

# Surveillance of Health Status in Minority Communities — Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health Across the U.S. (REACH U.S.) Risk Factor Survey, United States, 2009



## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	2
Methods.....	3
Results .....	5
Discussion .....	9
Conclusion .....	11
References.....	12

The *MMWR* series of publications is published by the Office of Surveillance, Epidemiology, and Laboratory Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Atlanta, GA 30333.

**Suggested Citation:** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. [Title]. *MMWR* 2011;60(No. SS-#):[inclusive page numbers].

### Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Thomas R. Frieden, MD, MPH, *Director*  
 Harold W. Jaffe, MD, MA, *Associate Director for Science*  
 James W. Stephens, PhD, *Office of the Associate Director for Science*  
 Stephen B. Thacker, MD, MSc, *Deputy Director for Surveillance, Epidemiology, and Laboratory Services*  
 Stephanie Zaza, MD, MPH, *Director, Epidemiology and Analysis Program Office*

### MMWR Editorial and Production Staff

Ronald L. Moolenaar, MD, MPH, <i>Editor, MMWR Series</i>	Martha F. Boyd, <i>Lead Visual Information Specialist</i>
Christine G. Casey, MD, <i>Deputy Editor, MMWR Series</i>	Malbea A. LaPete, Julia C. Martinroe,
Teresa F. Rutledge, <i>Managing Editor, MMWR Series</i>	Stephen R. Spriggs, Terraye M. Starr
David C. Johnson, <i>Lead Technical Writer-Editor</i>	<i>Visual Information Specialists</i>
Jeffrey D. Sokolow, MA, <i>Project Editor</i>	Quang M. Doan, MBA, Phyllis H. King
	<i>Information Technology Specialists</i>

### MMWR Editorial Board

William L. Roper, MD, MPH, Chapel Hill, NC, <i>Chairman</i>	Patricia Quinisk, MD, MPH, Des Moines, IA
Virginia A. Caine, MD, Indianapolis, IN	Patrick L. Remington, MD, MPH, Madison, WI
Jonathan E. Fielding, MD, MPH, MBA, Los Angeles, CA	Barbara K. Rimer, DrPH, Chapel Hill, NC
David W. Fleming, MD, Seattle, WA	John V. Rullan, MD, MPH, San Juan, PR
William E. Halperin, MD, DrPH, MPH, Newark, NJ	William Schaffner, MD, Nashville, TN
King K. Holmes, MD, PhD, Seattle, WA	Anne Schuchat, MD, Atlanta, GA
Deborah Holtzman, PhD, Atlanta, GA	Dixie E. Snider, MD, MPH, Atlanta, GA
John K. Iglehart, Bethesda, MD	John W. Ward, MD, Atlanta, GA
Dennis G. Maki, MD, Madison, WI	

# Surveillance of Health Status in Minority Communities — Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health Across the U.S. (REACH U.S.) Risk Factor Survey, United States, 2009

Youlian Liao, MD  
David Bang, PhD  
Shannon Cosgrove, MHA  
Rick Dulin, BS  
Zachery Harris, BS  
Alexandria Stewart, BS  
April Taylor, MPH  
Shannon White, MPH  
Graydon Yatabe, MPH  
Leandris Liburd, PhD  
Wayne Giles, MD

*Division of Adult and Community Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion*

## Abstract

**Problem:** Substantial racial/ethnic health disparities exist in the United States. Although the populations of racial and ethnic minorities are growing at a rapid pace, large-scale community-based surveys and surveillance systems designed to monitor the health status of minority populations are limited. CDC conducts the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health across the U.S. (REACH U.S.) Risk Factor Survey annually in minority communities. The survey focuses on black, Hispanic, Asian (including Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander), and American Indian (AI) populations.

**Reporting Period Covered:** 2009.

**Description of System:** An address-based sampling design was used in the survey in 28 communities located in 17 states (Arizona, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington). Self-reported data were collected through telephone, questionnaire mailing, and in-person interviews from an average of 900 residents aged  $\geq 18$  years in each community. Data from the community were compared with data derived from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) for the metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area (MMSA), county, or state in which the community was located and also compared with national estimates.

**Results:** Reported education level and household income were markedly lower in black, Hispanic, and AI communities than that among the general population living in the comparison MMSA, county, or state. More residents in these minority populations did not have health-care coverage and did not see a doctor because of the cost.

Substantial variations were identified in the prevalence of health-related risk factors among minority populations and among communities within the same racial/ethnic population. In 2009, the median prevalence of obesity among Asian/Pacific Islander (A/PI) men and women was 10.3% (range: 4.8%–45.3%) and 6.7% (range: 4.5%–38.2%), respectively, whereas it was 46.2% (range: 39.4%–53.6%) and 45.5% (range: 35.1%–55.1%), respectively, among AI men and women. The median percentage of cigarette smoking among black (28.0% in men and 19.9% in women) and AI communities (36.1% in men and 36.0% in women) was much higher than the national median (19.6% in men and 16.8% in women) among the 50 states and the District of Columbia (DC). Among the four minority communities, blacks had the highest median percentage of persons who reported engaging in no leisure-time physical activity (28.5% in men and 31.6% in women). A much lower percentage of black women met physical activity recommendations in almost all communities compared with that in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state.

Substantial variations were identified in self-perceived health status and prevalence of selected chronic conditions among minority populations and among communities within the same racial/ethnic population. In 2009, the median percentage of men who reported fair or poor health was 15.8% (range: 8.3%–29.3%) among A/PI communities and 26.3% (range: 22.3%–30.8%) among AI communities. The median percentage of women who reported fair or poor health was 20.1% (range: 13.3%–37.2%) among A/PI communities, whereas it

**Corresponding author:** Youlian Liao, MD, Division of Adult and Community Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, CDC, MS K-30, 4770 Buford Hwy, N.E., Atlanta, GA 30341. Telephone: 770-488-5299; Fax: 770-488-5974; E-mail: ycl1@cdc.gov.

was 31.3% (range: 19.4%–44.2%) among Hispanic communities. AI and black communities had a high prevalence of self-reported hypertension, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes. For most communities, prevalence was much higher than that in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state in which the community was located. The median percentages of persons who knew the signs and symptoms of a heart attack and stroke were consistently lower in all four minority communities than the national median.

Variations were identified among racial/ethnic populations in the use of preventive services. Hispanics had the lowest percentages of persons who had their cholesterol checked, of those with high blood pressure who were taking antihypertensive medication, and of those with diabetes who had a glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA<sub>1c</sub>) test in the past year. AIs had the lowest mammography screening rate within 2 years among women aged ≥40 years (median: 72.7%; range: 69.4%–76.2%). A/PIs had the lowest Pap smear screening rate within 3 years (median: 74.4%; range: 60.3%–80.8%). The median influenza vaccination rates in adults aged ≥65 years were much lower among black (57.3%) and Hispanic communities (63.3%) than the national median (70.1%) among the 50 states and DC. Pneumococcal vaccination rates also were lower in black (60.5%), Hispanic (58.5%), and A/PI (59.7%) communities than the national median (68.5%).

**Interpretations:** Data from the REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey demonstrate that residents in most of the minority communities continue to have lower socioeconomic status, greater barriers to health-care access, and greater risks for and burden of disease compared with the general populations living in the same MMSA, county, or state. Substantial variations in prevalence of risk factors, chronic conditions, and use of preventive services among different minority populations and different communities within the same racial/ethnic population provide opportunities for public health intervention. These variations also indicate that different priorities are needed to eliminate health disparities for different communities.

**Public Health Action:** These community-level survey data are being used by CDC and community coalitions to implement, monitor, and evaluate intervention programs in each community. Continuous surveillance of health status in minority communities is necessary so that community-specific, culturally sensitive strategies that include system, environmental, and individual-level changes can be tailored to these communities.

## Introduction

Substantial racial/ethnic health disparities have been identified in the United States (1). In 2006, one of every four U.S. residents identified themselves as being a racial or ethnic minority (2). The U.S. Census Bureau projects that by 2050, populations that have historically been called “minorities” will make up approximately 50% of the U.S. population (3). Achieving a healthy nation is impossible without healthy minority populations and without eliminating racial/ethnic health disparities. Eliminating health disparities was one of the goals of Healthy People 2010 (4). Individual health is closely linked to the health of the community\* and environment in which persons live, work, and play (4). The health of a person is inseparable from the health of the larger community and the health of every community in every state/territory determines the overall health status of the nation. Healthy People 2010 called for community partnerships in building healthy communities (4).

CDC launched the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) in 1999 (5). During 2000–2006, CDC funded the initial phase of the REACH project, REACH 2010, supporting 42 community coalitions in designing, implementing, and evaluating community-driven strategies to eliminate health disparities (5). The project supported the development and implementation of innovative approaches to working with racial and ethnic minority populations. REACH 2010 demonstrated that health disparities can be reduced and that the health status of populations traditionally most affected by health inequities can be improved (6). Building on the successes of the initial phase of the project, a new funding phase, REACH Across the U.S. (REACH U.S.), was launched in 2007. REACH U.S. endeavors to address the social determinants of health through policy, environmental, and system change and to disseminate effective strategies to more community partners (7). A total of 40 communities were selected competitively and funded by CDC on the basis of the cultural relevance of the proposed intervention, investigator expertise, community participatory strategies, and demonstrated success in prior training, translation, and dissemination activities. These 40 funded communities focused on one or more racial and ethnic population, including blacks, Hispanics, Asians (including Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders), and American Indians (AIs). The health focus areas include cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, breast and cervical cancer, adult/older adult immunization, hepatitis B, asthma, and infant mortality.

\* As used in this report, “community” has two possible meanings, referring either to a locale (e.g., a community in Los Angeles county) or to members of an minority population (e.g., the Hispanic community). Unless preceded by the name of a racial/ethnic population group, the word should be understood as meaning a locale (e.g., a neighborhood or county) in which data were collected. On several occasions the word is used in the commonly accepted sense of meaning the entire city, county, state, or nation as opposed to a segment of the larger whole (e.g., “the health of the larger community”).

In 2001, to monitor the health of racial/ethnic minority communities and as part of the REACH project evaluation, CDC began to conduct annual REACH 2010 Risk Factor Surveys. Baseline data for the REACH 2010 project have been published previously (8). This report presents data from the first survey year of the REACH U.S. project collected during May–November 2009.

## Methods

### Survey Communities

CDC contracted with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to conduct the REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey in 28 of the 40 U.S. REACH communities.<sup>†</sup> The survey included adult residents aged ≥18 years. The 28 communities participating in the survey were located in 17 states.<sup>§</sup>

The survey areas and populations were consistent with the focus of the intervention programs. The areas included specific counties, census tracts, zip codes, neighborhood areas, or tribal areas (Table 1). The size of the survey area varied by community, ranging from a small neighborhood (e.g., within the boundaries of four specific streets in west Philadelphia) to a whole county (e.g., Pima County, Arizona) and from several census tracts or zip codes to an entire state (e.g., Oklahoma). Among the five communities in California, some geographic overlapping occurred. The survey was conducted independently in each community. The REACH project led by the Morehouse School of Medicine, the Southeastern U.S. Collaborative Center of Excellence for the Elimination of Disparities, involved several areas in south Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina. The survey for this project included only the intervention areas in Fulton County, Georgia. In 20 REACH communities, just one minority population was focused (black or Haitian American: eight; Hispanic: four; Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander [Asian/Pacific Islander (A/PI)]: four; and AI: four); six communities focused on both blacks and Hispanics; and two communities focused on three minority populations (blacks, Hispanics, and A/PIs) (Table 2).

<sup>†</sup> Five communities whose targeted health priority was infant mortality were excluded because the design of the survey on adult populations was not appropriate to study issues related to infant mortality. An additional seven communities whose interventions were widely spread geographically were excluded because conducting the survey was not feasible.

<sup>§</sup> Arizona, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington

### Address-Based Sampling Design

An address-based sampling method was used in the REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey to reduce the potential coverage bias of traditional random-digit-dialing. When the previous REACH 2010 Risk Factor Survey was initiated in 2001, random-digit-dialing was the preferred mode of data collection, except in three communities in which in-person face-to-face interviews were performed because of low telephone coverage (8). Since then, use of cellular telephones has increased. In 2009, 25% of U.S. homes had only cellular phones (9). In addition, 15% received most or all of their calls on cellular phones even though they had a landline. Therefore, up to 40% of U.S. homes might not be reachable by traditional random-digit-dialing used in most surveys targeting landlines. Minority populations have embraced cellular phones at a higher rate than the majority, increasing the risk for coverage bias in REACH communities (9). The basis of the address-based sampling frame is the U.S. Postal Service delivery sequence file. This file contains nearly all addresses in the United States that receive mail. Geographic information systems technology was used to construct an address frame that matched the intervention geographies of the REACH program. After a sample of addresses was selected randomly, the addresses were matched to telephone numbers. The median matching rate was 60% (range: 40%–71%). Advance letters describing the survey were sent to sampled households with known telephone numbers. The survey was conducted by telephone for these addresses. Self-administered questionnaires were mailed to households without a phone match and to those who did not respond by telephone. Finally, an in-person follow-up to a subset of nonresponders was conducted.

To increase the efficiency of the survey, designers purposely selected those addresses that were more likely to be households of the survey race/ethnicity. These addresses were identified by aggregating data from multiple sources (e.g., residential directory listings, administrative data, and consumer transactions).

For telephone and in-person interviews, the household screening was conducted with any household member aged ≥18 years to ascertain the age and racial/ethnic eligibility of each adult household member. Up to two eligible adults were selected for further household member interviews. For the survey by mail, all household members were invited to complete the mailed survey. The goal was to survey 900 adult household members in each community.

Complete data were collected from 24,117 eligible household members. Of these, 19,177 (79%) were from telephone interviews, 4,022 (17%) from questionnaire mailings, and

918 (4%) from in-person interviews. Among household members who were contacted by telephone, 43% cooperated with the screening interview (range: 25%–65%). The completion rate of detailed household member interviews was 42% (range: 26%–58%) for eligible household members. In the questionnaire mailing, the mail return rate was 20% (range: 8%–25%). In the in-person survey, the screening completion rate was 75% (range: 48%–88%), and the completion rate of household member interviews was 72% (range: 50%–92%).

## Questionnaires

A uniform questionnaire was used for all communities and was administered in English, Spanish, Vietnamese, Khmer, Haitian Creole, or Chinese (Mandarin or Cantonese). The questionnaire included questions regarding respondents' demographics, socioeconomic status (e.g., education and income), perceived health status, health-care access, self-reported height and weight, leisure-time physical activity, fruit and vegetable intake, cigarette smoking, awareness of hypertension, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes and diabetes care, and receipt of preventive services (e.g., cholesterol screening, mammography, Papanicolaou [Pap] smear test, and influenza and pneumococcal vaccination). The questions were identical to those used in the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) (10).

## Comparison Populations

Health status and risk factor level in the REACH U.S. communities were compared with those in the general population from BRFSS. BRFSS is a state-based telephone survey of civilian residents aged  $\geq 18$  years (10). Typically, BRFSS reports state-level estimates. Since 2002, BRFSS has had sufficient samples to produce area-level estimates for selected metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas (MMSAs), metropolitan divisions, and selected counties. For 13 REACH U.S. communities, data from each community were compared with data from BRFSS in the MMSA in which the community was located (Table 1). For eight communities, community data were compared with county data from BRFSS. For the remaining seven communities that could not be matched to a specific MMSA or county, state-specific BRFSS data were used for comparisons.

The sample size of respondents from the comparison populations was increased by combining MMSA- or county-level data from 2007–2009 survey years and state-level data from 2008–2009 survey years (Table 2). Certain BRFSS data were available only in the 2007 and 2009 survey years (e.g., meeting physical activity recommendation, fruit and vegetable intake, having cholesterol checked, awareness of hypertension, and the use of antihypertensive medication among those who reported

having high blood pressure). Certain questions were included in BRFSS as the optional modules that were asked only in certain states (either all samples or subsamples) for selected years. Therefore, state-level data from the combined years of 2007–2009 were used whenever available to compare with community-level data for the following modules: signs and symptoms of heart attack and stroke (2007 and 2009), diabetes care (glycosylated hemoglobin [HbA<sub>1c</sub>] test, foot, and eye exams) (2007–2009), and women's health (mammography and pap smear test) (2007–2009). Aggregated data across communities by race/ethnicity also were compared with the national estimates for all 50 states and the District of Columbia (DC) in the 2009 BRFSS (women's health data in 2008).

## Data Analysis

The prevalence of risk factors, chronic conditions, and access to and use of preventive services was estimated by community, four racial/ethnic populations, and sex. In Boston, Massachusetts, the surveyed minority population, Haitian Americans, were reported under the "black" racial category. The term "Asian/Pacific Islander (A/PI)" included various Asian populations, Native Hawaiians, and Other Pacific Islanders. For example, the community in Waianae, Hawaii, focused on Native Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders. A community in New York City focused on Chinese, Koreans, and other Asians. Special Services for Groups in California focused on Cambodians, Filipinos, Laotians, Vietnamese, and Samoans. Orange County Asian and Pacific Islanders Community Alliance focused on Cambodians, Hmong, Thais, Vietnamese, Laotians, Native Hawaiians, Samoans, Tongans, Marshallese, and Guamanians/Chamorros, all of whom were grouped under A/PIs. So that sample sizes could be increased, data from men and women were combined in the analyses for the following variables: taking antihypertensive medication among those with reported hypertension, HbA<sub>1c</sub> tests and foot and eye examinations among persons with diabetes, and vaccinations among persons aged  $\geq 65$  years.

In the calculation of prevalence, persons who replied "don't know" or who refused to answer the questions were excluded from the denominator. If a denominator was  $< 30$ , the prevalence estimate was considered unstable and was not presented. SUDAAN was used in the analysis to account for the complex sampling design and to calculate the 95% confidence intervals for both the REACH U.S. and BRFSS data. For the REACH U.S. survey, each sample was weighted to reflect the probability of selection, the number of eligible members, and the number of selected members at the sampled address and was adjusted by age-gender population sizes of members of the surveyed minority population. For BRFSS, each sample was weighted to

reflect the adult population for each MMSA, county, or state. Use of MMSA, county, or state BRFSS as the standard permits a percentage estimated from a community to be described as being higher than the standard if the percentage in the MMSA, county, or state is lower than the lower limit of the confidence interval of the percentage in the community (11). Conversely, the percentage estimated for the community can be described as being lower than the standard if the percentage in MMSA, county, or state is higher than the upper limit of the confidence interval. These comparisons were not used as an indicator of statistical significance in a formal statistical test.

## Results

### Social Demography and Access to Health Care

#### Education

Among men, the median percentage of adults who reported having less than a high school education ranged from 6.3% in A/PI communities to 29.5% in Hispanic communities (Table 3). Among women, the median percentage ranged from 9.3% in A/PI communities to 31.5% in Hispanic communities. Except for A/PI men, these medians were higher than the national median among the 50 states and the DC in the 2009 BRFSS (8.5% in men and 7.5% in women). With a few exceptions, a much higher percentage of black and Hispanic men and women in the surveyed communities reported having less than a high school education compared with that in the general populations from the same MMSA, county, or state in BRFSS. Among minority populations, Hispanics reported the lowest education level, whereas A/PIs had the highest education level. However, substantial community variations were identified within certain racial/ethnic populations. For example, <2% of A/PI men or women reported having less than a high school education in the surveyed community in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California, compared with 21.3% of men and 27.1%, of women from the surveyed community in New York City.

#### Household Income

The median percentage of men who reported having annual household income of <\$25,000 ranged from 27.2% in A/PI communities to 45.4% in Hispanic communities (Table 4). The median percentage among women ranged from 27.6% in A/PI communities to 50.5% in black communities. All these medians were higher than the national median percentage of household income of <\$25,000 among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (21.3% in men and 26.4% in women). The median percentages of persons with incomes of <\$25,000 in black and Hispanic communities were about twice the national level. A substantially

higher percentage of men and women reported low income in all Hispanic and AI communities and in the vast majority of black communities compared with that in the comparison MMSA, county, or state populations. Substantial community variations were identified within the same racial/ethnic population. For example, 12.1% and 19.2% of A/PI men and women, respectively, had an income of <\$25,000 in the surveyed community in Seattle and King County compared with 41.6% and 46.9%, respectively, in the community in New York City.

#### Health-Care Coverage

Respondents were asked if they had any kind of health-care coverage, including health insurance, prepaid plans such as HMOs, or government plans such as Medicare. The median percentage of men who reported having no health-care coverage ranged from 14.8% in A/PI communities to 29.2% in Hispanic communities (Table 5). The median percentage among women ranged from 15.2% in A/PI communities to 26.7% in AI communities. Except for A/PI men, these medians were higher than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (16.5% in men and 12.4% in women). Higher percentages of men and women without health-care coverage were reported in the majority of black, Hispanic, and AI communities compared with those in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state in which the community was located. Within the same racial/ethnic population, a two- to fourfold difference was identified in coverage rates across communities.

#### Cost as a Barrier to Obtaining Health Care

Respondents were asked whether at any time in the previous 12 months they had needed to see a doctor but could not do so because of cost. The median percentage of men who could not see a doctor because of cost ranged from 10.6% in A/PI communities to 21.8% in Hispanic communities (Table 6). The median percentage among women ranged from 14.0% in A/PI communities to 25.6% in Hispanic communities. Except for A/PIs, these medians were higher than the national median in 2009 (12.2% in men and 14.7% in women). A higher percentage of adults who had not seen a doctor because of the cost was reported consistently in Hispanic communities compared with the corresponding MMSA, county, or state in which the community was located. A greater variation in the one-on-one comparison between the individual community and BRFSS counterpart was observed in black, A/PI, and AI communities.

### Chronic Disease Risk Factors

#### Obesity

Obesity is defined as body mass index  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> calculated from self-reported height and weight. The median percentage of obesity

among men ranged from 10.3% in A/PI communities to 46.2% in AI communities (Table 7). The median percentage among women ranged from 6.7% in A/PI communities to 45.5% in AI communities. Except for A/PI communities, these median percentages were higher than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (28.6% in men and 26.0% in women). The prevalence of obesity was substantially higher among both men and women in AI communities and among women in black communities compared with that in the comparison MMSA, county, or state in which the community was located. Overall, approximately 45% of AI men and women and black women were obese in the surveyed communities, whereas slightly more than one fourth of adults were obese at the national level. Obesity was uncommon in most A/PI communities. However, obesity prevalence in Native Hawaiians/Other Pacific Islanders (45.3% in men and 38.2% in women) was much higher than in the general population in Honolulu (24.5% in men and 19.9% in women). Two- to threefold differences in obesity prevalence were reported across black communities.

### Cigarette Smoking

Cigarette smokers were defined as those who had ever smoked  $\geq 100$  cigarettes and who currently smoke. The median percentage of cigarette smoking among men ranged from 13.8% in A/PI communities to 36.1% in AI communities (Table 8). The median percentage among women ranged from 3.7% in A/PI communities to 36.0% in AI communities. The median percentages among black and AI communities were higher than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (19.6% in men and 16.8% in women). Substantial community variations in prevalence of smoking within the same racial/ethnic population were identified. The difference could be up to fourfold across communities. For example, the prevalence of smoking was  $< 5\%$  in women in the majority of A/PI communities, compared with 21.3% in Waianae, Hawaii.

### Leisure-Time Physical Activity

Respondents were asked if they had participated, other than as a part of their regular job, in any physical activities or exercises (e.g., running, calisthenics, golf, gardening, or walking for exercise) during the past month. The median percentage of men who reported having no leisure-time physical activity ranged from 23.6% in A/PI communities to 28.5% in black communities (Table 9). The median percentage among women ranged from 25.6% in A/PI communities to 31.6% in black communities. Except for women in A/PI communities, these median percentages were higher than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (21.5% in men and 25.6% in women). Substantial variations were identified within the same racial/ethnic population in one-on-one comparisons between individual communities and the corresponding MMSA, county, or state.

