

## **Title**

Rural Public Health Landscape: Funding, Personnel, Expertise, Community Resources, and Barriers in Rural Settings

Olivia Ellison<sup>1</sup>, and Vincent Silenzio<sup>2</sup>

1. Rutgers University, School of Public Health

2. Rutgers University, School of Public Health, Department of Urban-Global Public Health

## **Abstract**

**Objectives:** To describe and understand the funding, personnel, expertise, community resources, and issues in rural settings by local public health departments post COVID-19.

**Methods:** Rural county health departments in ten states were sent a survey via web link in the Spring of 2021. 552 responses were collected with a 63% completion rate for all counties surveyed.

**Results:** Most counties utilized public health nurses, administrators, or community health professionals. Of these, 25% had formal education in public health and 10% had public health experience. 65% of respondents disagreed with having adequate funding, staff, and resources. 83% of counties reported working with nonprofits and 43% utilized volunteers. The top two issues in rural public health identified were mental health and substance use.

**Conclusions:** Rural county public health departments do not have the support needed to sustain or advance public health in their specific population.

**Policy implications:** This report gives insight into the needs of rural health in 2021 that can be used to guide policy and funding to support rural health's specific needs.

# 1 Rural Public Health Landscape: Funding, Personnel, Expertise, Community Resources, and 2 Barriers in Rural Settings

3

## 4 INTRODUCTION

5 In the United States, approximately 66% of local health departments serve fewer than  
6 50,000 residents.<sup>1</sup> Even as rural areas make up the majority of local health departments, rural  
7 public health is often under studied, departments are expected to provide the same or more  
8 services as their urban counterparts, and are underfunded.<sup>1,2</sup> In a study published in 2002,  
9 focusing on three rural states: Alaska, Montana and Wyoming, the authors found that  
10 personnel in these public health departments are less likely to have formal training and/or  
11 experience<sup>1,3</sup> and are less likely to be accredited.<sup>3</sup> Personnel are more likely to be employed  
12 part time and the support of a physician or dentist is used for support or signing death  
13 certificates but is also deficient.<sup>1</sup> Without the support of the state or the community, the rural  
14 public health department is set up for potential failure.<sup>1</sup>

15 In terms of infrastructure, rural public health departments customarily serve smaller  
16 communities, leading to smaller tax bases to support public health activities. Charity demand is  
17 also higher in these areas due to lower insurance coverage rates, which contributes to having  
18 fewer resources available to support epidemiologists, physicians, etc.<sup>4</sup> Even when considering  
19 federal policies targeting underserved areas, they can often unintentionally benefit wealthier  
20 communities. Examples of these programs are the Medicare Hospital Readmissions Reduction  
21 Program and the federal 340B Drug Discount Program. Additionally, urban areas have seen  
22 sizable advances with help of federal programs like the Accountable Health Communities Model

23 and the Prevention of Public Health Fund, which have yet to translate considerably to rural  
24 communities.<sup>4</sup>

25 A rural county can be defined as having a small population, restricted access to  
26 resources, and lower density, unlike more urban areas.<sup>3</sup> Rural-urban health disparities have  
27 continued to widen, since even before the COVID-19 pandemic. According to *Healthy People*  
28 *2020*, between 2007 to 2017 the mortality disparity increased for 5 of the 7 major causes of  
29 death: cancer, heart disease, suicide, diabetes, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.<sup>4,5</sup>  
30 Data also suggests that those most vulnerable to the spread of disease by injecting drugs are  
31 those in rural areas. They traditionally have fewer preventative measures, such as  
32 immunizations, sexual education, and tobacco control.<sup>4,6</sup> Maternal and child health also suffers  
33 at the hands of underfunding as morbidity and mortality rates continue to rise after 100 years  
34 of decline.<sup>3</sup> The mothers most at risk of severe adverse outcomes are Black women in the rural  
35 South. Rural areas are plagued by racism which has exacerbated the public health crises  
36 occurring in rural populations and is confounded by racism not being considered a factor in  
37 public health outcomes.<sup>3</sup>

