



A Region-wide Community Needs and Opportunity Assessment

Community Data Indicators and Strategic Philanthropic Plan for the Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation

Authored by: Mason Burley, Ph.D.
January 2020



INNOVIA
FOUNDATION

A Region-wide Community Needs and Opportunity Assessment

Author Note

This project was completed under contract to Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation, with additional financial support from Idaho Community Foundation, Avista Foundation and Premera Social Impact. Thank you to all partners that provided technical expertise, logistical assistance and organizational support to this assessment. Your contributions helped make this project a collaborative effort that will benefit the entire community.

Mason H. Burley, Ph.D., Innovia Foundation



Contents

- Executive Summary i
- Purpose 1
- Scope.....2
 - Collaboration between partners3
 - Proactive planning – prevention strategies4
 - Generalizable data - reflecting population.....5
 - Replicable – able to update and verify information6
- Methods6
 - Community Survey6
 - Administration and Scope.....6
 - Population and Sample Segments7
 - Survey Implementation/Design.....8
 - Public Data Indicators8
 - Overview and Criteria8
 - Data Hub9
 - Community Assessment Reporting9
 - Rankings Calculation11
 - Community Forums and Feedback12
 - Format12
 - Schedule.....13
- Results14
 - Community Survey14
 - Community Indicators.....25
 - Community Forums31
 - Palouse Forum Summary - Moscow, Idaho/Pullman, Washington (September 23, 2019).....31
 - LC Valley Forum Summary - Clarkston, Washington/Lewiston, Idaho (September 30, 2019).....32
 - Idaho/Lewis County Forum Summary - Grangeville, Idaho (October 2, 2019).....33
 - Clearwater County Forum Summary - Orofino, Idaho (October 3, 2019)34
- Strategic Direction35
 - Focus Areas35
 - Strategic Planning Practices and Principles.....39
 - Building Connections40

Table of Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation Service Region.....	1
Exhibit 2: Social Determinants	4
Exhibit 3: Proportional Contribution to Premature Death	5
Exhibit 4: Community Survey Sample Frame and Response Rate	7
Exhibit 5: Data Hub Community Indicators, by Category	10
Exhibit 6: Community Forum Schedule and Attendance	13
Exhibit 7: What is your household’s level of need for the following health and social services? (Q28) ..	15
Exhibit 8: Need for social and health services by region (Q28)	15
Exhibit 9: Do any of the following conditions apply to you? (Q27)	16
Exhibit 10: Reported Health Conditions (Q27).....	17
Exhibit 11: In the past 12 months, did any of the following hardship situations happen to you or any member of your household? (Q30)	18
Exhibit 12: Reported hardship situations (Q30)	18
Exhibit 13: Past Year Food Assistance Services (Q36 & Q37).....	20
Exhibit 14: In the past 12 months, how often have you or your household used each of the following types of food assistance services? (Q37)	21
Exhibit 15: In the past 12 months, how often did you do the following? (Q46)	22
Exhibit 16: Participate in Activity At Least Monthly (Q46)	22
Exhibit 17: Participate in Activity At Least Yearly (Q46)	23
Exhibit 18: Thinking about this community, which of the things below, if any, do you think most need improving? (Q4)	24
Exhibit 19: Aspects of Community Most in Need of Improvement (Q4).....	24
Exhibit 20: Health and Wellness Data Indicator Ratings, LCVH Foundation Region.....	26
Exhibit 21: Health and Wellness Data Indicator Ratings, by County	28
Exhibit 22: Example Resources for SDOH Strategy Development.....	37
Exhibit 23: Social Determinants and Social Needs – A ‘Whole Stream’ Approach.....	38

Table of Appendices

Appendix A – Members of Technical Advisory and Oversight Committees

Appendix B – Survey Introduction Letter

Appendix C – Survey Questionnaire

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Appendix E – Data Walk Invitations and Outcomes

Appendix F – County Level Data Indicators with Low Ratings: Detail

Appendix G – Organizations Attending Data Walks

Executive Summary

Needs assessment is a commonly understood term, defined by Wikipedia as “a systematic process for determining and addressing needs, or ‘gaps’ between current conditions and desired conditions or ‘wants’.” While the definition may sound straightforward, designing, implementing and reporting on a needs assessment can be challenging. How are current conditions measured? Whose perspective is included or excluded when deciding what needs to address? This report summarizes a needs assessment conducted for the Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare (LCVH) Foundation – a hospital conversion foundation established in 2017. The LCVH Foundation serves nine counties across Southeast Washington, Northeast Oregon, and North Central Idaho. To fairly evaluate community needs for over 200,000 persons living throughout this region, this project took a three-pronged approach:

- A **community survey** sent to a random sample of over 8,400 households in this area. The random sample was designed to reduce bias and ensure that diverse viewpoints were represented. Nearly one third (32%) of invited household completed a survey.
- An analysis of **secondary data indicators** was completed to assess community outcomes and conditions using publicly available data from the U.S. Census Bureau and other sources. The project ‘data hub’ includes a community assessment tool: www.inlandnorthwestinsights.org/community-assessment-tool/.
- A **series of community forums** were held to share results from data collection and hear from residents about community strengths, opportunities, and experiences. The forums included a ‘data walk’ where people could hold small-group discussions at stations focused on an important community topic.

Every needs assessment process will have some shortcomings and this year-long project may include limitations that are noted throughout this report. However, the underlying principle for each phase was grounded in a desire for inclusiveness and broad community participation. Listening to the ‘voice’ of community organizations and residents was imperative for this needs assessment. Based on a synthesis of survey/data analysis and resident feedback, we identified four themes where community needs were evident.

1. **Economic security and empowerment** – Unexpected household hardships and rising costs of living impact the health and well-being of persons, particularly financial insecure households, in this region. Addressing food insecurity/hunger, transportation obstacles and support for struggling households (such as fixed income seniors and low-income working families) were key themes reflected in the assessment.
2. **Educational opportunity and youth development** – Empowering residents to improve health and expand personal opportunity starts with access to education. The assessment revealed that school-based supports (such as mental health counseling), activities for teenagers, and training/education pathways that improve job prospects represent current gaps in many communities.
3. **Access to quality health and dental services** – Based on analysis of collected data and feedback from community forums, access to quality medical and dental care stood out as a key need highlighted in this assessment. There are numerous challenges to health service delivery throughout this region – distance, cost, and a changing policy environment among them. But these challenges create an opportunity for innovative delivery models (e.g. telehealth), patient

engagement (e.g. mobile care) and philanthropic support (e.g. rural residents). The healthy community rests on proactive and preventative care models. This assessment underlines the strong desire to have predictable, accessible and affordable health care available to all community members.

- 4. Community development and social connection** – The strength and pride and witnessed in the towns and rural communities throughout this region stood out as a memorable takeaway from this assessment process. Participants expressed a strong desire to work together to improve health by supporting community gathering and recreation places and inclusive civic participation models. Social isolation is perpetuated when residents do not feel like they are a part of the community. This disconnection hinders effort to promote wellness and prevent disease. Bringing people together and building on community pride – through housing options, community centers, public spaces and community-led initiatives – are all avenues for bolstering health and wellness.

All of these themes surfaced as ‘gaps’ in the community. The four themes based on data indicators and survey responses are not ranked by importance. Rather, these issues stand as guideposts, marking community concerns and essential needs (also called social determinants of health). These guideposts, and the findings laid out in this report, provide a means to navigate available opportunities, define community priorities and move forward on the road to improving health and wellness in the region.

Purpose


The Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare (LCVH) Foundation was established in 2017 with the sale of St. Joseph's Hospital in Lewiston, Idaho. The foundation manages the initial \$26 million endowment that resulted from the conversion of the hospital from a nonprofit to a for-profit entity. The LCVH Foundation is charged with:

Making grants, contributions, or program-related investments to qualified (nonprofit) organizations that promote the health, wellness, or disease prevention within the St. Joseph Regional Medical Center's service area.¹



The hospital's service area includes Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis and Nez Perce counties (Idaho), Wallowa county (Oregon), and Asotin, Garfield and Whitman counties (Washington) – **Exhibit 1**. The endowment will generate an estimated \$1 million in annual grants made available to serve the estimated 200,000 persons that reside in the 20,000 square mile service area.

Exhibit 1: Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation Service Region



Idaho Trust Bank serves as the trustee for the LCVH Foundation and grant decisions are made by a volunteer Board of Community Advisors (BCA). In the first grant round administered by the LCVH Foundation, the BCA elected to award Innovia Foundation a research grant to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment that will guide grantmaking strategies in the coming years.

*Lewis~Clark Valley
Healthcare Foundation*

The BCA recognized the tremendous potential to improve the health and wellness of area residents through the stewardship of foundation assets. In this sense, the **strategic philanthropic plan** outlined in this report provides *both* a needs and opportunity assessment. While this report is directed to the BCA, the work outlined here can benefit numerous organizations and entities concerned with improving community health and wellness in the region, including:

- Community organizations and nonprofits
- Local governments, boards and committees
- Public agencies
- Grantmaking foundations and community investment groups

The purpose of this project is twofold. First, through the process outlined below, we aimed to identify the most pressing health and wellness needs facing the region’s population. Second, and of equal importance, this assessment provided a forum to engage in community conversation around opportunities to support locally driven solutions.

The intention behind this effort is to utilize multiple sources of data, assemble up-to-date, reliable information and solicit feedback from diverse voices. In doing so, the assessment cannot only provide a report that serves as a useful reference, but outline a framework for examining, analyzing and sharing community needs.

Scope

For grantmaking foundations and community funders, requests for support invariably outpace available grant dollars. To achieve maximum impact with community funding, it is necessary to define both the scope of the issue and the intended response to address identified community needs. As noted by Wright, Williams and Wilkerson:

Importantly, health needs assessment also provides a method of monitoring and promoting equity in the provision and use of health services and addressing inequalities in health. The importance of assessing health needs rather than reacting to health demands is widely recognized, and there are many examples of needs assessment in primary and secondary care.

There is no easy, quick-fix recipe for health needs assessment. Different topics will require different approaches. These may involve a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods to collect original information or adapting and transferring what is already known or available.²



While the mission of the LCVH Foundation is broad – promoting health, wellness and disease prevention – the mandate for this assessment reflects an intentional plan meant to extend the reach of this work and achieve long-term results. This assessment plan emphasized the following priorities:

- Collaboration – input and ‘buy-in’ from community partners
- Proactive response – prevention focus
- Generalizable data – reflect population
- Replicable findings – shared openly

Collaboration between partners

From the outset of this project, the BCA expressed a desire to involve community partners to create a comprehensive and inclusive understanding of community needs and opportunities. Fortunately, additional regional funders and foundations recognized the value of collecting reliable data and developing a common ‘playbook’ for assessing community needs. Organizations providing financial support to this project included:

- Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation (primary sponsor)
- Innovia Foundation (primary sponsor)
- Idaho Community Foundation (supporting partner - ID)
- Avista Foundation (supporting partner – WA and ID)
- Premera Social Impact (supporting partner – WA)
- Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Community Development (community forums)

In addition, the commitment to collaboration involved numerous community partners that contributed to the design and implementation of this needs assessment. This included, but was not limited to, revisions to survey questions, distribution of paper surveys, selection of community indicators, and outreach for community forums and events.

The project was guided by both a Technical Advisory Committee and Oversight Committee. The Technical Advisory Committee provided regional representation and the content expertise necessary to ensure assessment produced valid and usable information. The Oversight Committee ensured that the project made consistent progress in meeting shared objectives of partners. Both groups met regularly to review the needs assessment methodology (described next) and suggest changes, where necessary.

Members of each committee are listed in **Appendix A** and included representatives from project funders and members of the following organizations:

- North Central Idaho Public Health
- Community Action Center
- COAST Transportation
- Twin County United Way
- Nimiipuu Health
- Lewis-Clark State College
- Syringa Hospital
- University of Idaho

It is important to note that dozens of additional community organizations and hundreds of area residents participated in the community forum phase of the project. The direct involvement from key organizations in planning the assessment demonstrates the broad commitment to share results of data analysis and work together to improve regional health indicators. These partnerships and pooled resources are particularly valuable in responding to health issues in rural areas. As Allen Smart, writing for Exponent Philanthropy notes,

Successful small foundations in rural areas leverage a number of non-financial assets to improve the lives of those they serve. They focus on meeting each community’s own vision of success by exploring the strategic possibilities that are well beyond the realm of check-writing.³

According to Smart, this type of engagement can improve health and wellness by 1) highlighting important issues, 2) educating the community, 3) building local infrastructure, 4) leveraging fundraising capacity, and 5) growing local voices. The coalition assembled for this project represents trusted community voices and content experts who can evaluate complex health problems and contribute to thoughtful solutions that are appropriate to the unique aspects of each community. These community contributions will prove the true value of this assessment, beyond any information presented in this report.

Proactive planning – prevention strategies

In considering grantmaking priorities, LCVH Foundation adopted a preference for looking ‘upstream,’ beyond the walls of the healthcare facility to focus on *social determinants of health (SDOH)*. Definitions of social determinants vary. However, a practical description involves, “complex circumstances in which individuals are born and live that impact their health. They include intangible factors such as political, socioeconomic and cultural constructs, as well as place-based conditions including accessible healthcare and education systems, safe environmental conditions, well-designed neighborhoods, and availability of healthful food.”⁴ While not exhaustive, the social determinants listed in **Exhibit 2** shows the wide range of factors that influence population health outcomes.

Exhibit 2: Social Determinants


Economic Stability	Neighborhood and Physical Environment	Education	Food	Community and Social Context	Health Care System
Employment	Housing	Literacy	Hunger	Social integration	Health coverage
Income	Transportation	Language	Access to healthy options	Support systems	Provider availability
Expenses	Safety	Early childhood education		Community engagement	Provider linguistic and cultural competency
Debt	Parks	Vocational training		Discrimination	Quality of care
Medical bills	Playgrounds	Higher education		Stress	
Support	Walkability				
	Zip code / geography				

Health Outcomes
 Mortality, Morbidity, Life Expectancy, Health Care Expenditures, Health Status, Functional Limitations

Source: Orgera, K. & Artiga, S. (2018, August 8). Disparities in Health and Health Care: Five Key Questions and Answers. Retrieved from <https://www.kff.org/disparities-policy/issue-brief/disparities-in-health-and-health-care-five-key-questions-and-answers/>.

Monitoring SDOH-related data as part of an ongoing assessment process makes logical sense, given the accumulation of research on domains that influence health outcomes. Only 10% of premature deaths, for example, are related to clinical or health-care related causes. The majority of early deaths (55%) can be attributed to behavioral or social factors (**Exhibit 3**).

Exhibit 3: Proportional Contribution to Premature Death



Source: Schroeder, S. A. (2007 September 20). We Can Do Better — Improving the Health of the American People. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357, 12, 1221-1228. Retrieved from <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMsa073350>

Full lists and categories of potential social determinants are available from a number of sources. The technical advisory committee for this project reviewed many of these sources including Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s County Health Rankings, Institute of Medicine’s Committee on Recommended Social and Behavioral Domains, United Health Foundation’s Health Rankings and the World Health Organization’s Health in All Policies initiative. The details of the selected indicators are listed in the methodology section (p. 6). Rather than debate the acceptability of each item on the list, however, it is important to emphasize the importance of thinking of health improvement in a new way. Meeting the goal of this effort – promotion of health, wellness, and disease prevention – cannot take place solely in a hospital or doctor’s office; it must start in homes, schools, parks, community gathering places and neighborhoods where we all live, work and recreate.

Generalizable data - reflecting population

The nine-county area served by LCVH Foundation is a diverse and changing region. For example, nearly one in five residents lives below the poverty line (19%), but the county poverty rates vary between 14% and 26% of the population. Region-wide, 17% of the population is age 65 or older, but the age 65+ population in each county ranges between 10% and 27%. With over 8,500 square miles, Idaho County represents the 18th largest county in the United States, by land area. Most of the census tracts and counties within this region have fewer than 20 persons per mile. However, in the quad-cities (Pullman, Moscow, Lewiston, Clarkston), population density exceeds 2,000 persons per square mile.

The stated priority of this effort, however, is to ensure that results reflect all members of the population. Partners cannot be responsive to population health needs if certain subgroups are not included in the assessment findings. The data collection methods outlined below were designed to collect a representative sample of the region’s population, including hard to reach and underserved groups, as well as those persons who may be more likely to respond to survey and self-report questions. Findings can be summarized to reflect the entire region or disaggregated to compare and highlight the county and local-area differences discussed above. By adhering to rigorous sampling procedures and proven

data collection methods, project partners were able to ensure the accuracy and credibility of assessment findings.

Replicable – able to update and verify information

Finally, project partners wanted to ensure that this was a “living assessment,” with information and analysis that could be accessed beyond the pages contained in this report. The importance of this commitment is twofold. First, the conclusions and summaries provided here could only be considered trustworthy if source material were open to further investigation and validation. Second, the needs and interests of community partners and funders varied. If data were open and accessible, additional learning about particular groups or locations could take place as part of this effort. With these goals in mind, community survey data collected for this assessment will be made available to requesting organizations and agencies. Additionally, access to a rich source of secondary data and locally relevant research has been compiled at the online project data hub: www.inlandnorthwestinsights.org. Both of these resources are discussed in the project methodology section.

Methods

Effective needs assessment requires a factual and wide-ranging understanding of important issues experienced by a community. Different data collection approaches each come with inherent strengths and limitations. To account for these trade-offs, the project team decided to adopt a three-phase approach: 1) primary data collection through a representative community survey, 2) secondary data collection and synthesis of available public data, and 3) a series of community forums and listening sessions to share findings and hear directly from community residents.



Community Survey

Administration and Scope

The objective of this survey was to obtain a comprehensive and illustrative profile of population health and social service needs facing households in Southeast Washington (Asotin, Columbia and Garfield counties), Latah County, Nez Perce County and North Central Idaho (Clearwater, Idaho and Lewis counties). The Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) at Washington State University implemented the survey in collaboration with the Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation, Innovia Foundation and other community partners.

It is important to note that two additional counties are part of the needs assessment project, but were not included in the community survey. These two counties are:

- **Wallowa County, OR** – At the time of the survey planning, project staff at the Northeast Oregon Health Network (www.neoregon.org) were preparing to launch a random-sample survey in Wallowa County, Oregon. The survey was designed to support the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) Coordinated Care Organization Care Integration Assessment. The prospect of two surveys in the field was likely to confuse residents and lower response rates. Therefore, for the 2019 cycle, a second survey in Wallowa County was postponed, and the Northeast Oregon Health Network agreed to share survey responses and reports for use in this assessment.

- **Whitman County, WA** – The Whitman Health Network utilized local and national funding sources to conduct a county-wide survey in both 2015 and late 2018. SESRC also administered the Whitman County survey using the same methodology for this survey study (described below). While the questionnaire for the Whitman County survey served as the basis for this effort, several questions were added or modified during the technical review process described previously. Partners from Whitman Health Network agreed to share responses from their 2018 survey, and it was determined that re-surveying the county in 2019 would not be necessary.