### Met Physical Activity Recommendation

Respondents were asked to recall their overall frequency and duration of time spent in moderate activities (e.g., brisk walking, bicycling, vacuuming, or gardening) and vigorous activities (e.g., running, aerobics, or heavy yard work) in a typical week. Persons were defined as meeting recommended physical activity levels if they reported participating in either moderate physical activity  $\geq 30$  minutes/day, 5 days/week, or vigorous physical activity  $\geq 20$  minutes/day, 3 days/week (12). The median percentage of men who met physical activity recommendations ranged from 39.8% in A/PI communities to 47.9% in AI communities (Table 10). The median percentage among women ranged from 34.6% in black communities to 44.9% in AI communities. These median percentages were all lower than the national median percentage among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (52.4% in men and 47.8% in women). With very few exceptions, a much lower percentage of black women met physical activity recommendations in the surveyed communities compared with that in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state in which the community was located. The results were less consistent in one-on-one comparisons between individual communities and the corresponding BRFSS counterparts for Hispanics, A/PIs, and AIs.

### Fruit and Vegetable Intake

Fruit and vegetable intake was calculated from six questions regarding the intake of fruit juices, fruit, green salad, potatoes, carrots, and other vegetables. A national education program has advocated eating at least five servings of fruits and vegetables daily (13). The median percentage of men who reported eating at least five fruits and vegetables daily ranged from 19.6% in Hispanic communities to 23.8% in black and A/PI communities (Table 11). The median percentage among women ranged from 23.5% in AI communities to 33.6% in A/PI communities. Overall the differences between these medians and the national median percentage (19.2% in men and 27.7% in women) were small. The percentage of women who reported eating at least five fruits and vegetables daily was much lower in most of the Hispanic communities than in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state. One-on-one comparisons between individual communities and the corresponding BRFSS counterparts were less consistent in other racial populations.

## Health Status and Selected Chronic Conditions

### Perceived Health Status

Respondents were asked to rate their own general health as either “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “fair,” or “poor.”



The median percentages of men who reported fair or poor health ranged from 15.8% in A/PI communities to 26.3% in AI communities (Table 12). The median percentages among women ranged from 20.1% in A/PI communities to 31.3% in Hispanic communities. These medians were all higher than the national median percentage among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (13.4% in men and 15.3% in women). With few exceptions, a substantially higher percentage of men and women in Hispanic communities and women in black communities reported fair or poor health compared with that in the comparison MMSA, county, or state populations. The one-on-one comparisons between individual communities and the corresponding BRFSS counterparts were less consistent for A/PI and AI communities.

### High Blood Pressure

The prevalence of high blood pressure was assessed by asking respondents, “Have you ever been told by a doctor, nurse, or other professional that you have high blood pressure?” Adults who reported prehypertension or borderline high blood pressure, and females who reported high blood pressure during pregnancy, were not considered as having hypertension. The median prevalence of high blood pressure among men ranged from 22.8% in Hispanic communities to 43.9% in AI communities (Table 13). The median prevalence among women ranged from 24.0% in A/PI communities to 46.2% in black communities. The medians among black and AI communities were much higher than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (29.8% in men and 27.8% in women). With very limited exceptions, the prevalence of high blood pressure was substantially higher in black and AI communities than in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state. The results of one-on-one comparisons between individual communities and the corresponding BRFSS counterparts were less consistent for Hispanic and A/PI communities. Substantial community variations in the prevalence of high blood pressure were identified within the same racial/ethnic population. For example, the prevalence of high blood pressure was 12.9% and 15.0% in Hispanic men and women, respectively, in the surveyed community in Seattle/King County, whereas it was 42.5% in Hispanic men in the surveyed community of Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico, and 36.5% in Hispanic women in the surveyed community of East Harlem, New York. The prevalence of high blood pressure was 23.7% and 16.8% in A/PI men and women, respectively in Seattle/King County, whereas the prevalence was twice as high in A/PI men in the surveyed community in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California (46.7%) and in A/PI women in the surveyed community of Waianae, Hawaii (38.1%).

### Cardiovascular Diseases

The percentage of cardiovascular diseases was assessed by asking respondents if they had ever been told by a doctor that they had any of the following conditions: heart attack or myocardial infarction, angina or coronary heart disease, or stroke. The median prevalence of cardiovascular diseases among men ranged from 6.6% in A/PI communities to 13.4% in AI communities (Table 14). The median prevalence among women ranged from 4.4% in A/PI communities to 12.3% in AI communities. The medians were higher among AI communities, and lower among Hispanic and A/PI communities than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (8.8% in men and 6.3% in women). A higher prevalence of cardiovascular diseases was apparent among women in the majority of black and AI communities compared with that in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state. One-on-one comparisons between the individual communities and the corresponding BRFSS counterparts were not consistent for Hispanic and A/PI communities.

### Diabetes

The prevalence of diagnosed diabetes was assessed by asking respondents, “Have you ever been told by a doctor that you have diabetes?” The median prevalence of diabetes (excluding gestational, borderline, or prediabetes) among men ranged from 10.0% in Hispanic communities to 18.0% in AI communities (Table 15). The median prevalence among women ranged from 10.3% in A/PI communities to 18.4% in AI communities. All these medians were higher than the national median among the 50 states and DC in 2009 (8.8% in men and 8.2% in women). With a few exceptions, the prevalence of diabetes was substantially higher in both men and women in black and AI communities than in the comparison MMSA, county, or states. The prevalence was also much higher in women in Hispanic communities compared with their BRFSS counterparts. Substantial community variations (two- to five-fold difference) were identified in the prevalence of diabetes within the same racial/ethnic population.

### Knowledge of Heart Attack Symptoms

A respondent was considered as having knowledge of heart attack signs and symptoms and the action to take if he or she correctly answered “yes” to all five questions on symptoms of heart attack, “no” to the incorrect symptom, and “call 911” when the responder thought someone was having a heart attack (14). The five symptoms of heart attack were 1) pain or discomfort in the jaw, neck, or back; 2) feeling weak, lightheaded, or faint; 3) chest pain or discomfort; 4) pain or discomfort in

the arms or shoulder; and 5) shortness of breath. An incorrect symptom was sudden trouble seeing in one or both eyes. The median percentage of men who knew heart attack symptoms and action ranged from 3.2% in Hispanic communities to 8.7% in AI communities (Table 16). The median percentage among women ranged from 4.7% in Hispanic communities to 13.5% in AI communities. These median percentages were all lower than the median percentage of 33 states<sup>‡</sup> and DC in the 2009 BRFSS (10.4% in men and 14.7% in women). The percentage of adults who knew heart attack symptoms and action was substantially lower in almost all black, Hispanic, and A/PI communities than it was in the comparison states or the median percentage of the 33 states and DC when state-specific data were not available. Within the same racial/ethnic populations, community variations in the percentage of persons who had knowledge of heart attack symptoms were substantial.

### Knowledge of Stroke Symptoms

A respondent was considered as having knowledge of stroke signs and symptoms and the action to take if he or she correctly answered “yes” to all five questions on symptoms of stroke, “no” to the incorrect symptom, and “call 911” when the respondent thought that someone was having a stroke. The five symptoms of stroke were 1) sudden confusion or trouble speaking; 2) sudden numbness or weakness of the face, arm, or leg, especially on one side; 3) sudden trouble seeing in one or both eyes; 4) sudden trouble walking, dizziness, or loss of balance; and 5) severe headache without known cause. An incorrect symptom was sudden chest pain or discomfort.

The median percentage of men who knew stroke signs and symptoms and what action to take ranged from 7.9% in A/PI communities to 14.5% in AI communities (Table 17). The median percentage among women ranged from 7.0% in Hispanic communities to 15.4% in AI communities. These median percentages were all much lower than the median percentage among 33 states and DC in the 2009 BRFSS (19.4% in men and 21.0% in women). With very few exceptions, the percentage of adults who knew stroke symptoms and action was substantially lower in black, Hispanic, and A/PI communities than that in the corresponding states or the median of the 33 states and DC when state-specific data were not available. Within the same racial/ethnic population, substantial community variations were identified in the percentage of persons who had the knowledge of stroke symptoms.

<sup>‡</sup>Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin

## Clinical Care and Preventive Services

### Blood Cholesterol Checked

The median percentage of men who reported having their blood cholesterol checked during the preceding 5 years ranged from 60.5% in Hispanic communities to 73.6% in black communities (Table 18). The median percentage among women ranged from 67.4% in Hispanic communities to 80.5% in black communities. The median percentage was much lower than the national median percentage in both men (74.4%) and women (79.2%) among the 50 states and DC. A substantially lower percentage of men and women reported having cholesterol checked in the preceding 5 years in almost all Hispanic communities compared with that of the population in the comparison MMSA, county, or state in which the community was located. One-on-one comparisons between the community and corresponding MMSA, county, or state were less consistent in other minority populations.

### Antihypertensive Medication Usage

The median percentage of adults with hypertension who reported taking antihypertensive medication ranged from 68.7% in Hispanic communities to 81.0% in black communities (Table 19). The median percentage among Hispanic communities was lower than the national median percentage (79.2%) among the 50 states and DC in 2009. The difference between the median percentage and the national median was small for the other three minority populations.

### Preventive Care in Persons with Diabetes

Respondents who reported having diabetes were asked whether in the preceding 12 months, they had 1) an HbA<sub>1c</sub> test, 2) their feet checked for any sores or irritations by a health professional, and 3) a dilated eye exam. The median percentages of respondents with diabetes who had none of these three exams were all <3% in the four minority populations. The median percentage of persons with all three exams ranged from 46.2% in Hispanic communities to 59.6% in A/PI communities.

**HbA<sub>1c</sub>.** The median percentage of adults with diabetes who reported having had an HbA<sub>1c</sub> test within the previous year ranged from 64.1% in Hispanic communities to 79.5% in AI communities (Table 20). The median percentage among black, Hispanic, and A/PI communities was lower than the national median percentage (79.7%) among 45 states (all states except Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and South Dakota) and DC in 2009. Substantially lower percentages of adults having an HbA<sub>1c</sub> test within a year were reported in almost all Hispanic communities compared with those in the comparison state populations. One-on-one comparisons between

individual communities and the corresponding states were less consistent in other minority populations.

**Foot exam.** The median percentage of adults with diabetes who reported having had their feet checked by a health professional within the previous year ranged from 68.7% in Hispanic communities to 82.0% in black communities (Table 21). The median percentage among Hispanic communities was lower, but higher among black and AI communities, than the national median percentage (73.4%) among 45 states and DC in 2009. Much higher percentages of adults who had their feet checked within the previous year were reported in the majority of black and AI communities compared with those in the corresponding states.

**Dilated eye exam.** The median percentage of adults with diabetes who reported having had a dilated eye exam within the previous year ranged from 71.3% in Hispanic communities to 78.3% in A/PI communities (Table 22). These median percentages were somewhat higher than the national median percentage (69.2%) among 45 states and DC in 2009. However, no substantive difference in the eye exam rate was identified in the majority of the one-on-one comparisons between the individual community and the corresponding state in which the community was located.

## Women's Cancer Screening

### Mammography

The median percentage of women aged  $\geq 40$  years who reported having had a mammogram during the previous 2 years ranged from 72.7% in AI communities to 80.7% in black communities (Table 23). These medians were lower than the national median percentage (83.2%) among the 50 states and DC in 2008 BRFSS. A lower mammography screening rate was reported in AI communities than in the corresponding state in which the community was located. The results of one-on-one comparisons between individual communities and their BRFSS counterparts were less consistent for the other minority populations.

### Pap Smear Test

The median percentage of women with an intact uterine cervix who reported having had a Pap smear screening during the previous 3 years ranged from 74.4% in A/PI communities to 85.0% in black communities (Table 24). The median percentage among A/PI communities, but not among the other three minority populations, was lower than the national median percentage (82.9%) in 2008. A lower percentage of women received Pap smear screening in the majority of the A/PI communities compared with that in the corresponding state. The differences were mostly small in the one-on-one comparisons between individual communities and their BRFSS counterparts for the three other minority populations.

## Immunization

### Influenza Vaccination

The median percentage of adults aged  $\geq 65$  years who reported that they had an influenza vaccination in the previous year ranged from 57.3% in black communities to 79.5% in A/PI communities (Table 25). The median percentage was lower than the national median (70.1%) in 2009 among black and Hispanic communities, while higher among A/PI communities. With very few exceptions, black communities had a much lower rate of influenza vaccination than that in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state population. The differences were not significant in most of the one-on-one comparisons between the individual community and BRFSS counterpart for the three other minority populations.

### Pneumococcal Vaccination

The median percentage of adults aged  $\geq 65$  years who reported that they had ever had a pneumococcal vaccination ranged from 58.5% in Hispanic communities to 78.7% in AI communities (Table 26). Except among AI communities, the median percentages among the other three minority communities were lower than the national median (68.5%) among the 50 states and DC in 2009. However, the vaccination rates in the majority of the communities and those in the corresponding MMSA, county, or state were not substantially different.

## Discussion

Several population-based surveys have been conducted in the individual states and the nation, including the National Health Interview Survey, the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, and BRFSS. These surveys were designed to collect data in national or statewide probability samples to obtain national or state-level estimates. They were not designed specifically to monitor the health status of persons at the community level or to focus on minority communities. As a result, surveillance data for racial/ethnic minorities often is lacking. The previous REACH 2010 Risk Factor Survey (8) and the current REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey provide valuable information at the community level on socioeconomic demographics, risk factors, chronic conditions, and the use of preventive services in the four minority populations surveyed.

Data from the REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey indicate that for the majority of health and socioeconomic indicators, black, Hispanic, and AI communities do not fare as well as the general populations in their respective MMSA, county, or state, or in the United States as a whole. Socioeconomic status as measured by

education level and household income was substantially lower among these communities. Minorities in these communities had less health insurance coverage, higher cost barriers to access health care, and worse self-rated general health. Variations were identified in the prevalence of risk factors and chronic condition burden among the four minority populations. Obesity, smoking, high blood pressure, cardiovascular diseases, and diabetes were the major health risk and chronic conditions in black and AI communities. Lack of physical activity was prominent in black communities, especially among women. Lack of knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms was prominent in black, Hispanic, and A/PI communities. The cholesterol screening rate and the percentage of persons who reported having high blood pressure and were taking antihypertensive medication was lowest in Hispanic communities. Underuse of selected preventive services was apparent, including underuse of mammography screening in AI communities, of Pap smear testing in A/PI communities, and of influenza vaccination in black and Hispanic communities.

The substantial variations identified among the four racial/ethnic minority populations in different risk factors and health conditions indicate that different priorities are needed to eliminate health disparities. In the REACH 2010 and REACH U.S. project, community-based coalitions were formed to address community-specific health issues. These coalitions were driven primarily by residents of the community at every stage of the program, including setting health priorities, planning, implementation and evaluation. A unique feature of REACH was that the project did not use a standardized intervention protocol but was sufficiently flexible to allow community choices on the basis of priorities, available resources, and local realities (6).

These survey data show an aggregation of socioeconomic demographic factors (e.g., education and income), risk factors (e.g., obesity, smoking, and physical inactivity) and chronic diseases (e.g., high blood pressure, cardiovascular diseases, and diabetes). This indicates that multifaceted and multisectoral strategies are needed to make effective changes. REACH U.S. grantees have identified numerous societal, policy, environmental, cultural, and individual-level factors that must be changed to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities. Thus, each grantee develops appropriate programs that address the complex root causes of racial and ethnic health disparities.

The data demonstrate a substantial heterogeneity across communities within the same broad racial/ethnic population. For example, obesity prevalence among black men was 13.0% in a community in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California, whereas it was 41.6% in a community in southern West Virginia. The smoking prevalence among Hispanic men was 10.3% in a community in Santa Clara Valley, California, whereas it was 34.4% in a community in Southeast Chicago. Although smoking was rare among women in Asian

communities, it was prevalent among Native Hawaii/Pacific Islander women in Waianae, Hawaii. Differences in percentages of persons receiving preventive services were also substantial across communities. The rate of mammography screening during the previous 2 years among women aged  $\geq 40$  years was only 66.3% in the Hispanic population surveyed in Seattle and King County, Washington compared with 93.5% among the Hispanic population surveyed in Lawrence, Massachusetts. Similarly, the rate of pneumococcal vaccination among blacks aged  $\geq 65$  years was 42.7% in Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, whereas the rate was 73.5% in the black population surveyed in southern West Virginia. These wide variations in prevalence of health-related behaviors, chronic conditions, and use of preventive services across communities likely are related to demographic, cultural, local laws, policies, and environmental influences among residents of these communities and the majority of these influences are more or less modifiable, depending on local circumstances. The salient variations and intrapopulation differences also indicate that opportunities and the possibility for change exist.

The baseline data of the previous REACH 2010 Risk Factor Survey were collected in 21 communities in 2001 (7). Among them, 11 communities also participated in the current REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey with complete geographic match in seven and partial matches in four communities. Although a list-assisted random-digit-dialing design instead of address-based sampling, was used in the previous REACH 2010 survey, the survey questionnaires were very similar. Since the previous survey was conducted 8 years ago (8), many improvements have occurred in the health and health care indicators in the four minority populations. For example, among men, the median prevalence of smoking was 28.8% in Hispanic communities 8 years ago, whereas it was 17.6% in the current survey. Likewise, the median prevalence of smoking decreased from 30.5% to 13.8% in Asian men, consistent with the 5-year smoking trend in REACH 2010 Asian communities reported previously (15). These improvements are greater than the national decreasing trend in smoking (25.5% in 2001 and 19.6% in 2009). Although an increase occurred in the percentage of adults who met physical activity recommendations in the nation for men (from 49.6% to 52.4%) and women (from 42.9% to 47.8%), the increase was larger among REACH communities during the same time period. Among men, the median percentage increased from 36.2% to 43.8% in blacks, from 35.1% to 45.8% in Hispanics, from 24.1% to 39.8% in A/PIs, and from 42.9% to 47.9% in AIs. Among women, the corresponding median percentage increased from 25.6% to 34.6% in blacks, 33.7% to 44.7% in Hispanics, 17.3% to 40.5% in A/PIs, and 35.9% to 44.9% in AIs, respectively. Similar trends also were observed in fruit and vegetable intake (data not reported).

Improvements in the measures of health care and preventive services were also evident in these communities. For example, fewer than half of Hispanics who reported having hypertension were taking medication for high blood pressure in the 2001 REACH 2010 survey; although still lower than the national level, this percentage increased to more than two thirds in the 2009 REACH U.S. survey. The vaccination rate for pneumonia increased from 50.5% to 60.5% in black communities, from 46.0% to 58.5% in Hispanic communities, from 37.5% to 59.7% in A/PI communities, and from 67.3% to 78.7% in AI communities. Racial and ethnic health disparities have long been recognized and actions have been called for to close the gap (16,17). Many improvements in health indicators have occurred during the past decade in minority communities (6). However, vital statistics data indicate that black-white mortality disparities widened during 1990–2005 in certain diseases (e.g., heart disease, breast cancer, and diabetes) at the national level, especially in such urban areas as Chicago (18).

## Limitations

The findings in this report are subject to at least eight limitations. First, because minority populations are not homogeneous, substantial ethnic, cultural, and social diversity exists within any racial/ethnic minority population. For example, Haitian Americans were grouped under blacks. Hispanics comprised multiple diverse subpopulations (e.g., Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Dominicans). A/PIs consisted of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, and various Asian populations (e.g., Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Filipinos). Second, because AIs were sampled in only four different communities, the data reported might not represent AIs from other communities in the United States. Third, although the survey sampled an average of 900 adult residents in each community, sample sizes in certain communities (e.g., Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina, and Intertribal Council of Michigan) were relatively small. Fourth, certain communities included multiple racial/ethnic populations, reducing the sample size for each minority population. Sample size was reduced further when prevalence estimates were limited to women, specific ages (e.g., age  $\geq 65$  years), or those with certain chronic conditions (e.g., diabetes). As a result of limited sample size, estimated confidence intervals were wide for certain health indicators in certain communities. Fifth, the response rates of the telephone and questionnaire mailing components of this survey were somewhat low. The survey aimed to collect representative samples from each racial/ethnic minority population surveyed. Respondents were weighted according to age and gender distribution of the

minority population in the community and accounted for varying inclusion probabilities among them. Approximately 42% of the mail questionnaire respondents reported having only cellular phones or no phone service. When compared with national data for each racial/ethnic population, participants in the REACH Risk Factor Survey tended to have lower income and educational attainment. This most likely reflects the lower socioeconomic status of the REACH communities along with the higher cellular phone coverage that was obtained in the REACH survey compared with the BRFSS. Sixth, because estimates were based on “having been told” and self-reported data and subject to recall errors/bias or social desirability effects, the prevalence of certain chronic conditions and use of preventive services might be under- or overestimated. Seventh, the questions used in this study related to physical activity were appropriate to evaluate the percentage of persons who met an earlier physical activity recommendation (12) but not the most current 2008 guideline (19). Finally, the prevalence estimates for small area (i.e., MMSA and county) might not be the same as those reported here if other statistical methods (e.g., Bayesian methodology) are used.

Despite these limitations, the REACH U.S. survey has multiple strengths. Unlike previous national or state-based surveys, it is the largest community-based survey that focuses on multiple minority populations in the United States. The use of an address-based sampling design, which included multiple data collection modes (telephone, mailing, and in-person interviews), enabled the survey to reach those without telephones or with only cellular phones. The survey was conducted from a single center using a uniform methodology across all communities. The questions used in the survey were identical to those used in BRFSS, thus allowing data from the two surveys to be compared.

## Conclusion

Despite measurable improvements in the overall health of the nation including minority populations, the REACH U.S. Risk Factor Survey demonstrates that health disparities remain widespread among members of racial and ethnic minority populations. The data from this survey provide important information for assessing, prioritizing, and planning intervention efforts in each community. These results underscore the need for community-based approaches that include policy, systems, environmental, and individual-level changes. They also underscore the need to tailor prevention strategies to the needs of specific communities to eliminate health disparities. Continuing data collection is necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of the interventions and for enhancing existing programs and disseminating the lessons learned.

