

October 2009

Variation in Insurance Coverage Across Congressional Districts: New Estimates from 2008

Timely Analysis of Immediate Health Policy Issues

Genevieve Kenney
Victoria Lynch
Stephen Zuckerman
Samantha Phong

Variation in Insurance Coverage Across Congressional Districts: New Estimates from 2008

Genevieve Kenney, Victoria Lynch, Stephen Zuckerman and Samantha Phong

SUMMARY

New data on health insurance coverage from the American Community Survey show extensive variation in rates of private and public coverage and uninsurance across congressional districts in the United States. This survey reveals those districts that face the greatest deficiencies in private coverage and pinpoints the districts where public coverage closes some of the gap left by low rates of private coverage. The picture that emerges is that (1) rates of private coverage are lowest in districts that have higher poverty rates, which tend to be concentrated in the South and West; (2) the needs in these high-poverty districts have led many to have above average rates of public coverage; and (3) despite these higher rates of public coverage, uninsurance remains most serious in districts with low rates of private coverage. This analysis identifies the districts in which residents would have the most to gain from health reforms that are designed to increase health insurance coverage toward a higher and more uniform national standard.

Introduction/Background

Numerous studies have documented considerable state and regional variation in uninsured rates across the country (Holahan 2002; Cohen and Makuc 2008; Ahluwalia et al. 2009; Fronstin 2007; SHADAC 2009; Kaiser Family Foundation 2009). For example, residents in the South and West are about 1.5 times as likely to be uninsured compared to those in the Northeast and Midwest (DeNavas-Walt et al. 2009). Likewise, newly released American Community Survey (ACS) data for 2008 from the U.S. Census Bureau confirm dramatic variation in uninsured rates across states (Turner et al. 2009). These data indicate that children in Nevada are over nine times as likely to be uninsured as children in Massachusetts (20.2 percent compared to 2.1 percent).

Studies suggest that state variation in uninsured rates is driven by underlying economic and demographic factors, such as the employment mix in the state (e.g., firm size, industry and occupation, and the degree of unionization), eligibility requirements for public programs such as Medicaid, and the demographic/socioeconomic composition of state residents (Brown et al. 2000; Fronstin 2007; Holahan 2002). State variation in employer-sponsored coverage provided through employers appears to be driven in part by employee characteristics, such as industry and length of time

spent with an employer, and local labor market characteristics, such as state-level unionization (Shen and Zuckerman 2003). There is also state variation in rates of public coverage due to varying income eligibility guidelines and the income distribution in the state (Holahan 2002). The fewer studies that have examined substate variation in coverage (Brown et al. 2000; Mendez et al. 2003) have found substantial variation in uninsured rates within particular states. For example, in California, areas with larger concentrations of young adults, Latinos, and low-income residents had uninsured rates up to four times higher than districts with the lowest uninsured rates (Mendez et al. 2003).¹

The potential for examining state and local variation in health insurance coverage and the composition of the uninsured has increased dramatically with the addition in 2008 of information on insurance coverage to the ACS, an annual survey of close to two million households conducted by the U.S. Census. Annual estimates are now possible for each congressional district and for 25 percent of counties nationwide.² This brief examines variation across congressional districts in rates of private coverage, public coverage and uninsurance among the nonelderly.³ We find that there is substantial variation in these three rates across congressional districts and that districts with

higher rates of private insurance coverage are likely to have lower rates of both public coverage and uninsurance. Coverage patterns vary systematically with the percent of residents living below the federal poverty level: districts with fewer people living in poverty have much higher rates of private coverage and lower rates of public coverage and uninsurance compared to the districts with more people living in poverty. In future work, we will examine how coverage rates and characteristics of the uninsured vary across other geographic areas, such as counties and Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs).

Data and Methods

These estimates are derived from the 2008 ACS. The ACS is fielded annually by the Census Bureau. The coverage estimates derived from ACS reflect the average experiences of respondents over the calendar year since the ACS data are collected each month throughout the year. The survey is administered using a mixed-mode approach—65 percent of the survey is completed by mail and the rest is completed by telephone or in person. The survey achieves a response rate of 98 percent and includes households with and without land line telephones (including those who rely exclusively on cellular phones).

The ACS survey questionnaire is based on the long form of the decennial census, including information on income, marital and work status, household structure, and presence of disabilities and activity limitations. In 2008, the Census Bureau added questions on health insurance coverage. Separate questions are asked about the coverage status of each individual in the household at the time of the survey. A check box approach is used as follows:

Is this person CURRENTLY covered by any of the following types of health insurance or health coverage plans? Mark “Yes” or “No” for EACH type of coverage in items a – h.

- a. Insurance through a current or former employer or union (of this person or another family member)
- b. Insurance purchased directly from an insurance company (of this person or another family member)

- c. Medicare, for people age 65 and over, or people with certain disabilities
- d. Medicaid, Medical Assistance, or any kind of government-assistance plan for those with low incomes or a disability
- e. TRICARE or other military health care
- f. VA (including those who have ever enrolled for or used VA health care)
- g. Indian Health Service
- h. Any other type of health insurance or health coverage plan—*Specify*

One of the concerns about the health insurance question on the ACS is that option d, which is intended to capture coverage through Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), does not mention CHIP or have state-specific names for the Medicaid and CHIP program in their state. This could lead to underreporting of public coverage, particularly for children (Davern et al. 2009).

Overall, the new coverage estimates from the ACS appear to line up quite closely with those from the Current Population Survey (CPS) for 2008 (Turner et al. 2009). Nationally, the uninsurance rate for children age 0 to 17 on both the CPS and ACS was 9.9 percent, while for adults age 18 to 64, the uninsurance rate on the CPS was 20.3 percent compared to 19.8 percent on the ACS.⁴ In addition, the patterns of uninsurance on the ACS with respect to gender, race/ethnicity, and marital status are consistent with those found on both the CPS and the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS). While overall the coverage distribution on the ACS is fairly similar to those found on the other two surveys, the share reported to have public coverage is lower on the ACS and the share reported to have coverage that was purchased directly from an insurance company is higher on the ACS than on the other two surveys (Turner et al. 2009).⁵

The estimates in this paper were derived from the Census Bureau’s American FactFinder, an online tool that allow us to assess rates of uninsurance, public, and private coverage vary for children age 0 to 17, nonelderly adults age 18 to 64, and for the entire nonelderly population across geographic areas with a population of 65,000 or more (<http://factfinder.census.gov>). These areas can

include states, congressional districts, public-use microdata areas, and selected counties and school districts, etc. In this brief, we examine variation across the 436 congressional districts that encompass the entire U.S. population.⁶ For each age group, the rate for a particular congressional district is compared with the national mean for that group and differences that are not significant at the .10 level are noted. Public coverage is defined as having coverage from Medicare, Medicaid, or any government assistance plan for low-income or disabled individuals, and VA. Private coverage is defined as employer/union provided, direct purchase, and TRICARE/Military. Since people can identify more than one category of insurance coverage on the ACS, these two groupings of health insurance coverage types are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

We first describe how rates of private coverage vary across districts since private health insurance forms the base for coverage in this country. We also examine patterns with respect to uninsurance and public coverage. Standard errors are calculated using the Census Bureau's replicate-based methodology.⁷ In addition, we examine how the coverage distribution varies with the percent of residents in the congressional district living below the federal poverty level, using income information provided on the 2007 ACS to rank congressional districts (the 2008 ACS income information was not available for analysis).

Findings

Nonelderly

In 2008, 69.6 percent of the nonelderly population in the nation had private coverage (Appendix Table A). There is substantial variation across congressional districts in the share of nonelderly residents who have private coverage (Exhibit 1), ranging across congressional districts from a low of 30.2 percent to a high of 89.7 percent. Congressional districts that have lower rates of private coverage are concentrated in the South and West.⁸ For example, over half (55.2 percent) of the districts with low rates of private coverage are in the South and over a quarter (25.9 percent) are in the West, whereas only 9.1 and 9.8 percent of the districts with the lower rates of private coverage are in the Northeast and Midwest, respectively (data not

shown). Rates of private coverage vary across states; for example, the proportion of the nonelderly with private coverage ranges from a high of 82.4 percent in Hawaii to a low of 56.9 percent in New Mexico. Rates of private coverage also vary across congressional districts within many states; for example, across the seven districts in Alabama, rates of private coverage vary from a low of 59.0 percent to a high of 81.8 percent.

Exhibits 2 and 3 show variation across congressional districts in rates of public coverage and uninsurance among the nonelderly. In 2008, 16.0 percent of the nonelderly population had public coverage and 17 percent were uninsured. Consistent with the lower rates of private coverage found in the South and West, we find that 91.8 percent of the congressional districts with higher rates of uninsurance are in those two regions, while only 4.8 percent and 3.4 percent, respectively, of the districts with the highest uninsured rates are in the Northeast and Midwest (data not shown). The share with public coverage ranged across congressional districts from a low of 4.3 percent to a high of 52.3 percent while the uninsured rate ranged from a low of 3.7 percent to a high of 43.0 percent.

Patterns of Private Coverage, Public Coverage and Uninsurance

Overall, districts with higher rates of private coverage tend to have both lower rates of uninsurance and lower rates of public coverage.⁹ The interaction between private and public coverage and uninsurance rates is illustrated through the 20 congressional districts with the highest and lowest rates of private coverage among the nonelderly (Exhibit 4). Of the 20 districts with the highest rates of private coverage, 17 are among the bottom 20 districts in terms of public coverage and/or uninsurance. And among those with the lowest rates of private coverage, 19 are among the top 20 districts in terms of public coverage and/or uninsurance.¹⁰

For example, only 30.2 percent of nonelderly residents of New York's 16th district are covered by private health insurance. However, the residents' high poverty rates and New York's broad eligibility rules for adults and children under Medicaid/CHIP provided 52.3 percent of these residents with public coverage. This public

Exhibit 1. Private Insurance Coverage Among the Nonelderly by Congressional District, 2008






Exhibit 2. Public Insurance Coverage Among the Nonelderly by Congressional District, 2008



Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, American Community Survey 2008

Exhibit 3. Uninsurance Among the Nonelderly by Congressional District, 2008



Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, American Community Survey 2008

Exhibit 4. Congressional Districts with the Highest and Lowest Coverage Rates among the Nonelderly in 2008: Private Coverage, Public Coverage, and Uninsurance

Highest 20	Private (%)	Public (%)	Uninsured (%)			
1	New Jersey 11	89.7	New York 16	52.3	Texas 29	43.0
2	New York 03	89.0	Michigan 13	37.1	California 31	42.4
3	Missouri 02	88.3	California 20	36.4	Texas 30	38.4
4	Wisconsin 05	88.2	New York 10	33.2	California 34	38.0
5	Pennsylvania 07	87.8	Kentucky 05	33.2	Texas 09	37.3
6	Minnesota 02	87.7	Pennsylvania 01	32.6	Texas 15	36.6
7	New Jersey 07	87.7	New York 15	31.5	Texas 18	36.0
8	Colorado 06	87.2	Michigan 14	30.5	Florida 17	35.9
9	New Jersey 12	87.1	New York 12	29.5	Texas 32	35.7
10	Pennsylvania 08	87.0	California 18	29.3	Texas 28	35.5
11	New Jersey 05	86.7	Mississippi 02	29.3	Texas 16	34.6
12	Illinois 13	86.4	California 37	29.1	Arizona 04	34.5
13	Hawaii 01	86.3	Arizona 04	28.8	Florida 23	34.1
14	Minnesota 03	86.1	New York 28	28.2	Florida 18	32.7
15	Minnesota 06	85.8	North Carolina 01	28.2	Illinois 04	32.2
16	Pennsylvania 06	85.5	New Mexico 02	27.9	Texas 27	32.0
17	California 30	85.5	Maine 02	27.3	California 47	31.7
18	Massachusetts 10	85.4	Wisconsin 04	27.2	Florida 21	31.3
19	Massachusetts 06	85.3	Arizona 07	27.2	Texas 20	31.3
20	Virginia 11	84.6	West Virginia 03	27.2	Florida 25	31.3

Lowest 20	Private (%)	Public (%)	Uninsured (%)			
1	New York 16	30.2	New Jersey 11	4.3	Massachusetts 03	3.7
2	California 31	34.8	Colorado 06	4.3	Massachusetts 05	4.0
3	Texas 29	34.9	Virginia 11	4.5	Massachusetts 04	4.0
4	California 34	36.5	Missouri 02	5.3	Massachusetts 06	4.1
5	California 20	37.7	Virginia 10	5.5	Massachusetts 02	4.3
6	Arizona 04	38.3	California 48	5.5	Massachusetts 09	4.3
7	Texas 15	38.9	New Jersey 05	5.6	Massachusetts 01	4.5
8	Texas 30	41.3	New Jersey 07	5.7	Massachusetts 10	5.1
9	Texas 28	42.1	New York 03	5.9	Massachusetts 07	5.2
10	Illinois 04	43.1	Georgia 06	5.9	Hawaii 01	6.0
11	Texas 09	44.5	California 30	6.2	Wisconsin 05	6.2
12	Texas 18	44.7	New Jersey 12	6.9	Massachusetts 08	6.8
13	Texas 16	45.7	California 42	7.0	Minnesota 02	6.9
14	Texas 27	46.7	Illinois 13	7.1	New York 26	7.0
15	California 47	46.7	Pennsylvania 07	7.1	New York 03	7.0
16	California 35	46.7	Colorado 02	7.4	Pennsylvania 07	7.2
17	Michigan 13	46.7	Minnesota 02	7.5	Minnesota 03	7.4
18	Florida 17	47.6	California 14	7.7	New Jersey 11	7.4
19	Kentucky 05	48.6	Virginia 08	7.8	New Jersey 12	7.4
20	Florida 23	48.4	Nevada 03	7.8	Pennsylvania 18	7.6

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, Tables B27001, B27002, and B27003, American Community Survey 2008

Note: Public coverage is defined as having coverage from Medicare, Medicaid, or any government assistance plan for low-income or disabled individuals, and VA. Private coverage is defined as employer/union provided, direct purchase, and TRICARE/military. Health insurance coverage types are not mutually exclusive.

coverage rate is extremely high by national standards. Still, this district’s uninsurance rate is 21.2, a rate that is high but well below what would have prevailed if the district had the national average rate of public coverage. Similarly, California’s 20th district had a low rate of private coverage (37.7 percent), but a rate of public coverage that is 16 percentage points below the New York-16 district (36.4 percent). As a result, this California district has an uninsurance rate of 28.2 percent, which puts it close to the top twenty uninsured rates in the nation. Two other districts—Michigan-13 and Kentucky-05—also have low rates of private coverage, but high enough public coverage so that their uninsurance rates are well outside the top twenty districts.

