New Mexico Primary Care Needs Assessment

New Mexico Department of Health Public Health Division Office of Primary Care and Rural Health -- June 7, 2021

Table of Contents

Introduction	1		
Disparities Assessment - Population Demographics	2		
Health Disparity Assessment – Health Status	5		
Health Disparity Assessment – Maternal and Child Health	10		
Health Disparity Assessment – Social Determinants of Health	14		
Health Disparity Assessment – Morbidity and Health Risk Health Disparity Assessment – Mortality Health Services Disparity - Assessment of Primary Care Access Advisory Group Data Assessment – Priorities	20 28 36 44		
		Attachments	
		Population and Demographics Tables	A-1
		 Health Status Disparities Tables 	B-1
 Maternal and Child Health Disparities Tables 	C-1		
 Social Determinants of Health Disparities Tables 	D-1		
Morbidity and Health Risk Disparities Tables	E-1		
Mortality Disparities Tables	F-1		
Primary Care Access Disparities Tables	G-1		

Introduction

In its Primary Care Needs Assessment (PCNA) the New Mexico Department of Health (NMDOH) Office of Primary Care and Rural Health (OPCRH) examined both <u>Health Status Disparities</u> and <u>Health Service Disparities</u> among the areas and populations of the state.

As part of this examination the OPCRH also examined multiple aspects of *Health Status Disparity* in the state. The OPCRH reviewed several categories of measurements which can be used to identify community disparities. Disparities were identified by comparing a community's measurements for a specific indicator to that measurement in other communities, in states or regions or to the nation. Several categories of measures were reviewed:

- Population/Demographic Measures,
- Health Status Measures,
- Maternal and Child Health Measures,
- Social Determinants of Health Measures,
- Morbidity and Health Risk Measures, and
- Mortality Measures.

Analysis of these measures suggested potential targets for specific interventions to be coordinated with community-based primary care services – including enhanced screening, health education and other interventions.

the OPCRH also explored *Primary Care Accessibility* as seen through three types of **barriers to primary care access**:

- **Availability Barriers**: areas where the supply of primary care services is inadequate to meet the demand of the local population,
- Affordability Barriers: areas where low-income populations cannot afford the available primary care services, and
- **Acceptability Barriers**: areas where local residents have special needs for primary care to be delivered in a linguistically or culturally competent manner.

The OPCRH examined these topics for *primary medical care*, *primary dental care* and *primary behavioral health care* services. Analysis of these barriers suggested potential targets for expansion of existing community-based primary care services.

After completion of its data analysis OPCRH consulted with a stakeholder panel for further review. The panel reviewed the different assessment measures and helped to interpret the identified disparities. This interpretation will assist the OPCRH in its priority setting for both *health service development* and *health status improvement*.

A narrative summary of the OPCRH PCNA is presented in this document. A complete set of the data tables used in the analysis is included in the Attachments.

Disparities Assessment - Population Demographics

Overview

New Mexico is a large land mass state with a significant rural/frontier population. Most of its counties are extensive, with some larger than small states. New Mexico is also a *majority/minority state* with over half the population defined as a racial or ethnic minority. These characteristics create challenges for health status and health status improvement. The population demographics of New Mexico are described in this section of the Needs Assessment.

Total Population and Rural/Urban Status

New Mexico had an estimated total population of 2,102,656 in 2019. This population was unevenly distributed across its 33 counties. 7 counties were classified as parts of Federal Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and contained about two-thirds of the total state population. It should be noted that several counties with MSAs are large in extent and contain remote census tracts that are considered rural/frontier by the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy. This mixed nature of rural/urban population settlement poses a significant health policy challenge.

The OPCRH prepared a Rural Health Plan in 2017. As part of this effort a planning advisory group created a consensus definition of county rural/urban status. This definition isolated four county categories:

- Small Town Rural 12 counties,
- Large Town Rural 14 counties,
- Small Metro 3 counties, and
- Large Metro 4 counties.

Small Town Rural counties are largely considered frontier under Federal definitions.

A table summarizing county population and county rural/urban categories is included in the Attachments. A mapping of these categories is also presented.

Older American Age Cohort

New Mexico's older population comprises about a fifth of the entire population of the state. In 2019 there were 378,675 persons age 65 and over – totaling 18.0% of the state's population.

Parts of New Mexico have a significantly higher population percentage age 65 and older. In eleven counties the percentage of population age 65 and over exceeds 25%:

- Catron
- Harding
- Sierra
- Lincoln
- Mora
- De Baca
- Grant
- Taos
- Colfax
- Quay
- Santa Fe

These are generally Small Town Rural counties, which are mostly designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas. Providing appropriate chronic disease care in these counties is an ongoing challenge. One county – Sierra – is a retirement community with seasonal 'snowbirds'. Surprisingly, Santa Fe, the state capital and a Small Metro county, is on the list. This may indicate that it is attracting a larger number of retirees.

A table summarizing New Mexico's older American cohort is included in the Attachments.

Child and Adolescent Cohort

New Mexico's younger population comprises almost a quarter of the entire population of the state. In 2019 there were 477,369 persons under age 18 – totaling 22.7% of the state's population.

Parts of New Mexico have a significantly higher population percentage under age 18. In seven counties the percentage of population under age 18 exceeds 25%:

- Lea
- McKinley
- Eddy
- Curry
- San Juan
- Luna
- Chaves

These include counties with large Native American populations as well as Southern border counties. Several of these counties are in the Southeast quadrant of the state.

A table summarizing New Mexico's child and adolescent cohort is included in the Attachments.

Hispanic Population

New Mexico's Hispanic population comprises about half of the entire population of the state. In 2019 there were 1,035,766 persons categorized as Hispanic – totaling 49.3% of the state's population.

Parts of New Mexico have a significantly higher Hispanic population percentage. In six counties the percentage of Hispanic population exceeds 67%:

- Mora
- Guadalupe
- San Miguel
- Rio Arriba
- Dona Ana
- Luna

These are generally Small-Town Rural counties, which are mostly designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas. Two of the counties are Southern border counties.

A table summarizing New Mexico's Hispanic Population is included in the Attachments.

Native American Population

New Mexico's Native American population comprises about a tenth of the entire population of the state. In 2019 there were 190,798 Native Americans in New Mexico – totaling 9.1% of the state's population.

Parts of New Mexico have a significantly higher Native American population percentage. These are largely the counties in which Navajo Nation, Apache Nation and Pueblo peoples are located on their historic lands. In three counties the percentage of the Native American population exceeds a third of the population:

- McKinley
- Cibola
- San Juan

These are counties where the Navajo Nation and Navajo checkerboard lands are located.

A table summarizing New Mexico's Native American Population is included in the Attachments.

Health Disparity Assessment – Health Status

<u>Overview</u>

OPCRH conducted an analysis of health status in the state to identify locations with substantially lower overall health measures. This analysis is used to prioritize locations for targeted investments in health promotion and disease/disability prevention. It is also used to prioritize locations for clinical improvement efforts linked to targeted health promotion and disease/disability prevention.

Methodology

The OPCRH chose several direct measures of health status in its analysis:

- Life Expectancy from Birth,
- Life Expectancy from Age 65,
- Years of Potential Life Lost Before Age 75 per 100,000 Population,
- Percent of Adult Population Reporting Fair or Poor Health, and
- Percent of Civilian Population with a Disability.

County data for each of these were assessed, and counties were ranked for each indicator. Tables for each indicator are included in the Attachments.

The OPCRH further extended its assessment of health disparities by creating a **Combined Health Status Disparity Index**. This index was calculated as a weighted score for each county in New Mexico combining the 5 measures. The resulting score is an indicator of a county's *overall* health status. It permits identification of high priority counties for general health promotion and disease/disability prevention efforts. This ranking is also included in the Attachments.

The detailed assessment is described below.

Disparities - Life Expectancy from Birth

The New Mexico statewide Life Expectancy from Birth in the period 2015-2019 is **78.2 years**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 78.7. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with life expectancy ranging from 72.3 years to 85.3 years. 19 counties have life expectancy lower than the statewide figure and 23 counties are lower than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very Low** Life Expectancy from Birth, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Sierra

- Rio Arriba
- Eddy
- Quay
- De Baca
- Chaves

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Low** Life Expectancy from Birth – the second priority classification:

- Lea
- Luna
- Cibola
- Curry
- San Juan
- Hidalgo
- San Miguel

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities - Life Expectancy from Age 65

The New Mexico statewide Life Expectancy from Age 65 in the period 2015-2019 is **20.6 years**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 18.1. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with life expectancy from age 65 ranging from 18.0 years to 27.0 years. 20 counties have life expectancy from age 65 lower than the statewide figure and only 1 county is lower than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very Low** Life Expectancy from Age 65, the highest priority classification:

- Sierra
- Eddy
- Curry
- Luna
- Lea
- Chaves
- Hidalgo

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Low** Life Expectancy from Age 65 – the second priority classification:

- Quay
- McKinley
- Cibola

- Valencia
- De Baca
- Otero
- Union

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Years of Potential Life (YPLL) Lost Before Age 75</u>

The New Mexico statewide YPLL per 100,000 population in the period 2015-2019 is **8,778.2.** This is *substantially higher* than a comparable US national figure of 6,715.9. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with YPLL ranging from 4,269.2 to 16,567.7. 20 counties have YPLL higher than the statewide figure and 29 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High YPLL** per 100,000 population, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Rio Arriba
- De Baca
- Mora
- Cibola
- Colfax
- Torrance

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having *High* YPLL per 100,000 population – the second priority classification:

- San Juan
- Eddy
- San Miguel
- Chaves
- Socorro
- Guadalupe
- Quay

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities – Adults Reporting Fair or Poor Health

The percent of Adults Reporting Fair or Poor Health for New Mexico statewide in the period 2011-2019 is **20.3%**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of

17.3%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with figures ranging from 7.2% to 28.0%. 20 counties have a percentage that is higher than the statewide figure and 27 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** percentage of Adults Reporting Fair or Poor Health, the highest priority classification:

- Hidalgo
- Socorro
- Luna
- Rio Arriba
- Sierra
- San Miguel
- Mora

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* percentage of Adults Reporting Fair or Poor Health, the second priority classification:

- Chaves
- Quay
- Guadalupe
- Dona Ana
- Torrance
- Lea
- Curry

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Civilian Population with a Disability</u>

The percent of the Civilian Population with a Disability for New Mexico statewide in the period 2015-2019 is **15.3%.** This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 12.6%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with figures ranging from 8.4% to 33.6%. 24 counties have a percentage that is higher than the statewide figure and 31 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** percentage of the Civilian Population with a Disability, the highest priority classification:

- Mora
- Catron
- San Miguel

- Sierra
- Cibola
- Socorro
- Harding

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* percentage of the Civilian Population with a Disability, the second priority classification:

- Colfax
- Hidalgo
- Quay
- Union
- Valencia
- Luna
- Grant

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

Combined Health Status Disparity Index

As discussed previously, the OPCRH calculated a combined index score for each of New Mexico's counties that reflects its ranking for the five health status indicators used in this portion of the assessment. One county had the highest combined score, indicating the worst relative health status. This county is in the **Very High Health Status Disparity** category:

Sierra

Eight other counties had the next highest scores, and fall into the second priority *High Health Status Disparity* category:

- Chaves
- Cibola
- Hidalgo
- Luna
- Mora
- Quay
- Rio Arriba
- San Miguel

Detailed scores and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

Health Disparity Assessment – Maternal and Child Health

<u>Overview</u>

OPCRH conducted an analysis of Maternal and Child Health in the state to identify locations with substantially lower measures related to this population. This analysis is used to prioritize locations for targeted investments in health promotion and disease/disability prevention. It is also used to prioritize locations for clinical improvement efforts linked to targeted health promotion and disease/disability prevention.

Methodology

The OPCRH chose several direct measures of Maternal and Child Health in its analysis:

- Percent of Births with First Trimester Prenatal Care
- Percent of Births with Low Birth Weight
- Percent of Births that were Pre-Term
- Adolescent Births per 1,000 Girls Age 15-19

County data for each of these were assessed, and counties were ranked for each indicator. Tables for each indicator are included in the Maternal and Child Health Tables section of the Attachments.

The OPCRH further extended its assessment of health disparities by creating a *Maternal* and *Child Health Disparity Index*. This index was calculated as a weighted score for each county in New Mexico combining the 4 measures. The resulting score is an indicator of a county's *overall* Maternal and Child Health status. It permits identification of high priority counties for targeted health service improvement, health promotion and disease/disability prevention efforts. This ranking is also included in the Attachments.

The detailed assessment is described below.

Disparities – Percent of Births with First Trimester Prenatal Care

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Births with First Trimester Prenatal Care in the period 2015-2019 is **64.6%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 77.5%. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the first trimester prenatal care percent ranging from 46.0% to 78.9%. 19 counties have a first trimester prenatal care percent lower than the statewide figure and 32 counties are lower than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very Low** Percent of Births with First Trimester Prenatal Care, the highest priority classification:

- Sierra
- Harding
- Union
- Cibola
- Chaves
- McKinley

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Low** Percent of Births with First Trimester Prenatal Care, the second priority classification:

- Mora
- Colfax
- Lea
- Dona Ana
- Eddy
- San Miguel

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Maternal and Child Health Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities - Percent of Births Low Birth Weight

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Births Low Birth Weight in the period 2008-2019 is **8.8%**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 8.3%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with Percent of Births Low Birth Weight ranging from 6.7% to 14.7%. 20 counties have a Percent of Births Low Birth Weight higher than the statewide figure and 22 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a Very *High* Percent of Births Low Birth Weight, the highest priority classification:

- Colfax
- Hidalgo
- Rio Arriba
- Catron
- Harding
- San Miguel
- Taos

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Births Low Birth Weight, the second priority classification:

- Santa Fe
- Torrance
- Grant

- Lincoln
- Cibola
- Sierra

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Maternal and Child Health Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Births that were Pre-Term</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Births that were Pre-term in the period 2008-2019 is **9.6%%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 10.0%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with pre-term birth percent ranging 5.3% to 13.7%. 13 counties have a pre-term birth percent higher than the statewide figure and 10 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Births that were Pre-Term, the highest priority classification:

- Colfax
- Harding
- Hidalgo
- Grant
- Socorro
- Torrance

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Births that were Pre-Term, the second priority classification:

- Valencia
- Sandoval
- Sierra
- Bernalillo
- Lea
- Curry
- Guadalupe

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Maternal and Child Health Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Adolescent Births per 1,000 Girls Age 15-19</u>

The New Mexico statewide rate of Adolescent Births per 1,000 Girls Age 15-19 in the period 2010-2019 is **36.9.** This is *substantially higher* than a comparable US national figure of 17.4. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the adolescent birth rate ranging from 0.0 to 81.9. 19 counties have an adolescent

birth rate higher than the statewide figure and 30 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** rate of Adolescent Births per 1,000 Girls Age 15-19, the highest priority classification:

- Luna
- Curry
- Lea
- Quay
- Eddy
- Sierra

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* rate of Adolescent Births per 1,000 Girls Age 15-19, the second priority classification:

- Cibola
- Chaves
- Otero
- Socorro
- McKinley
- Rio Arriba
- Lincoln

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Maternal and Child Health Tables section of the Attachments.

Combined Maternal and Child Health Disparity Index

As discussed previously, the OPCRH calculated a combined index score for each of New Mexico's counties that reflects its ranking for the four health status indicators used in this portion of the assessment. Two counties had the highest combined score, indicating the worst relative Maternal and Child Health status:

- Harding
- Sierra

One additional county had the next highest scores, and fell into the second priority category:

Colfax

Detailed scores and rankings are displayed in the Maternal and Child Health Tables section of the Attachments.

Health Disparity Assessment – Social Determinants of Health

<u>Overview</u>

OPCRH conducted an analysis of the Social Determinants of Health in the state to identify locations with substantially higher structural challenges to population health. This analysis is used to prioritize locations for targeted investments in health promotion and disease/disability prevention. It is also used to prioritize locations for coordinated service improvement efforts linked to targeted health promotion and disease/disability prevention.

Methodology

The OPCRH chose several social determinant measures in its analysis:

- Percent Population in Poverty,
- Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty
- Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty
- Unemployed Percent of Civilian Workforce
- Percent Civilian Population with No Health Insurance
- Percent of Population 5 and Over with Low English Proficiency

County data for each of these were assessed, and counties were ranked for each indicator. Tables for each indicator are included in the Attachments.

The OPCRH further extended its assessment of health disparities by creating a **Social Determinants of Health Disparity Index**. This index was calculated as a weighted score for each county in New Mexico combining the 6 measures. The resulting score is an indicator of a county's *overall* Social Determinants of Health status. It permits identification of high priority counties for general health promotion and disease/disability prevention efforts. This ranking is also included in the Attachments.

The detailed assessment is described below.