## References

1. CDC. CDC Health disparities and inequalities report—United States, 2011. *MMWR* 2011;60(Suppl).
2. CDC. Health, United States, 2006: With chartbook on trends in the health of Americans. 2006. Hyattsville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, National Center for Health Statistics; 2006. Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/06.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/06.pdf). Accessed March 30, 2011.
3. US Census Bureau, US interim projections by age, sex, race and Hispanic origin: 2000–2050. Available at <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/usinterimproj>. Accessed March 30, 2011.
4. US Department of Health and Human Services. Healthy people 2010. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2000.
5. Giles WH, Tucker P, Brown L, et al. Racial and ethnic approaches to community health (REACH 2010): an overview. *Ethn Dis* 2004;14(Suppl):S5–8
6. CDC. REACHing across the divide: finding solutions to health disparities. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 2007. Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/reach/pdf/health\\_disparities\\_101607.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/reach/pdf/health_disparities_101607.pdf). Accessed March 30, 2011.
7. CDC. At glance: racial and ethnic approaches to community health (REACH U.S.). Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 2008. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/reach>. Accessed March 30, 2011.
8. Liao Y, Tucker P, Okoro CA, et al. REACH 2010 surveillance of health status in minority communities—United States, 2001–2002. *MMWR* 2004;53(No. SS-6).
9. Blumberg SJ, Luke JV. Wireless substitution: early release of estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, July–December 2009. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless201005.pdf>. Accessed March 30, 2011.
10. CDC. Public health surveillance for behavioral risk factors in a changing environment. *MMWR* 2003;52(No. RR-9)
11. Rosner B. Fundamentals of biostatistics. 5th ed. Pacific Grove, California: Duxbury Thomson Learning; 2000.
12. Pate RR, Pratt M, Blair SN, et al. Physical activity and public health: a recommendation from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the American College of Sports Medicine. *JAMA* 1995;273:402–7.
13. CDC. About the National Fruit and Vegetable Program. Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services, CDC; 2011. Available at [http://www.fruitsandveggiesmatter.gov/health\\_professionals/about.html](http://www.fruitsandveggiesmatter.gov/health_professionals/about.html). Accessed March 30, 2011.
14. Greenlund KJ, Keenan NL, Giles WH, et al. Public recognition of major signs and symptoms of heart attack: seventeen states and the US Virgin Islands, 2001. *Am Heart J* 2004;147:1010–6.
15. Liao Y, Tsoh JY, Chen R, et al. Decreases in smoking prevalence in Asian communities served by the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) Project. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100:853–60.
16. US Department of Health and Human Service. Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Black and Minority Health. Bethesda, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services; 1985. Available at <http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/assets/pdf/checked/1/ANDERSON.pdf>. Accessed March 30, 2011.
17. US Public Law 106-525. Minority Health and Health Disparities Research and Education Act of 2000. 106th Congress 2nd session, November 22, 2000.
18. Orsi JM, Margellos-Anast H, Whitman S. Black-white health disparities in the United States and Chicago: a 15-year progress analysis. *Am J Public Health* 2010;100:349–56.
19. US Department of Health and Human Services. 2008 physical activity guidelines for Americans. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services; 2008. Available at <http://www.health.gov/paguidelines>. Accessed March 30, 2011.

**TABLE 1. Geographic descriptions of the 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009 — United States**

Community	Community geography	BRFSS comparison area
Richmond, Virginia	12 census tracts in Richmond, Virginia	Richmond MMSA, Virginia
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Within the boundaries of four specific streets in West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	15 zip codes in southern West Virginia	West Virginia
Boston, Massachusetts	Greater Boston area	Boston–Quincy and Cambridge–Newton–Framingham MMSAs, Massachusetts
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	South Carolina
Fulton County, Georgia	23 census tracts in Fulton County, Atlanta, Georgia	Atlanta–Sandy Springs–Marietta MMSA, Georgia
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	11 census tracts in Cleveland, Ohio	Cleveland–Elyria–Mentor MMSA, Ohio
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	16 zip codes in south Los Angeles and 2 zip codes in Inglewood, California	Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSA, California
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	5 neighborhoods around the City of Chicago, Illinois	Cook County, Illinois
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	4 neighborhoods in the Southeast Chicago, Illinois	Cook County, Illinois
South Los Angeles, California	20 zip codes in South Los Angeles, California	Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSA, California
East Harlem, New York	25 census tracts in East Harlem, New York	New York–White Plains–Wayne MMSA, New York–New Jersey
Southwest Bronx, New York	4 zip codes in southwest Bronx, New York	New York–White Plains–Wayne MMSA, New York–New Jersey
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	2 neighborhoods in Northwest Chicago, Illinois	Cook County, Illinois
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	8 census tracts in Gilroy, California	San Jose–Sunnyvale–Santa Clara MMSA, California
Pima County, Arizona	Pima County, Arizona	Pima County, Arizona
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	New Mexico
Lawrence, Massachusetts	Lawrence, Massachusetts	Essex County, Massachusetts
Seattle and King County, Washington	Seattle and King County, Washington	King County, Washington
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	79 zip codes in Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	Santa Ana–Anaheim–Irvine and Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSAs, California
Special Service for Group, California	32 zip codes within Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	Santa Ana–Anaheim–Irvine and Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSAs, California
Waianae, Hawaii	Waianae (zip code 96792), Hawaii	Honolulu County, Hawaii
New York City, New York	23 census tracts in New York City, New York	New York–White Plains–Wayne MMSA, New York–New Jersey
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	Entire Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	Santa Ana–Anaheim–Irvine and Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSAs, California
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	2 zip codes in Jackson and Swain counties	North Carolina
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	11 counties in the southeast corners of Oklahoma	Oklahoma
Intertribal Council of Michigan	Tribal lands in 3 counties, Michigan	Michigan
Oklahoma	State of Oklahoma	Oklahoma

**Abbreviations:** MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area and A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander.

**TABLE 2. Number of respondents in the 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and the comparison population samples from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by sex and race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. population samples					BRFSS	
	Sex	No. of respondents				MMSA/County/State*	
		Black	Hispanic	A/PI	AI	Name	No.
Richmond, Virginia	<b>Total</b>	<b>915</b>	—†	—	—	Richmond MMSA	<b>2,497</b>
	Male	271	—	—	—		933
	Female	644	—	—	—		1,564
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	<b>Total</b>	<b>907</b>	—	—	—	Philadelphia County	<b>4,210</b>
	Male	267	—	—	—		1,323
	Female	640	—	—	—		2,887
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	<b>Total</b>	<b>898</b>	—	—	—	West Virginia	<b>8,985</b>
	Male	327	—	—	—		3,428
	Female	571	—	—	—		5,557
Boston, Massachusetts	<b>Total</b>	<b>585</b>	—	—	—	Boston–Quincy and Cambridge–Newton–Framingham MMSAs	<b>23,001</b>
	Male	214	—	—	—		8,448
	Female	371	—	—	—		14,553
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	<b>Total</b>	<b>908</b>	—	—	—	South Carolina	<b>20,062</b>
	Male	270	—	—	—		7,445
	Female	638	—	—	—		12,617
Fulton County, Georgia	<b>Total</b>	<b>911</b>	—	—	—	Atlanta–Sandy Springs–Marietta MMSA	<b>7,709</b>
	Male	280	—	—	—		2,689
	Female	631	—	—	—		5,020
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	<b>Total</b>	<b>884</b>	—	—	—	Cleveland–Elyria–Mentor MMSA	<b>3,679</b>
	Male	267	—	—	—		1,342
	Female	617	—	—	—		2,337
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,144</b>	—	—	—	Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSA	<b>7,041</b>
	Male	352	—	—	—		2,794
	Female	792	—	—	—		4,247
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	<b>Total</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>523</b>	—	—	Cook County	<b>5,245</b>
	Male	199	201	—	—		1,911
	Female	542	322	—	—		3,334
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	<b>Total</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>289</b>	—	—	Cook County	<b>5,245</b>
	Male	189	97	—	—		1,911
	Female	467	192	—	—		3,334
South Los Angeles, California	<b>Total</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>229</b>	—	—	Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSA	<b>7,041</b>
	Male	163	92	—	—		2,794
	Female	348	137	—	—		4,247
East Harlem, New York	<b>Total</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>495</b>	—	—	New York–White Plains–Wayne MMSA	<b>12,629</b>
	Male	115	154	—	—		4,697
	Female	305	341	—	—		7,932
Southwest Bronx, New York	<b>Total</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>424</b>	—	—	New York–White Plains–Wayne MMSA	<b>12,629</b>
	Male	176	139	—	—		4,697
	Female	351	285	—	—		7,932
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	<b>Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>273</b>	—	—	Cook County	<b>5,245</b>
	Male	96	96	—	—		1,911
	Female	200	177	—	—		3,334
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	<b>Total</b>	—	<b>945</b>	—	—	San Jose–Sunnyvale–Santa Clara MMSA	<b>1,492</b>
	Male	—	362	—	—		657
	Female	—	583	—	—		835
Pima County, Arizona	<b>Total</b>	—	<b>1,073</b>	—	—	Pima County	<b>2,255</b>
	Male	—	413	—	—		857
	Female	—	660	—	—		1,398
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	<b>Total</b>	—	<b>907</b>	—	—	New Mexico	<b>15,064</b>
	Male	—	333	—	—		5,837
	Female	—	574	—	—		9,227
Lawrence, Massachusetts	<b>Total</b>	—	<b>914</b>	—	—	Essex County	<b>8,079</b>
	Male	—	332	—	—		2,875
	Female	—	582	—	—		5,204
Seattle and King County, Washington	<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>624</b>	—	King County	<b>11,184</b>
	Male	48	96	310	—		4,459
	Female	91	91	314	—		6,725

See table footnotes on page 15.



**TABLE 2. (Continued) Number of respondents in the 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and the comparison population samples from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by sex and race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. population samples					BRFSS	
	Sex	No. of respondents				MMSA/County/State*	
		Black	Hispanic	A/PI	AI	Name	Number
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>768</b>	<b>99</b>	—	Santa Ana–Anaheim–Irvine and Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSAs	<b>7,041</b>
	Male	35	282	36	—		2,794
	Female	64	486	63	—		4,247
Special Service for Group, California	<b>Total</b>	—	—	<b>835</b>	—	Santa Ana–Anaheim–Irvine and Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSAs	<b>7,041</b>
	Male	—	—	414	—		2,794
	Female	—	—	421	—		4,247
Waianae, Hawaii	<b>Total</b>	—	—	<b>901</b>	—	Honolulu County	<b>8,931</b>
	Male	—	—	340	—		3,656
	Female	—	—	561	—		5,275
New York City, New York	<b>Total</b>	—	—	<b>900</b>	—	New York–White Plains–Wayne MMSA	<b>12,629</b>
	Male	—	—	407	—		4,697
	Female	—	—	493	—		7,932
Orange County AP/I Community Alliance, California	<b>Total</b>	—	—	<b>731</b>	—	Santa Ana–Anaheim–Irvine and Los Angeles–Long Beach–Glendale MMSAs	<b>7,041</b>
	Male	—	—	326	—		2,794
	Female	—	—	405	—		4,247
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	<b>Total</b>	—	—	—	<b>228</b>	North Carolina	<b>29,112</b>
	Male	—	—	—	93		10,977
	Female	—	—	—	135		18,135
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	<b>Total</b>	—	—	—	<b>1,052</b>	Oklahoma	<b>15,658</b>
	Male	—	—	—	395		5,604
	Female	—	—	—	657		10,054
Intertribal Council of Michigan	<b>Total</b>	—	—	—	<b>349</b>	Michigan	<b>18,708</b>
	Male	—	—	—	146		6,956
	Female	—	—	—	203		11,752
Oklahoma	<b>Total</b>	—	—	—	<b>830</b>	Oklahoma	<b>15,658</b>
	Male	—	—	—	331		5,604
	Female	—	—	—	499		10,054

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Data for MMSAs and counties are from survey years 2007–2009; data for states are from survey years 2008–2009.

† Not applicable.