Fifteen of the remaining 16 districts with the lowest rates of private coverage do not have enough public coverage to offset these very low rates of private coverage and end up among the districts with the highest rates of uninsurance (the one exception is California-35; see footnote 8). For example, less than 35 percent of the residents in the California-31 and Texas-29 districts have private coverage and, despite having relatively high rates of public coverage (24.2 percent and 23.2 percent, respectively), more than 4 out of 10 residents in these districts remain uninsured. Of the 15 districts with the lowest rates of private coverage and the highest rates of uninsurance, 8 are in Texas, 3 are in California, 2 are in Florida, and one each in Arizona and Illinois.

The remaining data in Exhibit 4 make two points quite clearly. First, the success of the Massachusetts health reforms is evident by the dominance of that state among the lowest uninsurance rate districts across the nation. All 10 of Massachusetts’s congressional districts fall among the 20 districts with the lowest rates of uninsurance. Second, districts outside Massachusetts with low uninsurance rates almost always have very high rates of private coverage. Eight of the 10 low uninsurance rate districts outside of Massachusetts are also among the top 20 districts in terms of private coverage.

Variation in Coverage Distribution by Poverty Rate in Congressional District

Districts with relatively few people living below the federal poverty level tend to have higher rates of private coverage and lower rates of public coverage and uninsurance compared with districts that have more people living below the federal poverty level (Exhibit 5). The districts in the lowest quintile of people living below the federal poverty level have a rate of private coverage among the nonelderly of 80.7 percent, whereas those living in the highest quintile in terms of the proportion of the population living below the federal poverty level have a rate of private coverage that is 55.4 percent. In contrast, rates of public coverage and uninsurance are 9.9 and 12.1 percent, respectively, for the nonelderly living in districts in the lowest quintile of poverty, while the rates of public coverage and uninsurance are 24.2 and 22.1 percent, respectively, for the nonelderly living in districts in the highest quintile of poverty. Similar patterns are found for children and nonelderly adults; however, children in districts in all poverty quintiles are more likely to have public coverage and less likely to be uninsured than nonelderly adults (data not shown).

Exhibit 5. Coverage Distribution among the Nonelderly in 2008 by Congressional District Poverty Quintile

Congressional District Poverty Quintile (poverty rate)	Private (%)	Public (%)	Uninsured (%)
Lowest (3.1%-8.7%)	80.7	9.9	12.1
Second lowest (8.8%-11.2%)	74.0	12.9	16.5
Middle (11.3%-13.2%)	70.1	16.8	17.3
Second highest (13.3%-17.2%)	65.2	18.2	17.8
Highest (17.3%-37.7%)	55.4	24.2	22.1

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, Tables B27001, B27002, and B27003, American Community Survey 2008 and Table GCT1701, American Community Survey, 2007

Note: Public coverage is defined as having coverage from Medicare, Medicaid, or any government assistance plan for low-income or disabled individuals, and VA. Private coverage is defined as employer/union provided, direct purchase, and TRICARE/military. Health insurance coverage types are not mutually exclusive.

Children and Nonelderly Adults

Appendix Tables B and C show the coverage distributions by state and congressional district for children and nonelderly adults, respectively. In 2008, an estimated 64.1 percent of all children in the nation had private coverage, 28.3 percent had

public coverage, and 9.9 percent were uninsured while 71.8 percent of all nonelderly adults had private coverage, 11.1 percent had public coverage and 19.8 percent were uninsured. For both children and nonelderly adults, there is substantial variation in patterns of coverage across the districts. For example, the share of children who were uninsured ranged across congressional districts from a low of 1.3 percent to a high of 31.4 percent; for nonelderly adults, the uninsured rate varied across districts from a low of 4.5 percent to a high of 51.8 percent. Not surprisingly, the rates of private coverage for children and nonelderly adults are very highly correlated across districts (the correlation coefficient is 96 percent). Similarly, the rates of public coverage for children and nonelderly adults are also highly correlated across districts (but the correlation coefficient is somewhat lower, at 78 percent). This difference is likely due to variation across areas in eligibility thresholds for adults and children. The net effect is that the rates of uninsurance for children and nonelderly adults are still highly correlated across districts, with a correlation coefficient of 84 percent.

Summary

New data on health insurance coverage from the American Community Survey show extensive variation in rates of private and public coverage and uninsurance across congressional districts in the United States. This survey also reveals those districts that face the greatest deficiencies in private coverage and pinpoints the districts where public coverage closes some of the gap left by low rates of private coverage. The picture that emerges is that (1) rates of private coverage are lowest in districts that have higher poverty rates, which tend to be concentrated in the South and West; (2) the needs in these high-poverty districts have led many to have above average rates of public coverage; and (3) despite these higher rates of public coverage, uninsurance remains most serious in districts with low rates of private coverage. This analysis identifies the districts in which residents would have the most to gain from health reforms that are designed to increase health insurance coverage toward a higher and more uniform national standard.

References

- Ahluwalia IB, Bolen J, Pearson WS, Link M, Garvin W, Mokdad A. 2009. "State and Metropolitan Variation in Lack of Health Insurance Among Working-Age Adults, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006." *Public Health Reports* 124: 34–41.
- Brown ER, Wyn R, Teleki S. 2000. "Disparities in Health Insurance and Access to Care for Residents across U.S. Cities." New York: The Commonwealth Fund and UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.
- Cohen RA, Makuc DM. 2008. "State, Regional, and National Estimates of Health Insurance Coverage for People Under 65 Years of Age: National Health Interview Survey, 2004-2006." National Health Statistics Reports; no. 1. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Cohen RA, Martinez ME. 2009. "Health Insurance Coverage: Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, 2008." Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Davern M, Quinn B, Kenney G, Blewett L. 2009. "The American Community Survey and Health Insurance Coverage Estimates: Possibilities and Challenges for Health Policy Researchers." *Health Services Research* 44(2):593–605.
- DeNavas-Walt C, Proctor B, Smith J. 2009. U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-236, *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2008*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Fronstin P. 2007. "Sources of Health Insurance and Characteristics of the Uninsured: Analysis of the March 2007 Current Population Survey." EBRI Issue Brief No. 310. Washington, DC: Employee Benefit Research Institute.
- Holahan J. 2002. "Variations among States in Health Insurance Coverage and Medical Expenditures: How Much is Too Much?" Assessing the New Federalism Discussion Paper. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Kaiser Family Foundation. 2007. State Health Facts Online. "Health Insurance Coverage of Nonelderly 0-64, States (2006–2007), U.S. (2007)." <http://www.statehealthfacts.org>.
- Mendez CA, Wallace SP, Yu H, Meng YY, Chia J, Brown ER. 2003. "California's New Assembly and Senate Districts: Geographic Disparities in Health Insurance Coverage." Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

SHADAC. 2009. "At the Brink: Trends in America's Uninsured. A State-by-State Analysis." Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and State Health Access Data Assistance Center.

Shen and Zuckerman. 2003. "Why Is There Variation in Employer-Sponsored Health Insurance?" *Health Affairs* 22(1): 241–51.

Turner J, Boudreau M, Lynch V. 2009. "A Preliminary Evaluation of Health Insurance Coverage in the 2008 American Community Survey." Bureau of the Census.

U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. 2008.. "Congressional Apportionment."
<http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment/index.html>.

Notes

¹ The Small Area Health Insurance Estimates (SAHIE) from the U.S. Census Bureau provide county- and state-level estimates of health insurance coverage. While these estimates are useful in the absence of other data sources, they have the disadvantages of having a three-year lag in their release and of being based on small-area estimation techniques.

² Uninsured estimates for each congressional district based on the ACS data are contained in Benincasa R, Hsu N. "The Uninsured: Rates by State and Congressional District." National Public Radio, September 22, 2009.
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=113042669>.

Also see Overby P. "Who's Representing the Uninsured on Capitol Hill?" National Public Radio. September 22, 2009.
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=113042528&ps=cprs>.

³ We focus on congressional districts in this brief because they are the smallest geopolitical areas that can be analyzed comprehensively using the ACS and because these data could be useful to decision makers involved in health care reform legislation.

⁴ The 2008 National Health Interview Survey found an uninsured rate of 8.9 percent among children ages 0–17 and 19.7 percent among adults ages 18–64 (Cohen and Martinez 2009).

⁵ These differences may mean that the ACS understates public coverage rates and overstates private coverage rates, but the magnitude of these differences is likely to be small enough so as to not have a major impact on the relative rankings of the congressional districts reported in the paper. We recognize that additional research is needed to assess these issues and should be conducted as the micro-data become more readily available.

⁶ Congressional districts are defined based on the population counts in the decennial census. District boundaries are redrawn based on population estimates and House seats are reapportioned after each decennial census. The average population represented by congressional districts is just under 650,000 (U.S. Census Bureau 2008).

⁷ This methodology is described in <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/ACS/accuracy2008.pdf>.

⁸ The Census Regions are groupings of states that are defined as follows: The *Northeast* includes Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The *Midwest* includes Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The *South* includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. The *West* includes Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington. Nineteen (19.0) percent of congressional districts are in the Northeast, 22.9 percent are in the Midwest, 35.6 are in are in the South, and 22.5 percent are in the West.

⁹ Among the nonelderly, the correlation coefficient between the rates of private and public coverage across districts is large and negative (-0.80); likewise, a correlation coefficient of -0.80 was found for the rates of private coverage and uninsurance across districts. In contrast, rates of public coverage at the district level are positively correlated with uninsured rates (with a correlation coefficient of 0.3).

¹⁰ California-35 is the only district in the low private coverage group that is not among the top 20 districts in terms of public coverage and/or uninsurance. Although this district has high rates of public coverage and uninsurance, neither is high enough to place the district in the top 20 on either measure.

Appendix Table A

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
NATION	69.6%		16.0%		17.0%	
ALABAMA	69.4%		18.3%		16.1%	
1	66.3%	149	17.8%	287	19.4%	293
2	69.3%	192	20.4%	337	14.5%	190
3	68.9%	187	20.5%	342	15.1%	203
4	63.8%	113	20.5%	340	20.0%	306
5	73.3%	253	14.2%	183	15.5%	209
6	81.8%	390	10.2%	71	10.6%	67
7	59.0%	66	26.7%	413	18.6%	282
ALASKA	67.8%		14.6%		21.4%	
1	67.8%	172	14.6%	197	21.4%	337
ARIZONA	62.6%		18.7%		21.2%	
1	53.2%	32	24.5%	395	26.0%	398
2	68.9%	189	16.7%	258	17.3%	248
3	67.8%	171	13.7%	165	20.6%	319
4	38.3%	6	28.8%	424	34.5%	425
5	77.6%	328	8.5%	33	15.4%	208
6	72.5%	240	13.1%	148	16.7%	238
7	49.8%	22	27.2%	418	25.5%	392
8	73.2%	250	17.0%	270	13.5%	166
ARKANSAS	59.9%		23.1%		20.8%	
1	55.2%	44	26.7%	414	21.7%	343
2	64.8%	128	21.0%	348	17.6%	253
3	62.7%	100	19.5%	320	21.8%	345
4	55.4%	45	26.4%	408	22.2%	351
CALIFORNIA	65.1%		17.1%		19.7%	
1	66.2%	144	18.9%	306	17.6%	254
2	57.3%	56	25.1%	400	20.7%	321
3	74.2%	272	16.1%	247	11.9%	116
4	74.3%	274	14.3%	187	13.9%	171
5	61.0%	80	25.1%	401	16.7%	237
6	75.7%	303	11.8%	107	14.5%	186
7	71.5%	227	16.6%	257	14.3%	183
8	74.4%	277	14.9%	206	12.8%	143
9	68.9%	186	16.0%	238	16.7%	236
10	80.4%	370	9.6%	60	11.8%	113
11	77.4%	326	12.4%	124	12.2%	125
12	83.4%	410	7.9%	22	10.4%	63
13	77.6%	330	12.7%	132	11.2%	83
14	82.6%	404	7.7%	18	11.2%	84
15	82.2%	396	8.8%	39	10.8%	76
16	71.0%	219	15.8%	231	15.0%	200