38 An underutilized resource for rural health communities are community healthcare  
39 workers (CHWs), and studies have their shown tremendous opportunities to create better  
40 health outcomes in rural communities.<sup>7</sup> A recent literature review focused on rural CHWs  
41 impact reported finding virtually all studies had positive outcomes and a positive return on  
42 investment in studies focused on cost. This is significant because this review provides support  
43 for community engagement to improve access to care and the cost effectiveness.<sup>7</sup> Barriers to  
44 rural health departments implementing a CHW program may include the lack of standardized

45 training, funding, limited access to transportation, technology, cultural barriers, poor  
46 healthcare system infrastructure, sustainability, and the recommendation from the U.S.  
47 Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration to  
48 conduct a comprehensive community health needs assessment before identifying a type of  
49 CHW program to implement.<sup>8</sup>

50 In six rural states studied in 2009, when asked about their funding from the Centers for  
51 Disease Control, respondents disclosed that the majority of funding is retained at the state level  
52 for statewide initiatives.<sup>9</sup> The study found that there was not enough local funding to address  
53 major issues including, cancer control, injury prevention or diabetes. Also, to note, federal  
54 funding commonly has a restriction on how much money can be used for administrative costs  
55 which is easily used up by the state before trickling down to the local health departments. The  
56 money that remains is usually distributed by a “mini-grant” process and does not always  
57 represent adequate amounts needed to start programs let alone sustain them.<sup>9</sup> This is also  
58 assuming that a local health department has the expertise or staffing to identify and apply for  
59 these grants. Occasionally, a health department must turn down a grant because of lack of  
60 staffing to create or sustain a program. In support of this barrier, there is the perception that a  
61 program may not necessarily be qualified for a grant based on their ability to collect data and  
62 prove effectiveness through evidence-based programming, or the inability to reach their  
63 audience due to the lack of public transportation.<sup>9</sup>

## 64 **METHODS**

65 The definition of *rural* used in this paper is based on that used by the United States  
66 Census and the Office of Management and Budget. The United States Census considers any

67 area not urban, urbanized areas of 50,000 or more people, or urban clusters of 2,500 – 49,999  
 68 people, as rural. The Office of Management and Budget considers counties of less than 50,000  
 69 people as rural.<sup>10</sup> Counties with less than 50,000 people were identified for inclusion using the  
 70 census data, *Population Data by County 2010 Census Data with Population Estimates*. All  
 71 counties with more than 50,000 people were excluded from the 2010 census or the 2020  
 72 estimate.<sup>11</sup> The results of the 2010 census were utilized due to the delays in the 2020 census  
 73 caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Counties were then filtered by size and those that had  
 74 fewer than 50,000 people were calculated and arranged by state.

75

State	# Of Rural Counties	State	# Of Rural Counties	State	# Of Rural Counties
Hawaii	1	California	15	Minnesota	68
Texas	185	Kansas	95	Iowa	88
Nebraska	88	Mississippi	68	North Carolina	47
Montana	50	Oregon	18	Illinois	73
Alaska	26	Georgia	118	Louisiana	43
New Mexico	22	Missouri	93	Wisconsin	43
North Dakota	49	Michigan	48	Pennsylvania	23
Colorado	49	Kentucky	101	New York	17
Idaho	38	Oklahoma	63	Tennessee	63
Nevada	12	Virginia	96	Arkansas	62
South Dakota	63	Wyoming	21	West Virginia	44
Utah	20	Washington	18	Indiana	65
Vermont	10	South Carolina	22	Arizona	4
Alabama	40	Florida	26	Massachusetts	2
Ohio	39	Maryland	6	South Carolina	22
Maine	7	New Hampshire	3	Rhode Island	1

76

State	# of Rural Counties (>50,000 people)
Texas	185
Georgia	118
Kentucky	101
Virginia	96
Kansas	95
Missouri	93
Nebraska	88
Iowa	88

Illinois	73
Mississippi	68

Ten states were identified having the

78 highest number of rural counties in the United States. Texas had the highest number of rural  
79 counties with 185, and Mississippi had the lowest with 68 rural counties.