**TABLE 3. Percentage of adults who reported having less than a high school education, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	25.3	(20.5–30.8)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	7.0	(5.0–9.9)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	19.8	(15.3–25.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.8	(9.2–17.3)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	7.8	(5.0–12.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.3	(13.0–15.8)
Boston, Massachusetts	24.3	(18.3–31.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.0	(5.2–7.0)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	18.4	(13.7–24.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.0	(10.8–13.3)
Fulton County, Georgia	15.5	(11.6–20.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.4–8.8)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	17.8	(13.2–23.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.5	(6.4–11.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	8.5	(5.5–13.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.1	(20.8–25.6)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	16.3	(10.9–23.6)	23.8	(17.9–30.8)	—	—	—	—	10.3	(8.5–12.4)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	10.7	(6.7–16.7)	22.7	(14.7–33.5)	—	—	—	—	10.3	(8.5–12.4)
South Los Angeles, California	9.5	(5.0–17.3)	40.4	(29.1–52.9)	—	—	—	—	23.1	(20.8–25.6)
East Harlem, New York	23.0	(15.7–32.4)	35.4	(27.5–44.3)	—	—	—	—	12.3	(10.8–14.0)
Southwest Bronx, New York	19.4	(13.4–27.2)	34.2	(25.6–44.1)	—	—	—	—	12.3	(10.8–14.0)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	18.2	(11.9–26.9)	18.7	(11.5–28.9)	—	—	—	—	10.3	(8.5–12.4)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	30.3	(25.4–35.6)	—	—	—	—	11.8	(8.3–16.3)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	17.1	(13.5–21.6)	—	—	—	—	6.7	(4.7–9.5)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	15.1	(11.3–19.8)	—	—	—	—	12.8	(11.4–14.3)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	41.2	(35.4–47.3)	—	—	—	—	9.3	(7.4–11.6)
Seattle and King County, Washington	8.3	(2.9–21.4)	28.6	(19.8–39.4)	6.0	(3.8–9.4)	—	—	5.4	(4.4–6.6)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	3.6	(0.9–14.2)	30.8	(25.4–36.8)	1.7	(0.2–11.0)	—	—	23.1	(20.8–25.6)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	5.6	(3.5–8.9)	—	—	23.1	(20.8–25.6)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	8.9	(6.2–12.5)	—	—	4.4	(3.6–5.3)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	21.3	(17.4–25.8)	—	—	12.3	(10.8–14.0)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	6.6	(4.3–10.0)	—	—	23.1	(20.8–25.6)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.0	(11.6–26.8)	16.0	(14.7–17.4)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.7	(12.1–20.2)	13.1	(11.8–14.5)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.8	(14.5–28.9)	6.5	(5.8–7.4)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.1	(14.9–26.4)	13.1	(11.8–14.5)
Median	17.1	—	29.5	—	6.3	—	19.1	—	8.5 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	3.6	—	15.1	—	1.7	—	15.7	—	4.5 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	25.3	—	41.2	—	21.3	—	20.8	—	20.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	27.2	(23.9–30.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.9	(3.8–6.3)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	15.3	(12.8–18.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.5	(8.6–12.6)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	7.8	(5.8–10.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.5	(12.5–14.7)
Boston, Massachusetts	25.8	(21.3–31.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.4	(4.8–6.0)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	16.6	(14.0–19.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.6	(10.7–12.5)
Fulton County, Georgia	15.4	(12.9–18.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.1	(6.1–8.3)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	18.2	(15.3–21.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.3	(3.4–5.4)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	6.0	(4.6–7.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.9	(21.1–24.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	13.5	(10.7–16.9)	30.4	(25.3–36.0)	—	—	—	—	7.9	(6.7–9.2)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	5.1	(3.4–7.6)	19.2	(14.3–25.3)	—	—	—	—	7.9	(6.7–9.2)
South Los Angeles, California	7.1	(4.5–11.0)	43.2	(32.9–54.0)	—	—	—	—	22.9	(21.1–24.9)
East Harlem, New York	19.1	(14.6–24.5)	38.1	(33.0–43.5)	—	—	—	—	11.8	(10.7–13.1)
Southwest Bronx, New York	17.0	(13.1–21.7)	32.5	(26.4–39.4)	—	—	—	—	11.8	(10.7–13.1)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	16.3	(11.4–22.7)	24.6	(18.6–31.6)	—	—	—	—	7.9	(6.7–9.2)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	33.8	(29.8–38.0)	—	—	—	—	14.8	(11.3–19.2)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	20.3	(17.2–23.8)	—	—	—	—	6.8	(5.2–8.9)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	21.3	(17.8–25.2)	—	—	—	—	12.2	(11.2–13.2)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	39.4	(35.1–43.8)	—	—	—	—	7.6	(6.4–9.1)
Seattle and King County, Washington	7.8	(3.8–15.5)	28.0	(19.2–38.9)	9.8	(7.0–13.7)	—	—	4.9	(4.1–5.9)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	4.9	(1.6–14.2)	42.7	(38.2–47.3)	1.4	(0.2–9.2)	—	—	22.9	(21.1–24.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	8.8	(6.3–12.2)	—	—	22.9	(21.1–24.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.0–9.4)	—	—	4.9	(4.3–5.7)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	27.1	(23.2–31.3)	—	—	11.8	(10.7–13.1)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	10.2	(7.4–13.9)	—	—	22.9	(21.1–24.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.8	(10.7–22.7)	12.5	(11.7–13.3)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.3	(8.2–13.0)	12.2	(11.4–13.0)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.7	(7.3–15.5)	6.2	(5.6–6.9)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.2	(10.1–17.1)	12.2	(11.4–13.0)
Median	15.4	—	31.5	—	9.3	—	12.0	—	7.5 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	4.9	—	19.2	—	1.4	—	10.3	—	3.6 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	27.2	—	43.2	—	27.1	—	15.8	—	19.6 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 4. Percentage of adults who reported having an annual household income of <\$25,000, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	49.9	(43.1–56.7)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	14.1	(11.0–18.0)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	52.2	(45.3–59.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.0	(22.9–33.7)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	36.0	(29.9–42.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	25.5	(23.7–27.4)
Boston, Massachusetts	41.6	(33.7–49.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.8	(14.4–17.3)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	47.9	(40.8–55.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.5	(21.8–25.3)
Fulton County, Georgia	46.2	(40.0–52.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	(11.3–15.6)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	54.6	(47.8–61.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.9	(16.0–22.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	38.6	(32.4–45.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.9	(30.2–35.7)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	50.6	(41.9–59.3)	41.3	(33.5–49.7)	—	—	—	—	23.7	(21.0–26.6)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	40.9	(32.7–49.8)	25.4	(16.7–36.7)	—	—	—	—	23.7	(21.0–26.6)
South Los Angeles, California	35.8	(26.5–46.3)	54.1	(42.2–65.6)	—	—	—	—	32.9	(30.2–35.7)
East Harlem, New York	42.9	(33.3–53.0)	56.7	(47.6–65.4)	—	—	—	—	23.2	(21.3–25.2)
Southwest Bronx, New York	46.9	(38.2–55.9)	61.8	(51.1–71.5)	—	—	—	—	23.2	(21.3–25.2)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	44.2	(33.1–55.9)	47.4	(36.2–58.9)	—	—	—	—	23.7	(21.0–26.6)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	38.4	(33.0–44.2)	—	—	—	—	16.6	(12.6–21.5)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	32.8	(27.5–38.7)	—	—	—	—	22.7	(18.6–27.5)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	36.7	(31.0–42.8)	—	—	—	—	28.9	(27.1–30.9)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	55.7	(49.5–61.7)	—	—	—	—	16.2	(13.9–18.7)
Seattle and King County, Washington	22.7	(11.7–39.5)	43.4	(33.0–54.4)	12.1	(8.4–17.1)	—	—	13.1	(11.7–14.7)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	20.6	(11.1–35.1)	47.8	(41.5–54.1)	26.1	(12.4–47.0)	—	—	32.9	(30.2–35.7)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	29.2	(24.1–34.9)	—	—	32.9	(30.2–35.7)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	28.2	(23.5–33.5)	—	—	11.8	(10.5–13.2)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	41.6	(36.3–47.1)	—	—	23.2	(21.3–25.2)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	21.0	(15.8–27.3)	—	—	32.9	(30.2–35.7)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	42.0	(31.8–52.9)	26.8	(25.2–28.4)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	41.2	(35.6–47.1)	29.5	(27.8–31.2)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	40.9	(32.6–49.7)	20.5	(19.2–21.9)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	45.3	(38.7–52.0)	29.5	(27.8–31.2)
<i>Median</i>	43.6	—	45.4	—	27.2	—	41.6	—	21.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	20.6	—	25.4	—	12.1	—	40.9	—	12.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	54.6	—	61.8	—	41.6	—	45.3	—	36.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	64.2	(60.2–68.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.9	(12.6–17.5)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	58.1	(53.9–62.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	38.3	(34.6–42.1)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	46.4	(41.9–51.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.1	(31.6–34.7)
Boston, Massachusetts	44.1	(38.0–50.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.1	(18.1–20.1)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	57.4	(52.8–61.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	31.1	(29.6–32.6)
Fulton County, Georgia	58.6	(53.9–63.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.4	(20.6–24.4)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	64.5	(60.3–68.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.9	(24.4–29.4)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	40.1	(36.0–44.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	40.8	(38.6–43.0)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	49.7	(44.7–54.8)	47.9	(41.8–54.1)	—	—	—	—	29.1	(27.1–31.3)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	45.5	(40.4–50.8)	41.1	(33.5–49.1)	—	—	—	—	29.1	(27.1–31.3)
South Los Angeles, California	41.6	(34.8–48.7)	72.1	(61.9–80.4)	—	—	—	—	40.8	(38.6–43.0)
East Harlem, New York	51.3	(45.2–57.3)	69.9	(64.3–75.0)	—	—	—	—	30.7	(29.1–32.4)
Southwest Bronx, New York	55.0	(48.3–61.6)	70.8	(63.9–76.8)	—	—	—	—	30.7	(29.1–32.4)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	55.9	(47.9–63.6)	47.1	(38.5–55.8)	—	—	—	—	29.1	(27.1–31.3)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	44.0	(39.7–48.5)	—	—	—	—	21.6	(17.6–26.1)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	39.9	(35.8–44.1)	—	—	—	—	25.0	(21.6–28.7)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	48.5	(43.8–53.2)	—	—	—	—	35.4	(33.8–37.1)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	67.5	(62.9–71.8)	—	—	—	—	22.7	(20.7–24.9)
Seattle and King County, Washington	35.2	(25.2–46.8)	47.9	(36.7–59.2)	19.2	(14.7–24.8)	—	—	14.3	(13.1–15.6)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	35.7	(24.2–49.0)	65.5	(60.8–69.9)	23.6	(14.4–36.1)	—	—	40.8	(38.6–43.0)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	31.5	(26.9–36.6)	—	—	40.8	(38.6–43.0)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	31.8	(27.7–36.1)	—	—	17.6	(16.3–19.0)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	46.9	(42.3–51.5)	—	—	30.7	(29.1–32.4)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	22.2	(17.7–27.5)	—	—	40.8	(38.6–43.0)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	44.6	(36.2–53.4)	30.7	(29.4–32.0)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	46.2	(41.9–50.6)	34.7	(33.4–35.9)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	40.2	(33.5–47.4)	25.6	(24.4–26.8)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	42.6	(37.6–47.8)	34.7	(33.4–35.9)
<i>Median</i>	50.5	—	48.2	—	27.6	—	43.6	—	26.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	35.2	—	39.9	—	19.2	—	40.2	—	16.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	64.5	—	72.1	—	46.9	—	46.2	—	42.1 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 5. Percentage of adults who reported having no health care coverage, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	24.9	(19.4–31.4)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	10.3	(7.7–13.8)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	22.7	(17.5–28.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.8	(13.4–23.2)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	28.5	(22.5–35.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.7	(16.9–20.6)
Boston, Massachusetts	18.7	(13.1–26.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.0	(5.1–7.0)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	31.3	(24.8–38.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	(17.3–20.7)
Fulton County, Georgia	37.7	(31.6–44.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.2	(12.8–18.0)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	30.5	(24.5–37.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.1	(8.8–14.0)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	25.3	(19.5–32.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	(16.8–21.3)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	38.4	(30.5–46.9)	39.1	(31.6–47.1)	—	—	—	—	20.6	(17.9–23.6)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	37.3	(29.2–46.1)	29.2	(19.2–41.6)	—	—	—	—	20.6	(17.9–23.6)
South Los Angeles, California	26.0	(17.6–36.7)	43.9	(32.7–55.6)	—	—	—	—	19.0	(16.8–21.3)
East Harlem, New York	16.9	(10.7–25.5)	37.0	(28.8–45.9)	—	—	—	—	17.2	(15.5–19.1)
Southwest Bronx, New York	22.3	(15.4–31.1)	21.3	(13.7–31.6)	—	—	—	—	17.2	(15.5–19.1)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	27.3	(18.2–38.7)	29.2	(20.2–40.1)	—	—	—	—	20.6	(17.9–23.6)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	27.5	(22.5–33.2)	—	—	—	—	10.2	(7.1–14.4)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	22.3	(17.5–27.9)	—	—	—	—	16.6	(13.0–21.0)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	20.9	(16.1–26.6)	—	—	—	—	20.9	(19.1–22.7)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	21.5	(16.7–27.3)	—	—	—	—	6.8	(5.1–9.0)
Seattle and King County, Washington	17.6	(9.5–30.1)	51.2	(41.9–60.4)	14.8	(10.6–20.2)	—	—	11.5	(10.2–13.1)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	21.6	(10.1–40.3)	43.2	(37.1–49.5)	16.0	(7.2–31.9)	—	—	19.0	(16.8–21.3)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	19.7	(15.3–25.0)	—	—	19.0	(16.8–21.3)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	14.8	(11.0–19.6)	—	—	6.9	(5.7–8.2)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	13.9	(10.5–18.1)	—	—	17.2	(15.5–19.1)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	13.2	(9.2–18.5)	—	—	19.0	(16.8–21.3)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.9	(12.2–28.2)	19.9	(18.5–21.5)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.9	(25.4–37.0)	19.7	(18.2–21.3)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.4	(19.3–35.0)	15.2	(13.9–16.6)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.5	(30.1–43.4)	19.7	(18.2–21.3)
Median	25.7	—	29.2	—	14.8	—	28.7	—	16.5 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	16.9	—	20.9	—	13.2	—	18.9	—	7.1 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	38.4	—	51.2	—	19.7	—	36.5	—	25.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	17.1	(14.1–20.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.0	(5.2–9.4)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	16.6	(13.5–20.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.6	(8.5–13.2)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	19.0	(15.4–23.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.1	(13.8–16.4)
Boston, Massachusetts	10.2	(7.0–14.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.5	(3.0–4.0)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	26.1	(22.1–30.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.0	(13.9–16.2)
Fulton County, Georgia	30.3	(26.3–34.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.4	(12.8–16.1)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	18.3	(15.2–21.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.6	(7.9–11.6)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	15.9	(12.9–19.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.7	(17.0–20.5)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	19.1	(15.4–23.5)	38.5	(32.6–44.7)	—	—	—	—	14.3	(12.6–16.1)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	19.4	(15.4–24.2)	29.4	(22.3–37.7)	—	—	—	—	14.3	(12.6–16.1)
South Los Angeles, California	17.3	(12.6–23.5)	44.4	(35.3–53.8)	—	—	—	—	18.7	(17.0–20.5)
East Harlem, New York	14.2	(10.5–18.8)	20.1	(15.8–25.2)	—	—	—	—	13.1	(11.8–14.4)
Southwest Bronx, New York	14.4	(10.2–19.9)	16.2	(11.1–22.9)	—	—	—	—	13.1	(11.8–14.4)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	23.6	(17.3–31.4)	34.3	(26.9–42.6)	—	—	—	—	14.3	(12.6–16.1)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	21.0	(17.5–25.0)	—	—	—	—	8.5	(5.9–12.1)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	20.3	(16.8–24.4)	—	—	—	—	11.3	(9.0–14.2)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	17.2	(13.8–21.3)	—	—	—	—	18.6	(17.2–20.0)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	11.4	(8.8–14.6)	—	—	—	—	3.9	(3.2–4.8)
Seattle and King County, Washington	20.8	(12.9–31.8)	41.7	(31.0–53.1)	15.8	(11.4–21.4)	—	—	9.1	(8.1–10.3)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	10.7	(4.8–22.0)	39.9	(35.4–44.6)	17.4	(10.4–27.5)	—	—	18.7	(17.0–20.5)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	15.5	(11.8–20.2)	—	—	18.7	(17.0–20.5)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	10.0	(7.4–13.2)	—	—	4.7	(3.9–5.8)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	13.2	(10.3–16.7)	—	—	13.1	(11.8–14.4)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	14.8	(11.2–19.3)	—	—	18.7	(17.0–20.5)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.4	(24.2–41.8)	16.1	(15.0–17.2)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	25.1	(21.4–29.3)	19.0	(17.9–20.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.5	(10.2–20.2)	10.2	(9.4–11.1)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.2	(23.6–33.2)	19.0	(17.9–20.1)
Median	17.8	—	25.2	—	15.2	—	26.7	—	12.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	10.2	—	11.4	—	10.0	—	14.5	—	3.6 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	30.3	—	44.4	—	17.4	—	32.4	—	25.0 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 6. Percentage of adults who had had a time when they could not see a doctor during the previous 12 months because of the cost, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	23.6	(18.2–30.0)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	9.6	(6.9–13.4)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	21.9	(17.1–27.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.0	(10.2–18.9)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	23.6	(18.1–30.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.2	(14.6–17.9)
Boston, Massachusetts	13.6	(9.0–20.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.6	(4.8–6.5)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	15.1	(10.8–20.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.5	(12.1–14.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	24.5	(19.2–30.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.4	(10.2–14.9)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	18.1	(13.5–23.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.9	(8.6–13.7)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	18.8	(14.0–24.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.6	(12.7–16.7)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	20.3	(14.2–28.2)	21.7	(16.0–28.8)	—	—	—	—	15.2	(13.0–17.7)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	20.8	(14.9–28.2)	21.8	(14.1–32.1)	—	—	—	—	15.2	(13.0–17.7)
South Los Angeles, California	20.2	(12.8–30.5)	31.4	(21.2–43.7)	—	—	—	—	14.6	(12.7–16.7)
East Harlem, New York	17.2	(11.1–25.8)	23.5	(17.0–31.6)	—	—	—	—	13.8	(12.3–15.4)
Southwest Bronx, New York	14.2	(8.9–21.8)	19.5	(12.7–28.9)	—	—	—	—	13.8	(12.3–15.4)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	12.0	(6.1–22.4)	23.5	(15.1–34.6)	—	—	—	—	15.2	(13.0–17.7)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	21.6	(17.3–26.5)	—	—	—	—	9.1	(6.4–12.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	20.8	(16.2–26.2)	—	—	—	—	10.1	(7.6–13.2)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	20.3	(15.9–25.6)	—	—	—	—	14.2	(12.8–15.8)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	21.6	(16.7–27.3)	—	—	—	—	6.3	(4.8–8.2)
Seattle and King County, Washington	20.0	(10.5–34.8)	23.1	(13.8–36.1)	11.6	(8.2–16.2)	—	—	8.5	(7.3–9.9)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	20.0	(9.4–37.6)	24.9	(19.8–30.8)	6.8	(2.1–19.4)	—	—	14.6	(12.7–16.7)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	13.5	(9.8–18.2)	—	—	14.6	(12.7–16.7)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	8.3	(5.6–12.1)	—	—	4.9	(4.0–5.8)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	9.5	(6.9–12.9)	—	—	13.8	(12.3–15.4)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	11.6	(8.0–16.7)	—	—	14.6	(12.7–16.7)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.8	(2.4–13.4)	14.5	(13.3–15.8)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.6	(15.3–24.8)	14.7	(13.4–16.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.4	(11.8–24.9)	12.4	(11.3–13.6)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.2	(15.3–26.2)	14.7	(13.4–16.1)
Median	20.0	—	21.8	—	10.6	—	18.5	—	12.2 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	12.0	—	19.5	—	6.8	—	5.8	—	4.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	24.5	—	31.4	—	13.5	—	20.2	—	18.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	20.6	(17.5–24.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.7	(7.9–11.8)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	20.2	(17.0–24.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.4	(11.8–17.4)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	21.0	(17.6–24.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.6	(18.3–21.0)
Boston, Massachusetts	16.6	(12.8–21.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.3	(5.6–7.1)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	25.4	(21.8–29.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.6	(17.4–19.8)
Fulton County, Georgia	30.3	(26.3–34.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.5	(16.9–20.2)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	21.1	(17.9–24.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.2	(10.4–14.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	19.9	(16.6–23.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.7	(18.1–21.5)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	18.0	(14.3–22.4)	32.6	(27.0–38.8)	—	—	—	—	15.7	(14.0–17.5)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	22.6	(18.4–27.5)	24.8	(18.3–32.6)	—	—	—	—	15.7	(14.0–17.5)
South Los Angeles, California	14.6	(10.2–20.4)	33.8	(24.3–44.8)	—	—	—	—	19.7	(18.1–21.5)
East Harlem, New York	15.3	(11.5–19.9)	22.2	(18.0–27.1)	—	—	—	—	15.4	(14.2–16.7)
Southwest Bronx, New York	12.9	(9.1–18.0)	22.2	(17.0–28.5)	—	—	—	—	15.4	(14.2–16.7)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	18.1	(12.8–25.0)	29.3	(22.6–37.0)	—	—	—	—	15.7	(14.0–17.5)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	26.3	(22.6–30.4)	—	—	—	—	13.9	(10.8–17.7)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	23.4	(19.9–27.2)	—	—	—	—	14.1	(11.6–16.9)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	22.8	(19.0–27.0)	—	—	—	—	18.1	(16.9–19.4)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	21.4	(17.9–25.2)	—	—	—	—	7.6	(6.5–9.0)
Seattle and King County, Washington	23.4	(14.5–35.5)	29.7	(20.2–41.5)	11.9	(8.4–16.5)	—	—	11.6	(10.4–12.8)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	13.2	(7.0–23.6)	35.3	(31.0–40.0)	23.0	(14.0–35.5)	—	—	19.7	(18.1–21.5)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	13.7	(10.4–17.9)	—	—	19.7	(18.1–21.5)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	13.7	(10.9–17.0)	—	—	6.2	(5.3–7.1)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	14.3	(11.3–17.8)	—	—	15.4	(14.2–16.7)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	15.5	(12.1–19.7)	—	—	19.7	(18.1–21.5)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.0	(8.2–20.1)	19.0	(18.0–20.0)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.3	(17.8–25.2)	20.7	(19.7–21.8)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.0	(13.2–24.0)	14.0	(13.1–14.9)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.2	(19.0–28.0)	20.7	(19.7–21.8)
Median	20.1	—	25.6	—	14.0	—	19.7	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	12.9	—	21.4	—	11.9	—	13.0	—	7.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	30.3	—	35.3	—	23.0	—	23.2	—	24.3 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 7. Percentage of adults who are obese,\* in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	32.3	(26.4–38.9)	—†	—	—	—	—	—	28.6	(24.5–33.0)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	29.2	(23.7–35.3)	—	—	—	—	—	29.4	(24.5–34.8)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	41.6	(35.3–48.2)	—	—	—	—	—	31.8	(30.0–33.7)	
Boston, Massachusetts	19.3	(13.5–26.8)	—	—	—	—	—	22.1	(20.8–23.5)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	30.8	(24.9–37.4)	—	—	—	—	—	29.8	(28.0–31.6)	
Fulton County, Georgia	21.9	(17.2–27.3)	—	—	—	—	—	25.4	(23.0–28.0)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	28.9	(23.4–35.1)	—	—	—	—	—	28.4	(25.4–31.7)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	31.7	(25.9–38.1)	—	—	—	—	—	24.1	(21.7–26.6)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	28.8	(22.0–36.6)	33.9	(26.8–41.7)	—	—	—	27.0	(24.4–29.8)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	36.8	(29.2–45.0)	45.0	(34.4–56.0)	—	—	—	27.0	(24.4–29.8)	
South Los Angeles, California	40.4	(31.2–50.4)	28.2	(18.6–40.2)	—	—	—	24.1	(21.7–26.6)	
East Harlem, New York	24.9	(17.5–34.2)	32.0	(24.1–41.1)	—	—	—	21.8	(20.1–23.6)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	27.1	(20.5–35.0)	25.9	(18.2–35.4)	—	—	—	21.8	(20.1–23.6)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	32.4	(22.6–44.0)	35.1	(25.0–46.6)	—	—	—	27.0	(24.4–29.8)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	28.4	(23.9–33.4)	—	—	—	17.7	(14.4–21.7)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	36.9	(31.5–42.6)	—	—	—	28.0	(23.9–32.6)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	30.6	(25.4–36.4)	—	—	—	25.7	(24.0–27.5)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	25.1	(20.3–30.6)	—	—	—	25.5	(22.8–28.4)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	29.3	(17.2–45.3)	32.3	(22.1–44.6)	10.9	(7.7–15.4)	—	22.0	(20.5–23.6)	
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	13.0	(5.0–30.0)	32.0	(26.5–38.0)	20.4	(8.4–41.7)	—	24.1	(21.7–26.6)	
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	9.6	(6.6–13.7)	—	24.1	(21.7–26.6)	
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	45.3	(39.9–50.9)	—	24.5	(22.8–26.3)	
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	8.7	(6.2–12.1)	—	21.8	(20.1–23.6)	
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	4.8	(2.8–8.1)	—	24.1	(21.7–26.6)	
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	53.6	(43.1–63.9)	29.9	(28.4–31.4)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.4	(33.8–45.2)	32.5	(30.8–34.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	43.1	(35.0–51.7)	30.3	(28.9–31.8)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	49.3	(42.8–55.8)	32.5	(30.8–34.1)
Median	29.3	—	32.0	—	10.3	—	46.2	—	28.6 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	13.0	—	25.1	—	4.8	—	39.4	—	15.8 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	41.6	—	45.0	—	45.3	—	53.6	—	35.0 <sup>§</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	45.1	(41.0–49.3)	—	—	—	—	—	27.2	(24.1–30.4)	
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	46.6	(42.6–50.7)	—	—	—	—	—	32.4	(29.0–36.0)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	47.3	(42.7–51.9)	—	—	—	—	—	31.8	(30.3–33.4)	
Boston, Massachusetts	32.5	(27.1–38.5)	—	—	—	—	—	17.9	(16.9–18.9)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	48.9	(44.5–53.2)	—	—	—	—	—	30.9	(29.5–32.4)	
Fulton County, Georgia	38.8	(34.4–43.3)	—	—	—	—	—	23.6	(22.0–25.3)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	45.9	(41.7–50.2)	—	—	—	—	—	26.4	(24.2–28.8)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	38.7	(34.8–42.6)	—	—	—	—	—	23.9	(22.1–25.7)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	52.1	(47.2–57.0)	42.3	(36.0–48.7)	—	—	—	26.6	(24.7–28.7)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	48.8	(43.7–53.9)	51.2	(43.4–59.0)	—	—	—	26.6	(24.7–28.7)	
South Los Angeles, California	46.3	(39.4–53.3)	33.7	(23.7–45.5)	—	—	—	23.9	(22.1–25.7)	
East Harlem, New York	40.1	(34.7–45.9)	42.4	(36.9–48.0)	—	—	—	22.4	(21.1–23.8)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	44.2	(37.8–50.7)	31.2	(25.2–37.8)	—	—	—	22.4	(21.1–23.8)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	44.2	(36.6–52.1)	39.8	(32.0–48.2)	—	—	—	26.6	(24.7–28.7)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	36.6	(32.3–41.0)	—	—	—	22.2	(18.4–26.5)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	33.3	(29.5–37.4)	—	—	—	23.9	(20.8–27.2)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	35.9	(31.6–40.4)	—	—	—	25.6	(24.2–27.0)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	36.9	(32.7–41.3)	—	—	—	18.7	(16.8–20.7)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	25.4	(16.9–36.3)	36.2	(25.8–48.0)	5.8	(3.7–9.1)	—	20.3	(19.0–21.6)	
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	39.3	(27.9–52.0)	41.9	(37.3–46.6)	8.6	(3.5–19.5)	—	23.9	(22.1–25.7)	
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	6.7	(4.5–10.0)	—	23.9	(22.1–25.7)	
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	38.2	(34.0–42.6)	—	19.9	(18.5–21.3)	
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	6.6	(4.6–9.2)	—	22.4	(21.1–23.8)	
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	4.5	(2.5–7.9)	—	23.9	(22.1–25.7)	
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	50.2	(41.5–58.9)	29.8	(28.6–31.0)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	35.1	(31.0–39.4)	30.6	(29.4–31.7)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	55.1	(48.0–62.0)	29.5	(28.4–30.7)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	40.7	(35.9–45.8)	30.6	(29.4–31.7)
Median	44.7	—	36.8	—	6.7	—	45.5	—	26.0 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	25.4	—	31.2	—	4.5	—	35.1	—	18.7 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	52.1	—	51.2	—	38.2	—	55.1	—	36.0 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Body mass index  $\geq 30.0$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> based on self-reported height and weight.

† Not applicable.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 8. Percentage of adults who currently smoke, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	38.6	(32.4–45.2)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	21.0	(17.2–25.4)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	36.6	(30.6–43.1)	—	—	—	—	—	29.9	(25.0–35.4)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	27.9	(22.2–34.3)	—	—	—	—	—	26.8	(25.0–28.8)	
Boston, Massachusetts	8.5	(4.7–15.0)	—	—	—	—	—	15.5	(14.2–16.9)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	33.0	(26.5–40.2)	—	—	—	—	—	21.5	(19.9–23.2)	
Fulton County, Georgia	29.5	(24.0–35.5)	—	—	—	—	—	18.0	(15.8–20.5)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	28.2	(22.6–34.7)	—	—	—	—	—	17.7	(15.2–20.5)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	19.3	(14.5–25.3)	—	—	—	—	—	16.0	(14.0–18.2)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	37.9	(30.2–46.3)	25.4	(19.2–32.7)	—	—	—	23.8	(21.2–26.6)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	28.0	(21.2–36.0)	34.4	(23.6–47.1)	—	—	—	23.8	(21.2–26.6)	
South Los Angeles, California	26.2	(17.8–36.9)	17.7	(10.4–28.4)	—	—	—	16.0	(14.0–18.2)	
East Harlem, New York	23.2	(16.1–32.2)	22.7	(16.0–31.1)	—	—	—	17.1	(15.5–18.8)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	17.8	(12.6–24.5)	15.5	(10.4–22.6)	—	—	—	17.1	(15.5–18.8)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	34.9	(24.9–46.3)	20.0	(12.8–29.8)	—	—	—	23.8	(21.2–26.6)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	10.3	(7.2–14.4)	—	—	—	11.9	(8.8–15.9)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	17.5	(13.3–22.7)	—	—	—	19.4	(15.9–23.4)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	20.3	(15.4–26.2)	—	—	—	20.9	(19.3–22.6)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	15.0	(11.2–19.8)	—	—	—	16.5	(14.1–19.2)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	17.7	(8.7–32.5)	14.0	(7.8–23.8)	13.1	(9.3–18.0)	—	12.5	(11.3–13.9)	
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	11.4	(4.2–27.4)	17.3	(12.9–22.9)	14.0	(5.8–30.1)	—	16.0	(14.0–18.2)	
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	16.0	(12.1–20.9)	—	16.0	(14.0–18.2)	
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	22.5	(18.3–27.4)	—	18.0	(16.4–19.8)	
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	13.6	(10.6–17.3)	—	17.1	(15.5–18.8)	
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	13.6	(10.1–18.1)	—	16.0	(14.0–18.2)	
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	31.7	(22.8–42.2)	23.4	(22.1–24.9)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	31.2	(25.9–37.1)	26.8	(25.2–28.5)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	56.3	(47.8–64.4)	21.8	(20.5–23.2)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	40.4	(34.0–47.0)	26.8	(25.2–28.5)
<i>Median</i>	28.0	—	17.6	—	13.8	—	36.1	—	19.6 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	8.5	—	10.3	—	13.1	—	31.2	—	11.9 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	38.6	—	34.4	—	22.5	—	56.3	—	27.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	30.7	(27.0–34.6)	—	—	—	—	—	16.1	(13.7–18.8)	
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	24.4	(21.1–28.1)	—	—	—	—	—	21.4	(18.5–24.5)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	24.3	(20.6–28.3)	—	—	—	—	—	25.3	(23.9–26.8)	
Boston, Massachusetts	2.9	(1.4–5.8)	—	—	—	—	—	13.1	(12.2–14.1)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	12.8	(10.2–16.1)	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	(17.8–20.2)	
Fulton County, Georgia	15.8	(13.0–19.1)	—	—	—	—	—	14.9	(13.4–16.5)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	29.5	(25.8–33.6)	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	(16.9–21.3)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	15.3	(12.6–18.4)	—	—	—	—	—	8.9	(7.7–10.3)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	24.6	(20.9–28.8)	6.4	(4.3–9.5)	—	—	—	16.3	(14.8–18.0)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	26.5	(22.2–31.4)	11.9	(7.9–17.5)	—	—	—	16.3	(14.8–18.0)	
South Los Angeles, California	17.6	(12.5–24.2)	10.2	(5.3–18.7)	—	—	—	8.9	(7.7–10.3)	
East Harlem, New York	20.1	(16.1–24.8)	16.7	(12.9–21.2)	—	—	—	12.5	(11.6–13.6)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	19.6	(14.9–25.4)	12.1	(8.3–17.4)	—	—	—	12.5	(11.6–13.6)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	23.5	(17.1–31.2)	14.5	(9.8–21.0)	—	—	—	16.3	(14.8–18.0)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	8.0	(5.8–10.8)	—	—	—	5.1	(3.7–7.2)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	11.1	(8.6–14.1)	—	—	—	14.7	(12.2–17.6)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	15.4	(12.2–19.3)	—	—	—	16.5	(15.3–17.7)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	10.0	(7.4–13.3)	—	—	—	15.2	(13.5–17.1)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	9.1	(5.1–15.7)	12.6	(6.6–22.6)	4.4	(2.4–7.8)	—	10.7	(9.7–11.8)	
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	11.6	(5.6–22.4)	6.9	(4.9–9.6)	4.3	(1.0–17.3)	—	8.9	(7.7–10.3)	
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	0.8	(0.3–2.1)	—	8.9	(7.7–10.3)	
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	21.3	(17.9–25.1)	—	12.5	(11.4–13.7)	
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	1.4	(0.7–3.1)	—	12.5	(11.6–13.6)	
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	3.1	(1.6–6.0)	—	8.9	(7.7–10.3)	
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.4	(31.2–48.3)	18.0	(17.0–18.9)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.4	(22.7–30.4)	23.5	(22.5–24.6)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	48.9	(42.0–55.8)	18.3	(17.4–19.4)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.6	(28.4–37.1)	23.5	(22.5–24.6)
<i>Median</i>	19.9	—	11.5	—	3.7	—	36.0	—	16.8 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	2.9	—	6.4	—	0.8	—	26.4	—	7.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	30.7	—	16.7	—	21.3	—	48.9	—	24.2 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 9. Percentage of adults who reported no leisure time physical activity during the preceding month, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	34.6	(28.5–41.2)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	18.1	(15.2–21.4)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	30.5	(24.5–37.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.8	(19.6–28.6)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	21.2	(16.7–26.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.6	(26.8–30.5)
Boston, Massachusetts	30.4	(23.8–38.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.5	(17.2–19.9)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	35.5	(28.9–42.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.6	(21.1–24.3)
Fulton County, Georgia	26.9	(21.7–32.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.3	(16.1–20.7)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	29.0	(23.1–35.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.1	(18.5–24.0)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	23.2	(18.2–29.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.4	(21.2–25.8)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	29.2	(22.3–37.3)	27.9	(21.1–35.9)	—	—	—	—	21.7	(19.3–24.4)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	27.9	(21.0–36.0)	16.6	(10.6–25.1)	—	—	—	—	21.7	(19.3–24.4)
South Los Angeles, California	30.0	(21.6–40.0)	22.5	(13.8–34.5)	—	—	—	—	23.4	(21.2–25.8)
East Harlem, New York	22.4	(15.4–31.4)	32.3	(24.7–40.9)	—	—	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
Southwest Bronx, New York	26.0	(19.0–34.5)	29.8	(22.0–38.9)	—	—	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	32.6	(22.3–44.9)	23.2	(15.4–33.5)	—	—	—	—	21.7	(19.3–24.4)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	24.5	(20.0–29.6)	—	—	—	—	15.2	(11.9–19.3)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	26.0	(21.1–31.5)	—	—	—	—	20.9	(17.1–25.2)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	23.9	(19.2–29.4)	—	—	—	—	19.9	(18.4–21.5)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	37.6	(31.6–44.0)	—	—	—	—	21.0	(18.5–23.7)
Seattle and King County, Washington	20.3	(10.0–36.8)	28.1	(18.5–40.4)	16.6	(12.6–21.7)	—	—	14.1	(12.9–15.5)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	22.5	(11.3–40.0)	27.1	(21.8–33.1)	23.5	(11.5–42.1)	—	—	23.4	(21.2–25.8)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	18.8	(14.8–23.7)	—	—	23.4	(21.2–25.8)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	25.9	(21.3–31.1)	—	—	15.1	(13.7–16.5)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	24.0	(19.7–28.7)	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	23.7	(18.1–30.2)	—	—	23.4	(21.2–25.8)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.8	(10.2–29.2)	22.2	(20.9–23.4)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.6	(28.4–39.1)	29.2	(27.7–30.8)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.7	(15.3–29.9)	22.2	(21.0–23.6)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.4	(33.1–46.1)	29.2	(27.7–30.8)
Median	28.5	—	26.6	—	23.6	—	27.7	—	21.5 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	20.3	—	16.6	—	16.6	—	17.8	—	15.1 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	35.5	—	37.6	—	25.9	—	39.4	—	29.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	42.1	(38.2–46.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.9	(20.0–26.1)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	31.8	(28.1–35.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.5	(33.0–40.2)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	32.8	(28.6–37.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	35.5	(34.0–37.0)
Boston, Massachusetts	36.9	(31.3–42.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.8	(19.9–21.8)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	34.2	(30.0–38.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.4	(29.1–31.8)
Fulton County, Georgia	31.3	(27.1–35.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.9	(22.2–25.7)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	37.0	(33.0–41.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	27.5	(25.4–29.9)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	24.0	(20.8–27.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	34.4	(29.8–39.2)	29.4	(23.8–35.7)	—	—	—	—	28.5	(26.6–30.5)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	35.5	(30.8–40.6)	28.3	(21.7–36.1)	—	—	—	—	28.5	(26.6–30.5)
South Los Angeles, California	31.3	(25.3–38.0)	28.1	(20.1–37.8)	—	—	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
East Harlem, New York	31.4	(26.1–37.3)	41.7	(36.2–47.4)	—	—	—	—	31.3	(29.8–32.8)
Southwest Bronx, New York	30.4	(24.8–36.6)	43.0	(36.3–50.1)	—	—	—	—	31.3	(29.8–32.8)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	28.6	(22.0–36.3)	36.7	(29.0–45.1)	—	—	—	—	28.5	(26.6–30.5)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	25.9	(22.4–29.9)	—	—	—	—	20.7	(17.2–24.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	22.3	(18.9–26.1)	—	—	—	—	23.3	(20.4–26.5)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	28.2	(24.1–32.7)	—	—	—	—	26.2	(24.8–27.7)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	42.3	(37.7–47.0)	—	—	—	—	22.8	(20.9–24.8)
Seattle and King County, Washington	21.6	(13.3–33.1)	34.3	(24.6–45.5)	26.9	(21.5–33.0)	—	—	17.0	(15.8–18.3)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	24.1	(14.8–36.9)	32.3	(28.2–36.8)	18.0	(10.2–29.7)	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	24.2	(19.9–28.9)	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	28.4	(24.5–32.7)	—	—	23.4	(21.9–24.8)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	27.3	(23.4–31.6)	—	—	31.3	(29.8–32.8)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	23.6	(19.1–28.8)	—	—	24.6	(22.8–26.5)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.9	(15.1–30.6)	28.7	(27.6–29.8)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	31.8	(28.0–35.9)	33.5	(32.4–34.6)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.3	(18.6–31.0)	26.3	(25.3–27.4)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.2	(24.0–32.9)	33.5	(32.4–34.6)
Median	31.6	—	30.9	—	25.6	—	26.3	—	25.6 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	21.6	—	22.3	—	18.0	—	21.9	—	16.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	42.1	—	43.0	—	28.4	—	31.8	—	36.8 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.



