Medicaid: 25.7%

**Disability Status**

- **Suffolk**
  - Population with a disability: 9.6%
- **New York State**
  - Population with a disability: 12.0%

**Uninsured**

- **Suffolk**
  - Population that are uninsured: 4.2%
- **New York State**
  - Population that are uninsured: 5.4%

**Foreign Born**

- **Suffolk**
  - Population born in a different country: 15.3%
- **New York State**
  - Population born in a different country: 22.4%
**Sociodemographics**

### Education

**Suffolk**

- College Graduates: 63.2%
- Population aged 25 years and older with at least some college

**New York State**

- College Graduates: 60.8%

### Poverty

**Suffolk**

- All Poverty: 6.5%
- Population below 100% FPL

**New York State**

- All Poverty: 13.6%

### Housing

**Suffolk**

- Rent: $1,742
  - Monthly median gross rent

**New York State**

- Rent: $1,280

### Transportation

**Suffolk**

- Mean travel time in minutes to work: 32.7
- Percentage of work population who drove alone (car, truck, and van): 79.6%

**New York State**

- Mean travel time in minutes to work: 33.6
- Percentage of work population who drove alone (car, truck, and van): 53.0%

### Substandard Housing

**Suffolk**

- 22.0%
  - Households with at least 1 of 4 housing problems: overcrowding, high housing costs, lack of kitchen facilities, or lack of plumbing facilities.

**New York State**

- 23.0%

---

**Other Data Points**

- Suffok
- New York State
Suffolk NYS

Findings:
- Hospitals in the County and New York State (NYS) remained relatively stable between 2016-2019.
- Emergency department visits have been relatively stable between 2016 – 2019 with the County having a lower rate than the NYS overall.
- The percentage of adults between 18-64 with health insurance has remained stable at above 93% in the County.
- Children in the County have health insurance at comparable rates to the State, above 97%.
- The percentage of the County population that are Medicaid insured population is smaller than the State, but has shown an increase.
- The percentage of adults with access to a regular healthcare provider have decreased at a faster rate in the County compared to the State.

Healthcare Utilization

Hospitalizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk 18-64 Hospitalization Rate</th>
<th>NYS 18-64 Hospitalization Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,157.3</td>
<td>1,077.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,171.2</td>
<td>1,065.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1,148.7</td>
<td>1,064.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,140.8</td>
<td>1,050.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ER Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk 18-64 ER Visit Rate</th>
<th>NYS 18-64 ER Visit Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,139.3</td>
<td>3,745.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,101.4</td>
<td>3,815.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,147.4</td>
<td>3,586.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3,959.5</td>
<td>3,850.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Healthcare Access

Insurance Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk 18-64 Health Insurance Coverage</th>
<th>NYS 18-64 Health Insurance Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Medical Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk % of Adults with a Regular Health Provider</th>
<th>NYS % of Adults with a Regular Health Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improving | No Change | Getting Worse
---|---|---
Health Status

Findings:

- Total preventable hospitalization rates improved in the County but remain higher than the State rate.
- The County’s Black population has experienced a considerable improvement in preventable hospitalizations compared to its White population; the overall trend for both the County and the State have been worsening with the County experiencing greater disparities.
- The Hispanic-to-White ratio of preventable hospitalizations in the County have noticeably improved but is still higher than the State’s ratio.
- The County experienced an improvement in the percentage of total premature deaths decreasing to 21%, lower than the State’s rate of 22.7%.
- The disparity in premature deaths between Black and White populations in the County have noticeably improved.
- The disparity in premature deaths between Hispanic and White populations in the County have not changed and is higher than it is for the State.

Preventable Hospitalizations

Overall
Potentially preventable hospitalizations among adults, age-adjusted rate per 10,000

- Suffolk: 133.4
- NYS: 129.0
- Suffolk: 128.1
- NYS: 125.9

Black to White
Potentially preventable hospitalizations among adults, difference in age-adjusted rates per 10,000 between Black non-Hispanics and White non-Hispanics

- Suffolk: 143.5
- NYS: 116.6
- Suffolk: 107.0
- NYS: 115.8

Hispanic to White
Potentially preventable hospitalizations among adults, difference in age-adjusted rates per 10,000 between Hispanics and White non-Hispanics

- Suffolk: 113.8
- NYS: 82.0
- Suffolk: 25.2
- NYS: 36.4

Premature Deaths

Overall
Percentage of premature deaths (before age 65 years)

- Suffolk: 23.0
- NYS: 21.0
- Suffolk: 23.4
- NYS: 22.7

Black to White
Premature deaths (before age 65 years), difference in percentages between Black non-Hispanics and White non-Hispanics

- Suffolk: 20.9
- NYS: 17.2
- Suffolk: 17.6
- NYS: 17.7

Hispanic to White
Premature deaths (before age 65 years), difference in percentages between Hispanics and White non-Hispanics

- Suffolk: 23.0
- NYS: 23.6
- Suffolk: 16.5
- NYS: 16.4

Improving
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

No Change
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

Getting Worse
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020
Findings:

- The overall prevalence of cigarette smoking has improved in both the County and the State; (County 17.8% to 11.2% vs State 14.2% to 12.8%)
- However, the percentage of cigarette smoking among the County’s low-income adults has worsened and is higher compared to the State
- The County’s percentage of low-income adults consuming sugar beverages has worsened and is now higher compared to the State
- The County has a noticeably lower percentage of households receiving Food Stamp/SNAP benefits compared to the State
- The percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch has increased in the County and the State, reaching approximately 38% and 55% respectively
Findings:

- The rate of adults participating in physical activity for leisure has improved in both the County and the State.
- Adults 65 and older improved in their rates of leisure time physical activity in the County compared to the State.
- Rates of physical activity also improved for adults with disabilities at the County and State level.
- The percentage of children aged 2-4 years old enrolled in WIC and watching TV for 2 hours or less a day noticeably improved.

