## Characteristics of Uninsured North Carolinians

2010-2011 Data Snapshot

Almost one out of every five non-elderly people in North Carolina were uninsured in 2010-2011. This is approximately the same rate as in the prior year report (2009-2010), but represents a slight decrease of 0.6% over five years ago. Most of the decline is due to more children being covered by health insurance.

More than 70% of the uninsured live in families where there is at least one full-time worker. However, there has been a large decline in the percentage of uninsured who live in families with two or more people who are working full time (decline of 12.0 percentage points over the last five years), with a commensurate increase in the percentage of uninsured who live in a household with no workers, part-time workers, and only one full-time worker. This is likely a reflection of the poor economy over the last three years, in which many people lost jobs altogether or moved to part-time positions.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) will extend coverage to many of the uninsured. However, the US Supreme Court ruled that state expansion of Medicaid was optional. If North Carolina choses to participate in Medicaid expansion, approximately 648,000 uninsured individuals would be eligible for Medicaid coverage, based on their having incomes equal to or less than 138% Federal Poverty Level (FPL). In addition, many of the 710,000 uninsured with incomes above 138% and below 400% of the FPL will be eligible for tax credits to purchase health insurance coverage through a newly created Health Benefits Exchange.

This data snapshot provides information about uninsured individuals in North Carolina, including family income, race/ethnicity, workforce status, firm size, age, citizenship, rural/urban residence, health status, and industry. Uninsured estimates are presented for 2010-11, using data from the US Census Bureau. Data are also provided to show the change in uninsured estimates over a five -year span from 2005-2006 to 2010-2011. County-level estimates of the uninsured are available at www.nciom.org.

#### Interpreting the Data

Consider the second row of data for the uninsured non-elderly persons with family incomes less than 138% of the federal FPL. In North Carolina:

	20	10-2011 Rates		Change: 2005-2006 to 2010-1011			
			Percent of			Percent of	
	Thousands of	Percent of All	Category	Thousands of	Percent of All	Category	
Category	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	
Total Population Ages 0-64	1,555	100	18.9	37	$0^{a}$	-0.6	
Income							
<138% FPL	648	41.6	31.8	117	6.7	-0.8	

#### In 2010-2011

- There were 648,000 non-elderly uninsured with family incomes less than 138% of the FPL.
- 41.6% of the non-elderly uninsured have family incomes less than 138% FPL.
- 31.8% of the non-elderly with family incomes less than 138% FPL were uninsured.

#### From 2005-2006 to 2010-2011

- The number of non-elderly uninsured with family incomes less than 138% FPL increased by 117,000.
- The percentage of non-elderly uninsured with family incomes less than 138% FPL increased by 6.7% (i.e. 34.9% of the non-elderly uninsured had family incomes below 138% in 2004-2005 compared to 41.6% in 2010-2011).
- The percentage of the non-elderly with family incomes less than 138% FPL who were uninsured decreased by 0.8% percentage points (i.e. 32.6% of non-elderly with family incomes below 138% FPL were uninsured in 2005-2006, compared to 31.8% in 2010-2011).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> 100% of non-elderly uninsured individuals (total population ages 0-64) were used in the calculations for both years. Therefore there is no change in the percent of all uninsured between 2005-2006 and 2010-2011.