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
CALIFORNIA						
(continued)						
17	62.6%	98	18.4%	297	21.7%	344
18	50.4%	25	29.5%	427	22.5%	355
19	61.0%	79	22.4%	370	18.5%	275
20	37.7%	5	36.4%	434	28.2%	411
21	53.5%	38	25.3%	402	23.8%	376
22	67.1%	159	19.7%	324	16.4%	230
23	61.5%	84	17.2%	275	23.2%	369
24	79.0%	353	9.7%	62	12.8%	146
25	68.3%	179	16.4%	251	17.3%	249
26	77.3%	325	9.9%	67	14.1%	175
27	63.3%	109	15.8%	232	22.3%	354
28	51.9%	30	21.8%	360	27.5%	409
29	65.7%	138	14.5%	195	21.4%	335
30	85.5%	420	6.2%	11	9.6%	37
31	34.8%	2	24.2%	390	42.4%	435
32	53.2%	35	21.1%	349	27.0%	407
33	53.4%	37	17.6%	283	30.2%	416
34	36.5%	4	26.8%	415	38.0%	433
35	46.7%	16	27.0%	416	27.8%	410
36	71.1%	220	12.0%	116	18.3%	271
37	50.1%	23	29.1%	425	22.5%	357
38	54.7%	42	19.7%	327	26.7%	404
39	56.0%	48	19.7%	326	26.0%	397
40	67.0%	157	13.2%	150	21.3%	333
41	61.4%	83	19.2%	311	21.7%	341
42	81.7%	387	7.0%	13	12.5%	136
43	53.3%	36	22.4%	371	26.3%	402
44	66.8%	154	13.9%	174	20.7%	322
45	59.8%	73	18.4%	298	24.1%	381
46	78.9%	350	8.4%	31	14.1%	176
47	46.7%	15	22.8%	375	31.7%	420
48	83.7%	411	5.5%	6	11.7%	105
49	65.6%	137	14.7%	201	21.9%	348
50	76.7%	318	9.6%	59	15.8%	219
51	56.6%	54	21.8%	361	24.5%	385
52	74.3%	275	13.8%	167	14.5%	188
53	63.1%	105	15.1%	210	24.3%	382
COLORADO						
	72.4%		10.6%		19.0%	
1	62.9%	102	14.0%	176	25.0%	388
2	77.3%	324	7.4%	16	16.8%	241
3	61.2%	81	16.5%	254	24.8%	386
4	73.0%	248	11.0%	88	17.8%	259
5	73.6%	261	11.4%	98	17.7%	256
6	87.2%	429	4.3%	2	9.9%	44
7	67.6%	166	11.3%	97	23.1%	367

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
CONNECTICUT	78.6%		13.4%		10.2%	
1	77.2%	323	16.3%	250	9.6%	36
2	82.4%	400	11.1%	90	9.0%	32
3	76.8%	319	15.3%	218	10.3%	55
4	78.3%	338	10.6%	81	12.4%	133
5	78.4%	340	13.9%	173	10.0%	46
DELAWARE	74.6%		16.8%		11.8%	
1	74.6%	279	16.8%	260	11.8%	112
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	70.0%		24.7%		8.7%	
1	70.0%	201	24.7%	397	8.7%	29
FLORIDA	63.7%		13.8%		24.8%	
1	65.2%	132	17.0%	269	21.3%	334
2	67.2%	161	17.4%	278	18.1%	267
3	50.2%	24	23.3%	380	29.1%	413
4	72.9%	247	11.7%	105	18.4%	273
5	62.4%	97	15.6%	226	24.8%	387
6	68.6%	182	13.3%	155	21.5%	339
7	70.3%	205	11.5%	100	20.7%	323
8	67.8%	170	11.2%	96	22.7%	363
9	70.3%	204	12.4%	127	19.7%	300
10	66.3%	148	13.9%	171	22.7%	364
11	57.9%	59	18.6%	301	25.8%	395
12	61.9%	87	18.7%	302	21.8%	347
13	64.4%	123	11.9%	112	26.2%	400
14	64.9%	129	11.1%	93	26.1%	399
15	64.7%	126	13.0%	143	25.0%	389
16	61.5%	85	13.8%	169	27.1%	408
17	47.6%	18	18.1%	290	35.9%	429
18	56.6%	53	11.8%	109	32.7%	423
19	67.6%	167	9.8%	66	24.3%	383
20	70.6%	208	9.5%	56	21.4%	336
21	58.0%	60	11.6%	102	31.3%	419
22	73.3%	252	9.4%	53	19.4%	291
23	48.6%	20	19.3%	315	34.1%	424
24	72.3%	237	9.5%	54	20.3%	312
25	58.2%	61	11.8%	108	31.3%	417
GEORGIA	65.8%		15.9%		20.7%	
1	64.0%	117	18.8%	303	20.6%	318
2	54.0%	41	26.7%	412	22.3%	353
3	73.8%	263	13.8%	168	14.7%	193
4	55.1%	43	16.8%	261	30.2%	415
5	62.2%	94	17.2%	274	22.5%	358
6	81.7%	388	5.9%	10	13.7%	169
7	70.9%	217	11.1%	92	19.8%	301
8	60.3%	77	21.6%	357	21.5%	338

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
GEORGIA						
(continued)						
9	64.5%	125	14.3%	189	23.2%	371
10	67.0%	155	15.7%	228	20.1%	308
11	69.9%	200	13.2%	152	18.8%	285
12	59.0%	67	23.3%	382	21.3%	332
13	64.0%	116	15.7%	230	22.6%	361
HAWAII						
	82.4%		12.5%		7.8%	
1	86.3%	424	10.5%	78	6.0%	10
2	78.8%	347	14.3%	190	9.4%	35
IDAHO						
	69.6%		13.4%		20.0%	
1	69.6%	197	13.5%	163	19.8%	304
2	69.6%	194	13.3%	154	20.2%	310
ILLINOIS						
	71.7%		16.3%		14.2%	
1	58.7%	65	26.6%	411	17.4%	250
2	59.2%	70	25.0%	399	18.5%	278
3	69.6%	195	15.7%	229	16.6%	234
4	43.1%	10	26.5%	410	32.2%	422
5	71.3%	225	11.4%	99	18.6%	280
6	78.9%	352	9.8%	64	12.6%	140
7	61.9%	89	23.5%	386	16.6%	235
8	79.8%	363	10.3%	73	11.5%	98
9	73.8%	264	11.9%	110	15.9%	222
10	82.3%	397	8.7%	37	10.2%	52
11	76.4%	313	15.0%	208	11.1%	81
12	67.3%	162	23.1%	377	13.1%	155
13	86.4%	425	7.1%	14	8.2%	26
14	76.3%	312	12.2%	122	13.2%	159
15	75.1%	291	16.6%	255	11.4%	95
16	75.9%	307	16.0%	245	10.7%	72
17	69.1%	190	21.6%	359	13.4%	162
18	75.0%	289	17.2%	273	10.7%	73
19	73.6%	260	18.2%	291	11.5%	99
INDIANA						
	72.5%		14.4%		15.7%	
1	70.8%	216	16.0%	239	15.7%	216
2	69.7%	199	15.6%	223	17.9%	261
3	70.8%	213	12.8%	136	18.9%	288
4	79.7%	362	10.0%	69	12.4%	131
5	81.8%	389	10.0%	68	10.4%	58
6	70.8%	215	14.3%	186	17.8%	258
7	59.1%	69	24.2%	392	19.9%	305
8	71.3%	223	15.9%	233	15.8%	218
9	75.5%	301	13.2%	153	14.3%	184
IOWA						
	78.8%		13.9%		10.5%	
1	78.8%	346	14.2%	181	10.4%	59

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
IOWA						
(continued)						
2	78.7%	345	14.0%	178	10.7%	70
3	80.3%	369	13.5%	159	9.2%	33
4	79.3%	357	13.5%	160	10.4%	60
5	76.6%	317	14.7%	200	11.9%	115
KANSAS						
	76.8%		12.1%		13.8%	
1	74.9%	285	12.9%	137	15.2%	204
2	77.6%	329	12.7%	133	13.0%	153
3	80.1%	366	8.9%	43	12.9%	149
4	74.1%	269	14.2%	184	14.3%	182
KENTUCKY						
	67.6%		19.7%		16.1%	
1	63.3%	107	21.6%	358	18.9%	287
2	70.6%	207	18.2%	292	15.6%	214
3	75.7%	304	15.2%	215	12.0%	120
4	74.0%	266	15.9%	236	13.1%	154
5	48.6%	19	33.2%	432	22.0%	350
6	71.8%	231	15.2%	213	15.5%	211
LOUISIANA						
	61.5%		21.5%		20.0%	
1	66.4%	151	17.8%	285	18.9%	289
2	53.2%	33	25.5%	404	24.0%	380
3	64.7%	127	20.4%	336	18.1%	265
4	60.0%	76	23.5%	383	20.3%	314
5	55.6%	46	24.1%	389	23.7%	374
6	65.6%	136	19.5%	322	17.2%	246
7	61.9%	88	21.4%	355	19.4%	292
MAINE						
	68.7%		22.7%		12.7%	
1	74.0%	267	18.1%	289	11.3%	85
2	63.3%	108	27.3%	420	14.2%	179
MARYLAND						
	78.4%		11.9%		12.3%	
1	80.9%	376	10.5%	79	11.1%	79
2	75.3%	295	14.8%	202	12.8%	145
3	81.7%	385	10.6%	82	10.4%	57
4	77.0%	321	10.2%	72	15.2%	206
5	83.7%	412	9.1%	46	10.1%	49
6	80.8%	375	10.8%	86	10.6%	69
7	68.3%	177	21.9%	362	13.4%	163
8	78.6%	343	7.9%	23	15.0%	199
MASSACHUSETTS						
	80.9%		17.5%		4.6%	
1	79.9%	364	19.4%	317	4.5%	7
2	77.7%	331	21.1%	350	4.3%	5
3	82.3%	399	16.6%	256	3.7%	1
4	82.5%	403	16.0%	242	4.0%	3
5	81.0%	377	17.7%	284	4.0%	2

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
MASSACHUSETTS						
(continued)						
6	85.3%	418	13.4%	158	4.1%	4
7	82.0%	394	15.5%	221	5.2%	9
8	72.4%	239	24.3%	393	6.8%	12
9	81.4%	383	16.9%	267	4.3%	6
10	85.4%	419	13.2%	149	5.1%	8
MICHIGAN						
	72.0%		18.1%		13.1%	
1	68.1%	174	21.4%	353	15.3%	207
2	74.1%	268	17.6%	281	11.7%	103
3	74.6%	280	15.9%	235	12.5%	135
4	70.7%	212	19.3%	316	14.0%	172
5	66.0%	143	26.4%	409	11.5%	100
6	70.6%	209	18.3%	293	14.7%	194
7	74.5%	278	16.8%	262	12.0%	118
8	79.5%	358	12.8%	135	10.2%	53
9	83.2%	408	8.1%	26	10.3%	56
10	78.5%	342	13.5%	162	11.3%	90
11	81.7%	386	9.1%	49	11.2%	82
12	72.4%	238	16.0%	243	14.2%	180
13	46.7%	17	37.1%	435	19.8%	303
14	53.9%	40	31.5%	429	18.6%	281
15	76.5%	316	15.3%	217	11.3%	87
MINNESOTA						
	80.0%		12.9%		9.8%	
1	81.9%	391	12.1%	120	8.9%	
2	87.7%	431	7.5%	17	6.9%	14
3	86.1%	423	8.5%	32	7.4%	18
4	76.9%	320	14.9%	204	10.6%	66
5	68.5%	181	19.0%	308	14.7%	192
6	85.8%	422	9.1%	47	7.7%	22
7	75.3%	296	16.8%	265	11.3%	86
8	72.8%	245	18.4%	296	12.2%	128
MISSISSIPPI						
	60.7%		22.5%		20.2%	
1	64.1%	120	20.4%	338	18.5%	279
2	51.7%	29	29.3%	426	22.6%	360
3	63.8%	114	22.0%	363	17.8%	260
4	62.0%	91	19.1%	310	22.3%	352
MISSOURI						
	71.8%		16.0%		14.9%	
1	64.1%	119	23.2%	378	15.7%	215
2	88.3%	434	5.3%	4	7.9%	23
3	78.2%	337	12.6%	129	11.8%	108
4	69.2%	191	17.6%	282	16.8%	239
5	67.7%	168	17.5%	280	17.7%	255
6	77.5%	327	12.6%	130	12.5%	137
7	66.0%	140	17.3%	276	19.5%	297
8	57.6%	57	26.0%	405	19.8%	302

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
MISSOURI (continued)						
9	74.7%	282	14.6%	198	13.4%	164
MONTANA						
	68.3%		13.6%		21.2%	
1	68.3%	178	13.6%	164	21.2%	329
NEBRASKA						
	78.0%		12.0%		12.7%	
1	80.5%	371	10.6%	84	11.3%	88
2	77.9%	333	12.4%	126	12.5%	138
3	75.4%	298	13.1%	146	14.4%	185
NEVADA						
	69.4%		9.4%		23.8%	
1	63.7%	112	10.4%	76	28.3%	412
2	68.5%	180	10.4%	75	24.3%	384
3	75.1%	290	7.8%	20	19.5%	296
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
	79.6%		10.9%		12.2%	
1	79.6%	359	10.6%	83	12.3%	129
2	79.7%	360	11.1%	91	12.2%	123
NEW JERSEY						
	76.3%		11.8%		13.9%	
1	72.6%	243	16.0%	241	13.6%	167
2	75.5%	300	14.6%	199	12.7%	142
3	82.8%	405	8.8%	41	10.8%	77
4	78.8%	348	12.0%	115	11.5%	97
5	86.7%	426	5.6%	7	9.3%	34
6	74.2%	271	10.7%	85	16.8%	240
7	87.6%	430	5.7%	8	8.0%	25
8	67.3%	163	16.0%	244	19.6%	298
9	75.4%	297	8.9%	44	17.1%	243
10	56.5%	52	23.5%	384	21.8%	346
11	89.7%	436	4.3%	1	7.4%	19
12	87.1%	428	6.9%	12	7.6%	20
13	56.0%	47	20.3%	335	25.8%	396
NEW MEXICO						
	56.9%		22.0%		24.2%	
1	63.5%	110	18.3%	294	20.7%	320
2	50.4%	26	27.8%	421	25.0%	390
3	56.4%	51	20.3%	334	26.9%	405
NEW YORK						
	70.2%		19.5%		13.3%	
1	81.9%	392	9.1%	48	11.3%	89
2	81.4%	381	8.6%	34	11.8%	109
3	89.0%	435	5.9%	9	7.2%	16
4	78.8%	349	9.5%	58	13.2%	157
5	62.0%	90	19.6%	323	20.5%	317
6	63.5%	111	23.8%	388	16.1%	226
7	56.3%	50	26.4%	407	21.2%	330
8	71.6%	229	20.4%	339	10.0%	47