Physical Activity

- Percentage of adults who participate in leisure-time physical activity:
  - Suffolk: 74.3%, NYS: 78.9%
  - Suffolk: 73.7%, NYS: 76.2%
- Percentage of adults who participate in leisure-time physical activity, aged 65+ years:
  - Suffolk: 69.0%, NYS: 74.3%
  - Suffolk: 69.0%, NYS: 68.9%
- Percentage of adults with disabilities who participate in leisure-time physical activity:
  - Suffolk: 58.5%, NYS: 60.4%
  - Suffolk: 56.2%, NYS: 61.2%
- Percentage of children (aged 2-4 years) enrolled in WIC watching TV 2 hours or less per day:
  - Suffolk: 80.8%, NYS: 85.7%
  - Suffolk: 83.9%, NYS: 86.6%

Improving:
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

No Change:
- 2015 - 2017

Getting Worse:
- 2018 - 2020
Findings:

- Hospitalization rates for cardiovascular disease have worsened in the County since 2016; the County’s mortality rates due to cardiovascular disease are comparable to the State and have shown no improvement.
- The County’s rate of hospitalizations for coronary heart disease (CHD) have improved but remain higher than the State rate.
- The County’s mortality rate for CHD has worsened over the last few years, while the State’s mortality rate for CHD stayed stable.
- The rate of hospitalizations for cerebrovascular strokes are comparable to the State but have worsened; stroke related mortality rates have experienced no change.

Cardiovascular Disease

- Age-adjusted cardiovascular disease hospitalization rate per 10,000
- Age-adjusted cardiovascular disease mortality rate per 100,000

Coronary Heart Disease (CHD)

- Age-adjusted coronary heart disease hospitalization rate per 10,000
- Age-adjusted coronary heart disease mortality rate per 100,000

Stroke

- Age-adjusted cerebrovascular disease (stroke) hospitalization rate per 10,000
- Age-adjusted cerebrovascular disease (stroke) mortality rate per 100,000
Findings:

- The County’s rate of preventable heart failure inpatient admissions is higher than the State and has increased since 2017.
- Compared to the State, the County’s mortality rate from congestive heart failure is higher, but has noticeably improved (from 16.6 to 13.7).
- Preventable Quality Indicators (PQI) for heart failure admission rates were highest in the eastern portion of the County.

Heart Failure

Potentially preventable heart failure hospitalization rate per 10,000 - Aged 18 years and older

Age-adjusted congestive heart failure mortality rate per 100,000

PQI 08  Heart Failure Admission Rate
Findings:

- The overall rate of preventable admissions were highest in the eastern section of the County.
- The eastern part of the County also experienced the highest rate of preventable admissions for acute conditions.
- The percentage of adults with chronic conditions who took a course or class to learn how to manage their condition, although lower than the State, showed an increase in the County as compared to no change statewide.
- Preventable admissions for chronic conditions were highest in the central-eastern portion of the County.

PQI 90: Overall Composite of Admissions

PQI 91: Acute Care Composite of Admissions

PQI 92: Chronic Composite of Admissions

Chronic Conditions

Percentage of adults with chronic conditions (arthritis, asthma, CVD, diabetes, CKD, cancer) who have taken a course or class to learn how to manage their condition.
Findings:

- The adult obesity rate for the County has trended in the same direction as the State and has worsened; the County’s obesity rate is currently similar to the State’s obesity rate.
- The percentage of the County’s low-income adults with obesity has noticeably improved (from 36.8% to 23.7%), and is currently lower than the rate statewide.
- Obesity trends among children and adolescents have been relatively stable in both the County and the State; the County has a higher rate of childhood obesity than the state (18.4% vs 17.2%).
- The percentage of children (aged 2-4) in the WIC program who are obese is higher in the County, compared to the State (20.5% vs 13.8%).

![Obesity Chart](chart.png)

![Childhood Obesity Chart](chart.png)
Findings:

- The County has a lower rate of hospitalization due to diabetes compared to the State, but rates have increased since 2016 (from 13.6% to 16.5%).
- Diabetes-related mortality rates have worsened both county- and state-wide, however, the County has a comparably lower rate (14.2% vs 18.1%).
- There has been a decline in the County’s adult (ages 45+) population who tested for high blood sugar or diabetes in the last 3 years.
- PQI - 93 diabetes composite inpatient admission rates are highest in the central and eastern sections of the County.

### Diabetes

#### Age-adjusted diabetes hospitalization rate per 10,000 (primary diagnosis)

- 2016: 15.9
- 2017: 18.3
- 2018: 19.0
- 2019: 19.4

**Suffolk: NYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Age-adjusted diabetes mortality rate per 100,000

- 2016: 11.8
- 2017: 14.2
- 2018: 16.8
- 2019: 18.1

**Suffolk: NYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage of adults who had a test for high blood sugar or diabetes within the past three years, aged 45+

- 68.8
- 68.3
- 63.0
- 63.8

**Suffolk: NYS**

### PQI 93 Diabetes Composite Admission Rate


High Rate of PQI: Red

Low Rate of PQI: Blue

Map showing the distribution of PQI rates for diabetes composite admission rates across the County.
Findings:

- Preventable hospitalizations for short term complications from diabetes steadily increased in both the County and the State since 2016.
- PQIs 01 and 03, preventable inpatient admissions for both short- and long-term complications due to diabetes are highest in the eastern and southwestern/south central portions of the County.
Findings:

- PQI 14 - uncontrolled diabetes admission rates are clustered in the northeastern, central and western sections of the County.
- PQI 16 - lower-extremity amputation among patients with diabetes rates are highest on the north and south forks of the County, as well as the central and southwestern sections.

Diabetes Complications

PQI 14 Uncontrolled Diabetes Admission Rate

PQI 16 Lower-Extremity Amputation among Patients with Diabetes Rate
**Findings:**

- Preventable hospitalization rates for adults with hypertension has worsened in both the County and the State, with relatively higher rates in the County (8.3% vs 7.7%)
- At 83.2%, the County has more adults with hypertension taking medicine to manage their high blood pressure than the State at 76.9%
- PQI 07 – Hypertension admission rates are highest in the central to eastern portion of the County

---

**Hypertension**

- Potentially preventable hypertension hospitalization rate per 10,000 - Aged 18 years and older
- Percentage of adults with hypertension who are currently taking medicine to manage their high blood pressure

- **Suffolk**: 8.3%
- **NYS**: 7.7%
- **Suffolk**: 83.2%
- **NYS**: 76.9%

---

**PQI 07 Hypertension Admission Rate**


---

**High Rate of PQI**

**Low Rate of PQI**
Findings:

- The age-adjusted rates of hospitalizations and mortality from asthma is lower in the County as compared to the State, including among those aged 65+
- Rates of asthma related hospitalizations improved having declined from 8.0 to 5.7 per 10,000
- The County’s asthma related mortality rates showed no change in its trend and remained lower in comparison to the State
- Asthma hospitalization rates for those 65 and older worsened in the County but remained lower than the State
Findings:

- Since 2016, hospitalization rates for chronic lower respiratory disease have decreased in the County and the State.
- Mortality rates per 100,000 from chronic lower respiratory disease have increased from 28.7 to 30.5.
- PQI 05 - Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) or asthma in older adults admission rates are high in the south-central part of the County.
Findings:

- Emergency department visit rates for asthma among the youth aged 0-17 declined significantly from 2016-2019 in the County and NYS. The NYS rate is nearly double the rate of the County throughout the timeframe.
- PQI 15 - asthma in younger adults admission rates are relatively low across the County with clusters in the central to south central, and southwestern sections.
- Hospitalization rates for pneumonia and the flu among those age 65 and older decreased in both the County and the State.
- PQI 11 - community acquired pneumonia admission rates were highest in the south-central part of the County.