Disparities – Percent Population in Poverty

The New Mexico statewide Percent Population in Poverty in the period 2015-2019 is **19.1%**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 13.4%. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the poverty percent ranging from 4.4% to 34.8%. 20 counties have a Percent Population in Poverty higher than the statewide figure and 29 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent Population in Poverty, the highest priority classification:

McKinley

- Socorro
- San Miguel
- Luna
- Sierra
- Dona Ana
- Cibola

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent Population in Poverty, the second priority classification:

- Hidalgo
- Roosevelt
- Grant
- Rio Arriba
- Torrance
- Otero
- San Juan

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Social Determinants of Health Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty in the period 2015-2019 is **26.7%**. This is substantially *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 18.5%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the under 18 poverty percent ranging from 3.0% to 43.9%. 20 counties have a Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty higher than the statewide figure and 28 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Quay
- Sierra
- Mora
- Dona Ana
- Harding
- Socorro

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty, the second priority classification:

- Grant
- Luna

- San Miguel
- Union
- Hidalgo
- Cibola
- Colfax

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Social Determinants of Health Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty in the period 2015-2019 is **12.0%**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 9.3%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the 65 and Over poverty percent ranging from 5.5% to 24.1%. 19 counties have a Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty higher than the statewide figure and 26 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Rio Arriba
- Cibola
- San Miguel
- Torrance
- Mora
- Luna

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty, the second priority classification:

- San Juan
- Chaves
- Hidalgo
- Dona Ana
- Lea
- Socorro

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Social Determinants of Health Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities – Unemployed Percent of the Civilian Workforce

The New Mexico statewide Unemployed Percent of the Civilian Workforce in October, 2020 was 8.5%. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 8.1%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the unemployment percentage ranging from 3.6% to 13.6%. 8 counties have an unemployment rate higher than the statewide figure and 12 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Unemployed Percent of the Civilian Workforce, the highest priority classification:

- Luna
- Lea
- McKinley
- Taos
- Grant
- Cibola

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Unemployed Percent of the Civilian Workforce, the second priority classification:

- San Juan
- Sierra
- Chaves
- Lincoln
- Torrance
- Otero

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Social Determinants of Health Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Civilian Population with No Health Insurance</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Civilian Population with No Health Insurance in the period 2015-2019 was 9.6%. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 8.8%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the uninsured population percentage ranging from 3.2% to 19.9%. 12 counties have an uninsured percentage higher than the statewide figure and 15 counties are higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Civilian Population with No Health Insurance, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Union
- San Juan

- Lea
- Roosevelt
- Santa Fe

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Civilian Population with No Health Insurance, the second priority classification:

- Catron
- Curry
- Lincoln
- Dona Ana
- Chaves
- Taos
- Eddy

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Social Determinants of Health Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Population 5 and Over with Low English Proficiency</u>

The New Mexico Percent of Population 5 and Over with Low English Proficiency in the period 2015-2019 was **8.7%**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 8.4%. There is significant variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the low English proficiency population percentage ranging from 1.2% to 16.8%. 11 counties have a low English proficiency percentage higher than the statewide figure and the same 11 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Population 5 and Over with Low English Proficiency, the highest priority classification:

- Luna
- Dona Ana
- Guadalupe
- Lea
- Socorro
- Otero
- San Miguel

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Civilian Population with No Health Insurance, the second priority classification:

Chaves

- McKinley
- Santa Fe
- Roosevelt
- Taos
- Curry
- Bernalillo

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Social Determinants of Health Tables section of the Attachments.

Combined Social Determinants of Health Disparity Index

As discussed previously, the OPCRH calculated a combined index score for each of New Mexico's counties that reflects its ranking for the six Social Determinants of indicators used in this portion of the assessment. One county had the highest combined score, indicating most challenging social determinants:

McKinley

Two other counties had the next highest scores, and fall into the second priority:

- Luna
- Dona Ana

Detailed scores and rankings are displayed in the Health Status Tables section of the Attachments.

Health Disparity Assessment – Morbidity and Health Risk

<u>Overview</u>

OPCRH conducted an analysis of Morbidity and Health Risk in the state to identify locations with substantially higher illness and disability measures as well as the higher likelihood for development of future illness an disability. This analysis is used to prioritize locations for targeted investments in health promotion and disease/disability prevention. It is also used to prioritize locations for clinical improvement efforts linked to targeted health promotion and disease/disability prevention.

Methodology

The OPCRH chose several direct measures of health status in its analysis:

- Percent of Adults Heart Disease or Heart Attack,
- Percent of Adults Diagnosed Cancer,
- Percent of Adults Diagnosed Stroke,
- Percent of Adults Diagnosed Diabetes,
- Percent of Adults Diagnosed COPD,
- Percent of Adults Overweight or Obese,
- Percent of Adults Current Smokers.
- Percent of Adults Binge Drinkers, and
- Percent of Adults Diagnosed Depression.

County data for each of these were assessed, and counties were ranked for each indicator. Tables for each indicator are included in the Attachments.

The OPCRH further extended its assessment of health disparities by creating a **Combined Morbidity and Health Risk Disparity Index**. This index was calculated as a weighted score for each county in New Mexico combining the 9 measures. The resulting score is an indicator of a county's *overall* morbidity and health risk status. It permits identification of high priority counties for general health promotion and disease/disability prevention efforts. This ranking is also included in the Attachments.

The detailed assessment is described below.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Heart Disease or Heart Attack</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults with Heart Disease or Heart Attack in the period 2011-2019 is **5.5**%. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 6.3%. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults with heart disease or heart attack ranging from 3.3% to 15.0%. 21 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 13 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults with Heart Disease or Heart Attack, the highest priority classification:

- Harding
- Curry
- De Baca
- Lea
- Lincoln
- Otero

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults with Heart Disease or Heart Attack, the second priority classification:

- Chaves
- Luna
- Eddy
- Mora
- Roosevelt
- Colfax

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities - Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Cancer

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Cancer in the period 2011-2019 is **9.9%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 13.9%. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults diagnosed with cancer ranging from 5.3% to 14.1%. 21 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and only 1 county higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Cancer, the highest priority classification:

- Sierra
- Quay
- Los Alamos
- Lincoln
- Torrance
- Valencia

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults with Diagnosed Cancer, the second priority classification:

- Harding
- Otero
- Grant
- Catron
- Santa Fe
- Lea

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Stroke</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Stroke in the period 2011-2019 is **2.6%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 3.2%. There is variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults diagnosed with stoke ranging from 1.1% to 4.8%. 17 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 10 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Stroke, the highest priority classification:

- Mora
- Socorro
- Lincoln
- Cibola
- Sierra

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Stroke, the second priority classification:

- Curry
- Eddy
- Otero
- San Juan
- San Miguel
- Roosevelt
- Torrance

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities – Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Diabetes

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Diabetes in the period 2011-2019 is **10.3%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 10.9%. There is

substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults diagnosed with diabetes ranging from 3.4% to 16.2%. 20 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 16 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Diabetes, the highest priority classification:

- Cibola
- McKinley
- Socorro
- Union
- Mora
- San Miguel

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults Diagnosed with Diabetes, the second priority classification:

- Luna
- Chaves
- Eddy
- Dona Ana
- Lea
- Rio Arriba

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities – Percent of Adults Diagnosed with COPD

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults Diagnosed with COPD in the period 2011-2019 is **5.6**%. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 6.5%. There is variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults diagnosed with diabetes ranging from 3.1% to 10.5%. 21 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 14 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults Diagnosed with COPD, the highest priority classification:

- Quay
- Curry
- Sierra
- Colfax
- Lea
- Otero

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults Diagnosed with COPD, the second priority classification:

- De Baca
- Hidalgo
- Eddy
- Chaves
- San Miguel
- Valencia

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities - Percent of Adults Overweight or Obese

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults Overweight or Obese in the period 2011-2019 is **64.6%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 66.7%. There is variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults overweight or obese ranging from 47.8% to 84.3%. 23 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 16 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults Overweight or Obese, the highest priority classification:

- Guadalupe
- Luna
- McKinley
- Mora
- Cibola
- Lea

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults Overweight or Obese, the second priority classification:

- De Baca
- Eddy
- Chaves
- San Juan
- Union
- San Miguel

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Disparities - Percent of Adults - Current Smokers

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults who were Current Smokers in the period 2011-2019 is **18.8%**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 16.0%. There is variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults reporting current smoking ranging from 9.7% to 29.5%. 22 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 29 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults who were Current Smokers, the highest priority classification:

- Sierra
- Torrance
- Socorro
- Quay
- Valencia
- Lincoln

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults who were Current Smokers, the second priority classification:

- Curry
- Guadalupe
- Catron
- De Baca
- Luna
- San Miguel

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Adults - Binge Drinkers</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults who were Binge Drinkers in the period 2011-2019 is **15.4%**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national figure of 16.8%. There is variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults reporting binge drinking ranging from 10.6% to 23.0%. 15 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 12 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults who were Binge Drinkers, the highest priority classification:

- Harding
- Guadalupe
- Mora
- Hidalgo
- Socorro

Lincoln

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults who were Binge Drinkers, the second priority classification:

- Grant
- Dona Ana
- Quay
- Lea
- Sandoval
- Eddy

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

<u>Disparities – Percent of Adults with Diagnosed Depression</u>

The New Mexico statewide Percent of Adults with Diagnosed Depression in the period 2011-2019 is **19.8%**. This is slightly *higher* than a comparable US national figure of 19.7%. There is variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with the percent of adults diagnosed with depression ranging from 10.3% to 26.7%. 15 counties have a percentage higher than the statewide figure and 16 counties higher than the national figure.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a **Very High** Percent of Adults with Diagnosed Depression, the highest priority classification:

- Torrance
- Quay
- De Baca
- San Miguel
- Sierra
- Luna

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having a *High* Percent of Adults with Diagnosed Depression, the second priority classification:

- Colfax
- Hidalgo
- Socorro
- Guadalupe
- Bernalillo
- Lincoln

Detailed data and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Combined Morbidity and Health Risk Disparity Index

As discussed previously, the OPCRH calculated a combined index score for each of New Mexico's counties that reflects its ranking for the nine morbidity and health used in this portion of the assessment. One county had the highest combined score, indicating the worst relative overall morbidity and health risk:

Lincoln

Five other counties had the next highest scores:

- Sierra
- Lea
- Mora
- Quay
- Socorro

Detailed scores and rankings are displayed in the Morbidity and Health Risk Tables section of the Attachments.

Health Disparity Assessment - Mortality

Overview

OPCRH conducted an analysis of mortality in the state to identify locations with substantially higher mortality rates linked to different causes. This analysis is used to prioritize locations for targeted investments in health promotion and disease/disability prevention. It is also used to prioritize locations for clinical improvement efforts linked to targeted health promotion and disease/disability prevention.

Methodology

The OPCRH used a sequential process to choose the key mortality rates to be used in its analysis. The analysis began with identification of the five leading causes of death for the *general population* of the state as well as for the *Hispanic and Native American populations* of the state. These are presented in tables in the Attachments.

There is significant overlap between the major causes of deaths for all three populations. However, the two racial/ethnic populations had additional distinct leading causes of death. Both groups had Diabetes Mellitus as a top cause of death, and Native Americans had Chronic Liver Disease/Cirrhosis as a top cause. Combining these mortality considerations for the three populations yielded a list of seven concerning causes of mortality

OPCRH expanded the analysis to examine several possible measures of *behavioral health related causes of death*. Substance abuse, alcohol and suicide measures were explored. OPCRH chose a combined behavioral health related mortality measure – *Deaths of Despair*. This measure combines all three of these causes of death. Based upon previous experience, the OPCRH felt that the combined measure is a better indicator of overall behavioral health disparities than any one component.

The analysis produced a final set of 8 mortality rates to be used for the assessment:

- Heart Disease,
- Cancer,
- Unintentional Injuries,
- Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease,
- Stroke.
- Diabetes Mellitus.
- Chronic Liver Disease/Cirrhosis, and
- Deaths of Despair.

County age-adjusted mortality rates for each of these causes were assessed, and counties with the highest rates for each cause identified.

The OPCRH further extended its assessment of health disparities by creating a **Combined Mortality Disparity Index**. This index was calculated as a weighted score for

each county in New Mexico that combining the 8 different mortality rate disparities. The resulting score is an indicator of a county's *overall* health disparities. It permits identification of high priority counties for general health promotion and disease/disability prevention efforts.

The detailed assessment is described below.

Heart Disease Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Heart Disease in the period 2015-2019 is **149.6 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national rate of 163.6. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 231.0 to 70.4. 20 counties exceed the statewide rate and 12 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** heart disease mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- Chaves
- Sierra
- Lea
- Luna
- Quay
- Curry
- Eddy

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* heart disease mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Guadalupe
- Hidalgo
- Roosevelt
- Otero
- Torrance
- San Miguel

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Cancer Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Cancer in the period 2015-2019 is **136.9 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national rate of 149.1. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 263.4 to 104.8. 17 counties exceed the statewide rate and 11 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Cancer mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- Harding
- Luna
- Sierra
- Quay
- De Baca
- Lea
- Guadalupe

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Cancer mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Otero
- Torrance
- Curry
- Eddy
- McKinley
- Chaves
- Valencia

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Unintentional Injury Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Unintentional Injuries in the period 2010-2019 is **66.3 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national rate of 48.0. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 145.1 to 28.1. 18 counties exceed the statewide rate and 30 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Unintentional Injury mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- Rio Arriba
- Mora
- Catron
- McKinley
- De Baca
- Sierra
- San Miguel

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Unintentional Injury mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- San Juan
- Guadalupe
- Torrance
- Socorro
- Cibola
- Hidalgo
- Taos

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease in the period 2010-2019 is **43.2 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national rate of 39.7. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 84.6 to 0.5. 11 counties exceed the statewide rate and 15 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- Sierra
- Eddy
- Torrance
- Curry
- Chaves
- Roosevelt
- Lea

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Quay
- Valencia
- Otero
- Luna
- San Juan
- Guadalupe
- San Miguel

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Stroke Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Stroke in the period 2010-2019 is **33.1 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is *lower* than a comparable US national rate of 37.1. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 42.8 to 30.4. 14 counties exceed the statewide rate and 5 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Stroke mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- Quay
- Socorro
- Luna
- De Baca
- Lea
- Torrance
- Valencia

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Stroke mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Bernalillo
- McKinley
- Dona Ana
- Rio Arriba
- Eddy
- Harding
- Sandoval

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Diabetes Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Diabetes in the period 2010-2019 is **26.7 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is *higher* than a comparable US national rate of 21.4. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 60.7 to 8.9. 19 counties exceed the statewide rate and 29 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Diabetes mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Cibola
- Mora
- Socorro
- Curry
- Chaves
- Union

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Diabetes mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Rio Arriba
- De Baca
- San Miguel
- San Juan
- Hidalgo
- Sierra
- Lea

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Chronic Liver Disease and Cirrhosis Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Chronic Liver Disease and Cirrhosis in the period 2010-2019 is **22.5 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is substantially *higher* than a comparable US national rate of 10.7. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 64.6 to 0.0. 14 counties exceed the statewide rate and 29 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Chronic Liver Disease and Cirrhosis mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- McKinley
- Rio Arriba
- Cibola
- San Miguel
- Socorro
- San Juan
- De Baca

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Chronic Liver Disease and Cirrhosis mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Quay
- Guadalupe
- Colfax
- Chaves
- Grant
- Luna
- Taos

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Deaths of Despair Mortality Disparities

The New Mexico statewide age-adjusted mortality rate for Deaths of Despair [substance abuse, alcohol and suicide] in the period 2015-2019 is **78.4 deaths per 100,000 population**. This is substantially *higher* than a comparable US national rate of 45.9. It is also the third leading cause of death in New Mexico for the general population. There is substantial variation on this indicator in the state's 33 counties, with rates ranging from 177.6 to 0.0. 15 counties exceed the statewide rate and 29 counties exceed the national rate.

As part of the assessment OPCRH divided New Mexico counties into 5 categories using this indicator. The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as having **Very High** Deaths of Despair mortality rates, the highest priority classification:

- Rio Arriba
- McKinley
- Taos
- Hidalgo
- San Juan
- San Miguel
- Quay

The following counties, in ranked order, were categorized as *High* Deaths of Despair mortality rates – the second priority classification:

- Colfax
- Lincoln
- Sierra
- Cibola
- Socorro
- Grant
- Eddy

Detailed rates and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Combined Mortality Disparity Index

As discussed previously, the OPCRH calculated a combined index score for each of New Mexico's counties that reflects its ranking for the eight mortality indicators used in the assessment. Three counties had the highest scores, indicating the highest relative mortality rates. They are in the **Very High Mortality Disparity** category:

- McKinley
- Quay
- Sierra

Three other counties had the next highest scores, and fall into the second priority *High Mortality Disparity* category:

- De Baca
- Lea
- San Miguel

Detailed scores and rankings are displayed in the Mortality Tables section of the Attachments.

Health Services Disparity - Assessment of Primary Care Access

Overview

The OPCRH has comprehensively divided the state into a matrix of pre-defined primary care services (PRSAs). These PRSAs are based upon market regions defined by the Dartmouth Atlas of Health Care. Separate PRSAs are defined for primary medical care services, primary dental care services and primary behavioral health services.

PRSAs are the building blocks for HPSA analysis and shortage designation within the state. On an annual basis OPCRH comprehensively assesses all PRSAs within the state to identify primary care shortages. It assesses primary care needs for the *general population* - resulting in the designation of geographic HPSAs - and the primary care needs of the *low-income population* — resulting in low-income population HPSAs. OPCRH also identifies the special primary care needs of Native American populations, leading to the designation of Native American population HPSAs. Finally, OPCRH analyzes the operations of *health safety net facilities* including community health centers, rural health clinics, IHS service units and correctional institutions to designate the special *primary care needs of populations served by these facilities*.