Population and Sample Segments

The surveyed population across this region includes nearly 140,000 persons. As discussed previously, it was important from a project standpoint to compare and explore differences for locations within this region. Therefore, we designed a survey frame that included a representative sample from four sub-regions (**Exhibit 4**). A random sample of 8,419 residential households was obtained from Marketing Systems Group for use with this study. The sample was drawn from an Address-Based Sampling (ABS) frame with the United States Postal Services Delivery Sequence File (USPSDSF) as its primary source.

Based on previous experience, survey managers at SESRC expected a 20-25% response rate. It was necessary to mail at least 2,000 invitations within each sub-region to ensure that survey estimates approximated population values with low sampling error. The survey administration and steps taken to increase response rate are detailed in the next section. Following these steps, the final response rate for the survey exceeded expectations, with 32% of available households completing an online or paper (mail) version of the survey. The calculated sample error was +/-1% - indicating low uncertainty between drawing a sample versus surveying the entire population. This high response rate provides an additional level of confidence in survey findings and improves the ability to draw conclusions about particular sub-populations and demographic groups.

Exhibit 4 – Community Survey Sample Frame and Response Rate

Region	Households	Invitations	Eligible	Completions	Response Rate
Southeast Washington Asotin*, Columbia, Garfield	28,879	2,419	2,283	679	30%
Latah County	40,134	2,000	1,858	638	34%
Nez Perce County	40,408	2,000	1,896	557	29%
North Central Idaho Clearwater, Idaho, Lewis	29,132	2,000	1,839	613	33%
Region Total	138,553	8,419	7,876	2,487	32%

The response rate is the ratio of completed and partially completed surveys to the total eligible within the sample. This formula is considered the industry standard for calculating response rates and complies with the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard definition of response rate. The formula is: (completed interviews + partially completed interviews) / [(completed interviews + partially completed interviews) + refusals + unable to interview + unable to reach]. Asotin County was oversampled so a representative sample could be obtained for both Southeast Washington and Asotin County.

Survey Implementation/Design

Using questions developed by project partners, in consultation with SESRC staff, a final questionnaire was created, with both an online and paper version. A survey protocol, based on the **Total Design Method**, was instituted. The total design method was pioneered by Don Dillman (Washington State University) and includes several prescribed steps designed to connect with potential respondents and encourage survey completion:

- For the random sample, a \$1 cash pre-incentive was enclosed with the mailing of the introductory letter. The cash pre-incentive is a token of appreciation, which helps draw attention to the mailing and helps to motivate respondents to participate. The cash pre-incentive was used to help improve survey response rates. The initial letter (**Appendix B**) introduced project partners and outlined the purpose of the study. Each letter included a unique code that allowed a member of the household to access the online survey site. The adult with the most recent date of birth was asked to complete the survey.
- The following week, residents who had yet to participate in the survey received a postcard reminder.
- Two weeks later, non-respondents received a paper questionnaire (**Appendix C**), and two weeks after that they received a final reminder letter.

The survey reminder period occurred between April and May 2019. During this period, each returned mail survey was coded into a database by SESRC data collection staff. The surveys were double-coded (entered a second time) to ensure accurate recording of all responses.

With assistance from COAST Transportation and other project partners, paper survey versions with pre-paid envelopes were distributed to libraries, senior centers, health offices and public gathering spaces throughout the region. The online version of the survey was also opened to the public with announcements airing on Northwest Public Broadcasting during two weeks in June. Despite extensive outreach with nearly 2,000 paper versions distributed, only 291 paper and online surveys were completed. While the results reported here do not include responses from this convenience sample, this extended dataset is available on request.

Public Data Indicators

Overview and Criteria

While the community survey data collected for this project are incredibly valuable, self-reported responses cannot provide a complete profile of issues facing a community. Important questions were omitted from the survey questionnaire where responses were likely to be subject to bias. Sensitive topics (e.g. sexual health, death by suicide), topics with social stigma (e.g. mental health, substance use), topics concerning vulnerable populations (e.g. incapacitated persons) or topics covered by populations not included in the survey (e.g. children) potentially fall in this category.

A robust collection and analysis of secondary data indicators was planned to both verify and augment information collected by the community survey. Secondary data indicators include those publicly available data sources that provide aggregated information for geographic regions of interest (i.e. counties, zip codes, school districts, census tracts). Of course, there are an innumerable set of public data sources that could potentially be examined as part of this effort. To narrow the list, we adopted the following criteria:



- Nationally available (not state-specific)
- Current (recent data in last 5 years)
- Consistent (published on a regular basis – not one time)
- Ongoing (data updates, permit trend analysis)
- Valid (data collected and published according to accepted research standards)
- Relevant (consistent with survey topics, health and wellness)
- Rural focus (possible to reliably examine rural profile and trends)

Data Hub

Ideally, data elements utilized for the assessment could be readily updated and made available to project partners in a cost-effective manner. Funding partners reviewed costs and features from several organizations that offered online data clearinghouses. After consideration, we contracted with the Center for Applied Research and Engagement Systems (CARES), located at the University of Missouri. The CARES Engagement Network (www.engagementnetwork.org/) provides an analysis and reporting platform that “connects communities to data.” The center develops customizable ‘data hubs’ that have been adopted by community networks across the United States.

A data hub for this assessment was developed with input and assistance from project funders and the technical advisory committee. The resulting online data hub – www.inlandnorthwestinsights.org – offers powerful mapping, reporting and data management tools. The hub also serves as a resource for grant writing, program development, and data-driven decision-making that can be accessed by community organizations and residents. Community research and results from the survey (www.inwinsights.org/community-survey/) discussed previously are also hosted on the data hub. Two recorded webinars were provided by the CARES team to explain features and functionality available on this site.



Community Assessment Reporting

The online mapping tool on the data hub makes over 15,000 indicators from hundreds of data sources available for rapid access, queries and export. The data cover topics ranging from civic/social, economic, education, environment and health (www.inlandnorthwestinsights.org/map-room/). While the mapping tool includes a vast repository of data, the geographic analysis of information cannot capture all aspects about the relative importance of a single data indicator. To rank indicators against relevant benchmarks and report on local trends, the data hub provides a community assessment tool (www.inlandnorthwestinsights.org/community-assessment-tool/).



The community assessment tool provides detailed reporting at the specified geography comparing rates to state and national benchmarks, showing annual trends, highlighting regional differences and demonstrating results by gender and racial/ethnic categories, when available. In total, the community assessment tool makes 100 indicators available for detailed analysis and reporting. The indicators are classified into the following categories, based on social determinants of health literature discussed earlier (Exhibit 5):

Exhibit 5 – Data Hub Community Indicators, by Category

1. Social and Economic Factors

Poverty
Early Childhood Education
Reading Proficiency
High School Graduation
High School Transitions
Social Support

2. Neighborhoods and Communities

Housing Affordability
Child Care Availability
Transportation
Parks and Recreation

3. Clinical Care

Health Care Access
Provider Availability
Screening and Prevention
Insurance Coverage
Primary Care Utilization

4. Health Behaviors

Alcohol Consumption
Smoking and Tobacco Use
Food Insecurity and Hunger
Substance Use
Physical Activity and Obesity

5. Health Outcomes

Chronic Health Conditions
Mortality and Premature Death
Infant Health
Oral Health
Sexual Health
Mental Health

6. Demographic Profile

Sex
Age Groups
Ethnicity
Household Composition
Veteran Populations

Detailed definitions and sources for the selected indicators are provided in **Appendix D**. The inventory of data indicators was selected by project partners based on several considerations. First, the selected indicators should show potential to be improved through philanthropic investment (and not the primary role of public financing). Second, the indicators should be comparative, so that results could be benchmarked to state or national levels. Third, indicators should be of high interest to local community groups. The local interest and focus on certain topics were also gauged against the list of community groups that submitted applications to the LCVH Foundation’s 2018 funding announcement. Finally, the BCA and project partners sought to ‘look upstream’ and prioritize prevention-related projects with a potential for early intervention and long-term impact. While one category covers health outcomes, the remaining provide leading measures of health, wellness, or disease prevention goals specified in the LCVH Foundation mission.

Rankings Calculation

The primary challenge with assessing and ranking a collection of measures, like those discussed here, comes from comparing figures with different baseline numerators and denominators. Diverging information should be evaluated on an ‘apples-to-apples’ basis whenever possible. Similar health ranking initiatives¹ have utilized a ‘z-score’ to standardize and compare each measure. The z-score transforms percentages and rates to a common metric based on the distribution of total scores.

For each indicator, raw data (percentages or rates) are obtained for each county in the LCVH Foundation service area. The z-score for each county is calculated as:


$$Z_{region} = \frac{(county\ value) - (regional\ value)}{(standard\ deviation\ of\ all\ counties\ in\ region)}$$

In this case, each z-score represents the number of standard deviations above or below the regional value. A z-score of 0.0, for example, indicates that the county has the same value as the entire region. To examine the relative position for each indicator at a national level, we also calculated a z-score based on results from all counties in the nation.

$$Z_{nation} = \frac{(county\ value) - (national\ value)}{(standard\ deviation\ of\ all\ counties\ in\ nation)}$$

The normalization of results into a z-score provides a common means to compare indicators on a regional or national basis. The z-score gives a consistent metric (standard deviation units) that show whether a county is above or below a regional/national norm. The z-score ranges between -3 and +3, but the meaning of this number can be difficult to communicate.

Fortunately, the z-score describes population values on a normal distribution (bell-curve) and shows the position a particular value (county) relative to all others. A county with a z-score of 1.65, for example, is higher than an estimated 95% of all other counties.



¹ RWJF County Health Rankings (<https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/our-methods/calculating-ranks>) and United Health America’s Health Rankings (https://assets.americashealthrankings.org/app/uploads/2018ahrannual_020419.pdf)

The indicator results presented in the results section correspond to the relative position of the county – the percentage of county scores that are above/below the selected county. There are no firm rules about how to categorize this continuous number. For the purpose of evaluating values of concern, this report adopts the following format:

- ↓ **much worse** – county value is in the lowest 10% of all counties regionwide/nationwide
- ↘ **worse** – county value is in the bottom 10%-30% of all counties regionwide/nationwide
- ↗ **better** – county value is higher than 30-60% all counties regionwide/nationwide
- ↑ **much better** – county value is higher than 60% of all counties regionwide/nationwide

Results provided in the next section include the indicator name and ranking (regional/national) according to the above format.

Community Forums and Feedback

Format

The final phase of the needs assessment involved direct conversations with area residents in a series of community forums. Innovia staff and members of the LCVH Foundation joined project partners in hosting nine forums held throughout the region. The forums included a daytime and evening event with the following formats:



- **Community leader forums** – a morning session was held with persons identified by project partners to be community leaders or local influencers. The purpose of the morning session was threefold. First, we aimed to encourage partnerships and facilitate coalition-building aimed at improving health and wellness of residents. Second, the sessions were also intended to introduce community organizations to project data and tools (survey and data hub). As mentioned, these tools are open and available to nonprofit organizations, civic groups, health systems, local governments, educational institutions and others interested in community improvement. Finally, the morning sessions provided a preview of the evening ‘data walk’ events with the opportunity to discuss preliminary data analysis results. Discussions at these morning forums were facilitated by the Regional Manager for Community Development with the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (www.frbsf.org/community-development/).
- **Evening ‘data walk’ and community conversation** – to encourage public participation and feedback from a diverse cross-section of the community, we also hosted a series of evening forums. The events included a free meal and childcare to show appreciation for participation and encourage attendance from all types of families. The events were held in a ‘data walk’ format. Data walks are “an interactive way for community stakeholders, including residents, researchers, program administrators, local government officials, and service providers, to engage in dialogue around research findings about their community.”⁵

The data walk invited participants to visit 4-5 different stations where a poster displayed early research findings from the community needs assessment. The stations focused on the following topics: economic security, food security, healthcare access, housing affordability, health limitations and behavioral health. Of course, community needs are not limited to the topics introduced at this session. However, based on the results from the community survey and feedback from the

technical advisory group, these were the topics chosen for a deeper dialogue with different stakeholders in the community.

At each station, participants were asked to address some of the following questions:

- What surprises you?
- What questions do these data raise for you?
- What further information would be helpful?
- What solutions can you think of to address these issues?
- What’s the story behind the data?
- What are the gaps in the community?
- What is role for... public/private sector? ...nonprofits and philanthropy?

The discussion provided an opportunity to ‘ground-truth’ the preliminary results and determine if data summaries aligned with residents’ views and experiences. At the conclusion of the data walk, participants recapped their conversations, shared local resources and discussed previous local initiatives. At the conclusion, the moderator asked a final open question – if you had a magic wand, what would you change in your community? This question invited attendees to ‘dream big’ and think about important areas where groups could come together to address challenges and opportunities. The responses to these questions are synthesized in the results section.

Schedule

The event locations, dates and attendance counts are displayed in **Exhibit 6**. Selected invitations, photos and references to news articles about these forums are included in **Appendix E**.


Exhibit 6 – Community Forum Schedule and Attendance

Event Location	Date	Community Partner	Attendees
Moscow Community Forum	23-Sep	Whitman County Health Network	19
Pullman Community Forum	23-Sep		17
Palouse Data Walk	23-Sep		50
Lewiston/Clarkston Community Forum	30-Sep	Twin County United Way	18
Lewiston/Clarkston Data Walk	30-Sep		94
Grangeville Community Forum	2-Oct	Syringa Hospital	22
Grangeville Data Walk	2-Oct	University of Idaho Extension	46
Orofino Community Forum	3-Oct	Clearwater Economic Development	11
Orofino Data Walk	3-Oct		64
Total			341

The events were not recorded, and verbatim participant feedback was not collected at the forums. Rather, a scribe wrote down comments on an easel visible to all attendees. The questions and conversation followed a consistent, but not identical, structure. Overall, however, the forums achieved the intended goal of engaging community residents, service providers and other stakeholders in a data-centered discussion about community change. The forums introduced a diverse group of stakeholders to the foundation’s work and will also provide a candidate pool for foundation board and leadership committees. Active community engagement represents a vital piece of the needs assessment process and reminds us that this work should be an ongoing part of responding to community needs.

Results

A considerable amount of data was collected for this assessment and, as a result, information from the survey, data hub and community forums can be utilized to address countless questions concerning the status and concerns of adults, children, families, senior citizens and other residents across the region. Given the limited space for this report, we focused on main findings and themes with the goal of prioritizing philanthropic funds for community benefit. Results are presented for each component of the assessment (survey, data indicators, forums) in this section. A synthesis of all three assessment phases is outlined in the final section – strategic direction for foundation grantmaking.



Community Survey

The 12-page community survey administered for this assessment included 48 questions spanning a number of topics such as household composition, employment/economic status, health/well-being, need for services, housing and food access. Results from each question are available on the project data hub: www.inwinsights.org/community-survey. Community organizations and groups wishing to query survey responses can also request access to raw data or the online analysis tool (Qualtrics) by contacting Innovia Foundation.

“Thank you for your work with this survey to support our community!”

-Survey participant

The results presented here cover six multi-part questions that ask respondents about household needs, health conditions, hardship situations and community involvement – factors directly related to grant funding priorities. It is important to note that results reflect population estimates – across all (adult) age groups, household sizes and income levels.²

Access to affordable healthcare services is critical to disease prevention, detection and treatment of illnesses, and improving quality of life. Rural residents, in particular, may face additional barriers to receiving necessary health care services, such as lack of health or dental insurance accepted by local providers, transportation distances or lack of convenient appointment times, among others. In addition, unexpected or rising medical costs pose difficulties for all area households. In this survey, 36-40% of respondents expressed a need for affordable medical or dental care (**Exhibit 7**). This need surpassed other household issues and was also consistent across surveyed regions (**Exhibit 8**).

“Even though we have a decent income, the cost of medical insurance and doctor dental care is a huge strain on our budget.”

-Survey participant

² Survey results for Whitman County, Washington and Wallowa County, Oregon were conducted by external organizations. Responses from these surveys were shared and a summary is provided in a separate supplementary report. As noted, the survey questionnaires differ from results presented here, but the supplementary report provides information on similar topics covered in this section.

Approximately 1 in 10 respondents reported being unable to see a doctor in the past 12 months due to inability to pay and 1 in 8 reported that lack of convenient appointment times prevented access. These rates are consistent with nationally reported numbers and demonstrate the importance of continued focus on care delivery.⁶ Additionally, the need for affordable dental and medical care is particularly

“It is very difficult to find local dentists that accept Medicaid for my children. We have to drive over 70 miles for appointments with our dentist because they are the only providers that accept Medicaid within 200 miles”

-Survey participant

pronounced for low-income households (under 200% poverty level) – where out-of-pocket health costs may be 2-3 times higher than moderate to high income families (as a percentage of family budget).⁷ Patients without consistent primary care often seek needed care in more intensive (and expensive) settings. Among all survey respondents, 15% reported accessing non-emergency care in the emergency room because they were unable to see a primary care provider. Effective solutions to address disparities in healthcare delivery may be a worthwhile investment that result in downstream savings for hospitals, health systems and public taxpayers.

Exhibit 7: What is your household’s level of need for the following health and social services? (Q28)




Exhibit 8: Need for social and health services by region (Q28)

Health/Social service need	percent reporting need (rank)				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
Affordable dental care	44% (1)	38% (1)	36% (1)	42% (1)	40% (1)
Affordable medical care	40% (2)	34% (2)	33% (2)	37% (2)	36% (2)
Mental health services/family counseling	30% (3)	12% (5)	21% (3)	21% (3)	22% (3)
Affordable housing	29% (4)	11% (8)	13% (7)	18% (4)	18% (4)
Food (help getting enough food)	17% (6)	14% (4)	14% (6)	14% (6)	15% (5)
Mortgage/rental assistance	17% (5)	11% (7)	15% (4)	14% (5)	15% (6)
Help with utility bills	12% (9)	16% (3)	15% (5)	14% (7)	14% (7)
Help finding a job/job training	15% (7)	9% (9)	11% (9)	12% (8)	12% (8)
Legal help	10% (10)	11% (6)	11% (10)	12% (9)	11% (9)
Access to library system	13% (8)	9% (10)	6% (14)	11% (10)	10% (10)
Affordable childcare	6% (14)	7% (11)	12% (8)	6% (14)	8% (11)

Reported health conditions for persons responding to the survey are listed in **Exhibit 9**. As shown, hypertension (high blood pressure) was reported by one-quarter (26%) of respondents, twice as high as other prevalent conditions (obesity, mental health issues, asthma).