Youth Asthma & Pneumonia

**PQI 15 Asthma in Younger Adults Admission Rate**

![Graph showing asthma emergency department visits rate per 10,000, aged 0-17 years.](image)

- Asthma emergency department visits rate per 10,000, aged 0-17 years.
- Data from 2016 to 2019.
- Comparison between Suffolk and NYS.

**PQI 11 Community Acquired Pneumonia Admission Rate**

![Graph showing pneumonia/flu hospitalization rate per 10,000, aged 65 years and older.](image)

- Pneumonia/flu hospitalization rate per 10,000, aged 65 years and older.
- Data from 2016 to 2019.
- Comparison between Suffolk and NYS.
Findings:

- The age-adjusted incidence rate for all cancer was higher in the County than the State; the trend in the rate since 2015 has improved.
- The age-adjusted mortality rate for all cancer declined for both the County (from 138.9 to 135.1 per 100,000) and the State (145.3 to 134.7 per 100,000).
Findings:

- The age-adjusted incidence rate for ovarian cancer was consistently slightly higher in County than the State since 2015 and has improved.
- The age-adjusted mortality rate from ovarian cancer declined in the County and the State.
- The age-adjusted incidence rate for cervix uteri cancer improved in County and the State since 2015.
- The age-adjusted mortality rate for cervix uteri cancer declined in the County and the State.

### Ovarian Cancer

Age-adjusted ovarian cancer incidence rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cervix Uteri Cancer

Age-adjusted cervix uteri cancer incidence rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ovarian Cancer Mortality Rate

Age-adjusted ovarian cancer mortality rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cervix Uteri Cancer Mortality Rate

Age-adjusted cervix uteri cancer mortality rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings:

- The County had a higher age-adjusted colon and rectum cancer incidence rate as compared to the State.
- The age-adjusted mortality rate from colon and rectum cancer increased in the County and decreased in State.
- The percentage of adults aged 50-64 receiving a colorectal cancer screening improved substantially in the County, reaching nearly the same level as the State.
- The central part of the County had greater than expected rates of observed colorectal cancer cases.

### Colorectal Cancer

**Age-adjusted colon and rectum cancer incidence rate per 100,000**

- **Suffolk**: 41.3, 39.3, 41.5, 40.1
- **NYS**: 38.5, 38.5, 38.0, 36.4

**Age-adjusted colon and rectum cancer mortality rate per 100,000**

- **Suffolk**: 10.8, 12.4, 12.3, 11.4
- **NYS**: 41.3, 39.3, 41.5, 40.1

**Percentage of adults who receive a colorectal cancer screening based on the most recent guidelines, aged 50-64 years**

- **Suffolk**: 49.1, 65.2, 65.2, 65.4
- **NYS**: 63.1, 65.4, 65.4

**Key:**
- Dark blue: 50.0% or greater than expected
- Light blue: 15.0% - 49.9% greater than expected
- Light yellow: Within 14.9% or less of expected
- Dark red: Getting Worse
- Light gray: No Change
- Light green: Improving
Findings:

- The County’s age-adjusted incidence rates for female breast did have a noticeable change since 2015.
- The age-adjusted late-stage female breast cancer rates improved in the County and the State.
- The age-adjusted female breast cancer mortality rate declined in the County and the State.
- Greater than expected cases of breast cancer were clustered in the central part of the County.

Breast Cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>138.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>136.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Blue: 50.0% or greater than expected
- Light Blue: 15.0% - 49.9% greater than expected
- Yellow: Within 14.9% or less of expected
- Orange: Getting Worse
- Green: Improving
- Tan: No Change

2015-2017
2018-2020
**Findings:**

- Between 2015 to 2019, the age-adjusted incidence rate for prostate cancer and late-stage prostate cancer increased from 122.0 to 130.8 per 100,000 population, and 21.6 to 25.5 per 100,000 population, respectively.
- The age-adjusted mortality rate for prostate cancer worsened in the County, while improving in the State.
- The southwestern part of the County observed greater than expected cases of prostate cancer.

### Prostate Cancer

**Age-adjusted prostate cancer incidence rate per 100,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>130.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age-adjusted prostate cancer late-stage incidence rate per 100,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age-adjusted prostate cancer mortality rate per 100,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- 50.0% or greater than expected
- 15.0% - 49.9% greater than expected
- Within 14.9% or less of expected
Findings:

- The age-adjusted incidence rate for lung and bronchus cancer has been substantially higher in the County as compared to the State however, the incidence has improved.
- The age-adjusted lung and bronchus cancer mortality rates both improved for the County and the State.
- Greater than expected rates of lung cancer were observed in the central and eastern parts of the County.

![Lung Cancer Graph]

**Lung Cancer**

Age-adjusted lung and bronchus cancer incidence rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

- **50.0% or greater than expected**
- **15.0% - 49.9% greater than expected**
- **Within 14.9% or less of expected**
- **Improving**
- **No Change**
- **Getting Worse**
Findings:

- The age-adjusted incidence and mortality rates for oral cavity and pharynx cancer remained stable for both the County and the State.
- The rate of outpatient visits for dental caries among children 3-5 years old has worsened but has been still significantly lower than the State.
- The age-adjusted melanoma mortality rate remained flat for the County and the State.
Findings:

- The central to eastern portions of the County experienced greater than expected rates of urinary cancer cases.
- The western to central portions of the County observed greater than expected rates of non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma cancer cases.

**Urinary Cancer**

**Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma**

**Key:**
- Blue: 50.0% or greater than expected
- Medium blue: 15.0% - 49.9% greater than expected
- Light blue: Within 14.9% or less of expected
Findings:

- The age-adjusted percentage of County residents who experienced mental distress during the past month, while initially lower, increased more substantially in the County than in the State.
- The County also has had a higher rate of adults reporting adverse childhood experiences compared to the State.
- Age-adjusted suicide rates have remained unchanged in the County and the State.
- Age-adjusted suicide rates for youths aged between 15-19 years old have noticeably improved in the County but worsened in the State.