80 State websites were utilized to find contact information for each of health departments  
81 in the identified rural counties. Every county did not have a designated health department or a  
82 designated person responsible for the health of the county. In the state of Texas, only 118 of  
83 the 185 rural counties had health departments, the remaining counties were served under the  
84 umbrella of the state and provided no overlapping services locally. The Texas Department of  
85 State Health Services only had contact information for 34 of the 118 (18%) rural defined  
86 county's health departments. Overall, we found 88.7% of contact information publicly available  
87 for counties/districts. We also encouraged district representatives to forward on to their county  
88 health departments within their district if individual county information was not publicly  
89 available. In total, 829 counties were contacted by county or district contact. We solicited help  
90 through rural public health associations, National Association of County and City Health Officials  
91 (NACCHO), LinkedIn, local state public health associations affiliated with the American Public  
92 Health Association (APHA), regional, district, and state offices through their rural, local, and/or  
93 communications departments and individual health department websites.

94 Some counties collaborated with other jurisdictions and shared personnel, so their  
95 district representatives were asked to fill out the survey. Those personnel were divided among  
96 the number of rural counties they serve. The data may be affected or influenced by a district  
97 having a non-rural county within but will still be a valid representation for how what resources  
98 rural counties have access to because how often that occurs. For example, some counties share

99 public health resources with various local counties and are represented by a single district  
100 umbrella.

101

102 *Survey*

103 The survey was designed specifically for this project due to lack of consistent  
104 instruments used in public health personnel surveys. Surveys that were referenced in the  
105 article, *Rural–Urban Differences in the Public Health Workforce: Local Health Departments in 3*  
106 *Rural Western States* by Roger A. Rosenblatt, MD, MPH, Susan Casey, PhD, and Mary  
107 Richardson, PhD, MHA, were not available or did not have enough information to design a  
108 survey based on their initial research on public health staffing. The survey specifically asked  
109 which “rural” public health departments the participant answering served due to some health  
110 departments serving more than one rural health department. Therefore, the pool of resources  
111 would be averaged across the # of rural departments that particular health department serves  
112 which excludes non-rural departments they may also serve. The survey included items  
113 pertaining to demographics, type of public health personnel, utilization of volunteers and  
114 nonprofit relationships pre and post COVID-19, types of funding, perception of funding,  
115 resources, expertise, and overall tools to be successful and top ten issues plaguing their  
116 jurisdiction in no specific order.

117

118 **RESULTS:**

119 Survey responses were excluded if the respondent did not consent to the survey, if the  
120 population size selected was more than 50,000 per the rural county definition with no rural

121 counties selected, if no state and county were selected or if the answer was duplicative for the  
122 specific county being served, or if the survey was not completed further than identifying the  
123 state and counties served. Duplicative answers were differentiated by if the respondent served  
124 more than one county. The answer that included more than one county was given priority to  
125 keep the consistency and reliability of the data. If there was no difference on how many  
126 counties were served by the survey answer, the response was chosen at random. The surveys  
127 counted were those considered finished which included questions left intentionally blank. If  
128 more than one county was served, the quantitative answers were divided by the number of  
129 rural counties selected.

### 130 *Descriptive Statistics*

131 A total of 552 responses were collected, 29.2% were incomplete (n=161), 0.01% were  
132 marked complete but had no data (n=4), 0.007% were not states/counties being studied (n=4),  
133 0.005% had no consent (n=3), 0.005% had no counties selected (n=3), 12.1% were duplicate  
134 answers (n=67), and 43.8% were complete responses (n=242). On average, over the 10 states  
135 surveyed when counted by county, we had a completion rate of 63%. The lowest response was  
136 from the state of Iowa at 36% and the highest being Mississippi at 100%. Mississippi's response  
137 was from one state official instead of individual county. Three counties were served by multiple  
138 health departments: in Georgia the county of Dooly and Macon, and in Texas the county of  
139 Borden. Missouri had the highest number of individual responses (n=54) and Mississippi had  
140 the least (n=1). Respondents were allowed to choose more than one size of population served,  
141 60% responded counties outside of metro or micro areas (n=151), 37% responded counties



142 described as micro area (10,000-49,999 people) (n=93), and 2% being a metro area (<50,000  
143 people) (n=6).

144

#### 145 *Personnel*

146 For full time personnel weighted by counties served, counties reported having less than  
147 one physician, physician assistant, nurse practitioner, nutritionist, health educator, social  
148 worker, community healthcare worker, or volunteer. The counties on average had 3.2 nurses,  
149 1.1 management positions, 1.9 administrators, and 1.5 other direct care providers. Of these  
150 full-time personnel, 25% of them had education in public health and 10% had previous  
151 experience in public health. For part time personnel weighted by counties served, all positions  
152 were reported as having less than one person or position. Of those that did serve in part time  
153 roles, 26% had education in public health and 16% had previous experience in public health.