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
NEW YORK						
(continued)						
9	73.2%	251	17.4%	277	11.3%	91
10	57.7%	58	33.2%	433	13.2%	158
11	61.7%	86	25.3%	403	16.0%	223
12	51.6%	28	30.5%	428	20.7%	324
13	73.1%	249	18.4%	295	10.9%	78
14	81.2%	379	9.4%	52	10.8%	75
15	53.8%	39	32.6%	430	18.2%	269
16	30.2%	1	52.3%	436	21.2%	328
17	66.3%	146	20.6%	344	16.2%	227
18	79.0%	354	10.6%	80	12.9%	147
19	83.2%	409	8.8%	40	10.4%	62
20	78.4%	339	12.8%	134	11.9%	117
21	77.2%	322	16.1%	246	9.8%	40
22	72.0%	234	15.9%	234	15.1%	202
23	71.1%	221	21.4%	354	11.6%	101
24	68.9%	188	22.0%	365	12.3%	130
25	78.9%	351	14.0%	177	10.1%	48
26	84.1%	415	12.1%	118	7.0%	15
27	73.4%	257	20.2%	332	9.9%	42
28	64.1%	118	28.2%	423	11.7%	107
29	78.6%	344	15.1%	212	9.9%	45
NORTH CAROLINA						
	67.8%		17.2%		18.0%	
1	56.8%	55	28.2%	422	18.5%	277
2	62.7%	99	19.8%	328	21.0%	326
3	71.6%	228	16.2%	248	16.5%	233
4	81.3%	380	9.5%	57	11.1%	80
5	70.8%	214	15.6%	225	16.3%	229
6	70.7%	210	15.2%	214	17.1%	244
7	58.4%	62	22.4%	373	23.1%	368
8	63.9%	115	19.3%	314	20.3%	313
9	79.7%	361	9.3%	51	12.8%	144
10	65.0%	130	18.8%	304	18.9%	290
11	62.3%	95	19.3%	313	21.3%	331
12	61.3%	82	19.5%	321	21.7%	342
13	68.8%	184	15.5%	220	18.1%	264
NORTH DAKOTA						
	79.9%		10.9%		12.1%	
1	79.9%	365	10.9%	87	12.1%	122
OHIO						
	73.8%		15.6%		13.4%	
1	72.2%	236	14.9%	205	15.1%	201
2	78.0%	335	11.9%	111	12.2%	127
3	73.3%	254	15.9%	237	13.9%	170
4	73.5%	259	16.4%	252	13.2%	156
5	80.2%	368	12.0%	117	10.5%	65
6	69.6%	196	19.4%	318	14.6%	191
7	74.2%	270	16.3%	249	12.9%	150

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
OHIO						
(continued)						
8	76.5%	314	14.3%	188	12.4%	132
9	71.2%	222	19.2%	312	13.0%	151
10	72.1%	235	17.1%	272	13.2%	160
11	63.0%	104	23.3%	381	16.2%	228
12	78.1%	336	11.7%	104	12.1%	121
13	74.9%	287	15.1%	209	13.0%	152
14	80.7%	374	10.5%	77	10.6%	68
15	76.2%	309	13.0%	141	12.9%	148
16	75.2%	293	13.9%	170	14.0%	173
17	69.4%	193	19.0%	309	14.5%	187
18	65.4%	134	20.5%	341	17.9%	262
OKLAHOMA						
	63.1%		17.8%		22.3%	
1	68.1%	173	14.9%	203	19.4%	294
2	50.9%	27	23.6%	387	29.3%	414
3	66.0%	141	16.7%	259	20.5%	316
4	70.0%	203	15.1%	211	18.7%	283
5	59.8%	75	18.9%	307	23.9%	377
OREGON						
	71.0%		12.7%		18.7%	
1	77.8%	332	9.8%	63	14.8%	195
2	65.5%	135	14.5%	196	22.6%	362
3	71.8%	233	12.1%	121	18.1%	268
4	67.4%	164	15.6%	224	20.2%	311
5	71.5%	226	12.1%	119	18.4%	274
PENNSYLVANIA						
	76.6%		15.9%		10.9%	
1	52.5%	31	33.1%	431	18.2%	270
2	66.5%	152	24.4%	394	14.3%	181
3	72.7%	244	20.3%	333	11.4%	96
4	81.5%	384	12.9%	140	8.6%	27
5	74.0%	265	18.9%	305	11.4%	94
6	85.5%	421	9.0%	45	7.9%	24
7	87.8%	432	7.1%	15	7.3%	17
8	87.0%	427	8.7%	36	6.9%	13
9	72.9%	246	18.0%	288	13.3%	161
10	74.3%	276	17.5%	279	11.8%	111
11	74.9%	286	16.8%	263	11.7%	106
12	69.6%	198	22.4%	372	12.2%	124
13	81.1%	378	12.0%	113	9.6%	38
14	70.7%	211	21.3%	352	11.7%	102
15	79.3%	356	13.3%	156	10.2%	54
16	74.8%	283	13.2%	151	14.5%	189
17	78.5%	341	14.4%	194	10.4%	61
18	84.1%	416	11.2%	94	7.6%	21
19	82.2%	395	11.6%	101	9.6%	39

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
RHODE ISLAND	75.6%		16.2%		12.0%	
1	75.4%	299	15.4%	219	12.6%	141
2	75.8%	306	17.0%	268	11.4%	92
SOUTH CAROLINA	66.2%		17.2%		19.9%	
1	67.7%	169	13.9%	172	21.9%	349
2	71.7%	230	14.4%	193	17.2%	245
3	66.0%	142	18.5%	300	18.5%	276
4	68.2%	176	14.9%	207	20.1%	307
5	64.3%	121	19.9%	329	18.8%	286
6	58.6%	63	22.7%	374	22.8%	365
SOUTH DAKOTA	75.2%		15.5%		13.5%	
1	75.2%	292	15.5%	222	13.5%	165
TENNESSEE	68.8%		18.6%		15.5%	
1	62.8%	101	22.0%	364	18.7%	284
2	74.6%	281	14.1%	179	13.6%	168
3	67.0%	156	19.9%	330	15.6%	213
4	62.9%	103	23.1%	376	17.4%	251
5	70.4%	206	16.4%	253	15.6%	212
6	72.5%	241	16.0%	240	14.2%	177
7	80.5%	373	11.7%	106	10.8%	74
8	65.2%	131	22.4%	369	16.0%	224
9	59.3%	72	24.9%	398	19.5%	295
TEXAS	60.4%		15.2%		26.5%	
1	60.3%	78	17.1%	271	25.5%	391
2	68.1%	175	12.5%	128	21.5%	340
3	68.9%	185	8.2%	30	24.0%	379
4	66.7%	153	12.9%	139	22.9%	366
5	62.0%	92	14.2%	182	25.8%	394
6	66.3%	147	12.4%	125	23.3%	372
7	75.8%	305	7.8%	21	17.6%	252
8	66.2%	145	13.3%	157	22.5%	356
9	44.5%	11	19.7%	325	37.3%	432
10	71.8%	232	8.8%	42	20.8%	325
11	59.8%	74	15.7%	227	27.0%	406
12	62.1%	93	14.4%	191	25.7%	393
13	64.4%	122	14.4%	192	23.7%	375
14	65.8%	139	12.0%	114	24.0%	378
15	38.9%	7	26.0%	406	36.6%	431
16	45.7%	13	22.2%	367	34.6%	426
17	65.3%	133	13.8%	166	23.2%	370
18	44.7%	12	20.8%	346	36.0%	430
19	63.1%	106	16.9%	266	22.6%	359
20	49.6%	21	24.2%	391	31.3%	418
21	75.9%	308	11.0%	89	16.4%	231
22	73.4%	256	8.2%	28	19.6%	299
23	56.2%	49	20.5%	343	26.2%	401

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
TEXAS (continued)						
24	72.5%	242	8.6%	35	20.5%	315
25	62.3%	96	13.1%	147	26.3%	403
26	70.0%	202	10.3%	74	21.1%	327
27	46.7%	14	23.5%	385	32.0%	421
28	42.1%	9	24.6%	396	35.5%	427
29	34.9%	3	23.2%	379	43.0%	436
30	41.3%	8	22.2%	366	38.4%	434
31	74.9%	284	11.6%	103	16.9%	242
32	53.2%	34	12.3%	123	35.7%	428
UTAH						
	76.0%		9.1%		16.9%	
1	76.5%	315	9.5%	55	16.5%	232
2	76.3%	310	9.7%	61	15.8%	221
3	75.3%	294	8.2%	29	18.1%	263
VERMONT						
	70.9%		22.3%		10.4%	
1	70.9%	218	22.3%	368	10.4%	64
VIRGINIA						
	78.2%		11.1%		13.4%	
1	84.0%	414	8.7%	38	10.2%	51
2	81.4%	382	9.2%	50	12.4%	134
3	64.5%	124	21.0%	347	18.1%	266
4	76.3%	311	12.7%	131	14.0%	174
5	73.4%	255	14.1%	180	15.5%	210
6	75.5%	302	13.0%	142	14.9%	197
7	82.8%	406	8.0%	25	11.4%	93
8	82.5%	402	7.8%	19	11.8%	110
9	67.0%	158	21.4%	356	16.0%	225
10	83.8%	413	5.5%	5	12.2%	126
11	84.6%	417	4.5%	3	12.6%	139
WASHINGTON						
	73.3%		15.0%		14.7%	
1	83.2%	407	8.2%	27	10.7%	71
2	73.5%	258	14.2%	185	15.2%	205
3	71.3%	224	16.8%	264	14.9%	196
4	59.1%	68	20.6%	345	23.6%	373
5	68.6%	183	21.2%	351	14.2%	178
6	66.4%	150	20.2%	331	17.8%	257
7	80.1%	367	10.0%	70	11.8%	114
8	82.4%	401	9.8%	65	9.8%	41
9	73.8%	262	15.2%	216	15.0%	198
WEST VIRGINIA						
	64.5%		21.6%		18.6%	
1	67.1%	160	19.4%	319	17.2%	247
2	67.4%	165	18.5%	299	18.4%	272
3	58.7%	64	27.2%	417	20.2%	309

Appendix Table A - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, All Nonelderly, 2008

	Insurance Status						
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured		
	District	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
WISCONSIN		78.0%		14.6%		10.4%	
1		80.5%	372	12.9%	138	10.1%	50
2		82.3%	398	11.2%	95	9.0%	31
3		78.0%	334	13.0%	145	11.7%	104
4		59.3%	71	27.2%	419	15.8%	220
5		88.2%	433	7.9%	24	6.2%	11
6		81.9%	393	13.0%	144	8.7%	28
7		74.3%	273	17.8%	286	12.0%	119
8		79.2%	355	14.0%	175	9.9%	43
WYOMING		74.9%		13.5%		15.7%	
1		74.9%	288	13.5%	161	15.7%	217

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, Tables B27001, B27002, and B27003, American Community Survey, 2008
 Note: Italicized rates indicate non-significant differences from the national mean at the .10 level.

Note: Public coverage is defined as having coverage from Medicare, Medicaid, or any government assistance plan for low-income or disabled individuals, and VA. Private coverage is defined as employer/union provided, direct purchases, and TRICARE/military. Health insurance coverage types are not mutually exclusive.

Appendix Table B

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
NATION	64.1%		28.3%		9.9%	
ALABAMA	62.6%		31.9%		8.0%	
1	58.5%	128	31.9%	289	12.3%	318
2	62.1%	172	34.1%	311	6.3%	142
3	61.0%	157	36.0%	326	6.7%	166
4	54.4%	95	39.1%	355	10.2%	279
5	69.0%	255	24.6%	180	7.9%	215
6	78.8%	381	16.6%	59	5.6%	110
7	49.8%	62	45.7%	403	7.2%	191
ALASKA	66.3%		25.6%		12.9%	
1	66.3%	229	25.6%	205	12.9%	334
ARIZONA	56.5%		29.1%		16.2%	
1	47.2%	46	32.6%	294	23.2%	427
2	65.3%	212	23.6%	156	13.3%	343
3	65.6%	217	22.3%	146	14.1%	356
4	28.1%	3	48.7%	415	24.2%	429
5	75.2%	334	14.8%	34	11.1%	300
6	71.2%	298	18.3%	81	12.1%	317
7	40.8%	26	40.8%	372	19.6%	414
8	70.2%	272	23.4%	153	8.7%	242
ARKANSAS	49.5%		45.1%		8.7%	
1	44.6%	37	52.3%	427	6.7%	161
2	51.7%	74	42.7%	381	7.6%	204
3	55.9%	107	37.2%	335	11.1%	299
4	43.5%	34	50.9%	422	9.2%	256
CALIFORNIA	59.9%		31.0%		10.8%	
1	61.0%	158	30.3%	272	10.4%	285
2	52.8%	81	39.3%	357	11.3%	302
3	70.8%	288	24.9%	184	5.6%	103
4	73.5%	318	22.0%	137	6.3%	140
5	54.1%	92	42.2%	378	6.8%	171
6	70.6%	281	21.8%	133	8.5%	234
7	66.1%	227	26.3%	219	9.2%	253
8	69.6%	263	28.3%	242	4.9%	72
9	62.1%	171	28.9%	253	10.4%	283
10	79.7%	388	14.6%	33	6.6%	158
11	76.6%	357	19.5%	95	5.5%	91
12	84.0%	418	13.0%	26	4.8%	64
13	75.7%	345	21.5%	128	4.0%	38
14	80.4%	397	15.5%	48	5.3%	84
15	83.2%	413	14.2%	32	4.6%	54
16	67.3%	236	28.7%	245	6.3%	141