### Mental Distress

- **Frequent mental distress during the past month among adults, age-adjusted percentage**
  - **Suffolk**: 8.1, 12.3
  - **NYS**: 10.7, 11.2

- **Percentage of adults who have experienced two or more adverse childhood experiences (ACEs)**
  - **Suffolk**: 38.3
  - **NYS**: 35.6

### Suicides

- **Suicide mortality, age-adjusted rate per 100,000 population**
  - **Suffolk**: 8.3, 8.2
  - **NYS**: 8.3, 8.2

- **Suicide mortality among youth, rate per 100,000, aged 15-19 years**
  - **Suffolk**: 6.7, 3.8
  - **NYS**: 5.4, 6.2

Improving: 2015-2017
No Change: 2018-2020
Getting Worse: 2015-2017
### Findings:

- The age-adjusted percentage of binge drinking, reported in the past month remained relatively flat in the County while improving in the State overall.
- The rate of alcohol-related motor vehicle injuries have noticeably improved in the County but are still relatively higher compared to the State overall.
- The age-adjusted opioid overdose death rate got worse since 2015, having peaked in 2017, for both the County and the State.
- The rate of opioid overdose ED visits have noticeably decreased in the County and the State overall, but the County rates are still relatively higher.
- The age-adjusted opioid analgesic prescription rates declined for both the County and the State, however the County’s rate is still higher in comparison to the State.
- The rate of buprenorphine prescriptions have remained relatively stable in the County but considerably higher than the State.

### Substance Abuse

#### Binge Drinking

Binge drinking during the past month among adults, age-adjusted percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Opioid Overdose Deaths

Overdose deaths involving any opioids, age-adjusted rate per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prescribed Opioid Use

Opioid analgesic prescription, age-adjusted rate per 1,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>141.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Drunk Driving

Alcohol-related motor vehicle injuries and deaths per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Opioid Overdose ED Visits

ED visits (incl outpatients & admitted patients) involving any opioid overdose, age-adjusted rate per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>651.5</td>
<td>660.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>660.7</td>
<td>651.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>651.8</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>649.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>649.8</td>
<td>641.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>641.4</td>
<td>415.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Buprenorphine Use

Patients who received at least one buprenorphine prescription for opioid use disorder, age-adjusted rate per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>320.3</td>
<td>346.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>346.3</td>
<td>378.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>378.6</td>
<td>411.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>411.4</td>
<td>415.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>415.6</td>
<td>415.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings:

- The County and NYS percentages of women aged 18-44 and 45+ receiving a preventive medical visit are very similar.
- In the County, 45% of women aged 18-44 reported talking with a health care provider about ways to prepare for a healthy pregnancy as compared to only 35.3% in NYS.
- The percentage of births with adequate prenatal care are 77.5% and 76% for the County and the State, respectively.

#### Preventive Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Care</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Care 45+</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prenatal Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal Care</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal Care 45+</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

- The maternal mortality rate increased more significantly in the County than in the State, more than tripling, going from 6.4 to 19.7
- The percentage of births to women aged 25+ without a high school education declined in the County and the State.
- The percentage of premature births remained relatively stable in both the County and the State.
- The County had a noticeably higher percentage of cesarean section births compared to the State (42.8% vs 33.2%), however the trends were stable.
Findings:

- The percentage of pregnant women in WIC who have gestational diabetes rose in the County and the State.
- The percentage of pregnant women in WIC with hypertension worsened in both the County and the State; the County’s rate increased more sharply than the State.
- The percentage of pregnant women in WIC with 1st trimester prenatal care improved in both the County and the State.
- The percentage of women in WIC who were pre-pregnancy underweight slightly improved for the County and the State.
- Compared to the State, the County had a higher percent of women in WIC who were pre-pregnancy overweight and obese; these trends have worsened overtime for the County.

### Pregnancy, Poverty & Comorbidities

#### Gestational Diabetes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Hypertension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1st Trimester Prenatal Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Underweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Obesity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

- The pregnancy rate is lower in the County than in the State; both have experienced slight declines.
- The percentage of geriatric pregnancies, defined as births to women aged 35 years or older, was slightly higher in the County than in the State.
- Teen pregnancy rates improved for both County and State but the County has a considerably lower rate per 1,000 females from 15-19 years old (14.7 vs 23.0 respectively).
- The percentage of births to teens did not change noticeably in either the County or the State.
Findings:

- The fertility rate declined steadily among women aged 15-44 in the County and the State.
- The teen fertility rate declined slightly in both the County and State.
- The abortion ratio in the County considerably decreased in the County compared to the State.

### Fertility Rates

#### All Fertility Rates
Fertility rate per 1,000 females - Aged 15-44 years

#### Teen Fertility Rates
Teen fertility rate per 1,000 (births to mothers aged 15-19 years/female population aged 15-19 years)

### Abortions
Abortion ratio (induced abortions per 1,000 live births) - All ages

---

Improving  | No Change | Getting Worse
---|---|---
Findings:

- The infant mortality rate per 1,000 live births (<1 year) has noticeably improved in the County while remaining flat for the State.
- The percentage of low birthweight singleton births (<2.5 kg) increased since 2015 for both the State and the County.
- The crude rate of newborns with any diagnosis relating to maternal drug use showed marked improvements in both the County and the State.
Healthy Women, Infants, & Children

Findings:

- The percentage of 6-month-old infants enrolled in WIC who were breastfed improved for both the County and the State; however the County still has a lower rate compared to the State.
- The percentage of infants who were supplemented with formula in the hospital remained stable in the County.
- The percentage of infants exclusively breastfed in the hospital remained flat in both County and State.
- The percentage of Black non-Hispanic infants exclusively breastfed declined in the County and remained flat in the State.
- The percentage of Hispanic infants exclusively breastfed remained flat for the County.