#### 154 *Resources*

155 For all 10 states, the state general fund was ranked the highest source of revenue for  
156 rural counties at 24%, the second highest ranked was tied for federal revenue streams and the  
157 state general fund at 27% respectively. The third highest ranked was Medicare/Medicaid at 30%  
158 then grants at 31%. This question collected 208 responses with the last ranking being left blank  
159 intentionally twice for 206 responses.

160 When asked about how adequate resources were, 237 responses were collected. 65% of  
161 the respondents reported “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” on having adequate  
162 funding. 62% reported “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” on having adequate staff to  
163 serve their community. 58% of respondents reported “Somewhat Agree” or “Strongly Agree”

164 that they had adequate expertise in their department. When asked overall if they had enough  
165 resources including funding, staff, and expertise, 66% “Somewhat Disagree” or “Strongly  
166 Disagree”.

167         Of 237 responses, 83% had nonprofit partnerships (n=196). Of those with partnerships,  
168 39% said yes COVID-19 effected these partnerships, 42% responded COVID-19 did not affect  
169 these partnerships and 18% responded “Maybe”. The types of nonprofits included local  
170 government programming (state and county), community boards and clubs, churches, clinics,  
171 hospitals, federally qualified health centers, schools, universities, nursing homes, and food  
172 pantries. When asked about utilizing volunteers, only 43% of the counties surveyed worked  
173 with volunteers (n=102). Of those who answered “Yes”, 49% responded that COVID-19 effected  
174 their ability to work with volunteers, 36% said COVID-19 did not, and 15% said “Maybe”. As for  
175 community interest, from 239 responses, 79% answered “Probably Yes” or “Definitely Yes”  
176 when asked if they had interest in their community to improve health outcomes.

177         The two top issues identified from the list of Healthy People 2020 topics plaguing rural  
178 communities were “Mental Health and Mental Disorders” and “Substance Abuse” at (n=170).  
179 Additionally, “Diabetes” (n=169), “Access to Health Services” (n=155), and “Heart Disease and  
180 Stroke” (n=149) were identified as prevalent issues health departments were working to  
181 improve outcomes of.

182         When asked to elaborate on what other resources these rural health departments may  
183 benefit from the common themes included: funding issues lack thereof and funding being tied  
184 to specific issues or populations (n=34), a need for public health personnel and infrastructure  
185 (n=21), transportation concerns (n=14), a need for mental health/behavioral health services

186 (n=13), an interest in clinics specifically for low income, dental and eye services (n=9), and  
 187 access (n=9).

188

189 **Table 1. Rate how adequate each of these are funding, staff, expertise and overall**

Variable	Strongly Agree (n=241)		Somewhat Agree (n=241)		Neither Agree nor Disagree (n=241)		Somewhat Disagree (n=241)		Strongly Disagree (n=241)	
<b>Funding</b>	7	3%	50	21%	29	12%	89	38%	63	27%
<b>Staff</b>	8	3%	58	24%	25	11%	91	38%	56	24%
<b>Expertise</b>	43	18%	95	40%	39	16%	52	22%	9	4%
<b>Overall</b>	4	2%	38	16%	38	16%	98	41%	60	25%

190

191

192 **DISCUSSION:**

193 When weighted by numbers of counties served, full time and part time, public health  
 194 nurses were the most utilized type of personnel then followed administrators and other direct  
 195 care supervisors. This leaves ample opportunity for other types of public health professionals to  
 196 contribute to rural public health. Only 25% of the full time rural public health workforce  
 197 surveyed had public health education and only 10% had professional public health experience.  
 198 Of these professionals, physicians, health educators, social workers, community health workers  
 199 and nurse practitioners were <1 per county. Comparatively, when surveyed on the adequacy of  
 200 their infrastructure, specifically their departments expertise, 58% strongly agreed or somewhat  
 201 agreed that the department possessed adequate expertise.

