

SUMMARY: MUSKEGON COUNTY

The following is a summary of selected demographic, health status, and health systems indicators for Muskegon County. Both standards and benchmarks are provided in this profile. Standards identify the level communities should strive toward and, wherever they have been set, targets for *Healthy Michigan 2000* objectives serve this purpose. Benchmarks establish a point of comparison but do not necessarily correspond with the ideal, standard, or goal to be achieved. It is recommended that individual communities use additional sources of data to look more closely at local health status, health risks, and delivery system to determine priorities for improvement. The indicators listed below have been selected because they vary substantially from the indicators for the state as a whole. In general terms, the process of determining meaningful differences from state levels has included the following steps:

1. Establish a range of expected variation around the state mean value; for example, if the expected range of variation is plus or minus 10 percent and the state value of the indicator is 160, then the low end of the range is 144 [160-16] and the high end of the range is 176 [160 + 16].
2. Check to see if the local value for that indicator is **within the range** and therefore does **not** represent a meaningful difference. For example, if the range is from 144 to 176 and the local value for the indicator is 155, the difference between the local and state values is **not** meaningful.
3. Check to see if the local value for that indicator is **outside the range** and therefore **does represent** a meaningful difference. For example, if the range is from 144 to 176 and the local value for the indicator is 135, we can state that the local value is **meaningfully lower** than that for the state. If the range is from 144 to 176 and the local value for the indicator is 180, we can state that the local value is **meaningfully higher** than that for the state.

For a complete description of how a **meaningful** difference from the state indicators was determined, refer to Section One of this profile. Appendix A shows the indicator ranges, the state mean, and local values.

Some indicators not listed below, but included elsewhere in the document, may illustrate important health concerns for the community. Such indicators may be of interest in identifying priority areas for potential intervention, even though they are not categorized here as meaningfully different from the indicators for the state.

Additional indicators of major health concerns may be identified in other documents such as *Healthy Michigan 2000* (Michigan Department of Public Health) or *Healthy People 2000* (Centers for Disease Control, USDHHS). Comparisons to the state are made throughout this profile; state goals are given in the text, while national levels and goals are given in Appendix E. To provide a more complete picture of the health of the community, the health status and health system indicators in this profile should be viewed within the context of the demographic and socioeconomic indicators for the region.

Demographic, Social, and Economic Indicators:

The following demographic indicators occur at rates meaningfully different from those for the state as a whole:

- The percentage of families with a family income of less than \$14,999 is **higher** than the corresponding

percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.5]

- The percentage of children below the age of 5 living in poverty is **higher** than the corresponding percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.6]
- The percentage of families with children living in poverty is **higher** than the corresponding percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.7]
- The percentage of single parent families with children living in poverty is **higher** than the corresponding percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.7]
- The average monthly proportion of persons participating in AFDC programs is **higher** than the corresponding proportion for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.13]
- The average monthly proportion of persons participating in food stamp programs is **higher** than the corresponding proportion for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.13]
- The average monthly proportion of persons participating in Medicaid programs is **higher** than the corresponding proportion for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.13]
- The average monthly proportion of persons participating in SSI programs is **higher** than the corresponding proportion for the state of Michigan. [Figure 2.13]

Health Status Indicators:

The following indicators of health status occur at rates **meaningfully different** from those for the state of Michigan:

- The age-adjusted death rates for ischemic heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and neurologic disorders are **higher** than the corresponding rates for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.3]
- The years of potential life lost for ischemic heart disease, pneumonia, neurologic disorders, and digestive disease are **higher** than the corresponding rates for the state of Michigan. The years of potential life lost for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and genitourinary disease are **lower** than the corresponding rates for the state of Michigan [Figure 3.3]
- The birth rate for children born to white women 15-19 years of age is **higher** than the corresponding rate for the state of Michigan [Figure 3.4]
- The birth rate for children born to African-American women 15-19 years of age is **higher** than the corresponding rate for the state of Michigan [Figure 3.4]
- The percentage of low birth weight infants born to African-American women is **lower** than the corresponding percentages for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.6]
- The rates for gonorrhea, pelvic inflammatory disease, and syphilis are **higher** than the corresponding rates for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.7]

- The rate of tuberculosis cases is **higher** than the corresponding rate for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.9]
- The percentage of males aged 16-64 years with a mobility or self-care limitation is **higher** than the corresponding percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.10]
- The percentage of females aged 16-64 years with a mobility or self-care limitation is **higher** than the corresponding percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.10]
- The percentages of males and females aged 16-64 years with a work disability are **higher** than the corresponding percentages for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.11]
- The percentages of males and females aged 16-64 years with a work disability which prevents them from working are **higher** than the corresponding percentages for the state of Michigan. [Figure 3.11]

Health System Indicators:

The following indicators of health system functioning occur at rates **meaningfully different** from those for the state of Michigan:

- The percentages of breast cancers diagnosed in the regional and distant stages are **lower** than the corresponding percentages for the state of Michigan. [Figure 4.9]
- The percentage of African-American women receiving adequate prenatal care is **lower** than the corresponding percentage for the state of Michigan. [Figure 4.11]
- The number of hospital days per 1,000 population is **lower** than the corresponding rate for the state of Michigan. [Figure 4.12]
- The adjusted costs per enrollee for Medicare are **lower** than the costs per enrollee for the state of Michigan. [Figure 5.5]
- The adjusted costs per enrollee for Medicaid are **lower** than the costs per enrollee for the state of Michigan. [Figure 5.5]
- The total adjusted health care costs per capita are **lower** than the corresponding costs for the state of Michigan. [Table 24]