OPCRH used the comprehensive dataset prepared for its HPSA designation efforts as the basis for assessment of primary care access. The data for geographic HPSAs were used as a basis for assessing the relative *availability* of primary care services for areas in the state. The data for low-income population HPSAs were used as the basis for assessing the relative *affordability* of primary care services in areas of the state. The data for auto-designated facility HPSAs – FQHC and IHS/Tribal HPSAs - were used as the basis for assessing the relative *acceptability* of primary care services for the special needs of populations served by these safety net agencies.

OPCRH oversees a mix of funding and other resources. As additional resources become available the needs identified in this assessment can guide further investments designed to improve access to primary care services. Depending on the program, these investments can be directed to improve the availability, affordability or acceptability of primary care for the underserved.

Details of the assessment and prioritization are presented below.

Primary Care Availability Assessment

The OPCRH reviewed all geographic, general population HPSAs in New Mexico to identify areas of the state with the greatest lack of primary care service capacity. This analysis was conducted separately for primary medical care, primary dental care and mental health care HPSAs. The analysis both looked at areas with the greatest **absolute** lack of availability – i.e., areas with the greatest **relative** lack of availability – i.e., areas with the

largest *percentage* of the population facing inadequate primary care supply. This two-pronged perspective provides a way of balancing analysis of the needs of urban, rural and frontier parts of the state. As part of the review, the OPCRH developed a separate index combining the two approaches, providing a way of identifying areas with the greatest absolute *and* relative needs for primary care.

Primary Medical Care Availability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Absolute Availability HPSAs with the greatest total population availability needs are listed below:
 - San Juan County
 - McKinley County
 - Lea County
 - Valencia County
 - Southern Dona Ana
- **Relative Availability** HPSAs with the greatest relative population availability needs are listed below: All have *no* physician providers:
 - Southern Sandoval
 - Cuba
 - o Hatch
 - Mora County
 - Catron County
 - De Baca County
 - Harding County
- **Combined Availability Index** HPSAs with the greatest combined absolute and relative availability needs:
 - Southern Sandoval
 - McKinley County
 - Socorro County
 - o Cerrillos/Madrid/Edgewood
 - Lea County

Primary Dental Care Availability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Absolute Availability HPSAs with the greatest total population availability needs are listed below:
 - Southwest Valley Service Area
 - Lea County
 - Southern Dona Ana
 - Otero County
 - Cerrillos/Madrid/Edgewood

- **Relative Availability** HPSAs with the greatest relative population availability needs are listed below: All have *no* dentist providers:
 - North/Western Rio Arriba
 - Quay County
 - Hatch
 - o Guadalupe County
 - Union County
 - Catron County
 - Harding County
- Combined Availability Index HPSAs with the greatest combined absolute and relative availability needs:
 - Lea County
 - Cerrillos/Madrid/Edgewood
 - Southwest Valley Service Area
 - North/Western Rio Arriba
 - Southern Dona Ana

Primary Mental Health Care Availability - The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Absolute Availability HPSAs with the greatest total population availability needs are listed below:
 - Southeastern Catchment Area
 - Catchment Area 1
 - Dona Ana County
 - Sandoval County
 - o Plains Mental Health Service Area
- Relative Availability HPSAs with the greatest relative population availability needs are listed below: All have no psychiatrist providers:
 - Southwest Valley
 - Valencia County
 - Rio Arriba County
 - South Central Catchment Area
 - San Miguel County
 - Cibola County
 - Colfax County
 - Torrance County
 - Mora County

- **Combined Availability Index** HPSAs with the greatest combined absolute and relative availability needs:
 - Southeastern Catchment Area
 - Southwest Valley
 - Sandoval County
 - Valencia County
 - Catchment Area 1

Primary Care Affordability Assessment

The OPCRH reviewed all low-income population HPSAs in New Mexico to identify areas of the state with the greatest barriers to *affordable* primary care services. This analysis was conducted separately for primary medical care, primary dental care and mental health care HPSAs. The analysis looked both at areas with the greatest *absolute* lack of affordability – i.e., areas with the largest populations facing inadequate access to affordable primary care – and areas with the greatest *relative* lack of affordability – i.e., areas with the largest *percentage* of the population facing inadequate access to affordable primary care. This two-pronged perspective provides a way of balancing analysis of the needs of urban, rural and frontier parts of the state. As part of the review, the OPCRH developed a separate index combining the two approaches, providing a way of identifying areas with the greatest absolute and relative affordability challenges.

Primary Medical Care Affordability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- **Absolute Affordability** HPSAs with the largest low-income population affordability needs are listed below:
 - Low Income South East Heights
 - Low Income Otero County
 - Low Income Santa Fe/La Familia
 - Low Income Eddy County
 - Low Income Taos County
- Relative Affordability HPSAs with the greatest relative low-income population affordability needs are listed below: All have no physician providers with provisions for serving low-income patients:
 - Low Income South East Heights
 - Low Income Santa Fe/La Familia
 - Low Income Taos County
 - Low Income Luna County
 - Low Income San Miguel County
 - Low Income Grant County
 - Low Income Otero County

- **Combined Affordability Index** HPSAs with the greatest combined absolute *and* relative affordability needs:
 - Low Income South East Heights
 - Low Income Otero County
 - o Low Income Santa Fe/La Familia
 - Low Income Taos County
 - Low Income Luna County

Primary Dental Care Affordability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Absolute Affordability HPSAs with the largest low-income population affordability needs are listed below:
 - Low Income San Juan County
 - Low Income McKinley County
 - Low Income Valencia County
 - Low Income North Valley
 - Low Income Chaves County
- Relative Affordability HPSAs with the greatest relative low-income population affordability needs are listed below: All have no dentist providers with provisions for serving low-income patients:
 - Low Income McKinley County
 - Low Income San Juan County
 - Low Income Valencia County
 - Low Income North Valley
 - Low Income Chaves County
 - Low Income La Familia
 - Low Income Taos County
 - Low Income San Miguel County
 - o Low Income Espanola
 - Low Income Roosevelt County
- Combined Affordability Index HPSAs with the greatest combined absolute and relative affordability needs:
 - Low Income McKinley County
 - o Low Income San Juan County
 - Low Income Valencia County
 - Low Income North Valley
 - Low Income Chaves County

Primary Mental Health Care Affordability – There are only two low-income population mental health care HPSAs in New Mexico:

- Low Income Santa Fe County
- Low Income North Valley

The low-income population of the Santa Fe County HPSA is over 50,000 – about 60% larger than the low-income population of the North Valley HPSA. Neither of the HPSAs have psychiatrist providers with provisions for serving low-income patients. This means that the relative needs of the two HPSAs are the same.

Primary Care Acceptability Assessment

The OPCRH reviewed *health safety net facility HPSAs* in New Mexico to identify special needs of populations served by these safety net agencies. Each facility is designated by the Federal government after a review that evaluates the access barriers faced by the population targeted by the facility. This includes an evaluation of the special needs of low-income, racial/ethnic minority and non-English speaking populations served by the facility. A facility receives a HPSA score which reflects the unmet needs of the target population.

The OPCRH assessed the relative needs of these of these facilities using the HPSA scores calculated by the Federal government. OPCRH created separate priority lists for Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) and Indian Health Service (IHS) and tribal facilities. Separate listings were created for primary medical care, dental care and mental health care facility HPSAs.

Primary Medical Care Acceptability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Priority FQHC Facilities FQHC facility HPSAs with the highest special population needs are listed below:
 - El Centro Family Health
 - Las Clinicas Del Norte
 - Albuquerque Health Care for the Homeless
 - o First Choice Community Healthcare
 - First Nations Community Health Source
 - Hidalgo Medical Services
 - Mora Valley Community Health Services
- **Priority IHS/Tribal Facilities** IHS/Tribal facility HPSAs with the highest special population needs are listed below:
 - Pine Hill Health Center
 - Acoma-Canoncito-Laguna Indian Hospital
 - o Canoncito Health Center
 - Crownpoint Healthcare Facility
 - Gallup Indian Medical Center
 - Laguna Health Center

- Pueblo Pintado Health Station
- Santa Clara Health Center
- Santa Fe Indian School.
- Santa Fe Indian Hospital
- Thoreau Health Station
- Tohatchi Health Center
- Zuni Indian Hospital

Primary Dental Care Acceptability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Priority FQHC Facilities FQHC facility HPSAs with the highest special population needs are listed below:
 - Albuquerque Health Care for the Homeless
 - La Familia Medical Center
 - St. Luke's Health Care Clinic
 - Las Clinicas Del Norte
 - La Clinica De Familia
 - El Centro Family Health
 - First Nations Community Health Source
 - Mora Valley Community Health Services
 - La Casa De Buena Salud
 - Ben Archer Health Center
 - First Choice Community Healthcare
 - Presbyterian Medical Services
 - De Baca Family Practice Clinic
- Priority IHS/Tribal Facilities IHS/Tribal facility HPSAs with the highest special population needs are listed below:
 - Zuni Indian Hospital
 - Pine Hill Health Center
 - Thoreau Health Station
 - Pueblo Pintado Health Station
 - Gallup Indian Medical Center

Primary Mental Health Care Acceptability – The results of the review are summarized below. Detailed tables are included in the Attachments.

- Priority FQHC Facilities FQHC facility HPSAs with the highest special population needs are listed below:
 - Las Clinicas Del Norte
 - La Clinica De Familia
 - La Casa De Buena Salud
 - Ben Archer Health Center

- o El Centro Family Health
- Mora Valley Community Health Services
- Hidalgo Medical Services
- **Priority IHS/Tribal Facilities** IHS/Tribal facility HPSAs with the highest special population needs are listed below:
 - o Zuni Indian Hospital
 - o Pine Hill Health Center
 - o Thoreau Health Station
 - Pueblo Pintado Health Station
 - o Gallup Indian Medical Center

Advisory Group Data Assessment – Priorities

<u>Overview</u>

The OPCRH empaneled an Advisory Group to review the detailed data of its primary care needs assessment. The Group was asked to evaluate the data and suggest priority targets for future program investments based upon the data rankings. The Group included representatives of the New Mexico Primary Care Association, New Mexico Health Resources and several partner programs of the New Mexico Department. This included representatives of the Department's chronic disease programs. The Advisory Group met for entire morning in its review. A summary of its discussions and recommendations are included in this section.

Review of Health Status Indicators

The Advisory Group reviewed the Health Status data tables prepared for the Needs Assessment. They discussed the overall quality of the data and its usefulness of the indicators in the measurement of health status. The Advisory Group identified the Years of Potential Life Lost measure as an important indicator of premature, preventable mortality. The Group found that the other data Rankings were consistent with previous assessments and experience.

The Advisory Group agreed that the following counties with Very High YPLL per 100,000 population, should be recognized as the areas with the poorest health status:

- McKinley
- Rio Arriba
- De Baca
- Mora
- Cibola
- Colfax
- Torrance

Review of Maternal and Child Health Indicators

The Advisory Group reviewed the Maternal and Child Health (MCH) data tables prepared for the Needs Assessment. They discussed the overall quality of the data and its usefulness of the indicators in the measurement of MCH disparities. The Group found that the data Rankings were consistent with previous assessments and experience. The Advisory Group accepted the Combined Maternal and Child Health Disparity Index as a useful indicator of relative MCH needs.

The Advisory Group agreed that the following counties with a Very High Low Birth Weight Percentages, should be recognized as the areas with the greatest MCH needs:

- Colfax
- Hidalgo
- Rio Arriba
- Catron
- Harding
- San Miguel
- Taos

The Advisory Group discussed the particular challenges to be faced in responding to MCH needs. They discussed the changes in how prenatal care and deliveries are being provided In New Mexico. Fewer locations are doing deliveries and prenatal care. A restructuring of systems is needed, particularly for rural and frontier counties. The Group suggested that the OPCRH work with partners and primary care centers/rural hospitals to develop appropriate models.

Review of Social Determinants of Health Indicators

The Advisory Group reviewed the Social Determinants of Health (SDH) data tables prepared for the Needs Assessment. They discussed the overall quality of the data and its usefulness of the indicators in the measurement of SDH disparities. The Group found that the data Rankings were consistent with previous assessments and experience. The Advisory Group emphasized the importance of poverty as a major factor influencing Health.

The Advisory Group agreed that the following counties with a Very High Poverty Percentage, should be recognized as the areas with the greatest SDH needs:

- McKinley
- Socorro
- San Miguel
- Luna
- Sierra
- Dona Ana
- Cibola

The Advisory Group discussed the association of poverty disparities are with disparities of health status. Low English proficiency disparities – an indicator of other issues, including citizenship – also appeared to be associated with health status. While expansion of wraparound services for some client populations can address these disparities, it will be challenging to get at root causes. The Group suggested that the OPCRH work with selected primary care centers in high-risk areas to promote multi-agency responses.

Review of Mortality Indicators

The Advisory Group reviewed the Mortality data tables prepared for the Needs Assessment. These tables highlight the leading causes of death in the state for the general population, the Hispanic Population and the Native American population. The Group discussed the overall quality of the data and its usefulness of the indicators in the measurement of Mortality disparities. The Group found that, in general, the data Rankings were consistent with previous assessments and experience.

The Advisory Group agreed that the following counties with a Very High rates of Deaths of Despair, should be recognized as the areas with the greatest preventable mortality needs:

- Rio Arriba
- McKinley
- Taos
- Hidalgo
- San Juan
- San Miguel
- Quay

The Advisory Group approved the addition of mortality indicators specific to the Hispanic and Native American populations of the state was appropriate for analysis. The group was particularly concerned with the extend of mortality from Deaths of Despair. These deaths – including deaths from alcohol, drug overdose and suicide – were identified as being linked to depression. Some members of the group emphasized that poverty and the lack of meaningful work can increase depression in populations. The Group suggested that the OPCRH work with select primary care centers in high poverty areas to expand the screening and treatment of depression.

Review of Morbidity and Health Risk Indicators:

The Advisory Group reviewed the Morbidity and Health Risk data tables prepared for the Needs Assessment. The Group discussed the overall quality of the data and its usefulness of the indicators in the measurement of Disease, Disability and Health Risk disparities. The Group found that, in general, the data Rankings were consistent with previous assessments and experience.

The Advisory Group agreed that the following counties with a Very High or High Combined Morbidity and Health Risk Disparity Index be recognized as the areas with the greatest health risk:

Lincoln

- Sierra
- Lea
- Mora
- Quay
- Socorro

The Group identified multiple places where the data quality is suspect. There was discussion of the limits of hospitalization data and the potential error associated with the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. The reported BRFSS data on diagnosed diabetes was flagged as a potential undercount, particularly in light of diabetes mortality data. The Group identified overweight, obesity and smoking as significant continuing issues in the state. They may be related, in part, to depression issues discussed previously. The Group suggested that the OPCRH consider areas with these risk factors in its targeted efforts on depression.

Review of Primary Care Access:

The Advisory Group reviewed the Primary Care Access data tables prepared for the Needs Assessment. The Group examined the data for primary medical care, dental care and mental health access disparities throughout the state. The Group discussed the limits of using HPSA data and the usefulness of the HPSA data set in constructing indicators of primary care need. The Group found that, in general, the data Rankings were consistent with previous assessments and experience.

The Group recognized that the high levels of continuing primary care need in the state make it challenging to establish a way of allocating additional resources. There is a need to balance the *high percentage* of underserved in rural and frontier locations with the *large underserved population* needs of more urbanized areas. An allocation approach which targets both is necessary.

In recognition of this the Group suggested that allocation of new resources be targeted both to those areas *very high relative need* and *very high absolute need* as identified in the *availability* rankings. This might require a carve-out of resources for areas of high relative need – typically frontier and rural areas.

The Group also recognized that Low Income Population HPSAs with *very high relative* and absolute need are important priorities for allocation of new resources. These would be priority targets for new resources addressing areas where affordability is the primary concern.