Exhibit 9: Do any of the following conditions apply to you? (Q27)




Exhibit 10: Reported Health Conditions (Q27)

Health condition	percent reporting health condition (rank)				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
High blood pressure	17% (1)	28% (1)	27% (1)	35% (1)	26% (1)
Obesity	9% (4)	12% (2)	15% (2)	15% (2)	13% (2)
Mental health issues	16% (2)	6% (8)	14% (3)	12% (6)	13% (3)
Asthma	12% (3)	11% (4)	13% (5)	15% (2)	12% (4)
Tobacco/vapor use	8% (5)	9% (6)	13% (4)	14% (4)	11% (5)
Diabetes	6% (7)	9% (5)	10% (6)	13% (5)	9% (6)
Physical disability	4% (9)	12% (3)	8% (8)	11% (7)	8% (7)
Dental disease/emergency	6% (6)	6% (9)	8% (7)	10% (8)	7% (8)
Heart disease	4% (10)	9% (7)	6% (9)	8% (9)	6% (9)
Alcohol or substance issue	3% (11)	1% (11)	5% (10)	1% (12)	3% (10)

“Cost of medical insurance, copays and deductibles are the largest expense and concern for this household. We save what we can to cover these expenses but cannot afford it if we both have an issue, which leads to skipping medications and Doctor visits.”

-Survey participant

Of course, respondents may under-report personal health issues due to social stigma or misconceptions about clinical categories that define a condition. In the next section, the prevalence of these conditions is also explored using secondary data indicators from public sources. While the specific occurrence of each condition can only be estimated, the rankings also indicate similar concerns across counties (**Exhibit 10**).

Another way to assess health needs involves taking a closer look at hardship situations faced by households in the community. Hardship situations may be a one-time or repeated event for a household. Additionally, a household may experience multiple difficulties that impact financial stability, quality of life and health outcomes. **Exhibit 11** shows the hardship situations for survey


respondents, with transportation difficulties reported most frequently (16%). Given that rural residents rely on vehicles more than urban residents and make longer trips, on average, it is not surprising that transportation issues top the list of hardships in all surveyed regions.



“I find it very difficult to get quality health care. My deductible is around 7,000 dollars, so I will be unable to pay for any type of medical services. If something catastrophic were to happen, we could literally lose everything we have in order to pay for the medical bills. It is extremely stressful.”

-Survey participant

Exhibit 11: In the past 12 months, did any of the following hardship situations happen to you or any member of your household? (Q30)



As shown in **Exhibit 12** (next page), the occurrence of other hardship situations varied across counties in the survey. Many of the situations, however, result in unexpected changes to lifestyle or family budgets. Car repairs, rent increases, extended illnesses, new caregiving responsibilities and family violence can create a level of financial and personal stress that impacts health and well-being. Navigating these challenges in rural areas can result in additional difficulties such as accessing healthcare services, commuting to employment or education settings, and utilizing social services or available local resources. While single questions are reported from this survey, underlying issues are often interconnected and require comprehensive strategies to address immediate needs and improve health and well-being.

“The most difficult thing for us, in this community, is finding decent housing. Over the years, we have rented houses, but were asked to leave because the owners wanted to live in their houses again or sell them. We were only given 20 days to leave our last house. Rentals are hard to find...”

-Survey participant

“There are very few jobs in this town. My husband is unemployed because he cannot find a job here. He could work 40 minutes away in a bigger city, but the transportation is very limited.”

-Survey participant

Exhibit 12: Reported hardship situations (Q30)

Hardship	percent reporting hardship (rank)				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
Faced transportation difficulties/issues	18% (1)	12% (1)	19% (1)	13% (1)	16% (1)
Shared housing with another household due to high housing costs	11% (2)	3% (7)	9% (2)	5% (5)	8% (2)
Assumed responsibility for overall care of an older adult	5% (5)	6% (3)	7% (3)	5% (4)	6% (3)
Experienced a serious or extended illness that left you or another adult unable to work or care for children	6% (4)	6% (2)	5% (6)	5% (3)	6% (4)
Moved due to high housing cost	9% (3)	2% (8)	7% (4)	2% (10)	5% (5)
Left a living situation due to emotional or physical violence	3% (6)	2% (10)	5% (7)	6% (2)	4% (6)
Phone service stopped by vendor	3% (7)	4% (5)	6% (5)	4% (6)	4% (7)
Unable to pay property taxes on home due to insufficient funds	2% (9)	4% (4)	3% (8)	2% (9)	3% (8)
Heat or electricity stopped by vendor	2% (10)	4% (6)	2% (10)	2% (8)	2% (9)
Assumed responsibility for overall care or guardianship of child other than your own	1% (11)	2% (9)	2% (9)	3% (7)	2% (10)
Other utilities or garbage service stopped by vendor	3% (8)	2% (11)	2% (11)	1% (11)	2% (11)
Evicted from housing	0% (12)	1% (12)	2% (12)	1% (12)	1% (12)

The need for food assistance and the extent of hunger in a region should be considered from multiple perspectives. Regionwide, six percent of persons replied ‘yes’ to the question: “In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your home gone hungry because you were not able to get enough food?” Reported hunger varied across survey regions, with 3% to 9% of households facing hunger in the last year (**Exhibit 13**). This definition, however, accounts for the most serious food-related issues facing households. When asked about food assistance, 15% of respondents reported “needing help getting enough food” (**Exhibit 14**). This is more consistent with national figures that show one in eight individuals (13%) are food insecure.⁸ Food security is present when “access to adequate food is limited by lack of money or other resources.”⁹ As shown in Exhibit 13, individuals typically rely on friends and family for food assistance (15%), but these rates also vary across survey regions, with food banks, SNAP benefits and church support also playing a role.

“In my work, I interact with people who are in great economic need. There is food insecurity on the Palouse, and with that comes a range of mental health problems. I hope community leaders find solutions for helping people in poverty. Many are working and not making enough to live on.”

-Survey participant

Examining food insecurity and response systems on a local level is a critical step in meeting population health needs. A review of county-level data from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and American Community Survey (ACS) found that counties with higher than average rates of food insecurity also had a higher share of people with a disability, diabetes or obesity.¹⁰ This relationship works both ways. Households with chronic health conditions may face choices between paying for medical expenses and food. Conversely, households struggling with hunger and access to nutritious food may face stress and rely on less expensive foods with poor dietary quality. These strategies are likely to increase risk of chronic conditions, such as depression, diabetes, heart disease and others. Food insecurity rates vary by household composition, age, race/ethnicity and income levels.¹¹ A collaborative, comprehensive response is necessary, particularly among populations more likely to struggle with hunger and food insecurity.




“In the past 12 months our family has been secure, but in the past we have struggled with food shortage and inability to pay for childcare. We found it cheaper for one adult to stay home to care for the toddler rather than have two working adults and pay daycare.”

-Survey participant

Exhibit 13: Past Year Food Assistance Services (Q36 & Q37)

	<i>percent reporting food assistance (rank)</i>				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
Faced hunger in last 12 months	9%	3%	6%	9%	6%
Used Food Assistance in Last Year					
Friends or family	20% (1)	10% (2)	17% (1)	11% (1)	15% (1)
Food Bank/Pantry	7% (2)	12% (1)	12% (2)	9% (2)	10% (2)
SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program)	3% (4)	6% (3)	6% (3)	7% (3)	5% (3)
Churches or faith community	6% (3)	2% (6)	3% (5)	3% (5)	3% (4)
Senior center meals	2% (5)	4% (4)	2% (7)	3% (4)	3% (5)
WIC (Women, Infants and Children)	2% (6)	3% (5)	3% (4)	2% (6)	2% (6)
Public garden/ gleaners	1% (7)	1% (7)	2% (6)	1% (8)	1% (7)
Meals on Wheels	0% (8)	1% (8)	1% (8)	1% (7)	1% (8)

Exhibit 14: In the past 12 months, how often have you or your household used each of the following types of food assistance services? (Q37)



The World Health Organization defines social determinants as “the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age.”¹² While the survey results presented thus far focused on impediments or gaps in health and well-being, it is also important to consider community assets and strengths when assessing these conditions. The Well Being Alliance (<https://winnetwork.org/well-being-alliance/>) represents a consortium of organizations and cities across the country with leaders committed to “improving the vital conditions for inter-generational well-being for all in the US.” The Alliance has developed a series of ‘Vital Conditions Primers’ that provide a framework and common metrics for conditions of well-being. The primer on ‘Belonging and Civic Muscle’ describes this condition as:

an indispensable vital condition that we all depend on for our health and well-being. Social support through friends, family, and other networks contributes to our practical and emotional needs, enhances mental well-being, helps us navigate the challenges of life and reinforces healthy behaviors. People with a stronger sense of efficacy, belonging and social connectedness tend to live healthier, happier lives.¹³

Exhibits 15 and 16 (next page) shows a high level of community engagement in this region. At least once a month, survey respondents reported following local news (77%), visiting public parks and trails (46%), attending religious services (35%), participating in community events (29%) and going to a library (25%). These activities were even more common on a yearly basis (**Exhibit 17**) with 85% or more of respondents reporting visiting public parks and trails and at least 75% either going to a movie, sporting event, concert or museum, or participating in community events.

Exhibit 15: In the past 12 months, how often did you do the following? (Q46)




Exhibit 16: Participate in Activity At Least Monthly (Q46)

Participate in activity at least <u>monthly</u>	percent reporting monthly activity (rank)				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
Follow what local government is doing	67% (1)	84% (1)	78% (1)	81% (1)	77% (1)
Visit public parks and trails	56% (2)	36% (3)	44% (2)	44% (2)	46% (2)
Go to a place to exercise	55% (3)	22% (8)	34% (4)	39% (3)	39% (3)
Attend religious services	30% (6)	39% (2)	37% (3)	37% (4)	35% (4)
Participate in community events	38% (4)	24% (6)	25% (7)	28% (5)	29% (5)
Go to a library	34% (5)	23% (7)	18% (10)	26% (6)	25% (6)
Volunteer for a community organization	28% (9)	25% (5)	19% (9)	24% (7)	24% (7)
Provide unpaid help to others, apart from your family	29% (7)	20% (9)	26% (6)	16% (10)	23% (8)
Go to a movie, sporting event, concert or museum	28% (8)	15% (10)	22% (8)	21% (8)	22% (9)
Provide unpaid care to seniors, including members of own family	19% (12)	25% (4)	26% (5)	18% (9)	22% (10)
Receive support from your family	27% (10)	9% (12)	13% (12)	13% (11)	16% (11)
Take time off other than your scheduled days off	20% (11)	13% (11)	17% (11)	13% (12)	16% (12)

Exhibit 17: Participate in Activity At Least Yearly (Q46)

Participate in activity at least <u>yearly</u>	percent reporting monthly activity (rank)				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
Follow what local government is doing	87% (3)	91% (1)	91% (1)	88% (1)	89% (1)
Visit public parks and trails	93% (1)	85% (2)	84% (2)	85% (2)	87% (2)
Go to a movie, sporting event, concert or museum	88% (2)	67% (4)	77% (4)	79% (3)	78% (3)
Participate in community events	84% (4)	75% (3)	77% (3)	76% (4)	78% (4)
Go to a library	71% (5)	51% (7)	57% (6)	61% (5)	61% (5)
Take time off other than your scheduled days off	67% (6)	51% (8)	61% (5)	53% (8)	59% (6)
Volunteer for a community organization	67% (7)	52% (6)	50% (9)	53% (7)	56% (7)
Attend religious services	47% (11)	55% (5)	54% (7)	57% (6)	53% (8)
Go to a place to exercise	66% (8)	36% (11)	47% (10)	50% (9)	51% (9)
Provide unpaid help to others, apart from your family	57% (9)	45% (9)	53% (8)	41% (10)	50% (10)
Receive support from your family	48% (10)	32% (12)	33% (12)	25% (12)	36% (11)
Provide unpaid care to seniors, including members of own family	32% (12)	37% (10)	41% (11)	32% (11)	36% (12)

“There needs to be more activities for people of all ages in the town area. For example, what do kids of young adults do in the evenings or after dark?”

-Survey participant

The primary focus of the community survey included questions about individual experiences or circumstances. Several questions, however, did ask about personal *viewpoints* regarding needs in the community. Across all surveyed regions, over 40% of respondents said that wage levels and local cost of living were “most in need of improving” in their community (**Exhibit 18**). Job prospects, affordable decent housing and activities for teenagers were also consistently listed (38%-41%) as community concerns and needed areas of improvement (**Exhibit 19**).

The Vital Condition Primer of Meaningful Work and Wealth covers:


personal, family, and community wealth that provides the means for healthy, secure lives. It is about good paying, fulfilling jobs and careers, and financial security that extends across the lifespan.¹⁴

As discussed earlier, social and economic factors will be examined as part of the analysis of secondary (public) data sources covered in the next section. The indicators provide additional evidence about relative need as reflected by a variety of factors available from county summary data. In addition to testing the consistency of public indicators to survey responses (for measures like food security), we also examined new indicators for issues not covered by the survey (for sensitive measures like suicide mortality or substance use).

“I go to places to exercise, but not places I have to pay for. Walking around reservoirs, biking down roads, kayaking down rivers, etc.”

-Survey participant

Exhibit 18: Thinking about this community, which of the things below, if any, do you think most need improving? (Q4)



“My wife and I are retired, and we don't need much assistance or services. This area is good for retired people such as us. But nearly all of my kids have moved away because of lack of job prospects that will cover their basic needs. Housing costs for family's with kids are not affordable, nor is childcare or insurance. They can't earn enough due to lack of good paying jobs to cover their living expenses. They have had to move to places where there are more help for families. States that have expanded Medicaid so they could have affordable healthcare, and help with childcare, and housing costs. None of these things are affordable for young families here. They cannot earn enough to cover these costs. They had to leave the area to get help. Sad but true!”

-Survey participant



Exhibit 19: Aspects of Community Most in Need of Improvement (Q4)

Improvement Area	percent reporting (rank)				
	Latah	N Central Idaho	Nez Perce	SE Washington	Region
Wages levels and local COL	41% (1)	42% (1)	44% (1)	43% (1)	43% (1)
Job prospects	40% (2)	41% (2)	40% (3)	43% (2)	41% (2)
Affordable decent housing	39% (3)	39% (4)	40% (2)	42% (3)	40% (3)
Activities for teenagers	36% (4)	39% (3)	40% (4)	39% (4)	38% (4)
Health services	26% (5)	23% (5)	21% (6)	27% (5)	24% (5)
Affordable quality childcare	24% (6)	22% (6)	24% (5)	22% (8)	23% (6)
Quality schools	23% (7)	20% (8)	20% (7)	23% (7)	22% (7)
Cultural centers	18% (9)	20% (7)	17% (10)	24% (6)	20% (8)
Public transportation	17% (10)	18% (9)	18% (9)	22% (9)	18% (9)
Facilities for young children	19% (8)	16% (10)	19% (8)	19% (10)	18% (10)
Community activities	15% (11)	13% (11)	14% (11)	15% (11)	14% (11)
Sports and leisure facilities	10% (12)	12% (12)	13% (12)	9% (12)	11% (12)

Community Indicators

Utilizing selected indicators from the project data hub, we rated the relative position of each health-related factor on several different dimensions (see **Appendix D** for indicator definitions and sources). Overall ratings appear in **Exhibit 20**, where we compare regional values for all nine counties combined (Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, Nez Perce, Wallowa, Asotin, Garfield and Whitman counties) against national figures for each indicator. We then examine the variability of results for all states to gauge the degree to which this region is behind (or ahead) of the national average (see methods section).

All nine counties in the LCVH Foundation are rated according to where the region sits in relation to other states for the given indicator. As a reminder, the ratings are classified as follows:

- ↓ **much worse** – region value is in the lowest 10% of all states
- ↘ **worse** – region value is in the bottom 10%-30% of all states
- ↗ **better** – region value is higher than 30-60% all states
- ↑ **much better** – region value is higher than 60% of all states

Based on the distribution of all states nationwide, we found that the following values for the multi-state LCVH Foundation would be considered in the lowest 10% of all states:

- Opioid Drug Claims, Percentage of Total Claims
- Population Health Professional Shortage (Underserved)
- Cohort Graduation Rate
- Estimated Number with Regular Pap Test
- Mortality – Suicide
- Percent Population with Income at or Below 200% FPL

Many of these indicators identified as ‘much worse’ than national rates are also reflected as concerns in survey responses (health professional shortage, household wage levels). Other indicators were not included in the survey (opioid drug use, suicide mortality), but should be considered in health promotion efforts. In similar fashion, the region shows a higher rate of residents with social/emotional supports, mirroring the higher degrees of civic involvement in the survey.

While these results show *overall* rankings of health-related indicators, each county has a distinct demographic, social and economic profile. There are also nine community hospitals and four public health districts that serve this region. It is vital to understand the status of health indicators in each county, as well. The county-level results and ratings are presented in **Exhibit 21** (page 26).

“We moved here to be closer to ailing parents and due to a good opportunity to stay active while maintaining our own place. My wife has always wanted to live where she could walk out her door w/doggie and go for a run/walk. We do that here.”