202 This identifies a gap in hiring capability or availability of public health graduates to work  
 203 in these departments. This is supported by 62% of survey respondents answering that they

204 strongly or somewhat disagreed that they had adequate staffing. To combat this, more funding  
205 would attract new candidates, as well as internships, work flexibility, and marketing of  
206 opportunities. A variety of type of staff and utilization of potentially unconventional or dual-  
207 purpose public health professionals like nutritionists could be beneficial.

208         Community connection is an underutilized way to support public health infrastructure.  
209 This is supported by <1 full time or part volunteer in the health departments surveyed but  
210 health departments identifying a 79% probability of *probably yes* or *definitely yes* in community  
211 interest. Although COVID-19 has affected their ability to work with volunteers by 49%, as the  
212 pandemic becomes more endemic, the opportunity arises. Mobilizing community healthcare  
213 workers as volunteers could be a solution to cycle of lack of funding contributing to lack of  
214 staffing. With ample community interest, a community can train volunteers to start  
215 conversations with their neighbors to promote positive health outcomes.

216         When asked about types of nonprofits counties worked with, responses included an  
217 extensive list: substance use, domestic violence shelters, Red Cross, United Way, Arc, Salvation  
218 Army, churches, schools, colleges, federal, state and local programs, community boards and  
219 organizations, food banks, mental health providers, clinics, community healthcare providers,  
220 etc. This further supports how vital community connection and contribution may be to filling in  
221 the gaps left by the lack of funding and staffing. This also illustrates what types of non-  
222 traditional resources can be tapped into to benefit the health outcomes of a community. These  
223 areas may warrant further study as types of resources rural communities are tapping into to  
224 identify not previously known issues in the rural community.

225           The types of funding for public health departments varied. Federal revenue streams  
226    comprised the majority at 24%, followed by the state, then Medicare/Medicaid, then fees and  
227    fines, and grants. When stratified by state, only 4 of the 10 states surveyed reported federal  
228    funding as their highest revenue stream. Illinois was included in this count but tied for their top  
229    revenue stream was grant money. Kansas also listed grants as their highest revenue stream.  
230    This illuminates either Illinois and Kansas' investment into grant writing or the inaccessibility of  
231    grants to other states. This topic could be furthered explored as to why other states do not or  
232    cannot take advantage of grant opportunities. Also, to note of importance, not all states chose  
233    to not expand immediately or have not expanded their Medicaid/Medicare programs under the  
234    Affordable Care Act implemented by the Obama administration.

235           As previously mentioned, survey respondents reported inadequate funding (65%) and  
236    inadequate staffing (62%) which contributed to inadequate resources and infrastructure overall  
237    (66%). This was supported by the qualitative answers categorized by topic with 22% answering  
238    funding/funding issues and 14% answering personnel/infrastructure as resources their  
239    department would benefit from. Funding issues included funding being tied to specific issues or  
240    populations. This contradicts studies done two decades ago that identified expertise as being a  
241    major contributor to lack of success in rural health departments. Funders and policymakers  
242    must consider whether their parameters for funding are benefitting specific populations  
243    enough with targeting funding or if they are contributing to a larger issue of lack of funding for  
244    health departments to improve health outcomes for more people.

245

246    **Limitations:**

247           Limitations of this study include the potential of uneven weighting for county resources.  
248   When asked which counties the jurisdictional health department served, only rural counties  
249   were given as options not metro counties. Health departments may have also served urban  
250   counties which may overestimate the number of resources the rural counties they serve are  
251   provided. At the time of publication some jurisdictions may still have been benefitting from  
252   COVID-19 emergency funding which could have inflated their answers on resources, funding  
253   and expertise. In the survey, the only question required to answer was the size of population.  
254   The results may be biased based on how many surveys were completed in full or had  
255   intentionally blank answers. Pre and post covid were not defined by specific dates, so the  
256   answer to those specific survey questions could have been interpreted inconsistently. The  
257   survey itself took place over a 3-month period, implying that the number of personnel could  
258   have changed during the survey period itself.

259

## 260 **CONCLUSION:**

261           Our study findings demonstrate that overall lack of funding and staffing are commonly  
262   afflicting our rural health departments in the United States. Nurses were found to be the most  
263   utilized type of public health personnel, and health departments noted having adequate  
264   expertise despite having minimal professional experience and formal education in public  
265   health. There is a significant opportunity to utilize community collaboration to better health  
266   outcomes in rural communities.