Breastfeeding

At 6 Months
Percentage of infants enrolled in WIC who are breastfed at 6 months among all WIC infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formula Supplementation
Percentage of infants supplemented with formula in the hospital among breastfed infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Infants
Percentage of infants who are exclusively breastfed in the hospital among all infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black Infants
Percentage of infants who are exclusively breastfed in the hospital among Black non-Hispanic infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hispanic Infants
Percentage of infants who are exclusively breastfed in the hospital among Hispanic infants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improving 2015 - 2017  2018 - 2020
No Change 2015 - 2017  2018 - 2020
Getting Worse 2015 - 2017  2018 - 2020
Healthy Women, Infants, & Children

Findings:

- The percentage of children in poverty remained relatively flat for both County and State, however the County has only half the rate of childhood poverty compared to the State.
- Roughly 59% of children aged 3 to 4 in the County and the State are enrolled in early education.
- 97-98% of children below the age of 19 have health insurance coverage on the County and State-levels.

### Childhood Poverty

Percentage of children aged <18 years below poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Early Education

Percentage of children aged 3 to 4 years old who enrolled in schools among population aged 3 to 4 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Childhood Insurance Coverage

Percentage of children aged <19 years with health insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings:

- The mortality rate for children aged 1-4 declined in the County but remained flat in the State.
- The mortality rate for children aged 5-14 remained flat in the County and the State.
- The mortality rate for youth aged 15-19 declined in the County and the State.
- The trend in teenage suicides has noticeably improved in the County (going from 6.7 to 3.8), while the same trend has worsened for the State (5.4 to 6.2).

### Pediatric Deaths

#### Mortality rate per 100,000 - Aged 1-4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mortality rate per 100,000 - Aged 5-14 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-14 years</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mortality rate per 100,000 - Aged 15-19 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Youth Suicide

#### Suicide mortality among youth, rate per 100,000, aged 15-19 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improving**
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

**No Change**
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

**Getting Worse**
- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020
Findings:

- The percentage of children and adolescents with obesity remained flat for both the County and the State.
- The percentage of obese children aged 2-4 in WIC remained flat in the State but declined in the County; the County rates are relatively higher.
- Rates of asthma-related ED visits for youth aged 0-17 steadily declined in the County and the State.
- The rate of outpatient visits for dental caries among children 3-5 years old has worsened but has been still significantly lower than the State.
Findings:

- Incidence rates per 100,000 population for hepatitis A have been low, but worsened since 2015, in both the County and the State.
- Incidence rates per 100,000 population for acute hepatitis B have been low, but worsened since 2015, in both the County and the State.
- Rates of chronic hepatitis C cases per 100,000 population improved for both the County and the State.
- Age-adjusted rates of sexually transmitted diseases per 100,000 population, such as chlamydia and gonorrhea all steadily increased since 2015, for both the County and the State; Early syphilis rates showed a slight increase but were relatively flat compared to the State.
- Age-adjusted rates per 100,000 population for newly diagnosed HIV cases remained relatively flat for the County but decreased for the State.
- Age-adjusted mortality rates per 100,000 population for AIDS remained relatively flat for the County but decreased for the State.
- Incidence rates for tuberculosis worsened for the County since 2015, while remaining flat for the State.
**Findings:**

- The County’s incidence rates got worse for diseases such as E. coli, haemophilus influenza, salmonella and shigella.
- The County’s incidence rates remained mostly flat for conditions such as mumps and meningococcus.
- The County’s incidence rate for pertussis remained relatively flat but observed fluctuations between 2015 - 2019.

### Communicable Diseases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>E. coli</th>
<th>Haemophilus Influenza</th>
<th>Meningococcus</th>
<th>Mumps</th>
<th>Pertussis</th>
<th>Salmonella</th>
<th>Shigella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. coli**

E. coli Shiga Toxin incidence per 100,000

**Haemophilus Influenza**

Haemophilus influenza incidence per 100,000

**Meningococcus**

Meningococcal incidence per 100,000

**Mumps**

Mumps incidence per 100,000

**Pertussis**

Pertussis incidence per 100,000

**Salmonella**

Salmonella incidence per 100,000

**Shigella**

Shigella incidence per 100,000
Findings:

- The index crime rate has improved for both the County and the State; however, the rates for the County are noticeably lower than the State. The violent crime rate is markedly lower in the County compared to the State; The County's violent crime rate improved while remaining largely unchanged for the State.
- While the homicide rate remained flat for the State, it got worse for the County.

### Crime

#### All Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index crime rate per 100,000</td>
<td>1,446.4</td>
<td>1,853.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime rate per 100,000</td>
<td>1,225.4</td>
<td>1,723.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Violent Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicides</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>360.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-adjusted homicide mortality rate per 100,000</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>357.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:

- The age-adjusted hospitalization rate for all assaults was slightly lower in the County compared to the State; trends for both State and County remained flat.
- Firearm assault-related hospitalizations are very similar between the County and the State and remained flat.
- The rate of assault-related hospitalizations ratio between black and white persons remained flat for the County and improved statewide.
- The rate of assault-related hospitalizations ratio between Hispanic and white persons increased for the County while remaining flat for the State.

### Assaults

#### All Assaults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Firearm Assaults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assaults: Black/White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assaults: Hispanic/White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improving

- 2015-2017
- 2018-2020

### No Change

- 2015-2017
- 2018-2020

### Getting Worse

- 2015-2017
- 2018-2020
Findings:

- The age-adjusted hospitalization rate from falls has been higher in the County than in the State; Hospitalizations for adults over 65+ years old were considerably higher in the County than in the State and have worsened over time.
- Work-related hospitalizations per 100,000 employed persons increased since 2016 with higher rates in the County compared to the State.
- The ratio of work-related ED visits between black and white individuals was slightly higher in the County compared to the State but remained flat overall.

### Falls

Age-adjusted falls hospitalization rate per 10,000 population, aged 65+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hospitalizations due to falls among adults, rate per 10,000 population, aged 65+ years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>237.7</td>
<td>182.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>249.4</td>
<td>177.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>269.3</td>
<td>192.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>281.4</td>
<td>193.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work-Related Injuries

#### All Hospitalizations

Work-related hospitalizations per 100,000 employed persons aged 16 years and older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>256.2</td>
<td>154.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>221.1</td>
<td>147.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>136.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ED Visits among Minorities

Work-related emergency department (ED) visits, ratio of rates between Black non-Hispanics and White non-Hispanics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improving**: 2015 - 2017, 2018 - 2020  
**No Change**: 2015 - 2017, 2018 - 2020  
**Getting Worse**: 2015 - 2017
Findings:

- The County had a higher rate of motor vehicle injury and mortality per 100,000 compared to the State; the trends remained flat for both.
- Alcohol-related motor vehicle injuries and deaths declined in the County and the State.
- The rate of crash-related pedestrian fatalities did not have a noticeable change in the County or the State.

**Vehicle Injuries & Deaths**

**Fatal Accidents**

Age-adjusted motor vehicle injury mortality rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Accidents</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drunk Driving – Injuries & Deaths**

Alcohol-related motor vehicle injuries and deaths per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drunk Driving</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedestrian Deaths**

Crash-related pedestrian fatalities, rate per 100,000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Deaths</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improving**

- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

**No Change**

- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020

**Getting Worse**

- 2015 - 2017
- 2018 - 2020
Findings:

- Since 2016, the age-adjusted hospitalizations for unintentional injuries steadily increased in both the County and the State.
- The age-adjusted mortality rates for unintentional injuries have improved for both County and State, however the County rates are relatively higher.
- The hospitalization rate from other injuries including poisonings and self-inflicted injuries have improved in the County but worsened in the State.
- Age-adjusted rate for traumatic brain injury hospitalizations was higher in the County than the State and did not experience a noticeable change.

Unintentional Injuries

Age-adjusted unintentional injury hospitalization rate per 10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age-adjusted unintentional injury mortality rate per 100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Injuries

Poisonings

Age-adjusted poisoning hospitalization rate per 10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Inflicted Injuries

Age-adjusted self-inflicted injury hospitalization rate per 10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traumatic Brain Injuries

Age-adjusted traumatic brain injury hospitalization rate per 10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bay Shore is a hamlet in the Town of Islip in Suffolk County on the South Shore of Long Island. Approximately 29% of residents were born outside the country. The 3 largest ethnic groups in Bay Shore are: White (Non-Hispanic), White (Hispanic), and Black or African American (Non-Hispanic). The poverty rate in Bay Shore is 7.4%.

### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67,484</td>
<td>1,481,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Life Expectancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COVID-19 Vaccination

People with completed vaccine series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Assets

- **Food Pantries:** Bay Shore Emergency Food Pantry, CenterPoint Church, First Baptist Church of Bay Shore, PRONTO of Long Island, St. Patrick Roman Catholic Church of Bay Shore, United Veterans Beacon House, Inc.
- **Northwell Community Programs:** Community Health Storefront at Westfield Mall in Bay Shore, Food as Health, Northwell Community Scholars
- **Parks:** Benjamin’s Memorial Beach, Shipwreck Cove Spray Park
- **School Districts:** Bay Shore Union Free School District
- **Transportation:** Long Island Rail Road, Suffolk County Transit

### RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Languages Spoken at Home Other Than English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bay Shore</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRENTWOOD

A hamlet in the Town of Islip in Suffolk County, Brentwood is the most populous Census Designated Place on Long Island outside of New York City. Approximately 41% of residents were born outside the country. The 3 largest ethnic groups in Brentwood are: White (Hispanic), Other (Hispanic), and Black or African-American (Non-Hispanic). The poverty rate in Brentwood is 9.3%.

**POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62,888</td>
<td>1,481,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIFE EXPECTANCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COVID-19 VACCINATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with completed vaccine series</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY ASSETS**

- **Food Pantries:** St. Anne’s Roman Catholic Church
- **Northwell Community Programs:** Northwell Community Scholars, Wellness on Wheels
- **Parks:** Brentwood State Park
- **School District(s):** Brentwood Union Free School District
- **Transportation:** Long Island Rail Road, Suffolk County Transit

**RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT HOME OTHER THAN ENGLISH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brentwood</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATISTIC</td>
<td>BRENTWOOD, 11717</td>
<td>SUFFOLK COUNTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQI 91 - Acute</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQI 92 - Chronic</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQI 93 - Diabetes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidable ED Visits</td>
<td>146.9</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATISTIC</th>
<th>HUNTINGTON STATION, 11746</th>
<th>CENTRAL ISLIP, 11722</th>
<th>BAY SHORE, 11706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PQI 91 - Acute</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQI 92 - Chronic</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQI 93 - Diabetes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidable ED Visits</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>158.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NYSDOH SPARCS/mc
Current faith-based centers include permanent sites; Other faith-based centers were provided by Community Relations; Avoidable ED Visits defined by NYU Algorithm; Prepared by the Office of Strategic Planning

- **Brentwood**
  - **Poverty**: Below 100% Federal poverty (9.3%)
  - **Housing Burden**: Monthly housing cost as a percentage of household income in the last 12 months (36.9%)
  - **Education**: Less than high school diploma (33.4%)
  - **Transportation**: Households with no vehicles available (11.6%)
  - **Unemployment Rate**: 3.3%

- **Suffolk**
  - **Poverty**: Below 100% Federal poverty (6.5%)
  - **Housing Burden**: Monthly housing cost as a percentage of household income in the last 12 months (38.1%)
  - **Education**: Less than high school diploma (9.6%)
  - **Transportation**: Households with no vehicles available (5.5%)
  - **Unemployment Rate**: 3.0%
  - **Prenatal Care**: Late or no prenatal care (4.1%)
CENTRAL ISLIP

A hamlet in the Town of Islip in Suffolk County. Approximately 33% of residents were born outside the country. The 3 largest ethnic groups in Central Islip are: White (Hispanic), Black or African American (Non-Hispanic), and White (Non-Hispanic). The poverty rate in Central Islip is 9.8%.

POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,139</td>
<td>1,481,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIFE EXPECTANCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COVID-19 VACCINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with completed vaccine series</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY ASSETS

- **Food Pantries:** Hands Across Long Island (HALI) Community Wellness and Recovery Center, Hope Missionary Baptist Church — Bethany Hospitality Kitchen, Lighthouse Mission Central Islip Food Pantry, St. John of God Roman Catholic Church
- **Parks:** Central Islip Community Park
- **School District(s):** Central Islip Union Free School District
- **Transportation:** Long Island Rail Road, Suffolk County Transit

RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT HOME OTHER THAN ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Islip</th>
<th>Suffolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Islip
9.8% POVERTY
Below 100% Federal poverty

Suffolk
6.5%

Central Islip
2.6% UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Suffolk
3.0%

Central Islip
45.2% HOUSING BURDEN
Monthly housing cost (i.e.: rent/mortgage as a percentage of household income in the last 12 months)

Suffolk
38.1%

Central Islip
10.2% TRANSPORTATION
Households with no vehicles available

Suffolk
5.5%

Central Islip
23.9% EDUCATION
Less than high school diploma

Suffolk
9.6%

Central Islip
7.8% PRENATAL CARE
Late or no prenatal care

Suffolk
4.1%

Source: NYSDOH SPARCS/Inc.
Current faith-based centers include permanent sites; Other faith-based centers were provided by Community Relations; Avoidable ED Visits defined by NYU Algorithm; Prepared by the Office of Strategic Planning
HUNTINGTON STATION

A hamlet in the Town of Huntington in Suffolk County. Approximately 24% of residents were born outside the country. The 3 largest ethnic groups in Huntington Station are: White (Non-Hispanic), Other (Hispanic), and White (Hispanic). The poverty rate in Huntington Station is 7.4%.

COMMUNITY ASSETS

- **Food Pantries**: Long Island Cares Inc.— Harry Chapin Food Bank and Humanitarian Center, St. Hugh of Lincoln Roman Catholic Church, The Redeemed Christian Church of God Chapel of New Songs
- **Northwell Community Programs**: Nutrition Pathways Program
- **Parks**: Froehlich Farm Nature Preserve, Manor Field Park
- **School District(s)**: Harborfields Central School District, Huntington Union Free School District, South Huntington Union Free School District
- **Transportation**: Long Island Rail Road, Suffolk County Transit, Huntington Area Rapid Transit (HART) buses
2022 GNYHA CHNA SURVEY COLLABORATIVE

CHNA SURVEY COLLABORATIVE OVERVIEW
In early 2022, GNYHA offered member hospitals and health systems the opportunity to participate in the GNYHA Community Health Needs Assessment (CHNA) Survey Collaborative. The collaborative supported participating members’ primary data collection efforts to meet the requirements of the Federal CHNA and the New York State Community Service Plan (CSP) by gathering information on community health needs and engaging with community members. While not a required element of a CHNA, surveys can be a part of a hospital’s CHNA and CSP along with other community engagement efforts and secondary data such as surveillance data from public health departments. The collaborative complemented longstanding GNYHA efforts to support members throughout their CHNA and CSP development and implementation process.

A diverse group of GNYHA member hospitals participated in the 2022 collaborative, including community and safety net hospitals, small health systems, and large academic medical centers. GNYHA developed a health needs assessment survey with member input, made the survey available in 11 languages on paper and online, collected the data and analyzed the results, and created custom reports for each participating hospital. The members recruited participants from their communities to respond to the survey, and more than 17,600 community members responded.

COLLABORATIVE SURVEY DESIGN
The CHNA collaborative survey is an abbreviated version of the 2022 GNYHA Model Community Health Needs Assessment Survey. GNYHA members provided input in multiple stages through a collaborative and iterative process. GNYHA developed the survey using best practice approaches in survey design and needs assessment. The survey used validated questions from existing surveys such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (CDC BRFSS) and the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene’s Community Health Survey (NYC CHS). GNYHA sought to minimize respondent burden by keeping the survey length to a minimum.

Community members could complete the survey online in a format compatible with mobile devices. The members also received copies of the survey in 11 languages (English and the top 10 languages spoken among non-English speakers as designated by New York State), which participants could print and use for data collection. Before the collaborative began, participating hospitals gave GNYHA a list of the counties or zip codes where the hospital would field the survey. GNYHA attributed respondents who lived in a hospital’s survey service area to that hospital. Hospitals recruited members of their community to participate in the survey and entered data from paper surveys online. Each hospital received a report with data from respondents who live in that service area.

COLLABORATIVE SURVEY RESULTS
Approximately 17,600 community members responded to the survey, and about 70% completed the entire survey. Community members qualified for the survey if they were age 18 and above and lived within any of the geographic areas identified by the members as their hospital’s service area.
During the survey fielding period, GNYHA held member forums in which the members shared best practices and challenges in recruiting community members for the survey. GNYHA produced biweekly geographic and demographic reports summarizing the responses in their service area, which allowed hospitals to adjust their dissemination strategy.

Following the survey’s close, GNYHA provided each participant with a report that summarized the survey responses and respondent demographics, and a spreadsheet with the processed respondent-level data for their service area, allowing for participating hospitals to conduct additional analyses. GNYHA also provided technical assistance to each hospital to interpret their results and identify areas of need, and created custom reports as requested by members.
2022 Community Health Survey

We want to improve the health services we offer to people who live in your neighborhood. The information you give us will be used to improve health services for people like yourself.

Completing the survey is voluntary. We will keep your answers private. If you are not comfortable answering a question, leave it blank.

We value your input. Thank you very much for your help.

1 Are you 18 years of age or older?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No → Thank you very much, but we are only asking this survey of people who are ages 18 and older.

2 We want people from all different neighborhoods to take part in this survey. Please tell us the zip code where you live so we can identify your neighborhood.

   Zip code: ________________
IF YOU PROVIDED A ZIP CODE, PLEASE GO TO PAGE 3. YOU DO NOT NEED TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS.

3 Do you live in New York City?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No → Skip to 5

4 If you live in New York City, please select the borough where you live:
   ○ The Bronx → Go on to page 3
   ○ Brooklyn → Go on to page 3
   ○ Manhattan → Go on to page 3
   ○ Queens → Go on to page 3
   ○ Staten Island → Go on to page 3

5 If you do not live in New York City, please tell us the county where you live:
   ○ Albany County
   ○ Allegany County
   ○ Broome County
   ○ Cattaraugus County
   ○ Cayuga County
   ○ Chautauqua County
   ○ Chemung County
   ○ Chenango County
   ○ Clinton County
   ○ Columbia County
   ○ Cortland County
   ○ Delaware County
   ○ Dutchess County
   ○ Erie County
   ○ Essex County
   ○ Franklin County
   ○ Fulton County
   ○ Genesee County
   ○ Greene County
   ○ Hamilton County
   ○ Herkimer County
   ○ Jefferson County
   ○ Lewis County
   ○ Livingston County
   ○ Madison County
   ○ Monroe County
   ○ Montgomery County
   ○ Nassau County
   ○ Niagara County
   ○ Oneida County
   ○ Onondaga County
   ○ Orleans County
   ○ Oswego County
   ○ Otsego County
   ○ Putnam County
   ○ Rensselaer County
   ○ Rockland County
   ○ Saratoga County
   ○ Schenectady County
   ○ Schoharie County
   ○ Schuyler County
   ○ Seneca County
   ○ St. Lawrence County
   ○ Steuben County
   ○ Suffolk County
   ○ Sullivan County
   ○ Tioga County
   ○ Tompkins County
   ○ Ulster County
   ○ Warren County
   ○ Washington County
   ○ Wayne County
   ○ Westchester County
   ○ Wyoming County
   ○ Yates County
   ○ Other_____________
6 In general, how is the overall health of the people of your neighborhood?
   ○ Poor
   ○ Fair
   ○ Good
   ○ Very good
   ○ Excellent

7 In general, how is your physical health?
   ○ Poor
   ○ Fair
   ○ Good
   ○ Very good
   ○ Excellent

8 In general, how is your mental health?
   ○ Poor
   ○ Fair
   ○ Good
   ○ Very good
   ○ Excellent
For each of the following, please tell us: How important is each of the following to you and how satisfied are you with the current services in your neighborhood to address each health issue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How important is this issue to you?</th>
<th>How satisfied are you with current services?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Access to healthy/nutritious foods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adolescent and child health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arthritis/disease of the joints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asthma/breathing problems or lung disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cigarette smoking/tobacco use/vaping/e-cigarettes/hookah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dental care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Diabetes/elevated sugar in the blood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heart disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hepatitis C/liver disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>High blood pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Infant health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mental health/depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Obesity in children and adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stopping falls among elderly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Substance use disorder/drug addiction (including alcohol use disorder)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Violence (including gun violence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Women’s and maternal health care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 **What are your COVID-19 needs?** (Select all that apply)

- □ At-home COVID-19 tests
- □ Boosters for COVID-19
- □ In-person testing for COVID-19 (e.g., doctor’s office, pharmacy, mobile van)
- □ Personal protective equipment (e.g., masks, hand sanitizer, face shields, gloves)
- □ Treatment for COVID-19
- □ Reliable source(s) of information on COVID-19
- □ COVID-19 vaccination

11 **In the last 12 months, was there a time when you needed medical care in-person but did not get it for any reason?**

- ○ Yes
- ○ No → Skip to 13

12 **For which of the following reasons could you not get medical care in-person the last 12 months?** (Select all that apply)

- □ I could not afford the cost of care (e.g., copay, deductible)
- □ I did not have health insurance
- □ There were no available appointments, or I couldn’t get an appointment soon enough
- □ I could not get through on the telephone to make the appointment
- □ Once I got there the wait was too long to see the doctor
- □ I did not have transportation
- □ I did not have childcare
- □ Because of COVID-19
- □ Other
- □ None of the above

13 **In the last 12 months, was there a time when you needed medical care by video or phone but could not get it for any reason?**

- ○ Yes
- ○ No → Skip to 15
14 For which of the following reasons could you not get medical care by video or phone in the last 12 months? (Select all that apply)

- I could not afford the cost of care (e.g., copay, deductible)
- I did not have health insurance
- There were no available appointments, or I couldn’t get an appointment soon enough
- I could not get through on the telephone to make the appointment
- I did not have a computer, phone, or other device to use for the visit
- I did not know how to see the doctor by video or phone
- I did not have internet
- I did not have data or minutes in my phone plan to use for a visit
- I did not have a private place to have my appointment
- Other
- None of the above

15 In the last 12 months, have you experienced any of the following? (Select all that apply)

- Anxiety or depression
- Difficulty paying your rent/mortgage
- Difficulty paying utilities or other monthly bills
- Increased household expenses
- Increased medical expenses
- Hunger or skipped meals because you did not have enough money to buy food
- None of these

16 What type of health insurance do you use to pay for your doctor or hospital bills? Is it insurance through:

- A plan purchased through an employer or union (including plans purchased through another person's employer)
- A plan that you or another family member buys on your own
- Medicare
- Medicaid or other state program
- TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS), VA, or Military
- Alaska Native, Indian Health Service, Tribal Health Services
- Some other source
- I do not have any kind of health insurance coverage
17 What is your age?  
_________________

18 Are you…  
○ Male  
○ Female  
○ Non-binary  
○ Another gender  
○ Prefer not to say

19 Do you describe yourself as…  
○ Lesbian or Gay  
○ Straight, that is not Gay  
○ Bisexual  
○ Other  
○ Prefer not to say

20 Are you Hispanic or Latino/Latina/Latinx?  
○ No  
○ Yes → Answer 21  
21 Which group best represents your Hispanic or Latino/Latina/Latinx origin or ancestry?  
○ Puerto Rican  
○ Dominican  
○ Mexican  
○ Ecuadorian  
○ Colombian  
○ Cuban  
○ Other Central American  
○ Other South American  
○ Other
22 Which one or more of the following would you say is your race? (Select all that apply)
   □ White
   □ Black or Black American → Answer 23
23 Some people in addition to being Black, have a certain heritage or ancestry. Do you identify with any of these? (Select all that apply)
   □ African American
   □ Caribbean or West Indian
   □ A recent immigrant or the child of recent immigrants from Africa
   □ Other
   □ Asian → Answer 24
24 Please tell me which group best represents your Asian heritage or ancestry?
   □ Chinese
   □ Asian Indian
   □ Filipino
   □ Korean
   □ Japanese
   □ Vietnamese
   □ Other
   □ Middle Eastern or North African
   □ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   □ American Indian, Native, First Nations, Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, or Alaska Native
   □ Other

25 What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed?
   ○ Grades 8 (Elementary) or less
   ○ Grades 9 through 11 (Some High School)
   ○ Grade 12 or GED (High School Graduate)
   ○ Some college or technical school
   ○ College graduate or more

26 Including yourself, how many people usually live or stay in your home or apartment?
   ______________________ person(s)
27 What is the primary language you speak at home?
   ○ English
   ○ Spanish
   ○ Mandarin
   ○ Cantonese
   ○ Russian
   ○ Yiddish
   ○ Bengali
   ○ Korean
   ○ Haitian Creole
   ○ Italian
   ○ Arabic
   ○ Other

28 What is your current employment status? Select the category that best describes you.
   ○ Employed full-time for wages or salary
   ○ Employed part-time for wages or salary
   ○ Self-employed
   ○ Out of work for 1 year or more
   ○ Out of work for less than 1 year
   ○ A homemaker
   ○ A student
   ○ Retired
   ○ Unable to work

29 What is your household’s annual household income from all sources, before taxes, in the last year? By household income we mean the combined income from everyone living in the household including even roommates or those on disability income.
   ○ Less than $20,000
   ○ $20,000 to $29,999
   ○ $30,000 to $49,999
   ○ $50,000 to $59,999
   ○ $60,000 to $74,999
   ○ $75,000 to $99,999
   ○ $100,000 or more

This is the end of the survey. Thank you very much for your help.