- Survey participant

Exhibit 20: Health and Wellness Data Indicator Ratings, LCVH Foundation Region

Rating	Indicator	Region	United States
↓ 0.01	Opioid Drug Claims, Percentage of Total Claims	7%	5%
↓ 0.04	Population Health Professional Shortage (Underserved)	27%	13%
↓ 0.07	Cohort Graduation Rate	81%	87%
↓ 0.07	Estimated Number with Regular Pap Test	73%	79%
↓ 0.08	Mortality – Suicide	19.3	13.3
↓ 0.10	Percent Population with Income at or Below 200% FPL	40%	33%
↘ 0.11	Median Household Income	\$45,998	\$57,652
↘ 0.13	Percent Population in Poverty	17%	14%
↘ 0.15	Dentists, Rate per 100,000 Population	46.6	65.6
↘ 0.17	Food Access - Grocery Stores - Establishments, Rate per 100,000 Population	8.3	11.0
↘ 0.18	Food Insecurity Rate	15%	13%
↘ 0.20	Median Family Income	\$61,634	\$70,850
↘ 0.24	Population with Diagnosed Diabetes, Age-Adjusted Rate	8%	9%
↘ 0.25	Estimated Adults Drinking Excessively (Age-Adjusted Percentage)	19%	17%
↘ 0.25	Percent Population with no Leisure Time Physical Activity	20%	23%
↘ 0.29	Percent Population Under Age 18 at or Below 200% FPL	46%	42%
↘ 0.30	Percent Population with Low Food Access	25%	22%
↗ 0.31	Percent Female Medicare Enrollees with Mammogram in Past 2 Years	61%	63%
↗ 0.31	Percent Renter-Occupied Housing Units	38%	38%
↗ 0.32	Percent Free/Reduced Price Lunch Eligible	42%	49%
↗ 0.34	Percentage of Cost Burdened Households (Over 30% of Income)	30%	32%
↗ 0.34	Cancer Incidence Rate – Lung	54.7	60.2
↗ 0.35	Cancer Incidence Rate - All Sites	132.5	124.7
↗ 0.37	Percent Adults with Asthma	14%	13%

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>United States</i>
↗ 0.37	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of a Park	33%	38%
↗ 0.41	Mental Health Care Provider Rate (Per 100,000 Population)	178.0	202.8
↗ 0.47	Estimated Population with Annual Pneumonia Vaccination	67%	68%
↗ 0.50	Percentage of Cost Burdened Households (Over 50% of Income)	15%	15%
↗ 0.50	Primary Care Physicians, Rate per 100,000 Population	74.3	75.6
↗ 0.50	Percent Adults with Heart Disease	4%	4%
↗ 0.51	Percent Adults with High Blood Pressure	28%	28%
↗ 0.52	Estimated Population Ever Screened for Colon Cancer - Percent Adults Overweight	62%	61%
↗ 0.53	Percent Population Age 25+ with Bachelor's Degree or Higher	31%	31%
↗ 0.53	Percent Adults with BMI > 30.0 (Obese)	29%	29%
↗ 0.57	Chlamydia Infections, Rate (Per 100,000 Population)	479.8	497.3
↗ 0.57	Rate of Federally Qualified Health Centers per 100,000 Population	3.3	2.8
↗ 0.60	Percent Population Age 25+ with Associate's Degree or Higher	41%	39%
↑ 0.61	Percent Population Smoking Cigarettes (Age-Adjusted)	17%	18%
↑ 0.62	Percent Adults with Inadequate Fruit / Vegetable Consumption	77%	76%
↑ 0.63	Percent Adults with No Dental Exam	29%	30%
↑ 0.63	Percent Adults Without Any Regular Doctor	20%	22%
↑ 0.65	Establishment Rate per 10,000 Population	11.4	10.4
↑ 0.68	Percent Population Under Age 18 in Poverty	18%	20%
↑ 0.69	Estimated Population with Poor or Fair Health	14%	16%
↑ 0.73	Mortality - Premature Death - Years of Potential Life Lost	6,076	6,947
↑ 0.76	Ambulatory Care Sensitive Condition Discharge Rate	41.8	49.4
↑ 0.77	Percent Adults with Poor Dental Health	13%	16%
↑ 0.79	Percentage of Households with No Motor Vehicle	6%	9%
↑ 0.86	Percentage Commuting to Work Alone in a Car	71%	76%
↑ 0.87	Food Access - Grocery Stores - Establishments, Rate per 100,000 Population	28.7	21.2
↑ 0.89	Percent Adults Overweight	35%	36%
↑ 0.90	Head Start Programs, Rate (Per 10,000 Children)	13.6	7.2
↑ 0.92	Percent with Depression	15%	18%
↑ 0.93	Percentage Commuting More than 60 Minutes	4%	9%
↑ 0.93	Teen Births, Rate per 1,000 Population	13.1	24.7
↑ 0.93	Infant Mortality Rate (Per 1,000 Births)	4.7	6.5
↑ 0.96	Gonorrhea Infections, Rate (Per 100,000 Population)	53.6	145.8
↑ 0.97	Percent Population Age 25+ with No High School Diploma	7%	13%
↑ 0.97	Lack of Social or Emotional Support	16%	21%
↑ 0.98	Percentage of Population Age 16-19 Not in School and Not Employed	4%	7%
↑ 0.98	Low Weight Births, Percent of Total	5%	8%

County-level ratings in **Exhibit 21** include only those indicators where results are much worse (bottom 10%) than either other counties in the LCVH Foundation region or much worse than other counties in the United States. Complete information (percentage or rates) for each listed indicator is included in **Appendix F**. Based on these criteria, several counties (Nez Perce, Latah, Wallowa counties) only have 3-4 identified indicators. Other counties (such as Clearwater, Idaho, Lewis) had a longer list of indicators with a low rating. This analysis speaks to geographic disparities in social determinants of health and emphasizes the need for county-specific prioritization.

The final phase of this assessment involved a series of community forums held throughout the region. The forums provided an opportunity to explore local challenges, opportunities and community priorities. The next section outlines key findings from these forums and provides potential pathways for health improvement efforts offered through the experiences and perspectives of area residents.

Exhibit 21: Health and Wellness Data Indicator Ratings, by County

Nez Perce County, ID		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Population Driving Alone to Work	↓ 0.04	
Heart Disease (Adult)	↓ 0.06	
Mortality - Suicide		↓ 0.08
Depression (Medicare Population)	↓ 0.09	

Asotin County, WA		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Asthma Prevalence	↓ 0.04	
Teen Births	↓ 0.05	
Mortality - Suicide		↓ 0.05
Diabetes (Adult)	↓ 0.05	
Population Driving Alone to Work	↓ 0.06	
Current Smokers	↓ 0.07	
Dental Care Utilization	↓ 0.08	
Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	↓ 0.09	
Opioid Drug Claims		↓ 0.09
Poor General Health	↓ 0.09	
STI - Gonorrhea Incidence	↓ 0.10	

Garfield County, WA		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Food Access - Low Food Access	↓ 0.00	
Health Professional Shortage Areas	↓ 0.00	↓ 0.01
Physical Inactivity	↓ 0.05	
Access to Mental Health Providers	↓ 0.05	
Recreation and Fitness Facility Access	↓ 0.06	↓ 0.08
Weight - Obesity	↓ 0.07	
Poverty - Population Below 200% FPL	↓ 0.07	↓ 0.09

Whitman County, WA		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Poverty Rate (< 100% FPL) (SAIPE)	↓ 0.01	↓ 0.03
Cost Burdened Households (50%)	↓ 0.04	
STI - Chlamydia Incidence	↓ 0.04	
Food Insecurity Rate	↓ 0.05	↓ 0.08
Renter-Occupied Housing	↓ 0.05	↓ 0.01
Cost Burdened Households (30%)	↓ 0.06	↓ 0.02
Households with No Motor Vehicle	↓ 0.08	

Latah County, ID		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Cancer Incidence - All Sites		↓ 0.05
Cancer Screening - Pap Test	↓ 0.08	↓ 0.06
Renter-Occupied Housing		↓ 0.10

Wallowa County, OR		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Low Birth Weight	↓ 0.00	
Park Access	↓ 0.05	
Poverty - Children Below 100% FPL	↓ 0.00	
Preventable Hospital Events	↓ 0.08	

Clearwater County, ID		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Population Commuting to Work Over 60 Minutes	↓ 0.00	↓ 0.02
Mortality - Premature Death	↓ 0.00	↓ 0.07
Education - High School Graduation Rate	↓ 0.00	↓ 0.00
High Blood Pressure (Adult)	↓ 0.01	↓ 0.04
Mortality - Suicide	↓ 0.02	
Teen Births	↓ 0.03	
Park Access	↓ 0.03	
Current Smokers	↓ 0.04	
Preventable Hospital Events	↓ 0.04	
Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	↓ 0.05	
Education - Bachelor's Degree or Higher		↓ 0.07
Poor General Health	↓ 0.08	

Idaho County, ID		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Dental Care Utilization	↓ 0.01	
Poverty - Children Below 200% FPL	↓ 0.01	↓ 0.07
Cancer Screening - Sigmoidoscopy or Colonoscopy	↓ 0.02	↓ 0.02
Mortality - Suicide	↓ 0.04	↓ 0.01
Poor General Health	↓ 0.04	
Weight - Overweight	↓ 0.06	
Physical Inactivity	↓ 0.06	
Social Associations	↓ 0.06	
Lack of a Consistent Source of Primary Care	↓ 0.06	
Cancer Screening - Pap Test		↓ 0.08
Income - Median Household Income	↓ 0.09	↓ 0.09
Weight - Obesity	↓ 0.10	

Lewis County, ID		
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Young People Not in School and Not Working	↓ 0.00	↓ 0.01
Fruit/Vegetable Consumption	↓ 0.01	↓ 0.08
Alcohol Consumption		↓ 0.02
Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	↓ 0.02	
High Blood Pressure (Adult)	↓ 0.03	↓ 0.09
Lack of Social or Emotional Support	↓ 0.03	
Cancer Screening - Mammogram	↓ 0.04	↓ 0.07
Physical Inactivity	↓ 0.04	
Infant Mortality	↓ 0.05	
Opioid Drug Claims	↓ 0.05	↓ 0.02
STI - Gonorrhea Incidence	↓ 0.06	
Recreation and Fitness Facility Access	↓ 0.06	↓ 0.08
Access to Mental Health Providers	↓ 0.06	
Education - High School Graduation Rate		↓ 0.07
Poverty - Children Below 200% FPL	↓ 0.07	
Access to Primary Care	↓ 0.08	↓ 0.08
Teen Births	↓ 0.08	
Population Commuting to Work Over 60 Minutes	↓ 0.09	
Income - Median Household Income	↓ 0.09	↓ 0.09
Education - Bachelor's Degree or Higher	↓ 0.09	↓ 0.06
Education - Associate's Level Degree or Higher	↓ 0.09	↓ 0.08

Community Forums

The listening sessions and public forums held for this assessment served an important purpose. As noted, a morning session involved invited community leaders from different sectors, including education, banking, social services, health systems/hospitals, churches, local/tribal governments, philanthropy and others. In the evening, a public 'data walk' was held. A free catered meal and childcare was provided in order to draw a wide range of participants. The attendees heard a short opening presentation and then were invited to join small groups to walk around the room and discuss posters with data exhibits. The data exhibits shared findings from both the community survey and data indicator analysis with key topics reflected in the results, including behavioral health, economic security, food security, health access/affordability and housing affordability.

Each of these forums provided an opportunity to learn additional detail and gather needed context to inform the assessment and guide subsequent activity. The conversation provided understanding about the community makeup and strengths, illuminated the issues that people in the community care about, and helped outline community priorities - based on local resources, experiences and values. In every forum, both during morning and evening sessions, we asked a similar set of starter questions:

- What is missing in the data?
- What has the community tried in the past?
- What are your big ideas for community change?

Over 300 people in total attended one or more of the nine forums hosted by Innovia and LCVH Foundation (see **Appendix G** for list of organizations represented). Staff at each event recorded notes and participant input and this material is available on request. The following synopsis highlights notable issues raised during the visit to each area. While the summary is necessarily subjective and not comprehensive, the topics outlined also appear as important issues based on analysis of survey and public data.

Palouse Forum Summary - Moscow, Idaho/Pullman, Washington (September 23, 2019)

- Federal poverty statistics for the Palouse are difficult to interpret due to higher percentage of college students with temporary low-income levels. While publicly reported figures are often considered over-inflated, there is considerable **poverty and economic hardship**, particularly in rural Whitman and Latah counties.
- **Food insecurity** remains a concern in this region for both students and resident populations. There is an interest in connecting to all residents through mobile food delivery, connections between food banks and health clinics, and distribution at existing community sites (such as libraries). Some of these efforts are in planning or early implementation stages but require additional marketing/communications support and resource commitments.
- A lack of **affordable public transportation** options makes it difficult to connect services and supports across counties. A bus between Pullman and Moscow no longer operates but was a valuable service.
- The high percentage of rental **housing** and low stock of affordable single-family homes in this area can cause difficulty for low- and moderate-income households. Increasing housing stock



and adopting solutions that involve homeowners/landlords/renters is necessary. While in two different states, Moscow and Pullman share a housing market, so approaches adopted in one county (e.g. Moscow Housing Trust) should be considered for expansion, when possible.

- A need for increased access to **mental health** providers/services was emphasized. Telehealth options for both mental and physical health delivery should continue to be evaluated.



“An important thing we’re missing is public transportation, especially regionally in rural communities.”

-Pullman forum participant

LC Valley Forum Summary - Clarkston, Washington/Lewiston, Idaho (September 30, 2019)

- A lack of **economic opportunity** was a central theme that encompassed many comments. Differences in minimum wage (between Idaho and Washington), lack of high-wage jobs, inability to participate in education/training and generational cycles of poverty create impediments to prosperity. A desire was expressed for cross-sector and community led solutions driven by participation by diverse stakeholders (i.e. **community visioning process**). The development of two new technology training centers are one example of a way to provide opportunity and grow the economy, but diversification of industry is necessary to retain students and residents.
- **Mental health services and suicide prevention** for youth and young adults emerged as a strong need expressed by forum participants. Suggested responses included adding providers in high schools and expanding preventative services by investing in **early childhood education and quality childcare**. The importance of addressing hopelessness and promoting resiliency through public messaging and the adoption of trauma-informed practices was also emphasized.



“If I could wave a magic wand, we would pull teams together to come up with a plan around these issues and take action on it with community, legislators and funders.”

-Lewiston forum participant

- While there are low-cost and community dental providers in the LC Valley, a need to grow capacity for **affordable dental care** was noted by many participants. This may include additional clinics, practitioners, clinic space or expansion of appointments for Medicaid patients.

- **Health services and access** were identified as a real need. While community clinics are available in the region, a desire for availability of after-hours appointments was expressed. Specialized services, such as reproductive and sexual health care for young people, health literacy, and transportation/mobile services for senior and rural residents were frequently mentioned.

Idaho/Lewis County Forum Summary - Grangeville, Idaho (October 2, 2019)

- Job growth in this region has exceeded other areas in state, with opportunities in forestry, agriculture, industry and manufacturing. There was an interest in developing **regional education** models to meet this demand, with a focus on satellite vocational training, local internships, business outreach and closer ties with state colleges and universities.
- Retaining younger workers and families will require a commitment to new **housing development**. There has been a lack of multi-family units and entry-level homes built in recent decades. Consequently, there are fewer rental units or affordable options for home buyers. A coordinated effort is needed to engage local leaders and identify regulatory, capital and other options to change this dynamic. This may be an area where impact investing and involvement of community re-investment programs can create incentives favorable for investment.
- Multiple participants talked about the lack of a **community center** in Grangeville. A lack of year-round recreational opportunities for youth and teenagers was underscored. A community center could also provide a gathering space to enhance social connections, serve as a clearinghouse for community resources and act as a performance space.
- The distance between towns in Idaho and Lewis counties also presents a real challenge to the provision of quality health care services. **Health care access** could be improved by increasing provider reimbursement rates (noted for mental health), recruiting new providers (noted for EMT) and developing substance use treatment options appropriate for rural residents. Continued work with local, state and federal partners, such as University of Idaho's WWAMI Rural Underserved Opportunities Program, will be necessary to support efforts to expand care.
- There was also an interest in restarting a community visioning process similar to the Horizons initiative that was carried out in Grangeville over ten years ago.



Clearwater County Forum Summary - Orofino, Idaho (October 3, 2019)

- Participants stressed the need for greater **access to dental care** – particularly increasing the number of providers that accept Medicaid patients or provide services at a sliding-scale fee. The existing low-cost dental clinic is only open Monday-Wednesday and has a long waiting list.
- Clearwater County has a number of towns that are separated by distance and geographical features. It is often difficult for some residents to access services available in different areas (such as senior meals). **Transportation options** to connect communities was listed as a recognized need. While the Nez Perce Tribe used to operate a cross-county bus, this service was discontinued.
- Attendees said that a distinct lack of **affordable rental housing** causes difficulties with household budgets. The mountains in and around Orofino place limitations on the availability of buildable lots and elevate development costs. Regional housing coalitions may be able to find options for gap financing or develop a strategy to leverage federal tax incentives, such as Opportunity Zones.
- There have been many community conversations about developing a **walking/biking trail** to promote recreation, connect different parts of the city and provide a safe way to navigate the state highway.



Note: orange highlighted items received most selections in dot-voting exercise

The topics brought forth at these forums are notable, because many of the expressed needs do not directly link to health treatment or delivery. This underscores the fact that disease prevention and health promotion occur during the time spent *outside* of the doctor's office. Supporting healthy living involves reducing financial stress, facilitating social connections and encouraging healthy behaviors. These social and economic determinants of health are complex, inter-related and often engrained in societal norms in ways that make transformative change difficult. This project, however, reveals the tremendous civic commitment and emerging networks that present real opportunities for making meaningful, measurable change. The next section presents a strategic direction for philanthropic grantmaking based on the learning acquired through this assessment.



“We each have a piece of information that adds to the whole, and it took this gathering to bring them together to provide a better picture of ourselves; what we offer and what still we need to accomplish.”

-Idaho County Free Press Editorial

Strategic Direction

Focus Areas

The findings laid out in this report are intended to serve as a reference for questions about regional needs. In addition, the tools and data available through this assessment establish an open resource for investigating and responding to regional concerns. The report does not, however, lay out specific recommendations about which identified needs are most important and should emerge as the highest priority for regional grantmaking. The assessment creates a foundation and starting point for strategic philanthropic grantmaking. Strategic philanthropy represents a dynamic process, not a static plan, as noted by Douglas Easterling and Laura McDuffee in a recent issue of *The Foundation Review*.



Becoming strategic requires time, commitment, in-depth analysis, hard choices, focused action, a host of complex skills, the ability to learn, and the willingness to let go of approaches that aren't working...Conversion foundations throughout the United States have similarly taken intentional steps to set a strategic direction that takes into account their resources, position, and values, **as well as** the needs and interests of the community that the foundation is serving. (*emphasis added*)¹⁵

The LCVH Foundation has made an early decision to consider its mandate to “promote health, wellness, or disease prevention” in a holistic fashion, by addressing those social and economic determinants of health in a way that improves not just health care, but community health. This is a tall order, as Easterling and McDuffee note, “Health foundations should not enter into SDOH work expecting to find some sort of ‘low hanging fruit’ that has been previously overlooked. Just as with improving health care, improving social and economic conditions is complex, long-term, politicized work.”¹⁶ A strategic decision toward community impact rests on identifying a selected number of determinants where the influence of the foundation (and partners) intersects with community needs. A number of themes related to community needs arose from this assessment process and could be used as a guidepost for strategic decision-making:

1. **Economic security and empowerment** – This assessment revealed a high level of civic engagement and participation from residents throughout this region. This type of community pride and involvement is not uncommon in rural America.¹⁷ However, both data results and community conversations also reflected struggles by many to meet rising housing costs, pay unexpected medical bills or respond to other financial emergencies. When household budgets are strained, stress levels rise, and proactive care is often postponed.

Health promotion and prevention means investing in people and empowering them with the support and tools needed to build a healthy future. There are a number of strategies that bolster economic security and individual health – such as helping seniors age in place, providing nutritious food and education to families in need, and improving transportation options to connect people, services and opportunity.