**TABLE 10. Percentage of adults who met physical activity recommendations,\* in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	38.3	(31.7–45.4)	— <sup>†</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	55.6	(49.9–61.1)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	43.7	(37.3–50.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	49.6	(42.5–56.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	50.1	(43.6–56.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.8	(34.0–39.6)
Boston, Massachusetts	32.3	(25.4–39.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	51.1	(48.9–53.3)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	39.1	(32.3–46.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	48.8	(45.9–51.7)
Fulton County, Georgia	48.7	(42.4–55.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	49.3	(45.5–53.0)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	42.8	(36.0–49.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	53.4	(49.1–57.6)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	47.2	(40.8–53.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	48.2	(44.4–52.0)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	49.3	(40.9–57.7)	34.4	(27.4–42.2)	—	—	—	—	49.7	(46.0–53.3)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	47.3	(39.0–55.7)	53.8	(42.1–65.1)	—	—	—	—	49.7	(46.0–53.3)
South Los Angeles, California	39.5	(29.9–49.9)	50.5	(38.8–62.1)	—	—	—	—	48.2	(44.4–52.0)
East Harlem, New York	43.6	(33.3–54.5)	45.7	(36.8–54.9)	—	—	—	—	49.8	(47.0–52.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	43.8	(35.4–52.6)	44.5	(34.8–54.7)	—	—	—	—	49.8	(47.0–52.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	34.3	(23.9–46.5)	57.1	(46.3–67.3)	—	—	—	—	49.7	(46.0–53.3)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	45.9	(40.4–51.6)	—	—	—	—	45.9	(39.0–52.9)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	53.0	(47.1–58.7)	—	—	—	—	54.4	(48.3–60.3)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	54.1	(48.0–60.1)	—	—	—	—	56.4	(53.7–59.1)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	40.0	(34.4–45.8)	—	—	—	—	51.2	(46.9–55.6)
Seattle and King County, Washington	49.5	(34.6–64.4)	35.0	(25.6–45.8)	36.3	(30.5–42.5)	—	—	54.9	(52.6–57.2)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	46.7	(29.4–64.8)	42.1	(35.9–48.5)	31.4	(18.5–47.9)	—	—	48.2	(44.4–52.0)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	49.7	(43.7–55.7)	—	—	48.2	(44.4–52.0)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	48.8	(42.9–54.6)	—	—	54.1	(51.7–56.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	33.2	(28.2–38.5)	—	—	49.8	(47.0–52.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	43.2	(37.2–49.5)	—	—	48.2	(44.4–52.0)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	49.2	(38.5–59.9)	50.1	(47.5–52.7)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	43.1	(37.3–49.2)	48.0	(45.4–50.6)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	48.6	(40.0–57.3)	52.7	(50.3–55.1)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	47.1	(40.4–53.9)	48.0	(45.4–50.6)
Median	43.8	—	45.8	—	39.8	—	47.9	—	52.4 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	32.3	—	34.4	—	31.4	—	43.1	—	36.8 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	50.1	—	57.1	—	49.7	—	49.2	—	63.3 <sup>§</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	29.9	(26.1–34.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	48.6	(44.3–52.9)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	34.5	(30.5–38.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.1	(34.5–43.9)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	33.1	(28.8–37.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.1	(31.1–35.3)
Boston, Massachusetts	25.6	(20.8–31.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	51.5	(49.8–53.2)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	27.5	(23.7–31.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.6	(37.4–41.7)
Fulton County, Georgia	34.6	(30.3–39.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	45.9	(43.3–48.4)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	35.0	(30.9–39.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	47.9	(44.6–51.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	37.5	(33.6–41.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	45.9	(43.0–48.8)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	35.9	(31.3–40.7)	46.7	(40.8–52.8)	—	—	—	—	46.6	(43.8–49.3)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	33.3	(28.6–38.2)	40.5	(33.0–48.4)	—	—	—	—	46.6	(43.8–49.3)
South Los Angeles, California	31.8	(25.8–38.5)	49.4	(39.5–59.4)	—	—	—	—	45.9	(43.0–48.8)
East Harlem, New York	40.0	(34.3–45.9)	40.6	(35.2–46.2)	—	—	—	—	43.4	(41.4–45.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	33.5	(27.5–40.1)	32.7	(26.2–39.8)	—	—	—	—	43.4	(41.4–45.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	37.9	(30.5–45.8)	44.2	(36.3–52.3)	—	—	—	—	46.6	(43.8–49.3)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	49.1	(44.7–53.4)	—	—	—	—	48.4	(42.3–54.6)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	45.2	(40.9–49.5)	—	—	—	—	51.4	(46.8–55.9)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	46.1	(41.4–50.7)	—	—	—	—	48.4	(46.3–50.5)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	36.8	(32.4–41.3)	—	—	—	—	50.6	(47.3–54.0)
Seattle and King County, Washington	48.4	(37.1–59.8)	45.3	(34.4–56.6)	38.3	(32.7–44.3)	—	—	51.5	(49.5–53.5)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	50.0	(37.4–62.6)	39.5	(35.1–44.2)	48.8	(36.2–61.5)	—	—	45.9	(43.0–48.8)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	39.1	(34.1–44.5)	—	—	45.9	(43.0–48.8)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	44.4	(39.9–48.9)	—	—	47.4	(45.3–49.5)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	33.4	(29.2–37.9)	—	—	43.4	(41.4–45.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	41.9	(36.6–47.5)	—	—	45.9	(43.0–48.8)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	44.9	(36.1–54.1)	41.0	(39.1–42.9)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	44.9	(40.4–49.5)	45.1	(43.3–46.9)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	46.2	(39.3–53.2)	47.8	(45.9–49.7)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.6	(34.7–44.6)	45.1	(43.3–46.9)
Median	34.6	—	44.7	—	40.5	—	44.9	—	47.8 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	25.6	—	32.7	—	33.4	—	39.6	—	32.7 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	50.0	—	49.4	—	48.8	—	46.2	—	55.9 <sup>§</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Participating in moderate physical activity  $\geq 30$  minutes/day and 5 days/week or in vigorous physical activity  $\geq 20$  minutes/day and 3 days/week.

<sup>†</sup> Not applicable.

<sup>§</sup> Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 11. Percentage of adults who reported eating at least five fruits and vegetables daily, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS		
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State		
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	
<b>Men</b>											
Richmond, Virginia	23.7	(18.2–30.3)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.2	(18.2–26.9)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	28.1	(22.4–34.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.0	(17.1–27.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	23.5	(18.5–29.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	(11.5–15.4)
Boston, Massachusetts	34.3	(27.4–41.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.6	(19.0–22.4)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	22.6	(17.0–29.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.9	(12.1–16.0)
Fulton County, Georgia	23.9	(19.1–29.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.4	(19.4–25.7)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	18.7	(13.9–24.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.1	(13.2–19.4)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	24.7	(19.5–30.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.1	(18.3–24.2)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	11.0	(7.0–16.8)	11.8	(7.7–17.6)	—	—	—	—	—	20.5	(17.7–23.6)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	16.3	(11.5–22.7)	15.5	(9.0–25.2)	—	—	—	—	—	20.5	(17.7–23.6)
South Los Angeles, California	31.7	(22.7–42.2)	22.8	(14.5–33.9)	—	—	—	—	—	21.1	(18.3–24.2)
East Harlem, New York	29.3	(20.8–39.5)	29.1	(21.7–37.8)	—	—	—	—	—	23.6	(21.3–26.1)
Southwest Bronx, New York	24.6	(18.0–32.7)	19.2	(12.8–27.9)	—	—	—	—	—	23.6	(21.3–26.1)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	19.4	(12.1–29.7)	14.7	(8.7–23.7)	—	—	—	—	—	20.5	(17.7–23.6)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	19.9	(15.8–24.9)	—	—	—	—	—	20.7	(15.9–26.4)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	19.5	(15.5–24.2)	—	—	—	—	—	25.9	(21.2–31.2)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	19.7	(15.5–24.8)	—	—	—	—	—	19.3	(17.5–21.3)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	23.6	(18.7–29.3)	—	—	—	—	—	19.4	(16.4–22.8)
Seattle and King County, Washington	21.5	(11.5–36.4)	19.4	(12.0–29.7)	23.6	(18.6–29.3)	—	—	—	23.2	(21.3–25.2)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	36.6	(20.9–55.7)	22.1	(17.2–27.9)	23.9	(11.9–42.2)	—	—	—	21.1	(18.3–24.2)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	25.2	(20.6–30.4)	—	—	—	21.1	(18.3–24.2)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	25.3	(20.7–30.5)	—	—	—	20.9	(19.0–22.9)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	15.4	(11.9–19.7)	—	—	—	23.6	(21.3–26.1)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	23.4	(18.5–29.2)	—	—	—	21.1	(18.3–24.2)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.5	(12.0–27.3)	—	17.4	(15.6–19.3)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.8	(16.3–26.1)	—	12.4	(10.7–14.3)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.1	(15.7–30.1)	—	18.5	(16.6–20.5)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.2	(10.4–19.1)	—	12.4	(10.7–14.3)
Median	23.8	—	19.6	—	23.8	—	19.7	—	—	19.2 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	11.0	—	11.8	—	15.4	—	14.2	—	—	11.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	36.6	—	29.1	—	25.3	—	22.1	—	—	28.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>											
Richmond, Virginia	29.5	(26.0–33.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	31.2	(27.6–35.2)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	31.7	(27.9–35.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.7	(24.7–33.1)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	27.7	(23.9–32.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.8	(17.3–20.5)
Boston, Massachusetts	22.4	(18.1–27.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.6	(31.1–34.2)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	29.2	(25.3–33.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.6	(19.0–22.3)
Fulton County, Georgia	23.8	(20.3–27.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.7	(28.4–33.0)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	21.0	(17.8–24.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27.5	(24.7–30.5)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	34.0	(30.1–38.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.1	(29.4–34.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	23.3	(19.3–27.8)	21.5	(16.8–27.1)	—	—	—	—	—	29.1	(26.7–31.6)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	21.2	(17.5–25.5)	21.8	(15.7–29.5)	—	—	—	—	—	29.1	(26.7–31.6)
South Los Angeles, California	29.3	(23.6–35.7)	25.4	(17.3–35.7)	—	—	—	—	—	32.1	(29.4–34.9)
East Harlem, New York	26.2	(21.3–31.9)	24.2	(19.9–29.1)	—	—	—	—	—	29.7	(27.9–31.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	25.7	(20.4–31.8)	27.0	(21.2–33.7)	—	—	—	—	—	29.7	(27.9–31.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	32.0	(25.2–39.6)	24.4	(18.5–31.6)	—	—	—	—	—	29.1	(26.7–31.6)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	28.3	(24.7–32.2)	—	—	—	—	—	38.3	(32.5–44.4)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	24.4	(20.9–28.3)	—	—	—	—	—	30.4	(26.6–34.6)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	26.0	(22.2–30.2)	—	—	—	—	—	26.8	(25.1–28.7)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	21.3	(17.8–25.3)	—	—	—	—	—	34.0	(30.9–37.2)
Seattle and King County, Washington	31.6	(23.2–41.3)	33.9	(24.0–45.4)	34.8	(29.3–40.8)	—	—	—	33.4	(31.6–35.3)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	23.8	(14.9–35.9)	24.8	(21.2–28.8)	35.7	(24.8–48.2)	—	—	—	32.1	(29.4–34.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	35.8	(31.0–41.0)	—	—	—	32.1	(29.4–34.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	28.3	(24.5–32.3)	—	—	—	28.2	(26.3–30.1)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	20.8	(17.3–24.8)	—	—	—	29.7	(27.9–31.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	32.4	(27.5–37.6)	—	—	—	32.1	(29.4–34.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	25.4	(18.5–33.9)	—	23.7	(22.3–25.2)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.1	(19.8–26.8)	—	16.7	(15.5–18.0)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.8	(18.2–30.4)	—	26.4	(24.8–28.0)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	(15.7–22.9)	—	16.7	(15.5–18.0)
Median	27.0	—	24.6	—	33.6	—	23.5	—	—	27.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	21.0	—	21.3	—	20.8	—	19.0	—	—	16.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	34.0	—	33.9	—	35.8	—	25.4	—	—	35.9 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 12. Percentage of adults who reported fair or poor health, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS		
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State		
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	
<b>Men</b>											
Richmond, Virginia	27.3	(22.0–33.3)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.2	(10.2–16.8)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	29.8	(24.3–35.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.0	(15.5–23.2)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	21.4	(17.1–26.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.5	(22.0–25.2)
Boston, Massachusetts	14.7	(10.3–20.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.7	(9.8–11.7)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	21.6	(16.7–27.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.5	(13.4–15.7)
Fulton County, Georgia	16.1	(12.3–20.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.6	(9.8–13.8)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	22.9	(17.9–28.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.1	(12.1–16.4)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	21.0	(16.8–25.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.0	(17.8–22.3)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	25.3	(19.0–32.8)	24.1	(18.1–31.4)	—	—	—	—	—	16.2	(14.2–18.5)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	17.6	(12.4–24.4)	29.5	(20.5–40.5)	—	—	—	—	—	16.2	(14.2–18.5)
South Los Angeles, California	21.7	(14.8–30.6)	34.8	(24.3–47.0)	—	—	—	—	—	20.0	(17.8–22.3)
East Harlem, New York	20.7	(14.4–29.0)	34.5	(27.1–42.8)	—	—	—	—	—	15.9	(14.4–17.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	18.9	(13.8–25.3)	24.6	(18.0–32.6)	—	—	—	—	—	15.9	(14.4–17.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	21.8	(14.0–32.2)	20.1	(13.0–29.6)	—	—	—	—	—	16.2	(14.2–18.5)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	23.3	(19.0–28.2)	—	—	—	—	—	12.2	(9.0–16.2)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	17.6	(14.0–21.8)	—	—	—	—	—	15.2	(12.4–18.5)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	20.8	(16.7–25.6)	—	—	—	—	—	16.3	(14.9–17.6)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	31.0	(26.1–36.3)	—	—	—	—	—	13.9	(11.9–16.1)
Seattle and King County, Washington	9.3	(3.7–21.8)	18.6	(12.0–27.6)	10.6	(7.6–14.5)	—	—	—	8.8	(7.9–9.9)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	16.5	(7.8–31.7)	30.2	(24.9–36.1)	8.3	(3.0–20.7)	—	—	—	20.0	(17.8–22.3)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	16.6	(13.0–20.9)	—	—	—	20.0	(17.8–22.3)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	23.3	(18.9–28.3)	—	—	—	13.2	(12.0–14.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	29.3	(24.8–34.2)	—	—	—	15.9	(14.4–17.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	15.0	(11.2–19.7)	—	—	—	20.0	(17.8–22.3)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.3	(14.9–32.2)	—	17.0	(15.8–18.3)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.8	(26.0–36.0)	—	18.4	(17.2–19.7)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.3	(18.0–32.1)	—	14.3	(13.3–15.3)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.2	(22.9–34.3)	—	18.4	(17.2–19.7)
Median	21.2	—	24.4	—	15.8	—	26.3	—	—	13.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	9.3	—	17.6	—	8.3	—	22.3	—	—	9.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	29.8	—	34.8	—	29.3	—	30.8	—	—	24.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>											
Richmond, Virginia	30.3	(26.7–34.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	(11.3–15.6)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	29.9	(26.4–33.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	22.7	(19.9–25.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	25.4	(21.7–29.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.2	(23.0–25.5)
Boston, Massachusetts	22.7	(18.8–27.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.6	(10.9–12.3)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	22.9	(19.7–26.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.8	(16.8–18.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	22.4	(19.3–25.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	(12.1–14.6)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	33.3	(29.5–37.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.1	(13.3–17.1)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	22.1	(19.2–25.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.0	(21.2–24.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	27.2	(23.3–31.5)	28.9	(23.8–34.6)	—	—	—	—	—	18.3	(16.7–20.0)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	25.7	(21.8–30.1)	19.4	(14.3–25.8)	—	—	—	—	—	18.3	(16.7–20.0)
South Los Angeles, California	26.9	(21.1–33.6)	32.3	(23.6–42.5)	—	—	—	—	—	23.0	(21.2–24.9)
East Harlem, New York	30.4	(25.5–35.8)	43.0	(37.8–48.5)	—	—	—	—	—	18.5	(17.3–19.8)
Southwest Bronx, New York	20.9	(16.6–25.9)	44.2	(37.5–51.2)	—	—	—	—	—	18.5	(17.3–19.8)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	24.6	(18.7–31.5)	37.5	(30.2–45.5)	—	—	—	—	—	18.3	(16.7–20.0)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	30.3	(26.5–34.3)	—	—	—	—	—	15.8	(12.5–19.7)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	21.7	(18.6–25.2)	—	—	—	—	—	14.7	(12.5–17.1)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	28.9	(25.0–33.2)	—	—	—	—	—	18.9	(17.8–20.1)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	40.5	(36.3–44.9)	—	—	—	—	—	13.4	(12.0–14.9)
Seattle and King County, Washington	14.3	(9.0–22.1)	25.6	(17.1–36.4)	14.2	(10.6–18.6)	—	—	—	10.8	(9.9–11.7)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	19.3	(11.3–30.9)	37.1	(32.6–41.9)	13.3	(6.6–25.0)	—	—	—	23.0	(21.2–24.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	19.7	(15.9–24.2)	—	—	—	23.0	(21.2–24.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	23.7	(20.2–27.6)	—	—	—	14.6	(13.5–15.8)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	37.2	(32.9–41.7)	—	—	—	18.5	(17.3–19.8)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	20.4	(16.4–25.2)	—	—	—	23.0	(21.2–24.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.6	(19.8–34.8)	—	18.5	(17.6–19.5)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	27.5	(24.0–31.3)	—	19.8	(18.9–20.8)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.5	(18.1–29.8)	—	14.9	(14.1–15.7)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.2	(19.6–27.3)	—	19.8	(18.9–20.8)
Median	25.0	—	31.3	—	20.1	—	25.1	—	—	15.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	14.3	—	19.4	—	13.3	—	23.2	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	33.3	—	44.2	—	37.2	—	27.5	—	—	23.5 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 13. Percentage of adults who have been told by a health professional that they have high blood pressure, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	38.9	(32.9–45.3)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	29.9	(25.5–34.7)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	44.0	(37.9–50.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.3	(27.3–39.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	53.6	(47.0–60.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	39.0	(36.3–41.7)
Boston, Massachusetts	23.7	(18.4–30.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.2	(24.5–28.0)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	40.9	(34.4–47.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.7	(31.2–36.3)
Fulton County, Georgia	31.6	(26.1–37.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	28.2	(25.3–31.3)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	40.9	(34.5–47.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	32.7	(29.0–36.6)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	41.3	(35.5–47.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.3	(21.6–27.1)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	39.1	(31.6–47.2)	21.0	(15.5–27.9)	—	—	—	—	29.1	(26.1–32.3)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	31.9	(25.2–39.3)	30.0	(21.5–40.1)	—	—	—	—	29.1	(26.1–32.3)
South Los Angeles, California	41.6	(32.6–51.1)	19.9	(12.9–29.4)	—	—	—	—	24.3	(21.6–27.1)
East Harlem, New York	35.7	(27.4–45.0)	22.5	(16.8–29.3)	—	—	—	—	25.5	(23.4–27.8)
Southwest Bronx, New York	29.3	(23.0–36.5)	27.0	(20.4–34.9)	—	—	—	—	25.5	(23.4–27.8)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	45.1	(34.5–56.2)	21.2	(14.1–30.6)	—	—	—	—	29.1	(26.1–32.3)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	23.1	(19.0–27.7)	—	—	—	—	22.5	(18.0–27.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	31.0	(26.4–36.1)	—	—	—	—	28.6	(24.2–33.4)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	42.5	(36.6–48.6)	—	—	—	—	28.4	(26.4–30.6)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	29.8	(25.1–35.0)	—	—	—	—	26.7	(23.6–30.0)
Seattle and King County, Washington	23.1	(13.3–37.2)	12.9	(8.3–19.6)	23.7	(19.2–28.9)	—	—	24.7	(23.0–26.6)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	35.9	(22.1–52.5)	21.7	(17.3–26.9)	46.7	(31.1–63.1)	—	—	24.3	(21.6–27.1)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	33.5	(28.6–38.8)	—	—	24.3	(21.6–27.1)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	41.6	(36.2–47.3)	—	—	30.2	(28.1–32.3)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	26.4	(22.1–31.1)	—	—	25.5	(23.4–27.8)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	26.0	(21.2–31.5)	—	—	24.3	(21.6–27.1)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	45.9	(35.4–56.7)	31.7	(29.6–33.8)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	42.5	(37.1–48.2)	34.9	(32.7–37.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	33.7	(26.5–41.8)	31.8	(29.9–33.9)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	45.2	(38.8–51.8)	34.9	(32.7–37.1)
Median	39.0	—	22.8	—	30.0	—	43.9	—	29.8 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	23.1	—	12.9	—	23.7	—	33.7	—	22.1 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	53.6	—	42.5	—	46.7	—	45.9	—	39.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	53.3	(49.1–57.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.6	(23.4–30.0)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	49.3	(45.2–53.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	34.5	(30.5–38.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	49.4	(44.8–54.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.3	(34.4–38.3)
Boston, Massachusetts	27.3	(22.8–32.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.3	(22.1–24.6)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	47.9	(43.5–52.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	31.7	(29.9–33.6)
Fulton County, Georgia	40.0	(36.0–44.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.1	(24.2–28.0)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	46.4	(42.4–50.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	29.5	(26.8–32.3)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	44.2	(40.4–48.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.5	(22.3–26.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	38.8	(34.4–43.5)	19.3	(15.4–24.0)	—	—	—	—	28.7	(26.5–31.0)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	47.8	(42.7–53.0)	21.7	(16.8–27.6)	—	—	—	—	28.7	(26.5–31.0)
South Los Angeles, California	45.5	(39.1–52.2)	23.5	(16.3–32.6)	—	—	—	—	24.5	(22.3–26.9)
East Harlem, New York	46.2	(40.7–51.9)	36.5	(31.4–41.8)	—	—	—	—	26.1	(24.5–27.8)
Southwest Bronx, New York	39.4	(33.6–45.5)	36.0	(29.6–42.9)	—	—	—	—	26.1	(24.5–27.8)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	46.1	(38.6–53.8)	25.6	(19.4–32.9)	—	—	—	—	28.7	(26.5–31.0)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	28.5	(24.8–32.5)	—	—	—	—	20.9	(17.0–25.5)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	27.4	(24.1–31.0)	—	—	—	—	24.8	(21.7–28.2)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	34.7	(30.6–39.1)	—	—	—	—	24.9	(23.4–26.3)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	33.1	(29.3–37.2)	—	—	—	—	23.6	(21.4–25.9)
Seattle and King County, Washington	31.3	(22.8–41.2)	15.0	(9.0–23.8)	16.8	(13.2–21.1)	—	—	21.8	(20.5–23.2)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	46.7	(35.1–58.7)	26.3	(22.4–30.6)	19.2	(11.0–31.3)	—	—	24.5	(22.3–26.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	29.7	(25.5–34.3)	—	—	24.5	(22.3–26.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	38.1	(33.9–42.4)	—	—	30.0	(28.3–31.9)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	27.3	(23.5–31.4)	—	—	26.1	(24.5–27.8)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	20.7	(16.5–25.6)	—	—	24.5	(22.3–26.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	41.4	(32.9–50.4)	31.4	(29.8–33.1)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	42.5	(38.5–46.7)	33.8	(32.3–35.4)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	36.4	(30.2–43.1)	27.8	(26.5–29.2)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	42.0	(37.2–47.0)	33.8	(32.3–35.4)
Median	46.2	—	26.9	—	24.0	—	41.7	—	27.8 <sup>†</sup>	—
Low	27.3	—	15.0	—	16.8	—	36.4	—	20.3 <sup>†</sup>	—
High	53.3	—	36.5	—	38.1	—	42.5	—	38.9 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 14. Percentage of adults who reported having cardiovascular diseases,\* in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	11.8	(8.8–15.7)	— <sup>†</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	8.4	(6.7–10.5)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	13.0	(9.6–17.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.3	(7.0–12.4)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	12.8	(9.7–16.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.1	(12.9–15.3)
Boston, Massachusetts	2.2	(1.1–4.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.5	(6.8–8.1)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	10.8	(7.4–15.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.2	(9.3–11.1)
Fulton County, Georgia	8.2	(5.8–11.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.9–7.9)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	11.6	(8.3–15.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.2	(8.6–11.9)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	7.9	(5.7–10.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.9	(5.0–6.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	12.2	(7.9–18.3)	6.0	(3.3–10.9)	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.7–8.2)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	8.8	(5.5–13.7)	9.9	(5.0–18.7)	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.7–8.2)
South Los Angeles, California	8.0	(4.4–14.2)	7.1	(2.9–16.0)	—	—	—	—	5.9	(5.0–6.9)
East Harlem, New York	8.1	(4.3–14.5)	11.8	(7.5–18.0)	—	—	—	—	7.0	(6.2–7.9)
Southwest Bronx, New York	6.5	(3.9–10.6)	7.7	(4.6–12.7)	—	—	—	—	7.0	(6.2–7.9)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	11.1	(6.5–18.3)	3.2	(1.3–7.6)	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.7–8.2)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	7.7	(5.2–11.3)	—	—	—	—	5.4	(3.8–7.5)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	6.7	(4.6–9.5)	—	—	—	—	7.7	(6.2–9.6)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	13.0	(9.7–17.2)	—	—	—	—	8.2	(7.4–9.1)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	9.0	(6.5–12.3)	—	—	—	—	8.8	(7.4–10.4)
Seattle and King County, Washington	4.4	(1.4–13.0)	7.2	(2.8–17.3)	4.8	(2.9–7.9)	—	—	6.1	(5.4–6.8)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	10.0	(3.8–24.2)	7.6	(5.0–11.4)	6.3	(2.0–18.3)	—	—	5.9	(5.0–6.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	7.7	(5.5–10.6)	—	—	5.9	(5.0–6.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	14.3	(11.0–18.4)	—	—	7.0	(6.2–8.0)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	6.9	(5.0–9.5)	—	—	7.0	(6.2–7.9)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	6.3	(4.1–9.5)	—	—	5.9	(5.0–6.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.8	(7.4–21.0)	9.8	(9.0–10.8)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.5	(13.1–20.5)	11.3	(10.5–12.2)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.7	(8.4–18.6)	9.5	(8.8–10.2)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.0	(10.8–18.0)	11.3	(10.5–12.2)
Median	9.4	—	7.7	—	6.6	—	13.4	—	8.8 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	2.2	—	3.2	—	4.8	—	12.7	—	5.5 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	13.0	—	13.0	—	14.3	—	16.5	—	13.6 <sup>§</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	11.5	(9.2–14.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.4	(5.1–7.9)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	13.7	(11.3–16.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.3	(8.4–12.4)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	11.8	(9.4–14.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.7	(11.8–13.6)
Boston, Massachusetts	2.9	(1.6–5.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.1	(4.6–5.5)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	6.0	(4.5–8.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.6	(7.0–8.2)
Fulton County, Georgia	7.4	(5.9–9.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.6	(4.9–6.4)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	12.1	(9.8–14.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.9	(6.0–8.0)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	8.6	(7.0–10.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.7	(4.9–6.7)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	8.8	(6.7–11.5)	4.3	(2.5–7.2)	—	—	—	—	7.0	(6.1–8.0)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	9.7	(7.4–12.7)	5.6	(3.4–9.2)	—	—	—	—	7.0	(6.1–8.0)
South Los Angeles, California	11.2	(7.7–16.2)	2.8	(1.1–7.1)	—	—	—	—	5.7	(4.9–6.7)
East Harlem, New York	11.8	(8.8–15.7)	10.7	(7.5–15.0)	—	—	—	—	6.3	(5.6–7.1)
Southwest Bronx, New York	6.7	(4.9–9.2)	8.3	(5.8–11.7)	—	—	—	—	6.3	(5.6–7.1)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	10.9	(7.1–16.4)	8.6	(5.6–13.0)	—	—	—	—	7.0	(6.1–8.0)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	5.3	(3.7–7.6)	—	—	—	—	5.0	(3.5–7.2)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	3.5	(2.3–5.2)	—	—	—	—	6.1	(5.0–7.4)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	8.2	(6.3–10.6)	—	—	—	—	6.0	(5.5–6.6)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	6.1	(4.6–8.2)	—	—	—	—	5.7	(4.9–6.8)
Seattle and King County, Washington	12.5	(7.2–20.7)	2.5	(0.6–10.9)	2.7	(1.5–4.9)	—	—	4.2	(3.8–4.7)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	5.9	(2.2–15.0)	5.7	(3.9–8.3)	4.0	(1.3–11.7)	—	—	5.7	(4.9–6.7)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	3.5	(2.3–5.3)	—	—	5.7	(4.9–6.7)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	8.4	(6.4–10.9)	—	—	5.4	(4.7–6.1)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	4.7	(3.2–6.9)	—	—	6.3	(5.6–7.1)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	4.7	(2.5–8.4)	—	—	5.7	(4.9–6.7)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.8	(7.7–17.5)	7.4	(6.9–8.0)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.5	(11.2–16.1)	9.2	(8.6–9.8)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.7	(8.7–18.3)	7.8	(7.3–8.3)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.1	(8.8–13.8)	9.2	(8.6–9.8)
Median	10.3	—	5.7	—	4.4	—	12.3	—	6.3 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	2.9	—	2.5	—	2.7	—	11.1	—	4.2 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	13.7	—	10.7	—	8.4	—	13.5	—	11.6 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Had any of the following: heart attack or myocardial infarction, angina or coronary heart diseases, or stroke.