Attachments - Population and Demographics Tables

Total Population and Rural/Urban Status

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2019 Estimates

County	Number of Persons	Persons per Square Mile	MSA Status	NMDOH County Category
Harding	657	0.3	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Catron	3,533	0.5	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
De Baca	1,840	0.8	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Union	4,090	1.1	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Hidalgo	4,242	1.2	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Guadalupe	4,419	1.5	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Mora	4,566	2.4	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Sierra	11,076	2.6	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Socorro	17,193	2.6	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Quay	8,396	2.9	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Colfax	11,903	3.2	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Lincoln	19,860	4.1	Non-Metro	Small Town Rural
Torrance	15,923	4.8	Metro	Large Metro
Cibola	26,801	5.9	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
San Miguel	27,969	5.9	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Rio Arriba	38,716	6.6	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Grant	27,862	7.0	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Roosevelt	19,901	8.1	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Luna	24,444	8.2	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Otero	67,700	10.2	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Chaves	64,104	10.6	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
McKinley	70,330	12.9	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Eddy	58,252	14.0	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Taos	32,513	14.8	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Lea	71,570	16.3	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
San Juan	126,122	22.9	Metro	Small Metro
Curry	49,915	35.5	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Sandoval	146,415	39.5	Metro	Large Metro
Dona Ana	218,836	57.5	Metro	Small Metro
Valencia	75,427	70.8	Metro	Large Metro
Santa Fe	149,635	78.4	Metro	Small Metro
Los Alamos	18,856	172.7	Non-Metro	Large Town Rural
Bernalillo	679,590	585.4	Metro	Large Metro
New Mexico Total	2,102,656	17.3		
Course	New Mexico Indicator Base	ed Information System [I	BIS]	
Source http://ibis.health.state.nm.us				

Population Age 65+

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2019 Estimates

County	Number of Persons	Percent Persons Age	
C-1	Age 65+	65+	
Catron	1,527	43.2%	
Harding	256	39.0%	
Sierra	4,149	37.5%	
Lincoln	5,801	29.2%	
Mora	1,317	28.8%	
De Baca	528	28.7%	
Grant	7,960	28.6%	
Taos	8,966	27.6%	
Colfax	3,254	27.3%	
Quay	2,160	25.7%	
Santa Fe	37,911	25.3%	
San Miguel	6,318	22.6%	
Hidalgo	953	22.5%	
Union	894	21.9%	
Torrance	3,419	21.5%	
Luna	5,184	21.2%	
Rio Arriba	7,771	20.1%	
Guadalupe	878	19.9%	
Socorro	3,397	19.8%	
Sandoval	27,029	18.5%	
Valencia	13,760	18.2%	
Los Alamos	3,412	18.1%	
Otero	11,725	17.3%	
Bernalillo	115,014	16.9%	
Cibola	4,490	16.8%	
Dona Ana	35,506	16.2%	
Chaves	10,355	16.2%	
San Juan	19,714	15.6%	
Roosevelt	2,921	14.7%	
Eddy	8,509	14.6%	
McKinley	9,058	12.9%	
Curry	6,404	12.8%	
Lea	8,138	11.4%	
New Mexico Total	378,675	18.0%	
Saaa	New Mexico Indicator Base	ed Information System [IBIS]	
Source	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Population Under Age 18

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2019 Estimates

County	Number of Persons	Percent Persons Under	
County	Under Age 18	Age 18	
Lea	21,248	29.7%	
McKinley	19,847	28.2%	
Eddy	15,436	26.5%	
Curry	13,106	26.3%	
San Juan	32,929	26.1%	
Luna	6,370	26.1%	
Chaves	16,626	25.9%	
Roosevelt	4,839	24.3%	
Dona Ana	53,158	24.3%	
Valencia	17,548	23.3%	
Cibola	6,231	23.2%	
Rio Arriba	8,940	23.1%	
Sandoval	33,462	22.9%	
Otero	15,469	22.8%	
Hidalgo	956	22.5%	
De Baca	411	22.3%	
Socorro	3,816	22.2%	
Los Alamos	4,146	22.0%	
Quay	1,793	21.4%	
Bernalillo	145,128	21.4%	
Guadalupe	903	20.4%	
Torrance	3,218	20.2%	
Grant	5,402	19.4%	
Union	769	18.8%	
Lincoln	3,620	18.2%	
Colfax	2,139	18.0%	
Santa Fe	26,305	17.6%	
San Miguel	4,903	17.5%	
Mora	798	17.5%	
Taos	5,621	17.3%	
Sierra	1,736	15.7%	
Catron	418	11.8%	
Harding	76	11.6%	
New Mexico Total	477,369	22.7%	
Source		ed Information System [IBIS]	
Source	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Hispanic Population

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2019 Estimates

County	Number of Hispanic	Percent Hispanic	
County	Persons	Persons	
Mora	3,711	81.3%	
Guadalupe	3,480	78.8%	
San Miguel	21,706	77.6%	
Rio Arriba	27,542	71.1%	
Dona Ana	150,376	68.7%	
Luna	16,587	67.9%	
Valencia	46,172	61.2%	
Lea	42,997	60.1%	
Hidalgo	2,470	58.2%	
Chaves	37,006	57.7%	
Taos	18,405	56.6%	
Socorro	8,805	51.2%	
Santa Fe	76,146	50.9%	
Grant	14,091	50.6%	
Eddy	29,419	50.5%	
Bernalillo	342,044	50.3%	
Colfax	5,862	49.2%	
Harding	315	47.9%	
Quay	3,877	46.2%	
De Baca	842	45.8%	
Torrance	6,964	43.7%	
Curry	21,634	43.3%	
Roosevelt	8,555	43.0%	
Union	1,758	43.0%	
Sandoval	58,376	39.9%	
Otero	26,033	38.5%	
Cibola	10,272	38.3%	
Lincoln	6,824	34.4%	
Sierra	3,437	31.0%	
San Juan	26,025	20.6%	
Catron	667	18.9%	
Los Alamos	3,481	18.5%	
McKinley	9,886	14.1%	
New Mexico Total	1,035,766	49.3%	
Source New Mexico Indicator Based Information System [IBIS]			
Jource	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Native American Population

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2019 Estimates

County	Number of Native	Percent Native	
County	Americans	American Population	
McKinley	52,985	75.3%	
Cibola	10,822	40.4%	
San Juan	50,024	39.7%	
Rio Arriba	5,599	14.5%	
Socorro	2,167	12.6%	
Sandoval	18,177	12.4%	
Otero	4,309	6.4%	
Taos	1,798	5.5%	
Bernalillo	30,517	4.5%	
Valencia	3,257	4.3%	
Catron	117	3.3%	
Lincoln	613	3.1%	
Santa Fe	4,010	2.7%	
Torrance	382	2.4%	
Sierra	185	1.7%	
Guadalupe	73	1.7%	
Colfax	178	1.5%	
Union	59	1.4%	
De Baca	25	1.4%	
Roosevelt	256	1.3%	
Grant	321	1.2%	
San Miguel	316	1.1%	
Eddy	654	1.1%	
Quay	89	1.1%	
Lea	642	0.9%	
Chaves	567	0.9%	
Los Alamos	163	0.9%	
Dona Ana	1,874	0.9%	
Curry	392	0.8%	
Luna	172	0.7%	
Mora	29	0.6%	
Hidalgo	23	0.5%	
Harding	1	0.2%	
New Mexico Total	190,798	9.1%	
Source		ed Information System [IBIS]	
Jource	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Attachments - Health Status Disparities Tables

Life Expectancy from Birth - In Years

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	Years from Birth	Quintile	
McKinley	72.3	1	
Sierra	73.5	1	
Rio Arriba	73.9	1	N
Eddy	75.2	1	Very Low
Quay	75.2	1	Ver
De Baca	75.6	1	
Chaves	76.0	1	
Lea	76.2	2	
Luna	76.2	2	
Cibola	76.3	2	
Curry	76.5	2	Low
San Juan	76.6	2	
Hidalgo	77.0	2	
San Miguel	77.2	2	
Socorro	77.2	3	
Guadalupe	77.4	3	ţ
Valencia	77.5	3	era
Colfax	77.8	3	Moderate
Otero	77.8	3	_ ≥
Torrance	77.9	3	
Roosevelt	78.2	4	_
Grant	78.3	4	
Lincoln	78.4	4	High
Bernalillo	78.5	4	<u> </u>
Sandoval	79.2	4	_
Mora	79.9	4	
Taos	80.1	5	4
Dona Ana	80.2	5	ے ا
Union	80.3	5	Very High
Santa Fe	81.3	5	
Catron	83.1	5	\ e
Los Alamos	83.7	5	
Harding	85.3	5	
NINA Chatandala	70.2		
NM Statewide	78.2		
US (2018)	78.7		
	Now Movies Indicates Des	d Information Susta	m [IDIC]
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base	•	ili [iRi2]
	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Life Expectancy from Age 65 - In Years

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	Years After 65	Quintile	
Sierra	18.0	1	
Eddy	18.5	1	
Curry	18.6	1	_ o.
Luna	18.6	1	Very Low
Lea	18.7	1	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Chaves	19.0	1	
Hidalgo	19.1	1	
Quay	19.2	2	
McKinley	19.6	2	
Cibola	20.0	2	
Valencia	20.0	2	Low
De Baca	20.1	2	_
Otero	20.1	2	
Union	20.3	2	
San Juan	20.4	3	
Bernalillo	20.5	3	9
Roosevelt	20.5	3	Moderate
Sandoval	20.5	3) po
San Miguel	20.5	3	Σ
Socorro	20.5	3	
Grant	21.0	4	
Torrance	21.1	4	
Dona Ana	21.3	4	45
Guadalupe	21.3	4	High
Rio Arriba	21.3	4	
Colfax	21.6	4	
Lincoln	22.3	5	
Los Alamos	22.6	5	
Santa Fe	22.8	5	Very High
Taos	23.4	5	H
Mora	25.5	5	/er
Catron	25.8	5	
Harding	27.0	5	
NM Statewide	20.6		
US (2017)	18.1		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base http://ibis.health.state.nr	•	em [IBIS]

Years of Potential Life Lost Before Age 75

- -- per 100,000 Population
- -- New Mexico Counties 2015-2019

County	YPLL per 100,000	Quintile	
McKinley	16,567.7	1	
Rio Arriba	13,864.9	1	
De Baca	13,097.1	1	igh
Mora	11,717.7	1	Very High
Cibola	11,275.7	1	Ver
Colfax	10,871.3	1	
Torrance	10,657.2	1	
San Juan	10,609.6	2	
Eddy	10,379.0	2	
San Miguel	10,146.9	2	ء
Chaves	9,699.8	2	High
Socorro	9,585.1	2	_
Guadalupe	9,573.2	2	
Quay	9,326.4	2	
Valencia	9,232.8	3	
Sierra	9,191.1	3	te
Lea	9,143.4	3	Moderate
Union	9,047.4	3	lod
Roosevelt	8,918.9	3	2
Grant	8,779.1	3	
Otero	8,679.5	4	_
Taos	8,455.0	4	
Bernalillo	8,414.3	4	Low
Curry	7,813.3	4	ַ נ
Hidalgo	7,778.8	4	_
Lincoln	7,694.0	4	
Luna	7,543.8	5	_
Sandoval	7,483.5	5	
Santa Fe	7,049.8	5	Very Low
Dona Ana	6,551.5	5	<u> </u>
Catron	6,396.2	5	%
Harding	4,412.2	5	4
Los Alamos	4,269.2	5	
NM Statewide	8,778.2		
US (2018)	6,715.9		
			<u> </u>
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	m [IBIS]
	http://ibis.health.state.nm	n.us	

Percent of Adult Population Reporting Fair or Poor Health

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adult Population	Quintile	
Hidalgo	28.0%	1	
Socorro	27.8%	1	
Luna	27.0%	1	Very High
Rio Arriba	26.7%	1] <u> </u>
Sierra	26.6%	1	/er
San Miguel	26.4%	1	
Mora Santa	26.3%	1	
Chaves	25.9%	2	
Quay	25.8%	2	
Guadalupe	25.3%	2	
Dona Ana	24.8%	2	High
Torrance	24.5%	2	Ξ
	+	2	
Lea	24.4%		-
Curry	24.3%	2	
		-	
Cibola	23.9%	3	
Eddy	23.5%	3	ate .
Valencia	22.8%	3	Moderate
McKinley	22.3%	3	lod
Otero	21.2%	3	Σ
San Juan	20.9%	3	
Taos	19.4%	4	
Grant	19.3%	4	
Union	19.3%	4	3
Colfax	19.2%	4	Low
Roosevelt	19.1%	4	
Lincoln	18.4%	4	
LIIICOIII	10.4/0	+	
Dannalille	10.00/	F	
Bernalillo	18.0%	5	
Santa Fe	16.8%	5	>
De Baca	16.3%	5	Very Low
Catron	16.2%	5	<u> </u>
Sandoval	15.6%	5	\ A
Harding	15.2%	5	
Los Alamos	7.2%	5	
NM Statewide	20.3%		
US (2018)	17.3%		
, ,			
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base http://ibis.health.state.nm		m [IBIS]

Percent of Civilian Population with a Disability

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	Percent of Population	Quintile	
Mora	33.6%	1	
Catron	31.0%	1	_
San Miguel	28.8%	1	gh
Sierra	26.1%	1	Very High
Cibola	24.4%	1	/er/
Socorro	24.2%	1	1
Harding	23.5%	1	1
_			
Colfax	22.9%	2	
Hidalgo	22.2%	2	1
Quay	21.8%	2	1 _
Union	21.2%	2	High
Valencia	20.3%	2	
Luna	20.1%	2	
Grant	19.9%	2	
Lincoln	19.8%	3	
Guadalupe	19.7%	3	e.
Roosevelt	18.8%	3	Moderate
Otero	18.6%	3	opo
Taos	17.8%	3	Ž
De Baca	17.7%	3	
Torrance	17.0%	4	
Curry	16.6%	4	
Chaves	16.4%	4	>
McKinley	16.3%	4	Low
Rio Arriba	14.9%	4	
San Juan	14.8%	4	
Dona Ana	14.1%	5	
Bernalillo	13.7%	5	
Sandoval	13.7%	5	}
Santa Fe	13.5%	5	V L
Eddy	13.3%	5	Very Low
Lea	11.3%	5	
Los Alamos	8.4%	5	
NM Statewide	15.3%		
US	12.6%		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Bas		m [IBIS
	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Health Status - Disparity Index Score -- New Mexico Counties

County	Health Disparity Score
Sierra	4
Chaves	3
Cibola	3
Hidalgo	3
Luna	3
Mora	3
Quay	3
Rio Arriba	3
San Miguel	3
De Baca	2.5
Eddy	2.5
McKinley	2.5
Socorro	2.5
Curry	2
Lea	2
Colfax	1.5
Torrance	1.5
Catron	1
Guadalupe	1
San Juan	1
Union	1
Valencia	1
Dona Ana	0.5
Grant	0.5
Otero	0.5
Bernalillo	0
Harding	0
Lincoln	0
Los Alamos	0
Roosevelt	0
Sandoval	0
Santa Fe	0
Taos	0

Attachments - Maternal and Child Health Disparities Tables

Percent of Births with First Trimester Prenatal Care

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	PCT Births With	Quintilo	
	First Tri PNC	Quintile	
Sierra	46.0%	1	
Harding	47.1%	1	>
Union	51.5%	1	Ĺ
Cibola	55.0%	1	Very Low
Chaves	55.2%	1	>
McKinley	55.2%	1	
Mora	55.4%	2	
Colfax	55.6%	2	
Lea	57.0%	2	Low
Dona Ana	58.5%	2	2
Eddy	59.0%	2	
San Miguel	59.0%	2	
Otero	59.7%	3	
Torrance	60.0%	3	
Catron	61.5%	3	ate
Guadalupe	61.6%	3	Moderate
Quay	62.5%	3	٩
Rio Arriba	63.3%	3	
Taos	64.1%	3	
Valencia	64.6%	4	
Hidalgo	64.9%	4	
Luna	64.9%	4	_
San Juan	65.3%	4	High
Socorro	65.4%	4	_
Lincoln	67.6%	4	
Roosevelt	67.7%	4	
Bernalillo	69.1%	5	
Santa Fe	69.1%	5	
Los Alamos	70.0%	5	igh
Sandoval	70.3%	5	Very High
De Baca	71.0%	5	Ver
Curry	73.1%	5	
Grant	78.9%	5	
NM	64.6%		
US (2018)	77.5%		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Bas		BIS]
	tp://ibis.health.state.nm.	us	

Percent Births Low Birth Weight

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2008-2019

County	Percent of Births	Quintile	
Colfax	14.7%	1	
Hidalgo	11.8%	1	
Rio Arriba	11.5%	1	Very High
Catron	10.9%	1	I >
Harding	10.9%	1	Ver
San Miguel	10.6%	1	
Taos	10.4%	1	
Santa Fe	10.2%	2	
Torrance	10.1%	2	
Grant	9.9%	2	High
Lincoln	9.6%	2	Ξ̈́
Cibola	9.5%	2	
Sierra	9.4%	2	
Guadalupe	9.3%	3	
Los Alamos	9.3%	3	a .
Bernalillo	9.1%	3	ate
Sandoval	9.1%	3	der
Valencia	9.0%	3	Moderate
Lea	8.9%	3	_
Socorro	8.9%	3	
Mora	8.7%	4	
Quay	8.4%	4	
Otero	8.3%	4	Low
Chaves	8.1%	4	9
Curry	8.1%	4	
McKinley	8.1%	4	
Dona Ana	7.9%	5	
Luna	7.9%	5	
Union	7.9%	5	o.
Eddy	7.8%	5	Very Low
San Juan	7.4%	5	Ve
Roosevelt	7.1%	5	
De Baca	6.7%	5	
NM Statewide	8.8%		
US (2018)	8.3%		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base		n [IBIS]
	http://ibis.health.state.nm	n.us	

Percent of Births that were Pre-Term

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2008-2019

County	Percent of Births	Quintile	
Colfax	13.7%	1	
Harding	12.7%	1	ų s
Hidalgo	11.2%	1	ij
Grant	11.0%	1	Very High
Socorro	11.0%	1	>
Torrance	10.8%	1	
Valencia	10.6%	2	
Sandoval	10.5%	2	
Sierra	10.3%	2	ء
Bernalillo	10.1%	2	High
Lea	10.0%	2	_
Curry	9.9%	2	
Guadalupe	9.9%	2	
Catron	9.6%	3	
Cibola	9.6%	3	o)
McKinley	9.6%	3	Moderate
Chaves	9.5%	3	ge
Lincoln	9.5%	3	Š
Quay	9.5%	3	
Rio Arriba	9.5%	3	
Roosevelt	9.4%	4	
Taos	9.3%	4	
Union	9.3%	4	Low
Otero	9.1%	4	ت
Eddy	9.0%	4	
Dona Ana	8.9%	4	
	2.00/	_	
San Miguel	8.8%	5	
Luna	8.3%	5	>
San Juan	8.3%	5	Гo
Los Alamos	8.2%	5	Very Low
Santa Fe	8.1%	5	×
Mora	7.7%	5	
De Baca	5.3%	5	
NINA Chata	0.694		
NM Statewide	9.6%		
US (2018)	10.0%		
	Name Administration 1	dlafa	[IDIC]
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base		II [IRI2]
	http://ibis.health.state.nm	.us	