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
CALIFORNIA						
(continued)						
17	55.4%	103	36.9%	333	10.7%	290
18	47.1%	44	45.8%	406	9.7%	268
19	53.9%	89	39.1%	354	8.6%	239
20	34.1%	11	55.7%	433	12.6%	325
21	45.2%	38	41.5%	376	16.0%	381
22	62.9%	178	31.4%	285	9.1%	251
23	50.3%	66	36.6%	330	14.7%	364
24	77.3%	367	16.3%	55	7.1%	187
25	65.7%	220	24.9%	186	10.8%	292
26	74.3%	325	18.8%	87	7.9%	222
27	60.6%	152	28.9%	251	11.4%	306
28	43.4%	33	45.8%	405	12.5%	324
29	65.1%	206	27.6%	235	8.8%	245
30	90.5%	434	6.5%	5	3.4%	23
31	28.8%	5	50.3%	419	22.2%	423
32	49.4%	59	40.1%	365	12.4%	321
33	46.6%	41	38.1%	345	16.1%	387
34	30.4%	7	48.1%	413	23.1%	426
35	39.4%	21	49.2%	417	13.3%	340
36	64.7%	196	27.7%	236	9.1%	252
37	38.8%	18	51.0%	423	11.6%	309
38	50.2%	64	37.2%	336	13.4%	345
39	49.4%	60	38.3%	346	14.2%	357
40	62.6%	175	25.9%	211	12.7%	329
41	56.8%	115	31.3%	282	13.4%	346
42	81.8%	404	12.4%	21	6.8%	169
43	48.4%	52	39.2%	356	14.5%	361
44	63.2%	180	25.5%	201	12.4%	322
45	55.3%	102	33.2%	301	14.0%	353
46	78.5%	378	15.0%	39	7.5%	201
47	38.5%	17	46.5%	409	16.8%	394
48	83.9%	417	10.8%	14	6.1%	127
49	64.7%	199	24.5%	178	12.6%	326
50	74.6%	329	15.9%	51	10.6%	288
51	52.6%	80	34.7%	318	15.2%	374
52	71.1%	293	22.3%	145	8.5%	237
53	51.2%	70	33.5%	305	18.6%	404
COLORADO						
	68.0%		19.0%		14.4%	
1	50.7%	69	26.9%	228	23.7%	428
2	73.6%	320	15.0%	36	12.3%	319
3	53.9%	90	29.0%	255	19.1%	410
4	68.6%	252	21.1%	118	12.1%	316
5	73.3%	317	16.9%	62	11.3%	304
6	88.6%	429	6.0%	3	6.2%	135
7	59.9%	147	22.2%	141	18.7%	405

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
CONNECTICUT						
	75.0%		22.0%		4.9%	
1	72.2%	305	26.2%	218	4.5%	51
2	78.9%	382	18.1%	79	5.0%	73
3	70.9%	290	27.2%	231	3.7%	28
4	78.3%	376	17.2%	65	5.4%	88
5	74.3%	326	22.2%	142	5.7%	111
DELAWARE						
	70.5%		25.1%		7.8%	
1	70.5%	278	25.1%	191	7.8%	212
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
	55.5%		43.7%		4.3%	
1	55.5%	105	43.7%	388	4.3%	46
FLORIDA						
	58.4%		25.5%		17.5%	
1	60.6%	153	26.5%	223	14.7%	365
2	59.5%	144	33.4%	304	9.0%	248
3	39.6%	22	42.6%	380	19.0%	407
4	70.9%	289	17.7%	74	13.3%	341
5	58.1%	123	26.0%	212	17.0%	396
6	64.0%	187	22.4%	147	16.0%	385
7	66.0%	226	19.8%	98	16.0%	384
8	64.0%	188	21.8%	134	15.2%	372
9	67.8%	243	20.6%	110	12.6%	327
10	61.4%	164	25.4%	199	16.3%	390
11	48.9%	54	33.9%	310	19.3%	412
12	53.8%	88	31.6%	286	16.0%	383
13	59.4%	141	21.7%	132	20.4%	416
14	57.8%	120	21.6%	130	21.3%	422
15	58.9%	133	22.2%	140	19.5%	413
16	58.1%	122	25.6%	203	18.1%	402
17	39.4%	20	35.2%	322	26.9%	435
18	56.0%	109	26.4%	220	18.0%	401
19	60.5%	151	19.7%	97	21.0%	421
20	69.1%	256	18.9%	89	13.2%	339
21	56.1%	111	25.4%	198	19.1%	408
22	71.0%	291	18.3%	82	12.7%	328
23	40.8%	25	38.6%	352	22.6%	424
24	69.3%	261	15.2%	41	16.0%	382
25	55.0%	99	23.5%	155	22.8%	425
GEORGIA						
	58.6%		32.0%		11.5%	
1	59.9%	148	33.3%	303	9.8%	271
2	41.8%	30	50.5%	420	10.4%	284
3	67.9%	245	26.5%	222	7.2%	190
4	44.0%	36	40.2%	367	17.9%	400
5	49.1%	56	39.4%	360	13.1%	338
6	80.6%	399	11.9%	18	8.7%	243
7	65.1%	204	23.7%	159	12.8%	332
8	50.6%	68	40.3%	368	11.8%	312

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
GEORGIA						
(continued)						
9	58.6%	129	30.5%	275	13.0%	336
10	61.1%	160	31.3%	283	10.4%	282
11	65.7%	222	25.7%	207	10.2%	278
12	47.1%	43	45.0%	397	10.4%	286
13	55.2%	101	32.7%	296	14.0%	354
HAWAII						
	77.9%		20.9%		3.6%	
1	83.6%	416	16.8%	61	2.0%	6
2	72.9%	311	24.4%	175	5.0%	75
IDAHO						
	64.6%		24.7%		13.7%	
1	64.7%	197	24.1%	169	13.7%	350
2	64.5%	194	25.4%	197	13.6%	348
ILLINOIS						
	65.9%		30.8%		5.6%	
1	50.3%	65	45.3%	401	6.9%	173
2	51.9%	76	42.7%	382	8.0%	224
3	64.8%	200	29.7%	267	6.8%	170
4	30.2%	6	60.2%	435	12.3%	320
5	65.5%	215	29.1%	256	7.2%	189
6	75.5%	340	21.1%	115	4.7%	60
7	49.3%	57	45.2%	399	7.9%	220
8	76.6%	356	19.8%	99	4.7%	58
9	69.9%	266	24.0%	166	7.7%	208
10	80.3%	396	17.4%	70	3.1%	17
11	73.3%	316	25.7%	209	3.4%	24
12	59.2%	139	38.3%	347	5.3%	86
13	85.7%	422	12.9%	25	2.9%	14
14	71.8%	302	24.3%	173	5.6%	107
15	65.3%	211	32.3%	292	5.8%	117
16	74.3%	324	26.4%	221	2.6%	12
17	60.2%	150	39.7%	362	6.2%	132
18	68.3%	248	31.7%	287	3.6%	27
19	69.9%	268	29.4%	261	3.9%	36
INDIANA						
	66.4%		26.0%		10.2%	
1	65.1%	207	29.1%	257	8.3%	230
2	62.1%	170	29.5%	263	11.6%	307
3	63.6%	184	22.0%	138	16.7%	393
4	75.8%	347	18.6%	85	7.3%	197
5	78.7%	380	16.6%	58	6.5%	148
6	65.9%	225	24.7%	182	12.7%	331
7	47.1%	45	44.4%	394	11.1%	298
8	65.1%	205	28.8%	248	9.0%	247
9	70.8%	287	23.9%	163	8.5%	238
IOWA						
	74.1%		24.5%		5.6%	
1	73.9%	323	25.1%	189	5.5%	96

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
IOWA (continued)						
2	75.5%	341	23.7%	158	5.6%	109
3	75.6%	342	22.9%	148	4.9%	69
4	75.2%	335	22.3%	144	6.6%	152
5	70.1%	271	28.9%	250	5.6%	104
KANSAS						
	71.4%		22.4%		8.3%	
1	67.9%	244	25.2%	193	9.8%	270
2	71.9%	303	21.3%	126	9.3%	258
3	76.3%	351	17.5%	72	7.6%	206
4	69.0%	253	26.1%	216	6.8%	167
KENTUCKY						
	61.8%		33.6%		7.0%	
1	55.9%	108	37.9%	344	9.4%	264
2	64.4%	193	29.9%	268	8.1%	228
3	70.5%	279	27.2%	230	4.2%	41
4	70.5%	280	26.6%	225	5.1%	80
5	41.6%	28	53.6%	430	7.2%	192
6	65.2%	208	28.8%	246	7.9%	218
LOUISIANA						
	51.3%		44.1%		7.7%	
1	58.7%	130	37.3%	337	6.9%	174
2	39.7%	23	52.7%	428	10.9%	293
3	56.0%	110	40.2%	366	7.9%	217
4	51.8%	75	44.9%	396	6.9%	175
5	43.6%	35	47.7%	412	12.0%	315
6	54.2%	93	43.8%	389	4.3%	48
7	51.4%	72	44.3%	393	6.6%	159
MAINE						
	64.4%		32.5%		7.4%	
1	71.0%	292	25.6%	202	6.4%	145
2	57.3%	118	39.9%	364	8.4%	232
MARYLAND						
	74.1%		22.8%		5.3%	
1	77.6%	370	20.0%	102	3.9%	35
2	67.4%	239	29.4%	259	5.5%	90
3	77.1%	363	20.2%	105	5.4%	89
4	73.8%	321	21.2%	122	6.9%	172
5	82.6%	408	15.0%	37	4.9%	68
6	76.3%	350	20.5%	109	4.9%	67
7	59.3%	140	39.5%	361	5.1%	78
8	77.6%	371	18.1%	78	5.5%	93
MASSACHUSETTS						
	77.0%		24.0%		2.1%	
1	76.4%	352	25.4%	200	2.4%	9
2	72.8%	309	29.4%	258	2.0%	5
3	79.0%	384	21.4%	127	1.7%	4
4	80.2%	395	20.1%	103	1.7%	3
5	77.1%	364	24.1%	167	1.3%	1

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
MASSACHUSETTS						
(continued)						
6	83.2%	410	17.2%	66	2.2%	7
7	78.3%	375	22.1%	139	1.5%	2
8	57.4%	119	45.8%	404	3.1%	18
9	77.9%	374	23.1%	151	2.4%	8
10	84.7%	421	15.4%	44	3.1%	15
MICHIGAN						
	67.7%		30.9%		5.2%	
1	63.4%	182	37.9%	343	5.6%	99
2	71.2%	295	30.4%	273	3.3%	21
3	70.6%	282	28.1%	239	5.8%	115
4	65.5%	214	34.8%	319	5.6%	101
5	59.6%	145	40.5%	371	4.1%	39
6	66.7%	232	32.2%	291	6.1%	126
7	72.0%	304	28.3%	243	3.8%	31
8	76.6%	359	21.6%	131	3.8%	33
9	82.0%	406	13.9%	31	4.8%	65
10	76.4%	353	23.6%	157	4.6%	56
11	81.6%	402	15.0%	38	5.1%	76
12	67.4%	238	28.9%	252	6.5%	149
13	39.0%	19	57.4%	434	7.1%	186
14	45.6%	40	51.4%	425	6.9%	178
15	71.2%	299	25.3%	196	5.5%	92
MINNESOTA						
	77.9%		18.2%		6.3%	
1	79.8%	389	17.1%	63	6.4%	144
2	87.8%	428	9.2%	9	4.7%	61
3	86.6%	424	10.4%	12	4.3%	47
4	71.1%	294	23.8%	162	6.6%	156
5	58.7%	131	34.5%	317	9.3%	262
6	86.3%	423	11.7%	16	4.2%	43
7	69.8%	265	25.6%	206	7.9%	219
8	71.2%	296	23.1%	150	9.2%	257
MISSISSIPPI						
	49.3%		41.0%		12.7%	
1	54.9%	98	37.1%	334	11.3%	305
2	35.5%	13	53.1%	429	14.8%	367
3	52.1%	77	41.1%	375	10.0%	276
4	53.5%	85	33.8%	308	14.7%	363
MISSOURI						
	66.7%		28.6%		7.1%	
1	54.2%	94	42.8%	383	6.2%	130
2	89.3%	433	7.2%	7	4.3%	44
3	75.0%	332	21.1%	114	6.1%	122
4	64.3%	192	30.4%	274	7.9%	216
5	59.2%	138	34.5%	316	9.7%	269
6	75.3%	337	21.5%	129	5.4%	87
7	58.3%	124	33.3%	302	11.3%	303
8	51.7%	73	44.5%	395	6.4%	143

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
MISSOURI (continued)						
9	69.0%	254	26.1%	214	7.0%	180
MONTANA						
	65.7%		21.9%		14.5%	
1	65.7%	219	21.9%	135	14.5%	360
NEBRASKA						
	74.2%		21.2%		6.9%	
1	76.7%	361	19.0%	91	5.7%	113
2	75.0%	333	21.1%	117	6.5%	151
3	70.2%	274	23.7%	160	8.7%	241
NEVADA						
	67.4%		14.4%		20.2%	
1	61.7%	167	15.4%	45	24.5%	431
2	66.5%	230	15.5%	47	20.8%	419
3	73.8%	322	12.5%	22	15.6%	380
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
	77.2%		20.2%		5.1%	
1	76.6%	358	21.3%	124	4.7%	59
2	77.8%	373	19.1%	92	5.5%	94
NEW JERSEY						
	74.0%		20.3%		7.2%	
1	67.3%	237	27.1%	229	7.0%	181
2	71.3%	300	24.0%	164	7.0%	182
3	84.5%	420	11.8%	17	5.1%	79
4	75.4%	339	21.3%	125	5.1%	77
5	88.7%	430	6.2%	4	5.3%	85
6	70.1%	269	21.3%	123	9.9%	272
7	88.8%	431	8.2%	8	3.8%	32
8	63.6%	185	29.9%	270	9.4%	266
9	75.7%	346	16.3%	56	9.3%	260
10	49.5%	61	41.1%	374	10.6%	289
11	91.6%	436	5.9%	2	3.3%	22
12	86.9%	426	9.3%	10	4.6%	52
13	46.7%	42	41.6%	377	14.7%	362
NEW MEXICO						
	47.4%		42.4%		13.7%	
1	55.8%	106	32.2%	290	13.5%	347
2	38.3%	16	55.0%	432	10.3%	280
3	48.1%	50	39.9%	363	17.3%	397
NEW YORK						
	66.4%		30.7%		5.8%	
1	82.5%	407	13.4%	27	5.2%	81
2	83.3%	415	11.9%	19	5.5%	95
3	90.5%	435	5.8%	1	4.4%	50
4	79.4%	387	15.5%	46	6.0%	121
5	63.7%	186	34.2%	313	4.6%	53
6	60.7%	155	38.6%	350	6.2%	136
7	54.0%	91	43.9%	392	7.4%	200
8	64.1%	190	36.1%	327	2.6%	10