<sup>†</sup> Not applicable.

<sup>§</sup> Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 15. Percentage of adults who have been told by a doctor that they have diabetes\*, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	19.3	(15.0–24.4)	—†	—	—	—	—	—	8.2	(6.6–10.3)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	18.6	(14.5–23.6)	—	—	—	—	—	11.0	(8.3–14.4)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	21.2	(16.9–26.4)	—	—	—	—	—	12.0	(10.9–13.2)	
Boston, Massachusetts	14.1	(10.3–19.1)	—	—	—	—	—	7.8	(7.1–8.6)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	15.7	(11.8–20.6)	—	—	—	—	—	10.7	(9.8–11.8)	
Fulton County, Georgia	10.8	(7.9–14.6)	—	—	—	—	—	8.3	(7.1–9.6)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	13.5	(9.9–18.2)	—	—	—	—	—	9.9	(8.4–11.7)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	14.7	(11.4–18.9)	—	—	—	—	—	9.0	(7.9–10.4)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	12.2	(8.5–17.1)	9.8	(6.4–14.8)	—	—	—	9.0	(7.6–10.6)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	13.3	(9.2–18.8)	10.2	(6.0–16.7)	—	—	—	9.0	(7.6–10.6)	
South Los Angeles, California	15.7	(10.8–22.2)	9.0	(4.8–16.0)	—	—	—	9.0	(7.9–10.4)	
East Harlem, New York	12.3	(7.8–18.8)	12.5	(8.6–17.9)	—	—	—	8.3	(7.3–9.3)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	13.9	(9.6–19.7)	9.1	(5.8–14.0)	—	—	—	8.3	(7.3–9.3)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	21.7	(14.3–31.6)	8.6	(4.5–15.7)	—	—	—	9.0	(7.6–10.6)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	12.1	(9.2–15.7)	—	—	—	6.8	(4.9–9.4)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	14.3	(11.0–18.5)	—	—	—	10.4	(8.0–13.4)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	16.4	(12.9–20.8)	—	—	—	8.4	(7.6–9.3)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	12.8	(9.7–16.6)	—	—	—	6.7	(5.5–8.1)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	9.3	(3.7–21.8)	4.9	(2.3–10.0)	7.8	(5.4–11.2)	—	6.7	(5.9–7.6)	
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	3.6	(0.9–13.6)	9.7	(6.9–13.3)	10.0	(4.1–22.4)	—	9.0	(7.9–10.4)	
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	14.7	(11.1–19.1)	—	9.0	(7.9–10.4)	
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	18.0	(14.3–22.4)	—	7.8	(6.9–8.8)	
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	12.3	(9.5–15.7)	—	8.3	(7.3–9.3)	
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	10.0	(7.4–13.4)	—	9.0	(7.9–10.4)	
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.4	(21.9–40.5)	9.2	(8.5–9.9)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.6	(8.9–15.1)	11.1	(10.2–12.0)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.1	(16.8–30.9)	10.0	(9.3–10.8)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.9	(9.7–17.0)	11.1	(10.2–12.0)
Median	14.0	—	10.0	—	11.2	—	18.0	—	8.8 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	3.6	—	4.9	—	7.8	—	11.6	—	6.0 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	21.7	—	16.4	—	18.0	—	30.4	—	13.1 <sup>§</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	20.0	(17.2–23.2)	—	—	—	—	—	6.7	(5.5–8.1)	
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	19.0	(16.1–22.2)	—	—	—	—	—	12.1	(10.2–14.4)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	17.0	(14.1–20.4)	—	—	—	—	—	12.3	(11.4–13.3)	
Boston, Massachusetts	10.7	(8.1–14.1)	—	—	—	—	—	6.4	(5.9–6.9)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	20.1	(17.1–23.4)	—	—	—	—	—	9.8	(9.1–10.5)	
Fulton County, Georgia	13.5	(11.2–16.1)	—	—	—	—	—	8.3	(7.5–9.3)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	15.9	(13.3–18.9)	—	—	—	—	—	8.5	(7.3–9.8)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	12.9	(10.8–15.3)	—	—	—	—	—	8.8	(7.7–10.0)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	15.6	(12.8–18.8)	7.4	(5.2–10.4)	—	—	—	9.1	(8.0–10.3)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	13.4	(10.7–16.7)	14.1	(10.3–19.1)	—	—	—	9.1	(8.0–10.3)	
South Los Angeles, California	15.9	(12.0–20.8)	10.3	(6.4–16.2)	—	—	—	8.8	(7.7–10.0)	
East Harlem, New York	16.2	(12.7–20.4)	14.5	(11.3–18.5)	—	—	—	8.4	(7.6–9.1)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	13.1	(9.6–17.7)	14.9	(11.1–19.8)	—	—	—	8.4	(7.6–9.1)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	17.2	(12.6–23.1)	11.8	(7.8–17.4)	—	—	—	9.1	(8.0–10.3)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	12.8	(10.3–15.7)	—	—	—	8.4	(6.2–11.2)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	12.9	(10.6–15.7)	—	—	—	6.8	(5.5–8.3)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	15.9	(13.1–19.1)	—	—	—	8.1	(7.4–8.8)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	12.5	(10.2–15.3)	—	—	—	7.4	(6.4–8.5)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	11.0	(6.3–18.4)	4.5	(1.8–10.8)	4.7	(2.8–7.7)	—	5.2	(4.7–5.8)	
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	20.8	(12.7–32.1)	11.7	(9.0–14.9)	9.3	(4.1–19.6)	—	8.8	(7.7–10.0)	
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	11.2	(8.6–14.5)	—	8.8	(7.7–10.0)	
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	14.5	(11.8–17.7)	—	8.9	(8.0–9.8)	
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	11.6	(9.1–14.6)	—	8.4	(7.6–9.1)	
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	5.3	(3.4–8.2)	—	8.8	(7.7–10.0)	
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.4	(17.1–31.1)	9.7	(9.1–10.4)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.2	(13.6–19.2)	10.1	(9.4–10.7)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.6	(15.5–26.8)	8.5	(7.9–9.0)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.4	(12.5–18.7)	10.1	(9.4–10.7)
Median	15.9	—	12.7	—	10.3	—	18.4	—	8.2 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	10.7	—	4.5	—	4.7	—	15.4	—	5.0 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	20.8	—	15.9	—	14.5	—	23.4	—	12.9 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Did not include gestational diabetes, prediabetes, or borderline diabetes.

† Not applicable.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 16. Percentage of adults who know signs and symptoms of heart attack, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	7.3	(4.3–12.2)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	9.7	(8.5–11.2)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	2.1	(1.0–4.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	6.2	(3.7–10.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.7	(11.9–15.7)
Boston, Massachusetts	2.5	(1.1–5.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.1	(7.4–11.2)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	4.2	(2.1–7.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.4	(7.1–9.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	6.8	(4.1–11.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.3	(8.2–10.5)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	1.9	(0.8–4.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.6	(10.4–15.0)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	4.2	(2.3–7.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	2.9	(1.5–5.6)	3.6	(1.6–8.0)	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	4.0	(1.9–8.3)	3.2	(1.2–8.8)	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
South Los Angeles, California	3.1	(1.0–9.3)	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
East Harlem, New York	6.7	(3.2–13.5)	2.5	(1.0–6.4)	—	—	—	—	12.3	(10.1–14.9)
Southwest Bronx, New York	2.7	(1.2–6.1)	2.6	(0.9–7.4)	—	—	—	—	12.3	(10.1–14.9)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	2.4	(0.8–7.3)	3.1	(1.3–7.5)	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	4.6	(3.0–7.1)	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	5.6	(3.8–8.3)	—	—	—	—	10.6	(8.4–13.4)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	8.0	(5.4–11.8)	—	—	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	2.0	(0.9–4.3)	—	—	—	—	9.1	(7.4–11.2)
Seattle and King County, Washington	6.0	(2.2–15.4)	5.4	(2.3–12.3)	5.9	(3.7–9.3)	—	—	15.0	(13.3–16.7)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	15.9	(6.7–33.2)	2.2	(1.0–4.8)	9.1	(3.4–22.4)	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	3.1	(1.7–5.5)	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	7.5	(5.1–10.8)	—	—	7.7	(5.9–9.8)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	4.2	(2.4–7.1)	—	—	12.3	(10.1–14.9)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	5.6	(2.9–10.4)	—	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.4	(3.6–14.4)	8.9 <sup>†</sup>	(8.0–9.8)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.8	(6.7–14.1)	8.2	(7.1–9.5)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.5	(4.3–12.6)	11.4	(9.2–14.0)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.8	(7.2–16.1)	8.2	(7.1–9.5)
<i>Median</i>	4.1	—	3.2	—	5.8	—	8.7	—	10.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	1.9	—	0.0	—	3.1	—	7.4	—	6.9 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	15.9	—	8.0	—	9.1	—	10.8	—	15.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	5.7	(4.1–8.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.7	(15.5–18.0)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	7.7	(5.7–10.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	7.6	(5.6–10.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	18.1	(16.6–19.7)
Boston, Massachusetts	3.2	(1.5–6.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	17.7	(15.6–19.9)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	6.5	(4.7–9.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.8	(12.4–15.4)
Fulton County, Georgia	6.1	(4.2–8.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	(12.4–14.3)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	5.7	(3.9–8.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.7	(14.8–18.9)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	7.4	(5.5–9.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	6.8	(4.8–9.5)	2.0	(0.9–4.4)	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	7.6	(5.3–10.8)	6.3	(3.7–10.6)	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
South Los Angeles, California	7.2	(4.2–12.0)	0.3	(0.1–1.2)	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
East Harlem, New York	7.3	(4.5–11.6)	3.9	(2.3–6.6)	—	—	—	—	14.6	(12.8–16.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	3.0	(1.5–5.9)	4.8	(2.6–8.6)	—	—	—	—	14.6	(12.8–16.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	6.9	(3.7–12.5)	4.7	(2.4–8.8)	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	4.6	(3.1–6.7)	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	9.6	(7.3–12.6)	—	—	—	—	14.6	(12.6–16.8)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	12.5	(9.5–16.2)	—	—	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	4.2	(2.7–6.4)	—	—	—	—	17.7	(15.6–19.9)
Seattle and King County, Washington	10.2	(5.2–19.0)	5.7	(2.6–11.9)	10.0	(7.3–13.7)	—	—	19.6	(18.1–21.1)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	11.6	(5.8–21.8)	3.5	(2.2–5.6)	8.5	(3.5–19.2)	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	4.9	(3.0–7.8)	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	4.8	(3.2–7.1)	—	—	10.4	(8.6–12.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	3.1	(1.8–5.1)	—	—	14.6	(12.8–16.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	4.0	(2.2–7.1)	—	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.6	(7.1–18.5)	13.8	(13.1–14.6)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.1	(8.7–14.1)	13.3	(12.4–14.3)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.8	(11.5–21.5)	17.7	(15.4–20.2)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.4	(12.1–19.4)	13.3	(12.4–14.3)
<i>Median</i>	7.1	—	4.7	—	4.9	—	13.5	—	14.7 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	3.0	—	0.3	—	3.1	—	11.1	—	10.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	11.6	—	12.5	—	10.0	—	15.8	—	19.6 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

<sup>†</sup> Data from 2009 BRFSS from 33 states (Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 17. Percentage of adults who know signs and symptoms of stroke, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	7.7	(4.8–12.3)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	21.6	(19.4–23.9)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	7.3	(4.7–11.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	11.8	(8.2–16.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.2	(17.1–21.5)
Boston, Massachusetts	3.4	(1.5–7.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.8	(17.9–23.9)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	9.3	(6.0–14.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.8	(13.9–17.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	13.8	(9.7–19.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.2	(17.5–21.0)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	6.2	(3.6–10.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.0	(17.4–23.0)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	12.6	(9.0–17.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	2.7	(1.3–5.5)	6.5	(3.4–12.0)	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	5.9	(3.4–9.9)	15.4	(8.3–26.8)	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
South Los Angeles, California	10.4	(5.4–19.0)	3.9	(1.2–11.5)	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
East Harlem, New York	9.1	(4.9–16.2)	5.5	(2.5–11.5)	—	—	—	—	18.8	(16.2–21.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	5.0	(1.9–12.4)	1.3	(0.4–4.1)	—	—	—	—	18.8	(16.2–21.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	8.4	(3.9–17.3)	3.8	(1.4–10.0)	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	11.4	(8.3–15.4)	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	12.1	(8.8–16.3)	—	—	—	—	19.3	(15.9–23.1)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	11.9	(8.5–16.3)	—	—	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	7.3	(4.8–11.1)	—	—	—	—	20.8	(17.9–23.9)
Seattle and King County, Washington	11.2	(4.3–26.0)	10.4	(5.8–18.1)	12.4	(8.9–16.9)	—	—	27.9	(25.8–30.1)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	8.2	(2.7–22.6)	9.9	(6.7–14.4)	7.2	(2.1–21.8)	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	7.1	(4.5–10.9)	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	8.5	(5.9–12.1)	—	—	14.5	(12.1–17.1)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	6.4	(4.3–9.5)	—	—	18.8	(16.2–21.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	10.0	(6.8–14.5)	—	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.5	(8.6–26.4)	16.9	(15.7–18.1)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.5	(11.6–20.5)	13.6	(12.2–15.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.4	(8.6–20.1)	20.8	(17.7–24.3)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.1	(9.5–17.9)	13.6	(12.2–15.1)
<i>Median</i>	8.3	—	8.6	—	7.9	—	14.5	—	19.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	2.7	—	1.3	—	6.4	—	13.1	—	14.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	13.8	—	15.4	—	12.4	—	15.5	—	27.9 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	10.7	(8.2–13.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.6	(22.1–25.2)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	13.6	(10.8–16.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	11.4	(8.9–14.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.1	(19.5–22.8)
Boston, Massachusetts	8.4	(5.7–12.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.0	(21.7–26.5)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	11.2	(8.8–14.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.3	(17.6–21.0)
Fulton County, Georgia	8.4	(6.1–11.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	20.0	(18.8–21.2)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	10.8	(8.4–13.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.9	(17.8–22.1)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	10.2	(7.8–13.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	11.4	(8.7–14.8)	5.6	(3.4–9.0)	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	15.4	(12.0–19.5)	8.6	(5.0–14.4)	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
South Los Angeles, California	10.6	(7.0–15.8)	1.1	(0.3–4.1)	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
East Harlem, New York	8.2	(5.6–11.8)	3.5	(1.9–6.4)	—	—	—	—	19.1	(17.1–21.3)
Southwest Bronx, New York	6.9	(4.2–11.3)	3.0	(1.0–8.5)	—	—	—	—	19.1	(17.1–21.3)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	9.8	(5.7–16.1)	6.5	(3.5–11.9)	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	10.8	(8.4–13.8)	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	13.7	(10.9–17.2)	—	—	—	—	21.0	(18.4–23.9)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	13.2	(10.3–16.9)	—	—	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	5.3	(3.7–7.7)	—	—	—	—	24.0	(21.7–26.5)
Seattle and King County, Washington	18.5	(11.5–28.6)	11.6	(6.6–19.6)	17.1	(13.3–21.8)	—	—	26.8	(25.1–28.6)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	10.4	(5.0–20.4)	7.4	(5.2–10.3)	7.1	(2.6–18.2)	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	6.8	(4.5–10.3)	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	8.1	(5.9–11.1)	—	—	16.1	(13.8–18.7)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	8.8	(6.5–11.8)	—	—	19.1	(17.1–21.3)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	9.2	(6.5–12.8)	—	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	13.3	(8.3–20.7)	20.0	(19.1–20.9)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.4	(11.6–17.8)	17.6	(16.5–18.7)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.4	(11.8–22.4)	23.4	(21.0–26.1)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	19.1	(15.5–23.2)	17.6	(16.5–18.7)
<i>Median</i>	10.7	—	7.0	—	8.5	—	15.4	—	21.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	6.9	—	1.1	—	6.8	—	13.3	—	16.1 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	18.5	—	13.7	—	17.1	—	19.1	—	26.8 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

<sup>†</sup> Data from 2009 BRFSS from 33 states (Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin) and the District of Columbia.