Births per 1,000 Girls Age 15-19

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2010-2019

County	Measure	Quintile	
Luna	81.9	1	
Curry	64.1	1	ج
Lea	64.0	1	Hig
Quay	59.4	1	Very High
Eddy	58.7	1	
Sierra	54.3	1	
Cibola	50.5	2	
Chaves	50.3	2	
Otero	46.5	2	
Socorro	46.4	2	High
McKinley	43.6	2	_
Rio Arriba	41.5	2	
Lincoln	41.0	2	
San Juan	40.5	3	
Grant	40.1	3	
Roosevelt	39.8	3	ē
Dona Ana	39.6	3	Moderate
Colfax	39.3	3	po
Guadalupe	38.0	3	Σ
Torrance	36.4	3	
Hidalgo	34.7	3	
Taos	32.7	4	
San Miguel	32.2	4	
Union	32.1	4	Low
Valencia	31.6	4	임
Bernalillo	28.2	4	
Santa Fe	27.7	4	
Mora	25.1	5	
Sandoval	22.3	5	>
De Baca	20.9	5	Very Low
Catron	9.6	5	ery
Los Alamos	5.2	5	>
Harding	0.0	5	
NM Rate	36.9		
US Rate (2018)	17.4		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Based Information System [IBIS]		
Source	tp://ibis.health.state.nm	.us	

Maternal and Child Health - Disparity Index Score -- New Mexico Counties

County Health Disparity Score Harding 3 Sierra 3 Colfax 2.5 Cibola 2 Hidalgo 2 Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5		
Harding 3 Sierra 3 Colfax 2.5 Cibola 2 Hidalgo 2 Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5		
Sierra 3 Colfax 2.5 Cibola 2 Hidalgo 2 Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5		
Colfax 2.5 Cibola 2 Hidalgo 2 Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5		
Cibola 2 Hidalgo 2 Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Sierra	3
Hidalgo 2 Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Colfax	2.5
Lea 2 Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Cibola	2
Chaves 1.5 Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Hidalgo	2
Curry 1.5 Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Lea	2
Eddy 1.5 Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Chaves	1.5
Grant 1.5 McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Curry	1.5
McKinley 1.5 Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Eddy	1.5
Rio Arriba 1.5 San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Grant	1.5
San Miguel 1.5 Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	McKinley	1.5
Socorro 1.5 Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Rio Arriba	1.5
Torrance 1.5 Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	San Miguel	1.5
Catron 1 Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Socorro	1.5
Lincoln 1 Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Torrance	1.5
Luna 1 Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Catron	1
Quay 1 Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Lincoln	1
Taos 1 Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Luna	1
Union 1 Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Quay	1
Bernalillo 0.5 Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Taos	1
Dona Ana 0.5 Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Union	1
Guadalupe 0.5 Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Bernalillo	0.5
Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Dona Ana	0.5
Mora 0.5 Otero 0.5 Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Guadalupe	0.5
Sandoval 0.5 Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5		0.5
Santa Fe 0.5 Valencia 0.5	Otero	0.5
Valencia 0.5	Sandoval	0.5
	Santa Fe	0.5
De Baca 0	Valencia	0.5
	De Baca	0
Los Alamos 0	Los Alamos	0
Roosevelt 0	Roosevelt	0
San Juan 0	San Juan	0

Attachments - Social Determinants of Health Disparities Tables

Percent Population in Poverty

- -- New Mexico Counties
- **-- 2015-2019**

County	Percent of Population	Quintile	
McKinley	34.8%	1	
Socorro	29.7%	1	-
San Miguel	28.2%	1	gh
Luna	27.7%	1	Very High
Sierra	26.7%	1	
Dona Ana	26.4%	1	_
Cibola	26.1%	1	
Hidalgo	25.8%	2	
Roosevelt	24.9%	2	
Grant	24.0%	2	_ ا
Rio Arriba	24.0%	2	High
Torrance	23.7%	2	1 -
Otero	22.1%	2	
San Juan	21.0%	2	
Curry	20.9%	3	
Quay	20.4%	3	i e
Colfax	20.0%	3	Moderate
Mora	20.0%	3	po
Chaves	19.4%	3	Σ
Union	19.4%	3	-
Taos	18.3%	4	
Valencia	16.9%	4	
Bernalillo	16.7%	4	Low
Catron	16.4%	4	2 (
De Baca	16.0%	4	
Lea	15.8%	4	
Guadalupe	15.4%	5	
Eddy	14.6%	5	
Harding	14.3%	5	Š
Santa Fe	12.8%	5	Very Low
Sandoval	12.7%	5	Ver
Lincoln	10.6%	5	
Los Alamos	4.4%	5	
NINA Chataurida	40.40/		
NM Statewide US	19.1%		
03	13.4%		
C C C C C C C C C C	New Mexico Indicator Bas	sed Information Syste	m [IBIS]
Source	http://ibis.health.state.ni		

Percent Population Under 18 in Poverty

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

	Percent of		
County	Population	Quintile	
McKinley	43.9%	1	
Quay	42.6%	1	
Sierra	39.8%	1	igh
Mora	39.5%	1	I
Dona Ana	38.3%	1	Very High
Harding	37.7%	1	
Socorro	37.3%	1	
Grant	37.0%	2	
Luna	36.8%	2	
San Miguel	35.3%	2	ء
Union	35.0%	2	High
Hidalgo	34.2%	2	
Cibola	32.5%	2	
Colfax	31.8%	2	
Roosevelt	31.8%	3	
Otero	31.0%	3	at e
Curry	30.4%	3	lera
Rio Arriba	28.9%	3	Moderate
Torrance	28.6%	3	-
San Juan	27.4%	3	
Chaves	26.6%	4	
Catron	24.9%	4	_
Bernalillo -	23.8%	4	Low
Taos	23.4%	4	_
Guadalupe	22.7%	4	
Valencia	22.4%	4	
1	24.40/		
Lea	21.1% 19.0%	5 5	
Eddy	18.3%	5	3
Santa Fe Sandoval	16.7%	5	Very Low
	14.8%	5	ery
De Baca Lincoln	13.8%	5	>
Los Alamos	3.0%	5	
LO3 AlaillO3	3.0/6	J	
NM Statewide	26.7%		
US	18.5%		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Bar http://ibis.health.state.n	•	m [IBIS]

Percent Population 65 and Over in Poverty

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	Percent of		
	Population	Quintile	
McKinley	24.1%	1	
Rio Arriba	19.9%	1	
Cibola	18.9%	1	igh
San Miguel	18.9%	1	
Torrance	17.9%	1	Very High
Mora	17.8%	1	
Luna	16.9%	1	
Taos	15.9%	2	
San Juan	14.5%	2	
Chaves	14.3%	2	ے
Hidalgo	14.2%	2	High
Dona Ana	14.1%	2	
Lea	13.8%	2	
Socorro	13.7%	2	
Otero	13.5%	3	
Sierra	13.4%	3	ate
Colfax	13.2%	3	lera
Roosevelt	13.0%	3	Moderate
Guadalupe	12.1%	3	_
De Baca	12.0%	3	
Eddy	11.9%	4	
Union	11.8%	4	
Curry	11.6%	4	Low
Harding	11.0%	4	_
Valencia	11.0%	4	
Bernalillo	10.1%	4	
	0.007	_	
Santa Fe	9.0%	5	
Sandoval	8.5%	5	>
Lincoln	8.3%	5	Lo
Catron	7.8%	5	Very Low
Grant	7.3%	5	>
Quay	7.1%	5	
Los Alamos	5.5%	5	
NM Statewide	12.0%		
US	9.3%		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Based Information System [IB http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		m [IBIS]
	intip.//ibis.neartii.state.n	11.43	

Unemployed Percent Civilian Workforce

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- October 2020

County	PCT of Workforce	Quintile	
Luna	13.6	1	
Lea	11.5	1	ے
McKinley	10.6	1	Hig
Taos	10.3	1	Very High
Grant	9.8	1	۶
Cibola	9.4	1	
San Juan	9.3	2	
Sierra	9.3	2	
Chaves	8.5	2	High
Lincoln	8.5	2	ij
Torrance	8.4	2	
Otero	8.2	2	
Quay	7.8	3	
Sandoval	7.8	3	1
Valencia	7.8	3	ate
Rio Arriba	7.7	3	der
Santa Fe	7.7	3	Moderate
San Miguel	7.6	3	
Catron	7.5	3	
Bernalillo	7.4	4	
Dona Ana	7.4	4	
Guadalupe	7.4	4	
Eddy	7.3	4	Low
Mora	7.2	4	1 - 1
Colfax	6.6	4	
Socorro	6.5	4	
Roosevelt	6.1	5	
Curry	5.6	5	
Hidalgo	5.5	5) No
Union	5.3	5	Very Low
De Baca	5.2	5	Ver
Harding	5.2	5	
Los Alamos	3.6	5	
NM Statewide	8.5		
US (2020)	8.1		
Source	US Bureau of Labor Statisti	cs	
Jource	https://data.bls.gov/map/	MapToolServlet	

Percent Civilian Population - No Health Insurance

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	PCT of Population	Quintile	
McKinley	19.9%	1	
Union	13.9%	1	ج
San Juan	13.5%	1	Very High
Lea	13.0%	1	ıry
Roosevelt	10.9%	1	>
Santa Fe	10.8%	1	
Catron	10.7%	2	
Curry	10.5%	2	
Lincoln	10.5%	2	_
Dona Ana	10.3%	2	High
Chaves	10.0%	2	
Taos	9.7%	2	
Eddy	9.5%	2	
Cibola	9.1%	3	
Rio Arriba	9.1%	3	
Sandoval	8.8%	3	न
Luna	8.6%	3	Moderate
Otero	8.5%	3	po
Bernalillo	8.2%	3	Σ
Socorro	8.2%	3	
Valencia	8.2%	3	
Harding	7.8%	4	
Colfax	6.0%	4	
Quay	6.0%	4	Low
Torrance	6.0%	4	Lo
San Miguel	5.7%	4	
Sierra	5.3%	4	
Guadalupe	5.1%	5	
Mora	5.0%	5	>
Hidalgo	4.2%	5	Lo
De Baca	4.1%	5	Very Low
Grant	3.7%	5	>
Los Alamos	3.2%	5	
NM Rate	9.6%		
US Rate	8.8%		
	New Mexico Indicator Bas	ed Information System	[[IBIS]
Source	tp://ibis.health.state.nm.u		[]

Percent of Population (5+) with Low English Proficiency

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	Percent of Population	Quintile	
Luna	16.8%	1	
Dona Ana	16.2%	1	
Guadalupe	13.8%	1	igh
Lea	12.6%	1	
Socorro	12.3%	1	Very High
Otero	11.4%	1	
San Miguel	10.9%	1	
Chaves	10.8%	2	
McKinley	9.9%	2	
Santa Fe	9.0%	2	1 _
Roosevelt	8.9%	2	High
Taos	8.3%	2	
Curry	7.9%	2	
Bernalillo	7.6%	2	
Hidalgo	7.5%	3	
Mora	6.9%	3	e e
Union	6.9%	3	Moderate
San Juan	6.4%	3	1 8
Valencia	6.4%	3	Ĭ
Sandoval	6.2%	3	
<u> </u>	3.2/0		
Lincoln	6.1%	4	
Eddy	5.7%	4	
Cibola	5.4%	4	>
Quay	5.2%	4	Low
Rio Arriba	5.2%	4	_
Harding	4.3%	4	_
narumg	4.5%	4	
Torrance	4.2%	5	
Colfax	3.6%	5	
Los Alamos	3.5%	5	3
	2.9%	5	Very Low
Sierra Grant	2.6%	5	ery
Grant	1.2%	5	>
Catron			-
De Baca	1.2%	5	
NM Statewide	8.7%		
US	8.4%		
	New Mexico Indicator Rad	sed Information Syste	m [IBIS]
Source	http://ibis.health.state.n	•	. [.5.5]
Source	New Mexico Indicator Bashttp://ibis.health.state.n	•	em [IBIS]

Social Determinants - Disparity Index Score -- New Mexico Counties

County	Health Disparity Score
McKinley	5.5
Luna	4.5
Dona Ana	4
Cibola	3.5
Lea	3.5
San Miguel	3.5
Socorro	3.5
San Juan	2.5
Sierra	2.5
Taos	2.5
Chaves	2
Grant	2
Mora	2
Otero	2
Roosevelt	2
Torrance	2
Hidalgo	1.5
Rio Arriba	1.5
Santa Fe	1.5
Union	1.5
Curry	1
Guadalupe	1
Harding	1
Lincoln	1
Quay	1
Bernalillo	0.5
Catron	0.5
Colfax	0.5
Eddy	0.5
De Baca	0
Los Alamos	0
Sandoval	0
Valencia	0

Attachments - Morbidity and Health Risk Disparities Tables

Percent of Adults - Heart Disease or Heart Attack

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Harding	15.0%	1	
Curry	9.9%	1	4
De Baca	8.9%	1	Hig
Lea	8.0%	1	Very High
Lincoln	7.7%	1	Š
Otero	7.7%	1	
Chaves	7.5%	2	
Luna	7.5%	2	
Eddy	7.4%	2	High
Mora	7.3%	2	Ξ̈́
Roosevelt	7.1%	2	
Colfax	7.0%	2	
Torrance	6.9%	3	
Sierra	6.6%	3	<u>.</u> .
San Miguel	6.2%	3	ate
Grant	6.1%	3	der
Quay	6.0%	3	Moderate
Rio Arriba	5.9%	3	
San Juan	5.8%	3	
Cibola	5.7%	4	
Valencia	5.7%	4	
Dona Ana	5.5%	4	
Socorro	5.5%	4	Low
McKinley	5.2%	4	2
Los Alamos	5.0%	4	
Bernalillo	4.8%	4	
Guadalupe	4.8%	4	
Union	4.6%	5	
Catron	4.5%	5	>
Taos	4.1%	5	Very Low
Sandoval	4.0%	5	ery.
Santa Fe	4.0%	5	×
Hidalgo	3.3%	5	
=			
NM	5.5%		
US (2019 Median)	6.3%		
•			
Source	New Mexico Indicator Bas	ed Information System [IE	BIS]

Percent of Adults - Diagnosed Cancer

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

Quay				
Quay	County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Los Alamos	Sierra	14.1%	1	
Note	Quay	12.8%	1	ł,
Note	Los Alamos	12.6%	1	Hig
Note	Lincoln	12.0%	1	ery
Harding	Torrance	11.6%	1	>
Otero	Valencia	11.4%	1	
Otero				
Santa 11.1% 2 2 5 5	Harding	11.3%	2	
Catron	Otero	11.3%	2	
Santa Fe 10.9% 2 Lea 10.8% 2 Curry 10.7% 3 Sandoval 10.5% 3 Eddy 10.4% 3 Bernalillo 10.3% 3 Mora 10.2% 3 Guadalupe 10.1% 3 Colfax 10.0% 3 Hidalgo 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 3 Chaves 9.6% 4 De Baca 9.6% 4 Roosevelt 9.5% 4 San Juan 9.2% 4 Dona Ana 9.1% 4 Cibola 8.6% 4 Taos 8.4% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Grant	11.1%	2	h2
Curry	Catron	11.0%	2	Ξ̈́
Curry 10.7% 3 Sandoval 10.5% 3 Eddy 10.4% 3 Bernalillo 10.3% 3 Mora 10.2% 3 Guadalupe 10.1% 3 Colfax 10.0% 3 Hidalgo 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 3 Chaves 9.6% 4 De Baca 9.6% 4 Roosevelt 9.5% 4 San Juan 9.2% 4 Dona Ana 9.1% 4 Cibola 8.6% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5	Santa Fe	10.9%	2	
Sandoval 10.5% 3 Eddy 10.4% 3 Bernalillo 10.3% 3 Mora 10.2% 3 Guadalupe 10.1% 3 Colfax 10.0% 3 Hidalgo 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 3 Hidalgo 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 4 Union 10.0% 1	Lea	10.8%	2	
Sandoval 10.5% 3 Eddy 10.4% 3 Bernalillo 10.3% 3 Mora 10.2% 3 Guadalupe 10.1% 3 Colfax 10.0% 3 Hidalgo 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 3 Hidalgo 10.0% 3 Union 10.0% 4 Union 10.0% 1				
Bernalillo	Curry	10.7%	3	
Bernalillo	Sandoval	10.5%	3	
Colfax	Eddy	10.4%	3	
Colfax	Bernalillo	10.3%	3	ate
Colfax	Mora	10.2%	3	der
Colfax	Guadalupe	10.1%	3	ΝO
Union 10.0% 3 Chaves 9.6% 4 De Baca 9.6% 4 Roosevelt 9.5% 4 San Juan 9.2% 4 Dona Ana 9.1% 4 Cibola 8.6% 4 Taos 8.4% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5	Colfax	10.0%	3	
Chaves 9.6% 4 De Baca 9.6% 4 Roosevelt 9.5% 4 San Juan 9.2% 4 Dona Ana 9.1% 4 Cibola 8.6% 4 Taos 8.4% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5	Hidalgo	10.0%	3	
De Baca 9.6% 4	Union	10.0%	3	
De Baca 9.6% 4				
Roosevelt 9.5% 4 San Juan 9.2% 4 Dona Ana 9.1% 4 Cibola 8.6% 4 Taos 8.4% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5	Chaves	9.6%	4	
San Juan 9.2% 4	De Baca	9.6%	4	
San Juan 9.2% 4 Dona Ana 9.1% 4 Cibola 8.6% 4 Taos 8.4% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Roosevelt	9.5%	4	>
Cibola 8.6% 4	San Juan	9.2%	4	Lo
Taos 8.4% 5 Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5	Dona Ana	9.1%	4	
Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Cibola	8.6%	4	
Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%				
Luna 7.8% 5 Rio Arriba 7.8% 5 Socorro 7.3% 5 San Miguel 7.1% 5 McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Taos	8.4%	5	
McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Luna	7.8%	5	>
McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Rio Arriba	7.8%	5	Lo
McKinley 5.3% 5 NM 9.9%	Socorro	7.3%	5	ery
NM 9.9%	San Miguel	7.1%	5	>
	McKinley	5.3%	5	
US (2019 Median) 13.9%	NM	9.9%		
	US (2019 Median)	13.9%		