**Table 1: Ages 0-64** 

		2010-2011 Rat	es	Change: 2005-2006 to 2010-1011			
Category	Thousands of Uninsured	Percent of All Uninsured	Percent of Category Uninsured	Thousands of Uninsured	Percent of All Uninsured	Percent of Category Uninsured	
Total Population Ages 0-64	1,555	100	18.9%	37	0	-0.6	
Income							
<100% FPL	437	28.1	31.6	77	4.4	-1.2	
100-138% FPL	211	13.5	32.1	40	2.3	0	
138-200% FPL	241	15.5	25.5	-103	-7.2	-7.9	
200-25-% FPL	169	10.9	22.5	-21	-1.6	-3	
250-400% FPL	299	19.2	16.9	12	0.3	0.9	
400%+ FPL	198	12.7	7.3	32	1.8	0.9	
Gender							
Male	784	50.4	19.5	-25	-2.9	-1.4	
Female	771	49.6	18.4	62	2.9	0.2	
Race/Ethnicity							
White, Not Hispanic	740	47.6	14.5	11	-0.4	0	
Black, Not Hispanic	431	27.7	22.5	62	3.4	1.8	
Not White or Black or Hispanic	86	5.6	18.5	-7	-0.6	-8.6	
Hispanic	298	19.2	40.7	-28	-2.3	-12.3	
Age							
0-18	233	15	9.4	-85	-6	-4.2	
19-29	422	27.2	31.3	26	1.1	1	
30-44	479	30.8	25.1	41	2	2.2	
45-54	246	15.8	19.1	31	1.6	0.6	
55-64	175	11.3	14.5	24	1.3	0.4	
Citizenship							
Citizen	1,306	84	16.7	62	2	-0.3	
Not a citizen	249	16	59.5	-25	-2	3.2	
Rural/Urban							
Urban	1,088	70	19	164	9.1	1.3	
Rural	467	30	18.7	-127	-9.1	-4.5	
Self-perceived Health Status							
Excellent	353	22.7	12.9	-69	-5.1	-1.9	
Very Good	483	31.1	17.4	22	0.7	-1.9 -1	
Good	519	33.4	27.5	32	1.3	0	
Fair	155	9.9	27.3	39	2.3	1.5	
Poor	45	2.9	16.8	13	0.8	2.5	
Family Workforce Status	73	2.9	10.0	1.0	0.6	2.3	
No Workers	253	16.3	20.9	49	2.9	-2.6	
Only PT Workers	196	12.6	30.8	44	2.6	1.8	
1 FT Worker	704	45.3	19	116	6.5	0.9	
2+ FT Workers	402	25.8	15	-172	-12	-3.2	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> 100% of non-elderly uninsured individuals (total population ages 0-64) were used in the calculations for both years. Therefore there is no change in the percent of all uninsured between 2005-2006 and 2010-2011.

Table 2: Children Ages 0-18

	20	10-2011 Rates		Change: 2005-2006 to 2010-1011			
			Percent of			Percent of	
		Percent of All	Category		Percent of All	Category	
Category	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	Uninsured	
Children Ages 0-18	233	100	9.4	-85	$0^{a}$	-4.2	
Income							
<100% FPL	82	35.2	13.3	1	9.6	-4	
100-138% FPL	27	11.7	11.8	-9	0.3	-7.1	
138-200% FPL	41	17.4	12.5	-35	-6.4	-8.2	
200-250% FPL	28	12	12.1	-17	-2.1	-7	
250-400% FPL	39	16.9	8.3	-15	-0.3	-3.5	
400%+ FPL	16	6.8	2.7	-9	-1.2	-1.5	
Gender							
Male	101	43.2	7.9	-75	-12.2	-6.7	
Female	132	56.8	11	-10	12.2	-1.6	
Race/Ethnicity							
White, Not Hispanic	90	38.5	6.6	-48	-4.7	-3.5	
Black, Not Hispanic	69	29.7	11.2	-16	2.8	-2.3	
Not White or Black or Hispanic	19	8.1	11.2	2	2.9	-2.6	
Hispanic	55	23.6	17.2	-23	-1.1	-19.6	
Citizenship							
Citizen	219	94	9	-72	2.3	-3.9	
Not a citizen	14	6	35.4	-13	-2.3	-1.8	
Urban/rural							
Urban	169	72.5	10.1	-12	15.6	-1.6	
Rural	64	27.5	8	-73	-15.6	-9.5	
Self-perceived Health Sta- tus							
Excellent	93	39.8	7.8	-38	-1.2	-3.3	
Very Good	77	33.1	9.4	-33	-1.6	-6.2	
Good	59	25.3	14.7	-13	2.8	-2.9	
Fair	4	1.9	8.2	-1	0.3	-6.2	
Poor	0	0	0	-1	-0.2	-14.7	
Living with Parents?							
Both parents	114	54.4	7.4	-60	-4.7	-4.7	
Mother only	51	24.4	8.9	-31	-3.5	-5.5	
Father only	30	14.2	33.1	17	10	17.7	
Neither parent	15	7	14.7	-11	-1.8	-14.1	
Family Workforce Status							
No Workers	38	16.3	10.1	14	8.7	-0.7	
Only PT Workers	19	8	9.4	-10	-1	-6.3	
1 FT Worker	120	51.6	10.2	-21	7	-2.9	
2+ FT Workers	56	24.1	7.8	-67	-14.7	-6.9	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> 100% of children ages 0-18 were used in the calculations for both years. Therefore there is no change in the percent of all uninsured between 2005 -2006 and 2010-2011.