2. **Educational opportunity and youth development** – After concerns related to household finances, the desire for educational opportunities and support was a key community need repeated in the assessment. Educational goals vary according to an individual’s stage of life, of course. However, not all residents grow up with the same educational aspirations and opportunities. Supporting education narrows this ‘opportunity gap,’ reduces health disparities

and encourages a lifetime of healthy choices.¹⁸ Quality early childhood education, social and school-based supports (such as mental health counseling), and post-secondary opportunities are just a few ways that foundations can foster a healthy community. When considering the relationship with life-expectancy, disease prevention and other health outcomes, education may be the ‘single most important modifiable social determinant of health,’ according to a recent review from the American Public Health Association.¹⁹

- 3. Access to quality health and dental services** – At the individual level, access to affordable dental and medical care was a predominant need conveyed by assessment participants. The LCVH Foundation serves an area that encompasses three states, nine hospital service areas and multiple payers/insurers with overlapping or discontinuous coverage areas. The low population density and changing policy environment makes health service delivery challenging. Fortunately, there are two research universities that operate medical schools committed to providing rural health care. Both universities and regional foundations are committed to rural medical education and service delivery.²⁰ The provision of preventive and primary care services is a critical step to ensuring a healthy community. In a diverse region such as this, foundation partners can play a key role in filling gaps in acute care services, supporting new and innovative delivery models, and bringing together community organizations to meet emerging needs.
- 4. Community development and social connection** – While hospitals are often a crucial part of a community’s health delivery system, the health of a region depends in large part on social connections, physical conditions and economic opportunities cultivated throughout the entire community. City officials, economic development directors, business leaders, civic organizations and other community leaders play a key role in creating opportunities for health.²¹ Indeed, many from these sectors attended community conversations and heard community members express desire for community and recreation centers, parks and public spaces, safe and functional municipal infrastructure, and inclusive local economies. Research is clear that social isolation results in lasting harm to both mental and physical health.²² The connected community creates an environment that encourages health and supports personal wellness.

Research detailing the impact of social determinants of health on population health outcomes are available from a number of different sources.²³ Foundation granting may support work across all of these areas. Together with competitive grants, a concentrated strategy can leverage foundation assets and create momentum for measurable, lasting change. For example, Empire Health Foundation (Spokane, Washington), developed a strategy centered around healthy youth development (through childhood obesity prevention programs) and health equity, and patient empowerment (family resilience and health coaching for seniors). A stated commitment helps demonstrate progress toward community impact and attract new funding.²⁴

Based on the regional needs assessment, sufficient evidence exists for a philanthropic focus on any of the above issue areas. By identifying one or two of these determinants, the LCVH Foundation can set a strategic focus (establish a ‘why’ for work), convey the improvement desired (what work hopes to achieve) and develop a strong network of partners committed to these outcomes (how the work gets executed). The challenge involves leveraging local and outside resources, identifying new opportunities, and aligning partner interests and objectives to effectively respond to these needs and make a lasting impact. **Exhibit 22** shows a few examples of technical assistance resources that may inform strategy development. Additional considerations for strategic planning are included in the final section.

Exhibit 22: Example Resources for SDOH Strategy Development

Economic security and empowerment	
Grantmakers in aging	www.giaging.org/initiatives/rural-aging
The Futures Project	https://caporegon.org/what-we-do/the-future/ www.cap4action.org/program/future-story-initiative-2/ www.wapartnership.org/what-we/futures
Housing Assistance Council	www.ruralhome.org/hac-services/technical-assistance
Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC)	www.rcac.org
Educational opportunity and youth development	
National Child Traumatic Stress Network	www.nctsn.org
Mental Health First Aid Training	www.mentalhealthfirstaid.org/population-focused-modules/teens
Community childcare (example school partnership)	www.nebcommfound.org/news/shickley-big-little-town-good-reasons
Search Institute Developmental Assets	www.search-institute.org/our-research/youth-development-research/developmental-assets/
Access to quality health and dental services	
Area Health Education Coordinators (AHEC)	www.uidaho.edu/academics/wwami/ahec https://inside.ewu.edu/ewahec
National Rural Health Resource Center	www.ruralcenter.org
Federal Office of Rural Health Policy	www.hrsa.gov/rural-health
University of Idaho Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes)	www.uidaho.edu/academics/wwami/echo
State Offices of Rural Health and Primary Care	http://healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/Health/RuralHealthandPrimaryCare/tabid/104 www.doh.wa.gov/forpublichealthandhealthcareproviders/ruralhealth
Community development and social connection	
Federal Reserve Bank – Community Development	www.federalreserve.gov/consumerscommunities/comm-dev-system-map.htm
Build Healthy Places Network	www.buildhealthyplaces.org
Enterprise Community Loan Fund	www.enterprisecommunity.org/financing-and-development/community-loan-fund
WealthWorks	www.wealthworks.org

As the LCVH Foundation reviews grant proposals and develops a strategic direction for work in this region, it is worthwhile to consider approaches that emphasize intervention and prevention. This assessment project identified many immediate needs and short-term requirements, such as the shortage of Emergency Medical Technicians and equipment in remote, rural areas, need for sexual health treatment, crisis mental health services, and others. Responding to these direct needs may not further sustainable, long-term health improvement. These care interventions, however, can save lives and establish the credibility of the foundation as a trusted partner able to meet critical community needs.

A recent article in Health Affairs titled, “Meeting Individual Social Needs Falls Short of Addressing Social Determinants of Health” suggests addressing the determinants of health at the community level and individual level, where both social and clinical needs are met. While long-term approaches and preventative efforts focus on the ‘up-stream,’ there is also a role for interventions that meet individual social needs. This ‘midstream’ impact (displayed in **Exhibit 23**) covers many of the social determinants that are associated with creating a healthy environment and providing social supports to all residents. A comprehensive ‘whole stream’ strategy is necessary to build healthy communities and ensure that the commitment to health and wellness extends beyond hospitals and health systems.²⁵

Exhibit 23: Social Determinants and Social Needs – A ‘Whole Stream’ Approach



Source: Castrucci, B. & Auerbach, J. (2019 January 16). Meeting Individual Social Needs Falls Short of Addressing Social Determinants of Health. Health Affairs Blog. Retrieved from <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20190115.234942/full/>

Strategic Planning Practices and Principles

The following recommendations are intended to assist the LCVH Foundation in developing a strategic response to the issues identified in this regional assessment. Of course, there is no uniform formula for creating community change. A clear set of practices and principles, however, helps all stakeholders move from vision to action – and advance change in the same direction.

While there are an overabundance of frameworks, models and theories about strategic philanthropic giving, any approach worth adopting will consider the complexity and changing nature of community needs and opportunities. The emerging practice of *Impact-Driven Philanthropy* provides a worthwhile starting place for establishing a strategic action plan. The core practices of the Impact Driven Philanthropy are listed below:



Start with a “beginner’s mind”

- Even if we’ve accomplished big things in other arenas, we challenge ourselves to approach philanthropy with openness, curiosity and humility. We listen more than we talk and seek to understand the wisdom, beliefs, needs, aspirations and life experiences of the people we hope to serve.
- We look for causes connected to our life experiences and values. A heartfelt connection drives passion for improving—and often increases the meaning, purpose and joy of giving.
- We focus our resources for impact. Focusing on a small set of issues, rather than taking a scattershot approach, gives us more opportunities to build meaningful relationships and knowledge in our chosen fields.
- We let form follow function. We develop our strategies and goals before selecting the best giving vehicle(s) to help achieve them.

Do our homework

- We invest the resources and time to unpack the complex issues we care about and understand the social and historical context in which these issues exist.
- We identify the outstanding needs and current actors in the space, including who has the power to make decisions that will affect change and who does not.
- We acknowledge our own beliefs about how systems work and change happens and consider all the resources we can contribute beyond money—including our professional skills, networks and influence.
- We develop goals based not only on the best evidence available but also the lived experience of those we hope to serve.
- We develop good indicators to help us determine where we’re headed and course-correct, as needed.

Work with others

- We seek out people who have intimate knowledge of the problems we’re trying to solve and join with them to co-create solutions. We avoid top-down “solutions” informed by experts but not the communities we hope to serve.
- Whenever possible, we engage other funders and build a network of peers with similar goals.

- If we have limited time to commit to our causes, we identify others who can leverage our resources for maximum impact, such as funding intermediaries or other donors.
- Whenever possible, we give flexible, multi-year grants—the types of support that organizations need to invest deeply in learning, innovation and talent.
- We help our partners strengthen their organizations' performance, not just their programs.
- We stick with strong grantees for a time period consistent with expectations and the difficulty of achieving social change. We communicate openly and often, and exit relationships with care.

Never stop learning

- We lean into ongoing learning to understand what's working and what's not—and help our nonprofit partners do the same. We use every resource available to inform our work, from peers and consultants to online platforms and in-person learning opportunities.
- We use qualitative and quantitative means to understand the impact of our efforts—positive and negative, intentional and unintentional—on the people and communities we serve.
- We seek unbiased, regular feedback from all of our stakeholders—including intended beneficiaries, grantees and other funders.

Source: The Giving Compass. (2017 October 24). *What Is Impact-Driven Philanthropy?* Retrieved from www.givingcompass.org/pdf/understanding-impact-driven-philanthropy/.

Building Connections

With these guidelines in mind, we encourage the LCVH Foundation to explore options to connect to local efforts and experience in order to enhance community health improvement efforts. The following options represent examples, but not necessarily endorsements, of potential connection opportunities.

✓ **Create and foster venues for local problem solving (build collective capacity)**

At several of the community forums, there was shared interest in launching a community prioritization process. Over 10 years ago, such a process was initiated in Spokane, Washington. Today, Priority Spokane (www.priorityspokane.org) brings together local government, businesses, nonprofit organizations and funding organizations to review community indicators and set a plan to prioritize community action. The priorities are re-evaluated every 2-3 years. Prior initiatives resulting from this process have included high school graduation rates, student and family homelessness, and child trauma and violence. The Priority Spokane effort continues to provide a common ground for community members to come together and respond to the most pressing local issues. Innovia Foundation was an early funder of this effort and continues to play a role on the oversight committee.

✓ **Support existing momentum**

At the time of this assessment, a number of community coalitions were already working to address health, economic and social service needs in the community. The Partnership for Economic Prosperity (www.pepedo.org) sponsored a regional housing needs report for the Palouse and the Palouse Tables Project (www.cacwhitman.org/palousetablesproject) and continues to develop collection plans to respond to food insecurity in the region. The ability of foundations to drive change rests on being part of the community conversations and collective action. Leading and joining community partnerships should be a key component of foundation efforts to catalyze and sustain health improvement. If current partnerships are effective and have ongoing 'momentum,' there is a particularly compelling case to explore foundation involvement.

✓ **Create relationships with partners region-wide**

While the political, economic, demographic and geographic diversity in this area poses distinct challenges for philanthropic initiatives, there are also inherent benefits to operating in such a region. There are a number of quality organizations and agencies with a reach that extends across multiple counties. Community health systems, public health offices, community action agencies, libraries and more operate throughout this area and can work side-by-side with grantmaking foundations on initiatives that have a regional reach. **Appendix G** includes a list of organizations that attended the data walk forums and have shown interest in community collaboration.

This assessment project – with multiple collaborators, funders and contributors – serves as just one example of the power of leveraging time, talent and resources from committed partners. In addition, the expertise at two land grant research universities and one regional college provides an unsurpassed knowledge base that the foundation can utilize to continue learning and responding to the most pressing needs in the region.

✓ **Stay connected to experts in field**

The field of philanthropy draws talented individuals with deep experience across a variety of sectors in business, government and industry. New, innovative ideas and well-tested viewpoints are shared through philanthropic publications and member organizations. While LCVH Foundation BCA members are already accessing and utilizing many of these knowledge stores, an initial list is provided here for the sake of completeness. As the strategy and direction of the LCVH Foundation continues to grow and evolve, these resources will serve as a useful reference to ensure the foundation can meet challenges and take advantage of new opportunities.

- Grantmakers in Health (www.gih.org)
- Peak Grantmaking (www.peakgrantmaking.org)
- Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (www.geofunders.org)
- Stanford Social Innovation Review (<https://ssir.org>)
- Center for Effective Philanthropy (<https://cep.org>)
- Exponent Philanthropy (www.exponentphilanthropy.org)
- Philanthropy Northwest (<https://philanthropy.org>)

The opportunity to steward philanthropic dollars for the benefit of the community is a tremendous privilege. The clear communication of the foundation’s strategy and direction is integral to building support in the community. However, the strategy must also evolve and adapt to changing circumstances and conditions in the community. As John Cawley, Director of Programs and Operations at McConnell Foundation notes, “The difference is between having a compass and a map. A map assumes that you’re going over terrain that somebody has been over before.”²⁶ The final assessment report does not map out a fixed direction for foundation activity. Rather, we survey the landscape and provide markers of the complex challenges and issues facing this region today. With humility and a commitment to service and learning, foundations can utilize data, build partnerships, leverage resources and generate a community impact that leaves a legacy for generations.

Endnotes

-
- ¹ Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation Trust Agreement. Approved May 1, 2017.
- ² Wright, J., Williams, R., & Wilkinson, J. R. (April 25, 1998). Health Needs Assessment: Development and Importance of Health Needs Assessment. *British Medical Journal*, 316, 7140, 1310-1313. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1113037/pdf/1310.pdf>.
- ³ Smart, A. (2018, July 9). Much More Than Money – The Impact of Small Rural Foundations. Retrieved from <https://www.exponentphilanthropy.org/blog/much-more-than-money-the-impact-of-small-rural-foundations/>.
- ⁴ <https://catalyst.nejm.org/social-determinants-of-health/>. (2017, December 1). Retrieved from <https://catalyst.nejm.org/>.
- ⁵ Murray, B., Falkenburger, E., & Saxena, P. (2015 November). *DataWalks: An Innovative Way to Share Data with Communities*. The Urban Institute, Washington D.C.. Retrieved from <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/72906/2000510-Data-Walks-An-Innovative-Way-to-Share-Data-with-Communities.pdf>.
- ⁶ Claxton, G., Sawyer, B., & Cox, C. (2019 January 22). *How does Cost Affect Access to Care?* Peterson-KFF Health System Tracker, Washington D.C.. Retrieved from <https://www.kff.org/slideshow/cost-of-insurance-and-its-affect-on-access-to-care-slideshow/>.
- ⁷ Claxton, G., Sawyer, B., & Cox, C. (2019 April 14). *How Affordability of Health Care Varies by Income Among People with Employer Coverage*. Peterson-KFF Health System Tracker, Washington D.C.. Retrieved from <https://www.healthsystemtracker.org/brief/how-affordability-of-health-care-varies-by-income-among-people-with-employer-coverage/>.
- ⁸ Feeding America (2018). Health Implications of Food Insecurity. Map the Meal Gap Series. Retrieved from <https://www.feedingamerica.org/sites/default/files/research/map-the-meal-gap/2016/2016-map-the-meal-gap-health-implications.pdf>.
- ⁹ The Department of Agriculture (USDA) measures food insecurity through responses to questions in the Food Security Supplement of the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS-FSS).
- ¹⁰ Dewey, A. (2018 May 21). Food Insecurity and Health Indicators at the County Level. Feeding America. Retrieved from <https://hungerandhealth.feedingamerica.org/2018/05/food-insecurity-health-indicators-county-level/>.
- Leonard, T., Hughes, A. E., Donegan, C., Santillan, A., & Pruitt, S. L. (2018). *Overlapping Geographic Clusters of Food Security and Health: Where do Social Determinants and Health Outcomes Converge in the U.S?* SSM - Population Health, 5, 160-170.
- ¹¹ Coleman-Jensen, A., Rabbitt, M., Gregory, C. & Singh, A. (2019). *Household Food Security in the United States in 2018*, ERR-270, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Retrieved from <https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/94849/err-270.pdf?v=963.1>.
- ¹² See https://www.who.int/social_determinants/sdh_definition/en/
- ¹³ See <https://winnetwork.org/about/vital-conditions/>
- ¹⁴ Ibid
- ¹⁵ Easterling, D., & McDuffee, L. (2018 April 13). Becoming Strategic: Finding Leverage Over the Social and Economic Determinants of Health. *The Foundation Review*, 10, 1.) Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1409&context=tfr>.
- ¹⁶ Easterling, D., & McDuffee, L. (2018 March 14). *Finding Leverage over the Social Determinants of Health: Insights from a Study of 33 Health Conversion Foundations*. Grantmakers in Health Presentation. Retrieved from <https://www.gih.org/files/FileDownloads/Easterling%20%20McDuffee-Finding%20Leverage%20over%20SDOH.pdf>
- ¹⁷ NPR/Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health. (May 2019). Life in Rural America Part II. Retrieved from https://media.npr.org/documents/2019/may/NPR-RWJF-HARVARD_Rural_Poll_Part_2.pdf.
- ¹⁸ See <https://www.theopportunitygap.com/>
- ¹⁹ McGill, N. (2016 August). Education Attainment Linked to Health Throughout Lifespan: Exploring Social Determinants of Health. *The Nation's Health*. 46 (6) 1-19. Retrieved from <http://thenationshealth.aphapublications.org/content/46/6/1.3.full>.

²⁰ See Dreher, A. (10 October 2019). WSU Unveils Mobile Unit that will Bring Doctors, Medical Students to Rural Communities that Need Them. *The Spokesman-Review*. Retrieved from

<https://www.spokesman.com/stories/2019/oct/10/ws-u-unveils-mobile-unit-that-will-bring-doctors-me/>.

²¹ Hacke, R., & Gaskins, A. (2019 March 01). How Can Clinicians Catalyze Investments to Improve Community Health? *AMA Journal of Ethics*, 21, 3, 262-268. Retrieved from <https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/how-can-clinicians-catalyze-investments-improve-community-health/2019-03>.

²² Weir, K. (2012, April). The Pain of Social Rejection. *Science Watch*– The American Psychological Association. 43 (4) 50. Retrieved from www.apa.org/monitor/2012/04/rejection

²³ See <http://thenationshealth.org/sdoh> ; <https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/social-determinants-health/interventions-resources> ; <https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/>

²⁴ Bjerken, L. (25 October 2018). Mission, influence grow at Empire Health Foundation. *Journal of Business*. Retrieved from <https://www.spokanejournal.com/up-close/mission-influence-grow-at-empire-health-foundation/>.

²⁵ See <https://www.cdc.gov/policy/hst/hi5/> for additional strategies and community-wide interventions

²⁶ Kania, J., Kramer, M. & Russell, P. (2014). Strategic Philanthropy for a Complex World. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Stanford, Calif: Center for Social Innovation, Stanford Graduate School of Business. Retrieved from https://www.oshkoshareacf.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Strategic_Philanthropy_for_Complex_World-1.pdf.

Appendices

A Region-wide Community Needs and Opportunity Assessment
Community Data Indicators and Strategic Philanthropic Plan for the Lewis-Clark
Valley Healthcare Foundation

Innovia Foundation
December 2019

Appendix A – Members of Technical Advisory and Oversight Committees

Technical Advisory Group

Tracy Flynn, PhD, MSN, APRN, CNE, NP-C
Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation & Lewis Clark State College

Priscilla Salant, Professor Emeritus
University of Idaho & Washington State University

Craig H. VanTine
Coast Public Transportation

Mike Tatko
Avista Corporation

LaChelle Rosenbaum, EdD, LMSW
Lewis Clark State College

Joseph Cladouhos
Nimiipuu Health

Carol Moehrle RN, BSN, District Director
North Central District Health Department

Jeff Guyett
Community Action Center

Oversight Committee

John Rusche, MD
Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation

Andrew Craigie
Fast Signs, Garfield County Hospital District (Retired)

Artemio "Tim" Rubio
Worksource, Walla Walla Community College (Clarkston)

Samantha M. Skinner
Twin County United Way

Paul Kimmel
Avista Corporation

Abner King, FACHE
Syringa Hospital & Clinics

Appendix B – Survey Introduction Letter



Social and Economic Sciences Research Center

Date

Name

Address

City, State Zip

Sponsors

Lewis-Clark Valley
Healthcare Foundation



Dear [INSERT COUNTY] County Resident,

The Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation, Innovia Foundation and additional community partners are working together to better understand the health and social service issues facing households in our communities and we're asking for your help.