Percent of Adults - Diagnosed Stroke

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Mora	4.8%	1	
Socorro	4.8%	1	Very High
Lincoln	4.5%	1	H >
Cibola	4.1%	1	/er
Sierra	4.0%	1	
Curry	3.6%	2	
Eddy	3.6%	2	
Otero	3.4%	2	_
San Juan	3.3%	2	High
San Miguel	3.3%	2	
Roosevelt	3.1%	2	
Torrance	3.0%	2	
Catron	2.9%	3	
Luna	2.9%	3	
Lea	2.8%	3	ate
Dona Ana	2.7%	3	dera
Grant	2.7%	3	Moderate
Hidalgo	2.6%	3	_
Chaves	2.5%	3	
Bernalillo	2.4%	4	
Rio Arriba	2.4%	4	
McKinley	2.3%	4	
Harding	2.2%	4	Low
Quay	2.2%	4	
Colfax	2.1%	4	
Guadalupe	2.1%	4	
Sandoval	2.0%	5	
Santa Fe	2.0%	5	
Valencia	2.0%	5	NO.
De Baca	1.8%	5	Very Low
Union	1.7%	5	Ver
Taos	1.6%	5	_
Los Alamos	1.1%	5	
NM	2.6%		
US (2019 Median)	3.2%		
	New Mexico Indicator Base	ed Information System [IF	BIS1
Source	IVICATED ITIAICATOF DAS	n.us	

Percent of Adults - Diagnosed Diabetes

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Cibola	16.2%	1	
McKinley	16.1%	1	_
Socorro	14.5%	1	Very High
Union	14.0%	1	7
Mora	13.8%	1	Ve
San Miguel	13.6%	1	
<u> </u>	-3.0,	_	
Luna	13.3%	2	
Chaves	12.9%	2	
Eddy	12.7%	2	Ę
Dona Ana	12.4%	2	High
Lea	12.4%	2	
Rio Arriba	12.3%	2	
San Juan	11.8%	3	
Guadalupe	11.7%	3	
Curry	11.5%	3	ė
Roosevelt	11.5%	3	erat
Colfax	11.3%	3	Moderate
Valencia	10.6%	3	Σ
De Baca	10.5%	3	
Otero	10.5%	3	
Sandoval	10.3%	4	
Quay	9.7%	4	
Torrance	9.6%	4	Low
Bernalillo	9.1%	4	2
Hidalgo	8.9%	4	
Lincoln	8.9%	4	
Grant	8.5%	5	
Taos	7.9%	5	
Sierra	7.6%	5	οw
Santa Fe	7.1%	5	Very Low
Los Alamos	4.4%	5	Vel
Catron	4.1%	5	
Harding	3.4%	5	
NM	10.3%		
US (2019 Median)	10.9%		
	Now Movice Indicator Res	ad Information System [15	nc1
Source	New Mexico Indicator Based Information System [no]
	http://ibis.health.state.nm.us		

Percent of Adults - Diagnosed COPD

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Quay	10.5%	1	
Curry	9.0%	1	_
Sierra	8.6%	1	Very High
Colfax	7.9%	1	_ /
Lea	7.9%	1	Ve
Otero	7.8%	1	
<u> </u>	71070	_	
De Baca	7.5%	2	
Hidalgo	7.5%	2	
Eddy	7.4%	2	4
Chaves	7.2%	2	High
San Miguel	6.9%	2	
Valencia	6.9%	2	
	0.070	_	
Torrance	6.8%	3	
Cibola	6.6%	3	
Grant	6.5%	3	a
Luna	6.2%	3	Moderate
Guadalupe	6.1%	3	ode
Roosevelt	6.1%	3	ž
San Juan	6.1%	3	
Socorro	6.1%	3	
Mora	6.0%	4	
Rio Arriba	5.3%	4	
Dona Ana	5.2%	4	>
Bernalillo	5.1%	4	Low
Taos	5.1%	4	
Sandoval	4.9%	4	
Catron	4.5%	5	
Lincoln	4.5%	5	
Santa Fe	4.4%	5	X
Union	3.7%	5	Very Low
Harding	3.4%	5	Ver
Los Alamos	3.2%	5	
McKinley	3.1%	5	
NM	5.6%		
US (2019 Median)	6.5%		
,			
	New Mexico Indicator Bas	ed Information System [IF	BIS1

Percent of Adults - Overweight or Obese

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Guadalupe	84.3%	1	
Luna	74.5%	1	ے
McKinley	74.0%	1	Very High
Mora	73.0%	1	Σ
Cibola	72.9%	1	۶
Lea	72.8%	1	
De Baca	71.5%	2	
Eddy	71.4%	2	
Chaves	71.1%	2	High
San Juan	69.7%	2	Ξ̈́
Union	69.5%	2	
San Miguel	68.9%	2	
Curry	68.7%	3	
Socorro	68.7%	3	•
Dona Ana	68.4%	3	Moderate
Valencia	67.1%	3	der
Colfax	66.1%	3	Σ
Quay	65.9%	3	
Torrance	65.8%	3	
Sandoval	65.7%	4	
Otero	65.2%	4	
Roosevelt	65.1%	4	>
Sierra	64.7%	4	Low
Hidalgo	64.2%	4	
Rio Arriba	63.1%	4	
Grant	62.2%	4	
Bernalillo	61.1%	5	
Lincoln	60.5%	5	_
Taos	58.1%	5	Lo
Santa Fe	55.2%	5	Very Low
Catron	54.5%	5	\ \
Los Alamos	50.3%	5	
Harding	47.8%	5	
NM	64.6%		
US (2019 Median)	66.7%		
		11.6 6	101
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base	•	515]
	http://ibis.health.state.nn	n.us	

Percent of Adults - Current Smokers

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Sierra	29.5%	1	
Torrance	29.4%	1	_
Socorro	29.1%	1	Very High
Quay	27.5%	1	ιγ
Valencia Valencia	26.0%	1	Ve
Lincoln	25.8%	1	
		_	
Curry	25.3%	2	
Guadalupe	24.9%	2	
Catron	23.9%	2	Ę
De Baca	23.2%	2	High
Luna	23.0%	2	
San Miguel	23.0%	2	
<u> </u>			
Colfax	22.5%	3	
Cibola	22.4%	3	
Otero	22.3%	3	ate
Rio Arriba	22.1%	3	Moderate
Eddy	21.5%	3	No
Lea	21.5%	3	_
Hidalgo	21.1%	3	
-			
Chaves	20.3%	4	
San Juan	20.2%	4	
Roosevelt	19.3%	4	
Bernalillo	17.6%	4	Low
Grant	17.5%	4	
Sandoval	17.1%	4	
Santa Fe	16.4%	4	
Dona Ana	16.3%	5	
Union	16.3%	5	
Mora	16.1%	5	NO W
Taos	15.2%	5	Very Low
McKinley	12.5%	5	Ver
Harding	9.9%	5	
Los Alamos	9.7%	5	
NID 4	40.00/		
NM	18.8%		
US (2019 Median)	16.0%		
	New Mexico Indicator Bas	ad Information System [II	DIC1
Source	http://ibis.health.state.nn		ادرر

Percent of Adults - Binge Drinkers

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Harding	23.0%	1	
Guadalupe	22.5%	1	ج
Mora	21.4%	1	Very High
Hidalgo	20.4%	1	
Socorro	20.3%	1	۶
Lincoln	20.2%	1	
Grant	18.8%	2	
Dona Ana	17.8%	2	
Quay	17.7%	2	High
Lea	17.4%	2	Ξ̈́
Sandoval	17.1%	2	
Eddy	17.0%	2	
Colfax	16.2%	3	
Union	16.2%	3	
Chaves	15.5%	3	ate
Curry	15.4%	3	der
Bernalillo	15.2%	3	Moderate
Roosevelt	15.2%	3	
San Miguel	15.2%	3	
Otero	15.1%	4	
Valencia	14.9%	4	
Catron	14.7%	4	,
Santa Fe	14.6%	4	Low
Sierra	14.3%	4	
Luna	14.2%	4	
Cibola	13.8%	4	
Taos	13.7%	5	
McKinley	13.3%	5	
Los Alamos	11.9%	5	NO W
San Juan	11.9%	5	Very Low
De Baca	11.3%	5	Ver
Torrance	10.7%	5	
Rio Arriba	10.6%	5	
NM	15.4%		
US (2019 Median)	16.8%		
or (2020 Micaidil)	_5.5/5		
	New Mexico Indicator Base	nd Information System [1]	RIS1
Source	http://ibis.health.state.nm		J13]

Percent of Adults - Diagnosed Depression

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- Age Adjusted 2011-2019

County	Percent of Adults	Quintile	
Torrance	26.7%	1	
Quay	25.7%	1	ч
De Baca	25.5%	1	Very High
San Miguel	24.5%	1	ŗ
Sierra	23.0%	1	×
Luna	22.6%	1	
Colfax	22.3%	2	
Hidalgo	22.1%	2	
Socorro	21.9%	2	٦,
Guadalupe	21.8%	2	High
Bernalillo	21.5%	2	
Lincoln	21.3%	2	
Chaves	21.0%	3	
Los Alamos	20.4%	3	
Grant	20.2%	3	ate
Eddy	19.8%	3	Jera
Harding	19.6%	3	Moderate
Dona Ana	19.4%	3	_
Rio Arriba	19.2%	3	
Santa Fe	19.1%	4	
Roosevelt	19.0%	4	
Cibola	18.9%	4	
Sandoval	18.9%	4	>
Taos	18.8%	4	Low
Otero	18.7%	4	
Curry	18.2%	4	
San Juan	18.2%	4	
Mora	17.8%	5	
Valencia	17.8%	5	>
Lea	17.3%	5	Very Low
Catron	13.3%	5	λi
McKinley	12.7%	5	Ve
Union	10.3%	5	
NM	19.8%		
US (2019 Median)	19.7%		
,			
	New Mexico Indicator Bas	ed Information System [IE	BIS]
Source	http://ibis.health.state.nn	n.us	

Morbidity and Health Risk - Disparity Index Score -- New Mexico Counties

County	Health Disparity Score
Lincoln	5.5
Sierra	5
Lea	4.5
Mora	4.5
Quay	4.5
Socorro	4.5
San Miguel	4
De Baca	3.5
Luna	3.5
Torrance	3.5
Cibola	3
Curry	3
Eddy	3
Guadalupe	3
Otero	3
Harding	2.5
Valencia	2.5
Chaves	2
Colfax	2
Hidalgo	2
McKinley	2
Union	1.5
Catron	1
Dona Ana	1
Grant	1
Los Alamos	1
Roosevelt	1
San Juan	1
Bernalillo	0.5
Rio Arriba	0.5
Sandoval	0.5
Santa Fe	0.5
Taos	0

Attachments - Mortality Disparities Tables

All New Mexicans

Leading Causes of Death - 2017-2019

Cause of Death	Deaths per 100,00 Population - Age Adjusted
Heart disease (ICD10: I00-I09, I11, I13, I20-I51)	152.1
Cancer (ICD10: C00-C97)	134.9
Unintentional injuries (ICD10: V01-X59, Y85-Y86)	71.7
Chronic lower respiratory diseases (ICD10: J40-J47)	42.2
Cerebrovascular disease (stroke) (ICD10: I60-I69)	33.1
All Causes	592.1

Hispanic New Mexicans

Leading Causes of Death - 2017-2019

Cause of Death	Deaths per 100,00 Population - Age Adjusted
Heart disease (ICD10: I00-I09, I11, I13, I20-I51)	136.7
Cancer (ICD10: C00-C97)	130.9
Unintentional injuries (ICD10: V01-X59, Y85-Y86)	68.6
Cerebrovascular disease (stroke) (ICD10: I60-I69)	34.8
Diabetes mellitus (ICD10: E10-E14)	30.8
All Causes	723.3

American Indian / Alaska Native New Mexicans Leading Causes of Death - 2017-2019

Cause of Death	Deaths per 100,00 Population - Age Adjusted
Unintentional injuries (ICD10: V01-X59, Y85-Y86)	125.2
Cancer (ICD10: C00-C97)	123.7
Heart disease (ICD10: I00-I09, I11, I13, I20-I51)	122.4
Chronic liver disease and cirrhosis (ICD10: K70, K73-K74)	88.0
Diabetes mellitus (ICD10: E10-E14)	70.1
All Causes	723.3

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Heart Disease

- -- New Mexico Counties
- **-- 2015-2019**

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
Chaves	231.0	1	
Sierra	221.0	1	_
Lea	211.3	1	Very High
Luna	209.5	1	, ,
Quay	206.5	1	Ver
Curry	201.6	1	
Eddy	200.0	1	
Guadalupe	183.6	2	
Hidalgo	179.9	2	
Roosevelt	174.0	2	High
Otero	165.0	2	Ξ̈́
Torrance	164.5	2	
San Miguel	161.0	2	
Socorro	157.6	3	
De Baca	156.9	3	
Valencia	156.9	3	Moderate
Union	156.3	3	der
Grant	154.8	3	Λοί
Cibola	154.4	3	_
Bernalillo	150.7	3	
Lincoln	145.3	4	
Catron	144.9	4	
McKinley	136.8	4	>
Colfax	135.5	4	Low
Sandoval	135.4	4	
San Juan	133.3	4	
Rio Arriba	130.1	5	
Dona Ana	129.7	5	
Los Alamos	112.0	5	>
Santa Fe	107.6	5	/ Lc
Taos	107.2	5	Very Low
Mora	103.2	5	_
Harding	70.4	5	
	75.7	J	
NM Statewide	149.6		
US (2018)	163.6		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base http://ibis.health.state.nm.		m [IBIS

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Cancer

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
263.4	1	
177.8	1	_
171.6	1	Very High
166.6	1	_
160.9	1	_ \ \ \ \ \
160.9	1	
160.5	1	
457.7	2	
		_
		_
		High
		⊣ ਤੋਂ
		-
		_
140.8		
143.5	3	
		٠ م
		Moderate
		ط ا
		Ϊž
132.8	3	_
132.2	4	
132.0	4	
131.8	4	_ ≥
131.5	4	Low
130.2	4	
127.4	4	
126.8	5	
119.9	5	
118.7	5) N
116.8	5	Very Low
116.0	5	Vei
113.9	5	
104.8	5	
1000		
149.1		
New Mexico Indicator Based	Information Co. 1	ome [IDIC
	263.4 177.8 171.6 166.6 160.9 160.9 160.5 157.7 156.7 156.4 148.1 146.8 1448.1 146.8 144.2 137.5 134.6 134.5 132.8 132.2 132.0 131.8 131.5 130.2 127.4 126.8 119.9 118.7 116.8 116.0 113.9 104.8	263.4 1 177.8 1 171.6 1 166.6 1 160.9 1 160.9 1 160.5 1 157.7 2 156.7 2 156.4 2 148.1 2 146.8 2 146.8 2 143.5 3 137.5 3 134.6 3 134.5 3 132.8 3 132.9 4 130.2 4 126.8 5 116.9 5 113.9 5 104.8 5

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Unintentional Injury

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2010-2019

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
Rio Arriba	145.1	1	
Mora	123.6	1	_
Catron	113.9	1	Very High
McKinley	112.3	1	H
De Baca	101.0	1	/er
Sierra	95.0	1	
San Miguel	84.9	1	
San Juan	83.8	2	
Guadalupe	81.1	2	
Torrance	76.9	2	
Socorro	76.2	2	High
Cibola	75.5	2	I
Hidalgo	74.7	2	
Taos	74.5	2	
1403	74.5	2	
Lincoln	74.2	3	
Eddy	73.5	3	a)
Colfax	71.8	3	Moderate
_		3	der
<u>Lea</u>	68.9		Š
Valencia	65.2	3	
Grant	64.3	3	
_	***	<u>.</u>	
Quay	63.9	4	
Santa Fe	63.1	4	
Chaves	63.0	4	Low
Bernalillo	62.1	4	Ľ
Sandoval	57.3	4	
Curry	56.8	4	
Otero	56.1	5	
Luna	55.1	5	
Roosevelt	54.5	5	%
Dona Ana	48.4	5	V L
Los Alamos	46.0	5	Very Low
Union	37.5	5	
Harding	28.1	5	
		-	
NM Statewide	66.3		
US (2018)	48.0		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base http://ibis.health.state.nm		m [IBIS