Table 3: Adults Ages 19-64

C J. Addits Ages 17-0-		010-2011 Rates		Change: 2005-2006 to 2010-1011			
Category	Thousands of Uninsured	Percent of All Uninsured	Percent of Category Uninsured	Thousands of Uninsured	Percent of All Uninsured	Percent of Category Uninsured	
Adults Ages 19-64	1,322	100	23	122	$0^{a}$	1.0	
Income	-						
<100% FPL	355	26.9	46.2	76	3.6	1.9	
100-138% FPL	183	13.9	43.1	49	2.7	3.5	
138-200% FPL	200	15.2	32.4	-68	-7.2	-8.1	
200-250% FPL	142	10.7	27.1	-4	-1.4	-1.4	
250-400% FPL	260	19.7	20.2	28	0.3	2.6	
400%+ FPL	182	13.8	8.5	41	2	1.5	
Gender							
Male	684	51.7	24.8	51	-1.0	1.1	
Female	639	48.3	21.3	72	1.0	0.9	
Race/Ethnicity							
White, Not Hispanic	650	49.2	17.4	59	-0.1	1.3	
Black, Not Hispanic	361	27.3	27.9	78	3.7	3.2	
Not White or Black or Hispanic	67	5.1	22.6	-9	-1.3	-11.5	
Hispanic	243	18.4	58.8	-5	-2.3	-2.7	
Age							
Age 19-29	422	31.9	31.3	26	-1.0	1.0	
Age 30-44	479	36.2	25.1	41	-0.2	2.2	
Age 45-54	246	18.6	19.1	31	0.7	0.6	
Age 55-64	175	13.2	14.5	24	0.6	0.4	
Citizenship							
Citizen	1,087	82.2	20.2	135	2.8	1.3	
Not a citizen	235	17.8	62	-12	-2.8	2.4	
Urban/rural							
Urban	919	69.5	22.7	176	7.6	2.5	
Rural	403	30.5	23.7	-54	-7.6	-1.9	
Self-perceived Health Sta- tus							
Excellent	261	19.7	16.9	-31	-4.6	-0.6	
Very Good	406	30.7	20.8	55	1.5	1.2	
Good	460	34.8	30.9	44	0.2	0.5	
Fair	150	11.4	29.2	39	2.1	2.5	
Poor	45	3.4	17.7	14	0.8	3.5	
Family Workforce Status							
No Workers	215	16.3	25.8	36	1.3	-2.2	
Only PT Workers	178	13.4	40.5	54	3.2	4.3	
1 FT Worker	584	44.1	23.2	137	6.9	2.5	
2+ FT Workers	345	26.1	17.6	-105	-11.4	-1.8	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> 100% of adults ages 19-64 were used in the calculations for both years. Therefore there is no change in the percent of all uninsured between 2005-2006 and 2010-2011.