267

## 268 **PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

269 The findings from this survey can be used to support rural public health departments when  
270 advocating for local policy, funding, and resources. These survey results illustrate the need for  
271 increased funding, and funding that can be flexibly used for different populations and issues  
272 specific to the area, public health personnel and infrastructure, assistance with transportation  
273 concerns, improved accessibility, mental/behavioral health services, and low-income clinics.  
274 These findings can also inform federal and state government efforts to enable rural areas to  
275 take fuller advantage of resources available and to inform future policy resource allocation.  
276 Additionally, our findings demonstrate potential opportunities for community engagement to  
277 fill gaps associated with traditional public health department structures.

## Acknowledgements:

We would like to acknowledge the championing of our survey by Tammy Moriearty at the Texas Department of State Health Services, everyone who took the time to answer our survey, and Rutgers School of Public Health at Rutgers University.

## Citations:

- 1 Rosenblatt, R. A., Casey, S., & Richardson, M. (2002). Rural–Urban Differences in the Public Health Workforce: Local Health Departments in 3 Rural Western States. *Am J Public Health*, 92(7), 1102–1105. [10.2105/ajph.92.7.1102](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.92.7.1102)
- 2 Dearinger, A. T. (2020). COVID-19 Reveals Emerging Opportunities for Rural Public Health. *Am J Public Health*, 110(9), 1277–1278. [10.2105/ajph.2020.305864](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2020.305864)
- 3 Ziller, E., & Milkowski, C. (2020). A Century Later: Rural Public Health’s Enduring Challenges and Opportunities. *Am J Public Health*, 110(11), 1678–1686. [10.2105/ajph.2020.305868](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2020.305868)
- 4 Owsley, K. M., Hamer, M. K., & Mays, G. P. (2020). The Growing Divide in the Composition of Public Health Delivery Systems in US Rural and Urban Communities, 2014–2018. *Am J Public Health*, 110(S2), S204–S210. [10.2105/ajph.2020.305801](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2020.305801)
- 5 Yaemsiri, S., Alfier, J. M., Moy, E., Rossen, L. M., Bastian, B., Bolin, J., Ferdinand, A. O., Callaghan, T., & Heron, M. (2019). Healthy People 2020: Rural Areas Lag In Achieving Targets For Major Causes Of Death. *Health Affairs*, 38(12), 2027–2031. [10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00915](https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00915)
- 6 Ph.D., J. W. (2014). Access to Medical Care in Rural America. In *Rural Public Health* (pp. 11–88). Springer Publishing Company.
- 9 Meit, M., Ettaro, L., Hamlin, B. N., & Piya, B. (2009). *Rural Public Health Financing*. 15(3), 210–215. [10.1097/01.phh.0000349738.73619.f5](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.phh.0000349738.73619.f5)



- 7 Berini CR, Bonilha HS, Simpson AN. Impact of Community Health Workers on Access to Care for Rural Populations in the United States: A Systematic Review. *J Community Health*. 2022;47(3):539-553. doi:[10.1007/s10900-021-01052-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-021-01052-6)
- 8 United States Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration. *Community Health Workers Evidence-Based Models Toolbox- HRSA Office of Rural Health Policy.*; 2013. <https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/toolkits/community-health-workers>.
- 10 Ratcliffe M. *A Century of Delineating a Changing Landscape: The Census Bureau's Urban and Rural Classification, 1910 to 2010*. U.S. Census Bureau; 2015. [https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/reference/ua/Century\\_of\\_Defining\\_Urban.pdf](https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/reference/ua/Century_of_Defining_Urban.pdf). Accessed November 18, 2022.
- 11 U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. *Table 1. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for the United States, Regions, States, and Puerto Rico: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019*. United States Census Bureau; 2020. <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/datasets/2010-2020/counties/totals/co-est2020-alldata.csv>.
- 12 Bolin, J. N., Bellamy, G. R., Ferdinand, A. O., Vuong, A. M., Kash, B. A., Schulze, A., et al. (2015). Rural healthy people 2020: New decade, same challenges. *The Journal of Rural Health : Official Journal of the American Rural Health Association and the National Rural Health Care Association*, 31(3), 326–333. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25953431>.