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2010-2019

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
Sierra	84.6	1	
Eddy	62.1	1	_
orrance	61.6	1	Very High
Curry	61.4	1	H ×
haves	60.2	1	Ver
oosevelt	59.7	1	
ea	58.7	1	
luay	54.9	2	
alencia	53.5	2	
)tero	47.3	2	_
una	44.1	2	High
an Juan	41.3	2	
iuadalupe	41.0	2	
an Miguel	40.9	2	
ernalillo	40.5	3	
ocorro	39.2	3	Moderate
incoln	37.5	3	
andoval	34.4	3	əpc
ibola	33.1	3	ĭ
rant	32.6	3	
e Baca	31.7	4	
olfax	31.6	4	
ona Ana	31.6	4	3
anta Fe	30.6	4	Low
nion	30.4	4	
idalgo	29.0	4	
io Arriba	28.4	5	
aos	25.0	5	
atron	21.6	5	NO N
ЛcKinley	20.0	5	Very Low
os Alamos	16.9	5	Ver
/lora	14.1	5	
larding	0.5	5	
IM Statewide	43.2		
JS (2018)	39.7		
. ,			
ource	New Mexico Indicator Base http://ibis.health.state.nm		n [IBIS]

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Stroke

- -- New Mexico Counties
- **-- 2010-2019**

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
Quay	42.8	1	
Socorro	41.6	1	
Luna	41.0	1	Very High
De Baca	39.8	1	H /
Lea	39.4	1	Ver
Torrance	36.6	1	
Valencia	36.5	1	
Bernalillo	36.0	2	
McKinley	35.7	2	
Dona Ana	35.5	2	
Rio Arriba	35.3	2	High
Eddy	34.5	2	Ξ
Harding	33.9	2	
Sandoval	33.8	2	
Sandovan	33.0		
Guadalupe	33.0	3	
Curry	32.5	3	ė
Sierra	32.4	3	erat
Hidalgo	32.1	3	Moderate
Cibola	30.5	3	Σ
Otero	29.7	3	
San Juan	29.6	4	
Colfax	29.4	4	
Lincoln	29.2	4	Low
Grant	28.7	4	
Chaves	28.6	4	
San Miguel	27.7	4	
<u> </u>	27.4	_	
Santa Fe	27.4	5	
Mora	26.9	5	>
Roosevelt	25.5	5	ľ
Union -	24.6	5	Very Low
Taos	22.6	5	×
Catron	21.7	5	
Los Alamos	20.4	5	
NM Statewide	33.1		
US (2018)	37.1		
	N N	11.6	F
Source	New Mexico Indicator Based http://ibis.health.state.nm.		m [IBIS

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Diabetes

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2010-2019

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
McKinley	60.7	1	
Cibola	50.1	1	_
Mora	43.7	1	ligh
Socorro	43.5	1	Very High
Curry	43.3	1	Ver
Chaves	36.4	1	
Union	34.4	1	
	24.2		
Rio Arriba	34.3	2	
De Baca	34.2	2	
San Miguel	34.2	2	, L
San Juan	31.8	2	High
Hidalgo	31.6	2	
Sierra	31.6	2	
Lea	31.3	2	
.	20.7	2	
Otero	30.7	3	
Eddy	30.4	3	Moderate
Harding	29.9	3	der
Guadalupe	27.8	3	No
Luna	27.6	3	_
Dona Ana	26.3	3	
T	26.2	4	
Taos	25.8	4	
Sandoval		4	
Roosevelt	24.8	4	Low
Valencia	23.9		
Grant	23.1	4	
Quay	22.4	4	
Lincoln	22.1	5	
	21.9	5	
Bernalillo Colfax	21.7	5	>
Torrance	21.7	5	2
Santa Fe	18.0	5	Very Low
	12.2	5	>
Catron			
Los Alamos	8.9	5	
NM Statewide	26.7		
US (2018)	21.4		
	New Mexico Indicator Based	d Information System	n [IBI9
Source	http://ibis.health.state.nm.		[1010

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Chronic Liver Disease and Cirrhosis

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2010-2019

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile	
McKinley	64.6	1	
Rio Arriba	63.7	1	_
Cibola	44.1	1	Very High
San Miguel	31.2	1	X
Socorro	30.4	1	Ver
San Juan	30.1	1	
De Baca	28.9	1	
Quay	27.5	2	
iuadalupe	25.7	2	
olfax	24.9	2	_
Chaves	23.3	2	High
Grant	23.1	2	
una	23.1	2	
aos .	22.6	2	
ddy	22.4	3	
ierra	22.2	3	ρ
lidalgo	21.0	3	Moderate
Otero	21.0	3	əpc
/alencia	20.9	3	ž
Inion	20.6	3	
		-	
urry	20.4	4	
anta Fe	20.1	4	
ernalillo	18.5	4	≥
andoval	18.4	4	Low
incoln	17.4	4	
ona Ana	17.2	4	
	<u>:-</u>		
1ora	16.8	5	
ea	15.3	5	
Roosevelt	15.0	5	>
orrance	9.0	5	/ Lc
Catron	6.1	5	Very Low
os Alamos	5.2	5	
Harding	0.0	5	
	5.0	3	
NM Statewide	22.5		
US (2018)	10.7		
Source	New Mexico Indicator Base http://ibis.health.state.nm		n [IBIS]

Age Adjusted Death Rate - Deaths of Despair

- -- New Mexico Counties
- -- 2015-2019

County	Deaths per 100,000	Quintile				
Rio Arriba	177.6	1				
McKinley	162.4	1				
Taos	102.7	1	igh			
Hidalgo	100.9	1	コェ			
San Juan	100.9	1	Very High			
San Miguel	98.7	1				
Quay	96.8	1				
Colfax	93.4	2				
Lincoln	92.2	2				
Sierra	91.9	2	_ ا			
Cibola	91.2	2	High			
Socorro	86.0	2				
Grant	82.6	2				
Eddy	82.1	2				
Santa Fe	81.9	3				
Bernalillo	78.1	3	, e			
Mora	77.4	3	Moderate			
Catron	76.7	3	7			
Valencia	74.3	3	Σ			
Otero	71.4	3				
Torrance	70.1	4				
Chaves	64.6	4				
Sandoval	64.4	4	>			
De Baca	64.0	4	- P			
Guadalupe	61.3	4				
Luna	60.7	4				
Curry	55.0	5				
Dona Ana	48.8	5				
Lea	47.8	5				
Los Alamos	41.6	5				
Roosevelt	39.9	5	Very Low			
Union	36.0	5				
Harding	0.0	5				
NM Statewide	78.4					
US (2018)	45.9					
	New Mexico Indicator Rased	Information Syst	em [IRIS			
Source	New Mexico Indicator Based Information Systematics http://ibis.health.state.nm.us					
	intep.//ibis.iieaitii.state.iiiii.t	13				

Mortality Disparity Index Score -- New Mexico Counties

County	Health Disparity Score
McKinley	5
Quay	5
Sierra	5
De Baca	4.5
Lea	4.5
San Miguel	4.5
Chaves	4
Luna	4
Rio Arriba	4
Socorro	4
Curry	3.5
Eddy	3.5
San Juan	3.5
Torrance	3.5
Cibola	3
Guadalupe	3
Hidalgo	2.5
Mora	2
Taos	2
Valencia	2
Harding	1.5
Otero	1.5
Roosevelt	1.5
Catron	1
Colfax	1
Grant	1
Union	1
Bernalillo	0.5
Dona Ana	0.5
Lincoln	0.5
Sandoval	0.5
Los Alamos	0
Santa Fe	0

Attachments - Primary Care Access Disparities Tables

NM Primary Medical Care	e HPSAs									
Geographic Designation	n									
Priority Ranking										
1 Horrey Ramang										
HPSA Name	HPSA ID	HPSA FTE	HPSA Designation Population	FTE Shortage	Population to FTE Ratio	HPSA Score	Rural Status	Population Availability Ranking	Relative Availability Ranking	Weighted Availability Score/Ranking
Southern Sandoval	1356841971	0.1	19,773	5.6	MAX	16	Partially Rural	9	1	5
McKinley County	1358768476	4.7	72,435	16.0	15,412	20	Rural	2	9	5.5
Socorro County	1355230041	0.8	17,103	4.1	22,804	18	Rural	10	2	6
Cerrillos/Madrid/Edgewood	1359007929	2.0	35,427	8.1	17,714	19	Partially Rural	7	6	6.5
Lea County	1357059311	5.6	64,646	12.9	11,648	21	Rural	3	10	6.5
Torrance County	1353585598	0.8	15,036	3.5	20,048	13	Partially Rural	11	3	7
Rio Arriba County	1353809306	2.5	39,623	8.8	15,661	8	Rural	6	8	7
Cuba	1353359502	0.1	8,928	2.5	MAX	19	Rural	14	1	7.5
Valencia County	1359965887	9.0	74,466	12.3	8,274	21	Partially Rural	4	13	8.5
San Juan County	1351452624	18.4	125,753	17.5	6,842	19	Partially Rural	1	16	8.5
Hatch	1353706127	0.0	4,778	1.4	MAX	15	Rural	18	1	9.5
Southern Dona Ana	1359621251	7.3	57,099	9.1	7,876	17	Non-Rural	5	14	9.5
Mora County	1358361998	0.0	4,722	1.3	MAX	19	Rural	19	1	10
Catron County	1351168065	0.0	3,630	1.0	MAX	18	Rural	20	1	10.5
Quay County	1355072376	0.5	8,759	2.0	17,518	19	Rural	16	7	11.5
Chaves County	1353255408	11.0	64,016	7.3	5,830	17	Rural	8	17	12.5
De Baca County	1353515026	0.0	1,940	0.6	MAX	21	Rural	25	1	13
Guadalupe County	1359812595	0.2	3,966	0.9	19,830	18	Rural	22	4	13
Colfax County	1351412872	1.1	12,168	2.4	11,062	17	Rural	15	11	13
Harding County	1357445811	0.0	655	0.2	MAX	17	Rural	26	1	13.5
Roosevelt County	1351954285	2.5	18,882	2.9	7,553	16	Rural	12	15	13.5
Union County	1355837695	0.2	3,861	0.9	19,305	16	Rural	23	5	14
Cibola County	1352719805	4.6	25,451	2.7	5,594	16	Rural	13	18	15.5
Hidalgo County	1358566658	0.5	4,628	0.8	9,256	17	Rural	24	12	18
Lincoln County	1351045737	4.0	19,995	1.7	4,999	16	Rural	17	20	18.5
Sierra County	1356343421	2.3	11,486	1.0	5,105	14	Rural	21	19	20

NM Primary Dental Care HPSAs										
Geographic Designation										
Priority Ranking										
Filolity Kaliking										
HPSA Name	HPSA ID	HPSA FTE	HPSA Designation Population	FTE Shortage	Population to FTE Ratio	HPSA Score	Rural Status	Population Availability Ranking	Relative Availability Ranking	Weighted Availability Score/Ranking
Lea County	6358494110	3.3	64,646	12.8	19,472	16	Rural	2	3	2.5
Cerrillos/Madrid/Edgewood	6359635579	1.7	35,427	5.4	20,839	15	Partially Rural	5	2	3.5
Southwest Valley Service Area	6355474572	11.3	134,336	22.3	11,909	19	Non-Rural	1	8	4.5
North/Western Rio Arriba	6355975581	0.0	11,172	2.8	MAX	17	Rural	11	1	6.0
Southern Dona Ana	6351635816	5.8	57,099	8.5	9,913	19	Non-Rural	3	10	6.5
Quay County	6356518836	0.0	8,759	2.2	MAX	19	Rural	13	1	7.0
Cuba (North Sandoval)	6356288097	1.4	17,696	3.1	13,012	19	Rural	8	6	7.0
Hatch	6351852357	0.0	4,778	1.2	MAX	20	Rural	15	1	8.0
Luna County	6357565310	2.3	24,598	3.8	10,603	21	Rural	7	9	8.0
Guadalupe County	6356948720	0.0	3,966	1.0	MAX	17	Rural	16	1	8.5
Torrance County	6351920798	1.1	15,036	2.7	14,320	17	Partially Rural	12	5	8.5
Socorro County	6353305823	1.4	17,103	2.9	12,393	19	Rural	10	7	8.5
Union County	6353859647	0.0	3,861	1.0	MAX	15	Rural	17	1	9.0
Dona Ana Hill Service Area	6354515870	4.7	37,150	4.6	7,887	13	Non-Rural	6	12	9.0
Otero County	6356247112	8.2	62,663	7.5	7,651	15	Rural	4	14	9.0
Catron County	6353487971	0.0	3,630	0.7	MAX	19	Rural	19	1	10.0
Harding County	6352249668	0.0	655	0.2	MAX	7	Rural	21	1	11.0
Hildago County	6354869794	0.3	4,628	0.8	14,463	19	Rural	18	4	11.0
Cibola County	6357290963	3.5	25,451	2.9	7,377	15	Rural	9	15	12.0
Sierra County	6352625791	1.2	11,486	1.7	9,902	15	Rural	14	11	12.5
Mora County	6356405904	0.6	4,722	0.6	7,870	15	Rural	20	13	16.5

NM Mental Health Care HPSAs										
Geographic Designation										
Priority Ranking										
HPSA Name	HPSA ID	HPSA FTE	HPSA Designation Population	FTE Shortage	Population to FTE Ratio	HPSA Score	Rural Status	Population Availability Ranking	Relative Availability Ranking	Weighted Availability Score/Ranking
Southeastern Catchment Area	7352736745	1.0	265,480	16.7	265,480	18	Rural	1	2	1.5
Southwest Valley	7357681729	0.0	63,794	4.3	MAX	18	Non-Rural	6	1	3.5
Sandoval County	7353769312	1.0	137,047	5.9	137,047	18	Partially Rural	4	3	3.5
Valencia County	7351347212	0.0	74,466	3.7	MAX	18	Partially Rural	7	1	4
Catchment Area 1	7352716392	2.5	198,188	10.7	79,275	19	Partially Rural	2	6	4
Rio Arriba County	7357011746	0.0	39,831	2.7	MAX	18	Rural	9	1	5
South Central Catchment Area	7353490939	0.0	28,589	1.9	MAX	18	Rural	10	1	5.5
Dona Ana County	7354132839	4.4	207,701	9.5	47,747	19	Partially Rural	3	8	5.5
San Miguel County	7358038326	0.0	27,509	1.8	MAX	20	Rural	11	1	6
Border Catchment Area	7359417731	0.8	61,562	3.4	82,083	20	Rural	8	4	6
Plains Mental Health Service Area	7352758723	1.3	86,973	4.6	69,578	18	Rural	5	7	6
Cibola County	7359141496	0.0	25,451	1.7	MAX	19	Rural	13	1	7
Colfax County	7351597470	0.0	12,777	0.9	MAX	18	Rural	14	1	7.5
Torrance County	7352532517	0.0	15,036	0.8	MAX	18	Partially Rural	15	1	8
Taos County	7354927268	0.4	32,716	1.8	81,790	20	Rural	11	5	8
Mora County	7358116231	0.0	4,722	0.3	MAX	16	Rural	16	1	8.5

NM Primary Medical Care HPS	SAs									
Low Income Designation Priority Ranking										
HPSA Name	HPSA ID	HPSA FTE	HPSA Designation Population	FTE Shortage	Population to FTE Ratio	HPSA Score	Rural Status	Population Availability Ranking	I Ranking	Weighted Availability Score/Ranking
Low Income - South East Heights	1353021279	0.0	38,097	12.7	Max	20	Non-Rural	1	1	1.0
Low Income - Otero County	1353718497	0.0	29,390	9.8	Max	18	Rural	2	1	1.5
Low Income - Santa Fe/La Familia	1355606734	0.0	21,778	7.3	Max	19	Non-Rural	3	1	2.0
Low Income - Taos County	1354983971	0.0	15,770	5.3	Max	19	Rural	5	1	3.0
Low Income - Luna County	1351216214	0.0	15,382	5.1	Max	19	Rural	6	1	3.5
Low Income - San Miguel County	1352114301	0.0	14,755	4.9	Max	19	Rural	7	1	4.0
Low Income - Grant County	1352807203	0.0	11,986	4.0	Max	19	Rural	8	1	4.5
Low Income - Eddy County	1351437541	0.0	19,202	6.4	Max	16	Rural	4	5	4.5
Low Income - Curry County	1352402334	1.8	21,769	5.5	12,230	17	Rural	9	4	6.5