Table 3: Adults Ages 19-64 continued

S. Mults Ages		010-2011 Rates		Change: 2	Change: 2005-2006 to 2010-1011			
Category	Thousands of Uninsured	Percent of All Uninsured	Percent of Category Uninsured	Thousands of Uninsured	Percent of All Uninsured	Percent of Category Uninsured		
Adults Ages 19-64	1,322	100	23	122	0.0	1.0		
Individual's Labor Force Status								
Not in Labor Force	337	25.5	23.8	19	-1.0	-3.3		
Unemployed	191	14.4	48.3	107	7.5	5.3		
Part Time	233	17.6	34.8	61	3.3	5.9		
Full Time	561	42.5	17.5	-65	-9.7	-0.6		
Firm size (among full time and part time)								
Not employed	528	39.9	28.2	126	6.5	-0.5		
1-99	462	34.9	31	-61	-8.7	0.6		
100-999	84	6.4	14.6	2	-0.5	1.1		
1000 or more	212	16	12.3	71	4.3	3.5		
Unknown	36	2.7	43.3	-16	-1.6	-5.1		
Industry (among full time and part time)								
Agriculture	20	2.5	48.1	5	0.6	20.8		
Construction	126	15.8	41.5	-71	-8.8	-7.6		
Manufacture	71	8.9	17.1	1	0.2	5.1		
Transport	30	3.8	18.6	6	0.8	4.1		
Trade	150	18.8	26.6	51	6.5	8.2		
Health & Ed- ucation	121	15.2	12.4	8	1.1	-0.3		
Finance	21	2.6	8.3	-19	-2.4	-0.3 -4.7		
Government	11	1.4	5.9	-19 5	0.6	2.3		
Hospitality	99	12.5	36.1	-15	-1.8	3.0		
	146			24		0.5		
Other	140	18.3	20.7	24	3.1	0.5		

Estimates prepared for the North Carolina Institute of Medicine by Mark Holmes, PhD, Health Policy and Management, UNC Gillings School of Global Public Health.

The North Carolina Institute of Medicine (NCIOM) serves as a non-political source of health policy analysis and advice in North Carolina. The NCIOM is an independent, quasi-state agency that was chartered by the North Carolina General Assembly in 1983 to provide balanced, nonpartisan information on issues relevant to the health of North Carolina's population. To meet its mission, the NCIOM convenes task forces of knowledgeable and interested individuals to study these issues and develop workable solutions. For more information, visit http://www.nciom.org.

For more information on this publication or the NCIOM, contact Pam Silberman, JD, DrPH, President and CEO of the North Carolina Institute of Medicine at 919.401.6599, or visit http://www.nciom.org.



# North Carolina County-Level Estimates of Non-Elderly Uninsured

North Carolina Institute of Medicine

2010-2011 Data Snapshot

This data snapshot provides information about uninsured individuals in North Carolina by age and county of residence. Uninsured estimates are presented for 2010-2011. This information will be helpful to state and local policymakers, health care professionals, insurers, and community groups and others interested in the provision of health care at the local level.

State-level estimates about the characteristics of uninsured individuals in North Carolina, including family income, race/ethnicity, workforce status, firm size, age, citizenship, rural/urban residence, health status, and industry are available on the North Carolina Institute of Medicine website at www.nciom.org.

### Methodology

County-level estimates were developed using data from the U.S. Census Bureau and the North Carolina Employment Security Commission. To generate county-level uninsured estimates, the state-level estimates for uninsured in North Carolina, obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement, were adjusted using county-level estimates of age, race/ethnicity, gender, poverty, and unemployment, as well as data on the types of industries and firm sizes in each North Carolina county. Estimates are not directly comparable to previously published NCIOM/Sheps Center estimates due to slight changes in the methodology.

The table below outlines the estimated rates for North Carolina's 100 counties for children (ages 0-18), adults (ages 19-64), and total non-elderly (ages 0-64). (Following convention, we do not include the elderly since only about one percent of older adults are uninsured.) Because these are estimates, numbers of uninsured have been rounded to the nearest thousands. We also present the quartile of the county – "Low" denotes those 25 counties with the lowest rate, "Mid-Low" the next 25 lowest rates, etc.