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
NEW YORK						
(continued)						
9	71.4%	301	26.1%	215	3.8%	30
10	50.4%	67	49.1%	416	5.5%	97
11	58.4%	126	40.9%	373	4.2%	42
12	45.3%	39	51.7%	426	6.7%	165
13	70.4%	276	26.7%	227	4.3%	49
14	80.2%	393	18.4%	83	3.2%	19
15	47.4%	47	51.4%	424	8.0%	225
16	23.9%	1	72.5%	436	8.0%	223
17	64.2%	191	32.9%	297	7.0%	184
18	79.4%	386	17.7%	75	6.2%	134
19	83.2%	411	12.7%	24	5.6%	108
20	77.5%	369	17.4%	69	7.7%	209
21	73.1%	314	23.2%	152	6.1%	129
22	69.3%	260	25.7%	210	7.5%	202
23	65.6%	218	29.5%	264	6.7%	163
24	59.4%	142	35.8%	325	6.8%	168
25	75.9%	348	21.2%	119	5.6%	106
26	81.8%	405	17.3%	68	3.2%	20
27	68.1%	246	30.5%	276	4.7%	57
28	52.8%	82	43.7%	387	6.1%	123
29	75.6%	343	20.5%	108	6.9%	176
NORTH CAROLINA						
	60.2%		32.2%		9.8%	
1	42.5%	31	50.6%	421	9.6%	267
2	54.7%	97	35.2%	321	12.4%	323
3	66.2%	228	28.3%	241	8.9%	246
4	77.7%	372	17.7%	73	5.9%	118
5	63.0%	179	30.8%	277	8.1%	226
6	63.5%	183	28.9%	249	10.4%	281
7	47.7%	48	43.9%	390	11.9%	313
8	56.8%	114	33.8%	309	11.3%	301
9	76.5%	355	16.3%	54	8.4%	233
10	58.5%	127	36.3%	328	7.4%	199
11	52.3%	79	38.4%	348	11.0%	295
12	51.3%	71	37.8%	341	13.0%	337
13	58.9%	134	33.2%	300	10.0%	275
NORTH DAKOTA						
	75.7%		19.0%		7.7%	
1	75.7%	344	19.0%	90	7.7%	211
OHIO						
	69.5%		26.2%		7.2%	
1	65.9%	224	26.6%	226	9.4%	263
2	77.2%	366	18.2%	80	6.9%	177
3	69.7%	264	25.1%	190	7.8%	213
4	70.4%	277	28.2%	240	5.8%	114
5	77.1%	365	21.2%	121	5.7%	112
6	64.6%	195	33.7%	307	5.6%	98
7	70.3%	275	25.6%	204	7.6%	207

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
OHIO (continued)						
8	72.7%	307	24.3%	172	6.7%	162
9	65.4%	213	31.8%	288	6.2%	138
10	65.8%	223	31.0%	278	5.6%	105
11	55.5%	104	40.5%	369	6.0%	120
12	74.7%	331	20.2%	104	7.0%	183
13	73.1%	315	23.4%	154	6.3%	139
14	76.7%	360	17.3%	67	7.5%	203
15	69.1%	257	25.3%	194	7.6%	205
16	73.5%	319	21.9%	136	8.5%	236
17	61.6%	165	35.6%	323	6.2%	133
18	61.0%	156	30.3%	271	12.8%	333
OKLAHOMA						
	55.1%		34.8%		12.9%	
1	61.3%	162	28.8%	247	11.6%	308
2	41.7%	29	46.4%	407	15.5%	377
3	58.0%	121	33.2%	299	12.9%	335
4	65.2%	209	27.2%	232	11.0%	297
5	49.1%	55	39.0%	353	13.7%	349
OREGON						
	67.9%		21.0%		12.8%	
1	76.5%	354	15.2%	40	10.0%	274
2	61.3%	161	25.3%	195	15.5%	376
3	68.3%	249	20.9%	112	11.7%	311
4	65.3%	210	24.0%	165	13.8%	352
5	66.7%	233	21.1%	116	13.3%	344
PENNSYLVANIA						
	70.5%		27.5%		6.1%	
1	40.6%	24	54.0%	431	9.3%	259
2	57.0%	117	42.9%	384	6.7%	164
3	65.5%	216	34.4%	315	5.9%	119
4	78.4%	377	21.2%	120	3.5%	26
5	65.7%	221	35.1%	320	6.2%	137
6	83.2%	412	15.7%	49	4.3%	45
7	87.2%	427	11.5%	15	4.2%	40
8	86.9%	425	12.0%	20	3.5%	25
9	65.0%	202	31.3%	281	8.5%	235
10	66.8%	234	31.2%	280	6.4%	146
11	69.2%	258	29.5%	265	5.6%	100
12	61.3%	163	38.6%	351	4.9%	71
13	77.3%	368	19.9%	100	6.2%	131
14	59.2%	137	40.5%	370	4.8%	66
15	73.0%	313	24.8%	183	5.6%	102
16	65.0%	203	24.1%	168	14.1%	355
17	72.7%	308	25.0%	188	6.6%	154
18	81.7%	403	18.7%	86	2.9%	13
19	78.7%	379	20.7%	111	5.0%	74

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
RHODE ISLAND	72.9%		25.9%		5.7%	
1	74.7%	330	24.4%	174	6.1%	128
2	71.2%	297	27.3%	233	5.2%	83
SOUTH CAROLINA	60.4%		29.3%		12.6%	
1	62.0%	169	24.9%	185	15.6%	378
2	67.7%	242	24.5%	177	10.1%	277
3	58.4%	125	32.4%	293	10.9%	294
4	64.1%	189	22.9%	149	14.9%	370
5	58.8%	132	34.1%	312	9.1%	249
6	49.4%	58	39.3%	358	14.8%	368
SOUTH DAKOTA	67.7%		29.4%		8.4%	
1	67.7%	241	29.4%	262	8.4%	231
TENNESSEE	63.7%		31.6%		7.2%	
1	59.0%	135	36.6%	329	7.3%	196
2	70.7%	285	24.7%	181	6.6%	157
3	60.7%	154	34.2%	314	6.7%	160
4	56.6%	113	39.3%	359	7.1%	188
5	61.7%	166	31.1%	279	9.3%	261
6	70.2%	273	26.2%	217	5.8%	116
7	80.0%	392	17.1%	64	4.8%	63
8	59.7%	146	35.8%	324	8.1%	227
9	48.2%	51	45.3%	400	10.0%	273
TEXAS	53.4%		30.3%		17.8%	
1	53.6%	86	32.7%	295	16.3%	391
2	62.4%	173	24.2%	170	15.1%	371
3	66.5%	231	16.5%	57	17.6%	398
4	64.7%	198	22.3%	143	15.2%	373
5	57.0%	116	28.0%	237	16.1%	386
6	62.6%	176	24.3%	171	14.4%	359
7	70.7%	286	18.0%	77	11.9%	314
8	61.9%	168	26.0%	213	13.3%	342
9	34.5%	12	42.4%	379	24.4%	430
10	69.2%	259	15.9%	52	15.6%	379
11	52.3%	78	29.9%	269	19.9%	415
12	53.3%	84	29.6%	266	18.5%	403
13	59.0%	136	26.5%	224	16.5%	392
14	61.1%	159	24.4%	176	16.1%	389
15	30.9%	8	49.9%	418	20.5%	418
16	37.8%	15	42.9%	385	20.9%	420
17	56.2%	112	29.4%	260	16.1%	388
18	33.0%	9	43.4%	386	24.5%	432
19	54.5%	96	33.6%	306	14.9%	369
20	42.6%	32	43.9%	391	19.1%	409
21	72.8%	310	17.8%	76	11.7%	310
22	70.7%	284	15.8%	50	14.3%	358
23	47.8%	49	36.8%	332	16.9%	395

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
TEXAS						
(continued)						
24	68.6%	251	17.5%	71	14.7%	366
25	53.7%	87	28.5%	244	19.2%	411
26	67.5%	240	19.6%	96	13.8%	351
27	36.5%	14	46.4%	408	18.9%	406
28	33.1%	10	48.7%	414	20.5%	417
29	27.0%	2	47.1%	411	26.8%	434
30	28.6%	4	46.5%	410	26.3%	433
31	74.6%	328	16.2%	53	11.0%	296
32	40.9%	27	29.0%	254	31.4%	436
UTAH						
	74.7%		13.8%		13.1%	
1	76.0%	349	13.7%	28	12.7%	330
2	75.4%	338	15.3%	43	10.7%	291
3	73.0%	312	12.6%	23	15.4%	375
VERMONT						
	63.4%		37.9%		4.0%	
1	63.4%	181	37.9%	342	4.0%	37
VIRGINIA						
	75.1%		19.3%		7.6%	
1	82.7%	409	13.8%	29	4.8%	62
2	79.1%	385	14.9%	35	7.9%	221
3	55.1%	100	38.5%	349	9.2%	254
4	74.4%	327	19.9%	101	7.3%	198
5	68.5%	250	25.2%	192	8.2%	229
6	69.5%	262	23.8%	161	10.5%	287
7	81.5%	401	13.9%	30	6.6%	155
8	76.8%	362	19.2%	93	6.1%	124
9	59.5%	143	37.3%	338	7.3%	195
10	83.3%	414	10.7%	13	7.3%	193
11	84.5%	419	7.0%	6	9.1%	250
WASHINGTON						
	67.9%		26.5%		8.5%	
1	80.2%	394	15.2%	42	6.1%	125
2	68.2%	247	24.6%	179	9.4%	265
3	67.1%	235	27.5%	234	7.7%	210
4	48.7%	53	36.8%	331	17.8%	399
5	62.4%	174	37.5%	339	4.9%	70
6	62.9%	177	33.1%	298	8.6%	240
7	75.3%	336	20.2%	107	6.4%	147
8	79.9%	390	16.7%	60	5.2%	82
9	69.9%	267	25.7%	208	7.8%	214
WEST VIRGINIA						
	59.7%		37.9%		6.7%	
1	60.1%	149	37.8%	340	6.5%	150
2	64.9%	201	31.4%	284	6.9%	179
3	53.1%	83	45.5%	402	6.6%	153

Appendix Table B - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Children, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
WISCONSIN	75.0%		22.9%		5.2%	
1	80.0%	391	18.8%	88	4.6%	55
2	80.5%	398	18.5%	84	3.9%	34
3	72.4%	306	21.0%	113	9.2%	255
4	49.8%	63	45.1%	398	7.0%	185
5	89.0%	432	10.2%	11	2.6%	11
6	81.5%	400	19.4%	94	3.1%	16
7	70.1%	270	28.1%	238	7.3%	194
8	79.0%	383	20.2%	106	3.8%	29
WYOMING	70.6%		25.0%		8.7%	
1	70.6%	283	25.0%	187	8.7%	244

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, Tables B27001, B27002, and B27003, American Community Survey, 2008
 Note: Italicized rates indicate non-significant differences from the national mean at the .10 level.

Note: Public coverage is defined as having coverage from Medicare, Medicaid, or any government assistance plan for low-income or disabled individuals, and VA. Private coverage is defined as employer/union provided, direct purchases, and TRICARE/military. Health insurance coverage types are not mutually exclusive.

Appendix Table C

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
NATION	71.8%		11.1%		19.8%	
ALABAMA	72.0%		12.9%		19.3%	
1	69.6%	165	11.9%	272	22.4%	287
2	72.4%	205	14.6%	349	18.0%	205
3	71.8%	194	14.8%	356	18.2%	208
4	67.4%	126	13.2%	310	23.8%	316
5	74.9%	255	10.3%	197	18.3%	210
6	83.1%	394	7.6%	91	12.6%	72
7	62.5%	68	19.4%	417	23.0%	300
ALASKA	68.5%		9.9%		25.0%	
1	68.5%	146	9.9%	177	25.0%	333
ARIZONA	65.3%		14.1%		23.4%	
1	55.8%	30	20.9%	423	27.2%	372
2	70.5%	179	13.5%	323	19.1%	227
3	68.7%	148	10.5%	212	23.1%	301
4	44.1%	7	17.5%	404	40.4%	426
5	78.3%	318	6.4%	44	16.9%	185
6	73.0%	214	10.7%	227	18.9%	226
7	54.4%	24	20.2%	420	28.6%	389
8	74.3%	246	14.6%	351	15.3%	150
ARKANSAS	64.1%		14.1%		25.7%	
1	59.7%	53	16.1%	383	28.0%	383
2	70.0%	173	12.3%	286	21.6%	271
3	65.6%	98	11.9%	274	26.4%	362
4	60.1%	56	16.7%	391	27.3%	373
CALIFORNIA	67.2%		11.3%		23.4%	
1	68.0%	137	15.1%	361	20.0%	246
2	59.0%	46	19.6%	418	24.3%	320
3	75.7%	275	12.4%	289	14.6%	130
4	74.5%	248	11.7%	260	16.5%	177
5	63.8%	78	18.1%	407	20.7%	258
6	77.4%	299	8.5%	123	16.4%	175
7	73.6%	228	13.0%	307	16.3%	170
8	75.3%	266	12.2%	282	14.3%	122
9	71.0%	183	11.9%	270	18.7%	223
10	80.6%	357	7.6%	90	13.9%	109
11	77.7%	309	9.1%	150	15.3%	151
12	83.2%	398	6.3%	40	12.2%	56
13	78.4%	321	9.4%	156	13.9%	107
14	83.4%	403	4.9%	17	13.3%	89
15	81.9%	377	6.8%	56	13.1%	78
16	72.4%	206	10.7%	225	18.5%	216