NM Primary Dental Care HP	SAs									
Low Income Designation Priority Ranking										
HPSA Name	HPSA ID	HPSA FTE	HPSA Designation Population	FTE Shortage	Population to FTE Ratio	HPSA Score	Rural Status	Population Availability Ranking	Relative Availability Ranking	Weighted Availability Score/Ranking
Low Income - McKinley County	6359587218	0.0	45,949	11.5	MAX	21	Rural	2	1	1.5
Low Income - San Juan County	6353107663	0.0	52,473	13.1	MAX	19	Partially Rural	1	2	1.5
Low Income - Valencia County	6358741407	0.0	34,202	8.6	MAX	19	Partially Rural	3	2	2.5
Low Income - North Valley	6358662259	0.0	33,505	8.4	MAX	19	Non-Rural	4	2	3.0
Low Income - Chaves County	6359917236	0.0	29,804	7.5	MAX	19	Rural	5	2	3.5
Low Income - La Familia	6359076169	0.0	23,862	6.0	MAX	19	Non-Rural	6	2	4.0
Low Income - Taos County	6358432305	0.0	15,770	3.9	MAX	19	Rural	9	2	5.5
Low Income - Curry County	6351979566	0.0	21,769	5.4	MAX	16	Rural	7	4	5.5
Low Income - San Miguel County	6357665934	0.0	14,755	3.7	MAX	19	Rural	10	2	6.0
Low Income - Eddy County	6355865239	0.0	19,202	4.8	MAX	15	Rural	8	5	6.5
Low Income - Espanola	6351966572	0.0	11,783	3.0	MAX	19	Rural	12	2	7.0
Low Income - Grant County	6359873604	0.0	11,986	3.0	MAX	17	Rural	11	3	7.0
Low Income - Roosevelt County	6351269565	0.0	10,146	2.5	MAX	19	Rural	13	2	7.5
Low Income - Lincoln County	6358518349	0.0	8,637	2.2	MAX	17	Rural	14	3	8.5
Low Income - Colfax County	6351101642	0.0	5,868	1.5	MAX	17	Rural	15	3	9.0
Low Income - De Baca County	6352321891	0.0	890	0.2	MAX	9	Rural	16	6	11.0

NM Mental Health Care HPSAs Low Income Population Designation Priority Ranking										
HPSA Name	HPSA ID	HPSA FTE	HPSA Designation Population	FTE Shortage	Population to FTE Ratio	HPSA Score	Rural Status	Population Availability Ranking	Relative Availability Ranking	Weighted Availability Score/Ranking
Low Income - Santa Fe County	7359383521	0.0	52,170	3.5	14,991	17	Partially Rural	1	1	1
Low Income - North Valley	7357314796	0.0	32,083	2.1	14,992	19	Non-Rural	2	1	1.5

NM Primary Medical Care HPSAs -- FQHC Facility Designations -- Priority Ranking **HPSA Name** HPSA ID **County Name HPSA Score Rural Status** 1359993553 EL CENTRO FAMILY HEALTH Rio Arriba County, NM 23 Rural 1359993567 LAS CLINICAS DEL NORTE, INCORPORATED Rio Arriba County, NM Rural 23 1359993570 ALBUQUERQUE HEALTH CARE FOR THE HOMELESS, INC. **Bernalillo County, NM** 22 Non-Rural 1359993566 First Choice Community Healthcare, Inc. Bernalillo County, NM 22 Non-Rural Bernalillo County, NM 13599935B1 FIRST NATIONS COMMUNITY HEALTH SOURCE INC 22 Non-Rural 13599935B9 Hidalgo Medical Services Hidalgo County, NM 22 Rural 1359993555 Mora Valley Community Health Services, Incorporated Mora County, NM 22 Rural 1359993552 BEN ARCHER HEALTH CENTER, INC. Dona Ana County, NM 21 Rural Dona Ana County, NM 1359993556 CLINICA DE FAMILIA INC, LA 21 Non-Rural 1359993577 DeBaca Family Practice Clinic De Baca County, NM 21 Rural 1359993569 La Casa De Buena Salud Inc **Roosevelt County, NM** 21 Rural 1359993557 PRESBYTERIAN MEDICAL SERVICES, INC. Santa Fe County, NM 21 Non-Rural 13599935CB ST. LUKE'S HEALTH CARE CLINIC, INC. Dona Ana County, NM 21 Non-Rural 1359993581 La Familia Medical Center Santa Fe County, NM 20 Non-Rural 1359993578 EL PUEBLO HEALTH SERVICES INC Sandoval County, NM 19 Non-Rural 1359783968 SOUTHWEST C. A. R. E. CENTER Non-Rural Santa Fe County, NM 19 135999350F Jemez, Pueblo of Sandoval County, NM 15 Rural 1359993573 La Clinica Del Pueblo Rio Arriba County, NM 15 Rural

NM Primary Medical Care HPSAs

- -- IHS/Tribal Facility Designations
- -- Priority Ranking

HPSA ID	HPSA Name	County Name	HPSA Score	Rural Status
1359993593	PINE HILL HC	Cibola County, NM	21	Rural
1359993558	ACOMA-CANONCITO-LAGUNA INDIAN HOSPITAL	Cibola County, NM	20	Rural
13599935C5	CANONCITO HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	20	Non-Rural
1359993561	CROWNPOINT HEALTHCARE FACILITY	McKinley County, NM	20	Rural
1359993562	GALLUP INDIAN MEDICAL CENTER	McKinley County, NM	20	Rural
1358347079	LAGUNA HEALTH CENTER	Cibola County, NM	20	Rural
13599935CE	PUEBLO PINTADO HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Rural
1359993589	SANTA CLARA HEALTH CENTER	Rio Arriba County, NM	20	Rural
1358856382	SANTA FE IND. SCH.	Santa Fe County, NM	20	Non-Rural
13599935A1	SANTA FE INDIAN HOSPITAL	Santa Fe County, NM	20	Non-Rural
1356901986	THOREAU HEALTH STATION	McKinley County, NM	20	Rural
13599935B6	TOHATCHI HEALTH CENTER	San Juan County, NM	20	Rural
1359993560	ZUNI INDIAN HOSPITAL	McKinley County, NM	20	Rural
1359993592	Alamo Health Center	Socorro County, NM	19	Rural
1359919575	ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN DENTAL CLIN	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
1359993563	ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
1352699221	COCHITI DENTAL CLINIC	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
13599935C6	COCHITI HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
13599935B7	DZILTH NA O DITH LE HEALTH CENTER	San Juan County, NM	19	Rural
1357968190	First Nations Comm HIth Source	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
1356558106	ISLETA HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
13599935C2	JEMEZ HEALTH CENTER	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
13599935B5	JICARILLA HEALTH CENTER	Rio Arriba County, NM	19	Rural
1354060628	KEWA PUEBLO HEALTH CORPORATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
13599935B3	MESCALERO INDIAN HOSPITAL	Otero County, NM	19	Rural
1359157102	Navajo Regional Behavioral Health Center	San Juan County, NM	19	Rural
1359993559	NORTHERN NAVAJO MEDICAL CENTER	San Juan County, NM	19	Rural
1357457590	Picuris Health Location	Taos County, NM	19	Rural
1359993595	SAN FELIPE HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
1359993585	SANDIA HEALTH CENTER	Sandoval County, NM	19	Non-Rural
1357786378	SANOSTEE HEALTH STATION	San Juan County, NM	19	Rural
1359993583	SANTA ANNA HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Non-Rural
1352033790	SIPI	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
1352723756	TOADLENA HEALTH STATION	McKinley County, NM	19	Rural
13599935A6	ZIA HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
13599935B4	TAOS-PICURIS INDIAN HEALTH CENTER	Taos County, NM	17	Rural

NM Dental Care HPSAs

- -- FQHC Facility Designations
- -- Priority Ranking

HPSA ID	HPSA Name	County Name	HPSA Score	Rural Status
6359993541	ALBUQUERQUE HEALTH CARE FOR THE HOMELESS, INC.	Bernalillo County, NM	26	Non-Rural
6359993545	La Familia Medical Center	Santa Fe County, NM	25	Non-Rural
635999355N	ST. LUKE'S HEALTH CARE CLINIC, INC.	Dona Ana County, NM	25	Non-Rural
6359993538	LAS CLINICAS DEL NORTE, INCORPORATED	Rio Arriba County, NM	25	Rural
6359993542	CLINICA DE FAMILIA INC, LA	Dona Ana County, NM	25	Non-Rural
6359993543	EL CENTRO FAMILY HEALTH	Rio Arriba County, NM	25	Rural
6359993554	FIRST NATIONS COMMUNITY HEALTH SOURCE INC	Bernalillo County, NM	25	Non-Rural
6359993526	Mora Valley Community Health Services, Incorporated	Mora County, NM	25	Rural
6359993540	La Casa De Buena Salud Inc	Roosevelt County, NM	25	Rural
6359993525	BEN ARCHER HEALTH CENTER, INC.	Dona Ana County, NM	25	Rural
6359993537	First Choice Community Healthcare, Inc.	Bernalillo County, NM	25	Non-Rural
6359993528	PRESBYTERIAN MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.	Santa Fe County, NM	25	Non-Rural
6359993552	DeBaca Family Practice Clinic	De Baca County, NM	25	Rural
6359993527	Hidalgo Medical Services	Hidalgo County, NM	23	Rural
6359993550	EL PUEBLO HEALTH SERVICES INC	Sandoval County, NM	19	Non-Rural
6359727150	SOUTHWEST C. A. R. E. CENTER	Santa Fe County, NM	17	Non-Rural
635999350F	Jemez, Pueblo of	Sandoval County, NM	17	Rural
6359993544	La Clinica Del Pueblo	Rio Arriba County, NM	15	Rural

NM Dental Care HPSAs

- -- IHS/Tribal Facility Designations
- -- Priority Ranking

				5 10
HPSA ID	HPSA Name	County Name		Rural Status
-	ZUNI INDIAN HOSPITAL	McKinley County, NM	24	Rural
-	PINE HILL HC	Cibola County, NM	24	Rural
-	THOREAU HEALTH STATION	McKinley County, NM	24	Rural
	PUEBLO PINTADO HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	24	Rural
	GALLUP INDIAN MEDICAL CENTER	McKinley County, NM	24	Rural
	ACOMA-CANONCITO-LAGUNA INDIAN HOSPITAL	Cibola County, NM	22	Rural
6359182534	LAGUNA HEALTH CENTER	Cibola County, NM	22	Rural
635999355H	MESCALERO INDIAN HOSPITAL	Otero County, NM	22	Rural
6359993559	JEMEZ HEALTH CENTER	Sandoval County, NM	22	Rural
6359993551	Alamo Health Center	Socorro County, NM	22	Rural
6359993533	CROWNPOINT HEALTHCARE FACILITY	McKinley County, NM	22	Rural
635999355K	TOHATCHI HEALTH CENTER	San Juan County, NM	22	Rural
6359993531	NORTHERN NAVAJO MEDICAL CENTER	San Juan County, NM	22	Rural
6359993551	DZILTH NA O DITH LE HEALTH CENTER	San Juan County, NM	22	Rural
6352094892	TOADLENA HEALTH STATION	McKinley County, NM	22	Rural
6356316179	SANOSTEE HEALTH STATION	San Juan County, NM	22	Rural
635999355F	CANONCITO HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	21	Non-Rural
6354544907	Navajo Regional Behavioral Health Center	San Juan County, NM	21	Rural
6352404551	First Nations Comm HIth Source	Bernalillo County, NM	20	Non-Rural
6354675578	ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN DENTAL CLIN	Bernalillo County, NM	20	Non-Rural
6359993535	ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	20	Non-Rural
6352845646	SANTA ANNA HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Non-Rural
635999355B	ZIA HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Rural
6355367344	SANTA FE INDIAN HOSPITAL	Santa Fe County, NM	20	Non-Rural
635999355T	SANTA CLARA HEALTH CENTER	Rio Arriba County, NM	20	Rural
635999355E	COCHITI HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Rural
6359993530	SAN FELIPE HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Rural
6353031100	SANTA FE IND. SCH.	Santa Fe County, NM	20	Non-Rural
6359993555	JICARILLA HEALTH CENTER	Rio Arriba County, NM	20	Rural
-	ISLETA HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	20	Non-Rural
-	SANDIA HEALTH CENTER	Sandoval County, NM	20	Non-Rural
	KEWA PUEBLO HEALTH CORPORATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Rural
	COCHITI DENTAL CLINIC	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
	Picuris Health Location	Taos County, NM	19	Rural
6359589119		Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
	TAOS-PICURIS INDIAN HEALTH CENTER	Taos County, NM	16	Rural

NM Mental Health Care HPSAs

- -- FQHC Facility Designations
- -- Priority Ranking

HPSA ID	HPSA Name	County Name	HPSA Score	Rural Status
7359993530	LAS CLINICAS DEL NORTE, INCORPORATED	Rio Arriba County, NM	22	Rural
7359993535	CLINICA DE FAMILIA INC, LA	Dona Ana County, NM	22	Non-Rural
7359993533	La Casa De Buena Salud Inc	Roosevelt County, NM	22	Rural
7359993519	BEN ARCHER HEALTH CENTER, INC.	Dona Ana County, NM	22	Rural
7359993531	EL CENTRO FAMILY HEALTH	Rio Arriba County, NM	21	Rural
7359993537	Mora Valley Community Health Services, Incorporated	Mora County, NM	21	Rural
7359993521	Hidalgo Medical Services	Hidalgo County, NM	21	Rural
7359993536	La Familia Medical Center	Santa Fe County, NM	20	Non-Rural
7359993529	First Choice Community Healthcare, Inc.	Bernalillo County, NM	20	Non-Rural
7359993520	PRESBYTERIAN MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.	Santa Fe County, NM	20	Non-Rural
7359993541	DeBaca Family Practice Clinic	De Baca County, NM	19	Rural
7359993534	ALBUQUERQUE HEALTH CARE FOR THE HOMELESS, INC.	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
735999355F	ST. LUKE'S HEALTH CARE CLINIC, INC.	Dona Ana County, NM	18	Non-Rural
7359993547	EL PUEBLO HEALTH SERVICES INC	Sandoval County, NM	18	Non-Rural
7353601994	SOUTHWEST C. A. R. E. CENTER	Santa Fe County, NM	17	Non-Rural
7359993544	FIRST NATIONS COMMUNITY HEALTH SOURCE INC	Bernalillo County, NM	17	Non-Rural
7359993538	La Clinica Del Pueblo	Rio Arriba County, NM	14	Rural
735999350E	Jemez, Pueblo of	Sandoval County, NM	14	Rural

NM Mental Health Care HPSAs

- -- IHS/Tribal Facility Designations
- -- Priority Ranking

HPSA ID	HPSA Name	County Name	HPSA Score	Rural Status
7359993524	ZUNI INDIAN HOSPITAL	McKinley County, NM	22	Rural
735999355B	PINE HILL HC	Cibola County, NM	22	Rural
7355765876	THOREAU HEALTH STATION	McKinley County, NM	22	Rural
735999355J	PUEBLO PINTADO HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	22	Rural
7359993526	GALLUP INDIAN MEDICAL CENTER	McKinley County, NM	22	Rural
735999355K	CANONCITO HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	21	Non-Rural
7356384608	ACOMA-CANONCITO-LAGUNA INDIAN HOSPITAL	Cibola County, NM	21	Rural
7358125730	LAGUNA HEALTH CENTER	Cibola County, NM	21	Rural
7359993551	JEMEZ HEALTH CENTER	Sandoval County, NM	21	Rural
7359993525	CROWNPOINT HEALTHCARE FACILITY	McKinley County, NM	21	Rural
7356485310	TOHATCHI HEALTH CENTER	San Juan County, NM	21	Rural
7359993523	NORTHERN NAVAJO MEDICAL CENTER	San Juan County, NM	21	Rural
7359993504	DZILTH NA O DITH LE HEALTH CENTER	San Juan County, NM	21	Rural
7359941941	TOADLENA HEALTH STATION	McKinley County, NM	21	Rural
7358111567	SANOSTEE HEALTH STATION	San Juan County, NM	21	Rural
7359993555	COCHITI HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	20	Rural
7357522501	First Nations Comm HIth Source	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
7357828856	ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN DENTAL CLIN	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
7359993527	ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
7356527833	SANTA ANNA HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Non-Rural
7359993553	ZIA HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
735999355M	SANTA CLARA HEALTH CENTER	Rio Arriba County, NM	19	Rural
7359993522	SAN FELIPE HEALTH STATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
735999355L	ISLETA HEALTH CENTER	Bernalillo County, NM	19	Non-Rural
7359993502	SANDIA HEALTH CENTER	Sandoval County, NM	19	Non-Rural
7358860704	KEWA PUEBLO HEALTH CORPORATION	Sandoval County, NM	19	Rural
7351803250	Navajo Regional Behavioral Health Center	San Juan County, NM	19	Rural
7351213059	COCHITI DENTAL CLINIC	Sandoval County, NM	18	Rural
7355226190	SANTA FE INDIAN HOSPITAL	Santa Fe County, NM	18	Non-Rural
7358370271	SANTA FE IND. SCH.	Santa Fe County, NM	18	Non-Rural
7359993559	Alamo Health Center	Socorro County, NM	18	Rural
7359993558	MESCALERO INDIAN HOSPITAL	Otero County, NM	17	Rural
7352427467	SIPI	Bernalillo County, NM	17	Non-Rural
7359993545	JICARILLA HEALTH CENTER	Rio Arriba County, NM	15	Rural
735999355G	TAOS-PICURIS INDIAN HEALTH CENTER	Taos County, NM	14	Rural
7354548521	Picuris Health Location	Taos County, NM	13	Rural