**TABLE 18. Percentage of adults who had cholesterol checked during the preceding 5 years, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity and sex — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
<b>Men</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	74.6	(67.8–80.5)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	79.9	(73.9–84.8)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	73.9	(67.2–79.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	73.9	(66.5–80.1)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	74.9	(68.1–80.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.6	(75.7–81.2)
Boston, Massachusetts	68.6	(60.4–75.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.3	(80.3–84.1)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	81.0	(74.0–86.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.0	(73.1–78.7)
Fulton County, Georgia	70.3	(64.0–75.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.9	(72.8–80.5)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	69.1	(62.0–75.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	77.2	(72.8–81.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	75.8	(69.1–81.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	71.5	(67.9–74.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	67.0	(57.9–75.0)	60.5	(52.5–68.0)	—	—	—	—	74.8	(71.2–78.1)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	65.6	(56.7–73.5)	63.1	(50.7–74.0)	—	—	—	—	74.8	(71.2–78.1)
South Los Angeles, California	67.9	(57.0–77.2)	41.0	(29.9–53.1)	—	—	—	—	71.5	(67.9–74.9)
East Harlem, New York	80.7	(69.3–88.6)	60.5	(51.6–68.7)	—	—	—	—	80.7	(78.2–82.9)
Southwest Bronx, New York	80.1	(71.5–86.6)	60.9	(51.1–69.8)	—	—	—	—	80.7	(78.2–82.9)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	80.4	(67.6–89.0)	76.4	(65.6–84.7)	—	—	—	—	74.8	(71.2–78.1)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	59.5	(53.5–65.3)	—	—	—	—	75.2	(67.7–81.4)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	63.3	(57.2–68.9)	—	—	—	—	73.3	(66.8–78.9)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	70.4	(64.5–75.7)	—	—	—	—	70.0	(67.1–72.6)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	57.1	(50.9–63.0)	—	—	—	—	81.6	(77.4–85.2)
Seattle and King County, Washington	71.5	(54.8–83.9)	45.3	(36.2–54.7)	71.5	(65.1–77.2)	—	—	74.8	(72.4–77.1)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	73.2	(58.7–84.0)	60.5	(54.3–66.5)	71.8	(49.6–86.8)	—	—	71.5	(67.9–74.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	77.8	(72.0–82.7)	—	—	71.5	(67.9–74.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	72.1	(66.6–77.1)	—	—	74.2	(71.7–76.5)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	77.8	(72.7–82.2)	—	—	80.7	(78.2–82.9)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	73.4	(66.3–79.4)	—	—	71.5	(67.9–74.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.7	(70.3–88.1)	75.2	(72.4–77.8)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	64.2	(58.2–69.8)	72.0	(69.4–74.5)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	61.3	(52.3–69.6)	76.5	(74.1–78.7)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	65.8	(58.9–72.1)	72.0	(69.4–74.5)
<i>Median</i>	73.6	—	60.5	—	72.8	—	65.0	—	74.4 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	65.6	—	41.0	—	71.5	—	61.3	—	67.5 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	81.0	—	76.4	—	77.8	—	80.7	—	83.8 <sup>†</sup>	—
<b>Women</b>										
Richmond, Virginia	80.4	(76.6–83.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.6	(76.3–84.3)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	83.4	(79.8–86.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.4	(75.4–84.6)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	78.1	(73.7–81.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.1	(80.1–83.9)
Boston, Massachusetts	66.7	(60.4–72.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	86.0	(84.4–87.4)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	82.3	(78.4–85.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	81.9	(79.8–83.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	72.1	(67.5–76.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.9	(78.3–83.2)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	77.3	(73.2–80.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.1	(76.9–82.9)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	82.2	(78.3–85.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.4	(77.9–82.6)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	83.1	(78.5–86.9)	70.7	(64.9–75.9)	—	—	—	—	77.8	(75.1–80.3)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	80.5	(75.5–84.6)	73.8	(65.7–80.5)	—	—	—	—	77.8	(75.1–80.3)
South Los Angeles, California	79.7	(72.3–85.6)	57.0	(46.2–67.2)	—	—	—	—	80.4	(77.9–82.6)
East Harlem, New York	79.7	(74.4–84.2)	69.7	(64.0–74.9)	—	—	—	—	83.0	(81.1–84.7)
Southwest Bronx, New York	80.9	(74.5–86.0)	67.4	(60.0–74.0)	—	—	—	—	83.0	(81.1–84.7)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	87.2	(80.1–92.0)	72.1	(64.4–78.7)	—	—	—	—	77.8	(75.1–80.3)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	63.2	(58.7–67.4)	—	—	—	—	81.1	(75.4–85.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	67.3	(62.8–71.5)	—	—	—	—	77.2	(72.3–81.5)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	72.8	(68.1–77.0)	—	—	—	—	73.9	(71.8–76.0)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	65.1	(60.6–69.4)	—	—	—	—	85.2	(81.9–87.9)
Seattle and King County, Washington	70.2	(58.3–79.9)	52.0	(40.9–62.9)	76.1	(70.1–81.2)	—	—	77.8	(75.7–79.8)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	89.7	(78.6–95.4)	65.3	(60.6–69.7)	82.4	(72.2–89.5)	—	—	80.4	(77.9–82.6)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	82.6	(77.5–86.7)	—	—	80.4	(77.9–82.6)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	76.8	(72.6–80.5)	—	—	79.7	(77.6–81.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	78.8	(74.7–82.3)	—	—	83.0	(81.1–84.7)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	74.8	(69.5–79.4)	—	—	80.4	(77.9–82.6)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	79.5	(70.5–86.3)	81.2	(79.2–83.1)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.5	(68.0–76.5)	76.9	(75.2–78.5)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.5	(72.1–83.7)	82.6	(80.9–84.2)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.4	(67.5–76.8)	76.9	(75.2–78.5)
<i>Median</i>	80.5	—	67.4	—	77.8	—	75.5	—	79.2 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	66.7	—	52.0	—	74.8	—	72.4	—	67.6 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	89.7	—	73.8	—	82.6	—	79.5	—	86.6 <sup>†</sup>	—

Abbreviations: AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 19. Percentage of adults with hypertension who are taking medication for high blood pressure, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	81.8	(77.6–85.4)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	82.7	(77.6–86.8)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	81.8	(77.4–85.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.3	(72.0–83.5)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	85.0	(80.6–88.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.3	(79.8–84.6)
Boston, Massachusetts	86.3	(79.5–91.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.4	(73.7–78.9)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	86.8	(82.4–90.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.9	(77.9–83.6)
Fulton County, Georgia	74.2	(68.4–79.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.9	(74.9–82.5)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	79.6	(74.4–84.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.7	(74.2–82.6)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	80.7	(76.1–84.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	67.7	(63.4–71.7)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	71.6	(64.2–77.9)	51.4	(40.9–61.8)	—	—	—	—	78.3	(74.3–81.7)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	79.0	(72.4–84.3)	73.7	(60.2–83.8)	—	—	—	—	78.3	(74.3–81.7)
South Los Angeles, California	82.2	(74.2–88.1)	59.2	(44.3–72.5)	—	—	—	—	67.7	(63.4–71.7)
East Harlem, New York	80.8	(74.1–86.1)	74.7	(66.5–81.4)	—	—	—	—	78.3	(75.3–81.0)
Southwest Bronx, New York	74.9	(67.3–81.2)	71.7	(62.5–79.5)	—	—	—	—	78.3	(75.3–81.0)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	83.8	(74.4–90.2)	68.3	(54.6–79.4)	—	—	—	—	78.3	(74.3–81.7)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	68.6	(62.3–74.3)	—	—	—	—	77.9	(70.0–84.2)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	77.3	(71.4–82.3)	—	—	—	—	79.3	(73.7–84.0)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	72.5	(66.8–77.6)	—	—	—	—	73.3	(70.4–75.9)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	68.7	(62.6–74.3)	—	—	—	—	82.8	(78.8–86.2)
Seattle and King County, Washington	81.2	(65.7–90.7)	61.3	(43.3–76.7)	72.9	(64.1–80.2)	—	—	71.2	(68.5–73.8)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	80.7	(65.1–90.4)	65.4	(57.9–72.3)	78.1	(52.6–92.0)	—	—	67.7	(63.4–71.7)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	88.3	(83.3–92.0)	—	—	67.7	(63.4–71.7)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	78.5	(73.5–82.8)	—	—	78.6	(76.2–80.9)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	76.3	(70.2–81.5)	—	—	78.3	(75.3–81.0)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	70.7	(62.3–77.9)	—	—	67.7	(63.4–71.7)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	77.4	(67.3–85.0)	81.6	(79.4–83.6)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	77.2	(71.9–81.7)	79.3	(77.2–81.3)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	73.7	(65.0–80.9)	79.2	(77.0–81.3)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.0	(69.8–81.2)	79.3	(77.2–81.3)
<i>Median</i>	81.0	—	68.7	—	77.2	—	76.6	—	79.2 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	71.6	—	51.4	—	70.7	—	73.7	—	66.9 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	86.8	—	77.3	—	88.3	—	77.4	—	86.7 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

<sup>†</sup> Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 20. Percentage of adults with diabetes who had a glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA<sub>1c</sub>) test during the preceding 12 months, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	65.9	(58.7–72.4)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	78.6	(75.8–81.0)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	78.6	(71.8–84.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	79.5	(77.1–81.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	85.3	(79.8–89.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	79.1	(76.8–81.1)
Boston, Massachusetts	57.1	(46.7–66.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	84.0	(81.2–86.4)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	79.2	(72.5–84.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.0	(74.0–77.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	78.8	(71.3–84.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.5	(75.9–80.8)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	66.2	(58.2–73.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	78.0	(74.8–81.0)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	72.3	(65.2–78.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	87.3	(84.2–89.8)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	76.0	(68.3–82.4)	64.1	(48.7–77.1)	—	—	—	—	80.9	(76.5–84.7)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	83.7	(75.3–89.6)	62.6	(48.3–75.0)	—	—	—	—	80.9	(76.5–84.7)
South Los Angeles, California	62.2	(51.2–72.1)	64.1	(44.9–79.6)	—	—	—	—	87.3	(84.2–89.8)
East Harlem, New York	65.0	(53.2–75.2)	55.5	(44.2–66.3)	—	—	—	—	77.0	(71.2–81.9)
Southwest Bronx, New York	68.7	(57.3–78.2)	55.4	(42.7–67.3)	—	—	—	—	77.0	(71.2–81.9)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	70.8	(57.3–81.4)	53.7	(36.5–70.0)	—	—	—	—	80.9	(76.5–84.7)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	68.0	(59.8–75.2)	—	—	—	—	87.3	(84.2–89.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	72.7	(64.3–79.7)	—	—	—	—	75.3	(71.4–78.8)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	78.6	(71.7–84.1)	—	—	—	—	76.7	(74.0–79.3)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	67.9	(59.2–75.4)	—	—	—	—	84.0	(81.2–86.4)
Seattle and King County, Washington	†	—	†	—	81.8	(66.9–90.9)	—	—	84.4	(83.2–85.6)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	†	—	63.7	(53.2–73.1)	†	—	—	—	87.3	(84.2–89.8)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	70.4	(62.0–77.7)	—	—	87.3	(84.2–89.8)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	82.1	(75.0–87.6)	—	—	76.4	(73.0–79.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	63.3	(54.2–71.6)	—	—	77.0	(71.2–81.9)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	61.3	(48.4–72.9)	—	—	87.3	(84.2–89.8)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	87.2	(75.8–93.7)	76.3	(74.4–78.2)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	81.6	(75.1–86.6)	75.7	(72.3–78.8)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.0	(60.6–81.1)	75.4	(72.3–78.3)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	77.4	(69.4–83.8)	75.7	(72.3–78.8)
<i>Median</i>	71.6	—	64.1	—	70.4	—	79.5	—	79.7 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	57.1	—	53.7	—	61.3	—	72.0	—	71.2 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	85.3	—	78.6	—	82.1	—	87.2	—	91.4 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI= Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Sample size <30; data not reported.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from 45 states (all states except Arkansas, Idaho, Missouri, Oklahoma, and South Dakota) and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 21. Percentage of adults with diabetes who had their feet checked by a health professional during the preceding 12 months, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	78.0	(70.8–83.8)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	73.1	(70.2–75.7)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	79.8	(72.6–85.4)	—	—	—	—	—	77.3	(74.9–79.6)	
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	82.1	(76.0–86.9)	—	—	—	—	—	69.4	(66.9–71.9)	
Boston, Massachusetts	72.3	(61.6–81.0)	—	—	—	—	—	81.2	(77.9–84.2)	
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	85.9	(80.1–90.3)	—	—	—	—	—	72.9	(70.7–75.0)	
Fulton County, Georgia	84.9	(76.9–90.5)	—	—	—	—	—	72.4	(69.7–74.9)	
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	78.4	(70.0–85.0)	—	—	—	—	—	72.9	(69.3–76.2)	
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	77.5	(70.1–83.4)	—	—	—	—	—	64.4	(60.5–68.1)	
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	87.4	(80.7–92.1)	58.3	(42.0–73.0)	—	—	—	72.3	(67.3–76.7)	
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	81.9	(72.6–88.5)	67.5	(52.9–79.3)	—	—	—	72.3	(67.3–76.7)	
South Los Angeles, California	80.1	(68.1–88.4)	65.3	(45.0–81.3)	—	—	—	64.4	(60.5–68.1)	
East Harlem, New York	84.3	(72.8–91.5)	62.9	(51.0–73.4)	—	—	—	77.7	(72.0–82.6)	
Southwest Bronx, New York	86.7	(76.5–92.9)	73.8	(58.5–84.9)	—	—	—	77.7	(72.0–82.6)	
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	84.8	(72.5–92.2)	70.1	(50.6–84.2)	—	—	—	72.3	(67.3–76.7)	
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	72.3	(63.9–79.4)	—	—	—	64.4	(60.5–68.1)	
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	73.3	(65.4–80.0)	—	—	—	66.6	(62.1–70.7)	
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	74.2	(66.8–80.5)	—	—	—	74.1	(71.4–76.7)	
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	68.7	(59.7–76.5)	—	—	—	81.2	(77.9–84.2)	
Seattle and King County, Washington	†	—	†	—	75.3	(59.1–86.5)	—	—	74.5	(73.0–75.9)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	†	—	67.1	(56.4–76.3)	†	—	—	—	64.4	(60.5–68.1)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	72.9	(63.4–80.6)	—	—	64.4	(60.5–68.1)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	81.5	(73.9–87.3)	—	—	74.8	(71.6–77.8)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	60.7	(51.3–69.4)	—	—	77.7	(72.0–82.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	61.4	(48.0–73.3)	—	—	64.4	(60.5–68.1)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	83.3	(70.8–91.1)	76.4	(74.3–78.3)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	75.3	(67.4–81.9)	66.8	(63.0–70.4)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	83.6	(72.6–90.8)	70.4	(67.1–73.5)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	77.3	(68.5–84.2)	66.8	(63.0–70.4)
<i>Median</i>	82.0	—	68.7	—	72.9	—	80.3	—	73.4 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	72.3	—	58.3	—	60.7	—	75.3	—	63.2 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	87.4	—	74.2	—	81.5	—	83.6	—	86.3 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Sample size <30; data not reported.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from 45 states (all states except Arkansas, Idaho, Missouri, Oklahoma, and South Dakota) and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 22. Percentage of adults with diabetes who had a dilated eye exam during the preceding 12 months, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

REACH U.S. community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	67.9	(60.7–74.4)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	71.4	(68.5–74.1)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	74.0	(66.4–80.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	73.1	(70.8–75.3)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	65.4	(57.1–72.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	66.6	(64.0–69.1)
Boston, Massachusetts	87.2	(77.5–93.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	77.3	(73.7–80.6)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	75.3	(68.2–81.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	67.6	(65.3–69.9)
Fulton County, Georgia	72.9	(64.5–80.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	69.6	(66.8–72.2)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	79.8	(71.8–86.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	68.7	(65.0–72.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	71.2	(63.3–78.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	70.0	(66.1–73.6)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	77.5	(68.6–84.5)	50.8	(35.7–65.8)	—	—	—	—	64.8	(59.5–69.8)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	76.5	(64.9–85.2)	66.5	(51.4–78.8)	—	—	—	—	64.8	(59.5–69.8)
South Los Angeles, California	73.3	(59.6–83.7)	61.6	(42.1–78.1)	—	—	—	—	70.0	(66.1–73.6)
East Harlem, New York	82.9	(72.1–90.1)	74.2	(63.1–82.9)	—	—	—	—	74.2	(67.6–79.8)
Southwest Bronx, New York	79.2	(66.4–88.0)	71.5	(58.2–81.9)	—	—	—	—	74.2	(67.6–79.8)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	69.0	(53.5–81.2)	67.3	(49.7–81.1)	—	—	—	—	64.8	(59.5–69.8)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	61.9	(52.8–70.2)	—	—	—	—	70.0	(66.1–73.6)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	72.3	(62.7–80.3)	—	—	—	—	71.4	(67.1–75.3)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	72.6	(64.3–79.7)	—	—	—	—	69.0	(66.2–71.7)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	85.6	(77.9–90.9)	—	—	—	—	77.3	(73.7–80.6)
Seattle and King County, Washington	†	—	†	—	78.3	(61.3–89.1)	—	—	71.3	(69.7–72.8)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	†	—	71.3	(61.0–79.8)	†	—	—	—	70.0	(66.1–73.6)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	78.9	(68.7–86.4)	—	—	70.0	(66.1–73.6)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	83.5	(76.6–88.7)	—	—	72.4	(69.1–75.5)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	77.5	(68.8–84.4)	—	—	74.2	(67.6–79.8)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	63.4	(50.2–74.9)	—	—	70.0	(66.1–73.6)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.3	(64.0–85.4)	69.6	(67.5–71.6)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	71.0	(63.2–77.7)	62.3	(58.4–66.0)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.4	(69.4–88.2)	69.9	(66.6–73.0)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	69.4	(60.9–76.7)	62.3	(58.4–66.0)
Median	74.7	—	71.3	—	78.3	—	73.7	—	69.2 <sup>§</sup>	—
Low	65.4	—	50.8	—	63.4	—	69.4	—	58.4 <sup>§</sup>	—
High	87.2	—	85.6	—	83.5	—	80.4	—	81.8 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI = Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Sample size <30; data not reported.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from 45 states (all states except Arkansas, Idaho, Missouri, Oklahoma, and South Dakota) and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 23. Percentage of women aged ≥40 who reported having received a mammogram during the previous 2 years, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	76.5	(72.4–80.1)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	85.3	(83.3–87.2)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	79.5	(75.8–82.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	83.5	(82.2–84.8)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	81.5	(77.5–85.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.5	(80.5–84.3)
Boston, Massachusetts	87.6	(82.4–91.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	89.6	(88.6–90.5)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	86.7	(83.1–89.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.6	(80.8–84.2)
Fulton County, Georgia	78.8	(74.8–82.4)	—	—	—	—	—	—	84.7	(83.6–85.6)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	82.2	(78.1–85.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.3	(81.0–83.6)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	81.1	(77.7–84.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	86.7	(85.4–87.8)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	80.3	(75.8–84.1)	77.1	(69.4–83.4)	—	—	—	—	83.2	(81.4–84.8)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	83.2	(78.6–87.0)	75.1	(66.8–81.9)	—	—	—	—	83.2	(81.4–84.8)
South Los Angeles, California	78.1	(71.3–83.7)	80.9	(70.2–88.3)	—	—	—	—	86.7	(85.4–87.8)
East Harlem, New York	84.1	(78.4–88.5)	82.9	(77.1–87.4)	—	—	—	—	86.1	(84.7–87.4)
Southwest Bronx, New York	79.0	(73.1–83.8)	88.8	(83.6–92.5)	—	—	—	—	86.1	(84.7–87.4)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	83.2	(75.8–88.7)	77.4	(67.7–84.8)	—	—	—	—	83.2	(81.4–84.8)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	83.6	(79.3–87.1)	—	—	—	—	86.7	(85.4–87.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	82.0	(78.5–85.1)	—	—	—	—	85.0	(82.5–87.2)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	71.9	(67.4–75.9)	—	—	—	—	79.5	(77.5–81.3)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	93.5	(90.4–95.6)	—	—	—	—	89.6	(88.6–90.5)
Seattle and King County, Washington	70.7	(57.9–80.9)	66.3	(51.4–78.5)	79.4	(73.3–84.3)	—	—	82.8	(81.8–83.7)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	78.3	(64.8–87.6)	77.9	(72.3–82.6)	78.5	(63.2–88.5)	—	—	86.7	(85.4–87.8)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	80.2	(74.8–84.7)	—	—	86.7	(85.4–87.8)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	84.9	(81.0–88.1)	—	—	83.4	(82.3–84.4)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	75.0	(69.6–79.7)	—	—	86.1	(84.7–87.4)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	80.3	(75.1–84.7)	—	—	86.7	(85.4–87.8)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	69.4	(59.6–77.7)	85.2	(84.1–86.2)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.3	(68.2–76.1)	76.9	(75.3–78.5)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.2	(67.5–83.2)	84.9	(83.6–86.1)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	73.0	(68.0–77.5)	76.9	(75.3–78.5)
<i>Median</i>	80.7	—	79.4	—	79.8	—	72.7	—	83.2 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	70.7	—	66.3	—	75.0	—	69.4	—	75.6 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	87.6	—	93.5	—	84.9	—	76.2	—	89.6 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI= Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

<sup>†</sup> Data from 2008 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 24. Percentage of women who reported having a Papanicolaou (Pap) smear test during the previous 3 years, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	85.0	(81.2–88.1)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	83.2	(79.5–86.3)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	86.0	(82.5–89.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.0	(80.3–83.6)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	87.0	(82.7–90.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.8	(78.3–83.1)
Boston, Massachusetts	81.2	(75.6–85.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	87.6	(86.3–88.8)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	85.6	(81.5–88.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	86.1	(84.1–87.8)
Fulton County, Georgia	89.4	(86.0–92.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	86.9	(85.7–87.9)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	87.0	(83.3–90.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.7	(81.0–84.2)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	82.1	(77.8–85.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	84.1	(82.5–85.6)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	84.7	(79.7–88.7)	82.4	(76.5–87.1)	—	—	—	—	83.8	(81.6–85.7)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	84.9	(80.1–88.6)	76.6	(68.5–83.1)	—	—	—	—	83.8	(81.6–85.7)
South Los Angeles, California	83.4	(75.7–89.0)	85.2	(76.1–91.3)	—	—	—	—	84.1	(82.5–85.6)
East Harlem, New York	85.0	(79.5–89.2)	81.0	(75.2–85.7)	—	—	—	—	83.3	(81.4–85.1)
Southwest Bronx, New York	84.5	(78.2–89.2)	85.4	(77.7–90.7)	—	—	—	—	83.3	(81.4–85.1)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	90.6	(83.6–94.8)	77.6	(68.7–84.5)	—	—	—	—	83.8	(81.6–85.7)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	88.1	(84.4–91.1)	—	—	—	—	84.1	(82.5–85.6)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	78.2	(73.6–82.1)	—	—	—	—	82.3	(78.1–85.9)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	79.7	(74.7–84.0)	—	—	—	—	80.7	(77.6–83.5)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	91.4	(87.9–94.0)	—	—	—	—	87.6	(86.3–88.8)
Seattle and King County, Washington	86.5	(75.2–93.1)	83.8	(72.4–91.1)	74.2	(67.7–79.8)	—	—	82.7	(81.4–83.8)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	75.6	(58.8–87.1)	84.6	(80.3–88.1)	75.5	(62.4–85.2)	—	—	84.1	(82.5–85.6)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	74.5	(68.6–79.6)	—	—	84.1	(82.5–85.6)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	80.8	(76.5–84.5)	—	—	82.4	(81.2–83.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	60.3	(55.2–65.2)	—	—	83.3	(81.4–85.1)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	69.7	(63.8–75.0)	—	—	84.1	(82.5–85.6)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	84.9	(75.3–91.2)	86.9	(85.5–88.2)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	79.4	(74.4–83.7)	81.4	(79.6–83.0)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	88.5	(82.1–92.7)	80.1	(78.4–81.6)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	82.1	(76.7–86.4)	81.4	(79.6–83.0)
<i>Median</i>	85.0	—	83.1	—	74.4	—	83.5	—	82.9 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	75.6	—	76.6	—	60.3	—	79.4	—	74.0 <sup>†</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	90.6	—	91.4	—	80.8	—	88.5	—	88.9 <sup>†</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI= Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

<sup>†</sup> Data from 2008 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

**TABLE 25. Percentage of adults aged ≥65 years who had received an influenza vaccination during the preceding 12 months, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	50.9	(45.1–56.7)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	76.1	(72.4–79.4)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	59.8	(53.6–65.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	68.7	(63.8–73.3)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	62.4	(56.4–68.1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	70.7	(68.8–72.6)
Boston, Massachusetts	65.6	(55.8–74.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.2	(74.8–77.7)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	57.2	(51.3–62.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	68.9	(67.2–70.5)
Fulton County, Georgia	54.4	(47.6–61.0)	—	—	—	—	—	—	66.1	(63.4–68.8)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	61.6	(55.6–67.3)	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.5	(69.6–75.3)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	56.8	(52.3–61.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	66.8	(63.5–70.0)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	52.5	(45.2–59.6)	59.5	(44.8–72.8)	—	—	—	—	61.9	(58.9–64.8)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	49.8	(42.6–57.1)	63.3	(47.7–76.5)	—	—	—	—	61.9	(58.9–64.8)
South Los Angeles, California	59.5	(53.7–65.1)	58.7	(44.9–71.3)	—	—	—	—	66.8	(63.5–70.0)
East Harlem, New York	63.2	(53.9–71.5)	67.6	(58.1–75.9)	—	—	—	—	65.1	(62.8–67.3)
Southwest Bronx, New York	57.4	(49.1–65.4)	60.4	(49.4–70.4)	—	—	—	—	65.1	(62.8–67.3)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	43.9	(33.2–55.2)	54.0	(33.7–73.0)	—	—	—	—	61.9	(58.9–64.8)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	67.5	(58.7–75.1)	—	—	—	—	72.1	(65.5–77.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	75.0	(67.8–81.0)	—	—	—	—	76.4	(73.1–79.5)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	66.1	(60.1–71.7)	—	—	—	—	69.0	(67.3–70.6)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	71.6	(63.0–78.9)	—	—	—	—	72.9	(69.9–75.7)
Seattle and King County, Washington	†	—	†	—	76.0	(68.3–82.2)	—	—	72.1	(70.2–73.9)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	†	—	59.0	(48.5–68.8)	†	—	—	—	66.8	(63.5–70.0)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	80.1	(75.7–83.9)	—	—	66.8	(63.5–70.0)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	77.6	(71.1–82.9)	—	—	76.8	(74.8–78.6)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	83.4	(77.9–87.7)	—	—	65.1	(62.8–67.3)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	79.5	(66.5–88.3)	—	—	66.8	(63.5–70.0)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	55.9	(42.0–68.9)	72.3	(71.0–73.5)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	70.6	(65.2–75.6)	72.7	(71.3–74.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	75.8	(60.0–86.7)	69.4	(68.0–70.8)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.5	(66.2–78.0)	72.7	(71.3–74.1)
<i>Median</i>	57.3	—	63.3	—	79.5	—	71.6	—	70.1 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	43.9	—	54.0	—	76.0	—	55.9	—	62.1 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	65.6	—	75.0	—	83.4	—	75.8	—	76.8 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI= Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Sample size <30; data not reported.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.



**TABLE 26. Percentage of adults aged ≥65 years who had ever received a pneumococcal vaccination, in 28 Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH) U.S. communities, 2009, and in the comparison populations from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS), 2007–2009, by race/ethnicity — United States**

Community	REACH U.S. racial/ethnic populations								BRFSS	
	Black		Hispanic		A/PI		AI		MMSA/County/State	
	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)	%	(95% CI)
Richmond, Virginia	59.2	(52.9–65.1)	—*	—	—	—	—	—	71.4	(67.2–75.2)
West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	59.2	(52.9–65.2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	60.0	(54.8–65.1)
Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia	73.5	(67.6–78.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	68.5	(66.5–70.4)
Boston, Massachusetts	49.4	(38.9–59.8)	—	—	—	—	—	—	69.9	(68.3–71.4)
Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina	65.0	(58.8–70.7)	—	—	—	—	—	—	68.0	(66.3–69.6)
Fulton County, Georgia	64.2	(57.2–70.6)	—	—	—	—	—	—	64.2	(61.4–66.9)
YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio	69.7	(63.9–74.9)	—	—	—	—	—	—	72.5	(69.4–75.4)
Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California	68.3	(63.7–72.5)	—	—	—	—	—	—	57.4	(53.8–60.9)
City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois	51.8	(44.2–59.3)	44.6	(29.8–60.4)	—	—	—	—	56.0	(52.9–59.1)
Southeast Chicago, Illinois	53.9	(46.3–61.3)	77.1	(62.0–87.4)	—	—	—	—	56.0	(52.9–59.1)
South Los Angeles, California	61.8	(55.7–67.6)	48.2	(34.2–62.4)	—	—	—	—	57.4	(53.8–60.9)
East Harlem, New York	53.2	(43.7–62.5)	59.9	(49.3–69.5)	—	—	—	—	55.3	(53.0–57.6)
Southwest Bronx, New York	68.2	(59.6–75.7)	59.1	(47.2–70.0)	—	—	—	—	55.3	(53.0–57.6)
Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois	42.7	(32.4–53.6)	45.4	(26.2–66.0)	—	—	—	—	56.0	(52.9–59.1)
YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California	—	—	58.3	(49.2–66.8)	—	—	—	—	65.3	(58.2–71.8)
Pima County, Arizona	—	—	70.7	(62.9–77.5)	—	—	—	—	75.1	(71.6–78.4)
Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico	—	—	67.2	(61.3–72.6)	—	—	—	—	66.8	(65.1–68.5)
Lawrence, Massachusetts	—	—	58.5	(49.5–67.1)	—	—	—	—	67.6	(64.4–70.6)
Seattle and King County, Washington	†	—	†	—	59.7	(49.3–69.3)	—	—	69.5	(67.6–71.4)
Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California	†	—	53.1	(41.7–64.1)	†	—	—	—	57.4	(53.8–60.9)
Special Service for Group, California	—	—	—	—	61.5	(56.5–66.3)	—	—	57.4	(53.8–60.9)
Waianae, Hawaii	—	—	—	—	74.6	(67.8–80.3)	—	—	66.0	(63.7–68.2)
New York City, New York	—	—	—	—	52.4	(45.5–59.3)	—	—	55.3	(53.0–57.6)
Orange County A/PI Community Alliance, California	—	—	—	—	52.1	(38.3–65.6)	—	—	57.4	(53.8–60.9)
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—	—	74.4	(60.1–84.8)	69.3	(67.9–70.7)
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	80.7	(75.7–84.9)	71.7	(70.2–73.1)
Intertribal Council of Michigan	—	—	—	—	—	—	81.5	(65.8–91.0)	66.9	(65.4–68.3)
Oklahoma	—	—	—	—	—	—	76.6	(70.3–82.0)	71.7	(70.2–73.1)
<i>Median</i>	60.5	—	58.5	—	59.7	—	78.7	—	68.5 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>Low</i>	42.7	—	44.6	—	52.1	—	74.4	—	59.9 <sup>§</sup>	—
<i>High</i>	73.5	—	77.1	—	74.6	—	81.5	—	73.9 <sup>§</sup>	—

**Abbreviations:** AI = American Indian, A/PI= Asian/Pacific Islander, CI = confidence interval, and MMSA = metropolitan and micropolitan statistical area.

\* Not applicable.

† Sample size <30; data not reported.

§ Data from 2009 BRFSS from the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

## Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health Across the U.S. (REACH U.S.) Risk Factor Survey Participating Communities and Organizations

**CDC, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Division of Adult and Community Health:** David Bang, PhD, Joyce Buckner-Brown, PhD, Shannon Cosgrove, MHA, Rick Dulin, BS, Wayne Giles, MD, Zachery Harris, BS, Youlian Liao, MD, Leandris Liburd, PhD, Thijuanie Lockhart, BBA, Aisha Penson, MEd, Mark Rivera, PhD, Paul Siegel, MD, Sakeena Smith, MPH, Alexandria Stewart, April Taylor, MPH, Pattie Tucker, DrPH, Shannon White, MPH, Graydon Yatabe, MPH.

**National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago:** Ashley Amaya, MS, Martin Barron, PhD, Keeshawna Brooks, MA, Michael Bush, Kari Carris, PhD, Angela DeBello, MA, Katie Dekker, MA, Ned English, MS, Julie Gasparac, Carmelita Grady, PhD, Sheri Hamilton, Kate Hobson, MA, Adish Jain, MS, Michele Koppelman, MA, MBA, Peter Kwok, MS, Heather Leaver-Spear, Jeffrey Leintz, Moazzam Lokhandwala, Lauren McNamara, Corey Miller, Hiroaki Minato, MA, Robert Montgomery, MA, Whitney Murphy, MS, Edward Sipulski, Colm O’Muircheartaigh, PhD, Debra Oliver, Diane Preciado, Hee-Choon Shin, PhD, Kelly Van Hao, Kirk Wolter, PhD, Kanru Xia, MA, field and telephone interviewing staff.

**Richmond, Virginia:** Vernon J. Harris East End Community Health Center: Lawrence Cary, Tracy Causey, MSPH, Ashlee Miller, Candace Nelms, Karen Wilson, MSW, Denise Wise, James Woody, BS; East End Partnership with Families-EEPF, Healthy Hearts Plus II, Inc.

**West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:** To Our Children’s Future with Health, Inc: Charmaine Sudler Milligan, Erica J. Purkett, MSW, Robin Foster-Drain, MD, Marsha Zibalese-Crawford, DSW; Haddington Community Health Project Collaborative.

**Kanawha and McDowell Counties, West Virginia:** West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources: Charlene Hickman, Regina Mitchell, Amber Stohr.

**Boston, Massachusetts:** Center for Community Health, Education, and Research, Inc., Haitian-American Public Health Initiatives, Haitian Multiservice Service, Massachusetts Community Health Services, Cambridge Health Alliance, Boston Medical Center, Caribbean U-Turn, Greater Boston Nazarene Compassionate Center.

**Charleston and Georgetown Counties, South Carolina:** Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston Diabetes Coalition, Georgetown Diabetes CORE Group, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Carolinas and Georgia Chapter of American Society of Hypertension, Diabetes Initiative of South Carolina, East Cooper Community Outreach, Franklin C. Fetter Family Health Center, Greater St. Peters Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Inc. (Palmetto Diocese), MUSC College of Nursing, SC DHEC Diabetes Prevention and Control Program (DPCP) and Epidemiology, SC DHEC Region 7, St. James-Santee Family Health Center, Tri-County Black Nurses Association, Trident United Way, Trident Urban League, Healthy Lifestyles Network, Palmetto Project.

**Fulton County, Georgia:** Southeastern US Collaborative Center of Excellence for the Elimination of Disparities, Morehouse School of Medicine Prevention Research Center: Daniel S. Blumenthal, MD, MPH, Venice Haynes, LeRoy Reese, PhD, John Wingfield, PhD; Fulton County Department of Health and Wellness: Deborah Cherry, Patrice Harris, MD, Larry Johnson, MPH, Vivian Moore, BS, Colet Odenigbo, MPA.

**YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio:** YMCA of the Greater Cleveland, Ohio /Clevelanders in Motion Branch: Barbara Clint, Tara Taylor, Alan Armstrong.

**Community Health Council of Los Angeles, California:** Lark Galloway-Gilliam, MPA; Gwendolyn Flynn; Jonathan Nomachi, MPP; Mia Boykin; University of Southern California: David S. Sloane, PhD; LaVonna Blair Lewis, PhD; African Americans Building a Legacy of Health Consortium.

**City Neighborhoods of Chicago, Illinois:** Chicago Department of Public Health, Lawndale Christian Health Center, Sinai Community Institute, Family Focus, Dr. Jorge Family Health Center.

**Southeast Chicago, Illinois:** Southeast Chicago Development Commission, Healthy Southeast Chicago: Dinah Ramirez, Chicago Department of Public Health: Herminia Vanna; South Shore Hospital: Earline Thomas; Advocate Health System: Joel Barron; Midwest Latino Health Research Training and Policy Center, University of Illinois at Chicago: Eve Pinsker.

**South Los Angeles, California:** Los Angeles Biomedical Research Institute at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center/South Los Angeles Health Projects: Steve Baranov, Jennifer Chiprich, PhD, Diane Gaspard, MA, Lizz Romo, Terry Silberman, DrPH, Akisha White, MPH, Immunize LA Families Coalition: Oliver Brooks, MD.

**East Harlem, New York:** Center of Excellence in the Elimination of Disparities – Communities IMPACT Diabetes Center, Mount Sinai School of Medicine: Carol R. Horowitz MD, Michelle Ramos MPH, Lawrence Kleinman, MD, Ellen Simon, DSW, Barbara Brenner, DrPH, Guedy Arniella, LCSW, Maida Galvez, MD, Hector Nazario, Pearl Barkley, Union Settlement Association, Bethel Gospel Assembly, Community Education Council for District 4, Lighthouse International, Little Sisters of the Assumption Family Health Service, Neighborhood Open Space Coalition, NYC Strategic Alliance for Health, Thomas Jefferson Houses Tenants Association, Yorkville Common Pantry, The East Harlem Diabetes Center of Excellence, The East Harlem Partnership for Diabetes Prevention; Communities IMPACT Diabetes Center Taskforce.

**Southwest Bronx, New York:** National Center to Eliminate Racial and Ethnic Disparity, the Institute for Family Health, Bronx Health REACH Coalition, New York Academy of Medicine: Neil Calman, MD, Maxine Golub, MPH, Charmaine Ruddock, MS.

**Humboldt Park and West Town, Chicago, Illinois:** University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC)’s Midwest Latino Health Research, Training and Policy Center at Jane Addams College of Social Work (JACSWS and UIC Healthy Cities Collaborative of the Neighborhood Initiative and Chicago Department of Public Health: Aida L. Giachello, Cynthia Barnes-Boyd, Joseph Harrington, Co-Principal Investigator, Sheila R. Castillo, Rosemary George, Jose Arrom, Amparo Castillo, Angela Ellison, Mayra Estrella, Ericka Garduno, Hong Hu, Natalie Meza, Sabrina Nelson, Eve Pinsker, Charles Williams, Yong Zhou.

**YMCA of the Santa Clara Valley, California:** Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, Santa Clara County Public Health Department: Lillian Castillo RD, CLE; Community Health Saint Louise Regional Hospital: Sr. Rachela Silvestri; Generations Community Wellness: Dan McClure; Bay Area Women’s Sports Initiative: Marlene Bjornsrud; Project Cornerstone: Anne Ehresman; Digital Clubhouse Network: Warren Hegg; Mexican American Community Services Agency: Art Barron; Hatchuel Tabernik & Associates; South County Collaborative of Santa Clara County.

**Pima County, Arizona:** Arizona Board of Regents, University of Arizona, Pima County Cervical Cancer Prevention Partnership, Pima County Health Department, UA Zuckerman College of Public Health Center of Excellence in Women’s Health, El Rio Community Health Center, Marana Community Health Center, Southeast Arizona Area Health Education Center, Sunnyside Unified School District, Sunnyside and Elvira Advocates for Health, Saint Elizabeth Health Center, Planned Parenthood.

**Grant and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico:** Hidalgo Medical Services, Grant County Community Health Council, Hidalgo Health Consortium, New Mexico Department of Health, the University of New Mexico, the New Mexico State University Cooperative Extension Offices, the Volunteer Center of Grant County, LULAC Grant County Chapter, The Wellness Coalition, Gila Regional Medical Center, SWORD (Southwest Outreach for Diabetes), FAN-C (Fitness and Nutrition in the Community group), Knights of Columbus, various community members.

**Lawrence, Massachusetts:** Greater Lawrence Family Health Center, Inc, Latino CEED Lawrence Partners/ Lawrence Council on Aging, Home Care Inc., YWCA of Greater Lawrence, City of Lawrence Department of Planning and Development, UMASS Worcester and Massachusetts Department of Public Health. Steering Committee Members: G. Dean Cleghorn, EdD; Suzanne Cashman, ScD, Martha Cruz, Patricia Daly, MSN, Milagro Grullon, MM, Vilma Lora, Jean Lussier, Theresa Petrie, Donna Rivera, MSW, Trinidad Tellez, MD, Martha Velez.

**Seattle and King County, Washington:** Seattle King County Department of Public Health: Roxana Chen, Cheza Garvin, Janet Kapp, Blishda Lacet; Center for MultiCultural Health: Eudora Carter, Shelley Cooper-Ashford, Devon Love, Edna Nunn; International Community Health Services: Sefie Cabiao, Michael McKee, Julie Siliga, Tammy Tai, Angela Wan, Minh Nguyen Wichman, Abbie Zahler, Sea Mar Community Health Centers: Antoinette Angulo, Valerie Baldisserotto, Mayra Carrillo, Edgar Lopez, Jackie Vasquez; Washington State University Extension: Juana Royster; University of Washington: Allen Cheadle; and University of Washington/Public Health-Seattle and King County: Noel Chrisman.

**Los Angeles and Orange Counties, California:** The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles: Antronette K. Yancey, MD, Roshan Bastani, PhD, Joyce Jones Guinyard, Annette Maxwell, PhD, and members of the C.H.A.T. Coalition.

**Special Service for Group, California:** Ailee Moon, PhD, Danielle E. Rose, PhD, David J. Yim, MSW, Michelle Y. Wong, MPH, and the REACH US HAPAS member agencies: Cambodian Association of America, St. Mary Medical Center/Families in Good Health, Samoan National Nurses Association.

**Waianae, Hawaii:** Waianae District Comprehensive Health and Hospital Board (Waianae Coast Comprehensive Health Center), Waianae High School, Hawaiian Electric Company, Hawaii Department of Agriculture, University of Hawaii School of Social Work, Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation.

**New York City, New York:** B Free National Center of Excellence in the Elimination of Hepatitis B Disparities (B Free CEED), New York University School of Medicine: Simona C. Kwon, DrPH, Chia-hui Peng, MPH, Henry Pollack, MD, Mariano J. Rey, MD, Chau Trinh-Shevrin, DrPH, and coalition partners Asian American Hepatitis B Program/B Free New York City, Charles B. Wang Community Health Center: Perry Pong, MD, Korean Community Services of Metropolitan New York, Inc.: Kay Chun, MD, NYU Center for the Study of Asian American Health.

**Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander Community Alliance, California:** Promoting Access to Health for Pacific Islander and Southeast Asian Women (PATH for Women) Center of Excellence to Eliminate Disparities and the partner/coalition agencies: Families in Good Health/St. Mary Medical Center, Guam Communications Network, Pacific Islander Health Partnership, Samoan National Nurses Association, Tongan Community Service Center/Special Service for Groups, Union of Pan-Asian Communities, California State University, Fullerton - Asian American Studies Program and Health Science Department, University of California Los Angeles - Asian American Studies Center and School of Public Health.

**Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, North Carolina:** Cherokee Choices: Jeff Bachar, Robin Callahan, Tinker Jenks, Tara McCoy, Lori Reed, Phyll Reed, Yvette Rivera-Colmant.

**Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma:** Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma REACH Coalition.

**Intertribal Council of Michigan, Michigan:** The Inter-Tribal Council of Michigan's REACH US tribes, the Bay Mills Indian Community, the Hannahville Indian Community, and one additional tribe that wishes to be unnamed.

**Oklahoma:** Oklahoma State Department of Health: Absentee Shawnee Tribe, Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, Cherokee Nation, Chickasaw Nation, Choctaw Nation, Indian Health Care Resource Center of Tulsa, Pawnee Nation of Oklahoma, Wichita and Affiliated Tribes, Muscogee (Creek) Nation, Otoe-Missouria Tribe, Association of American Indian Physicians, Central Oklahoma American Indian Health Council Inc., Northeastern Tribal Health System, Central Oklahoma Integrated Network Systems Inc., Native Youth Preventing Diabetes Corporation.

## Surveillance Summaries

The *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)* Series is prepared by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and is available free of charge in electronic format. To receive an electronic copy each week, visit MMWR's free subscription page at <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/mmwrsubscribe.html>. Paper copy subscriptions are available through the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402; telephone 202-512-1800.

Address all inquiries about the *MMWR* Series, including material to be considered for publication, to Editor, *MMWR* Series, Mailstop E-90, CDC, 1600 Clifton Rd., N.E., Atlanta, GA 30333 or to [mmwrq@cdc.gov](mailto:mmwrq@cdc.gov).

All material in the *MMWR* Series is in the public domain and may be used and reprinted without permission; citation as to source, however, is appreciated.

Use of trade names and commercial sources is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

References to non-CDC sites on the Internet are provided as a service to *MMWR* readers and do not constitute or imply endorsement of these organizations or their programs by CDC or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CDC is not responsible for the content of these sites. URL addresses listed in *MMWR* were current as of the date of publication.

☆ U.S. Government Printing Office: 2011-723-011/21048 Region IV ISSN: 1546-0738