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
CALIFORNIA						
(continued)						
17	65.6%	99	10.5%	214	26.5%	365
18	52.1%	21	21.0%	424	29.1%	395
19	64.2%	84	14.9%	357	22.9%	298
20	39.9%	5	24.5%	431	37.9%	421
21	57.8%	39	17.1%	397	27.8%	382
22	68.9%	154	14.4%	346	19.7%	237
23	65.5%	96	10.2%	188	26.2%	358
24	79.6%	344	7.0%	68	15.3%	147
25	69.7%	167	11.8%	263	20.7%	257
26	78.5%	323	6.5%	46	16.5%	178
27	64.4%	87	10.7%	230	26.6%	367
28	55.4%	28	12.0%	277	33.7%	411
29	65.8%	102	10.2%	191	25.4%	339
30	84.2%	411	6.1%	35	11.3%	40
31	37.1%	2	13.9%	334	50.3%	435
32	54.9%	27	12.8%	304	33.4%	410
33	55.5%	29	11.2%	244	34.6%	412
34	39.8%	4	15.6%	373	45.8%	433
35	50.3%	15	16.2%	384	35.0%	416
36	73.2%	219	6.8%	57	21.4%	269
37	56.1%	33	17.5%	403	28.2%	385
38	56.7%	35	11.9%	268	32.8%	408
39	59.1%	47	10.9%	236	31.5%	405
40	68.7%	149	8.1%	114	24.7%	327
41	63.5%	75	13.7%	329	25.4%	337
42	81.7%	374	4.9%	16	14.7%	132
43	55.9%	32	13.7%	327	32.4%	407
44	68.4%	145	8.9%	138	24.3%	322
45	61.9%	63	11.3%	247	29.0%	393
46	79.0%	334	6.3%	39	16.4%	173
47	50.9%	16	10.8%	232	39.3%	424
48	83.7%	409	3.6%	4	13.7%	102
49	66.1%	107	9.9%	176	26.4%	363
50	77.5%	305	7.0%	65	17.9%	204
51	58.7%	44	15.0%	358	29.4%	397
52	75.7%	276	10.1%	184	17.1%	189
53	66.3%	112	10.1%	183	25.8%	348
COLORADO						
	74.1%		7.4%		20.7%	
1	67.6%	130	9.0%	145	25.5%	340
2	78.6%	326	4.7%	13	18.4%	213
3	63.8%	77	12.0%	275	26.8%	369
4	74.6%	250	7.2%	76	20.0%	245
5	73.8%	235	9.1%	148	20.4%	253
6	86.6%	425	3.7%	5	11.4%	41
7	70.5%	178	7.2%	73	24.7%	329

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
CONNECTICUT						
	80.0%		10.2%		12.2%	
1	79.0%	335	12.7%	299	11.4%	42
2	83.6%	406	8.6%	125	10.4%	28
3	78.7%	328	11.4%	250	12.5%	66
4	78.3%	317	7.9%	105	15.2%	146
5	80.1%	350	10.6%	219	11.7%	45
DELAWARE						
	76.2%		13.5%		13.4%	
1	76.2%	282	13.5%	325	13.4%	91
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
	74.0%		19.4%		9.9%	
1	74.0%	238	19.4%	416	9.9%	27
FLORIDA						
	65.7%		9.5%		27.4%	
1	67.1%	122	13.3%	316	23.9%	317
2	69.8%	169	11.9%	267	21.3%	267
3	54.5%	25	15.3%	365	33.3%	409
4	73.6%	232	9.5%	162	20.3%	251
5	64.0%	79	11.8%	264	27.7%	379
6	70.3%	176	10.0%	182	23.5%	306
7	71.8%	195	8.6%	127	22.4%	286
8	69.2%	157	7.2%	78	25.5%	341
9	71.2%	188	9.4%	155	22.4%	284
10	67.7%	132	10.5%	215	24.6%	326
11	61.4%	62	12.8%	302	28.3%	386
12	65.3%	94	13.2%	311	24.3%	321
13	66.1%	108	8.7%	131	28.1%	384
14	67.4%	127	7.3%	83	27.8%	381
15	66.7%	116	9.7%	170	26.9%	371
16	62.8%	70	9.4%	160	30.4%	402
17	51.1%	17	10.8%	234	39.8%	425
18	56.8%	36	7.7%	100	36.9%	418
19	70.3%	175	6.1%	37	25.5%	342
20	71.1%	185	6.3%	43	24.2%	319
21	58.6%	43	6.9%	62	35.5%	417
22	74.0%	240	6.6%	51	21.5%	270
23	52.0%	20	11.0%	240	39.1%	423
24	73.3%	220	7.4%	86	21.8%	276
25	59.7%	52	6.6%	52	35.0%	415
GEORGIA						
	68.8%		9.1%		24.6%	
1	65.9%	103	12.1%	278	25.6%	345
2	59.6%	51	15.8%	380	27.7%	380
3	76.4%	285	8.3%	120	17.9%	203
4	59.4%	50	7.6%	92	35.0%	414
5	66.2%	110	10.4%	207	25.4%	338
6	82.2%	382	3.3%	1	15.9%	160
7	73.6%	230	5.3%	21	23.0%	299
8	64.5%	89	13.2%	313	25.8%	349

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
GEORGIA						
(continued)						
9	67.1%	121	7.3%	80	27.7%	378
10	69.2%	156	9.8%	173	23.7%	314
11	71.7%	193	7.9%	104	22.5%	290
12	64.2%	83	13.9%	337	26.0%	353
13	67.9%	133	8.2%	116	26.5%	364
HAWAII						
	84.1%		9.4%		9.3%	
1	87.2%	430	8.3%	117	7.4%	10
2	81.1%	366	10.5%	211	11.2%	38
IDAHO						
	71.8%		8.3%		22.9%	
1	71.8%	196	8.8%	133	22.6%	292
2	71.9%	197	7.8%	101	23.2%	303
ILLINOIS						
	74.0%		10.6%		17.6%	
1	62.4%	66	18.5%	409	22.0%	279
2	62.6%	69	16.8%	393	23.4%	305
3	71.7%	192	9.5%	163	21.0%	261
4	48.7%	10	11.7%	255	40.8%	427
5	73.1%	216	6.2%	38	22.0%	278
6	80.3%	352	5.3%	22	15.8%	157
7	66.4%	113	15.8%	379	19.7%	238
8	81.1%	365	6.5%	45	14.2%	118
9	75.1%	260	8.1%	110	18.5%	218
10	83.1%	395	4.8%	15	13.3%	83
11	77.7%	307	10.7%	226	14.2%	116
12	70.5%	177	17.3%	399	16.1%	167
13	86.6%	426	4.6%	11	10.5%	30
14	78.4%	319	6.9%	59	16.6%	180
15	78.5%	324	11.1%	243	13.3%	84
16	76.6%	289	11.7%	256	14.1%	112
17	72.4%	204	15.1%	359	16.0%	161
18	77.5%	304	11.8%	261	13.4%	92
19	75.0%	256	14.1%	339	14.3%	119
INDIANA						
	75.0%		9.8%		17.9%	
1	73.2%	218	10.6%	220	18.7%	224
2	72.8%	209	10.0%	179	20.4%	254
3	74.0%	239	8.7%	130	19.9%	242
4	81.2%	367	6.6%	50	14.3%	121
5	83.1%	396	7.1%	72	12.0%	51
6	72.6%	208	10.3%	199	19.7%	239
7	64.3%	86	15.7%	375	23.7%	311
8	73.6%	229	11.1%	242	18.3%	209
9	77.2%	297	9.3%	154	16.4%	176
IOWA						
	80.6%		9.9%		12.4%	
1	80.7%	358	9.9%	178	12.3%	59

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
IOWA (continued)						
2	79.8%	347	10.5%	213	12.5%	69
3	82.3%	384	9.5%	165	11.1%	37
4	80.8%	362	10.3%	203	11.7%	46
5	79.2%	338	8.9%	137	14.5%	127
KANSAS						
	79.0%		7.8%		16.1%	
1	77.8%	310	7.7%	97	17.5%	193
2	79.8%	346	9.4%	158	14.5%	126
3	81.6%	372	5.4%	25	15.0%	140
4	76.4%	284	9.0%	142	17.6%	195
KENTUCKY						
	69.9%		14.4%		19.5%	
1	66.1%	109	15.2%	364	22.5%	291
2	73.0%	215	13.6%	326	18.6%	221
3	77.7%	308	10.7%	224	15.0%	139
4	75.4%	267	11.7%	259	16.2%	169
5	51.2%	18	25.7%	433	27.4%	375
6	74.1%	243	10.4%	208	18.2%	207
LOUISIANA						
	65.6%		12.3%		25.1%	
1	69.3%	163	10.3%	198	23.5%	308
2	58.1%	41	15.7%	376	28.8%	391
3	68.4%	144	11.9%	269	22.5%	289
4	63.6%	76	14.0%	338	26.2%	357
5	60.7%	59	13.9%	335	28.6%	390
6	70.2%	174	9.8%	174	22.4%	285
7	66.3%	111	11.8%	262	24.8%	331
MAINE						
	70.2%		19.4%		14.5%	
1	75.0%	258	15.6%	374	12.9%	75
2	65.3%	92	23.2%	428	16.1%	164
MARYLAND						
	80.0%		7.8%		15.0%	
1	82.1%	380	7.0%	66	13.8%	104
2	78.3%	316	9.2%	151	15.7%	156
3	83.2%	399	7.3%	81	12.1%	52
4	78.3%	312	5.9%	30	18.5%	219
5	84.2%	412	6.7%	53	12.2%	55
6	82.5%	386	7.1%	71	12.9%	73
7	71.7%	191	15.3%	366	16.5%	179
8	79.0%	333	4.2%	8	18.5%	214
MASSACHUSETTS						
	82.3%		15.2%		5.5%	
1	81.0%	363	17.4%	402	5.2%	6
2	79.5%	342	18.0%	406	5.2%	7
3	83.6%	407	14.8%	354	4.5%	1
4	83.3%	402	14.6%	348	4.8%	3
5	82.6%	388	15.2%	362	5.1%	5

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
MASSACHUSETTS						
(continued)						
6	86.1%	423	12.0%	276	4.8%	2
7	83.2%	397	13.4%	319	6.4%	9
8	76.0%	281	19.2%	413	7.7%	12
9	82.7%	391	14.7%	352	5.1%	4
10	85.7%	420	12.4%	292	5.8%	8
MICHIGAN						
	73.7%		13.2%		16.1%	
1	69.7%	166	15.9%	381	18.5%	220
2	75.3%	265	12.4%	288	15.1%	141
3	76.2%	283	10.8%	235	15.3%	148
4	72.6%	207	13.8%	332	17.0%	188
5	68.7%	147	20.7%	422	14.5%	128
6	72.2%	201	12.9%	305	18.0%	206
7	75.4%	268	12.4%	287	15.1%	143
8	80.6%	356	9.5%	167	12.5%	68
9	83.6%	408	6.0%	33	12.3%	63
10	79.3%	340	9.6%	168	13.9%	108
11	81.7%	375	6.9%	60	13.6%	95
12	74.2%	244	11.6%	253	16.9%	186
13	50.2%	14	28.0%	435	25.6%	346
14	57.5%	38	22.8%	427	23.7%	312
15	78.4%	322	11.7%	257	13.3%	87
MINNESOTA						
	80.7%		10.9%		11.1%	
1	82.7%	390	10.3%	196	9.8%	26
2	87.7%	431	6.8%	58	7.9%	13
3	86.0%	422	7.7%	94	8.7%	19
4	79.1%	336	11.5%	251	12.1%	53
5	71.5%	190	14.3%	344	16.3%	171
6	85.5%	419	8.0%	107	9.1%	21
7	77.4%	300	13.5%	324	12.5%	70
8	73.4%	225	16.8%	392	13.3%	86
MISSISSIPPI						
	65.6%		14.5%		23.5%	
1	68.1%	141	13.2%	312	21.6%	272
2	58.9%	45	18.6%	410	26.1%	356
3	68.7%	150	13.9%	336	21.1%	264
4	65.7%	101	12.7%	295	25.6%	344
MISSOURI						
	73.8%		11.1%		17.9%	
1	67.9%	136	15.4%	368	19.4%	231
2	87.9%	433	4.5%	10	9.4%	24
3	79.4%	341	9.5%	166	13.8%	105
4	71.2%	186	12.4%	291	20.4%	256
5	71.1%	184	10.7%	228	20.8%	260
6	78.4%	320	9.1%	149	15.3%	149
7	69.0%	155	11.1%	241	22.8%	295
8	60.0%	55	18.6%	412	25.1%	334