	Children (0-18)			Adult (19-64)			Total (0-64)			
County	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	
Alamance County	4,000	8.8%	High	21,000	21.3%	Mid-High	25,000	17.6%	Mid-High	
Alexander County	1,000	7.6%	Low	5,000	19.5%	Low	5,000	16.2%	Low	
Alleghany County	< 500	8.7%	High	1,000	21.6%	Mid-High	2,000	18.2%	Mid-High	
Anson County	1,000	8.5%	Mid-High	4,000	23.1%	High	5,000	19.2%	High	
Ashe County	< 500	7.6%	Low	3,000	19.7%	Low	4,000	16.7%	Mid-Low	
Avery County	< 500	8.2%	Mid-Low	3,000	21.1%	Mid-High	3,000	18.2%	Mid-High	
Beaufort County	1,000	8.5%	Mid-High	6,000	20.3%	Mid-Low	7,000	17.0%	Mid-Low	
Bertie County	< 500	8.7%	High	3,000	24.8%	High	4,000	20.6%	High	
Bladen County	1,000	8.6%	Mid-High	5,000	21.2%	Mid-High	6,000	17.7%	Mid-High	
Brunswick County	2,000	7.8%	Low	14,000	20.0%	Mid-Low	16,000	17.0%	Mid-Low	
Buncombe County	4,000	7.7%	Low	30,000	18.5%	Low	34,000	15.8%	Low	
Burke County	2,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	11,000	18.7%	Low	13,000	15.6%	Low	
Cabarrus County	4,000	8.1%	Mid-Low	25,000	20.9%	Mid-High	29,000	16.8%	Mid-Low	
Caldwell County	2,000	7.7%	Low	10,000	18.6%	Low	12,000	15.6%	Low	
Camden County	< 500	6.8%	Low	1,000	19.5%	Low	1,000	15.6%	Low	

	Cl	nildren ((	)-18)	Α	dult (19-	-64)	Total (0-64)		
County	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
Carteret County	1,000	7.4%	Low	8,000	18.8%	Low	9,000	16.1%	Low
Caswell County	<500	8.1%	Mid-Low	4,000	23.2%	High	4,000	19.4%	High
Catawba County	3,000	7.9%	Mid-Low	18,000	17.5%	Low	21,000	14.7%	Low
Chatham County	1,000	8.9%	High	9,000	22.5%	High	11,000	18.8%	High
Cherokee County	< 500	7.9%	Mid-Low	3,000	17.2%	Low	3,000	14.8%	Low
Chowan County	<500	8.2%	Mid-Low	2,000	20.6%	Mid-Low	2,000	17.0%	Mid-Low
Clay County	<500	7.6%	Low	1,000	18.7%	Low	1,000	16.0%	Low
Cleveland County	2,000	7.9%	Mid-Low	12,000	19.3%	Low	14,000	16.0%	Low
Columbus County	1,000	8.5%	Mid-High	8,000	22.2%	Mid-High	10,000	18.3%	Mid-High
Craven County	2,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	14,000	20.2%	Mid-Low	16,000	16.6%	Mid-Low
Cumberland County	9,000	8.6%	Mid-High	50,000	22.8%	High	58,000	18.4%	Mid-High
Currituck County	< 500	7.0%	Low	3,000	19.8%	Mid-Low	4,000	16.2%	Low
Dare County	1,000	7.8%	Low	4,000	18.2%	Low	5,000	15.7%	Low
Davidson County	3,000	7.8%	Low	22,000	20.5%	Mid-Low	25,000	16.9%	Mid-Low
Davie County	1,000	7.6%	Low	5,000	19.8%	Mid-Low	6,000	16.3%	Low
Duplin County	2,000	10.0%	High	10,000	26.7%	High	12,000	21.6%	High
Durham County	7,000	9.1%	High	41,000	21.5%	Mid-High	48,000	18.1%	Mid-High
Edgecombe County	1,000	8.8%	High	8,000	22.2%	Mid-High	9,000	18.2%	Mid-High
Forsyth County	9,000	8.9%	High	47,000	20.3%	Mid-Low	56,000	16.9%	Mid-Low
Franklin County	1,000	8.4%	Mid-High	9,000	23.0%	High	11,000	18.7%	High
Gaston County	4,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	28,000	20.3%	Mid-Low	32,000	16.8%	Mid-Low
Gates County	<500	7.7%	Low	2,000	22.8%	High	2,000	18.5%	High
Graham County	< 500	7.9%	Mid-Low	1,000	20.4%	Mid-Low	1,000	16.9%	Mid-Low
Granville County	1,000	8.4%	Mid-High	9,000	20.5%	Mid-Low	10,000	17.3%	Mid-High
Greene County	1,000	9.7%	High	4,000	27.0%	High	5,000	22.3%	High
Guilford County	11,000	8.5%	Mid-High	68,000	20.3%	Mid-Low	79,000	16.9%	Mid-Low
Halifax County	1,000	8.6%	High	8,000	23.0%	High	9,000	18.9%	High
Harnett County	3,000	8.5%	Mid-High	19,000	24.3%	High	22,000	19.1%	High
Haywood County	1,000	7.4%	Low	7,000	18.0%	Low	8,000	15.3%	Low
Henderson County	2,000	8.2%	Mid-Low	13,000	20.0%	Mid-Low	15,000	16.8%	Mid-Low
Hertford County	1,000	8.9%	High	4,000	22.7%	High	4,000	18.8%	High
Hoke County	1,000	8.8%	High	9,000	27.1%	High	10,000	21.0%	High
Hyde County	< 500	8.5%	Mid-High	1,000	24.6%	High	1,000	20.9%	High
Iredell County	3,000	7.7%	Low	20,000	19.1%	Low	24,000	15.7%	Low
Jackson County	1,000	8.3%	Mid-High	6,000	20.6%	Mid-Low	6,000	17.4%	Mid-High
Johnston County	5,000	8.5%	Mid-High	26,000	23.3%	High	31,000	18.5%	High
Jones County	< 500	8.3%	Mid-High	1,000	22.7%	High	2,000	18.9%	High
Lee County	2,000	9.4%	High	8,000	22.2%	Mid-High	10,000	18.2%	Mid-High
Lenoir County	1,000	8.7%	High	8,000	20.9%	Mid-High	9,000	17.3%	Mid-High
Lincoln County	2,000	7.6%	Low	11,000	20.3%	Mid-Low	12,000	16.8%	Mid-Low
Macon County	1,000	8.1%	Mid-Low	4,000	19.5%	Low	5,000	16.4%	Mid-Low



	C	hildren (	0-18)	1	Adult (19	-64)	Total (0-64)		
County	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
Madison County	< 500	7.5%	Low	3,000	19.2%	Low	3,000	16.1%	Low
Martin County	1,000	8.5%	Mid-High	3,000	21.1%	Mid-High	4,000	17.6%	Mid-High
McDowell County	1,000	7.8%	Low	6,000	18.9%	Low	6,000	15.9%	Low
Mecklenburg County	24,000	8.7%	High	139,000	21.2%	Mid-High	163,000	17.5%	Mid-High
Mitchell County	< 500	7.6%	Low	2,000	18.7%	Low	2,000	15.9%	Low
Montgomery County	1,000	9.5%	High	4,000	22.5%	Mid-High	5,000	18.7%	High
Moore County	2,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	10,000	19.5%	Low	12,000	16.2%	Low
Nash County	2,000	8.6%	Mid-High	13,000	20.7%	Mid-Low	15,000	17.2%	Mid-Low
New Hanover County	4,000	7.9%	Mid-Low	28,000	20.0%	Mid-Low	32,000	16.9%	Mid-Low
Northampton County	< 500	8.6%	Mid-High	3,000	23.1%	High	4,000	19.2%	High
Onslow County	4,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	30,000	24.0%	High	34,000	19.2%	High
Orange County	3,000	8.2%	Mid-High	19,000	19.5%	Low	22,000	16.4%	Low
Pamlico County	< 500	7.9%	Mid-Low	2,000	20.2%	Mid-Low	2,000	17.2%	Mid-High
Pasquotank County	1,000	8.2%	Mid-High	6,000	21.1%	Mid-High	7,000	17.4%	Mid-High
Pender County	1,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	8,000	22.2%	Mid-High	9,000	18.2%	Mid-High
Perquimans County	< 500	7.7%	Low	2,000	21.5%	Mid-High	2,000	17.8%	Mid-High
Person County	1,000	7.9%	Mid-Low	5,000	20.7%	Mid-Low	6,000	17.1%	Mid-Low
Pitt County	4,000	8.5%	Mid-High	26,000	22.0%	Mid-High	30,000	18.1%	Mid-High
Polk County	< 500	8.0%	Mid-Low	2,000	18.6%	Low	3,000	15.9%	Low
Randolph County	3,000	8.3%	Mid-High	19,000	20.5%	Mid-Low	22,000	16.9%	Mid-Low
Richmond County	1,000	8.6%	Mid-High	7,000	22.8%	High	8,000	18.6%	High
Robeson County	4,000	9.8%	High	22,000	25.4%	High	26,000	20.3%	High
Rockingham County	2,000	8.0%	Mid-Low	12,000	20.3%	Mid-Low	14,000	17.0%	Mid-Low
Rowan County	3,000	8.2%	Mid-High	19,000	20.8%	Mid-High	22,000	17.2%	Mid-Low
Rutherford County	1,000	7.9%	Mid-Low	9,000	20.2%	Mid-Low	10,000	16.8%	Mid-Low
Sampson County	2,000	9.6%	High	11,000	26.0%	High	12,000	21.0%	High
Scotland County	1,000	8.5%	Mid-High	5,000	21.7%	Mid-High	6,000	17.7%	Mid-High
Stanly County	1,000	7.5%	Low	7,000	18.9%	Low	9,000	15.6%	Low
Stokes County	1,000	7.1%	Low	6,000	20.0%	Mid-Low	7,000	16.5%	Mid-Low
Surry County	2,000	8.4%	Mid-High	9,000	19.7%	Mid-Low	11,000	16.5%	Mid-Low
Swain County	< 500	9.4%	High	2,000	21.8%	Mid-High	2,000	18.1%	Mid-High
Transylvania County	1,000	7.7%	Low	4,000	18.5%	Low	4,000	15.7%	Low
Tyrrell County	< 500	9.0%	High	1,000	26.6%	High	1,000	22.5%	High
Union County	5,000	7.7%	Low	28,000	21.3%	Mid-High	33,000	16.6%	Mid-Low
Vance County	1,000	9.1%	High	7,000	23.2%	High	8,000	18.8%	High
Wake County	22,000	8.1%	Mid-Low	126,000	19.7%	Low	149,000	16.2%	Low
Warren County	< 500	8.9%	High	3,000	25.2%	High	4,000	20.9%	High
Washington County	< 500	8.8%	High	2,000	22.1%	Mid-High	2,000	18.3%	Mid-High
Watauga County	1,000	8.1%	Mid-Low	8,000	21.8%	Mid-High	9,000	18.6%	High
Wayne County	3,000	8.8%	High	18,000	22.6%	High	21,000	18.5%	Mid-High



	Children (0-18)			Adult (19-64)			Total (0-64)		
County	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
Wilkes County	1,000	7.7%	Low	9,000	19.2%	Low	10,000	16.0%	Low
Wilson County	2,000	9.0%	High	12,000	22.1%	Mid-High	14,000	18.1%	Mid-High
Yadkin County	1,000	8.3%	Mid-High	5,000	20.9%	Mid-High	6,000	17.3%	Mid-High
Yancey County	< 500	7.9%	Mid-Low	2,000	19.9%	Mid-Low	3,000	16.8%	Mid-Low
North Carolina	214,000			1,341,000			1,562,000		

The North Carolina Institute of Medicine (NCIOM) serves as a non-political source of health policy analysis and advice in North Carolina. The NCIOM is an independent, quasi-state agency that was chartered by the North Carolina General Assembly in 1983 to provide balanced, nonpartisan information on issues relevant to the health of North Carolina's population. To meet its mission, the NCIOM convenes task forces of knowledgeable and interested individuals to study these issues and develop workable solutions. For more information, visit http://www.nciom.org.

For more information on this publication or the NCIOM, contact Pam Silberman, JD, DrPH, President and CEO of the North Carolina Institute of Medicine at 919.401.6599, or visit http://www.nciom.org.