Your household has been randomly selected to complete a 15-minute survey, which will ask you about the health and well-being of you and your household members. The survey should be completed by the adult, 18 years of age or older, currently living in this household who has had the most recent birthday.

Additional Funding Partners



To complete the online survey, please go to:

www.opinion.wsu.edu/regionname

Please enter this Access Code to start the survey: «RESPID»



It is important for us to get responses from a wide representation of households in [INSERT COUNTY] County, so please complete the survey even if your household does not use the services. Results will help hospitals, grantmaking foundations, nonprofit organizations, and public health agencies meet the most serious needs in this region.

While this survey is voluntary, all responses are important and we will keep your information confidential. All information will be summarized in a way that no individual's response can ever be identified.

The Social and Economic Sciences Research Center (SESRC) at WSU is implementing this survey on our behalf. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact the SESRC Project Manager Lauren Scott. Her email address is lauren.n.scott@wsu.edu, or you can call 1-800-833-0867 and indicate you are calling about the Community Survey.

Project Information

509-624-2606
info@innovia.org

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey and for assisting us as we work to understand the health and social service issues facing our region.

Best wishes,

Shelly O'Quinn
CEO, Innovia Foundation

John Rusche, MD
Chairman, Board of Community Advisors
Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation

Research and Administrative Offices, 133 Wilson-Short Hall
PO Box 644014, Pullman, WA 99164-4014 | 509-335-1511 | Fax: 509-335-0116

Public Opinion Laboratory, 1615 NE Eastgate Blvd, Section F
PO Box 641801, Pullman, WA 99164-1801 | 509-335-1721 | Fax: 509-335-4688

A Community Survey about Health and Social Service Needs



Sponsors

Lewis-Clark Valley
Healthcare Foundation

INNOVIA
FOUNDATION

Additional Funding Partners

IDAHO
COMMUNITY
FOUNDATION

PREMERA | 
BLUE CROSS
An Independent Licensee of the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

The Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation and Innovia Foundation with support from Idaho Community Foundation and Premera Social Impact are working together to better understand the health and social service issues facing households in Southeast Washington and North Central Idaho. The information will be used to plan for and better serve residents, and to provide support for new programs and initiatives throughout your county.

All information provided in this survey is confidential. Personal identities are not known and all responses will be presented as summaries without individual identifiers. Please have only one adult per household complete the survey and return in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. **Thank you for your help!**

Q1. In which county do you currently live in?

- Asotin County
- ₁ Clearwater County
- ₂ Columbia County
- ₃ Garfield County
- ₄ Idaho County
- ₅ Latah County
- ₆ Lewis County
- ₇ Nez Perce County
- ₈ Other
- ₉ Other

Q2. How would you rate the overall quality of life in your community?

- ₁ Excellent
- ₂ Good
- ₃ Fair
- ₄ Poor
- ₅ Very poor

Q3. How long have you lived in this community? If less than 1 year, please write "0".

Year(s)

Q4. A. Thinking generally, which of the things below would you say are most important in making somewhere a good place to live? *Please select up to 5 boxes only in the left column.*

B. And thinking about this community in your county, which of the things below, if any, do you think most need improving? *Please select up to 5 boxes only in the right column.*

	A. Most important in making a community a good place to live	B. Most in need of improving in your community
Access to nature	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Activities for teenagers	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Affordable decent housing	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Affordable quality child care	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Community activities	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Cultural centers (e.g., museums, theaters)	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Facilities for young children	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Health services	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Job prospects	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Parks and open spaces	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Public transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Quality schools	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Sports and leisure facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Wage levels and local cost of living	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁
Other, please specify: <input style="width: 200px;" type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁	<input type="checkbox"/> ₁

Employment and Economic Status

To better understand the health and social service issues in your county, we need to know more about the employment and economic status of people living here. All responses are confidential.

Q5. Which of the following categories best describes your current employment status? *Please select only one answer.*

- ₁ Employed full-time (≥ 30 hrs/week) → **Go to Q6**
- ₂ Employed part-time (<30 hrs/week) → **Go to Q6**
- ₃ Employed part-time, and looking for full-time employment → **Go to Q6**
- ₄ Student with full-time employment → **Go to Q6**
- ₅ Student with part-time employment → **Go to Q6**
- ₆ Not employed, but looking for employment → **Go to Q10**
- ₇ Not employed, not looking for employment → **Continue with Q5 below**
- ₈ Retired → **Go to Q10**

Q6. Which of the following categories best describes your reason for not looking for employment? *Please select only one answer.*

- ₁ Stay-at-home parent
- ₂ Stay-at-home grandparent
- ₃ Primary caregiver for someone 18 years or over
- ₄ Student
- ₅ Short-term disability
- ₆ Long-term or permanent disability
- ₇ Other, please specify:

Q7. How long have you been employed in your present position?

- ₁ Less than a year
- ₂ About 1 year
- ₃ 1-5 years
- ₄ More than 5 years

Q8. Which one of the following categories best describes your employer?

- ₁ Private, for-profit company or business, or an individual (for wages, salary, or commission)
- ₂ Private not-for-profit, tax-exempt, or charitable organization
- ₃ Local government (city, county, etc.)
- ₄ State government
- ₅ Federal government
- ₆ Self-employed
- ₇ Working without pay in family business or farm
- ₈ Other, please specify:

Q9. During the LAST WEEK, which one of the following was your usual way to get to work or school?

- ₁ Your own vehicle
- ₂ Bus/public transportation
- ₃ Carpool, with or without your own vehicle
- ₄ Bicycle
- ₅ Walking
- ₆ Worked at home
- ₇ Other, please specify:

Q10. During the LAST WEEK, how many minutes did it usually take to get from your home to work or school?

- ₁ Less than 10 minutes
- ₂ About 10 to 30 minutes
- ₃ More than 30 minutes, but less than an hour
- ₄ More than an hour

Q11. How many vehicles at your household are available for local transportation?

- ₁ None
- ₂ One
- ₃ More than one

Q12. Have you or anyone in your household ever served in the U.S. Armed Forces, Reserves or National Guard?

	Yes, now on active duty	Yes, but not actively serving	Retired	Never served
You	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄
Member of your household	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄

Q13. Including yourself, how many persons age 18 years or older in your household are in each of the following employment categories?

Employment Category	Number in household, including you, in this category
Full-time employment (≥ 30 hrs/week)	<input type="text"/>
Part-time employment (<30 hrs/week)	<input type="text"/>
No employment	<input type="text"/>
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Q14. In the past 12 months, have any of the following been a source of income for you or anyone in your household?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Wages, tips, or salaries	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Investment income	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Government assistance (e.g., welfare assistance, Veteran's Affairs benefits, rental assistance)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Retirement income (e.g., pension, social security)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Relatives, friends, partners	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Child support	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃

Q15. In the past 12 months, were any of your household's sources of income reduced or stopped?

- ₁ Yes → Continue with Q16 below
- ₂ No → Go to Q17

Q16. Which sources of income were stopped, and why?

Q17. Which category best describes your household's total income before taxes from all sources, including benefits and public assistance, in the past 12 months?

- ₁ Less than \$10,000
- ₂ \$10,000 to less than \$25,000
- ₃ \$25,000 to less than \$50,000
- ₄ \$50,000 to less than \$75,000
- ₅ \$75,000 to less than \$100,000
- ₆ \$100,000 to less than \$250,000
- ₇ \$250,000 or more

Q18. If you have little to no income, are you able to make ends meet?

- ₁ Yes → **Go to Q20**
- ₂ No → **Continue with Q19 below**
- ₃ Doesn't apply to our household → **Go to Q20**

Q19. If you have little to no income, how are you able to pay for basic living expenses?

Q20. Have any of the following financial situations applied to you or anyone in your household within the past 12 months?

	Yes	No
Have had a bank account (checking and/or savings)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Hired someone to prepare your taxes	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Owed balances on credit card(s) for nonessential purchases	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Owed balances on credit card(s) for basic household needs	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Used retirement account savings for a major purchase or non-basic household needs (e.g., travel, down payment on a house or car, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Used retirement account savings for basic household needs (e.g., food, rent, house payment, utilities, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Borrowed money from a friend or relative	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Borrowed money from a payday lender	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Other financial activity, please specify: <input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂

Health and Well-Being

Another way to better understand the health and social service issues in your county is to know more about the health and well-being of people living here. All responses are confidential.

Q21. Are you and/or members of your household covered by a health insurance plan? Including private insurance, Medicare, Medicaid(Apple Health (WA)/Health Connections (ID)), and Indian Health Service (IHS) coverage.

	Yes	Not at all	Doesn't apply
You	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Adult member of your household	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Children under 18 yrs living at home	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃

Q22. If you have health insurance, which of the following types of plans currently cover you and/or members of your household?

	Yes	No	Doesn't apply
Private insurance through employer	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Private insurance, not through employer	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Medicaid insurance	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Medicare	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Indian Health Service (IHS) coverage	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Some other type of insurance, please specify: <input style="width: 150px;" type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃

Q23. Because of a health or physical problem, do you have difficulty doing the following activities?

	No, I do not have difficulty	Yes, but I do not need assistance	Yes, I usually need supervision, or stand-by assistance	Yes, I usually need one-person physical assistance	Yes, I usually need two-person physical assistance, or complete mechanical assistance
Bathing	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Dressing	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Eating	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Getting in or out of chairs	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Walking	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Using the toilet	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅

Q24. In the past 12 months, have you or any members of your household been unable to get in to see a physician due to any of the following reasons?

	Yes	No
No appointment times in your schedule	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Inability to take time off work	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Inability to pay for services	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Physician not accepting new patients	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
No transportation/too far	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Physician did not accept your insurance	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
You had no insurance	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Did not know where to seek care	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂

Q25. Have any of the following health situations applied to you or anyone in your household within the 12 months?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Accessed non-emergency care in the emergency room because you were unable to see a primary care provider	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Delayed or canceled a dental procedure due to lack of ability to pay	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Unable to access preventative care (annual physicals, immunizations, well baby exams, etc.)?	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Unplanned hospitalization	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃
Delayed filling a prescription to save money	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃

Q26. About how many miles is your household from the nearest medical facility?

- ₁ Less than 5 miles
- ₂ 6 to 10 miles
- ₃ 11 to 20 miles
- ₄ 21 to 30 miles
- ₅ More than 30 miles

Q27. Do any of the following conditions apply to any children or adults (including you) in your household? *Please select all that apply in each row.*

	You	Child(ren) in the household	Another adult in the household
Asthma	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Obesity (above 75th percentile)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dental disease/emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diabetes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heart disease	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
High blood pressure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Physical disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alcohol or substance abuse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tobacco/vapor use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Behavioral issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mental health issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developmental delays	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other health conditions, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Need for Services

Q28. What is your household's level of need for the following health and social services?

	No Need	Slight Need	Moderate Need	Strong Need
Mortgage/rental assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordable childcare	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Basic education (GED)/English (ESL)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Legal help	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food (help getting enough food)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordable medical care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordable dental care	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help with utility bills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental health services/family counseling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Drug/alcohol treatment and counseling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family violence advocacy/treatment/counseling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transportation, especially to access other services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Help finding a job/job training	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Access to library system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affordable housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emergency housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parenting support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Caregiver support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Preschool education (Head Start, ECEAP or other)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q29. If there is need for the following services, how difficult or easy is it for you or your household to obtain the health and social services needed?

	Not needed	Very difficult	Difficult	Easy	Very easy
Mortgage/rental assistance	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Affordable childcare	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Basic education (GED)/English (ESL)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Legal help	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Food (help getting enough food)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Affordable medical care	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Affordable dental care	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Help with utility bills	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Mental health services/family counseling	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Drug/alcohol treatment and/or counseling	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Family violence advocacy/treatment/counseling	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Transportation, especially to access other services	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Help finding a job/job training	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Access to library system	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Affordable housing	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Emergency housing	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Parenting support	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Caregiver support	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Preschool education (Head Start, ECEAP or other)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Family planning	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅

Q30. In the past 12 months, did any of the following hardship situations happen to you or any member of your household?

	Yes	No
Heat or electricity stopped by vendor	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Phone service stopped by vendor	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Other utilities (e.g., water/sewer) or garbage service stopped by vendor	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Moved due to high housing cost	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Faced transportation difficulties/issues	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Unable to pay property taxes on home due to insufficient funds	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Evicted from housing	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Shared housing with another household due to high housing costs	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Left a living situation due to emotional or physical violence	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Experienced a serious or extended illness that left you or another adult unable to work or care for children	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Assumed responsibility for overall care or guardianship of a child other than your own (e.g., grandchild(ren) or other child(ren) of a relative)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Assumed responsibility for overall care of an older adult	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂
Other hardship, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂

Housing

Q31. In what type of housing do you currently live?

- ₁ House
- ₂ Apartment
- ₃ Duplex/Triplex/Fourplex
- ₄ Mobile home
- ₅ Condo
- ₆ Shelter (e.g., Domestic Violence or other type)
- ₇ Staying with family/friends
- ₈ Homeless
- ₉ Other, please specify:

Q32. Do you own or rent your place of residence?

- ₁ Own
- ₂ Rent
- ₃ Neither own nor rent

Q33. How do you feel about your current housing situation?

- ₁ Very stable and secure
- ₂ Fairly stable and secure
- ₃ Fairly unstable and insecure
- ₄ Very unstable and insecure
- ₅ Not sure

Q34. Have you been homeless within the last 3 years?

- ₁ Yes → Continue with Q35 below
- ₂ No → Go to Q36

Q35. Please describe the primary reason for your homelessness.

Food Access

Q36. In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your home gone hungry because you were not able to get enough food?

- ₁ Yes
- ₂ No

Q37. In the past 12 months, how often have you or your household used each of the following types of food assistance services?

	Not at all	Yearly	Twice a year	Monthly	Weekly
Food Bank/Pantry	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Senior center meals	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Meals on Wheels	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Churches or faith community	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
WIC (Women, Infants and Children)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Public garden/gleaners	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Friends or family	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅
Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅

Q38. If a public/community garden was available to you, how likely are you to use it?

- ₁ Very likely
- ₂ Somewhat likely
- ₃ Somewhat unlikely
- ₄ Very unlikely
- ₅ Not sure

Background Information about You and Your Household

Q39. What is your sex?

- ₁ Male
- ₂ Female
- ₃ Other

Q40. How old are you today?

years

Q41. Are you Hispanic/Latinx?

- ₁ Yes
- ₂ No

Q42. Which best describes your race? *Please select all that apply.*

- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Caucasian/White
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other, please specify:

Q43. Do you or any member of your household have difficulty accessing services because of a language barrier?

- ₁ Yes → Continue with Q43b below
- ₂ No → Go to Q44

Q43b. What is the primary language spoken by the person(s) in your household who have difficulty accessing services because of a language barrier?

Language:

Q44. Including yourself, provide the number of persons in your household in each age group.

Age Group	Number in household, including you, in this category
0-5 years old	<input style="width: 40px; height: 15px;" type="text"/>
6-17 years old	<input style="width: 40px; height: 15px;" type="text"/>
18-59 years old	<input style="width: 40px; height: 15px;" type="text"/>
60 years of age and older	<input style="width: 40px; height: 15px;" type="text"/>
Total	<input style="width: 40px; height: 15px;" type="text"/>

Q45. Do you have internet access in your home?

- ₁ Yes
- ₂ No

Q46. In the past 12 months, how often did you do the following?

	Once a day	Once a week	Once a month	A few times a year	Once a year	Not at all
Go to a movie, sporting event, concert or museum	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Volunteer for a community organization	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Follow what local government is doing (through newspapers, TV, websites, blogs, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Provide unpaid care to seniors, including members of your family	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Provide unpaid help to others, apart from your family	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Receive support from your family or relatives	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Attend religious services	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Participate in community events/activities	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Take time off other than your scheduled days off	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Visit public parks and trails	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Go to a library	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆
Go to a place to exercise	<input type="radio"/> ₁	<input type="radio"/> ₂	<input type="radio"/> ₃	<input type="radio"/> ₄	<input type="radio"/> ₅	<input type="radio"/> ₆

Q47. What is your highest level of education?

- ₁ Less than high school
- ₂ GED (General Educational Development)
- ₃ High school graduate
- ₄ Vocational/Technical
- ₅ 2 year degree or some college
- ₆ 4 year degree or more

Q48. In which city or town do you currently live or is nearest to where you live? *Please provide the city or town name and zip code.*

City or Town:

Zip Code:

Q49. Public forums to discuss community needs are planned for fall 2019. Would you like to be notified by email about these events?

- ₁ Yes → Continue with Q49b below
- ₂ No

Q49b. To receive notifications about public forums, please provide your email address in the box below or send a request to info@innovia.org.

Email address:

Thank you for completing this survey!

If you have additional thoughts about any of the topics or the survey itself, please share them here.

Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
130 Wilson-Short Hall
Washington State University
PO Box 641801
Pullman, WA 99164-1801

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Indicator	Description	Source
Health Behaviors		
Alcohol Consumption	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 18 and older who self-report heavy alcohol consumption (defined as more than two drinks per day on average for men and one drink per day on average for women). This indicator is relevant because current behaviors are determinants of future health and this indicator may illustrate a cause of significant health issues, such as cirrhosis, cancers, and untreated mental and behavioral health needs.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Current Smokers	In the report area an estimated sum of adults age 18 or older self-report currently smoking cigarettes some days or every day. This indicator is relevant because tobacco use is linked to leading causes of death such as cancer and cardiovascular disease.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Deaths of Despair (Suicide + Drug/Alcohol Poisoning)	This indicator reports the rate of death due to intentional self-harm (suicide), alcohol-related disease, and drug overdoses per 100,000 population. Figures are reported as rates age-adjusted to year 2000 standard. Rates are resummarized for report areas from county level data, only where data is available. This indicator is relevant because suicide is an indicator of poor mental health.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Vital Statistics System,
Food Access - Grocery Stores	This indicator reports the number of grocery stores per 100,000 population. Grocery stores are defined as supermarkets and smaller grocery stores primarily engaged in retailing a general line of food, such as canned and frozen foods; fresh fruits and vegetables; and fresh and prepared meats, fish, and poultry. Included are delicatessen-type establishments. Convenience stores and large general merchandise stores that also retail food, such as supercenters and warehouse club stores are excluded. This indicator is relevant because it provides a measure of healthy food access and environmental influences on dietary behaviors.	US Census Bureau, County Business Patterns, 2016.
Food Access - Low Food Access	This indicator reports the percentage of the population with low food access. Low food access is defined as living more than ½ mile from the nearest supermarket, supercenter, or large grocery store. Data are from the 2017 report, Low-Income and Low-Supermarket-Access Census Tracts, 2010-2015 . This indicator is relevant because it highlights populations and geographies facing food insecurity.	US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, USDA - Food Access Research Atlas, 2015.
Food Access - Low Income & Low Food Access	This indicator reports the percentage of the low-income population with low food access. Low food access is defined as living more than ½ mile from the nearest supermarket, supercenter, or large grocery store. Data are from the 2017 report, Low-Income and Low-Supermarket-Access Census Tracts, 2010-2015 . This indicator is relevant because it highlights populations and geographies facing food insecurity.	US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, USDA - Food Access Research Atlas, 2015.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Food Access - WIC-Authorized Food Stores	This indicator reports the number of food stores and other retail establishments per 100,000 population that are authorized to accept WIC Program (Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children) benefits and that carry designated WIC foods and food categories. This indicator is relevant because it provides a measure of food security and healthy food access for women and children in poverty as well as environmental influences on dietary behaviors.	US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, USDA - Food Environment Atlas, 2011.
Food Insecurity Rate	This indicator reports the estimated percentage of the population that experienced food insecurity at some point during the report year. Food insecurity is the household-level economic and social condition of limited or uncertain access to adequate food.	Feeding America, 2017.
Fruit/Vegetable Consumption	In the report area an estimated sum of adults over the age of 18 are consuming less than 5 servings of fruits and vegetables each day. This indicator is relevant because current behaviors are determinants of future health, and because unhealthy eating habits may cause of significant health issues, such as obesity and diabetes.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2005-09.
Opioid Drug Claims	According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), in the report area, Medicare Part D Beneficiaries filed claims for prescriptions (new prescriptions and refills) in year 2017.	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2017.
Physical Inactivity	Within the report area, percentage of adults aged 20 and older self-report no leisure time for activity, based on the question: "During the past month, other than your regular job, did you participate in any physical activities or exercises such as running, calisthenics, golf, gardening, or walking for exercise?". This indicator is relevant because current behaviors are determinants of future health and this indicator may illustrate a cause of significant health issues, such as obesity and poor cardiovascular health.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2016.
Soda Expenditures	This indicator reports soft drink consumption by census tract by estimating expenditures for carbonated beverages, as a percentage of total food-at-home expenditures. This indicator is relevant because current behaviors are determinants of future health and this indicator may illustrate a cause of significant health issues such as diabetes and obesity. Expenditures data are suppressed for single counties and single-geography custom areas. Rank data are not available custom report areas or multi-county areas.	Nielsen, Nielsen SiteReports, 2014.
Weight - Obesity	Percentage of adults aged 20 and older self-report that they have a Body Mass Index (BMI) greater than 30.0 (obese) in the report area. Excess weight may indicate an unhealthy lifestyle and puts individuals at risk for further health issues.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2016.
Weight - Overweight	Percentage of adults aged 18 and older self-report that they have a Body Mass Index (BMI) between 25.0 and 30.0 (overweight) in the report area. Excess weight may indicate an unhealthy lifestyle and puts individuals at risk for further health issues.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2011-12.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Clinical Care		
Access to Dentists	This indicator reports the number of dentists per 100,000 population. This indicator includes all dentists - qualified as having a doctorate in dental surgery (D.D.S.) or dental medicine (D.M.D.), who are licensed by the state to practice dentistry and who are practicing within the scope of that license.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Area Health Resource File, 2015.
Access to Mental Health Providers	This indicator reports the rate of the county population per 100,000 population to the number of mental health providers including psychiatrists, psychologists, clinical social workers, and counsellors that specialize in mental health care.	University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, County Health Rankings, 2017.
Access to Primary Care	This indicator reports the number of primary care physicians per 100,000 population. Doctors classified as "primary care physicians" by the AMA include: General Family Medicine MDs and DOs, General Practice MDs and DOs, General Internal Medicine MDs and General Pediatrics MDs. Physicians age 75 and over and physicians practicing sub-specialties within the listed specialties are excluded. This indicator is relevant because a shortage of health professionals contributes to access and health status issues.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Area Health Resource File, 2014.
Cancer Screening - Mammogram	This indicator reports the percentage of female Medicare enrollees, age 67-69, who have received one or more mammograms in the past two years. This indicator is relevant because engaging in preventive behaviors allows for early detection and treatment of health problems. This indicator can also highlight a lack of access to preventive care, a lack of health knowledge, and/or social barriers preventing utilization of services.	Dartmouth College Institute for Health Policy & Clinical Practice, Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care, 2015.
Cancer Screening - Pap Test	This indicator reports the percentage of women aged 18 and older who self-report that they have had a Pap test in the past three years. This indicator is relevant because engaging in preventive behaviors allows for early detection and treatment of health problems. This indicator can also highlight a lack of access to preventive care, a lack of health knowledge, insufficient provider outreach, and/or social barriers preventing utilization of services.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Cancer Screening - Sigmoidoscopy or Colonoscopy	This indicator reports the percentage of adults 50 and older who self-report that they have ever had a sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy. This indicator is relevant because engaging in preventive behaviors allows for early detection and treatment of health problems. This indicator can also highlight a lack of access to preventive care, a lack of health knowledge, insufficient provider outreach, and/or social barriers preventing utilization of services.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Dental Care Utilization	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 18 and older who self-report that they have not visited a dentist, dental hygienist or dental clinic within the past year. This indicator is relevant because engaging in preventive behaviors decreases the likelihood of developing future health problems. This indicator can also highlight a lack of access to preventive care, a lack of health knowledge, insufficient provider outreach, and/or social barriers preventing utilization of services.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006-10.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Depression (Medicare Population)	This indicator reports the percentage of the Medicare fee-for-service population with depression.	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2017.
Federally Qualified Health Centers	This indicator reports the number of Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) in the community. This indicator is relevant because FQHCs are community assets that provide health care to vulnerable populations; they receive extra funding from the federal government to promote access to ambulatory care in areas designated as medically underserved.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Provider of Services File, November 2019.
Health Professional Shortage Areas	This indicator reports the number and location of health care facilities designated as "Health Professional Shortage Areas" (HPSAs), defined as having shortages of primary medical care, dental or mental health providers. This indicator is relevant because a shortage of health professionals contributes to access and health status issues.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services Administration, February 2019.
Health Professional Shortage Areas - Dental Care	This indicator reports the percentage of the population that is living in a geographic area designated as a "Health Professional Shortage Area" (HPSA), defined as having a shortage of dental health professionals. This indicator is relevant because a shortage of health professionals contributes to access and health status issues.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services Administration, February 2019.
Insurance - Population Receiving Medicaid	This indicator reports the percentage of the population with insurance enrolled in Medicaid (or other means-tested public health insurance). This indicator is relevant because it assesses vulnerable populations which are more likely to have multiple health access, health status, and social support needs; when combined with poverty data, providers can use this measure to identify gaps in eligibility and enrollment.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Insurance - Uninsured Adults	The lack of health insurance is considered a <i>key driver</i> of health status. This indicator reports the percentage of adults age 18 to 64 without health insurance coverage. This indicator is relevant because lack of insurance is a primary barrier to healthcare access including regular primary care, specialty care, and other health services that contributes to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, 2017.
Insurance - Uninsured Children	The lack of health insurance is considered a <i>key driver</i> of health status. This indicator reports the percentage of children under age 19 without health insurance coverage. This indicator is relevant because lack of insurance is a primary barrier to healthcare access including regular primary care, specialty care, and other health services that contributes to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, Small Area Health Insurance Estimates, 2017.
Insurance - Uninsured Population	The lack of health insurance is considered a <i>key driver</i> of health status. This indicator is relevant because lack of insurance is a primary barrier to healthcare access including regular primary care, specialty care, and other health services that contributes to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Lack of a Consistent Source of Primary Care	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 18 and older who self-report that they do not have at least one person who they think of as their personal doctor or health care provider. This indicator is relevant because access to regular primary care is important to preventing major health issues and emergency department visits.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2011-12.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Population Living in a Health Professional Shortage Area	This indicator reports the percentage of the population that is living in a geographic area designated as a "Health Professional Shortage Area" (HPSA), defined as having a shortage of primary medical care, dental or mental health professionals. This indicator is relevant because a shortage of health professionals contributes to access and health status issues.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services Administration, February 2019.
Preventable Hospital Events	This indicator reports the discharge rate (per 1,000 Medicare enrollees) for conditions that are ambulatory care sensitive (ACS). ACS conditions include pneumonia, dehydration, asthma, diabetes, and other conditions which could have been prevented if adequate primary care resources were available and accessed by those patients. This indicator is relevant because analysis of ACS discharges allows demonstrating a possible "return on investment" from interventions that reduce admissions (for example, for uninsured or Medicaid patients) through better access to primary care resources.	Dartmouth College Institute for Health Policy & Clinical Practice, Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care, 2015.
Prevention - Pneumonia Vaccination	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 65 and older who self-report that they have ever received a pneumonia vaccine. This indicator is relevant because engaging in preventive behaviors decreases the likelihood of developing future health problems. This indicator can also highlight a lack of access to preventive care, a lack of health knowledge, insufficient provider outreach, and/or social barriers preventing utilization of services.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Prevention - Recent Primary Care Visit (Adult)	This indicator reports the number and percentage of adults age 18 and older with one or more visits to a doctor for routine checkup within the past one year. Data for this indicator is only available for the population within the top 500 most populous cities across the United States. County, State, and National values represent the population within those cities, and not the total US population.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2015.
Demographic Characteristics		
Families with Children	Percent of occupied households in the report area that are family households with one or more child(ren) under the age of 18, according to the most recent the American Community Survey estimates. As defined by the US Census Bureau, a family household is any housing unit in which the householder is living with one or more individuals related to him or her by birth, marriage, or adoption. A non-family household is any household occupied by the householder alone, or by the householder and one or more unrelated individuals.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Female Population	Percentage of females that reside in the report area according to the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 2013-17 5-year estimates.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Hispanic Population	The estimated population that is of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin. Origin can be viewed as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person's parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be of any race.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Household Composition	This indicator reports the total number and percentage of households by composition (married couple family, nonfamily, etc.). According to the American Community Survey subject definitions, a family household is any housing unit in which the householder is living with one or more individuals related to him or her by birth, marriage, or adoption*. A non-family household is any household occupied by the householder alone, or by the householder and one or more unrelated individuals. Family households and married-couple families do not include same-sex married couples even if the marriage was performed in a state issuing marriage certificates for same-sex couples. Same sex couple households are included in the family households category if there is at least one additional person related to the householder by birth or adoption.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Male Population	Percentage of males that reside in the report area according to the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 2013-17 5-year estimates.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Non-Hispanic White Population	The estimated population that is non-Hispanic white in the report area.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population Age 0-4	This indicator reports the percentage of children aged 0-4 in the designated geographic area. This indicator is relevant because it is important to understand the percentage of infants and young children in the community, as this population has unique health needs which should be considered separately from other age groups.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population Age 18-64	This indicator reports the percentage of population age 18-64 in the designated geographic area. This indicator is relevant because it is important to understand the percentage of adults in the community, as this population has unique health needs which should be considered separately from other age groups.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population Age 5-17	This indicator reports the percentage of youth aged 5-17 in the designated geographic area. This indicator is relevant because it is important to understand the percentage of youth in the community, as this population has unique health needs which should be considered separately from other age groups.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population Age 65+	Percentage of the population in the report area is age 65 or older according to the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 2013-17 5-year estimates. The number of persons age 65 or older is relevant because this population has unique health needs which should be considered separately from other age groups.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population Under Age 18	Percentage of the population in the report area is under the age of 18 according to the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 2013-17 5-year estimates. The number of persons under age 18 is relevant because this population has unique health needs which should be considered separately from other age groups.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population with Any Disability	This indicator reports the percentage of the total civilian non-institutionalized population with a disability. This indicator is relevant because disabled individuals comprise a vulnerable population that requires targeted services and outreach by providers.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population with Limited English Proficiency	This indicator reports the percentage of the population aged 5 and older who speak a language other than English at home and speak English less than "very well." This indicator is relevant because an inability to speak English well creates barriers to healthcare access, provider communications, and health literacy/education.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Total Population	Total people that live in the report area defined for this assessment according to the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 2013-17 5-year estimates.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Veteran Population	This indicator reports the percentage of the population age 18 and older that served (even for a short time), but is not currently serving, on active duty in the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or that served in the U.S. Merchant Marine during World War II.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Health Outcomes		
Asthma Prevalence	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 18 and older who self-report that they have ever been told by a doctor, nurse, or other health professional that they had asthma. This indicator is relevant because asthma is a prevalent problem in the U.S. that is often exacerbated by poor environmental conditions.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2011-12.
Cancer Incidence - All Sites	This indicator reports the age adjusted incidence rate (cases per 100,000 population per year) of females with breast cancer adjusted to 2000 U.S. standard population age groups (Under Age 1, 1-4, 5-9, ..., 80-84, 85 and older). This indicator is relevant because cancer is a leading cause of death and it is important to identify cancers separately to better target interventions.	State Cancer Profiles, 2012-16.
Cancer Incidence - Breast	This indicator reports the age adjusted incidence rate (cases per 100,000 population per year) of females with breast cancer adjusted to 2000 U.S. standard population age groups (Under Age 1, 1-4, 5-9, ..., 80-84, 85 and older). This indicator is relevant because cancer is a leading cause of death and it is important to identify cancers separately to better target interventions.	State Cancer Profiles, 2012-16.
Cancer Incidence - Cervical	This indicator reports the age adjusted incidence rate (cases per 100,000 population per year) of females with cervical cancer adjusted to 2000 U.S. standard population age groups (Under age 1, 1-4, 5-9, ..., 80-84, 85 and older). This indicator is relevant because cancer is a leading cause of death and it is important to identify cancers separately to better target interventions.	State Cancer Profiles, 2009-13.
Cancer Incidence - Lung	This indicator reports the age adjusted incidence rate (cases per 100,000 population per year) of lung cancer adjusted to 2000 U.S. standard population age groups (Under age 1, 1-4, 5-9, ..., 80-84, 85 and older). This indicator is relevant because cancer is a leading cause of death and it is important to identify cancers separately to better target interventions.	State Cancer Profiles, 2012-16.
Diabetes (Adult)	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 20 and older who have ever been told by a doctor that they have diabetes. This indicator is relevant because diabetes is a prevalent problem in the U.S.; it may indicate an unhealthy lifestyle and puts individuals at risk for further health issues.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, 2016.
Heart Disease (Adult)	Adults aged 18 and older have ever been told by a doctor that they have coronary heart disease or angina. This indicator is relevant because coronary heart disease is a leading cause of death in the U.S. and is also related to high blood pressure, high cholesterol, and heart attacks.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2011-12.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

High Blood Pressure (Adult)	Adults aged 18 and older have ever been told by a doctor that they have high blood pressure or hypertension.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Infant Mortality	This indicator reports the rate of deaths to infants less than one year of age per 1,000 births. This indicator is relevant because high rates of infant mortality indicate the existence of broader issues pertaining to access to care and maternal and child health.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Area Health Resource File, 2006-10.
Low Birth Weight	This indicator reports the percentage of total births that are low birth weight (Under 2500g). This indicator is relevant because low birth weight infants are at high risk for health problems. This indicator can also highlight the existence of health disparities.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Vital Statistics System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.
Mentally Unhealthy Days	This indicator reports the average number of mentally unhealthy days (during past 30 days) among sample respondents age 18 and older. Figures are multi-year estimates from the 2006-12 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006-12.
Mortality - Premature Death	This indicator reports Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL) before age 75 per 100,000 population for all causes of death, age-adjusted to the 2000 standard. YPLL measures premature death and is calculated by subtracting the age of death from the 75 year benchmark. This indicator is relevant because a measure of premature death can provide a unique and comprehensive look at overall health status.	University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, County Health Rankings, 2015-17.
Mortality - Suicide	This indicator reports the rate of death due to intentional self-harm (suicide) per 100,000 population. Figures are reported as crude rates, and as rates age-adjusted to year 2000 standard. Rates are resummarized for report areas from county level data, only where data is available. This indicator is relevant because suicide is an indicator of poor mental health.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Vital Statistics System, 2013-17.
Poor Dental Health	This indicator reports the percentage of adults age 18 and older who self-report that six or more of their permanent teeth have been removed due to tooth decay, gum disease, or infection. This indicator is relevant because it indicates lack of access to dental care and/or social barriers to utilization of dental services.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006-10.
Poor General Health	Adults age 18 and older self-report having poor or fair health in response to the question "would you say that in general your health is excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?". This indicator is relevant because it is a measure of general poor health status.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006-10.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Poor Mental Health Days	This indicator reports the average number of self-reported physically unhealthy days in past 30 days among adults (age-adjusted).	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2018.
Poor or Fair Health	This indicator reports the percentage of adults age 18 and older who self-report having poor or fair health. This indicator is relevant because it is a measure of general poor health status.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2018.
Poor Physical Health Days	This indicator reports the average number of self-reported mentally unhealthy days in past 30 days among adults (age-adjusted).	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2018.
STI - Chlamydia Incidence	This indicator reports incidence rate of chlamydia cases per 100,000 population. This indicator is relevant because it is a measure of poor health status and indicates the prevalence of unsafe sex practices.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD, and TB Prevention, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2016.
STI - Gonorrhea Incidence	This indicator reports incidence rate of Gonorrhea cases per 100,000 population. This indicator is relevant because it is a measure of poor health status and indicates the prevalence of unsafe sex practices.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD, and TB Prevention, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2016.
Teen Births	This indicator reports the number of births per 1,000 female population age 15-19.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Vital Statistics System, 2011-2017.
Neighborhoods & Communities		
Affordable Housing	This indicator reports the number and percentage of housing units affordable at various income levels. Affordability is defined by assuming that housing costs should not exceed 30% of total household income. Income levels are expressed as a percentage of each county's median household income.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey,
Cost Burdened Households (30%)	This indicator reports the percentage of the households where housing costs exceed 30% of total household income. This indicator provides information on the cost of monthly housing expenses for owners and renters. The information offers a measure of housing affordability and excessive shelter costs. The data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of people at different economic levels.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Cost Burdened Households (50%)	This indicator reports the percentage of the households where housing costs exceed 50% of total household income. This indicator provides information on the cost of monthly housing expenses for owners and renters. The information offers a measure of housing affordability and excessive shelter costs. The data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of people at different economic levels.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Households with No Motor Vehicle	This indicator reports the number and percentage of households with no motor vehicle based on the latest 5-year American Community Survey estimates.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Nationally Accredited Child Care Centers	This indicator reports the number of nationally accredited child care facilities in the community. Access to quality child care is important to both the health of the child but the financial and emotional stability of the parent.	National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), 2017.
Park Access	This indicator reports the percentage of population living within 1/2 mile of a park. This indicator is relevant because access to outdoor recreation encourages physical activity and other healthy behaviors.	US Census Bureau, Decennial Census, ESRI Map Gallery, 2013.
Population Commuting to Work Over 60 Minutes	This indicator reports the percentage of the population that commutes to work for over 60 minutes each direction.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Population Driving Alone to Work	This indicator reports the percentage of the population that commutes to work on a daily basis using a motor vehicle where they were the only occupant of the vehicle. This indicator provides information on how vital the transportation network is to people's daily routines, but also conveys information about the efficiency of the public transportation network and the availability of carpool opportunities.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Recreation and Fitness Facility Access	This indicator reports the number per 100,000 population of recreation and fitness facilities as defined by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 713940. This indicator is relevant because access to recreation and fitness facilities encourages physical activity and other healthy behaviors.	US Census Bureau, County Business Patterns, 2016.
Renter-Occupied Housing	Tenure provides a measurement of home ownership, which has served as an indicator of the nation's economy for decades. This data covers all occupied housing units, which are classified as either owner occupied or renter occupied. These data are used to aid in the distribution of funds for programs such as those involving mortgage insurance, rental housing, and national defense housing. Data on tenure allows planners to evaluate the overall viability of housing markets and to assess the stability of neighborhoods. The data also serve in understanding the characteristics of owner occupied and renter occupied units to aid builders, mortgage lenders, planning officials, government agencies, etc., in the planning of housing programs and services.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Use of Public Transportation	This indicator reports the percentage of population using public transportation as their primary means of commuting to work. Public transportation includes buses or trolley buses, streetcars or trolley cars, subway or elevated rails, and ferryboats.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Social & Economic Factors		
Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	Public school students that are eligible for Free/Reduced Price lunch out of total students enrolled. This indicator is relevant because it assesses vulnerable populations which are more likely to have multiple health access, health status, and social support needs.	National Center for Education Statistics, NCES - Common Core of Data, 2016-17.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

	Additionally, when combined with poverty data, providers can use this measure to identify gaps in eligibility and enrollment.	
Education - Associate's Level Degree or Higher	Percent of the population aged 25 and older that have obtained an Associate's level degree or higher. This indicator is relevant because educational attainment has been linked to positive health outcomes.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Education - Bachelor's Degree or Higher	Percent of the population aged 25 and older that have obtained an Bachelor's level degree or higher. This indicator is relevant because educational attainment has been linked to positive health outcomes.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Education - Head Start	This indicator reports the number and rate of Head Start program facilities per 10,000 children under age 5. Head Start facility data is acquired from the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) 2018 Head Start locator. Population data is from the 2010 US Decennial Census.	US Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, 2019.
Education - High School Graduation Rate	Percent of students that are receiving their high school diploma within four years. Data represents the 2016-17 school year. This indicator is relevant because research suggests education is one the strongest predictors of health.	US Department of Education, EDFacts, 2016-17.
Education - No High School Diploma	Percent of persons aged 25 and older without a high school diploma (or equivalency) or higher. This indicator is relevant because educational attainment is linked to positive health outcomes.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Education - Student Reading Proficiency (4th Grade)	Percentage of children in grade 4 whose reading skills tested below the "proficient" level for the English Language Arts portion of the state-specific standardized test. This indicator is relevant because an inability to read English well is linked to poverty, unemployment, and barriers to healthcare access, provider communications, and health literacy/education.	US Department of Education, EDFacts, 2016-17.
Income - Median Family Income	This indicator reports median family income based on the latest 5-year American Community Survey estimates. A family household is any housing unit in which the householder is living with one or more individuals related to him or her by birth, marriage, or adoption. Family income includes the incomes of all family members age 15 and older.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Income - Median Household Income	This indicator reports median household income based on the latest 5-year American Community Survey estimates. This includes the income of the householder and all other individuals 15 years old and over in the household, whether they are related to the householder or not. <i>Because many households consist of only one-person, average household income is usually less than average family income.</i>	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Lack of Social or Emotional Support	This indicator reports the percentage of adults aged 18 and older who self-report that they receive insufficient social and emotional support all or most of the time. This indicator is relevant because social and emotional support is critical for navigating the challenges of daily life as well as for good mental health. Social and emotional support is also linked to educational achievement and economic stability.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, US Department of Health & Human Services, Health Indicators Warehouse, 2006-12.

Appendix D – Data Hub Community Indicators Definitions

Poverty - Children Below 100% FPL	Percent of children aged 0-17 that are living in households with income below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This indicator is relevant because poverty creates barriers to access including health services, healthy food, and other necessities that contribute to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Poverty - Children Below 200% FPL	Percent of children that are living in households with income below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This indicator is relevant because poverty creates barriers to access including health services, healthy food, and other necessities that contribute to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Poverty - Population Below 100% FPL	Percent of individuals that are living in households with income below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This indicator is relevant because poverty creates barriers to access including health services, healthy food, and other necessities that contribute to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Poverty - Population Below 200% FPL	Percent of individuals that are living in households with income below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This indicator is relevant because poverty creates barriers to access including health services, healthy food, and other necessities that contribute to poor health status.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.
Social Associations	This indicator reports the number of social associations per 10,000 population. Associations include membership organizations such as civic organizations, bowling centers, golf clubs, fitness centers, sports organizations, political organizations, labor organizations, business organizations, and professional organizations.	US Census Bureau, County Business Patterns, 2016.
Social Capital Index	Social capital is a measure of economic benefits gained from cooperation between individuals and groups. The indicator measures each county's social capital as an index relative to all other counties in the United States.	Pennsylvania State University, College of Agricultural Sciences, Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, 2009.
Young People Not in School and Not Working	This indicator reports the percentage of youth age 16-19 who are not currently enrolled in school and who are not employed.	US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013-17.



We are coming to your community and want to hear from you!

FREE DINNER, CHILDCARE AND PRIZE DRAWINGS

We are seeking public input on how to invest in your community. At this public gathering, we will share results from a needs assessment and survey through a Data Walk presentation.

Data walks are an interactive way for community members to share about what it is like to live in this region by discussing community needs and providing important input that will help guide local solutions.

EVENT DETAILS:

This will be an informal, fun event with free dinner and conversation. Childcare will be provided and participants will be entered to win one of two \$50 gift cards.

MOSCOW/PULLMAN

Monday, September 23
5:30-7:30 PM
1912 Center

LEWISTON/CLARKSTON

Monday, September 30
5:30-7:30 PM
CrossPoint Alliance Church

GRANGEVILLE

Wednesday, October 2
5:30-7:30 PM
Grangeville Elementary/
Middle School

OROFINO

Thursday, October 3
5:30-7:30 PM
The Lodge at
River's Edge

For more information and to RSVP visit: www.innovia.org/news/data-walk



WHO WE ARE: Innovia Foundation ignites generosity that transforms lives and communities. We envision vibrant and sustainable communities, where every person has the opportunities to thrive. As the community foundation for Eastern Washington and North Idaho, we partner with people who want to make our part of the world better.

Appendix E – Data Walk Invitations, Agenda, Photos



Community Forum/Data Walk Planning

September 11, 2019

Purpose

Identify the most pressing health and wellness needs facing region's population. Engage in community conversation around opportunities to support locally driven solutions.

Partners

Sponsors: Lewis Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation, Innovia Foundation, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Community Development, Idaho Community Foundation, Avista Foundation, Premera Social Impact

Partners: COAST Transportation, Lewis Clark State College, Twin County United Way, North Central Idaho Public Health, Nimiipuu Health, Community Action Center

Schedule

Event	Date	Location	Community Partner
Moscow Community Forum	23-Sep	1912 Center	
Pullman Community Forum	23-Sep	SEL Event Center	Whitman County Health Network
Palouse Data Walk	23-Sep	1912 Center	Whitman County Health Network
Lewiston/Clarkston Community Forum	30-Sep	Clarkston Event Center	Twin County United Way
Lewiston/Clarkston Data Walk	30-Sep	CrossPoint Alliance Church	Twin County United Way
<i>Nez Perce Tribe Listening Session</i>	1-Oct	Clearwater Casino	Nez Perce Tribe
Grangeville Community Forum	2-Oct	Soltman Center	Syringa Hospital
Grangeville Data Walk	2-Oct	Grangeville Elementary/Junior School	University of Idaho Extension
Orofino Community Forum	3-Oct	Lodge at River's Edge	
Orofino Data Walk	3-Oct	Lodge at River's Edge	

Appendix E – Data Walk Invitations, Agenda, Photos

Agenda

Community Forum (Day)

- 'Data Walk' (9:00-9:30 am) - break into groups to 4-5 stations to discuss data issue/poster involving regional/local issues
- Welcome (9:30-9:40) – recognition of sponsors
- Introduction (9:40-9:50) – Why are we here? (Craig Nolte)
 - Encourage and facilitate coalition-building aimed at improving health and wellness of residents. Find efficiencies in collecting quality data that can be used to provide common understanding of local needs that will drive strategic initiatives and attract outside resources/funding.
- Data Themes (9:50-10:20) – Review Resources Key Findings (Mason)
 - Survey data - online
 - Introduce data hub/Oct 10 webinar
- Group convening (10:20-end) – Takeaway and next steps (Craig Nolte)
 - How will this data inform your work?
 - What are the gaps in community?
 - What are potential resources/solutions/opportunities? Where can philanthropy/community investment play role?

Evening Data Walk and Conversation

5:00 Doors Open

5:30 Dinner Starts

5:50 Welcome and Intro

Opening Comments (Shelly/Aaron/Funding Organizations)

6:00 Data Walk Instructions (Molly)

6:10 5 stations; 8 minutes each

7:00 Report Out

- What surprises you? What questions do these data raise for you?
- What's the story behind the data? Does this relate to any personal experiences you've had?
- What further information would be helpful?
- What solutions can you think of to address these issues?

7:30 End

Appendix E – Data Walk Invitations, Agenda, Photos

Moscow, Idaho



Clarkston, WA



Grangeville, ID



Orofino, ID



Local Press

Idaho County Free Press: Community Members Invited to Take Part in 'data walk' -

https://www.idahocountyfreepress.com/news/community-members-invited-to-take-part-in-data-walk/article_231d3bac-de6d-11e9-b4ec-5f683713dbbd.html

Clearwater Tribune: Innovia shares survey responses with Data Walk

https://www.clearwatertribune.com/news/top_stories/innovia-shares-survey-responses-with-data-walk/article_b9f68da8-eac0-11e9-b510-6b0ee8364b35.html

Idaho County Free Press: Editorial: Innovia event starts conversations that need continuing toward addressing community needs https://www.idahocountyfreepress.com/opinion/editorial-innovia-event-starts-conversations-that-need-continuing-toward-addressing/article_34ac9374-e9ec-11e9-957c-a70ba39d100e.html

Idaho County Free Press: Innovia Foundation dinner and conversation is tonight

https://www.idahocountyfreepress.com/calendar/innovia-foundation-dinner-and-conversation-is-tonight/event_cf05adca-d966-11e9-91a2-ff449cb1ef62.html

Appendix F – County Level Data Indicators with Low Ratings

Garfield County			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Nation</i>
Food Access - Low Food Access	7.8%	0%	
Health Professional Shortage Areas	9.9%	0%	1%
Physical Inactivity	24.8%	5%	
Access to Mental Health Providers (per 100,000 population)	45.2	5%	
Recreation and Fitness Facility Access (per 100,000 population)	0	6%	8%
Weight - Obesity	33.3%	7%	
Poverty - Population Below 200% FPL	46.6%	7%	9%

Nez Perce County, ID			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Population Driving Alone to Work	82.1%	4%	
Heart Disease (Adult)	5.9%	6%	
Mortality - Suicide (per 100,000 population)	24.4		8%
Depression (Medicare Population)	19.3%	9%	

Asotin County, WA			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Asthma Prevalence	16.6%	4%	
Teen Births (per 1,000 female population age 15-19)	31.9	5%	
Mortality – Suicide (per 100,000 population)	24.3		5%
Diabetes (Adult)	10.2%	5%	
Population Driving Alone to Work	81.1%	6%	
Current Smokers	23.1%	7%	
Dental Care Utilization	35.9%	8%	
Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	53.9%	9%	
Opioid Drug Claims	8.1%		9%
Poor General Health	20.7%	9%	
STI – Gonorrhea Incidence (per 100,000 population)	117.6	10%	

Appendix F – County Level Data Indicators with Low Ratings

Latah County, ID			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Cancer Incidence – All Sites (per 100,000 population)	158.2		5%
Cancer Screening – Pap Test	67.7%	8%	6%
Renter – Occupied Housing	46.7%		10%

Whitman County, WA			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Poverty Rate (< 100% FPL) (SAIPE)	25.9%	1%	3%
Cost Burdened Households (50%)	22.3%	4%	
STI - Chlamydia Incidence (per 100,000 population)	853.1	4%	
Food Insecurity Rate	18.3%	5%	8%
Renter-Occupied Housing	55.5%	5%	1%
Cost Burdened Households (30%)	37.9%	6%	2%
Households with No Motor Vehicle	8.2%	8%	

Wallowa County, OR			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Low Birth Weight	8.5%	0%	
Park Access	11.1%	5%	
Poverty – Children Below 100% FPL	21.3%	0%	
Preventable Hospital Events (per 1,000 Medicare enrollees)	54.3	8%	

Clearwater County, ID			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Population Commuting to Work Over 60 Minutes	19.2%	0%	2%
Mortality - Premature Death (per 100,000 population)	2459	0%	7%
Education - High School Graduation Rate	47.6%	0%	0%
High Blood Pressure (Adult)	39.6%	1%	4%
Mortality – Suicide (per 100,000 population)	42.2	2%	
Teen Births (per 1,000 female population age 15-19)	34.7	3%	
Park Access	7.1%	3%	
Current Smokers	24.5%	4%	
Preventable Hospital Events (per 1,000 Medicare enrollees)	57.4	4%	

Appendix F – County Level Data Indicators with Low Ratings

Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	56.7%	5%	
Education - Bachelor's Degree or Higher	17.4%		7%
Poor General Health	21.0%	8%	
Education - Associate's Level Degree or Higher	25.1%	9%	8%

Idaho County, ID			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Dental Care Utilization	41.9%	1%	
Poverty - Children Below 200% FPL	61.8%	1%	7%
Cancer Screening - Sigmoidoscopy or Colonoscopy	42.6%	2%	2%
Mortality – Suicide (per 100,000 population)	34.5	4%	1%
Poor General Health	21.4%	4%	
Weight - Overweight	39.3%	6%	
Physical Inactivity	24.8%	6%	
Social Associations (per 10,000 population)	6.15	6%	
Lack of Consistent Primary Care	23.7%	6%	
Cancer Screening - Pap Test	68.6%		8%
Income - Median Household Income	\$40,299	9%	9%
Weight - Obesity	32.8%	10%	

Lewis County, ID			
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in Region</i>	<i>Rating Relative to Counties in U.S.</i>
Young People Not in School and Not Working	21.4%	0%	1%
Fruit/Vegetable Consumption	83.4%	1%	8%
Alcohol Consumption	28.5%		2%
Children Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch	59.8%	2%	
High Blood Pressure (Adult)	37.0%	3%	9%
Lack of Social or Emotional Support	23.9%	3%	
Cancer Screening - Mammogram	51.2%	4%	7%
Physical Inactivity	25.2%	4%	
Infant Mortality (per 1,000 births)	9.8	5%	
Opioid Drug Claims	9.9%	5%	2%
STI - Gonorrhea Incidence (per 100,000)	132	6%	
Recreation and Fitness Facility Access (per 100,000 population)	0	6%	8%
Access to Mental Health Providers (per 100,000 population)	51.5	6%	
Education - High School Graduation Rate	75.9%		7%
Poverty - Children Below 200% FPL	56.0%	7%	

Appendix F – County Level Data Indicators with Low Ratings

Access to Primary Care (per 100,000 population)	26.0	8%	8%
Teen Births (per 1,000 female population age 15-19)	28.6	8%	
Population Commuting to Work Over 60 Minutes	10.9%	9%	
Income - Median Household Income	\$40,313	9%	9%
Education - Bachelor's Degree or Higher	16.3%	9%	6%
Education - Associate's Level Degree or Higher	25.6%	9%	8%

Appendix G – Organizations Attending Data Walks

Aging & Disability Resource Center
Augies
Avista Corporation
Backyard Harvest
Beautiful Downtown Lewiston
Big Country News
Brookside Langing
Camas Financial Services
Camas Prairie Food Bank
Catalyst Medical Group
Center for Civic Engagement
Chamber of Commerce
CHAS Health
City of Lewiston
City of Orofino
City of Peck
City of Peck Mayor
City of Pullman
Clearwater County
Clearwater County EDC
Clearwater Tribune
Clearwater Valley Hospital and Clinics
Clearwater Youth Alliance
COAST
Columbia Bank
Community Action Center
Community Action Partnership
Disability Action Center
Evergreen Suites
Families Together
Farm & Fiber
Farmers Market, Grub Club
Festival Dance
Framing Our Community
Garfield County Public Health
Grangeville Arts
Grangeville Community Foundation
Grangeville Elementary Middle School
Grangeville Farmers Market
Green Things Nursery
Holy Trinity Episcopal Church
ICARE, Inc
Idaho Assistive Technology Project
Idaho Community Foundation
Idaho County Court Services
Idaho County Free Press
Idaho County Veteran's Association
Idaho Foodbank
Idaho Housing and Finance
Inland Cellular
Jefferson Regional Medical Center
Joint School District 171
Kiemle Hagood
KLER Radio
Latah County Community Foundation
Latah County Historical Society
Latah Human Rights
Lewis-Clark State College
Lewis-Clark Valley Healthcare Foundation
Lewiston City Library
Life Choices Clinic
Moscow Affordable Housing Trust
Moscow Area Mountain Bike Association
Moscow Chamber of Commerce
Nez Perce Tribe
Northwest Children's Home
Northwest Insurance
Opportunities Unlimited
Orofino Flower Shop
PACT EMS
Palouse Alliance
Palouse Habitat for Humanity, Inc.
Public Health-Idaho North Central District
Pullman Good Food CO-OP
Pullman Regional Hospital
Reliance Center
SEL
Skinner Consulting
Snake River Community Clinic
Society of St. Vincent de Paul
St Joseph Regional Medical Center
St. Mary's Hospital
State of Idaho
Suicide Prevention of the Inland Northwest
Super 8
Syringa Hospital & Clinics
The Partnership for Economic Prosperity, Inc
Timberline Schools
Tribune/Studio 1892
Tri-State Hospital
Umpqua Bank
United Methodist Church
United Way
University of Idaho
Valley Community Center
Valley Meals on Wheels
Valley Vision Inc.
Washington State University
Washington Trust Bank
Wells Fargo Bank
Whitman County Library
Willow Center
Wintz Company, LLC
LC Valley Resilience Coalition
WWCC, Clarkston
YWCA

innovia.org • info@innovia.org • 509-624-2606 • 

421 W Riverside Ave
Suite 606
Spokane, WA 99201