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
MISSOURI (continued)						
9	76.8%	293	10.2%	189	15.9%	159
MONTANA						
	69.3%		10.5%		23.8%	
1	69.3%	162	10.5%	216	23.8%	315
NEBRASKA						
	79.6%		8.2%		15.0%	
1	81.9%	378	7.4%	84	13.5%	93
2	79.2%	337	8.6%	124	15.2%	145
3	77.4%	301	8.8%	136	16.8%	182
NEVADA						
	70.2%		7.4%		25.3%	
1	64.6%	90	8.1%	109	30.0%	399
2	69.3%	158	8.3%	119	25.8%	347
3	75.6%	270	6.0%	34	21.0%	263
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
	80.5%		7.6%		14.7%	
1	80.6%	355	7.0%	64	14.9%	138
2	80.3%	353	8.3%	118	14.5%	125
NEW JERSEY						
	77.1%		8.5%		16.5%	
1	74.6%	251	11.8%	265	16.0%	163
2	77.1%	295	11.0%	239	14.9%	137
3	82.2%	381	7.7%	99	12.9%	74
4	80.3%	351	8.1%	112	14.1%	113
5	85.9%	421	5.4%	24	10.8%	33
6	75.6%	272	7.0%	67	19.2%	229
7	87.2%	429	4.8%	14	9.6%	25
8	68.9%	153	10.3%	202	23.7%	313
9	75.2%	263	6.6%	49	19.6%	232
10	59.4%	49	16.0%	382	26.5%	366
11	89.0%	436	3.7%	6	9.0%	20
12	87.1%	428	6.0%	32	8.7%	18
13	59.1%	48	13.1%	308	29.6%	398
NEW MEXICO						
	60.9%		13.5%		28.6%	
1	66.6%	115	12.7%	301	23.6%	310
2	55.8%	31	15.7%	377	31.6%	406
3	59.8%	54	12.1%	279	30.9%	404
NEW YORK						
	71.6%		15.4%		16.0%	
1	81.7%	376	7.5%	88	13.7%	100
2	80.7%	359	7.3%	82	14.1%	114
3	88.5%	435	5.9%	31	8.3%	16
4	78.6%	327	7.4%	85	15.8%	158
5	61.4%	61	14.7%	353	25.8%	350
6	64.6%	91	18.2%	408	19.9%	243
7	57.1%	37	20.3%	421	26.0%	354
8	73.8%	236	15.8%	378	12.2%	57

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
NEW YORK						
(continued)						
9	73.8%	234	14.4%	347	13.9%	110
10	61.1%	60	25.7%	432	16.9%	184
11	62.8%	71	19.9%	419	20.0%	248
12	53.8%	23	23.2%	429	25.5%	343
13	74.1%	241	15.5%	371	13.1%	79
14	81.4%	371	7.6%	89	12.3%	60
15	56.1%	34	26.2%	434	21.6%	273
16	33.6%	1	41.3%	436	28.4%	387
17	67.1%	124	15.5%	372	20.0%	247
18	78.8%	331	7.8%	102	15.5%	152
19	83.3%	400	7.2%	75	12.3%	62
20	78.7%	329	11.2%	245	13.3%	88
21	78.5%	325	13.7%	330	11.1%	36
22	72.9%	210	12.7%	298	17.6%	196
23	73.0%	213	18.6%	411	13.2%	82
24	72.1%	199	17.4%	401	14.2%	117
25	80.0%	349	11.4%	249	11.7%	44
26	84.8%	417	10.4%	205	8.2%	15
27	75.3%	264	16.6%	388	11.7%	43
28	68.1%	140	22.7%	426	13.8%	103
29	79.7%	345	13.2%	314	11.0%	34
NORTH CAROLINA						
	70.8%		11.2%		21.2%	
1	62.4%	65	19.3%	414	22.0%	280
2	66.1%	106	13.3%	318	24.7%	328
3	73.9%	237	11.0%	238	19.8%	240
4	82.7%	392	6.3%	41	13.2%	81
5	73.6%	231	10.1%	186	19.3%	230
6	73.4%	226	10.0%	181	19.6%	234
7	62.5%	67	14.1%	340	27.4%	376
8	66.9%	118	13.1%	309	24.2%	318
9	81.0%	364	6.3%	42	14.7%	134
10	67.5%	129	12.2%	283	23.3%	304
11	65.7%	100	12.7%	297	24.8%	332
12	65.3%	93	12.2%	281	25.2%	335
13	72.4%	203	9.1%	147	21.0%	262
NORTH DAKOTA						
	81.4%		8.0%		13.7%	
1	81.4%	370	8.0%	106	13.7%	98
OHIO						
	75.4%		11.5%		15.8%	
1	74.7%	252	10.3%	201	17.4%	191
2	78.3%	314	9.4%	157	14.4%	124
3	74.8%	254	12.2%	284	16.4%	174
4	74.7%	253	11.7%	258	16.1%	165
5	81.4%	369	8.6%	126	12.3%	64
6	71.3%	189	14.6%	350	17.7%	199
7	75.8%	278	12.4%	293	15.1%	144

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
OHIO						
(continued)						
8	78.0%	311	10.4%	204	14.6%	131
9	73.4%	227	14.2%	343	15.6%	155
10	74.4%	247	12.1%	280	16.0%	162
11	66.0%	104	16.5%	387	20.3%	252
12	79.5%	343	8.2%	115	14.2%	115
13	75.6%	271	11.8%	266	15.6%	154
14	82.3%	383	7.8%	103	11.8%	49
15	78.8%	330	8.3%	122	14.9%	136
16	75.9%	279	10.8%	233	16.1%	168
17	72.1%	200	13.4%	320	17.3%	190
18	67.1%	123	16.7%	390	19.9%	244
OKLAHOMA						
	66.4%		10.7%		26.2%	
1	70.9%	182	9.0%	141	22.8%	296
2	54.6%	26	14.3%	345	34.8%	413
3	69.3%	159	10.1%	187	23.5%	307
4	72.0%	198	10.2%	195	21.8%	274
5	64.5%	88	10.1%	185	28.4%	388
OREGON						
	72.1%		9.7%		20.9%	
1	78.3%	315	7.7%	95	16.6%	181
2	67.0%	120	10.4%	209	25.3%	336
3	73.1%	217	9.0%	140	20.4%	255
4	68.0%	139	12.8%	303	22.3%	283
5	73.3%	222	8.8%	135	20.2%	250
PENNSYLVANIA						
	78.8%		11.7%		12.7%	
1	57.8%	40	23.7%	430	22.3%	282
2	69.8%	168	18.0%	405	16.9%	187
3	75.2%	261	15.3%	367	13.3%	90
4	82.6%	387	10.0%	180	10.5%	29
5	76.6%	286	13.8%	331	13.0%	76
6	86.4%	424	6.6%	48	9.3%	23
7	88.0%	434	5.4%	23	8.5%	17
8	87.0%	427	7.5%	87	8.1%	14
9	75.7%	273	13.3%	317	15.1%	142
10	76.9%	294	12.7%	300	13.6%	97
11	76.8%	292	12.5%	294	13.8%	106
12	72.3%	202	17.2%	398	14.6%	129
13	82.6%	389	8.8%	134	11.0%	35
14	74.2%	245	15.5%	370	13.7%	101
15	81.7%	373	9.0%	143	12.0%	50
16	78.9%	332	8.6%	129	14.7%	133
17	80.6%	354	10.6%	222	11.8%	47
18	84.9%	418	8.6%	128	9.2%	22
19	83.5%	405	8.3%	121	11.2%	39

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
RHODE ISLAND	76.6%		12.8%		14.2%	
1	75.7%	274	12.4%	290	14.8%	135
2	77.5%	302	13.2%	315	13.6%	94
SOUTH CAROLINA	68.5%		12.5%		22.7%	
1	69.9%	172	9.8%	172	24.3%	323
2	73.3%	221	10.2%	193	20.1%	249
3	68.8%	152	13.4%	321	21.2%	266
4	69.9%	170	11.9%	271	22.1%	281
5	66.5%	114	14.2%	341	22.8%	297
6	62.1%	64	16.4%	386	25.9%	351
SOUTH DAKOTA	78.3%		9.9%		15.5%	
1	78.3%	313	9.9%	175	15.5%	153
TENNESSEE	70.8%		13.7%		18.7%	
1	64.1%	80	17.1%	396	22.6%	293
2	75.9%	280	10.4%	206	16.1%	166
3	69.3%	160	14.8%	355	18.8%	225
4	65.3%	95	16.9%	394	21.3%	268
5	73.7%	233	11.0%	237	17.9%	202
6	73.4%	224	11.9%	273	17.5%	194
7	80.7%	361	9.5%	164	13.3%	85
8	67.4%	125	17.0%	395	19.2%	228
9	64.1%	82	16.2%	385	23.6%	309
TEXAS	63.6%		8.3%		30.4%	
1	63.1%	72	10.5%	217	29.3%	396
2	70.7%	180	7.3%	79	24.4%	324
3	69.9%	171	4.6%	12	26.8%	368
4	67.5%	128	9.0%	139	26.2%	359
5	64.2%	85	8.1%	113	30.0%	400
6	67.9%	134	7.1%	69	27.3%	374
7	77.6%	306	4.0%	7	19.7%	236
8	68.0%	138	8.1%	108	26.3%	360
9	48.9%	11	9.7%	169	43.0%	430
10	73.0%	212	5.7%	27	23.2%	302
11	63.1%	73	9.3%	153	30.1%	401
12	66.0%	105	7.7%	96	28.8%	392
13	66.8%	117	9.0%	144	26.9%	370
14	67.9%	135	6.5%	47	27.5%	377
15	43.8%	6	11.3%	248	46.5%	434
16	50.1%	13	10.7%	231	42.1%	429
17	68.8%	151	7.7%	98	25.9%	352
18	50.0%	12	10.6%	218	41.2%	428
19	67.0%	119	9.4%	159	26.0%	355
20	52.9%	22	15.1%	360	37.0%	419
21	77.3%	298	8.1%	111	18.5%	215
22	74.6%	249	4.9%	18	21.9%	277
23	60.4%	57	12.3%	285	30.8%	403

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

District	Insurance Status					
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured	
	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
TEXAS						
(continued)						
24	74.1%	242	5.1%	19	22.7%	294
25	65.6%	97	7.2%	77	29.1%	394
26	71.2%	187	6.1%	36	24.4%	325
27	52.0%	19	11.6%	252	38.8%	422
28	47.4%	9	10.2%	190	44.6%	432
29	39.1%	3	10.2%	194	51.8%	436
30	47.3%	8	10.7%	223	44.1%	431
31	75.0%	259	9.3%	152	19.8%	241
32	58.5%	42	5.1%	20	37.6%	420
UTAH						
	76.7%		6.6%		18.8%	
1	76.7%	291	7.2%	74	18.5%	217
2	76.7%	290	6.9%	63	18.4%	211
3	76.6%	288	5.8%	28	19.6%	233
VERMONT						
	73.3%		17.3%		12.5%	
	73.3%	223	17.3%	400	12.5%	67
VIRGINIA						
	79.4%		8.0%		15.6%	
1	84.5%	415	6.7%	54	12.3%	65
2	82.4%	385	6.8%	55	14.4%	123
3	68.4%	143	13.7%	328	21.8%	275
4	77.1%	296	9.7%	171	16.8%	183
5	75.0%	257	10.4%	210	17.9%	201
6	77.5%	303	9.4%	161	16.3%	172
7	83.3%	401	5.8%	29	13.2%	80
8	84.2%	414	4.2%	9	13.6%	96
9	69.3%	161	16.7%	389	18.6%	222
10	84.0%	410	3.4%	2	14.3%	120
11	84.6%	416	3.5%	3	14.0%	111
WASHINGTON						
	75.3%		10.8%		17.0%	
1	84.2%	413	5.6%	26	12.3%	61
2	75.5%	269	10.3%	200	17.5%	192
3	72.9%	211	12.7%	296	17.6%	198
4	64.1%	81	12.9%	306	26.3%	361
5	70.9%	181	15.2%	363	17.6%	197
6	67.7%	131	15.5%	369	21.1%	265
7	81.2%	368	7.6%	93	13.1%	77
8	83.5%	404	6.9%	61	11.8%	48
9	75.2%	262	11.3%	246	17.7%	200
WEST VIRGINIA						
	66.2%		16.0%		22.6%	
1	69.4%	164	13.4%	322	20.8%	259
2	68.3%	142	13.9%	333	22.5%	288
3	60.6%	58	21.0%	425	24.7%	330

Appendix Table C - Continued

Health Insurance by Congressional District: Rate and Rank for Private, Public, and Uninsurance, Nonelderly Adults, 2008.

	Insurance Status						
	Private Coverage		Public Coverage		Uninsured		
	District	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank	Rate	Rank
WISCONSIN		79.2%		11.5%		12.3%	
1		80.7%	360	10.6%	221	12.2%	58
2		82.9%	393	8.7%	132	10.8%	32
3		79.9%	348	10.2%	192	12.6%	71
4		63.5%	74	19.4%	415	19.6%	235
5		87.8%	432	7.1%	70	7.5%	11
6		82.1%	379	10.7%	229	10.7%	31
7		75.7%	277	14.2%	342	13.7%	99
8		79.3%	339	11.7%	254	12.1%	54
WYOMING		76.6%		9.1%		18.4%	
1		76.6%	287	9.1%	146	18.4%	212

Source: Urban Institute analysis of data from the American FactFinder, Tables B27001, B27002, and B27003, American Community Survey, 2008
 Note: Italicized rates indicate non-significant differences from the national mean at the .10 level.

Note: Public coverage is defined as having coverage from Medicare, Medicaid, or any government assistance plan for low-income or disabled individuals, and VA. Private coverage is defined as employer/union provided, direct purchases, and TRICARE/military. Health insurance coverage types are not mutually exclusive.

About the Authors and Acknowledgements

Genevieve Kenney and Stephen Zuckerman are senior fellows, Victoria Lynch is a research associate, and Samantha Phong is a research assistant at the Health Policy Center of the Urban Institute.

This research was supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The authors appreciate the helpful advice and suggestions of John Holahan, Brian Quinn, Andrew Hyman, Michael Davern, and Michel Boudreaux as well as the valuable map making provided by Adam Kent and research assistance of Jennifer Pelletier and Juliana Macri.

About the Urban Institute

The Urban Institute is a nonprofit, nonpartisan policy research and educational organization that examines the social, economic, and governance problems facing the nation.

About the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation focuses on the pressing health and health care issues facing our country. As the nation's largest philanthropy devoted exclusively to improving the health and health care of all Americans, the Foundation works with a diverse group of organizations and individuals to identify solutions and achieve comprehensive, meaningful, and timely change. For More than 35 years, the Foundation has brought experience, commitment, and a rigorous, balanced approach to the problems that affect the health and health care of those it serves. When it comes to helping Americans lead healthier lives and get the care they need, the Foundation expects to make a difference in your lifetime. For more information, visit www.rwjf.org.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to any campaign or to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, or the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders.